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Jimmy Carter seemed to be the appropriate presidential candidate in the election of 1976 due to his personal characteristics of honesty, devotion to others and his incredible work ethic. He provided a type of possible salvation from the dual fiascos of Watergate and Vietnam, which had caused many Americans to simply write the political system off as corrupt, especially the presidential office. The political climate post Watergate is important to understand as well as the type of man Americans were willing to elect in 1976. Many scholars have looked to the Moral Jimmy (Morris Jimmy Carter: American Moralist) as just that type of man and yet that same trait may have made getting anything done a more difficult task in Washington.

From his childhood and through his Naval career, Mr. Carter personified the small town boy. Growing up in a small Southern peanut farm, the Carters were never a rich family. Often waking early in the morning to help his father with chores, a sense of hard work was ingrained at an early age. Religion played a key role in his upbringing, as did the role of family, especially his mother. Incensed by the inequities he found in his post WWII hometown he entered politics. From a Georgia Senate seat to the governor’s mansion, Carter worked hard, promised not to lie, and to be thrifty with the people’s money. (Carter, Why Not the Best, Bourne, Jimmy Carter and Hyatt, The Carters of Plains)

The Election of 1976 was in many ways a new type of election, altered by legislation hoping to curb the powers of an imperialistic president and yet it was also
dominated not by the issues that had dominated early elections, for example civil rights and the policies in Vietnam. (Schram, *Running for President 1976: The Carter Campaign*, Bitzer and Rueter, *Carter v Ford: The Counterfeit Debates of 1976*) Instead, it was a contest between two men promising healing and a new outsider perspective. In many ways, American voters said that they wanted a man of integrity first and then worry about the issues the nation was facing because without trust all else was a mute point. (see Appendix M: Carter’s Acceptance Speech at the Democratic Convention)

Everything about his childhood and political career seemed to say that Carter was sincere in his goals, yet as crisis after crisis arose during his presidency he found it increasingly difficult to balance his personal feelings of morality with the political massaging necessary to get things done in Washington. From the Middle East to the economy, the Iranian hostage situation and the environment, Carter was always trying to do the “right thing.” The hard work turned out to be overworked and the honesty was sometimes too honest for many American to swallow. (See Carter’s “Crisis of Confidence” Speech) Of course, Carter’s presidency has been viewed as ineffective and filled with contradictions (Mollenhoff, *The President Who Failed: Carter Out of Control* and Kaufman, *The Presidency of James Earl Carter Jr.*) In many ways the characteristics that made Carter a viable and popular candidate also hampered his ability to participate in the political process. Carter struggled with his desire to do the right thing in a world where that was not always possible.

However once free from the constraints of the Oval Office, Congress and the constant scrutiny of the press, a Carter enveloped by his passions is revealed. (Brinkley,
Carter’s human rights efforts around the world have been recognized, including a Noble Prize.
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HISTOROGRAPHY

Introduction

“The sad duty of politics is to establish justice in a sinful world.”

- Reinhold Niebuhr

James Earl Carter rose from the clay soaked soil of Southwest Georgia to become president at one of the most critical junctures in American history. The country was reeling from the twin disasters of Vietnam and Watergate bringing the trust in authority and the office of the president to an all time low. The economy was souring through job loss and inflation was beginning to eat away at disposable incomes. Coming as a savior with Populist economics and Christian morals, his astonishing rise is one of the remarkable political stories of the later twentieth century. Ironically the characteristics that made Carter so appealing to the electorate in 1976, outsider status, honesty, and a return to a more simplistic view of the government, would become political liabilities. Recent film biographer, Adriana Bosch said, “The very qualities that got him elected – tenacity, religious certitude and an absolute confidence in his abilities—made it nearly impossible to govern.” Tough relationships with a more powerful and more active congress and a beleaguered, tired public plagued Carter’s only term. His lofty goals faced tough resistance and his idealistic and moralistic stances were not wholly compatible with US foreign policies around the world. Biographical writings on Carter’s life have often shown how his early upbringing reinforced fundamental ideas that would become the
cornerstone of Carter’s beliefs including smaller, more efficient government and a moralistic human rights policy. As an unknown figure running for public office a second wave of literature evolved around Carter the candidate and his 1976 presidential victory. Carter’s time in office has also been interpreted in various ways: he was a failure, he was morally right but a failure, he was right and the rest of U.S. didn’t want to hear it. Whatever the take, most historians have recognized that Carter made some mistakes. Some also recognize that he had been handed a difficult situation. The most recent writings revolve around aspects of Carter’s post president activities, including his Nobel Peace Prize in 2002, often presenting Carter in a much more favorable light.

The historical process by which presidents are examined and critiqued is very slow. Not until their complete presidential records are available and long after their passing, can a clearer less biased version of the historical record be made. Even now we are only really beginning to comprehend the origins of the Cold War and are far away from understanding the downfall of the USSR. Add to this the vast array of media from the former Soviet Union that is still yet to be made accessible and one can understand why a definitive picture of Cold War events is still not written. Coverage of Jimmy Carter’s presidency, a mere 28 years ago, has been mostly a partisan affair. This paper is an exercise in demonstrating the problem of writing about a recent political figure. The biases were so often apparent in the books on Carter, that by simply looking at the image on the front cover one could ascertain the author’s point of view. Many of the authors, some of whom were historians but mostly journalists, made narrowly focused issues their primary topic and then attempted to use those accounts to portray Carter in their version
of his presidency. Realistically, historians have only begun to look at the long-term consequences of Carter’s time in office and any unbiased assessment will only be made in the future. The ever-changing reputation of Carter has yet to be set in stone, if it ever is. Historians still debate the merits of presidents like Jefferson and Lincoln.

Jimmy Who?

The number of biographies on Carter is growing with each passing year as his name is introduced to a new generation. His accomplishments, failures, and their long-term effects will take some time for historians to evaluate. A few decent biographies have been written with most focusing on his life prior to the presidency. To comprehend his time in office and the courses of action he took, one must first understand his upbringing. Somewhat isolated on a small farm in rural Georgia, Carter was raised the oldest boy in a family of four, followed by two younger sisters and a much younger brother. Central in his life were his parents, a schoolteacher named Ms. Julia Coleman, and the church. The best look at the aspects of Carter’s pre-presidential life can be found in two books, Peter Bourne’s *Jimmy Carter: A Comprehensive Biography from Plains to Postpresidency* (1997) and Kenneth E. Morris’ *American Moralist* (1996). Bourne, trained as a physician, served as special assistant to Carter, and later as assistant secretary general at the United Nations. As a close friend of 25 years, he traveled extensively with Carter and provided an insider’s view of Carter throughout his presidency. Writing often about the psychology of Carter’s personality, he offers a great combination of factual detail and insightful primary comments, yet his lack of training as a historian leaves much to be
desired in terms of understanding the historical significance of many of Carter’s actions. His close friendship with Carter also can be seen in several aspects of his book, which leads one to wonder perhaps what might have been left out of his text.

*American Moralist* provided a different yet equally interesting look at the 39th president. Wrapping a biographical approach within a social context, Morris calls Carter’s presidency the moral story of our time. A professor of sociology, neither a professional author nor historian, from the University of Georgia, Morris sees Carter as a man so tied to his beliefs that he cannot see the limitations they would create for him as president. Both of these books look to Carter’s early years in Plains as a stage upon which Carter serve as the central figure. They discuss the exhausting and grinding life on the family farm which both conclude led to an incredible work ethic in Carter the president. Bourne says:

> Earl set an exacting standard for his son, although Carter has said, ‘one reason I never thought about complaining about the work assigned to me as a boy was that my father always worked harder that I did or anyone else on the farm.’ Yet similar demands were never placed on his siblings, and other noted Earl to be a harsh taskmaster compared to other fathers in the community. Carter also said of his father, ‘He was a stern disciplinarian and punished me severely when I misbehaved.’

Morris talks similarly of Carter’s upbringing.

By all accounts Earl Carter’s demands on Jimmy were excessive. Noting, ‘[M]y father shaped my life more than anyone else as far as my work habits and ambitions were concerned,’ Jimmy Carter added, ‘his standards for me were extremely high.’

Later observers of his work ethic claim that he was one of the most active, hard working presidents. Both authors also point to Carter’s attempt to win attention from his
father and its subsequent denial as a key factor in the psychological make up of Carter. Bourne points to a story about quail hunting where Jimmy, so excited about his first kill, dropped his gun and ran proudly to show his father. His father quickly admonished Jimmy for leaving his gun and said nothing of the quail. Carter would later say, “My father loved me very much,” but acknowledged that there were aspects of “my father’s relationship with me that at times I resented very much.”

Morris ties into this theme with the following commentary:

Yet, no matter how hard he tried to meet his father’s expectations, Jimmy could not. His father’s demands were simply unmatched by enough approval or affection to enable Jimmy to feel successful by meeting them. When Jimmy did well, his father remained silent; remarks were reserved for reprimands.

Carter himself recognized this relationship with his father and would write about it many times, especially the years after the presidency. In a 1995 book of poems titled, *Always a Reckoning, and Other Poems*, Carter wrote “I despised the discipline,” and expressed a “hunger for an outstretched hand/ a man’s embrace to take me in/ the need for just a word of praise.” Both of the works by Bourne and Morris, have inherent problems; Bourne was a close friend and Morris sociological approach, while interesting, has limitations and does not provide the historical background or synthesis to lay the foundation work on Carter’s term as President.

Carter’s other major work on his early life, *An Hour Before Daylight* (2001), also declares that his relationship with his father was strained. However, most of his energy was focused on the good times he enjoyed living on the farm. He chose to concentrate on the positive and not the negative aspects of his life. Whether this was an intentional
response to protect himself from reliving the pain or simply an acknowledgement that too much has been made of the father/son relationship is not clear. Carter’s own words will be important to future historians but again his lack of acknowledgment about harmful or less than idealistic situations will limit the usefulness of this work.

Another general biography on Carter is *The Carters of Plains* (1977) by Atlanta born Richard Hyatt. Having followed and admired Carter since his journalism days of working for the *Columbus Enquirer* in Georgia, Hyatt provided a sympathetic, Southern view of Carter. He went into some depth about Carter and had some great flavor on what life was like in Plains. While not as academic as Bourne’s book or as themed as Morris’ book, it did provide an interesting perspective on Carter’s birthplace. The publication date, the year Carter took office, is important in that perhaps it was released as an attempt to gain support by showing Carter in a positive Southern light. It does leave one to wonder how seriously its author took the job as historian without providing any notes and a chapter titled “Billy Carter: Baron of the Beer Cooler.”

It is from all these books that we see the other important relationships that shaped Jimmy. Perhaps the lack of affection from Carter’s father explained his love for Ms. Julia Coleman. A leading figure in education for 35 years in Sumter County, Ms. Coleman pushed her students to think beyond the railroad lines that divided up the small town. Teaching a classical curriculum, she encouraged young Jimmy to read Tolstoy’s *War and Peace* at age 12, to debate, to think of what might be possible. In him she saw ambition and Carter embraced school as a place where he could succeed and be rewarded. At his
35th high school class reunion in the summer of 1976, Carter said of his education in Plains,

    It prepared us to go out in the world and do the best we could. We’re small and isolated down in Plains, but you can learn just as much coming to Plains as you can from any of the people in New York City. We lived together, played together, fought together, and learned together.?

    Ms. Coleman was not the only woman in Jimmy’s life. His mother, Ms. Lillian, was a powerful figure who shaped much of Carter’s views on race, volunteering, and religion. Interestingly, Lillian’s father, a political man, urged his favorite daughter to discuss and debate politics with him; this was an enlightened attitude toward women in the rural South. A fiery female throughout her life, very little could stop her once her mind was set, a trait her son would inherit. From her education as a nurse, to her outspoken views on race, she was a woman ahead of her times. The most important of his mother’s influences was on the issue of race relationships. Almost all works on Carter attribute his more liberal stance (by Georgia’s 1960 standards) to his mother’s stimulation. She forbade the use of “nigger” in their home and ordered Jimmy to refer to his black elders as “aunt” and “uncle.” This would help explain later why Carter would refuse to join the White Citizens Council (even after intimidation and a boycott of his business), and his unpopular stance in his local church on the admission and acceptance of African-Americans. Of course both of these items show up in many narratives on Carter as examples of how he had always supported civil rights. This is somewhat similar to the myths told surrounding Abe Lincoln’s life. His childhood playmate, A.D. Davis,
said, “See, Jimmy and them were raised up with nothing but colored people. He ain’t
never acted like he was more than somebody because he was white.”

Lillian was also influential in Carter’s lifelong pursuit of volunteerism. She had
voluntarily nursed nearly all the black sharecropping families on her husband’s property
at one time or another and entertained black ministers at her home, much to her
husband’s despair. Although less time is spent on this topic by biographers it does clearly
help to explain Carter’s later passion for such causes as Habitat for Humanity. Bourne
concludes,

The philosophy of volunteerism, with its roots in the ideal of Christian
service, which his mother exemplified, made a lasting impression on
Jimmy. It would be a model that he would emulate as well as a philosophy
he would expect others to pursue.

A young Jimmy recognized his mother’s professional drive but again resented
having to search for her time or love. Bourne quotes Jimmy as saying, “The strong
memory in my mind is coming home and my mother not being there.”

Lillian, Earl, and practically the entire community of Plains, all attended church.
In addition to school, it was the primary force in the town and certainly no one would
want to miss a sermon. Earl had been involved with the church most of his life, teaching
Sunday school and serving as its treasurer, thus, it was no surprise when an eleven-year-
old Jimmy was baptized at the end of a summer revival in 1935. Carter’s religious fervor
would be a key aspect of his political life and authors Bourne, Morris and Hyatt look to
his early childhood for the roots of his convictions. At church, they claim he learned a
strong Christian work ethic, taught right from wrong, and first became knowledgeable of
the land of Israel. In May of 1976 Carter gave one of his most revealing interviews with Bill Moyers, in which he reflected about the role of religion in his life:

…I thought I was a good Christian. And one day the preacher gave this sermon- I don’t remember a thing he said- I just remember the title… ‘If you were arrested for being a Christian, would there be any evidence to convict you?’ And my answer by the time the sermon was over was ‘No.’ I never had really committed myself totally to God- my Christian beliefs were superficial. Based primarily on pride, and- I’d never done much for other people. I was always thinking of myself, and I changed somewhat for the better. I formed a much more intimate relationship with Christ. And since then, I’ve had just about like a new life.11

Carter, in the 1976 election, was relatively unknown outside the South. He had risen from a school board member, to Georgia’s Senate, to ultimately as Governor in 1972. It was not an easy time to be in politics in the South given an old system of corruption and the divisive Brown v Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas decision of 1954. Carter’s 1992 book, Turning Point: a Candidate, a State, and a Nation Comes of Age, depicts the chaos and corruption rampant in Georgian politics during the early 60s. Central to his story is his first run for the Georgia Senate. When the totals were counted it appeared that Carter had lost but then there was a closer inspection of the votes from Quitman County, where the polling officials had directed and personally supervised each voters ballot. There were some irregularities. Voters were given instructions to “scratch out Jimmy Carter’s name. Joe wants you to vote for Homer Moore.”12 Faced with an obvious case of corruption Carter pushed ahead and called for a recount of the votes. This showed he was prepared to take on powerful people to do what was right. The corruption aspects of the story will be retold many times as Carter ran for president, obviously an attempt to prove the honesty of a man poised to replace a decade of corruption. He also
discussed the problems associated with racism and focused on how he could move
Georgia into the forefront of a new Southern ideal.

In an attempt to get his name known on a national scale and on the advice of his
presidential election team, Carter wrote a book called *Why Not The Best* (1975). This
purely political volume would help the electorate learn about Carter’s ideas by explaining
his childhood and political career in Georgia. Using stories of strenuous farm life,
segregation in childhood and his education by a small town but brilliant teacher, Carter
paints an idyllic but fruitful picture of his life. The book examines his political career
with heavy emphasis placed on his reorganization of Georgia’s government agencies,
fiscal conservatism and liberal view on a Southern spectrum of segregation. However, the
primary focus, and title of the book, revolves around a story of a man Carter compares to
his father, Admiral Hyman G. Rickover. After high school Carter persuaded his life
long ambition, a naval career. Several years at a community college would eventually
lead to the Naval Academy in Annapolis where Carter would be seen as a serious, detail
orientated, and academic student but far from a natural leader. After several assignments,
Carter’s diligence paid off when he landed a position under Rickover in the elite nuclear
submarine program. An incredibly driven but somewhat rebellious leader, Rickover hand
selected his underlings and drove them to perfection. This management style would later
serve as a model for Carter. In an exchange with Rickover, Carter was asked if he had
done his best at the academy. In an attempt to tell the whole truth, an introspective Carter
replied, “No sir, I didn’t always do my best.” Rickover asked one single, plain question,
“Why not?” Carter sat there, shaken and then slowly left the room. He said later about the
question, “…I have never been able to forget –or to answer.” This story appears in several books on Carter’s early life and all seem to see it as a pivotal moment in Carter’s life. Challenged during most of his adolescence, in an attempt to gain his father’s approval, he is once again pushed to try and be the best. Carter would internalize this drive and draw upon it in times of stress to propel him into a compulsive work ethic.

In *Why Not The Best*, Carter points to the political position on race that would help him win in 1976. “It is disconcerting to remember with what mistaken notions many of us clung for a long time to the rigid structure of segregation without realizing for a while what a blessing it would be when we passed on to a new and free relationship.” Carter recalls one of the very first speeches he made in the Georgia Senate; it was to urge the abolition of the “thirty question” test for potential voters that was designed to keep the status quo in the South. Much of Carter’s own writings stress his early life experiences as the origin of his views on race relations. Again Carter’s words are important for historians, but the political nature of *Why Not The Best* leaves it open to concerns about its historically accuracy.

Carter’s childhood was certainly idealized in many of his own and others’ works. According to them he led a simple, productive, God fearing life that was marked by key people; his parents, an educator and a demanding boss. Only Morris points out that perhaps it was not all that idyllic. Living with few close friends, obsessing over the requirements for naval school (he used to worry that his teeth didn’t line up correctly and that he might have withheld urine one time too many thus having a debilitating condition called urine retention) and his demanding career, Morris argues it might have been a
cover; hiding a more stubborn, driven, attention needing person. Bourne makes several attempts to show some of the possible cracks in the ever-solid Carter façade but they are quickly smoothed over by another story. Regardless of the stories, the warmth and sincerity in Carter’s wish to do the right thing is obvious. Most view his physically hard, early life as a character building experience and while his relationships may have been strained, they were important in understanding his standard of frankness with others. Carter would use the foundation he gained during those years to propel himself to the forefront of Georgia and national politics. It is significant to note that many of the authors have been close friends or admirers; others simply were out to make a quick dime based on their proximity to Carter. His political career also became the focal point for writings. Overall these books will surely be important to a future historians analysis as they analyze the personality of Carter, but none of them are without obvious biases.

Candidate Carter

Carter’s thoughts on his elections are best looked at through two of his books, *Turning Point* and *Why Not The Best*. Starting off as a member of many local clubs and organizations, Carter would rise relatively quickly to the highest office in the land. Carter claimed he wanted to have a wider congregation, a bigger influence, to help more people. Some called it a political miracle. Insiders who provided a detailed account of Carter’s plan and actions wrote the best books on the rise of Carter and his victory in the election of 1976. Authors like Martin Schram (*Running for President, 1976*), and Patrick
Anderson (*Electing Jimmy Carter*) write very detailed accounts of Carter’s victory. Only from their viewpoint can one see the depth of his commitment to becoming president.

Before Carter’s father, Earl, died of cancer, he had been elected to the Georgia House of Representatives, a source of pride for his son. Upon his death, Carter returned home, over the extreme concerns of his wife, Rosalynn, and began to rebuild the family farming business. Once it was on stable ground, Carter began to consider a run for the Georgia Senate race in 1962. *Turning Point; a Candidate, a State, and a Nation Come of Age* (1992), explains this and many of Carter’s political experiences prior to the White House. Keeping a relatively low profile, Carter impressed others with his work ethic and was elected by his colleagues as one of the outstanding members of his freshmen class in the Senate. In 1966 Carter turned his eyes on the governorship of Georgia only to lose to race baiter Lester Maddox; who was best know for waving a hatchet handle at his restaurant, and vowing never to allow “niggers” inside. Carter’s reflective account is valuable in understanding how he would handle later defeats. Carter had his own crisis in confidence; he could not understand why people would choose a man like Maddox over him. He turned to his preacher sister, Ruth, for advice. Most authors cite this as a prime example of Carter’s tenacious attitude and Christian morals. Carter described the situation, “As a result of the meeting which was not tearful or emotional or anything, I decided, along with Ruth, that I would try to reassess my relationship with God, and did. I began to try much more than I had ever tried before.” In Ruth’s book, *The Gift of Inner Healing* (1978), she urged Jimmy to strive for a “fresh, intimate, personal, loving, caring, relationship with Jesus Christ.” Within one month he was planning his next gubernatorial
campaign. Interestingly, Carter does not talk about this event in his book, *Why Not The Best*. Perhaps the spiritual revelation aspect of the story would have been too much for many readers in 1976. But this story certainly would help people understand the events surrounding his mid 1979 meeting at Camp David where Carter reevaluated his presidency and composed his most important speech, “The Crisis of Confidence.”

In 1970 Carter won the Governor’s seat by upsetting Carl “Cufflinks” Sanders. His campaign, however, was not without controversy. Carter promised himself that he would not make the same mistake as in 1966 and many claim, that to beat his opponent, Carter became more conservative in his anti-segregation rhetoric. His phrasing led many to believe that he would continue to support the status quo. The race topic was hotly debated in Southern politics and George Wallace, the preeminent Southern politician, would look at the race question and choose to support segregation. Carter understood that although he needed to maintain the traditional base, he could and should appeal to the new South, especially if he ever wanted a national audience. Once on a Carter campaign sign was scrawled, “You Can’t Establish Justice in a Sinful World Unless You Win Elections.” Carter recognized that he couldn’t change the world if he wasn’t in a position to do so. Bourne emphasizes a parallel between Carter’s career at this stage and that of Jesus Christ: “That Jesus was a social revolutionary and a populist who presented a peaceful but brazen challenge to both the Roman rulers and the Jewish elite was something that Jimmy understood and appreciated.” Again this was a character building experience where Carter rose to a challenge, defeated his opponent and he could feel
some pride in the result. Many now saw that perhaps he had the political savvy to make it further, if not for himself perhaps for the South.

His time as governor was filled with a flurry of activity and some hard nosed politics. Carter would certainly show his stubborn side, especially with issues like government reorganization. Some authors admire this stubbornness and view it as proof of Carter’s convictions. To others he was seen as uncompromising, rigid and difficult to work with or under. This is where a rift becomes visible in biographers’ perceptions of Jimmy Carter. Up until this point, most writers saw Jimmy as a small time, outsider who attracted a thin slice of the southern electorate. Some of his success was due to hard work and some of it was due to luck; either way, after Carter’s inauguration speech, a new, more powerful Carter had risen. Although many claimed that he had downplayed his liberal racial views to get elected, his inauguration speech ended that hope. In it he condemned the segregationist’s stance.

At the end of a long campaign, I believe I know our people as well as anyone. Based on this knowledge of Georgians North and South, Rural and Urban, liberal and conservative, I say to you quite frankly that the time for racial discrimination is over.... No poor, rural, weak, or black person should ever have to bear the additional burden of being deprived of the opportunity of an education, a job or simple justice.¹⁸

He called for a “new south”, a south free from the constraints of segregation, a south that would be the fulfillment of Reconstruction’s ideals. Carter wanted to be its leader. He worked hard and pushed through many reforms to create a new south in Georgia, but it was not always an easy or soft sell. In Jimmy Carter: a character portrait (1979) Bruce Mazlish and Bruce Diamond, assert “Governors must work with others to
achieve goals: Governor Carter’s record in this regard contains few successes.” Many other authors point to this area of weakness in Carter’s management style. Burton Kaufman, in *The Presidency of James Earl Carter, Jr.* (1993) says of Carter, “… he was loath to compromise on what he regarded as matters of principle.” Richard Hyatt in *The Carters of Plains* (1977) quotes a long time member of the Georgian Senate: “He just won’t compromise…he’s the worst governor in the entire history of the state. I’ve tried to deal with him, but it’s impossible.” The problem seemed to arise when Carter thought his principles should be everyone else’s principles. He wanted to make the state of Georgia run like an efficient business and set about a major reorganization plan. Major reforms are never easy but Carter was able to get it passed, barely. Others point to the false belief that Jimmy’s quiet, soft-spoken voice and comfortable demeanor meant that he was weak. They say that during his time as governor the true center of the Carter backbone became evident. It has been called solid steel. He was also more colorfully referred to as an old South Georgian turtle. “He doesn’t stop and back up. He doesn’t even worry about trying to go around. He just starts pushing, and he keeps at it until before you know it that limb is laying off to one side, and he’s heading down the same path he started on.” Political players realizing that Carter’s term would be over soon, due to Georgia’s one-term limit on the governorship, began to wonder if this could be the candidate to bring the South back into the limelight. Jimmy went home to tell his mother he was running for president. Her response was, president of what?

Regardless of style, the 1976 presidential campaign against Gerald Ford has been viewed by many who worked with Carter as one of his greatest achievements. The best
four books on the presidential election come from Kathy Stroud’s *How Jimmy Won: The Victory Campaign from Plains to White House* (1977), Patrick Anderson’s *Election Jimmy Carter: The Campaign of 1976* (1994), Betty Glad’s *Jimmy Carter; In Search of the Great White House* and Martin Schram’s *Running for President 1976, The Carter Campaign* (1977). All four texts point to the amazing work ethic of Carter, who would literally work 20 hours a day, 7 days a week for two years prior to the 1976 election. As well they show the great planning of Carter’s team and the adept use of the new Democratic nomination process, by which a candidate could receive partial votes in individual states. This allowed a candidate could win the nomination by doing fairly well in many states, without relying on the larger states. This was system tailor made for an unknown candidate who could build steam in the smaller markets. In reaction to the improprieties of Watergate, new rules were put into place dealing with campaign financing. A solid plan regarding the number of delegates and spending of money was essential to winning the nomination. In addition, the field was full of competent, experienced men; Carter was an outsider. His initial outlook was bleak and the chances of winning the nomination were slim at best. Schram, a journalist for *Newsday’s* Washington Bureau Chief, followed Carter’s rise from Georgia and spent much time talking with him on the campaign trail. He illustrates Carter’s plight in his campaigns first press event in Iowa. “The were Jody and myself (Carter) and the man and woman who arranged the reception- and I think that there were three other people. We had enough food there to feed, I guess 200 folks. So everybody was embarrassed…” Carter had to leave the food and the building to find voters willing to listen. As a one-term
governor from a Southern state with no name recognition, Carter and everyone around him knew he faced an uphill battle.

Most of the books also discuss the role of Carter’s family in the campaign. His wife, mother and siblings spread themselves out like a warm, Southern blanket. The so-called “Peanut Brigade”, a group of fellow Georgians and Carter supporters, flew to New Hampshire and spread their feelings and opinions about Carter around the state; one small town to another. This made Carter appear to be the boy next door, one any neighbor would trust, an ever present theme in the Carter campaign. Schram talks about the role of the Carter family but most biographers, including Stroud’s 1977 book How Jimmy Won, The Victory Campaign From Plains to the White House, did a better job of describing the individual persons. Stroud, a journalist who authored several articles on Carter during his Georgia days writes in greater detail about Plains and the people surrounding Carter, including the “Georgia Mafia.” This elite group of Carter advisors helped him win the election and many would follow him into the White House, especially campaign manager Hamilton Jordan and press secretary Jody Powell. She glowingly discusses Carter’s rise as that of a misunderstood man who faced snobbery and yet rose to power for the service of mankind. Anderson’s Electing Jimmy Carter (1994) also tells of the miracle, or the crusade, as he believed it to be; a group of outsiders on a 6-month adventure out to change the system. Anderson, a chief speechwriter for Carter, does an excellent job of trying to explain Carter’s personality. During the run against Ford he described Carter as “Machiavelli and Mr. Rodgers” in one. He does a better job describing the campaign as a whole, whereas Schram is mired in the almost daily activities of the campaign. It is
important to note that Anderson makes it clear that his work is “…no scholarly treatise.” Rather it is an “intensely personal, partisan and novelistic view of Jimmy Carter.”

Betty Glad’s, *Jimmy Carter; In Search of the Great White House* (1980), is well documented and researched. Through hundreds of interviews with Carter friends and associates she points to several inconsistencies in the façade of Carter. While she thanks them for their participation, she clearly points out that, “… I hope they will understand that the obligations of a scholar override the feelings of friendship and personal indebtedness.” She points to the psychological appeal of Carter the outsider. She saw him as a puzzling figure that many were trying to understand, and that his rise to the White House was nothing less than a political miracle. She also recognized that some of the issues raised by Carter’s style in the Georgia Senate and Governorship could come back to be a political liability.

He seemed to experience opposition as a personal affront and as a consequence responded to it with attacks on the integrity of those who blocked his projects. He showed a tendency… to equate his political goals with the just and the right and to view his opponents as representative of some selfish or immoral interest.

All the books looked upon the Carter as an outsider who literally willed himself to win. They all discussed the role of Carter as the hardworking, faithful, candidate urged forward by his loyal troops. Occasionally they would point to some of the less than positive aspects of Carter’s personality; obsessive control, detail orientated, difficulty with staff. But overall they portray a candidate who was bucking the system and creating his own path. They rarely discuss the errors made in the campaign or the strengths of the
Ford team, instead they talked about their own contributions. The insiders who worked with Carter seemed unable to look beyond what they wanted to see and consequently do not provide a bias free representation of Carter the candidate.

The contest between Gerald Ford and Carter was highlighted by several key moments but the most dramatic, as in any election, are the face-to-face debates. Two books that concentrate on this subject are Lloyd Bitzer and Theodore Rueter’s *Carter vs Ford; The Counterfeit Debates of 1976* (1980) and Sidney Kraus’s *The Great Debates: Carter vs Ford, 1976* (1979). These two books both discuss the canned format of the debates and the basic questions that would be asked of the candidates. They also focused on the problems within the debates. Bitzer and Rueter’s suggest that Carter and Ford lacked enthusiasm during the debates. “Their argumentation was shallow, often defective in reasoning and evidence, and seldom went beyond the commonplaces uttered from the stump.” Kraus is also quoted several times in Charles Jones’ book, *The Trusteeship Presidency* (1988) where he discusses the role of the debates in establishing Carter’s less than enthusiastic views on Congress. Bitzer and Rueter divide the book into 2 major parts; with the first portion detailing the debate format, questions, and panelists. The second portion includes the transcripts of the three Ford-Carter debates and the one VP debate between Robert Dole and Walter Mondale. In terms of dissecting the outcomes and polling numbers of the debates, neither one of these books would be helpful. They both seem to be written with a speech or debate class in mind. Nevertheless they do provide some insight to the debate concept.
While the debates probably did more to help Carter, Ford’s campaign would gather momentum in the last weeks of the campaign. He pulled closer in the polls but Carter was able to hold on to win by some eight and a half million votes. It was a virtual political miracle; from nowhere Jimmy Who became President Carter.

President Carter

Of course the majority of studies of Carter focus on his four years as president. In general early works were less than flattering. The country was in economic decline and the Iranian hostage situation drove a stake in the last year of his term. Little of positive value was seen in his policies and his style of presidential organization left many seeing Carter as a naïve outsider who pushed his agenda with little effectiveness. Some of the titles that would fall into this category would be Barton Kaufman’s *The Presidency of James Earl Carter, Jr.* (1993), Donald Spencer’s *The Carter Implosion* (1988), Clark Mollenhoff’s *The President Who Failed: Carter Out of Control* (1980), and Victor Lasky’s *Jimmy Carter: the man & the myth* (1979). But since the late 1980’s there has been a change in the general view of Carter’s time in office. More recent scholarship generally has portrayed Carter as an honest, decent man who made attempts at managing an impossible governmental system and yet was able to make some significant contributions. Erwin Hargrove’s *Jimmy Carter as President* (1988), Garland Hass’ *Jimmy Carter and the Politics of Frustration* (1992) and most impressively John Dumbrell’s *The Carter Presidency: A Re-Evaluation* (1995), all look at the Carter presidency as one marked by relatively small errors but overall successful.
It is easy to point out the problems Carter faced. The twin disasters Vietnam and the Watergate scandal created an all time low in respect for the government and especially the office of president. The University of Michigan’s Center for Political Studies showed the dramatic decline of public trust of government. In 1964, 61% of the public held trust in their government, by 1976 in was 22%. Add to this the decline in confidence in the executive branch and Congress, which dropped from 41% to 9%, and one can see that it would take a person of extraordinary strength to be president. Several authors believe that Carter was not that man. Burton Kaufman in *The Presidency of James Earl Carter, Jr.* (1993) shows Jimmy Carter as a man who failed to see the necessity of playing politics as usual and therefore failed to get many of his programs passed. Kaufman alludes to several key points regarding Carter as president: 1) he does not think the country was as “ungovernable” as some Carter defenders claim, 2) he claims that revisionists are too quick to overlook that this country has a process that a president can not simply ignore because he claims to be above it, 3) a trustee president, as some have claimed Carter to be, could ignore the “pluralistic nature of American society”, 4) he failed to articulate his plan and give direction, and 5) he failed to establish a base of public support and political legitimacy. His book points to several of the failures within Carter’s four years. Especially disconcerting to him was Carter’s failures in foreign policy, as he claims Carter was incapable of defending America’s honor abroad. He does point to several successes- most importantly the peace negotiations on the Middle East but in the next breath he discusses the failures of SALT II. This was perhaps
the best of the critics on Carter’s presidency offering brief explanation of his bibliography and some background information.

Other writings that critiqued Carter were less scholarly in that they failed to provide citations for many quotes and events and took a partisan stance. In Professor Donald S. Spencer’s view, Carter was a foreign policy failure because he lacked any sense of what America’s standing should be in the world. In an almost dismissive tone, he refers to President Carter as “Mr. Carter” and rails against his inept attempts at managing domestic affairs. Spencer points to those events in his book *The Carter Implosion* (1988), as being “… the unfortunate results of a self-consciously amateur style of diplomacy” where Carter had professed huge goals but was then unwilling to use the tools necessary to achieve them. He goes on to say,

This imbalance between means and ends-easily predictable from Mr. Carter’s campaign rhetoric and typical of those who dream of transforming the world of sovereign nation states into a reflection of their own idealized vision of what humanity ought to be- ruined the extravagant promises of the Carter candidacy, and the consequence was a series of staggering blows to this nation’s most enduring interests.29

Spencer, a professor of foreign relations, is particularly critical of Carter’s diplomacy with the Soviet Union. He sees Carter as too soft on the communist threat and willing to sell out regimes that could be helpful, regardless of their human rights status. This was one of the major arguments used by Ronald Reagan and those on the conservative right against Carter.

Born out of the tradition of Watergate reporting, journalist Clark R. Mollenhoff claims to have written about the Carter presidency in hard, investigative style. In *The
President Who Failed: Carter Out of Control (1980), Mollenhoff painted a picture of a man out of touch with those he hired and fired, citing such examples as the Bert Lance affair, the firing of U.S. Attorney David Marston and appointment of Georgian Griffin Bell as Attorney General. Overall, the book seems to be a collection of incidents thrown together in an attempt to sell copies. With no notes, footnotes or bibliography, Mollenhoff apparently believed that his Pulitzer Prize and 10 previous books were enough to make readers accept his judgment of Carter.

Victor Lasky’s Jimmy Carter: the man & the myth (1979), holds nothing back. As one in a series of books he has written on presidents, he argues that the simplistic “down home” image of Carter that was advertised to the American public in 1976 was a farce and refers to him as a fuzzy, inept leader. He points out that Carter campaigned on style and not on substance. This is a critique that many leveled against Carter. He also argues that Carter’s “Everest Complex” propelled him to run for the highest office; he did it simply because the opportunity was there. He saw Carter as a power hungry man who ran a presidency similar to “The Gong Show”. Lasky’s attempts to show Carter as a driven person is valid but his overt biases against Carter are clearly written into the style of the book and the use of analogies plainly show this.

Some have looked at specific aspects of Carter’s term for analysis, mostly in the area of foreign relations. They either state that they see Carter as naïve or support Carter’s attempts to alter America’s foreign policy. Gaddis Smith’s Morality, Reason, and Power: American Diplomacy in the Carter Years (1986) is less a study of Carter than it is of foreign policy in a historical context. He argues that the four years under Carter
were the most significant in the 20th century, providing unusual clarity and long-term solutions to complex issues. Using nuclear weapon proliferation as an example, Smith examines the policies of SALT II and believes that although the treaties may have only been a partial success at least it was an attempt to deal with the issue in a realistic manner. Smith, author of several books on American Foreign Policy (Dean Acheson, The Aims of American Foreign Policy and American Diplomacy during the Second World War), believes that Carter’s Administration was significantly different from previous presidents, because he was unusually open about its purposes.

Supporters and critics alike have pointed at Carter’s human rights policy as unique. One of the most scathing criticisms comes from Josh Muravchik, the author of The Uncertain Crusade: Jimmy Carter and the Dilemmas of Human Rights Policy (1986). Muravchik, who wrote this book based on his doctoral dissertation, sees Carter’s biggest error as the gap created between his campaign expectations and the realities of his office. Part of the blame he lays at the feet of Carter for his overuse of his “outsider” status, thereby compromising his ability to work with Washington’s power brokers. Additionally he argues that human rights cannot be the only force in determining foreign policy. He credits Carter with raising the public’s education level on this issue and bringing more attention to the issue of human rights as well as being more responsive to abuses in the specific areas of Argentina, Ecuador, Ghana and Peru. But he contends that his policies in Iran and Latin America ultimately did little to restore America’s injured pride. In both of those areas, America’s foreign policies created a quagmire due to years of varying ideologies. For example, as much as Carter may have wanted to make a simple
decision on the return of the hostages, previous US policy, especially regarding the Shah, made this an immensely complex task. Muravchik blames Carter for not being politically strong enough to tackle the situation. Instead he says Carter did little to alter the fundamental problems in a meaningful way.

Overall authors critical of Carter seem to point to the scandals, for example the Bert Lance banking affair, and his weak response to the USSR as their main arguments. Others blame his management style, seeing it as without direction and ineffective. His self proclaimed image as a Washington outsider, although used as a political asset earlier by Carter, hampered his relationship with Congress and ultimately ruined the support of his own Democratic Party. Many saw Carter himself as the problem due to his stubborn streak and never ending pursuit of power. Nearly all of the critics point out that Carter worked hard, attempting to master topics, but some claimed he tried to take on too much in too many arenas. It is interesting to point out that those who see Carter in a more favorable light view this same characteristic as a sign of internal strength.

After Reagan’s presidency, many authors began to re-examine Carter’s contributions, some in a more favorable light. The Iran-Contra scandal, a huge deficit and the waning economy of the late 1980’s seemed to prove to some that Carter’s time in office by comparison, was not without merit. Of course as the years passed it had become easier to see the larger picture, and the daily pain of the hostage situation and gas lines faded from memory. These authors attempted to explain the problems that confined Carter and suggest that his presidency was really a success, considering the complexity of the issues he faced.
In 1988, Erwin Hargrove threw the first positive light on Carter in his book *Jimmy Carter as President: Leadership and the Politics of the Public Good* (1988). As part of the Miller Series Project, the book was an early attempt to review Carter’s presidency. Usually there are two stages of presidential review by historians and other writers; one, while they are in the White House and, two, after some of their presidential papers become available. Hargrove’s work, based heavily on oral interviews through the Carter Center and Miller Series Program, was written between these two events, as he put it “middle distance in history.” He describes Carter as a president outside the familiar mold; the first from the deep South since the Civil War, first under a new presidential selection system and first true outsider. Not a liberal spending democrat, he alienated his party’s power bases and could not or would not participate in the politics of persuasion. Overall Hargrove suggests that Carter tried to press for a program of major policy changes that provided no short-term gains to the politicians he needed to get them passed. Without a public mandate, and little natural constituency, opposition by powerful people hampered Carter, labeling him as ineffective. Nevertheless he sums up Carter as a well meaning and able president but one who faced serious challenges when dealing with Congress. “Most of the achievements were personal, and it is not clear that anyone else could have done as well. Carter’s ineptness was most evident in those areas of leadership, especially with Congress, in which any brand of leadership would have had trouble succeeding.”

Adding to this view is Garland Haas’ *Jimmy Carter and the Politics of Frustration*. Written in 1992, he also believes that Carter faced insurmountable odds and that as the unknown, one-term Georgia Governor, his election alone was significant and
worthy of praise. Encountering “bad luck”, he looks chiefly at Carter’s relationship with Congress as fundamentally flawed and others have agreed with this assessment. In 1980, Robert Strauss, Democratic Presidential campaign chairman said, “Poor bastard – he used up all his luck getting here. We’ve had our victories and defeats, but we’ve not had a single piece of good luck.” With each section of text, Haas looked at several issues and how the Congress may have not held up its end of the workload. He points to Carter’s problems, especially his lack of leadership with Congress as the greatest error in Carter’s term but overall his is still a positive view.

Charles Jones takes a different look at the role of a president; perhaps not as a leader charging in a direction but that of a manager. In *The Trusteeship Presidency* (1988) Jones, a professor at the University of Virginia, maintains that Carter didn’t want to play politics as usual. Instead he argues that Carter was a “policy politician.” James Sterling Young, Director of the Carter Presidency Project at the Miller Center, under which Jones’ book was written, defined this is an elected politician who concentrates on policy work and who makes the achievement of good policy his main goal. Therefore Carter urged the legislature to think about policy and not worry about politics; to vote for the best and not what might be politically expedient. Of course such a request flies in the face of traditional Washington politics and as such was deemed a dangerous path to take. Many could not follow, and, consequently, Carter faced an arduous battle alone. Trying to create coalitions issue by issue was difficult, but especially for an outside, tight knit group that showed little understanding of Congress’ situation. Whether they understood or simply refused to give in is still under question, but Jones does concede that Carter’s
group performed better as the years went on. Asking Congress to create and support policies that solved problems, not merely satisfying them, was well meaning but it did little to convince America, at least in the short term, that things were being well managed. Instead most American saw a country that was drifting and floundering and a president that was either incapable or unwilling to compromise to get things done. All the promises he made became a list of what he could not get done. By contending that he was doing the right thing regardless of the political consequences, Jones paints Carter as the injured party whom history will eventually vindicate. Obviously having worked so closely with Carter and the Carter Center have led Jones, and others— notably Hargrove (Jimmy Carter as President, 1988), to see some of Carter’s actions in a more insightful manner because originally he saw Carter as politically naive. His access to oral histories, primary materials, and perceptions on the role of the president, all lead him to believe that Carter’s historical reputation will improve.

Adding to the growing positive view of Carter is John Dumbrell’s The Carter Presidency: A Re-Evaluation (1995). The Journal of American History called it “the strongest revisionist case to date in support of Carter.”35 Created from extensive research at the Jimmy Carter Library in Atlanta, Dumbrell evaluated Carter’s presidency by using his 1976 campaign theme of “competence and compassion” and argues that he met both of these goals and in doing so revitalized American democracy. By restoring traditional values of virtue and efficiency, which Dumbrell claims had been distorted by big corporations, global foreign policy and unchecked presidential power, Carter created a rebirth of the American spirit. Promising to stay close to the people, and removing some
of the pomp from the office (for example he walked to his inauguration, carried his own luggage, dressed more casually, and made his cabinet drive themselves to work) Carter harked back to FDR and even Thomas Jefferson. Morality was once again a priority and Carter’s promise to “never tell a lie” was going to be put to the challenge. Dumbrell recognizes that not everyone supports his view of Carter’s reputation. The conservative right saw him as too weak, the left as too naïve and not liberal enough, especially in fiscal policies. Some saw him as fuzzy with organizational issues and inclined to over-use his linear engineer mind, one not politically suited to the complexity of bargaining. But Dumbrell contends that he did live up to the two most important promises: compassion (through his human rights policies) and competence (through his hard work).

Unfortunately, he would argue, it was the right man at the wrong time.

The political and attitudinal backcloth against which the Carter Administration operated did not make the President’s job impossible, nor should it be used to excuse incompetence. It must be given due weight, however, when assessing how adequately the Administration fulfilled its commitments to competence and compassion.36

Presidential Legacy

It is not only Dumbrell who has begun to see Carter in a glowing post presidency light. In July of 1988, the Wall Street Journal published an editorial entitled ‘Jimmy, We Hardly Knew Ye’ where they credit Carter with post-Vietnam military revitalization and economic prudence. In May of 1989, E.J. Dionne, of the New York Times, claims that in the wake of the Iran-Contra scandal, Carter’s hands on style of government looks more like responsible governing rather than obsession with detail. As more of Carter’s post
presidency activities became known, his reputation would receive a new, shinier coat. In September of 1989, *Time* referred to Carter as the best ex-president the U.S. has had since Herbert Hoover and *The Nation* a year later hailed him as the very model of an ex-president. Perhaps of the most ironic outcomes of the changing view of Carter are the dreaded polling figures that so plagued his term. The *Washington Post* on September 14, 1979 published a public opinion poll giving Carter the lowest job approval rating of any president for three decades. In 1983 a survey of historians ranked Carter twenty-fifth with such presidents as Nixon, Grant and Harding behind him. Yet in a July 1995 Gallup opinion poll Carter was ranked as the U.S. president with the highest moral character. The turnaround in public opinion was coming. Carter has commented on the changing view of his time in office. In a *Washington Post* article in December of 2002 he acknowledged that, “the prize will shift attention to the more favorable things and maybe forget the ones that were not so favorable.”

Getting publicity, however, has not been an issue for Carter since he left the Oval Office. From monitoring elections, building homes for Habitat for Humanity, and mediating conflicts around the world, Carter’s name has become known to a new generation and several books have been written on this aspect of his life. In 1996, Rod Troester published *Jimmy Carter As Peacemaker*. Looking at the 15 years post White House, Troester glowingly revitalizes Carter’s image as that of a peacemaker around the world by examining his trips to Korea, Haiti, and Bosnia. He also compares Carter’s accomplishments to that of Nixon, Ford, Reagan and Bush, Sr. While he concede that Carter was not a great president, the author certainly thinks that he is reshaping the role

> His has been a consistent attempt to strengthen the pillars of human progress through his wisdom and core value of affirming the dignity of every human being. Our world is indeed safer, better housed, healthier, more economically secure and sustainable because of his efforts.38

Perhaps one of the most rewarding aspects of Carter’s life outside of the White House was his 2002 Nobel Peace Prize. Some have contended that Carter, unable to get his policies passed while in office, now sought to continue his vision as a private citizen. Was he a one man UN or a meddling citizen? In Carter’s presidential memoirs, *Keeping Faith: Memoirs of a President* (1982), he said “I had the same kind of thoughts about alleviating tension in the troubles areas of the world, promoting human rights, enhancing environmental quality, and pursuing other goals which were important to me.”39

Douglas Brinkley has chronicled Carter’s activities in *The Unfinished Presidency* (1998). Originally starting out to complete a projected three volume series on Jimmy Carter, Brinkley instead began to concentrate on his post presidential career. Incredibly well documented, he follows Carter from one end of the world to another; Haiti to Desert Storm and from one leader to another, Noriega to Clinton. Although it is an unauthorized biography it is a flattering portrait of a man whose work ethic and compassion seem to be limitless.
Conclusion

Whether one likes to admit it or not, so much of what is remembered about a president’s tenure revolves around the mishaps or mistakes. One recalls, Ford’s pratfalls, Nixon’s famous assertion “I’m not a crook” or Clinton’s declaration “I did not have sexual relations with that woman.” If one were to quote Carter perhaps it would be his famous Playboy interview from the 1976 campaign where he said, “I have lusted for women in my heart many times.” But to summarize the works of a man takes more than just such quotes. One must also take into account the triumphs- however less colorful they are. Carter had many flaws: micromanaging, stubbornness, and a tendency to self-righteousness. His critics saw him as fuzzy, a flip-flopper on issues with a moralistic, arrogant attitude and naïveté in foreign affairs. But he also had a warm heart, charitable thoughts, and a true desire to help others. To supporters, he was a tragic hero.

Both of these standpoints can be seen in the books on Carter that have been published so far. The initial wave came from those close to Carter who wanted to tell their side of the story and those who wanted to point out why he failed. It was especially hard for many to see the positive items of Carter’s presidency when he was so clearly rejected by the American public in 1980. The critics seemed to have the upper hand with scathing journalistic reports of Carter’s inept management style and misguided foreign policy. Even some of his closest advisors seemed to have abandoned him at this time, notably Cyrus Vance and Zbigniew Brzezinski. Carter meant failure and no one wanted to be associated with him. Better documented, and well-researched writings, although not all positive, have appeared in the last fifteen years as historians begin to examine some of
the presidential papers. As the public is once again acquainted Carter’s name through various mediums, books, television reports and the Nobel Peace Prize in 2000, many seemed to have forgiven him or at least forgotten how much they disliked him. They are contributing to the changing perceptions of Carter. Sensing this mood, writers and historians, like Brinkley and Dumbrell are re-evaluating Carter. Is it possible that such an obviously caring, dedicated man could have been such a failure? Interpretations will change over the years and Carter’s post presidency years will surely become part of his legacy; accordingly his popularity will rise. Jones, in *The Trusteeship Presidency*, echoes this sentiment. “Jimmy Carter may never be rated a great president. Yet it will be difficult in the long run to sustain censure of a president motivated to do what is right.” This is the difficulty of examining a presidential legacy that is still in motion, what is “right” changes with the generations. Only many more years of research and reflection will clarify the reputation of Jimmy Carter, and the final word will probably never be written. This is the fate of all presidents, ultimately.
INTRODUCTION TO LESSON PLANS

As one of the key presidents in the last 20 years, James Earl Carter has left a legacy of achievements. He came into power at a time of chaos and general distrust in the federal government, only to make big promises to the American public. In post Watergate America such as statements as “I will not lie” and the “government should be as good as its people” appealed to many voters. Economic and world turmoil made a traditional difficult job nearly impossible, yet some of the blame should be assessed against Carter’s own actions. Rising from near obscurity as a one term Governor of Georgia, to one of the most powerful positions in the world, was not a smooth transition. Seen as an outsider with a small, tight-knit working group, no matter how diligent and well meaning, Carter could not force a major change in a system built on 200 years of history. He was stubborn and obsessive about his beliefs even if they were contrary to those outside his circle of power. Although he faced huge issues during his term, he did have some success. However he was never able to control Congress, fix stagflation or bring the hostages home on his watch. When Carter left the White House in 1980, he continued working to improve human rights and with the poor. These actions have expanded his post-presidency influence on national and international politics.

This lesson plan will focus on Jimmy Carter’s rise and his single four-year term. It was conceived with several goals in mind. First, students should understand that presidents and other elected officials are real people fallible in many ways. One of our best ways to examine their true character is to look at how they have responded to
previous life experiences. The childhood failures and success of an individual help us understand the actions they will make later in life. It is clear when looking at Carter’s childhood and early experiences what he core beliefs will revolve around. Second, students should understand that presidents must function under tremendous personal and professional strife. Americans want the president to represent the best of America whether that is an all knowing wise man (Washington), a princely leader (Kennedy) or the Horatio Alger rising from obscurity to prestige (Carter). However while we want our leader to fulfill some sort of mythical existence, we also search for holes in our idols, especially in post-Watergate society. Thirdly, students should understand that often, the circumstances create the leader, and that no one person can do it all on their own. No matter how well meaning, hard working, or intelligent they are a president may be, he or she will be shaped by the political, economic, and social realities of the period.

The themes of this lesson are defined by these goals: experiences and circumstances shape our actions; presidents must function under intense personal and professional scrutiny; and the political, social and economic realities of an era influence the success and failures of every president. This unit is designed for eight, fifty-minute class periods in an 11th grade US History course. The relevant California and National Standards are detailed in the lesson plans.

Prior Content Knowledge and Skills

By the time this unit begins, students will have finished a unit on Nixon’s presidency and the Watergate scandal. They should have a firm grasp on the political
scene of the time due to our discussions of an imperial presidency, failures of Vietnam, and of the political crisis caused by the Watergate scandal. They will also have a brief understanding of the challenges faced by President Ford and his attempts to unify the country.

Economically, we will have covered the beginnings of the gas crisis and unemployment, which will lead to our topic of stagflation. Foreign policy is a major component of 11th grade US History. We will have covered the Cold War, and the Vietnam within that context. Nixon’s foreign policy regarding China and the Soviet Union will also have been covered. In terms of the Middle East, most material was covered in the world history curriculum, so we will need to review some aspects prior to beginning the Camp David Accords.

In terms of skills, students will have already looked at physical geography maps, analyzed cartoons, evaluated electoral maps and used critical thinking about primary sources. Although we have used these skills before, a brief review of any of them may be required as follows:

- For maps, they must be able to recognize the title and legend key and use a compass rose. For electoral maps, students should be able to identify the states, the meaning of blue and red coloration, and the significance of the electoral count.
- For cartoons, I ask students to locate and explain any words or phrases, identify and explain the significance of any symbols, describe the author/artists point of view or message, and explain how the cartoon fits into a larger topic or theme by explaining its context and significance.
For primary sources, the technique varies depending on the style of document. For the documents used in this lesson, mostly speeches, the best approach would be to define all the unknown vocabulary, and then break down the text into smaller sections and summarize the idea in each. At the end of the documents, we summarize the author’s point of view, the context, and the target audience.

Discussion of Content Hook

One of my themes in this unit is previous experiences and circumstances shape one’s actions. In this particular lesson, students will learn that President Carter’s actions as president are predictable in some ways based on what we know about his life up until the election of 1976. He was hard working, financially frugal and extraordinarily religious. To emphasize these facts, students will take a virtual field trip of Carter’s boyhood home, particularly his bedroom, and compare his surroundings to their own room. Students often go to historical places and look at the buildings and surroundings. But what can the style of building and its interior furnishings teach us about the people who lived there? What can we learn about people based on their surroundings? Through this exercise, students should see how important their current decisions and actions can be in determining who they will become in the future.

Hook:

A. Have students draw a detailed sketch of their bedroom. Describe the location of all furniture, closets, windows, etc. and the style of furnishings, bed linens, and color of walls. On the back of their paper they should also include a detailed list
of all the valuables inside the room including items like a TV, VCR, computer, phone, or trophies and pictures. The more detail the better. Encourage them to think about what is important in their room. Make sure students do not put their names on it!

B. Provide a sample of your own room. The class will review and discuss what we can learn about the person who occupies it.

C. Collect the drawings and lists, and randomly hand them out to other students. Next students should answer a series of based on their “artifact.”

1. What kind of socio-economic situation can be hypothesized about the individual?

2. What kind of values do you think this person has?

3. Choose three words to describe this person based on their room.

D. Randomly call on students and ask for their three words and upon what they based their ideas. Make them support their responses.

E. As a class, discuss some of the problems with this type of analysis.

   1. Do historians ever do this type of work?

   2. How might this lead to misinterpretations or show bias?

   3. What could we add to this activity to create a better view of the people who lived there?

F. One can see that how one lives does tell us something, but not everything, about the person.
1. Based on your room what might historians say about you in fifty years, or a hundred years from now?

2. Should your room/home be kept as a national historic place?

G. Now let’s look at Jimmy Carter’s boyhood home.

1. Go to the National Park Service website for information and to this particular address for a virtual tour:
   
   http://www.sowega.net/~plainsed/vtour/farmtour.htm

2. What can we tell about him?

3. What kind of president do we think he would make?

4. What three words would we choose for him?

Students will probably come away with an austere feeling for Carter. While his family had property and a higher standard of living than some, he still lived a fairly simple life that was full of hard work, honesty, charity, and frugality. These will be become part of the core of Jimmy Carter as President and afterwards. Students often believe that the characteristics that describe Carter would make a good president. If that is true, why was Carter so rejected by the American public in the 1980 election? Over the next week we will look at Carter’s and evaluate his Presidency and legacy.

Content of Lesson Plans

California State Standards:

United States History Standards

11.9 Students analyze U.S. foreign policy since World War II.
.3 Trace the origins and geopolitical consequences (foreign and domestic) of the Cold War and containment policy, including the following: Latin American policy.

.6 Describe U.S. Middle East policy and its strategic, political, and economic interests, including those related to the Gulf War.

11.11 Students analyze the major social problems and domestic policy issues in contemporary American society.

.2 Discuss the significant domestic policy speeches of Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Carter, Reagan, Bush, and Clinton (e.g., with regard to education, civil rights, economic policy, environmental policy).

.5 Trace the impact of, need for, and controversies associated with environmental conservation, expansion of the national park system, and the development of environmental protection laws, with particular attention to the interaction between environmental protection advocates and property rights advocates.

Government Standards

12.6 Students evaluate issues regarding campaigns for national, state, and local elective offices.

.1 Analyze the origin, development, and role of political parties, noting those occasional periods in which there was only one major party or were more than two major parties.
.2 Discuss the history of the nomination process for presidential candidates and the increasing importance of primaries in general elections.

.3 Evaluate the roles of polls, campaign advertising, and the controversies over campaign funding.

.4 Describe the means that citizens use to participate in the political process (e.g., voting, campaigning, lobbying, filing a legal challenge, demonstrating, petitioning, picketing, running for political office).

12.7 Students analyze and compare the powers and procedures of the national, state, tribal, and local governments.

.1 Explain how conflicts between levels of government and branches of government are resolved.

.5 Explain how public policy is formed, including the setting of the public agenda and implementation of it through regulations and executive orders.

Economic Standards

12.2 Students analyze the elements of America's market economy in a global setting.

.7 Analyze how domestic and international competition in a market economy affects goods and services produced and the quality, quantity, and price of those products.

12.3 Students analyze the influence of the federal government on the American economy.
1. Understand how the role of government in a market economy often includes providing for national defense, addressing environmental concerns, defining and enforcing property rights, attempting to make markets more competitive, and protecting consumers' rights.

Historical and Social Sciences Analysis Skills

Chronological and Spatial Thinking

1. Students compare the present with the past, evaluating the consequences of past events and decisions and determining the lessons that were learned.

2. Students analyze how change happens at different rates at different times; understand that some aspects can change while others remain the same; and understand that change is complicated and affects not only technology and politics but also values and beliefs.

Historical Research, Evidence, and Point of View

3. Students evaluate major debates among historians concerning alternative interpretations of the past, including an analysis of authors' use of evidence and the distinctions between sound generalizations and misleading oversimplifications.

4. Students construct and test hypotheses; collect, evaluate, and employ information from multiple primary and secondary sources; and apply it in oral and written presentations.
Historical Interpretation

1. Students show the connections, causal and otherwise, between particular historical events and larger social, economic, and political trends and developments.

2. Students recognize the complexity of historical causes and effects, including the limitations on determining cause and effect.

4. Students understand the meaning, implication, and impact of historical events and recognize that events could have taken other directions.

5. Students analyze human modifications of landscapes and examine the resulting environmental policy issues.

6. Students conduct cost-benefit analyses and apply basic economic indicators to analyze the aggregate economic behavior of the U.S. economy.
National Standards:

Era 10 Contemporary United States (1968 to the present)

1A: Demonstrate understanding of Nixon’s domestic agenda and the Watergate affair.
   - Analyzing the constitutional issues raised by the Watergate affair and evaluating the effects of Watergate on public opinion.

1B: Demonstrate understanding of domestic policy issues in contemporary American society.
   - Analyzing the Ford and Carter responses to “the imperial presidency.”
   - Evaluating the Republic and Democratic administrations’ attempts to deal with the economic “stagflation.”

1C: Demonstrate understanding of major foreign policy initiatives.
   - Assessing U.S. policies toward arms limitation and improved relations with the Soviet Union.
   - Examining the interconnections between the United States’ role as a superpower with the evolving political struggles in the Middle East, Africa, Asia, and Latin America.
   - Evaluating the reformation of U.S. foreign policy in the post-Cold War era.
Daily Lesson Plans

Day One: Carter Biography

Lesson A: Discuss what qualifications are important in electing a president.

- Ask students to consider the following questions:
  - What sort of qualifications should they have? Consider military, legislative, and governorship experience.
  - What about citizenship status?

- List the ideas on the board and discuss. Add recent events like the conflicts over Bill Clinton and George Bush Jr.’s military record, and California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger’s citizenship status.

- Use overhead copy of Constitution (Article II, Section 4)
  - What does it say about the qualifications for president?
  - What should be changed, if anything, to fit today’s society?
  - How could we change it?

Lesson B: Lecture on Carter. (see Appendix A). At the bottom of the notes, have students list the qualifications that Carter had to become president.

Day Two: Carter Becomes President

Lesson A: Review the election process and discuss the path to nominations.

Discuss Carter’s strategy. (see Appendix B).
• By winning a portion of the state, a candidate could win a portion of the nomination votes. No longer a shoe-in for those that campaign in and win only the large states.

• Carter started early and made good use of his money so that he could survive the long haul. Made significant wins in Iowa, and then in New Hampshire and Florida where he beat Wallace. (Showed a Southern candidate could win a national election.) By June, Carter had enough votes to win take the nominations. People were surprised. Jimmy Who?

Lesson B: Use a video clip of a Carter campaign ad. It can be found at University of Wisconsin-Madison website:

http://www.polisci.wisc.edu/tvadvertising/Historic%20Ads%20Library/Themes/Archive%20Themes.htm

• Ask students to consider the following questions:
  o What was the central theme of ad?
  o How does the theme relate to Vietnam and Watergate?
  o Morality has become a central issue in modern campaigns. On a scale of 1-10, how important do you believe the issue to be when choosing a candidate? Justify your explanation.

• Also use cartoons from book: Best Editorial Cartoons of the Year, edited by Charles Brooks, 1977.¹ Suggest: Hugh Haynie about the 1976

campaign (pg. 27), and Calvin Grondahl on the image of Carter as a backward Southerner (pg. 26).

Lesson C: Discuss the election between Carter v Ford. (see Appendix B).

- Use a video clip of the 1976 debates between Carter and Ford that can be found at the Museum Broadcast Corporation:
  

  Also use cartoons from book: *Best Editorial Cartoons of the Year*, edited by Charles Brooks, 1977.²  

  Suggest: Andy Donato’s on the affect of Kissinger on debates (pg. 49), Jim Borgman’s on the flip-flop and fuzzy issue of debates (pg. 49), Michael’s Konopacki’s on the influence of McCarthy and Maddox on the debates (pg. 50), and Jim Berry’s about lust (pg. 76).

Lesson D: For extra assignment or homework.

- Give students a copy of a blank U.S. map and a list of each states electoral count in the 1976 election.

  o See these addresses for examples:

  o http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/electoral_college/votes.html

  o http://www.usconstitution.net./ev_1976.html


• Students should generate a key and color the map based on the statistics. See Appendix C for some examples.

Day Three: Carter’s Basic Presidency

Lesson A: Review yesterday’s material, the Electoral Map of the 1976 Election

• Discuss the following:
  o The meaning of mandate
  o Did Carter have a mandate?

Lesson B: Lecture on Carter’s Presidency. (see Appendix D).

• Also use cartoons from book: Best Editorial Cartoons of the Year, edited by Charles Brooks, 1977. Suggest: Scott Long’s on the supply and demand issue (pg. 90) and chemical dependency (pg. 91), and Jeff MacNelly’s on tax reform (pg. 21).

Day Four: Domestic Issues in Depth

Lesson A: Discuss stagflation.

• Have students guess the definition of stagflation. Then define stagflation, (a combination of high inflation and high unemployment) and explain why it is such a problem.

• To show students the extent of the problem, graph the misery index. (see Appendix E).

Lesson B: Discuss reasons behind the energy crisis and its effects on Carter’s term.

---

• Read excerpt one of Carter’s “Crisis of Confidence” speech together as a class. (see Appendix F). It would be good to read the text for vocabulary words pertinent to your own grade level. Define any words not familiar to your students, and summarize each paragraph.

• Ask students respond to the following questions:
  
  o What does Carter believe to be the real problem facing the U.S.? Explain what you think he means in your own words.
  
  o Discuss the relationship between confidence, progress and democracy.
  
  o Examine the following quote: “… to many of us now tend to worship self-indulgence and consumption. Human identity is no longer defined by what one does, but by what one owns. But we’ve discovered that owning things and consuming things does not satisfy our longing for meaning. We’ve learned that piling up material goods cannot fill the emptiness of lives which have no confidence or purpose.” Do you agree with his idea? Can you think of any examples of how this might be true?

Lesson C: Read and assess Excerpt Two of Carter’s “Crisis of Confidence” speech.

• Assign students the handout associated with excerpt two of Carter’s “Crisis of Confidence” speech. (see Appendix G). It contains the second excerpt and an activity to help students read through the primary source. It should help them outline Carter’s attempts to fix the energy crisis and
provide them with an opportunity to think about how they can help the
situation.

Days Five and Six: Foreign Affairs in Depth

Lesson A: Foreign Affairs Project

- Break the class into 4 groups and assign each student a job: a director, a
  writer, two researchers, and one organizer. You can also add an artistic
director if you have more students. See Appendix J for copy of assignment
and its guidelines.

- Give each group their topic and two library days. Assignment is to be
  presented by the group to the class during the last half of class on the
  second day.

- See Appendix K for sample ideas on each topic.
  Topic 1: Panama Canal Treaties
  Topic 2: SALT II Treaties
  Topic 3: Iranian Hostage Situation
  Topic 4: Camp David Accords

Day Seven: Video Clip on Carter

Lesson A: I will be using only a portion of the video by American Experience titled
Jimmy Carter. I will start with the second CD, which covers most of Carter’s
foreign affairs and should reinforce the ideas discussed the previous day.

- See Appendix J for full notes on the video. It is on two CD’s and quite
  comprehensive, covering his early life through his post presidency
activities. There is much more information about Carter and this video on the PBS website: http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/carter/

- The day six activity may need to run over into day seven, so length of film would be determined in part by other constraints.

**Day Eight:** Carter Post-Presidency Activities and Report Card

**Lesson A: Carter’s Post-Presidency Lecture**

Most presidents’ simply fade away into the background and only occasionally make appearances for national disasters, party politics, or the opening of their library. An exception to this is Carter, who has accomplished some amazing things in the time since he left office. This is an important aspect of his image and has cast a positive glow on his overall presidential service. See Appendix K for notes.

**Lesson B: Wrap up Carter’s post-presidency activities**

- Show the last portion of the *Jimmy Carter* Video, which discusses the post-presidential activities of Carter. Ask students to add to their Carter post-presidency notes while watching the film. Be sure to discuss Carter’s last few years since the Nobel Peace Prize at the conclusion of the film.

- Ask students to respond to the following questions:
  - What should be the role of presidents after office?
  - How does this affect the way people, and historians, interpret their presidency?
Day Nine: Evaluation

Lesson A: Presidential Report Card

After discussing several aspects of his presidency, students will have an opportunity to grade President Carter’s performance. Students will be encouraged to look at the overall picture of Carter’s term and assess how well they believe he served the country. Justifying his grade will be an important function of this activity. This format will also be used for subsequent presidents in our study. See Appendix L for report card example.

Lesson B: Essay Prompt

Students often read about presidents with a cursory knowledge. The basic facts are presented about their time in office, yet rarely is there a discussion of their lives, before or after office. However much of an individual’s historical image centers on these times. Having students assess this can help them see how history is written.

- Ask students to respond to the following questions:
  - Do you think a man like Carter could be elected today? Why or why not?
  - Why do you think he was not re-elected?
o Describe what you think Carter’s historical image should be. How should he be remembered?

o What experiences prior to assuming the presidency helped to shape the man he was in the White House?

o What were the primary political, social, and economic realities that shaped Carter’s presidency?
Appendix A

Carter Biography Lecture Notes
Born in 1924, small Georgia town, RR tracks, farming center of life

Raised throughout the Great Depression but farm produced almost everything they needed.

Father was idolized, referred to Carter as “Hot Shot.” Strove to please his father, but a very difficult man to impress. He demanded much from Jimmy, almost perfection.

Mother was a square peg in round city. Had a strong career in nursing, treated black as equals and bucked the system of segregation. Her father was a political man.

School: Jimmy was good in school, strived to be the best, rarely got in trouble. But when he did, he received a swift paddling from father and or principal. Teacher Ms. Julia Coleman was a major factor in his life who encouraged him to think out side the town of Plains. Went to Community college and then transferred to Annapolis Naval Academy. Life long dream.

Came home to visit and met his sister’s friend Rosalynn Smith. They dated once and he told his mom he was going to marry her. They courted long distance and then married in 1946. She gave birth to 3 boys: John (Jack), James Earl Jr, Donnel Jefferey (Jeff).

Respected in the navy, seen as an intelligent, disciplined officer. Earned a spot with elite nuclear submarine program. He worked with first nuclear sub: Seawolf.

Father dies, goes home and takes over business, peanut wholesaling; builds business back up with hard work; gets involved in local politics and the school board, church, and Lions Club. Brown v Board caused shock and anger throughout much of his community. Asked to join, local White Citizens Group, which he refuses and faced some discrimination for that decision.

Decides to run for 1962 State Senate seat where he encounters fraud in his opponents tactics. He attacks system and has a revote which he wins. Quiet but not a leader.


Runs again in 1970, and wins. Segregation was a hot topic. Carter wasn’t a segregationist but he did say things that might’ve been seen by some as not denying the movement. Once he was made governor, he insisted that racial segregation was over. See his first inaugural address as example. This ties into George Wallace’s theme. Carter seen as a leader of a “New South.”

Reorganized state government, stubborn, looks to presidency

Makes ties and thinks about national run but sees that he needs more foreign experience

What kind of qualifications should a person have before they become president?

What qualifications did Carter have? Is that enough? What would’ve made him a better candidate?
Appendix B

Election of 1976 Notes
Election of 1976, Carter v Ford

Country reeling from Watergate and Post Vietnam. Who could they trust?
Statistic or polling number:

- 1976 Harris polling said only 11 percent of respondents felt a “great confidence” in the executive branch. (41 percent in 1966, 28 percent in 1974, 13 percent in 1975)
  - National Journal Jan 19, 1980, pg 112.4
- 1979- Jimmy Carter had the lowest presidential approval rating of any president- even lower than Nixon’s during the height of the Watergate affair.
  - Kaufman, The Presidency of James Earl Carter, Jr., page 179.5

Carter strategy:

- started early, analyzed country’s mood, emphasized honesty and integrity, promised “I will never lie to you”,
- seen as an outsider, not part of the old system, he was a fresh change
- Peanut Brigade
- Strong showing early in Iowa, beat Wallace in Florida.
- ABC Movement: Anyone But Carter.
- Blacks move to help Carter.
- Good management of time and money, able to win small contests consistently.
- By July he had the nomination.

SHOW CARTER CAMPAIGN AD, clip found @
http://www.polisci.wisc.edu/tvadvertising/Historic%20Ads%20Library/Themes/Ad%20Archive%20Themes.htm
“A government as good as its people”
Discuss with students what themes we see in the video clip.

Carter vs Ford:

Ford: saddled with Nixon image; never really elected, had to beat Reagan which was a tough bruising fight.

Carter: support was soft, they liked him but not quite sure why. Some could be persuaded otherwise.
Some considered him fuzzy and felt like he changed tune to fit song. He tried not to upset anyone. His lead starts to slip.
Concern about his religion and its role in life- born again.

Gives *Playboy* interview- hopes to appeal to younger audience, not seem like a prude “I’ve looked at a lot of women with lust. I’ve committed adultery in my heart many times.”\(^6\) Caused a lot of problems.

**Debates:** first debate went to Carter, but lead was falling. By second debate there were concerns. Ford blunders says, “there is no Soviet domination of Eastern Europe, and there never will be under a Ford administration.” Stopped the Carter slide.

VIEW PORTION OF DEBATES- clip found @ [http://www.museum.tv/debateweb/html/history/index.htm](http://www.museum.tv/debateweb/html/history/index.htm) go to 1976, Video section
Can view clip from first debate, Ford’s gaffe and Carter’s responses to *Playboy* interview

**Election:**
It was close, and Carter didn’t know if he had won until 3:30 am.
Carter got 50 percent of the popular vote to Ford’s 48 percent, electoral vote 297-241. This was the smallest winning total since Woodrow Wilson in 1916.
Carter carried the traditional FDR/New Deal Democrats: the South, blacks, and labor
But had problems:
  * pulled crossover, white, conservative Southerners – they would be keeping a very close eye on him
  * scored weaker than most Democrats with Northern Catholics and some liberals

---
Appendix C

Electoral Maps and Popular Vote Map of 1976 Election
Also see:
University of Virginia for a popular vote map:

National Archives and Records Administration for statistical information:
Appendix D

Carter’s Presidency Notes
James Earl Carter:

**Personal:** low key, walked to his inauguration, told public what he thought rather than maybe what they wanted to hear, wore sweaters, broke problems down, better with details. Scandal around his friend, Bert Lance.

**Domestic:**

- **Problems with Congress:** seen as an outsider, bad mouth congress, Demo mad because he didn’t spend. Not traditional spending liberal.
- **Environment:** water use, created Department of Energy, increase in alternative energy sources like wind and solar. **3 Mile Island accident:** near nuclear meltdown in Penn March 79.
- **Economy:** Stagflation, 79 and 80 worst years of inflation, interest rates past 20 percent, high unemployment.

**Foreign Policy:** focus on human rights: withheld economic aid

- **Latin America:** willing to work with LA countries, Panama Canal Treaties.
- **Middle East:** Camp David Accords signed between Egypt and Israel (Sadat and Begin, respectively) 79. Normalized relations.
- **Iran:** since 53 US backed the Shah: modernized econ, but jailed political opponents. In 79: there was revolution. Real power Ayatollah Khomeini dislike US interference/ideas, etc. took 60+ hostages, one eve of Reagan’s inauguration make deal. **444 days.**
- **US/USSR:** relations sour after invasion of Afghanistan.

James Earl Carter:

**Personal:** low key, walked to his inauguration, told public what he thought rather than maybe what they wanted to hear, wore sweaters, broke problems down, better with details. Scandal around his friend ____________.

**Domestic:**

- **Problems with Congress:** seen as an outsider, bad mouth congress, Demo mad because he didn’t spend. Not traditional spending liberal.
- **Environment:** water use, created Department of Energy, increase in alternative energy sources like wind and solar. ______________: near nuclear meltdown in Penn March 79.
- **Economy:** Stagflation, 79 and 80 worst years of inflation, interest rates past ____ percent, high unemployment.

**Foreign Policy:** focus on ______________: withheld economic aid

- **Latin America:** willing to work with LA countries, Panama Canal Treaties.
- **Middle East:** ________________ signed between Egypt and Israel (Sadat and Begin, respectively) 79. Normalized relations.
- **Iran:** since 53 ________________ modernized econ, but jailed political opponents. In 79 ________________. Real power ________________: dislike US interference/ideas, etc. took 60+ hostages, one eve of Reagan’s inauguration make deal. ________ days.
- **US/USSR:** relations sour after invasion of ________________.
Appendix E

Misery Index
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Inflation Rate (percent)</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States

The poor economic record of the Carter years, and in particular, the unusual combination of high inflation and high unemployment, was an important reason for Carter's loss of popularity and his 1980 defeat. Using the data in the table, draw a graph with two lines: one representing the change in inflation between 1973 and 1980, and the other representing the change in unemployment during that period. Be sure to label both lines. Then draw another graph representing the change in the "misery index" for the period. (The misery index is the sum of the inflation rate and unemployment rate for a given year.)

- What do these graphs suggest about the success of Carter's economic policies?
- Is there any information in these graphs that Carter could have used to defend those policies?
Appendix F

Excerpt One from Carter’s “Crisis of Confidence” Speech
Background to speech:
In June 1979, Jimmy Carter was headed to Hawaii for a few weeks of relaxation when he received a disturbing telephone call urging him to come home. Economic and energy issues were developing into a serious crisis; Carter’s approval rating had dropped to 25 percent, lower than Nixon during Watergate. Coming home, he retreated to Camp David and started working on his 5th energy speech. Unhappy with the response, Carter decided to cancel the speech. Instead he called upon various people, from governors to clergy, to discuss what was wrong in America. That discussion led to the following speech where Carter attempted to identify the problems with America in a broader sense. Given on July 15, 1979, millions tuned in to hear what became known as the “Malaise Speech.”

Excerpt One: “Crisis of Confidence” Speech

... 

I know, of course, being president, that government actions and legislation can be very important. That's why I’ve worked hard to put my campaign promises into law -- and I have to admit, with just mixed success. But after listening to the American people I have been reminded again that all the legislation in the world can't fix what's wrong with America. So, I want to speak to you first tonight about a subject even more serious than energy or inflation. I want to talk to you right now about a fundamental threat to American democracy.

I do not mean our political and civil liberties. They will endure. And I do not refer to the outward strength of America, a nation that is at peace tonight everywhere in the world, with unmatched economic power and military might.

The threat is nearly invisible in ordinary ways. It is a crisis of confidence. It is a crisis that strikes at the very heart and soul and spirit of our national will. We can see this crisis in the growing doubt about the meaning of our own lives and in the loss of a unity of purpose for our nation.

The erosion of our confidence in the future is threatening to destroy the social and the political fabric of America.

The confidence that we have always had as a people is not simply some romantic dream or a proverb in a dusty book that we read just on the Fourth of July.

It is the idea which founded our nation and has guided our development as a people. Confidence in the future has supported everything else -- public institutions and private enterprise, our own families, and the very Constitution of the United States. Confidence has defined our course and has served as a link between generations. We've always believed in something called progress. We've always had a faith that the days of our children would be better than our own.

Our people are losing that faith, not only in government itself but in the ability as citizens to serve as the ultimate rulers and shapers of our democracy. As a people we know our past and we are proud of it. Our progress has been part of the living history of America, even the world. We always believed that we were part of a great movement of humanity itself called democracy, involved in the search for freedom, and that belief has always strengthened us in our purpose. But just as we are losing our confidence in the future, we are also beginning to close the door on our past.
In a nation that was proud of hard work, strong families, close-knit communities, and our faith in God, too many of us now tend to worship self-indulgence and consumption. Human identity is no longer defined by what one does, but by what one owns. But we've discovered that owning things and consuming things does not satisfy our longing for meaning. We've learned that piling up material goods cannot fill the emptiness of lives which have no confidence or purpose.

The symptoms of this crisis of the American spirit are all around us. For the first time in the history of our country a majority of our people believe that the next five years will be worse than the past five years. Two-thirds of our people do not even vote. The productivity of American workers is actually dropping, and the willingness of Americans to save for the future has fallen below that of all other people in the Western world.

As you know, there is a growing disrespect for government and for churches and for schools, the news media, and other institutions. This is not a message of happiness or reassurance, but it is the truth and it is a warning.

These changes did not happen overnight. They've come upon us gradually over the last generation, years that were filled with shocks and tragedy.

We were sure that ours was a nation of the ballot, not the bullet, until the murders of John Kennedy and Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King Jr. We were taught that our armies were always invincible and our causes were always just, only to suffer the agony of Vietnam. We respected the presidency as a place of honor until the shock of Watergate.

We remember when the phrase "sound as a dollar" was an expression of absolute dependability, until ten years of inflation began to shrink our dollar and our savings. We believed that our nation's resources were limitless until 1973, when we had to face a growing dependence on foreign oil.

These wounds are still very deep. They have never been healed. Looking for a way out of this crisis, our people have turned to the Federal government and found it isolated from the mainstream of our nation's life. Washington, D.C., has become an island. The gap between our citizens and our government has never been so wide. The people are looking for honest answers, not easy answers; clear leadership, not false claims and evasiveness and politics as usual.

What you see too often in Washington and elsewhere around the country is a system of government that seems incapable of action. You see a Congress twisted and pulled in every direction by hundreds of well-financed and powerful special interests. You see every extreme position defended to the last vote, almost to the last breath by one unyielding group or another. You often see a balanced and a fair approach that demands sacrifice, a little sacrifice from everyone, abandoned like an orphan without support and without friends.
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Excerpt Two of Carter’s “Crisis of Confidence” Speech

and

Crisis of Confidence Activity Guide
Excerpt Two: Carter’s “Crisis of Confidence” Speech

...Energy will be the immediate test of our ability to unite this nation, and it can also be the standard around which we rally. On the battlefield of energy we can win for our nation a new confidence, and we can seize control again of our common destiny.

In little more than two decades we’ve gone from a position of energy independence to one in which almost half the oil we use comes from foreign countries, at prices that are going through the roof. Our excessive dependence on OPEC has already taken a tremendous toll on our economy and our people. This is the direct cause of the long lines which have made millions of you spend aggravating hours waiting for gasoline. It's a cause of the increased inflation and unemployment that we now face. This intolerable dependence on foreign oil threatens our economic independence and the very security of our nation. The energy crisis is real. It is worldwide. It is a clear and present danger to our nation. These are facts and we simply must face them.

What I have to say to you now about energy is simple and vitally important.

Point one: I am tonight setting a clear goal for the energy policy of the United States. Beginning this moment, this nation will never use more foreign oil than we did in 1977 -- never. From now on, every new addition to our demand for energy will be met from our own production and our own conservation. The generation-long growth in our dependence on foreign oil will be stopped dead in its tracks right now and then reversed as we move through the 1980s, for I am tonight setting the further goal of cutting our dependence on foreign oil by one-half by the end of the next decade -- a saving of over 4-1/2 million barrels of imported oil per day.

Point two: To ensure that we meet these targets, I will use my presidential authority to set import quotas. I'm announcing tonight that for 1979 and 1980, I will forbid the entry into this country of one drop of foreign oil more than these goals allow. These quotas will ensure a reduction in imports even below the ambitious levels we set at the recent Tokyo summit.

Point three: To give us energy security, I am asking for the most massive peacetime commitment of funds and resources in our nation's history to develop America's own alternative sources of fuel -- from coal, from oil shale, from plant products for gasohol, from unconventional gas, from the sun.

I propose the creation of an energy security corporation to lead this effort to replace 2-1/2 million barrels of imported oil per day by 1990. The corporation I will issue up to $5 billion in energy bonds, and I especially want them to be in small denominations so that average Americans can invest directly in America's energy security.

Just as a similar synthetic rubber corporation helped us win World War II, so will we mobilize American determination and ability to win the energy war. Moreover, I will soon submit legislation to Congress calling for the creation of this nation's first solar bank, which will help us achieve the crucial goal of 20 percent of our energy coming from solar power by the year 2000.

These efforts will cost money, a lot of money, and that is why Congress must enact the windfall profits tax without delay. It will be money well spent. Unlike the billions of dollars that we ship to foreign countries to pay for foreign oil, these funds will be paid by Americans to Americans. These funds will go to fight, not to increase, inflation and unemployment.
Point four: I'm asking Congress to mandate, to require as a matter of law, that our nation's utility companies cut their massive use of oil by 50 percent within the next decade and switch to other fuels, especially coal, our most abundant energy source.

Point five: To make absolutely certain that nothing stands in the way of achieving these goals, I will urge Congress to create an energy mobilization board which, like the War Production Board in World War II, will have the responsibility and authority to cut through the red tape, the delays, and the endless roadblocks to completing key energy projects.

We will protect our environment. But when this nation critically needs a refinery or a pipeline, we will build it.

Point six: I'm proposing a bold conservation program to involve every state, county, and city and every average American in our energy battle. This effort will permit you to build conservation into your homes and your lives at a cost you can afford.

I ask Congress to give me authority for mandatory conservation and for standby gasoline rationing. To further conserve energy, I'm proposing tonight an extra $10 billion over the next decade to strengthen our public transportation systems. And I'm asking you for your good and for your nation's security to take no unnecessary trips, to use carpools or public transportation whenever you can, to park your car one extra day per week, to obey the speed limit, and to set your thermostats to save fuel. Every act of energy conservation like this is more than just common sense -- I tell you it is an act of patriotism.

Activity: Excerpt Two: “Crisis of Confidence” Speech

What are our current energy sources?

What happens to the economy if the price of oil goes up? Cite specific examples

Summarize his 6 key points:

- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓

Explain which of the 6 points do you think is the most important?

In what ways have consumers lessened their energy consumption since the 1970’s? What could the government do to encourage oil conservation?
Defend or deny the following statement: “Every act of energy conservation like this is more that just common sense -- I tell you it is an act of patriotism.”
Appendix H

Assignment Outline for Project
Carter’s Foreign Policy Assignment

Objective: You and your partners will be examining the foreign policies of the Carter Administration, looking at the following topics:
- Panama Canal Treaties
- SALT II Treaties
- Iranian Hostage situation
- The Camp David Accords.

Your topic will be randomly assigned and each person will have a specific job: director, writer, researcher, organizer, and artist.

Assignment: Create a poster that incorporates the details and long-term consequences of your topic. Each project must include:
1) The background of events leading up to the event.
2) The specific details of the event, including key people, ideas, dates
3) Analysis of a primary source document and a copy of it on poster
4) A map of the region
5) Several images associated with topic- minimum of 5
6) A clear title
7) A thoughtful, concise paragraph that describes the long term effects of the topic upon modern U.S. history

Important Dates:
Each group will be given their topic and jobs the evening prior to our library date.
**Your homework is to bring 5 items associated with your topic the next day.**
We will then spend two days in the library where students can organize and work on the project. It is to be turned in the following day.

Due Date: ________________________________

My Topic is: ________________________________

My Partners are: _____________________________ Contact Info:
_______________________________
_______________________________
_______________________________
_______________________________
_______________________________
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Sample Information on Foreign Policy Topics
Panama Canal Treaties:

In 1970 Torrijos had rejected U.S. revisions of the 1967 treaties, but in 1971 he reopened negotiations. In September 1977 the U.S. and Panama signed the Panama Canal Treaty, providing for continued U.S. operation, maintenance, and defense of the canal until Dec. 31, 1999, and giving Panama a percentage of the tolls. A companion document, the Treaty Concerning the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal, signed at the same time, stipulated that all nations would have access to the canal and that the U.S. would defend it indefinitely. Although some nationalist and leftist groups in Panama objected that the treaties did not go far enough, Panama ratified them by plebiscite in October 1977. Opposition was widespread in the U.S., where conservatives argued that the U.S. was giving away its rightful property and that, in Panamanian hands, the canal might be less efficiently run. After contentious debate, both treaties were ratified by the U.S. Senate in 1978 and took effect on Oct. 1, 1979.

In 1977 the U.S. and Panama agreed on two new treaties to replace their 1903 agreement. The U.S. ceded the Canal Zone to Panama on Oct. 1, 1979, and surrendered control over the canal itself on Dec. 31, 1999. From 1979 through 1999, the canal was operated by the Panama Canal Commission, a U.S. government agency, under the supervision of a bi-national board of directors. As mandated by the treaty, a Panamanian began serving as canal administrator in 1990. When the Panamanian government assumed full responsibility for the canal at the end of 1999, the commission was dissolved and the Panama Canal Authority took over canal operations. The U.S. retains the right to “expeditious passage” of its warships through the canal at all times and the obligation to ensure that the canal remains open, neutral, and secure.

*Gen. Torrijos stepped down as chief of government in 1978

Source: www.historychannel.com, Panama Canal

Iranian Hostage Situation:

The seizure of the American embassy in Tehran by Iranian students on Nov. 4, 1979 led to the Iranian hostage situation. The overthrow of Muhammad Reza Shah Pahlevi of Iran by an Islamic revolutionary government earlier in the year had led to a steady deterioration in Iran-U.S. relations. In response to the exiled shah's admission (Sept., 1979) to the United States for medical treatment, a crowd of about 500 seized the embassy. Of the approximately 90 people inside the embassy, 52 remained in captivity until the end of the crisis.

President Carter applied economic pressure by halting oil imports from Iran and freezing Iranian assets in the United States. At the same time, he began several diplomatic initiatives to free the hostages, all of which proved fruitless. On Apr. 24, 1980, the United States attempted a rescue mission that failed. After three of eight helicopters were damaged in a sandstorm, the operation was aborted; eight persons were killed during the
evacuation. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, who had opposed the action, resigned after the mission's failure.

In 1980, the death of the shah in Egypt and the invasion of Iran by Iraq made the Iranians more receptive to resolving the hostage crisis. In the United States, failure to resolve the crisis contributed to Ronald Reagan's defeat of Carter in the presidential election. After the election, with the assistance of Algerian intermediaries, successful negotiations began. On Jan. 20, 1981, the day of President Reagan's inauguration, the United States released almost $8 billion in Iranian assets and the hostages were freed after 444 days in Iranian detention; the agreement gave Iran immunity from lawsuits arising from the incident.

In 2000 former hostages and their survivors sued Iran under the 1996 Antiterrorism Act, which permits U.S. citizens to sue foreign governments in cases of state-sponsored terrorism. The following year they won the lawsuit by default when Iran did not offer a defense. The U.S. State Dept. sought dismissal of the suit, arguing it would hinder its ability to negotiate international agreements, and a federal judge dismissed the plaintiffs' suit for damages in 2002, ruling that the agreement that resulted in their release barred awarding any damages.

The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia, Iranian Hostage Situation

**SALT II:**

SALT II was a second round of the **Strategic Arms Limitation Talks** from 1972-1979 between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which sought to curtail the manufacture of strategic nuclear weapons. It was a continuation of progress made during the SALT I talks. An agreement to limit strategic launchers was reached in Vienna on June 18, 1979, and was signed by Leonid Brezhnev and President Jimmy Carter. The Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan and the treaty was never formally ratified by the United States Senate, but its terms were honored by both sides.

Massive amounts of mistrust on both sides contributed to difficulties with the treaty process, however. The U.S. Senate never passed the treaty due to arguments about the terms of the treaty not being enforceable due to cheating by the other side and the U.S. government's ability to detect if cheating was occurring. The process of ratification lost momentum after time and was never picked up, although the terms were apparently honored anyway. Subsequent discussions took place under Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Camp Davis Accords:

Background
Upon assuming office in January of 1977, Carter moved to rejuvenate the Middle Eastern peace process that had stalled throughout the 1976 presidential campaign in the United States. Carter wasted no time in visiting the heads-of-state on whom he would have to rely to make any peace agreement feasible. By the end of his first year in office, he had already met with Anwar Sadat of Egypt, King Hussein of Jordan, Assad of Syria, and Yitzhak Rabin of Israel. Carter’s exploratory meetings indicated he had a basic outline of how to reinvigorate the peace process, but a number of public diplomacy miscues with Rabin revealed a failure on his part to take into account Israel’s domestic political dynamics.

Accompanied by their capable negotiating teams and with their respective interests in mind, both leaders converged on Camp David for thirteen days of tense and dramatic negotiations from September 5-17, 1978. By all accounts, Carter’s relentless drive to achieve peace and his reluctance to allow the two men to leave without reaching an agreement are what played the decisive role in the success of the talks. Numerous times both the Egyptian and Israeli leaders wanted to scrap negotiations, only to be lured back into the process by personal appeals from Carter. Begin and Sadat had such mutual antipathy toward one another that they only seldom had direct contact; thus Carter had to conduct his own microcosmic form of shuttle diplomacy by holding one-on-one meetings with either Sadat or Begin in one cabin, then returning to the cabin of the third party to relay the substance of his discussions.

Carter chose to continue and for three more days negotiated, arm-twisted, assured, and petitioned until at last an agreement was possible. The result was the Camp David Accords. The first agreement dealt with the future of the Sinai peninsula and peace between Israel and Egypt. The second was a framework agreement establishing a format for the conduct of negotiations for the establishment of an autonomous regime in the West Bank and the Gaza strip.
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American Experience: *Jimmy Carter* Video Notes
Intro:
basic on Carter’s rise, and his downfalls while pres, moral crusade, tenacity, stubborn, religion, details, don’t think about politics but what is right.

Start:
scenes of Plains.
Father as central role, wanted to please his dad. Father was respected, knew who he was, SW Georgia, small empire, 350 acres, corn cotton and peanuts. 5 sharecropper families worked for him. Jim Crow South. Ate and slept in homes of blacks, played with his children.
Mother: mom not home, reader, travel, long hours as a nurse, wanted to help those that had less, Lillian, serve to others, Earl put steel into him.
Plains: small town, nothing for miles, all white Baptist church, all white schools, worked harder than, basketball, books, Navy- uncle Tom Gordy, requirements for Naval- worried about not making it, won’t give up, June 1943- admitted to Naval Academy,

7 min
Rosalynn: friend of Ruth, church, dedicated, bright, reader, wanted to see the world, get away, 18 yrs old, JC was 21. Norfolk Virginia. Jack, James Chip, Jeff, 3 small boys, lonely, he has no patience for tears, learned to be very independent, submarine service after 2 yrs, always on time, sense of order, mental discipline, always something constructive, 6 yrs, he was senior officer of Seawolf, nuclear sub, 1953 father dying

12 min
10 yrs had passed. Father and son had grown distant, father and son rejoined. Black and white visitors, secret acts of kindness, father had created a sense of community, he reexamined his life, duty to family business, took over father’s business, Rosalynn upset, did not talk to him all the way back, pouted for about a year, 1954 Brown v Board changes everything, White Citizen’s Councils, JC approached- said no, required some courage.

17 min
peanut farmer, tried new things, turned to R for help, partners in everything, came and kept books, worked hard, fishing, golf, vacations, Sumter Board of Education, VP of Lions Club, 1962 decided to run for State Senate but no money and staff, lasted 15 days, politics always in his life, natural, Joe Hurst ran county, he wanted Homer Moore to be senator, they watched people vote, fraud!!!, Jimmy lost, contested the election, showed doggedness, appealed to newspapers, went to court, JC was threatened, threaten to burn business, JC was followed, Judge overturns, member of new state H of R, also had 1st black since reconstruction, Carter opposed special interest, kept away from parties, made
no waves, served 2 terms. Got into Gov race 1966, left as a family, better school and hospitals, and roads, more responsible gov’t, went to all parts of Georgia, was closing in on Maddox, lost by less than ½ a percentage point, 66 K in debt and JC lost 22 pounds

28 min
walk with Ruth, felt that his faith had been superficial, traveled north as a personal witness for Jesus, political theology, Niebur, the sad duty of politics is the bring truth to the sinful world, I believe God wants me to be the best politician I can be.

31 min
1970 ran for Gov, 11 hour days, well coordinated: Powell as assistant, Hamilton Jordan to manage, Gerald Rafshoon to media, Calhoun as advisor, a tough campaign, Carl Sanders had 20 percent lead, support of AA and Atlanta. Carter goes after him hard, Carl too rich, Cater appeals to white blue color, segregationist vote, JC used key words, Wallace, no busing, private schools, JC asked for trust from AA, 46 yrs old, Sworn in, time for end of racial issues, AA happy, segregationists unhappy now see him as a traitor,Gov mansion, difficult for Rosalynn, had to learn so much, tough from Plains to Gov Mansion, Amy a favorite, made people pay for sandwiches, reorganizations, fought for what he wanted, wanted complete control, wanted things DONE, run over people and things in his way. Took his case to the people and force legislature to follow. Never was into personal politics, South Georgia Turtle

40 min
1972- he was looking higher, Democrats came to his office, JC was unimpressed with people, hoped for VP, went to Demo Convention, walked away thinking JC could be President. Americans were ready for a change due to Watergate. Themes written out: Who was Jimmy? Arrogance? Character was key. LBJ and Vietnam, Nixon and Watergate, run early and hard, wonderful speaker in small groups, almost like a preacher, grassroots effort, 11 family members in 11 different states at one time, Carter used Iowa to gain strength, New Hampshire: build on win, raise money, Peanut Brigade, won, Florida he was up against Wallace, could he win against a fellow southerner, had support of AA especially Andrew Young, underestimation of JC, beats Wallace, becomes a powerful force, NY Convention 1976: Carter had a lock on nomination, able to unite country N and S, pulled off a miracle, 1975 late, he was less than 5 percent in the polls, by convention he was 70 percent.

51 min
During summer had lead, press goes to Plains, a campaign as a theme, idealist, not on larger issues, went to church, separation for church and state, could be tough and moral, family provided color, Billy: drinking beer, reader, and smarter, Lillian: helped poor, Peace Corps
Carter had 15 point lead, returned to themes of honesty and trust, pressured to take stand, he was presented as central Demo with liberalism in heart, support was soft, *Playboy* interview was 5 hours where he tried to explain his views, makes lust comment, created problem, Debates: Carter lead was going, Ford then makes blunder on Eastern Europe, stopped Carter’s slide. Only at 3 am did networks say Carter was President. Offered a biography of what we wanted to hear.

Jan 20, 1977 Carter walked to inauguration, breath of fresh air, human rights, laws fair, so different, pure, and simple, exactly what we say we want, full of confidence, close knit brand of brothers seen cocky, resentment by others, they haven’t paid their dues. We will show them that this town is tougher. Get things done by power, must go to people.

Fireside chat after 2 weeks, rally around ideas, thrifty, turn down heat, conservation, no limo, no magazines, turned off air conditioning, all functions cut off by 12:00 am, no hard alcohol served. He presented his agenda: energy #1, hospital, ethics in gov’t, struck down 19 million dollar water projects, made people unhappy, had to build political capital first. Never understand how system worked and he didn’t want to learn it either, felt representatives and senators were corrupt, wouldn’t return calls, never showed respect, lack of connection between him and party. Balanced budget no pork barrels, liberal demo want to spend on programs. Instincts were to cut and balance budget. Why did you add 61 million in programs? O’Neill so we can help people. But we need balance. Entered with 51 percent by June had 70 percent.

Lance affair: budget director, criminal banking practices. Carter stands by his friend, press goes on the attack, could they be as tough on a Democratic president as a Republican. Try to bring down Carter, loyalty to his friend versus his reputation, gave the first blow to image, approval drops 25 percent, changed presidential power. Now seen as a wounded leader.

Foreign Policy: communism fear gone, China, USSR arms control, new peace process in Middle East, and Panama Canal Treaty and human rights. Notre Dame Speech, Beacon on the Hill of liberty and democracy. Goal of state is not always to protect its national interests but to help others.

Human rights, friends and foes: Chile, Nicaragua, seen as undermining US allies. Goes after USSR with human rights violations. Middle East: leadership of Iran and Shah seen as an island of hope, trusted ally, Carter reaffirms support. Strategic concerns trumped human rights! Absolute values didn’t work all the time. One week later, anti-shah protests, students killed by secret police, religious leaders call for fall of Shah’s gov’t.
7 min
marriage was partnership, Rosalynn was a great advisor. Ambitious, listened to cabinet meetings, Amy had run of place, roller skated down marble hallways, dog named Grits, public schools, Billy made money and marketed beer, president tolerated him

9 min
economic problems: inflation, getting worse, sacrifice, no win economic situation, last victim of Vietnam, peace time economy, keep wages and prices down, Congress to cut down spending. Wanted people to just follow. Doubts about leadership, seen as too mired in details, ineffective with Congress. Promised too much and delivered too little. Did well but had promised so much.

12 min
Camp David, Sept 78, Middle East peace. Had only a 30 percent approval. Nothing to really lose, land disputes, four years, refugees, and land grabs, all issues in Middle East. No real way to win. Sadat took first step who went to Israeli soil, JC welcomed Sadat and Begin to Camp David. JC studied really hard, knew populations of cities. Let’s just get them together and they will see. They were mean to each other. By day three nothing was done. JC would be mediator and American would draft proposal and they could then talk about it. Long process, Carter seen as tenacious, tough on each leader, broker, odds were against it ever working. Sept 14th had some success. Day 10, triumph of diplomacy! Crowning glory, enshrined in history. Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be the children of god. Nobel Prize for Sadat and Begin but did nothing for Carter’s polls.

25 min
At home problems, Foreign policy was good. Established formal relations with China, In June met with Breznif about SALT II, on to Japan for trade agreements. US economy: mortgage rates at 20 percent, price of gas doubled, unemployment rising. Summer of 1979 inflation was at 14 percent. Investment, building, all going down. Carter reduced budget deficit by cutting social programs, traditional FDR group unhappy, AA join fight vs Carter. Frustrations on rise, truckers barricade roadways, riots, polls falling behind, seems to have no control, shaking, floundering, no leadership, approval rating at 25 percentage lower than Nixon during Watergate. He seems to have lost nerve. Make a major speech and put blame on price of oil. Carter says no. Next ten days presidential soul searching. Listened to scalding critics. Subject deeper than oil, crisis of moral/spirit. Problem was economic not national psychosis. People were worried. July 15th descended from the mountain. Threat to democracy: “crisis of confidence” speech like a sermon, redemption, sacrifice themes, malaise speech, we don’t always want our leaders to tell us its all our fault. People said maybe the problem is in the White House. Asked entire cabinet to submit to quit. 5 resignations were accepted. Polls go down again Liberal wing broke with president and went with Kennedy. Collapses during running race, weakness, killer rabbit attack. Billy taking a bribe from Libyan gov’t. Family fun gone.
Sept 1979: 3500 students march to US embassy. Islamic revolution, Khomeini blames the US. Carter had worked to build a relationship with Shah now coming back to hurt him. Told not to allow Shah back, US credibility at stake, Oct 22 Shah admitted, 2 weeks later take hostages, 53, Khomeini says it is ok. Showed hatred of Americans on the TV. JC tries to think up something, military was too risky, wanted them home. Still threat of superpower confrontation.

44 min
1979, Dec 25: USSR goes into Afghanistan. Final blow for US and USSR relations. USSR now scene as a threat, boycott Olympics, withdrew SALT agreement from Senate. Carter gave groups a lecture but didn’t ask for help. Media coverage of hostages, it becomes a national obsession seesaw of emotions. Things fell apart. Carter not seen as strong.
By April we needed to get them out. Desert One six planes, ninety men, eight helicopters, and bad logistics, crashed, two failed, eight die, three severely burned. Carter takes full responsibility.

51 min
Carter wins nomination, Kennedy seen as too liberal but fight weakens Carter. Reagan launched campaign on Labor Day, this guy means what he is saying. Carter comes out but there were weaknesses, he is trapped by events. Oct 28, 1978 Debates, Carter and Reagan are running neck and neck. Reagan seen as not dangerous in debates. Carter campaign works all weekend before elections. But it is a landslide for Reagan and the Democrats lose control of the Senate.
Deal with Iran had been reach. Crew from ABC video follows Carter around. He wanted the hostages home on his watch but he was not able to do that. Seen as a weak leader again.

59 min
Carter goes home, business in debt one million, withdrawn, fifty-six year old has been, all the things they once loved now seen as weakness and moral superiority. People avoided him. He never rested: worked with wood and building. Wrote memories, presidential library, place to resolve conflicts, host leaders. Consisted of twenty-eight million, thirty-five acres, staff of one hundred, to be called the Carter Center.
All his life he had done the impossible.
Habitat for Humanity: built houses, popularity on the rise. 1984 went to NYC to build tenements. Seen as honest man.
Four years later the failed president resurfaced as champion of poor. 1986 poll showed respect for Carter as an elder statesman; watch over elections, peacemaker.
Haiti: Aristide should be back elected rightly. Felt he deserved another chance.
Upset with gap between rich and poor, going after diseases and hunger. Post presidency can’t change job as President, but can show true characteristics. Carter never had “program” but tackled issues one by one.
He was a kind man, devotion to human rights.
Oct 11, 2002 he wins Nobel Peace Prize.
Appendix K

Carter Post-Presidency Notes
1980: Loses election to Reagan
returns to Plains, GA, read and works in woodshop
1982: Publishes memoirs “Keeping Faith: Memoirs of a President”
establish the Carter Center and Presidential Library in Atlanta
Mission Statement:
The Carter Center, in partnership with Emory University, is committed to
advancing human rights and alleviating unnecessary human suffering. Founded in
1982 by former U.S. President Jimmy Carter and his wife, the Atlanta-based
Center has helped to improve the quality of life for people in more than sixty-five
countries.
Led by the Carter’s and an independent board of trustees, the Center's staff wage
peace, fight disease, and build hope by both engaging with those at the highest
levels of government and working side by side with poor and often forgotten
people.
1984 starts working for Habitat for Humanity building houses for poor

Very active in foreign affairs:
1989: Observes election in Panama
1990: Observes elections in Nicaragua and Dominican Republic
1991: Announces Atlanta Project: domestic plan to tackle inner-city social problems
1993: Travels to former Yugoslavia to facilitate talks between Bosnian Muslims and
Serbs, results in four month cease-fire
   Travels to Benin, Togo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, and Sudan to advance efforts
to increase agricultural production, eradicate Guinea worm disease and promote
democracy
1995: Negotiates Sudanese cease-fire, meets with Nigerian head of state General Sani
   Abacha and secures the release of former head of state Obasanjo
1997: Meets with Palestinian leader Yassar Arafat in Plains, GA
1998: Receives the first U.N. Human Rights Prize
1999: Observes elections in Cherokee Nation, Indonesia, China, Nigeria and
   Mozambique
   Awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian award
2002: Accepts invitation from Castro to visit Cuba, 1st former president to visit island
   since 1928.
   Awarded the Nobel Peace Prize
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Report Card
# Report Card

**Student:** President Carter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Qualities</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Ethic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Presidential Qualities | | | | |
|------------------------| | | | |
| Economics              | | | | |
| Domestic Affairs       | | | | |
| Foreign Affairs        | | | | |
| Social Environment     | | | | |
| Office of the President| | | | |

**Suggestions for Improvement:**

**Areas of Acknowledgement:**

**Overall Grade:** ________________
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Carter’s Governor of Georgia Inaugural Address
Inaugural Address
January 12, 1971

Governor Maddox and other fellow Georgians:

It is a long way from Plains to Atlanta. I started the trip four and a half years ago and, with a four year detour, I finally made it. I thank you all for making it possible for me to be here on what is certainly the greatest day of my life. But now the election is over, and I realize that the test of a man is not how well he campaigned, but how effectively he meets the challenges and responsibilities of the office.

I shall only take a few minutes today to summarize my feelings about Georgia. Later this week my program will be described in some detail in my State of the State and Budget messages to the House and Senate.

I am grateful and proud to have with us the Naval Academy Band, because it reminds me as it did when I was a midshipman of the love of our Nation and of its goals and ideals. Our country was founded on the premise that government continually derives its power from independent and free men. If it is to survive, confident and courageous citizens must be willing to assume responsibility for the quality of our government at any particular time in history.

This is a time for truth and frankness. The next four years will not be easy ones. The problems we face will not solve themselves. They demand from us the utmost in dedication and unselfishness from each of us. But this is also a time for greatness. Our people are determined to overcome the handicaps of the past and to meet the opportunities of the future with confidence and with courage.

Our people are most precious possession and we cannot afford to waste the talents and abilities given by God to one single Georgian. Every adult illiterate, every school dropout, every untrained retarded child is an indictment of us all. Our state pays a terrible and continuing human financial price for these failures. It is time to end this waste. If Switzerland and Israel and other people can eliminate illiteracy, then so can we. The responsibility is our own, and as Governor, I will not shirk this responsibility.

At the end of a long campaign, I believe I know our people as well as anyone. Based on this knowledge of Georgians North and South, Rural and Urban, liberal and conservative, I say to you quite frankly that the time for racial discrimination is over. Our people have already made this major and difficult decision, but we cannot underestimate the challenge of hundreds of minor decisions yet to be made. Our inherent human charity and our religious beliefs will be taxed to the limit. No poor, rural, weak, or black person should ever have to bear the additional burden of being deprived of the opportunity of an education, a job or simple justice. We Georgians are
fully capable of making our judgments and managing our own affairs. We who are strong or in positions of leadership must realize that the responsibility for making correct decisions in the future is ours. As Governor, I will never shirk this responsibility. Georgia is a state of great natural beauty and promise, but the quality of our natural surroundings is threatened because of avarice, selfishness, procrastination and neglect. Change and development are necessary for the growth of our population and for the progress of our agricultural, recreational, and industrial life. Our challenge is to insure that such activities avoid destruction and dereliction of our environment. The responsibility for meeting this challenge is own. As Governor, I will not shirk this responsibility.

In Georgia, we are determined that the law shall be enforced. Peace officers must have our appreciation and complete support. We cannot educate a child, build a highway, equalize tax burdens, create harmony among our people, or preserve basic human freedom unless we have an orderly society. Crime and lack of justice are especially cruel to those who are least able to protect themselves. Swift arrest and trial and fair punishment should be expected by those who would break our laws. It is equally important to us that every effort be made to rehabilitate law breakers into useful and productive members of society. We have not yet attained these goals in Georgia, but now we must. The proper function of a government is to make it easy for man to do good and difficult for him to do evil. This responsibility is our own. I will not shirk this responsibility. Like thousands of other businessmen in Georgia, I have always attempted to conduct my business in an honest and efficient manner. Like thousands of other citizens, I expect no less of government. The functions of government should be administered so as to justify confidence and pride. Taxes should be minimal and fair. Rural and urban people should easily discern the mutuality of their goals and opportunities. We should make our major investments in people, not buildings. With wisdom and judgment we should take future actions according to carefully considered long-range plans and priorities. Governments closest to the people should be strengthened, and the efforts of our local, state and national governments need to be thoroughly coordinated. We should remember that our state can best be served by a strong and independent governor, working with a strong and independent legislature. Government is a contrivance of human wisdom to provide for human wants. Men have a right to expect that these wants will be provided this wisdom.
The test of a government is not how popular it is with the powerful and privileged few, but how honestly and fairly it deals with the many who must depend upon it.

William Jennings Bryan said, “Destiny is not a matter of change, it is a matter of choice: Destiny is not a thing to be waited for, it is a thing to be achieved.”

Here around me are seated the members of the Georgia Legislature and other State Officials. They are dedicated and honest men and women. They love this state as you love it and I love it. But no group of elected officers, no matter how dedicated or enlightened, can control the destiny of a great state like ours. What officials can solve alone the problems of crime, welfare, illiteracy, disease, injustice, pollution, and waste? This control rests in your hands, the people of Georgia.

In a democracy, no government can be stronger, or wiser, or more just than its people. The idealism of the college student, the compassion of a woman, the common sense of the businessman, the time and experience of a retired couple, and the vision of political leaders must all be harnessed to bring out the best in our State.

As I have said many times during the last few years, I am determined that at the end of this administration we shall be able to stand up anywhere in the world – in New York, California, or Florida and say “I’m a Georgian” – and be proud of it.

I welcome the challenge and the opportunity of serving as Governor of our State during the next four years. I promise you my best. I ask you for your best.

Source: www.carterlibrary.org
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