

entertainment which will not cost 25 cents or cost \$750, but will have cartridges which would fit into this box and you could then play any film that you want to play on your television set instead of free entertainment.

Why is this not against the public interest? I think the public interest in a free country like ours is to select the entertainment. I think in a capitalistic country like ours it is only the box office that will really prove what people want to see and not those free things which I personally don't believe.

For instance, it is also very obvious that the quality of entertainment will immediately become a thousandfold better. I would like you gentlemen to consider the following:

If an advertiser pays for a show he pays with advertising dollars. In other words, he can only take a very small portion of the money that he has for this advertising because otherwise he has no money to produce the goods, he has no profits from cigarettes or whisky or automobiles.

But if, for instance, a young producer would say, "I would like to produce a terrific production of Shakespeare," he would get the greatest actors from all over the world to do Hamlet, this would not cost more than about \$750,000. Let us say with time charges and so forth, a million dollars.

It would take only 4 million people to pay 25 cents to get this initial investment back and then you could play it over and over. Don't you believe that 4 million people in the United States, whatever the Hartford test says, would like to see a really great production of Hamlet?

If you today read the television columns you will see that any show that doesn't have at least 12 million viewers is being canceled. Why?

Because the advertiser cannot give away something to 4 million people. He needs to get 20, 30, 40 million people. Otherwise he has to throw out this show.

And you cannot find really high-class entertainment for that many people because they are different interests. There are people in the United States who want to see ballets. There will be more people if you show them ballets, if it is not restricted to New York, Chicago, and San Francisco.

There will be people who will want to see symphony orchestras and listen to them. If we are so concerned about the poor people—I think this is hypocrisy—if people are concerned why don't they give away food to hungry people instead of entertainment. It should come first.

Why don't the advertisers give away something to eat? Why do they give away those terrible shows?

And the networks have proven in 20 years of network programming that they cannot compete with old films that we made 20 years ago, 15 years ago. Our films are now, according to their own ratings, what makes people turn on television and what makes the advertisers pay.

Otherwise they could not. The network shows all followed. So, where is the proof that our culture has been improved during these 20 years through television? The opposite is true.

Furthermore, I believe that the people will pay. They will be happy to pay 25 cents for a show that otherwise, if they went to New York, would cost \$10 or \$12 a seat. And the whole family could see it on television.