

ISOJ 2022: Day 1

Keynote session: Key Questions for Journalists Seeking to Reinvent Journalism for our Digital Age

Chair: [Sue Cross](#), executive director and CEO, **Institute for Nonprofit News**

- Keynote Speaker: [Richard Gingras](#), global vice president of news, **Google**
-

Sue Cross Hello, everyone. Welcome. I know it's mid-afternoon. We're going to move quickly just because you may be wondering about your coffee break. You will get your coffee break, but we'll be at 3:30. So stick with us. You have a real treat today in hearing from Richard Gingras, who as vice president of news for Google, I would say is a masterful spokesman and politician, often for Google. He's also one of the most insightful, astute and valued constructive critics of news media, and his GNI, the Google News Initiative, team supports a lot of the innovation that's reinventing journalism. In a spirit of transparency, I'll tell you GNI has provided millions over the last few years for the nonprofit newsrooms that are members of INN and supporting our training. And they have supported through in-kind and funding media across the land. But INN members who are also part of the media trying to figure out how to navigate and sometimes survive Google's dominance in the ad markets and in news attention. And so it's fair to say it's a complex relationship. Richard brings an incredible background to this work. He started in news in 1980, what he says was the steam era of modems, and has worked at Apple, Xcite, many other digital ventures, as well as Google. And he also is part of our industry. He is on the board of the ICIJ, the UC Berkeley School of Journalism, International Center for Journalism and others. So, we really welcome his voice here today and his observations on the field. And if you have questions, I encourage you, I believe the hashtag is up there, send your questions. We should be able to see at least some of them, and we will have time for some Q&A at the end. So thank you, and Richard, thank you.

Richard Gingras Thank you very much. I want to say specifically, I'm not here to tell you what you need to know about the future of journalism. I wish I knew. I'm actually here, I think, more to pose questions that I think we all need to answer as we attempt to mold the future of journalism. In 1974, I worked at the Public Broadcasting Service, implementing the first satellite network to deliver television programs to public television stations across the United States. HBO was also on a similar pioneering path. Until this point, distributing programs to television stations was costly and cumbersome. Using telephone lines was extremely expensive, so tapes were often shipped serially from station to station in what was called bicycling. Using satellites to cheaply deliver programs would change the face of television. It enabled dozens of new programming networks. It laid the foundation for the explosion of cable television. The number of channels multiplied from five to 500 within a decade. I was there when Ted Turner introduced the first all-news channel CNN. His proud objective was to deepen news coverage, expanding beyond the two-minute story. Since then, Turner's vision for dedicated news channels has devolved from thoughtful coverage to less costly and more combative opinion programming, from an opportunity for deeper journalism to the frenetic crossfire of determined divisiveness. At the beginning, there were channels for a wide array of niche audiences from serious documentaries on the History Channel to classical performances on A&E. Today, it's not what it was then, except for the

names. The programming is now largely reality shows and shark attacks, all owned by a handful of large media companies. The expanded distribution of cable was left in the hands of a few, which in the mind of some was the rightful order of things. What's my point? The fight for share of voice will happen no matter the means of distribution. Those with real or perceived influence, be they governments or the private sector, will give no quarter to maintain and expand their share of voice, their share of influence. Timothy Wu in the Master Switch crafted a superb analysis of how this happens at every step in evolving distribution, from the growth of telephony to the expanding radio, from AM to FM, to the introduction of cable and now the Internet. The Internet expanded access to distribution beyond the dreams of a free expression purist. It lowered the bar. It eliminated the friction for any voice seeking an audience. The audience might have to find you, but you can be found. Word can be spread. New audiences can meet new voices. At the dawning of the Internet era, many of us, including me, had an optimistic view. We believed and do believe that the broader our free expression rights, the better. Many of us, including me, believed our better angels would win. But we learned there was a dark side. We learned that they're not all angels, that the Internet has enabled challenging and problematic behaviors. Seeing the real and perceived impact on their societies, governments are now regulating the internet, typically with good intentions, but often with a very weak understanding of the dynamics and a blind eye toward the problematic secondary consequences of regulatory action. Consequences that can impact the free press and the openness of the internet that I think we all admire, which leads to the first fundamental question we face. How can we assure that evolving Internet policy will enable, indeed promote, an open and diverse press versus reinforcing a specific political interest or propping up a moribund legacy business? I fear that the open internet is slipping away from us, that our 25 years of an internet that enabled the penultimate model of free expression was an aberration. The challenge of problematic expression cannot be ignored. However, it's essential we understand and balance the risks to free expression itself. The slope is slippery.

Global media players see the Internet as a threat to their share of voice. I think you know the kind of parties I'm talking about. They'd rather turn the Internet into a distribution environment like those that enabled their earlier success, where sure, a voice went to those with power and influence to command distribution. They would rather see more friction between new voices in the audiences they seek. They would prefer to see core concepts of free linking and fair use curtailed. They may campaign with noble words, but the bottom line is a desire to maintain prior dominance, to constrain the openness of the web, to reduce the diversity of voice it enables. I urge close attention. I urge journalists reporting on matters of Internet policy to dig deep beyond the means and be cautious, to not be blinded by short-term self-interest. Why not have big tech pay? The stakes are high for the future of journalism, for the future of open societies.

We support thoughtful Internet regulation, to be clear. We only ask and hope that it respects these key principles. Protect the open web, and the open internet, and the free expression it enables, and not a closed distribution system favoring the powerful few. Enable an open and free press. Protect against undue government influence that imbalances the news ecosystem. I fear we trust regulation will have the desired effect, but please verify the fine print. Will legislation that purports to address misinformation, but creates wide exceptions for politicians and any spin master calling themselves a journalist be effective? Will regulation proposed by legacy interests seeking a return to their era of dominance constrain the openness of the web and the opportunity for a more diverse and free press? The world has changed. More than ever, societies need quality journalism to understand their world and express their roles as citizens. The impact of the internet

overwhelms us. It continues to change, click by click with every glob of media the inter tubes spit out. That prodigious, gargantuan generator of free expression, from the sweet memes of TikTok to the endless array of influencers, opinionators and spin masters, from the inspired dreams of YouTube creators to the hucksters and the propagandists, from snapshots of cute grandkids to doctored photos of false righteous indignation, from thoughtful forays into innovative digital journalism to Astroturf journalism funded by who knows who. It's a complicated ecosystem, composed of frightening simplicity. Our culture, politics and news reduced to memes and 280-character soundbites lacking context and substance. Our world is twisted and torqued by daunting cultural memes we are induced to amplify by bad ads offering false remedies, by politicians igniting the fears he or she pledges to extinguish. Yes, there is thoughtful, fact-based journalism sprinkled in, hard to identify, largely overwhelmed by the cacophonous, mind numbing cicada buzz that is the collective expression of the internet.

How does journalism perform its role in the midst of all that? How might we better understand how journalism is perceived in the societies we serve? Do our audiences understand the role of journalism? Do they understand what is fact-based journalism and what is not? Which sources to trust and which to give their presses' attention? Which to lend their financial support? Can audiences find credibility, in fact-based coverage when it's surrounded by opinion? Has the explosion of inexpensive but popular opinion distorted their perception? Is the drift towards partisan news making the problem worse? Do they understand what we think they understand? Today, publications seek financial support through subscriptions and memberships. They make earnest pledges about the importance of local news, the virtues of quality journalism. What small percentage of our societies understands any of that? Yes, we can demand more media literacy. But telling us 18 reasons we should eat more broccoli and less pizza, not enough. We need to go deeper. We need to explore new ingredients, new recipes for an enticing and healthy journalistic menu.

How might news organizations better understand this, better understand the needs and interests of their communities? I asked publishers about the research they do. I've been doing this for a few years. In nearly every case, the answer is not much or none. Or it's, we study our logs. We analyze our traffic. Okay, but that says nothing about who doesn't visit. It says nothing about what they value. One friend, a managing editor, told me with confidence, "I understand what my readers want." Now, I'm not a fool. I wasn't about to pass judgment on my friend's wisdom. I only respectfully suggested, "But don't you expect your reporters to ask a whole bunch of questions before deciding what they know or don't know about an issue? So why not do the research, and ask the questions, and make your own judgment?" I know from long experience journalists are suspicious of research and have an intrinsic mistrust of marketing. In which case, let the newsroom own it. But do the research. Do it all the time. Rigorous research, not just self-selected listening tours or focus groups. What do our communities want? What information do they need on a daily basis? What will drive their interests? What will build ties with their community? What will they value? What will they pay for?

We've been working closely with emerging local news outlets around the world. We recently funded 37 local news research projects with our North American Innovation Challenge. I've learned a lot from the success of publishers like the nonprofit Cityside in Oakland and Berkeley, California, to the for-profit Village Media serving some 60 communities across Canada and the U.S. They're successful. They're sustainable. They found their success through deep engagement with their communities and by thoughtfully addressing the community's comprehensive information needs. With the emphasis on the

word "comprehension." Their success points to an opportunity that I feel many local news entrepreneurs can benefit from. Yes, accountability journalism is critical to our role, but I fear local news startups that focus solely on accountability journalism are narrowing their opportunity, and their impact, and their success. Communities have broad information needs. Often it's mundane stuff, except that it's useful and valued. Community events, local sports, obituaries. It's often referred to as service journalism, or news you can use. It's this kind of information that drives engagement exponentially, builds strong community ties, enables local advertising, and expands the audience for the accountability journalism you do want to provide. As David Walmsley of Canada's Globe and Mail noted, might we underpin the high church work with respect and mutual accommodation for all of our community information needs?

How can journalism rebuild trust? Eight years ago, I joined Sally Lehrman to call for a focus on the declining trust in journalism. With the Trust Project, she has generated further research, advanced thoughtful leadership, and assembled principles and playbooks to guide news organizations on approaches to transparency and trust. They've worked with hundreds of news organizations around the world. But as Sally would admit, there is more to learn and more to do. Ulrik Haggerup, at the Constructive Journalism Institute in Denmark, pursues a different angle, and I think a very interesting and powerful one. Rethinking the models, the format, the linguistics we use to express our journalistic work. He began with Danish broadcasting, studying its viewers, making changes in coverage approaches, and harvested gains in both respect and size of audience. The word "constructive" is key. It's not news that scares. It's not news that just makes you feel good. Constructive journalism goes beyond the typical coverage model with clear signals and clear intent to include the necessary context, the how's and the why's, and importantly in consideration of how that calamitous event would be prevented. It is designed to seek a common ground. When assessing sources, they ask, "Is the source adding to the story, or are they just moving their lips?" When staging debates, they avoid that divisive terminology like "crossfire." How do we build bridges? It's a powerful philosophy. He's shown it can work. What better ways for news organizations to gain society's respect than by demonstrating the power of journalism to help a community understand its challenges and address them?

Let's go further on how a society understands its challenges. How can journalism avoid amplifying a society's distorted sense of risk? We are 400 times more likely to die in a traffic accident than in an act of terrorism. We are 35 times as likely to die from cancer or heart disease than from a violent death in any form. Yet research tells us we perceive those fears in reverse. Our fear of terrorism is several hundred times higher than dying in our cars. We live in a landscape of distorted risk. We live in a society where our perceived fears are amplified such that we lose sight of our society's real challenges. Every day we read headlines about terrorism, home invasions, kidnappings, refugee flows, all the horrific but anomalous events that occur in our modern world. However unintentional, news reporting plays an intrinsic role in molding perceptions of reality that conflicts with actual reality. What should really concern me in my world, in my town? If I enter a polling booth with a distorted sense of societal risk, might that not skew how I consider particular issues and candidates? If we believe the role of journalism is giving citizens the information they need to be informed citizens, might we provide more context? Was there a trend of home invasions, or is it an exceptional occurrence? Can we close the gap between irrational fear and rational fear? Can we build a foundation of data-driven knowledge to be found, shared or embedded by journalists to provide context? In the United States, we're piloting a project, which is very dear to my heart, called Common Knowledge. We built an extensive data commons of information from governments on thousands of topics across the United

States. We normalized the data to simplify analysis. We're working with newsrooms like those at McClatchy to make it easy for journalists to embed a nugget of data-driven, contextual knowledge to distinguish a disturbing anomaly from a dangerous trend.

How might we adapt to the media forms our cultures are adopting? The underlying assumption of a democratic society and the profession of journalism is this: If we express our ideas with the right words in the right narratives and logical arguments, and if enough people read those words, then our democracies will be effective; the world will be a better place. Again, the internet and new media forms have rearranged social, political and cultural structures. We see it with Twitter. We see it with TikTok. We see it with short-form video. The messages get shorter. An inescapable progression, or some might say, a digression of how we communicate, of how we understand the society we live in. We communicate via meme, not thoughtful treatises. We can't ignore it.

In 1985, Neil Postman wrote about the impact of television. "Our politics, religion, news, athletics, education and commerce have been transformed into congenial adjuncts of showbusiness. The result? We are a people on the verge of amusing ourselves to death." What would Neil Postman say today? Kevin Munger in a piece called "Sympathy for the Wordcel," makes the argument that forms of human conversation have an overwhelming influence on what ideas we can conveniently express, and what ideas that are convenient to express inevitably become the important content of a culture. Wordcel, by the way, he notes, is an undignified word for an undignified phenomenon. The literary, cultural, deadender who refuses to see the writing on the wall. I'm not suggesting TikTok is the future of journalism. I'm not suggesting we don't do long-form journalism. I'm just suggesting that we have to recognize these trends. TikTok, even today in its own crowdsourced way is a medium of journalistic expression. Our language and information constructs change over time. We must adapt. At Google we'll continue to experiment with storytelling tools and formats like web stories to explore how they map to behaviors of contemporary users. I love long reads, but when I encounter in my colleagues a high-functioning, thoughtful person who doesn't read long articles disclaiming them as imposing walls of text, I hear a call to action. We don't have all the right tools for the job.

How do we empower journalists with better tools? In the digital world, knowledge is often hidden in the data, and the data, often hidden behind technical complexity. Can new tools allow reporters to pursue investigations that otherwise are impractical or manually daunting? We've made progress at Google with Pinpoint, a suite of tools for investigative journalists that utilizes our capabilities to analyze documents and understand them. As an early test, we analyzed 75,000 documents released by the U.S. Archive about the Kennedy assassination. Images, and PDFs of old typewritten pages with notes scrawled in the margins. We can understand all of that. We can understand that JFK, John Kennedy, President Kennedy, are all the same entity. We can organize the information by time and topic. We can map the entities to the knowledge graph and the open web to offer understanding and context. It's powerful. It was gratifying to see Pinpoint used in exhaustive award winning investigations by the Boston Globe and Tampa Bay Times winning Pulitzers and Polk Awards, respectively. No credit to us. Just great to see them use the tools. More than 100 organizations are using Pinpoint. Jeremy Gilbert is leading an excellent data-driven reporting project at Medill. Please join them, and please take advantage of Pinpoint if you'd like to. I'm on the advisory board of the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists. The Panama Papers and the Pandora Papers are extraordinary examples of high-impact journalism and difficult, detailed document analysis. It's doubly impressive how they've empowered collaboration across newsrooms. There's

much more we can do. Every journalist can benefit from better tools to increase their powers and save their times. Where's Reporter's Notebook 2.0, 3.0., 4.0.?

Last but not least, how can we reach those who don't care or who've lost interest? A small minority, not much beyond 10%, regularly consume what we call serious news. According to the Reuters Institute, even fewer pay for news in any society around the world. We hear it from our friends. They avoid the news. It makes them sad, or anxious, or fearful. They find solace in other ways, binging the latest on Netflix or feeding their addiction on TikTok. So do I. What George Orwell feared were those who would ban books. What Aldous Huxley feared was there would be no reason to ban books, for there would be no one who wanted to read one. Orwell feared those who would deprive us of information. Huxley feared those who would give us so much that we would be reduced to passivity and egoism. Orwell feared the truth would be concealed from us. Huxley feared the truth would be drowned in a sea of irrelevance. As Huxley remarked in *Brave New World Revisited*, the civil libertarians and rationalists who are ever on the alert to oppose tyranny failed to take into account man's almost infinite appetite for distractions. In Orwell's 1984, Huxley added, people are controlled by inflicting pain. In *Brave New World*, they are controlled by inflicting pleasure. In short, Orwell feared what we hate will ruin us. Huxley feared that what we love will ruin us.

I suspect you're thinking, Richard didn't mention the business model. Everyone says it's broken. It's broken, and it's not. Yes, the business model of the rich, near-monopoly metropolitan newspaper will never return. In 1985, newspapers were the internet before there was one. But now we have the internet. Classified ads went to online marketplaces, department stores got smothered by e-commerce, printed food coupons became loyalty programs. There went that business model. But it's not broken for the journalism entrepreneurs I know, and I know lots of them. They didn't launch their ventures thinking they had no business model or path to success. They launched those ventures because they knew there were voids to fill, opportunities to harvest. Many are succeeding. Lots of hard work, long nights of stressful doubt. But they believe, and every day we see the proof. It's no longer a question of whether news ventures can succeed. Now it's about sharing those formulas of those who have succeeded. How do we scale the success of some to many? With every advance in media distribution, there was an early phase of exploration, failure, success, evolution. Then at some point, it was clear what the models for local radio would be, or in their time, local alt weeklies. We are now, in my view, at the beginning of the second phase, where successful models can be propagated. Yes, I asked, no specific question relating to the business model, because every question I just asked is critical to a successful news organization in both journalistic and business impact. They are foundational. The answers are the path to success, whatever those answers might be. It was one of the great Greeks, I didn't pay much attention in college, I can't remember which one, who said "Our open societies, our democracies, will be destroyed by the freedoms we enable." Wise words. Terrifying words. They hit a little too close to home. The political sphere has adapted to the capabilities of the internet to speak to voters, to build political alliances, far more quickly and effectively than the world of journalism. We see the impact around the world. We see the loss of liberal democracies. The trend is concerning. It's as concerning to me and to Google as it is to you.

I always complain when people use the word platforms generically. Let's talk about Google. Our success is greatest in open societies. Search wouldn't be search without a rich ecosystem of the web, nor would our ad technologies without publishers to use them and find their own success. So our success is greatest in open societies. The impact of journalism is also greatest in open societies. We have common objectives, a common

sense of mission. It's why the hundreds of people at Google who work with news publishers and journalists are passionate about their work. It's why I'm passionate about my work. When journalism succeeds, we all do better. I feel our commitment is stronger than ever. We want to do more. We plan to do more. And I believe through trusted partnership, we'll get there. But as I've said before, it will take the leadership of many, not the leadership of one. And I think we're at a very sensible point in the history of our civilization. And if we don't get this right, we're going to lose the opportunity to try. I thank you.

Sue Cross Thank you, Richard. We have just a few minutes for questions, and one that I want to follow up from your talk. As you said, the internet has lowered the bar to a diversity of voices. And I want to call you out on that a little bit, because Google now really determines what the world knows from news. I think more than any other, I know it's arguable, but any other source. And there have been multiple studies that show that that's tending to consolidate eyeballs and reduce the diversity and the democratization of news, if you will. So, you know, Penn found that local news has subsumed under national and Google search results. We just saw the presentations earlier today about how search might not reflect what news producers or readers ask. And we see the social impacts when the shootings happened in Atlanta about a year ago, profound impacts on the Asian American community in Atlanta. And there was coverage. Their voices were out there, but you couldn't find it in Google search. Not just that night, but the day after. The day after that. So, you know, it feels odd for Google to say don't regulate us because we preserve a diversity of voices. How are you doing that, and how are you addressing local at a time that local is so critical.

Richard Gingras So there's a bunch of stuff there. I've never said don't regulate us. I've said be careful how you approach it. You know, there are calls sometimes for algorithmic transparency. I don't think anyone wants the government setting what the algorithms do either. What I do think is fair and what we try to practice is be clear about our principles. We have a 160-page document about our principles. Be clear about our methods,, and be open to third-party accountability research. So I want to see the research from Medill. I want to understand what's there. We listen to that stuff and we listen to it carefully. Look, with search, we look to do our best to reflect the collective expression of the internet and rank it by relevance and authoritativeness. Not going to suggest we always get it right. We continue to evolve it, and develop it, and further make progress.

Local is a very important question. And in fact, I just over the last few months have been reviewing what our product plans and objectives are. In news, the number one objective actually was do a better job of surfacing local, which comes in a couple of dimensions. One, is do we do we actually understand, particularly as we see so many emerging players, are we good at identifying them? I mean, as you know, you can start any website or news outlet. It doesn't automatically mean that you get reflected at the top rankings of search, so it doesn't happen overnight. But do we understand all the sources? Are we appropriately understanding their reputations and ranking them? Are we doing the right thing to surface local outlets versus national outlets? Right? One of the unfortunate things, it's not unfortunate, it is what it is, but the big national outlets flood the zone with content, as is their right. You know, you've got publications that put out a thousand articles a day. CNN probably more than that. New York Times, Washington Post, so on and so forth. And some of them, like Axios, are going for local audiences, too. I would like to reverse that. You know, I kind of always, like they say, all politics is local, all news is local, people's interests are local. So frankly, even on national stories, I would prefer it if there was a local story that was the local view of the national story, that would be more appropriate. So we

know there's more work to do there, without question. And again, I'll continue to say to anyone here, researches and not, give us your feedback. Tell us where you see problems. I always tell, give us examples. Give me screenshots. We filter that into our systems. You know, I will say, again, we reflect the corpus of expression. I don't know who gets to set the agenda. Obviously, lots of people want to set the agenda. News organizations, politicians, interest groups. We have zero desire in setting an agenda. And if there's one reason for that, it's really simple. It's like when your user base is as large as ours, you frankly don't want to piss off anyone. Right? So you really want to be as reflective as you can of the broad base of expression as you possibly can. Sorry for the length of the answer.

Sue Cross That's all right. I'm going to give you one follow-up question that came from the audience, which is your thoughts on the censorship of Sputnik, and RT, and how Google thinks about situations like the Ukraine and the information and misinformation coming out of Russia, and that area, and how you handle that as a search engine?

Richard Gingras I mean, obviously, there's been heightened interest and focus on that. But like all things, you know what our job is, how do we best understand the authoritativeness of individual sources? You know, so our treatment of Sputnik was not any different in the last three weeks than it's been in the last two years. I mean, unless they change their approaches because obviously they do and we do as well. So, of course, as Google, we look at that in two dimensions. You look at YouTube, which is a hosting environment, so obviously has a whole different structure of policies with regard to who gets to use those platforms, who gets to use our advertising tools. On search, there's no such thing as censorship. It's about ranking, right? And we want to make sure that we're ranking for authoritativeness and relevance. And I hope to God I'm not seeing a Sputnik article high on a result about the Ukraine today. And if so, let me know because it's a problem.

Sue Cross Thank you. A question about regulation, which Google says it welcomes, but only in some ways. So in Australia there are very nontransparent deals that have generated, what, about \$150 million U.S. from Google and Facebook to major publishers. And Google has said, well, those are going to the major players, not overall. But there now is follow-up action in Brazil. Canada just this week is considering legislation. Here in the U.S., the JPCA, which is being considered in Congress. You know, if not regulation or payments tied to any value of news, whether that's headlines or snippets or market size, although I think you have considered market size and content volume, if regulators are looking to balance this, why not tie it to some measure of the market or the value of news? Why just hold that as a tax or separate?

Richard Gingras One could do that. I mean, again, our objection is more about the method rather than the objective. Right? If, for whatever reason, companies think that large tech companies like ours should commit more money to news, I'm all for that. We're all for that. It might be better if you just did a levy, and set up a fund, and had other people distribute it. I do not like being in the middle of it. Australia was not a great example of public policy. In fact, the public policy doesn't even apply to us. Instead, an unworkable public policy was put out there, and they said, "Go out and do enough deals. And if we hear the right things, then we won't designate you." By the way, it's not just the large players. We have through showcase done hundreds and hundreds of arrangements in Australia from large to small. But my point there is, again, we don't want to be in the middle of it. We try to be very careful and consistent in our criteria of how we do things like showcase. But even if we do it perfectly, there'll always be suspicion, which I hate.

Suspicion not only about whether we're unbalancing the ecosystem with our funding, but does that translate into an imbalance in how we rank content? Right? I've never felt we should be in the middle of that, so I just think there are better ways to do it. And I hope we see better ways to do it. But, you know, again, keep in mind, as I said there, the pressures at play here are interesting, and they're not necessarily in the interest of the diversity we see here. I've had associations tell me quite directly, "Richard, we'd be nicer to you if you stopped supporting those emerging players." So, you know, again, it's not about the objective. It's about how we get there. And, you know, good, thoughtful public policy, where, frankly, we don't want to be in any more of a position to, quote, "pick winners" or be perceived to pick winners as anyone else.

Sue Cross Thank you. I would say, I think it's hard for Google not to be in the middle of ranking various kinds of news.

Richard Gingras That's my point. We are exactly in the middle of that. Obviously, we make judgments every day with the algorithm. You know, but to us, that's why it's been so sacred to keep the economics out of it. Right? Right now, the language of a proposed law in Brazil basically says that we would have to have a license to use anything more than a naked URL. Is that the position you want us to be in? I don't think so. I hope not. You know, I mean, I keep in mind, again, we can always go back and say, are we doing the right job, algorithmically? Fair to have those discussions. Fair to give us all the feedback and an expression of concern that you might have. Because the other thing that's been really painful to me is when I see certain publisher associations who say they're here to defend journalism, but then come out and say things like, "Oh, you stole our content. You stole our revenue." When, in truth, what we do with search, and have done with search for 25 years, is we're basically the largest newsstand on earth. And there's a headline, and there's a snippet, and we send 24-plus billion visits per month to news organizations around the globe. Right? The largest newsstand on Earth that obviously news publishers don't pay for. And distribution was 30% of the business model in the era of print. So again, that to me, that's back to that same question. Are we crafting appropriate public policy to respect and enable the openness of the internet and the diversity of the ecosystem? And be very careful for undue government influence and who gets the money.

Sue Cross Okay. We are going to wrap there and thank you.

Richard Gingras I thank you. I thank you. I thank you for what you do. And I look forward to keep working with you. Thank you.