MARVIN KALB: Hello, and welcome to another edition of The Kalb Report. I'm Marvin Kalb, and our subject today is Why Murrow Matters in the Digital Age. Many of you know that we usually do our reports for the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. But today, we're in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, for the annual convention of the Society of Professional Journalists and the Radio Television Digital News Association. Where better to ask why Murrow matters in the digital age? The journalists in this ballroom, hundreds of them, face a technological and financial problem, some call it a crisis, and it's been that way for a while. The result is that journalism seems thinner these days, but its responsibilities have never been, forgive me, thicker.

The nation is absorbed with degrees of political deadlock and economic uncertainty and overseas of the world is in dramatic turmoil and danger. Stories are everywhere. Question: can journalism do its job when its budgets are being pinched, staffs are cut and morale in many places way down? Journalism now needs inspired and imaginative leadership. It could also use a new Ed Murrow, but where is he or she?

I confidently predict that our panelists will provide the answers. And let me introduce Casey Murrow, Ed’s son. He’s Executive Director of Synergy Learning, a nonprofit that supports math and science teachers. He has co-authored books on elementary and preschool education, including two series supported by the National Science Foundation. He’s taught at the University of Vermont and he is the executor of the literary estate of his father, the legendary Edward R. Murrow.

Erin Moriarty is a lawyer and a CBS News correspondent who’s also received many prizes including nine Emmy Awards and one Overseas Press Club Award. She's covered just about everything from the death of Princess Diana to the war in Iraq. She joined CBS in 1986 after working for affiliates in Chicago, Columbus, Ohio, Baltimore, and Cleveland.

And finally, Dean Baquet, who is Managing Editor of the New York Times after stints as its national editor and Washington bureau chief. He was also the editor of The Los Angeles Times, and before that, a Pulitzer Prize winning investigative reporter for the Chicago Tribune. He’s been there, in other words, and done it.

Okay panelists, our theme, Why Murrow Matters in the Digital Age, but let’s start with a simpler question, why Murrow matters at all. Why is it that every news organization earnestly seeks a Murrow prize of some sort or another? Why is it that so many journalists pattern their professional lives after Murrow? Why is it that when offered the chance, I name my professorship at Harvard the Edward R. Murrow Professor of Press and Public Policy, certainly the highest honor I will ever receive. Why Murrow Matters? Obviously because he was so very special, but that's only the beginning of an explanation. And I want to start with Murrow’s son, Casey. How would you answer that question?

**CASEY MURROW:** Well, I would answer it in the past tense, first of all, because he was a wonderful father and one who set standards that I believe in and appreciate even today. In the current era, why does he matter? I think, again, because of the standards that he believed in and managed to achieve most of the time as a reporter and that I think he was able to inculcate in a lot of other folks as well as they began their careers, in his case with CBS.
MARVIN KALB: Were you aware at the time, Casey, that your father was having such an impact upon his profession and the nation?

CASEY MURROW: Not as a young kid, no. My parents were very careful to not let me get stuck in what would be a rut, I think, for a kid. I simply knew the family as it was and it wasn’t clear until I was in my teens, really, of what Dad had done.

MARVIN KALB: And the current phraseology, is quality time. He was very busy. Were you ever able to get that quality time?

CASEY MURROW: Yes, in strange chunks. We did a lot of fishing together, we did hunting together. He taught me how to paddle a canoe. So he took chunks of time off when I did get to spend significant time with him.

MARVIN KALB: That's wonderful. Erin, you work at CBS. I once worked at CBS for 24 years. Ed worked at CBS, of course, same network. Same question, really. How would you define as a CBS correspondent the Murrow legacy?

ERIN MORIARTY: Well, I think one of the reasons why we look to him, there were some terrific reporters before him. But it was almost like the perfect storm. We got to see him in action because of television and hear him in radio. He was this person who took on an iconic figure at the time, and there wasn't the noise that exists now.

MARVIN KALB: What do you mean by that?

ERIN MORIARTY: Well, I mean there were three networks, there were some newspapers. You really saw him. Now, I believe there are Murrows out there, but it’s hard to see them because there's so much going on. But he represents in some ways an ideal, what we all should be as reporters. But the fact that he was a human being and we
got to see his personality, it also made it something that we could achieve then, too. It wasn’t just an ideal, it was a human person as well.

**MARVIN KALB:** Bob Edwards, author of one of the really good Murrow biographies, we know that Murrow mattered. But from your own research, observation, why, how?

**BOB EDWARDS:** He professionalized what we do. I mean, news was done on radio before Murrow, news was done on television before Murrow. But it was done by announcers. It was done by people who also covered parades and beauty contests, they were jacks of all trades. What Murrow did was devote himself and his associates, the fabulous, fabulous staff that he hired, strictly on news and they were professionals. He set the highest standards very early. When you can start an industry with the best and have those standards laid down including motive, why do you do the news? For what reasons do you do the news? Are you serving an audience? Are you doing this for commercial advantage? Are you doing this to make money for William Paley?

And he had the courage of his convictions. He was fearless, set that example up against McCarthy, up against William Paley when that was necessary, and paid the ultimate price. He’s a hero, he’s a martyr.

**MARVIN KALB:** He is, and he’s also introduced the--

**BOB EDWARDS:** Professionally a martyr, I mean.

**MARVIN KALB:** Yes. But also ethics. He also, in the very definition of what you're saying, introduced the concept of ethics into journalism.

**BOB EDWARDS:** Yes, and doing everything for the right reasons. And talk about fair and balanced, he was quite fair. Balance he didn’t care for. [laughter] To add balance is
to say all arguments are equal. He would not bring a liar on to balance the truth. He would investigate, very thoroughly investigate, and then come down with what he had learned, and that was it.

**MARVIN KALB:** Terrific. Dean, you're our newspaper man here. And does Murrow, a radio and television man, matter to you?

**DEAN BAQUET:** I think even more so now, for a ton of reasons. First off, the news business, in general, from newspapers to the internet to television, is undergoing the same kind of revolution that it probably was undergoing at the time he first became an iconic figure. I think that the ethics of the news business is being challenged like never before partly because, to be frank, our sins are more evident, the mistakes we make-- which I think is a healthy thing, by the way-- the mistakes we make are more evident. Partly because there are new players in the industry who while I think they are bringing terrific things to the industry may not know all of the history.

I think we're in the middle of a significant revolution in news gathering, in the way news is presented, in the very definition of a reporter. So I think to have a figure who’s sort of a north star who helped set a definition for what a reporter should be, for what the ethics should be, is probably even more important now than 25 years ago.

**MARVIN KALB:** Thank you, Dean, thank you very much. Casey, I want to test your objectivity. When you turn on a television these days, or listen to the radio, do you see or hear any reporter who measures up to your dad?

**CASEY MURROW:** Oh, that's a nasty question. [laughter] I want to agree with Erin because I think there are many people who are doing very, very exciting work. I don't think people have the opportunity to get programs on the air in the way my dad did. He had access to CBS as a corporation in ways that people don’t today. And he probably had
access to people who are willing to take some risks, or in some cases lots of risk, beyond what they may be willing to take today. So identifying that, if we were to look for a person, it seems to me that's extremely hard in this day and age.

MARVIN KALB: I've got a question for Bob and for Erin. And this has been mentioned earlier. In 1958, Murrow delivered a very important speech, probably the most important of his life. He proposed, among other things, that the network set aside an hour of prime time on Sunday, not every Sunday, but often enough to discuss a major issue facing the nation, whether that be the economy, the Middle East or education.

He said of television, that “it can teach, it can illuminate, yes, and it can even inspire. But,” he added, “it can only do so to the extent that humans are determined to use it to those ends. Otherwise,” he concluded, “television is only wires and lights in a box.” So Bob, has television news lived up even in part to Murrow’s hopes?

BOB EDWARDS: I think there's a lot of great television, and television does a fabulous job of journalism on a breaking story. They're all over it and they're able to be in places they were never able to be before with all this marvelous technology. And to cover the story better than, at least from a technical standpoint, than Murrow’s people could.

But the rest of the time, I worry about it. Cable news networks have got shout shows in prime time, or celebrity interviews, or whatever. Where is the journalism there? Why is it just one great breaking story that's covered to death when the routine should be investigative reporting, what corporate America's up to, how lobbyists write our laws, all of that sort of thing should be exposed every day of our lives.

MARVIN KALB: And you're putting that within the context of the rise of cable. But Newt Minow, way back in 1962, made the point that if you sat down for 24 hours and that was the challenge you put to the people listening, he said, “If you watch television
for 24 hours, you would describe it as a vast wasteland.” So even back then, there were the seeds of that negative impression?

**BOB EDWARDS:** Right. What Murrow was arguing for was one hour a week, one hour. We get that now with cable, but he was asking for just one hour. Television could not break away from the cowboy shows of the time, the crime shows of the time, the sitcoms, the variety shows, for just one hour. It seemed to me a very modest request.

**MARVIN KALB:** But he didn’t get it?

**BOB EDWARDS:** No.

**MARVIN KALB:** Erin, would CBS hire Murrow today?

**ERIN MORIARTY:** That's an interesting question. But I want to disagree with Bob a little bit because *60 Minutes* is on every week, and I would argue that often *60 Minutes* is great journalism and most of the time it’s not breaking news, it’s usually putting things in perspective.

And the other thing I found, now I think it's just tough to find good television. There is a wasteland out there, but I've been an Emmy judge and when you take a look at the documentaries that appear on television, I'm sometimes embarrassed. I'm thinking, “Why didn’t I see this?” There's a lot of good stuff out there, wonderful reporting. But it’s hard to find today. How you define Edward R. Murrow, he would have to be probably good looking for CBS at first. No, but I'm just saying--

**MARVIN KALB:** But I'm talking about Edward R. Murrow that we know, would CBS hire him today?
ERIN MORIARTY: Today, this CBS would. Under Jeff Fager, I actually think would.

MARVIN KALB: What do you think he would be doing?

ERIN MORIARTY: He’d probably be working for 60 Minutes.

MARVIN KALB: [laughter] Okay. Dean, it's been said that the New York Times represents the gold standard of print journalism with all of the problems, finances and that. How do you maintain that high standard these days in a world of digital media?

DEAN BAQUET: First off, we're fortunate. The primary reason is that we're fortunate to be controlled by a family that cares more about the quality of the newspaper and its future than anything else. And that's not just a patriotic gesture to keep my job; that, in fact, is true. I mean, I think if the New York Times were to listen to the market, it would not be what it is today.

It’s really difficult now to put out a quality news report that does what the web demands and that's what is good about the web. But also that does what print demands. It’s really difficult.

MARVIN KALB: What are the specific pressures that you work under?

DEAN BAQUET: I mean, I'll give you-- as a reporter 20 years ago, if I covered a story-- I'll be pretty granular-- if I covered a press conference at ten a.m., I could go back to the office, I can make phone calls, I could come to understand it. I could write a story at 7:00 that captured the result of a lot of reporting. The White House reporter for the New York Times or the Washington Post or any print medium, and I'm talking about print because that's what I know, goes to cover the press conference at ten, has to file at 10:10 if it’s important. Has to then write again at 11:30 when somebody updates it or somebody
responds to it, maybe even one more time. And then by the end of the night has to start thinking about what kind of story is going to be analytic enough and smart enough to feel fresh to the print reader in the morning.

And that's really difficult. I think the biggest, most committed news organizations have managed to pull it off, partly because of the commitment of the people who work in the newsrooms.

**MARVIN KALB:** And you didn’t even mention the website demands.

**DEAN BAQUET:** Well, I was talking about the website demands when I said filing for 10:00 and 10:10, 10:20--

**MARVIN KALB:** Oh, you meant that for the web?

**DEAN BAQUET:** I meant for the web, yes.

**MARVIN KALB:** Oh, I'm sorry.

**DEAN BAQUET:** No, I meant for the web. The press conference that used to be, I meant-- that is the demand of-- that is today’s newspaper news cycle. And most newspapers, by the way, we're fortunate to be doing it with a staff that's the same size. A lot of papers are doing that with staffs that are half the size, a third the size. I would say, by the way, if you asked me the same question about newspaper journalism that you asked about print journalism, I would say that newspaper journalism is significantly weaker today as a rule than it was five or six years ago. I would say that the demands of the market on newsrooms and the resulting cuts in some of the great big American newspapers have hurt their ability to do what they even used to do, and to do what I just described has gotten to be almost impossible for a lot of newspapers.
I think newspapers-- what I think is great, by the way, is that I think that the best of what we're seeing in the web, the best of what we're seeing in this sort of nascent journalism, is making up for some of that, though.

**MARVIN KALB:** Well, it's interesting. There's a recent Pew study saying that an increasing number of print executives have said that in roughly five years, many newspapers in the U.S. may be able to offer a print copy only on a Sunday, and perhaps a couple of days during the week. Are you one of those executives who think that?

**DEAN BAQUET:** There's no doubt that's the future for a lot of print papers. It’s already started. I mean, the New Orleans paper, where I started, is going to print three days a week. Sunday is the day that most newspapers make all their money. I think it's inevitable. Many papers, I don't think that will be true of the *New York Times*, many papers will not print seven days a week. That's a guess from somebody who knows less about the business side. But it feels inevitable.

**MARVIN KALB:** But I don’t want to misunderstand you. Are you saying that you think even the *New York Times*?

**DEAN BAQUET:** No, I think not the *New York Times*.

**MARVIN KALB:** Not the *New York Times*?

**DEAN BAQUET:** But I think a lot of regional newspapers that are more economically challenged, that don’t have ways to generate huge income in their websites, that don’t have national advertising, that are dependent on local ad sources that are dwindling, I think you'll see a lot more of those papers shrink to two, three, one day a week print.
MARVIN KALB: Does the *Times*, both print and digital, make any money?

DEAN BAQUET: Yes. Oh, yeah. The *New York Times* print is still where the *New York Times* makes most of its money. But the *New York Times* as a newspaper, and a newspaper operation, still does make money, yes.

MARVIN KALB: You know, it’s interesting. There’s another study by the Newspaper Association of America, which says that newspapers have lost $798 million in print in the first six months of 2012, and made only $32 million in digital in that same period of time. I mean, if those numbers are right, how do you project print newspapers 5, 10, 15 years from now?

DEAN BAQUET: Well, first off, if you back up a little bit before we start to begin the death knell for newspapers, 25 years ago, print newspapers made unbelievable amounts of money. I mean, just had staggering profit margins. They were the dominant ways to advertise in their cities, so they were making tons of money. I think we were all too slow to adapt to an era in which we suddenly had a lot more competition. I mean, selling an ad at the *Los Angeles Times* of 25 years ago, I'm not being facetious, meant going out to play golf with the ad exec for Paramount Films. They said, “We got ten great movies coming out,” they said, “Great, we’ll have ads.” That era is gone.

MARVIN KALB: It was easy.

DEAN BAQUET: It was easy. And I'm not exaggerating how easy it was. It's really hard now. I think that it’s going to require much more of a public service belief on the part of newspaper executives, some of whom I think have shown-- Sam Zell, I hope you're listening-- have shown that they don’t have a public service fiber in their bodies. Some of whom, Don Graham, Arthur Sulzberger, do have a public service mentality and belief. And I think that's going to make a huge difference in the future of newspapers.
MARVIN KALB: I want to take a brief moment now to remind our radio and television audiences that this is The Kalb Report. I'm Marvin Kalb, our subject is Why Murrow Matters in the Digital Age and our panelists are Casey Murrow, Bob Edwards, Erin Moriarty and Dean Baquet.

Casey, many more people today are getting their news from the internet than they are from the mainstream media, the old CBS Radio and Television. May I ask where you get your news from these days?

CASEY MURROW: Probably half from the internet and a very high percentage from NPR.

MARVIN KALB: And in the internet, where do you go? What sorts of websites?

CASEY MURROW: I'm somewhat addicted to the New York Times website. But I realize there are faster sources of things--

DEAN BAQUET: No, that's enough. [laughter] The rest is sort of unnecessary, fine, really.

CASEY MURROW: I don't really go anywhere else.

DEAN BAQUET: Yeah, good. [laughter]

MARVIN KALB: Erin, where do you get your news from?

ERIN MORIARTY: I start in the morning on the internet, absolutely. And because the Times comes to my-- that’s the first place I look-- if there's a story that really interests
me, then I'll get off on Google and start looking. But I never miss morning television as well because as a television person, I need the pictures, too. And so then I flip on-- now, I have to admit, whether it’s radio or television, I use it as radio in the morning because I'm running around. But the first place, I have to say, I start is the internet.

MARVIN KALB: Bob, for you?

BOB EDWARDS: Still NPR and CNN and the Washington Post has been my local daily newspaper since 1971. It's a shadow of its former self, but it is still a great, wonderful newspaper.

MARVIN KALB: And when you say the internet, I want to be clear about this, what is it-- Casey was saying the internet meant for him largely-- I don’t want to misstate-- the New York Times web page.

CASEY MURROW: First choice.

MARVIN KALB: First choice. Erin, what would be-- on the internet, where do you go?

ERIN MORIARTY: Well, because the New York Times is right in my email, so that's the first place I go because I have it sent to me. That's my paper that I've always been addicted to.

MARVIN KALB: And the internet for you means what?

BOB EDWARDS: The Washington Post. The same one on the web, NPR and CNN. I don't know why, but that's where I go.

MARVIN KALB: And Dean, you?
DEAN BAQUET: All over the place. I mean--

MARVIN KALB: That's ducking. Where do you start?

DEAN BAQUET: No, no, I'll be more specific. Where I start depends on the biggest story of the day. In the middle of a campaign, I will put aside the *New York Times* because I will have looked at it the night before and in the morning.

MARVIN KALB: And memorized it.

DEAN BAQUET: Right. I look at the *Washington Post*, I look at Politico. If there's a big foreign story, I'll look at *The Guardian* first. I mean, it really depends on the story. If it’s a big economic story, I'm more likely to look at *The Journal*, I look at all the networks online. It's a ton of stuff, and a lot of it depends on the big story of the morning.

MARVIN KALB: For someone like you, it is professional homework to read up on stories?

DEAN BAQUET: Yes.

MARVIN KALB: You want to find out how the competition has done, other big stories that you might have to pursue that day?

DEAN BAQUET: Yeah. You want to see different perspectives. I mean, I find *The Guardian* extremely valuable for stuff, they're in a different time zone and it’s a very different kind of news organization. I find it valuable. I find the networks valuable. So I have to look at everything.
**MARVIN KALB:** Let me ask you all about a letter that was sent recently by six major journalism foundations. They were urging journalism schools to radically change their ways. They want to journalists to teach and to live on campus, and students and professors to focus on applied research. Too much theory, not enough practical training, seems to be their underlying message. They issue a thinly veiled threat, that if the journalism schools do not recreate themselves, they may not get any more money, which is a questionable aspect of that letter, and I hope that I'm misreading their intent.

But what I would like to know, Casey, and I'll start with you here because you deal with curricula quite often, you're dealing with students all the time, how does that sound to you? Can you recreate a journalism school in this manner?

**CASEY MURROW:** Well, I only heard about this idea this morning from the point of view of journalism and journalism schools. But, it rang a bell right away because schools of education are being told the same sorts of things by foundations. I think a lot of it is a message from foundations about their strength, in a way, and their ability to call some shots that they perhaps haven't exercised before.

In terms of journalism schools specifically, I really don’t know how that would work out. But it does seem to me to be a somewhat remarkable set of demands, particularly presented as a letter. But that was my--

**MARVIN KALB:** But in the education schools, for example, what is the intent of the foundation?

**CASEY MURROW:** Well, an interesting problem is that in a letter like that, they're actually right in terms of education. I mean, education schools are usually quite behind the times. They're not always teaching what they could to prepare students for
immediately entering classrooms. I'm guessing that in journalism, that could be true, too, but I'm not an expert in that.

MARVIN KALB: Erin, if it was your job at CBS to hire young journalists, would you want them to be graduates of this practical down to Earth applied model of journalism school?

ERIN MORIARTY: Well, yeah, I think I would. I would definitely want that, but I would also want-- I didn’t go to journalism school because I'm a lawyer and I went to law school. But it strikes me as the one place that you get a time to really think about what you're doing because we don’t get time day to day to think about what we're doing. When we run into an ethical situation, we have to deal with it on the fly. So the idea that you might be able to deal with those things in journalism school, I wouldn’t want to see that lost. But, yes, I would want to see it. Because one of the advantages, a couple of things with practical, is that they may run into a very real ethical situation that they have to deal with a story while they're in school, and so I'd want to see that.

And also because there's so many stories now that are happening where you could-- in these schools they're almost like on the front lines of some stories. When Aurora happened with the university right there, when you have Virginia Tech, sometimes the very first information you get because there is so much technology, I would like to think that the journalists who are covering it, these young students, are really learning the practical part of it and not suddenly caught off guard.

MARVIN KALB: There may be the danger that you can reach, lean too far in the direction of technology and then lose sight of what it is that you're there in the first place to do.

ERIN MORIARTY: Absolutely.
MARVIN KALB: Bob, Roger Ailes, I don't know if you know, but the president of Fox?

BOB EDWARDS: Fair and balanced. [laughter]

MARVIN KALB: He recently suggested to journalism students at the University of North Carolina, “In your shoes, I’d go into a new line of work.” Now, Roger Ailes is a notorious jokester and he might have been kidding, though I don't think so. And I'm wondering, why do you think he would say such a thing, not reading his mind here, but to talk to journalism students and raise a doubt, why?

BOB EDWARDS: I would not begin to try to read the mind of Roger Ailes. He's trying to discourage young journalists from entering the field?

MARVIN KALB: Either that or telling them they're in the wrong line of work. Or, he’s raising a question, really, in his way, that there are so many problems now in journalism, why bother to go into that industry when you could be a lawyer, for God’s sake. I mean, your father would be so proud of you.

BOB EDWARDS: Well, leaving Roger aside, I would tell young people there are certainly more lucrative professions. But nothing more fun.

MARVIN KALB: Nothing more fun.

BOB EDWARDS: And nothing more important, ultimately, to an informed electorate. By being a good journalist, you're participating in the governance of your country and serving a very important role. And it's just-- it’s fun. It’s the dirty little secret, it’s fun.
MARVIN KALB: Dean, as you know, there is now a believability rating, believe it or not, and according to a Pew study, ever since 2004 when the Times began to be included in that study, what they say is the believability of the Times has dropped 13 points. Now, first, do you believe that believability?

DEAN BAQUET: I actually don't, though I do think there's no question the believability in the media has dropped some. I'm not even sure I can contemplate how they got to that point. I will say a couple of things about trust in the media. First off, there's greater scrutiny of the media, which I think is healthy. Having been beaten up a couple of times and having not liked it, I still think it’s healthy. It’s what we do. I don't think we can complain about getting beat up when we essentially have a business model that depends on beating people up.

So, I think it's probably healthy. I think it’s also the result of another good thing, which is that we are much more open. People can see our mistakes much more. Partly that's because of the web. We make them fast, we try to fix them after, we make them fast. We try to be more transparent.

And then I think there's one really bad thing, which is I think that there's a-- and I would put a lot of this on institutions like Fox News, to be frank-- I think there are some news organizations that thrive on division and that would prefer to sort of beat the other guy up than do its own independent reporting, and I think that's contributed to it. All of those things combined--

MARVIN KALB: But to be fair to Fox here, I think you're talking about evening Fox where you have very opinionated anchors.

DEAN BAQUET: Yes, that's exactly what I'm talking about.
MARVIN KALB: But during the day, they are more or less straight?

DEAN BAQUET: No, you're right to correct me.

MARVIN KALB: But let's say for a second that this believability rating on the Times dropping 13 points is right, might that have something to do with falling revenues, cutting staffs? For example, when you were at the L. A. Times, you got an order to cut a staff that you didn’t like, you thought it excessive and you quit. Or left, anyway.

DEAN BAQUET: Right.

MARVIN KALB: Could that be the reason why people-- I mean, you ticked of a couple of reasons.

DEAN BAQUET: Sure, that's part of it. I think news-- and again, forgive me, I'm speaking about print because I don't know-- I think print organizations are weaker than they used to be. I think they're less in communities, I think they're less visible to people. I don't know how you could-- I mean, I think the L. A. Times is a terrific newspaper and I have tremendous respect for it. But I don't see how you could not-- or the Washington Post-- I don't see how you could not say they're not weaker because they're half as big. And I think anybody who says you can be just as good with half as many journalists is just ridiculous. It's a ridiculous observation.

MARVIN KALB: Bob, I'd like your view on this believability rating and wondering whether you feel it might have something to do with the polarization of our politics as well?

BOB EDWARDS: I think some of the slime sticks after a while. This has been a concerted campaign against us since at least Agnew and Nixon, and it’s been relentless,
it's picked up steam again and again. It’s turned out to be, I guess, still a winner for them on through Sarah Palin and the mainstream media. And I think ultimately, some of the slime just sticks and people who don’t give this a whole lot of thought or who have independent judgment, are willing to be led into sharing those views.

MARVIN KALB: And we have the phenomenon of people watching Fox who are, by nature, conservative politically and feel that the truth is what they're getting on Fox. And so when they--

BOB EDWARDS: And on the other side, too.

MARVIN KALB: Sorry?

BOB EDWARDS: And on the other side, too. Liberals, yeah, seek their--

MARVIN KALB: Yes. But what I'm saying is but that accounts for this increasing distrust of the media overall, and I think Erin was telling me about a recent poll that says what, Erin, 60 percent of the American people have increased--

ERIN MORIZARTY: Six out of ten Americans have little or no trust in the media, which is about the highest numbers they’d seen in a Gallup poll. Very concerning. But I think it has a lot to do with the polarization, too, that you don’t trust certain people because they're not expressing the views you believe in.

MARVIN KALB: You believe in.

DEAN BAQUET: It's also, by the way, that same trust factors true of all sort of big organizations. I mean, there's also been a significant drop in trust in politicians, big
corporations, et cetera. I think part of it is reflective of a changing view of American society.

**ERIN MORIARTY:** I'm just disappointed because it used to be lawyers were at the very bottom, so I thought I was moving up.

**DEAN BAQUET:** You sure they're not?

**ERIN MORIARTY:** No, I think both--

**BOB EDWARDS:** You're a twofer so-- [laughter]

**MARVIN KALB:** But you know what? In this new digital world, which is expanding rapidly as the old world of print shrinks, I'm wondering if we're seeing the development of two standards for judging editorial content? Like one standard for print newspaper and one standard for its website? And I asked the question because you can often see comments online about an online article. If you imagine that that same article appeared in the print edition, it would not necessarily make letters to the editor. It seems to be on the website at a lower level. And I'm wondering if that inherently creates a danger, that you're creating two standards of broadcast journalism. How does that strike you?

**DEAN BAQUET:** I don't buy it.

**MARVIN KALB:** I didn’t think you would. [laughter]

**DEAN BAQUET:** I think that readers are sophisticated enough to understand that the website of a news organization by its nature is going to have a little bit more sloppiness, by its nature. Because I do think that people understand that phenomenon of the press conference at ten, the story at eleven, there's not quite the expectation that it would be as
sophisticated or perfected as the thing that goes in the-- I don't think that means there should be a different standard. I mean, the standards of being honorable, being true, playing it straight, being as fair as possible. I think that holds. And in fact, I think if anything, I think that the web forces us to think even harder about it.

I gave you the example earlier of a day that the Supreme Court made its decision about the Obama healthcare plan, and we had a conversation the night before in which we all said, “We are not going to be first online to explain what this decision is, because we know what these things look like, we're not going to understand it. And we need to write a note to the readers that say, ‘Dear Readers, we're not going to be first. We're not going to put up anything until we understand what this thing is.’” And we did. And we were late, but I think we got it righter than most people.

MARVIN KALB: Second, but first get it right.

DEAN BAQUET: Right. Well, in that case, I think getting it wrong in that case would have been devastating for the integrity of our website and would have set it back a long ways.

BOB EDWARDS: I don't think there should be any tolerance for the difference. I mean, a newspaper required you, a writer of a letter to an editor, to sign your own name, and have an address in many cases. So that people can go to your home. You think twice about writing that letter. Online? You know, somebody named Dogface from Arkansas can say anything he wants about--

DEAN BAQUET: He writes to you, too?

BOB EDWARDS: Yeah. [laughter] And there are no consequences, and it can be outrageous and libelous. It's okay because it’s online. No, I believe it’s wrong.
MARVIN KALB: Bob, do you use Twitter?

BOB EDWARDS: No, I wouldn’t know how to. [laughter] I wouldn’t know how to Tweet.

MARVIN KALB: Do you have a blog?

BOB EDWARDS: I have a blog. I had an opportunity to blog.

MARVIN KALB: What does that mean?

BOB EDWARDS: I mean, I have a site, the show has a site and I could run my mouth if I wanted to. I just choose not to, only on rare occasions.

MARVIN KALB: Erin, I'm told that--

ERIN MORIARTY: I'm a big fan.

MARVIN KALB: I was just getting there. I'm told that you us Facebook regularly to engage your viewers?

ERIN MORIARTY: I do, but I don't like Facebook very much. I don't.

MARVIN KALB: And so why do you use it?

ERIN MORIARTY: Well, because what I like is the interactivity of it. During our show, our show airs on Saturday nights live--
MARVIN KALB: It’s 48 Hours.

ERIN MORIARTY: 48 Hours. And that's the show I'm assigned, I also report for other shows, but that's the one that people really connect to me with. And I can go on live and not only do I sometimes get amazing remarks about the show, things I didn’t think about, but we get very interested viewers. People become very connected and invested and invested in me. That part I like about Facebook. Most of the time, though, Facebook just seems to be so much noise. What I do love is Twitter, I do.

MARVIN KALB: Why?

ERIN MORIARTY: I think that during a big event, and this actually can enhance broadcast news, in a big event people are connecting. And they want to talk about it. And they're actually watching television more if they can be tweeting at the same time. I use it as a news service for people I believe in.

Mark Knoller is-- I always like Mark Knoller-- he is the White House radio correspondent. If you don’t know him, you--

MARVIN KALB: For CBS?

ERIN MORIARTY: Yes, for CBS News, sorry, CBS News Radio. You should follow him on Twitter and here's why. He is also a White House historian and every single morning-- he’s one of the first people I go to. I look at him on Twitter in the morning because I learn something from him. And I think Edward R. Murrow would have used Twitter, I do, because it can amplify an important story.

David Pogue of the Times, he will post something on Twitter that I might have passed over on the New York Times or somewhere else. So I'm sorry, I love Twitter as a news
service. I don't Tweet as much because I don't think I'm smart enough to do it. I like really good Tweets. There's 140 characters, what you put on there should be really important. But I'm a big fan. Sorry.

**MARVIN KALB:** No, no. Really? [laughter] With all of the new technology, social websites, Twitter and God knows what else, what I'm finding is that local radio and local newspapers and local television is where most people still find the greatest source of comfort. And there's a study that says as many as 72 percent of the American people, when questioned, will tell you that when they want to go for news, they’ll go to a local source rather than a national source. Now, that doesn't say very much positive about the national source. I could understand a figure of 30 percent, 40 percent, going local, but 72 suggests either that there's something magnificent and special about local, or something quite repellent about national. I'm just wondering what you guys think. Casey?

**CASEY MURROW:** Well, I'm not sure in the modern era, but as you were speaking, I was thinking of the fact that the affiliates would sometimes drop see it now, drop that feed from the network, if they didn’t like the topic or what they thought the topic was going to be. And it seems to me that's a 1950s version of the same sort of thing, of seeing the local outlet, whatever it may be, as a safer source or one where I might see my cousin or my uncle in some way. Whereas the national stuff might not grab people in the same way. Too bad.

**MARVIN KALB:** Erin, what do you think?

**ERIN MORIARTY:** I don't think it says anything terrible about national. The problem is much of national news comes from New York and I travel for a living and even though I'm an Ohioan and very much a Midwesterner, people, when I come in they’ll go, “Oh, you're a New Yorker, you may not understand.” I think it's more this idea that those New Yorkers or someone from L. A. may not understand the problems of local and you trust
someone who’s grown up and you forget that most of these people who are covering national news came from the Midwest, came from all over the country. But I think that’s really what it is. You just want to hear it from somebody who’s more like you, talks like you do.

**MARVIN KALB:** Bob, what's your sense of this?

**BOB EDWARDS:** I keep thinking of a famous Murrow quote. I mean, he was dealing with new media. Radio and television were new in his time and the technology could finally have you speak to the other end of the country. And he famously said. “Just because the new technology allows you to speak to the other end of the country gives you no more wisdom than you had when your voice only reached the other end of the bar.” I still think that's true. It's content, is what he’s saying, content. You can have all the technology in the world, but if you have nothing to say, it's useless. So the quality of your message.

**MARVIN KALB:** Dean?

**DEAN BAQUET:** I think people would find local news more trustworthy and in some way-- I mean, local news is, you know, your taxes, your local taxes, how your school system is doing, how your mayor is doing. Seventy percent of local issues are not right/left issues the way people see war and presidential elections as right/left issues. They're sort of bread and butter issues. The closer they are to home, the more you can tell-- the fewer questions you have about it. There aren’t epic, philosophical battles over-- I mean, there are some, but there aren’t epic, philosophical battles over who should be the next mayor, they're more bread and butter.

I'm not sure that says as much about national news as much as it says about the tenor of national issues versus the tenor of local issues, to be honest.
MARVIN KALB: That it would be, in your judgment, a more natural thing for a person to be interested in stuff closer to home?

DEAN BAQUET: Yeah.

MARVIN KALB: So that we can't read too much into that?

DEAN BAQUET: I don't think so. I think national issues, by their nature, carry with them a certain amount of controversy. People understand them less, they seem a little bit vaguer, they're far away.

MARVIN KALB: I'm wondering also whether it could be an issue that we were just glancingly (sic) touching on earlier, about the nature of the polarization of politics and the way in which that affects so much of our judgments about other things as well. Because it’s very easy to think about the New York Times, and I won't stress the Times here, but large national news organizations, as being in the clutch of some leftist gaggle and you've got to be very careful about that. And that may be around the country as well. What I would like to do as a kind of concluding question to each one of you because we are running out of that precious thing called time, and I want to start with Casey. Now, Erin said before that your father would probably use Twitter. In his world, were there a Twitter, Edward R. Murrow would be using it. So do you buy that?

CASEY MURROW: Oh yeah, I do buy that in a sort of general sense. Because he was very interested in technology and as Bob pointed out, they were engaged in all new technology in his television work, but certainly in his radio work before that. He would have said he just was in the right place at the right time for those things to happen, which to some extent was true. But yes, he was intrigued by technological advances, and so why not today’s?
MARVIN KALB: Well, what do you think his judgment would be of today’s journalism?

CASEY MURROW: I always try to avoid that question. I think he would worry about many aspects of it, but he worried about so many aspects of what he saw when he was alive that I assume he would continue his critiques in some fashion.

MARVIN KALB: I hope so. Erin, at this stage of your career, what is it that inspires you? And I'm asking the question in the following way. A lot of us, when we get up in the morning, you can say, “Oh God, another day.” But some of us who are involved in journalism have the feeling that there's something special about what it is that we're going to do. What inspires you now?

ERIN MORIARTY: Well, I'm very lucky. I think that I cover trials, but I often focus on wrongfully convicted cases. And so I can work years on a case, and what inspires me, I've got one coming up right now, a young man who had an actual innocence hearing because of three hours that we've aired on his case and new evidence came out because of it. And if he walks out of prison, or at least gets a new trial, I mean, there's nothing greater. That inspires me.

MARVIN KALB: That would be terrific. Bob, radio clearly holding its own, NPR is doing very well, CBS Radio is doing very well. Murrow loved radio. If he were alive today, what in your judgment would he be working, Sirius XM satellite or NPR?

BOB EDWARDS: Oh, I think NPR because he would have the room, the depth.

MARVIN KALB: Without any doubt in your mind?
BOB EDWARDS: Well, Fred Friendly told me that, Ed Bliss told me that. So, I take their word for it.

ERIN MORIARTY: Along with 60 Minutes. [laughter]

CASEY MURROW: And his Twitter account.

MARVIN KALB: And Dean, for you, how does the Times turn around that believability issue to the degree that it exists? How would you go about it? I mean, you're close to being the big boss now. When you become big boss, how would you handle it?

DEAN BAQUET: Transparency. I think acknowledging when we screw up. I don't think there's anything wrong with saying, “I got that one wrong. Forgive me, I'll try to do it better the next time.” But, making sure that you don’t screw up on the big ones. I used the Supreme Court as an example. Working really hard not to get the big ones wrong, whether it’s issues of war and national security. Understanding and embracing our role as being sort of a tough counterpoint to government. I think if you do all of those things, I can't imagine that your numbers won't go up. And to be frank, even if they don’t, that's what you're supposed to do anyway.

MARVIN KALB: And would you say that that is something that all news organizations ought to be addressing at this point?

DEAN BAQUET: Sure, absolutely, absolutely.

MARVIN KALB: And no difference between newspapers or radio/television?

DEAN BAQUET: No, absolutely. I think all news organizations should behave that way. Some of our screw-ups over the last few years have been healthy for us because it’s
forced us to sort of own up to our screw-ups and just be open about them and just be transparent about them.

**MARVIN KALB:** Well, thank you. Thank you all very much for those observations. I would like to add one thought. We're all dazzled by the digital world, and understandably so; the speed, the access, live cut-ins, instantaneous analysis. It's all truly amazing. But sometimes, it's a bit troubling as well. Murrow used the new technology of his era, radio and then television, and both are still here. And today, you are using your new technology, the new media, Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, Google, Hangouts, and probably Hangouts, God knows other places as well.

But I must confess that every now and then, I worry that we may be losing sight of the fact that technology is only a tool. It's a tool for the dissemination about what we as journalists discover. It can never be considered more important than the content of what we discover in our daily work, hourly work, in fact. The story that sometimes needs telling, a crime, a misdeed, a misjudgment, that needs exposing. Journalism is more important today than ever before. I know you've heard that before, but it’s true.

I also believe that Murrow and what he represented matters more today than ever before. Murrow was a great journalist, in part because he was endlessly curious and remarkably courageous. Are there any Murrows in this audience? We need you to help sustain our democracy and efforts all over the world to build democracy. Good, honest, bold, unafraid, even on occasion outrageous journalism, is essential to democracy. As Murrow once said, “This is no time for fear.”

So young Murrows, rise up. This is your time. Use your tools, use them well, because remember, otherwise they're just lights and wires in a box. So thank you all very much for coming. Thank our panelists, thank you, you're all terrific. I'm Marvin Kalb, and as Ed Murrow used to say, good night and good luck. [applause]
Now, we're at that time in the program where it’s your opportunity to ask the panelists questions. And I'm very nasty at this point, too, because if I sense that you're making a speech, I'm going to cut you off. So, come to the two microphones on either side if you have a question and identify yourself, please, and then ask whichever panelist you'd like to have an answer from. Please?

HAGIT LIMOR: Hello, is this on? Hi, I'm Hagit Limor, I'm an investigative reporter for the ABC affiliate--

MARVIN KALB: We're not hearing you, that microphone is not on. All right, let's go over here on the right, please?

BOB BECKER: Bob Becker from the D.C. Pro Chapter of SPJ.

MARVIN KALB: I'm not sure that we have that one on, either. Can you speak directly-?

BOB BECKER: I'm Bob Becker from the D.C. Pro Chapter of SPJ. Two well known political thinkers, one liberal, one conservative, recently indicted our system of polarized government. One of the counts in the indictment is at the media for being so fair and balanced that they are not doing their job to call out the bad guys. And that seems to be Murrow’s approach, was to call out the bad guys. Where are we going to get back to that approach?

MARVIN KALB: Bob, you got a thought on that?

BOB EDWARDS: And who was much tougher in his time because you had the fairness doctrine. And William Paley routinely gave half an hour of his air time to counter
broadcasts Murrow had done, and it got worse and worse and worse. But yeah, if he could do it in his day, why not now? But, you know, you can't be a scold, you can't be a partisan in doing it. You have to investigate, come to a conclusion, show the facts and let listeners, viewers and readers make up their own mind, as he did.

MARVIN KALB: Good. Is that microphone working now? Yes, please?

HAGIT LIMOR: Hello, my name is Hagit Limor, I'm an investigative reporter from Cincinnati, Ohio.

MARVIN KALB: I'm sorry, maybe it’s me.

ERIN MORIARTY: She just needs to really talk into it.

BOB EDWARDS: You've got to get real close.

HAGIT LIMOR: All right. My name’s Hagit Limor, I'm an investigative reporter for the ABC affiliate in Cincinnati. And my question is what would Edward R. Murrow have said of quote approval as was utilized by some reporters, including at the New York Times?

MARVIN KALB: I'm having trouble with that.

DEAN BAQUET: I can repeat it.

MARVIN KALB: Please?

DEAN BAQUET: She said what would Edward R. Murrow have said about the practice of quote approval which was done by some reporters for the New York Times. I would
say he would say the same thing we said when we realized that it was a practice, that it was a mistake, that it was a bad practice. I guess everybody knows the background of this, right?

MARVIN KALB: Why don’t you briefly tell us, Dean?

DEAN BAQUET: One of our reporters who covers the media wanted to write a story during the presidential campaign about the Obama candidacy, and I can't remember all the details. But he was told that he had to submit the quotations he got from the people he interviewed back to the campaign for approval. Which he then wrote about and he came to us. I didn't know, nor did Jill Abramson, the executive editor, we didn’t know that this was a practice. And we called all of the reporters in to ask them about it. Came away thinking that it was a common enough practice. We were appalled by it, and we stopped it. I think that's one of those cases where when I said earlier you try to be transparent, you own up to the fact that it’s not something you want to do and you stop it. So I think he would have done the-- I suspect he would have done the same thing.

MARVIN KALB: Yes, please?

ALYCIN BEKTESH: Alycin Bektesh, news director at WFHB Community Radio in Bloomington, Indiana. Several of you said that we might not be able to find the Murrows right now because there's so much out there. We don’t have just three big networks, everyone’s talking. Is that to go so far as to suggest that we do kind of back down to just several trusted sources instead of all that noise?

MARVIN KALB: Well, again, I confess to you all that I'm not hearing the questions terribly well. And so I don’t want to paraphrase anything.
ERIN MORIARTY: Could you just repeat the very end of your question? I hear what you were talking about.

ALYCIN BEKTESH: What fewer networks or fewer news sources lead us back to better reporting, more Murrows?

ERIN MORIARTY: I don't think it would be fewer, and I don't think I'd want to see that. I actually kind of like the fact that there is so many people interested in news and you can-- because that really just adds to the picture. I just think you can't automatically identify one or two Murrows. But I would venture to say that there are a lot out there. When I was thinking about this before coming here, I thought of Anderson Cooper, who even at times when he didn't have a network sending him somewhere and he felt the stories were important, he went with a camera. There are a lot of people like that. Lara Logan would do that during the war.

There are a lot of people I work with all the time who’d take on management and stand up. So, I just don’t think we recognize them as clearly as we could see him because there were only three networks. But I think there are some amazing journalists, and probably in this room people who want to be. So I wouldn’t want to see fewer, I guess I wish they would speak up and be aggressive and make sure that people notice them.

MARVIN KALB: Please?

ANDREW HUMPHREY: Good afternoon, thank you for being here. My name is Andrew Humphrey, I'm a meteorologist at WDIV in Detroit, Michigan. My question regards ownership. It seems that there are more private equity firms that own local TV and radio stations. Many of them are less transparent publicly, and may have political agendas. What effect do you think this has on news?
DEAN BAQUET: Well, first off, I assume everybody heard the question, first off you have to remember in the history of the country, the reality is for most of the life of the press in the country, the press was owned by people who were not the most trustworthy people around who were either trying to make a buck or trying to push a-- in fact, I would venture to say that the period that we all have lived through the last two or three generations were an anomaly and a sort of golden period.

I do think that news organizations, in general, that are not owned by publishers who have themselves a public service mission, are at a great disadvantage. Because I do not think private-- I don’t think anybody would say private equity-- even private equity would not say that a public service mission is their primary goal, whereas I think a publisher or an owner of a television station locally or nationally who truly believes in the mission is the ideal goal. I think the days when that's going to happen constantly may be over, but I think that's the ideal goal in my mind. I don't think most people would disagree with that.

MARVIN KALB: Well, there is today on the radio side, I think you'll find a corporation or two that owns more than a thousand radio stations around the country. And if one of these corporations had a political agenda, it would not be above it to insist that a certain point of view not be heard on their station or be heard on their stations depending on the point of view. My gut feeling tells me that the corporations would likely be closer to a conservative political point of view than to a liberal political point of view. But I do feel that there is a concern that has to be expressed with respect to corporate ownership of small radio stations, small newspapers around the country. Seventy percent of the 1,350 newspapers in this country have readerships fewer than 25,000. So you're talking about small newspapers with small agendas dependent upon local sponsors. And if a local sponsor doesn't like your editorial point of view, you're going to suffer.

DEAN BAQUET: Oddly enough, by the way, from my own experience from when I was editor of the L. A. Times when it was owned by the pre-Sam Zell Tribune Company,
I didn’t feel that their problem-- they were terrible publishers. I mean, I didn’t think their problem was that they wanted to skew the paper one way or the other politically. I thought their problem was they could care less about the public service mission of the paper and their primary, sole goal was cash flow. I think that they were bad publishers for that reason, not for any other reason.

MARY ROGUS: Good afternoon, my name is Mary Rogus. I’m a broadcast and electronic journalism professor at the E. W. Scripps School of Journalism at Ohio University. And since you brought up the letter from the foundation, foundations, I would like to ask the panel if you really think it’s true that we’re not providing extensive practical experience? You interact with our interns and you hire our students. And there are programs across the country, not just the big schools, that are doing wonderful jobs of giving students opportunities to produce some excellent journalism. All you have to do is look at the wide variety of schools that are represented in the major journalism student awards to see the quality of journalism that our students are producing in their journalism and communication programs.

So I would ask the panel, do you believe what these foundation people are saying knowing that you work with our young people?

MARVIN KALB: I can tell you about a recent visit to the University of Maryland Journalism School. And I walked through one shop after another where there was intense learning of all of the new technology without any slippage, in my opinion, this is one tour, without any slippage in what it is that journalism represents and its role in society. And what I was saying before, in my judgment, about its critical role in sustaining democracy of this country and in places around the world.
Journalism can make it happen, and it can discourage it very, very rapidly. Because people today while they maybe 60 percent of Americans have a problem with American journalism in one way or another, they are still fixated on what it is that is journalism writ large. This kind of social media, all the way up to the site of the *New York Times*. So my sense is that what you said is absolutely on target, which raises yet a question: why would the foundations raise that kind of question? Is that based on a study? Do they really know that to be the case? I know it on limited experience for it to get the other way. But maybe other people want to come in, and are more than welcome to.

**BOB EDWARDS:** I got my master’s at American U under Ed Bliss, who founded that program and was Murrow’s writer and editor. And the idea there was to turn out working journalists. And we did two radio newscasts each day for WAMU in Washington. On the other hand, and I totally applaud that and profited from it. On the other hand, a journalism department exists within a university. It is not unreasonable for the university to expect from that department, from that school, scholarship and research. I don't think the two are mutually exclusive. I think they can get along just fine. But for journalism to have standing within a university, there has to be some scholarship, some research while you're turning out tomorrow’s beat reporters.

**MARVIN KALB:** Totally agree. Yes, sir?

**JAM SARDAR:** Hi, my name’s Jam Sardar. I'm the news director at WLNS TV in Lansing, Michigan. I've got two quick and related questions. First, do you think there's a duality in the American public that seems to despise Congress but love its own personal congressperson and similarly distrusts the national media so much but love its own kind of local media?

Second and related, do you think these attacks on the media, especially the national media, and we've seen of late, too, attacks on what we call the truth squads who go
through speeches and other people's work to determine what's true and what's false, do you think that's an attempt to kind of work the refs to try and see if, well, the media might go a little easier or to see if they can swing coverage, if not in their favor at least maybe not favoring the other guy so much?

MARVIN KALB: Thank you. Erin, you want to start us?

ERIN MORIARTY: Well, I mean, that's something where we were talking about before, that people do connect more with the local person that grew up and speaks like them, who doesn't come from a big city, who understands. And that is interesting where it does seem like those in Congress are so low in terms of approval, but people still get out and vote. So that's just, I think, the nature that you trust somebody that you've grown up with.

I do think that there is the truth squads, but this has been going on for a long time. A friend of mine who's a lawyer said that when Dateline made a mistake years ago, and they did, they set up [?], they decided that they would, as a lawyer, they would actually suggest to their clients to go after every story hoping that it would-- even if they were completely accurate-- hoping that it would discourage the networks who were concerned about money. So, I think there's a little bit of that.

MARVIN KALB: Okay, we've got about five minutes left. So that question here, please?

WAYNE STAFFORD: Hello, my name’s Wayne Stafford, and I'm from Colorado State University. And my question also has to do with truth, and more particularly with bias and framing. And we all have our own bias and I'm just wondering, what do you think Edward R. Murrow and yourselves would think of these stations like Fox News and MSNBC who not only have bias and seem to be pushing their own agenda, but framing
stories differently? If you look at the Trayvon Martin case, you know, if you look at MSNBC and then Fox, you would get two different sides of the story and it's hard to determine truth from that. What do you think of the progression of that in the future?

MARVIN KALB: Thank you very much, thank you. Casey?

CASEY MURROW: He struggled with it all the time, if we're thinking of my dad. He had biases, obviously, as we all do. But he would agonize over how he could overcome those or hit an even keel in some way. I'm sure he didn’t always manage to do that, but the agonizing must have helped to some degree, to answer your question.

MARVIN KALB: Why don’t the three people here just ask your questions, and then we’ll try to provide answers. Start.

JULIE REISNER: I'm Julie Reisner, I'm an 11th grade student in high school. And what do you think the advice that-- what advice can you give, and what advice do you think that Edward Murrow would give?

MARVIN KALB: Thank you very much. Next question?

DAVID CARR: I'm David Carr, I write for a web publication on technology and social media in business. One of the models that's come out of the web in blogging is sometimes to not pretend you don’t have biases but to disclose them. A financial and technical journalist who I admire, Kara Swisher, will regularly have a little link in her story saying, “Here’s something about my relationship to Google.” I believe she was in a romantic relationship with somebody at Google. So, maybe she's at their Christmas parties. It doesn’t stop her from reporting on them. She may have a bias in there somewhere but she's letting you know about it and people will do that sometimes with their political biases, too.
MARVIN KALB: Thank you very much. That last question, please?

MICHAEL FITZGERALD: Hi, Michael Fitzgerald. I'm a freelance journalist in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and I'm interested in whether any of you think that content, the stuff that we produce, might some day be valuable enough to audiences that we won't need advertising or sponsors or promoters, that people will just pay for it in a way that will support it?

MARVIN KALB: Well, we certainly hope so. [laughter] Dean, do you want to start on any of the three?

DEAN BAQUET: I'll take the--

MARVIN KALB: On the first, there's the first by the young lady asking you about advice that Murrow, or perhaps we, would like to contribute.

DEAN BAQUET: I'll do that one.

MARVIN KALB: You want to do that?

DEAN BAQUET: I would do that in one sentence and then I'll jump to-- I would say, and this affects the journalism education, too, that you should be as broadly educated and curious as possible. Obviously, you have to learn a lot of the fundamentals and mechanics in journalism school. But the best journalists I know are curious, it makes them clearer writers, it makes them very aggressive and competitive.

On the question, since it's a big issue for the New York Times of whether or not people will one day pay for content and you won't need advertising, I'm not sure that's going to
happen. But I think there's now ample evidence that people are willing to pay a premium for good content, not just for content. But I think that there's much-- in fact, now most of our revenue, if you count circulation and you count money from subscriptions to the website, I think if you add those two together, they probably now surpass advertising for the *New York Times*.

**MARVIN KALB:** Thank you. Who would like to answer that second question, which had, I think, to do with transparency? Erin?

**ERIN MORIZARTY:** I actually like that one, and I'd like to know-- because for one reason you're putting out-- you're just saying, “Look, this is my connection to the story.” But it also indicates you know a lot about the story. Again, it's what Dean’s been saying, transparency helps a lot. Everybody has biases and to me, where you're actually dealing with it as part of the story, I think it's great.

**MARVIN KALB:** I would like to put in a word to the young lady about what one might learn or what kind of advice. I pick up a point that Dean just made about the need for a broad education. But above and beyond that, I believe, and I hope I'm right on this, that if you have in mind a journalism, a world of journalism that is free and virile and as I said before even on occasion outrageous, but that kind of journalism sustains democracy. And if you can understand the connection of one to the other, and if you like the idea of living in a free country, as free as we are in this country, then you want to sustain that kind of democracy. And you can do that by having a vigorous free press.

So my advice would be both what Dean was saying, and I think the thrust of what you were all trying to convey over the last hour, that with all of the problems in American journalism today, if it continues with a sense of independence and freedom, and don’t push me around and that can keep us all free. There's a link, one to the other. I tell you that in travels around the world, I know within one minute what kind of political system
I'm in by going to the kiosk. You take a look at the kiosk and you take a look at the kind of newspapers or magazines that are being sold and the way they're handled, the political smell of it and you know immediately what kind of society you're in, more or less.

And that's why I keep on making that same point about the intimate link between a free press and a free society. And if you like that one, you better stick up for this one.

Anyway, we're out of time. Thank you all very much for being here. And again, thanks to the panelists. And God bless you all, thank you. [applause]