

CD-1: “Stride Towards Freedom” Dr. Martin Luther King, Feb. 15, 1962. And “The Future of Integration”, Dr. Martin Luther King, Feb, 14, 1962. (56 minutes)

Introduction by unidentified woman: President Bauer, I welcome all the guests today to Inter-American University and I welcome also the members of the university school. We are pleased to have you here with us. It is a great honor for me to introduce this speaker as part of our 50th anniversary celebration. We are trying to search together during this 50th anniversary within the theme “toward a world of understanding.” And our speaker today is in the best of tradition in this searching for a world of understanding. He’s in the tradition of that which has made United States great. And he follows in the tradition of one, if not the greatest, of the Presidents of the United States, Abraham Lincoln. He also follows in a worldwide tradition. And this is a tradition of our own century. Mohandas Gandhi. This speaker is a scholar, having the doctor of philosophy degree. He is recognized in many parts of this world. He is the president of several very important church organizations. He is the vice president of several important church organizations. He is a member and the president of the Montgomery Improvement Association, showing his civic responsibilities that he has been willing to assume. But more, and most important, and you young men and women here today are going to hear this, but you also are going to be able to feel this. This man is striving towards freedom. And this is a particular kind of freedom. This is the freedom that is the state of mind that considers all people and each person on the basis of his soul...and only his soul. This person is Dr. Martin Luther King. Doctor King....

Since this is the last time that I will make a public appearance on the campus I would like to say what a delightful experience it’s been for me to share with you these past two days. I can assure you that the hours that I spent here shall remain with me in my thoughts...you have extended the warm hand of fellowship and every courtesy...and I can certainly go away knowing that I have been among friends.

Victor Hugo said on one occasion that there is nothing more powerful in the world than an idea whose time has come, and the idea whose time has come today is the idea of freedom and human dignity. Wherever men are assembled today, whether they are in Johannesburg, South Africa, Nairobi, Kenya, Lagos, Nigeria, Accra, Ghana, New York City, Montgomery, Alabama, Jackson, Mississippi, the cry is always the same. We want to be free. And it is more than a solo voice today, it is a mighty chorus, crying out with amazing harmony, and because of this surge towards freedom, we see a new age developing, those of us who live in the 20th century are privileged to stand between two ages, the dying old, and the emerging new. In this sense it is a great time to be alive.

I know there are some people who would argue with me at this point. They would contend that the deep rumblings of discontent around the world and all of the tension which we witness in so many situations are indicative of the fact that we are going backwards, instead of forward. They would contend that we are retrogressing, instead of progressing. But far from representing retrogression and tragic meaninglessness, it may well be that the present tensions that we see in the world are indicative of the fact that a new age is coming into being. For it seems to be both historically and biologically true that there can be no birth and growth without birth and growing pains. An old order is passing away and the new order is coming into being.

We are all familiar with the old order that is passing away because we have seen it, and we have lived with it, and we have experienced it in all of its dimensions. We have seen the old order in its international dimensions in the form of colonialism and imperialism. Out of the of the two billion, seven or eight hundred million people in our world, the vast majority of these people live on two continents, Asia and Africa. Almost 700 million in China, about 500 million in India and Pakistan, about 100 million in Indonesia, 96 million in Japan, more than 220 million in Africa. And for years most of these people have been dominated politically, exploited economically, segregated and humiliated by some foreign power. But as Prime Minister MacMillan said a few months ago, the wind of change is blowing. And what a mighty wind it is. Thirty years ago there were only a few independent countries in the whole of Africa. The Union of South Africa, Liberia and Ethiopia. I remember when Mrs. King and I journeyed to what was then known as The Gold Coast, just a few years ago, to attend the independence celebration of the nation which became the nation of Ghana. And I remember at that time there were only seven independent countries in Africa. And we were happy about the fact that growth has taken place. But since that time more than 21 countries have come into being as independent nations in Africa. And with the recent birth of the nation of Tanganyika, there are now 29 independent countries in the continent of Africa. Just about 18 years ago, the British Empire had under its domination more than 700 million people in the world. And that number has been reduced now to 70 million. And so in a real sense the old order of colonialism is passing away and the new order of freedom and human dignity is coming into being. But not only have we seen the old order in its international dimensions, we have seen the old order in the United States of America. In the form of slavery and later racial segregation. We all know the long history of the old order in the United States. It had its beginning in 1619 when the first slaves landed on the shores of that nation... These slaves were brought to the United States from Africa. Unlike the Pilgrim fathers who landed at Plymouth

a year later, they were brought there against their will and throughout slavery the Negro was treated as a thing to be used, not a person to be respected.

With the growth of slavery it became necessary to give some justification for it. It seems to be a fact of life that human beings cannot continue to do wrong, without eventually reaching out for some sin rationalization, to clothe an obvious wrong in the beautiful garments of righteousness. And this is exactly what happened during the days of slavery. It was even argued from pulpits that the Negro was inferior by nature, because of Noah's curse upon the children of Ham. Then the Apostle Paul's dictum became a watchword. "Servants, be obedient to your master." Then one brother had probably read the Logic of Aristotle and you know Aristotle was the great Greek philosopher and he did a great deal to bring into being what we know as pharalomic. And he had something that is covered by the big word, the syllogism, which had a major premise, and minor premise, and then a conclusion. And so this brother had probably read Aristotle and he put his idea in the framework of an Aristotelian syllogism. He could say all men are made in the image of God, that was major premise, then came the minor premise, God as everybody knows is not a Negro, therefore, the Negro is not a man. This was the kind of reasoning that prevailed at that time. Living with the system of slavery, and then later segregation many Negroes lost faith in themselves and many came to feel that they were inferior. This is always the tragedy of any inhuman system. It not only inflicts physical inconveniences, but it does something to the soul. It damages the personality. And this is exactly what happened to millions of Negro people, as they confronted this system. But many things began to happen to cause the Negro to take a new look at himself. And Negro masses all over began to reevaluate themselves. And the Negro came to feel that he was somebody. And in a sense the tension which we witness in race relations today in the United States grows out of this new evaluation of himself on the part of the Negro. For he has come to feel a new sense of dignity, a new sense of destiny, and therefore has reached a new determination to struggle and sacrifice in order to be free. But something else happened to bring a gradual end to the old order in the States. The Supreme Court of the nation rendered a decision. In 1954, on May 17. Now in 1857 the Supreme Court of the Nation had rendered the Dred Scott decision which said in substance that the Negro had no rights that the white man was bound to respect. The Supreme Court of the Nation had rendered in 1896 the Plessy vs. Ferguson Decision, which established segregation as the law of the land. But then in 1954, the Supreme Court rendered a new decision, which said in substance the old Plessy doctrine must go. That separate facilities are inherently unequal, and that to segregate a child on the basis of his race is to deny that child equal protection of the law. And so as a result of this we see a new day emerging on the horizon. The old order of racial segregation is passing away and the new order of freedom and human dignity is coming into being. But whenever anything new develops in history it brings with it new challenges and new responsibilities. And I would like to mention some of the challenges that we face as we strive towards this City of Freedom, so to speak, some of the challenges that all of the people of the world face, and some of the challenges that those who have been on the oppressed end of the old order continue to face.

First I'd like to say that we are challenged to develop a world perspective. The world in which we live now is geographically one, and we must make this world one in a very creative and meaningful sense. Now it is true that the geographical oneness of our world has been brought into being to a large extent through man's scientific ingenuity. Man through his scientific genius has been able to dwarf distance and place time in chains. And our jet planes have compressed into minutes distances that once took days. One of the outstanding comedians in the United States is a man named Bob Hope. And he has described this new age in rather humorous terms. He said that it is an age in which it is possible to take a nonstop flight from Los Angeles, California to New York City, a distance of about 3500 miles, and if while taking off in Los Angeles, you develop hiccups, you will "hick" in Los Angeles and "cup" in New York City. (*laughter*). It is true because of the time distance to take a flight from Tokyo, Japan on Sunday morning and arrive in Seattle, Washington on the preceding Saturday night, and when your friends meet you at the airport and ask when you left Tokyo you will have to say "I left tomorrow." (*laughter*). That is the kind of world in which we live.

Well, this is a bit humorous. But I'm trying to laugh a basic fact into all of us. It is simply true that man, through his scientific genius has made all of the world into a neighborhood. And now through our moral and ethical commitment we must learn to live together as brothers, or we will all perish together as fools. No nation can live alone. No individual can live alone. We are interdependent.

Some months ago Mrs. King and I journeyed to that great country known as India. I never will forget the experience. The marvelous opportunity to meet and talk with the great leaders of India. And to meet and talk with people all over the villages and the cities of that vast country. These experiences will remain dear to me for years and years to come. But I say to you this morning there were also those depressing moments. How can one avoid being depressed when he sees with his own eyes millions of people going to bed hungry at night? How can one avoid being depressed when he see with his own eyes millions of people sleeping on the sidewalks at night? No beds to sleep in, no houses to go in. How can one avoid being depressed when he discovers that out of India's population of 400 million people more than 360 million make an annual income of less than 70 dollars a year? Most of these people have never seen a doctor or a dentist. And as I noticed these conditions something within me cried out; can we in the United States sit idly by and not be concerned? And the answer came "oh no." Because the destiny of the United States and the destiny of every other nation is tied up

with the destiny of India. And I started thinking about the fact that we spend more than a million dollars a day to store surplus food in our nation and I said to myself I know where we can store that food, free of charge, in the wrinkled stomachs of the people of Asia and Africa, and South America, and even in the United States, who go to bed hungry at night. Maybe we spend far too much of our national budget establishing military bases around the world, rather than bases of genuine concern and understanding. All I'm saying is simply this: that all life is interrelated. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly affects all indirectly. As long as there is extreme poverty in this world no man can be totally rich, even if he has a billion dollars. As long as diseases are rampant, and millions of people cannot expect to live more than 28 or 30 years, no one can be totally healthy, even if he or she just got a checkup in the finest clinic of the world. For some strange reason, I can never be what I ought to be until you are what you ought to be. And you can never be what you ought to be until I am what I ought to be. This is the interrelated structure of reality. John Donne caught it some years ago and placed it in graphic terms. "No man is an island entire of itself. Every man is a piece of the continent. A part of the main." Then he goes on to say "Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind." I think this is the first challenge of the New Age.

The second thing I would like to mention is this. As we move toward the day of freedom all over the world men must get rid of the notion once and for all that there are superior and inferior races. Somehow this idea still lingers around. There are those who still feel that there are superior and inferior races and usually they think of the white race as being the superior race and the darker races as being the inferior. But there is no truth in this. The anthropological sciences have pointed out over and over again that there are four types of blood and these types of blood are found in all racial groups. They said over and over again that there may be superior or inferior individuals academically and intellectually within all races. But there are no superior races and there are no inferior races. And the time has come that men all over will get rid of this notion.

Now I've said earlier there was a time that people used to argue about the inferiority of racial groups on the basis of religion, The Bible. But they've gotten away from that in many instances; they do it on subtle sociological and cultural grounds. I know in the United States we hear the argument so often: "the Negro is not ready for cultural integration." And if you integrate the schools and other things the Negro will pull the white race back a generation. And the Negro has criminal tendencies. Look at the crime rate. And the people who protect this argument fail to see that these things are environmental, and not racial. They fail to see that poverty and ignorance, these breed crime whatever the racial group may be. And it is a torturous logic, to use the tragic results of racial discrimination as an argument for the continuation of it. The thing to do is to get rid of the cause. And I think over and over again it has been proven that individuals of minority groups can, even in the midst of their oppression, rise up and make creative contributions which reveal that there is no truth in the idea of inferiority. And I could name, even in the United States, many Negroes who even though living amid the dark night of oppression have risen up to plunge against cloud-filled nights of affliction new and blazing stars of inspiration. And so from an old slave cabin in Virginia, Booker T. Washington rose to become one of America's great leaders. He lit a torch in Alabama and darkness fled. From the red hills of Gordon County, Georgia and on to the mother who could neither read nor write, Roland Hayes rose up to become one of the world's great singers and carried his melodious voice into the palace of King George the Fifth and the mansion of Queen Mother of Spain. From poverty stricken conditions in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Marian Anderson rose up to become the world's greatest contralto, so that Toscanini could say "a voice like this comes only once in a century." From crippling circumstances, George Washington Carver rose up and carved for himself an imperishable niche in the annals of science. There was star in the diplomatic sky. And then came Ralph Bunche, the grandson of a slave preacher, and allowed it shine in his light with all of its radiance. And these are but few of the examples of Negroes in the United States, and I could name Negroes and members of other minority groups all over the world who have revealed that there is no truth in the idea of racial inferiority. And so all over the world men must get rid of the notion once and for all that there are superior and inferior races.

There is another thing that I would like to mention that is very closely connected to the first point. That is we must be sure that we keep our moral progress abreast with our scientific progress. One of the great problems in the world today is the fact that there is that cultural lag. We have allowed our civilization to outdistance our culture. How much of our modern life can be described by that true dictum of the poor Thoreau: "Improved means to an unimproved end." So often we have allowed the material means by which we live to outdistance the spiritual end for which we live. We our mentality to outrun our morality. We have allowed our technology to outrun our theology. And if we are not careful we will end up with guided missiles and misguided men. And that is a necessity now, more than ever before, to keep the means, rather than ends, for which we live, abreast with the means by which we live.

Another point that I would like to mention is that men everywhere must go into the new age with understanding, creative redemptive goodwill in their hearts. This is true for everybody. This is true for those who have been the oppressors in the old system; every white person in the world must examine his or her soul to be sure that every vestige of white supremacy has been removed, to be sure that every vestige of prejudice has been removed, and every white person must go into the new age with a sense of penitence, a sense of genuine goodwill.

As I have said so often, I have said over and over again, that those who have been on the oppressed end of the old order must also go into the new age with understanding and goodwill. And this is why I say all over the United States and anywhere else that I get a chance, that those of us who have been oppressed must not enter the new age with bitterness in our hearts, and with a desire to retaliate, or to pay those back who have exploited us across the years. Because if this happens the new age which is emerging will be nothing but a duplicate of the old age. Somebody must have sense in this world. Somebody must have sense enough to meet hate with love. Somebody must have sense enough and be religious enough to meet physical force with soul force. That is why I believe so firmly in non-violence. And I am convinced that if the Negro succumbs to the temptation of using violence in his struggle this will bring a dark night of bitterness into being.

And so I say that we must work passionately and unrelentingly for first-class citizenship, but we must never use second-class methods to gain it. And I know the temptation that comes to those of us who have been exploited so long. Those of us who have been trampled over by the iron feet of oppression. Those of us who have seen the viciousness of lynching mobs with our own eyes. Those of us who have faced economic exploitation, there is a temptation to enter the new age with bitterness in our hearts. But I say again, that if this happens we will be turning the same thing that once existed around again. And so we must not seek to rise from a position of disadvantage to one of advantage, thus subverting justice. We must not seek to substitute one tyranny for another. This is why I contend that Black Supremacy is as dangerous as White Supremacy. For God is not interested merely in the freedom of black men, and brown men, and yellow men; God is interested in the freedom of the whole human race, and the creation of a society where all men will live together as brothers. And I believe that by living this philosophy, by using every resource of energy that we can develop to pare down the old order, but at the same time maintaining an attitude of love, and refusing to use violence, we will be able to bring into being this new day, and it will be a great and marvelous day when all of God's children will be able to live together as brothers. And so, to paraphrase the words of John Oxenham, the high nation climbs the high way and the low nation gropes the low, and in between the rest drift to and fro, but every nation decides which way its soul shall go.

God granted every nation to choose the high way, a way in which men will be able to live together as brothers. A way in which the nations of the world will beat their swords into plowshares. And their spears into pruning hook. And nations will not study war anymore. A way in which every man will respect the dignity and the worth of human personality. A way in which every man will realize that every other man is a child of the almighty God, made in the image of God. If we will but follow this way we will be able to emerge from the bleak and desolate midnight of man's inhumanity to man into the bright and glittering daybreak of freedom and justice. And we must do this immediately, all over the world; may men begin to make the decision not next week, not next year, not even tomorrow, but at this minute.

Somewhere I read a little poem which went something like this. A tiny little minute. Just sixty seconds. And I didn't choose it, I can't refuse it. It's up to me to use it. A tiny little minute, just sixty seconds in it, but eternity, eternity, eternity is in it. And God grant that we will use the moment creatively in order to make brotherhood a reality all over the world. May we pray. The Lord blesses thee and keeps thee. The Lord makes His face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee. The Lord lifts up the light of His countenance. unto thee. And be with thee in thy going out and coming in. In thy rising up and in thy lying down. In thy moments of joy and thy moments of sorrow. Until the day when there shall be no sunset and no dawning. Amen.

Part of a second speech by Dr. King on CD-1

President Bauer, members of the faculty, and members of the student body in Inter-American University, ladies and gentlemen...I am delighted to be here on this lovely, beautiful campus. I want to express my personal appreciation to the President of this institution, to Doctor Fulton, and others for extending the invitation. I have looked forward to being here with great and eager anticipation. And I can assure you that it is a real privilege for me, and I look forward to the few hours that I will spend on this campus.

I would like to discuss with you this morning the whole question of race relations and the question of progress of race relations in the United States. In dealing with all of this under the title: The Future of Integration.

There are three basic attitudes that one can take toward the question of progress in the area of race relations. The first attitude that can be taken is that of extreme optimism. The extreme optimist would contend that we have made marvelous strides in race relations in the United States over the last few years. And from this he would conclude that the problem is just about solved now. And that we can sit down comfortably by the wayside and await the coming of the inevitable.

The second attitude that can be taken is that of extreme pessimism. The extreme pessimist would contend that we have made only minor strides in the area of race relations. He would contend that the deep rumblings of discontent all over the United States, the presence of Federal troops in a city like Little Rock, Arkansas, the resurgence of the Ku Klux Klan, and the birth of White Citizens Councils are all indicative of the fact that we are going backwards instead of forward. And that

we have created many more problems than we have solved. And so from all of this, the extreme pessimist would conclude that there can be no real progress in the area of race relations.

It is interesting to notice that the extreme pessimist and the extreme optimist agree on at least one point. They both feel that we must sit down and do nothing in the area of race relations. The extreme optimist: do nothing because racial integration is inevitable. The extreme pessimist: do nothing because integration is impossible.

But there is a third position that can be taken. Namely, the realistic position. The realist in the area of race relations seeks to combine the two opposites, while avoiding the extremes of both. And so the realist would agree with the optimist that we have come a long, long way, but he would seek to balance this by agreeing with the pessimist, that we have a long, long way to go before integration is a reality in the United States of America.

And so I would like to use this realistic position as a basis for our thinking together as I discuss with you the future of integration, and the progress that has been made in the United States in grappling with this difficult problem.

First, let me say that we have come a long, long way... Now in order to illustrate this a little history is necessary. It was in the year 1619 when the first Negro slaves landed on the shores of the United States. They were brought there from the shores of Africa. And unlike the Pilgrim fathers who landed a year later, they were brought there against their will.

Throughout slavery the Negro was treated in a very inhuman fashion. He was a thing to be used, not a person to be respected. He was merely a depersonalized cog in a vast plantation machine. The Supreme Court of the nation rendered a decision in 1857 which gave legal and constitutional validity to the whole system of slavery. And that decision, known as the Dred Scott Decision, said in substance that the Negro was not a citizen of the United States, he was merely property, subject to the dictates of his owner. This was the attitude that prevailed throughout the days of slavery. Living with the conditions of slavery and then later segregation, many Negroes lost faith in themselves. Many came to feel that perhaps they were less than human, perhaps they were inferior. But then something happened to the Negro. Circumstances made it possible and necessary for him to travel more. The coming of the automobile. The upheavals of two world wars. The great Depression. And so his rural plantation background gradually gave way to urban industrial life. His economic life was gradually rising through the growth of industry. The influence of organized labor, expanded education opportunities, and other forces. And even his cultural life was rising through the steady decline of crippling illiteracy. All of these forces conjoined to cause the Negro to take a new look at himself. Negro masses all over began to reevaluate themselves. And the Negro came to feel that he was somebody. His religion revealed to him that God loves all of His children, and that all men are made in His image, and that in the final analysis the important thing about a man is not determined by... the texture of his hair or color of his skin but his eternal dignity and his eternal worth to God. And so the Negro can now unconsciously cry out with eloquent force ... black complexion cannot forfeit nature's claims. Skin may differ but affection dwells in black and white the same... I must be measured by my soul. The mind is the standard of the man. With this new sense of dignity and this new sense of destiny a new Negro came into being with a new determination. To struggle, and to suffer and sacrifice in order to be free. And so in a real sense we have come a long, long way from 1619, but if I am to be true to the facts I must also say to you that the United States has come a long way in extending the frontiers of civil rights. Fifty years ago a year hardly passed that numerous Negroes were not brutally lynched by some vicious mob. I can say that lynchings have about ceased in the United States today. Fifty years ago, or twenty five years ago, most of the states in the south sought to prevent the Negro from being a registered voter through many conniving methods and through the poll tax. But the poll tax has now been eliminated in all but four states. The turn of the century there were very few Negroes registered voters in the south. But even in this area we've come a long way. Certainly we have a long way to go, but strides have been made. By 1948, the number had leaped to 750,000 Negro voters registered in the south, and today it stands at 1 million, 300,000. And so this reveals that strides have been made in that area.

In the area of economic justice, there has been some progress. The average Negro wage earner in the United States today makes ten times more than the average Negro wage earner of 12 years ago. And the national income of the Negro is now \$26 billion a year. This is more than all of the exports of the United States, and the national income of Canada. This reveals that we have come a long, long way.

And probably more than anything else, we have gradually noticed that the walls of segregation are crumbling. It was in the year 1896 that the Supreme Court of the nation rendered a decision known as the Plessy vs. Ferguson Decision. And this decision established a doctrine of separate but equal as the law of the United States. It was the law of the land. And this ended up placing strict enforcement under "separate." Without the slightest intention to abide by the "equal." But things began to happen in the nation and so in 1954, on May 17, the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a new decision. This decision said in substance that the old Plessy Doctrine must go, that separate facilities are inherently unequal, and that to segregate a child on the basis of his race is to deny that child equal protection of the law. Now when this decision was rendered 17 states and the District of Columbia practiced absolute segregation in the public schools. But I can say today that most of these states have now made some moves toward integrating their schools....
(end of CD1)

CD2: Continuation from CD1. February 14, 1962. (32 minutes)

It was in 1896 that the Supreme Court of the nation rendered a decision known as the Plessy vs. Ferguson Decision. The decision established a doctrine of separate but equal as the law of the United States. This was the law of the land. And this Plessy doctrine ended up placing strict enforcement on the “separate”, without the slightest intention to abide by the “equal.” But things begin to happen in the nation, and so in 1954, May 17, the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a new decision. This decision said in substance that the old Plessy Doctrine must go, that separate facilities are inherently unequal, and that to segregate a child on the basis of his race is to deny that child equal protection of the law. Now when this decision was rendered 17 states in the United States and the District of Columbia practiced absolute segregation in the public schools, but I can say today that most of these states have now made some moves towards integrating their schools. Now many of them have only made token moves, but they’ve made some moves. Fourteen states and the District of Columbia have made some moves towards integrating the schools since the 1954 decision. And only three states now stand out with all-out resistance. The state of South Carolina, the state of Alabama, and the great sovereign state of Mississippi that I’m sure you’re familiar with. But all of the other states have made some moves towards integration. So to put it figuratively and in Biblical language, we’ve broken loose from the Egypt of slavery and we have moved to the wilderness of segregation, and now we stand on the border of The Promise Land of integration. We have come a long, long way since 1896 when the Supreme Court of the United States declared that segregation was the law of the land.

Now this would be a marvelous place for me to stop. First it would mean making a short speech. This would be magnificent accomplishment for a Baptist preacher. But second it would mean that the problem is solved in the United States, and one could maybe say the problem is solved all over the world, and it would mean that we could sit down and be content. It would be a marvelous thing if every speaker who came to you would be able to say that the problem is solved. But if I stop at this point I will merely be stating a fact and not telling the truth. You see a fact is merely the absence of contradiction. But truth is the presence of coherence. Truth is the relatedness of facts. Now it is a fact that we have come a long, long way, but it isn’t the truth. In order to tell the truth we must add the other part and say we have a long, long way to go. And if I stop at this point I’m afraid I will leave you the victims of a dangerous optimism. If I stop at this point I will leave you the victims of an illusion, wrapped in superficiality. So in order to tell the truth it is necessary to move on, and say not only have we come a long, long way, but we have a long, long way to go before the problem is solved.

Now we don’t have to look very far to see this. You can open your newspapers here in Puerto Rico. You can look at your televisions. And you can hear certain things, and you can read certain things to remind you that there is a great deal to be done before justice is a reality in the United States of America. We know for instance that there are still states in the South resisting the Supreme Court’s decision with all of the energy that can be mustered. We know that the legislative halls of many Southern states ring loud with big words as interposition and nullification. And there are organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan, and the White Citizens Councils which will do anything to preserve racial segregation. And at points they will even use physical violence to preserve segregation. This reveals that we have a long, long way to go.

Now I mentioned that we’ve made real strides in voting, and registration, but I must also remind you that in this area as we think of the future of integration there is a great deal to be done before justice is a reality for Negro people, and I might say other minority groups in some sections of our country. There are approximately 5 million Negroes who are eligible to vote in the South. And yet there are only 1 million, 300 thousand of them registered. Now many of these people are not registered, and many of them are not voting because they confront reprisals. Many of them are not registered and many of them are not voting because they confront all kinds of conniving methods being used to keep them from voting. Complex literacy tests. And other things that are always at work to keep the Negro from being a citizen in terms of registering and voting. And so there is a great deal that can be done, that must be done, in this area, if justice is to be a reality.

I mentioned the fact that some strides have been made in economic justice. But even here there is a great deal to do before the Negro and certain other minority groups can face real justice in the economic realm. Forty-three percent of the Negro families in the United States still earn less than \$2,000 a year, while just 17% of the white families earn less than \$2,000 a year. Twenty-one percent of the Negro families of the United States earn less than \$1,000 a year, while just 5% of the white families of the United States earn less than \$1,000 a year. Eighty-eight percent of the Negro families of the United States earn less than \$5,000 a year, while just 58% of the white families of the United States earn less than \$5,000 a year. And so this reveals that we have a long, long way to go before economic justice is a reality in the United States.

And I must also say that there is a great deal that must be done before segregation, before all the barriers of segregation are finally broken down.

I mentioned that figuratively speaking that Old Man Segregation is on his death bed. But history that proven that social systems have a great last-minute breathing power. And the guardians of the status quo are always on hand with their oxygen tents to keep the old order alive. And so segregation is still with us. We still confront it in the South in its glaring and conspicuous form. We still confront it in the North, where Negroes and Puerto Ricans and other minority groups are

concerned, and it's hidden in several forms. There are those who have come to see now that if democracy is to live, segregation must die. For segregation is a cancer in the body politic, which must be removed before our democratic and Christian health can be realized. We don't have long to solve this problem. And this is what I have tried to say, and this what many others are saying all over the nation. We don't have long to solve it.

Now there are those who are saying to those of us who are in the struggle for racial justice "slow up for a while, you're pushing things too fast." They are saying that a policy of moderation...well, if moderation means moving forward towards the goal of justice with wise restraint and calm reasonableness then moderation is a great virtue which all men of goodwill must seek to achieve during this tense period of transition. But if moderation means slowing up in the move for justice, and capitulating to the undemocratic practices of the deadening status quo, then moderation is a tragic vice which all men of goodwill must condemn. The fact is that we can't afford to slow up. We have our self-respect to maintain. But even more than that because of our love for America, because of our love for democracy, we can't afford to slow up. We know that there are approximately two billion 700 million people in this world, and the vast majority of these people live in Asia and Africa. And for years they have been dominated politically, exploited economically, segregated and humiliated by some foreign power. But today many of these countries are receiving their independence, and they are saying in no uncertain terms that racism and colonialism must go. They are saying in no uncertain terms that they will have no respect for any nation that will subject a segment of its citizenry on the basis of race and color. And in a real sense the hour is late. The clock of destiny is ticking out. And the United States must act now before it is too late. The shape of the world today does not afford us the luxury anemic democracy.

Now I must hasten to say that I'm convinced we must not seek to solve the problem merely to meet the Communist challenge. We must not seek to solve the problem merely to appeal to Asian and African peoples as important as this is. But in the final analysis, racial discrimination must be uprooted from American society because it is morally wrong. It must be uprooted from American society because it against all of the noble precepts of our Judeo-Christian heritage. Racial discrimination is wrong because it substitutes an I-if relationship for the I-thou relationship. And relegates persons to the status of things. And so this problem must be solved not merely because it is diplomatically expedient, but because it is morally compelling.

Now many forces in the United States will have to work together in order to solve this problem, and in order to carry us this additional distance in the future, and make the American Dream a reality. Certainly there must be leadership from the Federal Government. If the problem is to be solved, all branches of the Federal Government, the legislative, the judicial, and the executive branch must stand out and do something about solving the problem. Now this means that we must get rid of two myths that often circulate around the states.

One is what I call the myth of time. There are those people who say that only time can solve the problem of racial injustice. They contend that legislative action, judicial decrees, and executive orders can do nothing about solving the problem. Well, for those who argue this, I would say that time is neutral, and it can use constructively or destructively. And at points people of ill will have used time much more effectively than people of good will. And it may well be that we will have to repent, not only for the loud and vitriolic words of the bad people, but for the appalling silence of the good people. The fact is that human progress never rolls in on the wheels of inevitability. It comes through the tireless efforts and the persistent work of dedicated individuals who are willing to be coworkers with God. And without this hard work, time itself becomes the ally of the primitive forces of social stagnation. And so we must help time, and realize that the time is always right to do Right.

There is another myth that circulates, the myth of educational determinism. I call it this for lack of a better phrase. This is the idea that only education can solve the problem of racial injustice in the United States or any other part of the world. It must be done through the slow process of education, which will change the mind. These other things can't do it. While I certainly believe that education is important in any period of history, but I think it is "both and", and not "either or"...it is both education and legislation. It is necessary to work on both fronts. It may be true that morality cannot be legislated, but behavior can be regulated. It may be true that the law cannot make a man love me, but it can keep him from lynching me. It thinks that's pretty important also. It may be true that the law cannot change the heart, but it can restrain the heartless. And this is what we often seek to do through legislation. In the final analysis, religion and education must change bad internal attitudes, but legislation can control the external effects of bad internal attitudes. And so I say it is very important for the Federal Government to see the necessity of proper civil rights legislation, so that every citizen in the nation can be assured of the right to vote, and all the other rights on an equal basis. It is necessary for Executive Orders and Judicial Decrees.

I think the time has come for the President of the United States, for instance, to issue an Executive Order outlawing all segregation, on the basis of the 14th Amendment of the Constitution. The first Executive Order that came from a President in this area was called The Emancipation Proclamation. This was issued by Abraham Lincoln. And this Executive Order brought an end to physical slavery. But I contend that there is a need for a second Emancipation Proclamation, which will bring an end to another kind of slavery. Because segregation is nothing but slavery covered up

with certain niceties of complexity. And the time has come for an Executive Order to end all segregation on the basis of the 14th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

I was in Washington a few weeks ago, and spent an hour of dinner with President Kennedy talking about some of these problems. I discussed with him the need for this Executive Order and after we ended our conversation and finished dinner, President and Mrs. Kennedy said "I'd like to show you around the White House. I'm sure there are some interesting things you'd like to see." And we started walking around that beautiful White House...and we came to a room and Mrs. Kennedy said "I'm sure you would like to see this room." And we walked in. It was The Lincoln Room. And it was a marvelous experience to stand in the room of The Great Emancipator. It was a great experience to see the bed where Abraham Lincoln slept. And to see the desk where Abraham Lincoln wrote. And then I walked over and looked at the mantel piece and there was a statement written there which said "In this room, Abraham Lincoln signed The Emancipation Proclamation." And at that time I looked at President Kennedy and said in a rather humorous vein "Mister President I would like to see you come back in this same room and sign the Second Emancipation Proclamation." (laughter) I think the hour has come in all seriousness for a Second Emancipation Proclamation in our country. There is need for strong leadership from the Federal Government.

There are many other things that I could mention. I could mention the need for more vigorous leadership and a greater moral witness from the church. I am ashamed to say, and yet I must say that when we stand on Sunday morning to sing in Christ there is no East or West. We stand in the most segregated aisle of a Christian America. The most segregated school of the week is the Sunday school. In the church we've had a high blood pressure of creeds and an anemia of deeds. Thank God we're beginning to shake the lethargy from our souls and many are coming to see here and there. But if we are to be true to our witness and if we are to be true to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, it is necessary to take a stand on this issue, because it is, at bottom, a moral issue. It is not merely a political or an economic issue. In the final analysis it is a moral issue. And there is still need for someone to stand up and make this clear all over the nation.

But in the final analysis, if this problem is to be solved, the people who are the victims of oppression must stand up with determination against the system. All over the South of the United States and all over the nation the Negro and all other groups that are oppressed must stand up against the system of segregation and racial discrimination.

There are three ways that oppressed people can deal with that oppression. One way is to just accept the oppression, to acquiesce, to surrender. And often people do this. They give up in the process. They feel it is too difficult to grapple with. And they find themselves becoming adjusted to the system of oppression. I remember when I was coming up in Atlanta as a boy I used to hear a man playing a guitar and he would sing certain songs, and one day I heard him sing a little song which went something like this: "Been down so long that down don't bother me." Now that often happens. That people adjust down to down-ness. This brother had achieved a freedom of exhaustion. He had adjusted to being down. But this isn't the way, because non-cooperation with evil is as much a moral obligation as is cooperation with good. So that this isn't the way.

There is another method that has often been used in history. And that is the method of physical violence and corroding hatred. And there have been those individuals who thought that this is the only way. But I am convinced that the method of violence creates many more social problems than it solves. I know that often nations have received their independence through violence, and I know that violence has often brought about temporary victory. But I contend that it can never bring about permanent peace. It ends up creating many more problems than it solves. And this I contend that if the Negro and other oppressed people succumb to the temptation of using violence in their struggle, unborn generations will be the recipients of a long and desolate night of bitterness. And our chief legacy to the future will be an endless rain of meaningless chaos.

But there is another way. Namely, the way of nonviolent resistance. It is possible for an individual or a group to stand up with zeal, to stand up with courage. To stand up with determination against an unjust system. And yet not use violence and hatred in the process. And this method has worked; it worked in a magnificent way in India. Mahandas K. Gandhi used it to free his people from the condition that they confronted as a result of many, many years of colonialism. And he struggled only with the weapons of non-injury, soul force, moral principles, and courage.

This method has been used in our country in the United States in the student movement which you've read about. These students have taken on passionate yearnings for freedom, and filtered them in their own souls, and fashioned them into a creative protest which is an epic known all over our nation. For all of these months they have moved in a uniquely meaningful orbit, imparting light and heat to distant satellites. And as a result of their non-violent discipline, their courageous actions, they have been able to bring about integration at lunch counters in more than 150 cities of the South, and I say that this is nothing less than revolutionary. This is a powerful method, and I believe it is a method that can be used in a creative way to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful brotherhood.

And so I move on toward my conclusion by saying, we've come a long, long way, and we have a long, long way to go. And we will only go this additional distance when enough people become so aroused that they are willing to rise up and work passionately and unrelentingly for brotherhood and for the creation of the beloved community.

You know there are certain technical words in every academic discipline that soon become stereotypes and clichés. Every academic discipline has its technical vocabulary. Modern psychology has a word that is probably used more than any other word in modern psychology. It is the word *maladjusted*. You have heard that word over and over again. This word is a ringing crown of modern child psychology. *Maladjusted*. And certainly we all want to live a well adjusted life, in order to avoid neurotic and schizophrenic personalities. But I say to you this morning that there are some things happening in the world to which I'm proud to be *maladjusted*. And I say that all men of good will should be *maladjusted* to these things until the good societies realize I never intend to adjust myself to segregation and discrimination. I never intend to become adjusted to religious bigotry. I never intend to adjust myself to economic conditions that will take necessities from the many to give luxuries to the few I never intend to become adjusted to the madness of militarism and the self-defeating effects of physical violence. But in a day when Sputniks and Explorers are dashing through outer space, and guided ballistic missiles are carving highways of death through the stratosphere, no nation can win a war. It is no longer a choice between violence and non-violence. It is either non-violence or non-existence. The alternative to disarmament, the alternative to suspension of nuclear tests, the alternative to strengthening the United Nations and thereby disarming the whole world may well be a civilization plunged into the abyss of annihilation. And so I never intend to become adjusted to the madness of militarism. It may well be that the salvation of our world lies in the hands of the *maladjusted*. And so if you will allow the preacher in me to come out, may I say to you let us be *maladjusted*, as *maladjusted* as the Prophet Amos, who in the midst of the injustices of his day could cry out in words that echo across the centuries "Let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness like a mighty stream." As *maladjusted* as Abraham Lincoln, who had the vision to see the United States could not exist and survive half-slave and half-free. As *maladjusted* as Thomas Jefferson, who could cry out in words lifted to cosmic proportion, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. That among these is life, liberty and the pursuit happiness." As *maladjusted* as Jesus of Nazareth, who could say to the men and women of his generation: "Love your enemies; bless them that curse you. Pray for them that spitefully use you."

I am convinced that through such *maladjustment* we will be able to emerge from the bleak and desolate midnight of man's inhumanity to man into the bright and glittering daybreak of freedom and justice. And this will be a great day. This will be a day when men all over the world will be able to join hands, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, Muslims and Hindus, able to sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual "free at last, free at last, thank God Almighty, we are free at last."

(Applause!)

CD 3: "Non-Violence & Racial Justice" Dr. Martin Luther King, Plus Question & Answer Period (62 minutes)

Male voice: On behalf of Inter-American University and the Fellowship of Reconciliation, I'm very pleased to welcome you this evening. It is an honor to have Doctor King in our presence. He gave us an address this morning of tremendous depth and power. This was the power of a very great ideal. It is a simple ideal, as all great ideals are simple. The ideal of the brotherhood of all men. The dignity of all men. Regardless of race, wealth, culture or station. Doctor King is a living example of this ideal in action. Doctor King is a Christian Minister. He is a scholar, the author of several books. He is recognized as one of the outstanding personalities of this time. And this is the result of his dedication to the cause of human brotherhood. In the tradition of Mahatma Gandhi, and in the manner of Christ. He will speak on non-violence and racial justice. Doctor King.

(Applause). Thank you very kindly. Let me say once more how very delighted I am to be here on this campus and to have the privilege of sharing with you these few hours. I have looked forward with great anticipation to the hour and the minute that I would be here in Puerto Rico and that I would be on the campus of Inter-American University, and I can assure you that it is a great privilege and pleasure for me to be with you.

There can be no gainsaying of the fact that we face a crisis in race relations in the United States and all over the world. Professor Sorokin of Harvard University wrote a book some years ago entitled "The Crisis of Hour Age." He says that a crisis develops in a society when an old idea exhausts itself and society seeks to re-orientate itself around the new idea. And I think the same thing is true in any society or in any civilization. And so in a sense the crisis which we witness in race relations today grows out of the fact that an old idea has exhausted itself and society is seeking to re-orientate itself around the new idea. In the United States the crisis has been precipitated on the one hand by the determined resistance of reactionary forces to the Supreme Court decision of 1954, outlawing segregation in the public schools. This resistance has risen to ominous proportions. We see it in White Citizens Councils. We see it in the Ku Klux Klan. We see it in other movements seeking to resist the Supreme Court decision. But beyond that, the crisis grows out of the fact that the old idea

of segregation, the old idea of paternalism, has exhausted itself, and American society is seeking to re-orientate itself around the idea of integration, or true inter-group, inter-personal living.

On a larger scale we see a crisis in the world because the old idea of colonialism has exhausted itself, and the civilization is seeking to re-orientate itself around the idea of freedom and human dignity.

Now, it seems to be a fact of history that once suppressed people rise up against an oppression there is no stopping point short of full freedom. On the other hand it is sociologically and historically true that privileged groups never give up their privileges without strong resistance. And they never do it voluntarily. So that realism impels us to admit that the struggle for racial justice will continue, and the real question is: how will the struggle be waged.

As I said this morning there are at least three ways that oppressed people can grapple with the problem of oppression. I mentioned the way of adjusting, the way of surrendering, and there are those who seek to deal with the problem of oppression by acquiescing. I mentioned also the way of physical violence, and corroding hatred.

But I also mentioned a third way, namely the way of non-violence. And this evening I would like to discuss with you the meaning of the philosophy of non-violence. As we confront the crisis of race relations, or as we seek to make racial justice a reality. As you know we have been engaged in a struggle in the United States to break down the barriers of segregation and discrimination. But this movement has had an underlying philosophy. And this philosophy is the philosophy of non-violent resistance. And it is this that I...the basic precept of non-violence.

First, the philosophy of non-violence contends that means and ends must cohere. In other words, in any struggle the means must be as pure as the ends. And I think this is the first and basic point in the whole philosophy of non-violence. And so that the non-violent resister does not seek to live with the idea that the end justifies the means. There has been long discussion philosophically and theologically over means and ends. And there have been those individuals in history, from Machiavelli on down, who argue that the end justified the means. Sometimes systems of government come into being with this same argument. But this is where non-violent resistance would break within any system that argues that the end justifies the means, if these means are demoralizing, and if these means are immoral. So the philosophy of non-violence would say that in the long run of history immoral means cannot be about moral ends because the end is pre-existent in the means. And somehow the means represent the ideal in the making, and the end in process. So that this method is a way to achieve moral ends through moral means. This I think is the first and basic point in any philosophy of non-violence.

A second point in this philosophy is to consistently refuse to inflict injury on another. Now this has two sides. This idea of non-injury first has an external side. You refuse to inflict physical violence on the opponent. And in many of our movements as we set out whether they pick the form of sit-ins, or stand-ins, or the bus boycott, there is always the synthesis that if you are hit, you do not hit back, that if you are the victim of violence you do not return violence. And this has been the emphasis throughout in this movement, that the individuals involved avoid external physical violence.

But there's also an internal side to this idea of non-injury. In a non-violent movement, you not only refuse to shoot the opponent, you refuse to hate the opponent. You avoid not only external physical violence, but also internal violence of spirit.

Not all people ask me all along what in the world do you mean when you talk about love as being a part of the movement. How can you love those people who are oppressing you, and those people who are trampling over you with the iron feet of exploitation. What do you mean? How can you do this?

Well let me hasten to say that when I speak of love in this movement I am not speaking of an emotional sentimental outpouring. I'm thinking of something much deeper. Fortunately the Greek language comes to our aid when we seek to define the meaning of love in this context. There are three words in the Greek language for "love". One is the word "Eros". And "Eros" is a sort of aesthetic love. Plato talked about it a great deal in his Dialogue, the yearning in the soul for the real of the divine. It has come to us to be a sort of romantic love and in this sense we have all experienced "Eros", we've read about it in the beauties of literature. In a sense Edgar Allan Poe was talking about "Eros" when he talked about his beautiful Annabelle Lee, with the love surrounded by the halo of eternity. In a sense Shakespeare was speaking of "Eros" when he said "love is not alters which alters when its alteration finds, or bends with the remover to remove. It is an ever fixed mark that looks on tempests and is never shaken. It is a star to every wandering bard." You know I can remember that because I used to quote it to my wife when we were courting. (*laughter*).

The Greek language also talks about "Philip", which is another love in a sense. It is a reciprocal love. It is intimate affection between personal friends. On this level, you love those persons that you like. It may be a roommate or some of the people you get along with, the people that you eat dinner with. This is friendship.

Then the Greek language comes out with another word, calls it a "Agape." This is more than a romantic love. "Agape" is more than friendship. "Agape" is understanding creative, redemptive good will for all men. It is the spontaneous overflowing love that seeks nothing in return. Theologians would say that it is the love of God operating in the human heart.

And so when one rises to love on this level, he loves everybody, not merely because he likes them, but he loves every individuals because God loves them, and he rises to the point of loving the person who does the evil deed, while

hating the deed that the person does. And I believe firmly that this is the kind of love that can guide us through this period of transition. It is if understanding creative, redemptive good will for all men that can transform the social situation.

This is why we say in our movement so often that I must be to defeat or humiliate the white man, but to win his friendship and understanding. This is why I said over and over again when I lived in Alabama that the tension in this community is not tension between Negroes and white people, but the tension is at bottom a tension between justice and injustice. It is a tension between the forces of light and the forces of darkness. And there is a victory, it will be a victory not merely for the 50,000 Negroes who live in Montgomery, Alabama, but it will be a victory for justice. It will be a victory for freedom. It will be a victory for human dignity.

And so this is the thing that stands at the center of the non-violent movement. Those involved in the struggle seek to convert the opponent and not to annihilate him. Those engaged in the movement seek to get rid of unjust systems, and not those individuals who may be caught up in the unjust systems. And so non-violent resistance says on the one hand that it is necessary to avoid external physical violence, but it says on the other hand that it is necessary to avoid internal violence or spirit.

There is another point in this approach. It says that suffering can have tremendous social power or it can serve as a tremendous social force. Now at this point non-violence agrees with violence. Violence would also say that suffering has tremendous social force, but the difference is this. Violence would say that suffering is a powerful social force when that violence or that suffering is inflicted upon another. But the non-violent movement says that suffering becomes a powerful social force when the individuals engaged in the movement willingly accept suffering. Willingly accept violence, even. So that they allow it to be inflicted upon them if necessary. And if any violence emerges in the situation they are willing absorb it. And so in the non-violent movement, as difficult as it is, the non-violent resister is able to say with Mohandas K. Gandhi that we will match your capacity to inflict suffering by our capacity to endure suffering. We will meet your physical force with soul force. And so over and over again leaders in the non-violent struggle in the United States have been able to see to opponents "do to us what you will, and as difficult as it is we will still love you. We cannot in all good conscience obey your unjust laws because a non-cooperation with evil is as much a moral obligation as is cooperation with good. So put us in jail and we will still love you. Send your hooded perpetrators of violence into our communities at the midnight hour, and beat us and even attempt to leave us half-dead, and as difficult as it, we will still love you. But be assured that we will wear you down by our capacity to suffer, and one day we will win our freedom. For not only will we win freedom for ourselves, we will also appeal to your heart and conscience that we will win you in the process. And thereby our victory will be a double victory."

This is something of what the non-violent resister is able to say and is able to live with in any movement to transform the social situation.

Another thing basic in this philosophy is the idea that there is within human nature real potential for goodness. Now at this point the non-violent resister can be misunderstood. He does live with the idea and he does believe that there is something within human nature that can respond to goodness, there is something within human nature which can be aroused, there is a sense of conscience there that can be touched. But this not to say at all that are not evil dimensions which can come into being within human nature. So that the non-violent resister is not so unrealistic that he believes that all men are innately good. He sees within human nature a strange dualism. And one the one hand he knows that there are great potentialities for goodness, but on the other hand he realizes that there are great potentialities for evil. And so he would probably agree with Carlyle that there are depths in man that go down to the lowest Hell and heights which reach the highest Heaven. For are not both Heaven and Hell made out of him, everlasting mystery and miracle that he is. And so in spite of all of this, in spite of realizing and recognizing this, the non-violent resister goes on and says that even though there are those potentialities for evil, there are those potentialities for goodness. And this can be aroused in human nature. And the human being can respond to that which is good.

There is another thing in this philosophy which I have already hinted. And that is that those who adhere to non-violence are willing to engage in civil disobedience. In other words they are willing to say that if a man-made law does not square with the moral law of the universe then the individual has a moral responsibility to revolt against that man-made law. And so the non-violent resister finds himself breaking laws occasionally. But he is not seeking to evade the law when he does this. He is not seeking to defy the law when he does this. He is not seeking to be an anarchist when he does this. He is merely seeking to straighten out the social situation. And I submit that any individual who breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust and willingly accepts the penalty by staying in jail is at that moment expressing the very highest respect for law. This is what has happened in the student movement. This is what has happened so often in the movement which took place in India under the great leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. There is another thing that is vital in this movement, and that is a feeling that when one is engaged in a non-violent struggle that he has cosmic companionship so to speak. That somehow there the arc of the moral universe may be long but it bends towards justice. And this is why in the very center of the movement for racial justice in the United States and other places there is this feeling that the universe is on the side of justice. And so I am convinced that there is something in this universe which justifies Carlyle in saying "no lie can live forever." I am convinced there is something in this universe which justifies William Cullen Bryan in saying

“truth crushed to earth will rise again.” I am convinced that there is something in the universe which justifies James Russell Lowell in saying “truth forever on the scaffold, wrong forever on the throne. Yet that scaffold sways the future and behind the dim unknown standeth God within the shadows. Keeping watch above his own.” This stands also at the center of the non-violent movement.

And so once we think in terms of the underlying principles of the underlying philosophy of non-violence it is this underlying philosophy which serves as the regulating ideal and it serves as that guiding principle that causes the individual to move on out into the realm of action and develop a great movement in order to break down the unjust system and all of the barrier associated with that system. And I am convinced that with this basic philosophy and with this powerful approach there a method available which is the most potent weapon available to oppressed people in their struggle for freedom, and in their struggle for human dignity. This is the underlying philosophy of the movement of non-violent resistance and it is the philosophy that gives the movement a sense of direction, and it is the philosophy which I believe can ultimately transform the social situation.

Now have seen this philosophy at work. We have seen this method at work in India. I mentioned earlier Mohandas K. Gandhi used this method in a magnificent way to free his people from the political domination and the economic exploitation inflicted upon them for years. And it has been used in a marvelous way by hundreds and thousands of Negro students all over the United States. And as a result of their non-violent, yet disciplined struggle they have been able to bring about integration at lunch counters in more than 150 cities in the United States. In the southern part of the United States, as a result of that struggle most of the bus terminals have been integrated where they were formerly segregated. As a result of the struggle many other barriers are breaking down every day. And I submit that this is nothing less than revolutionary. So that this is not a weak method. In the final analysis it is a powerful method. It does resist. It is not a method of stagnant passivity and deadening complacency. It does resist the evil system. And it is possible for the individual to stand up with determination, with courage, and with zeal, and yet refuse to succumb to the temptation of using violence and hatred in the struggle achieve racial justice. And so I close by saying that there are these three ways open to people in the struggle for freedom. But I am still convinced that non-violent resistance is the most powerful way because it has a way of disarming the opponent, it exposes his moral defenses, it weakens his morale, and at the same time it works on his conscience. This is the power of non-violent resistance. (*Applause*)

*Voice: Doctor King has agreed to entertain any questions and attempt to answer them. Are there questions?
Inaudible question.*

I frankly didn't know that this situation existed with reference to soldiers. This is new to me. I would certainly feel that if this existed any soldier would have the kind of redress or would have the possibility of appealing to higher authorities in the nation so that that particular situation could be changed. I don't think, for instance, the federal government could stand to have these conditions existing, and I'm pretty sure the federal government would go all out to protect soldiers more than that. With conditions existing like this it would be not only injurious to the soldiers involved but also to the image of the nation. So I am sure that if they once existed these conditions do not exist as much at this time. As you know there is also a pretty I would say generally speaking ...the armed forces of the United States have been integrated. And this includes all branches of the service. So that along with the integration that has taken place I'm sure that other conditions have been changed and other conditions have been rectified, where unjust conditions existed.

Well I would say that many things must be done to meet the Russian threat. Many things must be done to meet the whole threat of atomic and nuclear annihilation. Now I must say that I am not optimistic about getting any whole nation in the world, certainly not the United States or any other nation, to disarm unilaterally. I think that we have to be realistic enough to know that this will not be, even though there may be a good case for advocating this. But when we come down to the practical realism of the situation, this probably won't happen. Consequently we must work through channels such as the United Nations to bring about disarmament, to bring about suspension of nuclear tests, and this means that there must be a greater willingness to negotiate on the part of the nations of the world. Now the other thing that I would say here is that somehow the conscience of the world must be aroused on this issue, the conscience of the United States, as well as the conscience of Russia. And I think that there is a great deal that can be done through individuals, through peace movements, to arouse the conscience of the world. This has already been done in some parts of the world. It has been done a great deal in England through Lord Russell and others. It has been done in the United States and in other places of the world. This attempt to save through civil disobedience is necessary that survival must be a form of concern and that if we consider, or rather if we feel that we have a right to survive then we must find some alternative to war. So that I think non-violence can work in bringing about disarmament and in this kind of disarmament we would certainly think of disarming the whole world. And I think we must continue to pursue this path of peaceful negotiations so that the whole world can be disarmed and a sort of international police power can be set up through the United Nations, but as far as the continuation of the arms race, but as far as the continuation of nuclear tests which can only serve to poison the atmosphere with radioactive fallout, all of this should come to and end.

(Inaudible question.)

I definitely think the continued existence of racial segregation or racial discrimination in the United States is doing a great deal to tarnish the image of the United States in the eyes of the world. I have seen this in many instances as I have traveled around the world, whether it's in Europe or South America, or in Africa, Asia. There's always a great concern about the problem of racial injustice in the United States. And there's always the statement that if the United States doesn't solve this problem, if it doesn't solve it in a hurry, it will certainly be relegated, not only to a second rate political power, but relegated in terms of its moral force and its moral power, that it will fail to be a moral voice in the world. So that there can be no gainsaying of the fact that it is hurting the reputation of the United States. However I think the hopeful sign is the fact that although the problem is there and no one can deny it, there are numerous people working passionately to get rid of it, and to change the situation. And I think that this will probably continue to grow, so that there's an awareness of the problem, and a new determination to solve it.

(inaudible question)

Well I would say first that I don't quite agree that laws represent a sort of organized violence. It is quite true that there have been persons who believed in non-violence very firmly who were anarchists. Henry David Thoreau was an anarchist at points. Tolstoy was an anarchist at point. I don't happen to be an anarchist. I believe that the state serves a vital purpose. I believe that we must have laws to regulate behavior. And this is why I believe that some persons who believe in non-violent resistance have been over optimistic concerning human nature. And they could see the goodness in man, but not the evil. And I live with the idea that man is neither innately good or innately bad. But he has potentialities for both. And because he has potentialities for evil it is necessary to have the kind of restraining agencies that you have through the state and through laws. That as I said serve to maintain order in society and to regulate behavior, so that I don't think this is organized violence at any point. I think laws only serve the purpose to maintain a degree of order within society.

The second point is, I can't see that non-violent resistance when one is committed to it represent a sort of psychological violence. You do not seek to demoralize the opponent. You do not seek to injure the opponent. Your ultimate aim is, as I said earlier, to win his friendship and understanding, and to convert him. And even if he is hurt in the process, this not your intention. If you are engaged in a boycott for instance it may mean that the man will get put out of business. But this is certainly not your intention. Your intention is to put justice in business and to put this man out of business. And you're seeking to create a moral balance in society which will help that man as well as those who are in the struggle to break it down. I happen to believe that segregation hurts the white man as well as it hurts the Negro. And that when we fight to get rid of segregation we are fighting not merely for the Negro but we are fighting to free the soul of the white man. So I don't think of non-violent resistance as psychological violence, first because it avoid physical violence, and second because the intent is always to create the beloved community. The intent is to make a better situation for all of the people involved. Not just a better situation for yourself, but a better situation for that opponent who is often misguided and who often has the system set up and follows it because he's been taught that way. So I think it must always be interpreted in terms of intent. And this is the only way that we can really deal with the problem of what you termed "psychological" violence. I believe that non-violent resistance represents non-violence in spirit as well as non-violence in physical terms.

(inaudible question)

I would say first there is no doubt about the fact that non-violence is based on the theory that you are able to carry on a movement when you have a potential ally in the conscience of your opponent. There is no doubt about that. Second, I must admit that I think this method does work better in a situation where you have democratic processes, where have freedom of press, where you have freedom of assembly. I don't think there's anywhere...I just left Mississippi last week, I was in the midst of the delta, trying to recruit people to engage in an extended voter registration campaign, and even there, which is the most difficult state in the United States in race relations, we had public meetings, I addressed three or four public meetings, and nothing stopped that. So even in difficult places we can at least have meetings, and we can at least organize, while in South Africa Chief Lutulla (?) couldn't call a meeting, a mass meeting next week, and have it. And I can assure that it would be much more difficult to organize a non-violent movement in such a situation than in a country where you do have some commitment to democracy.

I think also that it is true that when you have a condition that is not a totalitarian one you are able to do more in non-violence. But after saying this I must say we have no empirical evidence that non-violence cannot work in these situations that are extremely difficult. I would only say that there was never any organized, mass non-violent movement against Hitler. We must make a distinction non-resistance and non-violent resistance. And it may well be that if there had ever been a mass, non-violent organized campaign against Hitler, the casualty list would have been less. This is speculation naturally. I cannot say, because it's impossible to know. But I think that this is a real possibility. That if there had been an organized, non-violent movement resisting the inhuman and brutal and vicious methods being used by Hitler, the casualty list may have been less. In South Africa the only movement that has worked, when I say it has worked I mean the only movement that has brought the government to its knees, has been a non-violent, direct action, mass movement. A few years ago they had a bus boycott in South Africa, and this was so effective that the government had to give in. So that

it has worked already in South Africa. And I think that, as difficult as it is, it wouldn't be as easy it would in some part of the United States, but as difficult as it is it would work. In Soviet Russia there again, we have an extremely difficult situation. A statement being made, at least Lenin said on one occasion, that any method, violence, deceit, lying or any other method, is justifiable in order to bring about the end of the classless society. Now whenever you get this idea and this kind of ethical relativism certainly it is more difficult to grapple with the problem there where the idea of non-violence doesn't emerge. But I submit to you that the people in Russia have consciences, I believe. I think there are some people who live in Russia who I think they love their children, and I think they respond to some of the human things that other human beings respond to. And I think we sometimes overplay the goodness and the conscience of the British and southerners in the United States. I think some of them are mighty bad and mighty misguided, and the difference is that in Russia I believe firmly that they are under the power of a system that I totally disagree with in terms of its philosophical structure and in terms of its moral projection, but the people themselves they have consciences that can be aroused, and I think we must always see this. That maybe we've gone to too far in thinking that other people have had good consciences and that all of the people in Russia are bad people. I think that there are people of conscience in Russia and that conscience can be aroused, even though they are under an evil and a vicious system.

(inaudible question)

I think the problem as I've said so often is a national problem. And it's not just a sectional problem. It is a problem facing the whole nation. It may be more conspicuous, more glaring in the South than in North, but it certainly exists in its subtle forms all over the country. Therefore every citizen of the United States should be concerned by getting rid of segregation and discrimination because injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. And no person who lives inside the United States can be considered an outsider. Therefore I have welcomed Northerners in the movement, and I think it helps to make it clear to those who live in the South and those who live in the North that the problem is a national problem, and it must be a concern of every citizen.

Now certainly I don't think the Northern help in the struggle should be a substitute for the determination of Southerners themselves. For I am convinced that the more people in the South that you get to rise up the more you are able to refute the idea that Negroes like segregation. This is what many of the Southern politicians say, that Negroes really like segregation and that it's only the agitators that stir them up, that basically they are content. The only way this can be refuted is for the people in the situation to engage in a determined, forthright way in the movement that is taking place. So that I would say it is necessary to have Southerners themselves, as you had in the lunch counter sit-ins, to make it crystal clear that they do not like segregation, but on the other hand I think it is good to have people from all sections of the country rising up and supporting the movement so that it is clear all over the nation that this is a problem which must be a concern of every citizen of the nation.

I quite agree that you do have that third man. At points maybe this third man is to be criticized even more than those who are brutal, and those who are vocal in their opposition. I think I said somewhere today that it may well be we will have to repent in this generation, not merely for the loud words of the bad people, but for the appalling silence of the so-called good people. I have been disappointed in many instances with the Christian church. I have been disappointed with many ministers in particular, and the church in general. It may be that the church has been a little slow on this point because it didn't read, or didn't translate, or didn't quite understand some Biblical passages. There is a passage in the New Testament which talks about the light of the world and many have felt that could at least apply to the church, because the church should be the light of the world. But I think that many of the preachers and Christians feel that this meant the tail light, instead of the headlight! *(laughter)* I guess they kind of misinterpreted the Bible. But it is true that the has often been the tail light. I remember last year in Atlanta, when the schools were getting ready to be integrated, the church, the Catholic Bishops announced that the Catholic schools, parochial schools, would be integrated, after the public schools are successfully integrated. So there was the tail light again. The same thing happened in New Orleans. Archbishop Romula announced back in '55 that they would integrate the parochial schools there, and there was a great deal of pressure and opposition, which led to a retreat, and finally last year it was said they would wait a while to see how the public school integration worked out, and then the church schools would be integrated. And of course I don't even need to talk about many of my fellow Protestants because they haven't even had the idea in mind of starting at all. But this is disappointing and I think that the failure of the church in this period to be a great moral voice is certainly one of the tragedies of this whole period. And I think it would be one of the tragedies of history if a future historian is able to look back and cry out in the history books that the Christian church proved to be the bulwark, the last bulwark of segregated power in the United States. This would be a great tragedy. I think though that there is a new awareness, at least a nagging of consciousness on the part of many ministers and many Christians. They are coming to realize that the church has failed to stand out in its witness at this point and many are trying to do something about it. So there is a ray of hope, even amid the darkness and the fact that they have not stood out in the past.

(inaudible question)

Well, one would have to go into the whole idea, and I have to go into the idea, and this could lead to a philosophical debate, the whole idea of who is religious and who isn't religious. And there have been people who believe

firmly in non-violence and consider themselves atheists. There are still people who are strong believers in non-violence who don't believe in God in the same sense that other people believe. Even Gandhi did not believe in a personal God in sense that a theist would believe in a personal God. The whole Hindu tradition believes more in an absolute, an impersonal Brahmin and I think it goes into this whole idea of who is religious, but there have been people, and there are people today, I read book the other day, "The Conquest of Violence", written by a woman who contends that this philosophy of non-violence has relevance to the world beyond the religious side of it because it is the first answer to the problem that I discussed earlier, means and ends. And she says the one thing she could accept was non-violence as a practical technique to grapple with a social situation, and to solve the problems which nobody has else has solved on such a great level like Gandhi, namely the problem of means and ends. I do think though that while it is possible for a non-religious person to believe in non-violence as a technique and as a passing strategy, in order for a person to really believe in non-violence as a way of life, he must have some religious orientation. I believe if it is to become more than just a passing technique to be used in a particular social situation, for the moment, it is to become a way of life, a creed, so that it touches the individual in his every day life and his every attitude, then I do believe that it is necessary to have some religious orientation.

(inaudible question)

I quite agree with you that prejudice is at center of this thing and that when we move into the realm of prejudice we are moving into the realm of emotional problems. I think it points in this whole... we are grappling with mass psychosis or mass neurosis, or whatever we want to call it. People are cornered in a system that they really can't explain, they don't know now they got there, it's irrational, and all of that. Now I think it is necessary to understand this in analyzing the problem and I think it is true that in understanding this it can help bring about a broader understanding, and I think this is what non-violence does in its deeper dimensions... it is that understanding good will.

On the other hand, I don't think it should lead one to the point of retreating to and not trying to change certain conditions. In other words it would not be fair to say to oppressed people that you should wait and just patiently accept injustice until all of the oppressors have their prejudices removed. I think it's necessary to work to move these prejudices and one of the ways to do it is to get rid of the system itself. I believe firmly that the only way you're going to get rid of some of the fears in the white South concerning desegregation is to present them with desegregation. I was reading the other day of a psychiatrist who had this little boy come to him, the mother brought the little boy who had a series of bad dreams about a bear who just tried to attack him every night. And every night he had a nightmare about the bear. And so the psychiatrist got the little boy and said "that bear really likes you. And he wants to play with you. Now tonight when he comes back, you just put your arms around him, and he's gonna like you, and you'll like him." And went on and had his bad dream that night, and the bear came, and he embraced the bear, and the bear embraced him, and he didn't dream about the bear any more. And if I can use the analogy here, there are many people who have fears in our nation concerning integration, and the only way they're gonna get rid of these fears is to be presented with the facts that they will have to accept it. And sometimes I think that the shock treatment is necessary to get people back to reality when there are emotional problems. There has to be occasionally(end of CD3 recording).

CD4. Remainder of Question & Answer Period from CD 3 (13 minutes)

...And the only way they are going to get rid of these is to be presented with fact that they have to accept it. And sometimes I think the shock method is necessary to get people back to reality when there are emotional problems. There has to be occasionally a sort of creative shock in society in order to get people back to reality. So that I think we must work on these two levels. I think there must that understanding good will. On the other hand I think we must continue to work to remove the conditions so that it will be easier for the people to get rid of their prejudices. It is true that as I said this morning laws cannot change attitudes maybe, but they can certainly control the external effects... It is true I know that in many situations laws have made it easier for people to rise out of their prejudices. In Montgomery, Alabama the buses are now integrated and I'm that the people who struggled against integration as we struggled to bring about bus integration felt they couldn't live with it, but now the buses are integrated and they go on and ride them, and they discover that the sun still got up that morning when the buses were integrated, and things are moving on fine. And the facts itself help to do something, and I think the more we can present the facts to people even though it's painful in the beginning, the more they will change. Just as certain laws have come into being in the United States to rectify certain unjust business practices I'm sure that the people today have changed their attitude concerning these very things that were once done, because the law helped to create the situation where attitudes could be changed much easier than they could with the continued existence of the system itself.

(inaudible question from young lady)

I don't know you are thinking of any specific religion at this point. I think it is true that some religions contend that they have the answer. In sense all religions would have certain contentions to make at this point. I would say this, that I'm a Christian, and as a Christian I believe in the saving power of Jesus Christ, for instance. But my Christianity has not led me to the point of believe that God has limited his revelation to Christianity. I think that God has revealed himself in

some way in all religions. And even though I believe that Jesus Christ represents the most unique revelation of God, I believe firmly that God has revealed himself in other religions and He has not left himself without a witness, and there are other sheep that are not of this fold, even the Christian fold. So that I'm not so narrow to say that only within Christianity do you have ultimate truth. I would say that there are truths revealed in the other great religions of the world. I am sure that there are some people who would disagree with me at this point. There are many people who would. But I would hold the theory and idea that there is an aspect of God's revelation in all religions.

(question)

I would start out by saying that you raise a very serious question. One of the real questions that one is committed to non-violence has to face. Whether there is that moral feeling of conscience that can be appealed to. The initial response of the oppressor, when oppressed people rise up is bitterness. Whether you use violence or non-violence. The initial response is bitterness. I don't think the people in Montgomery, Alabama or in Jackson, Mississippi, or in Albany, Georgia, just to mention some examples, I don't think they were inspired by at all by the fact that the Negroes were using non-violence when the movement first started. I think their initial reaction was bitterness. Prime Minister Nehru said he never saw the British officials more angry than when they first turned the other cheek. That's when they would beat them a little more. Some times this can arouse the guilt feeling more than anything else. And there are two ways we response to guilt feelings. One is to try to repent and to change our ways, allow this guilt to so raise the conscience that we really try to get better and make a right about face. On the other hand, the guilt feeling can cause the individual to try to drown that sense of guilt by engaging even more in the guilt-evoking act. And I have seen this in so many instances. I believe that many of the people in any struggle, whether its in the white South of the United States or in other places, many of the people who use violence are really fighting a sense of guilt, and they are trying to drown that sense of guilt by engaging more in the very act which brought it into being.

Now after saying this though, I do feel that if there is a persistence in non-violence it does eventually arouse the conscience, it does eventually appeal to that moral sense. It doesn't do it overnight. It doesn't do it the next week. But if one continues, if the group continues, I do feel that it eventually gets over. I think the virtue of it is that it leaves an aftermath of brotherhood, of reconciliation, while violence always leaves an aftermath of bitterness. I can give an example on a large scale. I think that one of the beautiful things is the kind of friendship that exists today between the British and the Indian people. I never will forget when I was in India a few years ago, we were having dinner with Prime Minister Nehru and two of the persons who had dinner with us were, one was Lady Mountbatten, and the other was the daughter. Now Lord Mountbatten I believe was the viceroy when India when India received its independence. But now there is a level of friendship and understanding, they're having dinner with Prime Minister Nehru, there is this level of friendship and understanding that would not have been there had that been won through violence. So that they didn't have the problem of spending the next hundred years getting rid of the bitterness that came into being as a result of the situation. So this is the first thing I would say.

The second point is that while it may be true that groups and people that have used non-violence have not been in the position of controlling the agencies of violence I don't necessarily feel that they have been the weak people. Gandhi used to say that if one has to choose between cowardice and violence it is better to fight, because cowardice is on a lower moral level than violence. And I quite agree with Gandhi. If one is non-violent because he doesn't have the weapons of violence, or because he's afraid, he isn't truly non-violent. And this was something that was taught over and over again by Gandhi and we could say that he was rationalizing because they really didn't have the weapons, and they really didn't have the know-how, the techniques of violence, but I think there was a deep commitment to non-violence in all of its dimensions and I believe the same thing in our struggle today. That we should not use it merely because we don't have the instruments of violence, but must follow this method because it is the method of the strong.

I can give an example in my own life. When we started our struggle in Montgomery, Alabama, I had the gun in the house just as many other people, and I went to my wife one day and we talked about this thing. I said, as I was a leader of the non-violent movement I cannot in all good conscience have a gun in the house. I don't think I need it and I don't want it, and we discussed it, and I said I know the vast majority of the people in Montgomery would not follow this, but it is often necessary for a leader to take an absolute position in order to get the followers to take a relative position. So felt it absolutely necessary and we finally agreed to get rid of the gun. And I haven't had a gun in my house since then, and I have been less afraid without a gun than I was when I had the gun in the house. (*laughter*). But I do think there is a power that can come within which causes the individual to engage in the non-violent movement, not because he can't go in his house and get a gun and shoot somebody. I think there are cases in the United States where Negroes could do pretty well with violence. At least for a few minutes anyway. But I think it would defeat the end, and I think another thing is this, that it is much more difficult in a situation where you are struggling to bring about integration. There is a difference between integration and independence. You are not driving out a foreign invader. You've got to live the next morning with the very people that you are struggling with at this hour. And there's a much greater difficulty grappling with that. The other thing is that in most places and situations where you have a struggle for independence it is a numerical majority struggling in a situation where a numerical minority is there in the political controlling situation. Where in our struggle in

the United States it's a numerical minority seeking to develop a new relationship, and a brotherly relationship with a numerical majority. So that I think in both situations, whether it's a struggle for independence or integration, non-violence is necessary and workable. But I think it's even more necessary in a situation where you're working for integration.

Speaker: Doctor King has been most generous with his time. Certainly most inspiring, and we are extremely grateful. He will speak again tomorrow morning, at 9:30 in this auditorium and all are invited. I should also like to say that there will be an informal gathering at Casa Maria after this meeting and you are invited to come up and meet Doctor King. This message is for university students, and for learners of all ages. Thank you very much. (*applause*).

The End

Martin Luther King speaks in Puerto Rico, 1962

Wednesday, January 5, 2011