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**Essential Question**

What were the political, social, and economic events of the 1970s?

**What You Will Learn**

In this chapter you will learn about the successes and failures of the Nixon, Ford, and Carter administrations.

**SECTION 1: The Nixon Administration**

**Main Idea** President Richard M. Nixon tried to steer the country in a conservative direction and away from federal control.

**SECTION 2: Watergate: Nixon’s Downfall**

**Main Idea** President Richard Nixon’s involvement in the Watergate scandal forced him to resign from office.

**SECTION 3: The Ford and Carter Years**

**Main Idea** The Ford and Carter administrations attempted to remedy the nation’s worst economic crisis in decades.

**SECTION 4: Environmental Activism**

**Main Idea** During the 1970s, Americans strengthened their efforts to address the nation’s environmental problems.

Richard Nixon leaves the White House after resigning as president on Friday, August 9, 1974.

**USA WORLD**

|------|------|------|------|------|------|
The date is August 9, 1974. You are serving your country as an honor guard at the White House. As a member of the military, you've always felt patriotic pride in your government. Now the highest officer of that government, President Richard M. Nixon, is stepping down in disgrace. The trust you once placed in your leaders has been broken.

Explore the Issues
- What are some powers granted to the president?
- What systems exist to protect against abuse of power?
- How can a president lose or restore the nation's trust?
In November of 1968, Richard M. Nixon had just been elected president of the United States. He chose Henry Kissinger to be his special adviser on foreign affairs. During Nixon’s second term in 1972, as the United States struggled to achieve an acceptable peace in Vietnam, Kissinger reflected on his relationship with Nixon.

“A Personal Voice  HENRY KISSINGER
“I . . . am not at all so sure I could have done what I’ve done with him with another president. . . . I don’t know many leaders who would entrust to their aide the task of negotiating with the North Vietnamese, informing only a tiny group of people of the initiative.”

—quoted in The New Republic, December 16, 1972

Nixon and Kissinger ended America’s involvement in Vietnam, but as the war wound down, the nation seemed to enter an era of limits. The economic prosperity that had followed World War II was ending. President Nixon wanted to limit the federal government to reduce its power and to reverse some of Johnson’s liberal policies. At the same time, he would seek to restore America’s prestige and influence on the world stage—prestige that had been hit hard by the Vietnam experience.

**Nixon’s New Conservatism**

President Richard M. Nixon entered office in 1969 determined to turn America in a more conservative direction. Toward that end, he tried to instill a sense of order into a nation still divided over the continuing Vietnam War.
NEW FEDERALISM  One of the main items on President Nixon’s agenda was to decrease the size and influence of the federal government. Nixon believed that Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society programs, by promoting greater federal involvement with social problems, had given the federal government too much responsibility. Nixon’s plan, known as New Federalism, was to distribute a portion of federal power to state and local governments.

To implement this program, Nixon proposed a plan to give more financial freedom to local governments. Normally, the federal government told state and local governments how to spend their federal money. Under revenue sharing, state and local governments could spend their federal dollars however they saw fit within certain limitations. In 1972, the revenue-sharing bill, known as the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act, became law.

WELFARE REFORM  Nixon was not as successful, however, in his attempt to overhaul welfare, which he believed had grown cumbersome and inefficient. In 1969, the president advocated the so-called Family Assistance Plan (FAP). Under the FAP, every family of four with no outside income would receive a basic federal payment of $1,600 a year, with a provision to earn up to $4,000 a year in supplemental income. Unemployed participants, excluding mothers of preschool children, would have to take job training and accept any reasonable work offered them.

Nixon presented the plan in conservative terms—as a program that would reduce the supervisory role of the federal government and make welfare recipients responsible for their own lives. The House approved the plan in 1970. However, when the bill reached the Senate, lawmakers from both parties attacked it. Liberal legislators considered the minimum payments too low and the work requirement too stiff, while conservatives objected to the notion of guaranteed income. The bill went down in defeat.

NEW FEDERALISM WEARS TWO FACES  In the end, Nixon’s New Federalism enhanced several key federal programs as it dismantled others. To win backing for his New Federalism program from a Democrat-controlled Congress, Nixon supported a number of congressional measures to increase federal spending for some social programs. Without fanfare, the Nixon administration increased Social
Security, Medicare, and Medicaid payments and made food stamps more accessible.

However, the president also worked to dismantle some of the nation’s social programs. Throughout his term, Nixon tried unsuccessfully to eliminate the Job Corps program that provided job training for the unemployed and in 1970 he vetoed a bill to provide additional funding for Housing and Urban Development. Confronted by laws that he opposed, Nixon also turned to a little-used presidential practice called impoundment. Nixon impounded, or withheld, necessary funds for programs, thus holding up their implementation. By 1973, it was believed that Nixon had impounded almost $15 billion, affecting more than 100 federal programs, including those for health, housing, and education.

The federal courts eventually ordered the release of the impounded funds. They ruled that presidential impoundment was unconstitutional and that only Congress had the authority to decide how federal funds should be spent. Nixon did use his presidential authority to abolish the Office of Economic Opportunity, a cornerstone of Johnson’s antipoverty program.

**LAW AND ORDER POLITICS** As President Nixon fought with both houses of Congress, he also battled the more liberal elements of society, including the antiwar movement. Nixon had been elected in 1968 on a dual promise to end the war in Vietnam and mend the divisiveness within America that the war had created. Throughout his first term, Nixon aggressively moved to fulfill both pledges. The president de-escalated America’s involvement in Vietnam and oversaw peace negotiations with North Vietnam. At the same time, he began the “law and order” policies that he had promised his “silent majority”—those middle-class Americans who wanted order restored to a country beset by urban riots and antiwar demonstrations.

To accomplish this, Nixon used the full resources of his office—sometimes illegally. Nixon and members of his staff ordered wiretaps of many left-wing individuals and the Democratic Party offices at the Watergate office building in Washington, D.C. The CIA also investigated and compiled documents on thousands of American dissidents—people who objected to the government’s policies. The administration even used the Internal Revenue Service to audit the tax returns of antiwar and civil rights activists. Nixon began building a personal “enemies list” of prominent Americans whom the administration would harass.

Nixon also enlisted the help of his combative vice-president, Spiro T. Agnew, to denounce the opposition. The vice-president confronted the antiwar protesters and then turned his scorn on those who controlled the media, whom he viewed as liberal cheerleaders for the antiwar movement. Known for his colorful quotes, Agnew lashed out at the media and liberals as “an effete [weak] corps of impudent snobs” and “nattering nabobs of negativism.”

**Nixon’s Southern Strategy**

Even as President Nixon worked to steer the country along a more conservative course, he had his eyes on the 1972 presidential election. Nixon had won a slim majority in 1968—less than one percent of the popular vote. As president, he began...
working to forge a new conservative coalition to build on his support. In one approach, known as the **Southern strategy**, Nixon tried to attract Southern conservative Democrats by appealing to their unhappiness with federal desegregation policies and a liberal Supreme Court. He also promised to name a Southerner to the Supreme Court.

**A NEW SOUTH** Since Reconstruction, the South had been a Democratic stronghold. But by 1968 many white Southern Democrats had grown disillusioned with their party. In their eyes, the party—champion of the Great Society and civil rights—had grown too liberal. This conservative backlash first surfaced in the 1968 election, when thousands of Southern Democrats helped former Alabama governor George Wallace, a conservative segregationist running as an independent, carry five Southern states and capture 13 percent of the popular vote.

Nixon wanted these voters. By winning over the Wallace voters and other discontented Democrats, the president and his fellow Republicans hoped not only to keep the White House but also to recapture a majority in Congress.

**NIXON SLOWS INTEGRATION** To attract white voters in the South, President Nixon decided on a policy of slowing the country’s desegregation efforts. In September of 1969, less than a year after being elected president, Nixon made clear his views on civil rights. “There are those who want instant integration and those who want segregation forever. I believe we need to have a middle course between those two extremes,” he said.

Throughout his first term, President Nixon worked to reverse several civil rights policies. In 1969, he ordered the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) to delay desegregation plans for school districts in South Carolina and Mississippi. Nixon’s actions violated the Supreme Court’s second *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling—which called for the desegregation of schools “with all deliberate speed.” In response to an NAACP suit, the high court ordered Nixon to abide by the second Brown ruling. The president did so reluctantly, and by 1972, nearly 90 percent of children in the South attended desegregated schools—up from about 20 percent in 1969.

In a further attempt to chip away at civil rights advances, Nixon opposed the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The act had added nearly one million African Americans to the voting rolls. Despite the president’s opposition, Congress voted to extend the act.

**CONTROVERSY OVER BUSING** President Nixon then attempted to stop yet another civil rights initiative—the integration of schools through busing. In 1971, the Supreme Court ruled in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* that school districts may bus students to other schools to end the pattern of all-black or all-white educational institutions. White students and parents in cities such as Boston and Detroit angrily protested busing. One South Boston mother spoke for other white Northerners, many of whom still struggled with the integration process.

**A Personal Voice**

“I’m not against any individual child. I am not a racist, no matter what those high-and-mighty suburban liberals with their picket signs say. I just don’t want my children bused to some . . . slum school, and I don’t want children from God knows where coming over here.”

—A South Boston mother quoted in *The School Busing Controversy, 1970–75*
Nixon also opposed integration through busing and went on national television to urge Congress to halt the practice. While busing continued in some cities, Nixon had made his position clear to the country—and to the South.

**A BATTLE OVER THE SUPREME COURT** During the 1968 campaign, Nixon had criticized the Warren Court for being too liberal. Once in the White House, Nixon suddenly found himself with an opportunity to change the direction of the court. During Nixon’s first term, four justices, including chief justice Earl Warren, left the bench through retirement. President Nixon quickly moved to put a more conservative face on the Court. In 1969, the Senate approved Nixon’s chief justice appointee, U.S. Court of Appeals judge Warren Burger.

Eventually, Nixon placed on the bench three more justices, who tilted the Court in a more conservative direction. However, the newly shaped Court did not always take the conservative route—for example, it handed down the 1971 ruling in favor of racially integrating schools through busing.

**Confronting a Stagnant Economy**

One of the more pressing issues facing Richard Nixon was a troubled economy. Between 1967 and 1973, the United States faced high inflation and high unemployment—a situation economists called *stagflation*.

**THE CAUSES OF STAGFLATION** The economic problems of the late 1960s and early 1970s had several causes. Chief among them were high inflation—a result of Lyndon Johnson’s policy to fund the war and social programs through deficit spending. Also, increased competition in international trade, and a flood of new workers, including women and baby boomers, led to stagflation. Another cause of the nation’s economic woes was its heavy dependency on foreign oil. During the 1960s, America received much of its petroleum from the oil-producing countries of the
Middle East. Many of these countries belonged to a cartel called OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries). During the 1960s, OPEC gradually raised oil prices. Then in 1973, Egypt and Syria started the Yom Kippur War against Israel. When the United States sent massive military aid to Israel, its longtime ally, Arab oil-producing nations responded by cutting off all oil sales to the United States. When they resumed selling oil to the United States in 1974, the price had quadrupled. This sharp rise in oil prices only worsened the problem of inflation.

**NIXON BATTLES STAGFLATION** President Nixon took several steps to combat stagflation, but none met with much success. To reverse deficit spending, Nixon attempted to raise taxes and cut the budget. Congress, however, refused to go along with this plan. In another effort to slow inflation, Nixon tried to reduce the amount of money in circulation by urging that interest rates be raised. This measure did little except drive the country into a mild recession, or an overall slowdown of the economy.

In August 1971, the president turned to price and wage controls to stop inflation. He froze workers’ wages as well as businesses’ prices and fees for 90 days. Inflation eased for a short time, but the recession continued.

**Nixon’s Foreign Policy Triumphs**

Richard Nixon admittedly preferred world affairs to domestic policy. “I’ve always thought this country could run itself domestically without a president,” he said in 1968. Throughout his presidency, Nixon’s top priority was gaining an honorable peace in Vietnam. At the same time, he also made significant advances in America’s relationships with China and the Soviet Union.

**KISSINGER AND REALPOLITIK** The architect of Nixon’s foreign policy was his adviser for national security affairs, Henry Kissinger. Kissinger, who would later become Nixon’s secretary of state, promoted a philosophy known as realpolitik, from a German term meaning “political realism.” According to realpolitik, foreign policy should be based solely on consideration of power, not ideals or moral principles. Kissinger believed in evaluating a nation’s power, not its philosophy or beliefs. If a country was weak, Kissinger argued, it was often more practical to ignore that country, even if it was Communist.

Realpolitik marked a departure from the former confrontational policy of containment, which refused to recognize the major Communist countries. On the other hand, Kissinger’s philosophy called for the United States to fully confront the powerful nations of the globe. In the world of realpolitik, however, confrontation largely meant negotiation as well as military engagement.

Nixon shared Kissinger’s belief in realpolitik, and together the two men adopted a more flexible approach in dealing with Communist nations. They called their policy détente—a policy aimed at easing Cold War tensions. One of the most startling applications of détente came in early 1972 when President Nixon—who had risen in politics as a strong anti-Communist—visited Communist China.
Since the takeover of mainland China by the Communists in 1949, the United States had not formally recognized the Chinese Communist government. In late 1971, Nixon reversed that policy by announcing to the nation that he would visit China “to seek the normalization of relations between the two countries.”

By going to China, Nixon was trying, in part, to take advantage of the decade-long rift between China and the Soviet Union. China had long criticized the Soviet Union as being too “soft” in its policies against the West. The two Communist superpowers officially broke ties in 1960. Nixon had thought about exploiting the fractured relationship for several years. “We want to have the Chinese with us when we sit down and negotiate with the Russians,” he told a reporter in 1968. Upon his arrival at the Beijing Airport in February, 1972, Nixon recalls his meeting with Chinese premier Zhou En-lai.

Besides its enormous symbolic value, Nixon’s visit also was a huge success with the American public. Observers noted that it opened up diplomatic and economic relations with the Chinese and resulted in important agreements between China and the United States. The two nations agreed that neither would try to dominate the Pacific and that both would cooperate in settling disputes peacefully. They also agreed to participate in scientific and cultural exchanges as well as to eventually reunite Taiwan with the mainland.

**A Personal Voice** RICHARD M. NIXON

“I knew that Zhou had been deeply insulted by Foster Dulles’s refusal to shake hands with him at the Geneva Conference in 1954. When I reached the bottom step, therefore, I made a point of extending my hand as I walked toward him. When our hands met, one era ended and another began.”

—The Memoirs of Richard Nixon

**NIXON VISITS CHINA** Since the takeover of mainland China by the Communists in 1949, the United States had not formally recognized the Chinese Communist government. In late 1971, Nixon reversed that policy by announcing to the nation that he would visit China “to seek the normalization of relations between the two countries.”

By going to China, Nixon was trying, in part, to take advantage of the decade-long rift between China and the Soviet Union. China had long criticized the Soviet Union as being too “soft” in its policies against the West. The two Communist superpowers officially broke ties in 1960. Nixon had thought about exploiting the fractured relationship for several years. “We want to have the Chinese with us when we sit down and negotiate with the Russians,” he told a reporter in 1968. Upon his arrival at the Beijing Airport in February, 1972, Nixon recalls his meeting with Chinese premier Zhou En-lai.

Besides its enormous symbolic value, Nixon’s visit also was a huge success with the American public. Observers noted that it opened up diplomatic and economic relations with the Chinese and resulted in important agreements between China and the United States. The two nations agreed that neither would try to dominate the Pacific and that both would cooperate in settling disputes peacefully. They also agreed to participate in scientific and cultural exchanges as well as to eventually reunite Taiwan with the mainland.

**NIXON TRAVELS TO MOSCOW** In May 1972, three months after visiting Beijing, President Nixon headed to Moscow—the first U.S. president ever to visit the

---

**KEY PLAYER**

**RICHARD M. NIXON 1913–1994**

The hurdles that Richard Nixon overcame to win the presidency in 1968 included his loss in the 1960 presidential race and a 1962 defeat in the race for governor of California.

Nixon faced many obstacles from the start. As a boy, he rose every day at 4 a.m. to help in his father’s grocery store. Nixon also worked as a janitor, a bean picker, and a Barker at an amusement park.

The Nixon family suffered great tragedy when one of Nixon’s brothers died from meningitis and another from tuberculosis.

None of these traumatic experiences, however, dulled the future president’s ambition. Nixon finished third in his law class at Duke University, and after serving in World War II, he launched his political career.

After winning a seat in Congress in 1946, Nixon announced, “I had to win. That’s the thing you don’t understand. The important thing is to win.”

---

**MAIN IDEA**

**Analyzing Effects**

How did Nixon’s trip change the United States’ relationship with China?
Soviet Union. Like his visit to China, Nixon’s trip to the Soviet Union received wide acclaim. After a series of meetings called the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), Nixon and Soviet premier Leonid Brezhnev signed the **SALT I Treaty**. This five-year agreement limited the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and submarine-launched missiles to 1972 levels.

The foreign policy triumphs with China and the Soviet Union and the administration’s announcement that peace “is at hand” in Vietnam helped reelect Nixon as president in 1972.

But peace in Vietnam proved elusive. The Nixon administration grappled with the war for nearly six more months before withdrawing troops and ending America’s involvement in Vietnam. By that time, another issue was about to dominate the Nixon administration—one that would eventually lead to the downfall of the president.
On July 25, 1974, Representative Barbara Jordan of Texas, a member of the House Judiciary Committee, along with the other committee members, considered whether to recommend that President Nixon be impeached for “high crimes and misdemeanors.” Addressing the room, Jordan cited the Constitution in urging her fellow committee members to investigate whether impeachment was appropriate.

“A PERSONAL VOICE BARBARA JORDAN

“We the people”—it is a very eloquent beginning. But when the Constitution of the United States was completed... I was not included in that ‘We the people’. . . . But through the process of amendment, interpretation, and court decision, I have finally been included in ‘We the people’. . . . Today . . . [my] faith in the Constitution is whole. It is complete. It is total. I am not going to sit here and be an idle spectator in the diminution, the subversion, the destruction of the Constitution. . . . Has the President committed offenses . . . which the Constitution will not tolerate?”

—quoted in Notable Black American Women

The committee eventually voted to recommend the impeachment of Richard Nixon for his role in the Watergate scandal. However, before Congress could take further action against him, the president resigned. Nixon’s resignation, the first by a U.S. president, was the climax of a scandal that led to the imprisonment of 25 government officials and caused the most serious constitutional crisis in the United States since the impeachment of Andrew Johnson in 1868.

**President Nixon and His White House**

The *Watergate* scandal centered on the Nixon administration’s attempt to cover up a burglary of the Democratic National Committee (DNC) headquarters at the Watergate office and apartment complex in Washington, D.C. However, the
Watergate story began long before the actual burglary. Many historians believe that Watergate truly began with the personalities of Richard Nixon and those of his advisers, as well as with the changing role of the presidency.

**AN IMPERIAL PRESIDENCY** When Richard Nixon took office, the executive branch—as a result of the Great Depression, World War II, and the Cold War—had become the most powerful branch of government. In his book *The Imperial Presidency*, the historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., argued that by the time Richard Nixon became president, the executive branch had taken on an air of imperial, or supreme, authority.

President Nixon settled into this imperial role with ease. Nixon believed, as he told a reporter in 1980, that “a president must not be one of the crowd. . . . People . . . don’t want him to be down there saying, ‘Look, I’m the same as you.’” Nixon expanded the power of the presidency with little thought to constitutional checks, as when he impounded funds for federal programs that he opposed, or when he ordered troops to invade Cambodia without congressional approval.

**THE PRESIDENT’S MEN** As he distanced himself from Congress, Nixon confided in a small and fiercely loyal group of advisers. They included H. R. Haldeman, White House chief of staff; John Ehrlichman, chief domestic adviser; and John Mitchell, Nixon’s former attorney general. These men had played key roles in Nixon’s 1968 election victory and now helped the president direct White House policy.

These men also shared President Nixon’s desire for secrecy and the consolidation of power. Critics charged that these men, through their personalities and their attitude toward the presidency, developed a sense that they were somehow above the law. This sense would, in turn, prompt President Nixon and his advisers to cover up their role in Watergate, and fuel the coming scandal.

**The Drive Toward Reelection**

Throughout his political career, Richard Nixon lived with the overwhelming fear of losing elections. By the end of the 1972 reelection campaign, Nixon’s campaign team sought advantages by any means possible, including an attempt to steal information from the DNC headquarters.

**A BUNGLED BURGLARY** At 2:30 a.m., June 17, 1972, a guard at the Watergate complex in Washington, D.C., caught five men breaking into the campaign headquarters of the DNC. The burglars planned to photograph documents outlining Democratic Party strategy and to place wiretaps, or “bugs,” on the office telephones. The press soon discovered that the group’s leader, James McCord, was a former CIA agent. He was also a security coordinator for a group known as the *Committee to Reelect the President* (CRP). John Mitchell, who had resigned as attorney general to run Nixon’s reelection campaign, was the CRP’s director.
Just three days after the burglary, H. R. Haldeman noted in his diary Nixon’s near obsession with how to respond to the break-in.

**A Personal Voice H. R. HALDEMAN**

“...The President was concerned about what our counterattack is... He raised it again several times during the day, and it obviously is bothering him... He called at home tonight, saying that he wanted to change the plan for his press conference and have it on Thursday instead of tomorrow, so that it won’t look like he’s reacting to the Democratic break-in thing.”

—The Haldeman Diaries

The cover-up quickly began. Workers shredded all incriminating documents in Haldeman’s office. The White House, with President Nixon’s consent, asked the CIA to urge the FBI to stop its investigations into the burglary on the grounds of national security. In addition, the CRP passed out nearly $450,000 to the Watergate burglars to buy their silence after they were indicted in September of 1972.

Throughout the 1972 campaign, the Watergate burglary generated little interest among the American public and media. Only the *Washington Post* and two of its reporters, Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein, kept on the story. In a series of articles, the reporters uncovered information that linked numerous members of the administration to the burglary. The White House denied each new *Post* allegation. Upon learning of an upcoming story that tied him to the burglars, John Mitchell told Bernstein, “That’s the most sickening thing I ever heard.”

The firm White House response to the charges, and its promises of imminent peace in Vietnam, proved effective in the short term. In November, Nixon was reelected by a landslide over liberal Democrat George S. McGovern. But Nixon’s popular support was soon to unravel.

**The Cover-Up Unravels**

In January 1973, the trial of the Watergate burglars began. The trial’s presiding judge, John Sirica, made clear his belief that the men had not acted alone. On March 20, a few days before the burglars were scheduled to be sentenced, James McCord sent a letter to Sirica, in which he indicated that he had lied under oath. He also hinted that powerful members of the Nixon administration had been involved in the break-in.

**The Senate Investigates Watergate** McCord’s revelation of possible White House involvement in the burglary aroused public interest in Watergate. President Nixon moved quickly to stem the growing concern. On April 30, 1973, Nixon dismissed White House counsel John Dean and announced the resignations of Haldeman, Ehrlichman, and Attorney General Richard Kleindienst, who had recently replaced John Mitchell following Mitchell’s resignation. The president then went on television and denied any attempt at a cover-up. He announced that he was
appointing a new attorney general, Elliot Richardson, and was authorizing him to appoint a special prosecutor to investigate Watergate. “There can be no whitewash at the White House,” Nixon said.

The president’s reassurances, however, came too late. In May 1973, the Senate began its own investigation of Watergate. A special committee, chaired by Senator Samuel James Ervin of North Carolina, began to call administration officials to give testimony. Throughout the summer millions of Americans sat by their televisions as the “president’s men” testified one after another.

**STARTLING TESTIMONY** John Dean delivered the first bomb. In late June, during more than 30 hours of testimony, Dean provided a startling answer to Senator Howard Baker’s repeated question, “What did the president know and when did he know it?” The former White House counsel declared that President Nixon had been deeply involved in the cover-up. Dean referred to one meeting in which he and the president, along with several advisers, discussed strategies for continuing the deceit.

The White House strongly denied Dean’s charges. The hearings had suddenly reached an impasse as the committee attempted to sort out who was telling the truth. The answer came in July from an unlikely source: presidential aide Alexander Butterfield. Butterfield stunned the committee when he revealed that Nixon had taped virtually all of his presidential conversations. Butterfield later claimed that the taping system was installed “to help Nixon write his memoirs.” However, for the Senate committee, the tapes were the key to revealing what Nixon knew and when he knew it.

The White House strongly denied Dean’s charges. The hearings had suddenly reached an impasse as the committee attempted to sort out who was telling the truth. The answer came in July from an unlikely source: presidential aide Alexander Butterfield. Butterfield stunned the committee when he revealed that Nixon had taped virtually all of his presidential conversations. Butterfield later claimed that the taping system was installed “to help Nixon write his memoirs.” However, for the Senate committee, the tapes were the key to revealing what Nixon knew and when he knew it.

**THE SATURDAY NIGHT MASSACRE**

A year-long battle for the “Nixon tapes” followed. Archibald Cox, the special prosecutor whom Elliot Richardson had appointed to investigate the case, took the president to court in October 1973 to obtain the tapes. Nixon refused and ordered Attorney General Richardson to fire Cox. In what became known as the **Saturday Night Massacre**, Richardson refused the order and resigned. The deputy attorney general also refused the order, and he was fired. Solicitor General Robert Bork finally fired Cox. However, Cox’s replacement, Leon Jaworski, proved equally determined to get the tapes. Several months after the “massacre,” the House Judiciary Committee began examining the possibility of an impeachment hearing.

The entire White House appeared to be under siege. Just days before the Saturday Night Massacre, Vice President Spiro Agnew had resigned after it was revealed that he had accepted bribes from engineering firms while governor of Maryland. Agnew pleaded *nolo contendere* (no contest) to the charge. Acting under the Twenty-fifth Amendment, the vice president left the White House to become governor of Maryland.
Amendment, Nixon nominated the House minority leader, Gerald R. Ford, as his new vice-president. Congress quickly confirmed the nomination.

**The Fall of a President**

In March 1974, a grand jury indicted seven presidential aides on charges of conspiracy, obstruction of justice, and perjury. The investigation was closing in on the president of the United States.

**NIXON RELEASES THE TAPES** In the spring of 1974, President Nixon told a television audience that he was releasing 1,254 pages of edited transcripts of White House conversations about Watergate. Nixon’s offering failed to satisfy investigators, who demanded the unedited tapes. Nixon refused, and the case went before the Supreme Court. On July 24, 1974, the high court ruled unanimously that the president must surrender the tapes. The Court rejected Nixon’s argument that doing so would violate national security. Evidence involving possible criminal activity could not be withheld, even by a president. President Nixon maintained that he had done nothing wrong. At a press conference in November 1973, he proclaimed defiantly, “I am not a crook.”

**THE PRESIDENT RESIGNS** Even without holding the original tapes, the House Judiciary Committee determined that there was enough evidence to impeach Richard Nixon. On July 27, the committee approved three articles of impeachment, charging the president with obstruction of justice, abuse of power, and contempt of Congress for refusing to obey a congressional subpoena to release the tapes.

**THE WHITE HOUSE TAPES** During the Watergate hearings a bombshell exploded when it was revealed that President Nixon secretly tape-recorded all conversations in the Oval Office. Although Nixon hoped the tapes would one day help historians document the triumphs of his presidency, they were used to confirm his guilt.

**SKILLBUILDER**

**Analyzing Political Cartoons**

1. What does this cartoon imply about privacy during President Nixon’s term in office?
2. What building has been transformed into a giant tape recorder?

**Background**

Although historians sued for access to thousands of hours of tapes, it was not until some 21 years later, in 1996, that an agreement was made for over 3,700 hours of tape to be made public.
On August 5, Nixon released the tapes. They contained many gaps, and one tape revealed a disturbing 18 1/2-minute gap. According to the White House, Rose Mary Woods, President Nixon’s secretary, accidentally erased part of a conversation between H. R. Haldeman and Nixon. More importantly, a tape dated June 23, 1972—six days after the Watergate break-in—that contained a conversation between Nixon and Haldeman, disclosed the evidence investigators needed. Not only had the president known about the role of members of his administration in the burglary, he had agreed to the plan to obstruct the FBI’s investigation.

The evidence now seemed overwhelming. On August 8, 1974, before the full House vote on the articles of impeachment began, President Nixon announced his resignation from office. Defiant as always, Nixon admitted no guilt. He merely said that some of his judgments “were wrong.” The next day, Nixon and his wife, Pat, returned home to California. A short time later, Gerald Ford was sworn in as the 38th president of the United States.

THE EFFECTS OF WATERGATE The effects of Watergate have endured long after Nixon’s resignation. Eventually, 25 members of the Nixon Administration were convicted and served prison terms for crimes connected to Watergate. Along with the divisive war in Vietnam, Watergate produced a deep disillusionment with the “imperial” presidency. In the years following Vietnam and Watergate, the American public and the media developed a general cynicism about public officials that still exists today. Watergate remains the scandal and investigative story against which all others are measured.

With wife Pat looking on, Richard Nixon bids farewell to his staff on his final day as president. Nixon’s resignation letter is shown above.
Television Reflects American Life

From May until November 1973, the Senate Watergate hearings were the biggest daytime TV viewing event of the year. Meanwhile, television programming began to more closely reflect the realities of American life. Shows more often addressed relevant issues, more African-American characters appeared, and working women as well as homemakers were portrayed. In addition, the newly established Public Broadcasting System began showing many issue-oriented programs and expanded educational programming for children.

**DIVERSITY**

*Chico and the Man* was the first series set in a Mexican-American barrio, East Los Angeles. The program centered on the relationship between Ed Brown, a cranky garage owner, and Chico Rodriguez, an optimistic young mechanic Brown reluctantly hired.

**SOCIAL VALUES**

*All in the Family* was the most popular series of the 1970s. It told the story of a working-class family, headed by the bigoted Archie Bunker and his long-suffering wife, Edith. Through the barbs Bunker traded with his son-in-law and his African-American neighbor, George Jefferson, the show dealt openly with the divisions in American society.
INDEPENDENT WOMEN

The Mary Tyler Moore Show depicted Mary Richards, a single woman living in Minneapolis and working as an assistant manager in a local TV news department. Mary symbolized the young career woman of the 1970s.

CULTURAL IDENTITY

The miniseries Roots, based on a book by Alex Haley, told the saga of several generations of an African-American family. The eight-part story began with Kunta Kinte, who was captured outside his West African village and taken to America as a slave. It ended with his great-grandson’s setting off for a new life as a free man. The groundbreaking series, broadcast in January 1977, was one of the most-watched television events in history.

DATA FILE

TV EVENTS OF THE 1970s

- A congressional ban on TV cigarette commercials took effect in 1971.
- ABC negotiated an $8-million-a-year contract to televise Monday Night Football, first broadcast in September 1970.
- In 1972, President Nixon, accompanied by TV cameras and reporters from the major networks, made a groundbreaking visit to China.
- Saturday Night Live—a show that would launch the careers of Dan Aykroyd, Jane Curtin, Eddie Murphy, and many other comic actors—premiered in October 1975.
- WTCG-TV (later WTBS) in Atlanta, owned by Ted Turner, became the basis of the first true satellite-delivered “superstation” in 1976.
- In November 1979, ABC began broadcasting late-night updates on the hostage crisis in Iran. These reports evolved into the program Nightline with Ted Koppel.

Average Weekly Hours of TV Viewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Children 2-11 years old</th>
<th>Teens 12-17 years old</th>
<th>Adults 18 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Nielsen Media Research

THINKING CRITICALLY

CONNECT TO HISTORY

1. Analyzing Causes In what ways did television change to reflect American society in the 1970s? What factors might have influenced these changes?

SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R7.

CONNECT TO TODAY

2. Creating a Graph Use the Internet or an almanac to find data on the number of televisions owned in the United States and the number of hours of TV watched every day. Make a graph that displays the data.
James D. Denney couldn’t believe what he was hearing. Barely a month after Richard Nixon had resigned amid the Watergate scandal, President Gerald R. Ford had granted Nixon a full pardon. “[S]omeone must write, ‘The End,’” Ford had declared in a televised statement. “I have concluded that only I can do that.” Denney wrote a letter to the editors of Time magazine, in which he voiced his anger at Ford’s decision.

**A Personal Voice James D. Denney**

“Justice may certainly be tempered by mercy, but there can be no such thing as mercy until justice has been accomplished by the courts. Since it circumvented justice, Mr. Ford’s act was merely indulgent favoritism, a bland and unworthy substitute for mercy.”

—Time, September 23, 1974

James Denney’s feelings were typical of the anger and the disillusionment with the presidency that many Americans felt in the aftermath of the Watergate scandal. During the 1970s, Presidents Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter sought to restore America’s faith in its leaders. At the same time, both men had to focus much of their attention on battling the nation’s worsening economic situation.

**Ford Travels a Rough Road**

Upon taking office, Gerald R. Ford urged Americans to put the Watergate scandal behind them. “Our long national nightmare is over,” he declared. The nation’s nightmarish economy persisted, however, and Ford’s policies offered little relief.
“A FORD, NOT A LINCOLN” Gerald Ford seemed to many to be a likable and honest man. Upon becoming vice president after Spiro Agnew’s resignation, Ford candidly admitted his limitations. “I’m a Ford, not a Lincoln,” he remarked. On September 8, 1974, President Ford pardoned Richard Nixon in an attempt to move the country beyond Watergate. The move cost Ford a good deal of public support.

FORD TRIES TO “WHIP” INFLATION By the time Ford took office, America’s economy had gone from bad to worse. Both inflation and unemployment continued to rise. After the massive OPEC oil-price increases in 1973, gasoline and heating oil costs had soared, pushing inflation from 6 percent to over 10 percent by the end of 1974. Ford responded with a program of massive citizen action, called “Whip Inflation Now” or WIN. The president called on Americans to cut back on their use of oil and gas and to take other energy-saving measures.

In the absence of incentives, though, the plan fell flat. Ford then tried to curb inflation through a “tight money” policy. He cut government spending and encouraged the Federal Reserve Board to restrict credit through higher interest rates. These actions triggered the worst economic recession in 40 years. As Ford implemented his economic programs, he continually battled a Democratic Congress intent on pushing its own economic agenda. During his two years as president, Ford vetoed more than 50 pieces of legislation.

Ford’s Foreign Policy

Ford fared slightly better in the international arena. He relied heavily on Henry Kissinger, who continued to hold the key position of secretary of state.

CARRYING OUT NIXON’S FOREIGN POLICIES Following Kissinger’s advice, Ford pushed ahead with Nixon’s policy of negotiation with China and the Soviet Union. In November 1974, he met with Soviet premier Leonid Brezhnev. Less than a year later, he traveled to Helsinki, Finland, where 35 nations, including the Soviet Union, signed the Helsinki Accords—a series of agreements that promised greater cooperation between the nations of Eastern and Western Europe. The Helsinki Accords would be Ford’s greatest presidential accomplishment.

ONGOING TURMOIL IN SOUTHEAST ASIA Like presidents before him, Ford encountered trouble in Southeast Asia. The 1973 cease-fire in Vietnam had broken down. Heavy fighting resumed and Ford asked Congress for over $722 million to help South Vietnam. Congress refused. Without American financial help, South Vietnam surrendered to the North in 1975. In the same year, the Communist government of Cambodia seized the U.S. merchant ship Mayaguez in the Gulf of Siam. President Ford responded with a massive show of military force to rescue 39 crew members aboard the ship. The operation cost the lives of 41 U.S. troops. Critics argued that the mission had cost more lives than it had saved.
Carter Enters the White House

Gerald Ford won the Republican nomination for president in 1976 after fending off a powerful conservative challenge from former California governor Ronald Reagan. Because the Republicans seemed divided over Ford’s leadership, the Democrats confidently eyed the White House. “We could run an aardvark this year and win,” predicted one Democratic leader. The Democratic nominee was indeed a surprise: a nationally unknown peanut farmer and former governor of Georgia, Jimmy Carter.

MR. CARTER GOES TO WASHINGTON During the post-Watergate era, cynicism toward the Washington establishment ran high. The soft-spoken, personable man from Plains, Georgia, promised to restore integrity to the nation’s highest office, “I will never tell a lie to the American people.”

Throughout the presidential campaign, Carter and Ford squared off over the key issues of inflation, energy, and unemployment. On Election Day, Jimmy Carter won by a narrow margin, claiming 40.8 million popular votes to Ford’s 39.1 million.

From the very beginning, the new first family brought a down-to-earth style to Washington. After settling into office, Carter stayed in touch with the people by holding Roosevelt-like “fireside chats” on radio and television.

Carter failed to reach out to Congress in a similar way, refusing to play the “insider” game of deal making. Relying mainly on a team of advisers from Georgia, Carter even alienated congressional Democrats. Both parties on Capitol Hill often joined to sink the president’s budget proposals, as well as his major policy reforms of tax and welfare programs.

Carter’s Domestic Agenda

Like Gerald Ford, President Carter focused much of his attention on battling the country’s energy and economic crises but was unable to bring the United States out of its economic slump.

CONFRONTING THE ENERGY CRISIS Carter considered the energy crisis the most important issue facing the nation. A large part of the problem, the president believed, was America’s reliance on imported oil. On April 18, 1977, during a fireside chat, Carter urged his fellow Americans to cut their consumption of oil and gas.

A PERSONAL VOICE JIMMY CARTER

“The energy crisis . . . is a problem . . . likely to get progressively worse through the rest of this century. . . . Our decision about energy will test the character of the American people. . . . This difficult effort will be the ‘moral equivalent of war,’ except that we will be uniting our efforts to build and not to destroy.”

—quoted in Keeping Faith
In addition, Carter presented Congress with more than 100 proposals on energy conservation and development. Representatives from oil- and gas-producing states fiercely resisted some of the proposals. Automobile manufacturers also lobbied against gas-rationing provisions. “It was impossible for me to imagine the bloody legislative battles we would have to win,” Carter later wrote.

Out of the battle came the National Energy Act. The act placed a tax on gas-guzzling cars, removed price controls on oil and natural gas produced in the United States, and extended tax credits for the development of alternative energy. With the help of the act, as well as voluntary conservation measures, U.S. dependence on foreign oil had eased slightly by 1979.

THE ECONOMIC CRISIS WORSENS

Unfortunately, these energy-saving measures could do little to combat a sudden new economic crisis. In the summer of 1979, renewed violence in the Middle East produced a second major fuel shortage in the United States. To make matters worse, OPEC announced another major price hike. In 1979 inflation soared from 7.6 percent to 11.3 percent.

Faced with increasing pressure to act, Carter attempted an array of measures, none of which worked. Carter's scatter-shot approach convinced many people that he had no economic policy at all. Carter fueled this feeling of uncertainty by delivering his now-famous “malaise” speech, in which he complained of a “crisis of spirit” that had struck “at the very heart and soul of our national will.” Carter's address made many Americans feel that their president had given up.

By 1980, inflation had climbed to nearly 14 percent, the highest rate since 1947. The standard of living in the United States slipped from first place to fifth place in the world. Carter's popularity slipped along with it. This economic downswing—and Carter's inability to solve it during an election year—was one key factor in sending Ronald Reagan to the White House.

**Vocabulary**

**lobby:** a special-interest group that tries to influence the legislature

**MAIN IDEA**

**Summarizing**

How did the National Energy Act help ease America’s energy crisis?

**THE 1980s**

**TEXAS OIL BOOM**

The economic crisis that gripped the country in the late 1970s was, in large part, caused by the increased cost of oil. Members of the OPEC cartel raised the price of oil by agreeing to restrict oil production. The resulting decrease in the supply of oil in the market caused the price to go up. Most Americans were hurt by the high energy prices. However, in areas that produced oil, such as Texas, the rise in prices led to a booming economy in the early 1980’s. For example, real-estate values—for land on which to drill for oil, as well as for office space in cities like Houston and Dallas—increased markedly.

**Unemployment and Inflation, 1970–1980**


**SKILLBUILDER Interpreting Graphs**

1. What trends did the economy experience during the Carter years?
2. Which year of the Carter administration saw the greatest stagflation (inflation plus unemployment)?
A CHANGING ECONOMY Many of the economic problems Jimmy Carter struggled with resulted from long-term trends in the economy. Since the 1950s, the rise of automation and foreign competition had reduced the number of manufacturing jobs. At the same time, the service sector of the economy expanded rapidly. This sector includes industries such as communications, transportation, and retail trade.

The rise of the service sector and the decline of manufacturing jobs meant big changes for some American workers. Workers left out of manufacturing jobs faced an increasingly complex job market. Many of the higher-paying service jobs required more education or specialized skills than did manufacturing jobs. The lower-skilled service jobs usually did not pay well.

Growing overseas competition during the 1970s caused further change in America’s economy. The booming economies of West Germany and countries on the Pacific Rim (such as Japan, Taiwan, and Korea) cut into many U.S. markets. Many of the nation’s primary industries—iron and steel, rubber, clothing, automobiles—had to cut back production, lay off workers, and even close plants. Especially hard-hit were the automotive industries of the Northeast. There, high energy costs, foreign competition, and computerized production led companies to eliminate tens of thousands of jobs.

CARTER AND CIVIL RIGHTS Although Carter felt frustrated by the country’s economic woes, he took special pride in his civil rights record. His administration included more African Americans and women than any before it. In 1977, the president appointed civil rights leader Andrew Young as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations. Young was the first African American to hold that post. To the judicial branch alone, Carter appointed 28 African Americans, 29 women (including 6 African Americans), and 14 Latinos.

However, President Carter fell short of what many civil rights groups had expected in terms of legislation. Critics claimed that Carter—preoccupied with battles over energy and the economy—failed to give civil rights his full attention. Meanwhile, the courts began to turn against affirmative action. In 1978, in the case of Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, the Supreme Court decided that the affirmative action policies of the university’s medical school were unconstitutional. The decision made it more difficult for organizations to establish effective affirmative action programs. (See Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, page 818.)
A Human Rights Foreign Policy

Jimmy Carter rejected the philosophy of realpolitik—the pragmatic policy of negotiating with powerful nations despite their behavior—and strived for a foreign policy committed to human rights.

ADVANCING HUMAN RIGHTS Jimmy Carter, like Woodrow Wilson, sought to use moral principles as a guide for U.S. foreign policy. He believed that the United States needed to commit itself to promoting human rights—such as the freedoms and liberties listed in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights—throughout the world.

Putting his principles into practice, President Carter cut off military aid to Argentina and Brazil, countries that had good relations with the United States but had imprisoned or tortured thousands of their own citizens. Carter followed up this action by establishing a Bureau of Human Rights in the State Department.

Carter’s philosophy was not without its critics. Supporters of the containment policy felt that the president’s policy undercut allies such as Nicaragua, a dictatorial but anti-Communist country. Others argued that by supporting dictators in South Korea and the Philippines, Carter was acting inconsistently. In 1977, Carter’s policies drew further criticism when his administration announced that it planned to give up ownership of the Panama Canal.

YIELDING THE PANAMA CANAL Since 1914, when the United States obtained full ownership over the Panama Canal, Panamanians had resented having their nation split in half by a foreign power. In 1977, the two nations agreed to two treaties, one of which turned over control of the Panama Canal to Panama on December 31, 1999.

In 1978, the U.S. Senate, which had to ratify each treaty, approved the agreements by a vote of 68 to 32—one more vote than the required two-thirds. Public opinion was also divided. In the end, the treaties did improve relationships between the United States and Latin America.

THE COLLAPSE OF DÉTENTE When Jimmy Carter took office, détente—the relaxation of tensions between the world’s superpowers—had reached a high point. Beginning with President Nixon and continuing with President Ford, U.S. officials had worked to ease relations with the Communist superpowers of China and the Soviet Union.

However, Carter’s firm insistence on human rights led to a breakdown in relations with the Soviet Union. President Carter’s dismay over the Soviet Union’s treatment of dissidents, or opponents of the government’s policies, delayed a second round of SALT negotiations. President Carter and Soviet premier Leonid Brezhnev finally met in June of 1979 in Vienna, Austria, where they signed an agreement known as SALT II. Although the agreement did not reduce armaments, it did provide for limits on the number of strategic weapons and nuclear-missile launchers that each side could produce.

The SALT II agreement, however, met sharp opposition in the Senate. Critics argued that it would put the United States at a military disadvantage. Then, in December 1979, the Soviets invaded the neighboring country of Afghanistan. Angered over the invasion, President Carter refused to fight for the SALT II agreement, and the treaty died.

SOVIET–AFGHANISTAN WAR Afghanistan, an Islamic country along the southern border of the Soviet Union, had been run by a Communist, pro-Soviet government for a number of years. However, a strong Muslim rebel group known as the mujahideen was intent on overthrowing the Afghan government. Fearing a rebel victory in Afghanistan, the Soviet Union sent troops to Afghanistan in late 1979.

While the Soviets had superior weaponry, the rebels fought the Soviets to a stalemate by using guerrilla tactics and intimate knowledge of the country’s mountainous terrain.

After suffering thousands of casualties, the last Soviet troops pulled out of Afghanistan in February 1989. Fighting between rival factions continued for years. By 2000, the Taliban, a radical Muslim faction, controlled 90 percent of Afghanistan.
Triumph and Crisis in the Middle East

Through long gasoline lines and high energy costs, Americans became all too aware of the troubles in the Middle East. In that area of ethnic, religious, and economic conflict, Jimmy Carter achieved one of his greatest diplomatic triumphs—and suffered his most tragic defeat.

**THE CAMP DAVID ACCORDS** Through negotiation and arm-twisting, Carter helped forge peace between long-time enemies Israel and Egypt. In 1977, Egyptian president Anwar el-Sadat and Israeli prime minister Menachem Begin met in Jerusalem to discuss an overall peace between the two nations. In the summer of 1978, Carter seized on the peace initiative. When the peace talks stalled, he invited Sadat and Begin to Camp David, the presidential retreat in Maryland.

After 12 days of intense negotiations, the three leaders reached an agreement that became known as the Camp David Accords. Under this first signed peace agreement with an Arab country, Israel agreed to withdraw from the Sinai Peninsula, which it had captured from Egypt during the Six-Day War in 1967. (See inset map above.) Egypt, in turn, formally recognized Israel’s right to exist.

**MAIN IDEA**

**Summarizing**

What was the significance of the Camp David Accords?
Joking at the hard work ahead, Carter wrote playfully in his diary, “I resolved to do everything possible to get out of the negotiating business!” Little did the president know that his next Middle East negotiation would be his most painful.

THE IRAN HOSTAGE CRISIS  By 1979, the shah of Iran, an ally of the United States, was in deep trouble. Many Iranians resented his regime’s widespread corruption and dictatorial tactics.

In January 1979, revolution broke out. The Muslim religious leader Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini (æ-yät-ə-lou̯h rō-hōł’ lā kō-mā’ nē) led the rebels in overthrowing the shah and establishing a religious state based on strict obedience to the Qur’an, the sacred book of Islam. Carter had supported the shah until the very end. In October 1979, the president allowed the shah to enter the United States for cancer treatment, though he had already fled Iran in January 1979.

The act infuriated the revolutionaries of Iran. On November 4, 1979, armed students seized the U.S. embassy in Tehran and took 52 Americans hostage. The militants demanded that the United States send the shah back to Iran in return for the release of the hostages.

Carter refused, and a painful year-long standoff followed, in which the United States continued quiet but intense efforts to free the hostages. The captives were finally released on January 20, 1981, shortly after the new president, Ronald Reagan, was sworn in. Despite the hostages’ release after 444 days in captivity, the crisis in Iran seemed to underscore the limits that Americans faced during the 1970s. Americans also realized that there were limits to the nation’s environmental resources. This realization prompted both citizens and the government to actively address environmental concerns.

U.S. hostages were blindfolded and paraded through the streets of Tehran.

### ASSESSMENT

1. **TERMS & NAMES** For each term or name, write a sentence explaining its significance.
   - Gerald R. Ford
   - Jimmy Carter
   - National Energy Act
   - human rights
   - Camp David Accords
   - Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini

### MAIN IDEA

2. **TAKING NOTES**
   Create a time line of the major events of the Ford and Carter administrations, using a form such as the one below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>event one</th>
<th>event two</th>
<th>event three</th>
<th>event four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   Which two events do you think were the most important? Why?

### CRITICAL THINKING

3. **EVALUATING DECISIONS**
   Do you think that Ford made a good decision in pardoning Nixon? Explain why or why not.

4. **COMPARING**
   How were the actions taken by President Ford and Carter to address the country’s economic downturn similar? How did they differ?

5. **ANALYZING ISSUES**
   Do you agree with President Carter that human rights concerns should steer U.S. foreign policy? Why or why not? **Think About:**
   - the responsibility of promoting human rights
   - the loss of good relations with certain countries
   - the collapse of détente with the Soviet Union
REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA v. BAKKE (1978)

ORIGINS OF THE CASE  In 1973, Allan Bakke applied to the University of California at Davis medical school. The school had a quota-based affirmative-action plan that reserved 16 out of 100 spots for racial minorities. Bakke, a white male, was not admitted to the school despite his competitive test scores and grades. Bakke sued for admission, arguing that he had been discriminated against on the basis of race. The California Supreme Court agreed with Bakke, but the school appealed the case.

THE RULING  The Court ruled that racial quotas were unconstitutional, but that schools could still consider race as a factor in admissions.

LEGAL REASONING  The Court was closely divided on whether affirmative-action plans were constitutional. Two different sets of justices formed 5-to-4 majorities on two different issues in Bakke.

Five justices agreed the quota was unfair to Bakke. They based their argument on the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Justice Lewis Powell, writing for the majority, explained their reasoning.

"The guarantee of equal protection cannot mean one thing when applied to one individual and something else when applied to a person of another color. If both are not accorded the same protection, then it is not equal."

The four justices that joined Powell in this part of the decision said race should never play a part in admissions decisions. Powell and the other four justices disagreed. These five justices formed a separate majority, arguing that "the attainment of a diverse student body . . . is a constitutionally permissible goal for an institution of higher education."

In other words, schools could have affirmative-action plans that consider race as one factor in admission decisions in order to achieve a diverse student body.

LEGAL SOURCES

U.S. CONSTITUTION, FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT (1868)
"No state shall . . . deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA v. WEBER (1979)
The Court said a business could have a short-term program for training minority workers as a way of fixing the results of past discrimination.

ADARAND CONSTRUCTORS v. PENA (1995)
The Court struck a federal law to set aside 10 percent of highway construction funds for minority-owned businesses. The Court also said that affirmative-action programs must be focused to achieve a compelling government interest.
WHY IT MATTERED

Many people have faced discrimination in America. The struggle of African Americans for civil rights in the 1950s and 1960s succeeded in overturning Jim Crow segregation. Even so, social inequality persisted for African Americans, as well as women and other minority groups. In 1965, President Lyndon Johnson explained why more proactive measures needed to be taken to end inequality.

“You do not take a person who for years has been hobbled by chains and . . . bring him up to the starting line of a race and then say, ‘you are free to compete with all the others’ and still justly believe that you have been completely fair.”

As a result, Johnson urged companies to begin to take “affirmative action” to hire and promote African Americans, helping them to overcome generations of inequality. Critics quickly opposed affirmative action plans as unfair to white people and merely a replacement of one form of racial discrimination with another.

University admissions policies became a focus of the debate over affirmative action. The Court’s ruling in Bakke allowed race to be used as one factor in admissions decisions. Schools could consider a prospective student’s race, but they could not use quotas or use race as the only factor for admission.

HISTORICAL IMPACT

Since Bakke, the Court has ruled on affirmative action several times, usually limiting affirmative-action plans. For example, in Adarand Constructors v. Pena (1995), the Court struck a federal law to set aside “not less than 10 percent” of highway construction funds for businesses owned by “socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.” The Court said that affirmative-action programs must be narrowly focused to achieve a “compelling government interest.”

On cases regarding school affirmative-action plans, the courts have not created clear guidelines. The Supreme Court refused to hear an appeal of a 1996 lower court ruling that outlawed any consideration of race for admission to the University of Texas law school. Yet in the 2003 decision in Grutter v. Bollinger, the Court protected a University of Michigan law school admissions policy that required the admissions committee to consider the diversity of its student body. The Court reaffirmed the Bakke view that “student body diversity is a compelling state interest.”

Since the Grutter decision, several states have passed laws or constitutional amendments requiring race-blind admissions—effectively barring affirmative action. These laws were passed by ballot initiative, reflecting a popular view that sees affirmative action as “reverse discrimination.”
Environmental Activism

**One American’s Story**

In 1972, Lois Gibbs and her family moved to Niagara Falls, New York. Underneath this quiet town, however, was a disaster in the making. In the 1890s, the Love Canal had been built to provide hydroelectric power for the Niagara Falls area. Chemical companies were dumping hazardous waste into the canal. In 1953, bulldozers filled in the canal. Shortly thereafter, a school and rows of homes were built nearby.

In 1977, when Lois Gibbs’s son fell sick, she decided to investigate. She eventually uncovered the existence of the toxic waste and mobilized the community to demand government action. In 1980, President Carter authorized funds for many Niagara Falls families to move to safety. Years later, Lois Gibbs wrote a book detailing her efforts.

**A Personal Voice**

**LOIS GIBBS**

“I want to tell you our story—my story—because I believe that ordinary citizens—using the tools of dignity, self-respect, common sense, and perseverance—can influence solutions to important problems in our society. . . . In solving any difficult problem, you have to be prepared to fight long and hard, sometimes at great personal cost; but it can be done. It must be done if we are to survive . . . at all.”

—Love Canal: My Story

Lois Gibbs’s concerns about environmental hazards were shared by many Americans in the 1970s. Through the energy crisis, Americans learned that their natural resources were limited; they could no longer take the environment for granted. Americans—from grassroots organizations to the government—began to focus on conservation of the environment and new forms of energy.

**The Roots of Environmentalism**

The widespread realization that pollution and overconsumption were damaging the environment began in the 1960s. One book in particular had awakened
America’s concerns about the environment and helped lay the groundwork for the activism of the early seventies.

**RACHEL CARSON AND SILENT SPRING** In 1962, Rachel Carson, a marine biologist, published a book entitled *Silent Spring*. In it, she warned against the growing use of pesticides—chemicals used to kill insects and rodents. Carson argued that pesticides poisoned the very food they were intended to protect and as a result killed many birds and fish.

Carson cautioned that America faced a “silent spring,” in which birds killed off by pesticides would no longer fill the air with song. She added that of all the weapons used in “man’s war against nature,” pesticides were some of the most harmful.

**A Personal Voice  RACHEL CARSON**

“*These sprays, dusts, and aerosols . . . have the power to kill every insect, the ‘good’ and the ‘bad,’ to still the song of birds and the leaping of fish in the streams, to coat the leaves with a deadly film, and to linger on in soil—all this though the intended target may be only a few weeds or insects. Can anyone believe it is possible to lay down such a barrage of poisons on the surface of the earth without making it unfit for all life?*”

—*Silent Spring*

Within six months of its publication, *Silent Spring* sold nearly half a million copies. Many chemical companies called the book inaccurate and threatened legal action. However, for a majority of Americans, Carson’s book was an early warning about the danger that human activity posed to the environment. Shortly after the book’s publication, President Kennedy established an advisory committee to investigate the situation.

With Rachel Carson’s prodding, the nation slowly began to focus more on environmental issues. Although Carson would not live to see the U.S. government outlaw DDT in 1972, her work helped many Americans realize that their everyday behavior, as well as the nation’s industrial growth, had a damaging effect on the environment.

**Environmental Concerns in the 1970s**

During the 1970s, the administrations of Richard Nixon and Jimmy Carter confronted such environmental issues as conservation, pollution, and the growth of nuclear energy.

**THE FIRST EARTH DAY** The United States ushered in the 1970s—a decade in which it would actively address its environmental issues—fittingly enough with the first *Earth Day* celebration. On that day, April 22, 1970, nearly every community...
in the nation and more than 10,000 schools and 2,000 colleges hosted some type of environmental-awareness activity and spotlighted such problems as pollution, the growth of toxic waste, and the earth’s dwindling resources. The Earth Day celebration continues today. Each year on April 22, millions of people around the world gather to heighten public awareness of environmental problems.

**THE GOVERNMENT TAKES ACTION** Although President Nixon was not considered an environmentalist, or someone who takes an active role in the protection of the environment, he recognized the nation’s growing concern about the environment. In an effort to “make our peace with nature,” President Nixon set out on a course that led to the passage of several landmark measures. In 1970, he consolidated 15 existing federal pollution programs into the **Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)**. The new agency was given the power to set and enforce pollution standards, to conduct environmental research, and to assist state and local governments in pollution control. Today, the EPA remains the federal government’s main instrument for dealing with environmental issues.

In 1970 Nixon signed a new Clean Air Act that added several amendments to the Clean Air Act of 1963. The new act gave the government the authority to set air standards. Following the 1970 Clean Air Act, Congress also passed the Endangered Species Act, in addition to laws that limited pesticide use and curbed strip mining—the practice of mining for ore and coal by digging gaping holes in the land. Some 35 environmental laws took effect during the decade, addressing every aspect of conservation and clean-up, from protecting endangered animals to regulating auto emissions.

**BALANCING PROGRESS AND CONSERVATION IN ALASKA** During the 1970s, the federal government took steps to ensure the continued well-being of Alaska, the largest state in the nation and one of its most ecologically sensitive.

The discovery of oil there in 1968, and the subsequent construction of a massive pipeline to transport it, created many new jobs and greatly increased state revenues. However, the influx of new development also raised concerns about Alaska’s wildlife, as well as the rights of its native peoples. In 1971, Nixon signed the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, which turned over millions of acres of land to the state’s native tribes for conservation and tribal use. In 1978, President Carter enhanced this conservation effort by setting aside an additional 56 million acres in Alaska as national monuments. In 1980, Congress added another 104 million acres as protected areas.

**THE DEBATE OVER NUCLEAR ENERGY** As the 1970s came to a close, Americans became acutely aware of the dangers that nuclear power plants posed to both humans and the environment. During the 1970s, as America realized the drawbacks to its heavy dependence on foreign oil for energy, nuclear power seemed to many to be an attractive alternative.

Opponents of nuclear energy warned the public against the industry’s growth. They contended that nuclear plants, and the wastes they produced, were potentially dangerous to humans and their environment.

**THREE MILE ISLAND** In the early hours of March 28, 1979, the concerns of nuclear energy opponents were validated. That morning, one of the nuclear reactors at a plant on Three Mile Island near Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, malfunctioned. The reactor overheated after its cooling system failed, and fear quickly arose that radiation might escape and spread over the region. Two days later,
THE ACCIDENT AT THREE MILE ISLAND
A series of human and mechanical errors that caused the partial meltdown of the reactor core brought the Three Mile Island nuclear power plant to the brink of disaster. The accident at Three Mile Island caused widespread concern about nuclear power throughout the American public.

REACTOR MELTDOWN
1. The radioactive reactor core generates heat as its atoms split during a controlled chain reaction.
2. An inoperative valve releases thousands of gallons of coolant from the reactor core.
3. Half of the 36,816 exposed fuel rods melt in temperatures above five thousand degrees.
4. The melted material burns through the lining of the reactor chamber and spills to the floor of the containment structure.

More than 30 years after the accident, clean-up at Three Mile Island continues. The final 'clean-up bill' could soar to more than $3 billion. The TMI-2 reactor was dangerously contaminated and could not be entered for two years. All the materials in the containment structure, along with anything used in the clean-up, had to be decontaminated. Because the reactor will never be completely free of radioactivity, it will one day be entombed in cement.
low-level radiation actually did escape from the crippled reactor. Officials evacuated some residents, while others fled on their own. One homemaker who lived near the plant recalled her desperate attempt to find safety.

**A Personal Voice**

“On Friday, a very frightening thing occurred in our area. A state policeman went door-to-door telling residents to stay indoors, close all windows, and turn all air conditioners off. I was alone, as were many other homemakers, and my thoughts were focused on how long I would remain a prisoner in my own home. . . . Suddenly, I was scared, real scared. I decided to get out of there, while I could. I ran to the car not knowing if I should breathe the air or not, and I threw the suitcases in the trunk and was on my way within one hour. If anything dreadful happened, I thought that I’d at least be with my girls. Although it was very hot in the car, I didn’t trust myself to turn the air conditioner on. It felt good as my tense muscles relaxed the farther I drove.”

—an anonymous homemaker quoted in Accident at Three Mile Island: The Human Dimensions

In all, more than 100,000 residents were evacuated from the surrounding area. On April 9, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the federal agency that monitors the nuclear power industry, announced that the immediate danger was over.

The events at Three Mile Island rekindled the debate over nuclear power. Supporters of nuclear power pointed out that no one had been killed or seriously injured. Opponents countered by saying that chance alone had averted a tragedy.

---

**History Through Film**

**HOLLYWOOD AND NUCLEAR FEARS**

At the end of the 1970s and in the early 1980s, Hollywood responded to Americans’ concerns over nuclear power by making pointed social-awareness films exposing dangers in the nuclear industry. These films alerted the public to the importance of regulations in the relatively new field of atomic energy.

In 1979, *The China Syndrome*, starring Jane Fonda and Jack Lemmon, became the movie everyone was talking about. Only 12 days after the film’s release, a serious accident similar to the one portrayed in the movie occurred at the Three Mile Island nuclear power plant.

In 1983, on her way to meet with a reporter from the *New York Times*, Karen Silkwood, a worker at a nuclear power facility, was hit and died in a car crash. In the film dramatization, *Silkwood* (1983), Meryl Streep played Karen, and Kurt Russell and Cher, her co-workers.

**SKILLBUILDER** Interpreting Visual Sources

1. Why do you think movies based on real events are popular with the general public?
2. How do you think these films influenced present-day nuclear energy policy?

SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R23.
They demanded that the government call a halt to the construction of new power plants and gradually shut down existing nuclear facilities.

While the government did not do away with nuclear power, federal officials did recognize nuclear energy’s potential danger to both humans and the environment. As a result of the accident at Three Mile Island, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission strengthened its safety standards and improved its inspection procedures.

**A Continuing Movement**

Although the environmental movement of the 1970s gained popular support, opponents of the movement also made their voices heard. In Tennessee, for example, where a federal dam project was halted because it threatened a species of fish, local developers took out ads asking residents to “tell the government that the size of your wallet is more important than some two-inch-long minnow.”

When confronted with environmental concerns, one unemployed steelworker spoke for others when he remarked, “Why worry about the long run, when you’re out of work right now.”

The environmental movement that blossomed in the 1970s became in the 1980s and 1990s a struggle to balance environmental concerns with jobs and progress. In the years since the first Earth Day, however, environmental issues have gained increasing attention and support.

**MAIN IDEA**

**Analyzing Effects**

How did the Three Mile Island incident affect the use of nuclear power in America?

**CRITICAL THINKING**

**3. ANALYZING CAUSES**

How much should the United States rely on nuclear power as a source of energy? Explain your view.

**Think About:**
- the safety of nuclear power
- the alternatives to nuclear power
- U.S. energy demands

**4. ANALYZING VISUAL SOURCES**

What message does this 1969 poster from the Environmental Protection Agency give about the government’s role in pollution?
TERMS & NAMES

For each term or name below, write a sentence explaining its significance to the Nixon, Ford, or Carter administrations.

1. Richard M. Nixon
2. stagflation
3. OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries)
4. SALT I Treaty
5. Watergate
6. Saturday Night Massacre
7. Camp David Accords
8. Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini
9. Rachel Carson
10. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

MAIN IDEAS

Use your notes and the information in the chapter to answer the following questions.

The Nixon Administration (pages 794–801)

1. In what ways did President Nixon attempt to reform the federal government?
2. How did Nixon try to combat stagflation?

Watergate: Nixon’s Downfall (pages 802–807)

3. In what ways did the participants in Watergate attempt to cover up the scandal?
4. What were the results of the Watergate scandal?

The Ford and Carter Years (pages 810–817)

5. What were Gerald Ford’s greatest successes as president?
6. How did President Carter attempt to solve the energy crisis?

Environmental Activism (pages 820–825)

7. What factors increased Americans’ concerns about environmental issues during the 1960s and 1970s?
8. What was the impact of the Three Mile Island incident?

CRITICAL THINKING

1. USING YOUR NOTES In a chart like the one shown, identify one major development for each issue listed that occurred between 1968 and 1980. Indicate whether you think the impact of the development was positive (+) or negative (–).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient energy use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. ANALYZING EVENTS Between 1972 and 1974, Americans were absorbed by the fall of President Nixon in the Watergate scandal. What might Americans have learned about the role of the executive office? Explain.

3. INTERPRETING GRAPHS Study the graph on page 813. Describe the changes in unemployment as compared to inflation from 1970 to 1980.

VISUAL SUMMARY

An Age of Limits

THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION
- Revenue sharing
- Law-and-order politics
- Integration delays
- Inflation, recession, and unemployment
- Opening to China
- Détente with the Soviet Union
- Watergate scandal
- Nixon resignation

THE FORD ADMINISTRATION
- Unelected president
- Nixon pardon
- Whip Inflation Now program
- Economic recession
- Mayaguez incident
- Helsinki Accords

THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION
- Energy crisis
- Worsening inflation
- Panama Canal Treaties
- Camp David Accords
- Nuclear power
- Iran hostage crisis

THE HEALING BEGINS

Special Issue
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Use the two graphs below and your knowledge of U.S. history to answer question 1.

1. The OPEC oil embargo hit the United States so hard in 1973 because —
   A. domestic oil consumption decreased as production decreased.
   B. domestic oil consumption remained steady as production decreased.
   C. domestic oil consumption increased while production decreased slightly.
   D. domestic oil consumption increased, although consumption increased faster.

2. How did Watergate affect the presidents who followed after Richard Nixon?
   F. It caused them to be less trusted and less powerful.
   G. It made them reluctant to oppose Congress.
   H. It made them more popular with the media.
   J. It caused them to rely less on the counsel of cabinet members.

3. Which of the following is a contribution made by Rachel Carson to the American environmental movement?
   A. Carson researched “cleaner” sources of energy.
   B. Carson lobbied for the passage of the National Energy Act.
   C. Carson lobbied for making April 22, 1970, the first Earth Day.
   D. Carson published a book on the hazards of pesticide use.

For additional test practice, go online for:
• Diagnostic tests
• Tutorials

INTERACT WITH HISTORY
Recall the issues that you explored at the beginning of the chapter. Now that you’ve learned how your country’s highest office holder, President Nixon, lost the nation’s trust after the Watergate scandal, would you change your response? Discuss your suggestions with a small group. Then create a list, ranking the misuses from least to most severe.

COLLABORATIVE LEARNING
In a small group, discuss possible environmental problems in each group member’s neighborhood, listing them on a sheet of paper. Compare lists with other groups to determine the most common problems. List possible solutions for each problem.

FOCUS ON WRITING
Based on what you have read in this chapter, write a paragraph that describes the American public’s reaction to President Ford’s pardon of Richard Nixon.