

ECONOMICS, LABOR & BUSINESS

tranced by the machine, but only 4,000 were sold in four years.

Why did the typewriter take so long to become a success? Monaco, a free-lance writer, cites economic, commercial, and social reasons. First, the country experienced a major recession in 1873, making the typewriter's \$125 price too expensive for most people when per capita personal income was less than \$200 a year. Second, Sholes mismarketed his machine, targeting the government and individuals (e.g., men of letters) as potential buyers rather than selling it to business managers as a record-keeping tool. (The first 16 typewriters to leave the Remington plant were shipped to court reporters, in the hope that they would provide favorable testimonials.) Third, typewritten correspondence was deemed insulting. A typewritten letter, observes Monaco, "suggested either that the sender thought the receiver was incapable of deciphering handwriting or that the letter was really an advertising circular." Lastly, there was a fear of forgery; the signatures of early typewritten letters were typed. It did not seem to occur to anyone to do otherwise.

In 1878, the "Remington No. 2" appeared on the market. It was a more practical machine, offering such needed improvements as a shift key, which allowed upper and lower case letters on the same keyboard. These innovations came at a time when businesses were starting to expand from sole proprietorships into large organizations with specialized units; the typewriter satisfied the demand for more complex record keeping and efficient communication between departments. Even a mediocre typist, Monaco notes, was more productive than a pen-wielding clerk.

By 1886, "almost every sizable office" employed a typist. By 1888, demand for Remingtons far exceeded the 18,000 produced each year, and by 1891 the Remington had dozens of competitors. Yet resistance to the typewriter persisted; Sears, Roebuck and Company still sent handwritten letters to its rural customers for years after the typewriter was widely accepted. And only in 1899 did the U.S. Treasury Department begin keeping its records in typewritten form.

SOCIETY

Day-Care Debate

"Brave New World" by Karl Zinsmeister, in *Policy Review* (Spring 1988), Heritage Foundation, 214 Massachusetts Ave. N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002.

A rising number of children in the United States are being raised by hired workers, rather than by parents or family. A 1984 Census Bureau study reported that eight percent of working mothers rear their children themselves, 40 percent give them to relatives during the day, and 52 percent hire others to tend their offspring.

However, according to Zinsmeister, a free-lance writer and demographer, evidence is growing indicating that, overall, no form of day care by outsiders can match the care mothers (and fathers) give to young children.

SOCIETY

Zinsmeister argues that during the 1980s, demand for day care has already exceeded the supply of people, qualified or not, willing to look after the children of others. As a result, a typical caretaker is responsible for more youngsters (up to 15) than he or she can really handle. A teacher may tire; in New York state, 40 percent of the teachers in day care, on average, quit each year. Like schools, day-care centers are places of contagion; U.S. public health officials warn that these centers are partially responsible for a rise in childhood diarrhea, dysentery, and jaundice.

Some child psychologists (notably Jay Belsky of Pennsylvania State University) warn that placing children in day care before age one results in "weak and insecure bonds" between children and parents. "Babies," says Burton White, director of the Harvard Preschool Project, "form their first human attachment only once." A 1985 study from the University of North Carolina found that five- to six-year-olds who spent time in day care were more likely to hit and argue than were their parent-raised counterparts.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 55 percent of mothers with children under three do *not* work, and an additional 20 percent work part time or seasonally. To encourage more mothers to work at home, Zinsmeister calls on employers to provide more part-time and "takeout" work for their employees. Also, the federal tax code could be revised by 1) doubling the existing tax exemptions (\$1,950 per person) for children only and 2) converting the child-care tax credit into a deduction for all parents, whether they pay others for care or provide it themselves. Such changes, he believes, would result in "more secure children, happier parents, a healthier society."

Native Americans

"American Indian Household Structure and Income" by Gary D. Sandefur and Arthur Sakamoto, in *Demography* (Feb. 1988), Population Association of America, 1429 Duke St., Alexandria, Va. 22314-3402.

American Indians, as a group, are among the nation's least affluent people. Sandefur and Sakamoto, sociologists at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, find a surprising source of Indians' economic survival: the dominance of the traditional family.

Forty-three percent of Indians lived in traditional two-parent households with children in 1980, compared to only 30 percent of whites and 24 percent of blacks. Eleven percent of Indians lived in single-parent families, more than whites (six percent) but less than blacks (20 percent).

Indians also tended to have larger families than either whites or blacks; 3.3 people live in an average Indian family, compared to 2.6 for whites and 3.0 for blacks. Thanks to family patterns, per capita income in *all* Indian households averaged \$5,998 in 1980, less than whites' (\$8,810) but slightly more than blacks' (\$5,570). However, people in households headed by single mothers did less well; per capita income in such families was \$2,595 for Indians, \$2,536 for blacks.

Nationally, the poverty rate for Indians (22 percent) is slightly lower than that of blacks (29 percent), but double that of whites (11 percent). The dominance of the Indian two-parent household helps; because single-