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They tell the story. There is no longer a need to warn of a gathering Chaos Scenario, in which the yin of media and yang of marketing fly apart, symbiotic no more. There is no need to seed doubt about the internet's prospects as an advertising medium, nor otherwise be a prophet of doom.

Chicken Little, don your hardhat. Nudged by recession, doom has arrived. The toll will be so vast -- and the institutions of media and marketing are so central to our economy, our culture, our democracy and our very selves -- that it's easy to fantasize about some miraculous preserver of "reach" dangling just out of reach. We need "mass," so mass, therefore, must survive. Alas, economies are unsentimental and denial unproductive. The post-advertising age is under way.

This isn't about the end of commerce or the end of marketing or...
news or entertainment. All of the above are finding new expressions online, and in time will flourish thanks to the very digital revolution that is now ravaging them. The future is bright. But the present is apocalyptic. Any hope for a seamless transition -- or any transition at all -- from mass media and marketing to micro media and marketing are absurd.

The sky is falling, the frog in the pot has come to a boil and, oh yeah, we are, most of us, exquisitely, irretrievably fucked.

Newspapers

Amid 23% population growth in the past two decades, U.S. newspaper circulation has dropped 20% -- one reason your morning paper, downsized every which way, is no match for a stiff breeze. Craigslist, siphoning off $7 billion worth of classifieds, is another.

There are so many horror stories to choose from. The Rocky Mountain News just folded, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer went web-only last week and the San Francisco Chronicle is on death's door. A decade ago, the Minneapolis Star Tribune sold for $1.2 billion. In January, it declared bankruptcy. Chicago’s vast Tribune Co. was valued at $12 billion in 2000, when it took on debt to acquire the Times-Mirror Co. for more than $8.3 billion. In April 2007, real-estate developer Sam Zell snapped up the whole empire for $8.2 billion, and commenced wholesale retrenchment, including layoffs, bureau closings and the sale to Cablevision of the venerable Newsday. Within 20 months, bankruptcy.

As for The Wall Street Journal, nobody knew when Rupert Murdoch plunked down $5.5 billion for a $3.5 billion paper last year whether he was a genius of synergy and valuation or a sucker. The recession obscures the answer, but last month News Corp. declared a write-down of $8.4 billion in assets -- about 40% of it attributed by Wall Street analysts to the Journal deal. Oops.

For sheer poignancy, though, it’s hard to beat The New York Times. With a $400 million May debt payment approaching like a runaway cement truck, the Times is selling 75% of its shiny new headquarters. More alarmingly, it has suspended its stock dividend and borrowed $250 million at usurious rates from Mexican oligarch Carlos Slim, whom a Times editorial not long ago condemned as a "robber baron." And if not Slim, who, Gazprom?

On the plus side, thanks to the internet, all of these papers -- especially the Times -- have seen their readership soar. Surely, with the attendant savings in production and distribution, the future online-only paper represents a promising business model, right? No. That ship has sailed. Long ago newspapers based their online strategy on advertising, at which point traffic became the holy grail. Times Select -- the walled garden of premium columnists available by subscription only -- generated income but depressed traffic. So out it went. The Times and 99% of its brethren opted to give away all content in exchange for audience, neglecting to understand two structural facts of online life: 1) Nobody clicks
on ads, because why would they? 2) The virtually infinite supply of online ad inventory will always depress the price even the best publisher can fetch. Always. Immutably. Forever. Mass media thrived on the economics of scarcity. The internet represents an economy of unending abundance.

As Philadelphia Inquirer and Daily News boss Brian Tierney told me at the end of January, “Clearly a free internet model online -- if you build it, they will come -- I don't think is working for media like ours. ... I think we're going to have to start to find a way to charge for it and not just rely on advertising.”

By the time anyone figured that out, it was too late. The audience doesn’t imagine that all cars want to be free, or that all toasters want to be free, or that all paper towels want to be free, but it somehow believes that all content wants to be free. That's an indefensible ethic, but moral high ground doesn't repay the creditors. And three weeks after our conversation, Tierney's Philadelphia Media Holdings declared bankruptcy.

Magazines

In 2008, newsstand sales -- the profit engine of the industry -- fell 12%. According to Media Industry Newsletter, gross ad pages so far in 2009 have dropped a staggering 22% -- that coming off a dismal 2008. In recent months, Conde Nast has folded Domino, Meredith has folded Country Home, Ziff-Davis has folded PC Magazine, Hearst has folded CosmoGirl and O at Home, The New York Times has folded Play, and Hachette has folded Home.

Playgirl is gone. Radar is gone. The formerly weekly, formerly biweekly U.S. News is now a monthly. Time Inc. magazines have reduced head count -- mostly through layoffs -- by 1,400 employees since 2004. And TV Guide magazine, the erstwhile 17 million-circulation goldmine, was sold in October to OpenGate Capital for $1, or $2 less than a copy at the supermarket checkout.

Two years ago, Jack Kliger, chairman of Hachette Filipacchi Media U.S. and then chairman of the Magazine Publishers of America, told an MPA audience: "I'm not ready to end up my career watching our industry get marginalized and fade away." That's been taken care of. Kliger was pushed out of daily responsibilities by his French owners who, as one of many cost-cutting measures, withdrew from the MPA in mid-February.

Be not tempted to dismiss this as the toll of a down cycle; this is structural, as articulated a few weeks ago by Wenda Harris Millard, co-CEO of Martha Stewart Living Omnimedia. "Advertising simply cannot support all the media that's out there." Or as the publisher of another famous-name, high-circulation title recently told me, begging for anonymity on the grounds of not wishing to be stoned to death: "We are living the Chaos Scenario." Nicely phrased.

Broadcast stations

Remember how Clear Channel, the radio-TV-billboard colossus, was going to destroy our very democracy by voraciously swallowing every broadcast station in America? For a decade, the mantra from media-concentration hawks: Stop Clear Channel now or we will all be slaves!
Yeah, well, we're probably safe. After being purchased by two private-equity firms (for $38 per share, down from $100 in 2000), Clear Channel dumped its 56 TV stations and tried to unload more than 500 of its small-market radio stations, but has been stymied by the credit freeze and declining value of those assets. Without those sale proceeds, the company's prospects for default on its $20 billion debt are worrisome enough that Standard & Poor's rates its commercial paper five steps below investment grade. Junk, in other words. In early February, S&P said it was considering downgrading the company yet again. The fearsome juggernaut has just laid off 9% of its work force.

At least it got out of TV when the getting was merely not so good. Bernstein Research predicts a 20% to 30% drop in 2009 TV station ad revenue. Stations' share of TV ad dollars, according to TNS Media Intelligence, dropped to 26% in 2007 from 34% in 2000. Affiliate fees from networks have essentially disappeared, and the values of local licenses have plummeted, resulting in massive write-downs by ownership groups. And two of the four major networks -- CBS and NBC -- have publicly hinted that the days of distributing programming over the air via affiliates are numbered.

TV networks

"Do we want to be what we've been?" asked NBC Universal CEO Jeff Zucker at a December investor conference, as if the matter were in his hands. If everybody had their druthers, the status quo would be just dandy: networks distributing programming to local broadcasters and selling the aggregated audience to advertisers at ever higher costs per thousand.

But nobody has their druthers. According to Nielsen Media Research, in the last reporting period, CBS's prime-time audience was down 2.9%, ABC was down 9.7%, Fox was down 17.5% and NBC was down 14.3%. The numbers were particularly devastating for Zucker, whose weak schedule has exacerbated viewer exodus, resulting in lost revenue, yielding huge spending cutbacks, producing cheap, even-less-popular programming (no dramas or sitcoms in the first hour of prime time, more and more "The Big Loser" and next "The Jay Leno Show" only in the last hour), leading to still more viewer defection and so on toward oblivion. Zucker keeps the lights on only because mass marketers, desperate for access to even the Incredible Shrinking Mass Audience, have continued to pay more and more for less and less.

The average price of reaching 1,000 households with a 30-second spot in prime time, according to Media Dynamics, has jumped from $8.28 in 1986 to $22.65 in 2008 -- but effectively more like $32, because between 150 and 200 of those 1000 households use DVRs to skip past the ads.

But the ratchet effect is over. What the law of diminishing returns could not influence, the deep recession has. Now the advertiser exodus, too, is under way. As of mid-February, 71% reported having slashed their 2009 budgets, and 6% more said the cuts were on their way.

That's why Zucker finally admits to considering a once-unthinkable proposition: once affiliate contracts and pro-sports deals expire, ceasing to be a network at all. NBC: the cable channel.

And that's not just the last resort of the Big Four laggard. It's also the last resort of the Big Four leader. At CBS, where fourth-
quarter profit was down 54%. Les Moonves has publicly speculated about a similar move “five or 10 years away.”

Cable

Just fair warning, guys: Cable has problems of its own. It’s no more DVR-proof than broadcast. It is also suffering a sort of distribution autoimmune disease, wherein the body attacks itself. The very coax the industry has been stringing for 50 years is now the pipe for broadband, which households increasingly are using to bypass pay cable entirely.

Charter Communications will soon be in bankruptcy after losing more than 75,000 basic-cable customers in the fourth quarter of 2008. Churn, the expensive process of replacing lost subscribers with new ones, is taking its toll. Comcast’s sign-ups in the fourth quarter were down by half from 2007. Here’s what Glenn Britt, CEO of Time Warner Cable, told analysts in his last earnings conference call: “People are saying, ‘All I need is broadband. I don’t need video.’”

Britt was referring to “over-the-top,” which, if you don’t like the autoimmune analogy, can equally be thought of as being shot with your own gun. The game changer in this respect is Boxee, a software app that aggregates all your videos onto one screen and allows you to feed them into your TV machine. This is what they mean by “convergence.”

But Boxee is such a threat to the business model of both cable and broadcast that Hulu -- which distributes NBC, Fox and Viacom programs online for free with minimal advertising -- demanded to be removed from Boxee’s offerings.

Because if you can watch TV programs on your actual TV, with very few ads and no subscription fees to a cable middleman, why wouldn’t you?

Online publishers

Yahoo, at about 3.5 billion daily page views, is the most visited website in the world. In 2008, it had a profit of $424 million on $7.2 billion in revenue. Not too shabby, unless you compare it with 2005, when the company had a profit of $1.9 billion on revenue of $5.3 billion. Last spring, after a prolonged dance, it finally rejected Microsoft’s takeover bid at $33 per share, or about $50 billion. Yahoo now trades in the range of $12, for a market cap of $17 billion.

What does it mean when online usage soars, yet the most popular publisher’s value is cut by two-thirds? It means Wall Street sees Yahoo’s margins headed steadily down -- not just because it gets trounced by Google in search but because its CPMs are going in the wrong direction.

The fundamental obstacle for online publishing, according to the president of the Interactive Advertising Bureau: “It couldn’t be more straightforward,” Randall Rothenberg says. “It is a disequilibrium between supply and demand.”

Yeah, that about sums it up. As (my former Ad Age colleague) Rothenberg details, “Today the average 14-year-old can create a global television network with applications that are built into her laptop. So from a very strict Econ 101 basis, you have the ability to create virtually unlimited supply against what has been
So the biggest online publishers, with all their vast overhead, have no more access to audience than Courtney the eighth-grader. And there are hundreds of millions of Courtneys, millions of them on Google AdSense, driving the price of ad space down, down, down.

Rothenberg also acknowledges to problem of ad avoidance, as evidenced by average click-through rates approaching zero. Yet, for all his economic realism, he stubbornly insists there's a solution: "Better advertising. More informational. More entertaining. More beautiful."

A latter-day Creative Revolution, that is.

"The interactive industry is finally and belatedly beginning to see that the way we built our sites, based on the direct-response foundation, infused the environment with ugliness and clutter."

Granted, fewer dancing silhouettes and pop-ups might be nice, but if you need to trump Econ 101 and basic human behavior, the job calls for something a bit more efficacious. Like a magic beanstalk. It's worth noting that Wenda Harris Millard's analysis about the structural glut of ad inventory took place at a conference of the IAB, where she is chairwoman. Her previous gig: head of sales at Yahoo.

But why pick on poor Yahoo? Consider Twitter, Facebook and YouTube, which among them have altered human behavior of a grand scale. Two and a half years ago, Google paid $1.65 billion for YouTube. The 2008 payoff: about $90 million in ad revenue -- which might (but probably won't) cover the costs of copyright-infringement litigation and certainly won't cover bandwidth charges. Facebook, whose 2007 valuation of $15 billion has shrunk to about $3.7 billion, had 2008 revenue estimated at $300 million. And Twitter had $0.

Thus, the mantra: "We have the audience. All we need is a business model." As if adequate revenue were somehow guaranteed by physics or heavenly deity. It isn't. I've pored over Isaac Newton and the Ten Commandments. There is no "Thou shalt monetize."

There's one realm that advertisers and publishers have yet to consider: I call it COSAS - Community Outreach Social Advertising System. It seems like the business model needs to concentrate on the "social networking" structure. Your comments on this concept. –eduardo@advertais.com | BALTIMORE, MD

@stephen byrne You're right. It isn't new. I've been writing and speaking about this since 2005. some have paid attention. some haven't needed me to connect the dots. some continue to live in denial. but when the titanic is going down, someone needs to inform the passengers on the sun deck, no? –garfield@crain.com | Anytown

Great piece. Would be great to give us your opinion on what the new landscape will be after this chaos. –melendez@elnorte.com | MONTERREY
There's nothing new in any of this. It merely affirms what many of us already know. The fact is that people in management right across the media simply don't read. Ironic isn't it? And if they did, then they would have seen this coming a long time ago and moved to a safe haven. And yet it has nothing to do with the recession. The recession is merely going to hurry it along. –stephenpbyrne | Australia

Nice link bait. This is a perfectly written, "pessimistic," traditional media point of view. I congratulate you. You prove how easy it is to criticize and be negative by stating the obvious. I didn't get any insight out of this. Nevertheless, I'm impressed you got me to read it. www.AdExchanger.com –adexchanger | New york, NY

Why is advertising so frequently and deeply relied upon to make innovation work out? Twitter is remarkable, naturally. But the innovation of Twitter (and a thousand other communications innovations) seem to stop once the idea is cooked and available. Then there always seems to be a half-hearted sense that "advertising" will make this thing pay. OK. Fair enough. But "advertising" is neither a monolithic solution, nor is it a silver bullet. Some kids in a garage may come up with a cool idea, then drop some HTML code into the margins that pull ads from Google (or wherever). But if those ads don't produce clicks, it doesn't prompt a damnation of advertising. It may just be that you have to think a bit farther in the innovation. Or get the ad guys working with the innovators earlier. "cut-and-paste-this-code" is not a monetization strategy. –gstein | San Francisco, CA

Fantastic essay. I always enjoy these pieces. –blowenthal@mediakitchen.tv | NY, NY

excellent insights...truly thought provoking. what's a magazine publisher to do????? You are a really BIG publisher or a really small publisher. A beach ball vs. a ball bearing... Me? I am happy to be a ball bearing. Read more here...if you dare! http://publishingcentral.com/ –mbrooke@interlog.com | Thornhill, ON

No one clicks on ads because they aren't targetted to them. When I go to a vertical market site - one on a single subject that I am interested in - I click on ads quite frequently. The first rule of marketing is that you can't sell something to someone who doesn't want it. –jkantor1 | St. Petersburg, FL

This article is a preview of Bob Garfield's new book, The Chaos Scenario: Amid the Ruins of Mass Media, the Choice for Business is Stark; Listen, or Perish. And, while this article forecasts the old media mode's demise, the book also points the way to a digitally-powered social marketing future. I am working with Bob to publish and promote the book according to the principles he espouses on its pages. Read more about it, register for updates, and even join the team of new media experts working to promote the book and transform an industry at http://www.thechaossenario.net/ Full disclosure: My name is Greg Stielstra and I am Bob Garfield's publishing partner on this project. GS –pyromarketing@bellsouth.net | Franklin, TN

Interesting article, it seems media as we know it TV,
newspapers and magazines are done. For far too long media feed us what they wanted not what we wanted and relied on advertisers to pay the bills. With advertising dead they are finding the public not wanting to pay. In my opinion it is not a public wanting something for free; it is a media not offering a reason to pay. Brett Burdsal –bburdsal | TUCSON, AZ

Bob, Thanks for the reality check. How do you feel about the future of live event marketing and impact and human touch will relate to the digital age and the marketing mix? Dick Lambert dick.lambert@gmail.com –dickl | New York, NY

I read this right after I downloaded a stunning promo video for the puma lift. The link came via email from a peer. http://lift.puma.com/ –kellys@criticalmass.com | Calgary, AB

As an ad agency creative for 25 years, I was at the center of the now-disintegrating 'aggregate and aggravate' model. Mass media made the content people loved. I made the ads we all hated to watch. And loved to zap. Not anymore. In Bob's new World of Chaos, I'm now applying my strategic skills to making entertaining video content for websites. Now I create content people WANT to see. It's the perfect rechanneling of the creative mind. Bob's right. The answer lies in new creative uses for the medium. Where most people use websites as online brochures, I'm helping to turn them into broadcast stations that offer unlimited free media. All you have to do is make the content interesting, and the audience will find it. Jim Courtright BYOB, (Become Your Own Broadcaster), Chicago –jimcourtri | chicago, IL

It's going to be tough, but we have hope in our future, that is because – we don't focus our efforts on media. We are focused on solutions – most of which, the majority of, are not driven by media. They're driven by customer interaction and results. You don't see any mention in the article about web site development and digital tools, mobile Aps, social network strategies, shopper marketing and events, or good old fashioned DM-CRM, other than the mention that banner ads don't work on Facebook and Twitter. How profound. Ad Age has never given any of these categories much coverage, because in their minds, they weren't Advertising. They weren't what "Mad-Men" were all about. It's been over 5 years now, these practices we do the most of – that Ad Age and the giant Advertising holding companies call – "below the line marketing," actually became "above the line," because they began generating the majority of all revenues for agencies. Here is the bottom line - it's huge, obvious and has never been more true; 1) Consumers are in control and they associate and buy things from "people they trust." 2) Advertising media at best, does not directly sell. It simply creates awareness, to stir curiosity and give people a reason to ask their trust network about a message they saw. 3)Friends, family and minimally general opinions found in trusted communities are trusted more than all media buys combined. Our job is to help clients build trust with an audience. Seeing is believing. That's why we're focusing on website development and tools, mobile aps, social networking strategies, events and shopper marketing, to provide tools to help people manage their lives and to make educated decisions that they trust. Can we produce TV, radio and outdoor? Yes. Is it important to our future? No. Clients are emphasizing the word "Trust" and "Building Trust with customers" in their briefs because they're hearing it focus groups. I write all of this to let you know, when Ad Age says,
"we are irretrievably fucked," you're right. You are, as long as you continue to see the "Ad World" as it once was. We're not, because we have never seen it that way. Rodney Mason, CMO Moosylvania The Great State of Design
rodney@moosylvania.com –Rodney33 | FRISCO, TX

Traditional disruptive media will continue to decline as technology continues to put consumers in control. This article does a good job of redefining the role of advertising in the digital age. http://promotions2.com/2009/new-rules-of-advertising-in-the-digital-age/ –gizmad | Danbury, CT

Having worked with Newspapers and TV stations for nearly who were trying to migrate their businesses online, it is clear that the institutional barriers to doing anything truly innovative will surely be their ultimate downfall. A comparison to the U.S. auto industry is not that much of a stretch. Garfield's assessment of the online space is much less grounded and seems to be built as "filler" because he had to mention the segment with some negative data (when 90% of the market data is positive). The key to the online inventory glut & lack of performance is not just about better creative -- but a shift from buying placement (old media style) to buying audience (the holy grail of new media). The way to do that is through DATA -- which is just beginning to play a major role in online advertising. Google's recent BT efforts and the growth of DATA exchanges like eXelate, attest to this fact and are poised to totally change the landscape of online advertising. Ms. Mallard win't know what hit her . . .
Mark Zagorski, eXelate –markz | New York, NY

The good news is consumer willingness to pay is growing - in 2008 according to Veronis, Suhler, Stevenson, almost 70% of industry revenues. It is harder to win a share of millions of consumer transactions than a couple of big advertisers' budgets. But understanding how to drive consumer transactions will both generate new revenue and a premium from marketers who value this new expertise.
katherine at comradity.com –kwkern | OLD GREENWICH, CT

Well, Good Morning Bob. Just Tweeted this via that free adless online network that brings in $0 worth of revenue. Now, 1,133 more people have access to it. –Jonathan_Trenn | FALLS CHURCH, VA

Ouch. That's brutal. That's frightening. And worse still, I can't find much wrong with your assessment to argue against. But now that the death knell is here, what do agencies and their clients do about it? –jimmymac | new york, NY

Certainly an eyeball-popping article for a Monday morn. But, frankly, there's not much in here that I find terribly shocking. But I DO salute the author's very careful rundown of all the bad news. Nicely catalogued for future reference for any of us who need a little back-up when making a case for some client recommendation. But frankly? I particularly enjoyed Larry Brown's optimistic tone to his brief note. And you can add me to the list of those who REMAIN optimistic. Time to get innovative again, people! Neilan Tyree –neilan | Ponte Vedra, FL

I've got a business model...but no one will listen.
Social media was bound to become more powerful when our collective future looked at its bleakest. We think less about furthering ourselves and more about survival of the species. Biology has a social context. Social connectivity has been annexed as a biological imperative. –annecaborn | Brighton

Agreed--best observations in years. Leadership is too rooted in how things have been--because that is how holding companies know how to make money. Breaks my heart every day--when an industry of ideas becomes too dependent on the old ways. –ahross1 | CHICAGO, IL

THE BEST ARTICLE WRITTEN ON ADAGE SINCE THE 75th Anniversary Issue! –jackgordon2009 | New York, NY

Bob, I usually love your articles, but this one is way too pessimistic... I believe you are right in most of your observations, but we should not forget that we are going through the intense evolution in the media business and as a result we feel that all the changes are too rapid and too dramatic. This is no different than what horse carriages went through in the beginning of the 20th centuries when Ford came up with its first car; or what the telefax went through when Bell started what is now AT&T. Newspapers, magazines and traditional TV networks are dying, no doubt about it. But the best ones will adapt to the online model and become leaner and much more efficient. I am convinced that the future of TV is in the On-Demand model and that DVRs and TiVos are just transitional models (similarly to Hybrid cars before the new, more efficient technology takes over the automotive industry). Why would anyone skip the TV spot, if they can avoid it all together with the VOD model? Evolution is ruthless, and those that adapt quickly will survive. Peace. –bojkiw | New York, NY

Nice a priori arguments. the only problem is that the facts always lead me to a different conclusion. I just did a meta-analysis of 388 ROI studies. The full presentation of results is available at http://www.slideshare.net/joelrubinson/tv-effectiveness-webcast-rubinson TV works as well as ever and TV, print (certainly magazines), and internet all had their strengths. shopper marketing is probably the sleeper in the bunch. I see the sidebar in AA saying that the DRTV ads for $19.95 are doing better than ever. Are the ads better (that couldn't be it) or are we simply able to more clearly see the impact of TV? All that is known about advertising will be presented by Prof Jerry Wind at the ARF conference on Mar 31st (www.thearf.org) and it will show that advertising still has impact. The point about newspapers is clear--but those who transcend platform, like the NY times are more likely to come out of this recession in a viable position. –bschachter@thearf.org | NEW YORK, NY

Hi Bob, Very insightful. I work 100% in real estate advertising. Stupidity or herd mentality are two things that plague thousands of brokers in the real estate market. Too many of them blindly plow 75% of their annual advertising budgets at print and either too little or zero dollars at Internet advertising. Newspaper ads and Real Estate Guide advertising magazines were one of the norms of real estate marketing -- which are largely printed by the same newspaper. Ironically, the National Association of REALTORS (NAR) publishes an annual report every year which clearly shows that more than 82% of customers searching for homes...
are using the Internet. It's a real shame to see how few brokers read the trends and reports from the same trade association they belong to. So it begs the question, why spend 75% of your annual marketing budget on print ads when 82% or more of your traffic is coming from the Internet? What's even more sad is many real estate brokers are still expecting the good old days of print to come back. Delivering them the leads they used to get from print media four years ago. Bart | Santa Fe –voyager360 | SANTA FE, NM

Hey, Bob, nice little piece with some mild warnings. If it's apocalypse that you want, try this: http://www.techcrunch.com/2009/03/22/why-advertising-is-failing-on-the-internet/ –Stevewax | NEW YORK, NY

Randy Rothenberg is right, the “targeting is everything” mantra is a lie. Brilliant creative is now, and always has been, the only answer. How hard can it be? Even I can do it. Larry Brown, AdSimple, East Hampton. NY –Now | New York, NY
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Its received even harsher reviews, and it’s also not as large or technically ambitious. ESO’s story isn’t great, but it’s there. It’s not a fantastic massively multiplayer game, but a solid entry in the genre, with the crowd, hub cities, and deep character progression that implies. Fallout 76 has none of that. Elder Scrolls Online (left) and Fallout 76. Someday, it may be a game that deserves glowing headlines and hot takes about how it’s really worth a try now, despite what you’ve heard. Just don’t expect it to be reborn, and be prepared to endure a hurricane of microtransactions. Editors’ Recommendations.