

"D'Souza's fine analysis provides a fresh opportunity to consider Reagan's achievements." —WILLIAM KRISTOL, *THE WEEKLY STANDARD*

RONALD REAGAN



How an Ordinary Man Became an Extraordinary Leader

DINESH D'SOUZA

Bestselling author of *Illiberal Democracy* and *The End of Racism*

Ronald Reagan: How an Ordinary Man Became an Extraordinary Leader

Dinesh D'Souza

Download now

Read Online →

Ronald Reagan: How an Ordinary Man Became an Extraordinary Leader

Dinesh D'Souza

Ronald Reagan: How an Ordinary Man Became an Extraordinary Leader Dinesh D'Souza

Ronald Reagan: How and Ordinary Man Became an Extraordinary Leader

292 pp. In this enlightening new look at one of our most successful, most popular, and least understood presidents, bestselling author and former Reagan aide Dinesh D'Souza shows how this "ordinary" man was able to transform the political landscape in a way that made a permanent impact on America and the world. Ronald Reagan is a thoughtful and honest assessment of how this underestimated president became a truly extraordinary leader.

Ronald Reagan: How an Ordinary Man Became an Extraordinary Leader Details

Date : Published February 23rd 1999 by Free Press (first published 1997)

ISBN : 9780684848235

Author : Dinesh D'Souza

Format : Paperback 304 pages

Genre : Biography, History, Politics, Nonfiction, Presidents

 [Download Ronald Reagan: How an Ordinary Man Became an Extraordin ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online Ronald Reagan: How an Ordinary Man Became an Extraord ...pdf](#)

**Download and Read Free Online Ronald Reagan: How an Ordinary Man Became an Extraordinary
Leader Dinesh D'Souza**

From Reader Review Ronald Reagan: How an Ordinary Man Became an Extraordinary Leader for online ebook

Michael says

DInesh D'Souza before he went insane. This is a good overview of President Reagan's time in the American spotlight. I always liked Reagan. I imagine that for many people in my generation, Reagan was like JFK was for my parents' generation: better in memory than he was in reality. Both Reagan and Kennedy had that intangible, all too rare quality in a President: leadership (actually, the longer I live, the more I see how rare a quality that is in any organization). Both JFK and Reagan have a certain mythology surrounding them, and tend to be viewed through the ideological prism of the viewer. I enjoyed this book, and thought the author--a deeply conservative man--was as balanced as he could be. Obviously a big fan of Ronald Reagan, D'Souza still managed to cast a critical light on the former President's failings and weaknesses, which is all you can ask for in a biographer.

Worth reading if you like history, politics, and Reagan. Unfortunately, Mr. D'Souza has taken a turn toward crazy town in recent years (this book was published in 1998). I fear that the author has, quite literally, become unglued by the Presidency of Barak Obama. It's unfortunate because D'Souza's first few books were really good. Now he's producing movies that say President Obama is a Kenyan anti-colonial Muslim or something. It's sad.

Four out of five stars just because the author recently dumped his wife of many years for some young hoodsie. Jerk.

John says

This is one of the best biographical books I've ever read. By the end it had accomplished something all such books should aspire to; to make you feel as though you have spent time with the subject. The book is worth it alone for the chapter contrasting Reagan's prescience regarding the decrepitude of the Soviet Union with the gormless admiration demonstrated by Ivy League so-called experts.

Joseph says

The best parts where was near the end of the chapters 'The Man Behind the Mask' and 'Spirit of a Leader.' There were other chapters that weren't bad either 'They Don't Call it Readanomics Anymore.' Then were a few that I skimmed over more. Overall pretty good and some of things he outlines of what he did accomplish and all the foes he faced were very good. He laid out the groundwork of how many critics were quick to blame or dismiss, then when proven wrong those same people then twisted things they said. It is interesting to see how much opposition he faced in the first some odd months to year into his presidency, which still holds true to now as Trump has taken office. Back then they said give the guy a chance, but I guess things change...

Connor Mcdermott says

In this chapter of the book the author explains how Reagan looks like he is a bad politician because he was an average student at a school that wasn't very good which made him not a very smart man. It was also said that he was a distant person and hard to talk to.

In this chapter it is extensively discussed how the tax cut policies that Reagan put into place effected America. It was good for some people but during this time a lot of people were laid off of their jobs. It was also discussed how Reagan admired hardworking Americans.

In this chapter of the book the main focus is how Reagan dealt with the cold war. It discusses how he is often criticized for the way he handled it but as usual the author defends Reagan but the evidence is not very strong so one could think he did not do a good job.

In this chapter it describes how when Reagan was governor in the 1960s he developed his interest in the nuclear missile defense program. It said how he started it and how The Soviet union collapsed and the cold war came to an end.

In the epilogue of this book it was discussed how the presidents after Reagan performed while in office. It discussed there good and bad actions in office. The epilogue did not really touch upon his life afterward surprisingly.

John Nelson says

When Ronald Reagan entered national politics the so-called "experts" declared he was incompetent, uneducated, senile, an intellectual lightweight, and that his dangerous ideas would ruin the already-wrecked economy and start a nuclear war with the Soviet Union. Reagan stayed the course, maintained his faith, and by the end of his two terms in office it was clear that he had been right, and the so-called "experts" and "intellectuals" wrong, about everything. The Cold War was over, with America and its allies the victors; the world had pulled back from the nuclear brinkmanship of the 1950s through 1970s, and the American economy was in the sixth year of what would prove, with a slight hiccup in early 1992, to be twenty years of sustained growth.

No biographer has fully captured the depth of Reagan's achievement and character. Those on the political left tend to deny or denigrate his accomplishments, as though history didn't happen, while the rest are stumped by the mysteries of Reagan's character.

Dinesh D'Souza does not make the first mistake. He shows how Reagan, by adhering to a basic set of values and the goodness of the American people, managed to achieve what virtually everyone else, from all ends of the political spectrum, said couldn't be done. Reagan was no adroit political insider like George H.W. Bush, and no policy wonk or political manipulator like Bill Clinton, but unlike those two as well as virtually every other President after Eisenhower, had the "vision thing" down pat. He also proved to be a better administrator than anyone gave him credit for, primarily because he knew how to delegate responsibility.

On a personal level, Reagan was affable, charming, glamorous, and very funny. At the same time, he closely guarded his innermost thoughts and failed to connect with most of the people closest to him. As D'Souza notes, even Nancy Reagan, with whom he had a famously close relationship, occasionally saw Reagan wall himself off emotionally, and learned to accept it.

Most Reagan biographers have struggled with this curious chameleon-like aspect of his character, and D'Souza is no exception. Perhaps Reagan, who grew up in a poor family with an alcoholic father and then persevered through the Great Depression, simply learned it was safest to guard his innermost thoughts, and never lost that reticence despite his outward affability. In any event, this book does not answer the questions.

It is noteworthy that history now seems to be repeating itself, if in a small way. Another political outsider now sits in the White House. All of the insults lobbed at Reagan have been thrown at Donald Trump as well, except that "insane" has been substituted for "senile." Yet, Trump appears to be repeating Reagan's success, if in a small way. The economy has edged back up toward its historical trajectory after the long years of stagnation under Obama, and there now appears to be real hope that North Korea has lost its taste for nuclear threats and international bad behavior, though the outcome remains extremely uncertain. Trump has none of Reagan's charm and charisma, and in my view cannot hold a candle to Reagan as a leader, a humanitarian, or an American, but perhaps the "resistance" should recognize the good things he has done and work with him to improve our lot, rather than simply acting as spoilers.

The definitive biography of Reagan remains to be written. At just under 300 pages, this book never was going to achieve that distinction, and D'Souza runs aground in discussing some of the more inscrutable aspects of Reagan's character. Nevertheless, it is a worthwhile read for those interested in politics and recent history. Three stars.

Zach Koenig says

Because a Ronald Reagan installment in Arthur Schlesinger's "The American Presidents" series has not been released yet, I had to turn elsewhere for my next President fix. I chose the right source here, as Dinesh D'Souza crafts a marvelous bio of one of the more interesting Presidents in the history of the Oval Office.

What I like about this book is that even though it is relatively clear that D'Souza is a "Reagan fan", he starts the book with all the criticisms thrown at Reagan in the years since his presidency. He then systematically goes through all of those points, showing BOTH how they are wrong AND how they are right. D'Souza is ready to admit where Reagan may have been weak, while also more than willing to examine Reagan's critics and show where they may have been wrong as well.

I also like how D'Souza examines the personal side of Reagan as much as the political side, as he realizes the two are deeply linked. That is the approach I like in bios, where the author realizes that the personal affects the professional and vice-versa.

All in all, this bio of President Reagan was exceptional. D'Souza writes in a format that is accessible to all, while not dumbing-down the content whatsoever. In this glad, I'm kind of glad that I had to stray from my typical "American Presidents" series!

Jarvis Johnson says

I'll start out by saying that I am a fan of Ronald Reagan. Still, I'm not blind to his shortcomings as President or Governor of California, nor am I a modern day conservative looking to resurrect him to run the country. I liked this book for a couple of reasons. One, it was an easy read. Unlike other biographies, this book isn't bogged down by the mundane details that tend to weigh down other biographies. Second, this book acknowledges his critics, from both the left and the right. People have a short memory when it comes to

politics, but this book is a reminder that a number of conservatives were critical of his ideas, including a then-presidential candidate named George H.W. Bush. Lastly, D'Souza makes a good case for Reagan as one of our top presidents. He certainly had an influence, that continues today (There's a reason there's a huge debate about letting the Bush tax cuts lapse). Still, there was nothing spectacular about him. He was not an ivy league attorney, or a decorated military man, yet he drove the Democrats crazy, and gained respect from those in the military. Put another way, if Reagan was the "amiable dunce," yet was able to play a large part in the end of the Cold War and the turnaround of the economy, what does this say about his more educated critics? Good read.

Lisa (Harmonybites) says

How people regard this biography seems to reflect how they regard the subject. That's rather understandable. I think it's far too early really to evaluate Reagan (or Carter or Clinton) very objectively. Too many people are still alive that were caught up in partisan passions during his presidency. Whether at university or at the very left-leaning neighborhood I've lived in, I've overheard any number of demeaning, vicious remarks about Reagan--even on the very day of his death. I've heard him bitterly blamed for the death of millions from AIDS (you'd think the man created the disease) and hysterical denials he had *anything* to do with the end of the Cold War.

That very reaction from people did cause me to look for a biography that wouldn't be just some hatchet job. I'd heard some not so good things about liberties taken in the biography of Reagan by famed presidential biographer Edmund Morris. On the other hand, I knew Dinesh D'Souza to be a conservative and admirer of Reagan and chose this book for that very reason. I did like it--it's very readable and it's not a complete hagiography--it is critical at some points. But D'Souza still feels too much the ideologue and the book too light-weight, which is why I'm not rating it higher and it's not likely to keep its place on my shelves. I have heard good things about Lou Cannon's works on Reagan; Cannon had worked as a White House correspondent for the *Washington Post*. Next time I want to read about Reagan, that might be the biographer of choice.

Atul says

Fantastic book. I especially liked the chapter titled "Making the World Safe for Democracy". It talks about how Reagan was not against supporting dictatorships as long as it meant the long-term demise of the Soviet Union.

I think this is a very pragmatic and sensible stance. The reality is that the world is full of dictatorships even today, and that a global superpower like the United States is going to have to support them sometimes to achieve long-term goals.

D'Souza draws a parallel to supporting the Soviet Union during World War II -- it was necessary to do so, given that Nazi Germany was the immediate threat facing the free world. Same way, the United States allied itself with dictatorships in the Philippines, South Korea, Latin America, and Africa to combat the threat of Soviet domination of the world's nations.

After all, if the Soviet Union became too powerful and had too many allies abroad, it would be horribly dangerous to American national security interests. And if the United States lost the Cold War, democracy would almost certainly have collapsed worldwide.

I also liked the chapter titled "They don't call it Reaganomics Anymore". Yes, the middle-class declined under Reagan. But that's primarily because so many middle-class folks moved into the upper middle class and rich income quintiles. Charitable giving exploded under Reagan's presidency. The misery index was drastically down from the Carter years. All in all, Reaganomics was a huge success. No wonder Reagan won such a historic victory in 1984! Of course, the same Keynesians who trashed Reagan's tax cuts and deregulation now try to take credit for the Reagan boom...

Sadly, Reagan could never get a clamp on government spending. But as the book mentions, his top priorities were tax cuts, deregulation, and rolling back Soviet influence in the world. He decided to compromise on welfare spending so the Democrats would give him his desired military spending increases. He left the issue of massive deficits to future presidents.

I also loved the way Governor Reagan handled those disrespectful, entitled California protesters. They chanted, "We are the future!" Reagan held up a piece of paper to his limousine window saying, "I'll sell my bonds." He told many protesters to "take a bath". And when one particularly entitled brat told him that as an old man, he doesn't understand young people who grew up with modern technology, Reagan told them that "my generation built those things".

All in all, Ronald Reagan was a truly great president. He left office with a very high approval rating, despite the Iran-Contra scandal. More than anything -- whether it be the booming economy or the decline of the Soviet Union -- Reagan re-ignited the fire of patriotism in the hearts of the American people. America was once again the global superpower, the land of the free, the home of the brave.

Brian says

According to my high school and university US history textbooks, Regan was an actor who expanded the national debt tremendously and happened to be president during the fall of the Soviet Union.

This book clearly explains what Regan actually accomplished. It also lists the major criticism of his presidency, and addresses the merits or (more often) the falseness of each. It also analyzes his leadership skills and style and what made him successful. There is much to be learned not only from what he did, but how he did it.

Regan was an incredible man, who influenced the world for good in significant ways. Common history textbooks try to rob him of his greatness by avoiding the major issues of his presidency. This book tells what really happened.

Leanna says

How people regard this biography seems to reflect how they regard the subject. That's rather understandable. I think it's far too early really to evaluate Reagan (or Carter or Clinton) very objectively.

Carrie Daws says

I don't read a lot of biography. I suspect the bottom line reason is because they are a lot of work for me. You

see, I love the story behind people's lives, what helped shape them into who they became, what influenced their ideas to form the person who made the choices they made. But I have a basic problem: I get lost in the names.

This affects my reading in all genres, including fiction books with large scripts of people. I remember quite clearly the struggle to continue through the first several chapters in Ted Dekker's Circle Series. I had to consciously choose to keep reading when I hit Chapter 2 and realized I would have to keep track of people in two different worlds. At some point in many books, my mind drops the characters it deems of little consequence. Of course, this sometimes causes problems when these characters sneak up on me several chapters later and I'm furiously trying to remember why I should know them. (I love authors who include character lists with their books!)

And so, in spite of enjoying history and the backstories of people, I subconsciously avoid biographies. So it was with upon the recommendation of two different people that I highly respect that I picked up Dinesh D'Souza's book and trudged my way through it.

Ronald Reagan: How an Ordinary Man Became an Extraordinary Leader did not disappoint me, although I'm confident I've forgotten the names of three-quarters of the people the author mentions. Mr. D'Souza includes enough of Reagan's one liners and humorous stories to keep the reading entertaining while including insights that show he clearly watched and studied the man himself.

Possibly this section from the book sums the former President up the best: "He was a realist who had a low view of human nature; at the same time, he was an optimist who had a high view of human possibility. He was a tolerant man who nevertheless had fixed and unalterable convictions. He was gregarious and liked people, yet he was a loner who seemed happiest by himself." Reagan was clearly a paradox.

Yet as I read the stories the author chose to include, the commentary based on what he knew and the information he received from others, I gained greater respect for him as a man and as President. And I laughed many times at his wit and quips.

If you've ever wanted to know more about Ronald Reagan and understand some of his reasonings and motivations behind decisions he made, this is definitely a book you should consider.

Adam says

Explains some of Reagan's eccentric characteristics both as a man and as a leader. Not apparent to me in previous studies is Reagan's aloof attitude when it comes to personal relationships. He was intimately close with his 2nd wife Nancy. However his cabinet, staff, and even his children seem to have a much different interpretation.

What this has that Reagan's Diaries do not is a connection from his personality to the major events of his Presidency. Reagan was able to stick to his wills on highly criticized goals like taxes, Reaganomics, and the beginning of the end of Communism... both in the Soviet Union and Central America. What's particularly interesting is the Reagan Gorbachev relationship. It's not entirely Reagan strong-arming the Soviet Union. Gorbachev's willingness to adopt more of a western lifestyle for his people has a noticeable contribution in the decline of Communism.

The author is clearly pro Reagan, goes so far in certain places that I think it's speculation on the author's part. For example the part where he explains that Reagan had been stringing along Sam Donaldson in the press

conferences, in some kind of subliminal feat of willpower....not sure how the author could possibly know that.

Fred Kohn says

Hoo boy, this book was a mixed bag! Half way through, I was sure I was going to give it two stars and open my review with, "The best thing about this book was that it wasn't horrible." But the last two chapters and epilogue were much more in keeping with the spirit of a biography than the early chapters I had been slogging through. Until then, the book didn't even really qualify as a biography. It was more of an apologetic, and apologetics is more suited for religion than politics.

D'Souza is a brilliant polemicist for the New Right, and his arguments cannot simply be waved off. I have done a fair bit of reading on Reagan's economic programs, and although it was painful to read the chapter on that side of Reagan, it was instructive as well. For example, I immediately noticed that when D'Souza writes, "Ed Meese told Reagan that the White house had a verbal assurance from the Democratic leadership on the Hill that for every dollar Reagan would approve in tax increases, Congress would approve three dollars in spending cuts" (p 102), that statement can be perfectly true, although any student of the so-called three-for-one deal knows that Ed Meese was completely mistaken. This required me digging back through my notes to find this passage from *The Deficit and the Public Interest: The Search for Responsible Budgeting in the 1980s*

In essence, the funny numbers, meant to impress voters and maybe markets, fooled the president. They also fooled Donald Regan and Ed Meese. When eventually somebody (Stockman blames Kemp) told Reagan that Congress did not give him any three-for-one, the president felt betrayed. Believing the administration had been "snookered," "screwed," "hornswoggled" on TEFRA, Reagan, Regan, and Meese became very suspicious of other compromises.

To Stockman, Baker, Darman, and congressional leaders, this sense of betrayal was ludicrous; no one ever said Congress would pass three-for-one. The resolution was clear enough about that. But when Stockman perceived, during the fight to pass TEFRA, that Reagan might have missed the point, there wasn't much the budget director could do. If he tried to clear up the confusion, Reagan might have changed his mind on TEFRA itself. Instead, Stockman let it slide and hoped for the best. He could not have anticipated the endless recriminations that would follow, outlasting him in the administration. In a letter to Reagan on January 16, 1984, for example, Senator [Bob] Dole [Head of Senate Finance Committee] had to write:

"The most frequently voiced objections to packaging new spending cuts and revenue increases together is that Congress would enact the new taxes but renege on the spending cuts. These critics cite as evidence the alleged failure of Congress in 1982 to deliver any of the promised three dollars in spending cuts for each dollar of tax increase. I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that you were not "taken in" by this budget plan."

So I actually learned a valuable tidbit from D'Souza's statement about Meese— that a lot of the smoke being blown around the Reagan administration came from this guy. This is also verified indirectly by comparing D'Souza's statement: "[An overall increase in tax revenues produced by a reduction of overall tax rates] obviously didn't happen, but no prominent supply sider said it would, and neither did the Reagan administration, whose budget projections, available for inspection in public documents, all show an expected loss in revenue due to the tax cuts (p 116)" to Stockman's account. This is a particularly brazen statement on D'Souza's part, because the public documents he is referring to were of course prepared by David Stockman, whom D'Souza calls "an economic genius but a political dunce" who should have been fired for going against Reagan's economic program! Stockman recounts in gory detail in *The Triumph of Politics: Why the Reagan Revolution Failed* how his budget projections were rejected by the supply siders in Reagan's

administration, particularly Ed Meese:

At the end of the dessert, I passed out a stack of thick black binders, each one forty-two pages long. Groans around the table— another Stockman paper flood ...

For the purposes of the August 3 briefing, I had continued to assume an early, powerful supply-side expansion— 5 percent real GNP growth. Nevertheless, page 20 should have been an eye opener. It showed that even with a forecast more compatible with the monetary policy actually in effect, the deficit would rise to \$81 billion in 1983— and reach \$112 billion by 1986.

When I had finished with this part of the briefing, I turned to look at the President. He looked . . . not very well, and it had nothing to do with his health. That was when he said I seemed to be agreeing with Tip O'Neill. Ed Meese jumped in, as he usually did when he saw that his boss was discomfited and at a loss.

"What about the revenue feedback from the tax bill?" he asked. "You haven't taken account of that in these scary numbers." His tone was slightly annoyed.

Meese was referring, of course, to the Laffer curve. The whole California gang (my emphasis) had taken it literally (and primitively). The way they talked, they seemed to expect that once the supply-side tax cut was in effect, additional revenue would start to fall, manna-like, from the heavens.

Since January, I had been explaining that there is no literal Laffer curve. "Higher real GNP and employment growth will not increase projected revenue by a dime," I reiterated. "Remember, we're putting the squeeze on inflation at the same time. That will bring down the growth rate of money GNP and federal revenue. The budget benefit of the combined anti-inflation and tax cut program comes entirely on the spending side. We get lower outlays for unemployment-related programs and indexed entitlements. But there is no revenue feedback. What you see is all we've got."

I had repeated this little lecture until I was blue in the face. But they never stopped asking about the magical Laffer curve. So, confident that the question would come up again in the face of my dire warnings about deficits, I had prepared a special tab in the new briefing book showing why there was no Laffer curve when you were trying to cure a high-inflation, low-growth economy.

As I looked around the table, it was evident that I had accomplished . . . nothing. Those who already understood (Anderson, Darman, and Weidenbaum) nodded their heads. The others were puzzled, bored, or annoyed.

OK so having said my peace about economics, I have to confess I am not that familiar with the issues surrounding Reagan's foreign policy. My general feeling here is that Reagan did better, and D'Souza is on more solid ground in defending his hero. What I found to be true gold here were the endnotes, which alerted me to a lot of new material I was unaware of, and which is must read.

Summing it all up, although I find D'Souza a completely annoying New Righter who can only seem to see things in terms of conservative/liberal, hawk/dove, and those who love Reagan or hate him, he is a fine writer and a (mostly) logical thinker who is instructive to read.

Steve says

A wonderfully written biographical defense of Reagan's presidency. D'Souza is fair and includes both Reagan's blunders and achievements. This is a good book to recap Reagan's own autobiography, An

American Life. It is much shorter and leaves out a lot of details. The book is also replete with Reagan's witticisms and D'Souza's own humor. A must read for any Reaganite, or a gift to those other folks...

Bryn Dunham says

Not so much a biography as it is a snapshot of the character and philosophy of Ronald Reagan. This is a very good book to learn what Reagan stood for and how he conducted himself in policy making. What we learn was that he was a principled Conservative but not so stubborn to accept only all or nothing in his proposed legislation.

Though the author is one of today's most influential conservative authors, he does provide accounts of Reagan's failures and contradictions. For example Reagan was a strong family values advocate but was divorced and had a distant relationship with his kids. He was a warm person to all but had few close friends. He invoked God in his speeches but was rare church goer.

In a way I couldn't help but compare him to President Lincoln for they had very similar personalities.

- Both were treated by the press as country bumpkin ignoramuses
- Both had a cabinet that at times thought lowly of their boss
- Both were witty and known for their humorous stories and anecdotes
- Both were devoted to their eccentric wives
- Both were principled and took criticism with grace and not easily swayed by public opinion
- Both were amazing orators and wrote many of their own speeches
- Both were upholding the rule of law and a military policy of "peace through strength"
- Both stood up to major adversaries and risked/conducted wars based on principle to the ideals set forth by the Declaration of Independence and Constitution.

Overall this was a good book and at times read like a eulogy and provides readers with a general overview of Reagan's life, philosophy, and presidency.

J.S. says

As a White House insider during the Reagan Administration, D'Souza observed first-hand the management style of one of the most respected and unrespected presidents of the last half of the 20th century. Initially, he agreed with some of the criticisms, but later came to understand that Reagan simply had a different style than other presidents.

Criticized for being intellectually lazy or simple-minded, President Reagan was never a favorite of the intellectual crowd. His Hollywood past and appeals to higher morals didn't help. Accused of napping during cabinet meetings and using his acting skills to sway public opinion, some dismiss him and his accomplishments, giving the credit to others or dumb luck. In reality, D'Souza says he was very intelligent and could grasp a situation easily, but disliked dealing in the minutiae, preferring to delegate to others. He was steered by a strong moral compass, and believed strongly in the people and their ability to make correct decisions when given the facts. His accomplishments were many, including turning around the high-inflation economy of the 1970s (although he had to weather a couple tough years of recession) and bringing the Soviet Union to it's knees by refusing to appease them.

Having grown up in the 1980s, I remember the Reagan years as a time when pride was restored to Americans, when the threat of the Soviet Union seemed very real and imminent. The suggestion that the USSR would fall by the end of the decade would have been ridiculous. But Reagan recognized that it was a system that offered no incentives to its people to perform better, and once he pushed it by forcing them into an arms race, its weaknesses were revealed. He was often criticized as too old and incompetent for his job, but he proved smarter than all his critics. Too bad a president like that doesn't come along more often.

I found the book to be an easy book to read. D'Souza writes in a clear and logical way that is easy to follow. His logic is persuasive and his language without a lot of flowery nonsense. Not especially impartial, but it helps to understand better the principles and thinking of President Reagan.

Frederick Hammill says

The author should invest in a more extensive editing process (and better editor!).

Jasmyn says

This was a great book about an incredible man--I read this right after we got back from our European trip, since we stood in Berlin and had Julie quote him as saying "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!" and I had no idea he was that forceful during the Cold War. He also passed away while we were in Europe and there were things about him written in all the European papers. A man of great courage and conviction--I loved this biography.

Jenni says

One of the most interesting, informative, and moving books I've ever read. Despite the intensity of political/historical information, the book is surprisingly easy to read and moves quickly. This is the history of Reagan no student will find in any text book. Ought to be required reading. Brilliant.
