Journalism Online

- Our Founders

|STEVEN BRILL

Steven Brill, a graduate of Yale College ('72) and Yale Law School ('75), conceived of the idea for Journalism Online as his most recent enterprise. He envisioned a new company to offer an innovative system for newspaper, magazine and other online publishers to realize revenue from the digital distribution of the original journalism they produce.

For the last eight years, Brill has also taught a seminar for aspiring journalists at Yale College. In 2006, Brill and his wife Cynthia (also Yale College '72) expanded that seminar by endowing the Yale Journalism Initiative — an array of non-fiction writing activities, career counseling services and supported internships aimed at channeling Yale students into the profession. In 2007, Yale Law School announced that Brill was providing significant support to a grant from the Knight Foundation aimed at establishing a similar journalism program at the Law School, and in 2009 Brill began teaching (with First Amendment attorney Floyd Abrams and *New York Times* reporter Adam Liptak) a seminar at Yale Law School covering modern media law issues, including how the Internet has affected journalism and the media industry.

Brill worked his way through Yale Law School by writing for *New York* and *Harper's* magazines. When he graduated, he became a legal columnist for *Esquire* and wrote a best-selling book about the Teamsters Union. In 1978, he founded *The American Lawyer* magazine, which soon expanded into a national chain of daily and weekly legal newspapers. In 1991, he launched Court TV. He sold the legal publications and Court TV in 1997 and returned to journalism full time, with the founding of *Brill's Content*, a magazine about the media which ceased publication in 2001. Brill then researched and wrote "AFTER," a book focusing on the aftermath of the September 11th attacks, which was published in 2003, while also serving as a *Newsweek* columnist and a consultant to NBC on the same subject.

GORDON CROVITZ

Gordon Crovitz is a media executive and advisor to media and technology companies. He is a former publisher of *The Wall Street Journal* and former executive vice-president of Dow Jones, where he launched the company's Consumer Media Group. Under his decade-long leadership, the Wall Street Journal Online became the largest paid subscription news site on the web, with more than one million paying subscribers. He founded the online news service Factiva and is a member of the board of directors of the news and information provider ProQuest, both of which provide highly profitable revenues to news publishers.

He is an advisor to several technology-based media companies in California and New York and was named to the "Silicon Alley 100" for 2008. He writes the weekly "Information Age" column in *The Wall Street Journal*.

While at Dow Jones, he turned around the financial performance of *The Wall Street Journal* to become strongly profitable after earlier losing money, including strong growth in circulation revenue in print and on the web. He led the acquisition of publicly traded MarketWatch as well as specialist services Private Equity Analyst, VentureOne and VentureWire, London-based news franchise eFinancial News and Frankfurt-based newswire VWD. Earlier in his career at Dow Jones, he served as the corporate vice president for planning and strategy. He was editor and publisher of the *Far Eastern Economic Review* in Hong Kong and founding editorial page editor of the *Wall Street Journal Europe* in Brussels.

He is a graduate of the University of Chicago and has law degrees from Oxford University, where he was a Rhodes scholar, and Yale Law School. He and his wife, Minky Worden, live in New York with their two sons.

LEO HINDERY, JR.

Leo Hindery, Jr. is Managing Partner of InterMedia Partners, LP, a New York-based media industry private equity fund manager which he first founded in 1988.

Until October 2004, Mr. Hindery was Chairman (and until May 2004 Chief Executive Officer) of The YES Network, the nation's largest regional sports network which he founded in the summer of 2001 as the television home of the New York Yankees. From December 1999 until January 2001, Mr. Hindery was Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of GlobalCenter Inc., a major Internet services company, which was then merged into Exodus Communications, Inc. Until November 1999, Mr. Hindery was President and Chief Executive Officer of AT&T Broadband, which was formed out of the $48 billion March 1999 merger of Tele-Communications, Inc. (TCI) into AT&T. Mr. Hindery was elected President of TCI and all of its affiliated companies, then the world's largest cable television system operator and programming entity, in February 1997, when he was Managing Partner of the original InterMedia Partners.

Mr. Hindery is Chairman of the Smart Globalization Initiative at the New America Foundation and a Member of the Council on Foreign Relations. He is a Trustee of New School University; a Director of the Minority Media & Telecommunications Council, the Paley Center for Media, and Teach for America; and a member of the Board of Visitors of the Columbia School of Journalism.

Mr. Hindery has in the past been recognized as International Cable Executive of the Year, Cable Television Operator of the Year, one of *Business Week's* "Top 25 Executives of the Year," and one of the cable industry's "25 Most Influential Executives Over the Past 25 Years." He is the author of *"It Takes a CEO: It's Time to Lead With Integrity"* (Free Press, 2005) and "The Biggest Game of All" (Free Press, 2003).

SENIOR STAFF

KEN FICARA

Ken Ficara, lead technologist, has dual backgrounds in journalism and computer science and has been working in online news for two decades. He was part of the team that founded *The Wall Street Journal Online*, the web's first and largest paid news site, and oversaw the implementation of three generations of its commerce system. He also wrote many of its editing systems, led its first major redesign and rearchitecture, and managed new product developments on the site for a decade. For many years he was the only person with both bylined articles and production software on the Journal's web servers.

Through his consulting firm, Harmonica LLC, he does content management and product development work for media companies including newspapers, radio stations and trade publishers. He specializes in using mashup techniques and web-2.0 APIs to create lightweight and flexible systems, including one the editors of the well-known *American Institute of Architects Guide to New York City* are using to manage thousands of photos and building descriptions. He also develops musician websites that integrate with existing social networking and other services musicians already use.

In his years at Dow Jones, he worked on dial-up text information services, CD-ROMs, fax products and pre-web Internet projects before joining the WSJ.com team. He moved from there to a role overseeing the company's overall content strategy, and then to Ottaway Newspapers, where he rebuilt and modernized their newspaper websites and launched a series of local search portals. He began his career as as a reporter and copy editor on weekly and daily newspapers and online news services.

Ficara is a graduate of Brooklyn College of the City University of New York, and of Rutgers University. He lives in Brooklyn, NY, where he plays harmonica and guitar in the city's old-time country music community. His photos are frequently seen on albums and web sites by local bands and on his music blog and newsletter.

Journalism Online, 25 W. 52nd Street, 15th Floor, New York, NY 10019

- Our Mission

Our Mission

Until recently, consumers of journalism always paid a reasonable price to access the news and information they valued. The Internet changed this bargain. Even as the Web inspired dramatic improvements in the depth and breadth of journalism, most news publishers choose to provide journalism online for free. Many readers who were happy to pay a reasonable amount for news in print and other media came to expect content for free online as publishers came to rely almost entirely on advertising to cover their news and other expenses.

Serious journalism has always required payments by consumers, a lesson now being remembered as it becomes clear that online advertising revenue alone will not sustain robust, independent news departments, whether for newspapers or online-only publishers. Everyone, from readers to reporters, is facing the consequences as news organizations of all kinds are forced to cut back.

That's why experienced media executives Steven Brill, Gordon Crovitz, and Leo Hindery, Jr. came together to form Journalism Online—to address the urgent need for a comprehensive, immediate plan to address this downward spiral in the business of publishing original, quality journalism.

Grounded by the common-sense principle that those who invest in and create content should not be bystanders while others make a profit from it, they seek to enable news publishers to generate new revenues from readers and distributors for their digital content and—because it does not have to be a choice between one revenue source or the another—to restore the optimal mix of circulation and advertising revenue necessary to finance original reporting and editing. For print publishers, this move toward paid access online will also restore the value proposition of the print medium by eliminating the fully free online alternative.

Click here to learn more about the services Journalism Online will offer, from the easy-to-use accounts for readers to the regular reports for news publishers on best practices for circulation-revenue strategies online.

Already, dozens of major newspaper, magazine and online-only publishers—from global brands to local media—are planning to use the services that Journalism Online will offer beginning this fall, including an innovative online payment system that will be flexible for publishers and easy for readers, making it simple for publishers to begin charging readers for access. The Journalism Online platform will help publishers and readers by offering common customer accounts across all its publishing affiliates and by enabling readers to select "all you can read" packages across different news publishers based on their areas of interest.

Contact us with your ideas or to request more information. We welcome your suggestions and look forward to your participation.

***

Click here to read Journalism Online Co-Founder Steven Brill's June 2009 speech at the OMMA Conference, "Preserving Valuable Journalism by Restoring the Value Proposition."

Journalism Online, 25 W. 52nd Street, 15th Floor, New York, NY 10019

|

- Our Model

What's in it for publishers and readers?

1. Each publisher's website is powered with the Journalism Online e-commerce engine, which allows customers to have one easy-to-use account common to *all* the publishers' websites. This allows consumers to sign up just once to purchase annual or monthly subscriptions, day passes, and single articles from multiple publishers. The password-enabled payment system is integrated into all of the member-publishers' websites, and the ***publishers have sole discretion*** over which content to charge for, how much to charge, and the manner of charge.

2. The option to sell an all-inclusive annual or monthly subscriptions for those consumers who want to pay ***one fee*** to access all of the Journalism Online-member publishers' content.

3. Negotiations of ***wholesale licensing and royalty fees*** with intermediaries such as Kindle or Apple or search engines and other websites that currently base much of their business models on referrals of readers to the original content on newspaper, magazine and online news websites.

4. Reports to member publishers on which ***strategies and tactics*** are achieving the best results in ***building circulation revenue*** while maintaining the traffic necessary to support advertising revenue.

Do you have suggestions? Contact us.

Journalism Online, 25 W. 52nd Street, 15th Floor, New York, NY 10019

Copyright © 2009 Journalism Online, LLC. All Rights Reserved.

|

- Contact Us

For General Inquiries

info@journalismonline.com

212.332.6405

For Press Inquiries

Cindy Rosenthal

cindy.rosenthal@journalismonline.com

212.332.6406

For Steven Brill, Gordon Crovitz or Leo Hindery

founders@journalismonline.com

To receive email updates, please complete the form on our home page.

Journalism Online, 25 W. 52nd Street, 15th Floor, New York, NY 10019

|

- In the News

http://www.journalismonline.com/press.php

Journalism Online Announces Services for Non-Profit Organizations

E-commerce platform will include a global e-support engine, with Institute for War and Peace Reporting as launch non-profit affiliate

NEW YORK, August 20, 2009 –Journalism Online, LLC, the company formed in April to help publishers generate much-needed digital revenues by charging consumers to access web site and other digital content, today announced an initiative aimed at enabling the growing number of non-profit news-gathering organizations also to benefit from Journalism Online's flexible e-commerce platform.

Participating organizations will have access to a range of fundraising options including online-membership programs, micro-donations, and donations dedicated to supporting specific reporting projects or coverage plans around particular topics. Users will have the convenience of being able to donate using the universally accepted accounts they set up when they access content from any of Journalism Online's affiliates around the world.

The first non-profit news organization to sign up for these services is the Institute for War and Peace Reporting (IWPR), a London-based organization that trains and supports reporters in many of the world's most difficult and free-press-challenged countries and publishes their work on its website.

"I've been an admirer and supporter of IWPR for years," said Journalism Online co-founder Steven Brill. "And in thinking about how vital their work is, and how much support they need, it struck me that this is a way they might be able to broaden and solidify their financial base beyond the conventional hunt for grants and big-giver donations. Imagine how their work could be fortified if the thousands of people who read and admire their courageous dispatches from Iran or Zimbabwe had a simple, convenient way to support it—and support it quickly—when they are moved by an article they have just read."

The Journalism Online e-commerce platform is designed to support many different approaches by news publishers, whether traditional publishers or non-profit organizations.

"Just as more and more traditional publishers will offer online subscriptions, a non-profit might solicit similar subscriptions or might ask readers to become regular supporters of its work." Journalism Online co-founder Gordon Crovitz said. "Bloggers and others who welcome contributions from readers will also be able to use our e-commerce service to enable readers to make one-click payments. Sustainable models for quality journalism from many different kinds of publishers will require revenues from readers."

"We're delighted at the prospect of using Journalism Online's uniquely flexible platform and benefiting from the many people who will already have accounts with the company," said Tony Borden, the founder of IWPR. "Put simply, we'll now be able to broaden our financial support with a simple click."

The Journalism Online payment platform launches this fall.

About Journalism Online, LLC

Founded in April 2009 by experienced media executives Steven Brill, Gordon Crovitz, and Leo Hindery, Jr., Journalism Online – now with more than 500 affiliate newspapers, magazines and news sites – will enable news publishers to generate new revenues from readers and distributors for their digital content and to restore the optimal mix of circulation and advertising revenue necessary to finance original reporting and editing. Journalism Online, whose services launch this fall, is pioneering the effort to make the transition to a paid online model successful for publishers while giving readers easy access to the news they want, when they want it, on the web and through other forms of digital distribution. For more information: http://www.journalismonline.com.

About Institute for War and Peace Reporting

IWPR undertakes long-term capacity building programs in more than two dozen areas of crisis and conflict around the world. Established in 1993, our work focuses on three pillars – training, reporting and institution-building. This includes establishing independent local media and supporting institutions; training local reporters, editors and producers in basic and specialist skills; supporting extensive in-depth reporting on human rights, good governance and related issues; disseminating fact-based reporting in developing countries and internationally, and strengthening communications capacity of local human rights, women's and grassroots organizations and activists. For more information: http://www.iwpr.net.

Journalism Online, 25 W. 52nd Street, 15th Floor, New York, NY 10019

"Preserving Valuable Journalism by Restoring the Value Proposition"

Keynote Address by Steven Brill, Co-Founder of Journalism Online, LLC
Delivered at the OMMA Conference, June 17, 2009, New York City

Thank you for inviting me to this morning's terrific event. I'm glad for the opportunity because I want to try to convince those of you who are deservedly proud of your role in Internet commerce, that despite all of your accomplishments, one by-product of the new world you have helped to create has to be fixed. If not, the solid, independent journalism that provides participants in democracies and in free markets the accurate, honest information they need to make decisions is going to disappear.

Put simply, because of what I'll call a cultural virus, the Internet has undermined the economic model for that kind of journalism.

The good news is that the problem can be solved.

We just have to return to one of the oldest principles of that business model — that those who consume journalism pay something for it, not only because it ensures an enterprise culture where content is perceived to have value beyond being something to fill the space around advertising, but because it provides a critical revenue stream.

I say this is an old principle for good reason.

In the history of the world no one can point to any quality journalism operation that depended only on ad revenue and, while giving its content away for free, thrived as a profitable, independent business. Not one. Ever.

> In the history of the world, no one can point to any quality journalism operation that depended only on ad revenue and, while giving its content away for free, thrived as a profitable, independent business. Not one. Ever.

The closest historical artifacts were the network news operations — and there were only three of them to share 90% of the country's eyeballs, and their news shows themselves were typically public service loss leaders. So the idea that advertising alone could support any significant journalism enterprise in today's online world of millions of constantly proliferating websites — and, therefore incessantly escalating competition for eyeballs and ad dollars — is especially preposterous.

Notice that I keep referring to journalism. I think it's an important profession. Ever since I sent some unsolicited op-ed pieces to the *NY Times* as a college student and made a few hundred dollars when they were published, then worked nearly full time as a writer for *New York Magazine* while in Law School, and then started a magazine about lawyers when I got out of law school, I've made my way in the world much of the time doing journalism, and along the way worrying about the quality and standing of my profession.

So about 8 years ago my wife and I decided that we'd do something to support the profession by endowing a program at Yale, called the Yale Journalism Initiative. Its goal is to lure and train two- or three-dozen top students a year to go into this profession and to give them the skills and ethical underpinning to flourish in it. And it's been quite successful.

I'm telling you this story, because it has to do with why I started Journalism Online.

About a year and a half ago I was sitting in my office when I got a call from a woman who demanded to know what I was doing to her daughter. After gasping for air I asked what she meant and she explained that her daughter was a senior at Yale and had just been accepted into our program. The problem was that the summer before she had interned at a big consulting firm and now, the woman said, I was luring her into a dead end job. "How is she ever going to pay off her student loans doing this," she demanded to know.

I've now spent nearly two years trying to answer that question. But at least for now, I'm afraid, that talented young woman's mother is right.

Why? Because about ten years ago most publishers of newspapers and magazines began committing group suicide by succumbing to a nonsensical Internet mantra — that stuff online had to be free.

Maybe they were caught up in the coolness of the moment. Or in a herd mentality, though I should add that the coolest, best business in the world of media distribution then starting to flourish online — Amazon — was built around the opposite idea. Whatever the reason they heeded the call of those who said that information online deserves to be free, or needs to be free, or whatever. To which I say that the bank that gave those college loans to the daughter of that woman who called me that morning wants its loans to be paid back. And that that woman's daughter — who so badly wants to go into a profession where you pound pavements and get doors slammed in your face and phones slammed down on you while you try honestly to find out stuff that governments or big companies or restaurants or baseball players would prefer that you not know — wants to eat and pay rent.

> Websites with original content can, over the next two years, engage eight to fifteen percent of their visitors and convince them to pay for some portion of their content, while maintaining most of the page views they have today.

So, about two months ago I got together with two partners to form Journalism Online. One is Leo Hindery, an old friend from the days when I started Court TV who now runs a successful media investment fund and used to be a newspaper publisher. The other is Gordon Crovitz, who as publisher of the *Wall Street Journal* was a trailblazer in charging for its content online.

So, what are we doing at Journalism Online? We're offering newspaper and magazine publishers a chance to work with us to reclaim their old business model — in which a combination of advertising and reader-paid revenue secures independent journalism.

Our proposition is that websites with original content can, over the next two years, engage eight to fifteen percent of their visitors — typically the hard core who visit them most often — and convince them to pay for some portion of their content, while maintaining most of the page views they have today — about 90% — which are necessary to maintain their advertising revenue.

To achieve that we're offering our Affiliates four key services.

First, we will put our Journalism Online e-commerce engine on all of our Affiliates' websites. That way, a consumer will only have to register once and establish one account to buy content across hundreds or thousands of Affiliate websites. If you already have a subscription to the Boston Globe and want to try the London Daily Telegraph or buy a special Hollywood report from the LA Times, you'll just have to click.

While consumers will each have a common account and password across multiple journalism websites, the uniformity will end there. For our e-commerce engine will allow each affiliate website to charge however much they want for whatever they want. Maybe they'll let you sample four articles a month for free before asking you to pay. Maybe they'll let you read the first two paragraphs of everything for free before asking you to pay. Maybe you'll get a 50% discount if you're a print subscriber. It's all up to them. And the payment could be a monthly subscription, an annual subscription, or even just a micropayment for one article.

We'll be creating an easy way for consumers to buy content with one account across multiple websites and eliminating millions in capital expenses for these hard-pressed publishers by supplying this robust, completely flexible e-commerce engine.

So, we'll be creating an easy way for consumers to buy content with one account across multiple websites and eliminating millions in capital expenses for these hard-pressed publishers by supplying this robust, completely flexible e-commerce engine.

Second, we'll market what we call "all you can read" packages. For example, maybe we'll charge $30 a month so you can read everything offered by all of our affiliates. Or $10 a month to read everything about the Chicago Cubs, or the media industry, or soccer. We'll split these revenues by page views among the participating publishers. For all of them it will be found money, because they'll be selling to customers who might otherwise have not been drawn to them.

Third, we'll be providing our affiliates with what we call reports from the front lines about what's working and what's not working.

Lately, there have been all kinds of debates about whether, for example, micropayments will work better than subscriptions. My hunch is that subscriptions will work better, even though our common password system will, as with Apple's success with I-Tunes, eliminate the hassle for these quick, one-item purchases, so that someone who already subscribes, let's say, to the LA Times will be able to by an intriguing report on European real estate from the FT with one click. Yet the truth is no one really knows how micropayments or subscriptions will work for which kind of content.

But our affiliates will know soon enough, from the reports we give them. Not just about the relative yields of types of payment — monthly, annual, or micro or something in between — but the type of sampling that lures subscribers most efficiently, or whether something like providing instant updates of your blog — yes, we'll have original content bloggers as affiliates — for a fee, while providing less frequent updates for free is proving to be effective.

Fourth, we're going to level the negotiation playing field between those who invest in and create content and those who have already built business models based on that content, such as Google or Amazon. These are two great companies worthy of everyone's admiration. But they clearly have had the upper hand in dealing with individual publishers. For example, how else could Amazon be extracting from major newspapers not only 70% of the revenue when they sell someone a Kindle subscription to a newspaper, but also completely controlling that customer relationship? How can it be that the Washington Post doesn't even know who its Kindle customers are, and gets only 30% of the revenue from those customers? It's as if Sony were to tell HBO that it wants 70% of the revenue from HBO subscribers who happen to watch HBO on a Sony television.

It's as if Sony were to tell HBO that it wants 70% of the revenue from HBO subscribers who happen to watch HBO on a Sony television.

Our business model for our affiliates is simple and based on a common sense premise that can only be restored once the balance of power is restored: If I want to buy a *New York Times* online subscription I'll be offered it first for, say, $95 a year, with maybe a big discount if bundled with a print subscription. And then I'll be given a chance to check a box and pay, let's say, $10 to get it on my Kindle also, and maybe another $10 to get it on my iPhone or my Blackberry. The point is that I'm a customer who wants the *New York Times*. How I want it is between me and the *Times*.

How will we achieve that change in the business model? By building our e-commerce engine to process all of these different kinds of delivery mechanism subscriptions and by negotiating from strength on behalf of all of our affiliates. And by having some talented, undaunted negotiators to help out.

As you may have read, we have brought on board two old friends of mine — David Boies and Ted Olson — to act as our counsel and help in these negotiations.

I bet by now some of you may be asking yourselves how we can expect publishers to start charging for their online content unless all of them do it at once. Don't we need to assemble a critical mass of newspapers before this can work?

Well, I now think we will get a critical mass, based on our ongoing discussions with publishers — which we are having with them one by one. But the critical mass issue has, I think, been overstated.

If a newspaper or magazine doesn't think some significant portion of its content (not the basic news of the day that multiple publications report) is unique enough to get some people — maybe ten percent — to want to pay for it, then why are they paying journalists to produce it? Publishers need to shed their inferiority complexes.

If a newspaper or magazine doesn't think some significant portion of its content is unique enough to get some people to want to pay for it, then why are they paying journalists to produce it? Publishers need to shed their inferiority complexes.

Second, in most cases individual newspapers already have critical mass: If you're the local newspaper in Wilmington Delaware covering the city council, or if you're Gourmet Magazine, The New Yorker, or the Baseball America website, your stuff should be, and is, unique enough to attract that 10%.

Notice, again, that I said 10%.

What about the other 90%?

That brings us to one of the abiding myths that early on (as in a few weeks ago), pervaded our discussions with publishers. Many thought that if, say, they had $5m in online advertising revenues and they went to a pay system they would lose all $5m, or most of it. So, they'd better get $5m in circulation revenue from people ponying up for online payments.

Not true.

We have devised a model — based on my partner Gordon's experience with the *Wall Street Journal* and the experience of other smaller newspapers that went against the tide early on — that says that through all kinds of free sampling methods you can maintain 88% of your page views and more than 90% of your ad revenues at the same time that you begin generating millions in online payments for content.

That's the business we are launching, and I noticed the other day that it's a model that Chris Anderson of *Wired* has also been talking about approvingly.

> We have devised a model that says that through all kinds of free sampling methods you can maintain 88% of your page views and more than 90% of your ad revenues at the same time that you begin generating millions in online payments for content.

The math works.

The other compelling aspect of this economic model has to do with print, not online, publishing. Here's how: Several weeks ago, my daughter, a first year law student, came home for the weekend. When I came down for breakfast, she was sitting at the kitchen counter reading the *New York Times* online. I picked up the paper and said, "Sophie, here's the real *New York Times*." To which she said, "No, I like it this way."

So, the *New York Times* is charging Sophie for the version of their content that she doesn't like and giving her the one she prefers for free.

Worse, they're now raising their print prices — a lot. How is that going to lure Sophie? It's got to have the opposite effect — of driving more people away from print — where their real ad revenue is, and onto online, where ad revenue is insufficient to support a large news gathering organization and where circulation revenue does not, yet, exist.

Once, however, the *Times* starts charging for online content — and they have said that they soon will, in some form — all of those dynamics shift the other way. When Sophie goes online she'll be asked to pay, which will remind her that the *Times* has real value, which of course it does. And she may even be offered a discount for a bundled print and online subscription and may now buy both.

> So, the *New York Times* is charging Sophie for the version of their content that she doesn't like and giving her the one she prefers for free.

So we have emphasized to publishers that this is as much about their print revenue and print circulation as it is about online.

I should stress again that our focus is on the business model for journalism, not just for print journalism or online journalism or Kindle journalism. Indeed, the best way to think about this is to think about transitions in delivery mechanisms. The most important thing about charging for online journalism — about establishing its value proposition — is that it's the only way to survive what is obviously going to happen.

Whether it's five years from now or ten or fifteen there can be no doubt that newspapers (magazines may be different) are going to be almost completely delivered online or through one or more electronic devices like a Kindle or an iPhone. I say almost completely because I think this will be gradual; a paper will skip printing on its least profitable weekday, then two weekdays, then all five, then maybe just print on Sunday. If that happens with no one paying for the digital versions, the papers will not survive. No way.

> Whether it's five years from now or ten or fifteen there can be no doubt that newspapers are going to be almost completely delivered online or through one or more electronic devices.

But if this inevitable transition is accompanied by the publishers having readers — customers — who are paying for this content however it is being delivered, including online, then it may just happen that the model will be as good or better than it was before: The old production costs of newspapers having been eliminated, paying customers providing circulation revenue, and advertisers paying to advertise online, though not with the bonanza revenues once anticipated. Plus the product will be a lot better: Faster, more participatory, better able to sweep the world for sources, able to mix video, audio and text.

But, again, it's only possible if you teach my kids that journalism has value no matter how they consume it.

Finally, I should note that, other than those who still mouth the mantra that what's on the Internet deserves to be free, those who disagree with Gordon and Leo and me and lots of others about the need to place a value on original content, fall into two categories. First, there are those who say that the publishers are a bunch of idiots who let the toothpaste out of the tube (meaning they gave away their stuff for free online) and that they can't reverse that. In fact, I can point to independent studies, including a recent one presented at last month's D Conference sponsored by Dow Jones, that indicate that a large majority of consumers would pay for some online news content if asked. Again, our model posits that just 10% need to. Surely, Apple got ten percent of the free music toothpaste back into the tube with iTunes.

My other response to those who say it won't work is simply that we have to try, because they have presented no alternative.

Which brings us to the second group of those who are most against our idea — the ones who don't care about an alternative, who say, "Who cares? Who needs journalists? We can rely on the wisdom of crowds to give us the information we need."

Well, I, too, love the way the Internet has democratized journalism, both in holding traditional journalism institutions accountable and in providing ready access to those who can make the most of it with original, important work. (Remember, I began my professional career sending a manuscript of a proposed Op-Ed series to a Post Office box at the *New York Times*, and I began writing about the inner workings of law firms with my own magazine because none of the mainstream press was doing it.)

And today, whether it's *Talking Points Memo* (which we hope will become one of our Affiliates), or someone who takes it upon himself or herself to wheedle their way into a candidate's fund raiser to hear him say something stupid, the Internet has opened doors for aspiring reporters and writers beyond the freelance opportunities I had to scrounge for way back when. But that does not lessen the need for journalism institutions that people can count on to make sense of an increasingly complex world.

"Institutions" may actually be a word with too much baggage for the journalism entities I am trying to describe. For they can and should be big and small, establishment and swashbuckling, new ones built by online pioneers, or old ones revived by a return to the economic model of circulation and advertising revenue. We're trying to create the economic underpinning for all of them.

Big and small, establishment and swashbuckling, new entities built by online pioneers, or old ones revived by a return to the economic model of circulation and advertising revenue—we're trying to create the economic underpinning for all of them.

And, yes, reporters ought to use the Internet to get source material from the wisdom of crowds. But amateur crowds, however well intentioned — and who knows which ones are well intentioned and which ones are paid by partisans in a particular controversy? — are not going to go down to the courthouse or the zoning board or to Afghanistan or hover outside the meeting of the government's General Motors oversight panel.

Yes, Twitter is a fabulous source of information about what's going on this morning in Iran, and a great tool for advocacy in Iran, too. But there is a difference between a blogger sitting at home in his pajamas pontificating about those Tweets and reporters like Richard Engel and Christiane Amanpour on the scene, or, as we saw this morning, the *New York Times* savvy analysis of the Iran vote province by province. We need reporters to sift through those stupendously important Tweets and cell phone camera shots and make sense of them and, indeed, to figure out the difference between information and advocacy.

True, reporters miss a lot of stories, but they didn't miss the atrocities of Abu Ghraib or the mistreatment of veterans at Walter Reade, or the you-name-it scandal in the community where you live. Put simply, the Internet has enormously expanded the ability of professional journalists to find and mine sources and be held accountable if they make mistakes, and that's great. But whether they're online or in print or on television, we need professionals — people paid to work at this and people who promise not to have an ax to grind — to do this. We need for that young woman whose mother is worried about her student loans to want to answer this call — and to be able to answer it.

Think of this dilemma not as an indictment of the digital world but simply as a turn in the road toward a great new world that the Internet can bring us.

So in closing, I urge you not to think of this dilemma not as an indictment of the digital world but simply as a turn in the road toward a great new world that the Internet can bring us.

A world in which the physical costs of printing and delivering content are eliminated. A world in which journalism can be quicker, and, yes, more collaborative with its community by spreading the net far wider and more efficiently for sources and reaction and instant criticism and accountability. And a world in which consumers continue to pay for the best of what they consume.

Reviving that old model of journalism this way was the only answer I could think of for that woman so rightly worried about her daughter's wayward turn toward the profession I revere.

I know it's worth trying because the alternative is just so much worse.

Thank you for listening.