

DEPARTMENT OF DISINFORMATION

BEDTIME FOR BONZO?

ELIZABETH TEMPLE

The de facto end of the Reagan presidency came at the precise moment—noon, November 25—the White House disclosed that proceeds from the arms sale had been laundered and funneled to the contras.

Fred Barnes, *The New Republic*, December 22, 1986

Perhaps the pundits are right this time. Perhaps Ronald Reagan's effectiveness as a president has finally come to an end. With his administration under siege for its handling of the Iran/Contra affair, everyone—from political scientist James David Barber to conservative activist Richard Viguerie—seems to be jumping on the Reagan Farewell Wagon.

But it's worth remembering that Ronald Reagan's political death has been reported many times before, and that ever since the *New York Times* unfavorably compared his acting talents with those of a chimpanzee, the nation's *cognoscenti* have been grossly underestimating Reagan's abilities. For more than 20 years, the "prophets" have predicted the end of the Reagan rise to power. Perhaps they have gotten wiser. But keep in mind all the times they were wrong.

Lights Out

[Universal-International has] come up with a chipper chimpanzee, name of Bonzo. And a good thing too. For without this frisky character, there would have been little comedy in this antic. As is, it is a minor bit of fun yielding a respectable amount of laughs but nothing, actually, over which to wax ecstatic. . . .

Ronald Reagan, as the professor, [and his co-stars] work hard but obviously ineffectively. They haven't a chance since Bonzo makes monkeys of them all.

New York Times, April 6, 1951

Reagan Can't Win

"If the Republican Party can't learn they can't win with a man of Reagan's philosophy, then I don't belong in politics."

George Christopher, Republican gubernatorial candidate, *Los Angeles Times*, June 7, 1966

Brown Can't Lose

"If Reagan were a more plausible candidate, we'd suffer more."

A "confident Brown campaigner," *New York Times*, September 18, 1966

Reagan's High Horse

"I'm tired of this great handsome knight on a white charger who has been created by a political management firm."

George Christopher, *Los Angeles Times*, June 7, 1966

'Citizen Politician'

Brown said that Reagan's jump from film to "citizen politician" reminded him of an airline passenger:

"You're sitting in a big jet. You're ready to taxi out and a nice-looking middle-aged man in a uniform comes up the aisle heading for the controls. You stop him and say you're a little nervous because it's your first flight.

'Mine too,' he says. 'I'm a citizen pilot. But don't worry. I've always had an active interest in aviation.' "

Governor Pat Brown, *Los Angeles Times*, June 17, 1966

That's a Take

"While we were building a dynamic working society in California, he was off making such film epics as *Bedtime for Bonzo* and *Tugboat Annie Sails Again*.

This actor hasn't had so much as three minutes in public service of any kind, nature, or description.

He has been auditioning for governor for more than a year now and has flunked the audition on every score that matters."

Governor Pat Brown, *Los Angeles Times*, October 6, 1966

Inevitably, Hollywood got into the act—on both sides. . . . [S]uch Democrats as Kirk Douglas, Burt Lancaster, Gene Kelly, Dan Blocker and John Forsythe appeared on television and radio, all uttering variations on this theme: "I could play a governor in a movie, but I don't have the ability to be one."

John Wayne, Pat Boone, Chuck Connors, Roy Rogers,

Fess Parker, Fred McMurray got on the airwaves with ads that countered, "Maybe you don't, but Reagan does."

Lee Edwards, *Ronald Reagan: A Political Biography*

Fantasy Candidate

Governor Brown belongs at the State Capitol in Sacramento, dealing with the stubborn public problems he knows so well; Mr. Reagan belongs in the studios in Hollywood, gracing the movie and television screens he knows so well. On Nov. 8, Californians will, we trust, understand where reality ends and fantasy begins.

New York Times editorial, October 6, 1966

Naming Names

Reagan is anti-labor, anti-Negro, anti-intellectual, anti-20th Century. We rather suspect Brown will take him. We really can't believe the old bogey of federal government still scares Californians.

The New Republic, May 11, 1966

Buckley Nixes the Gipper

It was December 1966, and Richard Nixon was in the room. Who, someone asked, would the Republican Party consider eligible in 1968? Nixon gave the usual names—and added Ronald Reagan's name. I objected. It strikes me, I said, as inconceivable. "Why?" Nixon asked. "Suppose he makes a very good record as Governor of California." Because, I said, people won't get used to the notion of a former actor being President. People are very stuffy about presidential candidates.

William F. Buckley, Jr., Foreword to Lee Edwards' *Ronald Reagan: A Political Biography*

Of course, Buckley has since changed his mind.

That Ol' Man Reagan . . .

At 11:35 a.m. last Friday in Washington, the last hope of Gov. Reagan ever to become President probably went glimmering.

At that point, Gerald R. Ford automatically succeeded Richard M. Nixon. It meant that Mr. Ford very likely would be the Republican nominee for President in 1976 and Reagan would have to wait until 1980.

By then, he would be 69 and probably too old to be nominated. Or elected.

Richard Bergholz, *Los Angeles Times*, August 13, 1974

. . . He Just Keeps Rollin' Along

The expectation among Reagan's present and former aides is that he will not plunge recklessly into campaigning. Ronald Reagan is no Hubert Humphrey and with his sixty-fifth birthday just before the New Hampshire primary there are some who contend he is beginning to show his age. In fact, his stamina or lack of it has always been a point of contention.

Jules Witcover and Richard M. Cohen, *Esquire*, March 1976

70-Year-Itch

Ronald Reagan is an ignoramus, a conscious and persistent falsifier of fact, a deceiver of the electorate and, one suspects, of himself. All else apart, I at age 73 am entitled

to assert that anybody who will turn 70 in early 1981 is too old to be beginning a first term in the presidency. Reagan's California ranch is the proper place for him to take the daytime naps that he craves.

John Osborne, *The New Republic*, June 14, 1980

The Greatest Gift of All

House Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill, an instinctual partisan Democratic warhorse, thinks the Republicans are going to do the Democrats a favor—by nominating Ronald Reagan for President.

"The only man Jimmy Carter could beat is Reagan," the white-maned Speaker said in an interview. "And the only man Teddy Kennedy could beat is Reagan."

"Other than a good-looking face and smooth talk, what does Reagan have?" the 67-year-old Speaker demanded while savoring a good cigar.

Wall Street Journal, April 25, 1980

We Could've Told You So

Reagan, the unbeatable, looks like a myth to me. People have said that before, particularly in 1976, and made fools of themselves. But in 1976, Reagan had an issue, the same one that catapulted Jimmy Carter into the White House: The issue was Washington. Now everyone has that issue and fiscal conservatism, too. Reagan seems to be a nostalgia figure whose time has passed; he looks like the past, he talks about the past. It is hard to imagine America turning to a candidate whose standard pitch is "I told you so!"

Richard Reeves, *Esquire*, May 8, 1979

And They're Off

Too many smart Republicans think it's [Reagan's 1980 presidential candidacy] not going to succeed. "I'm telling," said Eddie Mahe, the party professional who's running Connally's campaign, "no matter how far ahead Reagan starts, he won't make it to the stretch. Period."

Despite his obvious self-serving, I have a warm spot for Mahe's words.

Richard Reeves, *Esquire*, May 8, 1979

Fairlie Ridiculous

To this muddled old man's view of politics will be added the usual stubbornness of old men when they hold the highest office. He will not rule; neither will he resign. He will merely try to reign by substitutes for the royal touch.

Ronald Reagan in his old age does not promise to rule the nation but to sanctify it, and Americans will discover too late that they elected only a shroud from which the image has faded.

Henry Fairlie, *Washington Post*, April 27, 1980

REAGAN IN '80/BUSH IN '81

Seen on a bumper sticker

Duck Soup

We thought about that as we watched the debate last week. If Carter wins he'll be a lame duck president with reduced authority. If Reagan wins he'll face a Democratic Congress, and his age makes him a probable lame duck,

too. Don't despair. America's sailing ship will make port if it has favorable winds. But don't overestimate the powers of the skipper.

The New Republic, November 8, 1980

Maxed Out

It didn't take a genius to predict on Inauguration Day that Reaganism would unravel. The omens were hardly bright for the nostalgic restoration of Reagan's ideology, or for the associated vulnerability and volatility of the electoral coalition subscribing to that ideology or for Reagan's patently contradictory fusion of monetarism and supply-side economics, or for a presidential regime announcing that it would combat the global currents of inflation with maxims out of McGuffey's Reader and Calvin Coolidge.

Kevin Phillips, *New York Review of Books*, May 13, 1982

Second Term? No Way

"The general supposition among Republican leaders now is that Reagan won't be a candidate," says a Republican Congressional leader who confers regularly with the President. "The job is going to grind him down. Nancy will want to leave. And he'll have done all he could reasonably be expected to do."

The New Republic, April 28, 1982

Hold Your Peace

It may be dangerous for the United States if Reagan tries during these next four years to recapture the nation's lost greatness. We may have an economic crash or a war if the effort fails. But the experiment is worth making, if only so that the country will be satisfied once and for all that someone really tried to recreate the (relatively) happy world of 1950. The conservatives now have their shot, and if they fail they can be called upon to hold their peace. If they succeed, and do it safely, they deserve to remain in power for a generation.

There are reasons to think they will not succeed, either substantively or politically.

Morton Kondracke, *The New Republic*, November 15, 1980

Failure of Will

Reagan has had less impact on foreign policy than any other modern president (Ford excepted). More than any modern President, Reagan campaigned against the mentality of the "permanent government" in foreign policy. Yet more than any modern President, he has abandoned foreign policy to the Secretary of State.

George Will, *Newsweek*, June 21, 1982



AROUND THE STATES

INDUSTRIAL HARA KIRI

How Protectionism Destroys Manufacturing Jobs

ARTHUR T. DENZAU

Senators and Congressmen who think that protectionist legislation will preserve their constituents' manufacturing jobs might want to think again. A state-by-state study reveals that protectionism in the steel industry has led to a loss of manufacturing jobs, even in most of those states that produce steel. Studies of protectionism in microchips, textiles, and other industrial products would most likely yield similar results.

In 1984, the Reagan Administration imposed a "voluntary" export restraint on our steel trading partners, which lowered the import share of the U.S. steel market from 26 percent to 22 percent. The tables appearing with this article indicate estimated gains and losses of industrial jobs, both nationally and state-by-state, as a result of this protectionist measure.

According to the study, the export restraint led to a nationwide gain of 16,900 jobs in the steel industry and in steel supplying industries such as chemicals, nonferrous metals, and industrial machinery. This resulted from the increase in market share of American steelmakers and the expanded business for their principal suppliers.

As the cost of steel rose, however, 52,400 jobs were lost in steel-using industries, such as metals fabrication (can making, utensils, plumbing supplies, nuts and bolts), motor vehicles, and electrical and non-electrical machinery.

The reason for this job loss is simple: More than 20 times as many Americans work in steel-using industries as in steel manufacturing itself. In 1982, 365,700 people worked in basic steel while over 8.3 million worked in manufacturing industries for which steel was a significant input. This much larger industrial labor force was penalized by the damage done by protectionism to the international competitiveness of American steel users. Rather than saving and increasing the number of American manufacturing jobs, the steel export restraint led to a loss of 35,600 industrial jobs.

The results of the 1984 steel protectionist measure on a state-by-state basis were, for the most part, equally damaging. In California, for instance, the measure brought only 700 new jobs to the basic steel and steel-supplying indus-

tries while it resulted in the loss of 4,200 jobs in the steel-using industries.

But while California was the biggest loser from the 1984 steel protectionist measure, few states came out winners. Forty-four states lost manufacturing jobs because of the measure. Ten states lost at least 1,000 jobs (California, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Texas and Wisconsin). Even Pennsylvania gained little from the measure. In 1982, Pennsylvania had 85,000 people working in basic steel, more than any other state, and it had 411,000 working in firms in steel-using sectors, second only to Texas. The large estimated gain in steelmaking jobs (3,500) was nearly overshadowed by the losses in steel-using firms in the state (2,500). Only five states showed a net gain in manufacturing jobs.

Steel trade protection has also been damaging to many metropolitan industrial areas. In Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit and St. Louis the 1984 protectionist measure resulted in a loss of manufacturing jobs. After taking into account their gains, the net losses for these four metropolitan areas alone totalled 2,800.

This analysis of the steel industry's reaction to the voluntary export restraint of 1984 is based on data from the Department of Commerce's 1979 input-output table for the steel industry and the 1982 Census of Manufactures. For the purpose of this study, those industries selling more than 1 percent of their output to the steel industry were considered steel-supplying industries. Steel-using industries were defined as those industries for which steel represented over 2 percent of costs. These figures were then used to forecast a reduction in output demanded from the industry, and thus the change in employment in that industry.

To obtain employment results for local areas, the employment in each industry in an area is increased or decreased by the relevant national factor. For example, while steel employment nationally is predicted to increase by 4 percent, the steel employment in Alabama (8,300 in 1982) is predicted to increase the same 4 percent, or 320 workers. The effect on a steel-supplying industry such as motor vehicles is determined by multiplying the 4 percent by the share of motor vehicle output sold to steel (1.5 percent). This would result in a gain in motor vehicle output sold and employment of 0.06 percent, or five jobs in the state of Alabama.

Adding together all the gains in steel and suppliers results in an increase of 380 Alabama jobs. This is then subtracted from the number of jobs lost in the steel-using sector. In the case of Alabama, those losses totalled some 500 manufacturing jobs. Thus, the net effect of the 1984 trade protection for steel on Alabama manufacturing jobs is a loss of 120 jobs.

ARTHUR T. DENZAU is a research associate with the Center for the Study of American Business at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri.