

around narrowly targeted financial, lobbying, and political interests, write Tyler Marshall, a former *Los Angeles Times* foreign correspondent, and the editors at Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism. Newsletters covering Washington alone have increased by nearly two-thirds. Niche publications are frequently financed by high-priced subscriptions or image advertising from corporations trying to influence policymakers.

The effect of the change from mainstream to niche media is likely to be that people who seek to influence policy will have access to more information than ever, while those affected by it but not organized to shape it will have less, the authors write.

Meanwhile, the size of the Washington contingent of reporters for

foreign media outlets has mushroomed. In 1968, the U.S. State Department reported the presence of about 160 foreign correspondents in the capital. Last year, there were 1,490. The Washington bureau of the Arab satellite channel al-Jazeera has grown in eight years from zero to a staff of 105—nearly as large as that of CBS News's radio and television operations combined, according to Pew.

The foreign correspondents—who typically have little access to policymakers in Washington—are likely to explain American political events to their audiences in considerably different terms than the American news agencies that as recently as the 1990s dominated the dissemination of Washington news.

Viewing American events through the prism of the national and cultural interests of foreign

correspondents' home countries certainly makes a difference in what is considered newsworthy. On February 5, the BBC World Service gave prominent website display to Senate votes to soften a "Buy American" clause in the economic stimulus proposal. Al-Jazeera featured remarks by former vice president Dick Cheney that the new administration might be going "soft" on Al Qaeda by closing Guantánamo Bay. Al-Arabiya, another Middle East satellite channel, focused on how upcoming U.S.-European diplomatic talks might deal with Iran.

On the same day, CNN International featured a story on the president's push to pass his economic package, and his effort to expand the office of faith-based initiatives.

HISTORY

The First Civil War

THE SOURCE: "An Evenly Balanced County: The Scope and Severity of Civil Warfare in Revolutionary Monmouth County, New Jersey" by Michael S. Adelberg, in *The Journal of Military History*, Jan. 2009.

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION was not a simple matter of downtrodden colonists rising up as one against their British oppressors. Revolutionary fervor was a minority sentiment. President John Adams later estimated that the population split into thirds: one-third loyalist, one-third revolutionary, and one-third neutral. Throughout the colonies,

neighbor was pitted against neighbor in a series of local civil wars.

An analysis of thousands of records in a single New Jersey county by historian Michael S. Adelberg has produced a somewhat different picture of the split, with considerably more residents trying to be neutral than Adams estimated, some of them "trimmers" or "flip-floppers" who changed sides during the course of the conflict. Among the committed, supporters of the Revolution outnumbered Loyalists in Monmouth County, a relatively prosperous

jurisdiction of about 12,500 people along the Atlantic coast. It was a military frontier, only nominally under patriot control, and close enough to British encampments that Loyalists had ready access to supplies and sanctuaries. The last great battle of the war in the North was fought at Monmouth Courthouse in 1778, when a British general marched his troops and their 12-mile-long baggage train across the county to reach the safety of New York. After a dramatic battle waged inconclusively in 100-degree heat, the British escaped under cover of night, but the colonists had fought them to a standoff.

Throughout the war, Adelberg found, the county's population was split, with 1,933 individuals favoring



Astride a horse presented to him only that morning, George Washington rallies his retreating soldiers at Monmouth Courthouse in a battle that made him America's undisputed commander in chief.

the insurgency and 1,622 supporting British rule—a division only slightly greater in percentage terms to that between Barack Obama and John McCain in the 2008 election.

Another 2,910 persons were neutral, switched sides, or left no records, stories, or letters to identify their political leanings. Very little was recorded of the views of the county's women, and almost nothing is known about those of its 1,000 African Americans.

Antagonism between Americans contributed substantially to the cost of the war. Monmouth County's Joshua Studson was among those who paid dearly, but he did not die at the hands of the British. A successful privateer who captured three British ships, Studson was shot and killed in a militia boat in 1780 as he pursued a party of his own countrymen who had remained loyal to King George III.

Adelberg's statistical research in the Monmouth historical archives revealed that nearly one local man in five suffered direct, serious effects from the conflict. Of the 5,466 men for whom Adelberg could find

records, 143 were killed, 77 wounded, and 332 captured. Another 372 lost property and 379 were punished in the legal system. Twice as many Loyalists suffered as patriots.

HISTORY

History by Name

THE SOURCE: "The Child of Death: Personal Names and Parental Attitudes Towards Mortality in Bunyoro, Western Uganda, 1900–2005" by Shane Doyle, in *Journal of African History*, Nov. 2008.

ACCUSTOMED TO THE LUSH details of sources such as the Code of Hammurabi of 1760 BC, the Domesday Book of 1086, and the 1692 Salem court transcripts, many historians have disdained African history because it offers so few written records. But inventive researchers have recently found new sources. Baby names, for example, paint a remarkably revealing picture of village life in western Uganda from 1900 to 2005, particularly the rise of Christianity and the ever-present specter of death.

Parents in Bunyoro Province bestowed names on their children in the first few decades of the 20th century that revealed marital strife, neighborhood conflict, changing beliefs, and attempts at ethnic integration, writes Shane Doyle, a historian at the University of Leeds. Many of those names reflected all-too-common fears. Of all the recorded names given to newborns from 1900 to 1959, almost a third directly referred to death:

Karafa (This child will die), Nkafrika (I am the only survivor), and Bagada (What a waste of energy).

The Bunyoro culture left a large collection of names referring to hidden enemies; for instance, Barungindoho meant "They are nice to my face." Some fathers selected names designed to trick death into thinking that the child was unimportant. Kunobere (I hate this child) and Kabaingi (So many children) were quite common, Doyle says.

During World War I, more than 40 percent of all recorded baby names were death related. (Bunyoro Province lost both doctors and farmers to the British war effort and suffered several epidemics.) The proportion dropped to 25 percent in the 1940s, and reached a colonial-era low of about 15 percent just before Uganda achieved independence in 1962.

The baby names Doyle analyzed were retrieved from baptismal records, which represented about 37 percent of all births in the province by 1924. Because the richest residents tended to become Anglicans and the poorest to remain Muslims or believers in indigenous spirits, the Christian