The world of journalism is changing. It is no longer common for people to buy a newspaper from a local kiosk or have a newspaper delivered daily to their doorstops. Today’s world is much more fast-paced and people are turning more and more to the Internet to get their daily news. But is digital news an effective form of journalism? According to Mitchell Stephens, who writes for CQ Researcher, it is not. He believes that “new approaches to journalism will have to be invented to take best advantage of digital communication.” He makes a good point that online news sites need to better account for the fact that the news is being reported simultaneously via many sites. In fact, I find it quite annoying when “Breaking News” is plastered in ten places on the internet. However, he makes other points I don’t quite agree with. Unlike Mitchell, I think today’s world demands journalism in more than one form—digital and print—and I believe that the digital journalism that exists is an effective and useful way to get the news.

Mitchell contends that journalism has to move completely to the online format. He believes that the digital format can offer the same aesthetically pleasing publication but for a fraction of the cost. With news available instantly online, he feels this change must happen. However, this seems like an extreme request. There are many people who still love their printed newspapers and magazines and seek those out over online sites. My father still reads the daily paper in the print format, taking the time to write out the crossword when he is done. He would never think about reading his news online. Every time I go to the dentist’s office, I grab a *Time* magazine off the table and pursue the articles. What would happen without these print options? Would there be Kindles on that table instead? I doubt it. The cost would be prohibitive. In fact, Mitchell fails to account for the cost of the devices that are necessary to read online. Computers, phones, and e-readers like Kindles are expensive, and in today’s world where these devices seem to be changing every month, they can cost a lot of money to replace. Additionally, it is necessary to have a connection to the Internet to access the Internet. What if there is a power outage? What if someone is traveling in a remote place and there is no Internet? What if someone can’t afford to pay for Internet at home? The option of having both the print format and the digital format needs to remain.

Another point that Mitchell makes is that online journalism sites are not creative enough and are “stuck” imitating the print form. I’m sure there are some digital journalism sites that do not take full advantage of what the Internet can allow, but I’m not sure this lack of creativity means they are not effective. There are also many online sites that are creative and unique. For example, the digital version of *The New Yorker* is its own unique publication from the print version. There is additional content, podcasts, and other features that are not available in the print version. Sure, maybe the headlins are the same format, but this brings continuity from the print to digital form. If both forms are available, this continuity is necessary.

Handwritten books might not be an option anymore as they were when the printing press was first invented, but Mitchell’s claim that print journalism will go the same way is short-sited. To print a newspaper or magazine does not take the time or energy of handwriting a book, and I cannot see the printed word dying out as handwritten books once did. Maybe there are some changes that are still needed to enhance digital journalism, but those enhancement are not going to cancel out the printed form—and shouldn’t.