

1. To what extent would the public pay for programs?
2. Does the service represent a potential for programming which is not otherwise available on free television?
3. What would be the impact of the service on free television?

Stated otherwise: Will it work? What will it provide? And at what cost to the public?

In requesting a nationwide authorization, the Pay-TV proponents⁷ have consciously interwoven what occurred in Hartford with excuses for what did not occur, relying upon the excuses to justify failures and the failures to justify speculation as to what would occur in the context of a nationwide authorization.

A test can lead to valid conclusions only to the extent that those conclusions reflect the facts developed during the course of the test. Conclusions as to what might have occurred if things had been different are essentially conjectures.

As will become evident hereinafter, the conclusions that flow from Hartford are not the conclusions suggested by the proponents. There were so few subscribers as to make the test virtually valueless. Pay-TV was a failure in Hartford in much the same way that it has failed wherever it has been tried. It did not provide programming which reasonably could be described as a supplement to free television. The programming that was presented did not attract an audience. The Commission, consequently, knows as little now concerning the effect of Pay-TV on free TV as it did in 1955, unless it assumes that Pay-TV will continue to present the same unsuccessful programming and attract the same size audience in the future.

⁷ Joint Comments of Zenith Radio Corporation and Teco, Inc. in Support of Petition for Nation-Wide Authorization of Subscription Television (dated March 10, 1965).