

MARVIN KALB: Hello and welcome to the National Press Club and to another edition of *The Kalb Report*. I'm Marvin Kalb. And our program tonight is entitled "Ink on the Brink: The Future of Print Journalism." Now, the title itself suggests that print journalism does have a future, which is encouraging since everyone lately has been writing its' obit.

So my first question to the panel (this is the obvious one) if it does have a future, what does that future look like in, say, ten or fifteen years from now? But let me first quickly introduce the panel itself. To my left, Marcus Brauchli, the executive editor of *The Washington Post*. He was, before coming to *The Post*, the managing editor of *The Wall Street Journal*, also for fifteen years a foreign correspondent for *The Journal* in Asia and in Europe. He's won many journalism awards.

To my right, David Hunke, the president and publisher of *USA Today*, the newspaper with the largest circulation in The United States. Before taking this job, he was chief executive officer of the Detroit Media Partnership, and he was also publisher of *The Detroit Free Press*. He led the team that won the Pulitzer Prize for local reporting.

To my immediate left, Cynthia Tucker, a twice-a-week columnist for *The Atlanta Journal Constitution* where she was the paper's editorial page editor. She also writes a blog. And in 2007, she won a Pulitzer Prize for her commentary. She is now her paper's "national political columnist" based here in Washington, D.C.

To my right, Anne Bagamery. She is the senior editor of *The International Herald Tribune*, which is the global edition of *The New York Times*. She's based in Paris where she's been, I think, for about fifteen years now. And she has major responsibility for business news, which has certainly been in the news.

Okay. You've all had a chance now to think about that opening question – what will newspapers look like in ten to fifteen years? Will there be newspapers as we know them today? Let's start with Cynthia Tucker.

CYNTHIA TUCKER: Oh great, Marvin. Thank you. First I want to say how delighted I am to be here and to see an audience so interested in this question. Makes me a little frightened though to think that they may think that I actually know the answer to the question. I don't. And my answer may convey my-- my hopes, my optimism about the future of print. I certainly think that there will continue to be newspapers in twenty years. But I fear that there won't be nearly as many of them. I think that we are going to look at a couple of decades of consolidation. I think that there will be fewer news magazines, fewer newspapers. Twenty years from now, I hope that there will still be large national newspapers like *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, *The IHT*, *The International Herald Tribune*.

I think the future for regional newspapers like the one that I work for, *The Atlanta Journal Constitution*, is more uncertain. Um, and I think that that would be a loss. Certainly there are many good reasons why we look, uh, for big national newspapers that cover the huge events of the day. But I think without regional newspapers, uh, medium-size city newspapers, um, a lot of citizens would be in the dark about what's going on in their state houses and their city halls. And I think that that's where we'll see some losses.

MARVIN KALB: Thank you very much, Cynthia. David Hunke, will there be a *USA Today* in twenty years?

DAVID HUNKE: There'll be a *USA Today* in twenty years.

MARVIN KALB: What's it going to look like?

DAVID HUNKE: Well, I suspect it's going to be very much a hybrid of what you may see today. And we have to keep in mind, *USA Today* is its own rather unique creation. It's also only 27 years-old. And a lot of the institutions that we're talking about in many cases are almost two centuries-old. But *USA Today*, like many other newspapers, are gonna have to evolve rapidly.

And the answer of how this is going to happen, I still contend is going to be a joint decision between the citizens, an engaged citizenry in this country, the folks who run news and journalism organizations, and the businesses like myself, and frankly, to a large degree, whether we continue to have commercial partners. Those are advertisers. There are a lot of people a part of this equation. And over a period of twenty years, let's also keep in mind, twenty years ago, the people hadn't founded Google yet. They're going to be still rapidly developing forms of transmitting news, information, and entertainment to us. So we have to keep that calculation out there as well.

But if we are serious about the primary tenets of journalism, and understand how important it is in this country, we will find the business models and the devices that allow us to be here in twenty years.

MARVIN KALB: Well, you know, I was going to throw a question at you. We absolutely, you said, believe in the future of great newspapers. But we can no longer do business as usual. And you were suggesting that a moment ago. How is the business itself going to change? I mean, you're the boss at *USA Today*. What would you be doing differently ten years from now?

DAVID HUNKE: I'd still (and I believe very strongly in this) ten years from now, I'd better have discovered a business model that works for a lot of people that allows us to continue to hire, retain, and train the intelligence, the fundamentals of journalism. This is

what anybody pays us for. This is the entire key to engagement. So my job principally is not on the journalism side, it's on the business side to unlock the funding streams that allow us to continue to produce the content that create this thing, whether it is ink on paper or any other device.

MARVIN KALB: Anne Bagamery, *The International Herald Tribune*. Now, it's been there for a long, long time. Can we count on it being there for another ten to fifteen years? And I ask the question specifically with a backup question that I'm told that you guys have been losing about \$40 million bucks a year. You can't continue-- Is that right?

ANNE BAGAMERY: No, that isn't right. I can say that.

MARVIN KALB: Then I back off that. That's what I was told. What have you been losing each year? Not \$40 million, what has it been?

ANNE BAGAMERY: It's not \$40 million. That much I can tell you.

MARVIN KALB: Okay.

ANNE BAGAMERY: You may have been thinking of other newspapers when somebody told you that. No. Will *The Herald Tribune* be there in another fifteen years? We've been there for 122 years. In fact, yesterday I was reminded, this evening at dinner was the 122nd anniversary of the paper. We've been through a succession of owners, most recently our principle owner, *The New York Times*, who's been in charge since 2003. Each change of ownership has brought a different cast, if you like, to the way our business is conducted. But the fundamentals of what we do have not changed. And everybody's going to be talking tonight, I think, about the importance of quality journalism, the importance of maintaining standards, of training the next generation. That is what we've been about for 122 years. So that principle mission isn't going to change.

The business side of it is, quite frankly, somebody else's job. Those of us on the editorial side are responsible for making sure that the product that we produce is worth paying for. And so if you want to look out fifteen, if you want to look out twenty, thirty years, I have absolute confidence that there will be an *IHT*.

MARVIN KALB: Okay. And are you at this point a money-making newspaper?

ANNE BAGAMERY: Since we are a wholly owned subsidiary of *The New York Times*, it's not broken out in terms of profit. It's broken up in terms of what we call contribution margin. So costs are shared across the whole organization and revenue is attributed to certain parts of the organization. On that basis, we contribute.

MARVIN KALB: Okay. Let it go at that for the time being. Let it go at that. Marcus Brauchli, *The Washington Post*, my lifeline to the world every morning, what is your crystal ball about *The Post's* longevity?

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: My crystal ball about *The Post's* longevity says *The Post* will be here for a long time to come. I don't see any reason that *The Post*, even as a newspaper, won't continue to publish. And certainly as a news organization, we intend to be here. We serve our readers over every platform that comes along, and adapt pretty much as quickly as we can, as quickly as our readers do.

I think that what we produce is journalism, high quality information and news, ideas and commentary for which we believe there is a robust market. And the market tells us there's a robust market. We have more readers and users, as they call them online, today than we've ever had in our history.

MARVIN KALB: Online, but not the newspaper.

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: Right. But I think-- The newspaper's circulation has actually been quite stable over the last year or so, which may have something to do with just a great flow of news. I think that there is a very strong, loyal core of readers for a newspaper like *The Washington Post*. And even though newspaper circulations in some cities have been ebbing, there remains dedicated readership for newspapers in this country.

Most newspapers in this country today do make money. They don't all make the money they used to make. And one of the things that's caused all the consternation at the moment is that newspapers that once made very large margins are making thinner margins. And many of them are parts of large companies that took on great deals of debt during corporate transactions to build up giant newspaper or news conglomerates. They can't make their debt payments with the narrower margins. Hence, the crisis.

But newspapers themselves are not, in many cases, unprofitable. In fact, smaller newspapers around the country are doing, in many cases, quite well. There are papers that really own their market. If you go to Manhattan, Kansas, I think it's *The Mercury* in Manhattan, Kansas, that newspaper has a paid online model. So if you want to see that newspaper online if you live in that community, you have to subscribe to it. The reason they do that is because they're trying to, not to make money necessarily in the online side, but to encourage people to continue to read the print edition.

MARVIN KALB: I know. But I could point out any number of cities where newspapers have gone under the last year or so.

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: There's no question that there are newspapers under pressure. And there are some newspapers, there are a number of newspapers operating either as newspapers or as part of larger groups under bankruptcy protection. And not all of those

newspapers will emerge. And some cities will, I think, lose their newspapers in coming years. But I think newspapers still have a fairly strong audience in most cases, and in places like Washington, a very robust and strong audience.

MARVIN KALB: Well let me ask you about your paper based on something that was in *Vanity Fair* in an article recently, which I'm sure you have read. In the article, it said that you have about a two- to five-year period now to come up with what is called an alternative to *The Post* as we know it today. So number one, do you buy into that kind of projection?

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: No, I think that's simplistic. First of all, you know, or what? Two to five years and *The Washington Post* doesn't exist? That's [simultaneous conversation]--

MARVIN KALB: --to come up with an alternative to the paper that we know today.

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: First of all, I don't think there will be *an* alternative. I think this is-- You know, people are looking around for a silver bullet. There is no silver bullet. There are myriad new opportunities for news organizations to explore. There are many possible avenues for generating revenue. You know, we now distribute our newspaper over Kindle, which is no longer a new thing. But there are new tablet computers coming out, new e-readers coming out. You'll be able to find *The Washington Post* and other newspapers like *USA Today*, the Atlanta paper on these platforms. We will serve our readers on mobile phones, on mobile devices--

MARVIN KALB: Excuse me for interrupting, but you're making a big deal about this. Do you guys make any money by placing all of your copy on Kindle and all of the other [simultaneous conversation] digital devices--

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: Sure. I mean, we have a profitable business right now in distributing *Washington Post* news over mobile phones. And I don't know how large any of these markets is individually at the moment. But it's clear if you look at the trajectory, some of these are growing very rapidly. But I do know that collectively, they give us hope that we can generate substantial revenues from other sources than newspapers. And mind you, the newspaper is still a huge revenue generator. And for a lot of Americans, newspapers are still a primary source of information that isn't going away anytime soon.

MARVIN KALB: I mean, we could go on with this. But I'm told that the Kaplan educational arm of the big *Washington Post* is where you're really making the money, and not at the newspaper.

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: Sure. I mean, The Washington Post Company which began as *The Washington Post* newspaper in 1877 (I think that's our legacy) is a holding company. And it owns more than *The Washington Post* newspaper. It owns television stations. It owns a cable TV network. It owns Kaplan Education, which was a very smart investment for which we are deeply grateful in the news business at the moment, because it's producing substantial revenues for The Washington Post Company that make our owners-- Don Graham is the chairman, the son of Kay Graham-- really determined and able to be determined to find the right model for the news business.

MARVIN KALB: Well, and *The Washington Post* is very fortunate because it does have a family behind it, not a large corporation, and a very wealthy family behind it. So it's good to have a couple of bucks. But I don't have to tell any of you that there is declining circulation. And ads have fallen off the table. And--

ANNE BAGAMERY: Excuse me.

MARVIN KALB: Yes?

ANNE BAGAMERY: The *IHT* circulation is growing.

MARVIN KALB: Good. Good. Good. I'm delighted.

ANNE BAGAMERY: I just thought I'd-- I want to mark that point.

[simultaneous conversation]

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: Marvin, it's important to say (I think I said this before, but...) circulation is one measure of readership and engagement. We're reaching readers in other ways. Now yeah, if you want to just look at newspapers narrowly, you know, our circulation is not what it was five years ago. On the other hand, our circulation the last year has been pretty flat, which in the current climate, isn't bad.

MARVIN KALB: It's good. Right. But, I mean, *The Post*, for example, has had four buyouts, to the best of my knowledge, within the last three, four, five years. And that means that you've gone from a force of about 900 reporters down to a force of 500.

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: More than that, but yeah.

MARVIN KALB: You have more than 500?

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: Yeah, substantially more than 500. We've clearly gone down. And other newspapers have also reduced their staff [simultaneous conversation]--

MARVIN KALB: Now, the question that I'm getting at is, there's a wonderful poll that's done by the George Washington University Battleground Poll, which is a good poll. And it says that 61% of the American people believe, they'll be able to get the

information they need to be informed citizens in a vibrant democracy even if the newspaper in their city goes under, goes out of business.

Now, you were talking before, Cynthia, about the possibility looking ahead that regional papers may go under. What happens in a community like Atlanta if *The Journal Constitution* goes under?

CYNTHIA TUCKER: I simply can't imagine. I read a story several months ago that predicted that San Francisco could easily become the first major city to be without a daily newspaper. It is hard for me to fathom what a city like San Francisco would be without a daily newspaper. Detroit now doesn't have newspapers publishing daily. They're publishing a few days a week, but Detroit no longer has newspapers published every day.

MARVIN KALB: Is that right, Dave?

DAVID HUNKE: No. I'm going to have to edit you.

MARVIN KALB: Go ahead.

DAVID HUNKE: I have oversight of Detroit and was the publisher. We publish a quarter of a million papers Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, all for sale, one dollar, and Saturday. But what you're referring to (and this was the very valid point) we had to make a decision in Detroit or we weren't going to survive. We had another little problem called the auto industry and unemployment that is unimaginable. We had to make a decision that we were not going to continue to drive newspapers to your homes Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Saturday, but we would have essentially a weekend home delivery package. We would drop the gasoline, diesel fuel, manufacturing, printing, and paper costs in exchange for maintaining the journalism.

And I will tell you, it is far too early to call a victory, but we're hitting our circulation goals. And Detroit will be cash flow positive by the end of this year.

MARVIN KALB: Wait a sec. Now, Cynthia was talking about certain days of the week when you don't [simultaneous conversation] have a paper--

CYNTHIA TUCKER: So it is published [simultaneous conversation]--

MARVIN KALB: --Thursday and Friday--

CYNTHIA TUCKER: The papers are published every day, but they're not--

DAVID HUNKE: Two newspapers, two competing newspapers [simultaneous conversation]--

CYNTHIA TUCKER: --but they're not delivered--

DAVID HUNKE: We don't offer home delivery. We don't drive it to your home. But we have electronic editions, digital editions, replica editions as well that come.

MARVIN KALB: Supposing you don't have a computer. How are you going to get your edition?

DAVID HUNKE: Yeah. At 27,000 locations, there are great competing, two different newspapers that are for sale every day.

MARVIN KALB: And let me jump overseas for a minute to Paris. We'll go to the *International Trib*. To the best of my knowledge, when *The New York Times* bought *The*

International Trib (and correct me on this if I'm wrong again) they paid \$65 million dollars. Right?

ANNE BAGAMERY: I believe it was \$75.

MARVIN KALB: \$75 million bucks. Well, I'm within ten anyway. So that's not bad. But I want to go back to that figure that you dismissed before. And you didn't really give me an answer to my question. You are or are you not a money making newspaper today? Marcus was making the point that most newspapers may still be making money, but not as much as they did before. So are you making less money or no money?

ANNE BAGAMERY: I'm going to have to be very careful how I answer this question because since we are a subsidiary of a company, these figures aren't broken out.

MARVIN KALB: What do you mean by broken out?

ANNE BAGAMERY: I mean, that there is not a separate balance sheet that's released to the public about *The International Herald Tribune* [simultaneous conversation]--

MARVIN KALB: --that it is not made public--

ANNE BAGAMERY: --that is not made public, and is not even made widely public within the organization. However, what we are told is that we are contributing to the profitability of The New York Times Media Group, which is the corporate designation, the corporate subsidiary of which we are a part.

And one of the reasons that we are contributing is because many of the cutbacks that you were discussing with Marcus and that everybody knows is happening widely in The United States happened a few years ago in Europe. One of the blessings and curses, if

you like, of living outside of a big and vibrant economy like The United States is that the highs are not quite as high when things are good, but the lows are not quite as low.

And as a result, your planning tends to be-- I'm not on the financial planning side. But I am a business reporter. So I look at this as an observer. Your planning is a little bit easier in that sense. And you also don't have quite as much of a crisis situation developing when there's an economic downturn. So you have the opportunity to make some of the tough decisions and you don't have to make them in the heat of a big downturn and reporting to shareholders that you're not going to make your numbers now(?).

MARVIN KALB: *The New York Times* itself is in trouble. *The New York Times*, earlier this year or last year had to go down and talk to Mr. Slim in Mexico City to pick up an awful lot of millions in order to make its payments. *The New York Times* has lost money in any number of different ways. I don't want to depress you, but if the financial people at *The New York Times* decide that they really don't have the money any longer and they have to peel off assets here and there, the idea of *The International Trib* being dropped is not farfetched. Right?

ANNE BAGAMERY: I suppose in the sense that anything is possible, that there's intelligent life on Mars. It's a question I can't really answer, because I'm not Janet Robinson and I'm not Arthur Sulzberger, Jr. I will tell you this – Janet Robinson, president of The New York Times Company, was just in Paris talking to us. And she was extraordinarily complimentary of everything we've done, including all of the cutbacks. And she stood four square behind keeping *The International Herald Tribune* and using it to extend *New York Times* journalism around the world. So, you know, I can only go by what is available to the general public within my building. And I have to take her at her word that that was an expression of support.

MARVIN KALB: Right. Now the people who would buy *The International Trib* generally are those people who speak English, live in Europe or other parts of the world now, and depend upon *The Trib* for their news.

ANNE BAGAMERY: Not entirely. Our readership is actually pretty evenly divided in three groups. One is what you think of as the average *Trib* reader, an American expatriate living in a country not his or her own--

MARVIN KALB: --English speaking--

ANNE BAGAMERY: --in English. And that person does tend to depend on *The Trib*, not only for news, but as a lifeline to America. If there's anybody here who traveled in Europe as a student, we remember going and looking on Tuesday, because it was Tuesday before we could get the football results. Okay? Well, good news, we get them now in the Monday paper. And you can get them online Saturday afternoon.

But I guess the point is that that's only one-third of our readership now. There's also a third of our readership that is people living in their home countries, so a British family in Britain, a French family in France. And there's another third that we call third country nationals, so would be a diplomatic family from India living in Paris. All of these people do speak and read good English. Most of them do not have English as a first language. So they are not totally dependent on *The Trib* for their news. They use it as a trusted source.

Interestingly enough, some of our greatest circulation growth in Europe has been in Britain where you would think that there would be plenty [simultaneous conversation] of competition in our native tongue. But they buy *The Trib*.

MARVIN KALB: Cynthia, let me turn to you for a sec. You've just started to write a blog. Right?

CYNTHIA TUCKER: Yes, I have.

MARVIN KALB: And that is in addition to your twice a week column.

CYNTHIA TUCKER: Yes.

MARVIN KALB: You are, therefore, already paying your respects to the world of the blog, the digital age, as you put it a moment ago. But the blogs are filled with opinion journalism, filled with it. And I'm wondering, really out of total curiosity, how has that fact affected your work as an opinion columnist for a newspaper? How does it work?

CYNTHIA TUCKER: Well, I see my blog as an extension of the work I do as a columnist. I was talking to a student earlier about what personality I think my blog should have, and how it should be different from the work that I do in print. I have spent decades in the print journalism business. I've been writing a print column for a very long time. I think I know what that should be like. I know what the standards are. I know what the professionalism I bring to it. I know that I should interview people. I know that it should be accurate.

It's not entirely clear to me what I should be bringing to the opinion pieces I put online. I certainly think it should be accurate, but I'm not sure what the personality of it should be.

MARVIN KALB: But you use that word, 'personality'. I'm told that you have to be very personal. You, as an individual, have to come through in a blog or people aren't going to read it.

CYNTHIA TUCKER: We'll see, Marvin. We shall see.

MARVIN KALB: Has the presence of the blogs and opinion journalism affected you in any way as a columnist?

CYNTHIA TUCKER: I think that there is huge potential in the ability to communicate with readers almost immediately. That's the exciting part. That's the part that most of us old-fashioned print journalists like. Readers are free to comment on the opinions I write on my blog. They do immediately. And it is interesting to see what readers have on their minds. Sometimes I get additional information that gives me other ideas about subjects I should pursue, columns that I should write in print. That's the upside.

The downside I think is in trying to figure out how this contributes to real journalism and trying to make sure that it continues to be real journalism that conforms to the professional standards to which I think we all wish to adhere.

MARVIN KALB: Let me just take a minute now to tell our listening and viewing audience that this is *The Kalb Report*. I'm Marvin Kalb. And we're talking today about the future of print journalism with Marcus Brauchli of *The Washington Post*, Cynthia Tucker of *The Atlanta Journal Constitution*, Anne Bagamery of *The International Herald Tribune*, and David Hunke of *USA Today*. Let's pick up our conversation with one statistic. According to *Editor & Publisher*, over the past year or so, job losses in journalism have risen from about one thousand a month in January of 2008 to more than seven thousand a month by December of 2008. And Dave Hunke, do you see a time in the relatively near future when you, at *USA Today*, will be able to hire more journalists rather than go through the painful process of letting them go?

DAVID HUNKE: We actually have positions posted right now. But that's not going to be an answer, yes, to your question. There's very little visibility into 2010 on core newspaper economics. We're going to have to get into the year. We're going to have to watch the national economy. It's almost a question of, when does this country stop laying

people off? When do we begin to get the sense from (because many of us are consumer-driven) that we've clearly hit a bottom in this country and we're getting to slowly stabilize and build? And I think [simultaneous conversation] when we get to that--

MARVIN KALB: But weren't you letting people off-- Dave, weren't you letting people off before the economy went south? My understanding is that newspapers-- I mean, you guys are all relatively optimistic here. But my understanding is that people are losing jobs in newspapers all over the country. That's sort of a fact.

DAVID HUNKE: Yeah, you'd have to ask about a specific newspaper in some cases. If I went back and-- I'm answering here for Marcus on this, but if you go back historically, *The Washington Post*, they were shifting those jobs as they migrated into digital formation. But it's certainly been a rough decade for print journalism with the explosion of digital platforms.

But the question is, do we think we're done with this? I think it would be premature for me to tell you we're done. But I certainly think we're at a point we can begin to sense some stability going forward on this.

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: Marvin, on this subject, you know, first of all, I question the statistic you gave. Seven thousand a month is 84,000 a year. And I'm not sure-- I mean, it may be true for some period--

MARVIN KALB: In both cases, by the way, in that questioning of the seven thousand and in your questioning of the \$40 million, I will send you the place where I got the information.

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: Thank you. I don't trust everything that's in print. It's not in *The Washington Post*, I'm never sure.

ANNE BAGAMERY: Especially numbers, numbers ...(inaudible).

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: But let's say 84,000 a year is the pace of job losses, which I think would wipe out the journalism profession pretty fast. I think what is really happening, and to your point about this happening before the most recent economic downturn is, there is a secular shift afoot. You know, newspapers had-- you know, in industry parlance, had over capacity. They had the ability to produce more journalism than they needed to produce. I mean, if you went to The White House-- I mean, back when you were a correspondent covering Washington, how many reporters, you know, covered The White House?

A lot of people would cover the same event. But today, you can get not only from a wire service, but your audience can actually view online live or you can see on cable television. There's so many other sources of this information. And if all you're going to do is repeat the same information in the same way and not add any value for your audience, you probably don't need the journalists doing that particular kind of information.

So you take your resources and you dedicate them to journalism where you really make a difference. To original journalism, high impact journalism, you define what it is that you have to do. And for a lot of metro papers and local papers, it's do your community right. And indeed, one of my biggest concerns in the decline of journalism jobs and the troubles, the financial troubles newspapers are having is that in metro areas where there is a risk there won't be newspapers in some cases, that there won't be strong coverage of local communities. Because I think that's the big vulnerability. It's not that there isn't going to be strong coverage in Washington. You know, you can ask the question whether there's enough people covering different agencies. But in general, there's still a small

army of journalists covering Washington for various organizations. And there are new organizations like Bloomberg that have come along and have big staffs.

But it's in the communities where metropolitan area newspapers that may be owned by a chain that has a lot of debt that may decide to cut the cost or they can't afford to keep operating. And it'll take some time, after this conflagration rips through, for the green chutes, to borrow a phrase from another debate, to emerge, for new forms of journalism to emerge, though I think they will and we're seeing it.

If you look in communities where-- Take New Jersey for example, actually where *The New York Times* is active. There's been a lot of really interesting activity (Johnny Roberts in *Newsweek* has just written an article about it recently) a lot of really interesting activity where small startup news blogs are emerging that are covering communities with a level of granularity and detail that you once would have had from a newspaper, but today you're getting from journalists conducting journalism in a sort of blog-like [simultaneous conversation] real-time way--

MARVIN KALB: But Marcus, what I'm asking is, anyone who reads *The Washington Post* on a daily basis (and I have for many years) can see that the paper has gotten thinner. There are fewer reporters out there to get the news. There are holes in your coverage. Now you can say that that's all being done on the Internet. But that is to suggest something that Dave was getting at a moment ago, implying that the people who are being let go from newspapers are getting jobs on the Internet.

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: No.

MARVIN KALB: That is true to some degree, but not to a very large degree. I keep on getting these emails from people who can't get jobs. So I want to hear from you, as you look forward, what becomes your business model? What is it that you're trying to do in

the next five or ten years to make it clear to people who live in this city that there will be a *Washington Post*?

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: Well first, you know, to your point on the number of journalists and the amount of space, it is true that there are fewer news columns in *The Washington Post* today than there were several years ago, although we've taken it back to the level of the early 1990s, preceding the last big economic run-up. And the same is true of staff — we've taken it back somewhat, but we've not reduced our staff. I mean, our staff is still significantly larger than it was, for example, at the time of Watergate. It's double the size [simultaneous conversation] of the staff at that time--

MARVIN KALB: Well, I mean, the country's larger, too.

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: Right--

[simultaneous conversation]

MARVIN KALB: And you have more potential readers.

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: --and the number of stories that we can cover-- Well, no. We don't have more potential readers, except-- not for our print edition in any case. But our business model is-- You know, the business model for news is evolving. There is clearly a strong business case to produce newspapers in places like Washington. I mean, you know, Dave can address this nationally as well. There are plenty of newspapers and there are plenty of markets where you can publish a newspaper profitably. And newspapers are being published profitably.

There are other platforms that we need to reach our readers through, and that we are reaching our readers through, where we also either can be or believe we can be profitable.

There will be new technologies emerging. You used a twenty-year timeframe before. There will be new technologies emerging à la Google or à la Twitter or other means of reaching audiences that we don't now have, and we now probably can't even envision that will change the conversation again. I think large news organizations like ours do face some challenges. But I don't think we're going away. We still do provide a very valuable service and have a fairly large, dedicated readership.

MARVIN KALB: I don't think there's any doubt, any doubt at all, Dave Hunke, I don't think there's any doubt that there's more information around. No one doubts that. You get to a computer, you've got tons of information. Elie Wiesel once said, sitting right here, that there are three levels, that you've got information of which we've got tons right now. But then if you go up to another level, you've got knowledge, which is a kind of digested form of the information, an edited form of the information. And then at the highest level, you've got wisdom, which is actually taking the nectar of it all and making it meaningful to people and enriching a democracy.

And what I'm trying to get at here is how as you go from one platform to another, and as you dig more deeply into the Internet and reach for its full potential, how does that make us a better, a richer democracy? How are people getting informed? If you just throw information at them, that doesn't inform them.

DAVID HUNKE: That is one reason I think you will hear some of us continue to describe a hybrid solution to this, and why-- And quite frankly, we're in more than a fair amount of trouble as an industry, print newspapers. And that maybe hasn't come across, at least from me today. We are. But there's a number-- But we will have newspapers. But we have got to diversify the streams of revenue that come in that allow us to hire and retain the journalists that we're talking about to package and deliver this information.

The fundamentals of aggressive reporting in a community, we've got to pay for that. We had a business model that we lost billions of dollars to Craig's List. And we didn't replace it. And even though it may seem a little un-sanitized or unsavory to suggest, it was our want ads that were putting many of us on stages and podiums to take credit for a lot of this great coverage. We didn't react fast enough to that. So really (and it perhaps uniquely my perspective on this)-- Again, I run our business. Perhaps the real sin in this and the motivation to move quickly is we've got to find a way to rebuild the businesses. Because we understand the central obligations to our communities, to our nation, and our reporting. We want to maintain those. But we've got to find a way financially to do that, and move it across these other platforms in a way that lets the reader control the access to the information.

MARVIN KALB: When you talk about a fourth distribution model, what are you talking about there?

DAVID HUNKE: Well, or more of a hybrid distribution model. I will tell you. Marcus touched on this. Believe me — a lot of our costs continued to be tied up in the subject that we mentioned today, which was print. But there are fabulous, enticing devices that will allow us to take everything we do in terms of writing and editing and reading and packaging that people will pay us for, with integrated advertising, that will move onto all kinds of devices (and you will choose whether you want to pick that up as a newspaper) but comprehensive newspapers, with embedded video in this, that I think will open up all kinds of advertising-- excuse me-- revenues and opportunities for us to stay aggressively in the journalism [simultaneous conversation]--

MARVIN KALB: Now, that assumes that your content is going to be paid for by the person who has the digital device in the palm of her hands. Now, are you going-- Does that happen now? I mean, you're boasting about all this digital stuff.

DAVID HUNKE: Yes.

MARVIN KALB: Does that actually make money for you?

DAVID HUNKE: Yeah. We make money on Kindle now. We make money on licensing our content now. I'm sitting up here with folks who are masters at-- We haven't put enough emphasis on the value of our content and the pricing of it. We're going to have to rely more on that.

MARVIN KALB: What do you mean by that?

DAVID HUNKE: Well, I think we've just given it away. And only recently, too many of us in this industry decided, heavens, why in the world would we do that? Common sense would tell you, there's great value to this content. That's why people are in this room tonight. We have to sell it.

MARVIN KALB: Right. But you are already doing that.

DAVID HUNKE: Yes. And we will do more.

MARVIN KALB: In the big world of journalism, who else is doing that now? *The Atlanta Constitution* doing that?

CYNTHIA TUCKER: We have experimented with selling some of our content online. But like most large newspapers, you can still get most of that that is published in the daily newspaper free online every day. But at *The Atlanta Journal Constitution*, like most newspapers around the country, there are people who are sitting in small rooms or large rooms every day struggling with what I think of as the Holy Grail of journalism at the

moment, which is to come up with this integrated business model that supports the journalism that we all want to do.

And I'm glad Dave, as the publisher on the podium, mentioned the advertising that pays for this work. While newspapers have been losing circulation for decades, that has been mostly a rather slow process. Slowly we've been losing readers, readership. But what is killing us, as I understand it-- and I'm not a publisher. I only know what I read in business sections of newspapers-- is the loss of advertising, particularly those classifieds that pay the bills — cars, real estate, and jobs — much of which is sold now online. The last time I bought a car, I did not look in the printed pages of a newspaper.

MARVIN KALB: You did it on the Internet.

CYNTHIA TUCKER: I did it on the Internet.

MARVIN KALB: Which an awful lot of people are doing. Anne, tell me, shifting the focus just a little bit, to the degree that all of this is valid and touches the lives of journalists-- You've been at this for awhile now. When you walk into a newsroom today, *International Trib* in your case (other newspapers here represented) are you going into a happy environment?

ANNE BAGAMERY: Marvin, you're talking about journalists. We got into this business to kick over rocks and see what crawls out from under them. I mean, we got into them to be professional questioners and professional skeptics. It's how we do our job. And we do it well. Is it a happy environment? There are pockets of happiness. I think I have to say that people who work at *The Herald Tribune*, the people who work at *The New York Times*, my friends at *The Journal* and *The Post* and at Bloomberg, they take great pleasure and great pride in what they do.

MARVIN KALB: Isn't that amazing?

ANNE BAGAMERY: And every single day — every single day — there's something that makes you say, "Thank god I chose this business."

MARVIN KALB: You know, just the other day, I had a very nice conversation with, I guess you would call him a senior editor at *The New York Times*. And I asked him. I said, "In preparation for this program that I'm going to do, what's going on at *The Times*? What should I be mindful of?" He had a very long, sour face. And I said, "Is it that bad?" He said, "It's worse." He said, "It's really worse."

And I was just kind of curious as to whether this is just a *New York Times* affliction, or whether you might see it at *USA Today* [simultaneous conversation]--

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: Of course there's a lot of anxiety out there. There ought to be a lot of anxiety because we've been going through great tumultuous times. But you know what does ground most of us in journalism is good journalism. And actually I think, you know, this whole conversation has turned so much on the business model that we forget that really what drives us and what drives our success most is doing good journalism. And if you see on any website what draws the most traffic-- You know, when we have a really blockbuster story on our website, you see huge attention to the journalism. And we know that if we practice good journalism, we will draw eyeballs. We will draw readers. And we ultimately can build a business around that.

MARVIN KALB: Let me bring your attention to a recent study by the Knight Foundation which raised a couple of interesting points. I'd like to get-- appreciate your thinking about it. The report said that one-third of the American people have no broadband connection to the Internet. And Alberto Ibargüen, the president of the Knight

Foundation, whom I'm sure you all know, he said, "That's a hell of a lot of people who don't have access to the way that we're communicating."

According to the report, we have in this country a broadband gap, a literacy gap, a participation gap. And I'm wondering, Dave, in what way does that kind of fact factor into the way in which you run your newspaper and all of the attendant operations?

DAVID HUNKE: Well, I don't want to come off as the glass half full person on this or be dismissive of constituents who can access us. I just moved to Washington from Detroit, a city where 47% of the adults are functionally illiterate. You talk about newspapers and how we're going to serve via broadband or distribution to other parts of this world. They now look at us with incredible sympathy because of our illiteracy rates and our failure to pay attention to this.

So I'm not sure how to grapple with an issue that is-- We have 70% of the population with some form of broadband penetration. Based on how poorly we've done in other areas, I almost think that that's somewhat commendable. And I don't mean to suggest we don't go farther. But, you know, good gracious, that's a gigantic question in this room, of, how do we connect and stay engaged in a society where we have so many people disenfranchised and unable to read us and communicate with us?

MARVIN KALB: Cynthia, you remember that-- I don't remember the exact date, but I think it was back in the '60s, there was a report that spoke about two Americas really, a black and a white America. And I'm wondering, is there any validity here in what it is that these statistics are saying, that there may be two Americas emerging in the digital age, one that actually is connected and one that, as Dave was now saying, isn't even part of that world? Does that become, getting to my large question about the impact on our democracy, does that become a factor in the way in which we will end up governing

ourselves? Are we going to hurt ourselves by not systematically going into that third of America and making sure that they have access to the Internet?

CYNTHIA TUCKER: Well actually Marvin, I think there is some remarkably good news there. One of the things that I am most encouraged about is that while I think that there is certainly a divide, I don't think it's a racial divide. It's a generational divide. There are certainly-- If you're poor, you are much less likely to have broadband or computer in your home. But certainly in large urban school systems, the school systems have been very good about installing computer technology and teaching public school children, no matter what homes they come from, to get online, to email, to use computers very well. Their parents may not know how to do it. But they do. And of course they can go to public libraries and use those facilities.

I worry much more about rural areas. My mother actually doesn't have broadband, can't get it. She has DSL, kind of slow, but it's okay. But my mother is never going to read a newspaper online. I don't care what happens. It's just not-- She uses the computer. She emails, but she's not going to read the newspaper online.

And the two newspapers that serve the very small town that she lives in both circulate from a hundred miles away. So one, for reasons that Dave just talked about, one has stopped circulating in Monroeville. Why would you drive trucks a hundred miles to circulate a paper to, you know, a handful of people who want it on their doorsteps?

So she's now getting the paper out of Mobile. But I fear that they will make the same decision in the next two or three years, that they can't drive trucks that far. So then I don't know how my mother will get her newspaper. She will no longer have access to a daily newspaper.

MARVIN KALB: Anne, in France, the president of the country, alarmed by what's been going on with newspapers. Has he actually taken money out of the French budget and given it to French newspapers like in the--

ANNE BAGAMERY: In January of this year, President Sarkozy did earmark €280 million Euros, which is about \$340 million dollars at today's exchange rate, for support for newspapers.

MARVIN KALB: It's sort of a bailout to newspapers in trouble in France.

ANNE BAGAMERY: It's a prop-up. Let's just say it's a prop-up. It's tax credits for distribution systems. It was even a fairly interesting, in terms of our discussion tonight, an interesting program. He has proposed offering every 18 year-old in the country a free subscription to the print product of his or her choice. Yes, he has done that.

MARVIN KALB: Now, the question that I would like to put to all of you is, does it make any sense at all in the American context of journalism to have a government bailout of newspapers? Dave?

DAVID HUNKE: Shall I go first? No. No. I would rather see the Justice Department review antitrust and competitive business restrictions I believe that are upon us. But no, not a government bailout of our journalism.

MARVIN KALB: Because-- ?

DAVID HUNKE: I fear control.

MARVIN KALB: Marcus?

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: You know, my gut says no. I guess given my role in running coverage, I'd rather step back from the actual discussion on that one.

MARVIN KALB: Do you see it as something that is even on the horizon?

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: There are people in Congress who have talked about what it is the government could do to support newspapers, including things like Dave suggested, you know, change the rules governing how certain parts of our business is regulated. You know? I think it's certainly a live conversation in Washington. And I think, you know, looking at it as an observer, I think newspapers in general have a lot of anxiety about becoming dependent in any way on the government.

MARVIN KALB: Because of the concern that Dave is raising about control ultimately?

DAVID HUNKE: I think those were my words and not Marcus's. Yes, in mine, I worry about controls.

MARVIN KALB: Right. Cynthia, what do you think?

CYNTHIA TUCKER: Well, Marcus's answer told me something, when he said he wanted to step back from this. Because I didn't realize that there was really that much conversation in Congress about it. So Marcus must think that. There will be more discussion of this in Congress, which I think would be fascinating.

I would love to see what was proposed and see how it worked. After all, when the Federal government took over GM, one of the first things that happened was that the CEO was bounced. So the last thing you'd want was a government bailout that resulted in that sort of direction intervention.

ANNE BAGAMERY: If I could just add something about the French experience, there's a wonderful principle in The United States called separation of powers, which I think a government bailout of the newspapers would go dangerously close to crossing a line that should never been crossed. Same principle doesn't operate in France. There's a concept of strategic industries. There's also a much tighter relationship between government and certain business interests. And I think that the proposal of the Sarkozy government fell within that context. So I'm not sure that you could ever look at something that happened in France and wonder if it could happen in The United States. I think it's a chalk and cheese situation.

MARVIN KALB: I wonder if, as you look back in the history of this country, whether we have gone through similar problem zones as we are right now. Marcus, are you aware [simultaneous conversation]--

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: In the newspaper industry?

MARVIN KALB: Yeah.

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: Well, you know, newspapers in this country were always a volatile business. I mean, there was a time a hundred years ago where there were, almost in any size city, multiple newspapers. And newspapers often lost a lot of money, run by proprietors who owned them in order to have a voice in their community. And when the proprietor went, the newspaper collapsed. And this was fairly commonplace until really the second half of the last century. You know, newspapers, as we know them today, as huge profitable quasi-monopolies, have existed largely in the last fifty years. Before that, there was intense competition. There were always losers, sometimes big losers.

And I think the days of the quasi-monopoly news organization in the nation and in cities are fading. I think that there is going to be a whole, you know, new crop of competition coming from sources that we can see, and some sources we probably can't imagine.

MARVIN KALB: We've got a little over a minute here. But I'm just wondering, Anne, when you look into the future-- And there are many young people here who would like to go into journalism. Is this a career field that you would recommend enthusiastically?

ANNE BAGAMERY: Yes, I would. And one of the reasons you asked before about is, the newsroom a happy place to be. I think one of the great pockets of happiness is working with the young people in our newsroom. We have interns and clerks who want to break into this business. They want to see their names in print. They want to do a good job. It's heavy lifting, believe me, to take someone who just has nothing but energy and maybe just the glimmerings of talent, and turn that person into someone who can write well for publication. But I think there's nothing more rewarding. And I think every newspaper, even at the NFL, which is what you're looking at here, and also especially in the small papers that produced more of us, I would say-- My first newspaper was *The Norfolk Ledger Star* which doesn't exist anymore, I'm afraid.

But those are all the great proving grounds for journalists. It's where you really learn your craft. And I think if anything is going to save this business, it's going to be young people who learn their craft and learn the basics and learn to be good journalists on whatever platform we decide to send it out on. It's the standards that are going to really save this industry and save what we think of as print. So would I recommend it? Yes, I would, if you're ready to work, if you're always curious about the world, and if that work and that curiosity is your reward. I'd say yes, absolutely.

MARVIN KALB: Give me fifteen seconds, same question.

CYNTHIA TUCKER: Absolutely. I am still in this business because I still am thrilled to get up every morning and find out what's going on in the world and tell people what I think about it.

MARVIN KALB: Well, I wish the heck that we could go on. I would like really to do that. But we have run out of time. We've got the turning of the clock once again. But I want to thank our panelists for being so kind to be with us and to speak to us as honestly as they have. And I want to thank all of you, dear audience, for coming onboard and for being with us here tonight. And I would like to say to all of the people watching and listening — remember, a free press is the underpinning of a free society. I'm Marvin Kalb. And remember, as Ed Murrow used to say, "Good night and good luck."

[applause]

MARVIN KALB: We are setting up now two microphones, one here, which I see, and the other is right there. And if you have a question, please come up to either one of the mics. Please ask a question. Do not make a speech, because if you make a speech, I'll cut you off. But let me start on this side right here. And identify yourself, please.

QUESTION: Joe Sidowsky(?). I'm from the Scripps Howard Foundation wire service. And I'm originally from Cincinnati. I have a question for, I guess, all the panelists. It's something that's been bugging me for awhile. Basically in journalism now, as a student (and I'm about to graduate) I hear that, you know, we need to be familiar with Flash, with Photoshop, Dreamweaver, photography, video, audio, as well as writing and editing. I'm just curious — I know you're supposed to avoid clichés, but one of them really gets to me when I think about that — jack of all trades and master of none. Do you worry that maybe that journalists are currently being brought up in this environment where they will be good at a lot of things, but not, you know, as great as they used to be in any particular area?

MARVIN KALB: Well, a really great journalist has to do everything, I think. But go ahead, Marcus.

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: Those are all means to the end. I mean, I have one regret about the whole conversation we had just now, which is, we didn't talk about journalism. We talked about the business of journalism. And that's unfortunate, because journalism's actually thriving in many levels, I think. You know, what you're talking about, you know, when Marvin was covering Indonesia, you probably had to know how to operate a Telex machine. And you probably had to know how to bribe the guy to get access to that Telex machine [simultaneous conversation]--

MARVIN KALB: I would never bribe ...(inaudible).

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: --and all kinds of things he had to do to get journalism done. That's not the journalism part. I mean, knowing all these things may be essential tools to the craft, but it doesn't mean-- You know, what you need to be a master of is not the technology. You need to be a master of the subject. And you need to be a master of writing. You need to understand how to dive in deep on a subject and understand all the nuance and report it back in plain English so that your audience will understand and care.

QUESTION: Hi. My name is Erica Anderson, a graduate of Indiana University's school of journalism. My question is actually for Marcus. Just recently, *The Washington Post* came out with a social media policy for your writers and for your producers. My question to you is, how will your social media policy impact the news gathering and personalities of your writers as it has taken some heat in the new media community for not being completely in-line, some people would say, with participatory journalism, crowd sourcing for ideas?

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: The question pertains to (just explain for those of you who may not know it) we recently put out a policy governing how our reporters should act when they're on social media like Facebook or Twitter, so they don't express opinions or viewpoints that are in conflict with the journalism they're asked to do. And the questioner pointed out that we've taken some heat for that because some people think that we're sort of perhaps not up-to-date.

The reality is, we operate in a different part of the world than some of the new media operate. We value and think it is important for our readers that we value our independence. And we think it is essential that *Washington Post* journalists do not suggest that they have a slant in their coverage. It's not to say that we would not have journalists Twittering or blogging. We have lots of journalists at *The Washington Post* who produce columns, who produce blogs who have opinions. But those opinions are opinions that go through a process. And we've assigned those people to those tasks so we know what they're doing.

But when you have a news staff of, you know, hundreds of people, and many of those people are covering somewhat delicate and politically sensitive issues, it's important for our readers to feel (and I think this is true, not just how our readers feel) that we are objective, we approach the stuff with a sense of fairness and balance, that the fix isn't in when you read *The Washington Post*.

QUESTION: Good evening. My name is Valerie Hopkins. I'm a native of Washington, D.C. And my question is, a recurring theme of this evening has been sort of the tension between accessibility and journalism as the ultimate public service. And my question is, you know, we've discussed the ways that we need to find new ways of reaching readers, while also finding new ways to generate revenue. And I'm just kind of interested in discussing what the model is for sort of the best fit curve between the two of these, if there is one. I know we're still exploring that. Thanks.

MARVIN KALB: Who would like to try that? Anne?

DAVID HUNKE: Anne, jump at that.

ANNE BAGAMERY: Thanks. What is the ideal, what is the golden mean, if you like, for making sure that we've got our journalism out and as many platforms as possible, but also, if I understand it, finding new ways to make money? I think they're two very different questions. I think these are both challenges that we have to face. But I don't think that they're-- How can I put this-- ?

The platform isn't the problem. Okay? It's not really the problem. Getting great journalism out on the Web is just a fantastic opportunity. And I think we all feel lucky that we're able to seize it. We're still doing great stories. We're still doing great journalism. And we're using all of the media that we can get our arms around. The problem is, as we'll all said, is, where's the money going to come from? Where's the pipeline? And that part is a bit broken.

But I don't think it's really a question of, can we find more ways-- There may be marginal ways that we're not thinking of right now that we can make more money out of what we're doing. But I don't know. As you can see, this is a very difficult place for the business right now. And I think one of the reasons that we struggle with how to make money and how to do our best is that we are still doing our best in an environment where the money is shrinking. But we are still managing to do our best.

This gentleman here has already pledged that he's going to come up with a business model in how many years? He's going to come up with a way to make the money.

QUESTION: I guess the only sort of elucidation is sort of, what trumps in terms of democracy and, like, promoting an engaged, informed public and the business model?

ANNE BAGAMERY: Which comes first?

QUESTION: Well, not which comes first, but just kind of how the tension between the two plays out. But that's what I--

MARVIN KALB: There is a continuing tension. You're right. I don't think there's any doubt about that.

QUESTION: Hi. My name is Alan DeLevy(?) and I'm a student at Penn State. With the Internet, there's been newer styles of journalism made possible that you couldn't really do with print. One of them is called process journalism. I don't know if you're familiar with that, but it's more iterative and rapid fire. I'm wondering if your newspapers will embrace that.

MARVIN KALB: Cynthia, you want to do some rapid fire?

CYNTHIA TUCKER: You know, I don't know the answer to the question about-- I certainly can't answer for anyone else here, whether their newspapers will embrace that. I will talk about tensions. I think that for old-fashioned, staid journalists like myself, there is a sense of tension between taking the time we traditionally took to make sure that all the information you put out there was accurate, and these new technologies that allow us to publish immediately.

I feel badly if my punctuation is incorrect in my blog. My mom was a schoolteacher. And I just can't get over that. But because of the pressure of writing quickly, it is often, my

punctuation is bad. My spelling is poor. I can't imagine what it would be like if participatory is having lots of different people participate. Is it sort of like Wikipedia?

QUESTION: Not quite, no.

CYNTHIA TUCKER: Not quite? Okay. I can't imagine what it would be like to have a process like that conform to the standards of traditional journalism.

QUESTION: My name is Austin Wright. I'm from Richmond, Virginia. It seems like many members of my generation would rather read 200-word, snarky recaps of your stories on Huffington Post or Gawker. How much do you see that as a threat? And what can be done to combat that?

MARVIN KALB: That's an excellent question. And there is a study which suggests that an awful lot of people who go to the Internet seeking information about the world or their community look at a headline. When they go to the aggregation page, they'll look at the headline and not use the headline as an open sesame to a deeper study of anything, but they'll be satisfied with the headline. And that is one of the, not dangerous, but it's one of the concerns that I think anyone ought to have.

QUESTION: Isn't the dead tree obsolete as a platform for delivering news? I mean, in five or ten years, aren't we all going to have wi-fi and Kindles, or wi-max, and be able to read our news electronically without the printing and distribution costs? And aren't you all going to go out of business if you don't realize that?

MARVIN KALB: Okay, well, Dave, I think you have answered this question, but we'll do it again.

DAVID HUNKE: Yeah. If we don't address the need of a consumer to receive, distribute, act upon, some of the process journalism question, interact in any way that they choose, we have a very good chance of going out of business. What I would caution everybody about, the news consumer will make this decision about the first question. And that is, when they choose not to have a printed newspaper delivered or available to them, the consumer will make this decision. I don't know that we're overly invested in trying to convince everybody that that's the best and only way for them to receive our branded content. But I would not agree that within ten years, there are absolutely no newspapers, ink on paper, distributed anywhere in the world. It's a utility issue right now.

QUESTION: My name is Stan Temption(?). I'm a native of Washington, D.C. And my question actually was alluded to by the young man before me. But I think the problem here is a generational gap. I still read two newspapers every morning. We have two children, both college graduates, who get 99% of their news off the Web. And they're very well informed, because I have discussions with them all the time. And I wonder here, when I see all these young people, not that you have to read two newspapers, but how many of them actually read a newspaper every day, but rather get all their information off the Web?

MARVIN KALB: I don't even think that an answer is required. I mean, we've just done it. Go ahead.

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: I hope you're reading, both newspapers, *The Washington Post*, right? That helps.

MARVIN KALB: I'll tell you something — about ten years ago or so, in starting a class at the Kennedy School, I asked the students, "How many of you read *The Boston Globe*," which is the Boston paper. Not a single hand went up, not a single hand. It all goes through the Internet now. And if it just is the headlines, then you've got a problem.

QUESTION: Hi, I'm Dina Levitz(?). I'm a freelance journalist in D.C. And I guess kind of tacking onto that gentleman's point, my concern is that readers my age (not so much myself but...) we're so used to getting content for free and we're kind of spoiled with that. So how do you counter that? Can you go back now and charge for content? Is that just impossible to do? And kind of on a related note, I've read a lot about efforts such as Steve Brill is trying to encourage content bundling where different news organizations would kind of work together to get people to subscribe in that way. What's your opinion about that?

DAVID HUNKE: I may jump into that and try to be brief. There are a lot of conversations between a lot of broadcast news, newspaper content organizations who are-- absolutely realized that we're giving away this primary thing that is our service every day, we're giving away for free. We have to find a way to systematically, my estimation, charge for some of this, whether that is on a per utilization charge or whether a subscription charge, or more importantly-- okay?-- how we bundle this into a comprehensive package of news, information, and entertainment that comes to you on a variety of devices. I think we're going to have a very hard time telling you tomorrow without a subscription to at least *USA Today's* website, which is absolutely free, that you're going to go, "Oh, I'll give my credit card number."

But there's a lot of attention being paid to this right now. We have to shift the burden from financing the journalism by advertising to a greater percentage of this to our users. We're going to have to earn that right.

MARVIN KALB: How long will it take for you to do that?

DAVID HUNKE: Well, I tell you, we're going to begin seeing a great deal of this the first quarter of 2010.

ANNE BAGAMERY: Rupert Murdoch has already said that he's going to start charging for certain kinds of content on all of his media properties.

MARVIN KALB: Isn't *The Wall Street Journal* already doing that?

ANNE BAGAMERY: Yes, it is. Yes, it is.

QUESTION: Hi, I'm Ruthie Kelly(?) from San Diego State University. And I'm actually still in college there. And you may be familiar with The Voice of San Diego. It's a relatively well-known non-profit journalism outlet. And I was wondering if you-- I know you all work for for-profit organizations. But do you think that the non-profit model is viable, considering that they have the same advertising difficulties that a corporation does? Are they going to save us? Or are they going to just dry up?

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: I think that there's room for multiple models. I think the notion that there is going to be one model is a flawed notion. There will be non-profits. I mean, there's MinnPost. There's Voice of San Diego. There's all kinds of interesting online things emerging. There will be newspapers in the old model or news organizations that originate and maybe grow out of newspapers. I'm quite sure that there will be successful content providers like that. I mean, look at, you know, all the public broadcasting affiliates, NPR and so on. There's ample room for good journalism to come out of those.

MARVIN KALB: If you're providing the content in these various ways that you're talking about, how can you be comfortable as an editor that the information is valid, has been checked?

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: What information-- that we produce?

MARVIN KALB: No, that you produce. You are in the market where you are interested in everything. And let's say what is happening out in San Diego is one example. But it's happening in different parts of the country. And people are very excited about it, because it seems right. My question is simply, how do you as an editor know, feel comfortable that the information has been checked?

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: You know, I don't think you know-- I know the information that's produced by our journalists is good. I trust our information. And over time, you learn what other organizations are following the same standards and practices. And you start to trust *The New York Times* or *USA Today*. And I think the same applies on the Internet. Once something has been consistently responsible and true, you put faith in it.

QUESTION: My name's Jason Pecaut(?). I've lived in D.C. for about thirty-two years. My question is, as we move to these platforms and the information becomes, you know, almost instantaneous, how concerned as you guys about the thing that happened on CNN with 9/11 and the shots fired, and, "Oh, there's," you know, "...this terrible-- Oh, what is this all about," and this story that sort of took a life on of its own that really didn't exist?

MARVIN KALB: Cynthia, you want to try that?

CYNTHIA TUCKER: I think that that has been-- Again, that tension between the new technologies and accuracy, has been upon us for some time now. And I think we will continue to struggle with that.

MARVIN KALB: And there's also such an enormous pressure. If you have the technology-- I mean, I remember when cameras were even bigger than these things, and you had to have sound men and light men and all of that. Today, the technology is so

swift. You could take one of these gadgets, point it, and it becomes a news story. That's what was happening in Iran in June.

A lot of the information came, not from journalists, but from people who held up a modern piece of technology, held it over their heads. And it showed certain things. And then we thought long distance that we could interpret what was going on, based on that. The tendency is to go with something because it's there. The quality of journalism is to know that it's there, but not to go with it unless it's been checked. And that's what's missing a lot today.

QUESTION: My name's Eric Webber. I'm a recent transplant to Washington. And I read an article somewhat recently that discussed that readers today have a much higher tendency than they have in the past to seek out news that says very much what they want to hear, especially from a political standpoint. And so to that extent, the freedom we have of information on the Internet-- And those are the sorts of types of places you can go, the snarky websites that were mentioned previously, or *The Colbert Report*, what have you. How is that phenomenon affecting the journalistic integrity, for instance, that *The Washington Post* is trying so hard to maintain?

MARCUS BRAUCHLI: Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson has newspapers that, you know, their followers read closely. And they sort of rallied troops to their cause. It happens today. I don't think that it has an impact on the need for us to do what we think is right, which is to pursue the truth as nearly as we can discern it, and to report it as clearly as we can report it.

MARVIN KALB: I think that's a terrific way of ending our session. I want to thank all of you once again for being with us and thank our panel. God bless you all very much. Thank you.

[applause]

END