Plays



5. 07 Martin Luther king jr stove to try to make peace he did not point a finger or complain he spoke his mind and showed people that with love and kindness we could change society and make it a better place for all American black and white or any other color. His tone was tranquil and understanding he did not want any one to get hurt he just wanted compromise. Violence as a way of achieving racial justice is both impractical and immoral.

It is impractical because it is a descending spiral ending in destruction for all. It is immoral because it seeks to humiliate the opponent rather than win his understanding; it seeks to annihilate rather than to convert. Violence is immoral because it thrives on hatred rather than love (MLK). A change with out violence is a change worth making would have been his slogan. Malcolm $X = ?^{rm} s$ Negros as the victims to Americas segregation and America as an abomination in society. African Americans were not Americans because if they were they would be equal to any white man.

His tone was victimized and resilient African that felt as he was left out of society because he was at the table of society but didn??™t dine at the table because of the self serving white white man. Im not going to sit at your table and watch you eat, with nothing on my plate, and call myself a diner. Sitting at the table doesnt make you a diner, unless you eat some of whats on that plate. Being here in America doesnt make you an American. Being born here in America doesnt make you an American(Malcolm x)Martin Luther king had an approach of peace and understanding while Malcolm x wanted to take action with aggression putting the blame on the white man and why it is their fault in a way promoting violence, but Martin Luther king saw violence

as immoral because it is lead by hatred and you cant gain the understanding of another person through hatred.

So by choosing the approach of Malcolm x it would be the least likely way to succeed and change anyone?? $^{\text{TM}}$ s mind.