

Ryan Pierson

Add to circles



Ryan Pierson Yesterday 7:55 PM (edited) - Public

Ad blocking software is one of the reasons I have such a hard time paying the bills these days. I work hard, very hard in fact, to produce free content and distribute information. Thousands of words per day, every day.

This used to allow me to pay the rent and put food on the table. Now, ad revenue is quickly drying up because everyone and anyone has an ad blocker. To make matters worse, traffic numbers are going up which means hosting costs are rising as well. Please take a moment to consider just how much you're hurting us when you block ads on our sites.



New Internet Ad Blocker and Why You Shouldn't Use It - LockerGnome »

There are addons that work with most of the more popular browsers to block out advertisements while you surf the Internet. These software solutions can be configured either manually or by selecting fr...

+353 109

141 comments



Mike Miller Yesterday 8:37 PM (edited) +50

The truth is, ads are a lousy way to do this. Of course there isn't really a better way. Speaking for myself, I'd much rather have the option to pay and avoid all the ads. This would also remove a lot of the motivation for sites to constantly track me everywhere I go.

If I want to listen to music ad free I can pay Sirius/XM. I want that same option on the Internet for content. Pheed seems to offer a possible solution for content providers but its way to early to know if they'll have any success.



Qassim Farid Yesterday 8:39 PM +27

I use an adblocker.

But I have quite a lengthy exception list. If I find myself repeatedly consuming content from a certain site, (could be just a couple of times), i'll add it to my exceptions list.

I essentially have an adblocker to stop the really annoying ads when i'm just trying to find a certain bit of information. It still isn't ideal from a content creators point of view, but if I'm just visiting the site once, then I don't feel **too** guilty.



Jeremy Parker Yesterday 8:48 PM +112

I use ad blockers and install them on all of my clients machines. And always will. Pollution is wrong.



Simon McKenna Yesterday 8:51 PM +51

Sorry, but calling people complete dicks for using ad blockers is also being a dick. That's aimed at +Chris Pirillo, not Ryan, but there are good reasons for using ad blockers.

<https://plus.google.com/u/0/114762139313526131091/posts/aH6oTLaaBVW>

Chris Pirillo Yesterday 8:57 PM +11



Works at **LogicLounge.com**

Lives in **Austin, TX**

[View full profile](#)

Mute Ryan

Report / block Ryan



And you're worse than a parasite, Jeremy.



Mike Miller Yesterday 9:14 PM +41

+Chris Pirillo You aren't going to have the moral high ground on this in my eyes until you offer an alternative.



Keith Hayes Yesterday 9:15 PM +118

Adblocking technology was developed in response to demand from people that got tired of being ambushed by obnoxious advertising to view content that isn't that original. It got so bad that it's consuming significant bandwidth and taking longer for pages to load because the browser needs to run all the scripts that have been encoded by wannabe web designers that read too many books on how to get rich off of the internet by being an annoying parasite. And I was paying my ISP for that "priviledge". Not anymore. Web advertising is the modern day equivalent of a telemarketer. Also, There is rarely original content that hasn't be co-opted, borrowed or outright plagerized. If you are counting on this revenue to earn a living then you have a poor business model. You're better off not publishing and finding a real job.



Dave Shevett Yesterday 9:21 PM +69

Sorry I still think the original premise here is wrong. I've been an active internet user ever since there was an internet. In all that time, I have never used an adblocker, and none but technological elite in my circles use one. The statement "everyone uses an adblocker, and that's why revenue is drying up" is demonstrably false.

The reason ad revenue is drying up is because the ads have faded into the background. Publishers create more and more obnoxious mechanisms to grab the attention of the reader, and interrupt what they're doing, thereby making the ads irritating, not informational. Eventually, we stop looking at those as well.

The landscape of the internet is changing. Calling one small segment of the population 'dicks' just makes you look like a fool.



Kevin Lanni Yesterday 9:30 PM +67

+Chris Pirillo is annoying anyway.

I block ads, mostly because they are *never* relevant for me and I have never nor will I ever (intentionally) click one, regardless of its relevance.

To put another spin on that, even if I find myself using a computer that doesn't have any ad blockers installed, I find that my eyes automatically slide right over ads without my brain even taking any notice (most of the time). I have heard other people sat the same. Some people are so used to seeing ads or so well trained to ignore them they don't even really see them anymore.

To top all that off, if I'm not mistaken, ad revenue is based mostly on impressions (how many times the ad gets loaded onto a page, though some providers also check IP and other factors as well). Taking that into account, most add blockers these days just remove the add from the DOM of the page, rendering it un-seeable, but the impression has already been made (the HTTP resource request to the ad provider), so in most cases content providers (bloggers et al) still make their money regardless if the ad was blocked.



Nanda Linn Aung Yesterday 9:40 PM +4

I als earn from Adsense, but i don't mind anyone using ad-blocker, it's a freedom of choice, if i don't earn, that's fine, i don't live on it.



Chris Pirillo Yesterday 9:44 PM +6

I'm glad all you freeloaders are having a circle jerk over here. There's a reason I disabled comments in my share. You're adding absolutely nothing intelligent to the conversation.

Randy Brown Yesterday 9:49 PM +44



Ultimately, all content generators are going to have to learn from the digital revolution and its effects on the print media. Ad revenue is not a viable long term strategy for profitability.

In an open market, if your model doesn't work, you have to adapt. Or you can beg and plead with the consumers so that they will continue to buy your product (in this case, be your product). Only one is likely to work though, sorry **+Chris Pirillo**

Remember the rule from economics 101: If you are not the consumer (and by consumer, I mean the person who is paying for a product), you are the product. In the modern content model, this means that the reader is the product, and the ad company is the consumer. The content is just the bait to get people there to be sold to the ad producer, so that they might in turn become the consumer of that product. I don't know about everyone here, but I didn't opt in to be a product. Ad blocker is people's way of opting out of being sold.

If content generators want a better relationship with their readers, they need not to beg them to stand on the shelves and be sold, but rather, to find a way to make the reader the consumer. I know the complaint: I couldn't make a living that way. Well, in an open market, that means that what you're making isn't worthwhile, or at the very least, you weren't capable of convincing people that it was. But that could be true with or without your audience being your consumer.



Mike Miller Yesterday 9:50 PM **+46**

+Chris Pirillo Dude, look in a mirror when you say that. Seriously, you are generally a lot more rational. I understand your living is being threatened but the right approach is to look for alternatives.

The cold hard facts of the world we live in is that technology is constantly changing the landscape. We may not like those changes but they are inevitable and if you want to survive you better figure out how to adapt.



Keith Hayes Yesterday 9:51 PM **+27**

You overestimate your intelligence Chris. Except for the one person who suggested they "kill themselves" the other comments were legitimate complaints about online ads. Consider it or don't. It's your choice.



Jonathan Pugh Yesterday 9:52 PM **+12**

I do use an ad blocker, but only because I can't stand those moving advertisements. They are sooo annoying! Is there an ad blocker that only blocks moving ads?



kyle links Yesterday 9:52 PM

Sewcuff



Rip Ryness Yesterday 9:58 PM **+11**

Ad blockers greatly improve the web experience, but there are sites where I've disabled it, for one of two reasons. 1. The site detected it and won't work with it on. 2. I want to see the ads on that page.

Now if I was specifically asked, say in a pop-up, to disable it, I probably would. And if the ads weren't really intrusive, I'd leave it that way. Now this little interaction probably build a tiny bit of rapport and chances are I'd remember your site.

I think it is generally true that every problem can become an opportunity given enough imagination. Experiment and I bet you can find a way to turn this in your favor.



Andres Kievsky Yesterday 9:58 PM **+14**

Oh, please, if it were up to people like you we would have all-ad pages with no content. Give me a break.



Andres Kievsky Yesterday 10:02 PM (edited) +41

+Chris Pirillo Why exactly do you need ads, if your reviews are ads themselves? Can you explain that?

Oh, wait, stating my opinion is 'bullying' now, isn't it? New definition of bullying: saying anything +Chris Pirillo doesn't agree with. And if you use an Adblock you are "worse than a parasite" (Chris' words, not mine). Who is bullying whom?



Ryan Pierson Yesterday 10:14 PM +2

+Andres Kievsky You don't know anything about me to make such a wild claim that I would support spammy pages like that.



Dean Cole Yesterday 10:18 PM +12

If we are blocking ads then we weren't going to buy anyway. So the ads we originally couldn't block really weren't driving paying customers to websites.



Sola Veritate Yesterday 10:20 PM +18

F off. Adverts suck. We already know what we want and where to get it from.

Leave us alone with your cookie induced repeating messages telling us to buy stuff. Absolutely pointless.



Robert Charette Yesterday 10:21 PM +14

If I want ads and commercials, I'll go watch cable T.V. I don't. So I watch most of my content online, with ad blockers, so I don't get retarded spam ads on my browser.



Andres Kievsky Yesterday 10:22 PM +1

+Ryan Pierson fair enough, but there's a fine line between monetizing a page and making a one page ad.



Ryan Pierson Yesterday 10:23 PM (edited) +7

+Sola Veritate Then please stop visiting our sties, costing us money in bandwidth, and leaving us to pick up the tab. It's very simple. Hate the ads, fine, but don't put the very site you're enjoying out of business because you can't be bothered to ignore the sidebar.



Kevin Lanni Yesterday 10:27 PM +38

+Ryan Pierson by that very same token, don't push your site for viewers to consume if you're not willing or not able to foot the bill. Especially if you're so destitute that you complain about some of those viewers blocking your ads.

Get a free blog if you can't afford to host your own. There are dozens upon dozens of completely free solutions out there.



Mark C Yesterday 10:32 PM +11

Ad blockers are one of the greatest inventions ever created. This saves so much more time than me trying to find the source IP to add to a loopback file.

There is nothing worse than going to say YouTube to watch a video to be bombarded by a totally irrelevant ad for 30 seconds. Now if only we could get the same for TV.



Ryan Pierson Yesterday 10:47 PM (edited) +2

+Kevin Lanni I'm not the owner of the site. I'm a paid writer, and that means my paycheck depends on the sites' revenue. Take a moment to find out who I am before you start making assumptions. (edited to clarify meaning)



Sean Bradshaw Yesterday 10:34 PM +25

The most ironic thing is, if I visit a site that doesn't have ads blocked, and they are obnoxious ads that distract from the content, I'll open up the browser debugger and delete the offending element from the page so I can continue to read. Moral of the story is, when your ads are more

important than the content, you lose visitors and revenue, remember MySpace? They crossed that line, Facebook is on the way to that same destination.



Ryan Pierson Yesterday 10:39 PM +4

+Sean Bradshaw I see a lot of merit in what you're saying. There are a LOT of sites out there that abuse advertisements, and that makes life hard for the rest of us. Pain points drive people to take actions like installing ad blockers. The problem is that we lose sight of our moral compass and forget that sites are businesses and those businesses depend on revenue. Someone has to pay for the content, and readers rarely will. Dignation tried to fund itself with viewer funding and premium content. The result... piracy.



Kevin Lanni Yesterday 10:41 PM +25

"Attacking"? Really? Had to play that card, huh?

Regardless, it's ironic that you blame ad blockers for your financial woes when really you just need to find a better source of income. Whether that be a new job or a new career, you're currently trying to treat a symptom instead of the problem.



Anthony Utter Yesterday 11:45 PM (edited) +8

I think some people make a good argument. On one hand, adverts help keep free content free. On the other, they can get very annoying at times. The thing we have to remember is that "annoying" is a relative experience which translates into a subjective opinion.

For me, I don't like ads with loud, obnoxious audio that is hard to turn off. Facebook is a good example of this. I also don't like being hit with ads every single time I do something. I offer Pandora mobile as an example.

To be honest, I don't know what the answer to this will be. As I try to sift through the negativity, I can tell people are fed up with how some sites use (or, in some cases, abuse) ads, some to the point that they disable ads altogether.

Of course, free content needs to remain free while still supporting those sites and people we like. *There's no such thing as a free lunch*, comes into mind. Some people like to pay for content, and that's fine. I don't, especially when I can get the same content for free elsewhere.

Here's hoping that someone has the answer.



Jack Markiewicz Yesterday 10:44 PM +3

You had more than enough time to use ads properly. Fuck you



Andres Kievsky Yesterday 10:45 PM +3

Also, the cost of bandwidth goes **down** as time goes by. So people use more, but the cost goes down and it usually balances out. How much do you pay for bandwidth anyway? Can I recommend a better deal with your host(s) or changing them?



Pierre Johnson Yesterday 10:47 PM (edited) +1

Many people don't want boring ads.

Publishers ought to consider getting voluntary participation from customers so that instead of blasting them with inane ads that lack relevancy to their lives, publishers could send them dossiers of sales pitches, which could help inform purchasing decisions. Computers make that kind of thing happen with ease.

Such publishers could match profiles with content of advertisers or have advertisers bid on profiles to prepare tailored sales pitches. Smarter publishers would move up the food chain, gearing their content to high net worth individuals and thus pitching their service to luxury goods providers.

For those who know publishing, text and pictures of articles exist as filler around ads. The days of print-descendant mass media is coming to an end.

The many who try to copy the print advertising on the Internet are stuck in a 20th century tar pit. If their businesses fail, they shall deserve their fate. Business failing is a referendum held by the rest of us who have spoken and have said that those with failing businesses are not good stewards of capital. Thus, what little capital they have should be taken from them. Someone competent would make better use of it.

Look at the Top 100 blogs on Technorati [<http://technorati.com/blogs/top100/>], I can't find Lockerdouce. Ars Technica, Engadget and TechCrunch are in the top 10.



Ryan Pierson Yesterday 10:47 PM +6

+[Kevin Lanni](#) Blogs are businesses. By stating that it's on us to "foot the bill" for free content is counter to the very spirit of business. Does Apple need to "foot the bill" for everyone to get a free iPad? No business will survive if it doesn't receive income. Free blogging sites do NOT cover you if your blog has any popularity. Trust me on this.. those sites either depend on ad revenue themselves, or start charging producers if their content becomes a burden on the servers. Nothing is free, really. Tell TechCrunch (ad supported) that it should move to a free host. Trust me, there isn't a free hosting provider around that would take them.



Sandy Beaches Yesterday 10:48 PM +27

You need to find a new way to earn your living.



Brendan Gadd Yesterday 10:50 PM +59

Wait... using an ad blocker may stop Chris Pirillo from posting content on the web? Sign me up!



Pierre Johnson Yesterday 10:51 PM +8

HA HA HA +[Brendan Gadd](#)



Ryan Pierson Yesterday 10:51 PM +4

+[Brendan Gadd](#) and put everyone that works for his company out of a job... thanks.



Anthony Utter Yesterday 10:52 PM +5

And now I see the lack of any intelligence creeping its way into this conversation...

Shame.



Linh Nguyen Yesterday 10:58 PM (edited) +6

The inherent problem here is all the drivel that is being claimed as "writing" (edit: I'm talking about nothing but rehash sites) in order to get page views. It drives up the noise and makes people cynical of ads. No to mention ads should in no way take away from your content. That is, IMO, the key issue here. And even google is getting away from it by sliding images into gmail.

So, the question is, how do we really fix this? Pay walls seem to just create a path of least resistance to copied content that will no doubt be readily available. Add DRM and then you add a layer of complexity that hurts the legitimate guys.

Penny-Arcade tried a pay model on kickstarter. I don't think it went well honestly, they only pulled in \$500k or something. I say "only" but they didn't even make it totally ad-free with that. And it'd have to be hit over and over and over.

Then you have the huffington post... I try not to go there, but auto-play loud ads? This is not how you get people to not use ad-block. Or sites that blend it in too well. I honestly despise that.

How many sites even offer paid ad-free versions? I'd be curious if this model could work.



Pierre Johnson Yesterday 10:57 PM (edited) +2

Blame those in charge, +[Ryan Pierson](#). They're doing a piss-poor job of managing capital.

Computers facilitate 1:1 marketing. There is no reason to try to port the trad print medium to the Internet.

Even the Google geniuses know this and this is why they're running a digital billboard company that pushes preferences-driven decision content to eyeballs that happen by their billboards, whether on Google products or rented space on others sites.

The days of newspapers and magazines are coming to an end. Newspapers fought the Internet all the way through the 90s. Many magazine publishers did as well. When their execs at long last embraced the Internet, they tried to port their failing business model — content as filler around mass media ads that relate to the article content rather than to each reader.



Nicholas James Yesterday 10:54 PM +8

I can sympathize, +[Ryan Pierson](#). I filter out unsolicited Flash content and scripts, but I never block static ads because I don't mind having them on the page if it gets me free content. Obviously, I'd prefer to see no ads, but I know you have to pay the bills somehow and having them clutter the page seems like a small price for me to pay.

If I could trust the scripts and the Flash content to not do anything bad, I'd allow them too, but I can't. Too many malicious scripts out there.



Ryan Pierson Yesterday 10:59 PM +7

+[Nicholas James](#) Thanks. Flash content should be on its way out anyway. Many browsers don't even support Flash anymore, and I for one wish I could live without it. Like I said before, some sites ruined it for the rest of us. The owners of these sites suffer for it, but one thing I hoped to convey in this post was that it's also the employees of those sites. An entire industry is basically a giant bubble right now and when it bursts, the online world we know today will change dramatically.



Anthony Utter Yesterday 11:01 PM

+[Ryan Pierson](#) Do you think it will get worse before it gets better?



Andres Kievsky Yesterday 11:03 PM +7

+[Ryan Pierson](#) who says that blogs should be businesses? Not everything can be monetized. That might just be the case in general with information - including movies, software, etc. As a software developer, that affects me too - but put it this way: just because you put a lot of effort and money into something doesn't mean that you can get money out of it.

Ads, DRM, etc - they are all artificial limitations. Can we agree on that?



Ryan Pierson Yesterday 11:04 PM +11

+[Anthony Utter](#) I don't know. What so many people said in this comment thread is telling, "Find a new way to make a living." I don't think it has quite sunken in that writers are a dying breed. Journalists are, as well. Many of them (like myself) moved from other broadcast mediums to the Internet because that's where the opportunity went. When sites can't afford to keep writers staffed, what's left? We've created our own bubble that is on the brink of bursting. When it does, the only thing that's left are hobbyists. Nothing against hobby bloggers, but I think the world still needs some dedicated journalists.



Pierre Johnson Yesterday 11:06 PM +4

If the content rocks and the ads prove to be relevant, people don't block. Blocking happens because the content is inferior, often lacking relevancy upon skimming.

As well, poorly made ads that try to appeal to a non-existent generic human assumed to fit the reader profile, fail.



Ryan Pierson Yesterday 11:08 PM +4

+Andres Kievsky Engadget, TechCrunch, GDGT, Twit.tv, Revision 3, The Verge, LockerGnome, etc... all of them are businesses. If they weren't, they wouldn't exist. The platform we're on right now was funded by ad revenue generated by all the millions of content producers on the Web. Find me a good, reliable news site that isn't a business. You won't. Hobbyists that have day jobs can't dedicate as much time to their craft. The few that can would still need help of additional staff to reach more than a handful of people.



Ping He Yesterday 11:09 PM +8

+Ryan Pierson Moral plea don't usually work, unfortunately. The invisible hands drive and shape people's behavior. Manufacturing jobs are going to Asia (cheaper), wall street is "courageously" gambling (not their money), corporations are cutting ppl's hours (avoid healthcare), and small artisan shops are dying (chain stores are cheaper). You either group together and try to fight for a regulation (limiting adblock), or adapt to this new world, i.e. find some other way to make money. End of story



Pierre Johnson Yesterday 11:11 PM +6

The difference tho is that Engadget and TechCruch are good businesses. That's why they're at the top of traffic.

If your blog/ezine isn't at the top in its category (top 3 or 4), it's time to move onward. Readers have spoken and are saying that your blog is an also-ran.

This story of also-rans is as old as commerce.

Have a

gander: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_defunct_automobile_manufacturers_of_the_United_States



Pierre Johnson Yesterday 11:12 PM

Please don't encourage anyone to become a political entrepreneur, +Ping He. That leads to ruin for all!



Anthony Utter Yesterday 11:12 PM

+Ryan Pierson I wonder that too. Also, I tend to think that the internet has become an increasingly crowded landscape with everyone trying to get in on the action. To be honest, it puts me on sensory and information overload when everyone with a computer, phone, a camera, and internet can get on and try to be a journalist. Why follow a lot of people when all they are doing is saying the same exact things as everyone else? It's becoming too much.



Ryan Pierson Yesterday 11:15 PM +6

+Pierre Johnson If your blog isn't in the top 3 or 4 of its category, it's time to move onward.... really? Sad for consumers, actually. There was a time when there were only 3 or 4 news sources. I'm glad I don't live in that time. I prefer choice.



Jonathan Frazer Yesterday 11:16 PM +7

I'm not a content producer, but I **never** use an ad blocker. If I come across a site that abuses ads, I'll avoid it in the future.

The only blocker I use is a Facebook blocker. Because I do not use Facebook at all, in any shape or form, I feel it is my prerogative to not be tracked and targeted by them. If I had an account or used their services, I would not block them.

I have gotten some pretty good deals from ads. As long as they are relevant, I am all for them. I understand nothing is free. As a consumer

I should pay, whether that be by seeing a few ads on a sidebar, or by paying outright. If I do not like the price or the number/quality of ads I will simply stop consuming that product. Unfortunately it appears this is not the case with most consumers.



Dan Swick Yesterday 11:18 PM +2

+Ryan Pierson "Find me a good, reliable news site that isn't a business. You won't."
Depends what you mean by business. PBS? BBC? CBC? NPR?

Web ads are kind of like CDs ten years ago - a dying revenue source. The music industry has adapted and changed to monetize new methods of content procurement and news/blog sites will have to do the same.



Dave Shevett Yesterday 11:19 PM +16

But I have to go back to the point I made further up there. The web content business is stuck in a dotcom mentality that's rooted in the print press. "Our sole purpose for functioning is to generate ad revenue. If ad revenue declines, then there must be something wrong - Ah, it's ad blockers! Lets go after them!" - Does this sound familiar? Sounds like the RIAA and the MPAA. "Our revenues are down, it must be those nasty filesharers!" - when in reality, the filesharers and torrent sites create sales, not destroy them.

The internet is changing, the web is changing, the revenue stream is changing. My blog used to generate \$300+ a month from adsense. Now it's about \$25. Do I blame adblockers? No. It's that ads are far less effective than they used to be. So the ads get more obnoxious, and ad blockers rise, however I'm not going to put dancing videos and popover ads on my blog. They'll just irritate my users.

You're harshing on the very community that supports you. The technical elite and the geeks. These people are NOT your customers. They will not click on ads (I certainly don't). So why are you attacking them and calling them 'dicks'? You're alienating the very people who spread the word about your content to their friends, relatives, and workmates.

THEY are the people your ads will work with. And I'll betcha a bucket o clicks that they're not running ad blockers.



Ryan Pierson Yesterday 11:21 PM +1

+[Dave Shevett](#) I didn't call anyone a dick.



Steve Sampson Yesterday 11:22 PM +3

The theory doesn't wash. I went through the startup of cable television. For \$8 a month we got a few more channels and they had 0, none, advertising. Then slowly, they started sneaking ad's in, as even the price went up.

So, even paying sites will have ad's. Probably even more than non-paying sites. In the end, the Internet will just be a wasteland much like cable television, and over the air television. I'll bet even Web sites will have laugh tracks...



Frank Carlson Yesterday 11:22 PM +8

You are free to earn money from ads and I am free to block ads I'm not interested in.



Ryan Pierson Yesterday 11:25 PM (edited) +5

+[Dan Swick](#) Let's go down the list, shall we?

PBS: A non-profit BUSINESS that pays its executive six-figure salaries.

BBC: The biggest broadcasting force in the UK. It generates and spends more money every year than some countries.

NPR: Supported by public funds, sponsors, and listeners. Still pays its staff a heck of a lot of money. Non-profit business.

CBC: Has corporation in its name. It's a business.



Alexander Ryan Yesterday 11:25 PM +4

+Frank Carlson Blocking said ads means that the person does not earn money from it.

Hence, your freedom to block ads is blocking their freedom of earning money from the ad.



Nathan Bohman Yesterday 11:27 PM +7

I would rather support blogs that I like by a donation button (and have multiple times) than to see ads of which I have no interest. Provide a donate button on each page instead of ads and see what happens



Sean Stevens Yesterday 11:28 PM +1

yea...quit sniveling. i get so bombarded by fucking ads...intrusive ads that cover something i am working on, or reading..coming from everywhere....thank God for ad blockers! If you gotta complain and cry that your hustle is drying up...you are not doing your homework, or you are in the wrong business.



Jem Matzan Yesterday 11:28 PM +1

The people who are blocking your ads would otherwise be ignoring them, or going to a competing site. Ad revenue on content sites has been declining since Jesus built the pyramids. You're just going to have to find a different way to make money... like everyone else.



jeff cobb Yesterday 11:29 PM +5

This will probably piss people off but as someone who hates how intrusive adverts have gotten, I go to lengths to outwit them. Before anyone says anything, if they didn't try to override **my** choices and shove things in my face I did not ask for, I reply if they would not do that (popups/unders et al) I would gladly let them go by my screen as we have allowed tv to do for years. Since that is not likely to happen...ever... I think it is time for a daemon to not block the ads (which can be detected, making the advertising peeps know they have to think of something else) the filter should pipe them to a null window so they are never ever seen and yet the ad servers don't know their bullshit has been dodged...getting to work on it after dinner....



Randy Brown Yesterday 11:41 PM (edited) +19

+Ryan Pierson I think the major issue I take with your logic is that, you seem to imply that, by merit of existence, businesses deserve to make a profit:

By stating that it's on us to "foot the bill" for free content is counter to the very spirit of business. Does Apple need to "foot the bill" for everyone to get a free iPad? No business will survive if it doesn't receive income.

Your implications are that, because the business exists, and has a revenue model in place, that the audience (not the consumers) should play by the rules to allow the business to get its product to its consumers.

this is contrary to an open market: If your business model doesn't work, it's not the readerships fault, and blaming it on them isn't going to get them to come to the table and work with you. Your readership is the product, you need them. On the contrary, the internet is a big place, with plenty of professional bloggers.

I've not said that you need a new career, but I have said that if you can't make money off of your readers, it's because your readers don't see merit in what you're writing--not enough to be a consumer of it. That's the reason the reader gets turned into the product.

What you really have to ask yourself is who are you working for? Not in terms of what business, but who are you selling your product to.

Not the reader. You write content to get readers to come to the site so that your site will get ad impressions and you will get a check. That's probably not the way you think about it on a daily basis, but when it comes down to it, posts like these clarify that for you.

There's nothing wrong with having this as a business model (so long as it works), but to say that because a reader isn't allowing you to make money, the reader is somehow at fault, is ridiculous. You're asking readers to act in the best interests of a business, that, by definition, isn't acting in the reader's best interests--it's acting in the business and the ad provider's best interests.

As an aside, you also don't want to encourage people not to read your stuff if they won't view the ads--that eliminates any possibility of turn over, and the end result will be the same: no one sees the ads, the company quietly slips into the night. People will yammer about it for a while, but more likely they'll just move on to another site posting very very similar content.



JaKuB MacKowsKi Yesterday 11:29 PM +3

It doesn't help that you write an article about an Ad Blocker. People that did not know about one do now.



mohamad abdul hadi mohamad Yesterday 11:29 PM +2

Maybe because ads are made of flash so much that it slows down the browsing experience, so if you do the ads in gif maybe it is ok for most of the peopla.



Angel Martinez Yesterday 11:30 PM +2

all this is so true



Tyler Kiefer Yesterday 11:31 PM +8

I use ad block not to simply block ads, it's the fact that the majority of ads are obnoxious, flashing, misleading, blocks of the page that just clutter the experience of most Web pages. I do, however, allow ads on Google sites because Google uses non intrusive, usually just text ads. If ads weren't designed to be so annoying I don't think people would be driven to blocking ads. It's not the ads we're blocking, it's the annoyances. Remember, some ads even go so far as to include sound! Just ridiculous...



Ryan Pierson Yesterday 11:32 PM (edited)

+[JaKuB MacKowsKi](#) Didn't write it, but I get your point. ;)



ชศธร อุเทน Yesterday 11:32 PM

8



Shawn McMahon Yesterday 11:33 PM +8

Instead of making YOUR living by selling access to MY mind, make your living by selling access to YOUR mind. Or pay me for access to mine.



Josh Preble Yesterday 11:38 PM

i dont click on them anyway



Randy Brown Yesterday 11:40 PM +6

Someone brought up pop-ups and it makes me think: did people similarly complain about the innovation of pop-up blockers?

Also, +[Ryan Pierson](#) , Wikipedia. and the entire Wikimedia conglomerate.

Quality content. Paid Staff. No Ads. It can be done.



Colin Nash Yesterday 11:41 PM +4

If web advertising stuck to simple gif/jpg/png images hyperlinked from the parent website (instead of being flash/java scripted things that pop out at you and take over your view - and often ran from some 3rd party

site) then I probably would not have resorted to ad-blocking.

I use ad-blocking because I think most advertising is too excessive and in-your face. Plus the launching of scripts via 3rd party sites is an increased security risk to my machine. Hence I block all scripting and only whitelist the URL's that I want scripting to function on. This also greatly reduces the chances of malware finding it's way into my system.

The no-script add-on for Firefox works wonders for security and stability.

I want to get to the content I want without having to dance through hoops by dealing with advertising that holds my net access to ransom.



Ben Rodick Yesterday 11:42 PM +3

Seems like the old Pay TV VS Free Broadcast in the 70's
Now we line up to pay \$85 a month for cable



Micah Cooper Yesterday 11:42 PM (edited) +4

Seems like a model that needs to change. Perhaps a dedicated advert page that was actually interesting?



Kyle Telechan Yesterday 11:45 PM (edited) +5

I've heard rumors of one of the primary AdBlockers including an option to allow "good" ads by default - that being simple, non-flashing, non noisemaking, non popup ads, probably designated by some sort of universal whitelist. I'd totally be down for keeping that checked.

In fact, I often "unblock" ads on sites who have historically been good about keeping crap off of their site.



Kenneth Lesch Yesterday 11:44 PM +2

+[Ryan Pierson](#) I think you should have put it this way: "what do we need to do so that people don't use ad blickers?" I think people would not have ad blockers if the ads were a particular way - just have to figure it out.



Aleric Johansen Yesterday 11:44 PM +2

Personally ads are never enough for me to go get the item, nor even click on the ads 2 learn more. if i want an item, i will search up the item or a way to do wat i want 2 do, never clicking on ads, which 2 say the least, r annoying & a waste of loading & bandwidth. so for me 2 have an adblocker just makes sense.

I didnt read the article, but i figure ads r never useful 4 me, so y wuld i need 2 read it? adblockers help me get 2 where i want 2 go w/o having 2 clicks X's or watever that slow me down



Thomas Jones Yesterday 11:45 PM +5

The problem isn't advertising, per se, it's the rude manner in which many sites implement advertising. It's another case of a few bad actors ruining it. That said, until those bad actors go away, I'm not uninstalling my ad-blockers.



Ryan Meader Yesterday 11:45 PM +1

I'd like to think the solution would be encouraging the whitelisting of good sites in order to support them (and clicking as well of course), but not many people are going to take the time.



Billy Collins Yesterday 11:45 PM +5

I'll never go to your crappy site now, so think of the bandwidth you saved!.



Alex Watts Yesterday 11:46 PM +2

Sorry but I visit too many sites which bombard me with Ads, you know the ones I'm talking about, hell even seemingly harmless sites can often bombard me with ads, which for the record, I am never interested in. Ads shit me to tears, sorry champ, can't help you out there



Me Fillion Yesterday 11:47 PM

My teacher got rid of television services because of ads! I'm ignoring the television because of ads! Not sure if my teacher uses ads blocker, but I uses ads blocker because I find ads useless! And I also say it spam! Even though it mean the publisher that Advertise are getting less, but I stop caring about them if they Advertise! But if I have ads blocker, then ads are less annoying and I can enjoy my day! I'm sorry! I'm an anti-ads! But I do accept ads in certain ways, but I also had to get rid of them because advertiser are putting too much ads in the wrong way which make me require to disable simple nice ads! Video ads, I only accept them if they are less than 16 seconds! For tv, I only accept up to 1 min for a commercial time! Not 1 min per ads in commercial times! I know I want revenue from YouTube via ads, but because I know I ignore ads, I decided to not put ads on my YouTube even if I don't have a popular channel! And ads on websites, I like them if they aren't in the most obvious location like at the bottom of the page, or some mini ads on the side or top!



Me Fillion Yesterday 11:47 PM

Woah, I wrote too much! '-_-'



David Guirao Tatlitug Yesterday 11:48 PM **+5**

Time to find a new job to put food on the table. I did not purchase a computer to read ads.



Shawn McMahon Yesterday 11:48 PM **+9**

Here's one hint; I tell Adblock to allow the text-based Google ads through. I don't think I'm alone in this.



Bethany Brown Yesterday 11:49 PM **+1**

people find ads annoying so no surprise that we block it!



steve stanker Yesterday 11:50 PM **+1**

you must be 'friends' with branson-putz



Donnavon Hallgren Yesterday 11:50 PM **+2**

I used to use ad blockers but I really don't have a use for them anymore. Internet speeds are fast enough that the load times are nil and if ads are that annoying I just leave the site.



Alex Childress Yesterday 11:51 PM **+1**

I don't bother with ad blockers. I'm so desensitized by ads that I never notice them anymore. For me, they block themselves.



Phillip Kerman Yesterday 11:54 PM **+1**

Whoa, there are ad blockers that work! Awesome--thanks for telling me about it. If someone's model is to have ads then great--live it up while you can. If someone can make a product (say an ad blocker that costs money--or even more ironic: one that has ads to pay for it) then I am free to support that. If it means some great piece of content is no longer available (because they can't make money selling ad space) then either that's a shame and it is no big loss--or they will adapt and offer me another way to pay them for their wonderful content. If ad blocking were illegal or something it might be a different story--but it isn't.

Want to know the future of ads: BETTER ADS. Ones that target me and actually bring value etc. Seems so simple really.



Steven Jandreau Yesterday 11:54 PM **+1**

Ryan who?



Sean Masters Yesterday 11:55 PM **+1**

Put up a paywall.



Brian McQuay Yesterday 11:55 PM **+5**

Bah, learn to adapt. That's what business is all about. No business environment is static. If your revenue model is broken then you adapt

your business instead of whining about the good old days.



Dan Swick Yesterday 11:56 PM +1

+Ryan Pierson ...and what else they have in common is they make money despite the fact none of them take out ads.



Doug Paice Yesterday 11:56 PM

I don't block ads, not as such, I do run flash block and I block popups, that takes care of most of the annoying ads. What I appreciate is targeted ads, they are less likely to waste my time and more likely to provide revenue to the site I'm on; e.g. Facebook knows I'm married so it should stop showing me dating ads, it knows I like photography, show me ads related to that.

I guess what it comes to is the only **real** ad-blocker I have and need is my attention: if it's not interesting then I ignore it.



Dave MacKay Yesterday 11:56 PM

There was a time when ad blockers were necessary, I am wary of ads loading my machine with junk, marketing companies want to know everything and ad blockers seem to help keep them away



charles embrey Yesterday 11:56 PM +1

I use ad blocker, and I don't except cookies. And I read few blogs.



Falkus Kibre Yesterday 11:57 PM +1

+Phillip Kerman

(say an ad blocker that costs money)

In fact, one of the best (AdBlock) and possibly oldest, has run entirely on donations for a long time now. The creator has made a ton of dosh. As for "how do money blog?" consider alternative methods.



Jayson Despain Yesterday 11:57 PM +2

I don't mind adds except for the intrusive ones or anything with audio. Those are the adds that made add blockers catch on.



Nick Plichta Yesterday 11:57 PM +3

If you pay me to watch your ads I'll uninstall my ad blocker. Otherwise I would start looking for a new job.



mick jagger Yesterday 11:57 PM +1

Try innovating instead of relying on a dated money making scheme. Times change.



Pat Ring Yesterday 11:57 PM +4

\$10 says you guys fast forward through the ads when you TIVO The Walking Dead (or whatever you TIVO).



Rob Yeichner Yesterday 11:58 PM +4

"blogs are businesses"

Doesn't seem like a very good business model you have going in this case if part of it succeeding requires social media campaigns to beg people to consume advertising. What next? Old fashioned radio pleading with drivers to not change the channel during commercial blocks?



George Dorn 12:07 AM (edited) +8

Damn. I was looking for the animated GIF of the world's smallest violin playing sad music, but it seems to be copyrighted. In other news, I hear Wendy's and Taco Bell are hiring.



Jiwon Kang Yesterday 11:59 PM +1

I actually NEVER used an ad blocker in my life, so its pretty much a given to stop adblockers. But I was considering getting one because I got a lot of ...**stuff**... I did NOT want to see again.



Richard Merren Yesterday 11:59 PM +6

Show me ads all you want, but stop with the popovers, the loud videos, the flashing animations, and (especially) the ads that slow down the page load so drastically that I never reach the content and I'll stop blocking them. While I am ranting, I especially hate the ads that cover up the content on my tablet but are sized wrong so I can never find a close button to send it away. I sympathize with you, but as long as I am paying for the bandwidth, I get to decide where I waste it.



Tim Pierce 12:00 AM +3

+Ryan Pierson +Chris Pirillo can we assume that neither of you have ever used a DVR or VCR to skip past the ads on a TV program?



Michael Bradley 12:01 AM (edited) +3

+Ryan Pierson Who are you and why should I care?

Can you demonstrate that your audience is using ad blockers vs. your ads not being properly targeted to your audience?

It seems rather counterproductive to plea to your audience to click on ads to generate revenue for your site.

If the ads are not generating the revenue you need, try another approach or try to attract a different audience.



Adam L 12:01 AM +3

I never use adblockers, but when an ad takes over the entire page, or even redirects me somewhere else when I'm trying to read something, I consider it. I especially consider it when audio starts playing on one of the 20 or so tabs that I have open, and I have to drop everything to scan every tab to figure out which one is causing it...



Benjamin Hibbard 12:03 AM +4

I dont use ad blockers. I edit my host file! the people blocking ads like me are saving you bandwidth! I will never buy anything from ads so no need to see them.



Pat Ring 12:03 AM +2

+Tim Pierce haha. I said that five minutes ago.



Ryan Pierson 12:03 AM +3

+Michael Bradley I'm nobody, and you shouldn't care. I don't know why you felt the need to even read this post... it was intended for people that care, but was shared by 36 of them. As for the burden of proof... I just said something that does impact online businesses and their employees. I'm just a writer, and one that depends on companies he writes for having enough revenue to stay in business. That's really it.



Ping He 12:04 AM +1

+Pierre Johnson lol it may actually make a good living in today's world w/o actually affecting anything.



David del Castillo 12:04 AM +2

I hate ads. I don't watch tv because of it. But I realize that I am not simply entitled to an ad free internet simply because I pay an isp for service. I will be more lenient in allowing ads on Web pages from now on because in all honesty I consume WAY MORE content than what I pay for. But still f#ck tv and commercials...sorry.



jeff cobb 12:04 AM +3

Seeing some of these responses reminded me of something and an additional thought. Those who spoke of grouping the adverts so those who wanted them could see them and those who did not could side-step them, I recall living in Europe in the mid-80s and on a weekday night of German television they did have adverts BUT for prime-time TV they would show ALL of the adverts that would normally show during prime-time from 7:30-8:00pm, just before the main programming began. Then

aside from a short break between shows, all content was uninterrupted. This worked out well and if you did want to see the ads, it was easy to see them all. After all, we were all strapping young men and wanted to see the soft-core porn of some of the commercials like for shower-soap and so on; they were nowhere near as prudish as our advertising standards agency....this was great. Now the ads are so bad, so much louder than the shows and so frequent (look at how many minutes of actual showtime you got in an hour show in say 1965 versus now, sometimes 55 minutes versus as little as 35 now) that I will do anything to get rid of them. Thus, though I get the show free on TV, I will grab The Walking Dead or Naruto or whatever off of the pirate boards since they come pre-filtered for that crap and so we have not involuntarily watched a commercial in close to 10 years. You may say you need this money to pay for the content but at the end of the day, I am picking up the cost of the bandwidth, regardless if I want to see the ad or not. You might have a case if the advertisers paid for the bandwidth too but they don't and you have no god-given right to mine. TV is broadcast for free so they can put what ads they want but if the user had to pay for the airwaves, you can bet there would be advertiser lynchings by Monday.



Mike McNamee 12:04 AM

Yea



mark anthony ruloma 12:04 AM

What does love look like? It has the hands to help others. It has the feet to hasten to the poor and needy. It has the eyes to see misery and want. It has the ears to hear the sighs and sorrows of men. That is what love look like.

---St. Augustine---



Michael Ireland 12:05 AM +13

+Ryan Pierson The problem does **NOT** lie with the viewer, the problem lies with the systems that have caused the ads to become annoying to the point that we block *all ads*. If the ads were not obnoxious, hard on the eyes, hard on the bandwidth, obstructive, confusing, misleading, offensive, and in bad taste, then we wouldn't be blocking them. *Do NOT blame your viewers* for reducing your income through ad blocking. Blame the advertisers who have abused the viewer into a cynical, jaded creature.

+Chris Pirillo FWIW, this is my first exposure to your content and it wasn't a particularly good impression. For a person who apparently makes his living at least in part by producing content for the internet, I find your comments unlikely to drum up additional viewers. I could be wrong of course, but *if* I had you in my circles before, I would have removed you. I am not telling you this to "get in your face" or anything, purely as an objective observation that you may find useful.

I use a variety of ad-reduction processes. When a **children's** website has ads for *Adult Dating* sites with admittedly highly attractive females in scanty clothing (*who doesn't like those haha?*) (clearly a mistake, but a grievous one) that my kids would be exposed to, I have to make the executive decision to start blocking the domains and IP addresses from which these offending ads come from. Net result? Completely ad-free internetting experience. Well, aside from the thinly (or not so thinly) veiled product placement attempts ...

Businesses must be flexible and adapt to their target demographic. If that means you or the company you work for needs to find an alternative way to earn an income, then so be it. It is the nature of businesses. It is why businesses die. It is why people get laid off from any company that is not turning as much of a profit as they would like. Do they come out and say, "You people should be buying more junk food to support the workers in the junk food factories!?" Yeah ... no. It wouldn't work. Just like telling your viewers to turn off their ad blockers isn't gonna work. It's unfortunate, but you really are going to have to adapt to the new paradigm.



Mike McNamee 12:05 AM
Torallt



Steve Faktor 12:05 AM +1
+Ryan Pierson The end of the display-based ad business model is near. As I wrote here (over 2 years ago), there are alternative opportunities: <http://www.ideafactory.com/technology/ad-blocking-web-of-lies/>



Paul A 12:06 AM +2
Ads get blocked because they're annoying otherwise ppl wouldn't bother finding a way to avoid them, they're also intrusive and tie in pretty well with spyware and viruses. In all honesty its not something I would look at by choice and the majority of people will gladly pay for content if they aren't bombarded with adverts constantly.
The amount of time I have probably wasted listening or attempting to get rid of an advert is ridiculous.
IMHO adverts are evil and like I said intrusive, I already pay a whopping bill to my ISP, why should I have to look at the go compare guys face following me around on a website ?

If forcing people to look at something that they simply don't want to see is your job or your only source of income. Then how long did you think it was going to last? Seriously ?



Wolfie Rankin 12:07 AM +3
BLOCK ALL OF THE ADVERTISING !!!

Yes, I will use one, but I can't stop those irritating self-playing videos and the popups which dim the screen (I hate those most of all).



Angel Rivera 12:11 AM (edited) +2
I'm not trying to be disrespectful but, we are constantly bombarded with ads everywhere we go in every corner, why would I want to get interrupted when I wanna see something I really like. Also if I want or need anything that you might have, I'll look it up...



Jasper Davis 12:08 AM +1
Ok question wut does the coke truck have 2 do with Internet ads



Alexey Igonen 12:10 AM (edited) +2
Being a priest/selling VHS allowed me to pay rent and put food on the table. Now everyone blocks themselves from going to church or watching vcr. What shall I do?



Paul A 12:10 AM +3
I also find your outlook and post lazy, selfish and desperate. I'm not just poking fun at you nor being cruel here but what did you expect if you try to ask the people on the net to allow ads because its your bread and butter?



Art Zemon 12:10 AM +22
I empathize, +Ryan Pierson so I tried loading your page <http://www.lockername.com/blade/2012/11/19/new-internet-ad-blocker-and-why-you-shouldnt-use-it/> with my ad blocker turned off. I am on a netbook with a screen 768 pixels high and my browser is full screen. With the ads present, **not one word of your article is visible "above the fold."**

Worse, I waited 7.30 seconds for that useless page to be presented to me.

When I turn on Adblock and Ghostery, I get the page twice as fast, in 3.85 seconds. Better yet, I can actually see the first 7 lines of your article without scrolling. Not great, but 7 lines is better than no lines at all.

I hope you understand why I use an ad blocker.



Mike Coleman 12:10 AM +2

Dave's comment struck a cord with me. A few years ago I participated in a usability study for a Web app. I got stuck on **Loading**, and couldn't figure out how to navigate away for a few minutes. Cause: the necessary nab button was posted in a location where ads normally appear. My eyes have been conditioned to ignore certain areas of my monitor.



Richard Byrd 12:11 AM +2

Too bad. Find another way to advertise. I don't shove things down your throat so don't shove them down mine.



Christopher Hill 12:11 AM +4

There is also the fear of advertising providers being hacked and having virus trojans or worms injected into the ad code then spreading it across to thousands of people across the planet in an instant due to the advertisements being live across so many websites.

Sorry, not going to live with spam in my face, and the possibility of an infected computer. And yes it happens, very recently one of the sites i frequent each day became black listed by google and other reporting sites for server trojans, which turned out to be the ad service they were using.

Oh and Ad Blockers have been around just as long as the Ads them selves. If every site used small and unobtrusive ads like Google Adwords then perhaps adblockers would not be needed any more. However more and more sites use the most obnoxious ads possible, sometimes covering over the actual site content with scroll outs, auto playing sounds and videos.

I whitelist all google adwords advertisements, other then that... sorry guess its time to go find a job and stop expecting us to pay your rent.



patrika Steer 12:11 AM

What?



Andrew Wippler 12:12 AM +2

I have used an ad blocker since 2000. The web is just a better place without them.

Chat

Mail Drive Calendar Sites Groups Contacts More ▾

admin@abbiecod.es

0

Share



Ryan Connell 12:12 AM +4

I gladly donated to the dev of Adblock plus. Any contribution to him is totally worth the service he provides for me and countless others.



John Raasch 12:13 AM +42

I'll add my voice to the masses' and say there are about 10 sites that I have whitelisted because they are polite and actually pay attention to the material that is served. If you're offering boner pills or European brides I need neither, it works just fine and I'm happy with my current European bride.



Igor Kotlyar 12:13 AM +38

"can we assume that neither of you have ever used a DVR or VCR to skip past the ads on a TV program?"

Or the old fashioned, switching the channel or doing something else for 3 minutes? I don't use ad blockers because I find ads annoying or want

a "free ride," but because many adds and pop ups use system resources and are completely contrary to my view of consumerism. In fact, advertising revenue considerations tend to dilute the quality of content by necessarily trying to appeal to a mean viewer/consumer.