

a nation the programs of which it was deprived? And how will it protect them from further deprivations?

56. And by what standards can the Commission so patronizingly assume that the lowest income group has "ample" amounts of free TV programming, while at the same time urge that the free service is not "ample" enough for the wealthier citizens? Does the Commission assert one standard of programming for the wealthy and a lesser standard for the poor?²² Is the Commission so satisfied with the quantity of free TV programming that it can conclude, even in cities with five or more stations, that the loss of one station's potential programming is a desired or non-harmful result? This patronizing attitude hardly commends itself as a standard which the Commission should follow.

57. And it is, of course, incredible for the Committee to assert that these persons "will not be deprived of anything." Of course they will be deprived of something — the free programming which the station would have presented had it not been given the opportunity of directly charging the public for the use of the public's own airways.

58. The Committee's final attempt to rationalize its disregard of a third of a nation is reflected in the Committee's attempted analogy to the color TV. The Committee argues that (Par. 75):

The same economic difference presently exists with regard to color TV. Many in the country who desire color sets with large screens cannot afford them.

The analogy is totally false. It is quite true that economic differences allow the wealthy to purchase color sets and deny the poor the same opportunity. But the ability of the wealthy to receive color sets can

²² Is the Commission urging in the Orwellian sense that: "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others"?