

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.

SOCIETY

Tenant farmers' children had little prospect of improving their lot. Needed as farm hands, they received little schooling. At the same time, the plenitude of cheap labor reduced farmers' incentives to invest in modern tractors, irrigation systems, and other technology. The result, in Tolnay's view, was an "ugly cycle" of rural poverty whose effects are still being felt today.

PRESS & TELEVISION

Post-Mortem for Newspapers

"Why Newspapers Die" by David Skylar, in *The Quill* (July-Aug. 1984), 840 North Lake Shore Dr., Ste. 801W, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

During the past 35 years, 253 U.S. daily newspapers have ceased publication, and 145 have merged with other papers. During 1982 alone, the presses stopped at three major dailies—the *Philadelphia Bulletin*, the *Cleveland Press*, and the *Buffalo Courier-Express*.

"Television is killing newspapers," lament failing publishers. Nonsense, says Skylar, a consultant to the newspaper industry. He contends that bad management by top press executives is usually to blame. "Newspapers don't compete against TV at all," he maintains. "They compete for readers, who read, as opposed to watchers, who watch." (Only 20 percent of all households tune in to the TV evening news on any one day.) Publishers of magazines and books have expanded their audiences at least as quickly as the population has grown. Only newspapers have failed to keep pace. Between 1950 and 1980, while the U.S. population swelled by 70 million, newspapers won only 8.5 million new readers.

Skylar also disposes quickly of other common explanations for newspaper failures. One is that TV evening news broadcasts inevitably "scoop" afternoon papers, thereby dooming them to redundancy. Actually, 1,258 of the nation's 1,699 dailies hit the streets after noon, and most of them, while relatively small, are in good health.

Equally unconvincing to Skylar is the notion that newspapers face economic hard times. Overall, the business is "outrageously profitable," he says. The industry rings up \$18 billion in advertising revenues annually—equal to all radio and TV income combined. On top of that, publishers take in \$5 billion from newsstand and subscription sales.

Skylar believes that publicly owned newspaper chains (e.g., Gannett, Knight-Ridder, the New York Times Company), whose shares are traded on the stock markets, generally do better than their privately owned competitors. The reason: They "have sophisticated marketing management to cope with adverse conditions, to anticipate change. They constantly reinvest in their people and products." The Hearst, Scripps-Howard, and Newhouse chains, all privately held, have suffered more than their share of newspaper failures. Skylar accuses their top management of an "accountant mentality," of worrying more