Internet and Telecommunication Regulation

Internet and Telecommunication Regulation

Stuart Minor Benjamin
Douglas B. Maggs Professor of Law
Duke University School of Law

James B. Speta
Professor of Law
Northwestern University Pritzker School of Law

Carolina Academic Press
Durham, North Carolina

ISBN 978-1-5310-1090-4
eISBN 978-1-5310-1091-1
LCCN 2018956947

Carolina Academic Press, LLC
700 Kent Street
Durham, North Carolina 27701
Telephone (919) 489-7486
Fax (919) 493-5668
www.cap-press.com

Printed in the United States of America

For Arti, Sophia, Anna, Denise, Mason, and Cameron

Contents

Table of Materials xvii
Copyright Permissions xxv
Preface xxvii

Introductory Materials

Chapter One · Introduction to Internet and Telecommunications Regulation 3
§1.A. Telecommunications as a "Regulated Industry" 5
§1.A.1. Justifications for Regulation 6
§1.A.1.a. Market Failure Justifications 7
§1.A.1.b. Additional Justifications 13
§1.A.2. Basic Regulatory Tools 14
§1.A.3. The Challenges of Regulation 17
§1.B. A Policy Analysis Framework 20

Chapter Two · Telecommunications Policy in Institutional Perspective 21
Introduction 21
§2.A. The Institutional Dimensions of Telecommunications Policy 22
§2.B. The Federal Communications Commission 24
§2.C. Regulatory Integration under the 1934 Act 26
§2.D. Institutional Structure and the FCC 28
§2.E. The FCC in a Functional Perspective 30
§2.E.1. Command and Control 30
§2.E.2. Rulemaking versus Adjudication 31
§2.E.3. Licensing 34
§2.E.4. Norm Entrepreneur 35
§2.E.5. Standard Setting 36
§2.F. The Statutory and Broader Institutional Context 38
§2.F.1. The Structure of the 1934 Act 38
§2.F.2. Other Relevant Statutes and Agencies 40
§2.F.3. FCC Discretion and Its Constraints 41
§2.G. Internet Regulators 44

Part One
Spectrum

Chapter Three · Regulating the Spectrum 47
Introduction 47
§3.A. Defining Spectrum 48
§3.A.1. Characteristics of Radio Waves 48
§3.A.2. Transmitting Through the Air 50
§3.A.3. Transmitting Using Wires 51
§3.A.4. Signal Modulation 52
§3.A.5. Newer Wireless Technologies 54
§3.A.6. The Spectrum as a Resource 57
§3.B. A Brief History of Early Spectrum Regulation 58
§3.C. Rationales for Regulation 63
§3.C.1. Scarcity/Interference 64
Why Not Use the Pricing System in the Broadcast Industry? 68
§3.C.2. Consumer Preferences 72
§3.D. An Overview of Spectrum Management 75
§3.E. Regulatory Tradeoffs and Allotment 76

Chapter Four · Zoning the Spectrum 79
Introduction 79
§4.A. Models of Spectrum Control 79
Spectrum Policy Task Force Report 81
§4.B. Implementing Flexibility 90
Redevelopment of Spectrum to Encourage Innovation in the Use of New Telecommunications Technologies 92
§4.C. Dedicating Spectrum to Unlicensed Uses 104
Some Economics of Wireless Communications 104
§4.D. Approaches to Unlicensed Access 112
§4.D.1. White Spaces 112
Unlicensed Operation in the TV Broadcast Bands and Additional Spectrum for Unlicensed Devices below 900 MHz and in the 3 GHz Band 113
§4.D.2. Spectrum Sharing 122
Realizing the Full Potential of Government-Held Spectrum to Spur Economic Growth 124
Amendment of the Commission's Rules with Regard to Commercial Operations in the 3550–3650 MHz Band 128
§4.E. Spectrum Leasing and Private Commons 135
Promoting Efficient Use of Spectrum Through Elimination of Barriers to the Development of Secondary Markets 137

Chapter Five · Structuring and Assigning Licenses 143
Introduction 143
§5.A. License Renewal and Transfer 144

§5.A.1. License Renewal 144
§5.A.1.a. Early History 145
§5.A.1.a.1. The *Shuler* Case 146
§5.A.1.a.2. The *Brinkley* Case 147
§5.A.1.a.3. The Judicial Response 148
§5.A.1.b. More Recent Developments 149
§ 5.A.2. License Transfer 153
§5.A.2.a. Format Changes 155
Changes in the Entertainment Formats of Broadcast Stations 156
§5.A.2.b. A Reversal, and a Reversal of That Reversal 157
FCC v. WNCN Listeners Guild 158
§ 5.B. License Assignment via Merit-Based Hearings 160
§5.B.1. Comparative Hearings 161
§ 5.B.1.a. Basic Comparative Hearing Criteria 162
Policy Statement on Comparative Broadcast Hearings 163
§5.B.2. Licensing Case Study 168
Applications of Simon Geller for Renewal of License of WVCA-FM and Grandbanke Corporation for Construction Permit 168
§5.B.3. Special Considerations for Racial Minorities and Women 173
§5.B.3.a. Minority Preferences before *Adarand* 174
Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC 174
§5.B.3.b. Preferences for Women 181
§5.B.3.c. *Adarand* (*Metro Broadcasting* Overruled) 181
§5.B.3.d. Equal Employment Opportunity Regulations 184
Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod v. FCC 184
§5.C. Transition to Assignment via Auctions 189
§5.C.1. Reform of the Licensing Process 190
Formulation of Policies and Rules Relating to Broadcast Renewal Applicants, Competing Applicants, and Other Participants to the Comparative Renewal Process and to the Prevention of Abuses of the Renewal Process 190
§5.C.2. Lotteries and Auctions 193
Using Auctions to Select FCC Licensees 194
§5.C.3. Initial Assignment by Auction 200
Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act—Competitive Bidding for Commercial Broadcast and Instructional Television Fixed Service Licenses 201

Part Two

Regulating Monopoly —The Case of Telephony

Chapter Six · Early Telephone Regulation Through Divestiture 217
Introduction 217
§ 6.A. Telephone History 218
§ 6.B. Infrastructure 224

§ 6.B.1. Telephone System Vocabulary 224
§ 6.B.2. Telephone Economics 225
§ 6.C. Telephone Regulation 227
§ 6.C.1. Categories of Regulation 227
§ 6.C.2. Who Regulates 228
§ 6.D. Precursors to Divestiture 230
§ 6.D.1. Competition in CPE 231
Federal Telecommunications Law 231
§ 6.D.2. Competition in Long Distance Telephony 234
§ 6.D.3. Communications and Computer Convergence 235
§ 6.E. Breaking Up Bell: The 1984 Divestiture 237
§ 6.E.1. The MFJ 238
United States v. American Telephone & Telegraph Co. 238
§ 6.E.2. Discussion of the Government's Theory 245

Chapter Seven · Control of Telephone Monopolies 253
Introduction 253
§ 7.A. Rate Regulation 253
§ 7.A.1. Rate of Return Regulation 254
§ 7.A.2. Price Cap Regulation 256
§ 7.A.3. Rate Regulation as Markets Become Competitive 257
§ 7.B. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 259
§ 7.B.1. The Local Competition Provisions 261
Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 262
§ 7.B.2. Jurisdiction to Implement the 1996 Act: Local Competition, National Regulation 269
United States Telecom Ass'n v. FCC [*USTA II*] 272
§ 7.C. Unbundling, Interconnection, and Line-of-Business Regulation under the 1996 Act 274
§ 7.C.1. Identifying UNEs 274
§ 7.C.1.a. Iowa Utilities Board 274
AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Board 274
§ 7.C.1.b. After Iowa Utilities Board 279
United States Telecom Ass'n v. FCC [*USTA II*] 282
§ 7.C.1.c. FCC Response to USTA II 289
Unbundled Access to Network Elements: Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers 289
§ 7.C.2. Pricing Network Elements 292
Verizon Communications Inc.v. FCC 295
§ 7.C.3. Interconnection 305
§ 7.C.4. BOC Line of Business Restrictions 309

Part Three
Multichannel Video and Broadcasting

Chapter Eight · Multichannel Video Foundations 313
Introduction 313
§ 8.A. Paying for Television 313
Why Not Use the Pricing System in the Broadcast Industry? 316
§ 8.B. Why Regulate? Are There Natural Monopolies? 318
§ 8.C. Why Regulate? Implications for Broadcast 320
The Deregulation of Cable Television 321
Establishment of Rules and Policies for the Digital Audio Radio Satellite Service in the 2310–2360 MHz Frequency Band 330
§ 8.D. Who Regulates Cable Television? 334
§ 8.E. Promoting Competition in MVPD Markets 340
Alliance for Community Media v. FCC 341

Chapter Nine · Shared Content 351
Introduction 351
§ 9.A. Individual Programs 352
§ 9.A.1. Compulsory Copyright Licenses 352
§ 9.A.1.a. Cable Television 352
§ 9.A.1.b. Direct Broadcast Satellite 355
§ 9.A.2. What Constitutes a Performance under Copyright Law? 359
American Broadcasting Companies, Inc. v. Aereo, Inc. 359
§ 9.A.3. Syndicated Exclusivity and Network Nonduplication 369
§ 9.B. Programs Grouped into Signals 372
§ 9.B.1. Retransmission Consent 372
Amendment of the Commission's Rules Related to Retransmission Consent (2011) 374
Amendment of the Commission's Rules Related to Retransmission Consent (2014) 381
§ 9.B.2. Must-Carry 385
§ 9.B.2.a. First Amendment Challenges to Cable Must-Carry 386
Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC [*Turner I*] 386
Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC [*Turner II*] 398
§ 9.B.2.b. DBS Carry One, Carry All 411
§ 9.C. Challenging "Channels" 415
§ 9.C.1. Requiring MVPD Programming to Be Delivered à la Carte 416
§ 9.C.2. Redefining Multichannel Video Program Distributors 417
Promoting Innovation and Competition in the Provision of Multichannel Video Programming Distribution Services 418

Part Four
Antitrust and Structural Regulation of Media

Chapter Ten · Structural Regulation of Content Distribution and Production 431
Introduction 431
§ 10.A. Structural Regulation of Broadcasting 432
§ 10.A.1. Television Networks and Vertical Integration 432
Schurz Communications, Inc. v. FCC 434
§ 10.A.2. Ownership Restrictions 444
Prometheus Radio Project v. FCC [*Prometheus I*] 448
2006 Quadrennial Regulatory Review — Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 465
§ 10.B. Structural Regulation of Cable Providers 475
§ 10.B.1. Judicial Review of the FCC's Cable Ownership Rules 476
Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC [*Time Warner II*] 477
Comcast Corp. v. FCC 486
§ 10.C. Regulation of Vertical Foreclosure by MVPDs 490
§ 10.C.1. The Initial Program Access Rules 491
§ 10.C.2. Extensions of the Program Access Rules 492
§ 10.C.3. Expansion of the Program Access Theory 495
§ 10.C.3.a. Extension of the Program Access Rules to DirecTV 495
General Motors Corp. and Hughes Electronics Corp., Transferors, and the News Corp. Ltd, Transferee, for Authority to Transfer Control 495
§ 10.C.3.b. MVPD Access to Buildings 502
National Cable & Telecommunications Ass'n v. FCC 502
§ 10.C.3.c. Extension of the Program Access Rules to Terrestrially Distributed Programming 507
Review of the Commission's Program Access Rules and Examination of Programming Tying Arrangements 507
Cablevision Systems Corp. v. FCC 518
§ 10.C.3.d. Extension to Online Video Distribution 524
Applications of Comcast Corp., General Electric Co. and NBC Universal, Inc. for Consent to Assign Licenses and Transfer Control of Licensees 524
§ 10.D. MVPD Non-Discrimination Obligations 529
Comcast Cable Communications v. FCC 530
§ 10.E. Spectrum Caps 537
Policies Regarding Mobile Spectrum Holdings: Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions 538
§ 10.F. Choice 555
§ 10.F.1. Is More Always Better? 555
The First Amendment in Cyberspace 555

Bad News 562
§ 10.F.2. What Could the FCC Do About It? 571
The Information Needs of Communities: The Changing Media Landscape in a Broadband Age 572

Chapter Eleven · Antitrust and Merger Review 577
Introduction 577
§ 11.A. Merger Enforcement and Communications Regulation 578
§ 11.A.1. Background on Merger Policy 579
Applications of Comcast Corp., General Electric Co., and NBC Universal, Inc. for Consent To Assign Licenses and Transfer Control of Licensees 580
§ 11.A.2. The SBC/Ameritech Proceeding 582
Applications of Ameritech Corp., Transferor, and SBC Communications, Inc., Transferee, for Consent to Transfer Control of Corps. Holding Commission Licenses and Lines Pursuant to Sections 214 and 310(d) of the Communications Act and Parts 5, 22, 24, 25, 63 583
Applications of Ameritech Corp., Transferor, and SBC Communications, Inc., Transferee, for Consent to Transfer Control of Corps. Holding Commission Licenses and Lines Pursuant to Sections 214 and 310(d) of the Communications Act and Parts 5, 22, 24, 25, 63 587
Applications of Charter Communications, Inc., Time Warner Cable Inc., and Advance/Newhouse Partnership for Consent to Assign or Transfer Control of Licenses and Authorizations 592
§ 11.A.3. Reconsidering the FCC's Merger Review Process 597
§ 11.A.4. The FCC's Own Institutional Reforms 597
§ 11.A.5. The Elusive Effort to Restrict the Scope of FCC Merger Review 600
Statement of the Department of Justice Antitrust Division on Its Decision to Close Its Investigation of XM Satellite Radio Holdings Inc.'s Merger with Sirius Satellite Radio Inc. 600
Commission Approves Transaction between Sirius Satellite Radio Holdings Inc. and XM Satellite Radio Holdings, Inc. Subject to Conditions 604
§ 11.A.6. The Comcast/NBCU Proceeding 606
Applications of Comcast Corp., General Electric Co. and NBC Universal, Inc. for Consent to Assign Licenses and Transfer Control of Licensees 606
§ 11.A.7. AT&T/Time Warner 620
United States v. AT&T 620
§ 11.B. Antitrust in a Regulatory Thicket 633
Verizon Communications Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP 633
§ 11.C. Is the Internet Special? 638
Google/Double Click 639

Part Five
The Internet

Chapter Twelve · Introduction and Evolution 645
§ 12.A. The History and Architecture of the Internet 645
§ 12.A.1. Basic Characteristics 647
§ 12.A.2. Network Elements 649
§ 12.A.3. Packet Switching and Addressing 651
§ 12.A.4. Services 653
§ 12.A.5. Layers 654
§ 12.B. Initial Principles of Internet Policy 654
A Framework for Global Electronic Commerce 656
Communiqué on Principles for Internet Policy-Making 659
NTIA Announces Intent to Transition Key Internet Domain Name Functions 661

Chapter Thirteen · Universal Service: From Telephony to Broadband 665
§ 13.A. Origins of Universal Service Policy 665
§ 13.B. Equity and Efficiency in Subsidizing Universal Service: Ramsey Pricing versus Distributional Policy 667
§ 13.C. Universal Service after Divestiture 670
§ 13.D. Universal Service after the 1996 Act 672
§ 13.D.1. Access Charge Reform 673
§ 13.D.2. Intercarrier Compensation Reform 674
In re FCC 11-161 674
§ 13.E. Broadband Universal Service 684
FCC, National Broadband Plan 685
In re FCC 11-161 687
§ 13.F. A New Blank Slate: The IP Transition 700
Technology Transitions 701

Chapter Fourteen · Regulating Broadband Networks 709
Introduction 709
§ 14.A. The Ancillary Jurisdiction Doctrine and the Past as Prologue? 710
United States v. Southwestern Cable Co. 711
FCC v. Midwest Video Corp. [*Midwest Video II*] 714
§ 14.B. Regulatory Characterization of Broadband Services 719
AT&T Corp. v. City of Portland 720
National Cable & Telecommunications Ass'n v. Brand X Internet Services 724
§ 14.C. Net Neutrality 740
§ 14.C.1. Net Neutrality Policy (and Jurisdiction, Again) 741
Appropriate Framework for Broadband Access to the Internet Over Wireline Facilities 741
Service Rules for the 698–746, 747–762 & 777–792 MHz Bands 743

Comcast Corp. v. FCC 751
Verizon v. FCC 756
Protecting and Promoting the Open Internet 770
United States Telecom Ass'n v. FCC (2016) 795
United States Telecom Ass'n v. FCC (2017) 808
Restoring Internet Freedom 816

Chapter 15 · Internet Platform Regulation 845
Introduction 845
§ 15.A. Internet Copyright Regulation 846
Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd. 847
Viacom International, Inc. v. YouTube, Inc. 859
§ 15.B. More General Protection for Intermediaries of User-Generated Content: "Section 230" 867
Zeran v. America Online, Inc. 868
Fair Housing Council of San Fernando Valley v. Roommates.com, LLC 874
Doe v. Backpage.com 881
§ 15.C. Are Platforms Public Utilities? 887
Kinderstart.com LLC v. Google, Inc. 887
Google Search (Shopping) 895
§ 15.D. Privacy Regulation 903
§ 15.D.1. Communications Act Privacy 904
Protecting the Privacy of Customers of Broadband and Other Telecommunications Services 904
§ 15.D.2. FTC Privacy Supervision 916
In the Matter of Snapchat, Inc. 916
Protecting Consumer Privacy in an Era of Rapid Change: Recommendations for Businesses and Policymakers 921
§ 15.D.3 FTC v. FCC Jurisdiction 923
FTC v. AT&T Mobility LLC 923

Part Six
Direct Regulation of Content

Chapter Sixteen · Direct Regulation of Content Deemed Valuable 933
Introduction 933
§ 16.A. The Fairness Doctrine and Related Obligations 934
§ 16.A.1. *Tornillo* and *Red Lion* 934
Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo 934
Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. FCC 936
§ 16.A.2. The FCC Abandons the Fairness Doctrine 945
§ 16.A.2.a. The Fairness Doctrine Report 945
Inquiry into the Commission's Rules and Regulations Concerning the General Fairness Doctrine Obligations of Broadcast Licensees 945
§ 16.A.2.b. *Syracuse Peace Council* 954

§ 16.A.3. The Personal Attack and Political Editorial Rules 958
§ 16.A.4. Political Broadcasting 961
Request of ABC, Inc. for Declaratory Ruling 962
§ 16.A.5. The Scarcity Rationale in Other Media 973
Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC (1996) 974
Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC (1997) 976
§ 16.B. Children's Television 980
Children's Television Programming and Advertising Practices 981
Policies and Rules Concerning Children's Television Programming (1991) 987
Policies and Rules Concerning Children's Television Programming (1996) 989

Chapter Seventeen · Direct Regulation of Content Deemed Harmful 1007
Introduction 1007
§ 17.A. Indecency 1008
§ 17.A.1. Regulation of Broadcast Indecency 1008
FCC v. Pacifica Foundation 1008
Action for Children's Television v. FCC [*ACT III*] 1020
Complaints Against Various Broadcast Licensees Regarding Their Airing of the "Golden Globe Awards" Program 1036
FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc. (2009) 1040
FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc. (2012) 1051
§ 17.A.2. Regulation of Cable Indecency 1055
§ 17.A.2.a. Denver Area 1057
Denver Area Educational Telecommunications Consortium, Inc. v. FCC 1057
§ 17.A.2.b. Playboy Entertainment 1075
United States v. Playboy Entertainment Group, Inc. 1076
§ 17.A.3. Regulation of Indecency via Telephone 1089
Sable Communications of California, Inc. v. FCC 1090
Regulations Concerning Indecent Communications by Telephone 1095
§ 17.A.4. Regulation of Internet Indecency 1098
Reno v. ACLU 1099
Ashcroft v. ACLU [*Ashcroft II*] 1108
ACLU v. Mukasey 1116
§ 17.B. Violent Programming 1126
Violent Television Programming and Its Impact on Children 1130

Statutory Appendix 1143
Conceptual Index and Glossary 1229

Table of Materials

2006 Quadrennial Regulatory Review—Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Report and Order and Order on Reconsideration, 23 FCC Rcd. 2010 (2008), 465

ACLU v. Mukasey, 534 F.3d 181 (3d Cir. 2008), 1116

ACLU, *see also* Ashcroft v. ACLU *and* Reno v. ACLU

Action for Children's Television v. FCC [*ACT III*], 58 F.3d 654 (D.C. Cir. 1995) (en banc), 1020

Advance/Newhouse Partnership, *see* Applications of Charter Communications, Inc.

Aereo, Inc., *see* American Broadcasting Companies, Inc. v. Aereo, Inc.

Alliance for Community Media v. FCC, 529 F.3d 763 (6th Cir. 2008), 341

Amendment of the Commission's Rules Related to Retransmission Consent, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 26 FCC Rcd. 2718 (2011), 374

Amendment of the Commission's Rules Related to Retransmission Consent, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 29 FCC Rcd. 3351 (2014), 381

Amendment of the Commission's Rules with Regard to Commercial Operations in the 3550–3650 MHz Band, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order, 27 FCC Rcd. 15,594 (2012), 128

America Online, Inc., *see* Zeran v. America Online, Inc.

American Broadcasting Companies, Inc. v. Aereo, Inc., 134 S. Ct. 2498 (2014), 359

American Telephone & Telegraph Co., *see* United States v. American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Ameritech Corp., *see* Applications of Ameritech Corp.

Applications of Ameritech Corp., Transferor, and SBC Communications, Inc., Transferee, for Consent to Transfer Control of Corps. Holding Commission Licenses and Lines Pursuant to Sections 214 and 310(d) of the Communications Act and Parts 5, 22, 24, 25, 63, 90, 95 and 101 of the Commission's Rules, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 14 FCC Rcd. 14,712 (1999), 583

Separate Statement of Commissioner Harold Furchtgott-Roth Concurring in Part, Dissenting in Part, 14 FCC Rcd. 14,712, 15,174 (1999), 587

Applications of Charter Communications, Inc., Time Warner Cable Inc., and Advance/Newhouse Partnership for Consent to Assign or Transfer Control of Licenses and Authorizations, Dissenting Statement of Commissioner Ajit Pai, 31 FCC Rcd. 6327, 6666 (2016), 592
ABC, Inc., *see* Request of ABC, Inc. for Declaratory Ruling
Applications of Comcast Corp., General Electric Co. and NBC Universal, Inc. for Consent to Assign Licenses and Transfer Control of Licensees, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 26 FCC Rcd. 4238 (2011), 524, 580, 606
Applications of Simon Geller for Renewal of License of WVCA-FM and Grandbanke Corporation for Construction Permit, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 102 F.C.C. 2d 1443 (1985), 168
Appropriate Framework for Broadband Access to the Internet Over Wireline Facilities, Policy Statement, 20 FCC Rcd. 14,986 (2005), 741
Ashcroft v. ACLU [*Ashcroft I*], 535 U.S. 564 (2002), 1106
Ashcroft v. ACLU [*Ashcroft II*], 542 U.S. 656 (2004), 1108
AT&T Corp. v. City of Portland, 216 F.3d 871 (9th Cir. 2000), 720
AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Board, 525 U.S. 366 (1999), 274
AT&T, *see also* United States v. AT&T
AT&T Mobility LLC, *see* FTC v. AT&T Mobility LLC
Backpage.com, *see* Doe v. Backpage.com
Benkler, Some Economics of Wireless Communications, 16 Harv. J.L. & Tech. 25 (2002), 104
Besen and Crandall, The Deregulation of Cable Television, 44 L. & Contemp. Probs. 77 (1981), 321
Brand X Internet Services, *see* National Cable & Telecommunications Ass'n v. Brand X Internet Services
Broadband Access, *see* Appropriate Framework for Broadband Access
Broadcast Ownership Rules, *see* 2006 Quadrennial Regulatory Review
Broadcast Renewal Applicants, *see* Formulation of Policies and Rules Relating to Broadcast Renewal Applicants
Broadcast Stations, *see* Changes in the Entertainment Formats of Broadcast Stations
Cablevision Systems Corp. v. FCC, 649 F.3d 695 (D.C. Cir. 2011), 518
Changes in the Entertainment Formats of Broadcast Stations, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 60 F.C.C. 2d 858 (1976), 156
Charter Communications, Inc., *see* Applications of Charter Communications, Inc.
Children's Television Programming and Advertising Practices, Report and Order, 96 F.C.C. 2d 634 (1984), 981
Children's Television Programming, *see also* Policies and Rules Concerning Children's Television Programming *and* Violent Television Programming
City of Portland, *see* AT&T Corp v. City of Portland
Coase, Why Not Use the Pricing System in the Broadcast Industry? Testimony before the FCC, December 1959, *reprinted in* 4 Study of Radio & Television Network Broadcasting, 68, 316

Comcast Cable Communications v. FCC, 717 F.3d 982 (D.C. Cir. 2013), 530
Comcast Corp. v. FCC, 579 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2009), 486
Comcast Corp. v. FCC, 600 F.3d 642 (D.C. Cir. 2010), 751
Comcast Corp., *see also* Applications of Comcast Corp.
Commercial Operations in the 3550–3650 MHz Band, *see* Amendment of the Commission's Rules with Regard to Commercial Operations in the 3550–3650 MHz Band
Commercial Broadcast and Instructional Television Fixed Service, *see* Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act
Commission Approves Transaction between Sirius Satellite Radio Holdings Inc. and XM Satellite Radio Holdings, Inc. Subject to Conditions, Press Release, FCC (July 28, 2008), 2008 WL 2902112, 604
Communiqué on Principles for Internet Policy-Making, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], OECD High Level Meeting on the Internet Economy: Generating Innovation and Growth (2011), 659
Comparative Broadcast Hearings, *see* Policy Statement on Comparative Broadcast Hearings
Competing Applicants, *see* Formulation of Policies and Rules Relating to Broadcast Renewal Applicants
Competitive Bidding, *see* Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act
Complaints Against Various Broadcast Licensees Regarding Their Airing of the "Golden Globe Awards" Program, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 19 FCC Rcd. 4975 (2004), 1036
Consumer Privacy, *see* Protecting Consumer Privacy in an Era of Rapid Change
Customers of Broadband and Other Telecommunications Services, *see* Protecting the Privacy of Customers of Broadband and Other Telecommunications Services
Denver Area Educational Telecommunications Consortium, Inc. v. FCC, 518 U.S. 727 (1996), 1057
Digital Audio Radio Satellite Service, *see* Establishment of Rules and Policies for the Digital Audio Radio Satellite Service
Doe v. Backpage.com, 817 F.3d 12 (1st Cir. 2016), 881
Double Click, *see* Google/Double Click
Efficient Use of Spectrum, *see* Promoting Efficient Use of Spectrum
Electronic Commerce, *see* Framework for Global Electronic Commerce
Entertainment Formats, *see* Changes in the Entertainment Formats of Broadcast Stations
Establishment of Rules and Policies for the Digital Audio Radio Satellite Service in the 2310–2360 MHz Frequency Band, Report and Order, Memorandum Opinion and Order, and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 12 FCC Rcd. 5754 (1997), 330
Fair Housing Council of San Fernando Valley v. Roommates.com, LLC, 521 F.3d 1157 (9th Cir. 2008) (en banc), 874
Fairness Doctrine, *see* Inquiry into the Commission's Rules and Regulations Concerning the General Fairness Doctrine Obligations of Broadcast Licensees

FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc., 556 U.S. 502 (2009), 1040
FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc., 567 U.S. 239 (2012), 1051
FCC v. Midwest Video Corp. [*Midwest Video II*], 440 U.S. 689 (1979), 714
FCC v. Pacifica Foundation, 438 U.S. 726 (1978), 1008
FCC v. WNCN Listeners Guild, 450 U.S. 582 (1981), 158
FCC, *see also* Action for Children's Television v. FCC, Alliance for Community Media v. FCC, Cablevision Systems Corp. v. FCC, Comcast Cable Communications v. FCC, Comcast Corp. v. FCC, Denver Area Educational Telecommunications Consortium, Inc. v. FCC, In re FCC 11-161, Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod v. FCC, Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC, National Cable & Telecommunications Ass'n v. FCC, Prometheus Radio Project v. FCC, Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. FCC, Sable Communications of California, Inc. v. FCC, Schurz Communications, Inc. v. FCC, Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC, Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC, United States Telecom Ass'n v. FCC, Verizon Communications Inc. v. FCC, Verizon v. FCC
Formulation of Policies and Rules Relating to Broadcast Renewal Applicants, Competing Applicants, and Other Participants to the Comparative Renewal Process and to the Prevention of Abuses of the Renewal Process, First Report and Order, 4 FCC Rcd. 4780 (1989), 190
Fox Television Stations, Inc., *see* FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc.
Framework for Global Electronic Commerce, A (1997), 656
FTC v. AT&T Mobility LLC, 883 F.3d 848 (9th Cir. 2018) (en banc), 923
Furchtgott-Roth, *see* Applications of Ameritech Corp.
Geller, Simon, *see* Applications of Simon Geller
General Electric Co., *see* Applications of Comcast Corp.
General Motors Corp. and Hughes Electronics Corp., Transferors, and the News Corp. Ltd, Transferee, for Authority to Transfer Control, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 19 FCC Rcd. 473 (2004), 495
Golden Globe Awards, *see* Complaints Against Various Broadcast Licensees Regarding Their Airing of the "Golden Globe Awards" Program
Google/Double Click, FTC File 071-0170, 2007 WL 4624893, Statement of the Federal Trade Commission, 639
Google Search (Shopping), Commission Decision, Case AT.39740 (European Commission, June 27, 2017), 895
Google, *see also* Kinderstart.com LLC v. Google, Inc.
Global Electronic Commerce, *see* Framework for Global Electronic Commerce
Grandbanke Corporation, *see* Applications of Simon Geller
Grokster, *see* Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.
Huber, Kellogg, and Thorne, Federal Telecommunications Law 663–70 (2d ed. 1999), 231
Hughes Electronics Corp., *see* General Motors Corp.
Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommu-

nications Act of 1996, First Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd. 15,499 (1996), 262
Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act—Competitive Bidding for Commercial Broadcast and Instructional Television Fixed Service Licenses, First Report and Order, 13 FCC Rcd. 15,920 (1998), 201
In re FCC 11-161, 753 F.3d 1015 (10th Cir. 2014), 674, 687
In the Matter of Snapchat, Inc., 2015-1 Trade Cas. ¶17,115 (F.T.C.) (2014), 916
Incentive Auctions, *see* Policies Regarding Mobile Spectrum Holdings
Indecent Communications by Telephone, *see* Regulations Concerning Indecent Communications by Telephone
Inquiry into the Commission's Rules and Regulations Concerning the General Fairness Doctrine Obligations of Broadcast Licensees, Report, 102 F.C.C. 2d 142 (1985), 945
Instructional Television Fixed Service, *see* Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act
Internet Domain Name Functions, *see* NTIA Announces Intent to Transition Key Internet Domain Name Functions
Internet Freedom, *see* Restoring Internet Freedom
Internet Policy-Making, *see* Communiqué on Principles for Internet Policy-Making
Iowa Utilities Board, *see* AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Board
Kinderstart.com LLC v. Google, Inc., No. C06-2057 JF (RS), 2006 WL 3246596 (N.D. Cal. July 13, 2006), 887
Kwerel and Felker, Using Auctions to Select FCC Licensees, FCC Office of Plans & Policy, Working Paper No. 16 (1985), 194
Local Competition Provisions, *see* Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act
Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, *see* Verizon Communications Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP
Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod v. FCC, 141 F.3d 344 (D.C. Cir. 1998), 184
Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC, 497 U.S. 547 (1990), 174
Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd., 545 U.S. 913 (2005), 847
Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo, 418 U.S. 241 (1974), 934
Midwest Video Corp., *see* FCC v. Midwest Video Corp. [*Midwest Video II*]
Mobile Spectrum Holdings, *see* Policies Regarding Mobile Spectrum Holdings
Mukasey, *see* ACLU v. Mukasey
Multichannel Video Programming Distribution Services, *see* Promoting Innovation and Competition in the Provision of Multichannel Video Programming Distribution Services
National Broadband Plan: Connecting America, FCC (2010), 685
National Cable & Telecommunications Ass'n v. Brand X Internet Services, 545 U.S. 967 (2005), 724
National Cable & Telecommunications Ass'n v. FCC, 567 F.3d 659 (D.C. Cir. 2009), 502
NBC Universal, Inc., *see* Applications of Comcast Corp.

Network Elements, *see* Unbundled Access to Network Elements
News Corp., Ltd., *see* General Motors Corp.
NTIA Announces Intent to Transition Key Internet Domain Name Functions, Press Release, NTIA (March 14, 2014), 661
OECD, *see* Communiqué on Principles for Internet Policy-Making
Open Internet, *see* Protecting and Promoting the Open Internet
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], *see* Communiqué on Principles for Internet Policy-Making
Pacifica Foundation, *see* FCC v. Pacifica Foundation
Pai, Ajit, *see* Applications of Charter Communications, Inc.
Playboy Entertainment Group, Inc., *see* United States v. Playboy Entertainment Group, Inc.
Policies and Rules Concerning Children's Television Programming, Report and Order, 6 FCC Rcd. 2111 (1991), 987
Policies and Rules Concerning Children's Television Programming, Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd. 10,660 (1996), 989
Policies Regarding Mobile Spectrum Holdings: Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions, Report and Order, 29 FCC Rcd. 6133 (2014), 538
Policy Statement on Comparative Broadcast Hearings, Public Notice, 1 F.C.C. 2d 393 (1965), 163
Portland, *see* AT&T Corp v. City of Portland
Posner, Bad News, N.Y. Times Book Rev., July 31, 2005, 562
Privacy, *see* Protecting Consumer Privacy in an Era of Rapid Change *and* Protecting the Privacy of Customers of Broadband and Other Telecommunications Services
Program Access Rules, *see* Review of the Commission's Program Access Rules
Programming Tying Arrangements, *see* Review of the Commission's Program Access Rules
Prometheus Radio Project v. FCC [*Prometheus I*], 373 F.3d 372 (3d Cir. 2004), 448
Promoting Efficient Use of Spectrum Through Elimination of Barriers to the Development of Secondary Markets, Second Report and Order, Order on Reconsideration, and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 19 FCC Rcd. 17,503 (2004), 137
Promoting Innovation and Competition in the Provision of Multichannel Video Programming Distribution Services, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 29 FCC Rcd. 15,995 (2014), 418
Protecting and Promoting the Open Internet, Report and Order on Remand, Declaratory Ruling, and Order, 30 FCC Rcd. 5601 (2015), 770
Protecting Consumer Privacy in an Era of Rapid Change: Recommendations for Businesses and Policymakers, FTC Report (March 2012), 921
Protecting the Privacy of Customers of Broadband and Other Telecommunications Services, Report and Order, 31 FCC Rcd. 13,911 (2016), 904

Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. FCC, 395 U.S. 367 (1969), 936
Realizing the Full Potential of Government-Held Spectrum to Spur Economic Growth, President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (2012), 124
Redevelopment of Spectrum to Encourage Innovation in the Use of New Telecommunications Technologies, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 7 FCC Rcd. 1542 (1992), 92
Regulations Concerning Indecent Communications by Telephone, Report and Order, 5 FCC Rcd. 4926 (1990), 1095
Reno v. ACLU, 521 U.S. 844 (1997), 1099
Request of ABC, Inc. for Declaratory Ruling, Staff Ruling, 15 FCC Rcd. 1355 (1999), 962
Restoring Internet Freedom, Declaratory Ruling, Report and Order, and Order, 33 FCC Rcd. 311 (2018), 816
Retransmission Consent, *see* Amendment of the Commission's Rules Related to Retransmission Consent
Review of the Commission's Program Access Rules and Examination of Programming Tying Arrangements, First Report and Order, 25 FCC Rcd. 746 (2010), 507
Roommates.com, *see* Fair Housing Council of San Fernando Valley v. Roommates.com, LLC
Sable Communications of California, Inc. v. FCC, 492 U.S. 115 (1989), 1090
SBC Communications, Inc., *see* Applications of Ameritech Corp.
Schurz Communications, Inc. v. FCC, 982 F.2d 1043 (7th Cir. 1992), 434
Section 309(j) of the Communications Act, *see* Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act
Service Rules for the 698–746, 747–762 & 777–792 MHz Bands, Second Report and Order, 22 FCC Rcd. 15,289 (2007), 743
Sirius Satellite Radio Inc., *see* Commission Approves Transaction between Sirius Satellite Radio Holdings Inc. and XM Satellite Radio Holdings *and* Statement of the Department of Justice Antitrust Division
Snapchat, *see* In the Matter of Snapchat, Inc.
Spectrum Policy Task Force Report, FCC, ET Docket No. 02-135 (Nov. 2002), 81
Spectrum, *see also* Promoting Efficient Use of Spectrum *and* Realizing the Full Potential of Government-Held Spectrum to Spur Economic Growth *and* Redevelopment of Spectrum to Encourage Innovation in the Use of New Telecommunications Technologies
Southwestern Cable Co., *see* United States v. Southwestern Cable Co.
Statement of the Department of Justice Antitrust Division on Its Decision to Close Its Investigation of XM Satellite Radio Holdings Inc.'s Merger with Sirius Satellite Radio Inc., Press Release, DOJ (Mar. 24, 2008), 600
Sunstein, The First Amendment in Cyberspace, 104 Yale L.J. 1757 (1995), 555
Technology Transitions, Proposal for Ongoing Data Initiative, 29 FCC Rcd. 1433 (2014), 701
Time Warner Cable, Inc., *see* Applications of Charter Communications, Inc.

Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC, 93 F.3d 957 (D.C. Cir. 1996), 974
Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC, 105 F.3d 723 (D.C. Cir. 1997), 976
Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC [*Time Warner II*], 240 F.3d 1126 (D.C. Cir. 2001), 477
Tornillo, *see* Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo
Trinko, *see* Verizon Communications Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP
Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC [*Turner I*], 512 U.S. 622 (1994), 386
Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC [*Turner II*], 520 U.S. 180 (1997), 398
TV Broadcast Bands, *see* Unlicensed Operation in the TV Broadcast Bands
Unbundled Access to Network Elements: Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, Order on Remand, 20 FCC Rcd. 2533 (2005), 289
United States v. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 552 F. Supp. 131 (D.D.C. 1982), 238
United States v. AT&T, 310 F. Supp. 3d 161 (D.D.C. 2018), 620
United States v. Playboy Entertainment Group, Inc., 529 U.S. 803 (2000), 1076
United States v. Southwestern Cable Co., 392 U.S. 157 (1968), 711
United States Telecom Ass'n v. FCC [*USTA II*], 359 F.3d 554 (D.C. Cir. 2004), 272, 282
United States Telecom Ass'n v. FCC, 825 F.3d 674 (D.C. Cir. 2016), 795
United States Telecom Ass'n v. FCC, 855 F.3d 381 (D.C. Cir. 2017), 808
Unlicensed Devices, *see* Unlicensed Operation in the TV Broadcast Bands
Unlicensed Operation in the TV Broadcast Bands and Additional Spectrum for Unlicensed Devices below 900 MHz and in the 3 GHz Band, Second Report and Order and Memorandum Opinion and Order, 23 FCC Rcd. 16,807 (2008), 113
Viacom International, Inc. v. YouTube, Inc., 676 F.3d 19 (2d Cir. 2012), 859
Verizon Communications Inc. v. FCC, 535 U.S. 467 (2002), 295
Verizon Communications Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP, 540 U.S. 398 (2004), 633
Verizon v. FCC, 740 F.3d 623 (D.C. Cir. 2014), 756
Violent Television Programming and Its Impact on Children, Report, 22 FCC Rcd. 7929 (2007), 1130
Waldman et al., The Information Needs of Communities: The Changing Media Landscape in a Broadband Age, FCC (2011), 572
WNCN Listeners Guild, *see* FCC v. WNCN Listeners Guild
XM Satellite Radio, *see* Commission Approves Transaction between Sirius Satellite Radio Holdings Inc. and XM Satellite Radio Holdings *and* Statement of the Department of Justice Antitrust Division
YouTube, *see* Viacom International, Inc. v. YouTube, Inc.
Zeran v. America Online, Inc., 129 F.3d 327 (4th Cir. 1997), 868

Copyright Permissions

Our sincere thanks go to the following copyright holders, who have granted permission for us to reprint or excerpt copyrighted materials in this book:

Aspen Publishers, Inc., for permission to excerpt Federal Telecommunications Law, Second Edition, by Peter W. Huber, Michael K. Kellogg, and John Thorne. Copyright 1999 by Peter W. Huber, Michael K. Kellogg, and John Thorne. All rights reserved.

Yochai Benkler and the Harvard Journal of Law and Technology for permission to excerpt Yochai Benkler, Some Economics of Wireless Communications, 16 Harv. J.L. & Tech. 25 (2002).

Ronald Coase for permission to excerpt Why Not Use the Pricing System in the Broadcast Industry? Testimony before the FCC (December 1959), reprinted in 4 Study of Radio & Television Broadcasting (No. 12,782) (1959).

The Duke University School of Law, Law and Contemporary Problems, Stanley Besen, and Robert Crandall, for permission to reprint The Deregulation of Cable Television, 44 Law & Contemp. Probs. 77 (1981).

Thomas Krattenmaker and Lucas Powe, for permission to adapt various sections of their book Regulating Broadcast Programming (1994). All rights reserved.

Richard Posner, for permission to excerpt Bad News, The New York Times Book Review (July 31, 2005).

The University of Chicago, the Journal of Legal Studies, and Thomas W. Hazlett for permission to reprint a figure from Thomas W. Hazlett & David W. Sosa, Was the Fairness Doctrine a "Chilling Effect"? Evidence from the Postderegulation Radio Market, 26 J. Legal Stud. 294 (1997). Copyright 1997 by the University of Chicago.

The Yale Law Journal Company and William S. Hein Company for permission to excerpt Cass Sunstein, The First Amendment in Cyberspace, 104 Yale L. J. 1757 (1995).

Preface

The theme of almost any law school casebook is apparent from the outset. An administrative law casebook, for example, pulls together materials about governmental administration. An antitrust law book evaluates the basic laws and judicial decisions that protect competition by limiting how and when firms can cooperate, engage in potentially anticompetitive behavior, and merge with one another. Thus, even though an administrative law book will consider agencies as diverse as the Environmental Protection Agency and the Federal Aviation Administration, and even though an antitrust law book will apply to industries ranging from real estate to computer software to supermarkets, it is not difficult to describe the overarching themes that structure the set of materials covered by the text.

The implicit logic of a book on "Internet and Telecommunications Regulation," at least on first blush, may be harder to understand. Why should statutes and regulations related to broadcast television, cable, satellite, wireline telephony, cellular telephony, and the Internet all be considered in a single volume? Do these communication mechanisms really have that much in common?

The challenge of capturing the story of Internet and telecommunications law is particularly interesting and important today because of technological convergence and the rapid growth of Internet platforms and services that this convergence has enabled. This means that once-distinct technologies — for example, the traditional telephone infrastructure and the traditional cable infrastructure — can provide very similar and substitutable services, including telephone service, cable television, and broadband Internet access. The question of how to treat different technologies, be they telephone networks, cable networks, or wireless providers, can no longer be answered by reference to the service that those networks titularly support. Given that this answer was often the way such policies developed in the past, this book can be read on two levels: (1) what is the best policy for communications networks of all kinds; and (2) in light of the legacy of policies long in place (and a statute first written in 1934), how can the administering agency (in almost all cases, the Federal Communications Commission) move towards the best policy (or find a second best one) if practical, legal, or political constraints limit its ability to get there?

Given the nature of technological convergence, it is hard to consider any one branch of communications in isolation. It is the combination of broadcast, cable, telephone, and Internet regulation that together determine how wire, air, and other communications resources are allocated between all their myriad competing uses. Because almost any resource can be put to more than one telecommunications use, these topics are necessarily interconnected. And, as noted above, today's decision-

makers are not writing on a clean slate, creating challenges insofar as decisions of yesterday, such as how much wireless spectrum to dedicate to over-the-air television broadcasts, are not easily reversed to address the needs of today—say, more spectrum for wireless broadband services.

The topics addressed in this book are not only related in terms of basic technologies, but also they share common economic and institutional characteristics. On the economic front, the range of technologies we discuss raises the question of whether competition is either unworkable or undesirable. To give but one example, policymakers have long worried that the economics of local wireline telephone service are such that either only one firm can survive in the long run ("competition is unworkable") or a single firm can provide a given quality of phone service at lower total cost than can multiple competitors ("competition is undesirable"). Policymakers in this area therefore struggled with the question of whether regulation should displace competition as the principal mechanism for ensuring good performance. Similar arguments that regulation might have advantages over competition arise in every communications market. This is therefore another reason to consider all of these topics in a single conversation. On the institutional side, the Federal Communications Commission has extensive regulatory authority over traditional telephony, broadcast, cable television, and satellite services, and at least some residual authority over all other telecommunications technologies. Thus, before we discuss the substantive Internet and telecommunications policy issues, Chapters One and Two begin with the basic economic and institutional issues that will be discussed throughout the book.

These similarities combined with the growth of the Internet have prompted us to name this book "Internet and Telecommunications Regulation." It has grown out of our previous "Telecommunications Law and Policy" casebook. The change in name denominates both the growth of the Internet in communications and the debate over "regulation" (by which we mean sector-specific law) for the Internet. The book retains most of the material on traditional communications regulation for, as we have said, that history and its economic assumptions form the intellectual and policy basis for current arguments. But we have also revamped and greatly expanded our coverage of Internet regulation, such that it now occupies a central place in the book.

Now, some acknowledgments. As noted, this book grew out of an earlier book, Telecommunications Law and Policy, which had four editions. We thank our coauthors on some of those previous editions, Doug Lichtman, Howard Shelanski, and Phil Weiser. We also thank Tom Krattenmaker, whose earlier version of the book was the kernel of our four editions, and whose contributions run throughout the book. Over the years, many people have helped us think through issues, including Jack Balkin, Dale Hatfield, Karl Mannheim, Preston Padden, John Roberts, Peter Shane, and Doug Sicker. Our thanks go to Stanley Besen and Lucas Powe as well. While their contributions came to us through Krattenmaker, those suggestions nevertheless benefit the book still today. Sincere thanks, too, to the family at Carolina Academic Press. Linda, you especially have been supportive of our work on this project; we genuinely appreciate everything you do for us and our readers. For this edition we owe a particular debt to a few people whose careful reading of the text helped it immeasurably:

Leanna Doty and Balfour Smith from Duke Law School and Northwestern Law students Amanda Wells and Samuel Rasche.

One final word before we step aside: the materials included in this book have been ruthlessly edited for style, length, and clarity. To avoid clutter, we have left almost all of those changes unmarked. While we are confident that none of our edits altered the meaning of the relevant passages, we do want to warn readers that the materials have been edited so as to maximize their value in the educational setting and, thus, attorneys looking to cite materials in court documents are advised to look to the original sources before quoting any of the materials excerpted here.

With that, we welcome you to the text. We hope you find your study of Internet and telecommunications law to be a rewarding one.

Stuart Benjamin and Jim Speta