

[applause]

Alan Wilson: [00:14] Good evening, friends. It is a pleasure for me to welcome you to the third and final public lecture of the season, given by the Alexander S. Keller Memorial Fund of the University of Hartford. As you know Alexander Sidney Keller was one of the honored founders of this university and was one of Hartford's leading citizens. He was always interested in the welfare of his fellow men and he gave much of his life, both here and abroad, to help build a better world. In his memory his friends in New England and elsewhere have established this lecture series at the University of Hartford. The aim is to bring to the university, and to this community, men and women of national prominence who are dedicating their lives to improving human relations and international understanding and goodwill. Previous speakers this year have been Judge Charles E. Wyzanski [Jr.] of the United States Circuit Court of Boston and Professor John Kenneth Galbraith, noted economist at Harvard University. Next year, under the auspices of the Keller lectures of the University of Hartford, we will bring to this city: Barbara Ward, noted British economist and author, and William C. Foster, vice president of the Olin Mathieson Chemical Corporation and former undersecretary of commerce, deputy secretary of defense, and administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, known by most of us as the Marshall Plan. Their messages will help you to keep informed about the great issues in the world about you and abreast of the ideas of our leading thinkers and on human relations and world understanding.

[02:28] Now it is my pleasure to present our speaker of the evening. He is a modest man who would have preferred to have gone his way without attracting attention to himself. Fate, however, had other plans for him. Although only thirty-years-old, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. is one of the most distinguished leaders of his time. Fifty-seven Gallup Poll attested to the worldwide admiration in which he was held as a religious leader. That same year Time magazine selected him as one of the ten outstanding personalities of the year.

[03:13] Dr. King was born in Atlanta, Georgia, the son and grandson of Baptist ministers. In 1955, he received his Doctor of Philosophy degree in the field of systematic theology from Boston University. Since 1954, Dr. King has served as pastor of the historic Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery for his devoted congregation attests to his sincerity and eloquence. In 1955, as a protest against segregation of Negroes from whites on public buses in Montgomery, Reverend King organized a peaceful resistance towards the bus company by urging Negroes to walk or ride in carpools. This peaceful resistance, almost 100 percent effective, lasted more than a year despite bombing of his home and a suspended sentence by an Alabama circuit judge. The situation ultimately was settled by the Supreme Court of the United States, which late in 1956 upheld an injunction against bus segregation.

[04:36] In January 1957, Dr. King called a conference of Southern Negro leaders at Atlanta, Georgia. Attended by sixty delegates from ten states, the conference endorsed his program of nonviolent integration based in part on Mahatma Gandhi's philosophy, and urged top federal officials - including President Dwight D. Eisenhower - to make addresses on behalf of civil rights in key southern cities. In June 28th, Dr. King was awarded the Spingarn Medal of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Among Dr. King's honorary doctorates is the Doctor of Divinity degree from the University of Chicago. He is the author of *Stride Toward Freedom*, published in 1958, which summarizes his efforts in the 1956 period to abolish racial segregation on Montgomery, Alabama buses.

[05:49] Dr. King has recently returned from India, where he visited at the invitation of Prime Minister Nehru and lectured and met with cultural groups and observe the many faceted activities of Indian life. The Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr will speak on the subject *The Future of Integration*. As chairman of the Administrative Council of the University of Hartford, I consider it a personal privilege to present Dr. Martin Luther King to this fine audience this evening. Dr King.

[applause]

Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.: [06:43] Dr. Wilson, ladies and gentlemen - I need not pause to say how happy I am to be here this evening and to be in this community. And I want to express my personal appreciation to the University of Hartford for inviting me here to be a part of this very significant lecture series. I'm sure that this experience will remain meaningful to me so long as the chords of memory shall lengthen.

[07:28] I come to Hartford, not totally a stranger because I have very pleasant memories of this city. When I was a freshman in college, some fifteen years ago, I joined several of my fellow students in coming to Connecticut to work for the summer on one of the tobacco farms. This was called the Cullman Brothers' farm it's near Simsbury, Connecticut. And all week long we would work very hard and the sun was very hot, and it was always a big relief for the weekend to come around when we could come to Hartford. I don't think I've been back to Hartford since that time and I'm very happy to have the opportunity to come back to this great city and to this great state, and to be a part of the Alexander S. Keller Memorial Fund Lecture Series.

[08:34] And this evening, I would like to discuss with you the future of integration. In order to understand the future, it is often necessary to get a clear picture of the past. In order to know where we are going, it is necessary to know from whence we have come. And so, I would like to open by looking to the past just a bit and seeing from whence we've come in the area of race relations. Broadly speaking, there have been three distinct periods in the area of race relations in the United States. And each period represents something of a little growth over the preceding period. There has been an evolutionary growth across the years. And it is also interesting to notice that in each period the Supreme Court of the nation finally rendered a decision which gave legal and constitutional validity to the dominant thought patterns of that particular period.

[10:23] The first period extended from 1619 to about 1863. This was a period of slavery. During this period, the Negro was a thing to be used, not a person to be respected. He was something

- of a depersonalized cog in a vast plantation machine. Toward the end of that period in 1857, the Supreme Court rendered a decision known as the Dred Scott decision which said, in substance, that the Negro is not a citizen of this nation; he is merely property, subject to the dictates of his owner. This was the dominant thought pattern of this period and this decision came to give legal and constitutional validity to this thought pattern.
- [11:40] The second period extended, broadly speaking, from 1863 to 1954. We may refer to this as a period of restricted emancipation. Now this period represents growth over the first period. And it is a little better than the first period because it at least freed the Negro from the bondage of physical slavery and accepted him as a legal fact. But it was not the best period because it did not yet except the Negro as a person. And so, it was no wonder that a few years after emancipation, a new doctrine came into being known as the "separate but equal" doctrine.
- [12:43] In 1896, the Supreme Court came out with a decision to give legal and constitutional validity to the dominant thought patterns of the period of restricted emancipation. This is the famous Plessy versus Ferguson decision. But as I said, this was not the best period because it did not quite accept the Negro as a person. And so, as a result of the Plessy doctrine, the Negro was plunged into the abyss of exploitation where he experienced the bleakness of nagging injustice. Living under the conditions of the first period and the second period, many Negroes lost faith in themselves. Many came to feel that perhaps they were inferior or that they were less than human. This is always the tragedy of slavery, or the tragedy of segregation. It does not only inflict physical inconveniences, but it does something to the soul. It distorts the personality. It gives the segregator a false sense of superiority. And it gives a segregated a false sense of inferiority. And this is exactly what happened during this period. The Negro lost faith in himself and came to feel that perhaps he was inferior. But then something happened to the Negro, and as these things happened it gradually brought an end, or at least it brought this second period to a testing point.
- [14:45] Circumstances made it possible and necessary for the Negro to travel more; the coming of the automobile, the upheavals of two world wars, the Great Depression. And his rural plantation background gradually gave way to urban industrial life. And even his economic life was rising through the growth of industry and through the influence and power of organized labor and other agencies. And 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 re-evaluate 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 the significant thing about a man is not his specificity, but his fundamentum; not the texture of his hair or the color of his skin, but the texture and quality of his soul. And so, the Negro could now unconsciously cry out with the eloquent poet:
- [16:13] "Fleecy locks and black complexion
Cannot forfeit nature's claim;
Skin may differ but affection,
Dwells in black and white the same."
- [16:27] "Were I so tall as to reach the pole

Or to grasp the ocean at a span;
I must be measured by my soul:
The mind is the standard of the man."

[16:44] With this new evaluation, the Negro gained a new sense of dignity and destiny. And this brought about a new determination for freedom. With this new determination, we noticed the gradual decline of the ethos of the second period. And so there came into being the third period. This period had its beginning in 1954\ . And there was also a decision from the Supreme Court to give legal and constitutional validity to the dominant thought patterns of this period. We may refer to it as a period of constructive integration. And the Supreme Court said on May 17th of that year, 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. And as a result of this decision, we stand today on the threshold of the most creative and constructive period of our nation's history. To put it in Biblical terms, we've broken loose from the Egypt of slavery, we move through the wilderness of separate but equal, and now we stand on the border of the promised land of integration.

[18:28] The great challenge before us at this hour - before the nation at this hour - is to bring into full realization the ideals and principles of this third period; to make integration a reality. To make person to person relationships a reality where we have genuine interpersonal and intergroup living. This is the challenge of the hour. And strangely enough we don't have long to solve this problem and to enter this other period and to bring its ideals into full realization. We don't have much time to do it. Occasionally, history places before a nation or a civilization, a deadline and the survival of the civilization of the nation depends on how it responds to its deadline. Historian Arnold Toynbee bases his whole philosophy of history on the challenge and response. And he says that there comes a time when every civilization is challenged and the way that civilization responds to the challenge determines the survival of that civilization. And he goes on to say that some twenty-three civilizations have risen upon the face of their earth, and all but about seven have destroyed themselves because they did not properly respond to the challenge of the hour. And that is the challenge facing America, the challenge facing western civilization. And that challenge is to solve the problem of man's in humanity to man and that challenge is to do away with the old idea of white supremacy, and paternalism, and segregation, and discrimination. We do not have long to meet the challenge. I know there are some people who are saying - they are occasionally writing letters from the South to the North saying - that "you must slow up." They are saying this to Negroes, and they are saying this to white people of goodwill; "slow up stop this process." They're saying that we must adopt a policy of moderation. And certainly, if moderation means moving on toward the goal of justice with wise restraint and calm reasonableness, then moderation is a great virtue of which all men of goodwill must seek to achieve in this tense period of transition. But if moderation means slowing up in the move for justice and capitulating to the whims and caprices of the guardians of a deadening status quo, then moderation is a tragic vice which all men of goodwill must condemn. For in a real sense we cannot afford to slow up. We love America too much to slow up, we love democracy too much to slow up, we must say to those who are telling us to slow up that of approximately two billion five hundred million people in this world, the vast majority of these people live in Asia and Africa, about 700 million in China, about 500 million in India and Pakistan, 100 million in Indonesia, more than 200 million in Africa, more than ninety-six million in Japan.

And for years, most of these people have been dominated politically; exploited economically by some foreign power. And now many of them on gaining their independence and they are saying in no uncertain terms that racism and colonialism must go.

[22:52] Two years ago, I had the privilege of traveling to Africa to visit the new nation of Ghana and its independence celebration. There I had the opportunity to talk with leaders from all over Africa. Just a few weeks ago, I return from India and made some stops in the Middle East and in Europe. Both from that experience two years ago in Africa and the recent experience in Europe, and the Middle East, and India, I am aware of the fact - and I'm sure you are aware of the fact - that the peoples of the world are saying that we must solve this problem if we are to maintain our prestige in the world. And they are making it clear that no extensive handouts and beautiful words will cause them to fail to see and understand the treatment of their colored brothers in the United States of America. So that in a real sense, the hour is late. The clock of destiny is ticking out and we must act now and solve this problem before it is too late.

[24:11] Now I must rush on to say, that we must not seek to solve it merely because there is a country in the world known as Russia and there is an ideology in the world known as communism. We must not seek to solve this problem merely to defeat godless communism. It must be done not merely because it is diplomatically expedient but because it is morally compelling; must be done because freedom and justice are ethical demands of the universe. But honesty impels us to admit, that if we solve the problem, we will do a great deal to defeat communism and to defeat much of its faults and much of its extensive propaganda all over the world. This is a challenge of the hour and we must solve this problem. This is what we must do in the future, in the years ahead.

[25:13] Now many agencies must work together to solve this problem. Many forces must come together, not just one but all of them must work together. And sometimes I wonder whether all of the moral forces of our nation have really been mobilized behind integration; mobilized to bring into being, the full realization of the ideals of this third period.

[25:43] First, there is a great role that the federal government must play in this tense period of transition. The federal government has this big job of enforcing the law. And it must continue to stand firm with positive, forthright action. And so far, we must admit that the positive, forthright action has come from the judicial branch of the government. The legislative and executive branches of the government have so often lagged behind. Now the challenge stands before all branches of the federal government to make this dream of our democracy a reality.

[26:35] There are people who would say that if this problem is to be solved in America - in general and the South in particular - it must be done through education. They would say that you can't legislate morals, so that the federal government should not push too much and should not be too positive. Legislation isn't a basic necessity at this time, they would say. The necessity at this time is to change the heart. Well, I believe that's true that we've got to change the hearts of men. But I would rather say that it is both legislation and education, rather than either legislation or education. We need both. Education and religion will serve to change the hearts of men, but in the process, we will need something to regulate the behavior, or control the behavior of men. And this is all we seek to do through the law. We

don't seek to change our internal attitudes through the law, but we seek to control the external expressions of bad internal attitudes through the law. That is what we seek to do.

[28:01] It is true that the law cannot make a man love me, but the law can control his determination to lynch me. It is quite true that the law cannot make an employer love and have compassion for the employees, but it can control his desire and even control his action in refusing to hire a person on the basis of his race. And sometimes, I think it is an immoral act for people to say to oppress people, "You must continue to accept oppression until the hearts of the oppressors are changed." And this is all the law says, that we need something to control and regulate behavior while through religion and education, we seek to change the attitudes. Religion and education seeks to change the internal attitudes, but we need the law to control the external effects of these internal attitudes. So, the federal government has a role to play in this hour.

[29:10] We can see it very clearly now, that is the pattern of terror in the South. It lets up occasionally, but it comes back. We can hear the screaming voice of a young man down in Poplarville, Mississippi; a bloody body being dragged from an unguarded jail. And a few days later we find that body in the confused waters of Mississippi. We can see things happening all over the South, in terms of violence on a determination not to comply with the Supreme Court's decision. In the legislative halls of the South ring loud with such words as interposition and nullification. This simply means that at this hour, we do need more civil rights legislation. And this means that in this session of Congress, we need new civil rights legislation, including an anti-lynch bill. This is a role that the federal government can play and this tense period of transition.

[30:22] But not only the federal government, we must look to other agencies. I think we must look to the moderates of the white South. And I come to you this evening, to say that there are many more white people of goodwill in the South than we are able to see on the surface. Many of these people are silent today because they are afraid. They fear political, economic, and social reprisals, and so they remain silent. God grant that something will happen to change these people or to break the shackles of fear, so that they will rise up with courage and determination and take over the leadership of the South in this period. It is tragic indeed that the leaders of the deep South are the extremists and the reactionaries, but I can assure you that they do not represent the thinking of the whole South. We do not have a solid South. We do not have a solid South from a regional point of view, we do not have a south from the point of view of attitudes.

[31:33] There are three Souths regionally: there is the south of compliance - Oklahoma, Kentucky, Missouri, Kansas, West Virginia, Maryland and so forth. There is a wait and see South which is not going in all out compliance, but it certainly isn't in the resisting category - that would be North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and maybe one or two more. And then there is the south of resistance - Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Louisiana. Just as there are three Souths from a regional point of view, I think there are three Souths more in terms of attitudes.

[32:15] There are some people in the white South who will use any means possible to prevent integration from becoming a reality, including physical violence. But I believe firmly that this group is in a small minority, a numerical minority; not more than five percent or ten percent

- at the most. And in the vast majority, would fit in the second category; people who sincerely believe in the moral and the constitutional rightness of segregation, but who basically are law abiding people. And they believe in law and order, and if their political leaders of the South would leave them alone, they would go on and comply with the law because it is the law.
- [33:06] And then there is another group - and I think at times this group is growing, maybe about ten percent, but it's still growing - people in the white south who believe in integration; who are working in quiet, unpublicized ways to make it a reality and to implement the Supreme Court's decision. These people often suffered, and they sacrificed, and they are abused, but they are there. And so, this reveals to us that we do not have a [[33:35] unintelligible, single?], we do not have a solid south. There are moderates in the white South. There are many people of good will in the white South. And I hope that in this hour, these people will be able to get into the leadership positions and thereby open the channels of communication between the races.
- [33:59] For we are going through that tragic period now in the South of trying to live in monologue rather than dialogue. People hate each other because they fear each other. People fear each other because they don't know each other. People don't know each other because they can't communicate with each other and they can't communicate with each other because they are separated from each other. Therefore, something must happen to reopen the channels of communication. And I think this can happen if the moderates of the white South will move on and stand out and decide that they are going to suffer and sacrifice until they are able to make the dream of our nation a reality.
- [34:47] Then also we must not only limit this to the South because the race problem is not a sectional problem. Segregation still exists in the South and it's glaring and conspicuous form, but we still have it in the North and its hidden and subtle forms. And we realize this that no section of the country can boast and say that it has clean hands at this point. It is true that it is more intensified in the South. It is true that it is legal in the South and I think that is certainly the main difference. And it is true that the North - if I had to answer the question which is better and which is further ahead - I would say the North naturally, because at least a legal battle has been won and segregation does not have legal validity. But since it is still this problem of brotherhood is a problem for the whole nation, we must say that the liberals of the North have a role to play in this period of transition. And so often what I find in Northern communities is a sort of quasi-liberalism which is based on the principle of looking sympathetically at all sides. And it gets so involved in looking at all sides that it doesn't get committed to either side.
- [applause]
- [36:23] It is so often a liberalism that is so objectively analytical that it never gets subjectively committed. It is a liberalism that is neither hot nor cold, but lukewarm. And what we need today is a true genuine ethical liberalism. I'm not saying that we should not look sympathetically on all sides - every righteous man, every man of good will has to do that - but in the process he discovers what is right, he discovers what is true, and he commits himself to that while having an attitude of understanding goodwill toward those persons who haven't come to see what is right. But he works with determination and with a sense of

urgency to rectify the situation. And this is what we need - a committed liberalism - one where individuals stand up on basic principles and discover that there is a right side in this issue. And that right is right, and wrong is wrong, and never the twain shall meet. This is something that we must see.

[applause]

[37:37] Then we must look to the religious bodies of our nation in this hour. Why not? Because the religious institutions are the moral guardians of the community. In the South we are very religious people. We go to church in big numbers. And I think now we must begin to take the ethical insights of our Hebraic-Christian tradition seriously and make this idea of brotherhood a reality. It is tragic, indeed, at eleven o'clock on Sunday morning, when we stand to sing "In Christ There is No East or West," we stand in the most segregated hour of Christian America. So often in the church, we've had a high-blood pressure of creeds and an anemia of deeds. Thank God we're beginning now to shake the lethargy from eyes, and we're coming to see that if we are to be followers of Jesus Christ and the great prophets, we must make brotherhood a reality.

[38:51] The church must continue to take its stand. For it's written all over the Christian scriptures; it's written all over the bible. Starts in the Old Testament with the view that man is made in the image of God and goes on over into the New Testament; "out of one blood God made all men to dwell upon the face of the earth." "In Christ there is neither Jew nor Gentile, bond nor free, male nor female, yes, Negro nor white. We all one in Christ Jesus." These things must be taken seriously, if we are to solve this problem. And I'm convinced that when the church is really determined and when it stands out as it should, the transition from a segregated to an integrated society will be infinitely smoother.

[39:45] There is another point that is very important. And that is that the Negro himself has a great role to play in this period of transition. To put it in a figurative manner -integration is not some lavish dish that the white man will pass out on a silver platter while the Negro merely furnishes the appetite. [laughter from the audience] If integration is to become a reality, we will have to work for it and struggle for it; yes, and even suffer for it. So that there is a role to play. In this period of transition and the Negro himself, we must work at every moment to make first class citizenship a reality. But I must also say that, we must never use second-class methods to gain it. We must have something of a consistency between the methods we use and the end which we seek to achieve.

[41:05] There are three ways that oppressed people can deal with their oppression. One way is to accept the oppression, to acquiesce, to resign oneself to the fate of oppression. And many people solve that problem just like this. Many oppressed people, they just surrender and they accept it, and they go through life conditioned to the system - to their oppression. Moses confronted this problem when he was leading the children of Israel out of Egypt. And some of them got out in the wilderness and there were actually some in the group who wanted to go back to Egypt. They preferred the fleshpots of Egypt to the challenges of the promised land.

[41:56] I remember down in Atlanta - my hometown - there was a man who used to play a guitar and I would see him all the time. And one day, I stopped to hear him, and he was playing his

guitar and I heard him singing these words, "been down so long, that down don't bother me." [laughter from the audience] Now some people actually get to that point. They get bogged down under the load of oppression and they achieve the freedom of exhaustion. They get exhausted in the process, but this isn't the way because non-cooperation with evil is as much a moral obligation as is cooperation with good. And if I make my brother feel that he's treating me right when I know deep down within that he isn't and that this system is right, then I am as much a part of the perpetuation of the system as he is. So that that this isn't the way.

[42:58] The second way open to oppressed people, in their struggle for freedom and justice, is to result to violence and corroding hatred. And this has often been used - we know about it in America, we know about it over the world - and I'm not here to say this evening that violence can never bring about temporary victory. I know that nations have received their independence through violence, and I know that violence has often brought about temporary victories. But I do submit to you that violence can only bring temporary victory, never permanent peace. It ends up creating many more social problems than it solves. So that to my mind, this isn't the way. And while there are those who might argue that nonviolent resistance is not a way and a method that can be used in international relations, I think almost anyone would agree with me in saying that in conflicts between groups within nations, it is almost absurd and certainly impractical to think of violence as a way out. It is both immoral and impractical. And if the Negro succumbs to the temptation of using violence and his 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 reign of meaningless chaos.

[44:27] That is a third way open to oppressed people and that is a way of nonviolent resistance. Where it is possible to stand up with as much determination and as much courage against an unjust system as a person who uses violence and yet you refuse to hate in the process, and you maintain an active attitude of goodwill toward your opponent. You come to the point where you can say, "I'm not out to defeat or to humiliate the opponent, but to win his friendship and understanding." There will be an act of love toward him in spite of everything else. I talk a great deal about love and people ask me from time to time, what in the world I mean and how can you tell people to love those people who are lynching you, and people who are bombing your home, and people who are oppressing you - how can you love them? I think the Greek language comes to our aid at this point. In the Greek language, there are three words for love. One is a word *eros*. *Eros* is something of an aesthetic love. Plato talks about it a great deal in his dialogues. It is the yearning of the soul for the realm of the divine. It has come to us to mean a sort of romantic love. And so, we know about *eros* because we have experienced it. We read about it in all of the beauty of literature. I imagine Edgar Allan Poe was talking about *eros* when he talked about his beautiful Annabel Lee, with the love surrounded by the halo of eternity. In a sense, Shakespeare was probably talking about *eros* when he said,

[46:13] "Love is not love which alters when it's 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 ever wandering bark."

- [46:27] You know, I can remember that because I used to quote it to my wife when we were courting. [laughter from the audience] That's *eros*. And then the Greek language talks about *philia*, which is on another level. It is a sort of love between personal friends. It is a reciprocal type of love. You love because you are loved. You love people that you like. You have things in common and you got along well, so that you love those people that you like. It is a love based on intimate affection and a goodwill.
- [47:08] But then the Greek language comes out with another word, it puts it in the word *agape*. And *agape* is more than *eros* or *philia*, it is understanding creative redemptive goodwill for all men. It seeks nothing in return. It is an overflowing love; a spontaneous love which seeks nothing in return. And theologians would say that *agape* is the love of God operating in the lives of individuals. So, when you rise to love on this level, you love men not because you like them. You love them because God loves them. And you come to see that it is possible to love the individual who does the evil deed, while hating the deed that the person does. And I believe firmly that if we will adopt this type of love and refuse to become bitter in this tense period of transition as a people, we will be able to make a great moral contribution to this generation and we will assist our generation in solving its problems. We must be able to stand before our oppressors all over the South and wherever they may be and say to them, "We will match your capacity to inflict suffering, by our capacity to endure suffering. We will meet your physical force with soul force. We cannot in all good conscience obey your unjust laws, but we will not hate you. Do to us what you will, and we will still love you. Bomb our homes, and we will still love you. Send your hooded perpetrators of violence into our communities at the midnight hours and allow them to drag us out, and beat us, and leave us half dead, and we will still love you. Put us in jail and beat us and leave us there, and we will still love you. Run around the country and use your propaganda techniques to make it appear that we are not fit morally, or culturally, or otherwise for integration, and we will still love you. And be assured that we will wear you down by our capacity to suffer and one day we will win our freedom and we will not only win freedom for ourselves, we will so appeal to your heart and conscience, that we will win you in the process." Therefore, our victory will be a double victory. It will defeat the evil system and transform the hearts and the souls of the perpetrators of the evil system. This is a possible way and I think this is the best way. This is a road, and this is a method that the Negro must adopt in playing his role in this period.
- [49:59] And this will help us to achieve not only desegregation, but also integration. For desegregation will only bring us together physically and break down the legal barriers, but after that we must think of genuine integration where we have a natural response and where men live together as brothers because it is natural and because it is right. And if we will follow this way, it will save us from substituting a sort of black supremacy, for white supremacy. For I must say tonight, that God is not interested merely in the freedom of black men and brown men, but God is interested in the freedom of the whole human race and creating a society where all men will be able to live together as brothers and respect the dignity and worth of all human personality.
- [50:50] With all of these forces working together - the federal government, the moderates of the white South, the liberals of the North, and the church, and the Negro himself - I believe that we will be able to solve this problem and the future will be a glorious future. We will be able

to achieve the ideals and the dreams of our democracy. So, I would say to you this evening, go away with a new determination to make this ideal a reality.

[51:25] In every academic discipline, there are certain technical words that eventually become stereotypes and clichés. Every academic discipline has its technical nomenclature. There is a word used in modern psychology which is probably used more than any other word in psychology. It is a word "maladjusted." Maladjusted - this is a ring and cry of the new child psychology - maladjusted. And certainly, we all want to live the well-adjusted life in order to avoid neurotic and schizophrenic personalities. But I close this evening, by saying to you that there are some things within our social system, to which I am proud to be maladjusted. And to which I call upon you to be maladjusted. I never intend to adjust myself to the viciousness of lynch mobs. I never intend to adjust myself to the evils of segregation and the crippling effects of discrimination. I never intend to become adjusted to the madness of militarism and the self-defeating effects of physical violence. And I call upon you to be maladjusted to all of these things. Let us be maladjusted - as maladjusted as a prophet Amos who in the midst of the injustices of his day could cry out in words that echo across the generations, "Let judgment run down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream." As maladjusted as Lincoln, who had the vision to see that this nation could not exist half-slave and half-free. As maladjusted as Jefferson, who in the midst of an age amazingly adjusted to slavery, could cry out in words lifted to cosmic proportions, "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." As maladjusted as Jesus of Nazareth, who could look into the eyes of the men and women of his generation, and cry out in beautiful terms, "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you." And I believe that it is through such noble maladjustment, that we will be able to save our generation. 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 when we do this America will be a great America and the ideals of our great democracy will come into being. To paraphrase the words of John Oxenham - to every nation there openeth a way, and ways, and a way. The high nation climbs a high way and the low nation gropes the low, and in between on the misty flats, the rest drift to and fro. But to every nation there openeth a high and a low way. Every nation deciding which way it's soul shall go. God grant that America will choose a high way.

[applause]

AW: [55:36] Thank you, Reverend King. This great audience tonight is thrilled with your message and their applause speaks far more eloquently than any words of mine, as to how happy we are to have had you here in Hartford and how grateful we are for your wonderful message and your great leadership throughout the country and the world. It means a great deal to us and to every man and woman who cherishes freedom and liberty under God and under law. We're delighted to have you here, sir. God bless you and your work, come back and see us again. Thank you and good night.

[applause]

[end of recording]