
is not the only way to avoid the oblivion of private life.

Political scientists Palmer, of George Mason University, and Vogel, of the University of Rochester, found that of the 925 congressmen who retired or were defeated at the polls between 1961 and 1992, a total of 153, or 16 percent, were appointed within two years of leaving office to judgeships, cabinet posts, ambassadorships, or other federal jobs. Of those who belonged to the president's party, interestingly, 28 percent received such appointments.

The implication, the authors note, is that presidents—who control some 4,000 executive and judicial positions—use their power of appointment to reward legislators who follow the chief executive's lead. The appointive jobs also serve as a "safety net" for congressmen who agree to quit the House to run for the Senate for the greater good of the party. Illinois representative Lynn Martin, for example, quit her relatively safe House seat in 1990 to

run for the Senate at the behest of GOP strategists who believed that Democratic senator Paul Simon was vulnerable. After Martin lost the election, President George Bush gave her a consolation prize: the post of secretary of labor.

Abortion Reconsidered

"The Conservative Case for Abortion" by Jerry Z. Muller, in *The New Republic* (Aug. 21 & 28, 1995), 1220 19th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036; "On Abortion: A Lincolnian Position" by George McKenna, in *The Atlantic Monthly* (Sept. 1995), 745 Boylston St., Boston, Mass. 02116.

Few issues have roiled the political waters in recent decades as much as abortion. While extremists dominate the public debate, the majority of Americans occupy an ambivalent middle. Muller, author of *Adam Smith in His Time and Ours* (1992), and McKenna, a political scientist at City College of New York, try

WJC Versus JFK

Like John F. Kennedy, President Bill Clinton is young, "addicted to action," and "thrives on chaos"—but there are also some significant differences between the men and their times, writes JFK biographer Richard Reeves in the *Washington Monthly* (Sept. 1995).

In the Clinton White House the doors are all closed, not because of a sense of secrecy, but often because someone inside is on the phone with a favored and famous reporter, giving his version of something that just happened inside the Oval Office. There is in the White House staff's willingness, even eagerness, to leak to the press an adolescent stargazing: Imagine this, Mom!—here I am chatting with Bob Woodward, or talking to Cokie Roberts about what she said on "Nightline."

In spite of the president's fury with the leaking, he does not seem to have fully confronted his own role in fueling it. Clinton told me that he was greatly impressed with [President John F.] Kennedy's ability to hold decisions open for

so long without constantly being called indecisive. "How did he do that?" Clinton asked. The answer was that Kennedy's men knew what would happen to them if they ever leaked stories of his private indecision. (When Kennedy suspected Chester Bowles, one of his closest advisers, of trying to make himself look good by letting it be known that he had opposed the Bay of Pigs decision, Bowles was ejected from the inner circle. Clinton's staff lives with no such fear.) And Kennedy did not analyze and agonize over his decisions in public. That is what I should have said [to Clinton], but I did not have the courage to tell my president in person that he should consider shutting up sometimes.

to stake out fresh positions that speak to their concerns.

It is not feminists who are the main obstacle blocking the success of the right-to-life movement, Muller contends. Rather, it is "the millions of more or less conservative middle-class parents who know that, if their teenage daughter were to become pregnant, they would advise her to get an abortion rather than marry out of necessity or go through the trauma of giving birth and then placing the child up for adoption." And many people in other circumstances—"young, unmarried, pregnant women loath to bring a child into a family-less environment; parents of a fetus known to be afflicted by a disease such as Tay-Sachs that will make its life painful and short; parents whose children are likely to be born with severe genetic defects, who know that the birth of the fetus will mean pain for them and for their other children—all choose abortion," Muller says, "not because they fetishize choice but because they value the family."

The unborn child has moral standing but sometimes, Muller says, "choosing to give birth may be socially dysfunctional, morally irresponsible or even cruel: inimical to the forces of stability and bourgeois responsibility conservatives cherish." Conservatives ought to favor abortion in such circumstances.

Even many who strongly defend abortion are uneasy about it, McKenna points out, as evidenced by the euphemisms they frequently employ. "Abortion is a 'reproductive health

procedure' or a 'termination of pregnancy.' Abortion clinics are 'reproductive health clinics' (more recently, 'women's clinics'), and the right to obtain an abortion is 'reproductive freedom,'" he notes.

Opponents of abortion, he argues, should take a leaf from Abraham Lincoln's position on the evil of slavery. In his "House Divided" speech of 1858, and in subsequent speeches and writings, "Lincoln made it clear . . . that his intention was not to abolish slavery but to 'arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in course of ultimate extinction.'" Pro-life politicians today should follow Lincoln, McKenna argues, recognizing abortion's legal status but treating it as "an evil that needs to be restricted and discouraged."

He believes that the Democratic Party is the natural home for such a Lincolnian position. The Republicans, as champions of unbridled individualism, "are pro-choice in their hearts." The Democrats, under the influence of pro-choice feminists and abortion lobbies, "are pro-choice for political reasons." But "the same formula—grudgingly tolerate, restrict, discourage—that I have applied to abortion is what liberal Democrats have been using to combat racism over the past generation," McKenna writes. In time, he thinks, Democrats may shake themselves free of the abortion lobbies and take a Lincolnian stand on abortion.

FOREIGN POLICY & DEFENSE

The Warlike Democracies

"Democratization and the Danger of War" by Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, in *International Security* (Summer 1995), Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard Univ., 79 John F. Kennedy St., Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

Shortly after U.S. peace-keeping troops landed in Haiti in 1994, U.S. National Security Advisor Anthony Lake declared that "spreading

democracy . . . serves our interests" because democracies "tend not to abuse their citizens' rights or wage war on one another."

A world full of mature, stable democracies probably would be a safer one for the United States, agree Mansfield and Snyder, political scientists at Columbia University. It is a common view. But trying to bring that world closer to reality, they argue, may promote not