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**Abstract**

The historiography on the American civil rights movements has developed for decades. Among these rich literatures, Fairclough’s *To Redeem the Soul of America* serves as one of the pioneering academic works to fairly discuss the role of the churches, with black and white in rallying support to this social movement. It also fully evaluates the black leaders, their organizations (represented by SCLC, SNCC, and others), and strategies in different events in the historical context of desegregation and nonviolent activities. Moreover, in many ways, *To Redeem the Soul of America* provides useful case study to testify the practical theory on social movement, reflecting both experiences of success and failure.
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This article mainly reviews and examines Fairclough’s work, *To Redeem the Soul of America: The Southern Christian Leadership Conference & Martin Luther King, Jr.*, as well as investigation of materials in this book with discussion of its advantages and errors. In addition, in the last part of the essay will use comparative analysis, testifying theory proposed by Kenneth T. Andrew’s article “Creating Social Change: Lessons from the Civil Rights Movement” in terms of the different perspectives Fairclough underscores on the organizational operations and strategic employment in the civil rights movement.
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1. Review of To Redeem the Soul of America:

To Redeem the Soul of America written by Professor Adam Fairclough is an extensive discussion of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), which as one of the most symbolic organizations of Civil Rights Movement from 1950s-1960s, and its leader Dr. Martin Luther King (MLK). Generally speaking, SCLC hid behind the towering figure of MLK. His powerful influence and legendary popularity stole the limelight from SCLC, while the secondary figures of the movement were almost always ignored. In his book, Professor Adam Fairclough attempted to restore the original form and character of SCLC, affirmed its value, and did his best to present the role and contributions of other members to the movement such as: Bayard Rustin, Stanley Levison, Ralph Abernathy, Ella Baker, Wyatt Walker, James Bevel, Andrew Young and many others.

Fairclough began the Introduction by quoting Charles Morgan, a man who served at the movement’s board of directors, “SCLC is not an organization...It’s a church”. This remark revealed the fact that SCLC was composed of black ministers from Southern. The black church was for a long time highly respected by the Southern black community and, thus, has a very strong mobilization force. Economic independence paved the way for the black ministers to defy mounting pressures and to become the leading representative of Southern black protesters. Moreover, as Ron Eyerman claimed, black preachers were more independent of white control (at least at the local level) that they made their protests and activities beyond white reformist movement, supported by another powerful group, black teachers. From hindsight, black churches, led by MLK, proved to be an efficient tunnel for the success of the movement itself, well proved in Fairclough’s narrations.

In addition, in the eyes of Fairclough, SCLC was not a mere extension of MLK despite its organizational weaknesses and limitations. On the contrary, it should be in equal position as MLK and regarded as an important complement to MLK. As the title of the book puts the two entities side by side, it is

---

1There are plenty of literatures and biographies about MLK. Biographical documents include: Peter J. Ling, Martin Luther King, Jr. (Abingdon, Oxon : Routledge, 2015); Roger Bruns, Martin Luther King, Jr.: a biography (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2006); Ron Ramdin, Martin Luther King, Jr. (London: Haus, 2004); Ira Peck, The life and words of Martin Luther King, Jr. (New York, N.Y.: Scholastic, 1999); The examination of MLK and his core fellows in Civil Rights Movements: David Howard-Pitney, Martin Luther King, Jr., Malcolm X, and the civil rights struggle of the 1950s and 1960s: a brief history with documents (Boston : Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2004); Jonathan Tilove, Along Martin Luther King : travels on Black America's main street (New York, N.Y.: Random House, 2003);Lillie Patterson, Title Martin Luther King, Jr. and the freedom movement (New York : Facts on File, 1989); Discussion about his nonviolentstrategy: John J. Ansbro, Martin Luther King, Jr.: nonviolent strategies and tactics for social change (Lanham, M.D.: Madison Books : Distributed by National Book Network, 2000); Mary King, Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr: the power of nonviolent action (Paris: UNESCO Publishing, 1999); The works concerning his religious and political influence:Johnny Bernard Hill, The theology of Martin Luther King Jr. and Desmond Mpilo Tutu (New York, N.Y. : Basingstoke, England : Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); Lewis V. Baldwin and others, The legacy of Martin Luther King, Jr: the boundaries of law, politics, and religion (Notre Dame, Ind. : University of Notre Dame Press, 2002).


4In page 3, the author raised the issue of inefficiency in the organization, changes in strategies, all the way to what journalists described as “an exercise in organized chaos”; the author further blamed SCLC’s neglect to maintain its cause by failing to become an “organization” and turning out to be just “a means to structure a movement” as explained in page 404.

5In the Afterword, the author wrote, ”my research had confirmed that SCLC was indeed more than an extension or reflection of King….Without SCLC….King’s voice would have been muted and his leadership ineffective; King endowed SCLC with a
clear that the author confirmed that SCLC must never be overlooked. Besides, the author offered his personal views regarding the criticisms most often aimed at SCLC. He explained that SCLC did not regard local protests as media events designed to induce federal involvement nor did it sacrifice black communities as part of a grand strategic design, and further described the strategy of SCLC as “hit-and-run”...and its task was not to “marry a particular local community but to generate action and protest in one community after another”\(^6\). Another point of discussion was SCLC’s attempts to take white violence to its advantage. Fairclough stressed that SCLC merely publicized white repression to the best possible effect. Sufferings and casualties of the demonstrators during rallies were minimized. Lastly, the author also explained why he chose to neglect the religious influences on SCLC and MLK in his entire book.

In Chapter one, the writer discusses how WWII stimulated a fundamental reorientation of expectations and attitudes among the black community (page 14). *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) formally challenged the segregation policy in public schools at the legislative level.\(^7\) This event was followed by a series of bus boycotts in Baton Rouge, Montgomery and Tallahassee that forced the American society to confront the issue of black segregation in public occasions. Especially, the year-long Montgomery bus boycott which began in December 1955 marked the beginning of extensive desegregation, but more importantly, gave rise to SCLC where portrayed the 26-year old MLK as charismatic leader. Also, the author emphasized how different the organization and activities of SCLC, established in 1957, from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR), and the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE). First of all, SCLC was dominated by black clergy from the South which made it extremely appealing to Southern blacks. It demonstrated difference with FOR and CORE, which were led by white middle-class intellectuals “often disguised as having paternalistic attitudes to the blacks”.\(^8\) Furthermore, SCLC was composed of affiliated churches and some community organizations like the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights (ACMHR), the Baton Rouge Christian Movement and the Nashville Christian Leadership Council as well as varied categories consisting of voter registration organizations and miscellaneous civil groups. SCLC “did not offer individual membership”. It preferred to be “an umbrella organization joined by local groups or affiliates in a loose alliance”.\(^9\) Hence, SCLC did not intend to make itself a competitor of NAACP or FOR but rather, it aimed to provide a collaborative platform for the other organizations. Plus, as far as MLK was concerned, Gandhism was his supreme concern so that SCLC had always abided by the principles of nonviolent disobedience. Mass demonstrations, protests, sit-ins, filling the jail and other similar methods were used to express their dissent and which differentiated them from NAACP.

\(^6\)Adam Fairclough, *To Redeem the South of America*, pp.407-408.
\(^8\)Ibid, p.31.
\(^9\)Ibid, p.33.
In Fairclough’s view, from 1957 to 1959 was the fallow years of SCLC. During this period, MLK rose to soaring personal prestige and became the invincible leader within the civil rights movement. Nevertheless, SCLC also showed its weakness for lack of clear strategy when the boycott activities began to reach the judiciary stage and the energy started to run out of gas.\textsuperscript{10} Although SCLC attempted to shift toward voter registration program and held relevant events such as “Crusade for Citizenship,” their impact gradually waned. Except from vague strategies, the author believes that the weak organizational structure, ineffective internal communications, and financial difficulties were also the causes. Ella Baker, the executive secretary of SCLC during this difficult time, was the best example.

The beginning of 1960 marked some changes in SCLC as a result of lessons learned from the challenges during the movement’s early days. First is the recruitment of social movement veterans like Bayard Rustin, James Lawson, etc, followed by the hiring of full-time staff to take charge of fund raising. Another change was the expansion and participation of more student members. Ella Baker helped to establish the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). And lastly, the citizenship school education was launched and voter registration was heavily promoted.\textsuperscript{11}

SNCC actively participated in the Sit-Ins launched by young students from Greensboro, North Carolina in 1960, as well as the Freedom Rides led by CORE in 1961. However, the comparative inertia and hesitation of SCLC in these events had stirred some members of SNCC. Cooperation with activists in Georgia, Albany, SNCC was heavily involved in protests for desegregation in public accommodations from the fall of 1961 to the summer of 1962. SCLC gave its total support to the cause and MLK chose to go to prison. Nevertheless, the event failed to produce tangible results. From hindsight, Fairclough addressed that the Albany Movement exposed the following facts: (a) SCLC lacked a reliable local base and hesitated in decision-making. The scarce number of volunteers willing to go to jail deterred long-term resistance. (b) The limitation of nonviolent protests was another issue. When Albany sheriff Laurie Pritchett took a nonviolent stance to deal with demonstrators, the intention that SCLC attempted to show white supremacy in front of the media failed. Fairclough believed that SCLC and MLK had learned the lessons from Albany Movement and revised in the Birmingham campaigns in 1963.\textsuperscript{12}

During the demonstrations in Birmingham, AL in 1963, SCLC obtained some advantages that it lacked in Albany—the solid local supports from Fred Shuttles worth, the clear aim toward the desegregation of Birmingham’s downtown merchants rather than total desegregation, and ruthless Public Safety Commissioner Eugene “Bull” Connor. The Birmingham incident has several features. First, the \textit{Letter from a Birmingham Jail} written by MLK resorted to the public assistances and reasserted his position of nonviolence. Secondly, since that the movements ran out of vigor after April, MLK exercised the black children to participate in the violent

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid, pp.42-43.
\textsuperscript{11}Ibid, pp.58-59, 69.
\textsuperscript{12}Ibid, pp.107-109.
civil rights demonstrations against police. Although this bold move restored protest activities and the intervention from Kennedy Administration, it roused numerous critics. Thirdly, Fairclough compared the relatively small responses gained in Birmingham to that produced in Selma, and he asserted that Birmingham events caught the attention of the Kennedy Administration which seriously felt the need to accelerate legislations to avoid another similar incident. This was the main driving force of Civil Rights Act of 1964. Fourth, Birmingham became a model for SNCC, CORE, and the local black movements because this city, once famous for its racial intransigence, offered a hope for change in other places dominated by racial segregation.\footnote{Ibid, pp.134-139.}

The March on Washington in August 1963 was an important milestone for civil rights movements, despite the happening of one tragedy in September that a bombing attack in the Baptist Church of the black community in Birmingham killed four young girls. From Fairclough, the massive demonstration held by SCLC, NAACP, CORE, SNCC, and other groups had important meanings: (a) After Birmingham, the massive demonstration in the capitol continued to put pressure on the Congress to pass a nationwide civil rights bill; (b) the nonviolent march that included a huge number of white people impressed America and softened the fears of society. It presented the civil rights movements as united, responsible and determined, mirroring the ideologies conveyed by MLK in his speech, “I Have a Dream”.\footnote{Ibid, pp.153-155.}

From 1963 to 1964, SCLC in cooperation with SNCC launched an unsuccessful desegregation movement in Atlanta, GA. After this, SCLC assisting with local activists in St. Augustin, Florida tried to replicate the Birmingham experience to produce direct actions that will put more pressure on the Government and Congress. The activities held by SCLC in this particular place such as the night march and the march to the Old Slave Market encountered violent attacks from Klansmen. SCLC and MLK expected for the government and the local Chamber of Commerce to intervene but to no avail. Fairclough concluded that “the campaign in St. Augustine was hurriedly conceived and poorly planned”. “SCLC did succeed in publicizing the growing Klan menace but it failed to move the federal government”. Therefore, SCLC acquired limited substantial achievements except stirring the anger and dissatisfaction of white people in this area.\footnote{Ibid, pp.183-191.}

Fairclough continued to mention that when JFK was assassinated in 1963, the civil rights movement lost a very powerful supporter and felt serious doubts about the successor, President Lyndon Johnson. Between 1964 and 1965, the Democratic Convention in Atlantic City was convened in August that nominated the presidential candidate. SCLC and MLK hoped to keep their harmonious ties with the Democrats and so backed up Lyndon Johnson, a candidate they deemed to be a staunch supporter of civil rights movement. Therefore, the support for Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (MFDP) became uncertain in SCLC and it led to conflicts from some members of SNCC whom supported strongly for the issues of MFDP. SNCC gradually moved towards radical black civil rights principles and eventually broke away from SCLC.\footnote{Ibid, pp.200-203.}
Except the MFDP actions in the Democratic Convention, during the period, another civil rights action that aimed to the black voter registration issues happened in Dallas County, Alabama. For SCLC and SNCC, Dallas County which locates at the heart of Alabama Black Belt was a great place to conduct the voter registration because the black made up more than half of the local population but were given a mere 1% electorate, and the local supports such as Dallas County Voters League and other organizations were strong. Therefore, SCLC expected for the potential energy in this area and invested in much resources.

In January 1965, the movements launched by SCLC in Dallas County were met with harsh attacks. Dallas County Sheriff Jim Clark did his best to suppress the supporters of voter registration by arresting most of the protesters. In less than a month, SCLC decided to expand the scope of their demonstrations by holding marches in Marion, Camden, and many other areas. MLK was also arrested by violating the parade ordinance. On February 18, Jimmie Lee Jackson, a black protester, was killed due to police violence in Marion. This event intensified the demonstrations and protests. On March 7, six hundred protesters attended the march from Selma to Montgomery and encountered another violent attack from the police, state troopers, deputy sheriffs and posse. The event which became known as “Bloody Sunday” shocked the nation. The strategies of SCLC and MLK once again proved successful. Nevertheless, SNCC severely criticized MLK for not showing up in this the parade.

In this period of time, the role of MLK seemed ambivalent. On the one hand, he sympathized with the black masses and was offended by the police and judge. On the other hand, he revealed his expectations from the institutional reform and hoped to negotiate with the Government. Plus, the injunction made him irresolute as well. Therefore, MLK hoped to launch an organized demonstration to pacify the angry masses while not ruining the possible compromising opportunities with the Government. Such thoughts reflected on the symbolical parade he led on March 16.

The negotiating tactics of MLK were met with the good intentions of President Lyndon Johnson. He ordered the federal troops to protect the five-day march to Montgomery which began in March 21. The parade attracted a crowd of 25,000 who expressed their supports for voting rights. Johnson Administration and the Congress were pressured by public opinion and thus, enacted the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

After 1965, SCLC and MLK gradually turned its focus on the black communities in northern and western cities particularly in Chicago. Fairclough mentioned that the New York riots in 1964 led the SCLC and MLK to begin to pay attention to the poverty issues of Northern blacks. The misery that the blacks suffered in the slum of Chicago and the intense racial segregation in both schools and resident communities in the area made SCLC to focus on this city gradually. In 1965, SCLC and the Coordinating Council of Community Organization (CCCO) formed an alliance to defy the racial segregation in schools and residences.

During the Chicago Freedom Movement in 1966, MLK led demonstrations in the city and lived with the blacks in the slum. Throughout the process, the white people vehemently guarded their right of abide. SCLC

\[^{17}Ibid, p.196.\]
was unable to control the march that it was infiltrated by some rogue individuals who conducted violence. Chicago Mayor Richard Daley became worried about the confrontation between the Chicago blacks and the whites that he eventually agreed to a concession and promised to promote fair housing. SCLC organized a march through the white neighborhood of Cicero where MLK chose not to participate. This march was met by 2,000 soldiers. On the whole, the Chicago Freedom Movement only gained small pledges from the Summit Agreement. In other words, SCLC was defeated. This event proved that the nonviolent direct action of SCLC which usually succeeded in the South was simply ineffective in the northern cities. Besides, the surging Vietnam War in 1966 switched the attention of Johnson Administration, leaving the civil rights movement in a difficult position.

From 1966 to 1968, Fairclough claimed, SCLC had to face the Black Power of SNCC, and gradually lost its control over the civil rights movement. During the period, SCLC and MLK made futile attempts to unite civil rights movement with anti-war movement, and SCLC faced the organizational because some members of its core left. In order to regain the energy to revive the civil rights movement, MLK intensified the efforts to resolve Black poverty and hoped for government intervention to alleviate the problem. In 1968, the Poor People’s Campaign organized by the SCLC pursued the standpoint of economic justice for various minorities. However, unfortunately, SCLC lost its greatest leader when MLK was assassinated in Memphis, Tennessee on April 4, 1968. Although MLK’s death facilitated the passage of the 1968 Civil Rights Act which incorporated fair housing proposals of the failed 1966 civil rights bill, it also marked the end of civil rights movement to a certain extent. Under the leadership of Abernathy, successor of MLK, SCLC gradually declined. Fairclough quoted remark of one of SCLC’s staff “We are a movement, not an organization”\(^{18}\) as his conclusion for the end of the SCLC and civil rights movement.

In conclusion, from the whole book, Fairclough’s discussions on the civil rights movements participated by SCLC and MLK were presented in chronological order. He did his best to narrate different aspects of every event or movement – its success, failures, gains, and losses. Not only that, Fairclough also gave his readers a clear background and juxtaposed the related opinions about every event. In this light, he could offer his comments from a relatively neutral stance and give more truthful evaluation of the civil rights movement.

2. Materials Examination

Fairclough’s research was rooted and derived from an abundant source of reference materials. His notes, which included many citations, reached an enormous amount of 72 pages. The original materials and archives related to SCLC and MLK were sourced from Martin Luther King, Jr. Center (Atlanta, GA) and Mugar Library (Boston University). These documents include conference records of SCLC, press releases, letters and files of MLK and other significant members of SCLC. Materials about JFK were obtained from John F. Kennedy Presidential Library; NACCP papers were taken from the Library of Congress (Washington DC); and

\(^{18}\)Ibid, p.405.
finally, FOR’s papers were retrieved from the Peace Collection of Swarthmore College (Swarthmore, PA). As regards the civil rights movements from Albany, Birmingham, Nashville, Tallahassee, and other areas, Fairclough consulted with various municipal governments, state authorities and searched voluminous archives and papers.\textsuperscript{19} He also consulted other sources like Burke Marshall Papers, Sanitation Strike Archival Project, files from the House and Senate, monography of previous studies like that of David Garrow, and etc.\textsuperscript{20} These essential and numerous firsthand historical data allowed Fairclough to accurately represent and assess the achievements and failures of MLK and SCLC.

Fairclough also included FBI wiretap materials that stealthily spied MLK, Rustin, Levison, and SCLC. These deciphered materials helped him inform his readers why J. Edgar Hoover opted to blackmail MLK. Also, these materials revealed how the FBI perceived the relationships or connections of MLK and SCLC to civil rights, anti-war movements, and the communists. Fairclough heavily referred to the interviews he personally conducted with other participants of the civil movement, particularly his interview with Leroy Collins. After “Bloody Sunday” took place in 1965, President Lyndon Johnson appointed Collins to coordinate with MLK in soften more violence and riots. Therefore, the interview with Collins can learn from Collins the tactics that MLK applied for in the symbolic march to Montgomery on March 16. Other interviews materials used by Fairclough to support his arguments were those from Ella Baker, Stanley Levison, Fred Shuttleworth, Andrew Young, Roy Wilkins, James Farmer, Harold Middlebrook, etc.

In the Afterword, Fairclough acknowledged the enormous information he was able to gather from the autobiography of two important members of SCLC – Ralph David Abernathy and Andrew Young. Newspapers such as the \textit{New York Times}, \textit{Washington Post}, \textit{Newsweek}, and \textit{Wallstreet Journal} were likewise a favorite reference of Fairclough. For every specific event, the author looked into local newspapers. For example, the remarks of \textit{Chicago Defender} about the Chicago Freedom Movement; the massive resistance in Virginia as recounted by the staunchly segregationist \textit{Richmond News-Leader}; the reports in \textit{Alabama Review}, \textit{Louisville Defender} and other newspapers on the challenges encountered by SCLC in Alabama and Louisville.

To sum up, the original ideas in Fairclough’s book may be attributed to the numerous and appropriate materials that he used. Regrettably, there was no essay or section in the book that described his sources, nor any bibliography. Fairclough also failed to explain how the materials were utilized in specific case. Besides, the Burke Marshall papers in the John Kennedy Library were used, but curiously and disappointingly, the riches of the LBJ Library were not.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{19}Includes City Archives, Albany, Ga; City Archives, Birmingham Public Library; Governor Farris Bryant Papers, Florida State Archives, R.A. Gray Building, Tallahassee, Fla.; Facts on Film (Nashville, Southern Education Reporting Service). See Adam Fairclough, \textit{To Redeem the South of America}, p.423.


3. Analysis of Fairclough’s view of SCLC and MLK:

Fairclough’s assessment of SCLC’s effectiveness as the means of social movement and his explanation about SCLC’s strengths and weakness were convincing. As historian Kenneth Andrews claimed that organizations and events were two influential factors of social movement that interacted with one another, Fairclough’s work echoed what Andrew proposed that “organizations can facilitate movement impact in several ways,” such as “parlaying their legitimacy into substantive influence through negotiation”, “encouraging authorities to make preemptive concessions”, and “influence policy through sponsorship and coordination of disruptive or persuasive protests.” In other words, “movement organizations implement change” and sponsor the protest. This point of view concurs with the statements declared by Fairclough about the organizational function of SCLC in civil rights movement, a point that usually was outweighted by conventional wisdom overstating extraordinary significance of MLK and black leaders in the movement.

As regards the effects of movement actions or protest events such as riots, demonstrations, boycotts, and other public actions toward social movements, Fairclough’s book singled out certain incidents like the Birmingham events or Selma protests, demonstrating how they affected the government and officials in one way or another so that the policies ended up in favor of the Civil Rights Act. Besides, Fairclough also underscored these events’ importance of buttressing SCLC and other civil rights organizations to innovate themselves to undergo long-term protests. This point somehow supported Andrews’s argument that movement actions “can have effects on elected officials, courts, third partisan and counter-movements”, and “can facilitate periods of organizational innovation” and expansion.

The dispute that Fairclough conceded that SCLC witnessed chaotically internal disorganization with crippling inefficiency and reliability, while his sharp view to present SCLC’s fluidity as a capacity of flexibility and advantage of quick decision that were beneficial for the loosely organized black community and constituency for mobilization both articulated the duality of asset and liability SCLC possessed for the movement. It gave credit for the author to convince readers that he firmly had a grasp of essential documents that made his organizational analysis both balanced and reasonable.

Fairly speaking, To Redeem the Soul of America is one of the pioneering academic works gave an overall and detailed study regarding MLK, his core colleagues and SCLC. This research, even not entirely based on original documents but mostly rested on secondary sources, successfully outlined the picture of modern black struggle in the civil rights movement. It demonstrated the track of the black movement transforming from church-centered southern social mobilization toward radical class politics, intertwined neutral judgment of influence of personalities of MLK and his fellow black leaders upon the SCLC and the events they operated.

---

Conclusion:

As one of the of the pioneering academic works discussing MLK and black civil rights with the organizational analysis, Fairclough’s *To Redeem the Soul of America* fairly evaluates the black leaders, their organizations (represented by SCLC, SNCC, and others), and strategies in different events in the historical context of desegregation and nonviolent activities. Moreover, in many ways, *To Redeem the Soul of America* provides useful case study to testify the practical theory on social movement, reflecting both experiences of success and failure.
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