12-2013

A Tangled Hope: America, China, and Human Rights at the End of the Cold War, 1976-2000

Jared Michael Phillips
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

A Tangled Hope: America, China, and Human Rights at the End of the Cold War, 1976-2000

A Tangled Hope: America, China, and Human Rights at the End of the Cold War, 1976-2000

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
Of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in History

by

Jared M. Phillips
University of Arkansas
Bachelor of Arts in History, 2006

December 2013
University of Arkansas

This dissertation is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

_____
Dr. Randall Bennett Woods
Dissertation Director

_____
Dr. Alessandro Brogi
Committee Member

_____
Dr. Liang Cai
Committee Member

ABSTRACT

A Tangled Hope: America, China, and Human Rights at the End of the Cold War, 1976-2000, discusses the evolution of both the international and American understanding of human rights. Beginning with a discussion of the philosophical and cultural frameworks concerning "rights" that developed in Europe and the Americas throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, this work moves into the post-World War II climate that shaped Jimmy Carter and his unique understanding of human rights and America's role in the Cold War world. In particular, I argue that the existing narrative concerning Carter's foreign policy is lacking in a nuanced understanding of his beliefs and experiences and how he subsequently brought them to bear on his development and application of a moral foreign policy.

Jimmy Carter established a system of ethically rigid, yet pragmatically applied, human rights structures in diplomacy, allowing constructive engagement across the world, and especially with China. Contrary to existing scholarship, I argue that Carter developed a policy of moral pragmatism that allowed for flexible implementation of his human rights agenda across varied fronts. In the case of normalization between Beijing and Washington, I challenge the existing narrative on Carter's application of his human rights policies to Sino-American relations. While Betty Glad, Warren Cohen, Michael Hunt, and others have argued that human rights played little to no role in Sino-American relations during the 1970s, newly declassified documentation shows human rights were discussed at every step and ultimately were placed within Carter's understanding of the Cold War and Christian Pragmatism.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A dissertation—or any research project of any length—is never the work of a single person. I am immensely grateful to my dissertation committee, Dr. Randall Woods, Dr. Alessandro Brogi, and Dr. Liang Cai. Dr. Woods took time out of numerous busy days to talk about ideas, challenge my preconceptions, and give sage advice on scholarship and life. His encouragement and dedication to this project spurred me to rethink not just how research and writing works, but also the historian's role within society. Any abilities I have as a teacher were learned from sitting in his classes; any as a historian from reading his works. Dr. Brogi, through reading my sporadic writing and reminding me to take things lightly, helped refine my thoughts on the nature of international relations and my naïve preconceptions of the diplomatic world. Dr. Cai helped me understand China—as much as anyone can—and pushed my thoughts and writing on Chinese philosophy, and gave wise council, as benefits a Confucian scholar, regarding life and parenting.

Many thanks to the Department of History here at the University of Arkansas, especially Dr. Lynda Coon, Dr. Kathy Sloan, Dr. Trisha Starks, Dr. Mike Pierce, Dr. Andrea Arrington, Dr. Rembrandt Wolpert, Jeanne Short, Brenda Foster, and Melinda Adams. They provided a safe, welcoming place to learn the art of teaching and writing. Fellow graduate students Jason McCollum, Bianca Rowlett, and Aaron Moulton allowed themselves to be continually subjected to conversations about Carter and his policies. This department is full life and intellectual rigor and I am proud and more than a little humbled to have been a part of it.

Archivists make the job of any historian much easier. Here in Arkansas, I am grateful to the entire staff of the Special Collections department, especially Geoffrey L. Stark. I am also indebted to the wonderful staff at the Jimmy Carter Presidential Library, Keith Schuler and

James Yancey in particular. Their knowledge of the collection greatly speeded my way in the time I was there. I am also grateful for financial support from a Fulbright College Dissertation Award and the Department of History for multiple fellowships. Without these aids, my efforts would have come to naught.

I am incredibly grateful for the support of my family. My parents, Mike and Terri Phillips, provided invaluable support and love throughout this entire process. My in-laws, David and Pam Parks, and Peggy Parks, provided support in every way, challenging me to follow wherever this adventure has lead. I am thankful as well to friends far and wide for supporting my family: Dondrup Nyima and Shara, Seth and Amber, Joseph and Lindsey, Travis and Kaitlin. You, and so many others, helped me to always remember why I do this work.

My son, Cass, has helped in ways he will never know. He arrived at the start of this project, and as he grew, so did the dissertation. In no small way did his growth spur me to work harder and faster each day in order to finish quickly and come home and play. He continually reminded to stop working at the end of the day—more than once by closing the computer on my fingers. You, my boy, are the light of my life.

There is no way to describe how my wife has encouraged and supported me throughout graduate school. Not only did she become a mother, but she also started a new, demanding career in midwifery and finished her own degree. These things alone would keep anyone busy, yet each day she found news ways to help me, challenge my thoughts, and read almost every word I have put down here. Her life is a shining example of sacrificially loving others, an example I remember each day. There is no way to repay her love, care, and devotion. All I can say is that you, Lindi, are my guiding star, without which I would be adrift at sea.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my grandfather, Clarence Orville Phillips.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

The Hope of Human Rights?

In the fall of 2012, a video on YouTube "went viral." In and of itself, this was nothing new. This particular video, however, was the product of the world's efforts to establish a more just global community. KONY 2012, and its call for the international world to bring justice to East Africa, spoke of a longing for the full measure of universal human rights to come into fruition.[1] Human rights, universal or not, are concepts which are relatively new in the international world, emerging as a unified concept after World War II only to be ignored until the 1970s. This decade—so "ruined" by bad hair, bad fashion, and disco—was suddenly redeemed as the ideals of human rights were debated, redefined, and enforced across the globe. Since then, a generation of activists, scholars, and politicians has emerged, boldly proclaiming and decrying rights abuses and attempting to end them.

In recent works, the movement in the late 1970s to create a global culture of human rights is viewed in two distinct ways: utopian or hypocritical. The argument for human rights as a utopian dream, most recently espoused by Columbia University's Samuel Moyn (2010), sees the quest for rights as yet another fatalistic manifestation of utopian political visions revamped in a post-Vietnam society. For these writers, once the dream fades in the face of reality, so too will the language and efforts to deal with abuses. Others in the utopian camp, like Jeffery Sachs, see human rights as utopian, yes, but ultimately attainable, if only we can work hard enough. This view is reminiscent of the global Progressive Era, and its belief that the ills of humanity could be fixed through hard individual work, government regulation, and the good works of social and economic groups. The hypocritical side focuses on the inevitable compromises made in the

[1] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y4MnpzG5Sqc.

battle to enforce human rights norms, focusing on opportunistic politicians aiming to gain political capital. Despite the skeptical look at human rights from these opposing schools of thought, they both agree on a loose definition of human rights—a set of moral or ethical ideals that can be applied to or imposed upon the international community to create a cosmopolitan global civilization that truly protects and defends the rights of all.

This general understanding of human rights tenuously emerged out of Western philosophical and ethical revolutions, traditionally seen to have began within Europe and the Americas and then spread across the world as globalization quickened in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It was based upon a definition of a progressive civilization; namely that civilization should progress according to a set pattern, moving from barbarism and savagery into an ever-increasing "civilized" state of being. Founded in part upon ideas of Judeo-Christian belief, then modified by the intellectual revolutions of the Enlightenment, this idea of civilization spread via economic, political, religious, and cultural tools loosely called "modernity," or perhaps "modernity version one." This idea held sway until 1917 and 1949, when Russia and China respectively "went" Communist.

The communist revolutions birthed a new idea of "civilization" that rapidly grew. The revolution increasingly won full and partial converts across the globe as the Cold War rose and fell. International communism, which seemed to argue for an even better version of democracy and modernity, attempted to wrest control of the international order via an eternal revolution. Thanks to the global depression and the rapid move to decolonization after World War II, it seemed as if Moscow and Beijing indeed offered a powerful alternative to democracy for the emerging Third World. Socialist revolutions across the Caribbean, South America, Africa, and Southeast Asia spoke to the apparent worth of Communism as applied by Stalin and Mao. By the

1970s, as it became clear that these positions were just as moribund as the West's, a new ideal of rights was proffered, one that combated the structure of the Cold War at fundamental levels. Ideas of personhood, membership in the body politic and the international community, and the protection of rights (however defined) were now debated in seemingly every meeting between the United States and the Soviet Union—and increasingly between American and Chinese spokesmen. In the brief moment following the Helsinki Conference of 1975 it seemed as if human rights had now transcended nation-state politics. Moscow was pushed to uphold its end of the Helsinki Accords; Washington enacted a new foreign policy based on protecting human rights everywhere; and in Beijing a new dissident movement, spurred on by Deng Xiaoping, called for expanded political rights for all. Each and every global relationship, it seemed, was now evaluated by its adherence to universal human rights.

So how do we as scholars deal with this elusive idea of "human rights?" First, we must recognize there are two problems that are bound up with this phrase. The first, as we have been discussing, is defining human rights in a manner universal enough to apply to all human civilizations.[2] This was the ostensible goal of Eleanor Roosevelt's work in leading the charge in the United Nations to draft the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR).[3] The UDHR was a momentous occasion in world history, to be sure. For the first time, a global representative

[2] Here I use the term "civilization" under the definition given by Felipe Fernández-Armesto in his work *Civilizations: Culture, Ambition, and the Transformation of Nature* (New York: Touchstone, 2001). There, Armesto argues a "civilization" or "civilized" group is engaged in "relationship to the natural environment," often with the goal of changing the natural world to suit the group's needs. (14-15) This definition is at odds with some of the historical proponents of human rights and current scholars, Moyn included.

[3] See Elizabeth Borgwardt, *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005) and Mary Ann Glendon, *A World Made New: Eleanor Roosevelt and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (New York: Random House, 2002).

body came together and crafted a document outlining thirty-two basic human rights. Enforcement, however, became the second issue, one that only grew as the Cold War settled into place and the proxy war system between Washington, Moscow, and China came to govern decolonization, nation building, and indeed, defining what these new basic rights were.

Concern for how we define "universal human rights" is relatively recent, despite how some scholars have termed it. The ideology and language of universal rights only began to formally emerge in the aftermath of World War II and the birth of the Cold War. How, then, to deal with this strange and polemical history? Understanding the complete scope of human rights' tortured history is beyond the scope of this project, and others are already well committed to the task.[4] Instead, following in part in the footsteps of Moyn's recent *The Last Utopia*, this work looks at when the rights movement sought vast global changes, that period from the end of World War II to the beginning of the Cold War's decline at the end of 1970s.

As at the end of the Great War, the end of the Second World War found humanity dismayed by its capacity for cruelty. Images both from Germany's concentration camps in Europe and America's nuclear victory in Japan dominated newspapers, movie reels, and books. Americans saw their war efforts as a defense of the basic liberties of humanity from evil and became concerned with the maintenance of liberty in the post-war world. The United Nations, created amid the ruin of the war, was not immune to the partisan infighting of its founders,

---

[4] See David Boucher, *The Limits of Ethics in International Relations: Natural Law, Natural Rights, and Human Rights in Transition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011; Lynn Hunt *Inventing Human Rights: A History* (New York: WW Norton, 2007); Samuel Moyn, *The Last Utopia: Human Rights in History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010); Borgwardt, *A New Deal*; Sarah Snyder, *Human Rights Activism and the End of the Cold War: A Transnational History of the Helsinki Network* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Aryah Neier *The International Human Rights Movement: A History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012); Michael Barnett, *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011); and Kenneth Cmiel, "The Recent History of Human Rights," *American Historical Review* 109, No. 1 (February 2004): 117-135.

infighting that soon dealt a blow to the UN's ability to extend and protect human rights. While the major nations (United States, USSR, China, and Great Britain) had various reasons for including an idea of "rights" in the UN charter, each did so assured that there would be little option for interventions in their domestic affairs by other nations—thus sovereignty of the nation-state held supremacy over the rights of man.

Despite this setback, the UN charter allowed for the United Nations Human Rights Commission (UNHRC). The UNHRC, headed by Eleanor Roosevelt, worked to push through a formalized statement on the rights of mankind, the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. It was ratified on December 10th, 1948, with several Soviet states abstaining from the vote. This seemed to be a major victory, one that the United States had spearheaded. Despite this, as Lynn Hunt has noted, "at a time of hardening lines of conflict in the Cold War, the Universal Declaration expressed a set of aspirations rather than a readily attainable reality."[5] Like so much of American rights struggles in the post war world, the ideals of legislation had little to regulate and promote enforcement.

The second problem is crafting workable political action from a rather abstract moral philosophy. Very quickly, leaders in the superpowers became concerned about applying these policies in a systematic way—in the United States the increasing visibility of segregation and civil right violations made for embarrassing news abroad.[6] In the Soviet world, and in China, the news of famines, political prisons, and the inability of the population to emigrate created similar

[5] Lynn Hunt, *Inventing Human Rights*, 204.

[6] See Thomas Borstelman, *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001); Jonathan Rosenberg, *How Far the Promised Land? World Affairs and the American Civil Rights Movement* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).

image problems for Communism. Consequently, human rights became a rhetorical tool in international arguments, only occasionally leading to meaningful debates between the Communist and non-Communist world to occur.[7] The problem of application became no less tangled than defining the ideal, especially as the United States and Russia were reluctant to take part in the growing Third World efforts to deal with human rights (or in the case of China, resoundingly humiliated by refutations of their heavy-handed approach on the issue) in the 1950s.[8]

By 1975, as American excesses in Vietnam caused soul-searching in Washington and Russia's experiences in Africa were doing the same, the international community began looking for a better way to understand and deal with human rights. The Helsinki Accords, unhappily signed by Gerald Ford, set the stage for a revised understanding of universal rights. The Accords allowed a new, internationally recognized, legal space for human rights dissidents throughout the Soviet Union, Europe, and the United States to agitate for lasting change. At the same time this international agreement was emerging, politicians in Washington made formal proposals that linked trade agreements to human rights progress, something President Jimmy Carter heralded while in office.[9] For the first time since World War II, enforcement of human rights ideals was

---

[7] See in particular the Kitchen Debate between then-Vice President Richard Nixon and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev in 1958. See also the debates surrounding nation-building and the Vietnam War, especially David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).

[8] See Roland Burke, *Decolonization and the Evolution of International Human Rights* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010).

[9] See the recent histories of the human rights "revolution" of the 1970s, in particular Sarah Snyder *Human Rights Activism and the End of the Cold War: A Transnational History of the Helsinki Network* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Aryah Neier *The International Human Rights Movement: A History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012); and Samuel Moyn, *The Last Utopia: Human Rights in History* (Harvard: Harvard University

becoming a reality.

This project attempts to place the human rights policies of President Jimmy Carter within the changing domestic and diplomatic environment of the 1970s. Though the literature dealing with this issue has grown, these works have ignored, until very recently, the influences in Carter's life prior to the presidency and the impact that his human rights philosophy and application would have on the evolving relationship between Washington and Beijing. Chapters one and two provide a brief history of America's understanding of human rights from the nation's founding up to the election of Carter in 1976. Chapter one, ending with the conclusion of World War II, highlights how Americans sought to define citizenship and the political, social, and economic rights that went along with it as the nation moved from isolationism to interventionism to internationalism. Chapter two surveys the first three decades of the Cold War, bringing the story up to 1976, and incorporates into the narrative the growing voice of the conservative movement in American life after World War II and its take on the "China problem."

Chapter three examines the coming of age James Earl Carter, Jr., in particular, the impact that the civil rights struggles of the American South had upon the future president. Raised during the heyday of Jim Crow, imbued with a deep faith in the Southern Baptist version of Protestantism, and tempered by serving in the nation's navy during the early years of the Cold War, Jimmy Carter developed a pragmatic understanding and approach to human rights. After his election in 1976, Carter's insistence on turning American foreign policy away from the bipolar Cold War structure and toward a multipolar diplomatic strategy would start the nation on the long and tortured path out of the Cold War. A key element in the Georgian's efforts was his

---

Press, 2010). For the growing human rights shift in Congress, see David P. Forsythe, *Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy: Congress Reconsidered* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1988).

human rights policy; an effort to reorient US foreign affairs around morality and ethics. In doing so, Carter relied on a neo-Wilsonian understanding of diplomatic relations, strongly influenced by a blend of Niebuhrian and Southern Baptist theology as well as lessons learned from the Second Reconstruction. This section of the project also provides an explanation of Carter's understanding of human rights and how it helped him craft a diplomatic policy of *moral pragmatism*.

Chapter four moves into a general discussion of Carter's foreign policy, showing how the ideology of moral pragmatism was applied in three case studies. American-Soviet relations and the negotiations for the second Strategic Arms Limitations Treaty (SALT II) in particular allows scholars to see how Cold War realities tested Carter's ideals. Examining U.S. policies in Latin America—the Panama Canal Treaties and Argentina—allow a glimpse into how moral pragmatism could achieve limited success, but success nonetheless. This discussion sets the stage for a more detailed look in Chapter five at Sino-American relations, the normalization process, and Carter's human rights strategy.

The last chapter, based largely on newly released documents from the Carter Library in Atlanta, deals with the impact human rights had on the normalization process with the People's Republic of China (PRC). Carter, instead of backing away from his policy of human rights in every as critics often maintained, had the long game in mind. While not pressing rights in the negotiations leading up to normalization, Carter relied on moral pragmatism to provide a political foundation to bring China into the international community and then begin to engage the rapidly growing country on human rights concerns. Traditional explanations of the normalization process argue the Georgian jettisoned his human rights agenda in order to gain a tacit ally against Russia, pointing to the lack of external discussion of the issue compared to the

open American concern regarding human rights within the Soviet Union. However, this chapter shows that the Carter Administration discussed human rights consistently throughout the normalization, and chose to keep relatively quiet about human rights within the PRC during the fall of 1978 in order to begin a relationship that would allow for greater engagement on the issue as Beijing was drawn more fully into the international world.

By the close of the 1970s, the understanding of "universality" in human rights appeared to be dismissed in favor of geopolitical realities—rights would only be enforced when it was useful for one of the world's major powers. The scholarly focus has traditionally been on the US-Soviet debate following the 1975 Helsinki Accords, where in exchange for *de jure* recognition of *de facto* borders by the Americans, Moscow agreed to the enforcement of a series of human rights concerns—freedom to emigrate, freedom of expression, and freedom from economic exploitation. Recent scholarship has even suggested that this was a contributing factor to the downfall of the Soviet Union by the end of the 1980s.[10]

There is something missing in these examinations of the shifting nature of the human rights network at the end of the 1970s—namely that it was *not* as shifting as is claimed. Following the end of World War II, as the world order was recovering and restructuring, new ideas of sovereignty and the maintenance of the nation-state developed. While the drive to resurrect the failed the League of Nations came to fruition with the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945, the new organization's ability to ensure its ideals was often circumscribed. This was especially the case with human rights. To call a member state out on human rights abuses meant enforcing internal changes, generally against the desires of the regime in power, no matter if the government was Communist or non-Communist.

[10] Sarah Snyder, *Human Rights Activism and the End of the Cold War*.

This system based on the old ideas of nationalism, national sovereignty, and nation-state foundations persisted. The UN was in no way able, nor were its members willing, to create a true world government. Because a government is based on, at least theoretically, the ability to guarantee for its people a basic level of security (though even defining this is problematic), it must also control the inputs into the system, and to a lesser degree the societal outputs (either intellectual, economic, cultural, or otherwise). Human rights concerns and enforcement, then, could not become truly universal, for that would push countries to surrender major aspects of their sovereignty to an unpredictable third party, one that by focusing on the supposed good of the international order might disregard the needs of a particular nation.

While some nation-states made no bones about their disavowal of universality in action, namely the United States or China (the Civil Rights Movement or Democracy Wall, for example), others—generally smaller, Third World countries—have argued for greater enforcement of rights in part as a measure of protection against the growth of neocolonialism. Groups left out of the debate, like the world's decolonized regions, argued for greater extension of universal human rights, but had little impact on the existing order. The debates surrounding human rights covenants and universality during the 1950s speak to this—colonial powers were loathe to impose "destabilizing or unwelcome rights on their subjects…They had enough problems without radically empowering women and needlessly alienating traditional elites."[11] In the United States as well politicians were unwilling to put themselves under the reach of UN human rights efforts, as "powerful interests perceived human rights as a dangerous foreign imposition."[12]

[11] Burke, *Decolonization*, 127.

[12] Burke, *Decolonization*, 128.

This project argues, however, that Carter's insistence on a basic definition of human rights and its application via moral pragmatism provided the world an alternative model for enforcing human rights. In part through diplomatic suasion, economic enforcement, and world opinion, Carter was able to enact real and lasting change throughout large portions of the world—the disappearances in Argentina dramatically lessened, the international world began voicing greater outrage on apartheid in South Africa, the Soviet Union was pressured to allow a more open emigration system. There were failures, yes, but under Carter the possibility for a lasting human rights revolution occurred and took root.

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men and women are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights…that to secure these rights governments are instituted, deriving their powers from the consent of the governed.[13]

Chapter 1

An Idea of Citizenship

WHILE the idea of human rights in American history is commonly associated with either the final phase of the Civil Rights Movement or with Jimmy Carter's foreign policy initiatives, the story begins much earlier. This chapter and the next provide an overview of the changing nature of "rights" in the United States from the colonial era to the 1970s with an emphasis on America's changing role in the international arena and, in particular, in the development of universal human rights after World War II. Human rights were intimately intertwined with the evolution of political and social rights for various sections of the American population: African Americans, women, Native Americans, and lower class whites. As the new republic aged, the question of rights expanded into the United States' international affairs. By tracing the high points of these contentious topics, these chapters aim to demonstrate the ebb and flow of the concept of the "rights of man" and what scholars now term *de jure* and *de facto* "access" in American life. This chapter examines the way in which a narrow concept of rights in the new country evolved into a more inclusive understanding by the start of World War II as demands for political, economic, and social inclusion—citizenship—grew.[14]

During America's formative years it seemed that little attention was paid to the idea of "universal human rights." The basic narrative is well established in popular memory: European

[13] "Seneca Falls Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions," 1848.

[14] For a more detailed discussion on access as a key component of human rights, see Thomas Pogge, *World Poverty and Human Rights* (New York: Polity, 2009).

settlers arrived primarily from England, France, and Spain, chopped down trees, waged war on the indigenous population, imported Africans as slaves, considered women second-class citizens, and erected customs and laws that enshrined the primacy of rich white men in the fledgling country. From these efforts emerged the struggle to define and enforce republican citizenship in America. This battle emerged from both New World experiences and Old World revolutions. During the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, settlers in New England fitfully developed a system of classifying "civilized" society; what Jill Lepore termed an "allegorical ideology" that helped forge the American identity by the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[15]

In an attempt to differentiate themselves from Native Americans during King Philip's War (1675-1676), the early colonists developed an exclusionary definition of society that granted citizenship only to those deemed non-barbaric.[16] This restricted notion of membership soon moved beyond the white-Indian context in New England and into gender relations and interactions with African slaves. In the South, women were increasingly sequestered, as illustrated by Kathleen Brown's work on Virginia. Brown shows how the gender discourse determined who was a member of society and who was not; namely, that married, white women held a place of power in the social hierarchy and African Americans—slaves or free—did not.[17]

---

[15] Jill Lepore, *In the Name of War: King Phillips War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York: Vintage, 1999).

[16] The idea of citizenship became an increasingly important part of the "rights" debates coming out of the Enlightenment. See Samuel Moyn, *The Last Utopia: Human Rights In History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010); Lynn Hunt, *Inventing Human Rights: A History* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2007); David Boucher, *The Limits of Ethics in International Law: Natural Law, Natural Rights, and Human Rights in Transition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009). For a very brief overview of human rights ideals throughout history, see Peter N. Stearns, *Human Rights in World History* (London: Routledge, 2012).

[17] Kathleen Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996) 5.

By the time of the Revolution, a world based on the separation of both gender and race emerged; one "in which all women were categorically excluded from the public."[18]

At the same time, slaves occupied a different space than white women and Native Americans. Slaves were considered less than human, a definition that placed Africans and African Americans in a distinct political and social category; one that allowed the continuance of brutal subjugation and the ownership of human beings.[19] In his excellent synthesis on slavery in the Americas, Ira Berlin offers scholars a window into their world as he redefines the traditional slave narrative. Berlin, arguing that the relationship between master and slave was constantly renegotiated, holds the position that as the concept of race continually shifted, it focused on excluding African Americans—slave or free—from American life.[20]

As these early colonists built their New World hierarchies, Europe was also engaged in a massive redefinition of political life that continued into the nineteenth century. From the Enlightenment emerged a radical shift in Europe's traditional power structure. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, European countries had begun to organize themselves along the emerging idea of the nation-state. As this occurred, the power of individual rulers grew—especially after the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia and England's Glorious Revolution—and in many cases supplanted the power of the church. As the ruler's power increased, the concept of the "state" changed; it was now articulated by "sovereignty," and all power was found within the

---

[18] Mary Beth Norton, *Founding Mothers and Fathers: Gendered Power and the Forming of American Society* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996) 405.

[19] See Brown, *Good Wives*; Jennifer Morgan, *Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery* (University of Pennsylvania, 2004).

[20] Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1998), introduction.

secular government, leaving the church and the common man virtually powerless. Soon, challenges emerged, challenges that gave birth to a new understanding of international law and citizenship founded on the legacy of thinkers like Thomas Aquinas. Aquinas differentiated between the laws within nations and the laws that govern international relationships. Subsequent theorists argued that Aquinas' theory referred to the application of "natural law" to international relations. What natural law was—and how it should be applied—was vague. This prompted the Spanish writer Francisco Suarez to declare that the "law of nations"—a nebulous external legal system that operated independently of the internal laws of any given country—was defined as whatever a large group of nations decided. Suarez sought to develop a stricter understanding and application of natural law, one that began within the individual mind and extended outward into the nation-state and, ultimately, the world. Such a system set more firmly in place customs of international relations, but natural law was applied only to the individual nation, which left the international world without a strict set of rules. In 1625, the Dutch political theorist Hugo Grotius further amended Aquinas' theory. Whereas Aquinas was remarkably unspecific in his understand of the law of nations, Grotius added a new twist. He posited that natural law, materializing from Divine Will, was something all people and nations could rationally understand and apply. He further argued that natural law required all nations to respect the sovereignty of other nations. Treaties and agreements governed political and economic life whether or not the Church was around to dictate its standards. In effect, Grotius advocated a world order that allowed treaties and agreements to change as the international world did. These ideas crystallized as Europeans settled the New World.

During the period between Grotius and the American Revolution new visions of what it meant to be a member of society—or a citizen—also emerged. In particular, these new ideas

took root in the English colonists in America. The settlers, scattered along the east coast, had grown accustomed to loose governance from London. Even after the Seven Years War (1756-1763), Americans expected this indirect governance to remain in place. Instead, they were forced by London to submit to more direct control and taxation. The backlash to these new laws ultimately culminated in revolutionary fervor; a fervor fueled in part by the ideas mentioned above. By the early 1770s, American dissidents, adopting and modifying the writings of John Locke (1632-1704), argued for the protection and maintenance of their rights as free Englishmen. In particular, they were concerned about a new understanding of "liberty," rooted in the Enlightenment's debates on the rule of law. The law allowed for free men to have a voice—either in protest or in vote—that was fueled by man's natural rights. Grasping this idea, American colonists believed they possessed natural rights, including personal liberty, independent from any government system. Many of the revolutionaries, most notably Thomas Jefferson, argued for a system of negative rights; that is, the limitation of a government's power, in order to preserve the people's liberty.

To help flesh out these concepts, American revolutionaries drew on the writings of Adam Smith. Smith's famous treatise on economics, written at the same time as the Declaration of Independence, linked ideals of the rights of man to the limitation of governmental power and presented a political philosophy for this new era. Stating that there should be relatively little restriction on economic life in the colonies, Smith argued that economic freedom would lead to true freedom and, in due course equality; thus, it followed that all men were created equal. This argument joined with Jean-Jacques Rousseau's thoughts on the subject. Rousseau, who, after 1750, believed that the nation-state was a corporate entity, posited that citizens joined this

corporate entity out of a fraternal spirit in order to create a society of perfect freedom, a society that worked to create greater freedom for its members.

Rousseau, like Aquinas before him, was vague on what provided the justification for this type of social structure. To explain this, Enlightenment thinkers in Europe and the Americas turned to the German philosopher, Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). Kant's writings established a system of ethical structures that dominated the international community's understanding of rights far into the twentieth century.[21] Kant, extending Rousseau's thesis, argued that individuals bore an ethical duty to subject themselves to the will of the populace. This was a problematic solution as it could result in the country's majority (of opinion or numbers) terrorizing its minorities. American writers and thinkers took to heart a distillation of all these ideas; namely, that sovereignty consisted not simply of the right of the government to rule, but also that the government must be composed of consenting citizens—a category of people that was slowly expanding.[22]

---

[21] In particular, see John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971); Pogge, *World Poverty*, Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2007); Nicholas Wolterstorff, *Until Justice and Peace Embrace: The Kuyper Lectures for 1981* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1983).

[22] For a brief survey of the Enlightenment and the political revolutions of the 17th and 18th centuries, see Armesto, *The World: A History, 2nd ed.* (combined volume) (London: Pearson, 2010) chapters 18, 19, 22; for a lucid discussion of Grotius' thought and modifications to it, see David Boucher, *The Limits of Ethics in International Law: Natural Law, Natural Rights, and Human Rights in Transition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009) chapters 3 and 4; and for a general compendium of Enlightenment thinkers' writings, see Peter Gay, *The Enlightenment: A Comprehensive Anthology* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973) [For authors mentioned here, see Sections 1, 2, 4, and 7.] For the classic survey of Enlightenment political thought, see Peter Gay, *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation, Volume II: The Science of Freedom* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969), especially chapters 7 through 10.

Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, written in 1776, reflected the influence of these ideas on the colonies. His phrase "all men are created equal" paid heed to the growing revolutionary spirit; a spirit that looked forward to new types of inclusive political structures. It was in this belief that the colonies declared their independence from the crown in July of 1776. Gary Nash has argued that contrary to popular belief, the subsequent Revolution was not simply thought up, fought by, or necessarily run by men like Washington or Jefferson.[23] Instead, it was a collective act of common people—a people struggling to gain freedom from political and economic oppression, to maintain native cultures against an onslaught of Europeans, or simply to hold on to a precarious livelihood. These people, Nash declared, were fighting less for ideological reasons—though ideology took hold as the war wound on—and more for their own personal gain, either in land, economic opportunity, or emancipation. Nash's work also demonstrated that the majority of the population did not, in fact, see the realization of republican citizenship that had allegedly motivated them. Indeed, the liberty achieved in the revolution was reserved for the uppermost echelons of society. This meant that the fledgling government abandoned many of its supporters—especially women, African Americans, and Indians.[24]

---

[23] Gary B. Nash, *The Unknown American Revolution: The Unruly Birth of Democracy and the Struggle to Create America* (New York: Penguin Books, 2005).

[24] For brief looks at the Native American experience, see Kathleen Duval, *The Native Ground: Indians and Colonists in the Heart of the Continent* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2007); Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), Pekka Hämäläinen, *The Comanche Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009). For slavery, see the above-mentioned Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone*. For a different view on the revolution and its impact on American political life from Nash, see Woody Holton's *Unruly Americans and the Origins of the American Constitution* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2008) and Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992).

Prior to the Revolution it had seemed citizenship would arise from the new republican status of the colonies and that it would be composed of a "mass of free people, who, collectively, possess sovereignty…[people] that have [no] hereditary rights superior to others [and] contains, within himself, by nature and the constitution, as much of the common sovereignty as another."[25] It must be remembered, though, that this inarticulate mass of revolutionaries was given voice by men like Jefferson and John Adams. Jefferson offered a stinging critique of British law in the colonies. His objections were founded on the ideals of natural law and the rights of British citizenry, based in part on Locke's understanding of these rights as not given by a legal code, but by nature itself.

IN the laws and customs established after the Revolution, though, the definition of citizenship formally excluded African Americans, unmarried women, and Native Americans. While the Revolution had indeed sparked a republican fervor, and while it had advanced some basic ideas regarding the rights of man, it had also mobilized the upper classes to craft a document to protect their interests. In essence they created a system that excluded the bulk of the population—women, slaves, Native Americans, and the swelling numbers of poor whites—from their hard-won freedom. These people were perceived as unable to handle the responsibility of true, unlimited democracy despite their contributions in forming the new republic.

During and after the Revolution, each new state created its own constitution, one rooted in the Enlightenment's understanding that rights were natural to all men. These constitutions often centered around three main themes: religion, speech, and press.[26] Added to these were

[25] David Ramsay, quoted in Wood, *Radicalism*, 169.

protections from unwarranted government intrusion in the form of searches, seizure, or unfair court proceedings; in other words, negative limits on government power. The Articles of Confederation provided the first attempt at securing a national government to protect these rights; however, it focused on the protection of each new state rather than on national application of citizen's rights. This structural problem, compounded by a lack of clear leadership and authority, caused the Confederation to devolve into chaos. By the middle of the 1780s, the upper strata of the new country saw the growing disorder and argued that the common man, despite whatever natural rights he might be endowed with at birth, should not rule.[27]

Out of this fervor, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay gave voice in the *Federalist Papers* to a growing desire for an expanded, republican government based on the will of the people. These men argued that this type of government would not be trapped by a narrow segment of the population—one of the critiques of the Confederation structure—and believed a stronger federal government would better protect the nation's hard-won freedom.[28] The Federalist-Antifederalist debate erupted after the Constitutional Convention presented its work to the people in 1787 and 1788. The Federalists, in favor of the new constitution, were primarily composed of the new country's upper class and argued that the elected officials of this proposed central government were just the people to protect the rights of the individual citizen. The Antifederalists—voiced, in part, by Jefferson—held fast to the opposing view. They were fearful of the proposed central government, arguing that the general populace must be mindful of the

[26] These will become a significant portion of the foundation for America's understanding of human rights in the later half of the twentieth century.

[27] See Boucher, *Limits of Ethics*, chapter 3-6.

[28] Jacob E. Cooke, ed. *The Federalist* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1961).

fact that the government had the power to take away their natural rights, the very things the Revolution was fought for. What fitfully emerged from these debates became the Constitution of the United States of America. The initial draft of the Constitution was one that some scholars argue was written without any protection of the natural rights of man.[29] The Antifederalists certainly believed so and thus forced the addition of a Bill of Rights to the Constitution. These ten amendments set the precedent for what would become the standard list of human rights for the country, and subsequently for much of the world as America's Constitution became a model for the protection of negative rights.

By 1789, the right to religion, press, assembly, speech, speedy trial by jury, right to bear arms, and a prohibition of unreasonable searches were written into the Constitution. In the years that followed, the same desire to protect individual freedom that produced the Bill of Rights helped birth a sustained abolitionist effort, even though many in the movement drew a sharp distinction between freedom from bondage and full citizenship for African Americans. Paralleling the abolitionist movement was a growing demand by women for a wider, more formal inclusion into the country's political and social life. During the Revolution, women had challenged the established social and economic structure by taking over traditionally male responsibilities—running farms, managing business transactions, and generally functioned as the

[29] Holton, *Unruly Americans,* introduction. This assertion is not entirely true. Section I, Article 9 protects a citizen's writ of habeas corpus, thereby establishing how legal cases against the people could proceed. Throughout Article I and Article II are the provisions of an electoral-style of government, allowing for the people to decide governance. Article II, Section 1 sets out that only citizens of the United States may be elected to office—"natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States." Article V, Section 2 details that each state in the country must respect the rights of citizens from other states. Article V, Section 4 details that the national government will "guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government." Finally, Article V allows for the addition of Amendments ratified by the states. The Bill of Rights adds to these basic prescriptions.

head of their households.[30] Despite limited gains in economic and political life, the ideal for republican womanhood still revolved around the home—especially the training of the next generation of republican citizens.[31]

Challenges to the new Constitutional order quickly emerged. Passage of the Alien and Sedition Acts was the first major test of the nation's commitment to the Bill of Rights. These Acts encapsulated the government's fear of the growing influence of the Republicans and an attempt to limit their access to the levers of political power. In what Jefferson termed a witch-hunt, the Alien and Sedition Acts empowered President John Adams to impose draconian security measures on the nation. The second president was allowed to deport any citizen of America's enemies or was not a citizen of the United States, limit access to voting, and imprison or fine critics of the government, the latter a serious threat to the First Amendment. Thomas Jefferson and James Madison soon mounted a counter-attack, and by the end of 1798 this threat to citizens' rights had ceased.

This battle, and the French Revolution that helped engender it, inspired a more concise definition among Americans of the rights of man. Even before the presidency of John Adams, the nation had worked to interpret and understand the French Revolution. At first, Americans cheered the revolutionaries, but when Robespierre unleashed the guillotines, American sentiment quickly divided. While George Washington saw the French Revolution as the fruit of anarchy,

---

[30] Abigail Adams is perhaps one of the most well known examples of this.

[31] For a brief look at this, see Susan Branson's *These Fiery, Frenchified Dames: Women and Political Culture in Early National Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia, 2001). See also Linda Kerber, *No Constitutional Right to be Ladies: Women and the Obligations of Citizenship* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1998); Norton, *Founding Mothers and Fathers.*

others—notably Thomas Jefferson—believed the French Revolution contained the seeds of a government committed to the protection of basic rights by all citizens.

By the time Jefferson was elected in 1800, the nation's understanding of citizenship was rooted in the Bill of Rights. This definition soon came to typify what people demanded when fighting for inclusion *or* exclusion from the country's political and social life; namely, the ideals of free speech and beliefs and just application of the law. These ideas revolved around a core concept; namely, that each individual citizen had the right—and perhaps the duty—to actively participate in political life, either by endorsing or challenging the existing structure.

These people, mostly white Americans, were increasingly forced to confront the humanity of African Americans both slave and free. The question remained, however, whether this confrontation would result in freedom and citizenship. In the north, it became easier for abolitionists to win freedom for blacks, as the economic system there did not revolve around a slave-based culture. Across the region, manumission societies formed and offered the first serious challenge to slave owners. By 1800, in many parts of the north, freedom was in hand for most African Americans. Despite this, they still faced rampant persecution and racism and were by and large not allowed to vote or engage in other civic activities. Northern blacks might have been technically free, but they were not accorded the full rights of citizenship. Access to education and economic opportunity was hard to come by. In the south, the profits produced by the slave-driven economy gave anti-abolitionist forces increasing reason to ignore calls for emancipation and find new ways to maintain the peculiar institution.[32]

[32] The refusal by authorities to incorporate African Americans within their modified Enlightenment structure was in part a response to very real concerns about the bloody aftermath of the Haitian Revolution, which had been lead by rebel slaves who firmly believed in the rhetoric coming from France. Jefferson would work to cut Haiti out of the international world,

In 1808, Congress' (with Jefferson's support) 1807 bill banning the importation of new slaves into the country went into effect. In addition to ending the arrival of slaves into the country (aided also by the British outlawing of slave trading within its empire), the bill helped improve the life of slaves in small ways. Slaveholders were obligated to take better care of their slaves if they wished to maintain the system. As a result—despite the ban on the international slave trade—America's slave population increased to nearly 4 million people on the eve of the Civil War.[33] While individual lives might have improved, though, this did not change the circumstances: African Americans remained in bondage.

As some sectors of American life faced increased restrictions, the small-time farmer and laborer felt there was cause to celebrate with the election of Andrew Jackson in 1828. Jackson's ascension to Washington was seen as a victory for the "common man." Indeed, Jackson's very inauguration marked this triumph as nearly twenty thousand spectators wreaked havoc on the White House. Jackson's rise to political dominance evidenced the merger of the forces of economic revolution, westward settlement, the growth of slavery, and the desire for an expanded democracy. Andrew Jackson's person represented the victorious common man as well. Coming from humble beginnings as an orphan in South Carolina, Jackson gained a national reputation through military service. In the 1828 presidential election, Jackson capitalized on this reputation, and touted a political platform based on individual liberty, states-rights, and small national government on his way to win fifty-seven percent of the vote.[34]

---

fearful that the contagion of freedom would spread to the United States and incite violent slave rebellions across the south.

[33] See Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone*; Morgan, *Laboring Women*.

[34] The election of Andrew Jackson also heralded the success of the restructured party system and its ability to mobilize white males at the polls.

Ironically, the politics of the common man as preached by Jacksonian Democrats soon led to the violation of the rights of many throughout the country. In particular, Native Americans suffered under the Indian Removal Acts of 1831. These Acts forced the removal of thousands of Indians from land granted to them by treaties previously made with the United States government.[35] White Americans flocked to the region and took over the vacated land—a dark tradition that had occurred for generations. At the same time Native Americans were being forced off their land, how the federal government defined tribes shifted. Previously seen as completely barbaric and below African Americans in civilization, in the 1830s Indians were instead relegated to a liminal space somewhere between whites and blacks.

The same year as the Removal Acts, William Lloyd Garrison launched his abolitionist movement with the publication of the *Liberator*, a journal arguing for the end of slavery and the use of colonized regions in Africa as a new home for freed slaves.[36] Garrison and other abolitionists, such as the former slave Frederick Douglas, attacked racism and slavery, and advocated resistance and the end of a system built around human trafficking. Nevertheless, in 1857, despite the changes in public opinion wrought by the movement, the Supreme Court ruled in *Dred Scott vs. Sandford* that African Americans were not citizens of America and in fact could

---

[35] See Anthony Wallace. *The Long, Bitter Trail: Andrew Jackson and the Indians* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993).

[36] For work on the Abolitionist movement and its opponents, see Larry E. Tise, *Proslavery: A History of the Defense of Slavery in America, 1701-1840* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987); John Stauffer, *The Black Hearts of Men: Radical Abolitionists and the Transformation of Race* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002); Richard S. Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism: Fighting Slavery in the Early Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Bruce Laurie, *Beyond Garrison: Antislavery and Social Reform* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); David Brion Davies, *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

not become citizens. In the Court's ruling, Chief Justice Roger Taney stated that only whites could be citizens of the United States. Taney believed that the founding fathers had felt that blacks had no rights, or at least no rights that should be respected.[37]

At the same time, gender roles in the home shifted as women pushed for a more egalitarian status in American life. This did not mean that legally there was a shift toward equality; that was decades away. It is in this period that the "Cult of Domesticity"—the idea that a woman's job was to create a home filled with love and shelter from the oppressive marketplace—solidified in the American mind. The Cult of Domesticity provided an understanding of national womanhood that was maintained in many respects into the mid-twentieth century. It joined the ideas of civic responsibility formed during the country's settlement and early years of the republic, ideas that granted women a sort of surrogate citizenship in which they were responsible for raising the next generation and maintaining social order. Though socially restricted, many women used the ideals of domesticity to provide a foundation to reform society and influence political debates on moral issues such as abolition.[38]

While women were not allowed to vote or take part in party politics, they were able to blur the lines between the public and private spheres. Women co-opted the same rhetoric used on behalf of African Americans in their own efforts to gain political and social equality. Thanks to the lessons learned from the abolition movement, female writers like the sisters Angelina and Sarah Grimke put forward a call for equal rights for women. The Grimkes argued that women were fully human and should be given their full participatory rights as citizens of the nation. This early feminist movement culminated in the Seneca Falls Convention of 1848, where a

---

[37] For a recent look at the Dred Scott case, see Earl Maltz, *Dred Scott and the Politics of Slavery* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2007).

[38] See Branson, *These Fiery, Frenchified Dames*.

gathering of women demanded that they be given the same rights as men, a call based in part on the language of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. The Seneca Falls Convention launched a protracted struggle for women to gain equal rights, a term that women activists saw as encompassing far more than simple suffrage. In language that foreshadowed future rights battles, the Grimkes and those that came after argued that women must be truly given the freedom speech and to take part in the rapid economic changes occurring across the country. These women, presaging Charlotte Perkins Gilman (1898), argued that marriage was domestic slavery for married women had no ability to govern their lives. Following this, women's groups argued for marriage and property law reformation, and even broached the subject of sexual abuse within marriage. While many of these efforts produced no immediate results, women's rights advocates made the "woman question" a permanent part of the national debate on freedom and citizenship.

During the antebellum period, the nature of citizenship and participation in its advantages was often murky. Though women were seen as holders of the republican ethos charged with raising the citizenry, they were not afforded a formal political voice. Blacks, despite the growth of the free population in the northern states, were further disadvantaged. Though they were more readily seen as human beings, African Americans occupied a conflicted space as some were free and some not. *Dred Scott* had affirmed that blacks had no civil rights to speak of, as they were not citizens according to the Constitution, which only saw African Americans as property and slaves.[39] The nation had changed in its views on the roles of these two groups, but the opinions

[39] For the full text of the case, see http://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/60/393/case.html (accessed 7 March 2013).

from the bench dictated that, at least for the time, changes in public opinion "cannot change [the] construction and meaning" of the Constitution.[40]

The *Dred Scott* case went beyond defining slavery and built a new legal precedent regarding Native Americans and stated that they could not become citizens. Though a state can make a noncitizen equal in terms of practical life, it cannot make that person a citizen of the nation. That power was left to the national government, which, foreshadowing the Dawes Act, made citizenship for Native Americans contingent upon accepting a land allotment and the renunciation of tribal affiliation. This was due in part to the existence of the tribes as "quasi-sovereign nations [that required] the immediate allegiance of their members."[41] The end of the Cherokee removal in 1839 saw Indians defined as a "class who are said by jurists not be citizens, but perpetual inhabitants, with diminutive rights…[an] inferior race of people without the privileges of citizens and under the perpetual protection and pupilage of the government."[42] Ruling back in 1831, Justice Marshall had helped lay the foundation for this definition, arguing that Native American tribes were dependent nations in a relationship with the U.S. government like a ward to his guardian.[43]

WITH the start of the Civil War in 1861, the federal government embarked upon its first major effort to grant the rights of citizenship to a group formerly denied them—slaves. The conflict

---

[40] *Dred Scott v. Sanford*, Section I, Article 9 (1856), http://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/60/393/case.html. (Accessed 8 March 2013.)

[41] James H. Kettner, *The Development of American Citizenship, 1608-1870*. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1978) 294.

[42] *Johnson v. MacIntosh* (1823), quoted in Kettner, *American Citizenship*, 295.

[43] Kettner, *American Citizenship*, 296.

highlighted the problems of a democratic system dominated by white males and presented what Lincoln termed the greatest effort to expand the democratic promise to all people in America. In 1863, Lincoln declared that all slaves in the South were free forever and allowed freedmen to enlist in the Union army, though they were generally segregated from white soldiers. Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation granted immediate freedom for all slaves and placed the Republican Party firmly on the side of abolition. The constitutional amendments passed in the wake of the Civil War and the Civil Rights Acts that followed provided a major revision to America's idea of citizenship. The January 1865 adoption of the 13th Amendment formally banned slavery throughout the Union.

Former slaves quickly learned, however, that freedom did not translate to full participation in American life. Just before he was assassinated, Lincoln called for limited suffrage for the freed slaves, but not full membership in the country's political life. For Lincoln and many other Republicans, freedom was simply a person's ability to enjoy the fruits of his or her work. Lincoln's successor, Andrew Johnson, put in place a Reconstruction policy that maintained this awkward stance. In part thanks to Johnson's efforts to court southern politicians, a series of "black codes" sprang up across the South that, while granting the right to marry, own property, and sue in court in a limited way, also worked to deny blacks the right to vote, serve on a jury, or join militias.

In 1866, Congress made the first constitutional effort to define freedom and citizenship with the passage of the Civil Rights Bill. This bill declared that all people born in America were citizens with inalienable rights regardless of race.[44] President Johnson vetoed the bill, but in

[44] The law did not deal with voting, only with interpersonal relations—contracts, businesses deals, and protection of personal property—and so is not a complete discussion of citizenship within a republic.

April 1866 Congress overrode his decision. Congress then established its own Reconstruction Act (1867), which divided the south into military districts, called for new state governments, and granted the franchise to black men. Soon after, the 14th Amendment permanently incorporated the provisions of the Civil Rights Bill and, in the process, extended federal protection over the rights of the citizenry. In 1869, the 15th Amendment was added to the Constitution, which prohibited any restriction on voting based on race, but not gender. By the end of the 1860s, then, America was able to define—on paper—who was a member of the nation and who could partake in its political and social life.

After the Civil War, Reconstruction policies pushed the South to adopt this new definition of citizenship, which allowed for the emergence of black politicians in local and national government as well as new economic opportunities for African Americans. The new amendments had fundamentally altered the very idea of a "citizen." Whereas prior to the Civil War state governments handled the protection of a citizen's rights, the Reconstruction Congress assumed this was now the job of the national government. Washington redefined itself as the protector of republican liberty and the defender of membership in the United States. Many who were opposed to this idea—not only in the South, but also in the North as concerns about immigration increased—formed a resistance effort that helped force the end of Reconstruction in 1877. President Rutherford B. Hayes' agreement to remove Federal troops from Southern streets spelled the end of much of the political progress made during Reconstruction.

Rutherford's actions ushered in the Gilded Age and signified, in part, the birth of an industrialized America. While the definition of citizenship had been revised in the wash of the Civil War, the growing conflict between the top and bottom sectors of society presented new challenges to the country's ideas of what citizenship should look like. As the 19th century came

to close, the debate centered in particular on the role of government in daily life. In many respects, those on the outside were the same as they had been since the founding of the country: African Americans, women, and Native Americans. New voices were added, though, as immigrants, labor unions, and organized farmers became more politically assertive.

Jim Crow, which legalized segregation, emerged in the South alongside sharecropping and the crop lien system as a replacement for slavery though it would not take a firm hold in the region until the end of the 1890s. Blacks continued to vote and run for office—indeed, some would make it to Congress—as Bourbon Democrats worked to rebuild their power base against an energetic Republican party. Despite the new amendments, however, black political activity was slowly marginalized by extreme violence.[45] As disfranchisement intensified, the nascent African American middle class took up the practice of law, religious leadership, and business enterprises.[46]

Jim Crow represented a concerted attempt to thwart the 14th and 15th Amendments. These actions were perfectly legal thanks to clever writing by Southern lawmakers. These discriminatory laws appeared color blind on paper, thus evading the new Amendments, but were

---

[45] For a now classic look at the Reconstruction Era, see Eric Foner, *Reconstruction, 1863-1877* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988). For a look at how the Indian Wars increasingly were swept into the broad plan of post-Civil War nation building, see also Elliott West, *The Last Indian War: The Nez Perce Story* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009). For a survey of the Gilded Age industry and economy (as linked to the railroads), see Richard White, *Railroaded: The Transcontinentals and the Making of Modern America* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2012); for the Indian Wars, refer to West, *The Last Indian War*; for race, see Glenda Gilmore, *Gender and Jim Crow: Women and the Politics of White Supremacy in North Caroline, 1896-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996) and C.V. Woodward's classic study on Jim Crow, *The Strange Career of Jim Crow* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955).

[46] African American women were active as well in groups like the National Association of Colored Women, which focused on civil rights advancement. See Gilmore, *Gender and Jim Crow.*

primarily designed to disfranchise African American communities as well as other ethnic groups. African Americans were excluded little by little from Southern political life via poll taxes, literacy tests, tests of "adequate" constitutional knowledge, and grandfather clauses.[47] Though the Supreme Court ultimately overturned the grandfather clause in 1915, it was too little too late. Its earlier *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) ruling ensured the separation of the races in public places so long as the facilities were equal. No sooner had this transpired than states across the South passed laws segregating everything from taxis to schools. By 1900, there were no public high schools for blacks in operation in the South while elementary schools were poorly constructed, understaffed, underfunded, and without any pretense of equality. Jim Crow was designed not only to prevent the races from comingling, but also to guarantee that whites would retain a monopoly on citizenship.[48]

Any challenges to this system were met with hostility.[49] In response to the increase in racial violence, segregation, discrimination, and disfranchisement laws, new voices for African American rights emerged. Ida B. Wells exposed the stark brutality of lynching to the world. At the same time, a group of middle-class blacks and whites formed the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). The NAACP fought against the conciliatory views

---

[47] The Supreme Court, in *Williams vs. Mississippi* (1898) upheld the attempts to restrict access to voting, arguing that things like the poll tax were not on its face discriminatory or in violation of Fourteenth Amendment. For a brief explanation of the decision, see *The Oxford Companion to The Supreme Court of the United States, 2nd edition*, edited by Kermit L. Hall et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) 1090.

[48] See C. Vann Woodward, *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974).

[49] For a relatively recent study of lynching, see W. Fitzhugh Brundage, *Lynching in the New South: Georgia and Virginia, 1880-1930* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993. Brundage illustrates the devastating impact lynching had on black (and white) communities in Henry Grady's "New South."

of Booker T. Washington's gradualist approach to racial integration. Led by W. E. B. Du Bois and William Monroe Trotter, the group protested legal segregation and disfranchisement, taking an outspoken stance on behalf of racial equality.[50]

Poor whites began agitating for change as well. As the economic consequences of the Panics of 1873 and 1893 hit farmers in the Midwest and South, Populism emerged as a political movement whose objective was to gain protection and fair treatment for farmers and some elements of organized labor. Populists argued for government intervention in the economy to protect the common man from predatory national and international economic forces. While the movement effectively ended in 1896 with the defeat of William Jennings Bryan, its legacy surfaced in the Progressive movement and the New Deal as reformers worked to create a more direct electoral system, greater protection for workers, and a more even economic playing field.[51]

Populism and Progressivism were responses to massive changes in the nation's economic and social structure. During the Gilded Age, new systems of production and marketing emerged in urban centers. These attracted not only rural Americans, but also immigrants from Asia and Eastern Europe. Once these groups arrived at the factories and mines they received little pay and worked in dangerous conditions. In an effort to change life in the factories, mines, and other areas of manufacturing, labor unions emerged. While labor unions came into being prior to the Gilded Age, they quickly grew as the nineteenth century came to a close. The Knights of Labor

---

[50] The NAACP and Dubois had risen to prominence over Booker T. Washington's "gradualist" approach, which he had laid out in a speech in Atlanta in 1895. Despite the progress clearly evident in the formation of the group, it was still a relatively racist group in its initial formation with Dubois as the *only* African American in leadership for some time.

[51] On Populism, see Charles Postel, *The Populist Vision* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Robert C. McMath, *American Populism: A Social History, 1877-1898* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993); Elizabeth Sanders, *The Roots of Reform: Farmers, Workers, and the American State, 1877-1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

(KofL), founded in 1869, argued for an eight-hour workday and an end to child labor.[52] By the spring of 1885 the KofL in St. Louis implemented strikes to achieve its demands, but Jay Gould's enforcers quickly crushed them. The chaos of the Haymarket Riot in Chicago (1886) was used to portray the KofL as a radical organization to the public, and by 1900 the organization had lost momentum. In its place grew the American Federation of Labor (AFL), founded in 1886 as a group for skilled workers. The AFL, unlike the KofL, understood that workers would probably always be workers rather than owners and argued for higher wages, better hours, and better working conditions. By 1892, the group had a membership of over 250,000; by 1901, the AFL boasted over one million members, or roughly one-third of the nation's skilled labor force. Despite its calls for a better quality of life for laborers, the AFL ignored women and was unavailable to blacks.[53]

In general, it can be said that during the later decades of the 19th century America was seen as a country becoming more xenophobic and less open to immigrants, who were perceived as a threat to the "American" way of life. This movement was a response to the times: the 1880s and 1890s were marked by a massive shift in the source of foreigners seeking refuge in the United States. Some 3.5 million people came to the country; over half these new arrivals came from Southern and Eastern Europe. Native-born Americans saw them as members of lesser races predisposed to criminal activity and incapable of participating in a democratic system. In the mid-1880s this anti-immigrant sentiment gave rise to groups like the Immigration Restriction League (IRL). The IRL called for reducing immigration via barring illiterate people from the

[52] The Knights of Labor had a progressive view of gender as well, allowing women and African Americans to gain membership in limited circumstances.

[53] For a useful, though problematic, look at labor and immigration in the early and middle decades of the 20th century, see Gary Gerstle, *Working-Class Americanism: The Politics of Labor in a Textile City, 1914-1960* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).

country, a measure Congress readily adopted in 1896. In 1897, however, President Cleveland vetoed the literacy test bill. Nevertheless, by the end of the 1890s most states had adopted the Australian ballot (secret ballot)—first proposed by the Populists to promote democracy—in order to keep illiterate immigrants from voting.

Meanwhile, the Indian Wars had culminated with the placement of Native Americans on reservations and broad plans for forced assimilation. After the Civil War, the nation had resumed its westward march and Washington was suddenly forced to pay attention to the region's indigenous people. The Army was soon called to aid settlers facing Native Americans who found the growing reservation system wanting. When the Sioux "rebelled" in 1876, General George Custer was sent to return them to the reservation. At the Battle of Little Big Horn Custer and the 7th Cavalry were soundly defeated, prompting the US War Department to send troops throughout the region to suppress further revolt. The soldiers succeeded, in a way, by killing off many of the Sioux who had participated in the attack. From this point forward, the continued presence of the Army, disease, alcohol, railroads, assimilation policies, and the ever-growing wave of settlers pushed the tribes to the brink of destruction.

The settlers moving westward had the government's unquestioning support. They became a key element in shaping reservation policy, which discriminated against Indians, but in a different fashion than Southern segregation weighed on blacks. Where segregation tried to keep blacks and whites separate, the new reservation policies attempted to change the "noble savage" into at least a facsimile of "civilized man," believing that this would require years of work. Indian children were sent away to boarding schools, where their hair was cut, their language banned, their clothes changed, and their beliefs mocked. Throughout the West, tribes continued to protest the destruction of their lives and cultures. One group, the Nez Perce, attempted to

leave the country, which prompted the US Army to chase a group of approximately 200 Nez Perce across three states as they tried to get to Canada, only to be caught 40 miles short of the border.[54] Their leader, Chief Joseph, became a symbol of native resistance after his speech in Washington in 1879 in which he condemned the national policy concerning Native Americans and, using the language of freedom and rights, asked that the government "Treat all men alike. Give them the same law. Give them all an even chance to live and grow. All men...are brothers...all people should have equal rights upon [the earth]."[55] In general, federal officials believed that Indians should embrace the religion, economic theories, gender roles, and agricultural techniques of their "betters." To help bring this about, in 1871 Congress revoked the treaty system that had governed Indian-white relations since the founding of the republic. This decision was supported in part by railroad companies greedy for Indian land joined with the the Republican Party and argued that the treaty system went against the hard-won national unity of the Civil War. The goal was to foist limited citizenship upon Native Americans.

The multifaceted battle over citizenship and its attending rights continued: African Americans were fighting for citizenship in the face of Jim Crow at the same time Native

---

[54] See West, *The Last Indian War,* for the most recent examination of the events surrouding this. West also makes a convincing case that the Indian Wars were not simply part of a plan to deal with the country's indigenous population, but also part of a broader period of nation building in the post-Civil War era.

[55] Speech by Chief Joseph in Washington, D.C., in 1879. Text available at http://www.pbs.org/weta/thewest/resources/archives/six/jospeak.htm in section IV. Another blow to native communities was the near destruction of the buffalo. After 1870 a company in Philadelphia invented a way to make buffalo hide into a cheap leather. This combined with the railroads, which cut right through buffalo grazing paths, opened the way for over four million buffalo to be killed between 1872 and 1874, leaving the meat to rot—meat that many native groups had depended upon for food and trade. By 1886, when the Smithsonian had sent out an expedition to find some buffalo for their collection they had trouble finding 25 buffalo that were acceptable—this was from a population that was numbered at somewhere around 30 million in 1800.

Americans were forced to join the United States. As the government tried to persuade American Indians to assimilate, it passed laws and acts to speed up the process, but its efforts were nearly always defeated as native peoples opted to retain their tribal affiliation over becoming "American." Ironically, the Supreme Court helped foster the non-acculturation of Native Americans by ruling that the 14th and 15th Amendments did not apply to Indian groups. In *Elk v. Wilkins* (1884), the US Supreme Court questioned whether any Indian had ever attained the level of civilization necessary for citizenship and answered with a resounding "no." Through the Court's opinion, the old maxim of "kill the Indian, save the Man" was reinvigorated, prompting the government and private citizens to search out new ways to deal with the so-called Indian problem.

In 1887, Congress passed the Dawes Act. Named for Senator Henry Dawes, the Act was an attempt by the government to persuade Native Americans to adopt white culture. The idea was to break reservations into individual land plots for private ownership, which provided a means for the president to grant citizenship to tribes willing to abandon the old ways. In this way, Indians were compelled to accept white notions of private land ownership in exchange for American citizenship. Any land left over was sold to white settlers. For example, on the Nez Perce reservation, some 172,000 acres were divided into farms for the tribe. White settlers received the remaining 500,000 acres. At the time, Indians owned about 138 million acres of land nationally. Over the next fifty years, the tribes lost some 86 million acres, but by 1900 only about 53,000 Indians had become citizens under the Dawes Act's provisions. In 1901, Congress granted citizenship to 100,000 Native Americans in the Indian Territory (modern-day Oklahoma). The rest of the country's Native American population would have to wait until 1919 (for WWI veterans) and 1924 for Congress to declare that they were citizens, a "privilege" often

hotly contested within Indian Country.[56]

THE Progressive Era (ap. 1896-1920) is often seen as the beginning of America's efforts to guarantee existing rights to white males and extend them to women and some immigrants, as well as setting the precedent for America's particular style of interventionist foreign policy. In general, Progressive ideology, formed out of a mixture of the Social Gospel and internationalism created systems within American society to lift up the downtrodden via education, government intervention, and private efforts.[57] During this period, the American worker won better workplace safety and working hours, women won the right to vote, and in many cases the ideal of full citizenship was more forcefully disseminated. To argue, however, that the Progressive Era was a victorious moment for social justice at home and abroad neglects the conflicted nature of Progressive activists.[58] Indeed, many of the Progressive Era's reforms neglected the plight of

[56] For comprehensive, yet accessible, look at the history of American legal structures pertaining to Native Americans, see N. Bruce Duthu, *American Indians and the Law* (New York: Penguin, 2009). For the most comprehensive collection of laws, treaties, and other governmental issues dealing with Native Americans, see Felix S. Cohen, *Handbook of Federal Indian Law* (Newark: LexisNexis, 2005, revised and expanded).

[57] To see the development of international Progressive ideology, see James T. Kloppenberg, *Uncertain Victory: Social Democracy and Progressivism in European and American Thought, 1870-1920* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986) and Daniel T. Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998).

[58] In general, the history of the Progressive cannot be classified as either pro-rights or anti-rights. Thanks to Peter Filene's excellent re-assessment of the movement in 1970, historians can argue that the biggest change coming out of the Progressive Era was simply a general willingness by the people to use the government for some end—reform, segregation, etc. See, Peter Filene, "An Obituary for the Progressive Movement," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. (1) (1970): 20-34. For other treatments, especially in an global context, of the Progressive Era, see Daniel T. Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998); Sanders, *Roots of Reform*; James T. Kloppenberg, *Uncertain Victory: Social Democracy and Progressivism in European and American Thought, 1870-1920*

African Americans, who were further pushed into neo-slavery by systems of sharecropping and tenant farming, making them vulnerable to lynch mobs and groups like the Ku Klux Klan (KKK).[59]

While America was pursuing domestic reform, it also began to venture outside its traditional international lanes. Before the 1890s, America was considered a second-rate world power. In 1880, the sultan of Turkey terminated the Turkish embassy in America to cut expenses; that same year, the American navy was smaller than Denmark's. At the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885, when Africa was divided up among the European powers, America attended but did not sign any of the agreements. The 1890s, however, saw this change. Largely due to industrialization and the economic expansion of the Gilded Age, Americans now viewed their country from an internationalist perspective and believed themselves to be an emerging international player. Alongside this new vision grew the belief that America had a duty to proclaim its civilization to the world. One group of Americans in particular worked to spread US influence abroad: missionaries—both of religion and modernity—went to Africa, Asia, Latin America, and all points in between and proclaimed the gospel of democracy.[60] This group aggressively promoted expansionism, and argued that America and its ideals must be bestowed

---

(New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Peter J. Coleman, *Progressivism and the World of Reform: New Zealand and the Origins of the American Welfare State* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1987).

[59] Native Americans were also generally left out the Progressive reforms. For a survey of Native American activity in the United States during the Progressive Era, see Paul C. Rosier, *Serving Their Country: American Indian Politics and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008), chapters 1 and 2.

[60] See Ian Tyrell, *Reforming the World: The Creation of America's Moral Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010. I am indebted to Roland Marchand's *Advertising the American Dream: Making Way for Modernity, 1920-1940* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985) for the phrase and idea of "missionaries of modernity."

upon less-developed races.[61] While presenting a confident outward face, the United States was in reality struggling to define itself and interpret its ideals in the face of a changing international world.

This angst was vividly apparent in America's global "coming out party," the Spanish American War (1898). The conflict, rooted in Cuba's struggle for independence from Spain, had started in 1868, and by 1895 the independence movement was supported in the United States as stories of Spanish atrocities against Cubans were circulated. Demands for American involvement grew and only intensified after an explosion on the *USS Maine* in February 1898. Some 270 people were killed; the press blamed the Spanish and demanded the *Maine* be avenged. In April 1898, President McKinley asked Congress for a declaration of war, a request which was quickly granted. Congress also adopted the Teller Amendment, which stated that America had no intention of annexing Cuba as this would impede on the emerging nation's ability to govern itself. The Spanish-American War lasted only four months with fewer than 400 American combat deaths. In fact, the single most important battle of the war took place in the Philippines, not Cuba. On May 1st, after Admiral George Dewey defeated a Spanish fleet, U.S. soldiers went ashore as the first American troops to fight outside of the Western hemisphere. In July 1898, America landed troops on Cuba and Puerto Rico and the war quickly ended.

Thanks to the war, America had proved its mettle on the international stage and landed itself a colony to boot.[62] But President McKinley did not want a colony, and indeed the nation itself was torn over the issue. After the war, the United States forced the new Cuban government

---

[61] The Baptist Church, which Jimmy Carter was affiliated with, was at the forefront of these efforts.

[62] The United States would gain control over Guan, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. America would also retain a large amount of control of Cuban affairs.

to approve the Platt Amendment, allowing America to intervene in Cuba whenever it saw fit (and the United States received Guantanamo Bay in perpetuity). McKinley was sure that America could not keep the Philippines, but he felt that the islands could not be left to their own devices as they were unprepared for independence. McKinley ultimately decided that America had the duty to civilize the Filipinos and tutor them in the ways of nationhood. The citizens of the Philippines resented this new civilizing mission. They had been at war with Spain since 1896, and once McKinley decided to keep the islands, they went to war with the US, a conflict that lasted until 1903. Some 100,000 Filipinos and 4,200 Americans died in the fighting. American troops burned villages, tortured prisoners, raped women, and executed civilians—actions that tarnished America's image but placed the nation alongside the other colonial powers.[63] During the insurrection, the status of America's new subjects in the commonwealth was continuously revised—not along ideas of self-governance and equal citizenship, but along entrenched beliefs regarding white superiority. Indeed, when William Taft became governor-general in 1901, he expressed the view that it would take a century to bring civilization and democracy to the islands.[64] The Taft administration worked hard to modernize the region by expanding railroads and harbors, bringing schoolteachers, and teaching new agricultural techniques. US citizenship for Filipinos, however, was out of the question.

---

[63] For basic examinations of the Spanish-American War, America's changing diplomacy in this era, and how America was viewing itself on the international stage, see Robert L. Beisner, *From the Old Diplomacy to the New, 1865-1900* (Wheeling: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1986); Walter LaFeber, *The American Search for Opportunity, 1865-1913* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); George C. Herring, *Form Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), chapters 6-9 (especially chapter 8).

[64] This is not to say America governed in the Philippines in either direct or indirect colonial systems. The United States never had a clear-cut plan of colonization, save the underlying ideology behind the Insular Cases.

At home, politicians argued over what to do with the new possessions. America, some argued, should not become a colonial power, prompting debates over nationhood, democracy, and race. In 1900, the Foraker Act declared Puerto Rico an "insular territory," meaning that Puerto Rico could not become a state. Its citizens were defined primarily as Puerto Rican, not American, citizens, which denied them the benefit of Constitutional protection. From 1901 to 1904, in a series of rulings called the "Insular Cases," the Supreme Court extended the logic of the Foraker Act and argued that the Constitution did not fully apply to these new territories. These regions would be governed on an "as needed basis" for an indefinite period, violating two of America's founding ideals: no taxation without representation and consent of the governed.[65]

The growing debates of the early Progressive Era paved the way for a contest of American political ideologies. The election of 1912 brought into sharp relief the nation's changing understanding of government and in particular its role in maintaining and extending citizenship. Theodore Roosevelt, the bombastic leader of the new "Bull Moose" Party, argued for the "New Nationalism," a national approach to the problems of industrial growth, expansion of rights, and the stewardship of national resources. Woodrow Wilson, a historian-turned-politician, presented the country with a counter-offer: the New Freedom. Rhetorically, the New Freedom would, like Roosevelt's plan, attempt to deal with the problems of the nation, but from within each state rather than the federal government. Wilson won the election, and his implementation of the New Freedom had a starkly nationalist overtone as he created federal bodies to exert greater control on the economy.

[65] See above noted works for further explanations of these cases and acts. Suffice to say, the Foraker Act and the Insular cases showed there was little desire to apply any ideal of "rights" abroad as America was expanding its presence internationally.

By the start of 1916, Wilson pushed for more reform laws at home, incorporating ideas from Roosevelt's earlier New Nationalism. Wilson was motivated to push these reforms forward as the Republican Party had reunited with the Bull Moose Party after the disastrous Republican split during 1912. Wilson knew he owed his 1912 victory to this split and needed to devise a new plan. In 1916, Wilson named Louis Brandeis to the Supreme Court, a win for Progressives—Republican and Democrat alike—for Brandeis was a noted labor advocate and the first Jewish person appointed to the Court. Wilson also signed the Adamson Act, imposing an eight-hour day on railroads and creating a new commission to study this perpetually problematic sector. Indeed, he eventually endorsed the eight-hour day for all workers. The Keating-Owen Act (1916) was the first federal child labor law, prohibiting interstate commerce relating to products manufactured by children under the age of fourteen. By the end of his term in Washington, Wilson reversed his earlier position and supported women's suffrage.

Underneath Wilson, American diplomacy took on a decidedly moralistic tone as Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan helped to advance Wilson's belief that America had the duty to help less fortunate nations along the path to democracy.[66] In 1913, Wilson rhetorically shifted America's relationship with Latin American and promised a move away from the "dollar" diplomacy of his predecessors. In truth, while the president argued for a new ideological high ground he maintained the style of an economically driven, patronizing diplomacy erected by Roosevelt and Taft. In this spirit, Wilson intervened in Mexico against the "butcher" Victoriano Huerta, arguing that Latin American governments must be based on the just exercise of law. This attitude set in place an interventionist American policy toward Latin

[66] For an excellent examination of Woodrow Wilson's foreign policy, see Thomas J. Knock, *To End All Wars: Woodrow Wilson and the Quest for a New World Order* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992). For an excellent recent biography of Wilson, see John Milton Cooper, *Woodrow Wilson: A Biography* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2009).

America that prompted questions by Mexicans and others as to America's commitment to the advancement of democratic rule.

As World War I broke out in 1914, Wilson initially kept America out of the Old World conflict. By 1917, however, Wilson led the country into war, prompting an increase in anti-German sentiment and persecution across the country. Along with this came the first major government effort to restrict freedom of speech since 1798. The Espionage Act (1917), Trading-with-the-Enemy Act (1917), and the Sedition Act (1918) all worked to restrict what individuals and the press could say about the United States, the government, and the war effort. The combined effect of these acts was the charging of over two thousand people, about half of which were convicted. These repressive actions prompted the First Red Scare, a reaction fueled by Wilson himself, who argued vehemently against Bolshevism and the success Russian Revolution of 1917.[67] In an effort to nip Soviet expansion in the bud and halt the spread of global communism, Wilson sent fifteen thousand troops to Russia. While there, the American troops joined forces with anti-Bolshevik groups and stayed until 1920. By the end of his term, Wilson had set in place laws similar in scope and nature to John Adams' Alien and Sedition Acts, severely challenging the rule of law in the United States while also subverting his own international policies.

The end of World War I and the Treaty of Versailles negotiations afforded Wilson the opportunity to see his plans for a global peace become reality, in what Thomas Knock has termed "progressive internationalism."[68] Wilson's Fourteen Points argued for a change in the international system, including revisions to treaty negotiations, adjusting the colonial order, self-

[67] This is yet another fulfillment of the problematic aspect of Kant's modification of political philosophy, where a majority can terrorize a minority population.

[68] See Knock, *To End All Wars*.

determination, and the establishment of a League of Nations. Many of Wilson's idealistic goals were compromised at Versailles by the desires of the Old World powers, and when he brought home his concession-laden Treaty to a Senate led by Henry Cabot Lodge (R-MA) it was shot down. Wilson refused to negotiate any further, which sounded the death knell for America's involvement in the League of Nations and, for a time, ended its presumptive global leadership. After the war, the Progressive elements, both domestic and international, saw their dream of an ordered world evaporate. While some portions of the Progressive agenda would survive, it would never again enjoy the power it once held. The elections of the 1920s signaled America's turn away from reform and into the harsh glitter of reckless consumption.

The America of the 1920s saw Jim Crow still in power in the South, labor increasingly threatened, and immigrants still perceived as a threat to the American way of life. The 1920s, however, were not without some limited successes in civil rights, especially for women. American women experienced a newfound political freedom as their right to vote was formally acknowledged with the 19th Amendment (1920). Despite this new success, women were unable to compete equally in society as gender roles experienced little change. White men still maintained public dominance while the nation's women remained sequestered in the home. Other feminist causes did not entirely die out; the Towner Act (1921) established health care programs for mothers and infants. A bid for a full-scale child labor law failed in 1925, but women still fought to be included in juries and as well as other measures of equality and protection. A notable effort occurred in 1923 with the Sheppard-Towner Act, which provided federal assistance to programs for infant and child healthcare, but it would fail in the face of widespread opposition from without, and within, the women's movement.

The economic crash of October 1929—though a long time in the making—placed the country firmly in the grips of the Great Depression. The financial (and soon ecological) calamity eroded the nation's perception of itself and prompted a period of national soul-searching regarding the usefulness of American-style capitalism. Herbert Hoover, president during the early years of the Depression, attempted to refrain from using the government to intervene in the lives of its people. Hoover, echoing the concerns of his fellow Republicans, feared government intervention would simply exacerbate the situation. When his belated efforts to extend aid failed (shifting from Volunteerism to Associationalism), Franklin Roosevelt took over in Washington, and immediately proffered an undefined "New Deal" to America.

The New Deal was in many ways an extension and modification of Populism and Progressivism. New Deal programs built on the Populist desire to create a more just economic order and focused on achieving economic justice through the reformation and regulation of capitalism. Roosevelt and his advisors felt that capitalism was fine; it had just gotten out of hand and needed to be restrained. While Progressivism had offered varied efforts at social reform, the New Deal generally steered clear of the sweeping social reorganization of the early twentieth century. Following the repeal of Prohibition, FDR showed little interest in social reform efforts such as settlement homes and offered little more than rhetorical support for racial and gender equality. Roosevelt tried to work within the constraints of the government as it was, modifying or correcting the parts that he could. By doing so, though, he elevated the power of the central government and injected it into sectors of the economy that a decade earlier would have been unthinkable. In doing so, he saved the American capitalist structure and changed the nature of American politics, laying the groundwork for the greatest expansion of rights in American life.[69]

New Deal legislation and government policies during World War II fostered the American people's growing expectations concerning federal presence in day-to-day life. The New Deal reforms, in part, established a social safety net with programs like Social Security for the elderly and unemployed and welfare payments for disabled adults and dependent children.

---

[69] See Nancy J. Weiss, *Farewell to the Party of Lincoln: Black Politics in the Age of FDR* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983).

Beginning in 1942, Social Security and other New Deal legislation marked a major change in how the government viewed its relationship to the people, and established for the first time a national system of benefits based on citizenship.[70]

By the beginning of America's involvement in the Second World War the ideas and debates on the rights—be they civil or human—of citizens, increasingly coalesced along two fronts: domestic concerns—in particular the growing African American and women's movements—and foreign affairs, that is to say, what form of government could ensure freedom for all people and who could best to enforce this. Though World War II challenged these ideas, Americans increasingly believed it was their duty to blaze a trail into greater freedom for humanity.

[70] For examinations of various elements of the New Deal, see Lizabeth Cohen, *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Colin Gordon, *New Deals: Business, Labor, and Politics in America, 1920-1935* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Ellis W. Hawley's classic *The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly* (Princeton: Princeton University Press) 1966; Anthony Badger, *The New Deal: The Depression Years, 1933-1940* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1989); Kim Phillips-Fein, *Invisible Hands: The Businessmen's Crusade Against the New Deal* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2009).

We look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression…The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way…The third is freedom from want…The fourth is freedom from fear.[71]

Chapter 2

Idealism and the American Century

In February 1941 Henry Luce wrote in his iconic *Life* Magazine about the new "American Century." He argued that the nation must "accept wholeheartedly our duty and our opportunity as the most powerful and vital nation in the world and in consequence to exert upon the world the full impact of our influence, for such purposes as we see fit and by such means as we see fit."[72] Though the United States could not ensure good behavior from all countries and peoples, America must work to create a "world-environment" that was safe, productive, and just.[73] In order to do this, the United States must share with all "our Bill of Rights, our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, our magnificent industrial products, [and] our technical skills."[74] Finally, Luce called on America to become "the Good Samaritan of the entire world."[75] Luce's essay attempted to define America's role in the postwar world, a world seemingly poised to accept America as messiah.

The news tycoon distilled America's perception of itself as World War II drew to a close and the Cold War developed. His writing offered a concise plan for how America should

---

[71] "Message to Congress, January 6, 1941. Franklin D. Roosevelt, accessed online at http://www.fdrlibrary.marist.edu/pdfs/ffreadingcopy.pdf (accessed April 4, 2013).

[72] *Life,* February 17, 1941.

[73] Ibid.

[74] Ibid.

[75] Ibid.

prioritize its global duties along the lines of Wilsonian internationalism, a vision that reaffirmed basic American principles writ large on the global stage, principles that had been under siege in the war. This prioritizing dovetailed with the birth of the Cold War, and for the emerging conservative movement, Washington's China policy became an early test of the White House's commitment to these new principles.

Franklin Roosevelt had his own vision of the American mission; he pledged the nation to fight for the protection and establishment of the Four Freedoms: freedom of religion, freedom from fear and want, and freedom of speech. While Roosevelt and his administration worked to prepare the nation for war at home, he set in motion a series of events that placed the United States at the forefront of the international debates surrounding human rights after World War II. The Atlantic Charter (August 1941), what Elizabeth Borgwardt called the "defining, inaugural moment for what we now know as the modern doctrine of human rights," provided FDR a framework to expand and broaden the promise of the New Deal to Europe and Asia.[76]

The civil rights movement reached a fever pitch at the same time Washington was debating the nation's new international role. By 1977, America's interest in human rights at home and abroad had grown at the same time America formally recognized Beijing as the leader of East Asia. Thus, the story of America's evolving ideas on human rights is intimately tied to that of its evolving relationship with Communist China. America's relationships with human rights and with China, while often diverging, came crashing together under Carter's tenure in the White House.

---

[76] Elizabeth Borgwardt, *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), 4. See also Mary Ann Glendon, *A World Made New: Eleanor Roosevelt and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (New York: Random House, 2001).

AS World War II ended, the seeds of the Cold War were planted. This conflict represented a return to an earlier attitude by Washington that had prompted Wilson to send troops to Russia in 1917 to hold back the forces of Soviet communism. As the 1940s came to a close, Soviet critiques of America's commitment to domestic human rights grew. Moscow, claiming to have solved the problem of minority rights, triumphantly pointed out the persistence of institutionalized racism in the US.[77] The Soviet critique was well placed. Truman's Fair Deal had sought to address civil rights, but by the end of his term in office the President had achieved only desegregation of the military via Executive Order 8891. While Truman was able to place civil rights in the Democratic Party platform, leadership in the fight for civil rights increasingly came from nongovernmental groups like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). The NAACP began waging battles in the nation's courts as it focused on tearing down *Plessy vs. Ferguson* (1896). During the early years of the Cold War, Washington remained silent regarding human rights, save denunciations of Soviet-lead communism as the chief affront to the democratic rights of all people and a desire to see China remain "free" from bondage.[78] Underneath the silence, however, changes were afoot.

As Truman's administration scrambled to define its relationship to the Cold War it soon found itself fighting for survival at home. Henry Luce increasingly portrayed the Democratic

---

[77] For two intriguing examinations of Moscow's claim, see Yuri Slezkin, *Arctic Mirrors: Russia and the Small Peoples of the North* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994) and Francine Hirsch, *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005). After 1949, China would jump on the bandwagon as well, establishing a set of fifty-six officially incorporated minorities. See Thomas J. Mullaney, *Coming to Terms with the Nation: Ethnic Classification in Modern China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).

[78] A notable exception to this came from the growing voice of China watchers, led by Henry Luce.

Party as weak on Communism, especially in Asia. Luce went on the offensive in 1948, aligned Time, Inc. with the Republican Party and ultimately supported Eisenhower in the 1952 election.[79] The *Time* owner and other conservatives argued in 1947 and 1948 that the defense of Nationalist China required a strong Republican president. After 1949, Luce declared the same was needed to retake Beijing and roll back communism everywhere else. Meanwhile, the Second Red Scare settled over America. The House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC), formed in 1938, refined its focus to rooting out potential Communist spies. Under pressure from HUAC, Truman's administration enacted a loyalty program in 1947, which forced government employees to declare allegiance to America or face draconian consequences.

The Red Scare culminated with the rise of Senate hearings led by Joseph McCarthy (R-WI). These hearings wrought havoc on the nation's ability to understand the tumultuous events occurring in the world, and especially in China.[80] McCarthy, seeking to retain his Senate seat, began a five-year witch-hunt intent on finding anyone who might possibly be construed as anti-American. His power was based on fear, a fear that allowed a successful suspension of American civil liberties as blacklists were imposed from universities to Hollywood, which

---

[79] Robert E. Herzstein, *Henry R. Luce, Time, and the American Crusade in Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 58-60.

[80] Charlatanism aside, McCarthyism's draw did not appear like a rabbit from a hat. Traditionalists throughout the emerging Sunbelt and elsewhere began incorporating the fear of Communism at home and abroad with their ideas of social politics as the 1940s came to a close. As this occurred, the nation's conservative political forces became nationally accepted as long-standing concerns regarding domestic and diplomatic policy became increasingly intertwined. Conservative groups increasingly aligned themselves with the national Republican Party and latched on to the demagoguery of neo-Nativist groups and white supremacists the South and Sunbelt. See Godfrey Hodgson, *The World Turned Right Side Up: A History of the Conservative Ascendancy in America* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1996); Philip Jenkins, *A Decade of Nightmares: The End of the Sixties and the Making of Eighties America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); and Darren Dochuk, *From Bible Belt to Sun Belt: Plain-Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Rise of Evangelical Conservatism* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2011).

alienated those with a different view than the powerful politician.[81] The cost of McCarthy's actions was high: the State Department was purged of Asia experts and consultants, like Owen Lattimore, thought to be fellow travelers. This deprived the White House of desperately needed expertise throughout the 1950s and early 1960s. McCarthyites also attacked the burgeoning civil rights movement and accused its members of being communists intent on destroying the nation.

The civil rights movement proved resilient, however. In 1954, the NAACP successfully demolished the *Plessy* ruling. *Brown vs. the Board of Education* (1954) declared "separate but equal" unconstitutional, and the Warren Court ordered integration with "all deliberate speed." In response, a defiant South began a long campaign of massive resistance against the Court's order that came to a head in Little Rock, Arkansas. In 1957, faced with Governor Orval Faubus' intransigent stance on integrating Central High, the President dispatched federal troops to enforce the *Brown* decision. Afterward, Eisenhower put forward a weak civil rights bill—the first since Reconstruction—and created the Commission for Civil Rights. African Americans, encouraged by these victories, embarked on a more direct course of action.

After *Brown* was handed down, civil rights leaders like Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the pastor-turned-voice of the civil rights movement, worked for legal and political equality with renewed vigor. They argued direct action was the way to ensure the citizenship promised in the Fourteenth Amendment. Many civil rights leaders adopted a strategy of nonviolence, which, when compared to Southern extremism, aroused white middle class consciences and forced Washington to rethink its position. At the same time, criticism from the Soviet Union concerning America's rights abuses at home continued and damaged the United States'

[81] Herzstein, *Henry R. Luce*, 120-124. Luce would also have little problem letting his friend and *Time Magazine* staffer Whittaker Chambers be crucified during the McCarthy hearings.

credibility in the decolonizing world.[82] The failure of the federal government to institute civil rights for minorities was touted by the Soviets as visible proof of America's lack of adherence to the ideals Luce had so proudly proclaimed.

As post-war America enjoyed the comfortable conformity of the Eisenhower years, a growing counter-culture emerged alongside the Civil Rights Movement and helped challenge the status quo. This group—the Beatniks, folk heroes like Woody Guthrie, and others—added new facets to demands that Washington focus on producing justice and equality at home and abroad. The election of John Kennedy in 1960 seemed to indicate this would happen and that Washington would address the human rights issue at home and abroad. Kennedy, the new face of the Democratic Party, was young, handsome, and spoke convincingly about humanitarian programs abroad like the Peace Corps and the need for reform at home, attracting the country's disgruntled youth. In 1960 and 1961, however, Kennedy was unable to push through a health care bill or reform the nation's education systems. In part, this was because Congress, still dominated by the conservative coalition, had little incentive to further the young President's agenda. Kennedy's primary focus was on fighting the Cold War and retaining southern political support for the next election cycle. Election concerns paired with shock as massive resistance turned violent throughout the south. With the Civil Rights Movement increasingly discontented with Washington's inaction, in 1961 the Congress for Racial Equality (CORE) sponsored freedom rides to test the Supreme Court's recent decision outlawing segregation on public transportation. Only after rides were attacked and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was jailed in Birmingham did the young President and his brother, Robert, pay more attention to civil rights

[82] See Thomas Borstelman's *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001) for an indepth discussion of this.

efforts, but their concern was belated, half-hearted, and partially in response to criticism from the communist world.[83]

As Kennedy struggled with the Civil Rights movement, conservatives in the GOP began taking on a new role in American political life, foreshadowing a massive shift in the country's population. Beginning during the Great Depression and continuing through World War II and the post-war boom, thousands of families left the South for the emerging "Sunbelt," that region of the American southwest centered in western Arizona and Southern California. Largely blue-collar, evangelical, and concerned about the status and security of the American dream, these people coalesced around religious leaders like Billy Graham and politicians like Barry Goldwater and eventually Ronald Reagan. As a whole, this group was concerned that communism would continue to spread unless radical action was taken at every level. By the end of the 1950s they advocated a paradoxical view: Washington should create both *free* man (economically) and *moral* man. This was at first a quiet attempt to challenge the supremacy of New Deal liberalism and its reliance on Reinhold Niebuhr's Christian Pragmatism. Concerned with redeeming mankind both from what they saw as creeping Socialism in Washington and creeping atheism in the nation's universities, the conservative movement grew in the aftermath of the *Brown* decision, the resurgence of feminism, and the election of a young Catholic president.

Following Kennedy's assassination in 1963, Lyndon Johnson, his larger-than-life Vice President, took the reigns. LBJ would usher in the nation's most sweeping rights reforms since the New Deal with his Great Society. The Great Society encompassed everything from a War on Poverty to the Civil and Voting Rights Acts and increased environmental protection. The

---

[83] See Mark Stern's *Calculating Visions: Kennedy, Johnson, and Civil Rights* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992) for succinct study of Kennedy's civil rights policies.

program—often hampered by LBJ's need to deal with the crisis in Vietnam—created an America that was more just and prosperous. Attempts to derail the program, such as Southern efforts to weaken the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by a adding a clause on gender, actually served to grant greater freedom to women, immigrants, and Native Americans in the coming decades.[84] As a whole, the Great Society's efforts created a new emphasis on protecting the *positive* rights of American citizens, as opposed to the traditional focus on *negative* rights. For example, during the nineteenth century the government could not restrict belief or speech; rights were defined along what the government could *not do*. Washington now believed its duty was to guarantee and enforce the right of all citizens *to do* something; namely, vote.

The rights of women, which had experienced a new visibility with the election of Kennedy and his creation of the President's Commission on the Status of Women in 1963, continued to expand under the Great Society. The White House's willingness to deal more forcefully with gender rights, like the civil rights battles for African Americans, did not occur quickly. Indeed, prior to the Kennedy administration, women—even highly educated women—were still refused jobs deemed "masculine" and encouraged to pursue the more "feminine" roles of secretary, stewardess, and teacher, so long as they were single—or at least not pregnant. To make matters worse, American women were scattered geographically and ideologically, a severe disadvantage when it came to organizing a campaign to promote and defend their rights. This changed with the publication of Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* in 1963, a work that

[84] The Supreme Court produced rulings protecting citizen's rights to have a lawyer in court, declared that suspects had to be informed of their constitutional rights, and had to have counsel present when being interrogated by the police. The Court also ruled that Tennessee had to redraw district lines so that equal representation could be had in Memphis in 1962 (*Baker vs. Car*, discussed more fully in the next chapter).

galvanized the second wave of American feminism.[85] Following Friedan's lead, women across the country adopted tactics from the civil rights movement and organized meetings, marches, and protests in an effort to place their needs before politicians and the White House. Thanks in part to Friedan's efforts and the gender clause in 1964's Civil Rights Act, women were able to seriously challenge the glass ceiling in employment and wages for the first time. They achieved further protections with the 1973 Supreme Court ruling in *Roe vs. Wade* that granted greater levels of personal rights in decisions relating to health care.[86]

The rights struggle, though, took its toll on the nation. By the time Richard Nixon was elected in 1968, the country was weary of reform. The Democratic convention in Chicago devolved into chaos as warfare erupted in the streets; violent protests in major urban areas like Los Angeles and Washington, D.C. continued as well. As a result of domestic turmoil and the discontent that surrounded the Vietnam War, President Johnson removed himself from electoral politics. This action served to bring about a measure domestic stability; stability that ushered in a more conservative era in the protection of domestic human rights. While the Nixon and Ford administrations saw advances in some areas, by 1976 the Republican administrations were seen as corrupt, unfit for rule, and regressive on issues such as school integration. Congress, reacting

---

[85] Betty Friedan, *The Feminie Mystique* (New York: Norton, 1963).

[86] For good surveys of women's rights battles and the role of women in post-1945 American life, see Carl Degler, *At Odds: Women and the Family in American from the Revolution to the Present* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980); Elaine T. May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1999). For brief overall look at the period, see Woods, *Quest for Identity*, 363-370. The politicization of women during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s was not limited to liberal groups. In particular, conservative icon Phyllis Schlafly and her Eagle Forum would dominate the airwaves in the fight over the ERA, arguing for a more traditional understanidng of the role of women in American life. For recent look at Schlafly's life and work, see Donald T. Critchlow, *Phyllis Schlafly and Grassroots Conservatism: A Woman's Crusade* (Princeton Princeton University Press, 2008).

to the growth of the conservative coalition and a desire to wrest control of America's purpose, struggled to become the champion of human rights at home and abroad.

HUMAN rights policy has generally been labeled a liberal cause, but the conservative movement had its own idealists, and in foreign policy they focused their hopes on a non-communist China. The country's interest in Asia dated from the Opium Wars (circa 1839-1860) and increased as the fruits of the Spanish-American War (1898)—the Philippines and Guam—placed the fabled economic and spiritual markets of China firmly within reach.[87] Henry Luce capitalized on this and used his magazines to influence "the way in which many Americans came to view China," creating a new sense of union between the United States and the struggling *Guomindang* (GMD), one that equated China and "everything Chinese so closely with ideals and events familiar to most Americans."[88] According to historian Christopher Jespersen, Henry Luce, the son of Christian missionaries to China, "foster[ed] illusions about Sino-American harmony that Americans would then insist must be preserved."[89] The media titan painted a picture of China analogous to nostalgic images that had stirred an earlier America, and argued that China needed American support and aid against encroaching Russian communism.[90]

---

[87] This is not to say America had no contact or interest in Asia prior to the Opium Wars. For an excellent new summary of America's contact with China in particular in the 18th and early 19th centuries, see Dong Wang, *The United States and China: A History from the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. 2013), chp. 1-2.

[88] T. Christopher Jespersen, *American Images of China, 1931-1949* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), xix; 23.

[89] Jespersen, *American Images*, 23.

[90] Jespersen, *American Images*, 24.

After World War II, Pro-Chinese Nationalist writers in America like Luce rehashed old arguments about communism and China; namely that communism was monolithic and that if Beijing fell it would be controlled by Moscow just like all other Marxist-Leninist regimes. This belief only grew in the aftermath of Mao's victory in the fall of 1949. By December, as the arguments that Truman had lost China gained ground, the noted conservative journal *Human Events* began revising history. Its authors argued that America alone had "refrained from infringement on the territorial integrity of China" during the Second World War, and that only the United States had "consistently championed China's interests in her relations with the rest of the world."[91]

Before the war, the perception had been that Josef Stalin, master of Russian communism, and thereby the global communist effort, had no problem using other communist organizations to "create trouble" for governments he had little regard for, especially the Chinese Nationalists.[92] Following the outbreak of World War II, conservative commentators focused on the civil war between the *Guomindang* (GMD) and the Chinese Communist Party (CCP)—especially as the CCP was under "double pressure" from Moscow to tone down its revolutionary ideology.[93] Conservative writers argued that the CCP was not a standard Marxist revolutionary group; rather, it was made up of "'agrarian radicals' under Russian influence" and as such would be a difficult group to work with at the end of the war.[94] This was a particularly urgent problem as the "future

---

[91] "China and Bipartisanship" by Henry P. Fletcher, *Human Events*, Vol. 6, No. 50, 14 December 1949, 2-3.

[92] "The True Soviet Challenge" Chamberlin, *Human Events*, 45.

[93] "How Strong is China?" by William Henry Chamberlin, *Human Events* Vol. 1, pg 81, 1944.

[94] "Our Dilemma in China" by Frank C. Hanigen, *Human Events* Vol. 1, pg 95, 1944.

peace of East Asia depend[ed] on a Soviet-American understanding about the status of China."[95] Caution was needed lest "the Asiatic war will give the Kremlin as many chances to profit by Roosevelt's lack of constructive policy as Russia has had in Eastern Europe."[96] The question remained as to how Stalin would mobilize Mao and his allies. Would they become "a pressure group to try and keep Chiang Kai-shek in line with Moscow's demands in foreign policy," or would Mao's troops win the civil war, becoming a puppet government led by Moscow?[97]

The writers at *Human Events* and other conservative voices wanted China to fill the power vacuum left by the collapse of Japan after the war, as long as it was not controlled by Moscow.[98] At the war's end, Mao was seen as Stalin's proxy, and "Since the Chinese Communists traditionally follow the lead of Moscow, their overlordship [sic] of [Northwest China] would be tantamount to making North China a part of Russia's sphere."[99] This was unacceptable to pro-GMD pundits, not only because of Communism, but because they believed Americans "fundamentally went to war in the Pacific to insure [sic] the integrity of China."[100] These authors argued that the Soviets were engaged in a waiting game in China, "digesting the

---

[95] "Soviet Aims in Asia" by William Henry Chamberlin, *Human Events*, Vol. 1, pg 122, 1944.

[96] "For What Are We Fighting in Asia?" by Norman Thomas, *Human Events*, Vol. 2, pg 39, 1945.

[97] "Stalin's Fifth Columns" by William Henry Chamberlin, *Human Events*, Vol. 2 pg 86, 1945.

[98] "High Stakes in the Far East" by William Henry Chamberlin, *Human Events*, Vol. 2 pg 98, 1945.

[99] "The Far Eastern Dilemma" by Frank C. Hanigen, *Human Events*, Vol. 2 pg. 139, 1945. See also "The Control of Manchuria" by Felix Morely, *Human Events*, Vol. 2 pg. 197, 1945.

[100] "The Far Eastern Dilemma" by Frank C. Hanigen.

solid advantages which accrued from the Soviet-Chinese Treaty of August 1945."[101] This was problematic for the establishment and maintenance of democracy in Asia. The journal's authors argued that as "Democracy is not a matter of name or form" and must "grow through a slow process of evolution," Asia must remain free from Communist control.[102]

As reports of the civil war reached America in 1946, conservative commentator William H. Chamberlain observed that the Chinese were falling prey to the "Soviet pattern" of "exploitation of internal forces of revolt and divisions for purposes of over-all Soviet imperialist control."[103] Chamberlain believed that the growing success of the Communists in China was due to Moscow; he simply ignored the excesses and paranoia of the Nationalists. Mao and his army, Chamberlain declared, looked to the Kremlin "for inspiration and guidance" in order to play "a leading role in the forces of unrest and disorder" which threatened Jiang Jieshi (Chiang Kai-shek).[104] After China fell it quickly replaced Munich as the symbol of appeasement in the eyes of many in the United States, not just conservatives.[105]

Following China's "fall," the Cold War battleground shifted to the Korea as Russia and America established regimes in the north and south of the peninsula. By 1949, both superpowers had reduced their forces in the region in lieu of elections to unify the country. Instead, on June

---

[101] "The Course of Soviet Expansion" by William Henry Chamberlin, *Human Events*, Vol. 3, No. 6, 6 February 1946, pg 3.

[102] "Japan and Democracy" by Kiyoshi K. Kawakami, *Human Events,* Vol. 3, No. 3, 16 January 1946, pg. 3.

[103] "The Soviet Pattern for China," William Henry Chamberlin, Vol. 4, No. 46, 12 November 1947, pg 1.

[104] "The Communist Offensive in Asia," William Henry Chamberlin, Vol. 5 No. 42 20 October 1948. In general, this work adheres to current *pinyin* transliterations of Chinese names.

[105] Heale, *American Anticommunism*, 155.

25, 1950, North Korean troops crossed the 38th Parallel in a surprise attack and nearly pushed the remaining American troops and the South Korean army into the ocean.[106] In September 1950, Douglas MacArthur broke through communist lines after his daring raid at Inchon, quickly closing on the Chinese border near the Yalu River. Zhou Enlai, the Chinese Foreign Minister, had warned the United States to stay away from the area, but a zealous MacArthur kept up his pursuit of the fleeing North Korean army. In response, that November over thirty divisions of the Chinese People's Liberation Army (PLA) crossed the Yalu and punched MacArthur's troops back down the Korean peninsula. The Chinese attack, despite warnings in the preceding months, took Washington by surprise. Americans had been certain the newly triumphant Mao would not take his fledgling country into war with a nuclear power. Over the 1950 holiday season and into early 1951, the American 8th Army pushed the Chinese back to the 38th parallel, where the battle lines stabilized. Faced with China's entry into the conflict, Truman quickly decided that while fighting communism in Asia was important, Moscow represented the primary threat. Pro-Nationalist Americans watched in dismay as Washington's focus returned to Europe; they never relinquished the argument that China was an agent of Moscow.

AS the Korean War drew to a close, foreign policy experts slowly reassessed their views of the "monolithic" communist world.[107] Analysts in Washington began to see the communist world as one that, while ideologically similar, increasingly was split between the Kremlin and Beijing. China and Russia's relationship was plagued by conflicted interpretations of the eternal

[106] See Woods, *Quest for Identity*, 52-62.

[107] See James Peck, *Washington's China: The National Security World, the Cold War, and the Origins of Globalism* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006), chp. 4-5.

revolution.[108] This re-evaluation was an unintended consequence of Eisenhower's redirection of America's foreign policy. Ike, elected in 1952, had promised to end the Korean War and continue the fight against Soviet communism; the new president seemed to be a product of a Red Scare world focused exclusively on Moscow. His refusal to take the fight to China in 1952 was a blow to supporters of Nationalist China in the US who still believed, even after the devastating show of power by Beijing in the winter of 1950, that China could be retaken. Eisenhower—though some State Department analysts had shifted their views—saw communism as a monolithic threat lead by Moscow. In general, Ike's take on diplomacy and containment, the New Look, created an era of nuclear brinksmanship with the new president focused on Soviet expansion abroad while he attempted to mute the growing power of domestic anti-communist coalitions.[109]

Eisenhower's first priority in Asia was protecting Jiang Jieshi—especially after Zhou Enlai's 1954 declaration that the mainland would "liberate" Taiwan from the Nationalist forces. Shortly after this announcement, the PLA began bombarding Quemoy and Matsu, two outlying islands near the coast of mainland China. Taiwan and Washington feared this was a prelude to a full-scale invasion. John Foster Dulles, Eisenhower's Secretary of State who had a flair for aligning America with right-wing dictatorships, travelled to Taipei and discussed the situation with Jiang. From these talks emerged the Mutual Defense Treaty (Formosa Treaty), which

---

[108] Peck, *Washington's China*, 6-7. Peck describes the slow change on communism in China in Washington during the Eisenhower years quite well. On NSC-68: the National Security Council Report #68 equated the expansion of communism *anywhere* with a threat to American national security. Crafted by Paul Nitze out of the legacy of the original containment doctrine, this ideology would become one of the major catalysts for American involvement in the Cold War's proxy battles. See John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*; Odde Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War*, Randall Woods and Howard Jones, *Dawning of the Cold War*.

[109] See Woods, *The Quest For Identity*, chp. 4 for a brief discussion of the development and application of the New Look.

promised American support in the event of an attack from the mainland as well as a commitment to sell defensive weapons to the island. Dulles, however, made sure to include in the Treaty that the United States alone would determine when it would act to protect Taiwan and the other islands claimed by the ROC.[110] For Washington, the Taiwan issue had become an matter of American credibility abroad as the White House strove to leverage their support of the island to gain allies in the growing Third World.

In particular, the emergence of the Bandung Conference (or Non-aligned Movement, NAM), illustrated the power of the Third World, whose decolonizing regions reinterpreted Wilsonianism and FDR's Four Freedoms as a clarion call for self-determination and the expansion of human rights. The United Nations itself underwent a massive shift as these newly independent nations joined the organization in the late 1950s. With this surge came two surprising phenomena: first—surprising perhaps only to the First World—was that the Third World forcefully defended their newly gained rights; second, America's UN ambassadors, under orders from Washington, abstained from participating in the human rights conversation due to fears of further Soviet critiques.[111] Stepping into the moral vacuum left by Washington was not

[110] John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History* (New York: The Penguin Press, 2005), 131. Despite the new agreement, the attacks by Red China continued throughout the fall of 1954 and into early 1955. In January 1955, Chinese mainland troops attacked Yikiang Island, prompting Ike to ask Congress for permission to use troops to defend Taiwan. The Formosa Resolution passed with wide margins in the House and Senate. In March, Dulles promised in a speech that in order to deal with the continued aggression of Beijing, Washington was prepared to use new weapons that destroyed military targets without hurting civilians—a bluff, to be sure, but one that worked. By April, the shelling had stopped, only to suddenly resume in the summer of 1958. Jiang had by now stationed a good portion of army on Quemoy and Matsu—something that Dulles decided was "rather foolish." While Beijing retained the right to shell the islands every other day, by and large the whole affair quieted down by the end of 1958. Quoted in Woods, *Quest for Identity*, 105.

Moscow, but Beijing—an unsettling turn of events for Washington that helped begin the process of re-evaluating the communist world. The PRC, though, was quickly repudiated by the other Bandung countries this thanks to its different vision of self-determination and its reluctance to endorse the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR, 1948).[112] Despite this brief setback, Washington watched in surprise as China began to compete with Moscow for resources and favor in Africa at the dawn of the 1960s.

By the end of the 1950s it was evident that Beijing and Moscow were attempting to play divergent roles, fighting over interpretations of the perpetual socialist revolution and each claiming the moral high ground in the struggle to promote social and economic justice.[113] As it became clear that China's revolutionary stature in the developing world had grown in the aftermath of Washington's rash actions in Korea, American efforts in Asia increasingly focused on nation building in an effort to win favor and friends. America supported Syngman Rhee's South Korea, aided, and subsequently supplanted the French in Vietnam, and maintained aid relationships with India, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Japan. Washington began competing with Beijing for dominance in Asia just as it was in Africa with Moscow.[114]

Competition in the developing world reached new heights after the 1960 election of John F. Kennedy. Though the young president was focused on Moscow and Cuba, the need to stand strong in South Vietnam drove him to commit American blood and treasure to maintain the

---

[111] See Roland Burke, *Decolonization and the Evolution of International Human Rights* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010) for an excellent (and, coincidentally, the only) discussion of this story.

[112] See Burke, *Decolonization,* 20-25.

[113] See Burke, *Decolonization*.

[114] Peck, *Washington's China*, 8-9.

failing government in Saigon. Kennedy's foreign policy, termed flexible response, led to a greater US military role in Vietnam, stalling any nascent attempts to build a new relationship with Beijing. Meanwhile, Kennedy breathed new life into America's humanitarian agenda, announcing the creation of the Peace Corps during a campaign speech at the University of Michigan in October 1960. Though, the Corps was a Cold War tool, it also exposed a generation of Americans to the struggles and desires of the developing world. Students and adults who dedicated two years to teaching agriculture or building clinics in Central America, Africa, or Asia returned home with a commitment to reform America's presence and reputation abroad. These young idealists were shocked and saddened by the sudden death of Kennedy in the fall of 1963 and looked with trepidation at the seemingly homespun-Texan, Lyndon Johnson, who took over in the Oval Office.

Lyndon Johnson entered the White House with a bold domestic plan that, like FDR, he subsequently tried to internationalize. A prime example was his proposal for a Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA)-style development program in the Mekong River Valley as America worked to defeat the Vietcong and establish democracy in South Vietnam.[115] Johnson reasoned that if he could call on America to rebuild itself, renewing its commitment to equality for all of its citizens, he could issue the same appeal to other countries. The United States, Press Secretary George Reedy told the Texan in 1964, was a "real inspiration and real example" for developing nations, a place that offered what Johnson later termed the path "to the liberation of man from every tyranny over his mind, his body, and his spirit."[116]

---

[115] See David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010) chapter 6.

By the end of Johnson's tenure in the White House, policy makers argued that communism was no longer monolithic, a development in the Cold War that opened the way for a new relationship with Beijing. Arguing that China, Russia, and Cuba had separate agendas, Washington insiders increasingly saw the PRC as a potential rival for supremacy in the East Asian world. Throughout the end of the 1960s and into the 1970s, Washington spent much time contemplating how to deal with this new reality. Though it would still fight communism in Vietnam, the battle to check communist expansion in Asia could now extend in previously unthinkable directions. The supposed "revolutionary blend of communism and radical nationalism that required an almost pathological fanaticism and hatred" for America and the West that James Peck describes could be met by a tentative alliance with Beijing aimed at containing Moscow.[117]

WITH the victory of Richard Nixon in 1968 and the ascent of Henry Kissinger to National Security Advisor, American Cold War diplomacy took a new turn. Washington began an adventure in *realpolitik* and détente abroad that culminated with the sudden opening to China in 1972. Enraged right-wing anti-communists charged that Nixon and Kissinger were selling out to

---

[116] Phone conversation, Lyndon Johnson to George Reedy, March 14, 1964, *The Presiden- tial Recordings: Lyndon B. Johnson, Toward the Great Society*, ed. David Shreve and Robert David Johnson (New York: W. W. Norton, 2005), 5:197; "Remarks at the University of Kentucky," February 22, 1965, *PPLBJ*, 1:211.

[117] Peck, *Washington's China*, 9. Peck takes this a bit far, implying Vietnam was giant exercise in containing the spread of Chinese communism, neglecting the long history of civil war within Vietnam, the historic conflicts between China and Vietnam that stretched back for centuries, and the overarching ideology surrounding domino theory. For the only comprehensive look at Johnson's policy regarding China, see Micahel Lumbers, *Piercing the Bamboo Curtain: Tentative Bridge-Building to China During the Johnson Years* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008).

the ultimate totalitarian regime. Suddenly, human rights loomed large on the conservative agenda. After Nixon's return from Beijing and Shanghai in 1972, conservatives were convinced that America had gone from simply refusing to stand by our allies in Korea to appeasing Mao and Zhou just as Britain had appeased Hitler before World War II.

The shift to reach out to Beijing was remarkable, especially as a Republican president presided over the initial opening. Prior to Nixon's trip to China in 1972, conservatives—Nixon included—had argued that the loss of China was the result of "Communist espionage and treachery at the highest levels in Washington."[118] Refusal to grant Jiang Jieshi aid by the "fellow travelers" in Truman's administration had been a miscarriage of justice, a betrayal of America's purpose in the post-war world. For conservatives, Truman's mistake was his focus on Europe when the nation's "real" interests rested on the fate of the Chinese Nationalists; thus, as M.J. Heale argues, for these groups "the abandonment of China to the communists was the consummation of Democratic perfidy," and by 1972, weak Republicans like Nixon.[119]

As Nixon's first term drew to a close, the growing closeness of America and China bothered old-school Cold Warriors concerned with battling communism. Nixon was a traitor to the cause; he had, after all, built his career on bashing Democrats after the CCP took power in 1949 and was now playing nice with Beijing. For ardent anti-communists, it was a shock when in, April 1971, after months of meetings and secret discussions, the American ping-pong team went to China and was defeated by China's crack team. Right-wing doyen Phyllis Schlafly

---

[118] Richard Powers, *Not Without Honor*, 228.

[119] M.J. Heale, *American Anticommunism*, 151. This opinion, though, was not reflected in national polls. Even though The *Gallup Poll* from September 19th, 1949, showed 53% of Americans unhappy with how Washington had been handling the China issue, 48% of the American people believed the Communists would win the Chinese civil war, and in the face of this, some 44% percent of the country felt Chiang Kai-shek should not be helped. *The Gallup Poll*, Vol. 2 (1949-1958), This was the majority number from the poll results.

declared that the reports coming from the American team were hard to believe, for "even in this age of befuddled college students, it is hard to see how there could be any so ignorant" about reality in China as liberals and, of course, the ping pong players.[120] Presenting the media reports on China as a guided tour of hell, Schlafly argued that history was being erased in a "deliberate self-deception [that] is dangerous for America."[121] Americans must be careful. "Peking has by no means 'reformed,'" the writers at *Human Events* argued. Beijing was known to be an aggressor—just look at Korea, Tibet, and its sponsorship of revolutionary activity across Africa and Latin America.[122] The "Red Chinese" were even "actively trying to stir up revolution in this country," the writers warned.[123]

The Nixon White House provided aid and support for Beijing's entry into the United Nations, which prompted *Human Events* writer David Brudnoy to write "each day brings the Nixon Administration closer to the folly of supporting Red China's admission to the United Nations."[124] Brudnoy went on to claim the country was being "subjected to a masterful propaganda assault to ready our citizens for the newthink of China…[coming from an] orgy of

---

[120] "Will Ping-Pong Propaganda Erase History?" *The Phyllis Schlafly Report*, Vol. 4, No. 10, May 1971.

[121] "Will Ping-Pong Propaganda Erase History?" *The Phyllis Schlafly Report*, Vol. 4, No. 10, May 1971.

[122] "Dangers in China's Ping-Pong Diplomacy," *Human Events*, Vol. 31 No. 17, 24 April 1971, 339.

[123] "Dangers in China's Ping-Pong Diplomacy," *Human Events*, Vol. 31 No. 17, 24 April 1971, 339.

[124] David Brudnoy, "Nixon Risks Losing Conservative Votes on Red China," *Human Events*, Vol. 32, No. 21 22 May 1971, 417.

premature Sinophilia."[125] Placing the PRC in the United Nations meant abandoning Taiwan, the "true" government of the Chinese people. Brudnoy ended his article by calling on conservatives across the country to make "every effort" to get the President "to commit himself publicly not to reverse the current China policy throughout his second term in office."[126]

The so-called propaganda campaign was led by liberal politicians long perceived as weak on communism, such as J. William Fulbright (D-AR). Fulbright, the powerful head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (SFRC), was a committed Wilsonian internationalist. Early in his Washington career, Fulbright had invested his senatorial reputation in an effort to create a more civil and enlightened international world with America as leader. As early as 1966, Fulbright had advocated a new relationship with the PRC, and he reacted positively to Nixon's shift toward Beijing.[127] What irritated conservative pundits was Fulbright's assertion that Truman and Eisenhower-era Cold Warriors had misled the country about events in the PRC and the Republic of China (ROC). After Fulbright and the SFRC voted to repeal the Mutual Defense Treaty in 1971, David Brudnoy declared Fulbright was guilty of "conditioning the American people into accepting a 'one-China' policy" that accepted Beijing and not Taipei.[128] Fulbright's hearings were stacked with one-China advocates who were selected to "soften American

---

[125] David Brudnoy, "Nixon Risks Losing Conservative Votes on Red China," *Human Events*, Vol. 32, No. 21 22 May 1971, 417.

[126] "Nixon Risks Losing Conservative Votes on Red China," by David Brudnoy, *Human Events*, Vol. 32, No. 21 22 May 1971, 422.

[127] Randall Bennet Woods, *J. William Fulbright, Vietnam, and the Search for a Cold War Foreign Policy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 254.

[128] "Fulbright Stacks Hearings on Red China," *Human Events*, Vol. 31, No. 29, 17 July 1971, 548.

opposition to Mao and his cohorts" and convince Americans to agree with the opening to Beijing.[129]

When Nixon decided to travel to Red China, conservatives were "deeply disturbed" as they saw "no evidence that Peking, which has imprisoned 750 million people and launched aggressive warfare against all her neighbors, had mellowed in any significant way."[130] According to Thomas Lane, this whole decision was "the kind of grossly inept policy into which U.S. governments have stumbled in the past under the illusions that they are promoting world peace."[131] Accusing Washington of often "surrender[ing] for knucklehead reasons positions of strength which the enemy could not have taken by force," Nixon's move toward "accommodation with Red China…has weakened the structure of freedom in the world." Lane claimed the President was perilously close to making a mistake equal to Truman losing China, even to Britain's mistake at Munich a generation earlier.[132] Instead of embracing appeasement, the United States must remember its strength, argued Edgar Mowrer. Mowrer declared that the opening to China was

> another attempt to achieve peace by the wrong method…too few of our leaders realize that to achieve peace a government must not pursue it directly, but seek it as the result of policy backed by preponderant power and the will to use that power as far as may be necessary.[133]

---

[129] "Fulbright Stacks Hearings on Red China," *Human Events*, Vol. 31, No. 29, 17 July 1971, 548.

[130] "Nixon's Red China Visit," *Human Events,* Vol. 31 No. 30, 24 July 1971, 563.

[131] Thomas A. Lane, "Red China Issue is Power, Not Trade," *Human Events*, Vol. 31 No. 30, 24 July 1971, 570.

[132] Thomas A. Lane, "Red China Issue is Power, Not Trade," *Human Events*, Vol. 31 No. 30, 24 July 1971, 570.

[133] Edgar Mowrer, *Human Events*, Vol. 31 No. 34, 21 August 1971, 641.

"[In] this world," Mowrer stated, "it is not enough to want peace; you must be strong enough to insure [sic] it."[134] A peaceful world could only exist if there was a suitable balance of power. Conservatives pointed to the American federal system, with its checks and balances, as a model for maintaining a balance of power throughout the world. Thus, just as "freedom and order together can be maintained in whatever kind of society," it must be done with balance, and sometimes force.[135] They quoted George F. Kennan, who argued that those countries whose "concepts of international relations arose out of life-and-death encounters with nomadic hordes, or contacts with the universal imperial pretensions" of a Byzantium or Russia had to be met with a strong face.[136] Many Americans agreed with this critique of Nixon's foreign policy: a September 1971 poll showed that 56% of the nation believed Communist China was the greatest threat to world peace.[137]

By August 1971, many conservatives had withdrawn their support from Nixon. To them, his astonishingly centrist domestic policies and "his overture to Red China, done in the absence of any public concessions by Red China" constituted a complete break with their beliefs and his previous record.[138] Conservative pundits took some pleasure from a Gallup Poll taken after the recent announcement on China. The president's popularity registered virtually no change,

---

[134] Morrie Ryskind "Tiddledywinks, Ping-Pong and History," *Human Events* Vol. 32 No. 17 22 April 1972, 317.

[135] Louis J. Hale, "A World At Peace," *Encounter* Vol. 36 No. 2 February 1971, 50.

[136] George F. Kennan, "A Note on Russian Foreign Policy," *Encounter*, Vol. 36 No. 2 February 1971, 54.

[137] Holmes Alexander, "We Are Losing the Cold War Battle," *Human Events*, Vol. 32 No. 6, 5 February 1972, 107. *The Gallup Poll*, Vol. 3 (1959-1971).

[138] "Leading Conservatives 'Suspend Support' of Nixon," *Human Events*, Vol. 31 No. 32 7 August 1971, 593.

moving from 46 to 47 percent.[139] Nixon's visit to Beijing in February 1972 "reflects, above all, the profound shift in the balance of military and political power which has taken place in the world during the past half-decade."[140] America now bargained from a position of weakness, or at least a weak will, instead of strength.[141] Indeed, nearly a quarter of the public felt that Nixon's new relationship with Beijing was detrimental to global peace, and almost half of the country viewed dealing with the People's Republic of China as highly unfavorable.[142]

AS Nixon unveiled his China policy and confronted a revolt on the right, he and Kissinger were compelled to respond to growing calls to respect human rights. By the early 1970s, the success of the domestic rights movement within the United States coincided with a growth of human rights activism globally. Both Congress and the nation pushed for a greater level of concern for human rights in American foreign policy. Intellectuals and policymakers like Henry "Scoop" Jackson (D-WA) launched a campaign to limit executive power while tying human rights concerns to America's trade agreements, in particular the bestowal of the "Most Favored Nation" (MFN) status. During the battles between the Nixon White House and Capitol Hill, Congress

---

[139] "Capitol Brief," *Human Events*, Vol. 31 No. 32, 7 August 1971, 594; "Red China on Their Mind: Another Conservative Run-in With 'Educational' TV in Boston" by David Brudnoy, *Human Events,* Vol. 31 No. 33 14 August 1971, 616; "Will Mao Tse-tung Throw Nixon a Bone?" *Human Events,* Vol. 31 No. 33, 14 August 1971, 609.

[140] Frank Johnson, "The Balance of Power May Shift to Peking: Nixon's Trip to China Could Bring on Another World Crisis," *Human Events*, Vol. 32 No. 8, 19 February 1972, 139.

[141] Frank Johnson, "The Balance of Power May Shift to Peking: Nixon's Trip to China Could Bring on Another World Crisis," *Human Events*, Vol. 32 No. 8, 19 February 1972, 139. See also George Putnam, "Nixon's Trip to China May Prove to Be Another Munich," *Human Events*, Vol. 32 No. 14 1 April 1972.

[142] *The Gallup Poll* (1972-1975), Vol. 4 9 March 1972; 30 June 1972—the statistic is 46% of Americans polled viewed Communist China as "highly unfavorable."

laid the legislative foundation that helped Jimmy Carter re-orient the country's diplomatic focus after 1977.[143] Jackson's actions were part of a broader reaction to White House excesses in Vietnam. Legislators challenged the Executive branch on a variety of fronts, setting new Cold War precedent with the battles over the Cooper-Church amendment to the Military Sales Bill for 1971. This was the first time since World War II that "Congress had controlled military operations through the appropriations power."[144] In what Clair Apodaca terms a "paradox," American human rights policy began to loosely form as Congress and others realized rights could be used "as a means to restrain Nixon's imperial presidency."[145]

As the Nixon administration came to its ignominious end in 1974, Congress continued to reassert itself in foreign policy in ways it had not done in a generation. As George Herring notes, by the mid-1970s, "The most dramatic change in the making of foreign policy…was the role of Congress…With the Cold War seemingly in remission and Vietnam nearing an end…Congress set out with a vengeance to reinsert itself into the policy process."[146] Emerging out of this desire to balance the creation and implementation of the country's foreign policy was a "new internationalist" group on Capitol Hill. These legislators were a strange mixture of liberals and

---

[143] As Clair Apodaca notes, this was very much in the face of Nixon and Kissinger's strategy of *realpolitik*. Their application of the principle dictated that the national security concerns of the nation trump any and all human rights needs in the international arena. Thus, while Congress was able to begin revising America diplomacy, the White House was loathe to consistently adhere to these provisions. See Apodaca, *Understanding U.S. Human Rights Policy: A Paradoxical Legacy* (London: Routledge, 2006), especially pages 30-44.

[144] Robert David Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 164.

[145] Apodaca, *Understanding U.S. Human Rights Policy*, 30.

[146] George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) 813.

conservatives, an outgrowth in part of Fulbright's bi-partisan coalition to investigate the abuses of federal power under LBJ and Nixon. These new internationalists were concerned about government growth and purpose, ideological purity, and a redefined notion of party loyalty. In general, "they challenged exorbitant defense spending, military aid programs, overcommitment and interventionism abroad, and U.S. support for right-wing dictators."[147]

This represented a major shift from early Cold War policy, in which liberal and conservative Cold Warriors joined together to support an executive-centered foreign policy. Champions of Congressional prerogative were derided as neo-isolationists. Men like Senators Joseph McCarthy and John Bricker (R-OH), who advocated a staunchly nationalist agenda, challenged President Truman's ability to send troops to Europe, demanded greater Congressional control over internal security affairs, and expressed a desire to align the country with emerging right-wing leaders against Communists.[148] Though the neo-isolationists' view was partly discredited with McCarthy's censure in 1954, the long-term impact of its agenda linked "the idea of enhanced congressional power with a right-wing foreign policy agenda."[149]

As is amply detailed elsewhere, the power of the neo-isolationists, a group Robert David Johnson has labeled "revisionists," slipped away as battles over appropriations—especially for foreign aid—emerged in the early 1960s and the new internationalists emerged. In what *U.S. News & World Report* termed a "foreign aid revolt," liberals complained that American aid was going to brutal right-wing leaders simply because they were not communist.[150] The new

---

[147] Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, 814.

[148] Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War*, xvii.

[149] Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War*, xvii.

[150] *U.S. News & World Report*, 25 November 1963.

internationalists focused on three major issues. First, they believed that the US had embraced policies that violated American values in the nation's quest to win the Cold War. Second, the group was concerned that policymakers had relied too heavily on military solutions for what they viewed as political or social problems. Finally, the internationalists feared that the United States had overextended and overcommitted itself in the global sphere.[151]

By the mid 1960s, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had come to represent this new view, as Fulbright and others searched for an alternative to the national security and containment-style policies that had dominated US diplomacy since the Truman years.[152] The Vietnam "effect" reshaped Congress into a body willing to challenge the Pentagon and Defense Department's arms race. Congress' desire was to develop a foreign policy that was more multilateral in nature and could recognize the complex nature of the decolonizing world.

Out of this Congressional movement came the push for greater human rights concerns in American diplomacy. In tandem with the Senate discussions mentioned above, a House report argued that the State Department and the White House must change their position on human rights. Donald Fraser (D-MN), chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements in the House, argued that "the human rights factor too often has been neglected in foreign relations despite the existence of internationally agreed guarantees."[153] Fraser and the committee hoped that their recommendations would help the White House and State Department "ensure a higher priority for human rights in U.S. foreign policy, and a great capacity for

---

[151] Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War*, xix.

[152] See Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War*; Woods, *J. William Fulbright*; Woods, *LBJ*.

[153] Preface to "Human Rights in the World Community: A Call for U.S. Leadership" 93rd Congress 2nd Session, 27 March 1974, (Government Printing Office, Washington D.C) xi.

international organizations to protect human rights."[154] The committee offered an opinion on how the changing Congress viewed the enforcement of human rights. It was "essentially the responsibility" of each government to protect the human rights of its citizens.[155] When a government would not or could not do so, the international community must aid victims of abuse who have "no recourse but to seek redress from outside his national boundaries."[156] Congress called on the State Department to establish an internal office or department to deal with these problems and insert human rights into America's diplomacy. Offering a stinging rebuke of NSA Henry Kissinger, the report declared that no longer should human rights be placed in a subordinate position in the "vast foreign policy horizon of political, economic, and military affairs. Proponents of pure power politics too often dismiss it as a factor in diplomacy."[157]

Henry Jackson and Representative Tom Harkin (D-IA) joined Fraser, among others, in working to realign America's foreign policy. In 1974, Jackson decided to use Congress to try to build a new policy to target the Soviet Union. The subsequent policy, the Jackson-Vanik amendment, linked the granting of Most-Favored-Nation (MFN) status to a given country's record on emigration. The policy was meant to hurt the great Cold War enemy while reasserting

---

[154] Preface to "Human Rights in the World Community: A Call for U.S. Leadership" 93rd Congress 2nd Session, 27 March 1974, (Government Printing Office, Washington D.C) xi.

[155] Preface to "Human Rights in the World Community: A Call for U.S. Leadership" 93rd Congress 2nd Session, 27 March 1974, (Government Printing Office, Washington D.C) 1.

[156] Preface to "Human Rights in the World Community: A Call for U.S. Leadership" 93rd Congress 2nd Session, 27 March 1974, (Government Printing Office, Washington D.C) 1.

[157] Preface to "Human Rights in the World Community: A Call for U.S. Leadership" 93rd Congress 2nd Session, 27 March 1974, (Government Printing Office, Washington D.C) 9.

American moral superiority abroad.[158] Following closely on the heels of this policy came Harkin's proposed amendment to the 1975 AID bill that tried to sever "aid to any nation with a persistent pattern of gross human rights violations."[159] The exception to the rule was national security—which highlighted the trouble Congress had in juxtaposing human rights ideals with geopolitical needs during the 1970s.[160]

It was Gerald Ford who reluctantly established the link between Congressional desire to act on human rights and executive policy. In the summer of 1975, Ford met with leaders from across Europe and Canada at the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) in Finland. There, in addition to dealing with economic and strategic concerns, the participatory nations agreed to "respect human rights and fundamental freedoms," paring down the Universal Declaration of Human Rights into distinct categories of belief, self-determination, and free emigration.[161] In signing the Final Act, which included a provision recognizing the division of Europe, cold war hawks attacked the President for giving away Europe to Moscow, prompting Ford to backpedal.[162] Though Ford distanced himself from the Helsinki Accords, his

---

[158] See Robert David Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006) 180-190 for a fuller discussion of Jackson's policy machinations.

[159] Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War*, 215.

[160] Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War*, 199; 215-216.

[161] See "The Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe," signed 1 August 1975, Helsinki, Finland. The human rights provisions of the Final Act are found in Basket 1, Principle VII and VII, and Basket 3. Full text of the act is available at http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/osce/basics/finact75.htm (last accessed 19 February 2013).

[162] For a brief discussion of the Helsinki Accords, see Apodaca, *U.S. Human Rights Policy*, pages 44-49. See also, Sarah Snyder, *Human Rights Activism and the End of the Cold War: A Transnational History of the Helsinki Network* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011). Snyder's work is the most up-to-date look at Helsinki and its aftermath.

actions provided a new mechanism for America to assert moral superiority in the Cold War world.

After the 1976 election, the legislative branch shifted to the right as most of the fourteen seats that changed hands went to conservatives. Old liberal cold warriors like Stuart Symington (D-MO) and J. William Fulbright were gone from Congress. Not only was the Hill moving to the right philosophically, but the manner in which it took care of legislation was changing. Old committees, like the powerful House Un-American Activities Committee, were dismantled in 1975.[163] The Democratic class of "Watergate babies" challenged the rules of seniority in committee chairmanship and erected reforms that allowed chairs to be chosen by secret ballot rather than being assigned to the most senior members of the majority party. In addition, filibuster rules in the Senate changed, requiring fewer votes to break a deadlock. On the heels of Watergate and Vietnam, the feeling across Capitol Hill was "that concentration of power was dangerous;" the new class of lawmakers worked to "disperse power, both away from the executive branch and from the congressional barons who had dominated Capitol Hill."[164]

AFTER Jimmy Carter declared his candidacy in 1974 and began building his policy team, he worked to factor in the shifting landscape of congressional and public opinion in the development of his foreign policy views. Cyrus Vance, the presumptive Secretary of State, advised in 1976 that Carter's administration should "accept the necessity to make the Congress

[163] Zelizer, *On Capitol Hill*, 170.

[164] James T. Patterson, *Restless Giant: The United States from Watergate to Bush v. Gore* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 84-85. See also Zelizer, *On Capitol Hill*, Chapter 9.

and the American people joint partners in foreign policy matters."[165] With a Democratic majority in Congress predicted, Vance felt this gave Carter a distinct advantage in pushing a human rights agenda. Vance pointed to a survey indicating "the vast majority of the American people believe that 'the United States has real responsibility to take a very active role in the world…[and] is ready to support an active, responsible, sacrifice-demanding foreign policy, if it can be demonstrated that the national interest will be served thereby.'"[166]

Carter and his advisors sensed that the people and the Congress, reeling from the ignominy of the Vietnam War and Watergate, wanted to see at least the wings of the imperial presidency clipped. Johnson's escalation of the Vietnam War and his success in having enacted dozens of Great Society programs exacerbated a fear of hidden government expansion. Nixon, with his secret diplomacy and Watergate machinations accelerated the loss of trust the American people and Congress felt toward the Oval Office. Carter seemed just the person to unite the increasingly polarized country. As a Southern evangelical Democrat focused on efficient government at home and the maintenance American supremacy abroad, Carter seemed able to bring stability back to Washington. Carter scholar Scott Kaufman writes

> Carter…was a racial moderate from the Sun Belt. He was religiously devout, born-again Christian, which appealed to the New Right. He was fiscally frugal, which neoconservatives found attractive. His strong sense of morality enticed not just new internationalists but those Americans upset by Watergate. Finally, during the 1976 campaign he was fuzzy on the issues…leaving unclear exactly what his specific plans were…[167]

---

[165] Memo, Cyrus Vance on Foreign Policy Issues, 24 October 1976 MS1664 S.2 B9F12, Yale Manuscript Collection.

[166] Memo, Cyrus Vance on Foreign Policy Issues, 24 October 1976 MS1664 S.2 B9F12, Yale Manuscript Collection.

[167] Scott Kaufman, *Plans Unraveled: The Foreign Policy of the Carter Administration* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008), 11-12.

The Georgian, in contrast with his predecessors, promised a new, open diplomacy with no more back-channel negotiations, a modern day Wilson. He also promised to restore the relationship between the White House and Congress. Carter "realized that [his] own election had been aided by a deep desire among the people for open government, based on a new and fresh commitment to changing some of the Washington habits" that had compromised America's standing abroad.[168] Carter, thanks to his beliefs and experiences, agreed with these sentiments and as President struggled to turn the country in a new direction.

[168] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 29; Memo, "Campaign Promises," 24 October 1976 MS1664 S.2 B8F6, Yale Manuscript Collection (YMC). Human rights, however, was not addressed in this memo.

To me, the demonstration of American idealism was a practical and realistic approach…moral principles were the best foundation for the exertion of American power and influence.[169]

Chapter 3

Rights, Religion, and Power

Jimmy Carter's foreign policy fundamentally altered America's role in world affairs. It is under Carter that the shifting ideologies of human rights and the moral purpose of American diplomacy were entwined with longstanding strategic concerns. For Carter, several influences intersected as he developed his philosophy of human rights and mapped out a strategy for incorporating the issue into his foreign policy. The Georgia farmer-turned-politician relied on a neo-Wilsonian understanding of diplomatic relations, strongly influenced by a blend of Niebuhrian and Southern Baptist theology. His views were also shaped by his experiences during the civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s. These influences led Carter to craft a diplomacy of moral pragmatism to implement his human rights ideals. This allowed the Georgian to challenge the existing Cold War order as his administration sought to impose a new sense of justice in all of its international relationships.

Members of the northeastern intellectual and political powerhouses have often occupied the Oval Office.[170] When outsiders "break into the henhouse," as it were, great consternation

---

[169] Jimmy Carter, *Keeping Faith: Memoirs of a President* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1995) 147.

[170] One might argue that the Presidencies of George W. Bush, Bill Clinton, Lyndon Johnson, and even Jimmy Carter belie this view. When duly considered, however, we see that the Bush family was educated in the Eastern elite and members of the Washington world for decades; that Clinton, educated at Georgetown and Oxford, was a member of Phi Beta Kappa—another mark of the Eastern establishment (despite this, he would still be castigated early on for his poor, Southern heritage). Lyndon Johnson and Jimmy Carter, by contrast, would cause high levels angst in the Northern political elite; Johnson, graduate of a Texas teacher's college, never

arises not just in the Northeast but also throughout the nation, especially if those breaking in are Southern. As candidate and president, Jimmy Carter—like Lyndon Johnson and Bill Clinton — was faced with such a reaction. This led to a faulty understanding of the Georgian while he was in office and in later scholarly assessments of his presidency. His human rights policy in particular has often been misunderstood, characterized as idealistic, utopian, or allegedly a product of Carter's misreading of Niebuhr and his outdated Southern beliefs.

Religion and American history, especially American foreign policy, are not often paired, as Andrew Preston observed in his recent work, *Sword of the Spirit, Shield of Faith*.[171] But, as Preston rightly notes, we cannot come to a full understanding of American diplomatic life without gaining a new understanding of how religion shaped those making policy and those pressuring politicians—the people. Historians of national politics have generally portrayed religion as a tool, or to use Marx's famous phrase, an opiate for the masses, something that politicians have used to placate or manipulate voters. New scholarship, however, is beginning to show how religious belief—especially American-style Protestantism—has shaped the United States' domestic and international life.[172]

As scholars began to assess the Carter presidency in the 1980s, the first serious investigations of "human rights" and American foreign policy were also forthcoming. These

---

achieved the complete trust and approval of the Georgetown world. Carter, a transfer student into the Naval Academy, gave up his promising military career to go back to the peanut business and a presumed adherence to old-time religion.

[171] Andrew Preston, *Sword of the Spirit, Shield of Faith: Religion in American War and Diplomacy* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012), Introduction.

[172] See Daniel Williams, *God's Own Party: The Making of the Christian Right* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010) and Darren Dochuk, *From Bible Belt to Sun Belt: Plain-Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Rise of Evangelical Conservatism* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2011).

works—influenced by the post-Vietnam national cynicism that characterized academia—argued that Washington twisted noble ideals to achieve specific, less noble, ends. This was the general tone of work until the 1990s, and is best represented by Gaddis Smith and Burton Kaufman.[173] Early Carter historiography dealt in generalities with his foreign policy, only briefly mentioning human rights in the context of US-Soviet relations, and as such, offered little explanation of how the Georgian formed his beliefs.

As new sources on US policies in Indonesia, Chile, Argentina, and Africa emerged in the mid-1990s and early 2000s, these early views regarding Carter's human rights policy broadened in depth and sophistication.[174] The new works, such as Betty Glad's 2009 book, seriously discussed Carter's vow that "human rights would be a 'fundamental tenet' of U.S. policy," and examined the President's effort to forcefully insert morality into US foreign policy more than any president since Woodrow Wilson.[175] Even in these assessments, though, little effort is made to explain Carter's philosophy and policy. Instead, Carter is portrayed as using the human rights agenda as a political tool to accommodate the Republican move to the right as groups like the Moral Majority gathered strength. For Glad and others, human rights policy was an area that

---

[173] Gaddis Smith, *Morality, Reason, and Power: American Diplomacy in the Carter Years* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1986); Burton Kaufman, *The Presidency of James Earl Carter, Jr.* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006). Smith's work, though dated, remains one of the best examinations of Carter's foreign policy to date, though it is relatively uncritical. Kaufman, by contrast, offers a very critical look at Carter, highlighting especially the problems between NSA Zbigniew Brzezinski and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance.

[174] Scott Kaufman, *Plans Unraveled: The Foreign Policy of the Carter Administration* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008), 4, 30; Smith, *Morality, Reason, and Power*, 50-55.

[175] Glad, *Outsider in the White House*, 1.

conservatives were initially unable to oppose; especially when used to attack the Communist world.[176]

These voices also claimed that Carter's policies were un-tethered and simplistic in the face of the Cold War, which compromised decision making in the White House. He was, moreover, duplicitous as he called for rights while his administration often dealt leniently with countries that abused human rights. David Skidmore casts Carter as a liberal internationalist frustrated by the realities of the Cold War. As such, the Georgian backed away from his moralistic policies. This movement, Skidmore believes, created the impression of a hypocritical White House with no coherent and pragmatic diplomatic strategy.[177] Sheldon Neuringer agrees with this assessment, arguing that, despite Carter's knowledge that each "human rights situation possessed its own distinctive character," the President never contextualized his policies, applying them with a broad brush.[178] Despite their criticisms, these writers agreed that the focus on human rights impacted the international dialogue and made the issue commonplace in diplomatic discussions at the end of the Cold War.[179]

---

[176] Joshua Muravchik, *The Uncertain Crusade: Jimmy Carter and the Dilemmas of Human Rights Policy*. (Lanham: Hamilton Press, 1986) 2-5. Jeanne Kirkpatrick would even write the forward for Muravchik's word, maintaining her sharp critique of the Carter administration. For fuller treatments of the 1980 election, critiques of the Carter administration, and the early years of the Reagan administration see, among others, Sean Wilentz, *The Age of Reagan: A History, 1974-2008* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2008); Williams, *God's Own Party*; Kaufman, *Plans Unraveled*; Michael Schaller, *Reckoning with Reagan: America and Its President in the 1980s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).

[177] David Skidmore, *Reversing Course: Carter's Foreign Policy, Domestic Politics, and the Failure of Reform* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1996), xi.

[178] Sheldon M. Neuringer, *The Carter Administration, Human Rights, and the Agony of Cambodia* (Lewiston: E. Mellen Press, 1993), 3.

[179] The enduring legacy of Carter's human rights agenda is often shown in two ways. First, the continued focus by Congress on the issue in the international arena; and, second, the

Over the last decade a new wave of scholarship concerning Carter's human rights policy has emerged. Recent articles in *Diplomatic History* reach conclusions similar to Skidmore's and Neuringer's, but they generalize from case studies dealing with Argentina, Cambodia and others and, therefore, fail to show insight into Carter's contextual understanding of meaningful progress on human rights in these regions.[180] Like their predecessors, these scholars argued that human rights policy was merely a tool that Washington applied like other humanitarian agendas; for instance, the Marshall Plan or Mekong Delta projects.[181]

Three problems emerge from these assessments of Carter's human rights policy. First, Carter is often overlooked in assessments of the last half of the Cold War. Instead of rigorous analysis, Carter is included in an unflattering succession of presidents—the warmongering Lyndon Johnson, the corrupt Richard Nixon, and the buffoon Gerald Ford—and the attending polemicized debates. Carter is the footnote, the tag end, of America's most banal decade. When scholars look at the actual end of the Cold War, Carter is once again given short shrift; he is overshadowed by the mighty aura of Ronald Reagan, projected and maintained by a never-

---

simple fact that even Ronald Reagan, who had lambasted Carter's policies in the 1980 election cycle, will adopt much of the rhetoric and mechanisms to further his Cold War agenda.

[180] William Schmidli, "Institutionalizing Human Rights in U.S. Foreign Policy: U.S.-Argentine Relations, 1976–1980" *Diplomatic History* 35:2 (2011), pages 351-377; Kenton Clymer, "Jimmy Carter, Human Rights, and Cambodia, *Diplomatic History,* 27:2 (2003), pages 245-278; David Schmitz and Vanessa Walker, "Jimmy Carter and the Foreign Policy of Human Rights: The Development of a Post-Cold War Foreign Policy," *Diplomatic History* 28:1 (2004), pages 113-144.

[181] See David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010); Michael Hogan, *The Marshall Plan: America, Britain, and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Kristin Ahlberg, *Transplanting the Great Society: Lyndon Johnson and Food for Peace* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008).

ending stream of nostalgia brokers. Also, when scholars examine the rise of Reagan and the Right, they often overlook Carter and return to the presumed giants of American political life: Nixon, Kissinger, Johnson, and Kennedy. In many ways, it can be said that Carter has been treated like William Howard Taft. Just as Taft was a president sandwiched between the immense reputations of Roosevelt and Wilson, so Carter is between Nixon and Reagan.

Second, the origins of Carter's human rights philosophy have rarely been given an adequate examination in the literature. This literature has only provided brief glances at his life in the South or his religious beliefs.[182] By refusing to deal holistically with Carter's background, religious beliefs, and historical philosophy, historians have failed to explain how and why the human rights issue and Carter's methods for implanting it in foreign policy have survived—and even thrived—beyond his tenure in office. Only an examination of Carter's beliefs, their historical setting, and how he applied them in policy-making can help scholars grasp why Carter's human rights vision transcended the Cold War.

Third, studies on Carter's policy have not been well situated in time and place. Though Carter used the Helsinki Accords to help formulate his human rights policy while in office, it was by no means the foundation for his understanding of human rights in action. For Carter, the Helsinki Accords merely served as a convenient framework for a global expansion of human rights, one that applied only to a specific region. Focusing on relationships with smaller Latin American countries, as much of the recent work has done, is also not an adequate basis to gain a comprehensive understanding of Carter's human rights policies and their longevity. Rather,

[182] Even Peter Bourne's biography does little to help in this regard. See Peter Bourne, *Jimmy Carter: A Comprehensive Biography From Plains to Postpresidency* (New York: Scribner, 1997).

historians must look at a global picture, and especially to Napoleon's "sleeping giant," China, to understand the depth and power of Carter's new policy.[183]

Carter's human rights policy reflected three major trends of mid-to-late twentieth century American thought: changing notions of civil rights, Niebuhrian pragmatism, and Wilsonian internationalism. Both Woodrow Wilson and Reinhold Niebuhr are touted throughout historical literature as key figures in the development of the "American Century," yet both are rarely discussed as a combined influence on the creation of American diplomacy.[184] Thus, while there is voluminous literature on Wilson's foreign policy, there has been little evaluation of the cumulative impact of Wilsonian internationalism and Niebuhrian theology on the nation's diplomatic trajectory. In the Southerner Jimmy Carter, though, scholars will find that Wilson and Niebuhr's thoughts merge, allowing an assessment of their combined impact on American policy. Carter's religious convictions and Niebuhr's meditations modified Wilson's progressive internationalism in a way that fundamentally altered American foreign affairs in the post-Nixon era.

Jimmy Carter's presidency represents a unique moment in American life when Niebuhr's influence was still quite strong, when Southern politics were gaining a new reputation in the wake of the massive resistance movement, and when America's global role was being redefined.

---

[183] Human rights issues and policies, though not always evenly applied, are now part of the evaluation tools in determining everything from foreign aid to recommendations on the international stage and the depth of a relationship with another country.

[184] Briefly, for Wilson see: Arthur Link, *The Higher Realism of Woodrow Wilson and Other Essays*, (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1971); Thomas Knock, *To End All Wars: Woodrow Wilson and the Quest for a New World Order*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Lloyd E. Ambrosius, *The Wilsonian Century: Woodrow Wilson and His Legacy in American Foreign Relations* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2002). For Niebuhr's influence see: Robert Lovin, *Reinhold Niebuhr and Christian Realism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Mark Kleinman, *A World of Hope, A World of Fear: Henry A. Wallace, Reinhold Niebuhr, and American Liberalism* (Columbus: Ohio University Press, 2000).

Carter, whose family—save his father—exemplified historian David Chappell's "inside agitators," became sensitized to human rights while working in the fields as a child during the heat of Georgia summers and as a young man fresh from the Navy in the 1950s.[185] He watched as the Freedom Rides, Martin Luther King, Jr.'s marches, and LBJ's political gambits brought about a new era of freedom and positive rights in the country. Subsequently, as governor of the state, he attempted to make Georgia once again the showplace of the New South. Though Carter relied heavily upon a Southern spirituality modified by Reinhold Niebuhr to link belief with political action, his understanding of the presidential role was also molded by his admiration for Harry Truman. In some ways, the beginning of the modern human rights movement in American diplomacy is to be found in the story of Carter progressing from farm-boy to naval officer to progressive Southern politician.

JIMMY Carter was born on October 1st, 1924 to Earl and Lillian Carter at the Wise Clinic in Plains, a small but rapidly growing town at the Western edge of Georgia's Sumter County. The South of Carter's childhood still smarted from the wounds of the Civil War, battles between Bourbon politicians and Southern Populists, the perpetuation of Jim Crow, and a general alienation from the rest of America. Jimmy Carter remembers being initially unaware of these problems as he grew up in a middle class family, played with the children of his father's African American farm hands, and worked at the same tasks as the children of his father's employees—

[185] David L. Chappell, *Inside Agitators: White Southerners in the Civil Rights Movement* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995).

carrying water, weeding gardens, and slopping hogs.[186] Growing up, Carter gained a more complex picture of reality in the Jim Crow South because, as he argued in his memoirs, "more than anyone else in my family…I could understand the plight of the black families, because I lived so much among them."[187] Lynching had been present in growing force since the end of Reconstruction. By the 1920s and 1930s, throughout the South it took on a new violence and vigor as part of "the strenuous and bloody campaign by whites to elaborate and impose a racial hierarchy upon people of color."[188] Carter, rather naively, initially placed much of the blame for interracial violence on economic competition during the Depression, and ignored in part the real currents of racism that existed throughout the South.[189] Throughout the region, lynchings rose dramatically by the early 1930s: in 1893, approximately 82 percent of the national count came from the South; by the 1920s that figure had risen to 95 percent. In Georgia, and in particular the Cotton Belt where Sumter County is located, the legacy of violence was particularly strong. Some 202 people were lynched between 1880 and 1930; the average number of lynchings in each Cotton Belt-county was three, ensuring that "most people in the region had some personal exposure to mob violence, if only through the stories of bystanders or participants."[190]

---

[186] Bourne, *Jimmy Carter*, 27; Jimmy Carter, *Why Not the Best?: The First Fifty Years*, (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1996), 12-14. Carter, *An Hour Before Daylight: Memories of a Rural Boyhood*, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001), 44.

[187] Carter, *An Hour Before Daylight*, 53.

[188] W. Fitzhugh Brundage, *Lynching in the New South: Georgia and Virginia, 1880-1930*, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 2.

[189] Carter, *An Hour Before Daylight*, 149.

[190] See Brundage, *Lynching in the New South*, 2-8; 105-11. In Sumter County was above the average, with four confirmed lynchings by 1930: Hamp Hollis (1898), William Redding (1913), Charles West (1919), and Bob Whitehead (1920), cited in Brundage, *Lynching in the New South*, Appendix A.

Carter is part of the longer story of a changing American South and the legacy of past political reformers in the region. Georgia in particular, and with it the Carter family, emerged in the mid-twentieth century as the inheritor of a strange political legacy. Carter's grandfather, Jim Jack Gordy, was a Populist, and in particular, supported the famed Georgian Tom Watson, one of the iconoclastic leaders of Southern Populism. The Populist movement in Georgia, as V.O. Key stated, was different from others: "Although the bitterness of feeling stirred by Populism gradually died down in most southern states, Georgia's agrarian crisis aroused a deeper and more lasting rural distrust of cities. Moreover, great Populist leaders lived on to keep rural antagonisms alive."[191] Tom Watson's early career, in particular, left a deep mark on Carter's family.[192]

Watson, while not a proponent of full integration, felt that equal political rights should be protected for all the populace—"poor whites and blacks would march in step to the voting booths in pursuit of their 'identical interests.'"[193] Tom Watson's early years as a political activist were marked by a vision "of the People's Party as a sectional and agrarian movement, one that brought together the farmers of the South and the West;" a sectionalism based on ideas of "scientific government" and "modern and businesslike systems of education, transportation,

---

[191] V. O. Key, Jr., *Southern Politics in State and Nation, A New Edition* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1984), 117-118.

[192] It must be noted that Carter's memory, or understanding, of Tom Watson is a bit lopsided: "Tom Watson [was] a nationally known populist in his day, who served as a Democratic congressman in North Georgia but was disavowed by his party when he advocated equal treatment for black and white workers and small farmers." Carter, *An Hour Before Daylight*, 246. While Watson was indeed a moderate on integration in political life, he would become a rabid advocate of segregation at the middle and end of his career.

[193] Charles Postel, *The Populist Vision* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 196. For a complete biography of Tom Watson, see C. Vann Woodward's classic *Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938).

communication, trade, credit, and money."[194] Populists in Georgia, and elsewhere in the South, initially worked to secure African American support, seeking not only to use these communities in their political struggles but also to "craft public policies that would benefit the African-American community."[195] In Georgia, while Populists did not generally dismantle the legal and social regulations of Jim Crow, they did work to mitigate its worst excesses by condemning lynching or seeking access to the voting booth for African Americans.[196] Populists envisioned the government as an instrument to secure social and economic justice and they succeeded in making the system a little bit more just, even for the South's black community. This legacy was passed to Carter's mother, Miss Lillian, who in turn imparted it to Jimmy at an early age.[197] Carter recalled proudly that his grandfather, Jim Jack, "treated local sharecroppers and farm laborers, if not as equals, at least with a degree of respect that set him apart," and helped to instill in Lillian, and subsequently the future president, a belief in the intrinsic worth of all people.[198]

By the 1930s, much of the country, and especially the agricultural South, was reeling from the Great Depression. The Carter family, however, was protected from much of the nation's hardship. Earl, a shrewd businessman, had refused to buy on credit for years, which allowed him to buy farms and failed businesses in the county. The Carter family experienced

---

[194] Michael Pierce, "Agrarian Rebel, Industrial Workers: Tom Watson and the Prospects of a Farmer-Labor Alliance" in *Populism in the South Revisited: New Interpretations and New Departures*, (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2012) edited by James M. Beeby, 95; Postel, *Populist Vision*, 166.

[195] Lewie Reece, "Creating a New South: The Political Culture of Deep South Populism" in Beeby, *Populism in the South*, 145.

[196] Reece, "Creating a New South," 159.

[197] Miss Lillian would even serve in the Peace Corps as senior citizen.

[198] Bourne, *Jimmy Carter*, 15-18.

financial stability and a degree of success while the rest of the country picked its way out of the Depression.[199] During the Roosevelt years, Carter's father became one of the leaders of the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) in Plains, and launched a small career in politics that lasted until his death in 1953.[200] Though his family benefited from the Depression, Carter never forgot the suffering and hardship he saw; he was forever influenced by James Agee's powerful documentation of the poverty and problems that beset Southern life.[201]

During the Depression, Carter continued attending school and playing with the children of his father's black staff. When he was twelve, his school superintendent, Julia Coleman, called Carter to her office and handed him a book to read, telling him it was time to read Tolstoy's magisterial *War and Peace*. Carter, reflecting on the book in his campaign autobiography, *Why Not the Best?*, described how he "was happy with the title because I thought that finally Miss Julia had chosen for me a book about cowboys and Indians. I was appalled when I checked the book out of the library because it was about fourteen hundred pages long…and of course not about cowboys at all."[202] The book became a favorite, and served to help him articulate his basic belief about government; namely, that "the course of human events, even the greatest historical events, are not determined by the leaders of a nation or a state [but] are controlled by the

---

[199] Bourne, *Jimmy Carter*, 31-32.

[200] Carter's father would not, however, always be happy with the Roosevelt administration—or the national Democratic Party. After the early administration problems with the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) forced the senior Carter to kill off pigs and plough under cotton he never again voted for a Democratic presidential candidate—though he would always vote the Democratic ticket in state politics. Carter, *Turning Point: A Candidate, A State, and A Nation Coming of Age*, (New York: Times Books, 1992), 5.

[201] Bourne, *Jimmy Carter*, 32. James Agee and Walker Evans, *Let Us Now Praise Famous Men: Three Tenant Families* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960).

[202] Carter, *Why Not the Best?*, 27.

combined wisdom and courage and commitment and discernment and unselfishness and compassion and love and idealism of the common ordinary people," for if Tolstoy was

> correct in his claim that the destiny of nations is controlled by the people, even when they are ruled despotically by kings and emperors, how much more true should this be in a nation like ours where each of us is free! Our government is supposed to be shaped and controlled by the collective wisdom and judgment of those among us who are willing to exert this power and democratic authority.[203]

EVEN at the end of the 1970s, the South was a region marked by a series of tragedies and the legacy of violence surrounding the Civil Rights Movement. This, combined with the ballooning popularity of politicians in the legacy of George Wallace and Orval Faubus, predisposed much of the nation to see Southern politicians as racist, ignorant, and incapable of moral leadership. The deep cycles of Southern poverty that Franklin Roosevelt had identified still existed, though somewhat moderated by his New Deal and Johnson's Great Society. Carter based his career in no small part on a challenge to these stereotypes as he presented a new type of Southern politician for the nation's consideration. Despite positive press in *Time* in the spring of 1971, in which Carter was declared the new face of Southern politics as governor of Georgia, he still struggled against the image of a backward South as he moved into the national spotlight. He declared that, "There's still a tendency on the part of some members of the press to treat the South, you know, as a suspect nation. There are a few who think that since I'm a Southern governor, I must be a secret racist or there's something in a closet somewhere that's going to be revealed to show my true colors."[204] Instead, Carter presented the nation with a politician firmly

---

[203] Carter, *Why Not the Best?*, 28. "A Message on Justice," Governor Jimmy Carter's address on "Law Day" at the University of Georgia, 4 May 1971.

[204] *Time Magazine*, 31 May 1971; Richardson, *Conversations With Carter*, 35. Indeed, early scholarship on Carter fulfilled his words. Betty Glad, in her *Jimmy Carter: The Search for the Great White House*, is quick to try and argue that nowhere in Carter's past was there an

rooted in Southern tradition, but willing and ready to ask the government to work on behalf of all people everywhere.

The *Time* article presented the country with a revision of Henry Grady's "New South." Quoting then-Governor Carter's inaugural speech from January 12, 1971, when Carter proclaimed to Georgians "[that] the time for racial discrimination is over," the writers at *Time* declared this was "a promise so long in coming, spoken at last."[205] The region was now led by the "class of 1970," a generation of moderate-to-liberal politicians. Black elected officials gained prominence throughout the old Confederacy and some 3.3 million African Americans were finally voting.[206] Described as a "South Georgia peanut farmer who is both a product and destroyer of the old myths," a man "as contradictory as Georgia itself, but determined to resolve some of its paradoxes," *Time* portrayed Carter as a man who could reinvent the South, the nation, and the world.[207]

To an extent, demographics and economics were on his side. By 1950, Georgia's traditional reliance on agriculture had shifted, leaving two out of every ten Georgians on the farm while the rest flocked into the growing urban areas of Augusta and Atlanta or moved out of state.[208] By 1960, over 55% of the state's population was found in urban areas and some 45%

---

impetus to focus on rights: "…nothing in Carter's early life…suggested that his ambition was ruled by a passion for justice." (17)

[205] Governor Jimmy Carter's Inaugural Address, January 12, 1971. Located online at http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/documents/inaugural_address.pdf, (accessed 12 November 2012); "A New Day A'Coming in the South," *Time* 31 May 1971.

[206] Numbers cited in *Time* 31 May 1971.

[207] "A New Day A'Coming in the South," *Time* 31 May 1971.

[208] Numan V. Bartley, *The Creation of Modern Georgia* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1983), 192.

lived in metropolitan centers.[209] Massive resistance had grown in the wake of the *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) ruling into a concerted effort to keep public schools from integrating. While often typified by events like the 1957 Central High School crisis in Little Rock, Arkansas, massive resistance also entailed the development of "white flight." White flight was a monumental movement of middle-income white families from inner city regions to the suburbs, especially in Atlanta.[210] Partly as a result of these population movements, massive resistance in Georgia began fading by the mid-1960s. Growing moderation also represented the first fruits of the Supreme Court's historic *Baker v. Carr* (1962) decision.[211] In this ruling, the Warren Court declared the now-famous "one man, one vote" edict, destroying the old county apportionment voting system that white supremacists had relied on to maintain segregation.[212] This, in the words of Numan Bartley, meant that the "urban victory over rural areas in the school desegregation controversy symbolized the transfer of the locus of power in Georgia from plantation county elites to uptown metropolitan elites."[213] In the process of capturing the

---

[209] Bartley, *Modern Georgia*, 193.

[210] See Numan V. Bartley, *The Rise of Massive Resistance: Race and Politics in the South During the 1950's* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1969) and Kevin Michael Kruse, *White Flight: Atlanta and the Making of Modern Conservatism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).

[211] See *The United States Supreme Court: The Pursuit of Justice*, edited by Christopher Tomlins (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2005) pages 293-295 for a succinct discussion of *Baker v. Carr*. For a longer treatment of *Baker*, see Stephen Ansolabehere and James M. Snyder, Jr., *The End of Inequality: One Person, One Vote and the Transformation of American Politics* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2008).

[212] The county voting system "grossly discriminated against the metropolitan counties, assigned unit votes to each county and stipulated that the candidate in a primary election who carried a county won that county's unit votes." Numan V. Bartley and Hugh D. Graham, *Southern Elections: County and Precinct Data, 1950-1972* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978), 93.

governorship in 1970, Carter took advantage of these changes and "restructured the debate over racial equality" in Georgia, "[helping] guide public debate" towards dealing with the realities of desegregation.[214]

Understanding how the Georgian viewed racism, racial politics, and Southern political life between the time he left the Navy and became governor highlights Carter's role as a link between the old Southern liberal Democrats like Senator J. William Fulbright (D-AR) and the emergence of the new, post-Cold War liberal Democrats like President Bill Clinton. Carter's views on civil rights were slow to materialize, and even slower to become a basis for action, something he readily admitted. The fact that his childhood friends were black "makes it more difficult for me to justify or explain my own attitudes and actions during the segregation era."[215] While Michael Allen has made much of general characteristics of Southern culture—ideas of honor, community, or individualism—in shaping the Georgian's views on race, what instead gave weight and depth to Carter's ideas about human rights was his experience watching and participating in the shifting political norms in Georgia.[216]

Carter's family heritage is mixed. Though his mother and father, a traditionalist, did not see eye to eye on the subject, his father turned a blind eye when Carter's mother, Miss Lillian,

---

[213] Bartley, *Modern Georgia*, 196.

[214] Bartley, *Modern Georgia*, 207. While Carter did not win all the African American vote in 1970, the election was marked by a dramatic increase in voter participation by black citizens. Bartley and Graham estimate that in 1950 approximately 140,000 African Americans voted; in 1970, this number jumped to about 395,000. Bartley and Graham, *Southern Elections*, 93.

[215] Carter, *An Hour Before Daylight*, 229.

[216] See Michael Leroy Allen, "The Human Rights Policy of Jimmy Carter: Foundations for Understanding," dissertation, 1984 Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

received African American friends in the living room. The family, within the confines of the Jim Crow South, was comparatively progressive—maintaining a friendship with the bishop of the major African American Episcopal Church or listening to boxing matches on the radio with the farm hands.[217] But the strict, unspoken codes of propriety were also followed. When Earl's workers listened to a radio broadcast of a boxing match outside the family house, they waited to return home to celebrate the victory of an African American boxer over a white one.[218]

This structure of deference, demanded by Southern culture, led to what Carter remembered as his first fight with his father about race. He recalled that during his stint as a naval officer serving on nuclear submarines, he "naturally forgot or ignored racial distinctions."[219] While on leave in 1950, he described to his father how he and the crew of his submarine had refused an invitation by the British government in Nassau to a party because the only black member of the vessel's crew was not invited. Earl voiced his disapproval and abruptly left the room, prompting Lillian to ask her son to leave race alone when talking to his father.[220]

The surge of civil rights activities and the white backlash following the *Brown v. Board* decision in 1954 caught Jimmy Carter by surprise. After his father's death in 1953, Carter returned home and took over the family business. Once back in Plains, he joined the school board and quietly campaigned to consolidate the Americus and Sumter County schools, black

---

[217] It would not be until Carter was in high school that he noticed how he and his old playmates began to be separated by race.

[218] Bourne, *Jimmy Carter*, 24.

[219] Carter, *Turning Point*, 17.

[220] Carter, *Why Not the Best*, 34; Jimmy Carter, *Turning Point: A Candidate, a State, and a Nation Come of Age* (New York: Times Books, 1992) 17.

and white both. As Peter Bourne noted, "naively discounting the emotions involved, Jimmy believed that skeptical parents, wanting the best for their children, would inevitably accept the plan if presented with the facts."[221] Carter argued for consolidation on the grounds that it provided a better education for all of Sumter County's children. Once the *Brown* ruling was handed down, though, consolidation was perceived as a backdoor for integration. Jimmy and his wife Rosalynn's stance on consolidation wreaked havoc on the extended family: an uncle and a cousin became outspoken opponents of consolidation, speaking for much of Plains' population. Ultimately, anti-integration forces defeated the effort by a narrow margin.[222] From this, Carter later observed that, "because of intimidation by White Citizen's Councils and the inflammatory rhetoric of politicians, the federal courts' civil rights decisions had little impact on the lives of most Georgians."[223]

As White Citizens Councils mushroomed following the *Brown* decision, Carter's political stance on civil rights—and ultimately human rights—took shape. He refused to join the local Citizen's Council, the only white man in the county to do so. This prompted a brief boycott of his fledgling peanut farming and warehousing business. The boycott began after the Citizens Council, joined by the police chief and the pastor at Carter's church, paid a visit to his office in 1958. The group pushed Carter to join, which he refused. They then offered to pay the membership fee, a paltry five dollars. Again Carter refused, this time becoming angry, tearing

[221] Bourne, *Jimmy Carter*, 106.

[222] According to Bourne, the county vote for consolidation was lost by only 84 votes but in Plains only 33 votes were cast in favor as opposed to 201 against. Bourne, *Jimmy Carter,* 107.

[223] Carter, *Turning Point*, 23.

up the application, and flushing it down the toilet.[224] Soon afterward, the Plains Baptist Church, which Carter and his family attended, voted to ban African Americans from attending services with whites. Only Carter's family—his wife, himself, his mother, and his two children—and one other parishioner voted against the deacons' decision. The affair prompted Carter to re-evaluate how he dealt with his beliefs in the face of injustice.

Carter ultimately decided that he had to put his beliefs into action. In doing so, he ran for political office, first as a state representative and then for governor. Elected governor in 1970, he quickly established himself as a progressive and activist leader. As governor, Carter left behind a legacy of pro-civil rights, responsible government, and environmental protection. His civil rights legacy was particularly significant. Though his platform was not entirely anti-segregationist, he proclaimed in his inaugural speech that his administration would be different—and it was. He replaced Roy Harris, a vocal segregationist, from the state university system's Board of Regents with Jesse Hill, an African American. Carter created a biracial Civil Disorder Unit to go into communities around Georgia and address civil rights problems before they got out of hand. In January 1973, he hung a portrait of Martin Luther King, Jr. in the State Capitol and declared a statewide Martin Luther King, Jr. Day. Carter's focus on civil rights was a combination of both substance and style. Both were important as Georgia had long been recognized as the leader in Southern life and politics, prompting one scholar to argue that it was "only fitting and proper that another son of Georgia…should sever the umbilical cord that had so nourished race as the central theme of Southern" politics.[225] Carter, in an interview in 1985,

---

[224] See Godbold, *Jimmy and Rosalynn*, 87-88.

[225] Gary M. Fink, "Jimmy Carter and the Politics of Transition," in *Georgia Governors in an Age of Change: From Ellis Arnall to George Busbee*, ed. Harold P. Henderson and Gary L. Roberts (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1988) 243.

observed that "I served at a time of racial unrest, and I always felt a heavy responsibility to try to leave the governor's office at the end of four years with as much harmony and common purpose among our black and white citizens as possible."[226]

IN no small part, Carter's activism grew out of his religious beliefs. Growing up in a small Southern Baptist church, Carter noted that white and black communities worshipped together in Plains until the Civil War and Reconstruction led to separate services. Though there were African American preachers in and out of his home, there was little black presence in his Sunday morning life during his childhood and later years.[227] The Carter family's style of Baptist faith was marked by "more moderate preaching, so we were not afflicted with the kind of harsh fire-and brimstone sermons that we sometimes heard in other churches."[228] The question, though, is how much did Southern religion impact Carter?

Jimmy Carter was a self-proclaimed Southern Baptist, though he straddled a fault-line within the denomination.[229] As Gary Smith notes, "In most ways, Carter's personal faith was typical of Southern Baptists and most other evangelicals. He believed in the deity of Christ, the need to accept Christ as Savior and Lord, the importance of evangelism, the sinfulness of human

---

[226] Interview by Gary L. Roberts, "Jimmy Carter: Years of Challenge, Years of Change,: in *Georgia Governors in an Age of Change: From Ellis Arnall to George Busbee*, ed. Harold P. Henderson and Gary L. Roberts (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1988) 249-250.

[227] Carter, *An Hour Before Daylight*, 220-221.

[228] Carter, *An Hour Before Daylight*, 220.

[229] This is a topic deserving its own study. Carter, though a Baptist was unable (and unwilling) to gain the support of the New Right in the 1980 election, a group led (in large part) by fellow Baptists like Jerry Falwell, yet he used the same theology to underscore his political and social beliefs.

beings, and the authority of the Bible."[230] Smith sees Carter as a man of mainstream Baptist faith moderated by a misunderstanding of Reinhold Niebuhr; that is, Carter adhered to the basics of Baptist theology while latching onto Niebuhr's understanding of love's role in the human community. Andrew Preston's recent work, while rightly noting the impact of religion on Carter, misreads two key elements. First, Carter—despite Preston's assertion—grew up firmly rooted in Baptist doctrines regarding the nature of man; namely, that man was, to use Norman Maclean's phrase, "by nature a damned mess."[231] By 1958, Carter had become a deacon in his local body, a position based in part on doctrinal acceptance of the idea of original sin. The position of deacon was linked to the book of Acts in the New Testament, where a group of seven men were selected to serve the needs of the congregation.[232] Those appointed as deacons focused especially on dealing with the effects of a sinful world on believers, specifically issues of poverty and justice. Second, the Baptists had always been an incredibly individualistic denomination thanks to their belief in soul competency. This allowed for massive differences in church governance regionally and nationally—something that was changing by the 1960s, ultimately affecting how Baptists, and the growing evangelical world, perceived Carter. As these shifts occurred, Carter represented a fading modernist trend within the Baptist Church, one that had emerged at the turn of the century under the leadership of Walter Rauschenbusch, leader of the Social Gospel movement, and others.

---

[230] Gary Scott Smith, *Faith and the Presidency: From George Washington to George W. Bush* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 296.

[231] Preston, *Sword of the Spirit*, 575. Norman Maclean, *A River Runs Through It and Other Stories, Twenty-fifth Anniversary Edition*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).

[232] See *Holy Bible*, Acts 6:1-7, English Standard Version (ESV).

Generally, Baptists throughout the country agreed with the long tradition of Reformed, or Calvinist, theology. They focused on "doctrines of the Trinity, the incarnation of Jesus Christ, the authority of Scripture, salvation by faith alone, the priesthood of believers [or soul competency], an ordained ministry [either in the traditional pulpit or in missionary activity], baptism by immersion and the observances of the Lord's Supper, all held together in a congregational form of church government."[233] For Jimmy Carter, two of these ideas are particularly important: first, the theological position of "soul competency," and second, the Baptist church's strong tradition of missionary work.

Baptists were a unique outgrowth of both American and British Protestantism. Taking Luther and Calvin's individualist doctrine literally, Baptist theology, through the idea of soul competency, held that each individual has the ability and the tools (via Scripture and prayer) to develop and maintain a direct, personal relationship with God. There is no wall between man and God, no priesthood to appease. Soul competency is profoundly democratic in that it holds that the individual is responsible, not just for his or her own religious well-being, but also for maintaining an active role in the wellbeing of the religious community and outside world.[234] For Carter this was key, as individuals had the responsibility to achieve community uplift as defined by the life and teachings of Christ. As one early scholar of the Georgian's philosophy put it, Carter

> was committed to the right of [all] people to have a say in the shaping of their own government. This basic human right, based on the Baptist distinctive of soul competence—the ability for and right of self-determination—was held as a human

[233] Bill J. Leonard, *Baptists in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 2; 88-89.

[234] Bourne, *Jimmy Carter*, 170; Michael Leroy Allen, *Human Rights Policy of Jimmy Carter*, 12.

rights goal for countries in other hemispheres, too.[235]

Carter's definition of soul competency was by no means the standard in the Southern Baptist world. Its impact on the Baptist world's endeavor to deal with the civil rights struggle in the South is evident in the life of Pastor Douglas Hudgins, who led the First Baptist Church in Jackson, Mississippi. In the aftermath of Reconstruction, Baptist congregations throughout the South had adopted a segregationist stance based on the "need" for racial purity.[236] The growing Southern evangelical Baptist movement began defining and implementing ideas of soul competency to uphold segregation in the face of a threatened "Southern way of life" by the 1960s.[237] This was often at odds with the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC), which had in the 1940s and 1950s—led by Southern Baptist Seminary professor James Weatherspoon—advocated racial equality, called on the denomination "to think about concrete political solutions to social issues," and ultimately accept and support the Supreme Court's *Brown v. Board* ruling in 1954.[238]

The debates at the SBC often had little impact on individual Baptist churches in the South. Douglas Hudgins' church, for example, argued that the local church's authority rested in the individual soul interacting with God. Accepting federal instructions on black-white relations

---

[235] Allen, *Human Rights Policy of Jimmy Carter*, 14. This would also produce a check on Carter's human rights efforts. Because he believed in personal responsibility and action, even at the national level, he was always loathe to directly interfere in a country's domestic affairs solely on the basis of human rights—it had to be compounded by other concerns.

[236] Charles Marsh, *God's Long Summer: Stories of Faith and Civil Rights*, 82-83.

[237] Marsh, *God's Long Summer*, 91.

[238] Marsh, *God's Long Summer*, 96.

"[amounted] to a betrayal of faith in God" and endangered the freedom of the individual.[239] As Charles Marsh notes, because the Baptist world dictated that the social order must mirror the spiritual order "the notion of lives triangulated on God, the body, and social purity turns racial homogeneity into a theological—if not metaphysical—necessity."[240] While Carter's church was less vocal than other congregations, it ultimately bent before the prevailing winds of localized Baptist theology (typified by Hudgins) when it voted to segregate, with only Carter and his family dissenting.

While individual congregations debated the race issue, Baptist missionary work, with its emphasis on social and economic justice, grew apace. In the nineteenth century, Baptist missions built schools and taught legalistic moralism, but as the twentieth century and the Cold War wound along, Baptist missionaries increasingly focused on protecting basic human needs.[241] Baptists were often in the vanguard of American mission work. Shortly after the SBC was founded in 1845, it created a special board to send missionaries abroad. By 1955, Southern Baptists were sending over 1,000 missionaries overseas; by 1980 that number had reached more than 3,000.[242] In his memoirs, Carter linked Baptist missionaries to his growing fascination with China: "My interest in China was kindled when I was a small boy during the 1930s, studying about Baptist missionaries there and reading letters from my Uncle Tom Grady, a radioman in

---

[239] Marsh, *God's Long Summer*, 111.

[240] Marsh, *God's Long Summer*, 112. Marsh goes on to argue that this is the "sad legacy" of soul competency.

[241] Leonard, *Baptists in America*, 36.

[242] Cited at the International Mission Board website (http://www.imb.org/main/page.asp?StoryID=4487&LanguageID=1709) accessed 23 June 2012.

the U.S. Navy, for whom China was a frequent port of call."[243] Carter later expanded on this, telling Chinese Vice-Premier Deng Xiaoping in January 1979 that, "as a child I had given five cents a week to help build hospitals and schools for Chinese children. Baptist missionaries to China were our ultimate heroes."[244]

While holding firm to the traditions and principles of his Baptist faith, Carter also followed in the footsteps of the Cold Warriors before him that relied on the New Left intellectual and theologian Reinhold Niebuhr.[245] Carter was a delayed Niebuhrian compared to most progressive Democratic politicians in the Cold War, reading Niebuhr during his first campaign for state government in the mid-1960s.[246] As a devout Southern Baptist, Carter had existed

---

[243] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 190.

[244] Carter, *White House Diary*, 283-284. By the 1960s, the SBC had renewed its focus on "home" missions with its restructured Home Mission Board (now called the North American Mission), sending groups across the United States to shore up other communities of faith while spreading the faith. Carter would take part in this internal mission movement in the late 1960s. See Godbold, *Jimmy and Rosalynn*, 135.

[245] Some historians and theologians have attempted to place Niebuhr within the neoconservative camp, or within the emergence of the New Christian Right. This view, however, is remarkable in its lack of understanding of both groups' theology. For example, Niebuhr did not hold the fundamentalist view of Biblical inerrancy; yet, this is a central tenant of the New Right's theology. His general social liberalism, plus his desire for inclusion in the community nations also lends one to question the validity of much previous writing on Niebuhr's influence on the New Right, neo-orthodoxy, and the development of neo-conservatism. Niebuhr rightly belongs in the neo-orthodox camp of Protestant theology that had emerged during the 1940s and 1950s, one that blended traditional Reformation theology with the concerns of the modern, industrial world. The neo-orthodox movement would indeed spawn figures that became neoconservatives, but also an equal number of left-leaning Protestant intellectuals. For the most recent examinations of these groups, see David A. Hollinger, *After Cloven Tongues of Fire: Protestant Liberalism in Modern American History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013) and David R. Swartz, *Moral Minority: The Evangelical Left in an Age of Conservatism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

[246] Many southern Democrats turned to Niebuhr as a way to find theological solace and a plan of action in dealing with racism, as E. Stanley Godbold, Jr. notes in his *Jimmy and Rosalynn Carter: The Georgia Years, 1924-1974* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 130-134.

within the tension of Niebuhr's insistence on the sinful nature of man and society and his desire to see a better world created.[247] In 1965, Carter, following the advice of his friend and Georgia Federal Judge William Gunter, read *Reinhold Niebuhr On Politics*, a concise distillation of Niebuhr's views.[248] Two weeks after he received the work from Gunter, Carter called him, stating "that's the most amazin' thing I've ever read."[249] William Miller, who examined Niebuhr's influence on Carter, observed that, "there is a kinship of understanding between the two men. President Carter…share[s] the main outline: Christian realism, realism in the service of social justice, social intelligence in the service of 'love.'"[250] As Carter's biographer and friend Peter Bourne stated, "For Jimmy, who sought precision and clarity in everything he did, Niebuhr seemed to answer the perplexing question of how a deeply committed Christian could conduct himself in politics without compromising his religious values."[251]

Niebuhr, raised in the American Midwest during the early twentieth century, was a pastor in pre-Depression Detroit, a post that pushed him into left-of-center politics (for a time Niebuhr was a committed Socialist) and, occasionally, theology. Niebuhr moved to New York's Union

---

Godbold's is perhaps the most inclusive and recent look at Carter's early years, correcting some of the problems found in Bourne's work.

[247] It must be said, though, that this perception is often based on an insufficient reading of both Niebuhr *and* Carter.

[248] Reinhold Niebuhr, *Reinhold Niebuhr On Politics: His Political Philosophy and its Application to Our Age as Expressed in His Writings*, ed. Harry R. Davis and Robert C. Good. (New York: Scribner, 1960).

[249] Conversation with William Gunter quoted in William Lee Miller, *Yankee From Georgia* (New York: Times Books, 1978), 214.

[250] Miller, *Yankee from Georgia*, 216.

[251] Bourne, *Jimmy Carter*, 171.

Theological Seminary in 1928, where he stayed for the rest of his illustrious career. While there, he made a name for himself with his vocal opposition to Nazi Germany, helped found the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), and joined the New York State Liberal Party.

Niebuhr's additions to Christian pragmatism and his subsequent impact on American politics during the early Cold War propelled him into the national spotlight. His view of the world—seen especially in *The Children of Light and The Children of Darkness* (1944)—was formed prior to the birth of the Cold War.[252] Instead of calling for a conciliatory relationship with the Soviet Union, he attacked Henry Wallace and others for this stance, and argued this view ignored the pervasive evil of socialism. Disagreeing with Hans Morgenthau, Niebuhr argued this evil was a reflection of mankind; thus it was not merely the American people that needed saving from communism, but rather all civilization needed saving from itself.[253] By the end of the 1940's, Niebuhr was a loud, fervent voice in the debate over America's purpose in the Cold War. He advocated that the United States must act against communism in order to protect democracy and western civilization.[254] The theologian's writings helped convince liberal America that racism, totalitarianism, and imperialism were threats to America's security and to its spiritual and moral well being as well as the Western world.[255]

---

[252] Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Children of Light and The Children of Darkness: A Vindication of Democracy and a Critique of its Traditional Defense*. (New York: Scribner, 1944).

[253] Campbell Craig, *Glimmer of a New Leviathan: Total War in the Realism of Niebuhr, Morgenthau, and Waltz* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 76.

[254] Craig, *New Leviathan*, 77-78.

[255] Randall Bennett Woods, *LBJ: Architect of American Ambition* (New York: Free Press, 2006), 501.

Niebuhr often dealt in dualities, something easily understood by a devout Southern Baptist like Carter. Niebuhr's dual emphasis on the inherent evil of man and the duty of the Christian to fight for social justice found fertile ground in Carter's rights-oriented Southern Baptist theology. Niebuhr gave voice to Carter's belief that though democracy was not perfect, it was the best way for humanity to achieve any justice. As he argued that the fight for justice joined neatly with a belief in God, Niebuhr "assaulted the illusions of utopianism in the name of Christian realism and political pragmatism" and showed that a person could be a "political progressive without shallowness, an anti-Communist moralist without fanaticism, a religious believer without delusion."[256] Niebuhr gave an anti-communist, intellectual voice to policy debates in America during the Cold War and recreated the American liberal dialogue, influencing a generation of Cold Warriors. His argument that humanity's imperfections in no way "reliev[ed] humanity of the obligation to improve the world where it could" resonated with Carter as he prepared for the presidency in the early 1970s.[257]

This theme of justice stayed with the Georgian. As a key element in Christian realism, justice was threatened by man's self-love. Self-love, according to Niebuhr, was the "source of all evil."[258] It translated into egocentricity, the tendency of man to think of himself as his own end and make himself "the false center" of any group.[259] By subsuming the individual to the community, democratic governments coerced the population into establishing justice.

---

[256] Stephen J. Whitfield, *The Culture of the Cold War* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), 99-100.

[257] Ronald Brownstein, "Pragmatic Path to an Ideal World," *Financial Times*, 27 March 2005.

[258] Niebuhr, *Political Problems*, 122.

[259] Niebuhr, *Political Problems,* 123.

"Governments must coerce," Niebuhr argued, even if that coercion came close to tyranny.[260] Despite the danger involved, Niebuhr felt that the inherent self-corrective powers of a democracy made for the best method of "accommodating and balancing the interests of competing groups."[261] This led him to assert that of the current governmental ideologies, communism was the antithesis of this because it was a rigid system. Democracy, Niebuhr wrote, should be "rooted in the principle of universal suffrage," thus providing society with the ability to self-correct.[262] The theologian argued that humanity has a "residual capacity for justice," and that humanity's institutions must be subject to changes in society.[263] Institutions could adjust because good and evil, save self-love, were not permanently defined and democracy was therefore able to shift as needed.[264]

Carter internalized these distinctions while running for governor of Georgia. Writing in 1974, Carter noted that Niebuhr was one of the major influences on his understanding of justice. Referring to one of the theologian's famous maxims—that it is the sad duty of political systems to establish justice in a sinful world—Carter argued that though he was a simple engineer unschooled in philosophy, the intellectual's insistence on the use of government, and its need for continued flexibility, was something he had learned back in Plains. Noting farmers and engineers always looked for the best way to make things work, Carter argued "as a scientist, I

---

[260] Niebuhr, *On Politics*, 182.

[261] Niebuhr, *On Politics,* 183.

[262] Reinhold Niebuhr, *Christian Realism and Political Problems* (New York: Scribner, 1953), 96.

[263] Niebuhr, *Political Problems*, 195.

[264] Niebuhr, *Political Problems*, 130.

was working constantly…to probe every day of my life for constant changes for the better…As a farmer, the same motivation persists. Every farmer that I know of, who is worth his salt…is ahead of the experiment stations and the research agronomist in finding better ways" to farm.[265]

Man's constant effort to improve was combined with a natural movement to establish social groups and governments. Niebuhr argued these groups, made up of sinful people, would breed problems that could destroy them.[266] For Niebuhr, and later, Carter, the larger human community was held together by emotion or force instead of the mind or education.[267] This created a lack of justice and a need for political order. Even though humanity did not possess the "conscious will" to set up a just form of governance, Niebuhr argued that humanity still had the responsibility to establish justice via cooperation, thanks to a Kantian understanding of morality and ethical responsibility.[268] Justice could be achieved only by a degree of coercion on one hand, and a resistance to it on the other.[269] For Niebuhr, coercion by government, even a democratic government, was inevitable. Though some evil crept in because of this, humanity still had the opportunity to achieve justice. Carter, during his time as Georgia governor, echoed this belief. In his campaign memoirs, Carter stated "that there is no way to establish or maintain justice without law, that the laws are constantly changing to stabilize the social balance of the

---

[265] "A Message on Justice," Governor Jimmy Carter's address on "Law Day" at the University of Georgia, 4 May 1971.

[266] Niebuhr, *On Politics*, 84.

[267] Niebuhr, *On Politics*, 87.

[268] Niebuhr, *On Politics*, 181.

[269] Niebuhr, *On Politics*, 182. Niebuhr elaborated, saying a "healthy society must seek to achieve the greatest possible equilibrium of power, the greatest possible number of centers of power, the greatest possible social check upon the administration of power, and the greatest possible inner moral check on human ambition, as well as the most effective use of forms of power in which consent and coercion are compounded."

competing forces of a dynamic society, and that the sum total of the law is an expression of the structure of government."[270]

As a theologian, Niebuhr argued that the major contribution Christianity could make to achieving political justice was to set all "propositions of justice under the law of love...creating the freedom and maneuverability necessary to achieve a tolerable accord between man and nations."[271] He argued that Christianity gave men freedom, even the freedom to sin.[272] This freedom correlated with the ability of a democracy to allow for change as men worked in social groups that were the "approximation of [a] loving community under the conditions of sin."[273] In a way, it stemmed back to the concept of *agape*, a type of love, which both Niebuhr and Carter acknowledged was largely unattainable in this world. For Niebuhr, justice "was the nearest equivalent, and was therefore the way to apply love to politics. In Jimmy's copy of *Courage to Change* he heavily underlined, 'Justice must be the instrument of love,'" a concept Carter expanded on in July 1976 when he noted

> Love in isolation doesn't mean anything. But love, if applied to other people, can change their lives for the better through what I describe…as simple justice—fairness, equality, concern, compassion, redressing of grievances, elimination of inequalities, recognizing the poor are the ones who suffer the most even in our society, which is supposed to be fair.[274]

---

[270] Carter, *Why Not the Best?*, 93-94.

[271] Niebuhr, *Political Problems,* 110.

[272] Niebuhr, *On Politics*, 72.

[273] Niebuhr, *On Politics*, 181.

[274] Bourne, *Jimmy Carter*, 171; Men's Bible class lesson, Plains Baptist Church, 18 July 1976, Compiled by Wesley Pippert, *Spiritual Journey of Jimmy Carter: In His Own Words*, (New York: MacMillan, 1978), 91.

Carter's understanding of how a new world was to be created was founded firmly in the joining of his understanding of the South's own struggles to achieve freedom for its citizens with Niebuhr's insistence that government was needed precisely because man was bent toward evil. As he declared shortly after receiving the Democratic nomination in 1976,

> We ought to translate love for one another into the application of simple justice. Justice takes on many forms, and although it can be described as simple, it's a complex thing, and the complexity of it arises from the fact that our nation is made up of so many people.[275]

Commenting on his human rights policy after he left office, Carter wrote that based on his experience in the South he knew "that this policy would not be painless, nor could it be based on a blind adherence to consistency. The world was too complex to respond to the application of a few simple rules."[276] Rather than being idealistic or hypocritical, Carter's human rights policy was the extension of a joint understanding of Christian pragmatism and the dual legacy of Southern religion and race relations. The Supreme Court cases and Civil Rights Acts represented coercion in behalf of justice by the government, something with which Carter wholeheartedly agreed.

CARTER'S final lessons in how to apply his beliefs and experiences to politics came from his study of American presidents. Carter was like most Americans and readily identified his favorite presidents—though his choices were somewhat different. The usual list from the twentieth century revolved around Presidents Wilson, Roosevelt, Eisenhower, and Kennedy. Two

---

[275] Speech to conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations on Rosh Hashanah, Boston, MA 30 September 1976, in Pippert, *Spiritual Journey*, 93-94.

[276] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 147-148.

presidents particularly influenced Carter: Woodrow Wilson and Harry S. Truman—Truman most of all. For Carter, the ethics and actions of these two men, along with their commitment to principle and idealism, served as inspiration and guidance.

Harry Truman, Carter's favorite twentieth-century president, was born in Lamar, Missouri in 1884, and grew up farming in Independence.[277] After fighting in World War I, Truman returned to Kansas City with his young wife, Elizabeth to become a small businessman. Soon after, he became active in the Democratic Party, and in 1934, with the help of the Pendergast machine, was elected US Senator. During World War II, he chaired a committee investigating waste and corruption in the war effort and was subsequently elevated to the vice presidency in 1944 by Franklin Roosevelt. In April 1945, President Roosevelt died of a heart attack and Truman suddenly found himself leading the nation as World War II came to a close.

After the war, Truman attempted to expand the New Deal with his Fair Deal, comprised of over twenty programs dealing with everything from education to civil rights to health care. Unfortunately for Truman, many of his plans were dashed upon the rocks of a Republican backlash in Congress. Following the end of World War II, the victorious powers jockeyed for position in a shifting global arena as the Cold War emerged. In the face of Soviet aggression and the very real problems of rebuilding Europe, the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, and Kennan's ideology (subsequently modified by Paul Nitze's NSC-68) of containment became the cornerstone for America's twentieth-century diplomacy. Truman's policies and ideals were intended to protect free peoples throughout the world from communist aggression.

This was the man Carter looked to for inspiration as he entered the White House. By the 1960s and 1970s, Truman was regarded as ineffectual and bumbling, yet goodhearted and

[277] Bourne, *Jimmy Carter*, 364.

earnest. By contrast, Carter saw Truman as "direct and honest, somewhat old-fashioned in his attitudes, bound close to his small hometown roots, courageous in facing serious challenges, and willing to be unpopular if he believed his actions were best for the country."[278] He saw in Truman's life a concern for human rights.[279] At home and abroad, Truman dealt with a variety of rights-based issues as he desegregated the Armed Forces in 1948, pushed forward the creation of the Nuremberg Charter (1945), and argued for expanded health care and education.[280] One of Truman's most under-appreciated accomplishments, for Carter at least, was his advocacy of the United Nations and its subsequent creation of the Human Rights Commission, an agency generally associated with Eleanor Roosevelt.[281]

Another easy link to Truman for Carter was a shared faith—both men were Baptists.[282] While much has been made of Carter's faith, scholars tend to dismiss Truman's; even his principle biographer, Alonzo Hamby, is guilty. Like Carter, Baptist-style Christianity attracted Truman because it afforded the individual direct access to God. Truman was fundamentally a

---

[278] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 70.

[279] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 70.

[280] Borgwardt, *New Deal for the World*, 236. See also, Thomas Borstelman, *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001); Jonathan Rosenberg, *How Far the Promised Land? World Affairs and the American Civil Rights Movement from the First World War to Vietnam* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006); Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).

[281] See Elizabeth Borgwardt, *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005); Mary Ann Glendon, *A World Made New: Eleanor Roosevelt and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (New York: Random House, 2001) for a full discussion of this subject.

[282] One scholar even argues both men were Southern Baptists. See Ellen M. Rosenberg, *The Southern Baptists: A Culture In Transition* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1989), 2-3.

man of the people, and the Baptist church was fundamentally a church of the people.[283] One is most able to connect Truman and Carter through their shared religious beliefs and their impact on policy. By attempting to blend together "aspects of Wilsonian idealism and Rooseveltian realism," Truman provided a ready model for a president faced with critical junctures in the international arena.[284] According to Truman, the Cold War was a battle not simply between the Soviet Union and America, but "between the 'world of morals' and the 'world of no morals.'"[285] For Truman, democracy was a link to spirituality. In a Mexico City speech in 1947, Truman stated:

> All our peoples have a common belief which we call democracy. Democracy has a spiritual foundation because it is based upon the brotherhood of man. We believe in the dignity of the individual. We believe that the function of the state is to preserve and promote human rights and fundamental freedoms. We believe that the state exists for the benefit of man, not man for the benefit of the state. Everything else that we mean by the word democracy arises from this fundamental conviction. We believe that each individual must have as much liberty for the conduct of his life as is compatible with the rights of others. To put this belief into practice is the essential purpose of our laws.[286]

---

[283] Alonzo Hamby, *Man of the People: A Life of Harry S. Truman* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 21.

[284] Elizabeth Edwards Spalding, *The First Cold Warrior: Harry Truman, Containment, and the Remaking of Liberal Internationalism* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2006), 2; 4. Spalding's work is useful for understanding the place of Truman's beliefs in his approach to the White House; however, her understanding of Truman's foreign policy is problematic, as is her grasp of its influence. For a more nuanced examination of Truman's policies, see: John Lewis Gaddis, *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941-1947* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000 *originally published in 1972*), John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Strategy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005 *originally published in 1982*); Randall B. Woods & Howard Jones, *Dawning of the Cold War: The United States' Quest for Order* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1991); and Melvyn Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992).

[285] Spalding, *The First Cold Warrior*, 221.

[286] Harry S. Truman: "Address in Mexico City.," March 3, 1947. Online by Gerhard

Connecting religion to governance and human rights came naturally to Truman. The Sermon on the Mount as recounted in the Gospel of Matthew was where Truman frequently turned. He did so in 1947, and declared that if "'men and nations would but live out the precepts of the ancient prophets and the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount, problems which now seem so difficult would soon disappear.'"[287] As with his Baptist faith, democracy "rested on the idea of the dignity and worth of each person, whereas totalitarian forms of government relied on precisely the opposite."[288] Democratic government for Truman was the only force capable of bringing forth the best in humanity. For Carter it was much the same; he, like Truman, in a Niebuhrian fashion, saw the world as divided into children of darkness and children of light, and only democracy, flawed as it was, could bring forth order, freedom, and the guarantee of universal human rights.

Woodrow Wilson was the second significant political influence on Carter. Wilson, more than any twentieth century president, transformed American thinking on diplomacy and the country's place in the world. Various interpretations of "Wilsonian internationalism" have ranged from imperialism wrapped in moralistic rhetoric to a campaign to export progressivism. Current scholarship on Wilson's legacy and influence has centered upon varied understandings of this idea of "progressive internationalism," as depicted by Thomas Knock and, to a degree,

---

Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency* http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=12841&st=mexico+city&st1=#ixzz1zbTgcKm6. (Accessed 3 July 2012.)

[287] Quoted in Anne R. Pierce, *Woodrow Wilson and Harry Truman: Mission and Power in American Foreign Policy* (Westport: Praeger, 2003), 136.

[288] Pierce, *Woodrow Wilson and Harry Truman*, 136.

Wilson's preeminent contemporary biographer, John Milton Cooper.[289] Like Truman and Carter, Wilson's beliefs shaped the nature of his policies and legacy.

Woodrow Wilson was born in 1856 to a Virginia Presbyterian, a minister-turned-professor. Wilson attended what is now known as Princeton University (then the College of New Jersey) and went on to become a lawyer. He quickly became bored practicing law and in 1890 began teaching and writing history, earning his doctorate at Johns Hopkins. Until 1902, Wilson was a professor of jurisprudence and political economy at Princeton. That year he became president of the university, and in 1910 ran successfully for the governorship of New Jersey. He led the state in adopting new election procedures, passing anti-corruption legislation, and imposing regulations on railroads.[290]

Wilson's progressive internationalism, a conglomeration of diplomatic ideals cobbled together during World War I and the fight over the Treaty of Versailles in Congress, has had a remarkable influence on American foreign policy. His progressive ideology was heavily reliant upon Rauschenbusch's Social Gospel and its call to uplift the less fortunate members of society.[291] For Wilson, America's role hearkened back to John Winthrop's shining city on the hill, beckoning the world to salvation. Wilson's foreign policy, termed "missionary diplomacy," focused on the triumph of "right" in the world, preservation of peace for mankind, and the extension of democracy to all nations, either by self-determination, or, more commonly, by tutoring emerging nations in the ways of democracy. As Knock argued, "The ultimate objective

---

[289] Thomas J. Knock, *To End All Wars: Woodrow Wilson and the Quest for a New World Order* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); John Milton Cooper, *Woodrow Wilson: A Biography* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2009).

[290] See Cooper, *Woodrow Wilson*.

[291] Walter Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960).

of Wilson and the progressive internationalists was a lasting peace that would accommodate change and advance democratic institutions and social and economic justice; and a just peace was dependent on the synchronous proliferation of political democracy and social and economic justice around the world."[292] Wilson's ideas set the standard for American international involvement during the American Century. They provided a foundation upon which to articulate a foreign policy of connectedness with the greater community of nations in a way that allowed America to bring the best of itself—its democratic tradition—to "younger" and "less" developed regions.

Wilson, though, was no cold-blooded arbiter of policy, crafting a master plan for America to take charge of the world. His efforts to forge a more peaceful and just world were rooted in his religious and social heritage. Woodrow Wilson, often portrayed as aloof and rigid, came by his stances honestly. As Malcolm Magee has recently shown, faith for Wilson was "intertwined with the president's reasoning processes, buttressed his thought and engaged his imagination of what the world should be."[293] Like the impact of religion on Carter in the 1970s, it is important to remember how Protestantism, especially the variety found in the South, shaped Wilson and was "inseparable from the other aspects of his philosophy."[294] Religion, especially the civic religion formed throughout the country during the Progressive Era, provided the foundation of Wilson's worldview by 1914. It afforded him, and the country, the mantle of a "'redeemer nation' [that] added strength to a particularly American foreign policy, based on faith in

---

[292] Knock, *To End All Wars*, 57.

[293] Malcolm Magee, *What the World Should Be: Woodrow Wilson and the Crafting of a Faith-Based Foreign Policy* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2008), 2.

[294] Magee, *What the World Should Be*, 9.

America's mission in the world, that continues to hold implications for American foreign relations," according to Magee.[295]

Wilson's views are even more clearly linked to Carter (and Truman) when tempered by the writings and philosophy of Niebuhr, who provided a clearer explanation than mere exceptionalism for why democracy might succeed when all other forms of government were destined to fail. Niebuhr, though different in his basic outlook and reasoning, expanded upon an important distinction that Wilson and the Social Gospel acolytes had made about the world. Niebuhr argued that—contrary to the Social Gospel—man and society cannot be perfected but that the evil of man, and especially of society, could be tempered and mitigated by Wilsonian self-determination and peacemaking. Jimmy Carter presented a study on how Wilson's thought joined with Niebuhr's.[296]

CARTER, governor of Georgia in 1970 with an eye increasingly turned toward the national spotlight, began looking for a way he could transition his fledgling philosophy of rights from state government to international affairs. His understanding of the world emerged while he served as a submarine officer under Admiral Rickover in the early years of the Cold War. Carter was part of the nation's military as containment moved into full swing in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Carter's ship had even arrived in China not long before the Communists pushed Jiang Jieshi (Chiang Kaishek) off the mainland; he subsequently helped develop the foundation of America's nuclear submarine force in the early 1950s, teaching nuclear engineering to naval

---

[295] Magee, *What the World Should Be*, 2.

[296] It should be noted that Carter did not identify with Wilson's record on race, which was horrible. But in Carter's identifying with at least part of Wilson's legacy, the duality of the Southern legacy is evident.

officers on the *USS Seawolf*. These experiences illustrate that Carter understood the complexities of the nuclear Cold War world. Thus, when then-Governor Jimmy Carter joined Zbigniew Brzezinski and others in the Trilateral Commission (TC) in 1973, he had already formed a basic understanding of foreign affairs—that is, a desire for a multilateral world that worked to create stability, peace, and the advancement of human rights. As a result, Carter was less concerned about maintaining a bi- or tri-polar détente or the traditional strategy of containment.[297] Carter instead wanted to apply his ideals to the world, and the TC provided him the tools to do so.

Carter's invitation to join this highly select group was extremely important to his presidential hopes: how else was a governor from Georgia going to build a serious reputation in foreign policy? Gaddis Smith, in his work on Carter's foreign policy, argued that prior to the White House, Carter had no major understanding of the Cold War. In making this statement, Smith—like other scholars to follow him—misses the importance of the combination of the Commission and Carter's own personal beliefs.[298] Not long after Carter became governor of

---

[297] John Lewis Gaddis, in his classic *Strategies of Containment*, sees Carter arriving in office wavering between asymmetrical and symmetrical applications of containment, and that Carter had few differences with how Kissinger had applied Kennan's ideas. This argument, though, is problematic in several ways. First, Gaddis' work is in some measure limited by sources—many of the Carter Administration's documents have only been declassified in the last decade. Second, Gaddis relies primarily on an examination of Soviet-American relations, and then only through his limited binary of asymmetrical-symmetrical use of containment. This brings up the third problem: by focusing almost exclusively on the Soviet issue, Gaddis ignores broader policy statements made by all members of Carter's staff before and during his presidency. In particular, Gaddis ignores Carter's beliefs and experiences in forming his understanding of international relations. Finally, by ignoring these, Gaddis is unable to see that while it had its problems, Carter did indeed have a consistent diplomatic strategy from before he entered office until he left it. For Gaddis' account of the Carter years, see *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Policy during the Cold War, Revised and Expanded Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 342-350.

[298] Gaddis Smith, *Morality, Reason, and Power*, 27.

Georgia, he had a fortuitous meeting in April 1973 with David Rockefeller, the founder of the TC, and was invited to join the group. The group defined "trilateralism" as "the project of developing an organic alliance between major capitalist states, with the aim of promoting a stable form of world order which is congenial to their dominant interests."[299] The Commission brought together representatives from multiple sectors (businessmen, academics, and politicians) in Western Europe, Japan, and North America. Meeting twice a year, the group discussed major global issues—nuclear war, environmental concerns, human rights, or trade issues—and recommended policies that would hopefully provide a corrective to the unilateralism of Nixon and Kissinger.[300] In general, the American membership in the TC came from moderates on both sides of the aisle; those on the extreme right, like Irving Kristol, were not in the Trilateral's membership, but emerging neoconservatives like Samuel Huntington were.[301]

The Trilateral Commission was increasingly convinced that America's place in the world was changing as a consequence of the Cold War in general, and Vietnam in particular. Rockefeller, Brzezinski, and others within the TC argued that America's time at the top was waning. For the TC, the Soviets were no longer the sole personification of evil. In fact, no country necessarily was, and consequently the Trilateral Commission argued for a "complex interdependency" across the globe where America would partner with old and new nations to craft a safe and stable world.[302] Carter used the Commission to learn as much as he could about

[299] Stephen Gill, *American Hegemony and the Trilateral Commission*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 1.

[300] Gill, *American Hegemony*, 133-137.

[301] Gill, *American Hegemony*, 145-150.

diplomacy, "preparing and assessing issues and questions that I thought might be addressed from the White House, and after the first year, from the Presidency itself."[303] The Georgian read everything given to him by the group, gaining invaluable knowledge and establishing relationships that served him well during the 1976 campaign and after.[304] The Commission's belief in multilateralism fit nicely with Carter's understanding of morality and power, and the experience on the Commission helped cement Carter's view that America's purpose was no longer to lead by power alone, but through moral example and reconciliation. The country's new goal would be to craft a community of nations centered on justice, a goal that would be messy and unlikely to fit into earlier American models of waging the Cold War. Carter was especially drawn to the TC's early "theme of global interdependence and the necessity of international policy co-ordination," as was evident in his speeches throughout the first years of his term.[305]

By the time the Georgian was elected in 1976, Carter's understanding of human rights was formed, though not tested. With Wilson, Niebuhr, and Truman in the background, Carter set out to remake the world, though not in one fell swoop, and not without an understanding of how difficult this task would be. Like his putative mentors, Carter was both an idealist and a realist. As Carter said, "To me, the demonstration of American idealism was a practical and realistic

---

[302] For more on the Trilateral Commission, see Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, pages 829-830. For the CPD, see Jerry Sanders, *Peddlers of Crisis: The Committee on the Present Danger and the Politics of Containment* (Boston: South End Press, 1983).

[303] Interview with Jimmy Carter, 29 November 1982, final edited transcript, Carter Presidency Project, Miller Center, http://millercenter.org/president/carter/oralhistory/jimmy-carter (accessed 21 April 2012).

[304] Peter Bourne, *Jimmy Carter*, 240.

[305] Gill, *American Hegemony*, 173.

approach to foreign affairs, and moral principles were the best foundation for the exertion of American power and influence."[306]

A month before the election in 1976, Carter told Bill Moyer that he did not see American society as just, and that in response to this situation the role of a leader was

> to try to establish justice. And that applies to a broad gamut of things—international affairs, peace, equality, elimination of injustice in racial discrimination, elimination of injustice in tax programs, elimination of injustice in our criminal justice system and so forth. And it's not a crusade. It's just common sense.[307]

For Carter, justice was no more or less than a matter of common sense, a sense that was born from watching the struggles of the civil rights movement, dealing with issues of poverty and wealth, and seeing government as something to be used for good. In the same interview, Carter told Moyers, "I want [a government] that, when it performs a function, does it well and performs a function in ways that alleviate the problems of those who have not had an adequate voice in the past."[308] Following in the footsteps of the Roosevelts, Wilson, Truman, JFK, LBJ, and Nixon, Carter came into office seeing the presidency, not Congress or public opinion, as the leader of the country. The office of the President should set the tone for ethics, morality, and America's purpose and be transparent and responsive to the people.[309] This desire for openness and responsiveness, as well as his hope for justice, reflected both his religious beliefs and political heritage. Carter was very aware of the complexities and dangers of the world he lived in: the problems of civil rights, religion, and politics were in his home since before he was born; he had

---

[306] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 147.

[307] Don Richardson, editor, *Conversations with Carter* (Boulder: Lynee Rienner Publishers, 1998), 13.

[308] Richardson, *Conversations with Carter*, 14.

[309] Richardson, *Conversations with Carter*, 14.

served in the nuclear fleet; and he had been elected in a deep South state during a period of racial turmoil. Instead of seeing the difficulties ahead as insurmountable, Carter chose to hope in the progression of justice, a hope borne out by his faith and life experience. In his inaugural address, he declared "Our commitment to human rights must be absolute, our laws fair, our national beauty preserved; the powerful must not persecute the weak, and human dignity must be enhanced."[310]

[310] Jimmy Carter "Inaugural Address" 20 January 1977. *Public Papers of the Presidents*, Jimmy Carter 1977 Book I, www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=6575#axzz1wrNJDupP (4 June 2012).

Our country has been the strongest and most effective when morality and a commitment to freedom and democracy have been most clearly emphasized in our foreign policy.[311]

Chapter 4

Principled Diplomacy

"WE cannot export human rights…[When] dealing with Third World countries, their foreign policy behavior should be the determining factor, not their domestic practices."[312] This quote, used to open one of the more critical works on Jimmy Carter's diplomacy and his understanding of human rights, illustrates the prevailing view of Carter's foreign policy. Generally seen as scattered, hypocritical, and devoid of any guiding ideology, Carter is often accused of naïveté and wishful thinking in formulating and implementing US foreign policy.[313] Others charge that the Carter White House was merely reacting to events beyond its control.[314] This has lead to a simplistic view of Jimmy Carter's foreign policy, one that allows the Georgian no coherent diplomatic agenda. The governor-turned-president, however, did have a central idea; a guiding philosophy he hoped would lead America out of the excesses of the Vietnam and Nixon-Kissinger era.

---

[311] Jimmy Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 146.

[312] Ernest Lefever, in U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Human Rights and U.S. Policy, Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations, 96th Congress, 1st Session, 1979, pg. 230-231.

[313] For this view in particular, see Joshua Muravchik, *The Uncertain Crusade: Jimmy Carter and the Dilemmas of Human Rights Policy* (Lanham: Hamilton Press, 1986).

[314] For major interpretations of Carter's foreign policy, see Raymond Garthoff, *Détente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1994), chapters 17-27; Betty Glad, *An Outsider in the White House: Jimmy Carter, His Advisors, and the Making of American Foreign Policy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009); and Scott Kaufman, *The Foreign Policy of the Carter Administration* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008).

What has largely escaped scholars attempting to understand Carter's view of the world is his effort to inject what is termed here as "moral pragmatism" into the country's foreign policy. Moral pragmatism, defined as Carter's application of his unique morality and belief in political action focused on the protection of human rights, became the guiding principle for the White House from 1977 until 1980. Though not always successfully communicated, Carter's moral pragmatism created a foreign policy dedicated to building a "lasting peace, based not on weapons of war but on international policies which reflect our most basic values."[315] As did his predecessors, Carter soon discovered that absolute consistency in foreign policy is not easy. He soon encountered unforeseen changes and problems; in particular, the Iran Hostage crisis, the Middle East peace efforts, and a domestic economy under duress. Carter's guiding principle for the country's diplomacy, human rights, was problematic, but it was not a global failure.[316] To illustrate both the success and failures of the policy, two case studies will be briefly examined. The first, the Soviet-American relationship, was fraught with difficulties due to the legacy of the Cold War. Second, US relations with Latin America proved more amenable to a policy of moral pragmatism.

Scholars have previously discussed the discrepancies between Carter's Soviet and Latin American policy. These earlier assessments, though, neglect Carter's attempt to inject moral pragmatism into the foundation of America's foreign policy. Like Wilson before him, Carter

---

[315] "Inaugural Address," Jimmy Carter, 20 January 1977, *Public Papers of the Presidents: Jimmy Carter, 1977, Vol. 1 (*hereafter *PPUS*). Accessed online via the American Presidency Project, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=6575&st=&st1= (24 January 2013).

[316] Most recently, Itai Sneh has espoused this view in his problematic work, *The Future Almost Arrived: How Jimmy Carter Failed to Change U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Peter Lang, 2008). Sneh takes the critique farther than most scholars, but like Schmidli, Gladd, and others, he misses Carter's desire to enact change over time, not an instant shift in global attitudes.

sought to build a diplomatic style based on an overarching moral standard, or as one commentator in the spring of 1977 termed it, a new American "crusade" in the post-Vietnam, post-Watergate era.[317] Whereas previous leaders had focused exclusively on national security concerns and variations of the containment strategy, Carter wanted to wean the nation off of alliances with totalitarian leaders throughout the developing world.[318] His desire to create a stable and ordered world was paradoxical. Simultaneously concerned with waging the Cold War and restoring moral credibility to the US, Carter relied on his religion and experience to resolve the paradox. Despite this effort, it often appeared to the nation—and sometimes his staff—as if the president's foreign policy amounted to little more than an undirected wielding of the nation's power abroad, despite his work in the military and the Trilateral Commission (TC).

Out of Carter's experience in Georgia politics and his work with the TC came most of the new president's foreign policy team. The TC introduced Carter to Walter Mondale, who became Vice President; Zbigniew Brzezinski, National Security Advisor (NSA); Cyrus Vance, who took charge of the State Department; Henry Brown at the Pentagon; and Sol Linowitz at the helm of the Panama Canal negotiations. Overall, twenty key posts within Carter's administration were filled by members of the Trilateral Commission. Other staffers, like Hamilton Jordan and Andrew Young, came from Carter's days in Georgia. Pat Derian, the first Assistant Secretary of

[317] Michael Reisman, "The Pragmatism of Human Rights," *The Nation*, May 7, 1977, page 554.

[318] For the standard look at containment and the development of the national security state, see John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Policy during the Cold War, Revised and Expanded Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

State for Human Rights, had built an impressive reputation battling for civil rights in Mississippi during the 1960s. Derian in particular would help reform the nation's purpose under Carter.[319]

Carter's Secretary of State, Cyrus Vance, was an old hand in Washington politics. Vance was one of the last practitioners of traditional Cold War diplomacy, a policy style rooted in Wilsonianism and Truman's desire to create a better world via containment and the export of American political values.[320] Born during World War I in West Virginia, Vance grew up in a well-respected family. He went to the prestigious Kent School, noted for its Christian idealism, where he was inculcated with a strong sense of morality and idealism. At home, his mother was highly religious, and left a strong imprint of right and wrong in the young man. His time at Kent was meant to prepare the young Vance for entering Yale University in 1935. As he grew up, Vance was surrounded by politicians like his uncle, John W. Davis, who ran against Calvin Coolidge in 1924. In 1942, after finishing a degree in law at Yale, Vance joined the Navy and served in the Pacific Theater. After the War, Vance returned to New York and practiced law, joined the Council on Foreign Relations, and, at the behest of his law firm, entered into the world of Washington politics. In 1960, John F. Kennedy appointed Vance to be the Department of Defense's general counsel. Two years later, Vance became Secretary of the Army, and by 1964, he was the Deputy Secretary of Defense, a post he held until he resigned in 1967 for health

---

[319] For an in depth look at Derian's career, see John Kelly Damico, "From Civil Rights to Human Rights: The Career of Patricia M. Derian," PhD dissertation, University of Alabama 1999.

[320] This was much to the consternation on the part of some of Carter's campaign staff, namely Hamilton Jordan, who would state in December 1976 that "if, after the inauguration you find Cy Vance as Secretary of State and Zbigniew Brzezinski as head of national security, then I would say we failed. And I'd quit." Jordan quoted in "Out of the Loop," Douglas Brinkley, *The New York Times*, 29 December 2002. This interview highlights how Carter, at least in retrospect, viewed his two main advisors. According to Carter, Vance held the same basic view on policy, so Carter generally knew what he would recommend. Brzezinski, on the other hand, viewed the world differently, providing a foil to Carter.

reasons. During the 1976 campaign, Carter tapped Vance to provide additional foreign policy advice, and after the election asked him to be Secretary of State.[321]

The other half of Carter's diplomatic team was Zbigniew Brzezinski. Like Kissinger before him, Brzezinski was a naturalized American citizen. Brzezinski's family was originally from Poland—his father had been Warsaw's representative in Canada before the German occupation in World War II. He held a PhD from Harvard and taught at Columbia University where he directed the Research Institute on Communist Affairs. Brzezinski quickly established a reputation as an expert on Soviet Communism and its impact on Eastern Europe. Like Vance, he was in Washington during the 1960s, but played a far more limited role, briefly serving on the Policy Planning Staff from 1966 until 1968. In 1968, while advising Vice President Humphrey's campaign for the White House, Brzezinski began writing on East Asian affairs, publishing a work on Japan and its changing role in international relations. Brzezinski went on to help lead the Trilateral Commission with David Rockefeller in the early 1970s, where he met Jimmy Carter and began a relationship that grew as Carter sought, and won, the Oval Office.[322]

Discussing the Carter administration in 1982, Brzezinski noted that he had his sights set on the post of National Security Advisor from the outset—he even wondered after he was asked by Carter for recommendations for the job "whether I should nominate some people for the slot who were obviously not suited for it" or people who would do a good job if chosen.[323] Indeed,

---

[321] For a concise, yet excellent, biography of Cyrus Vance, see David S. McLellan *Cyrus Vance* (New York: Rowman & Allanheld, 1985).

[322] At the moment, no biography of note exists on Brzezinski. The best concise biographical information resides in Gerry Andrianopoulos, *Kissinger and Brzezinski: The NSC and the Struggle for Control of U.S. National Security Policy* (New York: St. Martins, 1991).

[323] Interview with Zbigniew Brzezinski, Madeleine K. Albright, Leslie G. Denend, and William Odom, 18 February 1982, Carter Presidency Project, (final edited transcript), Miller

Brzezinski, long a critic of Henry Kissinger, was very aware of the increasing importance of the NSA's role and recognized that under a president like Carter the Secretary of State would be less involved in forming policy and more engaged in its implementation.

Brzezinski and the Trilateral Commission opposed not just Kissinger's model of diplomacy, but by 1976 and 1977, the growing voice of the Committee on the Present Danger (CPD) and its neoconservative audience within and without Washington. The CPD, reorganized in 1976, was chock full of old-school Cold Warriors intent on destroying the Soviet menace through the application of a military-focused containment strategy.[324] A breeding ground for neoconservative policymakers, the CPD argued for a massive American arms build up, evoking the heady days of the Cold War when NSC-68 reigned supreme in the Beltway.[325] Implicit in their anticommunism and policy agenda was a belief in America's moral, economic, and strategic superiority. These exceptionalist notions were reflected in the CPD's principle organizers, Eugene Rostow and Paul Nitze. By 1974 and 1975, Eugene Rostow in particular was convinced (thanks to his experience on the CIA's "Team B" exercise) that the Soviets had embarked on a massive arms buildup that Rostow claimed proponents of détente had ignored. Rostow had come of age politically in the wake of World War II, helped build the Marshall Plan, served in Lyndon Johnson's administration (with his brother, Walt, who was Johnson's NSA), and in general had helped formulate the fundamental strategies of early Cold War America.

Center, url http://millercenter.org/president/carter/oralhistory/zbigniew-brzezinski (accessed 20 April 2012).

[324] Jerry Sanders, *Peddlers of Crisis*, 8. The name "Committee on the Present Danger" was not a new one—it had been used from 1950-1953 for a group with a similar purpose.

[325] NSC-68, crafted by Paul Nitze, argued that any expansion of communism anywhere constituted a credible threat to American national security. This helped to spawn the arms race, proxy wars, and growing challenges to America's moral superiority in the Third World.

Of the eventual thirty-two people who became the CPD's core, Rostow was most keen on recruiting Paul Nitze, a Harvard trained lawyer who had married into the Standard Oil fortune.[326] It was Nitze who had crafted NSC-68, the document that militarized George Kennan's ideology of containment. After Eisenhower won the 1952 election, Nitze became a Washington outsider. Despite this, he continued to play a major role in building anti-Soviet, pro-nuclear sentiments throughout the country. In particular, Nitze crafted the Gaither Report in 1957 and 1958, which served as the basis for John Kennedy's attack on Nixon and Eisenhower in the 1960 election. Under JFK, Nitze became Secretary of the Navy and then moved to Deputy Secretary of Defense under Lyndon Johnson. Nitze's credentials as an anti-Soviet hawk willing to countenance nuclear warfare were impeccable. From Rostow's perspective, Nitze also had another major credential in the war against détente. In 1969, Nitze was named the Pentagon's representative in the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT) talks and had left the negotiations in the wake of Henry Jackson's failure to have the treaty amended in the Senate. Nitze felt Washington was giving too much away to a dangerous opponent. In 1974, after leaving the SALT II team in protest and arguing détente was a threat to American safety, Nitze joined Rostow at the CPD.[327]

In the days following Carter's election, the CPD went on the offensive. At a press conference on November 11, 1976 the group handed out its position paper, titled "Common

---

[326] A complete list of the original members of the CPD is available in *Alerting America: The Papers of the Committee on the Present Danger"* edited by Charles Tyroler, II (Washington: Pergamon Brassey's, 1984), pages 5-9. A few of the most notable names include Richard V. Allen, Saul Bellow, John M. Cabot, William J. Casey, William E. Colby, Andrew J. Goodpaster, Leon H. Keyserling, Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, Clare Boothe Luce, Norman Podhoretz, Matthew B. Ridgeway, Dean Rusk, and Elmo R. Zumwalt.

[327] See Vaisse, *Neoconservatism*, 159-162; Paul Nitze, *From Hiroshima to Glasnost: At the Center of Decision, A Memoir* (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1989), pages 180-192; chapters 16 and 17. Nitze also helped draft the initial Team B report calling for greater American action and caution regarding Soviet military technology and intentions.

Sense and the Common Danger." Warning that "our country is in a period of danger, and the danger is increasing," the paper observed that, "there is still time for effective action to ensure the security and prosperity of the nation…[and] to seek reliable conditions of peace with the Soviet Union, rather than an illusory détente."[328] The CPD argued that effectively dealing with Soviet aggression would allow for human security to flourish—indeed, it is only "Soviet expansionism [that] threatens to destroy the world balance of forces on which the survival of freedom depends," and America is "essential to the hopes of those countries which desire to develop their own societies."[329] Washington's leadership could be sustained only through continued dominance in economics, military strength, and foreign policy. Above all, the US must dramatically increase arms spending. Only military superiority would give Washington a "strong foundation" from which "we can pursue a positive and confident diplomacy, addressed to the full array of our economic, political and social interests in world politics."[330] We must be strong on all fronts, argued the CPD's first paper, otherwise America would find itself alone in a dangerous world.[331] Initially the CPD gained little attention. Only after the New Year did the

[328] "Common Sense and the Present Danger," 11 November 1976, paper by the Committee on the Present Danger, http://neoconservatism.vaisse.net/doku.php?id=common_sense_and_the_common_danger (accessed 31 January 2013).

[329] "Common Sense and the Present Danger," 11 November 1976, paper by the Committee on the Present Danger, http://neoconservatism.vaisse.net/doku.php?id=common_sense_and_the_common_danger (accessed 31 January 2013).

[330] "Common Sense and the Present Danger," 11 November 1976, paper by the Committee on the Present Danger, url: http://neoconservatism.vaisse.net/doku.php?id=common_sense_and_the_common_danger (accessed 31 January 2013).

[331] Because of this, the CPD initially approved of Nixon and Ford's past overtures to China as a way to weaken the Communist world.

New York Times mention the new group, and even then only select quotes on American-Soviet relations were mentioned.[332]

Despite this initial lack of publicity, the CPD—like the Trilateral Commission—worked to influence the nation's policy makers and their appointments to key posts. The CPD, aware of Carter's Trilateral predilections, utilized a dual strategy of external and internal influence. First, the CPD worked to influence debates via media and direct mail campaigns on an issue before Carter and his advisors began formulating policy. At the same time, they tried to get into the White House to meet with Carter and his advisors to recommend nothing short of "sharp change in direction of the country's foreign and defense policy."[333] The CPD's efforts reflected the growing resurgence throughout American society and politics of a hawkish stance on Communism. The CPD was but one facet of this movement, concentrating on maintaining American superiority in the face of a real buildup in the Soviet Union. Other groups focused their ire not simply on détente, but on Carter's openings to China, New Deal liberalism, and concerns about America's place in the world. While the Trilateral Commission and the CPD presented Americans with two different visions of the country's role in the world, both rejected Kissingerian diplomacy. As the CPD's concern about Soviet aggression pushed Nitze and upcoming hardliners like Jeanne Kirkpatrick to hark back to NSC-68, the Commission's leaders—Brzezinski in particular—initially advocated a more nuanced approach.[334]

---

[332] "On US Dealings with the Soviet Union," *The New York Times*, 11 January 1976, page 27.

[333] Vaisse, *Neoconservativism*, 170.

[334] This is not to discount Cyrus Vance's contributions to the development of America's policy in the Vietnam era. His refusal to fall into lock step with the Johnson administration speaks volumes about his perception of America's role in the world, and he would be a consistent voice for pragmatism in diplomacy, erring on the side of balance in an increasingly

Brzezinski's views on communism had solidified in the 1960s and early 1970s and shared some things with the early generation of Cold Warriors. Brzezinski agreed that the Soviet Union was a totalitarian dictatorship, but he and his co-author, Carl Friedrich, expressed uncertainty as to what the "lasting qualities" of the USSR would be. In 1965, Brzezinski and Friedrich observed that thanks to the Soviet's "intense concern [for] ideological conformity," Moscow had created a paradox. The Kremlin lived within the language of peaceful coexistence yet maintained a fierce dependence on eternal revolution.[335] This had led to the rise of a "country-to-country" strategy as the method to maintain the eternal revolution and complete the inevitable progression of history.[336] While the Kremlin had modified its rhetoric on violent expansion due to internal concerns, "the Communists have actually proclaimed this priority [of expansion] as a principle of their own foreign policy. But in view of their world-revolutionary goals, the claim is patently hypocritical…[as] war is a necessary means to the end the Communist strives for; it is not an end in itself."[337] Thus, Moscow—not Beijing—lived within a paradoxical joining of peaceful coexistence and eternal conflict. Conflict was only one way to expand the revolution, but peaceful coexistence with the outside world created stability for

---

dangerous world. Hence his seemingly problematic support for Carter's understanding of SALT II and his desire to work for stability in U.S.-Soviet relations.

[335] Zbigniew Brzezinski and Carl J. Friedrich, *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy, 2nd Ed.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 10; 15-16; 88.

[336] Brzezinski and Friedrich, *Totalitarian*, 96. The authors will also note that Khrushchev, in the 1950s, revised the practice of perpetual revolution and in doing so had "jettisoned the Leninist concept of civil war as a *necessary* stage in any society's transition to socialism." (113, italics in original)

[337] Brzezinski and Friedrich, *Totalitarian,* 353-358.

internal development.[338] In 1969, Brzezinski argued that for the present Russia needed international stability to maintain internal cohesion. Unfortunately for the Kremlin, the 1970s, according to Brzezinski's "own pessimistic view" would be a decade without "much international stability," leading to a potentially unstable Communist world.[339] Among other things, the rise of the Third World, the changing nature of Moscow and Beijing's relationship, and the expected end of the Vietnam War all led him to observe that conditions might not be conducive to Soviet growth.

At the time he came to the White House in 1977, Brzezinski felt Carter would be "reasonably tough and realistic in foreign policy and yet would be guided by certain basic principles…which I have always felt were America's strength, namely the fact that this is a society founded in certain philosophical assumptions which have historical relevance."[340] Elaborating on this theme in his exit interview in 1981, he stated that, "I felt very strongly that America had to be identified with an ideal. And, human rights is the essence of what America is about."[341] Because this refocused America's role in the world, argued Brzezinski, it allowed the

---

[338] Brzezinski and Friedrich, *Totalitarian,* 359. For further insight to Brzezinski's understanding of the Soviet Union, see Brzezinski and Samuel P. Huntington, *Political Power: USA/USSR* (New York: Viking Press, 1965); Zbigniew Brzezinski, *The Soviet Bloc: Unity and Conflict* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971).

[339] "Concluding Reflections," Zbigniew Brzezinski, in *Dilemmas of Change in Soviet Politics*, edited by Zbigniew Brzezinski (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969) 155.

[340] Interview with Zbigniew Brzezinski, Madeleine K. Albright, Leslie G. Denend, and William Odom, 18 February 1982, Carter Presidency Project, (final edited transcript), Miller Center, url http://millercenter.org/president/carter/oralhistory/zbigniew-brzezinski (accessed 20 April 2012).

[341] Zbigniew Brzezinski Exit Interview, 20 February 1981, Jimmy Carter Library, url http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/exitInt/Brzezinski.pdf (accessed 8 July 2012).

country to reconnect "with a certain basic aspiration—an aspiration which is very central to our time, namely that of freedom—and I think that was good for America."[342]

The desire to redefine America's purpose was indeed central to the new president. In the summer of 1976, Carter had offered a stinging rebuke of the Ford and Nixon legacy. "Under the Nixon-Ford administration, there has evolved a kind of secretive 'Lone Ranger' foreign policy—a one-man policy of international adventure. This is not an appropriate policy for America."[343] In his proposal for a new strategy, Carter argued that

> We simply must have an international policy of democratic leadership, and we must stop trying to play a lonely game of power politics. We must evolve and consummate our foreign policy openly and frankly…we must re-establish a spirit of common purpose among democratic nations…We and our allies, in a creative partnership, can take the lead in establishing and promoting basic global standards of human rights [and] by our example, by our utterances, and by the various forms of economic and political persuasion available to us, we can quite surely lessen the injustice in this world.[344]

In May of 1977, four months into his presidency, Carter continued this theme. The foreign policy of his administration "is based on an historical vision of America's role. [It] is derived from a larger view of global change…rooted in our moral values, which never change…[It] is designed to serve mankind."[345] This address echoed themes Carter had been discussing since he began his term. Back in January, he had declared "[I want] to assure you that

---

[342] Zbigniew Brzezinski Exit Interview, 20 February 1981, Jimmy Carter Library, url http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/exitInt/Brzezinski.pdf (accessed 8 July 2012).

[343] "A Community of the Free" (speech) 23 June 1976. Collected in Jimmy Carter, *A Government as Good as Its People*. (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1996), 94.

[344] "A Community of the Free" (speech) 23 June 1976. Collected in Jimmy Carter, *A Government as Good as Its People*. (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1996), 94-96.

[345] Address by the President at Commencement Exercises at Notre Dame University, May 22, 1977, "United States Foreign Policy." Located in *American Foreign Policy: Basic Documents, 1977-1980*, 9. This, while noting a change in American foreign policy, also highlighted Carter's attempt to keep the attention of the growing neoconservative movement. Situations may change but America's values do not.

the relations of the United States with the other countries and peoples of the world will be guided during my own administration by our desire to shape a world order that is more responsive to human aspirations. The United States will meet its obligation to help create a stable, just, and peaceful world order."[346] According to Robert Strong, Carter made human rights the "unifying theme in the Democratic Party and a rallying cry in the nation at large."[347] For Carter and his team, this was not just a "convenient campaign issue in 1976."[348] It had "deep roots in his personal experiences and his early political career. It had a central place in his worldview."[349] Carter was reinvigorating America's purpose; he was looking back to the dreams of Woodrow Wilson and Harry Truman to help him reinstate a powerful idealism in America's morally defunct foreign policy.[350]

In his inaugural speech, Carter declared that human rights would take a central role in American foreign policy, but citing past experience, he observed that America could not and should not rigidly apply human rights strictures, allowing for flexibility in policy application. In addition to an open diplomacy, Carter wanted America's diplomatic efforts to incorporate the basic tenants of trilateralism and multilateralism he learned at the Trilateral Commission. Stating

---

[346] Speech by Jimmy Carter, "Join Us in a Common Effort Based on Mutual Trust and Mutual Respect," 20 Jan 1977, in *American Foreign Policy Basic Documents, 1977-1980*.

[347] Robert Strong, *Working in the World: Jimmy Carter and the Making of American Foreign Policy* (Baton Rough: Louisiana State University Press, 2000), 72. For a good—though a bit dated—look at the human rights battles on Capitol Hill before the Carter Administration, see David P. Forsythe, *Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy: Congress Reconsidered.* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1988).

[348] Strong, *Working in the World,* 73.

[349] Strong, *Working in the World,* 73.

[350] Jimmy Carter, *Keeping Faith: Memoirs of a President* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1995), 145-147.

that the United States had "acquired a more mature perspective on the problems of the world," Washington could now rightly focus on "meet[ing] its obligation to help create a stable, just, and peaceful world order."[351] Times had changed; the United States could not act unilaterally for "we alone do not have all the answers" and "cannot lift from the world the terrifying specter of nuclear destruction" nor grant to all people "the basic right…to be free of poverty and hunger and disease and political repression."[352]

In March 1977, Carter announced to the United Nations General Assembly that America's international efforts would no longer come from "imposing our particular solutions" on a troubled world.[353] Outlining a bold plan, Carter informed the UN of Washington's intent to build multilateral trade agreements and implement the Helsinki Accords, reframe Latin and South American agreements, and push the relationship with the Soviet Union to more productive long-term footing than détente. For the President, these issues pointed to the need to develop and maintain human rights institutions, a project the United States had "a historical birthright to be associated with."[354] Carter believed his plan accepted the realities of the post-Vietnam world: "We've fought fire with fire, never thinking that fire is better quenched with water…but through failure we have now found our way back to our own principles and values, and we have regained

---

[351] Speech by Jimmy Carter, "Join Us in a Common Effort Based on Mutual Trust and Mutual Respect," 20 Jan 1977, in *American Foreign Policy Basic Documents, 1977-1980*.

[352] Speech by Jimmy Carter, "Join Us in a Common Effort Based on Mutual Trust and Mutual Respect," 20 Jan 1977, in *American Foreign Policy Basic Documents, 1977-1980*.

[353] Speech by Jimmy Carter before the United Nations General Assembly, "United States Commitment to United Nations Ideals," 17 March 1977, in *American Foreign Policy Basic Documents, 1977-1980.*

[354] Speech by Jimmy Carter before the United Nations General Assembly, "United States Commitment to United Nations Ideals," 17 March 1977, in *American Foreign Policy Basic Documents, 1977-1980.*

our lost confidence."[355] Carter's foreign policy showed the world America was committed to restoring its lost moral reputation while still challenging Moscow.[356]

As the president announced and implemented his diplomatic agenda, Carter also worked to placate various constituencies throughout the country—the burgeoning Moral Majority, the ever popular Eagle Forum, the emerging neoconservatives led by hawkish Democrats like Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson (D-WA), and die-hard liberals like Senator Edward Kennedy (D-MA). Carter and his staff understood that Congress had shifted its views on waging the Cold War, and on Sino-American relations in particular, since World War II. In the early 1950s, a powerful group of Senators articulated the nation's understanding of what had happened in China, and how the nation would define the protection of human rights during the Cold War; namely, that the absence of communism was the ultimate protection of a person's rights. This group, historian Robert Johnson's "revisionists," gave way to the "new internationalists" in the early 1960s.[357] The new internationalists rejected the earlier containment-based strategy and argued for a foreign policy that saw beyond the bi-polar cold war world. They did not, however, enjoy the overarching success in reorienting American diplomacy that the revisionists had seen. By the time Carter came to office, the new internationalist's ideas had been supplanted by a more conservative vision of America's role in the world; a vision that saw human rights as a tool to

---

[355] Speech by Jimmy Carter, "United States Foreign Policy," Commencement Exercises at Notre Dame University, 22 May, 1977, in *American Foreign Policy Basic Documents, 1977-1980.*

[356] See Chapter 1 and 2 for a detailed discussion of these influences.

[357] Key revisionists in the Senate were Pat McCarran (D-NV), John Bricker (R-OH), and Joseph McCarthy (R-WI). Key new internationalists were Senators George McGovern (D-SD), Frank Church (D-ID), and J. William Fulbright (D-AR). Johnson also makes much of the transitional nature and role of Stuart Symington (D-MO).

pummel the Soviet Union. In short, this was a return to a notion that equated the absence of communism with the realization of human rights.

In 1976, Cyrus Vance described for Carter the new, aggressive Congress. Though current legislation (the Jackson-Vanik amendment) used human rights as a weapon and limited aid granted to governments deemed oppressive, Vance noted there was wiggle room on adopting a wholesale application of the regulations. "It would be a mistake, in my judgment, to do so. Conditioning economic assistance on such a policy would appear to be an intrusion into the internal affairs of the recipient countries. In addition, it would appear to be saying that in order to show our sympathy for the poor, we are withdrawing the aid designed to improve their wellbeing."[358] As things stood at the moment, the Oval Office had to show that aid granted to a country was getting to the people that needed it; further limiting aid programs would be an error. The President's job was to build a better relationship with Congress while maintaining a pragmatic foreign policy, something that in "no way" was going to "be done easily, and sometimes it will not be possible to do it at all."[359] Brzezinski agreed, and added that in Carter's first days as president it must be explicit that he was assuming "the traditional role of the President as the formulator and articulator of U.S. foreign policy—making clear that henceforth the United States will speak to the world through you."[360]

---

[358]Memo, Cyrus Vance on Foreign Policy Issues, 24 October 1976 MS1664 S.2 B9F12, Yale Manuscript Collection.

[359] Memo, Cyrus Vance on Foreign Policy Issues, 24 October 1976 MS1664 S.2 B9F12, Yale Manuscript Collection.

[360] Memo, Brzezinski, Henry Owen, Richard Gardner to Jimmy Carter, 3 November 1976, Vance Papers, MS 1664 S.2 B9F19, Yale Manuscript Collection.

CARTER launched his administration's foreign policy activities with two major international shifts. First, he decided that the Helsinki Final Act and its human rights provisions had given the world, not just Washington or Moscow, a distilled definition of human rights that could apply to non-Helsinki states.[361] Second, the new President planned to aggressively pursue disarmament during the next round of negotiations for the Strategic Arms Limitations Treaties, SALT II, which was coming up.[362] Carter found his desired policy of moral pragmatism immediately under fire. In particular, he had to come to grips with the growing might of America's reborn-conservative movement. In part, these battles explain Carter's seeming vacillations as he sought to reconcile his own paradoxical understanding of the Cold War, a paradox personified in his chief advisors, Vance and Brzezinski. Carter's desire to bring about a world order based on human rights and the maintenance of peace often clashed with geopolitical reality, as he would learn during the SALT II talks. He later admitted that he "did not fully grasp all the ramifications" that a moral diplomacy would have on the delicate arms negotiations or America's relationship with its allies.[363] This resulted in Carter further shifting the application of

[361] The Helsinki Accords focused on the freedom of expression, migration, and from economic exploitation. As such, the Accords provided a simple language for America to use when enforcing human rights internationally than the thirty-two points in the 1948 Declaration of Human Rights from the United Nations. See Sarah Snyder, *Human Rights Activism and the End of the Cold War: A Transnational History of the Helsinki Network* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011). Carter was also aided by the growing human rights lobby—both private and congressional—that had grown in the 1970s, a group widely disillusioned by U.S. intervention in various places over the last three decades. William Michael Schmidli, "Institutionalizing Human Rights in U.S. Foreign Policy: U.S.-Argentine Relations, 1976–1980," *Diplomatic History* 35, no. 2 (April 2011): 363. See also the recent histories of the human rights "revolution" of the 1970s, in particular Aryah Neier *The International Human Rights Movement: A History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012); and Samuel Moyn, *The Last Utopia: Human Rights in History* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2010).

[362] For a more detailed discussion of the SALT II negotiations, see Garthoff, *Détente*, chapter 23.

policy to a less rigid understanding of how human rights should be approached. This caused some outcry from critics that there was confusion reigning in the US's foreign policy. Time and again, Brzezinski and Vance appear to be the manifestation of Carter's efforts to apply his moral pragmatism to world. The president's efforts in South Africa, the Soviet Union, Latin America, and eventually in China would often find his two principle foreign policy advisors at odds with each other as they struggled to understand how to implement Carter's philosophy globally. This was especially true with Moscow, where Carter tried to uphold an international human rights agenda while rewriting the rules of détente. As Gaddis Smith has argued, in the East-West relationship Carter hoped to eliminate nuclear arms and allow America's foreign policy to expand its focus beyond the Soviet Union, all while maintaining that Communism—while not the ultimate evil as was argued by conservatives—was an evil that must be fought.[364]

AS Carter took office in the spring of 1977, his old friends at the Trilateral Commission were discussing with new seriousness ideas of national security. These talks revived older discussions on how to deal with the Soviet Union now that the Vietnam conflict was over. Scholar Stephen Gill shows how the Commission split into two factions on the issue, Team "A" and Team "B."[365]

---

[363] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 148.

[364] Smith, *Morality, Reason, and Power*, 66. Indeed, as a student of Niebuhr, Carter would be inclined to feel that Communism—at least how it was acted out by Moscow—was an abuse of fundamental human rights.

[365] Gill, *American Hegemony*, 179-181. The Team B mentioned here is *not* to be confused with the famous Team B instrumental in the formation of neoconservative and hawkish opinion in 1974-1976. That group, organized at the request of then-CIA Director George H. W. Bush, was tasked with reevaluating intelligence estimates on Soviet military technology and capability. This group—"Team B"—was actually a conglomerate of three groups, and argued that the Soviets were rapidly increasing their military abilities just like the Nazis had in the 1930s. Thus, America must be strong and work to halt and stop this trend. See *Intelligence*

Team A reflected the early stance of the Commission, namely that the world détente had created was fading away and that a new, more cooperative vision of American power that sought true peaceful coexistence with the Soviets should emerge. Cyrus Vance soon became the main proponent of this view in the Carter White House and would hold sway until early 1980. Team B argued, however, that full cooperation between Washington and Moscow was impossible, and increasingly taking their cue from George Kennan, insisted that conflict between the leaders of two competing systems was inevitable, a position Brzezinski had held since the 1960s—though he had not advocated confrontation.

This change in the TC helped set the stage for Carter's efforts negotiating SALT II. Coming into the 1977 talks, Soviet Premier Leonid Brezhnev had expected a continuation of earlier discussions between Kissinger and the Kremlin, which were based on the non-binding agreement established at Vladivostok in the fall of 1974. This agreement built on the success of SALT I, in which both parties had established a relatively stable working relationship for the first time since World War II. Then-President Ford and Brezhnev agreed to work for an "equal aggregate level" of bombers and launchers and an "equal sublimit" for launchers equipped with Multiple Independently Targetable Reentry Vehicles (MIRVs).[366] This was a decided shock to many Americans, who in turn hoped that "Scoop" Jackson's Senate resolution would at least stall the talks if not destroy them. Jackson's resolution, born of the Senate fights to end the Vietnam War and his challenging of the Executive Branch's dominance of foreign policy, was

---

community experiment in competitive analysis : Soviet strategic objectives an alternative view: Report of Team "B," (Washington D.C.: National Security Press, 1976) for their report. See also Justin Vaisse, *Neoconservatism: The Biography of a Movement*, translated by Arthur Goldhammer, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008), pages 153-157.

[366] Garthoff, *Détente*, 494-497. This language does not mean that the agreement was true numerical equality; indeed, according the numbers debated between Brezhnev and Ford prior to the meeting, the United States would have a lesser amount of weapons.

geared toward maintaining the existing ratio of weapons between Russia and America. In truth, the Senator's efforts were a game of semantics: numerical equality would set in stone America's military lead for US weapons had greater accuracy, distance, and payload (including MIRV technology) compared to Moscow.[367]

Jackson's efforts to make certain that any arms agreement signed with the Soviets included parity only complicated diplomacy during the early days of détente. His second major diplomatic foray caused an equal stir, though it would not be as effective as the Senator hoped. In the course of working to modify SALT I in 1972, he attacked Russian limitations on Jewish emigration. In 1973, Jackson gained enough votes in the Senate to push through an amendment to a new trade bill between Washington and Moscow that required liberalization of Soviet emigration law. The Soviets—and some American Senators—were less than pleased. It looked as if Jackson was not negotiating in good faith; the Soviets, just prior to the amendment, had already agreed to wave exit taxes on Jews. It seemed that "as soon as the Soviets offered one concession, Jackson demanded another," and the Senator's efforts ended with a new amendment that called for open movement across the Soviet border for the whole Soviet population.[368] The Soviets immediately backed out of the trade agreement. The final amendment Jackson pushed through—the Jackson-Vanik Amendment—passed in 1974. It prohibited the granting of Most

[367] Jackson had garnered enough votes to scuttle Nixon and Kissinger's interim arms agreement in 1972, foreshadowing a new type of Congress as the era of Watergate dawned. Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War*, 184-187.

[368] Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War*, 198-199.

Favored Nation (MFN) status to any country refusing or restricting emigration.[369] The focus was to isolate the Soviet Union.

The SALT agreements and the discussions that surrounded them before the Carter administration, as George Herring has stated, were in many ways the essence of détente—and détente was an idea that had come under heavy fire in the United States as the Nixon presidency crumbled and Gerald Ford moved in to pick up the pieces.[370] While Carter agreed with the basic idea of global stability, he differed with his predecessors on how to achieve it. Because he believed arms control was linked to the creation of a better world, the president pushed further than any previous administrations with the Soviets and argued for total nuclear disarmament. Carter's actions, based on his human rights focus, publically pushed the Kremlin much further than it was willing to go and hampered the SALT II negotiations.

The American-Soviet relationship swung back and forth between progress on SALT talks and problems related to human rights enforcement throughout Carter's presidency. Along the way détente, as established by Nixon and Kissinger, fell by the wayside. Instead, Washington relied on the new Helsinki Accords, combined with the president's desire to create a just world. Convinced human rights must take hold, especially in countries that were signatories of the Helsinki Accords, Carter had consistently attacked the Ford administration during the campaign for refusing to meet with noted rights activist and author Alexander Solzhenitsyn and take a firm stance on abuses within the Soviet Union. Soon after taking the Oval Office, Carter moved to rectify the situation. In early March, he met with dissident Vladimir Bukovsky and

---

[369] See Clair Apodaca, *Understanding U.S. Human Rights Policy: A Paradoxical Legacy* (New York: Routledge, 2006) for brief explanation of various human rights tools, especially pages 7-27; 40-44.

[370] See Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, 794-795; 818-819.

communicated openly with dissidents still within the Soviet sphere (notably Andrei Sakharov, physicist and Kremlin critic). Moscow immediately protested and argued that Washington was violating a tradition of soft critiques on internal Soviet affairs. Moscow—citing the actions of Senator Jackson—saw human rights as an American tool to spark unrest and bring down the Soviet Union. Carter inadvertently reinforced this impression by insisting on human rights enforcement while pushing for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

Within a week of his inauguration, Carter addressed the American-Soviet relationship and informed Premier Leonid Brezhnev that he was committed to détente despite Brzezinski's ardent anti-communism and the Georgian's belief in the power of the Helsinki Accords. Détente, as articulated by Kissinger and Nixon, however, was not quite what Carter had in mind. The president wanted to reorient détente along both a moral and strategic axis. The moral axis centered on human rights; the strategic axis centered on Carter's desire to focus more on the decolonized regions, the Third World, and places like China rather than exclusively on Moscow.[371] In early 1977, Carter instructed his NSC, State, and Defense staff to begin preparing plans to deal not only with the SALT considerations, which only limited nuclear production, but also to develop a policy geared toward reducing the total number of nuclear weapons and delivery systems already in existence.[372] In a meeting with Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin, Carter confirmed his desire to uphold the existing SALT framework, but declared that he wanted to extend it further than originally envisioned. Carter indicated that his hope was to create a safer and more stable world. In addition to bringing about a cooler geo-political climate, the President saw arms reduction as "the best tool for improving" the Washington-Moscow

[371] See Garthoff, *Détente and Confrontation*, 625 for a brief discussion of this.

[372] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 222.

relationship.[373] The initial Soviet response to Carter's SALT proposals was negative; Brezhnev declared in February 1977 that Carter's new proposals were completely unacceptable. The Soviet leader wanted to move slowly where Carter wanted bold action.[374] Carter had been very open about America's goals, asserting that the policy had been developed with "wide consultation and without secret terms."[375] When paired with the new human rights policy, however, the Soviets were afraid Washington was not negotiating in good faith.[376]

The president soon dispatched Secretary Vance to Moscow to set the stage for the SALT talks using two options: the Vladivostok terms or a "substantial overall reduction in armaments and lessening the vulnerability of either nation to a first strike by the other," the option Carter clearly favored.[377] Again, the Soviet response was quick and negative, with no counter-offers until May 1977 in Geneva. Over the next two months, the White House developed a three-part approach to the stalled negotiations. First, it wanted to craft an agreement that would last until 1985. This would allow for the second and third goals: limitations and new regulations on cruise missiles and ABM systems, and establishing guidelines for SALT III that imposed deep arms reductions.[378] Gromyko agreed to the broad strokes but bickered over the details. When he and Carter met in September 1977, they agreed that SALT discussions would not be linked to any

---

[373] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 223.

[374] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 224.

[375] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 224.

[376] Carter, *Keeping Faith,*150; 220-225.

[377] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 224. The second option also had far tighter limits on weapons modifications and missile threats.

[378] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 225.

other issue, including human rights.[379] By November 1977, it seemed as if SALT II negotiations were on the way toward an agreement, but then came Sadat's visit to Israel, which made Moscow feel excluded from the Middle East peace process.[380] Moscow reacted by slowing down their side of the negotiations.

Early in 1978, the talks were still moving slowly. Vance and Gromyko were still discussing basic elements of SALT in New York, discussions later continued by Carter. Carter observed in the commencement address for the United States Naval Academy that the relationship with the Soviets "will be competitive," but that America—in its efforts to create a stable world—sought collaboration with Moscow, one that gave a good forecast for SALT II.[381] As the summer of 1978 progressed, the negotiations began to make progress. In September, Carter and Gromyko agreed to remove test bans from the broader SALT negotiations, prompting the President to feel SALT talks would come to fruition unless Chinese issues—normalization—derailed them. Carter felt "sure that our announcement [of] plans to normalize diplomatic relations with China would cool the Soviets' willingness to conclude the SALT agreement."[382] He was surprised, though, by Brezhnev's desire to continue. The Soviet leader did refuse to have a meeting in Washington until after Deng Xiaoping came to the United States in early 1979

---

[379] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 153-154. See also Garthoff, *Détente*, 647-652.

[380] Though Carter argues the toughest problem for SALT came from Republicans and a few key Democrats in America. See Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 229-230. Garthoff, *Détente*, 640-642.

[381] Jimmy Carter, "United States Naval Academy Address at the Commencement Exercises," 7 June 1978, *PPPUS: Carter, 1978: Book 1*. Accessed online at http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=30915&st=SALT&st1= (6 February 2013).

[382] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 239.

to finish the recognition process.[383] Despite these issues, in March 1979 SALT II negotiations came to a successful conclusion. Though SALT II only achieved minor reductions and limitations on the use of US cruise missiles and the Soviet backfire bomber, it served to keep the issue of disarmament alive.[384] In early April, Carter returned from Geneva with a treaty for Capitol Hill. Looking back on his administration's relationship with Moscow, Carter would admit one key mistake in dealing with the Kremlin:

> The only mistake I made was in underestimating the Soviets' displeasure in three things. One was our human rights policy. Second was the somewhat radical change from the Vladivostok proposal. And the third one was my inclination to make public the American position on the SALT discussions.[385]

As his presidency progressed, Carter became more confrontational with the Soviets, partly due to the urging of his NSA. Until the end of 1979, Secretary of State Vance had balanced Brzezinski's confrontational style. Like Carter, Vance saw the intersecting issues of nationalism, development, and decolonization as increasingly more important than the Cold War rivalry. While Brzezinski agreed, and both he and Vance supported Carter's goal to foster the spread of economic, political, and social rights the world over, he would quietly urge a more confrontational stance toward the Kremlin. As Carter sought to move Washington away from the dominance of the bi-polar competition and questioned the idea of détente, Brzezinski worked to add a bellicose tone focused on the USSR. Though poverty and social justice were

---

[383] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 240.

[384] For a comprehensive look at the SALT II agreement, see Garthoff, *Détente*, chps. 21 and 22.

[385] Interview with Jimmy Carter, 29 November 1982, final edited transcript, Carter Presidency Project, Miller Center, url http://millercenter.org/president/carter/oralhistory/jimmy-carter (accessed 21 April 2012).

increasingly a key concern for Washington, and Carter consistently attempted to enforce this new agenda, as when he recognized Andrei Sakharov, he was caught between applying his ideals and the legacy of destabilizing the Cold War. This was combined with Soviet aggression in Central Asia and chilled the relationship further, which made all subsequent discussions difficult.[386]

CARTER had an easier time implementing moral pragmatism in Latin and South America than with the Soviet Union. While rights efforts with Moscow conflicted with the need for a SALT II agreement, White House strategic concerns in Latin and South America were more flexible. As Stephen Rabe has noted, by the middle of the 1970s, Americans were paying closer attention to how they dealt with their neighbors to the south, which allowed a serious debate on Latin American policy to develop for the first time in nearly thirty years. As détente was repudiated, Kissinger and Nixon's policy of partnering with right-wing dictatorships throughout the world increasingly lost its appeal.[387] In late January 1977, Brzezinski directed the NSC to take a new look at America's Latin America policy in light of the Panama Canal negotiations and the president's new diplomatic agenda. In Presidential Review Memorandum (PRM) 17, the NSA asked his staff to assess "whether the current assumptions underlying U.S. policy toward the region, as well as the policies themselves are appropriate" for effectively dealing with issues of

[386] Betty Glad, *An Outsider in the White House: Jimmy Carter, His Advisors, and the Making of American Foreign Policy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009), 1. Despite the movement on SALT II, though, the Carter administration would withdraw the agreement from the Senate after the Soviet's invaded Afghanistan in the fall of 1979.

[387] Stephen G. Rabe, *The Killing Zone: The United States Wages the Cold War in Latin America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 145-146.

regional development and anti-Americanism.[388] What gradually emerged over the spring of 1977 was a policy that Betty Glad termed "benign neutrality."[389] In a speech in April 1977, Carter told the Organization of American States that, "a single United States policy toward Latin America and the Caribbean makes little sense. What we need is a wider and more flexible approach, worked out in close consultation with you."[390] No longer would America see the Monroe Doctrine as a free pass to intervene in the region's politics.[391]

The "wider and more flexible approach" Carter outlined centered on human rights, high respect for the sovereignty and individuality of each nation, and the desire to help each country develop economically and socially.[392] Human rights policy alone, though, was not the only source for Carter's Latin America focus. The substance found in the Georgian's policies—a substance lacking in his predecessors' agenda—stemmed in part to his affinity for the region. Carter spoke Spanish well and had traveled throughout Mexico and Brazil often with his family. Moreover, his key advisors generally agreed on policy initiatives. A final element in America's changing relationship with South America was policy-makers' assumption that Soviet interest in the region had faded; thus there would be less competition for South American hearts and minds.

---

[388] Presidential Review Memorandum/NSC 17, 26 January 1977. Accessed online at http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/documents/prmemorandums/prm17.pdf (7 January 2013).

[389] Betty Glad, *An Outsider*, 242.

[390] "A New Approach to Policy Toward Latin America," address by the President Before the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States, Washington, D.C., April 14, 1977, *American Foreign Policy: Basic Documents, 1977-1980*, 1271.

[391] Glad, *An Outsider*, 242.

[392] "A New Approach to Policy Toward Latin America," address by the President Before the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States, Washington, D.C., April 14, 1977, *American Foreign Policy: Basic Documents, 1977-1980*, 1272.

Negotiations over the Panama Canal became important for the Carter administration very early on. When Carter came into office the negotiations were at a critical point, having virtually stalled over the last few administrations. The White House was concerned they might completely break down, and if that happened, "It was generally felt that violence would then ensue, and every intelligence assessment pointed to the likelihood that it would spread to other parts of Central America. Moreover, there would be a strong wave of anti-Yankee sentiment throughout Latin America."[393] Quickly reworking the agreement with Panama also served the White House's desire to incorporate the Global South more fully into policy considerations and thus hopefully "diminish hostility toward the U.S.," always crucial in the battle against Soviet influence.[394] The Panama Canal treaty would be a symbol to the Third World that America was willing to listen and work with it.[395]

The Canal treaties showed Carter's desire to implement a diplomacy of human rights as a pragmatic strategy to win favor as the Cold War was heating up. As Brzezinski put it in his memoirs

> We hope that in attacking the problems [of injustice in the Global South] at their most basic level the United States would thus become more engaged in shaping a world more congenial to our values and more compatible with our interests. America would no longer be seen as defending the status quo, nor could the Soviet Union continue to pose as the champion of greater equality. This effort was epitomized in our human-rights

---

[393] Brzezinski, *Power and Principle*, 51.

[394] ZB, *Power and Principle*, 54. Carter wanted to finish the Panama Canal issue quickly as he knew it was increasingly growing in unpopularity among the American people, stating later that "I though the best thing to do was to get that most unpopular issue out of the way as early as we could." Interview with Jimmy Carter, 29 November 1982, final edited transcript, Carter Presidency Project, Miller Center, url http://millercenter.org/president/carter/oralhistory/jimmy-carter (accessed 21 April 2012).

[395] ZB, *Power and Principle*, 54.

> policy…[and] in our determination to resolve the anachronistic "colonial" problem of the Panama Canal through a ratified treaty…[396]

Both Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon had worked to resolve the tensions left from the 1903 treaty. The original treaty, forced on Panama by President Theodore Roosevelt, had given the United States virtually indefinite jurisdiction over a ten-mile wide stretch of land surrounding the canal. As the era of colonialism was crumbling, Panamanians were adamant the agreement needed to be changed. In April 1977, at the Organization for American States, Carter outlined his basic desire for a new Canal Treaty as the old one was "no longer appropriate or effective." Any new agreements must acknowledge Panama's "legitimate needs as a sovereign nation."[397] In the fall of 1977, Carter's negotiator, Sol Linowitz, managed to get two agreements signed and brought to Capitol Hill. The first agreement, the new Canal Treaty, stated America would operate the canal until the year 2000, when it would be given back to Panama as long as the Americans employed there retained their jobs until they retired. The second agreement, titled the Treaty Concerning the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal, gave the U.S. the ability to ensure and enforce the permanent neutrality of the canal.

Almost immediately the treaties hit problems, pushing Carter to take the strongest stance he had yet taken on foreign policy. Through the fall of 1977 and into the spring of 1978, political and rhetorical battles erupted over the treaty. The opposition, led by the neoconservatives, argued that giving over the canal constituted a betrayal of American national security and was an appeasement to the forces of communism in the region. Panama, argued

---

[396] ZB, *Power and Principle*, 123.

[397] "A New Approach to Policy Toward Latin America," address by the President Before the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States, Washington, D.C., April 14, 1977, *American Foreign Policy: Basic Documents, 1977-1980*, 1273.

people like presidential hopeful Ronald Reagan, would be able hold the world's mightiest nation hostage over a few ships.

Reagan had claimed in 1976 that the Canal was sovereign territory of the United States because "We bought it, we paid for it." Jimmy Carter was quick to point out this was not the case. Attempting a revival of Franklin Roosevelt's fireside chats, Carter went before the nation in an interview with Walter Cronkite in March 1977 to explain that America had not, in fact, bought the Canal Zone. All the US had legally obtained was the right to use the canal.[398] The Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS), Henry Kissinger, President Ford, former CIA director William Colby, John Wayne, and even William Buckley spoke out in support of Carter's treaties. The new agreements were passed in the Senate in the spring of 1978, and the House's implementation bills soon followed.

The Carter Administration pointed to the Panama Canal Treaties as a symbol of its new style of moral diplomacy. The treaties allowed Washington to show the world it could deal with weaker nations with maturity and respect, putting "some teeth into Carter's human rights rhetoric."[399] It was a starting point from which to build a new sense of community with Latin and South America through "mature relationships based on mutual respect."[400] The cost, though, had been high. By the end of the debates, Carter had lost a significant amount of flexibility in Congress, which impacted disarmament talks with Moscow. GOP leaders "were telling me very

---

[398] "Ask President Carter" Remarks During a Telephone Call-in Program on the CBS Radio Network, March 5, 1977. *Public Papers of the Presidents: Jimmy Carter, 1977, Book I*, accessed online at http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=7119&st=Panama+Canal&st1= (9 January 2013).

[399] Natasha Zaretsky, "Restraint or Retreat? The Debate over the Panama Canal Treaties and U.S. Nationalism after Vietnam," *Diplomatic History* Vol. 35, No 3 (June 2011), 540.

[400] Brzezinski, *Power and Principle,* 134.

frankly that they would never support SALT II, no matter what was in it…They said they had gone as far as they could…in supporting my basic positions."[401]

ARGENTINA was another major facet of Carter's efforts to re-orient the nation's policy in Latin America and the world. As the negotiations for the Panama Canal Treaties moved along, Carter sought to revise Washington's relationship with the brutal military regime in Argentina. The leadership in Buenos Aires was reeling from its efforts to gain self-determination and political stability. By the mid-1970s, these efforts had turned into tyrannical repression. In 1955, the military, reacting to Peron's populist, pro-labor policies, pushed him into exile in Spain, where he directed the Peronist movement for the next several decades. Chronic economic problems further compounded the country's political woes. Argentina's foreign economic ventures, largely based on agricultural exports and state funds, were increasingly funneled into domestic production issues (manufacturing or production facilities), which led to the development of massive foreign-held debt. By the end of the 1960s, Argentina had gone through several dramatic boom-bust cycles, characterized by massive inflation, stagnation, deficits, and ruthless austerity plans. As these cycles worsened, anti-military protests—led in part by Peronist groups—grew.

In 1973, the military stepped down in disgrace and the country held its first elections in over seven years. Hector Campora, a Peronist candidate, was elected, and subsequently brought Juan Peron back in October of 1973. His return, though, did not usher in a new era of freedom. He quickly moved to distance himself and his government from more left-leaning Peronists who

[401] Interview with Jimmy Carter, 29 November 1982, final edited transcript, Carter Presidency Project, Miller Center, url http://millercenter.org/president/carter/oralhistory/jimmy-carter (accessed 21 April 2012).

had coalesced into a group known as the Montoneros. The summer of 1974 found Argentina filled with a disillusioned population and continued economic stagnation. Then Peron died, leaving the country in the hands of his wife, Isabel Martinez de Peron, an inexperienced politician, to say the least.[402] By the end of 1975, Argentina had become one of the world's economic pariahs: inflation hovered at around 700 percent and national production levels had halved over the last year. Isabel Peron increasingly backed right-wing terrorist groups that sought to root out communists across the country. By 1976, State Department representatives were losing faith in the ability of the Peron government to handle the country and were predicting a leadership change at almost any moment.

Washington had been training the Argentinean military since 1950, and it supported a new military government in the hope they could restore economic and social order.[403] This decision reflected Washington's resumption of early Cold War norms; namely, the "quiet cultivation of robust ties with politically ambitious Latin American militaries to protect U.S. national security."[404] Once the military resumed power in 1976 and 1977, however, there was little recourse left for the United States officials to promote human rights in the country. State Department officials soon presented over thirty cases of abuses to Buenos Aires that had risen from the military's paranoia over perceived leftist subversion in Argentina.[405] Kissinger, Secretary of State at the time, was less than pleased about the focus on human rights despite President Ford's recent approval of the Helsinki Accords (1975). In June 1976, Secretary

---

[402] Schmidli, "Institutionalizing Human Rights," 354.

[403] Schmidli, "Institutionalizing Human Rights," 356.

[404] Schmidli, "Institutionalizing Human Rights," 356.

[405] Schmidli, "Institutionalizing Human Rights," 357-361.

Kissinger met with Argentinean Foreign Minister Guzzetti. Guzzetti informed Kissinger that of the problems facing the new Argentinean government the largest "is terrorism…[and] there are two aspects to the solution…ensure the internal security of the country; the second is to solve the most urgent economic problems."[406] Kissinger responded that Washington wished the new government well and hoped that "it would succeed…We understand you must establish authority…If there are things that have to be done, you should do them quickly."[407] In October 1976, during the presidential debates, Kissinger met again with Guzzetti in New York. Responding to Argentinean Ambassador Ortiz de Rosas' concerns about Carter's emphasis on human rights, Kissinger was quick to point out that at least the Georgia governor did not mention Argentina. This sparked a resumption of the previous June's conversation concerning the imposition of stability throughout the country. Guzzetti told Kissinger that "Our struggle has had very good results in the last four months…If this direction continues, by the end of the year the danger will have been set aside."[408] Kissinger responded, stating

> Look, our basic attitude is that we would like you to succeed. I have an old-fashioned view that friends ought to be supported. What is not understood in the United States is that you have a civil war. We read about human rights problems but

[406] Memorandum of Conversation between Secretary Kissinger and Foreign Minister Guzzetti; June 6 1976, accessed online at the National Security Archive, National Electronic Archive Briefing Book No. 133, posted online August 27, 2004. Website http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB133/index.htm (accessed 10 January 2013).

[407] Memorandum of Conversation between Secretary Kissinger and Foreign Minister Guzzetti; June 6 1976, accessed online at the National Security Archive, National Electronic Archive Briefing Book No. 133, posted online August 27, 2004. Website http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB133/index.htm (accessed 10 January 2013).

[408] Memorandum of Conversation, Secretary's Meeting with Argentine Foreign Minister Guzzetti, October 7, 1976, accessed online at the National Security Archive, National Electronic Archive Briefing Book No. 140, posted online December 4, 2003. Website http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB104/index.htm, (accessed 10 January 2013).

not the context. *The quicker you succeed the better*…The human rights problem is a growing one…If you can finish before Congress gets back, the better.[409]

After Pat Derian's appointment to Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights in 1977, she looked into the state of affairs in Argentina. She quickly met with ambassador Robert Hill in Buenos Aires, a man known for his pairing of conservative politics and a pro-human rights agenda in Argentina. Derian quickly learned how Kissinger's quest to maintain détente had silenced Hill's reports of the "dirty war" to Washington.[410] In February 1977, based on these new revelations, Secretary Vance worked to cut President Ford's promised $32 million aid package to Argentina's military in half.[411]

While in Argentina, Derian also began the long process of confronting its rulers about the alleged human rights abuses. The American embassy interviewed victims of the *los desaprecidos* (the disappeared) and quickly compiled overwhelming evidence of the dirty wars. By March 1977, the CIA reported that across southern South America—and especially in Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay—there was growing resentment of Carter's new focus on protecting human rights. Indeed, due to Derain and Vance's pressure, Argentina announced that it would refuse the halved aid package from the United States, arguing Washington's stance on human rights served to aid and abet subversion throughout the country.[412] In November 1977,

---

[409] Memorandum of Conversation, Secretary's Meeting with Argentine Foreign Minister Guzzetti, October 7, 1976, accessed online at the National Security Archive, National Electronic Archive Briefing Book No. 140, posted online December 4, 2003. Website http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB104/index.htm, (accessed 10 January 2013). (Emphasis added.)

[410] Rabe, *The Killing Zone*, 147.

[411] Smith, *Morality, Reason, and Power*, 128.

[412] National Intelligence Daily Cable, March 3, 1977. Accessed through the CIA Freedom of Information Act site. Document url: http://www.foia.cia.gov/best-of-

Carter approved a complete end to military aid to Argentina. Hoping to push Buenos Aires to respect its citizens, the following spring the White House began cutting off all foreign aid; in particular a nearly $300 million loan from the Export-Import Bank needed for the construction of hydroelectric dams.[413]

While the record of the Carter Administration's relationship with Argentina is not perfect, White House and the State Department actions provide ample illustration of the President's desire to implement moral pragmatism.[414] Carter and his human rights staff worked to enforce measures that pushed Argentina to respect the basic human rights of its people. The new U.S. Ambassador, Raul Castro, repeatedly brought up human rights concerns with Argentina's Foreign Ministry, arguing that once improvements occurred, aid money would be released. In the fall of 1978, Washington, responding to concessions by Buenos Aires, agreed to release some Export-Import Bank money in exchange for Argentina's invitation to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) to conduct an on-the-ground investigation. While activists in the United States and elsewhere accused the White House of hypocrisy, in reality Argentina's invitation of the IACHR was a major move toward the *junta*'s taking

---

crest/CIARDP79T00975A029900010006-4.pdf; CIA routing number: CIA-RDP79T00975A029900010006-4 (accessed 15 January 2013). The next week the Daily Cable noted that the leadership of Nicaragua, Somoza, was arguing that America's insistence on human rights in the region would ultimately "adversely affect broader US interests [and] alienate friendly governments." National Daily Intelligence Cable, March 7, 1977. http://www.foia.cia.gov/best-of-crest/CIA-RDP79T00975A029900010012-7.pdf; CIA Routing number: CIA-RDP79T00975A029900010012-7 (accessed 13 January 2013).

[413] Rabe, *The Killing Zone,* 147.

[414] Schmidli's assessment of Carter's relationship with Argentina broadly concurs with this assessment. In his excellent *Diplomatic History* article on the subject, he notes that while Washington was not perfect, "To a certain extent, State Department authorization of military sales reflected a conscious effort on the part of top State Department policymakers…to examine U.S. transactions with Argentina—and other nations with human rights problems—on a case-by-case basis." Schmidli, 373.

significant steps to deal with the disappearances. Realizing that the IACHR was going to report the truth, Buenos Aires decided to end the disappearances, allow at least a smattering of political activity, and began to release political prisoners.[415]

Washington's efforts to rebuild America's relationship with Latin America along an equal footing, rooted in a more nuanced attention to human rights, was relatively successful. Carter endeavored to build confidence throughout the region by restructuring the Panama Canal agreements. The new treaties, while not perfect, showed developing countries that America wanted to play fair. On major human rights abuses, Carter was also successful in Argentina. Though the disappearances did not completely stop under his watch, they lessened.[416] In general, throughout Southern Cone countries like Argentina, there was an improvement in human rights abuses and a gradual move toward democracy.[417] Through Latin and South America, Carter's desire to build a just and stable world can be counted a success.

CARTER came to office hoping to reinvigorate America's sense of purpose at the end of the 1970s. While he presided over some major failures—Iran to name one—he was able to build into the nation's foreign policy establishment a new respect for presidential idealism and internationalism. Throughout his tenure in the White House, Carter pushed the country to join an international community that abided by the promise of moral action—or human rights—as the bipolar Cold War crumbled in the last days of detente. Looking back on his presidency, Carter

---

[415] Kathryn Sikkink, *Mixed Signals: U.S. Human Rights Policy and Latin America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006) 136.

[416] See especially Schmidli, "Institutionalizing Human Rights," for the most recent assessment of the success of Carter's policies in Argentina. See also Sikkink, *Mixed Signals*, chapter 6, for a broad discussion of Carter's policies throughout Latin America.

[417] Sikkink, *Mixed Signals*, 123.

argued that his main goals were achieved, and asserted that "unless you want to include SALT II as having been voted on, we never lost a vote on a single foreign policy issue while I was President. That's one area we never lost."[418] Carter presided over the end of the détente system established by Nixon and Kissinger and reminded Americans of why they had built an American Century: to protect and defend inalienable rights for all people. In so doing, Carter reoriented the nation around the ideals of moral pragmatism as a way to rebuild US moral authority globally. His legacy had its blemishes. Partly as a result of Carter's refusal to give way on human rights concerns, and partly because of national politics after 1976, America's relationship with the Soviet Union became more confrontational, clearing the way for Ronald Reagan's brash actions. It also had a profound effect on what would become America's most important post-Cold War relationship, that with China.

[418] Interview with Jimmy Carter, 29 November 1982, Carter Presidency Project. Carter—though he does address Congressional problems and backlash in this interview—does tend to downplay the battles he faced to pass foreign policy projects like the Panama Canal or normalization with China issues.

We saw our cooperation with China as a means to promote peace and better understanding…[419]

Chapter 5

Washington meets Beijing

1979 began with a foreign policy success—a visit by the People's Republic of China's (PRC) Vice Premier, Deng Xiaoping, to Washington. As noted in his diary, Carter was "favorably impressed with Deng," and he and his advisors basked in the success of their endeavors.[420] The road had been long and rocky, with Sino-American diplomatic relations often in jeopardy due to Cold War tensions and rivalries. Deng's trip to the United States represented the end of thirty long years of struggle to redefine Washington's relationship with Beijing.

Normalization, announced on December 15, 1978, was not simply Carter's accomplishment. As he often pointed out, rapprochement was a product of the Nixon and, to a lesser extent, the Ford administrations. Indeed, much scholarly attention has been paid to efforts of Nixon, Ford, and Kissinger to build normalization with only cursory glances given to Carter's China policies. Only recently have scholars turned their attentions to Carter's engagement with the Republic of China (ROC) and the PRC. Within this new scholarship, however, little effort has been made to link Carter's normalization policies with the administration's general foreign policy goals, and more specifically, human rights.[421] When human rights issues are joined to the

---

[419] Jimmy Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 200.

[420] Jimmy Carter, *White House Years*, 283.

[421] In particular see: Brian Hilton, "Maximum Flexibility for Peaceful Change": Jimmy Carter, Taiwan, and the Recognition of the People's Republic of China *Diplomatic History* Vol. 33, No. 4 September 2009. What little writing occurs on human rights and the normalization process is generally in a dismissive paragraph on the way to a different issue, or written off as Carter either being hypocritical, overwhelmed by Brzezinski, or blinded by the commercial opportunities of the fabled "China Market."

normalization story, they are only given passing remarks. Brian Hilton's recent argument that "although Carter had claimed that human rights formed the centerpiece of his foreign policy decisions, PRC human rights violations played virtually no role in the administration's discussions of normalization" is the most recent in this understanding.[422]

This claim, echoing the earlier scholarship of Patrick Tyler, James Mann, Warren Cohen, and others, is superficial.[423] A detailed examination of the record reveals a different story; thus, the normalization process cannot be understood outside of the context of human rights policy. Carter, instead of "undercut[ting] the moral basis for his human rights policy and establish[ing a] double standard" as Patrick Mann has argued, or simply ignoring human rights when it came to China, had another approach in mind.[424] Carter did not force human rights into normalization discussions because he wanted to adhere to his stated desire to apply a morally pragmatic strategy. The president's plan, as in Russia and Argentina, relied on the lessons of his experience in Southern politics and recognition of prevailing conditions in China. The Georgian ultimately felt human rights could wait until China was fully incorporated into America's orbit, ideally during a second Carter term. While the path to normalization began under Nixon, it reached its final culmination under a president with a desire to inject human rights into all areas

---

[422] Hilton, "Maximum Flexibility," 601. Hilton does note there is widespread misunderstanding on the issue of Sino-American relations and human rights. Hilton will actually provide evidence against his statement quoted above by arguing a few pages later that "Carter came to view normalization as a tool to facilitate gradual improvement in the lives of ordinary Chinese under the Communist regime." (see page 602)

[423] Patrick Tyler, *A Great Wall: Six Presidents and China, An Investigative History* (New York: A Century Foundation Book, 1999); James Mann, *About Face: A History of America's Curious Relationship with China, from Nixon to Clinton* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000); Warren I. Cohen, *America's Response to China: A History of Sino-American Relations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990).

[424] Mann, *About Face*, 81-82.

of America's foreign policy. This distinctively colored not only the outcome of the agreement, but also the growing international human rights movement and the shape of the post-Cold War world.

After the success of the Communist Party in 1949, the United States—with the outraged Henry Luce and Joseph McCarthy in the lead—recognized the Nationalist government, in residence on the island of Taiwan, as the legitimate government of China. The ROC, established after Mao Zedong won the Chinese civil war, became the focus of the hopes of Americans fascinated with China. Taiwan represented the last chance for China to realize its spiritual and material potential. Groups throughout the United States were aghast by the "fall" of China and at the knowledge that this land of nascent democracy was now opposed to everything America held dear. Accusations flew, directed especially at Harry Truman, who had "lost" China to Moscow. Under increasing pressure, Washington rallied behind the tyrannical *Guomindang* (Nationalist Party, GMD). Any dialogue between the newly founded People's Republic of China occurred via intermediaries. This policy remained in place as American troops moved out of Korea and into Vietnam. By the end of the Johnson administration, it seemed as if the relationship would remain stagnant for the foreseeable future.[425]

As Richard Nixon took office in 1969, thanks to the crises in Vietnam, the country was looking for a new Asia policy. Nixon and his National Security Advisor (NSA), Henry Kissinger, wanted to reach a new understanding with Beijing. It had become increasingly apparent that China and the Soviet Union were competing for favor throughout the Third World and dominance over international communism, a fight that was highly visible thanks to Sino-

[425] See Michael Lumbers, *Piercing the Bamboo Curtain: Tentative Bridge-Building to China During the Johnson Years* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008); Noam Kochavi, *A Conflcit Perpetuated: China Policy During the Kennedy Years* (Westport: Praeger, 2002).

Soviet border skirmishes in 1970 and 1971. The president and Kissinger wanted to take advantage of this split to play Moscow and Beijing against each other, hoping this would create a global environment more receptive to détente and strengthen America's global position. First, though, Nixon needed to resolve the situation in Southeast Asia, and then, if everything went well, establish a constructive relationship with the People's Republic.

The White House kept secret the negotiation process between Washington and Beijing that blazed the trail for normalization. Nixon quietly ordered Kissinger to embark on a series of negotiations with China in hopes of reestablishing relations with one fourth of the world's population. By the end of 1969, America relaxed travel restrictions to the PRC. In the spring of 1971, American ping-pong players paid a visit to China as Kissinger shuttled back and forth from Washington to Paris negotiating an end to the Vietnam War. Then, in a surprise visit in 1971, the NSA met with Zhou Enlai, the dynamic premier of China. In the secret meeting, both men agreed it was time to move past the legacy of Korea, the current problems in Southeast Asia, and tensions over Taiwan. In July 1971, Nixon announced the essence of these discussions as well as his plans for a trip to the PRC the following February.[426]

Nixon's visit produced the Shanghai Communiqué, a joint statement issued in February 1972. The Communiqué was an agreement to disagree on key issues—namely Taiwan—while attempting to move the relationship into a new framework for trade and technology exchanges.[427]

---

[426] The secret negotiating style established by Kissinger and Nixon set the precedent for Carter and Brzezinski's efforts six years later—and would nearly set off a political firestorm in the U.S. as a result in the emerging neoconservative movement.

[427] Jussi Hanhimaki, *The Flawed Architect: Henry Kissinger and American Foreign Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) 171. According to polls taken in the fall of 1971 and spring of 1972, 56% of Americans felt China was a danger to world peace as of 30 September 1971, 24% felt Nixon going to China was a bad idea as of 9 March 1972, especially

The statement did not resolve all the differences between the two countries, but it did establish the basic guidelines for normalization. It initiated discussions on Taiwan, stated the desire for greater exchange between the two nations, and provided for senior political representatives to visit each country as they finalized diplomatic recognition in the years to come. The most important principle in the Communiqué was Washington's acceptance that there was, in fact, only one China—and Taiwan was a part of that China.

Kissinger neatly summed up Washington's understanding of the Sino-American relationship when he argued that China needed America "to help break out of its isolation and [serve] as a counterweight" to the growing Soviet threat.[428] The United States, by contrast, needed the PRC to "enhance the flexibility of our diplomacy" primarily in Asia, but also in American-Soviet relations.[429] Kissinger, like most Americans during the middle of the 20th Century, had little nuanced understanding of China and its relationship to the rest of Asia.[430] The NSA saw China as the sole cultural locus for the region, the progenitor of all Asian civilization, and thus, the prime power—no matter the ideology—that America should align itself with as the global climate radically shifted in the 1970s. A new relationship with China would allow America to develop a flexible influence in East Asia and bring about new levels of peace and

---

as 46% of the country felt China was a "highly unfavorable" country as of 30 June 1972. *The Gallup Poll*, Vols. 3 & 4 (1971, 1972).

[428] Henry Kissinger, *White House Years* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1979) 1049.

[429] Kissinger, *White House Years*, 1049.

[430] In a surprising bout of humility, the former NSA admitted his lack of knowledge regarding China in an interview with *Encounter* in 1978. See *Encounter*, Vol. 51, No. 5, pg. 20-23.

stability.[431] This relationship nearly foundered, however, under the presidency of Gerald Ford. Beijing believed that Nixon's resignation placed the process in great jeopardy. Despite assurances to China, Ford was unable to push through a normalization agreement. Domestic events, the end of the Vietnam War, and challenges to détente from all sides persuaded Ford to leave the difficult situation to the next president.[432]

Carter, who had learned of these diplomatic problems during the 1976 election cycle, quickly gathered advice on China policy from a diverse group of professional academics, old secretaries of state, and former members of policy planning councils. The day after the election, Brzezinski, joined by Richard Gardner and Henry Owen, recommended a policy that had little early focus on China.[433] For the administration's first three months, they advised, no action should be taken regarding China. Brzezinski and his co-authors did make one recommendation that impacted Washington's policy regarding Beijing, namely, that the new President should emphasize that he dictated the nation's foreign policy. Thus, in his first State of the Union address, Carter should make it "clear that henceforth the United States will speak to the world" from the Oval Office.[434] Returning to an executive-dominated foreign policy, one similar to that

[431] Jeremi Suri, *Henry Kissinger and the American Century* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard, 2007) 234-235.

[432] Mann, *About Face*, 65-77.

[433] Memo on Foreign Policy Goals for first Six Months, Brzezinski, Gardner, and Owen to Carter, 3 November 1976, Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts MS 1664 S.2 B9F19.

[434] Memo, ZB, Gardner, Henry Owen to Jimmy Carter, 3 November 1976, Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts MS 1664, S.2 B9F19.

of Wilson and Truman, meant that the country could "initiate a new phase in U.S. foreign policy, going beyond the Atlanticist/East-West Cold War framework of the years 1945-1976."[435]

Vance and others prepared for this by reading everything they could get their hands on regarding the fragile US-Chinese relationship. It became increasingly clear to the presumptive Secretary of State that many people were advising Carter to accept the newly articulated "Japanese formula," at least regarding Taiwan.[436] This formula, based around Tokyo's withdrawal of official Japanese recognition of Taiwan in favor of Beijing, presented Washington with a way forward. The Taiwan issue and its resolution, counseled Vance's friend Carter Burgess, was what normalization revolved around; resolving this issue would greatly ease the way forward.[437] As advice poured in during October of 1976, Vance wrote that Carter's advisors must be careful not to limit the President's ability to deal with China by creating more

[435] Memo, ZB, Gardner, Henry Owen to Jimmy Carter, 3 November 1976, Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts MS 1664, S.2 B9F19. This was partially in response to the current public opinion regarding Nixon and Kissinger's apparent duplicity in crafting foreign policy. It was also a power move, as Congress had been trying to build a new role for itself in dictating the country's foreign policy after Watergate (see earlier chapters in this dissertation).

[436] The "Japan Formula" is given an excellent summary in Hungdah Chiu's "The Taiwan Relations Act and Sino-American Relations" in *Occasional Papers/Reprints Series in Contemporary Asian Studies*, No. 5, 1990 (100), School of Law University of Maryland. In it, Chiu states Japan, after their September 1972 establishment of diplomatic relations with Beijing, set up "unofficial" institutions to deal with economic, cultural, tourist, and other issues with Taiwan. (pages 10-11) This system of official relations with Beijing and unofficial relations with Taiwan, yet in no substantive way limiting any of the parties' involved ability to trade, travel, or otherwise work together is what would become known as the "Japan Formula," which Leonard Woodcock would modify in his proposals to both the White House and Deng Xiaoping in December, 1978.

[437] "The present question in furthering normalization," he stated, "is whether the U.S. is willing to withdraw its diplomatic recognition of Taiwan, remove our Ambassador and place a liaison office in that country." Carter L. Burgess "China Journey-1975," in the Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts MS1664 S.2B9F15.

committees; to do so "would be a mistake…[and] would tend to tie the President's hands and limit his options."[438] A major reason for this, Vance would say, was

> the recent transfer of leadership in China has not yet taken firm roots, and it is too early to predict whether it will last. This uncertainty cannot fail to affect its foreign relations. I believe China will not embark on an expansive foreign policy in the foreseeable future. It will rather concern itself with sorting out its domestic—political and economic—problems.[439]

Vance, in the fall of 1976, stated "Japan remains the most important country for us in the Far East."[440] Nevertheless, he felt Washington must inform Beijing early in 1977 that the White House

> stands behind the ultimate goal of normalization of diplomatic relations…Further, I believe it is important to move to a new degree of cordiality and understanding with China. To this end, I believe early contact should be made with the Chinese government.[441]

In the spring of 1977, the President was advised to send the secretary of state to sound out how the Chinese government felt about normalization and the ever-problematic issue of Taiwan.[442] While in China, the Secretary would discuss a wide range of issues, become more

---

[438] Memo, Cyrus Vance to Jack Watson on Policy Paper Ideas, 24 October 1976, Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts MS1664 S.2B9F12.

[439] Foreign Policy Memo to Carter by Cyrus Vance, 24 October 1976, Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts MS1664 S.2B9F12. Briefly stated, China was recovering from the death of Mao Zedong (1976) and the purges from the infamous "Gang of Four." By the end of 1976 and early 1977, Hua Guofeng had centralized leadership and was beginning to bring members of the Gang of Four to trial, and part of the aftermath of these actions would be a) the second rehabilitation of Deng Xiaoping (who had been purged in February of 1976 after the death of Zhou Enlai), and, b) the rise of the poster movements which would eventually become known as "Democracy Wall" by the late summer of 1978.

[440] Foreign Policy Memo to Carter by Cyrus Vance, 24 October 1976, Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts MS1664 S.2B9 F12.

[441] Foreign Policy Memo to Carter by Cyrus Vance, 24 October 1976, Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts MS1664 S.2B9 F12.

acquainted with Chinese diplomatic goals, and explain Carter's position.[443] The idea was to move slowly, argued Vance, for "the issue of 'normalization' is very complex and must be approached with caution…I do not think we have to rush."[444] Vance and others recognized communism was no longer monolithic and had not been so for a long time, if ever. The temptation to justify normalization as a "wedge strategy" to divide the USSR and the PRC was great, though Paul Warnke, an old friend of Dean Acheson and member of the Johnson Administration, counseled a different approach: "In our dealings with China, common interest must be found *beyond* a matching distrust of Soviet intentions."[445]

Before plans for normalization could be made, the new administration had to discover what commitments the previous administration had made to Beijing.[446] Carter's team requested access to Nixon and Kissinger's papers "immediately," lest they be removed from Washington and placed into private, unreachable collections.[447] Kissinger, at least in part, opened his papers and gave a great deal of advice to the new team. In a conversation with Carter and Mondale after

---

[442] Memo, ZB, Gardner, Henry Owen to Jimmy Carter, 3 November 1976, Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts MS 1664, S.2 B9 F19.

[443] Foreign Policy Memo, Vance to Carter, 24 Oct 1976, Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts MS 1664, S.2 B9 F19.

[444] Foreign Policy Memo, Vance to Carter, 24 Oct 1976, Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts MS 1664, S.2 B9 F19.

[445] In the same memo Warnke tells Watson that the "communist monolithy [sic] has been destroyed and no enmity is more sincere than that" between the Soviets and the Chinese. Memo, Paul Warnke to Jackson, 28 October 1976, Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts, MS 1664 S.2 B9 F19. Italics added.

[446] Memo on Foreign Policy Goals for first Six Months, Brzezinski, Gardner, and Owen to Carter, 3 November 1976, Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts MS 1664 S.2 B9 F19.

[447] Memo on Foreign Policy Goals for first Six Months, Brzezinski, Gardner, and Owen to Carter, 3 November 1976, Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts MS 1664 S.2 B9 F19.

the election, Kissinger observed that there was uncertainty due to new leadership in Beijing and that overall the Chinese "were the most cold-blooded balance of power analysts he had ever encountered."[448] For the PRC, the relationship with Washington was a matter of balance, and as such, China's new leaders would "seek better relations with both the United States and the Soviet Union."[449] Focusing on Taiwan, however, "was the wrong perspective in which to view the problem."[450] Normalization of relations with Beijing would have a high cost—Taiwan—a cost that had not been acceptable to the Ford administration, and even to Kissinger himself. Pay lip service and do nothing, was Kissinger's counsel.[451]

The leadership change that had Kissinger worried was the end of the Gang of Four and the return of Deng Xiaoping. In 1976 and 1977, China was moving out of the Maoist and Gang of Four period and into a new, more open period. This new era was marked by the gradual ascension of Deng Xiaoping to China's leadership after 1976. The thrust of Chinese policy, both domestic and diplomatic, was at a crossroads. Though it was certain that the CCP would remain in power, the question remained as to which faction would lead the way into the 1980s. Deng Xiaoping's sudden re-entry into Party life in 1976 and 1977 made a tense situation even more

---

[448] Memo of Conversation, Kissinger, Carter, Mondale, Eagleburger, Aaron 20 November 1976, Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts, MS 1664 S.2B 8F6.

[449] Memo of Conversation, Kissinger, Carter, Mondale, Eagleburger, Aaron 20 November 1976, Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts, MS 1664 S.2B 8F6.

[450] Memo of Conversation, Kissinger, Carter, Mondale, Eagleburger, Aaron 20 November 1976, Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts, MS 1664 S.2B 8F6.

[451] Memo of Conversation, Kissinger, Carter, Mondale, Eagleburger, Aaron 20 November 1976, Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts, MS 1664 S.2B 8F6. Kissinger would also state that he was unwilling to "give up Peking for Taiwan" as the relationship had to always be seen in a geopolitical context. Nevertheless, he did council the Carter administration to stay away form full out normalization. Memo of Conversation, Kissinger, Carter, Mondale, Eagleburger, Aaron 20 November 1976, Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts, MS 1664 S.2B8 F6.

volatile. Deng held the post of Vice-Premier and represented the potential for change and modernization, while Hua Guofeng, the Premier, represented the conservative, early revolution side of the Party. In 1977 and 1978 the Party, under Deng's influence, allowed greater freedom of expression and movement of its people, which caused the Carter administration to remain subdued on other concerns—in other words, to pursue a policy of moral pragmatism.

When Carter came to office in January 1977, normalization depended on implementing the Shanghai Communiqué; especially the touchy issue of Taiwan, a subject that Bryan Hilton has nimbly explored.[452] From the outset, though no immediate action was announced, both the NSA and the Secretary of State agreed on the importance of opening relations with the PRC. Vance stated, "On China, we [Carter and Vance] were in complete agreement that normalization of relations should be one of our principle objectives…I believed we should proceed promptly but carefully."[453] Brzezinski seconded this, stating that "we set for ourselves the end of 1978 as the goal for normalization of relations with China…because we saw that relationship as a central stabilizing element of our global policy and a keystone for peace."[454]

Brzezinski outlined in more detail how he felt this process should occur:

> We wanted to initiate talks with the P.R.C. and complete the claims negotiations during 1977 and to establish full diplomatic relations by 1979. We wanted, in 1978, to facilitate Chinese acquisition of nondefense and possibly even defense-oriented

---

[452] Hilton, "Maximum Flexibility."

[453] Cyrus Vance, *Hard Choices: Critical Years in America's Foreign Policy* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983) 32.

[454] Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Power and Principle: Memoirs of the National Security Advisor, 1977-1981* (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1983) 53-54. Vance would agree that by the end of 1978 was ideal, stating that "From the very outset, normalizing relations with the People's Republic of China was my goal and that of President Carter, but I did not expect that diplomatic recognition could be achieve before the second year of the administration." Vance, *Hard Choices*, 75.

> Western technology and by 1979 to host a visit by a leading P.R.C. political figure, sign trade and cultural agreements, and lay the basis for a long-term cooperative relationship.[455]

A new relationship with China that achieved some peace and stability in the region was a key goal of the administration. Cyrus Vance especially, with his long history of Washington service, understood the problems faced by Asia in the post-Vietnam era:

> I believe that better relations with China would help to stabilize post-Vietnam Asia…China constituted a political, economic, and cultural weight in the world that the United States could not ignore. Better relations would help our foreign relations across the board—by producing increased regional stability and, in the long run, a more stable global order. As I saw it, China was a great country that had an important role to play in the final quarter of the twentieth century, *not simply one that might be a useful counterweight to the Soviet Union*.[456]

Jimmy Carter agreed with his advisors, and wrote in his diary on February 13th, 1977 that "My inclination is to alleviate tension around the world, including disharmonies between our country and those with whom we have no official relationships, like China…and I'll be moving in this direction."[457] China had been of interest to Carter ever since he had learned about the country from Baptist missionaries; this interest was sustained by family connections and his own trip to China in April 1949 as a young officer in America's submarine fleet.[458] In his memoirs, Carter recalled that

> [My] interest in China was kindled when I was a small boy during the 1930s, studying about Baptist missionaries there and reading letters from Uncle Tom Gordy…From the slide programs put on by itinerant missionaries on furlough I was taught to look upon the

---

[455] Brzezinski, *Power and Principle*, 54. Brzezinski also notes here that he wanted to see China able to gain access to military technology by the end of 1978.

[456] Vance, *Hard Choices*, 75-79 (emphasis added).

[457] Jimmy Carter, *White House Diaries*, 27.

[458] Carter, *White House Diaries*, 38.

> Chinese as friends in urgent need of hospitals, food, schools, and the knowledge of Jesus Christ as their Savior.[459]

Carter would even tell Deng Xiaoping in January 1979, when asked about his interests, that "as a child I had given five cents a week to help build hospitals and schools for Chinese children. Baptist missionaries to China were our ultimate heroes."[460]

What remained to be determined was how to restart the foundered negotiations with Beijing. Two courses were ultimately decided upon: first, a reflection of Brzezinski's influence in the foreign policy-making apparatus, was a move away from Carter's ideal of open diplomacy; and, second, a delicate balancing act of pursuing normalization while minimizing its effect on the Administration's other initiatives—namely SALT II and the Panama Canal Treaties.[461] While sorting this out, the Carter Administration immediately faced Chinese accusations that it had backed out of the Shanghai Communiqué, at least concerning Taiwan. Vance, in a meet-and-greet between himself, Kissinger, and Huang Zhen, the head of the PRC Liaison Office, reasserted the President's support of the Communiqué.[462] A month later, on February 8th, Carter proposed a three-pronged strategy to reassure China. The President wanted to show Beijing how important the growing relationship was; how America was working to balance everything between America, the Chinese, and the Soviets; and to "reconfirm that normalization is the goal of our policy;" in other words, that the United States was still "guided

---

[459] Carter, *Keeping Faith*, 190.

[460] Jimmy Carter, *White House Diaries*, 283-284.

[461] During the campaign Carter had lambasted the Nixon/Ford administrations (and Kissinger) for their refusal to conduct its diplomacy out in the open.

[462] Richard Solomon, *U.S.-PRC Political Negotiations, 1967-1984: An Annotated Chronology* (Rand Corporation, December 1985) 60. The Liaison Offices of the U.S. and the PRC, at least during normalization talks, acted very much like traditional ambassadors.

by the principles of the Shanghai Communiqué."[463] In response, Huang Zhen attempted to calm a White House fear about Chinese politics as he told Carter politics within the PRC were stable.[464]

In the midst of this effort to sustain a fragile relationship, the PRC and ROC became increasingly focused on the President's new human rights policy. At the end of January, the NSC spokesman, Jerrold Schecter, told Brzezinski that James Wei, head of Taiwan's Central News Agency, was pressuring him on the issue: "Wei indicated that Chi'ang Ching-Kuo is aware of the Carter Administration's concern for human rights…He also, of course, raised the human rights question in reference to the future of the people of Taiwan and said, 'that is a human rights issue too.' No doubt that will be a major theme with the Taiwan Lobby in its efforts to avoid full recognition of the PRC by the U.S."[465]

Brzezinski told Carter that Beijing had previously thought America would back down on human rights because of SALT negotiations, but "Peking [Beijing] is now convinced that U.S. statements on human rights are not a 'domestic political gimmick' and represent a facet of U.S. policy which will be constant throughout your administration."[466] Furthermore, the PRC

---

[463] Memo, Vance to Carter 7 February 1977, Plains File, Box 6, Folder 9. RAC Files Project (hereafter *RFP*), Jimmy Carter Library (hereafter *JCL*). Vance would reiterate to the President "the key understandings underlying the productive working relationship established in 1972 were incorporated in the Shanghai Communiqué. Both parties pledged to work for 'normalization' of relations, understood by both to mean the establishment of full diplomatic relations." Memo, Vance to Carter 7 February 1977, Plains File, Box 6, Folder 9. *RFP*, *JCL*.

[464] Solomon, *Annotated Chronology*, 61.

[465] Memo of Conversation with Mr. James (Jimmy) Wei, Head of Central News Agency, Taiwan; Jerry Schecter to Brzezinski, 29 January 1977, White House Country File (hereafter *WHCF*) CO 34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 4, *JCL*.

[466] Memo, Brzezinski to Carter, 29 March 1977, Brzezinski Material: President's Daily Report File, Box 1, Folder 3. *RFP*, *JCL*.

believed that the new policy would "keep a certain level of tension between Washington and Moscow and probably will prevent the U.S. 'from being lulled by Soviet blandishments over détente;'" this policy "placed Moscow off-balance because they did not know how to handle such comments."[467] A few days later, the NSC East Asia Desk, led by Michael Oksenberg, a China expert who taught at Columbia and the University of Michigan before joining the NSC, noted that China believed "human rights issues will not cause a conflict between China and the U.S. since the gap between the regime and people in China is not as wide as it is in the USSR. Accordingly, the Chinese believe the primary tensions over human rights would remain between America and the Soviet world."[468]

At the same time Carter was learning of this, the administration started sending Congressional delegations (CODEL) to China. These trips sparked an internal discussion in the State Department and the White House on how to present both these trips and the whole normalization process to the American public. While no concrete answers were forthcoming, at a meeting in April 1977, Vance again wondered how to bring about meaningful—yet cautious—public discussion on normalization.[469] The issue remained undetermined for some months yet. Later, in the fall of 1977, the unresolved nature of portions of Carter's foreign policy and its

---

[467] Memo, Brzezinski to Carter, 29 March 1977, Brzezinski Material: President's Daily Report File, Box 1, Folder 3. *RFP*, *JCL*.

[468] NSC Evening Report-Far East (Oksenberg) to Brzezinski, 30 March 1977, Staff Material: Far East, Box 39, Folder 6, *RFP*, *JCL*. The East Asia Analyst for the NSC was Mike Oksenberg, a political scientist from the University of Michigan and a life-long China watcher. He was particularly focused on the political system in China, one of the rare experts in the country on this at the time—making him an invaluable addition to the Carter foreign policy establishment. He would remain a key part of American efforts to deal with China until his death in 2001.

[469] Cyrus Vance Meeting Notes, 28 April 1977, Vance Papers, MS 1664 S.2 B10 F27, YMC.

intersection with Congress emerged again, this time around human rights. The NSC sent a memo on the subject to Mondale and Vance—how does the White House make sure that it is in compliance with Congressional regulations, especially on foreign aid? How was the administration to deal with the problem of enlarging the international concern for human rights? And how should the Administration deal with growing Congressional pressure (via Jackson-Vanik and Harkin) to link aid and development funding to a country's human rights ratings?[470] The early December report on human rights initiatives Brzezinski sent Carter focused on these problems:

> Relations between Congress and the Administration in the human rights area are at a very low ebb. It is hard to accept, given your own deep commitment to this issue, but most human rights advocates in Congress believe that, were it not for their continuing pressure and vigilance, the Administration would renege on its commitment to human rights. The situation has been complicated by the fact that the Right wing has recognized this issue as a golden opportunity to turn a "liberal" issue to its own ends…Thus we face a strange alliance of both ends of the ideological spectrum that caused us so much difficulty during this past year.[471]

"One of the main reasons we have not been able to win Congress' trust," Brzezinski observed, "is that with the best of intentions, we have found it impossible to implement some of the legislation in this area…Congress did not think through the damage such a list would do to our overall foreign policy."[472] According to the NSA, a new series of meetings with Congressional

---

[470] Memo for Vice President, Secretary of State, et al from National Security Council 16 September 1977, Staff Material: Staff Secretary, Box 7, Folder 2. *RFP, JCL*.

[471] Memo, Brzezinski to Carter, "Human Rights Initiatives" 3 December 1977, Donated Historical Material: Mondale, Walter F. Box 109, Folder 3. *RFP, JCL*.

[472] Memo, Brzezinski to Carter, "Human Rights Initiatives" 3 December 1977, Donated Historical Material: Mondale, Walter F. Box 109, Folder 3. *RFP, JCL*. The list referred to here was attached to the Harkin bill, one that listed countries according to their human rights abuses and recommended strong reaction by the United States.

and Senate leaders could both remedy the situation and sound out feelings regarding normalization.

In April 1977, Carter laid out Washington's plan to deal with China in Presidential Review Memorandum (PRM) 24. A study, to be completed by June, was to detail how the administration would move forward in the relationship, with each option falling "within the framework of the Shanghai Communiqué."[473] In May of 1977, Carter appointed former labor leader Leonard Woodcock as the Chief of the United States Liaison Office (USLO) in Beijing and prepared to send a high-level delegation to China.[474] Carter was excited about his choice of Woodcock, noting that while the labor leader was not a foreign policy expert, "as head of UAW [United Auto Workers] Woodcock was a superb negotiator. This is what I wanted, since I was ready to begin serious talks with China, largely bypassing the State Department except for Cy Vance."[475] The President wanted to limit access to information about normalization. The growing conservative movement in the 1970s was focused upholding the relationship with Taiwan. Carter, Brzezinski, and Vance were concerned about public opinion limiting their options during the delicate negotiations.[476]

On May 22nd, in a speech at Notre Dame, Carter highlighted his administration's commitment to human rights and to normalizing relations with China. "It's important that we

---

[473] Presidential Review Memorandum/NSC 24, 5 April 1977, located online at http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/documents/prmemorandums/pres_memorandums.phtml (accessed 18 September 2012). Human rights, as such, were not mentioned in the list of topics to be discussed.

[474] Carter, *White House Diaries*, 38. In this entry from April 1, 1977, Carter notes that he had been in discussions about sending a representative to Beijing and that it "sounds like a good idea to me." *Ibid*.

[475] Carter, *White House Diaries*, 53.

[476] Carter, *White House Diaries*, 53.

make progress toward normalizing relations with the People's Republic of China," Carter said. "We see the American and Chinese relationship as a central element of our global policy and China as a key force for global peace…and we hope to find a formula which can bridge some of the difficulties that still separate us."[477] By June, Beijing was becoming cautious about the issue especially as the President consistently discussed the role of human rights in all of America's international efforts. Based on intelligence coming out of China, the State Department argued "the question of human rights in the PRC is a sensitive issue with implications for Sino-U.S. relations and the process of normalization…Peking could be expected to react strongly to official U.S. criticism of human rights in China."[478] Beijing seemed suddenly to have difficulty grasping the motivation for this new policy and its relation to "more traditional issues of national interest, security and economic relations between our two countries."[479] China realized that, when compared to Western-style democracy, their human rights record fell short—a tool already useful to pro-Taiwan groups, Tibetans, and others. This was a significant issue, as pro-Taiwan groups pointed to human rights problems on the mainland as reasons to abandon the nascent normalization process. The State Department noted that, "Official U.S. attacks on [their] violation of human rights would likely provoke strong criticisms which could lead to a more

---

[477] Solomon, *Annotated Chronology*, 61; Jimmy Carter, Address at Commencement Exercises at the University of Notre Dame, *Public Papers of the Presidents*, Jimmy Carter 1977, Vol. 1. Hua Guofeng would state that with this apparent resolve—the PRM, appointing Woodcock, the public announcement—by Carter and his administration to uphold the Shanghai Communiqué, that the question of Taiwan was essentially resolved. "'We appreciate that, Hua said.'" State Department Telegram, August 1977 (exact date uncertain), Cyrus Vance Papers, Yale Manuscripts MS1664 S.2B9F15.

[478] Department of State Telegram, June 1977, Staff Materials: Far East, Box 39, Folder 8, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[479] Department of State Telegram, June 1977, Staff Materials: Far East, Box 39, Folder 8, *RFP*, *JCL*.

inflexible and antagonistic posture towards the U.S."[480] How much of an issue human rights would become for normalization remained to be seen, however. Officials on both sides of the Pacific would have to wait on the reaction of China's critics and how Carter would apply moral pragmatism in Asia.[481]

The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) complicated matters in late June 1977. Oksenberg wrote Brzezinski "you should be aware that some people at CIA are attempting to generate interest in the subject of labor camps in China. The timing of this suggests that it be related to PRM-24, and is an effort to inject the human rights issue into our China policy considerations."[482] In the face of thousands of documented prisoners, Oksenberg told Brzezinski that he was not at all surprised. "Let us look forward," he told the NSA, "to the day when our diplomatic relations with China are such that we can begin to raise this issue, and the Chinese will have a sufficient stake in their relationship with us that they will simply have to respond."[483] From the beginning of Carter's efforts at establishing normalization, then, it would be a waiting game as Carter worked to create a more favorable environment to push Beijing on the issue.

Pete Tarnoff in the State Department sent a memo to Brzezinski at the end of June which declared that despite human rights concerns, the Carter administration hoped to open formal ties with "most, if not all those countries with whom we presently have tensions or no relations…of

---

[480] Department of State Telegram, June 1977, Staff Materials: Far East, Box 39, Folder 8, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[481] Department of State Telegram, June 1977, Staff Materials: Far East, Box 39, Folder 8, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[482] Memo, Oksenberg to Brzezinski, 20 June 1977, Brzezinski Material: Brzezinski Office File, Box 41, Folder 6, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[483] Memo, Oksenberg to Brzezinski, 20 June 1977, Brzezinski Material: Brzezinski Office File, Box 41, Folder 6, *RFP*, *JCL*.

these, China is the most important and we hope to have formal diplomatic relations with Peking [Beijing] within the next four years, with due consideration for the security of Taiwan."[484] Human rights concerns, important though they might be, required "both consistency *and* flexibility in how we deal with specific circumstances. Our goal should be clear improvement in the practice [of human rights] of as many countries as possible."[485] America's duty was to engage in multilateral and bilateral discussions with countries and the United Nations as well as to stress the "broad scope of economic, social, political, and civil rights."[486] Tarnoff concluded that the United States must have "[a] sensitivity to real divergence in national interest and the realization that the US may have to modify some domestic and other diplomatic goals to retain good relations with our allies;" a policy of moral pragmatism.[487]

Throughout June, the Administration worked to reassure Beijing that normalization was a priority. When a delegation from the Chinese People's Institute for Foreign Policy visited Washington, Oksenberg sent a series of memos to the Cabinet and the White House to remind officials that this group was the "equivalent to a Council on Foreign Relations" and was

---

[484] Department of State Memo (by Tarnoff) to Brzezinski, 28 June 1977, Plains File, Box 6, Folder 17, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[485] Department of State Memo (by Tarnoff) to Brzezinski, 28 June 1977, Plains File, Box 6, Folder 17, *RFP*, *JCL*, emphasis my own.

[486] Department of State Memo (by Tarnoff) to Brzezinski, 28 June 1977, Plains File, Box 6, Folder 17, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[487] Department of State Memo "1976-1980 Goals for Foreign Policy" (by Tarnoff) to Brzezinski, 28 June 1977, Brzezinski Material: Brzezinski Office File, Box 78, Folder 6, *RFP*, *JCL*. (This document is has additional pages to the memo not located within the folder.)

"obviously an extension of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs" in Beijing.[488] Oksenberg asked White House officials meeting with the delegation to make sure it understood the "great importance" Washington attached "to our relations with the People's Republic of China…This Administration is deeply committed to the normalization process under the framework of the Shanghai Communiqué."[489] When Woodcock stopped by the White House a few weeks later to discuss normalization plans with Carter, he was reminded that normalization was "advisable," and that President Carter would cover any political fallout. The only real problem was Taiwan; namely, "our commitment not to abandon the peaceful existence of the Chinese with Taiwan."[490]

Meanwhile, opposition to normalization was growing in America. Secretary Vance, in a Policy Review Council meeting, pointed out there was a "problem on the Hill, where quite a group was forming against normalization, a cimbination [sic] of conservatives with ties to

---

[488] Memo, Mike Oksenberg to Hamilton Jordan, "Regarding Visit by Chinese People's Institute for Foreign Policy," 29 June 1977, *WHCF*, China CO-34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 1 (1/20/77-12/31/78), *JCL*.

[489] Memo, Mike Oksenberg to Walter Mondale, "Regarding Visit by Chinese People's Institute for Foreign Policy," *WHCF*, China CO-34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 1 (1/20/77-12/31/78), *JCL*. In this memo, the NSA advisor would go so far as to recommend the Vice President state that "I personally believe that all of mankind will benefit from a Sino-American relationship in which we have full diplomatic relations and in which our peoples and governments are at last able to cooperate fully in matters of mutual concern." This push to help fill the gaps was felt elsewhere throughout the end of 1977; for example, when the Chinese Higher Education Delegation was in Washington, Christine Dodson sent a memo to Stuart Eizenstat asking that he finish his meeting with the group by concluding with "some heartfelt remarks about the importance to which you attach to the normalization process under the framework of the Shanghai Communiqué." Memo, Christine Dodson to Stuart Eizenstat, 16 December 1977, "Your Visit with the Chinese Higher Education Delegation, *WHCF*, China CO-34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 1 (1/20/77-12/31/78), *JCL*, (underlining in original).

[490] Carter, *White House Diary*, 68.

Taiwan and liberals concerned about human rights in the PRC."[491] The same day the Administration issued PRM 28, the now-famous review of America's human rights policy, which provided opponents of the administration with more fuel. Defining U.S. human rights objectives as an attempt to "encourage the respect that governments accord to human rights," the memo presented a detailed definition of human rights that could be used in domestic debates and applied to international relations.[492] Carter was aware that PRM 28 might pose a problem for normalization as the directive mentioned China, specifically stating that "the potential of normalization of relations with China and Cuba will place some strain on the credibility of our human rights policy, for in both cases other considerations are likely to govern in the short term. As the relations are stabilized, we will be expected to take human rights initiatives…we should recognize that with respect to human rights we will have little, if any, leverage or influence with the PRC at this time."[493]

Critics on and off Capitol Hill seemed to miss Carter's emphasis on flexibility; it appeared to them that the new relationship would not be what many had expected of the "human rights" president. In reports on global developments related to Washington's new human rights policy in early August, the CIA supplied some revealing statements. In Taiwan, where the

---

[491] Memo Oksenberg to Brzezinski, 8 July 1977, Staff Material: Far East, Box 47, Folder 7, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[492] Presidential Review Memorandum/NSC 28, 8 July 1977, located online at http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/documents/prmemorandums/prm28.pdf (accessed 10 May 2012)

[493] Presidential Review Memorandum (PRM)-28 15 August 1977, NSC Institutional Files, 1977-1981, Box 44, Folder 6, *RFP*, *JCL*. This realization was in part prompted by a growing surge of telegrams coming in to the State Department from Chinese "refugees" living in Taiwan or Hong Kong asking that the White House re-evaluate its diplomatic strategy with Beijing due to the CCP's abuse of human rights. See numerous telegrams in *WHCF*, CO 34-2. B. CO-19, Folder 3, *JCL*.

citizens and government were becoming increasingly edgy about the potential for a more cordial American-PRC relationship, a CBS reporter was refused entry. Taiwanese officials "accused the US of picking on Taiwan," and "criticizing Chinoy's [the CBS reporter] reporting...asked why nothing was said about human rights in the People's Republic."[494] The Soviets, the CIA report noted, were unhappy as well, and "may choose to cite lack of US criticism of China's human rights record in support of this interpretation."[495] Though the Taiwanese and Soviets were less than thrilled about how things were turning out, Beijing "thus far appear unconcerned about their own vulnerability on the human rights issue," though the report noted, the PRC "probably has some private misgivings on this score."[496] China was not highlighting the human rights issue in state newspapers; the initial approval Beijing expressed of American critiques of Moscow's rights record "may have been tempered by realization [sic] that the status of human rights in China could become a controversial issue in the US and complicate the process of normalizing Sino-US relations."[497]

Initially, some in Beijing had believed that while human rights might be useful for attacking the Soviets it was actually an American "domestic political gimmick."[498] By April

---

[494] CIA Report on Developments Regarding Human Rights Policy, 5-11 August 1977, Staff Material: Global Issues, Box 10, Folder 11, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[495] CIA Report on Developments Regarding Human Rights Policy, 5-11 August 1977, Staff Material: Global Issues, Box 10, Folder 11, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[496] CIA Report on Developments Regarding Human Rights Policy, 5-11 August 1977, Staff Material: Global Issues, Box 10, Folder 11, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[497] CIA Report on Developments Regarding Human Rights Policy, 5-11 August 1977, Staff Material: Global Issues, Box 10, Folder 11, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[498] NSC Evening Report, Far East to Brzezinski 30 March 1977, Staff Material: Far East, Box 39, Folder 6. *RFP, JCL*.

1977, however, the majority of the leadership in China had shifted their view. Beijing's ambassador to Egypt noted that Beijing was "quite pleased" with Carter's new policy focus and that human rights issues would "not cause a conflict between China and the U.S. since the gap between the regime and people in China is not as wide as it is in the USSR. Accordingly, the Chinese believe the primary tensions over human rights would be between the U.S. and the USSR/Eastern Europe."[499] By the fall of 1977, though the PRC was warming up to the policy, Beijing was still wary of how to approach the new administration, wondering if Carter might move away from the Communiqué thanks to challenges to the administration's human rights agenda in Eastern Europe. Brzezinski told Carter that while "China had initially believed the US would alter its human rights stand for Soviet concession(s) on SALT," they were waiting to see how far Washington would go to ensure human rights. The NSA noted a "PRC official disclosed that China will be looking with interest at the U.S. reaction to the 17 October sentencing in Prague of four Charter-77 dissidents. The Chinese believe that the harsh sentences meted out is a Soviet probe as to how far the U.S. is willing to retreat from its human rights policy."[500]

Beijing remained cautious thanks in part to the visit Secretary Vance paid to Huang Hua, the Chinese Foreign Minister; Deng Xiaoping, the Vice-Premier; and Hua Guofeng, Chairman of the CCP and Premier in Beijing in August. While discussing policy with Huang Hua, Vance

---

[499] NSC Evening Report, Far East to Brzezinski 30 March 1977, Staff Materials: Far East, Box 39, Folder 17. *RFP, JCL*.

[500] Undated Memo, ZB to President, Brzezinski Material: President's Daily Report File, Box 1, Folder 3. *RFP, JCL*; Evening Report (Armacost to Brzezinski) 21 October 1977, Brzezinski Material: Staff Evening Reports File, Box 6, Folder 1. *RFP, JCL*. Charter-77 was a group of 243 dissident intellectuals in Czechoslovakia led by Vaclev Havel, Jan Patocka, and Jiri Hajek.

declared that one of the "common thread[s]" of American foreign policy was human rights.[501] Indeed, the issue was now a "central pillar" of Washington's policy, an attempt to act on America's "belief that the world should seek more than economic survival and we believe that human dignity and human freedoms are among man's fundamental needs."[502] Perhaps sensing an objection from the Chinese official, Vance quickly added that this policy "does not mean that we are attempting to conduct our foreign policy by rigid moral maxims or impose our political systems on others."[503] For Vance, this was a continuation of the previous days' discussions of American diplomatic goals, namely that the "goals of our foreign policy are based on fundamental values and on using our material strength and power to further our national interests and to achieve humane purposes."[504]

In early September 1977, an article by John Wallach appeared in the *Boston Herald American* that praised Vance's trip and declared that headway had been made in the normalization discussion.[505] Angered by this, Deng told Louis Boccardi and others on a sixteen-day Associated Press trip that the normalization process had actually been significantly hampered after Vance's visit and the apparent misunderstanding of China's requirements

---

[501] Memo of Conversation, Vance and Huang Hua, 23 August 1977, Vertical File, China (MR-NLC-98-214[1] through China MR-NLC-98-214[2]), B40, Folder 3, *JCL*.

[502] Memo of Conversation, Vance and Huang Hua, 23 August 1977, Vertical File, China (MR-NLC-98-214[1] through China MR-NLC-98-214[2]), B40, Folder 3, *JCL*.

[503] Memo of Conversation, Vance and Huang Hua, 23 August 1977, Vertical File, China (MR-NLC-98-214[1] through China MR-NLC-98-214[2]), B40, Folder 3, *JCL*.

[504] Memo of Conversation, Huang Hua and Vance, 22 August 1977, Vertical File, China (MR-NLC-98-214[1] through China MR-NLC-98-214[2]), B40, Folder 3, *JCL*.

[505] "Breakthrough Seen on China-Taiwan Issue," by John Wallach, *Boston Herald American*, 26 August 1977.

regarding Taiwan in particular.[506] During the August meeting, Deng had been firm with the Secretary of State, stating that America seemed to be retreating from the Shanghai Communiqué and needed to develop a path forward.[507] By the end of September, China was still waiting for Carter to decide how to proceed. The Chinese frustration would last until November, when Woodcock reported that Huang Hua was expressing the hope that the American president would view the Sino-American relationship not merely as a problem of diplomacy, but in a broad, far-reaching perspective.[508]

WHILE Vance was in Beijing he told Huang Hua that the administration believed it "must be partners with the Congress in both the formulation and the implementation of foreign policy."[509] Meanwhile, the White House was discussing just how to achieve this: should the administration bring Congressional leaders into the discussion surrounding Beijing, or leave it in the dark as Kissinger and Nixon had done? While acknowledging the "Congressional role in normalization will be important," many in a July policy meeting decided that bringing Congress into the decision making process in the summer of 1977 would be "premature."[510] Commentary on the

---

[506] "Teng Says Vance Trip Set Back Normal Ties," by Louis D. Boccardi, *The New York Times*, 7 September 1977. Carter would also amend his published diary on 3 November 1977, remarking that there was "a surprising incompatibility between Secretary Vance and the Chinese leaders, which I never really understood." Carter, *White House Diaries*, 128.

[507] Memo of Conversation, Vance and Deng Xiaoping, 24 August Vertical File, China (MR-NLC-98-214[1] through China MR-NLC-98-214[2]), B40, Folder 4, *JCL*.

[508] USLO Woodcock to Secretary of State Vance, Meeting between Woodcock and Huang Hua, 14 November 1977, Vertical File (JCL) China MR-NLC--214[1] through China MR-NLC-98-214[2] B40 F1, *JCL.*

[509] Memo of Conversation, Vance-Huang Hua 22 August 1977, Vertical File, China MR-NLC-98-214[1] through China MR-NLC-98-214[2] B40 F3, *JCL*.

administration's move toward the PRC from legislators started pouring in by August. Senator Henry Jackson (D-WA) wrote, somewhat surprisingly, that "to the extent that we [US-China] are strategically useful to each other, there will be a willingness to accommodate each other on such seemingly intractable matters as Taiwan."[511] Jackson put the relationship squarely into a pragmatic, balance-of-power equation and argued that Washington got things from China only when seen as useful for Beijing, and vice-versa. America needed to appear as a "credible counterweight to the Soviets," which would allow the United States and China "to arrive at a formula through negotiations which would enable us to establish full diplomatic relations with Peking."[512] The senator was quick to point out that though he was concerned about the Soviets, the relationship with China was increasingly "strategically important to us."[513]

Not all Congressmen were as pragmatic as Jackson when it came to establishing relations with China. For example, in late August, Representative John Ashbrook (R-OH) told Brzezinski that Senator Edward Kennedy's (D-MA) recent advice to go forward with normalization "should be rejected."[514] Indeed, normalizing with China would lead to a loss of America's credibility the

---

[510] Memo Oksenberg to Brzezinski, 8 July 1977, Staff Material: Far East, Box 47, Folder 7. *RFP, JCL*.

[511] Memo to Jimmy Carter from Sen. Henry Jackson, "On China Policy," 5 August 1977, White House Country File (WHCF) CO 34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 5, JCL.

[512] Memo to Jimmy Carter from Sen. Henry Jackson, "On China Policy," 5 August 1977, White House Country File (WHCF) CO 34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 5, JCL. Jackson would also state in the same memo that "The Chinese will be responsive to our initiatives only when they are convinced that we are determined to meet the global Soviet challenge."

[513] Memo to Jimmy Carter from Sen. Henry Jackson, "On China Policy," 5 August 1977, White House Country File (WHCF) CO 34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 5, JCL.

[514] Letter, John Ashbrook to Brzezinski, 20 August 1977, *WHCF*, China CO 34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 5, *JCL*.

world over. "To seek peace and strengthen human rights are worthy goals for America's foreign policy," Ashbrook declared.[515] "Breaking off relations with Taiwan will do nothing to further that goal."[516] The President's assistant, Frank Moore, received a letter from Rep. William Dickinson (R-AL) charging that Carter did not understand the situation; he had refused to see "both" Chinas. "One is a dictatorship denying basic human rights to 800 million and the other free, carrying on the traditions and ancient culture of the Chinese people."[517] In short, Dickinson argued, "we should do nothing to deliver a free people to the ranks of the enslaved—do nothing at the expense of free China!"[518] Moore replied, "This Administration believes that our strategic interests and the interests of peace are served by a continued improvement and normalization of our relations with the People's Republic of China…Our China policy is not intended to settle outstanding issues between Taipei and Peking."[519] Moore went on to reassure Dickinson that the Administration intended to maintain close consultation with Congress throughout the process.[520] Not long after, Brzezinski echoed this in a message to Senator Alan Cranston (D-CA) before a

[515] Letter, John Ashbrook to Brzezinski, 20 August 1977, *WHCF*, China CO 34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 5, *JCL*.

[516] Letter, John Ashbrook to Brzezinski, 20 August 1977, *WHCF*, China CO 34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 5, *JCL*.

[517] Letter, William Dickinson to Jimmy Carter, 23 August 1977, White House Country File, CO 34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 5, JCL.

[518] Letter, William Dickinson to Jimmy Carter, 23 August 1977, White House Country File, CO 34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 5, JCL.

[519] Letter, Frank Moore to Rep. William Dickinson, 29 September 1977, White House Country File (WHCF) CO 34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 5, JCL.

[520] Letter, Frank Moore to Rep. William Dickinson, 29 September 1977, White House Country File (WHCF) CO 34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 5, JCL.

trip to China that the White House understood "that Congress has a major role to play in the normalization process, and I hope that you will stress this to the Chinese."[521]

White House discussions about dealing with Congress on normalization continued into the spring of 1978. Responding to a question about this, Richard Holbrooke argued

> There are two danger points…(1) the Goldwater challenge; and (2) whether effort to find a suitable alternative to our present security commitment to Taiwan is acceptable to the Hill. There are three ways that have been recommended for normalization; first, the Woodcock proposal—simply present the Congress with a fait accompli. The President would announce that we have established diplomatic relations with the PRC, and is requesting action from Congress to make sure that our ties with Taiwan remain unimpaired…[522]

Vance commented later in the meeting that all this was fine. The real problems, he felt, were the "two-China" types and the Congressional members concerned about Taiwan's human rights.[523] A few days later, Mike Oksenberg and Mike Armacost told Brzezinski that in their view, normalization strategy "has been designed" not to need "explicit Congressional approval;" instead, Carter could act directly, which, in fact, was what he did throughout the remainder of the negotiations.[524]

---

[521] Letter, Brzezinski to Senator Alan Cranston, 21 December 1977, White House Country File, CO 34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 6, JCL.

[522] Summary of Meeting Minutes on Korea and China policy, 11 April 1978, National Security Affairs: Far East, Armacost Chronological File, B.7 4/11-18/78 through 6/14-30/78 F. 1, JCL. The meeting was held between Brzezinski, Holbrooke, Vance, Brown, Aaron, Abramowitz, Armacost, and Oksenberg. The "Woodcock proposal" is what the administration would essentially adopt later in the year.

[523] Summary of Meeting Minutes on Korea and China policy, 11 April 1978, National Security Affairs: Far East, Armacost Chronological File, B.7 4/11-18/78 through 6/14-30/78 F. 1, JCL.

[524] Memo, Oksenberg and Armacost to Brzezinski "Normalization Strategy," 24 March 1978, National Security Affairs: Far East, Armacost Chronological File, B.6 2/1-12/78 through 4/1-10/78, Folder 6, JCL. In 1980, when Congress was investigating the White House's actions toward China, it declared that "Below the surface [of the new China fever in America, 1978-

BY October 1977, the normalization process seemed stalled. Mike Oksenberg reported that Dick Solomon felt current policy toward Beijing "has just about played itself out."[525] Something had to be done soon. The relationship between the PRC and Washington was getting stale, so much so that Solomon observed that if "agreement under present circumstances is unattainable" then perhaps some "future common threat will impart a new sense of urgency to the idea of normalization."[526] At the end of the month, Brzezinski told Vice President Mondale that the "pace of our efforts to normalize relations with Peking has been slowed by the Panama Canal issue" because of the attention the White House diverted to pass the new Canal treaties.[527] It seemed likely that Sino-American relations would revert to how they were in the 1960s when the State Department had a difficult time sending CODELs to Beijing. On top of this,

---

1980] lay a serious and festering dispute between the Congress and the administration over President Carter's handling of China policy, particularly the administration's record in consulting with Congress over that policy." "Executive-Legislative Consultations on China Policy, 1978-1979" No. 1 in *Congress and Foreign Policy Series*, Washington DC, Government Printing Office, June 1980, 1.

[525] Memo, Far East to Brzezinski, 17 October 1977, Brzezinski Materials: Staff Evening Reports File, Box 5, Folder 6, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[526] Memo, Far East to Brzezinski, 17 October 1977, Brzezinski Materials: Staff Evening Reports File, Box 5, Folder 6, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[527] Memo, Brzezinski to Mondale, 27 October 1977, "Lunch with the People's Republic of China Ambassador Huang Chen, *WHCF*, China CO-34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 1 (1/20/77-12/31/78), *JCL*. The Carter Administration had decided to wait to push normalization until after the fight in Congress regarding the Panama Canal was completed. In the fall of 1977, Carter had committed the United States to agreements with Panama giving the canal back by the year 2000 while still allowing America to ensure the canal's neutrality and move its warships through when needed.

neoconservative and nationalist ire was now roused and focused on maintaining strong ties with Taipei and not Beijing.[528] This concern pushed the NSA to advise Mondale that it was

> particularly important that we symbolically affirm the importance which we attach to China at this time…In the course of this lunch, I hope you would affirm our commitment to the Shanghai Communiqué, describe our global policies, indicate our resolve to remain a credible power in the Western Pacific…the underlying message we would want Huang Chen to take to Peking is that we remain interested in normalization and that we wish to develop a consultative relationship with the Chinese on world affairs.[529]

With the growth of the pro-Taiwan lobby and interest in human rights, the small but vocal Tibetan exile community came to Washington and asked Carter to reconsider normalization. Oksenberg, writing about the affair, stated "there is no reason to cover up the PRC's record…[but] at the same time, Tibet could become a sore point in Sino-U.S. relations…the Chinese record in Tibet can be used by pro-Taiwan elements to raise the spectors [sic] of what might happen to Taiwan in the event of normalization."[530] Oksenberg observed that this was "indicative of the kind of problems our China policy is beginning to encounter. In the absence of momentum toward normalization, we must engage in a series of rather annoying, inconsequential, and unpleasant rear-guard actions to sustain the relationship."[531]

---

[528] Memo, Far East to Brzezinski, 17 October 1977, Brzezinski Materials: Staff Evening Reports File, Box 5, Folder 6, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[529] Memo, Brzezinski to Mondale, 27 October 1977, "Lunch with the People's Republic of China Ambassador Huang Chen, *WHCF*, China CO-34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 1 (1/20/77-12/31/78), *JCL*.

[530] Memo "The Tibetan Front" Oksenberg to Brzezinski 18 October 1977, Brzezinski Material: Brzezinski Office File, Box 50, Folder 6, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[531] Memo "The Tibetan Front" Oksenberg to Brzezinski 18 October 1977, Brzezinski Material: Brzezinski Office File, Box 50, Folder 6, *RFP*, *JCL*.. The issue of Tibet will always be lurking—in April, 1978 the State Department was working on how to set up a decision-making framework for Tibetan questions and accusations on Chinese human rights abuses. Memo, Tarnoff to Brzezinski 18 April 1978, *WHCF*: Subject File, Box 11, Folder 23 *RFP*, *JCL*. (If needed, the ESDN designation for this is NLC-34-11-23-1-8.)

Meanwhile, the Chinese were still waiting to see how Carter would respond to human rights issues in other communist states. In 1977, 243 Czechoslovakian dissidents, led by Vaclav Havel, Jan Patocka, and Jiri Hajek, signed the Charter 77 manifesto, which outlined rights violations committed by the Czech government. Charter 77 quickly grew as a dissident organization focused on reforming the Soviet-backed regime according to human rights norms recently written into Czech law.[532] China wanted to see how Washington would react to the Soviet Union's harsh sentencing of these dissidents. Would the White House step back from its hard-line policy toward the Kremlin, or would it stay the course?[533] Beijing felt the answer to this question would indicate how it might be treated during the normalization process.[534] For the PRC, Washington's response to the sentencing of the Charter-77 activists was heartening. Carter, Vance, and Brzezinski all took a hard line on the Kremlin's actions, pushing the Soviets to hold up their end of the Helsinki agreements, but they had made no move to hold Beijing accountable.

As 1977 came to a close, concerns about Chinese violations of human rights grew as reports on political executions within the PRC mounted in Washington. The American consul in Hong Kong, Thomas Shoesmith reported "the number during the past year may have been as

---

[532] In 1976, the Czech government, prompted by the Helsinki Accords, had adopted many of the provisions found in the International Covenants on Social, Cultural, and Economic Rights and on Civil and Political Rights. See Aryah Neier *The International Human Rights Movement: A History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), pages 145-147 for a recent, brief history of the movement. See also Sarah Snyder, *Human Rights Activism and the End of the Cold War: A Transnational History of the Helsinki Network* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), especially pages 68-71.

[533] Evening Report, Armacost to Brzezinski, 21 October 1977, Brzezinski Material: Staff Evening Reports File, Box 6, Folder 1, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[534] Evening Report, Armacost to Brzezinski, 21 October 1977, Brzezinski Material: Staff Evening Reports File, Box 6, Folder 1, *RFP*, *JCL*.

high as 20,000."[535] An intelligence analyst concluded "If this number is anywhere accurate, it has great implications for the consistency of our human rights policy. It dwarfs most other country concerns."[536] The CIA portrayed the executions as a reflection of "Peking's efforts to restore an effective, regularized, and responsive public security apparatus" following the last vestiges of the Cultural Revolution, the Gang of Four, and the excesses of the Tiananmen Square demonstrations in 1976.[537] The number of executions, despite Beijing's need to restore order, was ostensibly going down, though not because of foreign attention, noted the CIA. The was decreasing because the new government needed to appear more lenient than the previous leaders. Nonetheless, Langley predicted that the restructuring of government and security institutions would "likely result in increased government control."[538]

The executions, as it turned out, did not become an issue in Sino-American relations. On December 13, 1977, Oksenberg sent a memo to Brzezinski about general policy goals and directives regarding China. Overall, the goal of Washington's policy was "to normalize relations with the PRC" along the lines of the Shanghai Communiqué and push human rights problems in China down the road.[539] The Carter administration "recognizes the historic and strategic

---

[535] Global Issues Alert Item, 8 December 1977, Staff Material: Global Issues, Box 63, Folder 3, *RFP*, *JCL*. Also see Brzezinski to Carter, 5 June 1977, Brzezinski Material: Brzezinski Office Material, Box 126, Folder 1, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[536] Global Issues Alert Item, 8 December 1977, Staff Material: Global Issues, Box 63, Folder 3, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[537] CIA Memo on Human Rights Impact, 2-8 December 1977, Staff Material: Defense/Security, Box 38, Folder 7, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[538] CIA Memo on Human Rights Impact, 2-8 December 1977, Staff Material: Defense/Security, Box 38, Folder 7, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[539] NLC-SAFE 4 A-6-9-2-0 Memo on Guidelines for Policy Review Council regarding the PRC, Oksenberg to Brzezinski, 13 December 1977, *RFP*, *JCL*.

necessity of normalizing our relations with the PRC…our relations with a quarter of mankind involve one of the most important issues with which this Administration must deal during its tenure in office."[540] Oksenberg observed that, "it is not our practice to comment on the domestic situation of other countries. On balance, we are impressed that the current leaders are grappling in a forthright manner with the issue currently confronting them."[541] Again, a flexible rights policy was applied in the normalization process.

One of the elements of Carter's human rights policy was the development of country reports on human conditions throughout the world. In the first reports from February 1978, the People's Republic of China was not mentioned (nor was Cuba, Vietnam, or the USSR, though Yugoslavia was).[542] In part, this reflected who was considered a legitimate government. The State Department only published information on countries with which America had diplomatic ties with; the PRC was still seen as illegitimate. As Washington's human rights bureaucracy became more entrenched, and as the urgings of the Helsinki network and Congressional human rights forces expanded in influence, the Country Reports came to include greater depth of coverage, commenting especially on those countries previously ignored.[543]

---

[540] NLC-SAFE 4 A-6-9-2-0 Memo on Guidelines for Policy Review Council regarding the PRC, Oksenberg to Brzezinski, 13 December 1977, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[541] NLC-SAFE 4 A-6-9-2-0 Memo on Guidelines for Policy Review Council regarding the PRC, Oksenberg to Brzezinski, 13 December 1977, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[542] Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, printed for Congress and Senate, 3 February 1978, Government Printing Office, Washington DC.

[543] One might also cynically argue that given the Carter administration's goal of normalization, and knowing the volume of anti-Beijing voices on the Hill, they simply decided to not bring any undue attention to the issue. This, though, was only partly successful—Congress itself would publish a separate volume discussing the countries left out of the initial State Department report. See "Human Rights Conditions in Selected Countries and the U.S. Response," Report for the House Subcommittee on International Organizations by Foreign

Throughout the remainder of 1977 and into the spring of 1978, normalization remained in limbo. The Carter administration had its hands full with the Panama Canal fight and SALT negotiations. Further contributing to the normalization inertia was the attitude of Chinese leaders. In January of 1978, Ted Kennedy met with Deng and Huang Hua. Undersecretary of State Warren Christopher reported that Kennedy had "tried to impress" on the Chinese leaders that they had to "take into account American public opinion."[544] The Chinese refused, arguing that it was not their responsibility to worry about American domestic politics.[545] Christopher reported that Deng told Kennedy the normalization process was up to Washington now. The Vice-Premier hoped it could be "promptly accomplished, but he saw this as entirely dependent on U.S. actions and had nothing new to propose."[546]

During discussions on normalization, human rights issues remained at the periphery of Washington's vision. In the January 13th NSC Weekly Report, Brzezinski told Carter that while the administration had sought to include human rights issues in regularizing relations with other governments—and had successfully done so—this had not occurred with China over the past year.[547] What had been done in this area had achieved little or no effect in the region. A CIA

Affairs and National Defense Division, Congressional Research Division, Library of Congress (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1978).

[544] Memo, Warren Christopher to Mondale, 5 January 1978, Brzezinski Material: Subject File, Box 19, Folder 5, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[545] Memo, Warren Christopher to Mondale, 5 January 1978, Brzezinski Material: Subject File, Box 19, Folder 5, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[546] Memo, Warren Christopher to Mondale, 5 January 1978, Brzezinski Material: Subject File, Box 19, Folder 5, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[547] Brzezinski to Carter, NSC Weekly Report #42, 13 January 1978, Plains File, Box 9, Folder 12, *RFP*, *JCL*.

report stated that American human rights concerns "appear to have had little direct impact on the Asian Communist states, aside from prompting occasional, fleeting defensiveness. In China…the major objective seems to be an improved climate for economic development rather than a broadening of individual rights."[548] While some rights were defined in the Chinese constitution, they were not observed by the government; indeed it seemed that aside from trying to promote economic growth, "Much of the publicity surrounding the resurrection of the judicial system and the return to legal processes, for example, was carried in English and was clearly aimed at an international, and particularly Western, audience."[549]

In March 1978, Brzezinski proposed a new plan to improve America's image on human rights in Asia and with Congress: the White House should consider partnering with human rights non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Led by Amnesty International (1961) and Human Rights Watch (1978), these groups had grown in stature since the mid-1960s. The NSC acknowledged that the best information on human rights came from these groups, and they supplied their findings to anyone who was willing to provide them with a forum, including Congress. Working with NGOs in tracking rights abuses and recommending new policies might "offer a much more hopeful route for turning Congress around than does a direct approach."[550]

---

[548] CIA Report on Human Rights Performance, January 1977-1978, Brzezinski Material: Inderfurth and Gates Chronological File, Box 3, Folder 6, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[549] CIA Report on Human Rights Performance, January 1977-1978, Brzezinski Material: Inderfurth and Gates Chronological File, Box 3, Folder 6, *RFP*, *JCL*. See also the CIA report from 10-16 March 1978, which states that "The publicity is in part intended for domestic consumption, but it also seems designed to tell foreign audiences that China is making efforts to restore orderly forms of government and 'normal' legal processes after years of disorder and unrest. *The commentaries may also reflect Peking's concern about China's vulnerability on human rights issues.*" CIA Memo on Human Rights Impact, 10-16 March 1978, Staff Material: Defense/Security, Box 39, Folder 11, *RFP*, *JCL*, (emphasis added).

It would also show a new level of openness in diplomatic style that would appeal to the increasingly interest group-based Congresses of the late 1970s.

As the NSA worked on this strategy, members of Congress continued to question Carter's commitment to human rights. In a letter to Brzezinski in mid-May 1978, Rep. Edward Derwinski (R-IL) argued that, "in my judgment, the Administration is making a serious mistake in pressing so-called normalization of relations with Peking. This is certainly contradictory to the strong human rights position taken by the President."[551] An NSC spokesman soon countered that, "our pursuit of improved relations with the PRC is not inconsistent with our position on human rights. The People's Republic of China understands that we are committed to human rights as a fundamental tenet of our foreign policy, and our views have been conveyed to Chinese leaders on several occasions, including during the visit of Secretary Vance to Peking last August."[552] The NSC spokesman neglected to include two issues. First, the Chinese did not enjoy talking with Vance, seeing him as to unwilling to compromise on US attitudes toward Taiwan. Second, when Vance brought up human rights, he assured Beijing that human rights would not be a significant element in the normalization process even though Administration officials privately believed rights would become a part of the relationship at a later date.

---

[550] Evening Report 24 March 1978, Brzezinski Material: Staff Evening Reports File, Box 10, Folder 2. *RFP, JCL*.

[551] Letter, Rep. Edward Derwinsky to Brzezinski 12 May 1978, *WHCF* China CO 34-2, Box CO-17, Folder 7, *JCL*.

[552] Letter, Douglas Bennet, Jr. to Rep. Derwinsky, 8 June 1978, Federal Government Organizations; Executive, FG 6-1-1/Brzezinski 2/16/78-3/31/78 through 7/16/78-8/31/78, Folder 5, *JCL*.

Earlier in February, Woodcock met with Carter to discuss China policy and argued that "after elections in the fall we ought to move."[553] Carter agreed, and decided it was time to send Brzezinski to Beijing with orders to "go as far as he could toward normalization without a final agreement."[554] That May, the National Security Advisor arrived in China and began discussions with PRC leaders. In a morning meeting on May 20, he sat down with Huang Hua and discussed the US-Soviet relationship, problems in Cambodia, and a common desire to see global stability achieved.[555] Later that afternoon, following Hua's assertion that China would not compromise on normalization issues, Brzezinski told the foreign minister "I can say on behalf of President Carter that the U.S. has made up its mind to normalize U.S.-PRC relations," leaving it understood that the basic principles of the Shanghai Communiqué would not be contested.[556]

Brzezinski felt that the moment was important, and told Carter "We have embarked on a course that could have very great international consequences. U.S.-China normalization could open the doors to a political-economic relationship with one-fourth of mankind. It could alter the international balance."[557] In June Cyrus Vance told Huang Hua that the USLO Chief Leonard Woodcock would begin serious negotiations. Between July and December of 1978, Woodcock held a series of meetings with Chinese representatives, the most productive occurring in the days preceeding the normalization announcement on December 15, 1978.

---

[553] Carter, *White House Diaries*, 170. Woodcock is referring to the midterm elections.

[554] Carter, *White House Diaries*, 178; 192-193; 195.

[555] See summary of the meeting in Solomon, *Annotated Chronology*, 64.

[556] Solomon, *Annotated Chronology*, 64. See also Brzezinski, *Power and Principle*, 202-215.

[557] Brzezinski to Carter, NSC Weekly Report, 7 July 1978, Plains File, Box 9, Folder 15, *RFP*, *JCL*.

During this last round of talks other issues emerged that further complicated the process. Chief among these was the growing impact of the Helsinki Accords. Signed by President Ford, the Accords consisted of human rights agreements that had, in many ways, superseded the cumbersome United Nations Declaration (UNDHR, 1948) in Europe. The Helsinki Final Act, achieved after a long series of negotiations, utilized a system of informal and formal agreements, none of which were legally binding to signatory countries. Though the Helsinki Final Act was "a declaration of intention, and therefore the obligations therein were only moral and political," it quickly became part of the official debate between Moscow and Washington.[558] The agreement was built around three "baskets," or groups of issues: the official acceptance of the borders in Europe by the Western states, certain economic agreements, and a series of human rights ideals and regulations, which were based on the 1948 UN Declaration of Universal Human Rights. This new human rights statement focused on the "fundamental" freedoms of religion, thought, and migration, but imposed economic enforcement mechanisms where the UN Declaration had none.[559]

In a conversation between the Chinese representative in London and the American attaché in August, the representative stated that China "considers [itself] still to be a very poor country, trying to raise its own standard of living" and having to overcome the "perfidy" of the Gang of Four.[560] While the new Chinese leadership understood and appreciated the West's desire for human rights, the Chinese official observed that Washington must remember, "the

---

[558] Snyder, *Human Rights Activism*, 5.

[559] Snyder, *Human Rights Activism*, Introduction.

[560] Memo, Situation Room to Brzezinski, 7 August 1978, Brzezinski Material: President's Daily File, Box 7, Folder 4, *RFP*, *JCL*.

problems of the third world are more fundamental and encompass the hard issues of human needs."[561] The State Department took this message to heart. In an August memo from Richard Holbrooke to Vance on Asian policy issues, human rights in particular, China was not mentioned.[562] Again, the Carter administration opted for moral pragmatism during the summer and fall of 1978. In the Weekly Report for July 20, 1978, Oksenberg wrote Brzezinski

> Since China is not a signator to the Helsinki Agreements and hence is not bound by them, since each meeting Chinese policies in the human rights area have improved in the past year and the Chinese have assisted in the reunification of several subdivided families in response to U.S. Government intervention, and since the Chinese have been behaving constructively in the international community during the past 12 months, I would assume that we do not intend to apply sanctions to China because of Soviet misbehavior. I therefore hope that China will be clearly exempted from the export control procedures we are instituting.[563]

In October, the effort to achieve normalization picked up. Oksenberg, writing to Brzezinski about the process so far, reported he had told his Chinese counterpart that the "optimum point for normalization, from the point of view of both sides, was rapidly approaching."[564] But the Chinese were still wary about the human rights issue. "An intriguing

---

[561] Memo, Situation Room to Brzezinski, 7 August 1978, Brzezinski Material: President's Daily File, Box 7, Folder 4, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[562] Holbrooke to Vance, 21 August 1978, Brzezinski Material: Brzezinski Office File, Box 3, Folder 5, *RFP*, *JCL*. Holbrooke does tell Vance that "Our human rights record is mixed [in Asia]…We have made progress, but difficulties remain."

[563] Weekly Report Oksenberg to Brzezinski, 20 July 1978, Carter archives, Brzezinski Material: Staff Evening Reports File, Box 13, Folder 6, *RFP*, *JCL*. In the report on Human Rights Performance from January 1977 to July 1978, it was noted that the slight improvements in rights issues in China were related not to the growing international concern for rights coming out of the prominence of the Helsinki networks, but rather out of the "increasingly pragmatic character of the new leadership." Report: Human Rights Performance January 1977-July 1978, Staff Material: Global Issues, Box 17, Folder 15, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[564] Oksenberg to Brzezinski 17 October 1978, Staff Material: Far East, Box 44, Folder 7, *RFP*, *JCL*.

cautionary phrase which they used with me," Oksenberg reported, "was that certain American friends had 'unrealistic views' about Chinese politics. I asked in what way were these views 'unrealistic.' They stated that we should be quite clear that the Chinese would do nothing other than insist on the three conditions and permit an American relationship with Taiwan according to the Japan Formula."[565] The issue of rights was left out of the memo.

At the end of October 1978, Pat Derian, the Assistant Secretary for Human Rights, met with Oksenberg to receive input on the China section of a speech about human rights in Asia. Derian and Oksenberg sent the draft on to Brzezinski, who rejected it, stating flatly that mentioning China in a human rights speech was not "timely." Oksenberg, who had been asked to "develop a record indicating our human rights concerns in China, in anticipation [of] one of the arguments to be used against us during normalization," protested.[566] As the lead NSC China specialist, he believed that the paragraph would not have provoked the Chinese and argued that "failure to mention China in this speech will be too conspicuous and would signal to Peking that we do indeed exempt them from our human rights concerns."[567] Oksenberg begged Brzezinski to reconsider his decision on the speech, but to no avail.[568]

During the fall of 1978, administration officials noted only two major changes in the Chinese human rights situation. First, Chinese officials used the phrase "human rights" in

---

[565] Oksenberg to Brzezinski 17 October 1978, Staff Material: Far East, Box 44, Folder 7, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[566] Oksenberg to Brzezinski 25 October 1978, Brzezinski Material: Staff Evening Reports File, Box 16, Folder 2, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[567] Oksenberg to Brzezinski 25 October 1978, Brzezinski Material: Staff Evening Reports File, Box 16, Folder 2, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[568] Oksenberg to Brzezinski 25 October 1978, Brzezinski Material: Staff Evening Reports File, Box 16, Folder 2, *RFP*, *JCL*.

denunciations of the Gang of Four and the late Mao years. An analyst noted that "the extraordinary use of this term in the publicity given to these efforts at least reflects China's concern for its image in the outside world. Much of the publicity…was clearly aimed at an international, and particularly Western, audience."[569] The second change coincided neatly with Helsinki ideals—Beijing was allowing greater numbers of Chinese people to emigrate and announced plans to send increasing numbers of its students abroad to study as part of the new "Four Modernization" campaign.[570] This pleased the White House, as "both the new émigrés and the students represent means for transmitting Western human rights concepts to what is still a very closed society."[571] Carter would use this information to both deflect Congressional attacks on human rights issues and to defend the policy of moral pragmatism.

---

[569] Internal Article, "Human Rights in East Asia-Pacific Area," 31 October 1978, Staff Material: Global Issues, Box 17, Folder 15, *RFP*, *JCL*. Note how even the analysis of this shift in official terminology is met with the *exact same* phrases from the summer reports on Chinese human rights.

[570] The "Four Modernization" Campaign was part of Deng Xiaoping and Hua Guofeng's attempt to rebuild the nation after the implosion of the Cultural Revolution and the rise of the Gang of Four. Generally speaking, it was focused on industrial, technological, and economic expansion as the way to bring China more fully into the modern world. A key component would be the increase in international exchange between Beijing and other governments, the United States being one of these. One area in particular had met with a great amount of success in the early negotiations between Beijing and Washington—scientific exchange. China was also interested in obtaining new technology in agriculture, industry, and other areas. The United States had been only too happy to help out, paving the way for new transfers of equipment and information from Europe first and then, later, the United States itself. By November 1978, the relationship was booming, prompting Holbrooke to report that there had been significant expansion, and this had only been helped by the visits of high level officials form Washington, especially Brzezinski earlier in 1978. Cable from State to Seoul Embassy 12 November 1978, Brzezinski Material: Cables File, Box 113, Folder 4, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[571] Internal Article, "Human Rights in East Asia-Pacific Area," 31 October 1978, Staff Material: Global Issues, Box 17, Folder 15, *RFP*, *JCL*.

In November, Deng told interviewers from the *Washington Post* that "Taiwan can maintain its own non-communist economic and social system under unification with the mainland," and that if America was worried about national security, "normalization…will do more for U.S. security than any number of SALT treaties with Moscow."[572] The lack of continued abstract nature of the relationship irked Deng Xiaoping, who told a Japanese party on November 18, 1978 that US and China could normalize within seconds if only the United States would commit to the process.[573]

There were several reasons why the White House was reluctant to do so. In part, Washington was recovering from a bitter fight with Congress over the Panama Canal treaties, a battle that had left them reluctant to stir up controversy regarding China. In addition, Washington, while it wanted normalization, had to be certain that they were negotiating with a stable government. Beijing had not been stable since Mao's death just a few years earlier, and the administration wanted to evaluate the impact Deng's return had on PRC governance. By late November 1978, the NSC was still concerned. Oksenberg told Brzezinski that Deng's actions in the Politburo and the emergence of public critiques of Mao endangered the returned leader of being purged yet again.[574] Finally, Washington was waiting to see how Beijing would react to the Democracy Wall movement.

---

[572] Solomon, *Annotated Chronology*, 70. See also "Teng, In Japan, Reasserts China's Terms on U.S. Ties," by William Chapman, *Washington Post*, 26 October 1978; "U.S. Trims Military Forces on Taiwan by Half in a Year" by Jay Matthews, 7 November 1978.

[573] Cable from State to Seoul Embassy 12 November 1978, Brzezinski Material: Cables File, Box 113, Folder 4, *RFP*, *JCL*; Solomon, *Annotated Chronology*.

[574] Memo, East Asia (Oksenberg) to Brzezinski, 22 November 1978, Brzezinski Material: Staff Evening Report's File, Box 16, Folder 6, *RFP*, *JCL*.

Democracy Wall was a poster movement that began in the fall of 1978 and quickly gained momentum. Building on Deng's challenges to the Politburo following his return, the movement called for greater openness nationwide, which generated a minor crisis in Chinese ruling circles. Reporting for the *Washington Post*, Jay Matthews wrote that "as posters went up in Peking calling for 'human rights and democracy' in China," a major meeting of the nation's leaders was called.[575] Matthews' article noted that "a plan was being considered that would apparently dilute Hua's influence, and strengthen the hand of Vice Chairman Teng Hsiao-ping, by increasing the size of the standing committee of the Politburo."[576]

The leadership's unease continued to grow regarding the direction the democracy movement was taking, especially in the East Coast regions. A new style of college entrance exams, ideas of rapid modernization, openness to foreign trade, and Western movies all presented the older revolutionaries with challenges that pushed them to try and maintain hold of their power. This was especially the case as some of the posters began "praising the United States, expressing envy of Taiwan and suggesting that Chinese leader Hua Kuo-feng might have obtained his post illegally."[577] As a reporter for the *National Review* noted, "Teng Hsiao-ping, having been sacked by Mao, has re-emerged as the prime political mover…[and is] bent on ending the revolutionary Puritanism, ongoing social upheaval, and economic autarky cultivated by Mao."[578] This whole process, the *Review* opined, "could lead to a major devolution of socio-

---

[575] "Chinese Leaders Expected to Meet on Rights Debate," *Washington Post* A29, 23 November 1978.

[576] "Chinese Leaders Expected to Meet on Rights Debate," *Washington Post* A29, 23 November 1978.

[577] "Protests Intensity in Peking; Chinese Wall Poster Campaign Reaches New Intensity" *Washington Post* A1 26 November 1978 (byline, Jay Matthews).

political power in China. The potentialities are mind-boggling."[579] This whole affair, Woodcock's office reported to Washington, had "obviously been useful to Teng by providing visible evidence of the popular support for a reevaluation of Mao's role and other events perpetrated in Mao's name."[580]

The question for the administration was where Deng would land concerning the protests. As Woodcock's office noted, "a little taste of democracy and freedom…can be a dangerous thing," and "beneath the surface of this tightly disciplined society lie a variety of pent up political desires."[581] The Liaison Office noted that while Deng had used the forces of liberal protest for his own benefit in the past year, "a social democrat he is not. He too may have been shaken by the evidence…that China's new generation of young people, like those of Czechoslovakia in 1968, find concepts of freedom, democracy, and human rights more attractive than further doses of discipline, hard work, and sterile rhetoric."[582] State Department analysts agreed: "the poster and rally activity of the past two weeks (which has now been curbed) was initiated and guided by Teng to pressure the leadership into full ratification of his far-reaching policies"—not a "true" human rights move at all.[583]

---

[578] "China's China Card," *The National Review*, Vol. 30, Is. 51, 1577.

[579] "China's China Card," *The National Review*, Vol. 30, Is. 51, 1577.

[580] Cable from Ambassador (Peking) to Secretary of State, December 1978, Brzezinski Material: Staff Evening Reports File, Box 17, Folder 1, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[581] Cable from Ambassador (Peking) to Secretary of State, December 1978, Brzezinski Material: Staff Evening Reports File, Box 17, Folder 1, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[582] Cable from Ambassador (Peking) to Secretary of State, December 1978, Brzezinski Material: Staff Evening Reports File, Box 17, Folder 1, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[583] Memo, David Mark to Vance, 1 December 1978, National Security Affairs: Brzezinski Materials, Box 9, Folder 1, *JCL*.

The poster movement was part of Deng's new ruling style, though the openness ultimately faded. The posters, poems, and essays displayed critiqued the Cultural Revolution, Mao's governance, and Party leadership and quickly circulated throughout China. Noted China scholar Jonathan Spence summed it up nicely, stating that this literature "stimulated debate and reflection about China's past and its future prospects."[584] By late November and December of 1978, thousands of people were participating by putting thoughts to paper and posting them in and around Tiananmen Square, especially at a section of wall not far from the fabled Forbidden City—an area that became known as "Democracy Wall."[585] By early January of 1979, the movement had grown from simple posters to street demonstrations consisting of hundreds, and occasionally thousands, of people arguing for greater democracy and human rights. One American liaison officer was surrounded and questioned about these topics; he then watched as people converged around a person holding a banner that stated, "oppose hunger; oppose persecution; we demand human rights; we demand democracy."[586] What followed instead was repression in the days preceding Deng's historic trip to Washington to sign the normalization papers.

AS Washington watched Democracy Wall unfold, normalization negotiations continued apace. Leonard Woodcock, in a meeting with Deng Xiaoping in the Great Hall of the People on

---

[584] Jonathan Spence, *The Search for Modern China* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1999) 621.

[585] See Spence, *Modern China*, 618-630, for an excellent, though limited, overview of this process.

[586] Situation Room to Brzezinski 8 Jan 1979, Brezinski Material: President's Daily Report File, Box 9, Folder 2, *RFP*, *JCL*.

December 12, talked through most of the remaining issues pertaining to normalization. Throughout the fall of 1978, Washington and Beijing had reached agreements—as well as agreements to disagree—on everything from technology transfers to education exchanges and economic programs. Woodcock reported that Washington's new proposal, re-written after a round of meetings in early November, was accepted and all seemed fine. Carter noted that evening that "Teng surprisingly accepted our draft communiqué, and we are trying to expedite the process."[587]

Alongside Washington's attempt to move quickly, the President was advised by Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV) to keep it secret, saying that "anytime I brief senators it wouldn't be secret more than five minutes."[588] In Beijing, Woodcock did just this. As he was finalizing negotiations with Deng Xiaoping, he stated, "Your Excellency, one final point. Because of our internal political problems, the President has instructed me to request that there be no public reference to this meeting, because if it is known that Vice Premier [Deng Xiaoping] met the Chief of the Liaison Office, many people will be jumping to conclusions in Washington."[589] Deng took this in stride, and replied that this did not present a problem: "it is easier to keep a secret in China than in the United States."[590] As long as normalization was settled, Deng acquiesced to most anything asked by Washington, even agreeing to discuss the finer points of American arms sales to Taiwan after the recognition process was finished. Woodcock later

---

[587] Carter, *White House Diaries,* 265.

[588] Carter, *White House Diaries,* 265.

[589] Cable Transcript, Woodcock to White House, 13 December 1978, Brzezinski Material: Cables File, Box 129, Folder 4, *RFP*, *JCL*.

[590] Cable Transcript, Woodcock to White House, 13 December 1978, Brzezinski Material: Cables File, Box 129, Folder 4, *RFP*, *JCL*.

noted Deng "has clearly committed his personal prestige to accomplishing normalization within a near-term time frame on terms that could easily be interpreted in China and abroad as comprising long-held Chinese positions."[591]

By December 15, Woodcock and Brzezinski informed Carter that an agreement on arms sales to Taiwan was in hand as long as Washington was discrete. That evening President James Earle Carter announced on national television that the United States of America and the People's Republic of China had reached an agreement to formally recognize each other, completing a nearly decade-long process. The new relationship would begin on January 1, 1979.[592]

While Woodcock was working on the last pieces of the normalization agreement during the week of December 11, Brzezinski and his staff were very much aware of the Party's repressive response to Democracy Wall. The Situation Room sent the NSA a report on the events at Tiananmen Square the day normalization was announced:

> Public security surveillance of 'democracy wall' in Peking apparently has increased. The liaison office reports one poster today accused the local security police of harassment,

---

[591] Cable Transcript, Woodcock to White House, 13 December 1978, Brzezinski Material: Cables File, Box 129, Folder 4, *RFP*, *JCL*. Woodcock also noted "now that we are on the brink, the risks of hesitating are self-evident." At the end of the memo, Woodcock provides a brief glimpse of how he felt Deng was viewing this whole process: "With normalization almost in his grasp, he seemed to relish the prospect of his long-awaited visit to Washington."

[592] While the purpose of this chapter is not to discuss each of the ripostes of the negotiations, a brief word about the last week of talks is needed. Current accounts as to the the exact timeline of the last week of negotiations vary. Patrick Tyler, in his sentionalist history *A Great Wall*, claims that much of the final negotiations were ad hoc in nature, with decisions about weapons sales being made on the fly. He then claims that the "official" record presents a much rosier picture; namely, that Carter and Brzezinski had a plan all along. Tyler's claims are problematic, however, thanks to his open dislike for Zbigniew Brzezinski. James Mann's *About Face* provides a more measured, though brief, account. It relies on readily varifiable interviews and public documents and maintains a proper objectivity throughout. For a more recent examination of the impact of the arms issue on the outcome of the agreement, see Brian Hilton's 2009 essay in *Diplomatic History*. See footnotes three and five of this chapter for complete citations.

> claiming that plainclothes police this week dragged away two bystanders who challenged a man while he was copying down bicycle license plates numbers. Several apparently unofficial banners proclaimed "we want socialist democracy, we don't want KGB!"[593]

The press agreed and quoted Deng's shift on the protests as he stated "some utterances are not in the interest of stability and unity."[594]

Stability and unity were the themes Washington was interested in maintaining, at least for the moment. As the administration continued to receive intelligence on the protests and Deng's reaction, Oksenberg, Brzezinski, and Carter opted to focus on ensuring normalization. The President, Oksenberg counseled, should not react to the poster movement until an "appropriate time," and even then the Administration should only "indicate…that even peoples as widely divergent as the American and Chinese share common values."[595] Brzezinski agreed, and decided to "seek the first suitable opportunity for an Administration spokesman to…note the yearning for greater liberty in China," but not in any way that potentially put Beijing and Washington at odds.[596] The goal was to build the relationship first and then push China on human rights.

Meanwhile, conservatives—given voice by Rep. John Ashbrook (R-OH)—around the country who had watched in surprise as the relationship between the White House and Beijing suddenly changed, argued that the impending shift in relations was evidence of a twenty year old

---

[593] Memo, Situation Room to Brzezinski, 15 December 1978, Brzezinski Material: President's Daily Report File, Box 8, Folder 8, *RFP*, *JCL*. Brzezinski had been briefed earlier in the week about this.

[594] *Facts on File World News Digest*, "Political Wall Posters Increasingly Appear in China; Placards Allude to Mao, Hua," 15 December 1978.

[595] Memo, Oksenberg to Brzezinski, 8 December 1978, National Security Affairs: Brzezinski Materials, Box 9, Folder 1, *JCL*.

[596] Memo, Oksenberg to Brzezinski, 8 December 1978, National Security Affairs: Brzezinski Materials, Box 9, Folder 1, *JCL*.

plot by the liberals to "diminish our sovereignty and move us ever slowly in the direction of being subordinate to the United Nations, the foreign economic treaties, etc."[597] Resurrecting the domino theory, Ashbrook argued

> Liberals seem to downplay the so-called domino theory, but let's apply that valid theory to the ROC-PRC situation. If the President can unilaterally negate a treaty which has been voted on by the [Senate]…why not someone else? Another aspect of the domino theory: If the United States can pull the rug out from under an ally and recant on a good faith commitment to an historic ally, why not the Philippines? Why not Korea? Why not any ally we have now?[598]

The White House responded with a flurry of letters to members of Congress who had been concerned about the Administration's sudden decision to back Beijing and the implications this would have for American foreign policy. Replying to Representative Robert Daniel's concerns that Washington was abandoning human rights for the sake of a potentially profitable relationship with China, Douglas Bennet argued that "The United States is not indifferent to the issue of human rights in the PRC or in any other country…Since well before the decision to normalize relations was reached, we have been discussing our human rights policy with Peking…Of course, recognition and the establishment of diplomatic relations are not ends in themselves and do not imply our approval of the policies of any foreign government. It is our belief that our interests, including those in the area of human rights, can best be advanced by improving relations with other countries."[599]

---

[597] "Liberals Plan the Betrayal of Taiwan" by Representative John Ashbrook, *Human Events*, Vol. 38 No. 49 9 December 1978, 1032.

[598] "Liberals Plan the Betrayal of Taiwan" by Representative John Ashbrook, *Human Events*, Vol. 38 No. 49 9 December 1978, 1032. See also 'The China Card," *The National Review*, Vol. 31, Is. 1, 5 January 1979, 13-14.

[599] Letter, Douglas Bennet to Rep. Robert Daniel, 26 January 1979, White House Country File, CO 34-2, Box CO-19, Folder 5, *JCL.*

Deng Xiaoping arrived in the United States on January 29th, 1979 amid much fanfare. Carter and the Chinese leader held a series of meetings to discuss global policy concerns and attended a gala at the Kennedy Center. At their final meeting on January 31st, the two leaders finished the recognition process as they signed the normalization agreement. With this, the post-Cold War order was established. The Middle Kingdom and the United States had established formal relations. Washington and Beijing clearly understood the significance of the moment. Brzezinski noted this in his memoirs, stating, "Deng…understood that a new global balance of power was in the making, that China and the United States shared common geopolitical interests and that concrete political conclusions needed to be drawn from reality."[600] The issue of human rights, a potentially explosive topic, was only obliquely referenced in private conversations between Carter and Deng.[601] While scholars have traditionally viewed the relationship with Beijing as outside of the President's human rights policies, in reality these policies were a concern throughout the entire process within and without the White House.

Carter's understanding of Sino-American relations reflected his moral pragmatism. The Georgian felt that bringing the Chinese firmly into the global community would serve a dual purpose. In the short term, it would bring greater stability to East Asia and the world and hopefully a check to growing Soviet aggression. Over the long term, Carter and his staff wanted to push China to adopt better human rights structures. As Beijing moved to incorporate better legal structures and allow more open emigration for its citizens, the White House felt reassured in its plan. By adopting a morally pragmatic policy structure on all fronts, Carter injected into American diplomacy in general, and into the new relationship with the PRC in particular, a

[600] Brzezinski, *Power and Principle*, 25.

[601] See Carter, *White House Years*, 283-284.

lasting concern for realistic human rights success. In so doing, Jimmy Carter offered an alternative to the chaotic Cold War world.

Conclusion

This project has sought to examine the foundations of Jimmy Carter's human rights policy and its impact on American diplomacy during the last decades of the Cold War. By tracing the development of an ideal of human rights in American life and Carter's interpretation of it, the preceding chapters have shown how the Georgian created a policy of moral pragmatism. This idea—rooted firmly in Carter's Niebuhrian-infused religious beliefs, personal and regional history, and a Wilsonian understanding of foreign policy—tried to create a new era in US foreign policy, one that attempted to focus on creating a true universal human rights regime. This work has also shown how the human rights emphasis of the Carter White House, contrary to previous scholarship, was consistent if not always successful. This consistency is especially seen in the opening to the People's Republic of China in the fall of 1978. The debate surrounding normalization was filled with the administration's concerns and efforts to flexibly apply its human rights strategy to Beijing while at the same time capitalizing on the moment. Based on this, and the other portions of this work, the work shows that Carter had a consistent human rights policy that he articulated and applied throughout his presidency.

Bibliography

Archives

Jimmy Carter Presidential Library, Atlanta, Georgia
Staff Secretary File
Susan Clough File
Plains File
White House Central File
White House Subject File
White House Name File
Vertical File
Domestic Policy Staff
National Security Policy
Congressional Liaison Office File
Harold Brown File
Zbigniew Brzezinski File
Lloyd Cutler File
Stuart Eizenstat File
Hamilton Jordan File
Robert J. Lipshutz File
George D. Moffet File
Walter Mondale File
Robert A. Pastor File
Jody Powell File

Yale University Libraries
Cyrus R. Vance Papers

Duke University Libraries
Patricia Derian Papers

University of Arkansas Special Collections
J. William Fulbright Papers
John Paul Hammerschmidt Papers

National Archives/Library of Congress
CREST File
Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection of the Association for Diplomatic Studies & Training

Memoirs and Interviews

Brzezinski, Zbigniew. *Power and Principle: Memoirs of the National Security Advisor, 1977-1981*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1983.

Carter, Jimmy. *Keeping Faith: Memoirs of a President*. Fayetteville: The University of Arkansas Press, 1995.

--------. *Turning Point: A Candidate, A State, and A Nation Coming of Age*. New York: Times Books, 1992.

--------. *An Hour Before Daylight: Memories of a Rural Boyhood.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001.

--------. *A Government As Good As Its People.* Fayetteville: The University of Arkansas Press, 1996.

--------. *Why Not the Best? The First Fifty Years*. Fayetteville: The University of Arkansas Press, 1996.

--------. *White House Diary.* New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2010.

Dobrynin, Anatoly. *In Confidence: Moscow's Ambassador to America's Six Cold War Presidents, 1962-1986)*. New York: Times Books, 1995.

Kissinger, Henry. *White House Years*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1979.

Kristol, Irving. *Reflections of a Neoconservative: Looking Back, Looking Ahead*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Miller Center Presidential Project, www.millercenter.org
David Aaron
Madeleine Albright
Jimmy Carter
Zbigniew Brzezinski
Leslie G. Denand
William Odom
Jody Powell

Nitze, Paul H. *From Hiroshima to Glasnost: At the Center of Decision, A Memoir*. New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1989.

Pippert, Wesley. *Spiritual Journey of Jimmy Carter: In His Own Words*. New York: MacMillan, 1978.

Powell, Jody. *The Other Side of the Story*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1984.

Richardson, Don, ed. *Conversations With Carter.* Boulder: Lynne Reinner Publishers, 1998.

Vance, Cyrus. *Hard Choices: Critical Years in America's Foreign Policy*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983.

Government Documents, Committee Papers, and Research Institute Reports

American Foreign Policy: Basic Documents, 1977-1980

Congress and Foreign Policy Series No. 1, "Executive-Legislative Consultations on China Policy, 1978-1979" Washington DC, Government Printing Office, June 1980.

Country Reports on Human Rights Practices. Government Printing Office, Washington DC, 1978-1981.

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1976
Volume I, Foundations of Foreign Policy, 1969-1972
Volume XVII, China, 1969-1972
Volume XVIII, China, 1973-1976
Volume XXXII, SALT I, 1969-1972

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1977-1980
Volume XLI, China, 1977-1980

"Human Rights Conditions in Selected Countries and the U.S. Response," Report for the House Subcommittee on International Organizations by Foreign Affairs and National Defense Division, Congressional Research Division, Library of Congress. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1978.

Preface to "Human Rights in the World Community: A Call for U.S. Leadership" 93rd Congress 2nd Session, 27 March 1974. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C., 1974.

Public Papers of the Presidents
Franklin D. Roosevelt
Harry Truman
Richard M. Nixon
Jimmy Carter

Solomon, Richard. *U.S.-PRC Political Negotiations, 1967-1984: An Annotated Chronology*. Rand Corporation, December 1985.

Supreme Court Cases
Dred Scott vs. Sanford
Elk vs. Wilkins
Plessy vs. Ferguson
Brown vs. the Board
Baker vs. Carr

Tyroler, Charles, editor. *Alerting America: The Papers of the Committee on the Present Danger*. Washington: Pergamon Brassey's, 1984.

Periodicals and Polls

The Black Scholar
Commentary
Encounter
Facts on File World News Digest
Foreign Affairs
Foreign Policy
The Gallup Poll
Human Events
Life Magazine
The Nation
The National Review
The Phyllis Schlafly Report
New Republic
New York Times
Time Magazine
The Washington Post

Articles and Book Chapters

Afshari, Reza. "On Historiography of Human Rights Reflections on Paul Gordon Lauren's *The Evolution of International Human Rights: Visions Seen*," *Human Rights Quarterly* 29 (2007) 1-67.

Allen, Mark. "James E. Carter and the Trilateral Commission: A Southern Strategy," *The Black Scholar*, May 1977, 2-7.

Brinkley, Douglas. "The Rising Stock of Jimmy Carter: The 'Hands on' Legacy of Our Thirty-ninth President," *Diplomatic History* Vol. 20 No. 4 (Fall 1996) 505-529.

Burgers, Jan Herman. "The Road to San Francisco: The Revival of the Human Rights Idea in the Twentieth Century," *Human Rights Quarterly* 14 (1992) 447-477.

Chiu, Hungdah. "The Taiwan Relations Act and Sino-American Relations," *Occasional Papers/Reprints Series in Contemporary Asian Studies*, No. 5 (1990).

Clymer, Kenton. "Jimmy Carter, Human Rights, and Cambodia," *Diplomatic History,* 27:2 (2003) 245-278.

Cmiel, Kenneth. "The Recent History of Human Rights," *American Historical Review* Vol. 109, No. 1 (February 2004):117-135.

Fardella, Enrico. "The Sino-American Normalization: A Reassessment," *Diplomatic History* Vol 33 No. 4 (September 2009): 545-578.

Filene, Peter. "On Obituary for the Progressive Movement," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No.

(1) (1970): 20-34.

Hilton, Brian. "Maximum Flexibility for Peaceful Change: Jimmy Carter, Taiwan, and the Recognition of the People's Republic of China" *Diplomatic History* Vol. 33, No. 4 (September 2009) 595-614.

Kirkpatrick, Jeane. "Dictatorships and Double Standards," *Commentary* No. 68 (November 1979) 34-45.

Levy, Daniel and Natan Sznaider. "The Institutionalization of Cosmopolitan Morality: The Holocaust and Human Rights," *Journal of Human Rights* VOl. 3 No. 2 (June 2004) 143-157.

Mazower, Mark. "The Strange Triumph of Human Rights, 1933-1950," *The Historical Journal* Vol. 47 Is. 2 (June 2004) 379-398.

McMath, Robert C. "The History of the Present" in *The Ongoing Burden of Southern History: Politics and Identity in the Twenty-First Century South*, ed. Angie Maxwell, Todd Shields, and Jeannie Whayne. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2012.

Pierce, Michael "Agrarian Rebel, Industrial Workers: Tom Watson and the Prospects of a Farmer-Labor Alliance" in *Populism in the South Revisited: New Interpretations and New Departures*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2012. ed. James M. Beeby.

Reece, Lewie. "Creating a New South: The Political Culture of Deep South Populism" in *Populism in the South Revisited: New Interpretations and New Departures*, ed. James M. Beeby.

Reuchel, Frank A. "Politics and Morality Revisited: Jimmy Carter and Reinhold Niebuhr," *Atlanta History: A Journal of Georgia* Vol. 37 Is. 4 (1994) 19-31.

Romano, Angela. "Détente, Entente, or Linkage" The Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in U.S. Relations with the Soviet Union," *Diplomatic History* Vol. 33 No. 4 (September 2009) 703-722.

Sanders, Randy. "The Sad Duty of Politics: Jimmy Carter and the Issue of Race in His 1970 Gunernatorial Campaign," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* Vol. 76, No. 3 (Fall 1992) 612-638.

Schmitz, David and Vanessa Walker, "Jimmy Carter and the Foreign Policy of Human Rights: The Development of a Post-Cold War Foreign Policy," *Diplomatic History* 28:1 (2004) 113-144.

Schlesinger, Jr. Arthur. "Human Rights and the American Tradition," *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 57, No. 3 (1978) 503-526.

Schmidli, William. "Institutionalizing Human Rights in U.S. Foreign Policy: U.S.-Argentine Relations, 1976–1980" *Diplomatic History* 35:2 (2011) 351-377 .

Schmidli, William. "Human Rights and the Cold War: The Campaign to Halt the Argentine 'Dirty War'" *Cold War History* 12:2 (2012) 345-365.

Stevens, Simon. "From the Viewpoint of a Southern Governor: The Carter Administration and Apartheid, 1977-1981," *Diplomatic History* Vol. 36, No. 5 (November 2012) 843-880.

Tulli, Umberto. "Whore Rights are Human Rights? The Ambiguous Emergence of Human Rights and the Demise of Kissingerism," *Cold War History* Vol. 12 Is. 4, 573-593.

Walker, Breck. "Friends, But Not Alies—Cyrus Vance and the Normalization of Relations with China," *Diplomatic History Diplomatic History* Vol. 33, No. 4 (September 2009) 579-594.

Wright, Jenny Anne. "Justice Between Fairness and Love? Christian Ethics in Dialogue with Rawls and Niebuhr," *International Journal of Public Theology* VOl. 6 (2012) 306-328.

Zaretsky, Natasha. "Restraint or Retreat? The Debate over the Panama Canal Treaties and U.S. Nationalism after Vietnam," *Diplomatic History*, Vol. 35, No. 3 (June 2011) 535-562.

Thesis and Dissertations

Campbell, George S. "Human Rights and American Foreign Policy: The Carter Years." Master's Thesis, University of Arkansas, 1980.

Damico, John Kelly. "From Civil Rights to Human Rights: The Career of Patricia M. Derian." PhD Dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1999.

Hammond, Michael. "Twice Born, Once Elected: The Making of the Religious Right During the Carter Administration." PhD Dissertation, University of Arkansas, 2009.

Books

Agee, James and Walker Evans. *Let Us Now Praise Famous Men: Three Tenant Families*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960.

Ahlberg, Kristin. *Transplanting the Great Society: Lyndon Johnson and Food for Peace*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008.

Allen, Michael Leroy. *Human Rights Policy of Jimmy Carter: Foundations for Understanding*. (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1984.

Ambrosius, Lloyd E. *The Wilsonian Century: Woodrow Wilson and His Legacy in American Foreign Relations*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2002.

Andrianopoulos, Gerry A. *Kissinger and Brzezinski: The NSC and the Struggle for Control of U.S. National Security Policy*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.

Ansolabehere, Stephen and James M. Snyder, Jr. *The End of Inequality: One Person, One Vote and the Transformation of American Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2008.

Apodaca, Clair. *Understanding U.S. Human Rights Policy: A Paradoxical Legacy.* New York: Routledge, 2006.

Badger, Anthony. *The New Deal: The Depression Years, 1933-1940*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1989.

Barnett, Michael. *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011.

Bartley, Numan V. *The Creation of Modern Georgia*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1983.

--------. *The Rise of Massive Resistance: Race and Politics in the South During the 1950's*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1969.

Bartley, Numan V. and Hugh D. Graham. *Southern Elections: County and Precinct Data, 1950-1972*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978.

Beisner, Robert L. *From the Old Diplomacy to the New, 1865-1900*. Wheeling: Harlan Davidson, Inc,, 1986.

Bell, Daniel A. *China's New Confucianism: Politics and Everyday Life in a Changing Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Berlin, Ira. *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America.* Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1998.

Berman, William C. *America's Right Turn: From Nixon to Clinton, 2nd Ed.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Blumenthal, Sidney. *The Rise of the Counter-Establishment: From Conservative Ideology to Political Power*. New York: Times Books, 1986.

Borgwardt, Elizabeth. *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005.

Borstelman, Thomas. *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

--------. *The 1970s: A New Global History from Civil Rights to Economic Inequality*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011).

Boucher, David. *The Limits of Ethics in International Law: Natural Law, Natural Rights, and Human Rights in Transition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Bourne, Peter. *Jimmy Carter: A Comprehensive Biography From Plains to Postpresidency.* New York: Scribner, 1997.

Branson, Susan. *These Fiery, Frenchified Dames: Women and Political Culture in Early National Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia, 2001.

Brown, Kathleen. *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Brundage, W. Fitzhugh. *Lynching in the New South: Georgia and Virginia, 1880-1930*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.

Brzezinksi, Zbigniew. *The Soviet Bloc: Unity and Conflict*. Cambrdige: Harvard University Press, 1971.

--------, editor. *Dilemmas of Change in Soviet Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.

Brzezinski, Zbigniew and Samuel P. Huntington. *Political Power: USA/USSR*. New York: Viking Press, 1964.

Brzezinski, Zbigniew and Carl J. Friedrich. *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy, 2nd Edition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Campbell, Colin. *Managing the Presidency: Carter, Reagan, and the Search for Executive Harmony*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1986.

Carroll, Peter N. *It Seemed Like Nothing Happened: The Tragedy and Promise of America in the 1970s*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1982.

Chappell, David L. *Inside Agitators: White Southerners in the Civil Rights Movement*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Clymer, Adam. *Drawing the Line at the Big Ditch: The Panama Canal Treaties and the Rise of the Right*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2008.

Cohen, Felix S. *Handbook of Federal Indian Law*. Newark: LexisNexis, 2005.

Cohen, Lizabeth. *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Cohen, Warren I. *America's Response to China: A History of Sino-American Relations*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.

Coleman, Peter J. *Progressivism and the World of Reform: New Zealand and the Origins of the American Welfare State.* Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1987.

Cone, James H. *The Cross and the Lynching Tree.* Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 2011.

Cooke, Jacob E. ed. *The Federalist*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1961.

Cooper, John Milton. *Woodrow Wilson: A Biography*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2009.

Courtwright, David T. *No Right Turn: Conservative Politics in Liberal America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Craig, Campbell. *Glimmer of a New Leviathan: Total War in the Realism of Niebuhr, Morgenthau, and Waltz*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Critchlow, Donald T. *Phyllis Schlafly and Grassroots Conservatism: A Woman's Crusade.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Dallek, Robert. *The American Style of Foreign Policy: Cultural Policy and Foreign Affairs*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1983.

Davies, David Brion. *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Degler, Carl. *At Odds: Women and the Family in American from the Revolution to the Present.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Del Pero, Mario. *The Eccentric Realist: Henry Kissinger and the Shaping of American Foreign Policy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Dochuk, Darren. *From Bible Belt to Sun Belt: Plain-Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Rise of Evangelical Conservatism*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2011.

Dorrien, Gary. *Social Ethics in the Making: Interpreting an American Tradition*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Dudziak, Mary L. *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Duthu, N. Bruce. *American Indians and the Law*. New York: Penguin, 2009.

Duval, Kathleen. *The Native Ground: Indians and Colonists in the Heart of the Continent.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2007.

Ekbladh, David. *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Evans, Richard. *Deng Xiaoping and the Making of Modern China*. New York: Viking Press, 1993.

Fernández-Armesto, Felipe. *Civilization: Culture, Ambition, and the Transformation of Nature*. New York: Touchstone, 2001.

Foner, Eric. *Reconstruction, 1863-1877*. New York: Harper and Row, 1988.

Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Norton, 1963.

Gaddis, John Lewis. *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941-1947.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

--------. *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Strategy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

--------. *The Cold War: A New History*. New York: Penguin Press, 2005.

Garrison, Jean A. *Making China Policy: From Nixon to G.W. Bush*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005.

Garthoff, Raymond. *Détente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1994.

Gerstle, Gary. *Working-Class Americanism: The Politics of Labor in a Textile City, 1914-1960*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Gill, Stephen. *American Hegemony and the Trilateral Commission.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Gilmore, Glenda. *Gender and Jim Crow: Women and the Politics of White Supremacy in North Caroline, 1896-1920*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Glad, Betty. *An Outsider in the White House: Jimmy Carter, His Advisors, and the Making of American Foreign Policy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009.

--------. *Jimmy Carter: In Search of the Great White House*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1980.

Glendon, Mary Ann. *A World Made New: Eleanor Roosevelt and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. New York: Random House, 2001.

Glynn, Patrick. *Closing Pandora's Box: Arms Races, Arms Control, and the History of the Cold War.* New York: Basic Books, 1992.

Godbold, Jr. E. Stanley. *Jimmy and Rosalynn Carter: The Georgia Years, 1924-1974.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Gordon, Colin. *New Deals: Business, Labor, and Politics in America, 1920-1935.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Hall, Kermit L. et al. *The Oxford Companion to the Supreme Court*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Hämäläinen, Pekka. *The Comanche Empire*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Hamby, Alonzo. *Man of the People: A Life of Harry S. Truman*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Hanhimaki, Jussi. *The Flawed Architect: Henry Kissinger and American Foreign Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Harding, Harry. *A Fragile Relationship: The United States and China Since 1972.* Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1992.

Hargrove, Erwin C. *Jimmy Carter as President: Leadership and the Politics of the Public Good*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988.

Hawley, Ellis W. *The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Heale, M. J. *American Anticommunism: Combating the Enemy Within, 1830-1970*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.

Herring, George C. *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Herzstein, Robert E. *Henry R. Luce, Time, and the American Crusade in Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Hirsch, Francine. *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005.

Hodgson, Godfrey. *The World Turned Right Side Up: A History of the Conservative Ascendancy in America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1996.

Hogan, Michael. *The Marshall Plan: America, Britain, and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

---------. *The Panama Canal in American Politics: Domestic Advocacy and the Evolution of Policy*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986.

--------. *America in the World: The Historiography of American Foreign Relations Since 1941*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Holton, Woody. *Unruly Americans and the Origins of the American Constitution.* New York: Hill and Wang, 2008.

Hunt, Lynn. *Inventing Human Rights: A History*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2007.

Hunt, Michael H. *The American Ascendancy: How the United States Gained and Wielded Global Dominance*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Ignatieff, Michael, editor. *American Exceptionalism and Human Rights*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Indoben, William. *Religion and American Foreign Policy, 1945-1960: The Soul of Containment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Jenkins, Philip. *A Decade of Nightmares: The End of the Sixties and the Making of Eighties America.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Jespersen, T. Christopher. *American Images of China, 1931-1949*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Johnson, Robert David. *Congress and the Cold War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Jones, Charles O. *The Trusteeship Presidency: Jimmy Carter and the United States Congress.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988.

Karl, Rebbeca E. *Mao Zedong and China in the Twentieth-Century World: A Concise History.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2010.

Kaufman, Burton. *The Presidency of James Earl Carter, Jr.* Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006.

Kaufman, Scott. *Plans Unraveled: The Foreign Policy of the Carter Administration*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008.

Kegley, Charles W. ed. *Reinhold Niebuhr: His Religious, Social, and Political Thought*. New York: Pilgrim Press, 1984.

Kerber, Linda. *No Constitutional Right to be Ladies: Women and the Obligations of Citizenship*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1998.

Key, Jr., V. O. *Southern Politics in State and Nation, A New Edition*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1984.

Kleinman, Mark. *A World of Hope, A World of Fear: Henry A. Wallace, Reinhold Niebuhr, and American Liberalism*. Columbus: Ohio University Press, 2000.

Kloppenberg, James T. *Uncertain Victory: Social Democracy and Progressivism in European and American Thought, 1870-1920.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Knock, Thomas. *To End All Wars: Woodrow Wilson and the Quest for a New World Order*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Kochavi, Noam. *A Conflict Perpetuated: China Policy During the Kennedy Years*. Westport: Praeger, 2002.

Konkle, Maureen. *Writing Indian Nations: Native Intellectuals and the Politics of Historiography, 1827-1863.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Kruse, Kevin Michael. *White Flight: Atlanta and the Making of Modern Conservatism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

LaFeber, Walter. *The American Search for Opportunity, 1865-1913.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

--------. *The Panama Canal: The Crisis in Historical Perspective (Updated Edition)*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

--------. *The Deadly Bet: LBJ, Vietnam, and the 1968 Election*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2005.

Lahr, Angela M. *Millennial Dreams and Apocalyptic Nightmares: The Cold War Origins of Political Evangelicalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Laurie, Bruce. *Beyond Garrison: Antislavery and Social Reform.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Leffler, Melvyn. *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.

Leffler, Melvyn P. and Odd Arne Westad, ed. *The Cambridge History of the Cold War, Vol. 1-3*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Leonard, Bill J. *Baptists in America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Lepore, Jill. *In the Name of War: King Phillips War and the Origins of American Identity.* New York: Vintage, 1999.

Link, Arthur. *The Higher Realism of Woodrow Wilson and Other Essays*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1971.

Lovin, Robert. *Reinhold Niebuhr and Christian Realism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Lumbers, Michael. *Piercing the Bamboo Curtain: Tentative Bridge-Building to China During the Johnson Years*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008.

Magee, Malcolm. *What the World Should Be: Woodrow Wilson and the Crafting of a Faith-Based Foreign Policy*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2008.

Maltz, Earl. *Dred Scott and the Politics of Slavery*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2007.

Mann, James. *About Face: A History of America's Curious Relationship with China, from Nixon to Clinton*. New York: Vintage Books, 2000.

Marsh, Charles. *God's Long Summer: Stories of Faith and Civil Rights*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

May, Elaine Tyler. *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*. New York: Basic Books, 1999.

McCormick, Thomas J. *China Market: America's Quest for Informal Empire, 1893-1901*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1990.

McGirr, Lisa. *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

McLellan, David S. *Cyrus Vance*. (New York: Rowman & Allanheld Publishers, 1985.

McMath, Robert C. *American Populism: A Social History, 1877-1898*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1993.

Melanson, Richard A. *Writing History and Making Policy: The Cold War, Vietnam, and Revisionism*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1982.

Miller, William Lee. *Yankee From Georgia*. New York: Times Books, 1978.

Miner, Craig. *The Corporation and the Indian: Tribal Sovereignty and Industrial Civilization in Indian Territory, 1865-1907*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1976.

Mitter, Rana. *A Bitter Revolution: China's Struggle with the Modern World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Moen, Matthew C. *The Christian Right and Congress.* Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1989.

Moffett III, George D. *The Limits of Victory: The Ratification of the Panama Canal Treaties*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Morgan, Jennifer. *Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery.* University of Pennsylvania, 2004.

Moyn, Samuel. *The Last Utopia: Human Rights in History.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Mullaney, Thomas. *Coming to Terms with the Nation: Ethnic Classification in Modern China* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.

Muravchik, Joshua. *The Uncertain Crusade: Jimmy Carter and the Dilemmas of Human Rights Policy*. Lanham: Hamilton Press, 1986.

Nash, Gary B. *The Unknown American Revolution: The Unruly Birth of Democracy and the Struggle to Create America*. New York: Penguin Books, 2005.

Neier, Aryah. *The International Human Rights Movement: A History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Newman, Richard S. *The Transformation of American Abolitionism: Fighting Slavery in the Early Republic*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Neuringer, Sheldon M. *The Carter Administration, Human Rights, and the Agony of Cambodia.* Lewiston: E. Mellen Press, 1993.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Christian Realism and Political Problems.* New York: Scribner, 1953.

--------. *The Irony of American History*. New York: Scribner, 1952.

--------. *The Children of Light and The Children of Darkness: A Vindication of Democracy and a Critique of its Traditional Defense*. New York: Scribner, 1944.

--------. *Reinhold Niebuhr On Politics: His Political Philosophy and its Application to Our Age as Expressed in His Writings*, ed. Harry R. Davis and Robert C. Good. New York: Scribner, 1960.

Norton, Mary Beth. *Founding Mothers and Fathers: Gendered Power and the Forming of American Society*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996.

Patterson, James T. *Restless Giant: The United States from Watergate to Bush v. Gore*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Peck, James. *Washington's China: The National Security World, the Cold War, and the Origins of Globalism*. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006.

Phillips-Fein, Kim. *Invisible Hands: The Businessmen's Crusade Against the New Deal*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2009.

Pierce, Anne R. *Woodrow Wilson and Harry Truman: Mission and Power in American Foreign Policy*. Westport: Praeger, 2003.

Podhoretz, Norman. *The Present Danger: Do We Have the Will to Reverse the Decline of American Power?* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1980.

Pogge, Thomas. *World Poverty and Human Rights*. New York: Polity, 2009.

Postel, Charles. *The Populist Vision* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)

Powers, Richard. *Not Without Honor: The History of American Anticommunism*. New York: Free Press, 1995.

Preston, Andrew. *Sword of the Spirit, Shield of Faith: Religion in American War and Diplomacy*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012.

Rabe, Stephen G. *The Killing Zone: The United States Wages Cold War in Latin America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Rauschenbusch, Walter. *A Theology for the Social Gospel*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.

Ribuffo, Leo P. *Right Center Left: Essays in American History*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992.

Rock, David. *Argentina, 1516-1987: From Spanish Civilization to Alfonsin*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Rodgers, Daniel T. *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Rosati, Jerel A. *The Carter Administration's Quest for Global Community: Beliefs and Their Impact on Behavior.* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1987.

Rosenberg, Ellen M. *The Southern Baptists: A Culture In Transition*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1989.

Rosenberg, Jonathan. *How Far the Promised Land? World Affairs and the American Civil Rights Movement from the First World War to Vietnam*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Rosier, Paul C. *Serving Their Country: American Indian Politics and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Ross, Robert S. *Negotiating Cooperation: The United States and China, 1969-1989*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Ross, Robert S. and Jiang Changbin, editors. *Re-examining the Cold War: U.S.-China Diplomacy, 1954-1973*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Rothkopf, David J. *Running the World: The Inside Story of the National Security Council and the Architects of American Power*. New York: Public Affairs, 2005.

Sanders, Elizabeth. *The Roots of Reform: Farmers, Workers, and the American State, 1877-1917*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Sanders, Jerry W. *Peddlers of Crisis: The Committee on the Present Danger and the Politics of Containment*. Boston: South End Press, 1983.

Schaller, Michael. *Reckoning with Reagan: America and Its President in the 1980s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Schekel, Susan. *The Insistence of the Indian: Race and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century American Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Shambaugh, David. *Beautiful Imperialist: China Perceives America, 1972-1990*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Sheinin, David M. K. *Argentina and the United States: An Alliance Contained*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2006.

Seymour, James. *The Fifth Modernization: China's Human Rights Movement, 1978-1979*. New York: Earl M. Coleman Enterprises, 1980.

Sikkink, Kathryn. *Mixed Signals: U.S. Human Rights Policy and Latin America*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007.

Slezkine, Yuri. *Arctic Mirrors: Russia and the Small Peoples of the North*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Skidmore, David. *Reversing Course: Carter's Foreign Policy, Domestic Politics, and the Failure of Reform*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1996.

Small, Melvin. *Democracy and Diplomacy: The Impact of Domestic Politics on U.S. Foreign Policy, 1789-1994.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Smith, Gaddis. *Morality, Reason, and Power: American Diplomacy in the Carter Years*. New York: Hill & Wang, 1986.

Smith, Gary Scott. *Faith and the Presidency: From George Washington to George W. Bush*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Sneh, Itai. *The Future Almost Arrived: How Jimmy Carter Failed to Change U.S. Foreign Policy*. New York: Peter Lang, 2008.

Snyder, Sarah. *Human Rights Activism and the End of the Cold War: A Transnational History of the Helsinki Network*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Spalding, Elizabeth Edwards. *The First Cold Warrior: Harry Truman, Containment, and the Remaking of Liberal Internationalism*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2006.

Spence, Jonathan. *The Search for Modern China, 2nd Edition*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1999.

Stauffer, John *The Black Hearts of Men: Radical Abolitionists and the Transformation of Race*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Stern, Mark. *Calculating Visions: Kennedy, Johnson, and Civil Rights*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992.

Strong, Robert. *Working in the World: Jimmy Carter and the Making of American Foreign Policy.* Baton Rough: Louisiana State University Press, 2000.

Suri, Jeremi. *Henry Kissinger and the American Century*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard, 2007.

--------. *Power and Protest: Global Revolution and the Rise of Détente.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Talbott, Strobe. *The Master of the Game: Paul Nitze and the Nuclear Peace*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1988.

Thompson, Keneth W. editor. *Three Press Secretaries on the Presidency and the Press: Jody Powell, George Reedy, Jerry terHorst.* Lanham: University Press of America, 1983.

Tise, Larry E. *Proslavery: A History of the Defense of Slavery in America, 1701-1840*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987.

Tomlins, Christopher, ed. *The United States Supreme Court: The Pursuit of Justice*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2005.

Tyler, Patrick. *A Great Wall: Six Presidents and China, An Investigative History*. New York: A Century Foundation Book, 1999.

Tyrell, Ian. *Reforming the World: The Creation of America's Moral Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Vaïsse, Justin. *Neoconservatism: A Biography of a Movement*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010.

Zelizer, Julian. *On Capitol Hill: The Struggle to Reform Congress and Its Consequences, 1948-2000*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Zimmerman, Andrew. *Alabama in Africa: Booker T. Washington, the German Empire, and the Globalization of the New South.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Wallace, Anthony. *The Long, Bitter Trail: Andrew Jackson and the Indians.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1993.

Wang, Dong. *The United States and China: A History from the Eighteenth Century to the Present*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. 2013.

Weiss, Nancy J. *Farewell to the Party of Lincoln: Black Politics in the Age of FDR.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

West, Elliott. *The Last Indian War: The Nez Perce Story*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Westad, Odde Arne. *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Whitcover, Jules. *Marathon: The Pursuit of the Presidency, 1972-1976*. New York: The Viking Press, 1977.

White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

--------. *Railroaded: The Transcontinentals and the Making of Modern America*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2012.

Whitfield, Stephen J. *The Culture of the Cold War.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.

Wilentz, Sean. *The Age of Reagan: A History, 1974-2008*. New York: Harper Perennial, 2008.

Williams, Daniel K. *God's Own Party: The Making of the Christian Right*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Wood, Gordon S. *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992.

Woods, Randall Bennett. *LBJ: Architect of American Ambition*. New York: Free Press, 2006.

--------. *Fulbright: A Biography*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

--------. *The Quest for Identity: America Since 1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Woods, Randall B. and Howard Jones. *Dawning of the Cold War: The United States' Quest for Order*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1991.

Woodward, C. Vann. *Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938.

--------. *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.