
Fulbright, the son of a wealthy farmer and banker who settled in Fayetteville, a small university town in the northwest corner of Arkansas, "had almost no personal contact with the poverty and racism characteristic of much of the South," Woods notes. Although he supported Johnson's Great Society and was one of the era's foremost spokesmen for liberal internationalism, Fulbright was in some ways deeply conservative. His opposition to the war, Woods says, stemmed from his determination "to preserve the traditional features of Anglo-American civilization—a republican form of government, rule by an educated elite, reverence for the law and tradition, political stability, and a humane free enterprise system." Fulbright feared that LBJ's unwise venture in Vietnam was endangering America's own republican institutions. Imperialism and republicanism were not compatible.

"If Fulbright's philosophy was rooted in the Anglophilia and class-consciousness of Arkansas's planting aristocracy, it grew also out of the mind-set of the southern highlanders who populated the Ozark mountains," Woods writes. "Their salient features—a stubborn independence and an ingrained tendency to resist established authority—contributed significantly to Fulbright's stance toward the war in Vietnam." So did his opposition to the Civil Rights movement, which he saw as largely just another effort by the North to impose its will and culture on the South.

Looking upon Southeast Asia with a southerner's historical memory, Woods says, Fulbright was led "to identify both with his own nation, embroiled in a hopeless war half a world away, and with Vietnam, struggling desperately to fend off a larger imperial power."

ECONOMICS, LABOR & BUSINESS

Turning Grain Into Gold

"The Coming Boom in American Agriculture" by Thomas J. Duesterberg, in *Hudson Briefing Paper* (May 1994), Hudson Institute, Herman Kahn Center, P.O. Box 26-919, Indianapolis, Ind. 46226.

It is no small irony that America's oldest industry is one of its strongest. Despite floods in the Midwest and drought in the South, U.S. agricultural exports in 1993 were close to the all-time high of \$43 billion. The surplus in agricultural products cut the overall U.S. trade deficit by more than \$19 billion. Now, argues Duesterberg, director of the Hudson Institute's Competitiveness Center, if the United States can take advantage of huge markets developing in Asia, Latin America, and elsewhere, U.S. farmers and food processors could sell an additional \$90 billion worth of their products overseas.

The key is rapid economic growth in East Asia and Latin America, including Chile, Argentina, and Mexico. As incomes go up, Duesterberg points out, so do appetites for more highly nu-

tritious foods such as milk products, meats, fruits, and vegetables. Asia's three billion people now consume, on average, only about 11 grams of high-quality protein per day, while the affluent Japanese take in about 52 grams per day (which is 20 fewer grams than Americans ingest). In recent years, China's consumption of pork has increased by three million tons annually, while in India milk consumption has grown by about two million tons per year.

If the trends toward higher incomes and better diets continue in Asia, estimates Dennis Avery, director of the Hudson Institute's Center for Global Food Issues, consumption of livestock and poultry there will grow by 500 percent over the next 20 years. The annual demand for grain alone would grow by 200 million tons.

It is often said that American farmers are the most productive and efficient in the world, and the United States is far and away the leading exporter of farm products. But that does not guarantee a bigger U.S. share of the market. The United States over the last decade has seen no substantial increase in its total farm exports.

Despite the end of the Cold War and the expansion of global trade, most nations still believe that they should "feed themselves," and many, including Japan and those of the European Union, provide massive subsidies to their farmers. The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and other agreements have only begun to open foreign markets, Duesterberg says.

A looming obstacle to U.S. farmers is the effort by "zealots" at home to ban the use of pesticides and biotechnology, which lift farm productivity without posing significant dangers to the environment, Duesterberg says. "A far-greater . . . environmental catastrophe," he writes, "would ensue if the world's farmers cut down forests equal in size to the entire land mass of South America—which is what they would have to do to meet world food demand using only organic farming." Duesterberg's formula for the 21st century might be summed up by the slogan: A free hand at home, free markets abroad.

Back to Hearth and Home?

"Are Women Leaving the Labor Force?" by Howard V. Hayghe, in *Monthly Labor Review* (July 1994), Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C. 20212.

Are more and more wives and mothers getting fed up with the world of work and choosing to stay at home? The percentage of women who had jobs, or were looking for them, rose consistently for nearly three decades, but that growth

has faltered in recent years, particularly among younger women. Trend spotters in the news media have begun to rumble about what *Barron's* calls "a quiet counterrevolution." The facts, declares Hayghe, an economist at the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, tell a different story.

Although the percentage of women 16 and older in the work force fell by a fraction after 1990, it rebounded in 1992. Last year, 57.9 percent of all women were in the work force, a half-point increase over 1990. Among teenagers, however, there was a pronounced drop, from a high of 53.9 percent in 1989 to 49.9 percent last year. Among women aged 20 to 24, meanwhile, there was also a notable decline, from a high of 73.0 percent in the labor force in 1987 to 71.3 percent last year. Where did the "missing" girls and young women go? Probably to school, Hayghe believes.

If women in significant numbers were returning to the traditional wife-and-homemaker role, Hayghe points out, there should be more "traditional" one-earner families and fewer "dual-earner" ones. In fact, according to the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey, the dual-earner family in 1992, at 69.8 percent of all two-parent families, was about as common as it had been five years earlier, and the proportion of traditional male-breadwinner families had shrunk—from 26.6 percent in 1987 to 25.4 percent in 1992. What did increase during that period (from 3.9 percent to 4.8 percent of two-parent families), the economist notes, was the proportion of families in which the father was not a breadwinner at all. Hardly a sign of a conservative counterrevolution.

SOCIETY

High-Fidelity America

"Marital Infidelity" by Andrew Greeley, in *Society* (May-June 1994), Rutgers-The State University, New Brunswick, N.J. 08903.

If such fountains of scholarship as Alfred Kinsey's famous "reports," *Cosmopolitan*, and

Shere Hite's *Hite Report* (1987) are to be believed, there's a whole lot of cheating going on in America. In his 1948 and 1953 tomes, Kinsey said that about half the men in his samples, and a quarter of the women, had committed adultery. More recently, *Cosmopolitan* and Hite came up with even higher figures: Just over half of married women and 72 percent of mar-