

[REDACTED]
New York, N.Y. 10021

May 8, 1993

C-Span

444 N. Capitol Street, N.W.

Suite 412

Washington, D.C. 20001

002594 MAY 13 1993

Re: The Moscow News

Dear Sirs:

Your announcer often makes the statement that CNN is devoted to serving the educational interests of its listeners. This assertion is not one I would feel inclined to argue about, but it seems to me that CNN is overlooking an opportunity to provide further service in its presentation of "The Moscow News."

At present the news program is scheduled at 5 PM, 8 PM, and again at 7:20 AM as three separate broadcasts. So far so good. But why not

over

offer variations of style as well as time differences?

Each program now carries the ^{single} same voice of the interpreter, with the voice-over covering up and drowning out the various voices of the Russian speakers. Although the interpretation is generally accurate, the listener is nevertheless prevented from hearing what is actually said. It may be that many would think that, so long as the facts are given, the words are of little or no consequence, but I am sure that a few are interested in the content of words for the sake of bettering communication.

Among this minority are people from all walks of life, with not the least being teachers and students of Russian culture. To them it is not enough to just understand but to develop fluency. To this group add the number of Russian speaking people who like to hear 'their'

language, and you have the potential for an audience wanting to see and hear the news as the Russians do.

Next you have the learners, as well as those who, given an incentive, find themselves wanting to learn.

Sight, sound, and subtitles would be for them, with subtitles providing the learning tool. Subtitles would also appeal to the hearing-impaired, and even attract a few who feel drawn to watch two TV sets at the same time.

Last, there is kind of listener who makes up the general viewing audience. So long as he feels informed about what 'they' are saying and doing, he thinks that is all he needs to know. For them, the interpreter is fine.

So what I am suggesting is

over

simply that the one program be broadcast⁴
three ways:

- 1) as the Russians see and hear it
- 2) with subtitles
- 3) interpreted
(no change from present
'interpreted' presentation)

Inasmuch as the viewer would no more be limited to one voice, he might decide to look at the program again and have the chance to hear it somewhat differently.

Before closing, I want to mention one more thing. The pre-emptive nature of the House "live" broadcasts make it dubious whether the 'news' will be broadcast or not. Is it at all possible for a ticker-tape message indicating delayed/cancelled status of program? What usually happens is that I switch channels and the "news" is forgotten.

Your attention is appreciated, and I hope you will remember my comments. Thank you!

Sincerely,

