

SOCIETY

the poor to use these facilities.

Americans tend to favor reforms that have little direct impact on them. Thus, 60 percent back federal price controls on doctors' services. Yet, Americans are nearly unanimous in their opposition to a British-style nationalized medical-care system or to curtailing federal spending for high-technology treatments such as kidney dialysis, which costs Washington about \$20,000 per patient per year.

A public so muddled in its thinking will be hard to lead, the authors say. But they believe that doctors should make it their business to turn public opinion around and begin the hard work of cutting costs.

*State Lotteries:
Few Winners*

"The Social and Economic Impact of State Lotteries" by H. Roy Kaplan, in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (July 1984), Sage Publications, 275 South Beverly Dr., Beverly Hills, Calif. 90212.

State governments are gambling that lotteries will provide a painless way to increase revenues. But to H. Roy Kaplan, a sociologist at the Florida Institute of Technology, lotteries are a poor substitute for "dependable, equitable, and responsible methods of revenue generation."

Using games of chance to finance public projects is nothing new. The Virginia Company raised money for its 1607 settlement in Jamestown through sales of lottery tickets, a method also used by the 1777 Continental Congress to pay for the American Revolution. (Benjamin Franklin, legendary for his frugality, was nevertheless an avid bettor.) After 1800, countless lotteries were sponsored by state and local governments as well as churches and colleges—including Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. The sales were nothing to sneeze at. The citizens of New York State bought \$1.5 million in lottery tickets in 1826. Lotteries were, however, invitations to corruption, and scandals cooled the lottery craze. By 1878, they were illegal in every state but Louisiana.

New Hampshire began today's revival by launching its new lottery in 1963. Now, 17 states run lotteries, claiming that they are needed to



An 1820 ticket for a lottery sponsored by the state of Pennsylvania. The proceeds were earmarked for the "improvement of internal navigation."

SOCIETY

boost sagging revenues and that they draw customers away from organized crime's illegal gambling enterprises. (Last November, voters in three more states authorized the creation of new lotteries.)

In fact, state lotteries have disappointing records, Kaplan says. The lotteries provide only three percent (\$2 billion) of the total revenues of the states that sponsor them. Boosting state income taxes by as little as one quarter of one percent would raise the same amount. Lotteries are not only less efficient than taxes, they are less fair. The poor spend a larger proportion of their income on such games of chance than do the well off. Finally, the hope that legalized gambling would hurt organized crime has proved to be an illusion.

Above all, Kaplan is critical of state governments that encourage their citizens to hinge "their aspirations for better lives on the ephemeral possibility of winning." He hopes that the 30 lottery-free states will stay that way.

Black Farmers In the Old South

"Black Family Formation and Tenancy in the Farm South, 1900" by Stewart E. Tolnay, in *American Journal of Sociology* (Sept. 1984), University of Chicago Press, Journals Division, P.O. Box 37005, Chicago, Ill. 60637.

In the American South after the Civil War, many ex-slaves, newly liberated from the great plantations, were quickly caught in a new trap: tenant farming. Tolnay, a University of Georgia sociologist, believes that the new mode of agriculture greatly harmed the black family.

After the war, many freed slaves hoped that Washington would redistribute southern lands, giving them a modest "40 acres and a mule." Instead, plantation owners retained their property and divided it up into small tracts, which they leased to their former slaves for cash or a share of the crops produced. About 75 percent of southern blacks became tenant farmers, Tolnay reports. (Some 36 percent of southern *white* farmers also rented their land.)

What difference did that make to black families? If blacks had become landowners instead of renters, Tolnay maintains, they probably would have married later and borne fewer children. In societies of "peasant" landowners, young men often delay marrying until they inherit land or save enough to buy it. Tenant farmers have no such incentives. In fact, data from the U.S. census of 1900 show that black men in areas of the South where tenant farming was prevalent married roughly two and one-half years earlier (at an average age of 22.8) than did their counterparts elsewhere in the South.

Once married, peasant farmers would often "restrict the number of their offspring as a strategy for improving their children's chances of buying a farm or to assure that their own landholding was divided among a small number of heirs." For tenant farmers, however, it made more sense to have as many children as possible to put to work in the fields. And by 1900, the average black farm family had eight children.