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King’s and Gandhi’s Analysis in “ Civil Disobedience” Martin Luther King Jr.

and Mohandas K. Gandhi both were inspired by Henry David Thoreau. Thoreau inspired both King and Gandhi to believe in civil disobedience. The term “ civil disobedience” refers to any nonviolent resistance to a governing authority on moral grounds. Their common belief was standing up for freedom, equality, and Justice. They both have their theories on civil disobedience.

Martin Luther King Jr. , “ Letter from Birmingham Jail,” made a good argument about peoples’ civil rights during the time he was in Jail unfairly.

Thoreau, in his enduring reflection of life and its purpose, insightfully analyzes the conflicting relationship between the government and the people it governs, which inspired both Martin Luther King Jr. and Mohandas K. Gandhi. They all three consider the notion of the majority of people are restrained by the government and society from making decisions with consideration of their conscience and that people need to overcome the reign of the government to realize their own ethics and morals.

King contends the injustice presented in the unfair treatment of and the discriminatory attitude towards Blacks. King gave several peeches, for example, “ l have a Dream,” which he explains peoples right and how Blacks should be treated equally. Also he states how he and his people have been discriminated and that the white should change their customs. King also describes on how the government should change their laws because they are unconstitutional.

King stood up for his own people which makes him very important person.

“ on Nonviolent Resistance” by Gandhi and “ Letter from Birmingham City Jail” by Martin Luther King, each makes a strong case for civil disobedience. Thoreau, Gandhi, and King each argues in his own way that when the rights of a minority or an individual re ignored by any government, it is urgent upon all who recognize this injustice to defy any laws instituted by that government which contribute to the resulting inequality.

Mahatma Gandhi wanted to stop South African government from making all Indians register with Asiatic. Thoreau’s argument is more philosophical; he posits more generally that governmental laws downtime individual into a kind of moral insensitivity, and that any rule of government is a poor substitute for individual conscience. In other words, Thoreau suggested that individuals could resist immoral government action by simply refusing to cooperate.

Gandhi adopted many of Thoreau’s thoughts in developing his concept of Satyagraha.

The stance of Gandhi and King rises out of their more specific experiences as minority recipients of violent injustices perpetrated on behalf of an oppressive government using the rule of law. They argue that since the governmental laws in place in their respective countries are immoral by design their only recourse is, according to Gandhi, to withdraw from participating in the requirements of government altogether, and thus, according to King, to break the law. I believe that I would take up Martin Luther Kings view