
PETER B. ORLIK

Systemic Limitations to Irish Broadcast Journalism

The continuing Irish tragedy is reflected strongly in the Republic of Ireland's broadcast news service, here described (based on first hand observation and interviews) by Dr. Orlik, a professor of broadcast and cinematic arts at Central Michigan University. Since the manuscript was edited, the Irish government has cracked down still further, having banned direct or secondary coverage of activities of members of the political wing of the IRA, as well as of three extremist Protestant groups in Northern Ireland. This research was supported by a University Achievement Award—and the cooperation of Louis McRedmond of RTE, Dublin. (Manuscript accepted October 7, 1975)

IRELAND has traditionally been the inspiration for the alluring prose of tourist journalism. But since 1968 and the rise of the Catholic civil-rights movement in the North, such holiday prose has been submerged in a torrent of battle statistics from Belfast and Ulster. Correspondents from around the world have drawn periodic assignments to cover the carnage in the North and, less often, the incidents and reactions in the South. Yet, the long-term prospects for peace on the island depend heavily on the way in which "the trouble" in the North is perceived and analyzed in the Republic to the South. And that analysis, woven and embellished over months and years of lulls as well as outbreaks, is a task of the journalists indigenous to the Republic of Ireland.

Radio Telefix Eireann

The focus of this article will be on Irish broadcast journalism, which pervades the entire country and is the monopolistic

product of a single semi-governmental entity known as Radio Telefis Eireann (RTE). As will be discussed, Irish broadcast journalism represents a viable microcosm of Irish journalism as a whole since broadcast practitioners, almost without exception, enter RTE's newsroom after years of work at the newspapers.

As the sole native source of broadcast news, and in some areas the only receivable broadcast voice whatever, RTE's news apparatus thus has the potential to be a prime shaper of public cognizance and opinion for the people of the Irish Republic. Yet, one finds this potential frustrated or compromised by a Gordian tangle of legal, societal, corporate, technical, and perceptual difficulties.

Legal Restrictions

As a public corporation, RTE may not, according to its head of information and publications, "have official or public views of our own. We cannot directly express ourselves, cannot editorialize. Instead, if we do hold strong views, we can convey these to the minister for posts and telegraphs who can speak out as he sees fit because he's not a structural part of RTE."¹ This principle is solidified in law by the 1960 *Broadcasting Authority Act*, which states that "any information, news, or feature which relates to matter of public controversy or is subject to current debate ... [must be presented] ... objectively and impartially and without any expression of the Authority's own views."² Since the appointed Authority is the overseeing body for RTE, this provision clearly and effectively prohibits editorializing.

A more specific and more discretionary regulation of Irish broadcast journalism is represented by Section 31 of the same Act which provides, "that the minister [for posts and telegraphs] may direct the Authority in writing to refrain from broadcasting any particular matter or matter of any particular class, and obliges the Authority to comply."³ While a similar provision exists in the BBC charter, the Irish, unlike the British, have invoked it. On October 1, 1971 Minister for Posts and Telegraphs Gerald Collins used his power under Section 31 to issue a directive instructing RTE to "refrain from broadcasting any matter that could be calculated to promote the aims and activities of any organization which engages in, promotes, encourages or advocates the attaining of any particular objective by violent means." This marked the first time Section 31 had been operationalized and was precipitated by an RTE television program that featured recorded interviews with the leaders of several Irish Republican Army (IRA) factions followed by a

studio discussion with governmental representatives of both the North and South. According to the minister, the delicate balance that RTE should maintain was compromised by reporting on the illegal IRA; the imprecise line had been crossed once and must not be crossed again. Such program content, said Mr. Collins, "is highly dangerous in the present situation in the North. It is prejudicial to the maintenance of peace and to the ultimate reunification of our country . . . a service provided by the Government, and paid for by the public, will not be used against them and especially in a way that threatens the security of the State."⁴

Nevertheless, the succeeding months saw at least three separate incidents in which RTE was charged with having breached the directive. The nine members of the supervisory Broadcasting Authority continued to maintain that RTE was respecting the rather ill-defined order and was endeavoring to provide balanced and objective coverage of the violent happenings in the North. Finally, in November 1972, RTE's airing of an interview with IRA Chief of Staff Sean Mac Stiofain was followed by the minister's dismissal of the entire Authority and appointment of replacements under Section 6 of the *Broadcast Act*. On the following December 15, the new Authority approved and issued to RTE staff a set of guidelines for the observance of the Section 31 directive. The ground rules were thus clarified but the Collins directive had clearly diminished the permissible scope of journalistic judgement within RTE.

Socio-Political Factors

If dangerous and expansive ambiguity was characteristic of the Collins directive and perhaps, of Section 31 itself, so too is it a part of the social and political context within which RTE and its news department operate. RTE's head of news labelled this context the "tacitly acknowledged consensus within which all of us stay. This expands and contracts and even those who don't like the consensus know it's best for stability."⁵ This consensus is viewed as a trial and error process through which Irish broadcast journalists as a whole allegedly discern the limits of their professional inquiry and social responsibility. Because RTE is a monolithic semistate corporation there is no competitor who may be tempted to stretch the boundaries of the consensus for commercial or political gain. The rules of the game are thus well established and require a force of unusual magnitude to bring them into question.

One such force was the 1974 Report of the Broadcasting Review Committee. Produced by a blue-ribbon panel appointed

by the minister of posts and telegraphs on June 17, 1971, the document was the result of a charge "to review the progress of the television and sound broadcasting services since the enactment of the Broadcasting Authority Act, 1960, with particular reference to the objectives prescribed in that Act, and to make any recommendations considered appropriate in regard to the further development of the services."⁶ Though the Committee was expected to suggest a blueprint for broadcasting in the 1980's, its report, in the view of an RTE news editor, "is a review of the '60's that, apart from the internal ripple on news, has hardly made a stir. No one with any broadcast experience served on the Committee and their criticism of our Northern Ireland coverage must be viewed with the knowledge that they never did any field work or interviewing in the North; never talked with the people or leaders there."⁷

While some question may exist as to just what were the precise expectations for the Committee's end product, there is little doubt as to its attitude about the news department, and seemingly about that tacit consensus in which the department elects to function. Four general criticisms were advanced by the Committee. Of these, three were treated quite briefly and consisted of truncated charges that proper care was not taken in staff training and recruitment, that there was too much emphasis on Dublin "metropolitan" news to the detriment of "provincial news of significance," and that the content and presentation of RTE news "too frequently reflect a lack of imagination, resulting in an overall dullness."⁸

Of much more profound impact was the statement and supporting discussion of RTE's coverage of the North. Here, the Committee pulled no punches and stated unequivocally that it "cannot regard RTE's treatment of Northern Ireland affairs throughout the period since 1968 as having conformed to an adequate standard of objectivity and impartiality. It has, on the contrary, exemplified many of the regrettable tendencies noted in paragraph 15.4 above."⁹ As the identified paragraph included references to bias, distortion, and sensationalism, RTE news had thus, in the view of its chief officer, been subjected to "three of the most damaging accusations that may be made against a journalist. No evidence is offered to support these accusations. Those who disagree may only express disagreement. They may not offer an argument questioning the Committee's conclusion."¹⁰ In a long and frequently incisive memo-response to the Committee report, Head of News Jim McGuinness went on to amplify the activities and tribulations of RTE journalism in those areas brought into question by the report. The Committee, he concluded,

offered this rebuke when it should have offered, had it been fully in a position to judge, a warm note of appreciation of all the journalists, cameramen, sound men, film editors and others who with devotion, courage, and skill, fairly and honestly reported on Northern Ireland's affairs, including its violence, since the latter part of 1968. This conclusion may not now carry the weight and authority of the Committee's conclusion. But time, I believe, is on its side.¹¹

Whether McGuinness is right, and whether the "tacitly acknowledged consensus" will expand or contract as a result of the Broadcasting Review Committee's finding remains to be seen. But if there is any clear connection between the Committee's report and the "tacit consensus" it is that both, in some synergistic way, serve to shackle the resourcefulness and limit the scope of Irish broadcast journalism.

RTE Corporate Problems

Training Problems: The functioning of RTE news is further hobbled internally by training, organizational, and union problems. Though the Broadcasting Review Committee was content with an oblique reference to RTE's insufficient care in staff training, recruitment, and appointment, this area seemed to merit far more detailed attention. In answering this charge, the head of news, after pointing out that the RTE personnel division sets basic policy in this area, did admit that "like many others in radio and television news, I got my training in newspaper journalism. I am not, as a result, unaware either of the advantages of this training or of its disadvantages."¹² To the outsider and, in fact, to the knowledgeable insider, it is the disadvantages which seem to more fully assert themselves. For as an RTE news editor with extensive North-American broadcast experience observes, "there is far too much print orientation to our writing style and far too little writing for the ear."¹³ This condition may account for the "dullness" that the Broadcasting Review Committee could observe as laymen but they could not diagnose.

In any case, there is no question that, upon stepping into RTE's newsroom, you are in the company of people who think in terms of print. A large table holds temporarily bound copies of the past week's Irish dailies to which reference is constantly made. Current issues of the local dailies are at every desk and are read and reread by staffers at all levels of the RTE News echelon. "Did you read in the morning papers" . . . is often the starting point for a newsstory or assignment with RTE following up on what "the press is talking about" that day. Such conditions and modes of operation are attributable not only to

the fact that virtually all RTE reporters and correspondents came to RTE direct from newspapers (if not from collegiate training in such fields as literature or classics), but also to Ireland's lack of its own press association (which folded in the 1950's due to union difficulties)...there is thus no domestic wire nor domestic broadcast competition for RTE journalists to monitor.

Whatever one's previous experience, training for Irish broadcasting is limited to six weeks at RTE's own training facility and some staffers are never even exposed to that. As the organization's evening anchorman observes, "you're given six weeks over at training and then thrown into it. There is no program for any further training after that."¹⁴ Individual impetus toward self-improvement is also blunted for broadcast journalists. As RTE's head of information concedes, with only one broadcast service in the country, promotion potential is severely limited. "If the man above you is only a few years older, your career may be stymied regardless of what you may do to improve your own skills."¹⁵

Organizational Problems: Organizational difficulties within RTE further contribute to the staffer's feeling that his labors and destiny are evaluated and determined by an amorphous if not fathomless "system" that makes decisions more by omission than by commission. The internal command structure of RTE news was changed four times between 1970 and 1974 causing the editors in charge difficulty in explaining how the contemporary pattern actually functioned. As a result of this fluctuation, a significant number of news staffers tend to go their own way in day-to-day working assignments and procedures. An Irish-language deskman commented to the writer that "none of the floor people really understand the administrative structure . . . a lot of editors and subeditors for radio and television are around but its all very confusing to the visitor and certainly to us." Consequently, the Irish-language desk, which is responsible for translating all stories into Irish for vernacular bulletins, has chosen to operate quite autonomously. "We don't stop to worry about what the editor of the day or head of news thinks. One of our own is our bulletin editor and this makes for a much tighter bulletin than the English one."¹⁶

English-language and support personnel exhibit a similar orientation. A cameraman commented that "my boss is the phone, not these guys in here" and pointed out that a call from his off-duty sound man got them both self-dispatched to the site of the Dublin car bombings long before any supervisor-assigned, on-duty crew arrived. The editors themselves are

frustrated by the blurred lines too. O'ny ruefully admitted that, "I'm supposed to be the editor of the day and I have less control over what goes on the news tonight than any technician around the place."¹⁷

This lack of communication within RTE divisions is magnified by a similar lack *between* divisions. In discussing the system's personnel problems, RTE's head of information observed that "there is a singular lack of understanding of each other's problems. News can't get the OB (remote) unit from production planning to cover the big fire because sports had pre-booked it last Tuesday and news is expected to plan ahead like everybody else." The head of information felt that two additional factors were both the cause and the effect of RTE's organizational and personnel problems:

Our employees—and this certainly includes news staff—have a preference for taking news about RTE from the newspapers who are naturally hostile to RTE, rather than from management and our internal organs. If management says it, it is to be taken with a few grains of salt and certainly to be forgotten. Also, we live in a fish bowl environment. The public, government, and press are watching RTE more than any other public or private corporation. They are always ready to criticize and this keeps the pot boiling inside as far as personnel problems and relations are concerned."¹⁸

There is a further, if not prime ingredient to RTE's "boiling pot" and that is unionization. The antagonisms and adversary relationships arising from its operation have an especially strong impact in the news division where at least two separate unions are involved in every story. News readers, for example, belong to Equity and may do nothing except read the copy others have written. RTE's evening anchorman observed that "last night we had a government minister come to the studio right during the bulletin and they had to scurry around to get a reporter/correspondent to interview him. I couldn't have done it under any circumstances no matter how acute."¹⁹

Union Problems: Reporter/correspondents and deskmen belong to NUJ, the militant National Union of Journalists, some of whose members have told the head of news (and also the author) that their main goal "is to get as much money for as little work as possible." A concrete manifestation of this attitude is conveyed in the following excerpts from a March 25, 1974 memo sent to the head of news by the secretary of NUJ's Dublin Radio & TV Branch:

You will know that our members have been concerned for some years about the manning arrangements for the Newsroom telexroom ... The collection and distribution of copy from these machines is

not regarded as appropriate work for journalists . . . Apart from its being inappropriate, the position has become increasingly onerous for our members with the developing intensity of Newsroom work in recent years. Accordingly it has been decided to discontinue collection of telex copy by journalists, between the hours of 6:30 a.m. and midnight.

As the wire room is an alcove directly off the news "bull pen," the burden of tearing copy off the machines there, rather than simply reading and walking away, seems to be of minor importance, at least to outside observers.

Such observers would also note a great reluctance on the part of reporters to answer the telephone; another activity viewed as inappropriate to their profession. The head of news has frequently come out of his office to answer an ignored phone and the author observed one story that went begging since all reporters save one were out to coffee or late breakfast and the one present wouldn't answer it since he was technically off duty for five more minutes. Disfunctions resulting from union difficulties can be even more acute in the Irish-language section due to its far smaller staff. There, the length of daily news bulletins actually varies from day to day if, for example, five men rather than six are on duty. Any time sickness or vacation causes the Irish desk to be shorthanded, and if replacements are not scheduled, the desk goes into a "withdrawal of good will," and informs the programming divisions that their bulletins will be proportionately shorter that day.

The head of news places the underlying blame for such conditions on the troubled economic climate in Ireland during the 1950s. "Some of these men," he states, "got their jobs twenty years ago when economic conditions were bad. Men grabbed onto any job they could, journalism or anything else, and held it to their bosom. It wasn't something they set out to be, but simply economic security. This has hurt RTE News."²⁰ And like his editor of the day who felt so powerless in the final determination of news content, the head of news too feels isolated, largely by union regulations, from the dynamics of the process. "The fact that the NUJ," he says, "can solemnly convene and support the [Broadcasting] Review Committee charge that the news is dull, is astounding. They are the ones that construct that news, no matter how inelegantly. I certainly don't. I'm really on the periphery of it all."²¹

"*Milking*": Apart from the union arena, but another example of how economic concerns impinge on RTE news output, is the massive amount of "milking" which goes on in the RTE newsroom. Approximately fourteen newsroom staffers are

"milkmen:" rewriters of stories that come into RTE for use by the outside agencies with whom they have personal working agreements. Thus, several people may "milk" the same story, each for their own source such as UPI, NBC, or CBC. While such moonlighting is certainly not unknown in other broadcast organizations, the proportional scope and intensity of the practice at RTE is unusual as is the sense of priorities exhibited by several of the "milkmen." During the immediate aftermath of the Dublin car bombings, one non-reporter in the newsroom observed that no phone lines or wires were available for official RTE newsgathering because they were tied up by reporters milking the story for their freelance contacts!

RTE management exhibits mixed feelings about milking. Several of the staffers engaged in the practice indicate that the head of news and even the director-general seem to take a degree of pride in the "Irish presence" that such audio and video activity manifests to listeners and viewers around the world. Milking that shows shows itself on "home broadcasts" (foreign transmissions receivable in Ireland), however, is another and much more sensitive matter. Consequently, a reporter told the writer that another "unwritten understanding" had been arrived at in which reporters stringing for such domestically receivable systems as BBC would agree to keep as low a profile as possible and send words rather than audio or visual dispatches in which the RTE man might be recognized. "This policy," the reporter continued, "has cost me about a thousand pounds a year, but on balance, I suppose it's fair."²²

Technical Problems

RTE's corporate and personnel difficulties exist alongside, and as in the case of the "milkmen's" telephone tie-up, are sometimes compounded by technical inadequacies. The head of news points to a severe shortage of telephones in the Republic of Ireland; a shortage that extends to the newsroom where there is an inadequate number of lines, even for official RTE business. This also causes reporters to cover stories largely on an assignment-only basis since there are insufficient means to communicate with "roamers."

The post office's line system is itself a further cause of union problems as well. During the May 1974 general strike in the North, the two-way video link with Belfast was shut down by the strikers. As this is the only telectronic way in which RTE can send or receive visual stories to the outside world (except for recording BBC-Belfast off the air) RTE-TV had virtually no topical external footage. With great resourcefulness and per-

suasiveness, RTE's Eurovision coordinator was able to secure the post office's own one-way line from Belfast to Dublin in order to receive Eurovision (EVN) contributions for the evening news. Unfortunately, this SIS (sound in sync) line is the subject of a dispute between the postal union and RTE. In other European countries it is accepted practice that the television system, as the only potential user of a SIS line, should administer it. Irish postal workers disagree, even though postal officials have decreed otherwise. Thus, as the laboriously arranged line feed began, only the visual part of the transmission reached RTE. A postal technician was systematically stripping sound from the incoming signal, forcing RTE to add its own voice-overs to what was previously sound footage.

Even in the absence of civil disturbances and union disputes, RTE's Belfast links are an inferior method for transmission and reception. For in the Eurovision hook-up, through which European, and now even Middle-Eastern countries may exchange visual news-stories three times daily, Belfast is considered only a technical co-ordinator. BBC Central does not allow its regional services to participate individually in Eurovision as acceptors/suppliers and this fact, combined with the long-standing postal agreement that classified Dublin as a regional branch of the British GPO (General Post Office), doubles the task that RTE's Eurovision coordinator must perform. EVN control in Brussels will book lines as far as London but from there, it is the RTE Coordinator's problem as to how the transmissions get to Belfast and thence to Dublin. In contrast, the capital city of every other European broadcasting system is served by international links directly booked by EVN/Brussels.

Though the problem of Dublin's regional GPO status may not be resolved for some time, RTE does have the potential to alleviate its total, and given the recent history of the North, precarious reliance on the Belfast links. Bangor, in Wales, is just across the Irish Sea from Dublin and has visual links tie-in, via Manchester, with London. Two micro-wave relay stations at Dublin and Bangor would therefore make it possible for RTE to bypass Belfast altogether. There is, in fact, a small micro-wave station already in place above Bangor, and the British GPO pays a Welsh shepherd a small sum to periodically look in on it. But the upgrading of the facility has yet to be accomplished and though the head of news states it is "coming," at least two of his editors maintained that it was one of those items "in the perpetual talking stage."

A final technical difficulty with which RTE news must attempt to cope relates to the gathering and preparation of film.

RTE-TV is gradually becoming colorized with color film/slide capability already in place in 1974. Yet RTE owns the only color film processor in the Republic—a GEVA, which film editors described as very slow and further hobbled by a mass of ventilation, noise, and mechanical problems. Its untrustworthiness has forced RTE to shoot black and white film more often and frequently mandates that non-temporal color stories be sent to London for processing. Portable video tape has been mentioned but that, RTE film people agree, is another item "in the very distant talking stage."

Role Perception

The final limitation to be discussed is not as tangible and easily describable as a broken-down film processor, unreasonable union, or threatening statute. Rather, it is a confusion of role to which all of these other factors may either contribute or help to mask. Various members of RTE news were asked what they perceived to be their prime task: to cover and serve only the people of the Republic, or the entire island including Ulster's six counties.

The view from the top is that the whole of Ireland constitutes not only the prime newsbeat, but also the prime public to be served. The head of news makes it quite clear that "it is one culture, Irish, and deserves RTE's service and concern. If we can't have peace indivisible here, in this small island, where will we have it?"²³ At the operational level, however, this view begins to fragment. One editor responds that "all of Ireland is our beat and all of the populace should be our audience but there are great technical limitations to this. RTE virtually ignored the North up to 1965. Then we tooled up and, between 1965 and 1968, had far better coverage than BBC. Since the start of the trouble, however, BBC and ITN (British commercial television) have increased their people twelve-fold and RTE does a very inadequate job by comparison."²⁴

A colleague editor takes a similarly pragmatic view when he observes that, though RTE's prime news beat is the whole island, and though Northern Ireland has been the organization's chief continuing story since 1968, "our prime news public is the South, simply because our technical reception is better there."²⁵ Perceptions vary more widely below the editor echelon, however, with RTE-TV's anchorman commenting that, "our news beat is the whole island, but certainly our public is the 26 counties (the Republic). The North has no interest in us as a people nor, for current practical purposes, do we in them."²⁶ Finally, a sound man articulates the view of many younger, low echelon news staffers when he says:

We're all conditioned to think of the North as a separate land. In school they draw a big line around it and make it a separate color. Official practice is to cover the whole island but certainly many of us just think of the 26 counties as our home beat and certainly as our audience. They can't get us up there in many cases and really aren't disposed to watch us anyway."²⁷

Clearly, the direction and scope of RTE news needs to be clarified and perhaps balanced with the technical and personnel realities to which the two editors alluded. An RTE reception investigation officer told the writer that, although the system's medium-wave (AM) signals are receivable in most of the North during the day, they provide very inadequate blanketing of this same area during the evening. RTE's FM signals are virtually absent from the North due to the limited strength of its transmitters and the low degree of FM receiver ownership in Ulster. Most significantly, reception investigation has found it is almost impossible to receive RTE-TV in the North without a substantial external antenna—and who in the North wishes to so graphically advertise they are trying to watch programs from the Republic of Ireland?²⁸

For its part, RTE's audience research office had no listener/viewer estimates of its own as to RTE's Ulster consumers. As of mid-1974, their sole documentation was a July 1973 *BBC Audience Research Report* on radio with a self-admitted inaccuracy arising from BBC research workers' understandable reluctance to venture into such Catholic "ghettos" as Bogside, where presumably RTE listenership would be higher. It is interesting to note at this juncture that the RTE audience research office thought reception investigation possessed accurate coverage maps of the North when in actuality their data were only theoretical and lacked field validation. Conversely, reception investigation believed that audience research had developed valid listenership/viewership figures when, in reality, they had nothing whatever on TV viewing in the North and only as much dated and flawed radio data as the BBC was willing to send. Finally, RTE's sales department discounted the whole concept of functionally servicing the North. They have not done, and have no plans to do, any study of their Norther audience, and they do not compute any Ulster listenership or viewership figures in promotional material given to broadcast advertisers feeling that audience cannot influence sales figures or charges one way or the other.

Conclusion

There is thus a major gulf between what the management of RTE News wants (at least as of mid-1974), and what its own

rank and file as well as other branches of the organization see to be as practical and/or desirable. This fragmentation of role perception would be debilitating enough even in a sophisticated and well-organized broadcasting system that did not have to contend with the legal, socio-political, corporate, and technical problems which plague Radio Telefis Eireann. When such role disagreement is added to RTE's mass of functional difficulties, however, the magnitude of the systemic limitations to Irish broadcast journalism is staggering.

There are many talented and dedicated people at RTE: from the reporter/correspondents who risk their lives in Belfast to the Eurovision coordinator who must be so resourceful in maintaining story input and output for RTE television. They, like their experienced and unquestionably dedicated management, work to harvest an acceptable yield from a rocky soil. At bottom they are the often frustrated prisoners of a system that the head of news seems correctly to describe as a "program-oriented rather than news-oriented enterprise. Otherwise gentlemanly, pleasant, and rational people get most adamant about anything news gets and feel that news is trying to take parts of the schedule from them, and like all journalists, use it for some great crusade."²⁹

RTE's systemic limitations make it doubtful that there will soon be any "great crusades" emanating from the news division. Perhaps the division's greatest crusade is in managing even to operate as the only purveyor of broadcast news to most of the people of the Republic of Ireland.

Notes

¹ Interview with Louis McRedmond, RTE head of information and publications, May 17, 1974.

² *Broadcasting Authority Act*, Section 18, 1960, no. 10 (Dublin: Stationary Office).

³ Leon O'Broin, "The Dismissal of the Irish Broadcasting Authority," *E. B. U. Review*, 24:24 (March 1973).

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 25-26.

⁵ Interview with Jim McGuinness, RTE head of news, May 20, 1974.

⁶ Broadcasting Review Committee. *Report 1974* (Dublin: Stationary Office), p. 5.

⁷ Interview with Michael Burns, RTE news editor, May 23, 1974.

⁸ Broadcasting Review Committee, *Report 1974*, chapter 15.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ Jim McGuinness, internal memo circulated to RTE news staff, May 16, 1974 (and published by *The Irish Times*).

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*

- ¹³ Interview with Michael Burns, May 23, 1974.
- ¹⁴ Interview with Michael Murphy, RTE anchorman, May 23, 1974.
- ¹⁵ Interview with Louis McRedmond, May 23, 1974.
- ¹⁶ Interview with an Irish-language deskman (name withheld by request), May 24, 1974.
- ¹⁷ Interview with RTE editor of the day (name and date withheld by request).
- ¹⁸ Interview with Louis McRedmon, May 23, 1974.
- ¹⁹ Interview with Michael Murphy, May 23, 1974.
- ²⁰ Interview with Jim McGuinness, May 23, 1974.
- ²¹ Ibid.
- ²² Interview with an RTE reporter/correspondent (name withheld by request), May 22, 1974.
- ²³ Interview with Jim McGuinness, May 23, 1974.
- ²⁴ Interview with Michael Burns, May 23, 1974.
- ²⁵ Interview with Rory O'Connor, RTE news editor, May 23, 1974.
- ²⁶ Interview with Michael Murphy, May 22, 1974.
- ²⁷ Interview with an RTE soundman (name withheld by request), May 23, 1974.
- ²⁸ Interview with Eddie Joynt, RTE reception investigation officer, May 22, 1974.
- ²⁹ Interview with Jim McGuinness, May 23, 1974.

Books in Brief (Part 2)

THE MEDIA AND THE LAW. Edited by Howard Simons and Joseph A. Califano, Jr. New York: Praeger, 1976. 225 pp. \$15.00/4.95. Presents the case studies examined at the 1975 Washington Conference on Media and the Law which was sponsored by the *Washington Post* and the Ford Foundation. Commentary and discussion by the conference members are provided.

GETTING THE MESSAGE ACROSS: AN INQUIRY INTO SUCCESSES AND FAILURES OF CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION IN THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD. Edited by UNESCO. New York: UNIPUB, 1976. 214 pp. \$6.95 (paper). A collection of 8 papers discussing communication from a variety of positions. The papers were presented at two meetings held by UNESCO in collaboration with the International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies and the International Social Science Council.