

An investigation of historical circumstances that contributed to the rise of Mohandas K. Gandhi's and Martin Luther King, Jr.'s non-violent movements.

Tatjana Lipiäinen
Ressun lukio
13.11.2005

Abstract

The aim of this essay is to investigate the historical circumstances that contributed to the rise of Mohandas K. Gandhi's and Martin Luther King, Jr.'s non-violent movements. The circumstances include social and political conditions that existed in South Africa, India and the United States at the time of each movement's birth. The investigation aims to weight the importance of each contribution and compare the different circumstances that are placed under consideration. The two historical contexts will be investigated with a focus on short-term periods of approximately five years that were preceding each movements rise, investigating the main similarities and differences of each context.

The conclusion drawn from this investigation is that the worsening social conditions raised the willingness for resistance among the oppressed, whereas the changing political circumstances in the first part of the twentieth century pushed the leaders of the British Empire and the United States into closer co-operation with the oppressed. Therefore it appears that the social and political circumstances, within a specific historical context, worked reciprocally to contribute to the development of non-violent movements led by Gandhi and King.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| I. Introduction | 4 |
| II. Evaluation of Sources | 5 |
| III. Historical Circumstances | 7 |
| A. Background Analysis | 7 |
| B. Previous Attempts for Change | 9 |
| IV. Social Circumstances | 10 |
| V. Political Circumstances | 12 |
| VI. Conclusion | 15 |
| Bibliography | 16 |

I. Introduction

The British domination in India began to change in the nineteenth century as its rule began to meet opposition. The superior attitude of the British rulers towards the natives of India kept on growing from the origins of the rule of the eighteenth century until the resistance of the Indian Mutiny in 1857, after which some concessions were made by the British. By the end of the nineteenth century the Indian nationalist movement had developed and Indian nationalism began to revive, although simultaneously creating conflicts between the Hindus and the Moslems.¹

The Civil Rights Movement in the United States similarly originated from a long-term position of inferiority that the African Americans were placed into initially by the founders of the United States in the seventeenth century. Slavery was abolished by President Abraham Lincoln in 1863 yet not resulting in full racial equality. Thus the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) was founded in 1909, creating the first organised movement of the black Americans.²

Both movements gained strong leaders, Mohandas K. Gandhi³ and Martin Luther King, Jr.,⁴ who managed to improve the social and political conditions of the oppressed more efficiently than their predecessors; introducing non-violence⁵ as a method of combating injustice. It is interesting to see what conditions gave rise to the similar non-violent movements of Gandhi and King, considering the different societies and time periods. The aim of this essay is to compare the historical circumstances that contributed to the rise of the two non-violent movements, concentrating on the social and political conditions that existed before and during the development of each movement. The reason for regarding historical circumstances as merely contributions to the rise of the movements, opposing to as direct reasons, is

¹ Roberts 1995, pp.817-821.

² Puckrein 1993, pp.2-3.

³ Mohandas was Gandhi's first name, whereas Mahatma (the Great Soul) a title given to him later. Born in 1869, in Gujarat (area in Western India). In 1888 left to England to study law, in 1881 returned to India as a lawyer. Sailed to South Africa in 1893 to represent his firm. Gandhi founded Natal Indian Congress in August 1894 to fight colour prejudice. Returned to India in 1915. (Gandhi 1982.)

⁴ Born in 1929, in Atlanta, US. By 1951 King had a Bachelor's degree in sociology and theology. In 1955 received a Ph.D. in systematic theology from Boston University. Became the official pastor of Dexter (Montgomery, Alabama) in October 1955. Elected as the head of MIA (Montgomery Improvement Association) in December 1955. (King 1998.)

⁵ Non-violence also referred to as civil disobedience and *satyagraha* (literally meaning truth and firmness) by Gandhi. The word is often associated with pacifism but both Gandhi and King described non-violence to be an active method of resistance to achieve change; often in the forms of boycott, strikes and self-sufficiency.

that many other factors had influenced the uprising of non-violent movements as well - by a large extent the personal contributions of both Gandhi and King. Therefore it is essential to narrow the scope of the topic to several concrete contributions in order to be able to study them in-depth.

The two historical contexts will be investigated with a focus on short-term periods of approximately five years that were preceding each movements rise;⁶ investigating the main similarities and differences of each context. First beginning by considering the differences due to the long-term historical and social distinctions, then in contrast drawing links between the historical and the social settings. Finally I will analyse the effects of the political conditions on the relations between the oppressors and the oppressed, and compare the conditions - linking them to the historical backgrounds as well as to social circumstances.

II. Evaluation of Sources

The answers to the research question of this essay were looked for from a wide variety of sources, thus aiming to obtain a comprehensive outlook on the issue.

One of the sources most frequently used to describe the historical circumstances of South Africa and India was a collection of Gandhi's texts and words, edited by an American journalist, Louis Fischer, who had also written Gandhi's biography. The book provides many primary sources but largely concentrates on Gandhi's personal beliefs and emphasises philosophical themes rather than the presentation of concrete historical evidence as James', Ferguson's and Roberts' books do.

J.M. Roberts' world history book does not specifically specialise on the topic of Gandhi's or King's non-violent movements, however it provides a view of a truly outsider historian who aims to inform and bring out purely historical propositions. But the extensive history book is written by one man, meaning that subjectivity at least to a certain extent must be kept in mind when using such a secondary source. Roberts' book is suitable and very helpful when combined with other more specified sources on a topic, for the purpose of comparing the two.

⁶ In Gandhi's case the short-term period investigation ranges from 1900 until 1906 in South Africa and from 1915 until 1921 in India. The rise of King's movement will be studied from 1950 until 1955. The three time periods will also be enlarged when looking for long-term contributions.

The motion picture about Gandhi's life as a leader aims to portray the main events of his life in a reliable manner, for example by working with Indira Gandhi⁷, her sons and Gandhi's grandson when shooting the picture.⁸ However, when comparing to Gandhi's autobiography it becomes evident that the director of the picture simplified many events and left even more unmentioned. The motion picture aims not only to inform but also entertain, and thus subjecting the viewer to director's bias. This source is convenient when looking for general conditions and the big patterns of the movement's development.

King's autobiography provides detailed descriptions about his life and the civil rights movement⁹. The purpose of his texts and words is often to emphasise the negative aspects of segregating society in order to justify the need for direct action. However, none of the other relating sources, such as documentaries and articles about the civil rights movement, contradict the facts presented by King. The main limitation of his autobiography is that unlike that of Gandhi it was not directly written by King. Instead a historian from Stanford university, Clayborne Carson, collected King's papers and combined them in the late 1990's to form an autobiography. Therefore it is not sure whether King himself would have chosen to include the same extracts in his autobiography as Carson did. But on the other hand autobiographies are more often subjective than not and thus should not be used as a sole source for historical investigations.

The civil rights movement brochures and the two documentaries about King's life and the movement include information about the main events of the struggle for civil rights in a concise and a clear manner. But they are made as homage to Martin Luther King and therefore portray his actions and aims in an idealistic light thus losing impartial historical interpretation. NBC's *Open Mind* programme shows a complete interview with King. The aim of this source is to explain the purpose of the civil rights movement, especially to the white viewers as King is joined by a white judge to support his words. The straight-forwardness and criticism of the white interviewer, despite the liberal name of the programme, make this source a valuable

⁷ Former Prime Minister of India. Daughter of Jawaharlal Nehru who was one of the closest colleagues of Gandhi and an influential Indian politician - becoming the first Prime Minister of independent India.

⁸ The film had received nine Oscars in 1982. The DVD also includes special features such as original interviews and news footage of Gandhi which are rare, and show how accurately Ben Kingsley played the role of Gandhi.

⁹ Civil rights are the protections and privileges of personal liberty given to all citizens by law. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil_rights)

one as it not only informs but also questions King's goals, thus creating a balance to the purely favourable descriptions presented by some other sources.

III. Historical Circumstances

A. Background Analysis

The initial birth of Mahatma Gandhi's non-violent movement took place in South Africa in 1906,¹⁰ whereas Martin Luther King adopted the method of non-violence from Gandhi's example and applied it into the struggle for civil rights from 1955 onwards.¹¹ Legislations against Asian immigrants in South Africa caused Gandhi, as a young lawyer, to aim to improve the position of the oppressed. After having successfully used *satyagraha* in South Africa; spreading the principle of self-reliance and using strikes¹² to reverse anti-Indian laws, Gandhi then applied the method in India, from 1915, in its struggle for independence.¹³

The non-violent movement in South Africa was initiated before the First World War and the movement in India right at the beginning of the war. The ending of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth marked a time period for growing nationalism in Europe and the gradual decline of imperialism. The nationalistic ideas consequently spread to the colonies of the British Empire. The power struggles in Europe meant that Britain had less time to occupy its attention on its colonies and therefore gradually losing its grip on such territories as South Africa and India. The weakening superiority was also due to the new trends of thinking within the more liberal circle of intellectuals in Europe who began to carefully question the inferiority of the colonial populations.¹⁴

In 1918 Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points were published that encouraged self-determination of nations and recognition of independent states. Although they were established after the emergence of Gandhi's civil disobedience movement, their

¹⁰According to Louis Fischer: "The performance and victory of the Japanese in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905 greatly impressed Gandhi." (*The Essential Gandhi* 2002, p.70.) Thus suggesting that the Japanese example might have directly motivated Gandhi to form the movement.

¹¹ King 1998, p.50.

¹² Indian term for strike action is *hartal*. From 1919 the practice of *hartal* became widespread throughout India, resulting from Gandhi's initiative, as a mean to protest against specific British Acts and later the British rule in general. (James 1998, p.416; Ferguson 2004, p.331.)

¹³ *The Essential Gandhi* 2002, pp.75-98.

message could only have served as encouragement to the non-violent and the determinant approach that Gandhi had taken. This is supported by the British author Lawrence James: “Sir Maurice Hankey¹⁵ blamed President Wilson’s fourteen points which, by their promotion of nationalism and self-determination, ‘struck at the roots of the British Empire.’”¹⁶

The two World Wars can be seen as factors contributing to the birth and strengthening of each movement. The Indian soldiers fought in the First World War to support the British government, however not receiving the expected changes in return, for example the promised Home Rule¹⁷. This deeply disappointed the Indian representatives in the Congress and made them realise all the more the necessity of being more persistent in their struggle for the right to make own decisions about the running of India. The words of the British historian, Niall Ferguson, reinforce this idea: “Indians looked to Ireland and drew the obvious conclusions. It was no good just waiting to be given Home Rule.”¹⁸ Ferguson suggests that the violent Irish rebellions against the British rule, that eventually led to south Ireland’s position as a Free State in 1921, gave an example to the Indians. This does support the growing decisiveness of Indian rulers after the First World War, but does not explain their commitment to non-violence.

The Montgomery movement¹⁹, which set off civil disobedience in the United States, was formed after the independence of India that was reached by non-violent means and ten years after the ending of the Second World War.²⁰ The United States used many black American soldiers in the fronts of WWII. Black and white soldiers were fighting together for the same cause, black soldiers actually killing white Germans under the US’s command. Therefore when returning to the US from the war, it seemed more unjust than ever before to segregate the black Americans. An American author Gary A. Puckrein²¹ makes the same point: “Thoughtful whites

¹⁴ Roberts 1995, p.820.

¹⁵ Successively a secretary to the Committee of Imperial Defence and to the war cabinet.

¹⁶ James 1998, p.372.

¹⁷ Also called *Swaraj*, meant a responsible Indian government within the Empire, not as free as a Dominion status. (Roberts 1995, p.942; *The Essential Gandhi* 2002, pp.104-105.)

¹⁸ Ferguson 2004, p.330.

¹⁹ The formation of the movement was initiated by Rosa Parks on December 1st, 1955 when she refused to give her bus seat to a white citizen. She was imprisoned because of the refusal. On the day of her trial, December 5th, 1955 the Montgomery Improvement Association was formed under the leadership of Martin Luther King. (King 1998, p.50.)

²⁰ *The Essential Gandhi* 2002, p.98; King 1998, p.50.

²¹ A publisher of *American Visions*, a magazine of Afro-American culture (Puckrein 1993, p.17.)

became painfully aware of the contradiction in fighting the racist philosophy of Nazism in Europe while permitting racial discrimination at home.”²²

The creation of the UN and the support the American government provided to this organisation also contradicted the racist policies used at home. The Soviet propaganda took advantage of this during the Cold War - British historian J. M. Roberts states: “Many of the new nations which were becoming a majority at the UN were nations of coloured people. It was an embarrassment - of which communist propaganda always made good use - for the United States to display at home so flagrant a contravention of the ideals she espoused abroad as was provided by the plight of many of her blacks.” All this contributed to encourage the civil rights movement in their struggle and pushed the US government into being more co-operative with the movement.²³

B. Previous Attempts for Change

In South Africa the Indian minority subdued to the discriminating laws set by the British, until Gandhi’s introduction of civil disobedience. In India the most significant attempt to resist the British rule was a series of rebellions that began in 1857, known as the Mutiny.²⁴ It was unsuccessful in that it did not fulfil the aims that started it in the first place. The failing of the Mutiny presented the inefficiency of violent rebellions, firstly because they were not carried out under a common command, nor were they systematically planned. The Mutiny did open the British eyes to the power of the Indian population but not to its constructive power but the anarchism that the Indian people were able to output. Consequently after the rebellions India’s national leaders chose not to resolve to violence again but instead concentrated on gaining the favour of the British politicians instead of resisting them.

By the turning of the twentieth century the gap between the Hindu and the Moslem ruling classes increased as they were competing for the British preference. In 1905 the partition of the Bengal region by the British divided it into the West Bengal

²² Puckrein 1993, p.3.

²³ Roberts 1995, p.942, pp.1049-1050; Puckrein 1993, p.3.

²⁴ Was initiated by Hindu soldiers who opposed the British command of using animal fat in cartridge. (Roberts 1995, p. 788.)

with a Hindu majority and East Bengal with the majority of the Moslems.²⁵ The conflicts between the Moslems and Hindus, combined with the British unwillingness to allow reforms, presented the need for unity and mutual understanding between the representatives of the two groups that would allow to resist British supremacy efficiently. Thus contributing to the formation of Indian *satyagraha* that gave opportunity for direct protest and room for compromise.

The first movement, in the US, to promote racial equality and agitate for civil rights was formed at the beginning of the twentieth century. It was founded by black intellectuals from Northern States. The rights for black Americans increased steadily in the North throughout the first half of the century, whereas the black population in the South was under tighter restraint - most often threatened by violence. Liberal white activists joined to help the civil rights movement, especially in the North. However, interracial reform moved very slowly until 1955, when Rosa Parks sparked off civil disobedience in the South.²⁶

Similarly to the bases of Indian *satyagraha*, King's movement arose from already existing initiatives. However, the previous attempts to change racial prejudices in the US were done in the Northern States therefore not directly where segregation was at its worse, thus leading to very slow improvements. The initiative brought by Rosa Parks was the first sign of the black population in the South having enough of unjust laws and racist treatment, although her actions did not present this frustration in an aggressive way as many Indians had done during the Mutiny, instead she provided an example of non-violence. Thus King's movement appears not to have learnt on the examples of failed violent resistance but rather on the examples of non-violent action that the movement would make into a successful method of protest.

IV. Social Circumstances

“I do not regard the force of numbers as necessary in a just cause...”²⁷ Gandhi wrote this in 1919 in a journal *Young India*. This is an example of one of Gandhi's

²⁵ Gandhi 1982; Roberts 1995, pp.820-822, p.942.

²⁶ *Legacy of a Dream* 1974; *The Assassin Years* 1977; Puckrein 1993, pp.3-5.

²⁷ *Young India*, November 5, 1919. (*The Essential Gandhi* 2002, p.133.)

personal convictions that greatly contributed to the birth of the movement. However the minority factor mentioned by Gandhi in the quote also may be seen as directly influencing the development of the practice of non-violence.

In the United States the population of the oppressed constituted a minority: the black Americans making up only 10% of the entire US's population.²⁸ In turn, the South African population varied according to regions²⁹, Gandhi's movement being formed in Transvaal where Indians constituted a minority. The Indian population was much larger than that of the British officials in India - amount of Indians being three hundred million compared with one hundred thousand of Englishmen.³⁰

Geographically India was a larger area than South Africa or the Southern States of the US.³¹ The differences between India's population were much more spread than those of the black Americans; differing in religions - most notably Hinduism and Islam - and social status. The caste-system in India separated the population according to ranks since 1000 BC and after the collapse of Moghul Empire in the early eighteenth century, India was constituted out of autonomous states without a central governing power until the British Empire took gradually over during the eighteenth century. Gandhi aimed to unify the different social and religious groups to achieve improvements in India.³²

The people constituting the oppressed in all the three countries mainly belonged to lower social classes; many of them living in poverty. Their leaders also did not possess the same economical nor militant resources as the oppressors did. Before the twentieth century this was often accepted because it was believed that the white race is superior to that of Indian or black population, due to the colonial history of the British Empire and history of legal slavery in the Southern States.³³

Considering that both non-violent movements were formed within the minority populations - in South Africa and Southern States - it may be suggested that this influenced the non-violent nature of these movements. Having a smaller population than that of the oppressors meant that had Gandhi or King even wanted to use violence to achieve their goals, it would not have been realistic to do so as the

²⁸ King 1998, p.320.

²⁹ "Natal in 1896 had 400,000 Negro inhabitants, 50, 000 whites and 51,000 Indians," whereas; "The Transvaal Republic had 650,000 Negroes, 120,000 whites and about 5,000 Indians." (*The Essential Gandhi* 2002, p.38.)

³⁰ *Young India*, August 11, 1920. (*The Essential Gandhi* 2002, p.137.)

³¹ Areas in 1942 - India: 4 684 000 km², South Africa: 1,219,912 km², Southern States: 2,384,143 km².

³² *Gandhi* 1982; Gandhi 1982; Roberts 1995, p.614.

military capacities of the British Empire and the United States were simply too strong. King's words support this idea: "...no internal revolution has ever succeeded in overthrowing a government by violence unless the government had already lost the allegiance and effective control of its armed forces. And anyone in his right mind knows that this will not happen in the United States."³⁴

On the other hand the great outnumbering of the Indian population did not set the Indians into a superior position either. According to Gandhi in 1920: "The British are weak in numbers, we are weak in spite of our numbers."³⁵ By this Gandhi is probably referring to the Indian poverty, differences in caste and religion, and the geographical distances between different regions which did not allow the Indian population to form a unified movement, as the NAACP in the US. Although Gandhi had already adopted non-violence as a political method in South Africa and wanted the Indian people to assume it as well, it can also be viewed that he realistically had no option of using violence considering the impoverished and disunited population of India.

Both movements arose within the oppressed who were divided; geographical, historical and economical differences between the blacks of the North and South of the United States; and more conflicting differences between the Hindus and Moslems in India. According to Gandhi: "No organization can run smoothly when it is divided into camps."³⁶ Thus the differing groups needed to unite their forces in order to reach their common goals - this required able leadership combined with a suitable political method.

V. Political Circumstances

Both governments that were oppressing the Indians and the black Americans were in fact democratic ones. "Let us not lose faith in democracy. For with all of its weaknesses, there is a ground and a basis of hope in our democratic creed."³⁷ With these words King urged his fellow protesters to remain committed to non-violence. The existence of and the belief in democracy present good reasons for using non-

³³ King 1998; Gandhi 1982; Puckrein 1993; James 1998, pp.184-199.

³⁴ King 1998, p.330.

³⁵ *Young India*, September 22, 1920. (*The Essential Gandhi* 2002, p.134.)

³⁶ *Young India*, June 9, 1927. (*The Essential Gandhi* 2002, p.192.)

violence. The oppressors were also not direct enemies of Indians or the black Americans as for example different races of different nations are during wars. In addition the promises given to the oppressed by the political leaders excluded violent revolutions since the Indian and the African American leaders had hope to negotiate their rights.

The British Empire was a leading world power in the beginning of the twentieth century as the United States became to be after the Second World War. However, Britain was losing its prestige in India as that of nationalism and Gandhi's movement kept on growing. In 1919 a command of a British general that killed 379 Indian demonstrators³⁸ greatly diminished the moral of the British government not only in India but also abroad. Unlike that of Britain, the American authority was increasing at the development of the civil rights movement. The growing status in turn required consistency between the American emphasis upon global democracy and the discrimination of the black population in the South. The unjust actions of the two governments drew attention to the non-violent movements that abided democratic ideals that the government officials themselves were overlooking.³⁹

India was a colony of the British Empire whereas the American black population belonged to the same nation as all other races of the United States. The oppressed depended upon their leaders (especially in the US) since they were the ones who could grant them civil rights in the US and a Home Rule in India. Both governments promised improvements and changes in law and did bring about gradual changes such as the development of an Indian National Congress⁴⁰ within the British Empire and the right to vote for the Northern black citizens as well as slow desegregation in schools of the US.⁴¹

Nevertheless neither of the governments was willing to voluntarily grant rights or freedom to the oppressed people. In a NBC interview of 1957 King was asked why the civil rights movement is not "taking it step by step" to this he replied: "It seems to me that it is both historically and sociologically true that privileged classes do not

³⁷ King said this after being fined in a Montgomery court, in 1956, for leading the bus boycott on March 22nd. (*The Wisdom of Martin Luther King, Jr.* 1993.)

³⁸ On April 13th 20,000 Indians had gathered to hear speeches about the injustices of the British rule in spite of Brigadier-General Rex Dyer's formal prohibition of all mass meetings and gatherings. Sustained shooting lasting for ten minutes left not only over three hundred dead but also wounded more than 1,500 civilians. (Ferguson 2004, pp.331-332; *Gandhi* 1982).

³⁹ Gandhi 1982; Puckrein 1993; *Generation of Change* 1989; *The Legacy of a Dream* 1974.

⁴⁰ Formed in 1885. (James 1998, p. 231.)

⁴¹ *Gandhi* 1982; Puckrein 1993.

give up their privileges voluntarily. And they do not give them up without strong resistance.” Similarly as the Indians realised that they need to be more persistent in their resistance after the First World War, the slow political changes in the US pushed the civil rights movement to demand harder for its rights from the government.⁴²

The same government and laws that bounded the different races of the British Empire and the United States meant that co-operation between the oppressed and the oppressors was possible and in deed expected. Both Gandhi and Martin Luther King agreed that only through non-violent co-operation could their movements achieve change - not by risking the existing relations by violence. “I don’t believe in black separatism...”⁴³ said King when referring to the arising of the Black Power⁴⁴ in the mid 1960’s. Both movements aimed to gain support of each strong government through non-aggression. Yet since changes in both countries were taking place very slowly, both Gandhi and King emphasised the importance of using strikes and methods of self-sufficiency that would lead to direct action and force the government to recognise its promises and duties.

Gandhi and King served as links not only within their movements but also arranging connections between the public opinion and the oppressors; aiming to reach an understanding with both sides.⁴⁵ This two sided co-operation would have been impossible had the movements resolved to violence. The political circumstances surrounding the birth of each movement required delicate actions for which non-violence was specifically fit as it would separate the movements from the violence that the governments had inflicted upon them, so lifting the moral of the oppressed and showing an example to the oppressors. The political means used by the non-violent movements were suited for connecting the opposing forces that were facing each other in the early half of the twentieth century in India and the mid-twentieth century in the US.

⁴² *The Open Mind* 1954; Roberts 1995, p.942; Puckrein 1993, p.3, *Gandhi* 1982.

⁴³ King 1998, p.320.

⁴⁴ The slogan taken by the black Americans who believed in using aggressive means to achieve Civil Rights.

⁴⁵ See appendices A and B to view images that support the linking roles of the two leaders.

VI. Conclusion

The key circumstances that contributed to the rise of Gandhi's and King's non-violent movements include short-term as well as long-term historical reasons, social conditions of the oppressed and the political circumstances between the governments and the oppressed. The long-term historical circumstances had taught the Indians that violence is an inefficient method of fighting the British rule. The short-term historical contexts surrounding the oppressed of South Africa, India and the United States introduced new liberal ideas and two dynamic leaders, as well as an accumulation of tensions between the governments and the public opinion. However, the social weaknesses of both Indians and African Americans meant that violence would not serve as a beneficent mean to solve their problems. Therefore the two historical contexts presented the willingness of the oppressed to fight injustice and at the same time the necessity to use a new approach in order to succeed. The governments of the British Empire and the United States similarly had to adapt to changing political circumstances of the first half of the twentieth century, which in turn led to their preparedness to co-operate with the oppressed.

From the key circumstances mentioned above it seems that there is no one dominating historical circumstance that would have contributed to the birth of the movements more than any other. Historical contexts are never one-dimensional, thus the time-periods that were being investigated included several circumstances that reciprocally created the conditions favourable to the rise of non-violent movements. However, even such a comprehensive consideration of contributions provides us with only one half of the contributions. A more complete answer would have been reached, had the personal contributions of Gandhi and King been considered, that undoubtedly played an immense role on the rise of each movement. The personal attributes of the two leaders would surely provide an equally interesting and challenging topic to investigate. Nonetheless, within the intended range of this investigation, the significant historical contributions were identified and thoroughly studied, (although still leaving room for other suggestions) leading to the conclusion that in deed many similar social and political circumstances had combined within two different time periods which provided fertile soil for the seeds of non-violence to be planted by Mohandas K. Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr.

Bibliography

Printed Sources:

The Essential Gandhi: An Anthology of His Writings on His Life, Work, and Ideas.

Editor: Louis Fischer. First published in 1962. Vintage Spiritual Classics Edition;
Second Edition: New York, 2002.

Ferguson, Niall. *Empire: How Britain Made the Modern World.* First published in
2003. Penguin Books: London, 2004.

Gandhi, M.K. *An Autobiography or My Story of My Experiments with Truth.* First
published in: Volume 1, 1927; Volume 2, 1929. Penguin Books: London, 1982.

Generation of Change: The Civil Rights Movement in America. Editor-in-Chief: Gary
Pergi. U.S. Department of State, 1989.

James, Lawrence. *The Rise & Fall of the British Empire.* First published in 1995.
Abacus: London, 1998.

King, M.L. *The Autobiography of Martin Luther King, Jr.* Edited by Clayborne,
Carson. Warner Books: New York, 1998.

Puckrein, Gary, A. *The Civil Rights Movement and the Legacy of Martin Luther King,
Jr.* U.S. Department of State, 1993.

Roberts, J.M. *History of the World.* Penguin Books; Reprinted Edition: London, 1995.

The Wisdom of Martin Luther King, Jr. Edited by Alex Ayres. Meridian: New York,
1993.

Videos:

Documentary: *The Assassin Years.* Directed by Richard Marquand. A Chatsworth
Film Production, 1977.

Motion picture: *Gandhi*. Directed by Richard Attenborough. Written by John Briley.
Columbia Pictures: UK/India, 1982.

Documentary: *Legacy of a Dream*. Directed and written by Richard Kaplan. A
presentation of The Martin Luther King, Jr. Foundation. Distributed by: Fox/Lorber,
1974.

Documentary: *The Open Mind*. Directed by Hugh McPhillips. NBC: New York, 1957.



Gandhi attending the second Round Table Conference in London, in 1931. The negotiations between Gandhi and British leaders over ending the civil disobedience of Gandhi's movements failed. However, this picture does illustrate that by the 1930's the British were already willing to co-operate directly with Indian leaders seeking for their consent in issues that posed a threat to the British rule.



Gandhi also received support from British workers.

Mahatma Gandhi with textile workers at Darwen, Lancashire (England), September 26, 1931.⁴⁷

Appendix B

⁴⁶ http://www.mahatma.org.in/pictures/images/piccat0006/ev_0046.jpg

⁴⁷ <http://www.hollandse-hoogte.nl/image/news/previous/gandhi/html/doc2%20mg185b.html>



President Eisenhower (third from left) meets with civil rights leaders on June 23, 1958. From left to right: Martin Luther King Jr., E. Frederic Morrow, A. Philip Randolph, William Rogers and Roy Wilkins.⁴⁸

Similarly to Indian non-violence movement, the Civil Rights' leaders maintained contact with the American leaders at the same time as having the support of the public.



Mrs. King Kisses Rev. King after Boycott Guilty Verdict, March 22, 1956.⁴⁹



Martin Luther King Jr., centre, and other protesters march arm-in-arm through Memphis, Tennessee, on March 28, 1968, a week before the civil rights leader was assassinated.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ <http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/mlk/king/photogallery.html>

⁴⁹ <http://www.stevenskasher.com/html/exhibresults.asp?exnum=297&exname=The+Civil+Rights+Movement>

⁵⁰ http://www.sptimes.com/2002/01/21/Floridian/Word_for_Word__A_wake.shtml

