

Gillard
~~~~~

## CULTURAL REVOLUTIONS

employment growth that robust.

The largest industrial states have recorded manufacturing job losses under President Obama. These include California (121,000), Texas (62,400), Illinois (59,000), Pennsylvania (50,900), North Carolina (50,400), Ohio (46,400), Indiana (29,200), and Michigan (23,900). National manufacturing job losses under President Obama have been broad-based. Durable-goods industry sectors that have recorded job losses under Obama include wood products, nonmetallic mineral products, primary metals, fabricated metals, machinery, computer and electronic products, electrical equipment and appliances, transportation equipment, furniture and related products, and miscellaneous manufacturing. Non-durable-goods sectors that have recorded losses include food manufacturing, beverages and tobacco products, textile products, apparel, leather and allied products, printing and related support activities, petroleum and coal products, chemicals, and plastics and rubber products. No manufacturing sector has yet to record a gain.

Most incumbent Republicans lack the credibility to raise the issue. They were, after all, largely silent on manufacturing job losses under President George W. Bush. Manufacturing contracted by 4.5 million jobs under the Republican Bush, a 27-percent decline unlikely ever to be surpassed. The longest consecutive monthly increase in manufacturing jobs under President Bush was five months (December 2005 through April 2006). Obama has already exceeded that record in 2010, recording six consecutive months of small gains from January to June after monthly declines last year.

Most Republicans have listened for too long to economists who argue manufacturing job losses are unimportant as long as output expands. This argument overlooks countries like China, where manufacturing employment and output have both increased. It downplays the social conse-

quences for families, including a greater government role as good-paying private-sector jobs disappear. It also ignores the political implications of long-term manufacturing job losses in a state such as Ohio, the key to the Electoral College. President Richard M. Nixon, the last Republican to preside over a net national gain in domestic manufacturing jobs, won Ohio's electoral votes twice, as did Clinton. How will these Republicans assail Obama's record to date in Ohio when nearly one in three manufacturing jobs (322,400) disappeared there under his predecessor?

Economists who defend President Obama's economic policies argue he inherited an economy in recession and note that Bush also presided over a net loss of manufacturing jobs. But at some point President Obama's economic policies, as they apply to the domestic manufacturing sector, will be judged on their own merit. And thus far under Obama, national manufacturing employment has declined to the level of spring 1941 (11.6 million), shortly before U.S. entry into World War II.

—Greg Kaza

## Aussie Election

MISS JULIA GILLARD (one takes particular pleasure in applying the honorific "Miss" to so stentorian and charmless a femocrat), the prime minister of Australia, faces an interesting challenge in her bid for reelection on August 21. Goodness knows, the Labor Party that she now leads—and which has been in office since 2007—should win at a canter. Not since 1931 have Australians thrown out a national government after a single term. And Australia has coped with recession and the global financial crisis better than most other Western countries. How much of this comparative success can be attributed to Miss Gillard's predecessor as prime minister, Kevin Rudd, and how much to sheer

luck, others must judge. Six months ago, Rudd appeared unstoppable. The opposition Liberal Party had thrown up (such gastric phraseology seems appropriate in the circumstances) its fourth leader inside two years; no obvious rivals to Rudd were visible within Labor itself; and Rudd commanded a healthy lead in opinion polls over every alternative.

Then it all went wrong for Rudd's rule. Tony Abbott, as newly installed Liberal boss, was by no means the New Class empty suit that his two immediate precursors, Brendan Nelson and Malcolm Turnbull, had been. Along with bloodcurdling vulgarity of attire (Abbott saw nothing wrong with posing for the cameras in the most exiguous swimwear, known as "budgie smugglers") and of utterance (he also saw nothing wrong with referring to Miss Gillard's "sh-t-eating grin"), he displayed apparent sincerity in his skepticism about anthropogenic climate change, as well as a certain intellectual curiosity of which no Liberal leader since Sir Robert Menzies' retirement in 1966 had been capable. These characteristics sufficed to give Rudd's administration a fright, and pollsters' findings reflected this. Three other factors aggravated Rudd's difficulties: the unpopularity of the resources tax that he wanted to impose on the mining industry; a shambolic home-insulation program that had led to no fewer than four deaths before the government abandoned it; and ever worse news from Afghanistan, where Australia has had 1,550 troops stationed since April 2009.

What saved Rudd at first was the reluctance of Miss Gillard to mount a challenge. Until this year such a challenge would have been unthinkable, given that Rudd enjoyed 69-percent approval ratings. When these ratings went into free fall, Miss Gillard and her backers struck.

Helping her cause was the fact that Rudd's own popularity, while it lasted, had been personal rather than institutional. It occurred in spite of, rather than because of, his political allegiance. Voters did not

Chronicles [Rockford, Illinois]  
September 2010

hand Rudd his comfortable 2007 victory (by a margin of 23 parliamentary seats) over incumbent Prime Minister John Howard through a sudden passionate enthusiasm for Labor—or because they found Rudd's invocations of Dietrich Bonhoeffer's theology, in season and out of season, inexhaustibly interesting—but simply because Rudd was obviously a fresh face, and the increasingly decrepit Howard was obviously not. The 2007 contest, in short, had been in essence presidential rather than party-based. Rudd's own slogan, "Kevin 07," testified to this. When Liberal attack ads started parodying 2007's propaganda by referring to the prime minister as "Kevin O'Lemon," the blow to Rudd's fortunes proved accordingly severe, in a way that it would not have been for a more Tammany-like operator. The Labor machine men whom Rudd had, for the most part, high-handedly ignored at the height of his acclaim took their revenge.

In contrast with Rudd, Miss Gillard was from the beginning the apparatchik's apparatchik. There is no evidence that she has read a serious book in her life. She began her career in a hard-left campus organization, the Australian Union of Students, of which she eventually became leader. (Its achievements included declaring 1983 the "International Year of the Lesbian.") From those heady days she has retained her enthusiasm for Emily's List and suchlike pro-abortion rackets, not to mention a gratingly pseudoproletarian speaking voice that can almost strip paint. Later, she worked at the ambulance-chasing legal firm Slater & Gordon. Today, Miss Gillard glories in her atheism (she was raised as a Baptist) and her concubinage. (Her live-in boyfriend, Tim Mathieson, has been unofficially known, ever since the prime ministerial swearing-in ceremony, as the "First Dude.") But never, unlike several of her fellow femocrats, has she given the impression of a desperate allegiance even to misguided principle. Looking out for Number One has always taken precedence.

Readers will soon know whether Miss Gillard's gamble in calling an early election (she was not obliged to call it until November of this year) has worked. There is no doubt that Australia's Liberals are not remotely ready for another turn at government, any more than were "Call Me Dave" Cameron's Conservatives in Britain. They have failed to carry out even the most elementary soul-searching over how and why they permitted John Howard to lead them to disaster three years back. Abbott's only real hope is that enough religious believers will be frightened off by Miss Gillard to hold their noses and turn to the Liberals instead.

—R.J. Stove

## Thomas Molnar, R.I.P.

ON JULY 10, in Richmond, Virginia, the intellectual historian Thomas Molnar went to his reward, leaving behind an array of gorgeous ruins. By these I mean not his works, which were masterfully crafted and will endure. No, the ruins that Molnar used to guard are the temples, forts, and libraries of our previous civilization, the crumbling traces of what David Gress called (in *From Plato to NATO*) the "Old West," those institutions of order that cannot neatly fit into any ideology—including the Americanism-for-export that "movement" conservatism promoted throughout the Cold War, whose legitimate heir is neoconservatism.

When I would visit him in his Lincoln Center digs, and later in (of all places) suburban New Jersey, Molnar used to shock me with such observations. I'd always believed, before meeting him, that the right/left spectrum was born with the French Revolution, but Molnar casually referred to the institutions of "the right" in ancient Greece and Rome, even Egypt. And again, to this American conservative, his definitions were unexpected. On the right he included, along with the priests and the sol-

diers, the magistrates—the government! On the left he grouped most rhetoricians and the leaders of the merchant class. Indeed, throughout his writing—from the book that made his reputation, *The Decline of the Intellectual* (1961), to the letters he traded with figures ranging from Albert Camus to the count of Paris—Molnar made clear that he had assimilated Marx's insight that the bourgeoisie is at its heart a revolutionary class. To make this point more vividly, he would say things like, "Calvin was the world's first Bolshevik."

Intellectuals, who began as the burghers' servants and propagandists against the interests of priests, aristocrats, and kings, soon grew impatient with what they saw as the blinkered self-interest and philistinism of their patrons, and turned to utopian ideologies of the left to advance the revolution they'd begun. In *The Counter-Revolution* (1969), Molnar traced the outlines of a movement in the opposite direction, a rebellion of intellectuals who renounced both the modern, bourgeois *paterfamilias* and his prodigal leftist sons. The counterrevolutionary, for Molnar, is a man who looks back behind his feckless father to his ancestors, the dusty portraits hanging on the wall, the soldiers and saints who toiled in service of causes deeper, higher, and to us moderns stranger than a house with a white picket fence. On this point, Molnar echoed the judgment of historian Christopher Dawson, whose famous essay "Catholicism and the Bourgeois Mind" rejects worldly, Puritan prudence in favor of the splendid, quixotic sanctity of the Spanish and French baroque. Here Molnar genially disagreed with another friend, the social philosopher and economist Wilhelm Röpke. "Wilhelm was always too sanguine about the shopkeepers," he told me, smiling sadly. "I knew better."

In *Twin Powers* (1988) and *The Church, Pilgrim of Centuries* (1990), Molnar identified secular "civil society" as the perennial enemy of both Church and state—or of any church or state conceived on tra-