
SOCIETY

With so much good fortune around, wondered Kaplan, a sociologist at the Florida Institute of Technology, what becomes of the people who win?

Between July and September 1984, he surveyed 576 lottery winners (their prizes ranging from \$10,000 to several million dollars). He found that despite the financial cornucopia, "the vast majority of winners and their spouses kept working." Specifically, only 11 percent of 446 winners and 13 percent of their 253 spouses who were employed at the time quit their jobs within a year of receiving the unexpected bonus. Moreover, Kaplan discovered that although nearly three-quarters of the adults in the surveyed group were married, "fewer of them are separated or divorced now than when they won, challenging the popular stereotype that money windfalls destroy marriages."

Some trends were predictable: The larger the cash prize, the more likely a victor was to leave his occupation. Nearly one-fourth of the million-dollar winners quit their jobs; no one getting a prize of less than \$50,000 quit. Money was not the only deciding factor. Almost 40 percent of all lottery winners aged 65 or older chose to retire; many younger winners quit but did not leave the labor force permanently. (A handful of recipients had to leave their workplaces because of jealous supervisors.) Those winners most likely to stay on the job tended to be middle-aged, college-educated professionals. Their less educated counterparts were more likely to opt for change. Frequently, recipients who quit jobs used the cash surge to indulge their interest in other serious pursuits—graduate school, part-time writing, and full-time motherhood.

Kaplan sees all this as good evidence that the American work ethic still has plenty of devoted adherents.

PRESS & TELEVISION

Fair News

"Views on the News" by William Schneider and I. A. Lewis, in *Public Opinion* (Sept. 1985), American Enterprise Institute, 1150 17th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Either the American public is quiescent these days, or America's journalists are doing a superb job. Whatever the case, Schneider and Lewis, a pollster for the *Los Angeles Times* and a Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, respectively, report that Americans voice few complaints against the people who bring them the news.

While surveys show that U.S. journalists lean to the Left politically, most Americans detect little bias in their reporting. A February 1985 nationwide poll taken by the *Los Angeles Times* queried 2,993 members of the general public and 2,703 journalists from 621 U.S. newspapers and found that a majority of journalists called themselves "liberal," while less than one-quarter of the population shared their sentiments.

In general, reporters and editors opposed increased defense spending,

PRESS & TELEVISION

Big Business, and prayer in public schools, and they favored divestment from South Africa, affirmative action, and abortion rights, consistently more often than the average American. Yet fewer than half of the news readers surveyed characterized their daily newspaper as either liberal or conservative; those with an opinion split evenly between the two assessments. Moreover, regarding the newspaper they read, those surveyed gave "positive" ratings for: overall performance (96 percent); staff quality (83 percent); accuracy (91 percent); and impartiality (84 percent).

The authors maintain that "there is no evidence that people perceive the newspapers they read as biased strongly to the Left. . . . Those with an opinion see their newspapers as sharing the public's (more conservative) views, not the prevailing liberalism of the reporters and editors."

Television news coverage also received a strong endorsement, note Schneider and Lewis. The viewers polled gave ratings of "fairly good" and "very good" to local TV news (95 percent) and network TV news (91 percent). The viewers objected only to a perceived "negativism." Roughly two-thirds of the respondents criticized the print and broadcast media for "overdramatizing," stressing "bad news," and "putting too much emphasis on what is wrong with America and not enough on what is right."

Despite such occasionally sharp criticisms, the authors conclude that, with respect to the Fourth Estate, "public opinion . . . is still heavily tilted in the positive direction."

RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY

Holy Days

"Lubavitcher Hasidim" by Lis Harris, in *The New Yorker* (Sept. 16-30, 1985), 25 West 43rd St., New York, N.Y. 10036.

Along the Eastern Parkway in Brooklyn, N.Y., men garbed in black with long beards and broad-brimmed hats are often seen chanting at sundown on Friday nights, before going to synagogue. These Lubavitchers, members of a branch of Judaism called Hasidism, have been congregating in Brooklyn's Crown Heights section since the mid-1930s, when they first emigrated from Eastern Europe.

Devoutly orthodox in their religious rituals, notes Harris, a writer for the *New Yorker*, Hasidim (pious ones) place "prayer, mysticism, dancing, singing, storytelling, and the sanctification of daily life on an equal footing with Talmudic scholarship [the study of Jewish laws]." The Lubavitchers are the largest Hasidic contingent, but other smaller groups—the Belzers, Bobovers, Satmarers (whose names derive from their Ukrainian and Hungarian cities of origin)—add to the estimated 250,000 Hasidim worldwide. Nearly 200,000 of them live in the United States, roughly one-half of them in Brooklyn.

In 18th-century Lithuania, around the town of Vilna (then a major center of Old Testament study), Hasidism first took hold. There, Rabbi Israel ben