

Index Continued

	Page
VII. THE HARTFORD TRIAL ESTABLISHES THAT SUBSCRIPTION TELEVISION WOULD RESULT IN AN INCREASE IN ECONOMIC AND PROGRAM RESOURCES WHICH WOULD FACILITATE SIGNIFICANT INCREASES IN THE NUMBER OF TELEVISION SERVICES AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC UNDER THE PRESENT SYSTEM	23
A. Business Projections Based on Hartford Trial Experience	25
B. Conclusions Which May Be Drawn From Business Projections	35
VIII. THE HARTFORD TRIAL DEMONSTRATES THAT SUBSCRIPTION TELEVISION WOULD NOT IMPAIR THE CAPACITY OF THE PRESENT SYSTEM TO CONTINUE TO PROVIDE ADVERTISING-FINANCED PROGRAMMING	36
A. Audience Siphoning Would Be <i>De Minimis</i>	36
B. Subscription Television Would Not Pre-empt Any Significant Amount of Time Now Utilized By Advertising Sponsors	38
C. The Type of Box-Office Programming Shown During the Hartford Trial Demonstrates That Subscription Television Will Not Siphon Talent and Existing Programs From Conventional Television	42
IX. THE HARTFORD TRIAL HAS DEMONSTRATED THAT SUBSCRIPTION TELEVISION WILL RECEIVE SUFFICIENT PATRONAGE FROM THE PUBLIC TO MAKE IT AN ECONOMICALLY VIABLE BUSINESS	48
X. MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES CLARIFIED BY THE HARTFORD TRIAL	50
A. The Modus Operandi of Subscription Television and Methods to be Employed	50
B. Technical Performance	52
C. The Role of the Participating Broadcast Station Licensee	54
D. The Hartford Trial Has Established That There Are No Inherent Monopolistic Features Arising From Subscription Operations	55
XI. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INTEREST CONSIDERATIONS	58