

and 'journalist-historians.' " It is time, Rice believes, to open up that shop, and to encourage academic historians "to write for

the educated public, to become freely functioning intellectual citizens, [and] to be teachers in [an] expansive sense."

'Pro-Choicers' and the Fact of Life

"Our Bodies, Our Souls" by Naomi Wolf, in *The New Republic* (Oct. 16, 1995),
1220 19th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

In a recent *Atlantic Monthly* essay, George McKenna, a political scientist at City College of New York, urged that foes of abortion take "an unequivocally pro-life" position that is also "effectively pro-choice": namely, recognize the legal status of abortion and "grudgingly tolerate" it but at the same time seek to restrict and discourage it (see "The Periodical Observer," *WQ*, Autumn '95, pp. 115-16). Now, from the other side of the barricades, Wolf, a noted feminist writer, argues that abortion rights advocates should abandon their euphemistic rhetoric and admit, to themselves and others, that "the death of a fetus is a real death," and that "this country's high rate of abortion—which ends more than a quarter of all pregnancies—can only be rightly understood as what Dr. Henry Foster was brave enough to call it: 'a failure.'"

By clinging to the pretense that there is

no life and no death involved in abortion, Wolf contends, the pro-choice movement forfeits the backing of "the millions of Americans who want to support abortion as a legal right but still need to condemn it as a moral iniquity." More important, she says, "choice" proponents "entangle our beliefs in a series of self-delusions, fibs, and evasions. And we risk becoming precisely what our critics charge us with being: callous, selfish, and casually destructive men and women who share a cheapened view of human life."

Making an analogy to war, Wolf writes that abortion should remain legal and is sometimes necessary. "Only if we uphold abortion rights within a matrix of individual conscience, atonement, and responsibility," she says, "can we both correct the logical and ethical absurdity in our position—and consolidate the support of the center."

Gotham's Anticrime Wave

"How to Run a Police Department" by George L. Kelling, in *City Journal* (Autumn 1995),
Manhattan Institute, 52 Vanderbilt Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017; "Giuliani: Start
Spreading the News" by David Brooks, in *The Weekly Standard* (Nov. 13, 1995),
1150 17th St. N.W., Ste. 505, Washington, D.C. 20036-4617.

New York City's crime rate plummeted in 1994, with murder down an astonishing 32 percent and robbery down 22 percent. In the first nine months of 1995, the murder rate fell an additional 30 percent. "New York is now the safest city in America with a population over one million," declares Brooks, a senior editor at the *Weekly Standard*. The chief reason for this, he and Kelling, a criminologist at Northeastern University, contend, is the militant anticrime strategy adopted by Mayor Rudolph Giuliani and Police Commissioner William Bratton since they took office in early 1994.

Their approach draws on the "Broken Windows" thesis that Kelling and political scientist James Q. Wilson advanced more than a decade ago: that disorder and petty

crimes, if ignored, make decent citizens fearful and put a neighborhood on the skids, and eventually lead to an upsurge in serious crime. Hence, writes Kelling, "the best way to prevent major crimes and urban decay is to target minor crimes—panhandling, youths taking over parks, prostitution, public drinking, and public urination."

This runs counter to the traditional view that serious crime is the only proper business of the police. But the Giuliani-Bratton strategy seems to be working (even if the two men have feuded over who deserves the credit). "The streets and parks are cleaner," Brooks notes. "Aggressive panhandling has been curtailed. The homeless now tend to spend their days sitting on park benches, whereas before they were likely to be found sleeping on the sidewalk. . . . New York [is