The Golden Age for Editorial Cartoonists at the Nation's Newspapers is Over

A report presented by

The Herb Block Foundation

www.herbblockfoundation.org

Table of Contents

The Introduction

The Golden Age for editorial cartoonists at the nation's newspapers is over.

At the start of the 20th century, there were approximately 2,000 editorial cartoonists employed by newspapers in the United States. Today there are fewer than 40 staff cartoonists, and that number continues to shrink.

At the same time, the digital age presents more potential outlets for editorial cartoons than at any time in the history of the news media.

"It's never been easier for anyone to find a wide audience for their self-expression; the tough part is getting paid for it," said a nationally recognized cartoonist who asked for anonymity. "The challenge is not one of technology, but of economics."

American newspapers are struggling to master the new economics of the digital age. Profits and circulation are continuing to fall as the industry is evicted from its traditional advertising base. And there are estimates that a third of the nation's reporters have lost their jobs in the past decade.

There are fewer than 1,400 daily newspapers today, several thousand below the peak in 1913. Since then, the nation's population has more than tripled, to 311 million.

For more than a century, American newspapers have relied on an economic model based on advertising revenue to finance their operations. But the advent of the Internet has turned advertising finances upside down, sharply changing the revenue stream for most newspapers. Until the Internet arrived, newspapers charged their highest rates for national advertisements and the lowest for local ads. Today just the opposite is the case, severely affecting the financial underpinnings of most newspapers.

Writing in the *American Journalism Review* in the fall of 2010, *Washington Post* reporter Paul Farhi used his own newspaper's experience to explain the reversal in advertising rates on the Internet. "*The Post* is one of the few local newspapers in America with a national and international following," Farhi wrote. "On a daily basis, the vast majority of its million-plus visitors come from outside the Washington area (unlike the printed *Post*, which circulates largely within greater Washington). This means that only a fraction of those visiting the paper's website are likely to be of interest to local advertisers."

In 1995, well in advance of the current profit decline, the advent of *Craigslist* dealt a major blow to newspaper revenue. At the time, classified ads often accounted for 40 percent or more of newspaper advertising revenue. *Craigslist* ads are free.

Today, Internet technology has given the news reader access to a vast array of cheap or free news that has taken control of the news agenda away from traditional newspapers. Columbia University journalism professor Michael Schudson said only 31 percent of the nation's 18- to 24-year-olds now get their news from newspapers.

The result has been an apparent devaluation of editorial cartoonists in the eyes of the nation's newspaper publishers. Asked what economic value newspaper publishers put on editorial cartooning, an official of one

of the nation's leading syndicates said: "Not much." And publishers who still value editorial cartooning find it much cheaper to purchase their cartoons from a syndicate. That way, said Paul Tash of the *St. Petersburg Times*, "you can pick the best cartoon of the day."

This goes a long way toward explaining why publishers may not place a great economic value on the work of an editorial cartoonist despite the fact that a cartoon may garner the most daily hits on a newspaper's website. Those hits simply do not translate into profits.

Newspaper syndicates, faced with a shrinking newspaper base, are also in a state of compression. The fate of syndicates has been closely tied to the newspaper industry, and they, too, are searching for new markets in the digital age. So far, the growth in syndicates' Internet sales has not made up for the income stagnation created by the loss of newspaper advertising revenue.

To help maintain their revenue stream, some syndicates are adding new cartoonists to an existing package of editorial cartoonists without increasing the cost of the overall package. For example, a syndicate offering a package of 10 cartoonists may now offer a package of 11 cartoonists without increasing the cost to the subscriber. But to keep its own revenue base, the syndicate will reduce its payments to all the other cartoonists in the package.

A 2010 report by the Congressional Research Service, "The U.S. Newspaper Industry in Transition," paints a bleak picture for the industry in the 21st century. Prepared by Suzanne M. Kirchhoff, an analyst in industry organization and business for the CRS, the report begins by saying:

"The U.S. newspaper industry is suffering through what could be the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. Advertising revenues have plummeted due in part to the severe economic downturn, while readership habits have changed as consumers turn to the Internet for free news and information. Some newspaper chains are burdened by heavy debt loads. Between 2008 and early 2010, eight major newspaper chains declared bankruptcy, several big city papers shut down and many laid off reporters and editors, imposed pay reductions, cut the size of the physical newspaper, or turned to web-only publication."

Kirchhoff added, "Advertising dollars are still declining and newspapers have not found a stable revenue source to replace them. As the problems continue, there are growing concerns that the decline of the newspaper industry will impact civil and social life." She said that while the emerging ventures of the digital era hold promise, they "do not yet have the experience, resources and reach of shrinking mainstream newspapers."

That's not a pretty picture, but it's the picture facing a dwindling cadre of editorial cartoonists as they contemplate survival in the transition to a new age of political satire.

The explosion of all-news programming, all the time, on cable television and the Internet and the increasing substitution of opinion programming based on a decreasing amount of basic news reporting has caused concern about the future role of a free press. Will anyone care?

Some of those answers are beginning to form. The Pew Project for Excellence in Journalism, in its annual "*State of the News Media*" report for 2011, reported that for the first time, more people said they get their news from the Web than from newspapers. This, according to the Pew report, also shows that while online ad revenue is projected to surpass print ad revenue, "by far the far largest share of that online ad revenue goes to non-news sources, particularly aggregators."

"In the 20th century, the news media thrived by being the intermediary others needed to reach customers," the Pew report noted. "In the 21st, increasingly there is a new intermediary: Software programmers, content

aggregators and device makers control access to the public. The news industry, late to adapt and culturally more tied to content than engineering, finds itself more a follower than a leader shaping its business. In the meantime, the pace of change continues to accelerate."

This report by the Herb Block Foundation is an attempt to outline the challenges that editorial cartoonists face. We are not attempting to break new ground or predict the future. Instead we hope to give a clear-eyed view of why the climate for cartoonists is changing and why it may never be the same again, and to provide a basis for discussions about the craft, its value to society and a free press, and its prospects for survival.

The report is broken down into four parts:

- The introduction, which explores the economic changes taking place in the newspaper industry as it searches for ways to make money and deliver its product in the new and rapidly changing electronic age.
- The results of a survey of cartoonists who belong to the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists. The survey explores the changing world as it affects individual cartoonists.
- A primer on new technology.
- Eleven "essays" representing a broad spectrum of editorial cartoonists on what they think the future holds for their craft.

The Survey

The Foundation sent the survey to 125 AAEC members and received 68 responses, a 54 percent return. Although disappointing, it was better than many people expected given the independent nature of the group being surveyed. Some thought the whole idea was stupid; others seemed genuinely pleased by our effort.

The survey did not produce any real surprises. It showed an art form in economic decline, basically mirroring the economic struggle of the newspaper industry as a whole. Fewer than half the respondents said they earned more than 50 percent of their income from their primary employer and 45 percent said they earned less than 25 percent of their income from their primary employer.

More than half of the people surveyed reported income from syndication, but more than a third of the respondents said they earned less than 20 percent of their income from syndication. And three quarters of the respondents reported earning income from other work.

Half the people responding to the survey said their employer provided health insurance coverage, meaning they offered it as a cost-sharing benefit program. The other 50 percent said they either had coverage through their spouse or had no health insurance at all.

The breakdown was similar for retirement plans. Slightly more than half those surveyed said their employer paid for pension coverage or made a contribution toward coverage. The remaining respondents said they either paid for their own retirement coverage or simply had no coverage.

The survey showed a stunning number of cartoonists — 44 percent — did not have liability insurance. Another 46 percent said that either they or their employer provided liability coverage. Some of those who said they did not have liability coverage, however, were not sure whether they had employer-provided coverage.

A vast majority of the cartoonists said they owned the intellectual property rights to their work.

The survey asked respondents about changing job requirements, specifically regarding blogging and animation.

Asked if they were required to blog or perform other similar duties, less than 10 percent said that was a requirement. But asked if they voluntarily blogged as part of their job, 71 percent said yes.

Asked whether they were required to make animation part of their job, only 5.8 percent of those responding answered affirmatively. But 21 percent of respondents said they voluntarily tried animation. More than 70 percent said they did not even attempt animation, reflecting the difficulty and expense involved in such work.

The closest thing to a unanimous response was on the question of whether editorial cartoonists thought they needed to become more entrepreneurial if they hoped to survive in the digital age. Ninety-six percent said "yes." It was a clear sign that the traditional cloistered life of editorial cartoonists was coming to an end. In the future, they will have to aggressively brand their work through energetic marketing.

Half the cartoonists surveyed said they believed that in 10 years, editorial cartoons will appear primarily electronically; 34 percent said they thought there would be no dominant format. Seven percent of respondents said they believed most cartoons would continue to appear in print in 10 years, and 9 percent said they were unsure.

A majority of the respondents said they believed that in 10 years, most editorial cartoonists would work part-time. Twenty-one percent said they thought most would be full-time. Twelve percent were unsure.

A large majority of those surveyed thought there would be few opportunities for young cartoonists to work as staff cartoonists. A sizable share — 24 percent — said they thought there would still be opportunities, but for far fewer cartoonists. At the same time, 68 percent said they believed there was still a long-term future for pen-and-ink cartoonists, but they did not specify the media in which those cartoons might appear.

A majority of the respondents said they thought there was still great value for newspaper publishers in having editorial cartoonists — staff or otherwise — because they helped attract more readers. But nearly a third of respondents said there would be less value because cartoonists did not bring in additional revenue.

The conclusion of the survey asked for comments from the respondents, and the gist of those comments was that while these are discouraging times, cartoonists must use every tool available through new technology to "brand" their work if they hope to survive. Some have given up, particularly the younger ones, but the majority of the respondents appear to have a sense of what they have to do to make the change into the digital age, even if they have not figured out how to earn a living doing it in the new world.

SURVEY RESULTS

INCOME

What percentage of your income comes from your Primary Employer?

- 41 percent of respondents report earning more than 50 percent of their income from their primary employer
- 45 percent of respondents report earning less than 25 percent of their income from their primary employer

What percentage of your income comes from syndication?

- 56 percent of respondents reported earning income from syndication
- 18 percent of respondents reported earning more than 50 percent of their income from syndication
- 38 percent of respondents reported earning less than 20 percent of their income from syndication

What percentage of your income comes from "other" work?

- 75 percent reported "other" income ranging from 1.5 percent to 100 percent of their earnings

BENEFITS

Who pays for your health insurance coverage?

- 50 percent of respondents said they were covered by their employer's plan
- 50 percent of respondents said they were either covered by their spouses' plan or had no coverage

Who pays for your retirement plan?

- 53 percent of respondents said their employer paid for their retirement plans
- 47 percent of respondents either paid for their own retirement plan or had no retirement plan

Who pays for your liability insurance?

- 46 percent of respondents either paid their own liability insurance or were covered by their employer
- 44 percent of respondents had no liability insurance

Who owns the intellectual property rights to your work?

- 85 percent of respondents owned the intellectual property rights to their work

JOB REQUIREMENTS

Are you required to blog or perform other similar duties as a requirement of your job?

- **Yes** 8.8 percent responded that it was a requirement of their job
- **No** 83.8 percent responded that it was not a requirement of their job

Do you voluntarily blog?

- **Yes** 71 percent of respondents said they do voluntarily blog
- **No** 24 percent of respondents said they do not voluntarily blog

Are you required to do animation as part of your job?

- **Yes** 5.8 percent of respondents are required to do animation
- **No** 87 percent of respondents are not required to do animation

Do you voluntarily do animation for your job?

- **Yes** 21 percent of respondents said they voluntarily do some animation as part of their job
- **No** 72 percent of respondents said they do not voluntarily do animation

Do editorial cartoonists need to become more entrepreneurial to survive in the digital age?

- **Yes** 96 percent of respondents said yes
  (One respondent said no and two others said they were unsure.)

INDUSTRY CHANGES?

In 10 years in what form do you believe editorial cartoons will appear?

- 50 percent of respondents believe editorial cartons will appear electronically through the internet or other devices
- 34 percent of respondents believe their will be no dominant format for cartoons
- 7 percent of respondents believe most editorial cartoons would appear in print
- 9 percent were unsure

In 10 years, do you expect most editorial will be full or part-time?

- **Full-time** 21 percent of respondents believe the majority will be full-time
- **Part-time** 63 percent of respondents
- **Unsure** 12 percent of respondents were unsure

Do you believe a young aspiring cartoonist will have opportunities to work for a single employer as a staff cartoonist?

- **No** 72 percent of respondents said young cartoonists would not have the opportunity
- **Yes** 24 percent of respondents said yes there would still be an opportunity, but for far fewer cartoonists
- **Unsure** 4 percent said they were uncertain about what opportunity would exist

Is there a long term future for traditional pen and ink editorial cartoonists?

- **Yes** 68 percent of respondents see a long term future
- **No** 24 percent of respondents do not see a long term future
- **Unsure** 7 percent of respondents were unsure

What is the economic value of an editorial cartoon to a newspaper publisher?

- **Valuable** 56 percent of respondents said the editorial cartoon would be more valuable because editorial cartoons attracted readers
- **Less Valuable** 32 percent said editorial cartoons would be less valuable because they didn't increase a newspaper's revenue
- **Unsure** 10 percent were not sure

How many respondents have worked for a newspaper?

- 68 percent of respondents said they had worked anywhere from 6 months to 40 years for a newspaper

New Technology

by Mark Potts

Introduction: Faster, Smaller, Better, Cheaper

To contemplate the state of digital technology and how it's radically changing the media and roiling journalism and cartooning, it would be helpful to conjure up a piece of particularly outlandish technology: a time machine.

We'll first use our wayback machine to head back in time about 20 years. Consider the media and technology landscape of 1991: People get most of their news from the morning newspaper. Televisions tune in just a handful of channels. Being a publisher or broadcaster is a great business, and it provides the millions of dollars required to pay for presses or broadcast facilities. It takes deep pockets to be a media mogul; no one else need apply.

In 1991, personal computers are clunky beige boxes that have just graduated to color screens (unless green type on a black cathode-ray screen counts). Data is stored on floppy disks. A gigabyte of data — a fantastic amount — can be stored on a hard drive costing thousands of dollars. Connecting to other computers via a modem involves an interminable period of buzzes and squeaks — and creeps along at an oh-so-slow 300 bits per second.

The Internet, circa 1991? It's a Pentagon-funded communications network used mostly by academics and researchers. The World Wide Web? Just a gleam in Tim Berners-Lee's eye. The @ symbol? A rarely used curlicue at the top of the 2 key on your keyboard. E-mail? Rare. Cellphones? Even more rare, and brick-like. Laptops? Rarer still, expensive — and generally too heavy for the average lap.

That's the state of the media and technology world, circa 1991. Remember? Twenty years later, it seems like the dark ages.

By comparison, what we have today seems incredible: super-thin flat screens, wireless high-speed connections, multi-gigabyte memory chips handed out as promotional items. There are iPads, iPhones, digital books on Kindles. Hundreds of cable or satellite channels. Your choice of music and movies on demand. Shopping for just about anything from your phone or couch. The ubiquitous Web. The Cloud. Blogs. Facebook. Twitter. Groupon. YouTube. Google. Even Google+.

The difference between today and 20 years ago can be summed up in a simple mantra of technological change: Faster, smaller, better, cheaper.

It's all fantastic, but of course, there are more melancholy effects of technology: Newspapers and magazines are in serious, perhaps fatal decline, reducing newsroom staffing as quickly as circulation and advertising plummet. With access to cheap (or free) powerful tools such as blogging platforms, anybody can be a publisher these days; it seems like everybody is. Aggressive new competitors are everywhere, many of which rely on business models (and pay scales) that bear no resemblance to the old days. Publishers and broadcasters — and journalists and journalism — are under siege.

If it seems almost unimaginable, based on where things were 20 years ago, you're not alone. William Gibson, who wrote the groundbreaking sci-fi novel "Neuromancer" (which eerily predicted the Web in 1984), recently

told the Paris Review: "If you'd gone to a publisher in 1981 with a proposal for a science fiction novel that consisted of a really clear and simple description of the world today, they'd have read your proposal and said: 'Well, it's impossible. This is ridiculous.' "

But it's reality. Science fiction brought to life.

Okay. Let's climb back into that time machine. We need to spin forward 20 years. What will that world be like? It's as impossible to predict as Gibson described. At best, we can make sort of educated guesses. But if you can fathom the enormous changes of the past 20 years in technology and the media, you can use them to start imagining the future, 20 years out, more or less.

Indeed, Gibson's "Neuromancer," which envisioned a world in which we're all connected via chips in our brains, may be as good a predictor as any. (Yes, brain chips.) In 2031, today's amazing iPad will look incredibly clunky, perhaps replaced by flexible screens that can be rolled up or folded up and carried in a pocket. Live, three-dimensional holograms, a la "Star Wars," are certainly within the realm of possibility. Three-dimensional printers — mind-blowing devices that produce items you can pick up, handle and use — already are being commercialized.

Twenty years hence, newspapers will essentially be dead; indeed, a newspaperman-turned-Microsoft-technologist named Dick Brass notoriously predicted (in 2000!) that *The New York Times* would print its last edition on paper in 2018. That prediction, outrageous then, now looks about right. If newspapers and magazines (and books) persist in print after that, they will likely be as boutique items for specialty audiences.

The rest of the media world will be entirely digital, a supersized version of what's already stunning today, replete with highly personalized editorial and advertising products, as well as infinite amounts of information and communications that's not just at our fingertips but follows us around and gets our attention before we know we need it — and entirely new business models for all of this, to boot.

These are, obviously, titanic changes — and there are many we cannot even begin to predict at this juncture. Who saw Facebook or Twitter coming just a few years ago? Or the iPad? But these seemingly wild predictions reflect the pace of change we've seen in the past 20 years. Again: ever faster, ever smaller, ever better, ever cheaper.

The past 20 years has seen changes in media and technology that rival anything seen since Gutenberg's movable-type press revolutionized printing in the 15th century. The next 20 years promise more of the same. As we disembark our time machine (please return your seats and tray tables to the upright position), we can begin to contemplate what those changes portend for journalism and for the journalism business — and what journalists and cartoonists can do to take advantage of the fast-changing landscape.

A Few Technologies and Trends to Watch

It seems dizzying sometimes to keep up with the quickly moving developments in technology. Every week, it seems, brings some sort of dazzling new advance — a glitzy piece of hardware, a social network with its own in-crowd, a way of purchasing or receiving things online that upsets the way we've done things for years. Don't feel left behind — nobody can really keep up with it all. (Remember: faster, smaller, better, cheaper.)

But there are a few significant technologies and trends, already making an impact or on the immediate horizon, that are worth knowing about and trying to understand. All of them will have enormous impact on our lives; some will continue the revolution that's roiling the media business. Let's take a digital Cook's Tour of what to watch:

Visual Journalism and Multimultimultimedia

For all we've heard over the past few years about a multimedia revolution driven by technology, most of our media is still fairly traditional. We still read text stories, look at static, two-dimensional photos and cartoons, and watch a lot of traditional video. But that's finally starting to change.

One of the barriers to true multimedia has been computing power. As impressive as they've become, most computers, tablets and smartphones have been largely limited to displaying variations on traditional media formats. But with inexpensive, off-the-shelf personal computers and mobile devices whose brains rival those of the supercomputers of just a few years ago, just about anything is possible on just about any device—rich interactivity, three dimensions, virtual reality, you name it.

With these powerful new tools, we need to be able to think beyond the traditional boundaries of text and two-dimensional images to look at new forms of storytelling and graphic presentation. A news story might combine text, sound, video and a simulation; an editorial cartoon can be animated and interactive. It may take a new generation of content creators to fully understand how to take advantage of the wide variety of media tools now available to us.

For cartoonists, this will mean thinking beyond traditional pen and ink. Pioneers such as *Newsday's* Walt Handelsman and the *Philadelphia Daily News'* Signe Wilkinson are already finding success with animated cartoons that bring their drawings to life and explore new media. The advent of three-dimensional technology opens new possibilities for striking visual opinions. The creation of instant, if crude, animated movies is possible through sites such as Xtranormal.com. Technologies such as "augmented reality," which allows the overlay of computer-generated images over existing scenes viewed through the lens of a smartphone's camera, summon up other exciting possibilities. These technologies are just now becoming widely available, and the only limit on them is our imaginations.

Goin' Mobile

Perhaps the largest single technology trend these days is the explosion in mobile technology. It began a couple of decades ago with cellphones and accelerated in the past few years with the advent of "smartphones," such as Apple's hugely successful iPhone. By untethering our ability to communicate, look up information, conduct transactions, keep up with the news, interact with friends, watch video, listen to music and play games, the mobile revolution has brought us into an era of constant connectivity. As Silicon Valley futurist Paul Saffo recently told *The New York Times*: "Before the iPhone, cyberspace was something you went to your desk to visit. Now cyberspace is something you carry in your pocket."

Cyberspace is in a lot of pockets. A recent study by the Pew Internet Research Project found that 51 percent of U.S. adult cellphone owners had used their phones to get info "they needed right away" in the previous month. That means they were checking news, sports scores, restaurant listings, traffic reports and the like (and remember, not all cellphones are smartphones, though the number is growing quickly).

It's not just about using the phone for information; Pew found that 42 percent of phone users had turned to the device in the palm of their hand to "stave off boredom" — in other words, to watch an episode of their favorite TV show or play "Angry Birds" while waiting in line. Among 18- to 29-year-olds, that number soared to 70 percent. Having a smartphone means never again having to spend an idle moment — there's always something available to do.

But that just scratches the surface of what's happening with mobile devices. Because they are "location-

aware," meaning that they always know where you are at all times (Big Brother alert!), smartphones portend a whole new type of personalized interaction with information. Imagine walking by a store and having your phone buzz with a discount offer. Or finding out that several of your friends are eating dinner at a restaurant around the corner. Or receiving news headlines and traffic alerts customized to where you are. All of this is not just possible, but already widely available through services such as Foursquare.

iPhones, Droids and their ilk also have given rise to a fascinating new software paradigm known as "apps." Short for "applications" — the traditional computer programs they resemble, but in a smaller form—apps allow users to infinitely customize their phones with services that fit their personal needs. Some are quite imaginative, such as Shazam, which can quickly identify a song being played in the background, or Word Lens, which instantly translates written language, or HistoryPin, an example of "augmented reality" that can layer historic photos over your view of a particular location. Apps — there are more than 300,000 of them for the iPhone — can track the weather, find restaurants, provide real-time simulations of sports events or even pay for your latte at Starbucks with a swipe of your iPhone — a preview of a fast-arriving technology that will turn your mobile phone into a virtual wallet.

The rapid advances in smartphones have interesting ramifications for journalism and cartooning, both in the ability to deliver location-specific information and advertising and in the ability to use a smartphone as a portable journalist's or artist's tool. With touch screens and ever-more-powerful built-in video and still cameras and recording ability, smartphones are like a handheld newsroom — you can even edit photos or videos or create art on a phone or tablet. Painting apps such as Brushes and ArtStudio can be used to create high-quality artwork (including several *New Yorker* covers) on an iPhone or iPad. Cyberspace in your pocket will be an important trend for years to come — at least until those brain-chip implants arrive.

Flat and Thin

If the smartphone was our introduction to mobile computing, then tablets such as the iPad are the next step. After several fits and starts, tablets have established themselves as the most important new computer platform since the laptop — which they threaten to replace. (I'm writing this essay on an iPad, in fact.) A quarter-inch thick, weighing around a pound, tablets have quickly become ubiquitous, sporting a much larger screen than a smartphone but far more portability than a desktop computer or even a laptop.

Apple's iPad is the best-known of the tablet genre, of course, providing a wide array of services ranging from e-mail to movie-watching to games to apps of all types. But Amazon's Kindle has been equally influential, presenting a terrific alternative to reading a traditional paper book, at a price just below $80. Being able to carry around a small device that can hold the equivalent of thousands of books and magazines beats lugging a bag full of heavy books on vacation.

Newspaper and magazine publishers have become particularly excited about tablets, albeit probably for the wrong reasons. Many executives see them and think, "Hey, a tablet is flat and lies on a table — what a perfect replacement for print." But initial efforts to sell apps that elaborately replicate print publications have been largely unsuccessful, finding small audiences at best and little advertiser support. More successful have been clever news-aggregation apps, such as Flipboard, Zite and Pulse, that draw content from multiple sources, sometimes based on the user's reading history, to create a customized news-reading experience that's presented in an attractively laid out package.

What's next for tablets? They're becoming ever more powerful and more connected, so that they can extend a user's computing range almost infinitely. They have the same location-aware features as smartphones, but

they are also doing things such as allowing a user to start watching a movie on the tablet, and then easily finish watching it on a larger screen at home, with just a flick of a finger to send the video from tablet to big screen. We're not far from even more fantastic tablets that offer 3-D viewing — or that can roll up and fit into a user's pocket, thus catching up to one of the remaining advantages of print.

The Audience Takes Over

One of the biggest trends in technology that has impacted journalism has been the way that readers and viewers have been brought into the process. "The people formerly known as the audience," as NYU journalism professor Jay Rosen has described them, have changed journalism from a mostly one-way lecture into a cacophony of conversations and audience participation.

This rankles many journalists, who resent losing their longtime sense of control. For better or worse, it also has empowered an enormous new set of participants in journalism and the discussions surrounding it. No longer do you need big bucks to be a publisher or broadcaster. As the business schools say, those once-insurmountable barriers to entry are gone, and competitors to traditional media abound.

Now anybody can start a blog, a Twitter feed, a Flickr page or a YouTube channel to gain a worldwide audience (though most are seen by just a handful of friends) for their writing, photography or artwork. Web commenting areas allow anyone to be a pundit. Notions such as "crowdsourcing," "user-generated content" and "iReports" are turning the former members of the audience into content creators alongside traditional journalists. The Internet truly is a participatory medium like nothing seen before.

Nowhere is this more apparent than in the phenomenon of Facebook, the social network started by Harvard student Mark Zuckerberg that now counts 750 active million members worldwide, larger than the population of most of the world's nations. Facebook's statistics are staggering — half of those users sign on every day, and some 700 billion minutes per month are spent on the service, sharing information "updates" with friends.

Facebook, and the nearly as popular 140-character status-broadcast network, Twitter, show the social power of connecting people and giving them tools to easily communicate and interact with each other. These social networks are creating a new definition of news and information: intensely personal and very important to the participants, turning the traditional mass market of media on its head. For many of us, news about our friends is more important than reporting of politics or foreign conflicts that journalists have long used as their definition of "news."

The rise of Facebook and Twitter in the past few years — and of their inevitable successors, such as Google+, which went from zero to 10 million users in just a couple of weeks earlier this year — demonstrates that the audience is in control and wants its voice to be heard. It will be interesting to see how the power of social media is used as a force for societal and political change from the grass roots up — as we've already seen in the social-media-powered Occupy Wall Street movement and citizen uprisings in the Middle East.

The Future of Journalism

Okay, let's jump into that time machine again for a minute and look again at journalism a generation ago, when the primary news sources were the daily newspaper and the brief evening newscasts. No *CNN*, no Internet, no blogs. What happened halfway around the world or halfway across the country? Generally, you'd wait a day or so to find out. How did your stocks or favorite team do? You didn't know until the paper came the next morning. What was the result of the important town council vote? You had to read

your community weekly, days later. Analysis of big news stories appeared in Sunday papers or newsweekly magazines. News was just slower, for better or worse.

Back to the present: We live in an age of instantaneous, 24/7 journalism. Make that 60/60/24/7. News is everywhere, live, as it happens, transmitted by all-news cable stations, constantly updating websites and fast-moving Twitter feeds. Ball scores and stocks are available in real time. Analysis and commentary are instantaneous, on everything from serious news sites to snarky blogs and Twitter feeds. We're living in, maybe drowning in, a fast-moving torrent of news — again, for better or worse.

This creates a raft of new challenges for journalism. With countless competitors able to publish immediately online, the premium is on speed — sometimes, some skeptics believe, at the expense of accuracy. The levels of reporting, fact-checking and editing heretofore enjoyed by many publications are actually impediments in the fast-moving world of online news. Hesitate and you risk being beaten by somebody's quick tweet of a key headline. Rush too fast, and you risk getting it wrong. Ironically, these are challenges that wire services such as the Associated Press and Reuters have faced for decades, and they evolved systems of quality control to avoid speed-driven mistakes. But for many journalists, these are new issues.

Technology is also creating new forms of journalism, and not all of the rules for them are yet firm. How does a journalist handle user-generated submissions? Are objectivity and fairness outmoded concepts when everyone seems to be able to publish an opinion? How do you skillfully combine video, text and interactivity to create new journalistic formats? What's the best way to handle often-vitriolic (and anonymous) reader comments? What are the implications of privacy online? How do you compete with unorthodox competitors such as Wikileaks? How should journalists use social media?

These are issues every newsroom is grappling with. It would be wrong to say that we're in entirely uncharted waters — after nearly two decades of digital journalism, some issues and standards are pretty well settled. But it's still a fast-changing environment, with new challenges and technologies popping up seemingly every day. It's incumbent on journalists to remain flexible and open to change in their profession, but also to wisely rely on long-held standards, judiciously applied, to form the new rules of the road.

The Changing Business of Journalism

The classic business school transformation case centers on what happened to railroad companies at the turn of the 20th century: Believing they were in the railroad business, rather than the transportation business, they clung to trains — and missed opportunities to capitalize on the rise of automobiles, trucking and air transport.

Sound familiar? Same thing in the media business. Publishers and broadcasters, fat and happy and sitting on enormous, monopoly-enforced profits, didn't realize they were in the information business and were painfully slow to embrace the changes — and opportunities — being wrought in their industries by fast-changing technology. Upstart competitors such as Google, Apple, Huffington Post, eBay and others now sit atop businesses that media companies once thought they dominated.

Over the past few years, newspapers, especially, have seen their core businesses attacked from multiple directions. The traditional triumvirate of newspaper revenue streams — classified advertising, display advertising and circulation — have been significantly eroded. Classifieds, especially, have been a ruinous loss, because the pages of tiny-type want ads accounted for half (or more) of newspaper revenue and profits. But the rise of free or low-cost classifieds competitors such as Craigslist, eBay and Monster.com has crushed the traditional classifieds business. Similarly, display advertising has moved to the Web or disappeared entirely as the result of consolidation in the retail industry. Online competition for advertising and audiences quickly eroded once

wildly profitable media monopolies. It's not a pretty picture — half of the newspaper industry's overall revenue has disappeared since 2005.

This tumult in the news business was accelerated in 2008 by the Great Recession, which slashed advertising revenue and circulation even further. We all know what happened: Tens of thousands of journalists lost their jobs; major newspapers in cities including Seattle, Denver and Oakland were shut down; and just about every other significant news organization downsized its operations. Most papers and broadcast news operations are shells of their former selves — leading to a decline in quality that is further driving away frustrated readers, viewers and advertisers. It's a vicious cycle.

The odds of reversing the decline of the traditional media industry are almost insurmountable. At best, publishers and broadcasters can hope to get to a point where the revenue from digital operations can cover costs — and it's not altogether clear, at this juncture, whether that's possible. There's too much competition for audiences and advertising dollars, much of it working at much lower costs than legacy media companies. Efforts to find other sources of revenue, such as charging for once-free online content, have had mixed results, at best. One Draconian option: to shut down expensive print production entirely and switch to digital-only versions. It's already happened in Seattle and Detroit and is likely to happen elsewhere. Indeed, some experts believe a "digital-first" strategy represents the last best hope to save the newspaper business.

The core issue is how to pay for the kind of high-quality, in-depth journalism that we've come to accept as the norm (at least at the best news organizations). There are any number of interesting experiments going on in search of a workable journalism business model — including low-cost local bloggers such as *New Jersey's Baristanet*, *New York's Batavian* and the *West Seattle blog*; nonprofit regional efforts such as the *Texas Tribune*, the *Voice of San Diego* and *MinnPost*; foundation- and donation-supported reporting entities such as *ProPublica* and *Spot.Us*; national chains such as AOL's Patch; news aggregators like *Drudge Report* and *HuffingtonPost* (which also does original reporting); and any number of solo practitioners following their passion for particular subjects ranging from sports to politics to food. These experiments, some of them already successful, others doomed to failure, are charting the future of news.

Cartoonists have their own challenges, and opportunities, in earning money for their work. With traditional print venues disappearing, cartoonists must find new ways to be seen — and paid. That means, increasingly, working as independent contractors and selling their art to multiple customers, some of them nontraditional. For websites? As advertising illustrations? For corporate uses? It's a bit like being a graphic artist, providing illustrations for hire. Cartoonists should also be looking for ways to resell their work through anthologies and collections that can be marketed online and through social media. You've got to be entrepreneurial and aggressive about finding new and profitable outlets for your work.

At least the news business isn't alone in the pain caused by changing technology — the same revolution is radically transforming businesses ranging from music to photography to travel to retailing to movies. Again: They'll teach this stuff in business schools for decades — as an object lesson in what not to do when confronted by enormous change.

The New Journalist (and Cartoonist)

The journalism business in which many of us started out a few years ago simply doesn't exist anymore. Any other view is romantic and unrealistic. Significant downsizing has cut thousands of jobs, and they aren't coming back, at least not in a recognizable form. The day when a journalist or cartoonist could expect a long-term, stable career, with a pension from a longtime employer, are over.

Journalism today is a much more individualistic business. If you're lucky enough to be working for an established media company, you need to be prepared for frequent, wrenching change, with little sense of loyalty. If you're already independent, you're already in the new world. In some sense, more and more journalists are living freelance existences, selling their services to whoever will pay or even trying to start freestanding businesses that will bring in a sustainable income. (Bad news: A lot of journalists, lacking business sense, don't make particularly good entrepreneurs).

Many journalists have learned the value of personal branding, making a name and distinctive identity for yourself that is independent of where you work. That way, your audience learns to follow you wherever you go. Active use of social media and a bit of self-promotion are key elements of personal branding. Create a strong, identifiable brand for yourself, nurture it and stick to it, and you've got something that can supercharge the skills you bring to your craft and create demand for your services. Nobody else is going to promote you like you can.

The jobs that do remain in journalism are often very different than the old newsroom job descriptions. Titles like community manager, blogger, search engine optimizer, programmer and social media expert reflect skills that nobody really learned in journalism school or in traditional newsrooms. These aren't difficult skills, and you need some of them to thrive in the new environment. You probably don't need to learn a computer language to survive, but you'd better be comfortable with, if not fluent in, social media such as Facebook and Twitter and have an understanding of how the media business really works.

What does all this mean for cartoonists? Well, to a large extent, cartoonists are the prototypes for the model of a modern journalist: independent, scrappy, a bit entrepreneurial. They follow their own muses rather than do editors' bidding. In today's world, that's a good way to operate. Work for yourself, promote yourself, look out for yourself. Pen and ink will continue to be the basic tools of the cartoonist, but technology provides other media such as animation and interaction. Enthusiastically embrace social tools such as Facebook and Twitter to spread the word about what you do, to cultivate online fans and to build your personal brands. In many ways, a cartoonist's style and signature is a perfect example of personal branding; today, the cartoonist must learn to propagate and reinforce that brand with the new digital tools.

Conclusion: Predicting the Unpredictable

Imagine having a front-row seat for the Industrial Revolution. Innovation after innovation flashes by — the steam engine, mass production, the telegraph, the automobile. Pretty thrilling stuff. Well, that's what's happening in the media business right now — a technological revolution every bit as profound as the one that remade industry.

But change is both exciting and scary. This revolution has cost thousands of jobs and shaken long-standing institutions to their foundations. And it's far from over. Technology continues to evolve at an ever-quickening pace (faster, smaller, better, cheaper), and there are innovations even now under development that we can't envision any more than we could have predicted Facebook, Twitter or the iPad just a few years ago.

Journalism, the journalism business and journalists will have to keep adjusting to these radical changes. Flexibility and open-mindedness will be key to success. Clinging to old ways, hoping that they'll somehow make a comeback, is a losing strategy.

That sounds bleak, and scary, but in fact, we're in a golden age of journalism and media. With these new tools and technologies, more media are being created, by more people, in more formats, than ever before. Journalism is changing, but it isn't broken. It's the business models underlying journalism that are in peril. There will continue to be wrenching change while these business models are sorted out. That won't be a rapid process — even after nearly 20 years of change, we're far from done understanding what the future of media will be.

No one has described this process of change in the media business better than NYU professor Clay Shirky, whose masterful 2009 essay, "Newspapers and Thinking the Unthinkable," managed to both reassure the pessimists and encourage the optimists. We'll close with some of Shirky's wise words about the uncertainty the media business faces, and why there's reason for hope:

> *"Society doesn't need newspapers. What we need is journalism. . . . Any experiment ... designed to provide new models for journalism is going to be an improvement over hiding from the real, especially . . . when, for many papers, the unthinkable future is already in the past. . . . No one experiment is going to replace what we are now losing with the demise of news on paper, but over time, the collection of new experiments that do work might give us the journalism we need."*

Mark Potts is a former newspaper reporter and editor who for the past 20 years has worked as a consultant to major Internet corporations as they move into the digital age.

Essays

by Clay Bennett

As editorial cartoonists go, I'm one of the lucky ones.

I still have a staff job on a daily newspaper; the editors who employ me seem to really appreciate what I bring to the pages of their publication; and the newspaper itself is part of a chain that is both privately owned and carries no debt whatsoever.

That puts me in a position that many of my colleagues would envy. But even though my situation might make it a bit easier to sleep at night, I still sleep with one eye open, wary that my whole world could change at any given moment.

Such is the life of print journalist.

Everyone knows our industry is reeling. Competition from television, radio and especially the Internet has taken its toll on the popularity of newsprint journalism. And while job opportunities decrease with every shuttered newspaper, those of us who staff the remaining dailies live in constant fear of the next round of newsroom layoffs.

In these austere times, job security is the paramount concern of everyone working in print journalism, but for someone with an expertise that might seem like a luxury, and therefore more expendable, the anxiety is even more acute.

The number of staff editorial cartoonists has dwindled over my entire career, but the past decade has been particularly devastating for this profession. Currently, the number of full-time, staff editorial cartoonists is at an all-time low of just over 60, and I fully expect that number to continue to fall in the future.

But even though we may never make it off the endangered species list, I'm convinced that our complete extinction is avoidable. Who survives, however, may well be determined by who works the hardest to keep their position alive.

And that effort, I believe, will involve a lot more than just drawing cartoons.

Being an old-school newsman, I have stubbornly held on to the belief that it is not the journalist but the journalism that matters. Consequently, my career has always been one devoted to the production of my cartoons and not the promotion of myself as a cartoonist.

I've always found the whole idea of self-promotion a bit unseemly, and, worse than that, counterproductive. As much as I love drawing cartoons, I've always detested selling them. The way I saw it, every minute I spent to promote or distribute my work came directly from the time I had to create it — a fact that led me to neglect and even resent the side of this business that would have garnered a wider audience for my work.

In the past, when the popularity of my cartoons was merely an issue of ego or income, it didn't really matter, but now that the promotion of my work might well determine the likelihood of my professional survival, I have learned to embrace the aspects of this job that I had spurned in the past.

Understanding that my very future as a staff cartoonist was directly linked to the popularity of my work, I developed a strategy to both increase the readership of my cartoons and to promote myself as never before. And the way to achieve both of these goals was through the very medium that is the main source of my industry's ills — the Internet.

Today's newspaper understandably puts a lot of stock in its website and the readers it attracts. Realizing that the traffic any feature commands is the most tangible proof of its relative worth to the publication, I have been concentrating my efforts on driving more traffic to my cartoons online.

I saw social networking as the first step to achieving that goal. Currently, I post links on two separate Facebook pages that lead to my cartoons on my newspaper's website. I began this effort by building an organic network of friends and colleagues but eventually established the strategy of targeting specific groups with cartoons that would appeal to their unique interests. I was literally looking for an audience, winning their support and thus establishing a wider following for my work.

The effort has really worked wonders. While my presence on Facebook has resulted in an exponential growth in the traffic to my cartoons online, my increased interaction with supporters through social media has served to build a more personal connection between the readers and myself.

Coupled with this outreach online, I have also worked to increase the number of public appearances I make locally. Although I have always been open to speaking in public, I am now much more ambitious about promoting myself for such events. And being able to publicize speeches and appearances online has produced larger audiences at each event and with it a greater demand to appear elsewhere.

Of course, this all takes time. Knowing that it would, I took on these additional tasks with the understanding that none of them would steal a single minute away from the production of my cartoons. That means the job that used to average 50 to 60 hours a week now demands between 70 and 80.

This is my new normal.

An editorial cartoonist who wants to hold on to a staff position can no longer merely draw cartoons and expect to thrive. In this brave new world of journalism, we'll have to multitask to survive. From here on out, we have to be part cartoonist, part pen pal and part carnival barker.

I now have a job that includes more responsibilities than at any point in my career. I put in longer hours than ever before and get paid less for the amount of work I do. But all that said, I've never been happier.

That is because the path I've taken these past few years, a journey that was driven by insecurity and fueled by desperation, has delivered me to a place of unexpected riches. I may have started out simply looking for an audience, but what I found instead was a community. Becoming a part of that community may not save my job, but it may save me should I ever lose my job.

Clay Bennett is the editorial cartoonist for the *Chattanooga Times Free Press*.

by Matt Davies

Back in ancient times (circa 2004), when I was the president of the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists, our members were telling everyone who would listen that the field of editorial cartooning was threatened by quarterly-numbers-obsessed, content-indifferent corporate boardroom-dwellers. While I was personally experiencing what felt at the time like a career high, I could feel the instability of the business model that was keeping my beloved job afloat. I thought that, with personal high-speed Internet connections expanding like splitting atoms and newspaper circulation and advertising revenue dwindling, I had about a decade to figure out a safe newspaper exit strategy. Unfortunately, I was off by four years, and in November 2010, despite having won many major journalism awards, including a Pulitzer, an RFK Journalism Award and the Herblock Prize, and my cartoons being a well-known reader favorite, I joined the long roster of my cartooning colleagues before me, and my Gannett-owned newspaper laid me off.

My personal journey in the past 10 months has been both exhilarating and humbling, and it has afforded me the ability to pause and really think about the rapidly transforming professional future of the field of editorial cartooning. What's informative is that while I was approached many, many times over the past 18 years of my career by newspapers seeking to lure me away — which served to boost both my earnings and my professional standing at my paper — my current search for work as a cartoonist has included not one single print newspaper.

Making a good living from drawing political satire will continue its 200-year-old tradition of being extremely difficult. As has always been true, different cartoonists with varying art skills, political and cultural savvy, writing abilities, work ethic, and business acumen (and luck) will forge different paths. Sadly, not everyone who chooses to call himself an editorial cartoonist is capable of being hugely valuable to a publisher of a newspaper, a website, an iPad app or a holographic laser newscast. The advice I would give to a young Mike Luckovich or a 22-year-old Tom Toles would be very different from the advice I might give to some others. When it comes to matters of creativity, everyone's journey, by definition, must be different.

There will probably remain a few good print cartoon jobs for a period, but those could disappear as the migration to the Web completes itself and the 20th-century print advertising business model virtually evaporates. As newspapers writhe, contract and transition to Web-only operations, salaried cartoonists may very well exist once more, but only the sharpest and most interesting of our numbers will be signed up for that duty. And by then, the best or most entrepreneurial may have already carved a niche anyway. Already there are Ann Telnaes, Mark Fiore and Daryl Cagle, who have marched profitably into the digital universe, each pursuing avenues without staff positions. Without a doubt, many will follow, each with their own twist, whether it be through animation, or some other signature flourish.

It is still my firm belief, however, that to be effective, an editorial cartoonist needs a host platform. It can be exceptionally challenging for a modern political cartoonist to consistently attract enough unique visitors and wield worthwhile influence (and traffic) as a solo website proprietor. The old appeal of the editorial cartoon as the one voice that attracts attention and misbehaves in the sea of monotonous gray newsprint will be challenged. However while the Web is now filled with millions of opinions, much of them tongue-in-cheek, hard-hitting and badly behaved, the editorial cartoonist's appeal will still be that she can do all this visually and stand out within an existing news platform. This distinction will help to identify a brand for a news site to be able to offer something different, in much the same way newspapers decided they needed the same so many years ago. The Web will undoubtedly provide some full-time employment opportunities, a lot of opportunities for freelance cartooning and definitely an unprecedented ability to showcase one's own work.

Who Will Pay?

While the Web — bastion of "free content" — is dismembering the print business model and its concomitant considerable profits, it has simultaneously created the biggest opportunity for self-syndication, distribution and audience expansion. The question is: How does a cartoonist avoid toiling in obscurity, shoulder-to-shoulder with the vast majority of the tens of millions of bloggers and website operators, and somehow earn a living from it?

There are several possibilities:
The first and best option is the century-old solution of seeking out fiscally healthy news organizations and convincing them to simply create a cartooning job. I am willing to wager that in the 21st century, none of these will be newspapers. However in my Web news site inquiries, I have found no shortage of publishers who want cartoons. They just haven't reached the levels of profitability where they can forgo a writer or two and indulge in fielding their own staff cartoonist. Yet.

The current temporary transition period from print to Web for editorial cartoonists could benefit from the participation of foundations that wish to loudly and playfully support the principles of the First Amendment. (Paradoxically, the best-funded practitioners of news and analysis are nonprofits.) This could be done through matching grants to fledgling news websites that might wish to have their own cartoonists but can't allocate satisfactory funding. For example, an organization such as the Herblock Foundation or the Knight Foundation could offer $50,000 to offset one half a salary to a group that wishes to contract the full-time services of its favorite pen-and-ink slinger.

For the Herblock Foundation — whose mission statement is to promote and support the field of editorial cartooning in America — this would make sense. As a cartoonist, I feel it is my duty to point out the irony of a nonprofit, generously funded by a famous 20th-century cartoonist to promote his pro-underdog values and the industry he loved so much, desperately figuring out how to Save The Cartoonists.

Another nonprofit-based possibility is that of the ProPublica model. Funding is allocated entirely by a foundation (in ProPublica's case, the Sandler Foundation) that wishes to support a particular societal goal. Obviously the tricky part is establishing a relationship with a deep-pocketed group that wishes to fund the work of one or more editorial cartoonists. An adjunct to that idea is the establishment of a support guild, originally discussed by members of the Editorial Cartooning Initiative, that would provide a group health/pension/fee structure for cartoonists. A complicated idea, but well worth a discussion. (The biggest issue would be that cartoonists are by definition hard to organize. They tend to be strong-willed lone operators who have little interest in leading and even more disdain for following.)

A third avenue is for artists to provide paid editorial cartoons for like-minded political lobbying entities that feel that an editorial cartoon will help promote a specific message that the cartoonist already agrees with, which may work for those cartoonists who possess a little of the mercenary spirit.

And another option is to go it alone and try to build one's own Web following, using social sites such as Twitter and Facebook for promotion. For the record, I have tried this and while I have had healthy traffic numbers, they are erratic, unique users can be fickle, and I earned $8.81 from advertisers in the month of August from this particular source. Others' results may, of course, vary.

The final question that remains: is the editorial cartoon syndication model sustainable? After I left my newspaper and began shopping my wares to websites, I told them that they could pay for an original cartoon and then I could distribute it through my fancy-pants syndication contract, thinking that the print

publicity of getting the websites' names into, say, the Boston Globe or the *Washington Post* would be a very attractive proposition. Surprisingly, it was not the enticing sales tool I thought it would be. websites looking for unique users have in fact expressed a desire NOT to allow work to be syndicated, so that users have to come to their sites to view the exclusive work of their contracted cartoonist.

At first I was puzzled, but in a Web filled with cartoon roundups and galleries, I gradually found myself understanding the need for exclusivity. So while there is still a fairly strong market for print syndication, only the most creative, agile and adaptive syndicates will be successful in selling previously published material on the Web. And they may find themselves inadvertently competing with their own creators. For some cartoonists, without a salary to offset low syndication revenue and a contractually dictated workload, the idea of syndication may be more of a burden than an asset.

Eventually, as profits grow from Web news sites, I do think some will adopt traits of print models past, and a good staff cartoonist may be what they feel they need to stand out from the others. My own personal experience can attest to this. I recently was contracted by Remapping Debate.org — a nonprofit news site — to create an original weekly editorial cartoon. They were anxious to create a home page that carved out a different look from other sites in the genre. They decided to place my black-and-white editorial cartoon front and center, which I was naturally very pleased about. After we were done negotiating and they sent me a mock up of the front page to look over, I couldn't help noticing the historical symmetry with the 1881 *Harpers Weekly* I have on the wall of my office. There on the cover page — front and center — is a black-and-white Thomas Nast editorial cartoon.

Matt Davies is editorial cartoonist for *Tribune Media Services* and the *Hearst Newspaper Group* in Connecticut.

by Mark Fiore

I'm honored to be asked to contribute my thoughts on the future of editorial cartooning and hope I may bring a seed or two of hope to the discussion. My first overarching thought is that we, as political cartoonists, have been operating on a wing and a prayer for some time now, which is really just another way of saying "entrepreneurial." "Seat-of-the-pants," "wing-and-a-prayer," "tap dancing" and "juggling" are all just ways of saying that we're making things up as we go along as conditions change rapidly all around us. "Entrepreneurial" sounds best because it implies success, so let's go with that term.

Unfortunately, there really are no more jobs in the field. There may be the occasional *Chicago Tribune* position that is filled or a *Washington Post* slot, but these are anomalies. While that sounds pretty depressing for the field, I think it can be somewhat liberating, as it has been in my case. We've got to change our mindset from the days of staff political cartoonists and look at ourselves as free-agent personalities. We are in charge, not the publishers. Yes, this means forgetting health benefits, parking spaces and vacation days, but it also means more flexibility and potentially greater compensation, or worse compensation if your entrepreneurial bets don't work out. Sure, the safe stability of a small raise at your annual review is gone, but you can aim higher on your own. In short, the stakes are higher: You can lose more and you can win more.

Only people truly dedicated to political cartooning and the world of satire would be crazy enough to revel in a profession that has such shaky odds. But then again, a career in banking isn't so safe now, either. Political cartooning/journalism isn't the only profession that has changed dramatically in recent history, so I think it's important to take a macro- view of our plight as much as possible. In short, we are figuring out ways to make funny pictures and stand on our soapbox . . . and get paid to do it. I'd say that's a pretty lofty goal in just about any economic situation. We're damn lucky and we want to keep it this way.

The best way to keep our craft moving in a forward direction is to look at ourselves as unique, unduplicatable creative minds with our own brands. We've got to elevate ourselves out of the employer/employee relationship and see ourselves as entrepreneurial cartoonists/artists/performers who are on our own. Though I create cartoons bashing an unfettered free market, whether I like it or not, I'm basically living it. Staying positive and doing everything you can to build your own empire is the best way I've found to handle this situation. Sure, I don't have a paycheck, but I also don't have a publisher who can fire me! I may lose a client, but I can't be given a box and shown the door.

In this new environment, there is added pressure to be unique and stand out from the crowd. This is mainly due to cartoons being delivered online, where all the other cartoonists are just a click away. You've got to give viewers or editors a reason to follow or buy your work. A MacNelly clone is going to have a very hard time, so you've got to have an original style and voice. While the pressure to stand out from the crowd was always there, it has grown more intense because the online world is much smaller than the old print world. At the risk of verging on motivational career-speak: Be yourself, stay positive.

Now that I've detailed the more theoretical, broad brushstrokes of what direction I think this profession may take, let's do the harder part of the job and talk specifics for my case. I haven't really thought of myself as having a job since 2001, when for several short months I had a staff political cartooning position with the San Jose Mercury News. Ever since then (and before then), I've been engaged in anything from a career to a compulsion.

When I look at the future of my career, I see myself continuing to rely on the basic elements that have served me well so far: an entrepreneurial attitude and a willingness to adapt to new technology and new markets. Or put another way, keep experimenting and trying new things!

When print cartooning was my main focus, I experimented on the side with political animation, initially just as a creative experiment. Before long, I decided to experiment with the market and see if anyone would actually buy these things. I sold the animation the same way I was selling my print work, by knocking on (now online) editors' doors and selling them the right to publish my work. This simple freelance/self-syndication model has worked for years and continues to make up a large portion of my income.

Another experiment that has paid off over the years is to work with organizations that aren't traditional media outlets but that have an extensive reach. I am occasionally approached by organizations such as Greenpeace and the Sierra Club, which see that my environmental cartoons align with their message. I create cartoons for these groups that are distributed to their members (just like subscribers) and have a reach beyond the millions of members thanks to viral distribution. This work is slightly different from my self-syndicated weekly work in that it is an animation done exclusively for one client, whereas my weekly animation is done via a non-exclusive license.

The self-syndicated cartoon and the occasional custom animation have made up the overwhelming bulk of my income since 2001. I am now increasingly focused on new experiments and finding new revenue streams because the self-syndication model seems to be on the wane. Youtube and "free" viral videos have had a huge impact on that portion of my business and have contributed to the notion that everything is free on the Internet.

After cursing Youtube and fighting the free distribution of content for a few years, I embraced its model and began receiving ad revenue from my Youtube channel. While it doesn't yet equal my more traditional self-syndication stream, it has great potential and completely eliminates editors and news sites from the equation. My main fear is cannibalizing my weekly (paying) online news site clients by releasing the animation on Youtube, where anyone can embed it on their site for free. My solution is to embargo my release on Youtube until a week has passed, so the traditional paying clients have the animation for a week before it is released to the Youtube hordes. I could do much better with my Youtube traffic and ad revenue if I released all at once, but that may kill my weekly news site clients. So at this point, it's a bit of a dance down the middle until one beats out the other.

Another avenue that paid off was my iPhone app. Initially just an experiment to see whether I could get my animation on an iPhone, it turned into a fairly profitable little venture thanks to a bump in publicity from Steve Jobs. I've lost quite a bit of momentum with this project due to development/programming hassles. Apps are difficult because as a cartoonist you are at the mercy of programmers, who are in high demand right now. Once I get the bugs worked out of the production process, I think this could be a great/profitable outlet for my work (and for other political cartoonists), but app development comes with a new set of hurdles and challenges.

Over the past year, I've begun to do more public speaking and now have an agent. I'm still very much in the early stages of this portion of my career, but it has been fairly successful without too much additional work. Public speaking is one of the best ways to build up the cartoonist-as-entrepreneur concept and is an important part of "building the brand."

In the Real Long Shot Department, I also have a television agent. With the success of satire on cable television and shows such as *The Colbert Report* and *The Daily Show*, Hollywood is now more receptive to political content. While it is easy to get lured by the siren song of Hollywood bucks that may or may not materialize, this is just another iron in the fire that I try to keep active without hurting the other elements of my business. As political cartoonists, we have a huge advantage over the thousands of people who are trying to sell something in Hollywood. We have characters, we write regularly, we are published and we have a certain amount of renown.

Although all of these avenues have potential and sound great, my main problem is finding the time to pursue the various possibilities or experiments. It can be frustrating at times, but I try to keep moving forward on different fronts, even though it may not be at the level that is ideal. There are only so many hours in the day. Any entrepreneurial adaptability will pay off more than just trying to hold on at all costs to what was successful in the past.

As you can see from my story, I don't think there is one thing that is going to save political cartooning. There are devices and satire-delivery-methods not yet invented and business models not yet explored. What will save political cartooning is our elemental skill at satire and our adaptability. This is an exciting/important/scary time of change, but we are better equipped than most to have careers that are truly entrepreneurial.

Mark Fiore is a political cartoonist for who specializes in Flash-animated editorial cartoons.

By Kevin Kallaugher (KAL)

Thank you for allowing me to share my thoughts on the important question: What's next for editorial cartooning?

Hmmmm ... good question. The immediate reasonable answer might be "slow death."

Our numbers are rapidly shrinking as newspapers diminish. We know the dire situation for the print industry is not likely to improve. Nor will the lot of the print cartoonist.

A decade from now, only a small group of staff cartoonists might exist. These cartoonists will probably be with large, wealthier papers (only three of the top ten papers today have a cartoonist on the payroll).

Their bosses will probably require them to draw mostly on local issues. They will also be asked to maintain a blog and a presence on other "new media" (Twitter, Facebook etc.).

This will be a far cry from the days of Herblock at *The Post*.

Despite this dark picture for editorial cartoonists, I remain optimistic. I believe an exciting new world lies ahead for the visual satirist.

Henceforth, I think it might be best to describe us as visual satirists rather than editorial cartoonists.

A cartoonist is the product of the print media. The visual satirist uses all media available as a tool of expression.

For a century we visual satirists used newspaper cartoons as our media of choice. Earlier visual satirists from Hogarth, Gillray and Daumier onward used prints, lithographs and paintings as their milieu.

The main theater for the future visual satirist will be the Internet.

I suspect visual satirists will employ four major vehicles for their expression:
1) Daily web cartoons
2) Web comics
3) Cartoon journalism
4) Film and animation

Daily Web Cartoons: This would be the closest thing to the editorial cartoon we know today.

It will be a drawn, satirical take on the day's news. The main difference from its print cousin will be its interactivity. Readers will post comments and forward the art to other social media sites. The artwork itself could also contain sound effects and links to other relevant sites.

The attraction of this form is its topicality and immediacy.

Web comics: The print newspaper has limited real estate to display cartoons. websites on the Internet have no such limitation. As a result visual satirists can employ long-format narrative techniques as a medium of expression.

Already there is a thriving community of Web comics, though the form is not primarily used for political commentary. They closely resemble comic books or graphic novels in format.

The attraction of Web comics is their engaging visual format. The downside is they take longer to create. Weekly instead of daily installments would be more probable (losing, in turn, some of the topical appeal of the daily Web cartoon).

Cartoon Journalism: This is an area of particular interest. Several recent artists have harnessed the long-form cartoon style (like the comic book or the Web comic) as a tool for reportage.

This is an exciting new area of development for the craft. In this format, the cartoonist/satirist/journalist researches an issue and uses the medium of cartoon art to deliver the story.

The most prominent name in the craft today is Joe Sacco, who has created several graphic novels around such subjects as the plight of Palestine (for which he won an American Book Award) and the war in Bosnia.

The Cartoon Movement, a nonprofit group based in Holland, is funding projects to encourage cartoon journalism, including a recent program in Haiti.

Animation: No doubt, the area with most potential for the visual satirist is in animation.

The still image has its power. But a moving image is almost always a more potent weapon.

Until recently, animation was a no-go area for topical satirists. Animation was a time-intensive medium taking days, sometimes weeks to produce seconds of film. Meanwhile, politics can change on a dime. The prospects of topical animation seemed out of the question.

Now with the advances in computer software, topical animated cartoons can be produced.

We are familiar with the work of Ann Telnaes and Mark Fiore in this field. I believe more will follow.

The promise of animation still has its limits. It is still a lengthy, technical and sometimes expensive process. I believe these barriers will become lower in the years ahead.

There are two challenges that will face all the visual satirists of the future. The first is money.

In the transition from print to digital media, cartoonists will suffer financially.

Currently, I describe the media landscape as the "Wild West" — a lawless, freewheeling environment where everyone is searching for gold but where few make it rich.

Like the Wild West, I think this time will pass.

Right now, the prospects of earning money on the Internet seem slim.

But many media groups on the Web are now experimenting with paywalls. They believe people are willing to pay for quality. I agree with that premise. In time, more opportunities to earn money on the Web will emerge.

The second challenge for the visual satirist of the future will be to create high-quality content that is worth paying for.

Just as our satirist forefathers earned their money by selling high-quality prints and lithographs, we need to produce goods of value we can sell.

My plans for the future are focused on animation. I am working with The Economist on a series of short (1:15 minute) animations.

Following my own advice, I am opting to go with a higher-quality product. This requires employing animators and voice actors. The result is a more expensive creation.

To finance this, The Economist is looking to sponsor these films. The magazine would procure an advertiser to sponsor a series of 5 or 10 animations in exchange for a short 10-second "pre-roll" plug.

Alas…. My 1,000 words are nearly up.

Once again, allow me to thank you for this opportunity to share my thoughts on the future of my craft. I would be delighted to talk with you further on the subject.

Kevin Kallaugher (KAL) is the editorial cartoonist for *The Economist* magazine of London.

by Mikhaela B. Reid

Without young cartoonists, political cartooning has no future. But how is a young editorial cartoonist these days supposed to get her start — and what does she have to look forward to — when even Pulitzer Prize winners can't keep their jobs?

Ten years ago, at the age of 21, I decided to make a real go at political cartooning, schoolwork, sleep and social life be damned. In the jingoistic, freedom-fries, immigrant-bashing, color-coded-terror-alert, Iraq-blaming fog that followed 9/11, cartoons seemed to cut through the warmongering haze and speak truth to power. I wallpapered my dorm room with sharp, angry, satirical — and sometimes even funny — work by such great editorial cartoonists as Tom Tomorrow, Kirk Anderson, Joel Pett and Clay Bennett.

I began drawing for the Harvard Crimson on whatever and whoever made me angriest in a given week, whether the offender was George W. Bush or the then-president of Harvard, Larry Summers. I started a blog and began getting fan — and hate! — e-mail.

But my cartooning career might have ended at graduation were it not for a fateful call from an editor at the Boston Phoenix alternative newsweekly, offering to pay me actual money for my work.

From then on, I lived and breathed politics, cartoons and political cartoons. I attended my first Association of American Editorial Cartoonists (AAEC) convention at the urging of then-board member Cindy Procious. I became friends with many of my established cartooning heroes, and they gave me invaluable artistic and career advice — and encouragement. I sought out cranky younger kindred spirits — like Jen Sorensen, Matt Bors and Brian McFadden — and we had long, rambling discussions and arguments in noisy bars after cartooning festivals, panels and slideshows.

The future of political cartooning I imagined in 2001 was already a far cry from the future of political cartooning in 1981. My fellow 20-something alternative cartoonist friends and I didn't even vaguely aspire to comfortable drafting-desk staff positions at daily newspapers with reasonable salaries and health benefits. The Pulitzer Prize application just seemed like a waste of money.

Our model was self-syndication in the alternative weeklies. We looked to Ted Rall, Keith Knight, Alison Bechdel. We'd pay our inky dues, toiling in the Bristol Board — or Wacom tablet — trenches. We'd work day jobs. By night we'd comb through news sources and write and draw and write. Sleep was for suckers.

We'd market ourselves with clever self-promotional packets mailed regularly to hundreds of alternative and niche publications. We'd blog and send e-mail newsletters, and we'd draw attention to our cartooning book collections at comic conventions with big vinyl banners and brightly colored tablecloths. We'd sell T-shirts and stickers to our legions of super-dedicated online fans.

Our aspirations were modest. Maybe one day we'd quit our day jobs and squeeze by on a low five-figure income. Or if we were already squeezing by fulltime, maybe one day we'd be able to afford — gasp! — basic health insurance.

But things were already rough then. The good ship Political Cartooning (to borrow an overused cartoon metaphor) was leaking if not actively sinking. Retired cartoonists were not replaced; reprint rates at daily papers and alternative newsweeklies failed to rise with inflation — or they decreased. More and more outlets folded, and new outlets often "paid" in exposure alone. Even our alternative cartooning heroes and mainstream favorites were doing more and more work for less and less money. I'd talk to

cartoonists who were drawing several political cartoons a week — and maybe a daily comic strip — and illustrating and drawing graphic novels on the side. Not to make it big — just to stay afloat.

Still, we hoped for a turnaround. Maybe it was just a really long rough patch, and if we hung in there long enough, some new business model would fly down from the sky and save us. Maybe some less talented cartoonists would drop out but a few of us would make it — cartoon Darwinism. We could educate the public about our importance! Draw more local cartoons! Blog! Tweet! Animate! Graphic novelize! Find niche markets!

And so I marketed myself. I picked up a second regular newspaper syndication gig, then a third. Eventually I had seven, plus a good variety of regular illustrations and other commissioned pieces. I was interviewed on NPR and the BBC, even reprinted in the occasional daily newspaper. The year I broke from the high four figures into (the very low) five figures, I thought I was on my way up.

You can guess how this story goes. I lost one self-syndication client ("We're cutting our comics pages!" "We're going in another direction."), then another. At first I could replace them with new gigs ... and then I couldn't. I could still find paying one-off commissions, but with my day job I didn't have time to keep searching for — or to create — extra art. Eventually I was down to one newspaper and a handful of websites. My cartoons barely paid for the software I drew them with.

Still, I couldn't give it up, though I'd periodically threaten to do so. I'd been cartooning so long I couldn't imagine NOT handing out business cards reading "Mikhaela Reid, angry cartoonist."

And then my husband and I decided to have a baby, and I had to make a choice. Working full-time and having a young child is hard enough — working a second, poorly paid night shift was out of the question. Cartooning used to be a profession you could count on to support a family, but for us it would barely have been diaper money.

The day I turned in my (last?) political cartoon wasn't nearly as weird as the first day I had no political cartoon deadline to meet. I avoided the news for several weeks because I couldn't stand the itch of not being able to draw anything about it.

So that was that. "Cartooning's Angry Young Woman" (as Ted Rall dubbed me in his second "Attitude" anthology of alternative cartoonists) was out of the ring.

And while many of my peers are still gamely struggling away — and doing amazing and inspiring work, and sometimes getting paid decently for it — it's been a long time since I've heard from any young editorial cartoonists looking for advice.

In fact, as this piece was about to go to press, I received an e-mail from a former client asking if I knew of any up-and-comers who'd be willing to draw for their website for "exposure."

I told them the bad news — that there aren't many (or maybe any?) — new cartoonists in the pipeline anymore, in great part due to the disappearance of paid outlets for cartoonists. I told them that most "exposure" rarely leads to paying work and amounts to exploitation.

And, among other things, I wrote: "As a progressive publication who understands the value of a living wage, I'm surprised you'd ask cartoonists to do real work — and political cartooning is real, hard, and valuable time-consuming work — for free. The best way to support young up-and-coming political cartoonists (if there are ever to be any again) would be the framed dollar bill on their wall — their first real pay for their work."

Here's hoping any young cartoonists will ever see those dollar bills.

Mikhaela Reid is a freelance political cartoonist.

by Jen Sorensen

My perspective on the future of political cartooning is largely informed by my background as an "alternative" cartoonist. That is to say, my clients are mostly free weekly newspapers as opposed to more traditional dailies. Unlike most daily editorial cartoonists, I self-syndicate my work; I have never been on a newspaper staff outside of college, and I deal with clients directly. Very rarely have cartoonists in my genre been given staff jobs, so the freelance life is all we know. Since we seem to be moving inexorably toward a freelance era, perhaps my experiences can offer some insights.

I'll start with a brief summary of my cartooning career before getting to my predictions and wish list for the decades ahead. I began my weekly political/social commentary strip "Slowpoke" in 1998, when alternative newspapers were a rapidly growing industry. Gradually — glacially, one might say — my client list expanded, and in 2006, I became a full-time cartoonist. Publications that "Slowpoke" regularly appears in include: the Village Voice, Ms. Magazine, NPR.org and the political website Daily Kos.

The situation for my genre of cartooning is, unsurprisingly, less than ideal. We aren't losing staff jobs, as so many daily cartoonists have, because we never had them; however, we are losing papers. Several papers have gone out of business over the years; others have cut space allotted to comics. As much of an uphill battle as it's been for me, breaking into alt-weeklies has been even more difficult for younger cartoonists who didn't already have a foot in the door. Some cartoonists have been driven to give away their work for "exposure" — a practice that tends to lower the monetary value of all cartoonists' work. Some have turned to their own websites for salvation, although the audiences for Web comics and political cartoons are very different. The Web-comic business model of selling merchandise and ad space, while worth trying, tends to yield a political cartoonist only beer money — and not even that, considering how much some of us drink.

What does all this mean for the future? Looking at the editorial cartooning profession as a whole, I predict some staff jobs at larger and more enterprising dailies will continue to exist. The visual immediacy of cartoons is well suited to the digital age. We've seen some success stories recently, such as the hiring of Scott Stantis by the Chicago Tribune. But as the economy continues to falter and the Internet takes its toll, smaller, cash-strapped dailies will increasingly rely on syndicated content and staff jobs will become ever more scarce.

A more likely model for political cartoonists will be the diversified approach that many of us freelancers have had to pursue out of necessity. By "diversified," I mean our political cartoons are one of many things we do; they are our calling card and, hopefully, a source of regular income, but only part of the story. In a time when no one job seems to pay enough, we must cultivate multiple revenue streams. Being a freelancer (or "solopreneur," as the current jargon goes) involves cobbling together a living from cartooning, illustration work, writing, public speaking, teaching, graphic journalism and commissioned comics, to name a few possible side gigs. Ultimately, political cartoonists' careers may be as unique as the cartoonists themselves.

This is hardly a utopian vision — it would be much easier to have the security of a regular salary and health insurance. But it's not entirely bad, either. In a way, a well-rounded career makes us less invisible. There's more emphasis on us as people. No matter how insightful the cartoonist, prose pundits are always taken more seriously. They usually have a photo next to their op-ed columns; we don't have one next to our cartoons. We need to cultivate the idea of ourselves as media personalities. Though they are a huge, nonpaying time-suck, social networking tools such as Facebook, Twitter, Tumblr and Google+ are made for this process of coming out from behind the drawing board. Instead of being marginalized, we may see some new opportunities to elevate our profiles and our profession.

I wanted to share a couple of encouraging experiences I've had taking on "extracurricular" projects. Earlier this year, I drew a graphic travelogue for The Oregonian about a trip I took to Montana. The paper had been running some longer-form journalistic comics by Jack Ohman, which may have made it more receptive to my idea. My artwork filled a full page and a half in the Sunday Travel section, making it the largest piece, dimension-wise, that I'd ever done. Not only was my editor thrilled (to my great relief), but reader response also was excellent. My inbox filled with appreciative e-mails; people clamored for more. The positive feedback led me to believe that comics journalism has great potential, with the caveat that it's not exactly the most efficient process when you factor in travel expenses and time. Of course, not all nonfiction comics require travel; I recently drew a biographical comic about a writer I interviewed from the comfort of my home. The new website Cartoon Movement, edited by Matt Bors, and a group blog to which I belong called GraphicJournos also suggest a promising future for graphic journalism.

Another side project that drew a good response was my blog coverage of the 2008 Democratic National Convention for my local alternative newspaper, *C-VILLE Weekly* in Charlottesville, Va., which had published my cartoons for years. While I filed cartoons from Denver, the blog consisted mostly of prose and photos. I realize I'm hardly the first cartoonist to go to a political convention (Rob Rogers, Tom Tomorrow and Ward Sutton were there that year, too), but it was exciting to be blogging as a cartoonist, with all the freedom of opinion and humorous observation that entails. The blog did so well that the paper decided to continue it until the end of the election, sending me to a Sarah Palin rally at a NASCAR speedway. I was paid for these various exploits, though not a large amount. My pay for the convention coverage covered my expenses, while the post-convention blogging was a bit more profitable.

While some might read this as though I'm saying the future of political cartooning is doing things other than political cartooning, I would argue that different kinds of work are interrelated. Everything reinforces everything else. When you tweet about side projects or link to them on Facebook (promoting them through social networks is de rigueur, of course), your cartoon fans will check them out. Meanwhile, in the opposite direction, new readers will discover your cartoons through your other projects.

A note about technology: while we've seen great animated cartoons from the likes of Mark Fiore and Ann Telnaes, I do not believe animation is essential. The vast majority of popular Web comics are static. At this year's Small Press Expo, attendees were buying plenty of good old-fashioned print books — though, once again, political cartoon collections are a harder sell. If anything, I feel innovations in artistic style will play a larger role than innovations in technological format.

What are my less-realistic hopes for the future? I would love group health insurance for freelance cartoonists so that we don't have to suffer the injustices and expenses of coverage through the individual market. I would love to see more awards and grants dedicated to supporting the work of lower-income cartoonists, and the abolition of steep contest fees that seem to be based on the anachronistic assumption that we're sponsored by our employers or at the very least enjoy a regular, middle-class salary. I would love it if more political websites followed Daily Kos's lead in creating a comics section and paying its contributors decently. I would love it if TV hosts such as Jon Stewart and Stephen Colbert interviewed cartoonists on their shows the way they currently interview writers, many of whom are far more obscure than we are.

I've long said that it's easier to become a rock star than it is to make a living as an editorial cartoonist. When younger cartoonists ask me for advice, I sometimes tell them to pick up the guitar. But for those who feel strangely compelled to practice this craft, some possibilities will remain. The path just won't be as straightforward, and it might lead through their parents' basement for a while. But hopefully not forever.

Jen Sorensen is the award-winning cartoonist behind *Slowpoke*, a weekly strip that appears in alternative newspapers around the country.

by Scott Stantis

The face of editorial cartooning will never die.

Ever.

It can't. It has been an intrinsic part of the human condition since the cavemen painted on walls. Later, a disgruntled laborer drew on the side of the pyramids as they were being built, and even in Pompeii, graffiti demeaning Christians was found on the sides of walls.

The question is wrong. While editorial cartooning will remain, the way for the editorial cartoonist to make a living at it remains in flux.

To look at the future of editorial cartooning, it is important to look at its past. As I mentioned, there have always been graphic commentators (the walls of ancient Rome were covered with their work), but they did not get compensated for their efforts. That model did not change until the advent of the printing press. The pay model that grew out of that was political or social commentary prints (often displayed in printers' windows), which were sold individually.

The notion of having what we today would consider an editorial cartoon came slowly — first in early 19th-century Europe, where Honore Daumier etched on stone and did such provocative work that he was thrown in prison for his efforts. The mid to late 19th century saw the rise of a new notion: a paid staff editorial cartoonist. As newspapers solidified their monopoly as the primary source for news and information, more and more hired editorial cartoonists to comment on local and national issues. Newspapers fought off attempts to usurp their position from movie newsreels, radio and television.

Then came the Internet.

And with it the inexplicable decision by newspapers NOT to charge for their content. A decade later we see newspapers on the ropes with diminished payrolls, and with that, unemployed editorial cartoonists.

Not long ago, in the mid-1980s, there were as many as 200 regular staff editorial cartoonists in the United States. Today there are as few as 40. The erosion can be blamed on a myriad of reasons: untalented cartoonists who shouldn't have had a staff job in the first place; high-salaried cartoonists who got a bulls-eye painted on their back because of it; myopic cartoonists who strove to be reprinted nationally at the expense of rarely, if ever, drawing on local issues; and, of course, shortsighted editors.

While the Internet offers any and all persons wishing to draw editorial cartoons access to a massive audience, few get the eyeballs and fewer still can come even close to making a reasonable amount of income to make this a viable career.

So what could be the model moving forward? When everything seems in flux, here is a possible workable model.

There is only one problem: The idea to follow goes against in the common temperament of just about every cartoonist.

The challenge of doing creative work on a daily basis is extraordinary. At some point in the process, it is essential for the cartoonist to cloister himself or herself in order to encounter and encourage their inner voice. It is this quest for serenity that is the defining characteristic of the profession. Many cartoonists will say the best part of their day is when they close the door to their offices and face a blank piece of paper, later to emerge with a finished cartoon that will be viewed by thousands if not millions of readers.

Well, the days of the cloistered cartoonist who draws a cartoon a day in a lonely garret and takes a hefty salary are pretty much over.

Branding of the cartoonist is becoming more and more important. This can take many forms. One model that is very workable in the current economic environment is for the cartoonist to approach various political action committees and other political groups to create cartoons specifically for them. Foundations are another option. There are so many of every stripe that the cartoonists would not have to compromise their beliefs. A cartoonist today could offer a menu of options, including single use for a newsletter or Web page (recent efforts at this have had phenomenal results; one website experienced a 200 percent increase in traffic when it started running work by a cartoonist whose newspaper recently closed) and distribution to trade publications. If the cartoonist is syndicated, there is really no reason not to offer that as another service to the client. What outfit, wishing to promote a particular perspective, wouldn't want its ideas disseminated to the widest possible audience?

In my case, I am fortunate enough to be on staff at a major metropolitan daily, the Chicago Tribune. In Chicago, the Tribune Co. owns not just the *Tribune* but also WGN television and WGN radio, and *ChicagoTribune.com*, which gets more than 6 million weekly unique views. While I was being interviewed for the position, I was asked how I would take advantage of the Tribune Co. resources. It was like being asked what would I like for Christmas. For years, I asked my previous employer to help me expand my brand. They looked at me as if I was insane.

In the two years since I joined the staff of the Tribune, I have had the opportunity not just to do my cartoons but also to create a cartoon caption contest with a heavy emphasis on local imagery. I do a weekly video rant for WGN America, which reaches more than 74 million homes. I appear regularly on WGN Radio. I also happen to draw a nationally syndicated comic strip, Prickly City.

Success as an editorial cartoonist may be variously defined. However, if that means doing editorial cartoons that generate a livable income, the answer is clear: Get on the phone and pound the sidewalk. Create your own market and brand the work as well as the person doing it.

Scott Stantis is the editorial cartoonist for the *Chicago Tribune*.

by Ed Stein

Miss Humphrey to the rescue.

A wonderfully irreverent print by James Gillray, the great 18th-century English political caricaturist, hangs in my studio. Gillray made a handsome living selling scathingly satirical etchings lampooning English politicians and nobility at the London shop owned by his publisher, Miss Hannah Humphrey. When Gillray lost his eyesight, took to drinking heavily and eventually went insane, Miss Humphrey cared for him until his death.

Unfortunately for contemporary satirists, the modern publishers of political caricature, daily newspapers, are in deep trouble, and they are not as generous or kind to their cartoonists as Miss Humphrey was. Newspapers are bleeding readers and revenue, and they are jettisoning editorial cartoonists and their salaries at a frantic pace. More than a third of the full-time positions once held by cartoonists have vanished in the past two decades. A number of papers, mine included, have gone out of business. Even if current experiments in creating paywalls for readers and expanding digital revenue succeed, newspapers will not regain their former economic strength anytime soon, if ever, and the downsizing of staffs is likely to continue.

Cartoonists have responded as best we can. Many of us lucky enough to still have daily jobs work to secure them by doing much more than drawing the traditional five cartoons a week. Clay Bennett of the Chattanooga Times Free Press spends hours every week working with a combination of social media, his own website and his speaking engagements to drive traffic to his newspaper's website and to build his popularity with the paper's readers. The Chicago Tribune's Scott Stantis, the world's poster boy for sleep deprivation, does a radio show, a blog, a podcast and a caption contest, along with his regular five weekly cartoons. Did I mention his comic strip? Almost every cartoonist blogs; many have podcasts, run caption contests and create additional special features for their papers — anything to make themselves more visible to readers and more valuable to their publishers. Oh, for the halcyon days of drawing a daily cartoon and going home! As the *Rocky Mountain News*, my employer, began its slow, agonizing decline, I created a local daily comic strip, which I drew in addition to my editorial cartoons. I'm convinced that "Denver Square" saved my job for a dozen years until the Rocky folded. These strategies may keep some cartoonists employed (assuming their papers stay in business), but they don't create new jobs or help those who've lost theirs.

The good news, if there is any, is that editorial cartoons remain enormously popular with readers, and they translate well to the Internet. Cartoon sites such as Comics.com and Daryl Cagle's Political Cartoonists Index garner huge numbers of hits, as do the websites of many individual cartoonists. The question, of course, is whether this will produce enough revenue for us to make a living.

Online comic strips such as *Penny Arcade* and *Homestar Runner* do well selling mugs and T-shirts in their online stores. Syndicates are reaching beyond newspapers to find new markets. Apps for smartphones and tablets have the potential to reach millions of readers, many of whom might be willing to pay for cartoons. Amazon and Apple allow authors to bypass publishers and to sell self-published books on their platforms. I know musicians who support their music with PayPal donations from readers. Editorial cartoonists might benefit from one or more of these approaches

When the *Rocky Mountain News* finally closed its doors, I reworked "Denver Square" for a national audience; its new incarnation, *Freshly Squeezed*, is syndicated by Universal Uclick. I've continued to draw two or three editorial cartoons weekly for syndication. I find that there is a freelance market for specialized editorial cartoons drawn for advocacy groups with political philosophies and objectives aligned with my own. Everything I post on my site goes to Facebook, Twitter, Open Salon, an RSS feed and e-mails to

subscribers. I sell original drawings and prints. The income from all those sources pays the bills, but it doesn't equal the salary and benefits I enjoyed at the Rocky. I work harder for less money and spend much of my time marketing my work, maintaining my website and trying to build an audience. So far I've resisted the advice of my tech-savvy son to invest even more time in using social networking tools to build a more robust audience for my work. There are only so many hours in the day, and I prefer to spend as many of them as I can drawing, not tweeting.

All these extra endeavors come at a price. I don't think my work is as strong as it was when I was able to concentrate on just drawing a cartoon a day, and I question whether any cartoonist can add so many distractions and still produce consistently forceful, biting cartoons.

This is the dilemma facing every editorial cartoonist, whether just starting out, trying to save a job or making the transition from a full-time post to self-publishing. How do we find the time and energy to sustain the quality of our work in this fractured publishing environment? Maintaining a website is a time-intensive pursuit on its own. Social networking is a time leech that can and will suck the life out of you, or at least any remaining hours out of your day. How can we be both effective cartoonists and successful self-marketers?

Perhaps some enterprising young cartoonist with an intuitive sense for the digital possibilities will come up with THE solution — a simple, brilliant system for making cartooning on the web economically rewarding — but until that happy day comes, I'm afraid we ink-stained wretches will continue to spend our days and nights trying multiple strategies on various platforms, attempting to gain a large enough audience and enough income to support our cartooning habits

Or maybe we will each find our own Miss Hannah Humphrey to champion our work, pay our bills and support us when we're old and feeble.

We can hope.

Ed Stein, the former editorial cartoonist for the *Rocky Mountain News,* is syndicated by United Media.

by Ted Rall

There are really three questions:

What are the prospects for editorial cartooning as a profession (as opposed to a hobby)?

What are the economic prospects for print media (which remain the primary delivery platform and income source for editorial cartooning) in the United States?

To what extent will editorial cartoonists find paying work in traditional print media platforms and new digital ones?

Political cartoons — words plus pictures that comment on current affairs — have been around for thousands of years. Political cartoons almost certainly have some sort of future as an art form. There will always be amateurs. But what about professional, political cartoonists?

The 20th century witnessed the employment and publication of thousands of professional political cartoonists in the United States — artists who were paid salaries to spend most of their time thinking about the issues of the day and drawing cartoons about them. Even before the digital revolution, the "staff cartoonist" model, wherein an artist is directly employed by a newspaper (and may disseminate his or her work to additional newspapers via syndication), was in disastrous decline. By the most reliable estimates, the number of staff cartoonists tumbled from 1,200 in 1900 to about 300 by 1980. By 2000, the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists counted fewer than 100 full-time professional staff cartoonists; today there are fewer than 40.

There have been fewer than 10 hires for staff jobs since 1990. Not one has represented a new position; all have replaced a spot vacated by resignation, termination or death. And these are the exceptions. Usually, when a cartoonist dies, quits or is laid off, he (it is usually a he) is not replaced.

The fortunes of editorial cartoonists have followed those of the papers that employed them. Circulation has been declining since the 1960s, long before anyone dreamed of the World Wide Web. Afternoon papers disappeared, turning two-paper cities into single-paper towns. More often than not, publishers looking for places to reduce their expenses have viewed their cartoonist as a disposable frill.

A handful of political cartoonists have been able to derive a substantial income from syndication alone. Until 2000, these included Pat Oliphant and myself. That is no longer the case. As newspapers have trimmed budgets, the typical syndicated editorial cartoonist has seen his client list (and syndication income) shrink by 75 percent since 2000.

During the 1990s, alternative weekly newspapers such as *The Village Voice* and *LA Weekly* seemed poised to employ cartoonists on a full-time or contract basis. There was also a push by national magazines, including *Details*, *Esquire* and *Time*, to pay for long–form "commix journalism" features by editorial cartoonists who reported in graphic form. Since 2000, however, these markets have dried up.

Does it matter whether political cartoons are produced by a professional full-timer as opposed to an amateur?

I believe it does. The experience of the 12-year-old genre called "Web comics" — comic strips created exclusively for an online audience — have not, as a rule, attracted political-minded cartoonists. To the contrary, their reliance on building an audience and selling related merchandise (T-shirts, etc.) obviates political Web cartoons, which usually cannot have recurring characters. The most successful Web comics focus on cultural niches such as video games and computing.

However, Web comics do open a window into a possible post-print, post-professional future on the Web.

As a rule, Web cartoonists have had a hard time making money. Online ad rates are too low to generate meaningful revenue unless a site gets millions of discrete visitors. Even popular cartoonists have trouble coming up with merchandise their fans want to buy. Competition is fierce; with thousands of Web comics competing for readers' attention, the revenue pie is divvied up into extremely thin slices. Only a few dozen Web-comic creators report earning a full-time living. (These "full-time" salaries rarely exceed $20,000.) And these lucky few have to work long hours, often involving a grueling schedule of traveling from one comic convention to another.

An art form with low potential for remuneration tends not to attract the best artists. No doubt, some talented artists soldier on as a labor of love. But they are the exceptions — and even they don't stick around forever. Over time, the inexorable pressures of society, the desire to purchase a car or even a house, and get married and have children, prompt even the most committed to get another job. Without firm deadlines (and a paycheck at stake), Web cartoonists begin posting new strips less frequently. Eventually a month or more will go by without a new comic. In the end the cartoonist will simply walk away.

It takes years of trial and error to become a good cartoonist; name a giant like Mauldin or Schulz or Thurber and you will discover years of youthful experimentation that precedes the cartoons for which they are now remembered. Unlike the Web cartoonists, however, cartoonists of an earlier generation were paid by magazines and newspapers as they struggled to find their way as artists. Paid apprenticeship makes all the difference in the world.

Although the world of Web comics has generated work that is innovative and exciting, occasionally far more so than what appears in daily newspaper comics pages, the average quality of even the "best" Web comics is decidedly sub-par. The most popular Web comics, features that include titles such as "Penny Arcade" and "PvP," do not even rise to the quality standard of a mediocre print comic such as "Tumbleweeds." (I also attribute the quality differential to the absence of an editor at a newspaper or syndicate to help develop new talent.)

The past 20 years, during which there have been few hirings, and then only of artists who either had previously worked at other papers or worked in slavishly derivative art styles, have discouraged young people from entering the profession. At this point I can name fewer than 10 "young" (under 50) professional political cartoonists who do not work at a newspaper.

The nonexistent market for editorial cartoonists has driven highly talented younger political artists out of the profession entirely. Chris Kelly, Kaz, Lloyd Dangle, Mikhaela B. Reid, Tim Kreider and David Rees are only a few of the giants we have lost in recent years.

At this writing the outlook for professional political cartooning in the United States is bleak, bordering on hopeless.

Only one cartoonist, Mark Fiore, has been able to derive income from animated editorial cartoons for the Web. As I learned from personal experience trying to sell more than 30 of my editorial cartoons, there is zero market for this genre. Quality doesn't matter; there is no website willing to consider them, much less buy them. Fiore entered the market at the right time and is grandfathered in to some extent, though he is struggling and certainly could not get anywhere today.

Newspapers are carrying very few syndicated editorial cartoons. Magazines do not buy political cartoons. Websites pay pennies on the dollar for reprints — if they pay at all. Mobile applications, though theoretically

promising, have not materialized. Staff cartooning jobs are nonexistent. I am 47 years old; since I began drawing cartoons for national syndication 21 years ago, I have never been offered a staff position at any newspaper at any price.

The future, if it exists for American political cartooning, lies in eking out an income from a variety of sources.

Some newspapers are willing to pay for local work, even if it is piped in from far away. I produce or have produced local cartoons for newspapers in Los Angeles, Pasadena, Toledo and other U.S. cities. But rates are low. To make this kind of work feasible, cartoons must be drawn in a simple, fast style not available to every professional cartoonist.

Cartoons about highly specialized topics for organizations are another potential source for revenue. I do cartoons for EurasiaNet, a website about Central Asian politics and news that is run by the Open Society Institute. I have also done environment-themed cartoons for the Sierra Club and stuff about labor-management issues for the AFL-CIO.

I began drawing graphic novels in the mid-1990s and continue to do so. Although the book industry faces similar downward pricing pressures, cartoonists able to work in longer formats can draw fiction and nonfiction works for exposure and of course royalties.

One irony is that, while political cartoonists are having trouble earning a living, readers love their work more than ever. Like some others, I have earned substantial honoraria speaking at universities and corporate venues based on the strength of my work. But not every cartoonist is a good speaker.

As Americans, we are by nature optimistic. But I want to be clear: The above bright spots do not change the overall picture, which is grim. Like some of my peers, I will hang on as long as I can creating work I enjoy and think is important (or would be, if it were seen more widely). Unless something changes fast, however, I can't imagine that political cartooning as we know/knew it will be around much longer.

Personally, I am flailing. I am doing much better than most of my peers, having never held a staff job. I am lean and mean and far more diversified (as a writer, for example) than most of my colleagues. Yet I may have to call it quits. I earn less from cartooning than I did in 1996, when I was just starting, and I am working harder.

Unless something dramatic happens, I expect that there will be fewer than a dozen professional editorial cartoonists left in the near future (10 years or less). All will be old (over 60). Because their work will be drawn in an old-fashioned style that does not resonate with younger readers, political cartooning will be even more marginalized than today, read by a tiny elite. Political cartooning will be like classical theater, experimental dance and fusion jazz — no longer a vibrant mainstream art form for a mass audience but an esoteric throwback.

You didn't ask what the Herblock Foundation could do to mitigate or reverse these trends, but I have some suggestions nonetheless.

The main takeaways are:
We need to encourage younger/newer political cartoonists (those under 50!) financially and professionally.

We need to educate potential future employers.

We need to actively promote new distribution channels for political cartoons.

For example:

Readers Poll: A hundred years ago, no editor or publisher doubted the value of political cartoons and comic strips at attracting readers, especially younger readers. Today, for reasons ranging from a general graphic illiteracy that afflicts the United States to the recruitment of newspaper management from journalism schools that don't teach graphics, that knowledge is far from a given. If the Foundation were to fund a scientific survey of thousands of readers of papers and websites and present its findings to old and new media organizations, it would provide the foundation for an education campaign by the AAEC and other professional organizations to push the idea that a good cartoonist can more than pay for himself or herself. The AAEC does not have the resources to pay for such a poll.

The Herblock Prize: This is the one way in which the Foundation directly puts cash into a cartoonist's pocket. Though the Herblock Prize has gone to some talented cartoonists, all the winners so far have been highly establishmentarian—mostly older, male, staff cartoonists, including winners of the Pulitzer Prize. With the exception of Pat Bagley, a relatively obscure artist who was obviously encouraged by his win to become better, the prize has been a squandered opportunity. Awards should be used to push the profession forward, to reward work that is daring, innovative and excellent, by artists whose career would be enhanced by a win. Also, on a purely financial basis, it is ridiculous to put $15,000 into the pocket of a six-figure cartoonist for the *Washington Post* while many cartoonists are earning four figures. Finally, I would suggest spreading the wealth by awarding cash awards for second and third place.

MacArthur-style grants: The Herblock Foundation should consider awarding grants to editorial cartoonists in order to pursue a project related to political cartooning, such as taking six months or a year to research and draw a graphic novel if he or she can find a publisher.

Public events: As AAEC president, I initiated Cartoonapalooza, an evening of talks by and with cartoonists so they could meet the public in cities where the AAEC has conventions. The Foundation could sponsor such gatherings in Washington and other cities, selling tickets to defray costs or even turn a profit if successful. This would attract media attention for cartooning in general and for the cartoonists involved, and it would reemphasize the popularity of the form for editors and publishers.

Editorial cartoon app: Incredibly, none of the syndicates is developing an app for editorial cartoons. There is no professional-grade mobile phone app for the form, which would undoubtedly be viable if given a chance. Who can't imagine an app that features cartoons about subjects only hours old and that offers the ability to send them to friends instantly? The Foundation could either develop such an app or partner with the AAEC.

AAEC: The AAEC is in major financial trouble. Attendance at conventions is plummeting because fewer cartoonists can afford the registration fees and travel expenses. Since the AAEC's sole activity is to put on a convention, the only professional organization for political cartoonists to discuss and share information is imperiled. If the Foundation were to substantially assist the AAEC to subsidize annual expenses, it would do more to support the professional of political cartooning than anything else I could imagine.

Ted Rall is a syndicated editorial cartoonist and columnist for *Universal Press Syndicate.*

by Ann Telnaes

"Art challenges technology and technology inspires the art."
— John Lasseter, Pixar

Even since it became apparent to almost everyone that the future of journalism was moving to an online forum, the American editorial cartooning profession has been slow to embrace the Internet. It is undisputed that the majority of young adults today get their news online, and so it's inevitable that editorial cartooning will have to adapt if it is to survive as part of mainstream journalism. The common complaint from editorial cartoonists is that there's no money to be made online. This may be true if we remain stuck thinking only in terms of the traditional print and reprint market. The Internet is based on concepts of dynamic innovation, so the editorial cartooning profession needs to be creative and use the technology and mobility to its advantage — this isn't about whether or not a cartoonist draws on paper or uses a Cintiq, it's about accepting that the print newspaper model is past and begin to think outside our rectangular box.

Visuals are just as powerful online as in print, but the Internet's still-developing technology offers cartoonists many more graphic opportunities than in print. Expand your perception of what an editorial cartoon looks like. Keeping in mind that an editorial cartoon is a visual opinion piece and reflects the artist's point of view, consider a graphic novel approach or animation. Use the mobility and immediacy of the Internet to your advantage and travel to where news is being made to create graphic commentary. The key is to be open to opportunities and situations you wouldn't usually consider just because it doesn't fit the conventional description of an editorial cartoon. For so long, newspaper print quality and size constraints have limited our artwork. With the development and increasing popularity of the iPad, for example, editorial cartoonists have more opportunity to create than we've had since the days one comic strip filled an entire news page.

With the disappearance of most staff newspaper jobs, the majority of editorial cartoonists are now effectively freelancers. Many of the characteristics of being a print freelancer are relevant to the online market as well; to be successful, cartoonists need to maximize the research capabilities of the Internet and really do their homework. As someone who has been a freelancer throughout my editorial cartooning career, the rise of the Internet has been a positive and exciting development — it gives me more control and opportunities without having to involve a syndicate. The Internet enables editorial cartoonists to have an international audience and a larger marketplace for our work than ever before. Look beyond the traditional news websites, find ones which champion specific political or social issues where your work would be a good fit; research which websites don't have original content (and have funding) and then offer them editorial cartoons that will enhance their site. In my experience, the times I've landed a long-term online cartooning gig have been due to my pitching something unique to those sites, something no one else had.

For the majority of our profession, gone are the days of landing a staff position at a newspaper, churning out a daily cartoon at your desk in the newsroom. While accepting this reality is a discouraging development for many editorial cartoonists, this is a major turning point for our profession. Be excited and challenged by what the Internet has to offer our stagnant profession. By definition, really, editorial cartoonists are creative. Now, more than ever, we need to create our own opportunities that will reinvent and invigorate our historic and proud profession.

links for inspiration:

Patrick Blower- livedraw http://www.guardian.co.uk/global/video/2011/apr/29/middleeast-royal-wedding?INTCMP=ILCNETTXT3486
Steve Brodner: http://stevebrodner.com/movies/
Sarah Glidden: http://www.smallnoises.com/

Ann Telnaes draws an animated editorial cartoon that appears three times a week on the *Washington Post's* Website.

by Matt Wuerker

The future of editorial cartooning is going to be different. I think that in the future the term "editorial cartoon" will be one of those vestigial phrases from a forgotten era, sort of like a "record" is now something that has little to do with discs of black vinyl. But just as music managed to survive after the age of vinyl, I'm sure the political cartoon will survive, if not thrive, after the age of newsprint news that is conveyed to your doorstep by a newspaper carrier person is long past.

It seems clear that the traditional habitat of the cartoonist — that fabled editorial page perch as a staffer at a daily newspaper — is well on its way to being the exception instead of the rule for cartoonists. Newspapers faced with shrinking revenue all seem to be cutting costs by replacing staff cartoonists with cheap syndicated content. The market forces are too irresistible for most publishers. I think there will continue to be a small, enlightened minority who see the great value that a staff cartoonist brings to a paper's news site and will keep some of those staff positions out there. There's even the chance that the concept could come back around and once again become fashionable. Perhaps bunches of news sites and newspapers will revive the idea of having their own staff cartoonist providing them with original content. I'd like to hope that the model Politico is providing by hiring me to a staff position might be a harbinger of such a trend, but that depends a lot on the wisdom and foresight of other publishers — which does throw some cold water on such hopes.

I think the most successful model in the future will be for cartoonists who see themselves as branded political satirists who do satire in many different ways, including the drawn cartoon — but who are not limited to just that. Hybridized cartoonist/satirists who can perform comedy more like standup comedians, or who write political humor blogs as well as incorporating their cartooning skills, will have an advantage getting their work on the Web, TV and radio. Andy Borowitz has one of the biggest followings on Twitter with his funny 140-character tweets, which are really just cartoonless captions. He'd be even more popular if he'd just learn to draw a little. There's a massive audience out there for political jokery. It's just a matter of being adaptable and getting your work out there as the new platforms like Twitter and Facebook emerge.

People talk a lot about developing an Internet community with readers. Engaging in back-and-forth through comments sections and through the social media is important in keeping your readers coming back and shoring up your brand.

How to turn all those page views into income is still a bit of a mystery, but I think there are so many content providers of different kinds out there waiting and working on wiring the money machine to the Internet that someone's going to figure out how to monetize content again. Just a few years ago, the idea of people paying for a television signal seemed outlandish, and then cable changed that. I'm hopeful a model that pays for popular content will arrive on the digital scene before too long.

In the meantime, entrepreneurial cartoonists who can figure out all the cross-fertilization that goes on in the new media landscape will be the survivors. Finding media appearances on cable news shows, radio, whatever — where you may only be a talking head — can still lead people to follow your cartoons and buy your cartoon books, calendars, T-shirts and other merchandise. Similarly, any other ways of boosting the brand identity of the cartoonist will be helpful — appearing on the Food Network, "Dancing with the Stars" (I'm only half joking here) — whatever it takes. Sadly, this will favor those few cartoonists who are telegenic and can dance. The rest of us had better start whitening our teeth and consider dancing lessons.

Matt Wuerker is a political cartoonist and illustrator on the staff of *Politico*.

When Herb Block died in October 2001, he left $50 million with instructions to create a foundation to encourage the art of editorial cartooning and to support charitable and educational programs that help promote and support the causes he championed during his 72 years of cartooning. The Foundation is committed to defending basic freedoms, combating all forms of discrimination and prejudice and improving the condition of the poor and underprivileged. In addition, the Foundation seeks to provide educational opportunities through scholarships, and to promote editorial cartooning through continuing research.

In keeping with its mission, the Foundation awards grants in three categories: Defending Basic Freedoms, Pathways out of Poverty, and Encouraging Citizen Involvement. In addition, the Foundation awards scholarships based on financial need to individuals seeking to attend community colleges in the Washington, DC metropolitan area.

HERBLOCK

The Herb Block Foundation

1730 M Street, NW, Suite 901 Washington, DC 20036
t: 202.223.8801 **f:** 202.223.8804 **w:** www.herbblockfoundation.org