



*Britain recruited many non-English colonists for the New World, including these German Moravians shown building a stockade at Gnadenshütten, near present-day Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.*

England's economy and military might grew in the early 18th century, imperial officials began looking elsewhere for colonists—chiefly, Scotland, Ireland, and Germany. “The new recruitment,” says Taylor, “invented America as an asylum from religious persecution and political oppression in Europe” (so long as the immigrants were Protestants). The

years 1700 to 1775 brought 145,000 Scots—many of whom preserved their Gaelic speech and customs—and 100,000 Germans. These foreigners outnumbered English newcomers 3 to 1. Thomas Paine was not indulging in his usual hyperbole when he declared, “If there is a country in the world where concord would be least expected, it is America.”

## *Smart but Single*

“How the B.A. Gap Widens the Chasm between Men and Women” by Andrew Hacker, in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (June 20, 2003), 1255 23rd St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

The growing gender gap on America's campuses may be ushering in a new era of life without marriage for educated women, contends Hacker, a political scientist at New York City's Queens College. It's happened before, though on a smaller scale: Through the early decades of the 20th century, graduates of women's colleges such as Vassar, Wellesley, and Bryn Mawr were less likely to wed. (“Only our failures marry,” M. Carey Thomas, a legendary Bryn Mawr president, defiantly proclaimed.)

Though, as Hacker notes, the term *spinster* “has disappeared, as has a presumption of celibacy,” the gendered disparity in numbers is a fact: For every 100 women who received a bachelor's degree last year, only 75 men did. The gap, he says, is making it harder for edu-

cated women to find equally educated mates.

Not so long ago, he points out, the collegiate sexual tables were turned: For every 100 men who obtained a college degree in 1960, only 54 women did. Such women were more likely to find husbands who'd also graduated, and the surplus of college-educated males meant that women who'd skipped higher education had a better chance of “marrying up.” Secretaries wed young executives; nurses wed doctors.

Today, however, it is men who increasingly “marry up”: Nearly 40 percent of married female graduates ages 25 to 34 have less educated husbands. But many educated women these days are unwilling to “marry down,” Hacker asserts. “As more and more women have experienced

higher education, they have developed higher expectations about what they want from life”—and set “higher standards” for potential husbands.

“[Women] have always had what it takes to be good students,” writes Hacker, “and ex-

panding opportunities over the last century have given them the chance to demonstrate that.” But as it almost always does in life, success exacts a toll. Among Americans who earn more than \$100,000 a year, 83 percent of the men are married, but only 58 percent of the women.

PRESS & MEDIA

## *The Daily Web*

“The Next Great American Newspaper” by David Gelernter, in *The Weekly Standard* (June 23, 2003), 1150 17th St., N.W., Ste. 505, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Newspapers on the World Wide Web have their minor uses, but they’re so-o-o boring—little imitation-newsprint newspapers that are standoffish and hard to browse. Gelernter, a computer scientist at Yale University, thinks that “America’s next great newspaper” will be published on the Web but that it will be very different from today’s “conventional Web-based losers.”

“No Web newspaper will match all of newsprint’s best qualities,” says Gelernter, “but Web designers should *understand* those qualities so they can concoct new ones that are (in their ways) equally attractive.” A print newspaper, in his view, is “a slab of space . . . that is *browsable* and *transparent*. Browsable is what a newspaper is for: to offer readers a smorgasbord of stories, pictures, ads, and let them choose

EXCERPT

### *Disgrace in Baghdad*

*Terror, totalitarian states, and their ways are nothing new to me, but I felt from the start that [Iraq] was in a category by itself, with the possible exception in the present world of North Korea. I felt that that was the central truth that has to be told about this place. It was also the essential truth that was untold by the vast majority of correspondents here. Why? Because they judged that the only way they could keep themselves in play here was to pretend that it was okay.*

*There were correspondents who thought it appropriate to seek the approbation of the people who governed their lives. This was the ministry of information, and particularly the director of the ministry. By taking him out for long candlelit dinners, plying him with sweet cakes, plying him with mobile phones at \$600 each for members of his family, and giving bribes of thousands of dollars. Senior members of the information ministry took hundreds of thousands of dollars of bribes from these television correspondents who then behaved as if they were in Belgium. They never mentioned the function of minders. Never mentioned terror.*

*In one case, a correspondent actually went to the Internet Center at the Al-Rashid Hotel and printed out copies of his and other people’s stories—mine included—specifically in order to be able to show the difference between himself and the others. He wanted to show what a good boy he was compared to this enemy of the state. He was with a major American newspaper.*

*Yeah, it was an absolutely disgraceful performance.*

—New York Times correspondent John F. Burns in *editorandpublisher.com* (Sept. 15, 2003), an excerpt from *Embedded: The Media at War in Iraq, an Oral History*, by Bill Katovsky and Timothy Carlson.