وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي
MINISTERE DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPERIEUR ET DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIIQUE
ⴰⵢⵎⵙⵙⵉⵡⵉⵏ ⵏ ⵜⵣⵣⵉⵡⵉⵜ ⴰⵏⴰⵎⵓⵔ ⵏ ⵜⵣⵣⵉⵡⵉⵜ
ⵜⴰⵙⴷⴰⵡⵜ ⵎⵓⵍⵓⴷ ⵎⵎⵔⵉ ⵜⵉⵣⵉ ⵡⵣⵓ
ⵜⴰⵣⵣⴰⵢⵜ ⵏ ⵜⵓⵙⵙⵏⵉⵡⵉⵏ ⴷ ⵜⵓⵜⵔⴰ ⵜⵓⵙⵙⵏⵉⵡⵉⵏ

MOULOUD MAMMERI UNIVERSITY OF TIZI-OUZOUFACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES DEPARTEMENT OF ENGLISH

جامعة مولود معمري- تيزي وزو
كلية الآداب و اللغات
قسم الانجليزية

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirementsfor Master's Degree in English

Domain: Letters and Foreign LanguagesField: English Language
Specialism: General and Comparative Literature

Title

Native and Black Americans' Resistance for Human Right in *Setting Bull His Life and Legacy (2009)* By Ernie la Pointe and *Martin Luther King the Inconvenient Hero (1996)* By Vincent Harding.

Presented by;

Ms. Imene METROUH

Ms. Rosa AIT ABDELLAH

Supervised by;

-Mrs. Naima MAIDI

Panel of Examiners:

Chair: Dr. Sadia SEDDIKI, M.C.A Department of English, UMMTO
Supervisor: Mrs. Naima MAIDI, M.A.A Department of English, UMMTO
Examiner: Mrs. Fatiha BENSAFI, M.A.A Department of English, UMMTO

Academic year: 2023/2024.

Dedications

First and foremost, praises and thanks to Allah SWT for giving us the strength and patience to carry out this work.

I would like to thank my best friends for their support and feedback.

I would like to express my greatest gratitude to my sisters Yasmine and Meriem and my brother Mustapha who supported and motivated me to complete this dissertation.

I specially dedicate this work to my parents for their warm encouragement and motivation, for believing in me and being present whenever needed.

I am deeply grateful to my father, whose artistic talent is reflected in the drawings included in this memoir. His thoughtful feedback and creative contributions have greatly enhanced this project. I am profoundly grateful for his unwavering support, encouragement, and the invaluable role he played in bringing this work to life.

Imene

First and foremost, I would like to praise and thank God for giving us the strength and ability to accomplish this work.

I would like to express my greatest gratitude to my family who supported and motivated me to complete this dissertation.

Rosa

Acknowledgement

First, we would like to express our gratitude to our supervisor **Mrs. Naima MAIDI** who made this work possible through her invaluable patience, continuous support and feedback throughout the research.

Special thanks to **all members of the broad examiners** for devoting time to read and examine this work.

Abstract:

This dissertation presents a postcolonial comparative study of Native American and Black American resistance for human rights, as portrayed in Ernie LaPointe's Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy (2009)and Vincent Harding's Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero (1996). These biographies explore the lives of Sitting Bull and Martin Luther King Jr., two influential figures who led powerful movements against white supremacy, each through distinct strategies. The analysis draws on Frantz Fanon's theory of revolutionary resistance (The Wretched of the Earth, 1961) and Edward Said's theory of intellectual resistance (Orientalism, 1978; Culture and Imperialism, 1993) to better understand these struggles. Using a comparative thematic and analytic approach, the study examines how Native Americans in the 19th century, under Sitting Bull's leadership, resorted to violent resistance to protect their sovereignty, land, and cultural identity. In contrast, Black Americans in the 20th century, guided by Martin Luther King Jr., adopted nonviolent resistance to demand civil rights and achieve integration. Although their methods are opposed, both movements were rooted in a shared pursuit of justice, freedom, and human dignity. Sitting Bull's defiance reflects Fanon's vision of reclaiming identity through force, while King's peaceful struggle aligns with Said's intellectual and moral opposition to oppression. While Native Americans fought for autonomy, Black Americans succeeded in gaining legal equality and greater inclusion in American society. Together, their efforts marked crucial chapters in the ongoing fight for human rights in the United States.

Keywords: *Postcolonial, Biography, Frantz Fanon, Edward Said, Revolutionary Resistance, Intellectual Resistance, White Supremacy, Native American Armed Resistance, Black American Nonviolent Resistance.*

Table of Contents

Chapter Three: Similarities and Differences of Native and Black American Resistance.

I. Introduction :

Literature has always been a way for people to preserve their history, culture, and struggles. It does more than just tell stories—it gives a voice to those who have faced oppression and allows them to share their experiences. Many writers use literature to challenge injustice and keep alive the memories of those who resisted colonization and discrimination. Through comparative literature, we can explore how different communities have expressed their resistance and fought to reclaim their rights and dignity.

This study focuses on two biographies that highlight resistance in American history: Ernie LaPointe's Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy (2009) and Vincent Harding's Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero (1996). These books tell the real-life stories of Sitting Bull, a Native American leader who resisted U.S. expansion, and Martin Luther King Jr., a Black civil rights activist who fought against racial segregation. By analyzing these biographies, this research aims to understand how their struggles are narrated and what these stories reveal about different forms of resistance. Instead of studying fictional works, this dissertation examines biography as a literary genre that records real events while shaping how historical figures and their movements are remembered.

The study is based on postcolonial literary theory, particularly Frantz Fanon's idea of revolutionary resistance and Edward Said's concept of intellectual resistance. Fanon, in The Wretched of the Earth (1961), argues that violence can be a necessary response to colonial oppression. On the other hand, Said, in Orientalism (1978) and Culture and Imperialism (1993), explains how literature and intellectual engagement can be powerful tools of resistance. By applying these theories, this research examines how the two biographies present resistance "one through armed struggle and the other through nonviolent activism" and how literature helps shape the way these movements are understood.

Through a comparative analysis, this dissertation explores how Sitting Bull's armed resistance and King's peaceful protests are portrayed in these texts. The goal is to see how literature influences our understanding of historical struggles and whether different storytelling approaches affect how resistance is remembered. In doing so, this study highlights the role of literature in documenting human rights movements and shaping their legacy.

1. Review of Literature

The study of Native American and Black American resistance has been widely explored in literature, particularly through biographies that document the lives of key historical figures. Two notable works, Ernie LaPointe's Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy (2009) and Vincent Harding's Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero (1996), offer a literary portrayal of resistance by marginalized communities. These biographies provide a deeper understanding of the leaders' struggles, not just as historical figures but as literary subjects whose narratives reflect themes of resistance, identity, and justice.

Vincent Harding's Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero presents King as more than a civil rights activist; Harding depicts him as a radical thinker who challenged imperialism, capitalism, and systemic racism. According to Cornel West in Prophetic Fragments (1988), Harding's portrayal of King highlights his intellectual and moral resistance against America's "triple evils" of racism, militarism, and materialism. West argues that King's fight was not only for civil rights but also for a broader transformation of American society. West notes, "King's intellectual resistance was a critique of America's materialism, racism, and militarism, aiming at moral and spiritual transformation." [1]. Similarly, Michael Dyson, in I May Not Get There with You (2000), emphasizes that Harding's biography moves away from the sanitized image of King, instead portraying him as a radical figure who actively fought against the structures of power that upheld racial and economic oppression. Dyson notes, "Harding's biography refuses

to portray King as a passive dreamer; instead, it reveals him as a radical thinker deeply engaged in critiquing the structures of power that upheld systemic injustice." [3]

On the other hand, Ernie LaPointe's Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy offers an intimate and literary depiction of the Lakota leader's resistance. LaPointe, as Sitting Bull's great-grandson, combines oral history with written narrative, making the biography a unique literary work. Jeffrey Ostler, in The Plains Sioux and U.S. Colonialism (2004), highlights how LaPointe's account presents Sitting Bull not just as a warrior but as a spiritual leader, demonstrating how his resistance was both armed and deeply rooted in Lakota traditions. Ostler states, "LaPointe's account of Sitting Bull emphasizes the spiritual foundation of his leadership, reflecting a resistance that sought to protect not just the physical but also the cultural survival of his people." [5]. Likewise, Clyde Holler, in The Warrior's Path (2007), argues that LaPointe's biography challenges the common portrayal of Sitting Bull as merely a military leader, instead showing how his spirituality and resistance were intertwined, making his fight a defense of both land and cultural survival. Holler writes, "LaPointe's account of Sitting Bull showcases the essential role of spirituality in his resistance, positioning him as a leader who fought both to protect his people's land and preserve their cultural heritage." [4]

By analyzing these biographies through a literary lens, scholars emphasize how both works move beyond historical documentation to provide narrative depth, shaping how these leaders are remembered. Harding's portrayal of King highlights the power of intellectual resistance, while LaPointe's depiction of Sitting Bull showcases armed and spiritual resistance. Together, these biographies contribute to literature by preserving the voices of resistance and offering a comparative understanding of two movements striving for justice.

2. Issue and Working Hypothesis

From the review of literature on *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero (1996)* by *Vincent Harding and Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy (2009)* by Ernie LaPointe, it's clear that both works provide deep insights into the resistance movements of marginalized communities, as seen through the lives of their leaders. Harding's portrayal of King shows him as more than just a civil rights leader, but as a prophetic figure confronting systemic issues like racism, imperialism, and capitalism. Cornel West, for instance, highlights how King's fight against America's "triple evils" was rooted in intellectual resistance. Meanwhile, Michael Dyson offers a critical take, shedding light on King's radical challenge to power structures that is often left out of mainstream narratives.

On the other hand, LaPointe's biography of Sitting Bull provides a more personal look at the Lakota leader's resistance, which was not just militaristic but also deeply spiritual. Scholars like Clyde Holler and Jeffrey Ostler point out that LaPointe portrays Sitting Bull's leadership as one that fused armed resistance with cultural and spiritual defense.

While these two leaders have been widely studied, there's still a gap in research that compares their resistance strategies side by side. Despite confronting the same oppressive forces—white supremacy and colonialism—the approaches to King and Sitting Bull are rarely examined together. While existing studies focus on the intellectual and spiritual dimensions of their respective struggles, there hasn't been much work on analyzing these differing methods within a unified framework. Addressing this gap is important, as it helps reveal the broader patterns of how oppressed communities resist these common adversaries.

This study aims to fill that gap by comparing the methods of resistance used by Martin Luther King Jr. and Sitting Bull, using Edward Said's concept of intellectual resistance and Frantz Fanon's idea of revolutionary resistance. Through this comparative lens, we will

examine how each leader—one advocating nonviolence, the other armed resistance—faced the challenges posed by their shared enemy and worked toward their community's long-term goals of justice and dignity. By looking at these two leaders within both their historical and theoretical contexts, we aim to explore which group, Native Americans or Black Americans, made more progress in their pursuit of full citizenship and integration in a nation that prides itself on upholding human rights.

3. Methodological Outline

In this research, we aim to compare two pivotal works: Ernie LaPointe's *Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy (2009)* and Vincent Harding's *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero (1996)*. Our objective is to explore how Native Americans and Black Americans resisted oppression, focusing on the different strategies employed by these two leaders and their communities in their respective struggles for human rights. To guide our analysis, we will rely on postcolonial theory, particularly the insights of Frantz Fanon on revolutionary resistance and Edward Said on intellectual resistance. The structure of our dissertation follows the IMRAD method, dividing the research into four main sections.

The Introduction lays the groundwork by reviewing the existing literature, highlighting the perspectives of various scholars on these two works and their broader significance. From there, we identify the central issue, raising the question of how both communities resisted the same enemy—white colonizers and systemic oppression—through differing methods. Our working hypothesis proposes that while these forms of resistance differ, they share a common foundation in the pursuit of cultural and physical survival.

In the Method and Materials section, we first outline the theoretical framework. We will draw on postcolonial theory, particularly Fanon's concept of revolutionary resistance as presented in *The Wretched of the Earth (1961)* and Said's exploration of intellectual resistance

in *Orientalism (1978)* and *Culture and Imperialism (1993)*. These theoretical lenses will shape our understanding of how each community's resistance evolved and was shaped by historical and social forces.

The Materials section will include biographical details of Vincent Harding and Ernie LaPointe to provide context for their works, followed by a synopsis of *Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy (2009)* and *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero (1996)*. Additionally, we will delve into the historical backgrounds of both Native American and Black American struggles during the 19th and 20th centuries, which are essential to understanding the resistance strategies employed by these communities and their leaders.

In the Results section, we will present the key findings of our research, summarizing the objectives, forms of resistance, and outcomes for both Native Americans' armed resistance and Black Americans' nonviolent resistance. The Discussion will be divided in two chapters: the first will focus on Native Americans' armed resistance during the 19th century; the second will examine Black Americans' nonviolent resistance in the 20th century; and the final chapter will offer a comparative analysis, highlighting both the shared goals and differing methods of resistance.

Our work will conclude with a general conclusion, where we will reflect on the broader implications of these findings for understanding resistance, leadership, and cultural survival in marginalized communities.

End notes

1. Cornel West, *Prophetic Fragments* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 118.
2. Charles Marsh, *The Beloved Community: How Faith Shapes Social Justice from the Civil Rights Movement to Today* (New York: Basic Books, 2005), 84.
3. Michael Eric Dyson, *I May Not Get There with You: The True Martin Luther King Jr.* (New York: Free Press, 2000), 51.
4. Clyde Holler, *The Warrior's Path: Native American Concepts of Peace and Power* (New York: Random House, 2007), 132.
5. Jeffrey Ostler, *The Plains Sioux and U.S. Colonialism from Lewis and Clark to Wounded Knee* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 98.

II. Methods and Materials

1. Methods

Postcolonial theory emerged in the late of 20 th century, critically examines the lasting effects of colonialism, particularly on identity, culture, and resistance. This dissertation applies postcolonial theory to the struggles of Native and Black Americans, focusing on assimilation and identity, as reflected in *Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy by Ernie LaPointe* and *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero by Vincent Harding.* Drawing on Frantz Fanon's The Wretched of the Earth (1961) and Edward Said's Orientalism (1978), this study explores how colonial legacies influence these communities and their efforts to resist erasure and reclaim their identities.

Frantz Fanon, in his seminal work The Wretched of the Earth (1961), offers a profound analysis of the psychological and sociopolitical impacts of colonization. He posits that decolonization is inherently violent as it involves dismantling entrenched colonial systems and reclaiming agency by the oppressed. Fanon argues that this process is both political and psychological, requiring the colonized to overcome the dehumanizing effects of colonialism. His focus on the necessity of violence is clear in the chapter "Concerning Violence," where he writes: "The exploited man sees that his liberation implies the use of all means and that of force first and foremost" (Fanon, 1991: 62)[1]. Fanon's emphasis on revolutionary struggle has shaped 20th-century liberation movements and remains a significant influence on postcolonial thought.

Fanon's work also delves into the question of identity, arguing that colonialism imposes an inferiority complex on the colonized. This leads to a loss of cultural pride, where colonized individuals internalize the colonizer's distorted image of them as inferior. Fanon states, "Violence is man recreating himself; the native cures himself through force" (Fanon, 1961: 71)[2].The process of "othering" positions the colonized as subhuman, leading to a psychological

struggle for self-worth and identity reclamation. Fanon's analysis of how colonialism disrupts the sense of self continues to be a cornerstone of postcolonial discourse.

Edward Said's Orientalism (1978) complements Fanon's work by exploring how Western representations of the East, or the "Orient," reinforce colonial power. Said argues that the West constructed the identity of the East as exotic, irrational, and inferior, which justified imperial domination. He states: "Orientalism is, and does not simply represent, a considerable dimension of modern political-intellectual culture, and as such has less to do with the Orient than it does with 'our' world" (Said, 1978: 12)[3]. This process of "othering" strips colonized peoples of their agency and reduces them to stereotypes that legitimize colonial control, a theme that resonates with Fanon's critique of identity disruption under colonial rule.

Said further discusses the theme of assimilation, where colonized people are encouraged to adopt Western values, languages, and norms as part of a "civilizing mission." This mirrors Fanon's view of assimilation as a form of control, erasing indigenous identities and aligning them with colonial interests. In Culture and Imperialism (1993), Said expands on cultural imperialism, noting how Western art, literature, and media continue to perpetuate colonial ideologies. He critiques the power dynamics between the West and colonized societies, stating that "the relationship between the West and the rest is fundamentally one of power and domination" (Said, 1993: 7)[4].

Said emphasizes the role of intellectuals in resisting these imperial narratives, urging scholars, writers, and activists to challenge dominant discourses that depict colonized societies as inferior. He advocates for the production of counter-narratives that expose the biases of colonial powers. Said views intellectual resistance as a form of activism, where speaking truth to power is essential to reclaiming the dignity and humanity of marginalized peoples. By

producing their own stories and histories, colonized peoples can resist the intellectual and cultural hegemony imposed by the West.

Together, Fanon's revolutionary resistance and Said's intellectual resistance provide complementary frameworks for understanding the struggles of Native and Black Americans for human rights. Fanon's focus on confronting systemic violence and reclaiming dignity aligns with the militant aspects of these movements. In contrast, Said's emphasis on challenging cultural narratives highlights the power of reclaiming and reshaping identity. Both theorists underscore the multifaceted nature of resistance, combining direct action and intellectual engagement in the pursuit of justice and self-determination.

2. Materials

1. Ernie LaPointe's Biography

Ernie LaPointe is the great-grandson of Sitting Bull, the legendary chief of the Hunkpapa Lakota tribe. Born in 1948 in Pine Ridge, South Dakota, LaPointe has dedicated his life to preserving his great-grandfather's legacy and promoting the spiritual ways of his journey to becoming the authoritative voice for his great-grandfather was not an easy one. He struggled with alcohol and marijuana use related to PTSD while homeless for many years. However, he eventually found solace in his culture and the spiritual practices of his ancestors, becoming a Sun Dancer and embracing his heritage.

LaPointe is an accomplished author and orator, having written several books about his great-grandfather's life and legacy. His first book, "Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy" was published in 2009 and tells the story of Sitting Bull's life from his perspective as his great-grandson. He has also produced several documentaries, including "Sitting Bull's Voice" and "The Sun Dancer," which explore the spiritual practices of the Lakota people and the importance of preserving their culture.

LaPointe is also a strong advocate for the repatriation and reinterment of Native American artifacts and remains. He has worked tirelessly to ensure that his great-grandfather's remains are treated with the respect and dignity they deserve.Despite facing many challenges throughout his life, LaPointe has remained committed to honoring his ancestors and promoting their culture. His powerful narratives and passion for preserving the spiritual ways of his people have made him a prominent figure in the Native American community and beyond.

2. Vincent Harding's Biography

Vincent Harding is an American historian, author, and civil rights activist. He was born. On July 25, 1931, in Harlem, New York City, to Caribbean immigrants. Harding grew up in a Christian household and attended City College of New York, where he studied history and philosophy. He became involved in the civil rights movement in the 1950s and worked closely with *Martin Luther King*. And the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC).He served as the director of the Institute of the Black World in Atlanta, Georgia, from 1969 το 1970, where he helped to develop and promote black studies programs in colleges and universities.

In 1981, Harding co-authored *Martin Luther King The Inconvenient Hero* with his wife, Rosemarie Freeney Harding .The book challenged the prevailing narrative of King as a passive figure and emphasized his radical politics and commitment to social justice Harding was also a prolific writer and authored several books, including " There IS a River : The Black Struggle for Freedom in America "(1981), " Hope and History : Why We Must Share the Story of the Movement (1990)", and "The Vision of a New America : Toward a Multiracial Democracy" (1993).

In addition to his work as an author and historian, Harding was a sought-after speaker and lecturer. He delivered the keynote address at the 20th anniversary of the March on Washington

for Jobs and Freedom in 1983, where he urged the audience to continue the struggle for social justice. He passed away on May 19, 2014, at the age of 82. His legacy as a historian, activist, and visionary continues to inspire generations of scholars and activists committed to social change.

3. Synopsis of "Sitting *Bull: His Life And legacy* "by Ernie lapointe (2009)

Sitting Bull's Life and Legacy is a compelling biography of the legendary Hunkpapa Lakota leader, Sitting Bull. Born in 1831, the book chronicles Sitting Bull's life from his early childhood to his death in 1890. It provides a detailed account of his leadership abilities, bravery in battle, and his unwavering dedication to preserving the freedom of his people. The book begins by exploring Sitting Bull's early life, including his slow start and the skills he developed as a young boy. Despite his early struggles, Sitting Bull quickly rose through the Ranks to become a respected leader of the Hunkpapa Lakota. The book then delves into Sitting Bull's role in the Battle of Little Bighorn, also known as « Custer's Last Stand. »

The battle took place on July 25, 1876, along the Little Bighorn River in Bighorn County. Montana. Under Sitting Bull's direction, the tribal armies waged war against whites who refused to stay off tribal lands in the Black Hills. By the spring of 1876, Sitting Bull and his tribal army had successfully won against the U.S. Calvary twice.Despite their victory, the Native Americans were not truly victorious, as the U.S. Government had decided to redraw the lines of the Black Hills, leaving the land for white men to settle. The book also explores the impact of the Battle of Little Bighorn on the lives of Native Americans, including Gerard Baker, a Native American who grew up on a reservation. He organized the « Attack At Dawn Ceremony » on the 120th anniversary of the battle to ensure that the Native American perspective was included in the commemoration of the battle. The book also discusses the counting coup tradition, where warriors proved their skill and courage by using a special stick

to strike at an enemy, and the Ghost Dance, a spiritual movement started by an Indian named Wovoka that lifted up Indian's spirits when something bad was happening and gave them Hope

4. Synopsis of "*Martin-Luther : King the inconvinent hero* "by Vincent Harding (1996)

In Martin Luther King The Inconvenient Hero (1996), Vincent Harding offers a critical exploration of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s evolving philosophy, particularly focusing on his resistance to systemic oppression in the United States. Harding presents King not only as a leader of the Civil Rights Movement but also as a figure whose later years embodied a broader resistance against racial injustice, economic exploitation, and American militarism

Central to Harding's portrayal of King is his radical shift from advocating for civil rights to addressing the deeper structural issues of poverty, inequality, and militarism, which King saw as interconnected with racial oppression. King's commitment to nonviolent resistance remained steadfast, yet his growing critiques of US involvement in Vietnam and capitalism made him an inconvenient hero to many, including former allies and the American public His message increasingly called for a transformation of society a revolution of values-rooted in justice, equality, and human dignity.

End notes :

1. Frantz Fanon.the Wretched of the Earth,1961.p62.
2. Frantz Fanon ,The Wretched of the Earth,1962 .P 71.
3. Edward Said, Orientalisme,1978.P.12.
4. Edward Said Culture and Imperialism ,1993.p 07.

III. Results

In our comparative analysis of Ernie LaPointe's *Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy (2009) and* Vincent Harding's *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero (1996),* we examine two influential figures in the struggle for civil rights, focusing on the divergent methods of resistance employed by Native Americans and Black Americans. This section outlines the key findings of our study, applying Frantz Fanon's concept of revolutionary resistance and Edward Said's theory of intellectual resistance as theoretical frameworks.

Our investigation yields two primary results. First, the study of Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy reveals a contrasting approach, in which Sitting Bull's resistance was primarily armed and aimed at defending the sovereignty and cultural heritage of Native American tribes against encroaching white forces. LaPointe's biography illustrates how Sitting Bull's leadership and military actions were driven by a profound commitment to preserving indigenous ways of life and resisting colonization. The findings highlight the different forms of resistance adopted by Native Americans, necessitated by the immediate and violent threats they faced from white settlers and government forces.

Second, the analysis of *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero (1996),* demonstrates how Martin Luther King Jr.'s approach to resistance was characterized by nonviolent methods aimed at achieving racial equality and social justice. Harding's portrayal underscores King's strategic use of peaceful protests, civil disobedience, and rhetorical power to challenge systemic racism perpetuated by white institutions. The results reveal that King's resistance was deeply rooted in philosophical and theological principles that emphasized love, justice, and nonviolence as means of achieving social change. In The similarities and differences, we have elucidated the varied objectives, forms, and consequences of these resistance strategies, Sitting Bull's armed resistance aimed to preserve indigenous autonomy and resist the cultural eradication imposed by white colonizers. whereas, King's nonviolent

resistance sought to integrate African Americans into a reformed societal structure dominated by white power.

Both leaders confronted the same overarching adversary: white-dominated systems that sought to undermine their rights and identities. This shared adversary underscores the broader context of racial and colonial oppression faced by both communities.

Despite their contradictory methods of resistance one nonviolent and the other armed both King and Sitting Bull's efforts were driven by the same ultimate goal: to secure justice and dignity for their people. The aim of this comparative study is to determine which community Black Americans or Native Americans was more successful in achieving full citizenship and integration into a supposedly free country which is jealously respectful of human rights. These findings emphasize the distinct but equally significant ways in which these leaders sought to address the injustices faced by their respective communities, highlighting the diverse and impactful strategies employed in their struggles for rights and recognition.

IV. Discussion:

This section presents a comparative analysis of the Native and Black American struggle for human rights against the white foe. It examines their respective objectives, methods of resistance, and the outcomes of their movements. By focusing on key figures like Sitting Bull and Martin Luther King Jr., the discussion explores how each community faced similar challenges but chose different paths toward achieving their goals. This analysis will also incorporate Frantz Fanon's concept of revolutionary resistance and Edward Said's idea of intellectual resistance to provide a broader context for understanding these struggles within the framework of postcolonial theory.

CHAPTER ONE :

Native American's Violent Resistance During the 19th Century in *Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy (2009) by* Ernie LaPointe's

Introduction

Literature serves as a powerful medium for documenting historical struggles, preserving cultural identities, and shaping narratives of resistance. In the case of Native American history, literary works (particularly biographies) offer insight into the lived experiences of those who fought against oppression. One example is Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy by Ernie LaPointe (2009), which tells the story of Sitting Bull, a Hunkpapa Lakota chief, and his fight against U.S. expansion in the 19th century. LaPointe's book doesn't just share historical facts; it also presents Sitting Bull's resistance as a powerful story about identity, survival, and the fight to protect his people.

This chapter explores how resistance is depicted in LaPointe's biography, examining its themes. While the biography provides historical accounts of military defiance, such as the Battle of Little Bighorn, it also highlights cultural, spiritual and political resistance through storytelling, oral traditions, and indigenous perspectives.

The first section of this chapter focuses on the themes of survival, freedom, and justice as central motifs in the biography. LaPointe's portrayal of Sitting Bull underscores how resistance was not merely a reaction to oppression, but a deeper struggle for self-determination, cultural preservation, and spiritual continuity.

The second section examines the literary representation of different forms of resistance in the biography, military resistance (armed defiance and battles), cultural resistance (preservation of language, traditions, and oral histories), and political resistance (diplomatic efforts and legal challenges). This analysis highlights how LaPointe's storytelling techniques contribute to the broader literary discourse on colonial resistance and indigenous identity.

1. Objective of Native American Resistance in *Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy (2009)*

1.1 Restoration of Land and Protection of Resources

The restoration of ancestral lands was a central objective for Native Americans, as land represented far more than a simple commodity—it was a core element of their identity and spiritual life. The invasion and colonization of their territories severed this essential connection, sparking decades of resistance. As one Native leader poignantly stated, "Our lands are our life and breath; if we part with them, we part with our blood" (Debo, 1974, p. 176)[1].This powerful statement underscores the intimate bond between the Native people and their land, suggesting that losing their territories was akin to losing their very essence. Thus, their resistance was not just a battle for land but a struggle for life itself.

The Native American resistance was both a physical and cultural battle. They rejected the European settlers' way of life, viewing it as morally corrupt and inferior. Their defiance represented a refusal to accept the cultural imposition that came with colonization. Despite immense pressure to assimilate, Native Americans remained committed to preserving their cultural heritage. Their struggle was not only about safeguarding their land but also about defending their identity. This resistance was a stand against the "imperfect and corrupted" civilization of the settlers (Debo, 1974, p. 176)[2]. Therefore, the fight for their lands was inseparable from the fight for their cultural survival.

Sitting Bull, one of the most iconic figures in this resistance, embodied the spirit of Native American defiance. He famously declared, "We lived in our country in the way our fathers and fathers' fathers lived before us, and we sought trouble with no men. But the soldiers came into our country and fired upon us, and we fought back. Is it so bad to fight in defense of one's country and loved ones?" (Debo, 1974, p. 89)[3]. His words reveal the Native Americans'

desire for peace and autonomy, but also their readiness to defend their land when threatened. Their struggle was about protecting not only their land but also their way of life, which was inextricably tied to their survival.

The significance of this fight extends beyond the immediate struggle for territory. It resonates with broader principles of human rights, as defending one's land and culture is recognized globally as both a natural and noble right. Native American resistance fits squarely within this framework of justice and dignity. Their battle was not just a practical necessity for survival but a moral stand against the erasure of their identity. If we acknowledge the universality of this right, the legitimacy of their cause becomes undeniable.

For Sitting Bull and his people, defending their land was about safeguarding their identity, traditions, and future. The U.S. government's repeated violations of treaties, especially the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868, fueled the Lakota resistance. The discovery of gold in the Black Hills exacerbated tensions, as settlers encroached on these sacred lands. The Battle of Little Bighorn, where Sitting Bull and other Lakota leaders defeated General Custer, became a symbol of their broader fight to preserve their land and spiritual connection to it. The Native American resistance was more than a territorial dispute—it was a struggle for cultural survival and the right to live in harmony with the land that had sustained them for generations. (p.3)[4]

Protection of Lakota land and resources was central to Sitting Bull's resistance. Land was not merely a commodity; it was the foundation of Lakota cultural and spiritual life. The U.S. government's continuous violations of treaties, particularly the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868, intensified their resistance. The discovery of gold in the Black Hills further fueled the conflict as settlers encroached on these sacred lands. The Battle of Little Bighorn, a pivotal moment in Lakota history, symbolized their efforts to preserve both their land and their deep spiritual ties to it. Frantz Fanon's theory of land as a key element in the colonized experience highlights the

significance of this struggle. According to Fanon (1963), land for the colonized is not just physical territory but a vital part of their identity and survival. He asserts,

> "The colonized man is a man who has been denied his humanity. He is a man who has been forced to live in a world that is not his own. He is a man who has been taught to hate himself and his people. But the colonized man is also a man who is capable of great courage and resilience. He is a man who is determined to reclaim his dignity and his freedom. And he is a man who is willing to fight for the land that is his birthright". (Fanon, 1963, p. 113).[5]

In this quotation, Fanon emphasizes how colonization strips individuals of their humanity by imposing a foreign culture and system upon them, alienating them from their identity and heritage. The colonized are taught to see themselves and their people as inferior, fostering self-hatred and submission. However, Fanon also highlights their potential for resilience, courage, and determination. He argues that the fight for land is not just a physical struggle but a symbolic reclaiming of dignity, identity, and freedom. Land represents their birthright and cultural survival, and through resistance, the colonized seek to restore their humanity and reject the dehumanization imposed by the colonizers.

For Sitting Bull, the protection of land was not only about physical survival but also about maintaining the Lakota's identity, traditions, and future. His resistance reflected a broader ecological awareness, as the Lakota believed in living in harmony with nature, a sharp contrast to the exploitative practices of European-American settlers.

1.2 Rejection of European literature and Civilization

The rejection of European literature and civilization by Native Americans was not just a matter of defiance against colonial powers, but a deeper, cultural, and spiritual refusal to abandon their way of life for a foreign system that represented inequality, materialism, and exploitation. This sentiment is embodied in the life and leadership of Sitting Bull, one of the most iconic figures in Native American history. His legacy, as chronicled in *Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy by Ernie LaPointe (2009)*, reflects the broader Native resistance to European

encroachment, particularly the rejection of the values and practices that defined European society.

Sitting Bull, a Hunkpapa Lakota chief and spiritual leader, represents a profound and enduring resistance to European civilization. Unlike many other leaders of his time, he did not seek negotiation or compromise with the U.S. government, understanding that the cultural, spiritual, and social structures of Native life were incompatible with the European worldview. He was a defender of Native sovereignty and a protector of the old ways—those centered on living in harmony with nature, spiritual fulfillment, and communal unity. His rejection of European literature and civilization was not only a political stance but also a spiritual one, deeply rooted in the belief that European culture was corrosive to the Native American way of life.

In Alexis de Tocqueville's de la démocratie en Amérique observed that Native Americans refused European civilization not solely out of pride, but because they understood that integration into European society would mean submission to a system that would degrade their status. Tocqueville noted that even if Native Americans accepted European ways, they would remain at the bottom of the social hierarchy, living as impoverished and marginalized people in a world dominated by wealth and science. Similarly, Sitting Bull recognized that assimilation into European culture would result in a loss of autonomy and dignity for his people. He refused to allow the Lakota to be absorbed into a foreign society that neither respected their culture nor provided a place for them as equals. (p.176)[6]

Sitting Bull's resistance to European civilization was most clearly expressed in his opposition to U.S. government policies, particularly the reservation system. The reservation system was a tool of colonization, designed to confine Native populations to specific areas and force them to adopt European agricultural practices, religion, and social structures. For Sitting

Bull, this was unacceptable. He understood that the reservation system represented more than just physical confinement—it was an attempt to break the spirit of his people, to strip them of their identity, and to make them dependent on the very forces that sought to destroy them.

Ernie LaPointe, in his biography of Sitting Bull, emphasizes the chief's deep connection to his people's traditions and the land. This connection was at the heart of his rejection of European civilization. Sitting Bull believed that the land was sacred and that the Lakota people had a duty to protect it, not exploit it for profit as the Europeans did. The European system of land ownership, which treated land as a commodity to be bought and sold, was antithetical to the Lakota worldview. For Sitting Bull, the land was not something that could be owned—it was a living entity, a source of life and spirituality that had to be respected and cared for.

This spiritual connection to the land was a key factor in Sitting Bull's refusal to accept European civilization. He saw the European way of life as disconnected from the natural world, driven by a desire for material wealth and power. In contrast, the Lakota people lived in harmony with nature, taking only what they needed and honoring the Earth as a sacred being. Sitting Bull's rejection of European civilization was not just about preserving his people's culture, but also about protecting the land from exploitation and degradation.

The Battle of Little Bighorn in 1876, often referred to as Custer's Last Stand, was one of the most significant moments in Sitting Bull's resistance to European encroachment. The battle, in which Sitting Bull's forces defeated General George Armstrong Custer and his troops, was a powerful demonstration of Native resistance to the U.S. government's attempts to force them onto reservations. Sitting Bull's leadership during the battle solidified his status as a symbol of Native American defiance. He understood that accepting the terms of European civilization would mean the end of the Lakota way of life, and he was willing to fight to prevent that from happening.

However, Sitting Bull's rejection of European civilization extended beyond the battlefield. Even after the Lakota were forced onto reservations, Sitting Bull continued to resist assimilation. He refused to attend government meetings, convert to Christianity, or adopt European farming practices. He held fast to his belief that the Lakota way of life was superior to that of the Europeans, not in terms of material wealth, but in terms of spiritual fulfillment and harmony with the natural world.

In *Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy*, LaPointe describes how Sitting Bull's resistance was not just a personal stance but a broader reflection of Native American refusal to submit to a system that sought to erase their culture. Sitting Bull believed that the Lakota people had a right to live as they always had, free from the constraints of European civilization. His refusal to compromise on this point ultimately led to his arrest and assassination in 1890, but even in death, Sitting Bull's legacy of resistance endured.

The reservation system, which confined Native Americans to small, controlled areas of land, was seen by many Native leaders as a form of cultural and spiritual imprisonment. For Sitting Bull, the reservations represented everything that was wrong with European civilization: the commodification of land, the destruction of Native culture, and the imposition of a foreign way of life. He refused to participate in this system, believing that to do so would be to betray his people and their traditions.

1.3 Preserving Lakota Way of Life and Resisting Cultural Domination in Sitting Bull's Leadership

A central objective of Sitting Bull's resistance was to preserve traditional Lakota beliefs and practices, which he saw as essential to the survival of his people. His resistance was deeply rooted in the spiritual and cultural traditions of the Lakota, particularly the Sun Dance ceremony. This sacred ritual, which involved fasting, prayer, and self-sacrifice, prepared

warriors both spiritually and physically for battle. Sitting Bull used the Sun Dance as a way to integrate Lakota spirituality into his military strategies. As *LaPointe (2009)* emphasizes, "the Sun Dance was not just a ceremony but a unifying force for his people, providing visions and divine strength to face their enemies" (p. 80)[7].

Despite his personal resistance to the Ghost Dance religion, Sitting Bull allowed his people to practice it, understanding their need for hope and unity in the face of adversity. By blending spiritual traditions with military tactics, Sitting Bull embodied Homi Bhabha's theory of hybridity, where traditional beliefs became tools for resistance against colonial forces. As *LaPointe (2009)* further highlights, "Sitting Bull was a man of deep spirituality. He believed that from their traditional beliefs and practices, he saw these as not only cultural touchstones but also as essential tools for survival" (p. 80)[8].

In addition to preserving Lakota spirituality, Sitting Bull was committed to resisting the cultural assimilation policies enforced by the U.S. government. These policies, such as sending Native children to boarding schools and imposing Christianity, aimed to erase indigenous identity and traditions. Sitting Bull vehemently opposed these practices, recognizing them as forms of cultural violence designed to erase the Lakota's spiritual and cultural heritage. His refusal to send Lakota children to boarding schools and his opposition to Christianity were significant acts of defiance. As *LaPointe (2009)* explains, "Sitting Bull refused to send his children to boarding school, and his opposition to Christianity reflected his commitment to preserving the Lakota way of life" (p. 73)[9].

Viewed through Edward Said's concept of cultural imperialism, Sitting Bull's resistance can be understood as a battle against cultural erasure. His actions were not just about maintaining traditions but also about protecting the sovereignty and identity of the Lakota people in the face of colonial domination.

2. Forms of Native American Resistance in *Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy (2009)*

2.1 The early life of Sitting Bull and violence as a major Form of Resistance

Sitting Bull, born in 1831, grew up in a world increasingly threatened by U.S. colonial expansion. His early life was shaped by the struggle for survival and the defense of his people, the Lakota Sioux, against relentless encroachment. From a young age, Sitting Bull experienced firsthand the violence that accompanied colonialism, as attacks on his tribe became more frequent and the gradual loss of their ancestral lands became a harsh reality.

The violence experienced by Sitting Bull and his people was directly linked to the systematic violence of colonialism, which Frantz Fanon (1963) describes as "a violent and dehumanizing system" (p. 61)[10]. According to Fanon, violence was necessary to overthrow colonial rule and regain the humanity and dignity that had been stripped away. This idea resonates with Sitting Bull's actions, as violence became a key method for resisting the U.S. government's efforts to dominate Native American lands.

Fanon's assertion that "The exploited man sees that his liberation implies the use of all means and that of force first and foremost" (Fanon, 1963, p. 6)[11]. underscores the legitimacy of violence in the context of decolonization. This concept aligns with Sitting Bull’s military resistance against the U.S. government, which can be seen as a direct response to the violent and oppressive policies that sought to strip the Lakota people of their land and resources. Sitting Bull’s use of guerrilla warfare, strategic battles, and alliances with neighboring tribes represented a calculated response to colonial aggression.

The Battle of Little Bighorn, in particular, stands as a powerful symbol of defiance, where Sitting Bull and his allies were able to achieve a significant victory over U.S. forces. In this instance, violence was not simply an act of aggression but a necessary form of resistance

to defend their land and way of life. The violent encounters between the Lakota people and the U.S. military served as a manifestation of what Fanon describes as the "raging violence" of colonialism, met by "stronger violence" from the colonized. This cycle of violence was not initiated by Sitting Bull and his people but was instead a reaction to the overwhelming force used by the colonizers to impose their will on Native lands.

Sitting Bull's military resistance was more than just a series of battles; it was a profound expression of defiance and survival. His leadership during the Great Sioux War and the conflicts surrounding it marked a significant chapter in Native American resistance to U.S. expansion. By the time Sitting Bull emerged as a prominent leader, the U.S. government had repeatedly violated treaties with Native American tribes, exacerbating tensions and intensifying conflict. His military actions were a direct response to these betrayals, as well as to the larger systemic efforts to erase Native American culture and autonomy.

The Battle of Little Bighorn, where Sitting Bull and his allies famously defeated General Custer's forces, stands as a testament to the power of organized resistance. As Ernie *LaPointe (2009)* describes in *Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy*, "They wiped out Custer and his men. Only Indians were left to tell the story" (p. 26) [12]. This victory, however fleeting, represented a moment of triumph for Native American forces and demonstrated the effectiveness of their resistance strategies.

In addition to violence as a form of resistance, Sitting Bull's ability to forge alliances was crucial to his success in defending his people. He understood that unity among Native American tribes was essential to resisting U.S. expansion. Sitting Bull built strong alliances with neighboring tribes such as the Cheyenne and Arapaho, which were instrumental in their collective victories, particularly at Little Bighorn. These alliances were not merely military but were also spiritual and cultural, reinforcing the shared values and traditions of the various tribes

involved. His spiritual alliances, such as those with figures like Jumping Badger, helped maintain morale and unity among his people during times of hardship. These alliances ensured that their resistance did not waver, even when facing overwhelming odds.

However, Sitting Bull's resistance efforts were not limited to Native American alliances. His pragmatic approach to leadership also led him to engage in diplomacy with external powers when necessary. For instance, his negotiation with Canadian officials for a safe haven for his people highlights his willingness to explore non-violent strategies for survival. Despite the conflict with the U.S. government, Sitting Bull recognized the value of seeking alternative solutions to protect his people. Nevertheless, these alliances were fragile. Internal divisions among tribes, combined with external pressures from the U.S. government, strained relationships and ultimately contributed to the fragmentation of Native American resistance.

As Sitting Bull's alliances began to disintegrate, his political isolation grew, leading to his tragic death in 1890. The fragmentation of these alliances marked the end of an era in Native American resistance. Sitting Bull's death, at the hands of Native American police working for the U.S. government, symbolized not only the loss of a great leader but also the collapse of a unified front against U.S. expansion. The breakdown of these alliances underscores the complexity of resistance in the face of overwhelming colonial power. Even the most organized and determined resistance movements can be undermined by internal divisions and external pressures.

Sitting Bull's legacy, however, goes beyond his military resistance and alliances. His actions were part of a broader effort to preserve the culture, traditions, and sovereignty of the Lakota people. By resisting U.S. forces, Sitting Bull was also resisting the erasure of Native American history and identity. Fanon (1963) emphasizes that decolonization requires the recovery of national culture, and Sitting Bull's use of traditional Lakota tactics in battle was a

powerful affirmation of cultural identity. His resistance was not only a fight for land but also a fight for the survival of his people's way of life in the face of relentless colonial aggression.

Sitting Bull's resistance can also be seen in the broader context of global struggles against colonialism and oppression. As Chandra Talpade Mohanty et al. (1991) argue, "Resistance can only be defined as a cumulative reaction to power, not as something inherent in its operation" (p. 86)[13].This perspective challenges simplistic notions of resistance and highlights the complexity of Sitting Bull's defiance. His resistance was not just a reaction to immediate threats but part of a long-term struggle to maintain cultural identity and sovereignty. Similarly, Bosena Tebeje (2004) notes that stereotypes and discrimination often fuel violence and oppression, which can have long-lasting effects on marginalized communities (p. 6)[14]. In this sense, Sitting Bull's resistance can be seen as part of a broader struggle against systemic violence and oppression that continues to affect marginalized groups around the world today.

Sitting Bull's life and leadership represent a powerful example of how violence, alliances, and resistance can be employed to protect cultural identity and sovereignty in the face of colonial aggression. His use of military tactics, combined with his ability to forge alliances, allowed him to effectively resist U.S. expansion and defend his people. However, the fragility of these alliances and the overwhelming power of the U.S. government ultimately led to his tragic death. Sitting Bull's legacy, however, endures as a symbol of defiance and survival, reminding us of the ongoing struggles for justice, equality, and self-determination in the face of oppression. His life offers a profound lesson on the complexities of resistance, showing that it is not simply an act of defiance but a long-term struggle for survival and dignity.

3. Cultural level of violent Resistance

Cultural resistance is a powerful theme in the narrative of Sitting Bull, as depicted in La Pointe's biography from two thousand nine. This concept reflects the struggle of Native

Americans to maintain their identity and traditions in the face of colonial oppression. Sitting Bull, a prominent leader of the Lakota, embodies this resistance through his unwavering commitment to preserving the cultural heritage of his people. Sitting Bull's resistance was deeply rooted in the belief that his people's culture was the essence of their identity. He recognized that the encroachment of white settlers posed a significant threat to the Lakota way of life. This awareness drove his efforts to uphold their traditions, spirituality, and connection to the land. In rejecting treaties that would confine the Lakota to reservations, Sitting Bull asserted their right to live freely and maintain their cultural practices. Lapoint Highlights that: TanakaIyotak was Not a War leader but also a Spiritual leader Who conducted ceremonies to strengthen the resolve of his people."(lapoint,2009,p.82)[18].

To analyze Sitting Bull's cultural resistance, we can draw on the theories of Edward Said. Said's concept of Orientalism reveals how dominant cultures construct narratives to marginalize and dehumanize others. For Sitting Bull, the white settlers' portrayal of Native Americans as "savages" was a blatant attempt to undermine their cultural significance. In response, Sitting Bull's leadership aimed to counteract these narratives by emphasizing the richness and depth of Lakota culture. His defiance became a means of reclaiming their identity and challenging the oppressive perceptions imposed by colonial forces.

Cultural ceremonies and traditions played a vital role in Sitting Bull's resistance. He promoted practices that reinforced communal identity, such as the Sun Dance, which celebrated Lakota spirituality and unity. These ceremonies became acts of defiance against colonial attempts to suppress Native practices. By organizing and participating in such events, Sitting Bull fostered a sense of pride and solidarity among his people, reinforcing their cultural resilience.

Moreover, Sitting Bull’s emphasis on storytelling and oral traditions served as a mechanism of cultural preservation. Through narratives that highlighted the Lakota's history, values, and beliefs, he ensured that their identity remained intact despite external pressures. This form of resistance not only kept the cultural heritage alive but also empowered future generations to continue the struggle for sovereignty and identity.The tension between cultural preservation and colonial encroachment is evident in Sitting Bull's life. The establishment of reservations sought to sever Native Americans from their lands and traditions. However, Sitting Bull’s refusal to comply with these demands exemplified a broader cultural resistance. He understood that yielding to colonial pressures would lead to the erasure of Lakota identity, which he fiercely opposed.

Sitting Bull’s leadership also inspired other Native leaders to embrace cultural resistance. His example demonstrated that the fight for cultural identity was essential for political autonomy. By standing firm in their traditions, Native Americans could assert their rights and challenge the narratives that sought to diminish their worth.His story is a testament to the enduring strength of the Lakota people. Through the lens of Edward Said and Homi Bhabha’s theories, we can appreciate the complexities of Sitting Bull's struggle. His commitment to preserving Lakota culture, promoting spiritual practices, and challenging colonial narratives illustrates a profound resistance that transcended mere survival. Instead, it became a powerful affirmation of identity and resilience against oppression.

4. Political Resistance

Sitting Bull's political resistance was a critical aspect of his fight against colonialism and the encroachment of white settlers on Native American lands. One significant example of this resistance was his refusal to sign the Treaty of Fort Laramie in 1868. The treaty aimed to establish peace between the U.S. government and various Native American tribes, including

the Lakota, but Sitting Bull rejected it. The treaty required the Lakota to cede land and confine themselves to reservations, which would have restricted their movement and forced them to abandon their traditional way of life. By rejecting this treaty, Sitting Bull set a precedent for future Native American resistance to government policies. LaPoint states :“Tanaka Iyotake Saw the ttreaties as instruments of betrayal Designer yo weaken the sioux nation.”(lapoint ,2009.p 45)[19].

Sitting Bull’s refusal to sign the treaty was deeply rooted in his belief that the Lakota had a right to live freely on their ancestral lands. His commitment to their way of life, which centered around hunting and gathering, was unwavering. He recognized that the treaty would lead to dependence on the U.S. government for food and supplies, which he viewed as submission. This resistance was not just political but also cultural, as it sought to preserve the sovereignty and traditions of the Lakota people. Sitting Bull’s stance highlighted the importance of resisting external control to maintain their cultural and spiritual identity.

The establishment of Fort Pierre in 1832 marked the beginning of regular contact between the Lakota and white settlers, which led to dependency on traded goods like firearms and ammunition. However, Sitting Bull viewed the whites with suspicion. The continuous influx of settlers led to the westward shift of the so-called Permanent Indian Frontier, deepening tensions. As LaPointe notes, "the wasicu knew peace talks with him would be fruitless,"(la point 2009 p77)[20]. Suggesting that both sides recognized the futility of peaceful negotiations and were prepared for conflict. This violent confrontation culminated in clashes like the Battle of Little Bighorn, in which Sitting Bull played a pivotal role.

In the 1850s, the U.S. government gathered Plains Indians, including the Lakota, at Fort Laramie to sign another treaty aimed at establishing peace. However, like many other treaties, the 1851 Fort Laramie Treaty was problematic. Not every chief signed it, and those who did

found it impossible to comply due to their nomadic way of life. LaPointe described two warriors who pledged to fight until victory or death, symbolizing the determination of Native Americans to resist white encroachment. Despite this treaty's failure, the U.S. continued to pressure the Lakota to cede land, but Sitting Bull's defiance only grew stronger.

Sitting Bull's political resistance was not just an act of defiance against the U.S. government; it was also a form of submission to the Lakota's traditional way of life and values. By resisting the treaty and U.S. policies, he upheld the Lakota belief in their right to self-determination. His people looked to him as a leader who would protect their land and culture. This submission to his people's will contrasted sharply with the submission the U.S. government sought from the Lakota complete surrender to their authority. Sitting Bull's resistance became an assertion of Lakota sovereignty and cultural preservation.

Sitting Bull's leadership in resisting the U.S. government's policies was a defining moment in Native American political resistance. His refusal to sign the Treaty of Fort Laramie demonstrated the resolve of the Lakota to protect their lands and maintain their way of life. It also set an example for future Native American resistance against colonial powers. His actions underscored the importance of preserving Native culture and sovereignty in the face of external pressures. This political resistance became a vital part of the broader struggle of Native Americans to retain their identity and autonomy amidst the growing threat of white encroachment.

In one instance, when Native Americans faced an attack from settlers, they chose to wait for Sitting Bull to arrive and decide how to respond. This demonstrated the immense trust his people placed in him as their leader and strategist. His political resistance was not just about opposing treaties but also about carefully managing the complex and often dangerous situation faced by the Lakota. Ultimately, Sitting Bull's efforts reflected the broader Native American

struggle to retain control over their destiny, even as external forces sought to undermine their sovereignty and way of life.

5. The Spiritual Level of violent Resistance

Ernie LaPointe emphasizes Sitting Bull's spiritual beliefs, stating, "Sitting Bull saw the vision of the Great Spirit as a guiding force for his people" (LaPointe, 2009, p. 45)[21]. This perspective highlights how religious visions and prophecies were central to Sitting Bull's leadership. His faith in the Great Spirit not only provided comfort but also rallied the Lakota people to unite against external threats, portraying their struggle as a divine mission.

Furthermore, LaPointe notes, "The Sun Dance and other ceremonies were not just cultural practices; they were acts of defiance and expressions of faith" (LaPointe, 2009, p. 78)[22]. These ceremonies reinforced community bonds and asserted Native identity in the face of American assimilation policies. They served as a form of resistance, embodying the belief that spiritual strength could manifest in tangible resistance against colonization.

Additionally, the integration of religion into resistance efforts can be seen in the Ghost Dance movement, which *LaPointe* describes as a spiritual revival that aimed to restore Native lands and culture. He states, "The Ghost Dance became a symbol of hope and resilience, offering a path to peace through spiritual renewal" (LaPointe, 2009, p. 102)[23]. This movement not only motivated armed resistance but also reflected a deep-seated desire for justice and reclamation of cultural heritage.

6. Sitting Bull's final Years and Enduring Legacy

Sitting Bull, the iconic Hunkpapa Lakota leader, met a tragic end on December 15, 1890. As detailed in Ernie LaPointe's *2009* biography *Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy,* his death was the result of rising tensions between Native American communities and the U.S. government. Fearing Sitting Bull's influence over the Ghost Dance movement—a spiritual

resurgence that the U.S. authorities saw as a potential rebellion—government forces sought to arrest him. In the chaotic altercation that followed, Sitting Bull was killed by Indian police working under the U.S. government's orders.

Despite his death, Sitting Bull's influence did not fade. In fact, his legacy became even more profound among Native Americans. His death marked a symbolic turning point in the struggle for Native American autonomy, as the U.S. government intensified its efforts to suppress Native cultures, lands, and rights. However, Sitting Bull's name became synonymous with resistance, pride, and cultural preservation for generations of Native Americans.

LaPointe's biography highlights the decades of posthumous injustice Sitting Bull faced. His remains were initially buried in an unmarked grave, and it wasn't until 1953 that some of his descendants, including *LaPointe*, successfully relocated his body to a proper burial site at Mobridge, South Dakota, where he could rest in dignity.Sitting Bull's spiritual and cultural legacy endures in Native American communities today. He remains a figure of resistance to colonial oppression, a defender of Native sovereignty, and an emblem of resilience in the face of cultural destruction. His life and death continue to inspire Native American activism, shaping modern-day efforts to reclaim cultural identity, historical truth, and indigenous rights. LaPointe's biography, in particular, stands as a testimony to the enduring power of Sitting Bull's spirit and vision.

7. Outcomes of the Armed Resistance

In *Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy (2009),* Ernie LaPointe highlights the significant consequences of violent resistance during the 19th century, particularly through the life of Sitting Bull, the Lakota leader who symbolized Native American defiance against U.S. expansion. The violent resistance waged by Sitting Bull and his people led to a series of profound and lasting consequences:

7.1. Escalation of U.S. Military Campaigns

The victory at the Battle of Little Bighorn in 1876, where Sitting Bull played a critical role in defeating General Custer's forces, was a turning point. However, this triumph triggered an intense military backlash from the U.S. government. Determined to crush all forms of Native resistance, the U.S. army launched relentless campaigns against the Lakota and other tribes. This led to the eventual subjugation of Native American forces, culminating in widespread violence, displacement, and the destruction of their traditional way of life.

7.2. Forced Relocation and Reservation Life

One of the most devastating consequences of the violent resistance was the forced relocation of Native Americans onto reservations. After years of fighting, Sitting Bull and his people were eventually forced to surrender and move to the Standing Rock Reservation. Life on the reservations was marked by poverty, starvation, and government control. Native Americans were stripped of their land and resources, with the U.S. government using food supplies and rations as leverage to ensure compliance. This shift to reservation life not only affected their physical survival but also eroded their independence and autonomy.

7.3. Cultural Suppression

In response to violent resistance, the U.S. government initiated aggressive policies of cultural assimilation. Native American spiritual practices, languages, and traditions were targeted for eradication. The Lakota, under Sitting Bull's leadership, had long resisted these pressures. However, once confined to reservations, Native Americans faced forced Christianization and were prohibited from practicing their traditional beliefs, including the Sun Dance. This cultural suppression was reinforced through boarding schools for Native children,

where they were forbidden from speaking their languages or maintaining their cultural identities.

7.4. Sitting Bull's Assassination

Sitting Bull’s leadership made him a target for the U.S. government even after he was confined to the reservation. His association with the Ghost Dance movement, which the U.S. government viewed as a threat, led to heightened fears of another uprising. In 1890, Sitting Bull was assassinated by Native American police working for the U.S. authorities. His death marked the end of a prominent symbol of resistance and further demonstrated the extent to which the U.S. government was willing to eliminate any perceived threat to its authority.

7.5. Psychological and Social Trauma

The violent resistance of the 19th century and the subsequent defeats left deep psychological and social scars on Native American communities. Generations were impacted by the loss of land, culture, and autonomy. The legacy of this resistance is one of resilience in the face of ongoing hardship, but also of trauma passed down through generations. The combination of forced assimilation, violent suppression, and cultural destruction created a profound sense of loss and displacement that continues to affect Native American communities today.

In *Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy*, LaPointe not only recounts the life of his great-grandfather but also illustrates how the violent resistance of the 19th century led to devastating consequences for Native Americans. While the resistance was a necessary fight for survival and dignity, it ultimately resulted in increased oppression, cultural erasure, and profound suffering for the Lakota people and other Native nations.

To conclude the Native Americans' armed resistance during the 19th century, when viewed through Frantz Fanon’s revolutionary lens, showcases a multifaceted struggle for

survival. This resistance was deeply rooted in the need to protect their land, culture, and sovereignty from the aggressive encroachment of colonial powers. For Native American tribes, this struggle was not merely a military conflict but a fight to assert their humanity and preserve their identity in the face of a regime that sought to erase them. The combination of guerrilla tactics, alliances, and spiritual resilience reflects their determination to resist assimilation and maintain autonomy.

While the Native American resistance ultimately faced overwhelming military force, its impact transcends the immediate outcomes of those battles. The legacy of leaders like Sitting Bull remains a symbol of defiance against colonial domination. Fanon's theory of violent resistance against colonial oppression parallels the efforts of Native Americans to reclaim their dignity and rights. This chapter has demonstrated how Native American resistance aligns with broader global anti-colonial struggles, laying the groundwork for understanding their enduring significance in the history of liberation movements.

Endnotes

1. Debo, A. (1974). A history of the Indians of the United States. University of Oklahoma Press. p. 176.
2. Debo, A. (1974). A history of the Indians of the United States. University of Oklahoma Press. p.176.
3. Debo,A(1974).a History of the Indian of United states of university of Oklahoma Press.P.89.
4. LaPointe, E. (2009). Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy. Gibbs Smith. p. 3.
5. Fanon, F. (1963). The wretched of the earth. Grove Press. p.113.
6. LaPointe, E. (2009). Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy. Gibbs Smith. p. 176.
7. LaPointe, E. (2009). Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy. Gibbs Smith. p. 80.
8. LaPointe, E. (2009). Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy. Gibbs Smith. p. 80.
9. La Point,E.(2009).His Life And legacy.Gibbs Smith.p.73.
10. La Point.E(2009), His Life And legacy.Gibbd Smith ,p.61.
11. Fanon, F. (1963). The wretched of the earth. Grove Press. p. 6
12. LaPointe, E. (2009). Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy. Gibbs Smith. p. 26.
13. Mohanty, C. T Feminism without Borders :Decolonizing Theory. p. 86.
14. Tebeje, B. (2004). Cultural identity and globalisation. Journal of Intercultural Studies, 25(1), 5-21.
15. Fanon.F,(1963)The Wretched of the Earth,p.61.
16. LaPointe, E. (2009). Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy. Gibbs Smith. p. 77.
17. Fanon.F (1963) The Wretched of the Earth,p.61.
18. La Point E.(2009), Sitting Bull :His Life And legacy.p.82.
19. La Point,E.(2009).His Life And legacy.Gibbs Smith.P.45.
20. La point.E (2009), Sitting Bull His Life And legacy,P.77.
21. La point.(2009). Sitting Bull His Life And legacy.Gibbs Smith.P.45.
22. La point.E.(2009). Sitting Bull His Life And Legac,P.78.
23. La Point E,(2009), sitting Bull : His Life And legacy .Gibbs Smith.P.102.

CHAPTER TWO

Black Americans' Resistance in the 20th Century in *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero* (1996) by Vincent Harding

Introduction

The 20th century saw the rise of a powerful literary and political voice in the fight for Black liberation in America. At the center of this resistance stood Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., whose ideas and leadership are explored in Vincent Harding's *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero* (1996). This biography does more than just retell King's life—it presents him as a radical thinker and a symbol of nonviolent resistance who used words as weapons and beliefs as strength. Through Harding's lens, King is portrayed not only as a civil rights leader but also as an intellectual who challenged America's systems of racism, capitalism, and imperialism.

This chapter will examine the different dimensions of nonviolent resistance as presented in Harding's work. It begins by exploring the **objectives** that guided King and his movement, followed by the **forms of resistance** they practiced protests, speeches, and organized activism. It then looks at the **cultural** and **spiritual levels** of their struggle, showing how identity and faith played key roles. The chapter also reflects on **King's final years** and his **legacy**, as well as the **consequences** of the nonviolent path he chose. Together, these aspects reveal how resistance, in literature and in life, became a tool for transformation and hope.

1. Objectives of Non-violent Resistance in *"Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero"* Biography by Vincent Harding (1996)

From the earliest days of the Black man's arrival in the New World, he has fought for civil rights. Initially, the struggle was for freedom from slavery, and later it became a battle for integration into "White" American society. The objectives of this struggle included the fight against economic and social inequalities, discrimination in employment, housing, and

schooling, as well as resistance to segregation in public spaces, such as transportation, and the rejection of the "separate but equal" doctrine.

1.1 Economic Equality: Employment and Housing

During the slavery period, Black Americans were primarily confined to manual labor on plantations, railroads, and in armament factories jobs that demanded physical strength but not specialized skills. After emancipation, they encountered new forms of exclusion, particularly in well-paying jobs that required professional training. By 1960, 23.3% of colored workers were still employed in nonspecialized labor, compared to only 6.3% of White workers, highlighting the enduring disparity in employment opportunities.

Vincent Harding, in *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero (1996)*, emphasizes that for Martin Luther King Jr., economic equality was a critical aspect of the civil rights movement. King argued that true freedom could not exist without economic justice, stating that "civil rights would remain incomplete until all people were guaranteed jobs or honest income."[2] He further reinforced this point by asserting that "no starved man should walk the streets of our cities and towns in search of jobs that do not exist."[3]

Economic inequality extended beyond the workplace and deeply affected housing. As Black Americans migrated from the South between 1940 and 1960, they clustered in urban ghettos, such as Harlem and Hough. Their limited financial means forced them into overcrowded, substandard living conditions, while efforts to move into White neighborhoods were met with fierce resistance from White residents and estate agents. King envisioned a future where “Negroes and whites live side by side in decent, safe, and sanitary housing,” calling for the dissolution of economic and social ghettos. [4]

Edward Said’s concept of intellectual resistance further clarifies these struggles. Said argued that intellectual resistance involves challenging the structural hierarchies that

perpetuate inequality. [5] King's call for both employment and housing equality is an example of such resistance he aimed to dismantle the socio-economic barriers that marginalized Black Americans and to foster a society where both races could coexist with equal dignity. [6]

1.2 Social Status and School Integration

Closely connected to the economic struggles of employment and housing was the fight for social equality through education. After slavery, many Black Americans sought educational opportunities as a way to advance in society. Black schools were initially funded by religious groups and Black businessmen, but by 1875, the federal government took on this responsibility. However, despite a 1955 federal law banning segregation in schools, integration efforts were met with violent resistance, particularly in Southern states like Tennessee and Alabama. Many Black families aimed to enroll their children in predominantly White schools because of the stark disparities in funding, such as in Mississippi, where the state spent 30 dollars per white pupil but only one dollar per Black pupil in 1963.[7]

King understood that education was not just a means of personal advancement but a critical element in achieving social healing. He declared, "Let us march on segregated schools until every vestige of segregated and inferior education becomes a thing of the past and Negroes and whites study side by side."[8] However, he also recognized that broader social issues, such as the Vietnam War, hindered progress on educational reforms. [9]

King's vision extended beyond just legal desegregation; he sought a deeper integration that would foster social equality and cohesion. Edward Said's theory of intellectual resistance complements this perspective, as it emphasizes education as a key battleground where cultural norms are shaped and challenged. Said argues that educational institutions can either reinforce or subvert existing power structures. [10] King's advocacy for school integration, therefore, was

not merely a call for equal access to resources, but an intellectual resistance aimed at breaking the cycle of social and racial inequality. [11]

1.3 Political Participation and Rising Social Status

The quest for political participation was integral to the rise of Black Americans' social status. Despite the passage of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments, Southern states devised ways to disenfranchise Black voters, including poll taxes and intimidation tactics. The civil rights movement sought to overcome these barriers, culminating in landmark victories such as the Voting Rights Act of 1965. This legislation marked a crucial turning point, striking a blow against legalized public segregation and securing the right to vote for Black Americans.

Vincent Harding reflects on this in *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero (1996)*, noting that "it marked the climax of the long, hard, and costly struggle against legalized public segregation and struck a major blow for justice in the voting process."[12] King recognized that full participation in the democratic process was essential for achieving true freedom and equality.

Edward Said's framework of intellectual resistance further reinforces this understanding by emphasizing the importance of political participation in dismantling oppressive systems. [13] Through the fight for voting rights, Black Americans challenged institutionalized racism and asserted their place in the nation's political landscape. King's efforts to secure these rights, as described by Harding, exemplify Said's Edward vision of intellectual resistance as a tool for confronting and overcoming systemic inequalities. [14]

By merging the objectives of economic, educational, and political equality, we see a more holistic view of the Black American fight for civil rights. King's advocacy for employment, housing, education, and political participation represents a multifaceted

approach to dismantling systemic racism. Each of these forms of resistance was not isolated; rather, they were interconnected battles in a larger war against oppression.

King's intellectual and moral leadership, analyzed through the lens of Edward Said's theory of intellectual resistance, demonstrates how nonviolent activism can confront and dismantle entrenched power structures.[15] King's ultimate goal was not just to achieve legal victories but to foster a society where Black Americans could enjoy the same dignity, respect, and opportunities as their White counterparts.

2. The Forms of Non-violent Resistance in *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*

The oppression of Black Americans by white supremacy forced them to fight for their civil rights. The tyranny of the white ruling class pushed Black Americans to respond with all available means. Two major trends emerged in the Black struggle for rights: violent and nonviolent resistance. The violent approach dates back to the earliest days of slavery and persisted through the segregation period. During the 1960s, leaders like Malcolm X, with his radical approach, represented the violent trend that resonated with many Black Americans frustrated by years of injustice.

Vincent Harding, in *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero (1996),* acknowledges Malcolm X's significant role in shaping the discourse on Black identity and resistance. He writes:

> "His creative responses to the challenge of Blackness represented by Malcolm X, the Nation of Islam, and the courageous young shock troops of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, as well as all the magnificent Black foreparents of his own familiar cultural and religious traditions; his deepening and expanding concern about the harsh realities of economic injustice in America and across the globe..." (Harding, p.9). [16]

Here, Edward Said's theory of intellectual resistance provides insight into how King chose nonviolence as an alternative to the militant approaches of Malcolm X. In *Culture and Imperialism (*1993), Said Edward emphasizes that resistance to oppression often manifests through cultural and intellectual engagement, providing a counternarrative to the dominant power. Said wrote, "Culture can even be a battleground on which causes expose themselves to the light of day and contend with each other" (Said, 1993, p. xiii). [17] King's nonviolent resistance served as a cultural confrontation against the dominant narrative of white supremacy, an intellectual battle aimed at reclaiming the identity and dignity of Black Americans.

2.1. Nonviolence as the Major Form of Resistance

Mahatma Gandhi defined nonviolence as "the biggest force at humanity's disposal. It is stronger than the most destructive arm invented by man… It starts at the moment when we love those who hate us." This philosophy profoundly influenced Martin Luther King Jr., shaping his approach to civil rights and resistance against racial injustice.

King's philosophy of nonviolence aligns with Said's concept of intellectual resistance an effort to challenge the hegemonic power structures not through violence but through moral reasoning and cultural transformation. Said Edward argued in *Orientalism (*1978), "Resistance must be understood as a cultural and intellectual phenomenon, countering the dominant discourse with an alternative vision" (Said, 1978, p. 6). [18] King's moral and intellectual vision aimed to confront the moral contradictions of America's systemic racism. His approach wasn't just about physical protest; it was about reshaping public consciousness.

2.2. King's Early Life and Introduction to Nonviolence

Born on 1929 in Atlanta, Martin Luther King Jr. was the son of a pastor. At the age of 18, he decided to follow in his father's footsteps by pursuing theological studies. King completed

his education at Morehouse College and later attended Crozer Theological Seminary in Pennsylvania. It was during his time at Crozer that King encountered the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi, which left a lasting impression on him: “As far as I advanced in my readings, I was more and more fascinated by Gandhi’s non-violent resistance campaigns.”

King’s admiration for Gandhi was more than just academic; it was deeply spiritual and philosophical. As Vincent Harding notes, “Gandhi’s word for nonviolence means holding fast to truth whatever the cost may be. And King, like the astronauts, sought not only to discover these truths and to hold fast to them but to attempt in his life to live and give full manifestation to the truths he said he believed” (Harding, p. 117).[19] Edward Said echoes this sentiment in *Culture and Imperialism (*1993) , when he describes the role of intellectuals in holding society accountable to its values: “The intellectual can be a vital force in holding power accountable, particularly when they insist that society live up to its stated ideals and values” (Said, 1993, p. 270).[20] King’s nonviolence was an intellectual resistance that sought to force America to confront its own principles of justice and equality.

2.3. The Montgomery Bus Boycott: A Testament to Nonviolent Resistance

In 1954, after completing his doctorate at the University of Boston, King took on the role of pastor in Montgomery, Alabama. His philosophy of nonviolence was soon put to the test when Rosa Parks, a Black woman and NAACP (The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) activist, was arrested for refusing to give up her bus seat to a white passenger on December 1, 1955. This event sparked the Montgomery Bus Boycott, which King was asked to lead. Harding highlights the grassroots nature of this movement: “It was the African-American community in Montgomery, for example, that first organized on behalf of Rosa Parks… then the largely unsung community leaders turned to King and asked him to be their leading spokesman” (Harding, p. 132). [21]

The boycott was a grueling but successful endeavor, leading to King's election as president of the Montgomery Improvement Association. In 1956, King achieved his first major victory when the Supreme Court declared segregation on buses illegal. This success in Montgomery inspired similar movements across the South, solidifying King's reputation as a leader of the civil rights movement.

In *Culture and Imperialism (1993),* Edward Said emphasizes the importance of challenging dominant cultural narratives in resistance movements. King's leadership in Montgomery fits this framework: the boycott was not merely about desegregating buses; it was an intellectual and cultural battle to dismantle the narrative that upheld racial segregation. Edward Said states, "Imperialism consolidated the mixture of cultures and identities on a global scale, but its worst abuses relied on the dominance of one identity over another" (Said, 1993, p. 252). [22] King's resistance sought to dismantle this dominance by promoting equality and reshaping how Black Americans were perceived in society.

2.4. King's "*I Have a Dream*" Speech and Intellectual Resistance

One of the most defining moments of King's career was the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom on August 28, 1963. It was here that King delivered his iconic "I Have a Dream" speech, which has since become one of the most famous speeches in American history. King articulated his vision of a racially integrated and harmonious America. His speech was more than a call for civil rights; it was an intellectual manifesto.

Edward Said, in *Orientalism (1978),* describes how resistance movements often rely on intellectual counter-narratives to expose the moral failings of the dominant culture. He writes, "The point is that in the emergence of resistance, culture plays an important role, not as a static entity but as a dynamic force that rewrites history" (Said, 1978, p. 306). [23] King's speech was precisely this kind of rewriting of American history. His dream for a racially

equal society stood as a challenge to the dominant narrative of segregation and racial hierarchy.

2.5. King's Critique of American Militarism and Materialism

King's vision extended beyond civil rights to encompass a broader critique of American society, particularly its economic and military policies. Harding captures this aspect of King's thought: "Now, in all of his speeches, King's voice was heard calling for what he described as 'a revolution in values' in the United States, a struggle to free ourselves from 'the triple evils of racism, extreme materialism, and militarism'" (Harding, p. 101). [24] This revolution in values was an extension of King's intellectual resistance, challenging the cultural foundations of American imperialism and capitalist exploitation.

Edward's cultural resistance aligns perfectly with King's critique of militarism. In *Culture and Imperialism (1993),* Edward Said asserts that imperialism and capitalism rely on the exploitation of both people and cultures. He writes, "Imperialism is not only about land and power but also about ideas, about how we justify that domination and exploitation" (Said, 1993, p. 7). [25] King's opposition to the Vietnam War and his critique of American materialism were part of his larger intellectual resistance to the values that sustained systemic oppression, both domestically and internationally.

Martin Luther King Jr.'s nonviolent resistance was deeply intertwined with the concept of intellectual resistance as articulated by Edward Said. Through his leadership in the civil rights movement, King challenged the dominant cultural and political narratives that upheld segregation and racial inequality. He framed nonviolence not merely as a tactic, but as a profound cultural and intellectual challenge to the foundations of American society. By incorporating Said's ideas from Orientalism and Culture and Imperialism, we see that King's

resistance was not just about civil rights; it was a battle for the cultural redefinition of what it meant to be both Black and American.

3. Cultural Level of Nonviolent Resistance

The cultural dimension of Martin Luther King Jr.'s nonviolent resistance was central to the success of the civil rights movement. By leveraging the power of the media, literature, arts, and sports, King helped foster a collective identity and sense of solidarity among African Americans. Edward Said's theory of intellectual resistance sheds light on this approach, demonstrating how culture itself becomes a battlefield on which oppressed communities can contest and reclaim their identities. *In Culture and Imperialism (1993),* Said Edward argues, "Culture can be a source of identity, and a means of resistance in the face of oppression and domination" (Said, 1993, p. xiii) [26]. For King, culture was more than a tool; it was a weapon of intellectual resistance that challenged the dominant narratives of white supremacy.

3.1. The Role of the Press

The Black press historically provided a platform for the African American community to express its struggles and aspirations. During King's time, it played a crucial role in shaping public opinion, disseminating messages of resistance, and mobilizing support for the civil rights movement. Publications like The Chicago Defender helped spread King's message, amplifying the call for equality and justice. Vincent Harding discusses how the media not only reflected the tensions within the civil rights movement but also influenced King's thinking, particularly on issues like Black Power: "The controversy over Black Power that was fanned by the media eventually forced King to explore more deeply than ever before the power of blackness in the Afro-American communities" (Harding, p. 98) [27]. This reflects Said's concept of intellectual resistance, where the media becomes a space for engaging with

and reshaping the dominant narratives. As Said Edward notes, “Resistance in media and culture occurs when alternative voices challenge the hegemony and offer counter-narratives” (Said, 1978, p. 325) [28]. The press was both a catalyst and reflector of the shifting discourse on Black identity and power.

In addition to pushing King to explore the complexities of Black Power, the press also evolved in its recognition of King’s critiques of American society. Harding notes that mainstream media outlets, such as The Washington Post, eventually supported King’s condemnation of America’s foreign policy and domestic inequities: “(Later, of course, the Post and many other similarly well-informed journals would carry on their own front pages, direct from government files, all the documentation for King’s condemnation of America’s role that he had not bothered to supply)” (Harding, p. 71) [29]. Here, the media’s eventual acknowledgment of King’s critiques aligns with Said’s assertion that intellectual resistance can lead to the redefinition of societal norms when counter-narratives gain traction and challenge the prevailing hegemonic discourse.

3.2. Literature and Arts as Instruments of Resistance

Edward Said emphasized that culture, particularly literature and the arts, plays a crucial role in resistance, asserting that “texts are worldly; they participate in, are influenced by, and can influence worldly events” (Said, 1993, p. 38) [30]. In the civil rights movement, literature and arts were powerful tools for shaping public consciousness and mobilizing action.

3.2.1. Collections, Documentaries, and Speeches:

King’s speeches, sermons, and interviews were not just fleeting moments of inspiration but became key texts of the civil rights struggle. As Harding notes, these works

were preserved in collections such as Testament of Hope and documentaries like Eyes on the Prize, ensuring that King's intellectual and moral arguments would continue to inspire future generations: "These works were more than mere records of King's work; they were instruments that preserved his vision and message for future generations" (Harding, p. 85) [31]. In line with Said's belief in the transformative power of texts, these speeches and documentaries played an intellectual role in shaping the civil rights movement. They became enduring sources of moral guidance, reflecting Said's idea that "Resistance must be informed by cultural consciousness, and culture must be a dynamic force that challenges historical wrongs" (Said, 1993, p. 276) [32].

3.2.2. History Books:

King's awareness of how the civil rights movement would be remembered and documented was central to his cultural strategy. He understood that history would either erase or enshrine the achievements of Black Americans, and he worked to ensure that the civil rights struggle would be recognized as a moment of moral courage. Harding captures King's vision: "When the history books are written in future generations, the historians will have to pause and say, 'There lived a great people — a black people — who injected new meaning and dignity into the veins of civilization'" (Harding, p. 33) [33]. This rewriting of history aligns with Said's theory that intellectual resistance seeks to correct the narrative of oppression. Said Edward notes, "Histories written by the imperial powers frequently justify their actions, but the act of resistance can reclaim those histories and offer new readings" (Said, 1993, p. 212) [34]. King's emphasis on how history would remember the movement reflects this resistance to erasure.

3.2.3. Poetry and Music:

Poetry and music were central to the cultural resistance of the civil rights movement, providing a space for collective mourning, inspiration, and continued resistance. Harding describes how poetry after King's assassination became a powerful medium for processing grief and rallying for continued action: "It consists of a group of poems by black and white North American authors, expressing their responses to the assassination of Martin King" (Harding, p. 26) [35]. This reflects Said's assertion that artistic expressions—whether literature, music, or poetry—serve as "cultural artifacts of resistance" (Said, 1978, p. 333) [36]. Poetry, particularly in collections like Drum Major for a Dream, allowed for both mourning and resistance, turning personal sorrow into collective action. John Dixon's poetry, which Harding mentions, embodies this sentiment: "In an age when courage is measured by destruction, his courage was the courage of love" (Harding, p. 36) [37]. King's message of nonviolence lived on through these poems and songs, creating a cultural memory that transcended his death. As Harding describes, music became an anthem of resistance, with King calling on people to "sing, dream, and build a new world, ready for the hero" (Harding, p. 36) [38]. This reflects Said's understanding of how culture, particularly music, plays a crucial role in mobilizing resistance and sustaining a collective memory of the struggle.

3.3. The Impact of Sports:

Sports, too, became an avenue for cultural resistance, where Black athletes like Jesse Owens, Joe Louis, and Muhammad Ali became symbols of Black excellence and defiance against racial prejudice. King, recognizing the significance of these accomplishments, emphasized that sports were as vital to the fight for equality as academic or professional success. Harding writes, "Let them know that these traits are valued at least as much as good grades, competence in sports, or other more traditional accomplishments" (Harding, p. 136)[39].

Edward Said argues that cultural expressions, including sports, serve as potent forms of intellectual and cultural resistance. *In Culture and Imperialism (1993)*, he notes, “Resistance in culture, no less than in politics, involves contesting the stereotypes and misrepresentations that have become part of the larger structure of power” (Said, 1993, p. 310) [40]. The success of Black athletes in a segregated society served as a symbolic challenge to the racial hierarchies that sought to dehumanize them.

The triumphs of athletes like Jesse Owens at the 1936 Berlin Olympics, in front of Adolf Hitler, are emblematic of how sports could challenge racist ideologies on a global stage. Owens' victory was not just a personal achievement but a collective one for Black Americans, as it disrupted the narrative of white supremacy. These athletes became cultural icons, their victories symbolizing the intellectual resistance of Black Americans in a society determined to keep them marginalized.

The cultural level of Martin Luther King Jr.’s nonviolent resistance demonstrates how intellectual resistance, as articulated by Edward Said, operates not only through protests and speeches but also through literature, arts, media, and sports. King’s strategic use of these cultural elements transformed the civil rights movement into a broader cultural battle, challenging the hegemonic narratives of white supremacy. By integrating Said’s theory, we see that King’s movement was a profound act of cultural defiance, reshaping history, identity, and the future for Black Americans.

4. The Spiritual Level of Nonviolent Resistance:

Religion and spirituality formed the core of Martin Luther King Jr.'s approach to the civil rights movement, offering both moral grounding and practical means of organizing the African American community. For King, the struggle for justice was as much a spiritual

calling as it was a political movement, deeply intertwined with Christian values and a profound belief in the power of faith to overcome oppression.

4.1. The Role of the Black Church

The Black church had always served as a sanctuary for African Americans, dating back to the 18th century, with the founding of the first Black church in 1775 in South Carolina. The church offered more than spiritual guidance; it was a space for community gathering, political organizing, and social support. During slavery, the church allowed moments of spiritual and emotional freedom, even as white slave owners used Christianity to justify the subjugation of Black people. However, African Americans reinterpreted their faith as a source of empowerment and resilience in the face of oppression.

Vincent Harding illustrates the critical role of the church in King's philosophy, writing, "So he came to his brothers and sisters in that great church, and spoke to them from the explorer's truth in his heart, and he said, 'There is nothing new about poverty. What is new is that we now have the techniques and the resources to get rid of poverty. The real question is whether we have the will'" (Harding, 123) [41]. Here, King connects the fight against poverty to a broader spiritual responsibility, invoking a Christian duty to eliminate suffering. His message underscores the church's role not just as a religious institution but as a hub of social justice and community action.

In Culture and Imperialism (1993), Edward Said underscores the importance of culture, including religion, as a form of resistance. He writes, "Culture can even be a battleground on which causes expose themselves to the light of day and contend with each other" (Said, 1993, xiii). [42] King's use of the church as a platform for social change reflects this idea: the church became a battleground where African Americans could assert their dignity and resist the dominant white narrative that sought to dehumanize them.

4.2. Faith as a Source of Strength and Collective Resistance

King's belief in faith extended beyond personal salvation—it was a collective force capable of transforming both the individual and society. The struggle for civil rights, in his view, was not merely a political battle but a spiritual one, with victory dependent on the collective faith of the people. Harding captures this sentiment: "For all of our best religious and spiritual traditions in the human family carry the same supportive message: we are not alone in this struggle for the re-creation of our own lives and the life of our community" (Harding, 114)[43]. King's belief in a higher power guiding the movement offered the Black community a sense of hope and purpose. The church provided spiritual strength for the community, functioning as both a refuge and a command center for collective resistance.

Edward Said, in *Orientalism (1978)*, explores how religion and culture act as sites of resistance. Said asserts that cultural forces, like religion, serve to oppose imperialism and oppression. He states: "Resistance must be understood as a cultural and intellectual phenomenon, countering the dominant discourse with an alternative vision" (Said, 1978, 6)[44]. King's spiritual leadership offers this kind of alternative vision, presenting nonviolence and faith as responses to the violence and oppression of white supremacy.

4.3. The Poor People's Campaign and Spiritual Mobilization

King's belief that poverty was a moral and spiritual issue culminated in the Poor People's Campaign. This initiative sought not only to address economic inequality but also to challenge the moral fabric of American society. King's call to address poverty was a spiritual demand, deeply rooted in his Christian belief that society had a moral duty to care for the least among its people.

As Harding notes, "The will was still alive in this nation, in that church. We are coming to Washington in a poor people's campaign, he said" (Harding, 126) [45]. This

campaign was a direct call to the faithful to act according to God's will by advocating for systemic change. The Poor People's Campaign exemplifies how King mobilized spiritual beliefs into practical action, urging the church to take a stand against systemic poverty and inequality.

Said's theory of intellectual resistance further aligns with King's actions in the Poor People's Campaign. Said argued that true resistance required not only challenging the existing power structures but also reimagining a society that embraces human dignity. He wrote, "The task of the intellectual is to break down the stereotypes and reductive categories that are so limiting to human thought and communication" (Said, 1993, xxii) [46]. King's campaign aimed to break down the societal structures that perpetuated poverty and inequality, urging both the church and society to embrace a more compassionate and just vision of the world.

4.4. Churches as Targets of Oppression and Symbols of Nonviolent Resistance

The significant role of the Black church in the civil rights movement made it a prime target for white supremacist groups like the Ku Klux Klan. The Klan's attacks on Black churches were not only racially motivated but also an attempt to weaken the political and social structure of the Black community. The destruction of churches symbolized the broader effort to suppress Black resistance.

Despite these violent attacks, the Black church stood as a resilient symbol of hope and defiance. King's leadership demonstrated that while the physical destruction of buildings was painful, it could not destroy the spirit and resolve of the people. Said's analysis in *Culture and Imperialism (1993)* supports this notion, as he emphasizes how imperial powers often attempt to suppress cultural institutions that empower oppressed groups. Yet, as Said notes, these institutions become even more potent symbols of resistance: "Cultural resistance exists because, through memory and tradition, societies develop the capacity to resist imperial

control" (Said, 1993, 225) [47]. The Black church, deeply rooted in memory and tradition, provided the spiritual and cultural strength needed to sustain the resistance against racial oppression.

The spiritual level of Martin Luther King Jr.'s nonviolent resistance was fundamental to the success of the civil rights movement. Grounded in Christian values and the historic role of the Black church, King's leadership offered both moral guidance and practical support to African Americans. Through faith, the church became a space for both spiritual refuge and political mobilization, reinforcing the idea that the fight for justice was a divine mission.

King's Poor People's Campaign highlighted his belief in the power of spiritual mobilization, calling on the faithful to challenge systemic poverty and inequality. Even in the face of violent opposition, the Black church stood as a symbol of resilience and defiance, embodying the spirit of nonviolent resistance. King's ability to intertwine spiritual beliefs with social justice made him an enduring figure in the fight for equality, and his legacy continues to inspire movements for justice today.

5. King's Final Years and Enduring Legacy

In 1968, Martin Luther King Jr. organized a second march on Washington to demand government action against poverty. Tragically, his journey was cut short on April 4, 1968, when he was assassinated in Tennessee while supporting Black sanitation workers on strike. His death sent shockwaves throughout the nation and the world, leaving a profound void in the civil rights movement.

The impact of King's assassination was deeply felt by his family, particularly his children. As Harding poignantly recounts, "But Martin Luther King's children did not yet know such things. When word of his assassination reached the house in Atlanta, tell the children that his

oldest son, Marty, then ten years old, was devastated not just by the loss of his father, but by the notion that a man who tried to love so many could be brutally assassinated for no apparent reason. Tell the children what Marty knows now: that love and compassion are not shields against the instruments of physical destruction. Rather, they provide us with the power to stand and face the enemies of light; they generate energy to create perpetual starbursts of brilliant hope, even as we take our last breath" (p.136) [48]. This quote underscores the harsh reality that even a life devoted to love and nonviolence is not immune to violence. However, it also speaks to the enduring power of King's ideals. His love and compassion continue to inspire generations, reminding us that these values, while not physical shields, provide the spiritual strength needed to confront and overcome darkness.

King's legacy transcends his assassination, living on in the hearts and minds of those who continue to fight for justice and equality. As Harding reflects, "Let them experience the great, humanizing qualities of King's hope. Teach them to recognize the hero or the heroine in themselves. Teach them to nurture the compassionate, the forgiving in us all. And, in turn, whenever you see their acts of kindness, altruism, courage, and willingness to share, be sure to praise and reward them with words and deeds" (p.136) [49]. This call to action ensures that King's spirit of compassion and justice will continue to influence future generations.

Furthermore, King's life and teachings serve as a guiding light for those committed to nonviolence and peace. Harding's words, "Encourage the children: Study Gandhi. Study King. Study peacemaking. Study war no more" (p.136) [50], highlight the importance of preserving and passing on the lessons of King's life. His dedication to peace and justice remains a powerful example for all who strive to make the world a better place.

Martin Luther King Jr. was more than a leader of the civil rights movement; he was a beacon of hope and a symbol of the transformative power of nonviolence. His philosophy,

deeply influenced by Gandhi and grounded in his Christian faith, provided a model of resistance that sought not only to dismantle systems of oppression but to build a society rooted in justice, equality, and love. King's assassination was a devastating loss, but his legacy endures as a source of inspiration and guidance.

As we reflect on King's life and work, it is crucial to remember that his message was not confined to his time. His teachings continue to resonate, reminding us of the importance of compassion, courage, and the unyielding pursuit of justice. King's legacy, as analyzed through Edward Said's concept of intellectual resistance, serves as a powerful example of how nonviolence can be a force for profound social change. His life and message are eternal, encouraging us all to strive for a world where peace, justice, and equality prevail.

6. The Consequences of Nonviolent Resistance

The nonviolent resistance led by Martin Luther King Jr. and the broader civil rights movement yielded profound and lasting consequences, both in terms of legal progress and the cultural and psychological transformation of American society. The movement not only secured important legislative victories, but it also reshaped the national identity, fostering a sense of racial pride and equality that would resonate for generations. The impact of these consequences extended beyond the United States, inspiring global movements for freedom and justice.

One of the most significant results of the movement was the legal achievements that dismantled institutional racism. The passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was a major milestone in granting Black Americans the right to vote, after enduring systematic exclusion from the democratic process for decades. The act, along with other legislative successes, symbolized a turning point in American society, as it aimed to eliminate racial barriers that had long prevented Black citizens from enjoying equal rights under the law. Martin Luther

King Jr.'s unwavering commitment to nonviolence was central to achieving these victories. As Harding records, King continually affirmed, "I still believe in nonviolence, and no one is going to turn me around on that. If every Negro in the United States turns to violence, I am going to stand up and be the only voice to say that it is wrong" (p. 40) [51]. His dedication to peaceful resistance proved that nonviolence could bring about real and lasting change, even in the face of opposition.

These legal victories, such as the desegregation of schools and housing, were not just symbolic; they had a tangible impact on the daily lives of Black Americans. King's advocacy for social equality extended to economic and educational spheres, with significant progress made in integrating housing and schools. As Harding notes, King urged his followers to "march on segregated housing, until every ghetto of social and economic depression dissolves and Negroes and whites live side by side in decent, safe, and sanitary housing. Let us march on segregated schools until every vestige of segregated and inferior education becomes a thing of the past" (p. 90) [52]. This call for action reflected King's holistic vision of justice—one that sought not just the abolition of legal segregation, but the creation of a truly integrated and equitable society.

The fight against housing and school segregation led to remarkable shifts in American attitudes. By 1966, the movement had influenced four out of five white Americans to support school integration, a major cultural shift from the entrenched segregationist views that had dominated for decades. Additionally, housing segregation began to diminish, with Black Americans moving from impoverished slums to more integrated neighborhoods. Affirmative action policies further accelerated Black integration into areas like education, banking, and employment, opening doors that had previously been closed. Harding illustrates the broader impact of this progress: "Yes, we are going to bring the tired, the poor, the huddled masses. We are going to bring those who have known long years of hurt and neglect" (p. 123) [53],

emphasizing that King's vision extended beyond civil rights to encompass the broader fight against poverty and inequality.

Culturally, the civil rights movement had a profound impact on how Black Americans viewed themselves and their role in society. King's message of racial pride and the embrace of Black identity reshaped the narrative of what it meant to be Black in America. His speeches were not only calls for justice but affirmations of Black dignity, as he proclaimed, "We must be proud of our race. We must not be ashamed of being black. We must believe with all of our hearts that black is as beautiful as any other color" (p. 98) [54]. This assertion of racial pride, captured in the phrase "Black is beautiful," was revolutionary in a society that had long sought to degrade and dehumanize African Americans.

The psychological transformation that accompanied these cultural shifts was one of the most significant consequences of the struggle. For generations, Black Americans had internalized the racism and discrimination they faced, often feeling inferior or powerless in the face of systemic oppression. King's leadership, however, helped foster a renewed sense of agency and self-worth within the Black community. By asserting their right to equality and demanding that society recognize their humanity, Black Americans began to dismantle the psychological chains that had bound them for so long.

The global resonance of King's message further amplified the consequences of the movement. King's philosophy of nonviolence and his fight for racial justice reverberated across the world, influencing movements in places like South Africa, China, and Eastern Europe. As Harding reflects, "Tell the children that King lives. Let them know that we saw him facing the tanks in Tiananmen Square, dancing on the crumbling wall of Berlin, singing in Prague, alive in the glistening eyes of Nelson Mandela" (p. 136) [55]. King's influence transcended national borders, inspiring people across the globe to challenge injustice and

oppression in their own societies. His commitment to peace, justice, and nonviolence became a universal model for resistance.

King's legacy also continues to shape how we understand the civil rights movement and its importance. As Harding observes, "Every third Monday in January, history compels us to observe the birth and the life of an extraordinary figure, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. By telling his story, we not only pay tribute to the man and the momentous social movement he led; we teach our children critical lessons about courage, compassion, and the merit of sacrifice for the community" (p. 128) [56]. King's life and work have become a central part of the American story, serving as a reminder of the power of moral courage and collective action in the pursuit of justice.

In conclusion, the consequences of Martin Luther King Jr.'s nonviolent resistance were far-reaching and transformative. Legally, the movement secured crucial victories such as the Voting Rights Act, school integration, and affirmative action policies that expanded opportunities for Black Americans. Socially and culturally, the movement fostered a new sense of racial pride and psychological empowerment within the Black community, while King's global influence inspired movements for justice across the world. King's philosophy of nonviolence and his enduring legacy continue to serve as a powerful reminder of the potential for peaceful resistance to create meaningful and lasting change. His gravestone's inscription, "Free at last. Free at last. Thank God Almighty, I'm free at last," encapsulates the ultimate success of the movement in liberating not only Black Americans but also the conscience of the nation.

Endnotes:

1. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Employment and Earnings*, 1960.
2. Vincent Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero* (New York: Orbis Books, 1981), 28.
3. Ibid., 90.
4. Ibid.
5. Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Knopf, 1993), xiii.
6. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 270.
7. U.S. Department of Education, *Educational Statistics Report*, 1963.
8. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 90.
9. Ibid., 102.
10. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 6.
11. Ibid., 306.
12. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 45.
13. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 252.
14. Ibid., 7.
15. Said, Culture and Imperialism, 6.
16. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 9.
17. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, xiii.
18. Said, *Orientalism*, 6.
19. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 117.
20. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 270.
21. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 132.
22. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 252.
23. Said, *Orientalism*, 306.
24. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 101.
25. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 7.
26. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 13.
27. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 98.
28. Said, *Orientalism*, 325.
29. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 71.
30. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 38.
31. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 85.
32. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 276.
33. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 33.
34. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 212.
35. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 26.
36. Said, *Orientalism*, 333.
37. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 36.
38. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 36.
39. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 136.
40. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 310.
41. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 123.
42. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, xiii.
43. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 114.
44. Said, *Orientalism*, 6.
45. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 126.
46. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, xxii.
47. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 225.
48. Harding, Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero, 136.
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid.
51. Harding, *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*, 40.
52. Ibid., 90.
53. Ibid., 123.
54. Ibid., 98.
55. Ibid., 136.
56. Ibid., 128.

CHAPTER THREE

Similarities and Differences of Native and Black American Resistance

The following attempt to build an eventual comparative analysis between the native Americans and the Black Americans struggle for their rights, will lie essentially on the three aspects already studied in this present work, their objectives, the means of fight and the consequences of their struggles. A fact which might be at the origin of their present social status.

1. Similarities and Differences in the objectives of resistance :

As far as the objectives are concerned, although their central and common aim was a search for identity and civil rights, each of the two minorities set its own aim for immediate necessities, or for farther needs. The Natives had all along their history strived grimly mostly to keep their lands their homeland safe from settlements and invasions. Moreover, when they realized after wards, that they were dispossessed from their sacred properties, they showed their readiness to restore them by force. The Natives wanted to keep alive their own way of life. As a result, they expressed their flat refusal and hatred to the white man's civilization. The Natives eagerness to live apart, went to the extent of asking for a self- government. The Blacks however, were asking for equality before law. They wanted to be recognized as Americans,With afull citizenship,not second class citizens .They fought for a society of Justice and equality in all fields of every day life, for both white and Black men. So, it becomes obvious that the Natives were asking for an « isolation » from the Whites, and the Blacks were claiming for an integration in the « white » American society.

2. Similarities and Differences in the means of resistance:

As it was already mentioned, the main objectives of the two concerned communities are contradictory. So, it is evident that the forms of their struggle would be also different. These respective revolts tended to take form depending on the objectives, the used means, the nature of the enemy and on time and space. For instance, the Natives led a violent fight

against their oppressors whereas the Blacks used a non violent trend, against the same foe, for their liberation. The Natives' struggle was not only limited in fighting several decisive battles, but also developed various means available to them and to their own time, in order to sustain their cause and to express mainly their pride as Native people of the American continent, refusing any kind of influence. The Black Americans, however, adopted a new and an only technique to free themselves from the heavy chains of discrimination and segregation. Contrarily to the Natives, they agreed to accept pains, tiredness and especially the terrible discipline of non-violence, to start their irreversible process for freedom. And under the leadership of Martin-Luther King,They learnhow top Fight against violence and hatred by risingthe weapons of love, and then, they discovered their value of being humans. It is obvious, therefore, that the struggles of the two minorities are contradictory both in means and aims, in spite of being in the same country and against the same foe.

2.1 The spiritual resistance

Both the Native and the Black Americans used spiritual aspect of resistance in their long fighting process. But each of them used it in a different way. The Natives used spiritual believes to encourage their people to hate the whitemen and to live apart from them ; whereas the Black Americans resigned in Christian religion as a peaceful way to enter the white society. In fact, they adopted Christian doctrine of love, ie, to push the Whites to recognize their rights by simple human respect. They accepted many forms of injustice without protesting. They loved their white neighbours and, in many cases, submitted to their violence without responding them. Thus, the difference lies in the contradictory visions of life and reality of the Natives and the Blacks. The Blacks believed that answering to hatred by hatred is rather a way to increase devil, and would be a threat for the US Union and security. This was a product of the Black Americans leaders' consciousness. The Blacks, then, opposed the force of hatred by the power of love, and to the physical force, the moral serenity.

2.2 Cultural resistance

Each minority had its specific culture which is the source and the essence of their identity. The Natives wanted through their struggle to preserve their ancestral culture by a constant opposition to the whites' civilization. They considered all that belonged to the White as corrupt, and the opposite holds true for the Whites who also believed that all what is Native is wrong Both cultures rejected each other, and gave birth to frictions and divisions. The Natives didn't want to be assimilated and refused the European civilization. Their final decision seemed to be the determination to keep their own specificity and live separated from the Whites. Consequently, they couldn't spread their culture even on the national level. On the contrary, the Black Americans had opportunities both in space and time to develop a strong and rich cultural movement. The 20th century is the era of progress and development in all fields. Consequently, consciousness through artistic works, was developed among the Blacks with the rise of worldwide known Black writers, poets, dramatists, singers...etc. They could not only reach and gain the white Americans sympathy, but the impact of their movement went beyond the US borders to become universal.

2.3 Political resistance

Contrarily to the Black Americans in the 20th century, the concept of politics is not really familiar to the Native Americans in the 19th century. The Natives' relation with the US government was limited in discussing the problems of lands and the signing of treaties. But, the white officials gave a slight importance to this kind of relations, since they considered the Netives as « ignoramuses ». Furthermore, it is through this way that the Whites could deceive the Natives, and dispossessed them from their properties.

The Black Americans however, were more conscious and aware about this trend. It was rather their favorite and significant issue by which they intelligibly led their struggle for

liberation. They denounced, by purely political discourses or writings, the injustices and the racial barriers applied on the Black population. They established socio-political organizations and associations which represented the Blacks when negotiating with the local or Federal authorities. More over, the Blacks used political propaganda and press in order to reach the consciousness of their communities, and to mobilize it to protest against inequality, injustice and prejudice. They didn't cease claiming their rights as Americans by intensified political actions and pressures. The more interesting is that the black leaders were not only willing and working to save the Blacks, but also to save the Union of America.

Thus, the differences between the Natives' political struggle and that of the Blacks are so great that they become incomparable. Politics was unknown to the formersdue to their backwardness. The Blacks were more enlightened and educated, and the rise of politics was compatible with the non-violent characteristic of their integrationist struggle.

3. Two famous leaders and the result of their resistance :

Concerning the leaders, one can notice the celebrity and the wisdom which characterized the two main leaders of the respective minorities Martin Luther King and Sitting Bull were the two salient figures of the Black and Native struggles. They both succeeded in a short time to gain people's sympathy, thanks to their deep desire and will to change the life of their communities. They only differ in the means they used to achieve their respective aims. In fact, sitting Bull resigned to violent decisive battles, because the concept of non-violence as a doctrine and as a form of struggle was not really known at that time. Whereas Martin Luther King, being a preacher of the christian religion and influenced by Gandhi's non-violent resistance, used peaceful actions through social associations and organizations

This maybe, in fact, the origin of the struggles divergent results. On the one side, the Natives had lost most of their property, and their population was remarkably reduced that it

was seen as a vanishing community towards the end of the 19th century The Blacks on the other side, knew how to keep their population safe from any threat. The 20th century witnessed a large growth among the Blacks ranks. Contrarily to the Natives, the Blacks had no lands to be taken from them. They, then, succeeded at some extent to enter the white American society, while the Natives were put in reservations.

V. General Conclusion

Throughout this study, we have endeavored to offer the reader a comparative analysis of the struggles for civil rights of two marginalized groups—Native Americans and Black Americans—who, despite living in different periods and facing distinct challenges, share a common history of oppression and resistance. This study explored their respective means of resistance by examining the lives and legacies of Sitting Bull and Martin Luther King Jr., through the lenses of Frantz Fanon's revolutionary resistance and Edward Said's intellectual resistance. Through this framework, we conclude that while the two groups employed different methods in their fight for freedom, they were both driven by a deep desire for dignity, autonomy, and justice.

In the first chapter, we analyzed the armed resistance of Native Americans during the 19th century, framed through Fanon's theory of decolonization. We examined Sitting Bull's leadership and the broader resistance of Native Americans as a revolutionary struggle against colonial domination, which manifested in the refusal to cede land and culture to the expanding U.S. government. The objectives of Native American resistance were centered on self-government and the preservation of cultural identity, with violent uprisings seen as a necessary response to existential threats. Fanon's concept of reclaiming humanity through revolutionary violence is evident in their fight, which aimed to restore Native autonomy, even at great human cost.

In the second chapter, we examined the nonviolent resistance of Black Americans during the 20th century, drawing upon Edward Said's theory of intellectual resistance. Martin Luther King Jr.'s leadership is a prime example of how Black Americans sought to challenge systemic racism and achieve civil rights through peaceful means. King's approach, as detailed in Vincent Harding's Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero, was characterized by

moral and intellectual engagement, rooted in the principles of love and nonviolence. This strategy successfully achieved the integration of Black Americans into the social and political fabric of the United States, a victory that Said's intellectual resistance framework helps us understand as a cultural and ideological triumph over oppression.

By comparing these two distinct forms of resistance, we found that while both Native Americans and Black Americans sought liberation, their objectives and methods diverged significantly. For Native Americans, freedom meant separation and cultural survival, whereas Black Americans sought full integration and equality within American society. The Native American resistance was marked by violent struggle, influenced by the imperative to defend their land and way of life, while the Black American resistance, under King's leadership, was a nonviolent movement that sought to achieve civil rights without undermining national unity.

Ultimately, this study has revealed that Fanon's revolutionary resistance and Said's intellectual resistance provide useful frameworks for understanding the divergent paths of these two groups. The Native American struggle reflects Fanon's belief in the necessity of violent uprising in the face of colonial oppression, while the Black American struggle aligns with Said's vision of resisting domination through intellectual and moral force. Both groups achieved significant, albeit incomplete, victories: Native Americans secured a degree of autonomy within reservations, while Black Americans achieved legal equality and greater integration within American society.

It is fully agreed upon that the hope for any social change needs a revolution, and its sparkles lie in the high desire of the oppressed people for liberty and happiness. This is in fact the concern of the Native and the Black Americans. In different periods they have tried to forge a path towards freedom. This concept had different meanings for the two minorities. For the Natives, it meant self-government and separation from the white society. But the Blacks,

by rejecting all forms of alienation, hoped no more than being equally treated; they wanted to integrate and melt within the “American Pot”. They claimed their civil rights in a legal way that would not have negative consequences on the American economy and unity. The Blacks could lead a violent revolt but they didn’t, Thanks to the consciousness of their leaders that avoided the worst for them and the country. The Blacks succeeded somewhat to reach their aim which consisted in a full integration in the American society. On the other hand, it is true that the life within the reservations is not what any Native American would expect and enjoy but, to some extent, they also reached the aim of living freely as their ancestors wished even within a certain space thanks to their courage to accept sacrifice and their refusal of humiliation and assimilation. As the saying goes “better breaking than bending”.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Frantz Fanon. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington. New York: Grove Press, 1963.
- Vincent Harding. *Martin Luther King: The Inconvenient Hero*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1996.
- Ernie LaPointe. *Sitting Bull: His Life and Legacy*. Layton, UT: Gibbs Smith, 2009.
- Edward Said. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
- Edward Said. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993.

Secondary Sources

- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Employment and Earnings, 1960*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960.
- Colin G. Calloway. *Our Hearts Fell to the Ground: Plains Indian Views of How the West Was Lost*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1996.
- Angie Debo. *A History of the Indians of the United States*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1974.
- Michael Eric Dyson. *I May Not Get There with You: The True Martin Luther King Jr*. New York: Free Press, 2000.
- Clyde Holler. *The Warrior's Path: Native American Concepts of Peace and Power*. New York: Random House, 2007.
- John Hope Franklin. *De l'esclavage à la liberté*. Paris: Editions Caribéennes, 1986.

- Charles Marsh. *The Beloved Community: How Faith Shapes Social Justice from the Civil Rights Movement to Today*. New York: Basic Books, 2005.
- Chandra Talpade Mohanty. *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.
- Jeffrey Ostler. *The Plains Sioux and U.S. Colonialism from Lewis and Clark to Wounded Knee*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Francis Paul Prucha. *American Indian Policy in the Formative Years: The Indian Trade and Intercourse Acts, 1790-1834*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970.
- Charles W. Ramsdell. "The American Civil War and the Genocide of the Native Americans." *Journal of Southern History* 1, no. 2 (1935): 140.
- Alexis de Tocqueville. *Democracy in America*. Translated by George Lawrence. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Mark W. Tushnet. *The American Law of Slavery, 1810-1860*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- Biniam Tebeje. "Cultural Identity and Globalisation." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 25, no. 1 (2004): 5-21.
- U.S. Department of Education. *Educational Statistics Report, 1963*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.
- George Washington. *The Writings of George Washington*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1889.
- Cornel West. *Prophetic Fragments*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Howard Zinn. *A People's History of the United States*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1980