

Telecommunications Law and Policy

*Carolina Academic Press
Law Advisory Board*



Gary J. Simson, Chairman
Mercer University School of Law

Raj Bhala
University of Kansas School of Law

Davison M. Douglas
Dean, William and Mary Law School

Paul Finkelman
Albany Law School

Robert M. Jarvis
*Shepard Broad Law Center
Nova Southeastern University*

Vincent R. Johnson
St. Mary's University School of Law

Peter Nicolas
University of Washington School of Law

Michael A. Olivas
University of Houston Law Center

Kenneth L. Port
William Mitchell College of Law

H. Jefferson Powell
Duke University School of Law

Michael P. Scharf
Case Western Reserve University School of Law

Michael Hunter Schwartz
*Dean, William H. Bowen School of Law
University of Arkansas at Little Rock*

Peter M. Shane
*Michael E. Moritz College of Law
The Ohio State University*

Telecommunications Law and Policy

FOURTH EDITION

Stuart Minor Benjamin
DUKE UNIVERSITY

James B. Speta
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY



CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2015
Carolina Academic Press
All Rights Reserved

ISBN 978-1-61163-691-8
LCCN 2014953062

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

Printed in the United States of America

For Arti and Denise

Contents

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Table of Materials | xvii |
| Copyright Permissions | xxi |
| Preface | xxiii |

INTRODUCTORY MATERIALS

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Chapter One · Introduction to Telecommunications Regulation | 3 |
| § 1.A. Communications as a “Regulated Industry” | 4 |
| § 1.A.1. Justifications for Regulation | 5 |
| § 1.A.1.a. Market Failure Justifications | 6 |
| § 1.A.1.b. Additional Justifications | 10 |
| § 1.A.2. Basic Regulatory Tools | 11 |
| § 1.A.3. The Challenges of Regulation | 14 |
| § 1.B. A Policy Analysis Framework | 16 |
| Chapter Two · Telecommunications Policy in Institutional Perspective | 17 |
| Introduction | 17 |
| § 2.A. The Institutional Dimensions of Telecommunications Policy | 17 |
| § 2.B. The Federal Communications Commission | 20 |
| § 2.C. Regulatory Integration Under the 1934 Act | 21 |
| § 2.D. Institutional Structure and the FCC | 23 |
| § 2.E. The FCC in a Functional Perspective | 25 |
| § 2.E.1. Command and Control | 25 |
| § 2.E.2. Rulemaking versus Adjudication | 26 |
| § 2.E.3. Licensing | 29 |
| § 2.E.4. Norm Entrepreneur | 29 |
| § 2.E.5. Standard Setting | 30 |
| § 2.F. The Statutory and Broader Institutional Context | 31 |
| § 2.F.1. The Structure of the 1934 Act | 32 |
| § 2.F.2. Other Relevant Statutes and Agencies | 34 |
| § 2.F.3. FCC Discretion and Its Constraints | 35 |

PART ONE**SPECTRUM**

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Chapter Three · Regulating the Spectrum | 41 |
| Introduction | 41 |
| § 3.A. Defining Spectrum | 42 |
| § 3.A.1. Characteristics of Radio Waves | 42 |
| § 3.A.2. Transmitting Through the Air | 44 |
| § 3.A.3. Transmitting Using Wires | 44 |
| § 3.A.4. Signal Modulation | 45 |
| § 3.A.5. Newer Wireless Technologies | 47 |
| § 3.A.6. The Spectrum as a Resource | 49 |
| § 3.B. A Brief History of Early Spectrum Regulation | 50 |
| § 3.C. Rationales for Regulation | 55 |
| § 3.C.1. Scarcity/Interference | 55 |
| Coase, Why Not Use the Pricing System in the Broadcast Industry? | 59 |
| § 3.C.2. Consumer Preferences | 63 |
| § 3.D. An Overview of Spectrum Management | 65 |
| § 3.E. Regulatory Tradeoffs and Allotment | 66 |
| Chapter Four · Zoning the Spectrum | 69 |
| Introduction | 69 |
| § 4.A. Models of Spectrum Control | 69 |
| Spectrum Policy Task Force Report | 72 |
| § 4.B. Implementing Flexibility | 79 |
| Redevelopment of Spectrum to Encourage Innovation in the Use of New Telecommunications Technologies | 81 |
| § 4.C. Dedicating Spectrum to Unlicensed Uses | 90 |
| Benkler, Some Economics of Wireless Communications | 90 |
| § 4.D. Approaches to Unlicensed Access | 97 |
| § 4.D.1. White Spaces | 97 |
| Unlicensed Operation in the TV Broadcast Bands and Additional Spectrum for Unlicensed Devices Below 900 MHz and in the 3 GHz Band | 98 |
| § 4.D.2. Spectrum Sharing | 106 |
| President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, Realizing the Full Potential of Government-Held Spectrum to Spur Economic Growth: Executive Summary | 107 |
| Amendment of the Commission's Rules with Regard to Commercial Operations in the 3550–3650 MHz Band | 111 |
| § 4.E. Spectrum Leasing and Private Commons | 117 |
| Promoting Efficient Use of Spectrum Through Elimination of Barriers to the Development of Secondary Markets | 119 |
| Chapter Five · Structuring and Assigning Licenses | 125 |
| Introduction | 125 |
| § 5.A. License Renewal and Transfer | 126 |
| § 5.A.1. License Renewal | 126 |
| § 5.A.1.a. Early History | 127 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| § 5.A.1.a.1. The <i>Shuler</i> Case | 128 |
| § 5.A.1.a.2. The <i>Brinkley</i> Case | 129 |
| § 5.A.1.a.3. The Judicial Response | 130 |
| § 5.A.1.b. More Recent Developments | 130 |
| § 5.A.2. License Transfer | 134 |
| § 5.A.2.a. Format Changes | 136 |
| Changes in the Entertainment Formats of Broadcast Stations | 136 |
| § 5.A.2.b. A Reversal, and a Reversal of That Reversal | 137 |
| FCC v. WNCN Listeners Guild | 138 |
| § 5.B. License Assignment via Merit-Based Hearings | 140 |
| § 5.B.1. Comparative Hearings | 141 |
| § 5.B.1.a. Basic Comparative Hearing Criteria | 142 |
| Policy Statement on Comparative Broadcast Hearings | 142 |
| § 5.B.2. Licensing Case Study | 146 |
| Applications of Simon Geller for Renewal of License of WVCA-FM and Grandbanke Corporation for Construction Permit | 146 |
| § 5.B.3. Special Considerations for Racial Minorities and Women | 151 |
| § 5.B.3.a. Minority Preferences before <i>Adarand</i> | 151 |
| Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC | 151 |
| § 5.B.3.b. Preferences for Women | 157 |
| § 5.B.3.c. <i>Adarand</i> (Metro Broadcasting Overruled) | 158 |
| § 5.B.3.d. Equal Employment Opportunity Regulations | 160 |
| Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod v. FCC | 160 |
| § 5.C. Transition to Assignment via Auctions | 164 |
| § 5.C.1. Reform of the Licensing Process | 165 |
| 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 | 165 |
| § 5.C.2. Lotteries and Auctions | 167 |
| Using Auctions to Select FCC Licensees | 168 |
| § 5.C.3. Initial Assignment by Auction | 174 |
| Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act — Competitive Bidding for Commercial Broadcast and Instructional Television Fixed Service Licenses | 174 |

PART TWO

REGULATING MONOPOLY — THE CASE OF TELEPHONY

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter Six · Early Telephone Regulation through Divestiture | 187 |
| Introduction | 187 |
| § 6.A. Telephone History | 188 |
| § 6.B. Infrastructure | 193 |
| § 6.B.1. Telephone System Vocabulary | 193 |
| § 6.B.2. Telephone Economics | 194 |
| § 6.C. Telephone Regulation | 195 |
| § 6.C.1. Categories of Regulation | 195 |
| § 6.C.2. Who Regulates | 196 |
| § 6.D. Precursors to Divestiture | 198 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| § 6.D.1. Competition in CPE | 198 |
| Huber, Kellogg & Thorne, Federal Telecommunications Law | 198 |
| § 6.D.2. Competition in Long Distance Telephony | 201 |
| § 6.D.3. Communications and Computer Convergence | 202 |
| § 6.E. Breaking Up Bell: The 1984 Divestiture | 203 |
| § 6.E.1. The MFJ | 204 |
| United States v. American Telephone & Telegraph Co. | 204 |
| § 6.E.2 Discussion of the Government's Theory | 210 |
| Chapter Seven · Control of Telephone Monopolies | 217 |
| Introduction | 217 |
| § 7.A. Rate Regulation | 217 |
| § 7.A.1. Rate of Return Regulation | 218 |
| § 7.A.2. Price Cap Regulation | 220 |
| § 7.A.3. Rate Regulation as Markets Become Competitive | 220 |
| § 7.B. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 | 222 |
| § 7.B.1. Introduction | 222 |
| § 7.B.2. The Local Competition Provisions | 224 |
| Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 | 225 |
| § 7.B.3. Jurisdiction to Implement the 1996 Act: Local Competition, National Regulation | 230 |
| United States Telecom Ass'n v. FCC [<i>USTA II</i>] | 233 |
| § 7.C. Unbundling, Interconnection, and Line-of-Business Regulation Under the 1996 Act | 235 |
| § 7.C.1. Identifying UNEs | 235 |
| § 7.C.1.a. Iowa Utilities Board | 235 |
| AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Board | 235 |
| § 7.C.1.b. After Iowa Utilities Board | 239 |
| United States Telecom Ass'n v. FCC [<i>USTA II</i>] | 242 |
| § 7.C.1.c. FCC Response to <i>USTA II</i> | 248 |
| Unbundled Access to Network Elements: Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers | 248 |
| § 7.C.2. Pricing Network Elements | 252 |
| Verizon Communications Inc. v. FCC | 254 |
| § 7.C.3. Interconnection | 262 |
| § 7.C.4. BOC Line of Business Restrictions | 266 |

PART THREE

MULTICHANNEL VIDEO AND BROADCASTING

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter Eight · Multichannel Video Foundations | 271 |
| Introduction | 271 |
| § 8.A. Paying for Television | 271 |
| Coase, Why Not Use the Pricing System in the Broadcast Industry? | 273 |
| § 8.B. Why Regulate? Are There Natural Monopolies? | 276 |
| § 8.C. Why Regulate? Implications for Broadcast | 277 |
| Besen & Crandall, The Deregulation of Cable Television | 278 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Establishment of Rules and Policies for the Digital Audio Radio Satellite Service in the 2310–2360 MHz Frequency Band | 285 |
| § 8.D. Who Regulates Cable Television? | 289 |
| § 8.E. Promoting Competition in MVPD Markets | 294 |
| Alliance for Community Media v. FCC | 295 |
| Chapter Nine · Shared Content | 303 |
| Introduction | 303 |
| § 9.A. Individual Programs | 303 |
| § 9.A.1. Compulsory Copyright Licenses | 303 |
| § 9.A.1.a. Cable Television | 303 |
| § 9.A.1.b. Direct Broadcast Satellite | 306 |
| § 9.A.2. What Constitutes a Performance under Copyright Law? | 310 |
| American Broadcasting Companies, Inc. v. Aereo, Inc. | 310 |
| § 9.A.3. Syndicated Exclusivity and Network Nonduplication | 318 |
| § 9.B. Programs Grouped into Signals | 320 |
| § 9.B.1. Retransmission Consent | 321 |
| Amendment of the Commission’s Rules Related to Retransmission Consent | 322 |
| Amendment of the Commission’s Rules Related to Retransmission Consent | 328 |
| § 9.B.2. Must-Carry | 331 |
| § 9.B.2.a. First Amendment Challenges to Cable Must-Carry | 332 |
| Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC [<i>Turner I</i>] | 332 |
| Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC [<i>Turner II</i>] | 345 |
| § 9.B.2.b. DBS Carry One, Carry All | 358 |
| § 9.C. Programming Delivered à la Carte | 362 |
| § 9.D. The FCC’s Role in Digital Copyright Policy | 364 |

PART FOUR

ANTITRUST AND STRUCTURAL REGULATION OF MEDIA

| | |
|---|------------|
| Chapter Ten · Structural Regulation of Media | 369 |
| Introduction | 369 |
| § 10.A. Structural Regulation of Broadcasting | 369 |
| § 10.A.1. Television Networks and Vertical Integration | 370 |
| Schurz Communications, Inc. v. FCC | 372 |
| § 10.A.2. Ownership Restrictions | 379 |
| Prometheus Radio Project v. FCC [<i>Prometheus I</i>] | 383 |
| 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 | 397 |
| § 10.B. Structural Regulation of Cable Providers | 405 |
| § 10.B.1. Judicial Review of the FCC’s Cable Ownership Rules | 406 |
| Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC [<i>Time Warner II</i>] | 407 |
| Comcast Corp. v. FCC | 414 |
| § 10.C. Regulation of Vertical Foreclosure by MVPDs | 418 |
| § 10.C.1. The Initial Program Access Rules | 419 |
| § 10.C.2. Extensions of the Program Access Rules | 420 |
| § 10.C.3. Expansion of the Program Access Theory | 422 |

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| § 10.C.3.a. Extension of the Program Access Rules to DirecTV General Motors Corp. and Hughes Electronics Corp., Transferors, and the News Corp. Ltd, Transferee, for Authority to Transfer Control | 422 423 |
| § 10.C.3.b. MVPD Access to Buildings National Cable & Telecommunications Ass'n v. FCC | 428 428 |
| § 10.C.3.c. Extension of the Program Access Rules to Terrestrially Distributed Programming Review of the Commission's Program Access Rules and Examination of Programming Tying Arrangements Cablevision Systems Corp. v. FCC | 433 433 441 |
| § 10.D. MVPD Non-Discrimination Obligations Comcast Cable Communications, LLC v. FCC | 446 447 |
| § 10.E. Spectrum Caps Policies Regarding Mobile Spectrum Holdings: Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum through Incentive Auctions | 453 453 |
| § 10.F. Choice § 10.F.1. Is More Always Better? Sunstein, The First Amendment in Cyberspace Posner, Bad News | 468 468 468 474 |
| § 10.F.2. What Could the FCC Do About It? Waldman et al., The Information Needs of Communities: The Changing Media Landscape in a Broadband Age | 482 482 |
| Chapter Eleven · Antitrust and Merger Review Introduction | 487 487 |
| § 11.A. Merger Enforcement and Telecommunications Regulation § 11.A.1. Background on Merger Policy Applications of Comcast Corp., General Electric Co., and NBC Universal, Inc. for Consent To Assign Licenses and Transfer Control of Licensees | 488 488 490 |
| § 11.A.2. The SBC/Ameritech Proceeding Applications of Ameritech Corp., Transferor, and SBC Communications, Inc., Transferee, for Consent to Transfer Control of Corporations 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 Separate Statement of Commissioner Harold Furchtgott-Roth Concurring in Part, Dissenting in Part | 491 492 496 |
| § 11.A.3. Reconsidering the FCC's Merger Review Process | 501 |
| § 11.A.4. The FCC's Own Institutional Reforms | 501 |
| § 11.A.5. The Elusive Effort to Restrict the Scope of FCC Merger Review 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. Commission Approves Transaction between Sirius Satellite Radio Holdings Inc. and XM Satellite Radio Holdings, Inc. Subject to Conditions | 503 505 508 |
| § 11.A.6. The Comcast/NBCU Proceeding | 510 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Applications of Comcast Corp., General Electric Co. and NBC Universal, Inc. for Consent to Assign Licenses and Transfer Control of Licensees | 510 |
| § 11.B. Antitrust in a Regulatory Thicket | 522 |
| Verizon Communications Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP | 522 |

PART FIVE

THE INTERNET

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter Twelve · Introduction and Evolution | 529 |
| § 12.A. The History and Architecture of the Internet | 529 |
| § 12.A.1. Basic Characteristics | 531 |
| § 12.A.2. Network Elements | 533 |
| § 12.A.3. Packet Switching and Addressing | 534 |
| § 12.A.4. Services | 535 |
| § 12.A.5. Layers | 536 |
| § 12.B. Initial Principles of Internet Policy | 537 |
| A Framework for Global Electronic Commerce | 539 |
| Communiqué on Principles for Internet Policy-Making;OECD High Level Meeting on the Internet Economy | 540 |
| NTIA Announces Intent to Transition Key Internet Domain Name Functions | 543 |
| Chapter Thirteen · Universal Service: From Telephony to Broadband | 545 |
| § 13.A. Origins of Universal Service Policy | 545 |
| § 13.B. Equity and Efficiency in Subsidizing Universal Service: Ramsey Pricing versus Distributional Policy | 547 |
| § 13.C. Universal Service After Divestiture | 549 |
| § 13.D. Universal Service After the 1996 Act | 551 |
| § 13.D.1. Access Charge Reform | 552 |
| § 13.D.2. Intercarrier Compensation Reform | 553 |
| In re FCC 11-161 | 553 |
| § 13.E. Broadband Universal Service | 561 |
| Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service | 562 |
| National Broadband Plan: Connecting America | 565 |
| In re FCC 11-161 | 567 |
| § 13.F. A New Blank Slate: The IP Transition | 578 |
| Technology Transitions | 578 |
| Chapter Fourteen · Broadband Jurisdiction and Structural Regulation | 587 |
| Introduction | 587 |
| § 14.A. The Ancillary Jurisdiction Doctrine and the Past as Prologue? | 588 |
| United States v. Southwestern Cable Co. | 589 |
| FCC v. Midwest Video Corp. [<i>Midwest Video II</i>] | 591 |
| § 14.B. Regulatory Characterization of Broadband Services | 595 |
| AT&T Corp. v. City of Portland | 596 |
| National Cable & Telecommunications Ass'n v. Brand X Internet Services | 600 |
| § 14.C. Net Neutrality | 614 |
| § 14.C.1. The Broadband Internet Access Marketplace | 614 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| National Broadband Plan: Connecting America | 615 |
| § 14.C.2. Net Neutrality Policy (and Jurisdiction, Again) | 619 |
| Appropriate Framework for Broadband Access to the Internet Over Wireline Facilities | 620 |
| Service Rules for the 698–746, 747–762 & 777–792 MHz Bands | 622 |
| Comcast Corp. v. FCC | 628 |
| Verizon v. FCC | 632 |
| § 14.D. Voice over Internet Protocol | 653 |
| Minnesota Public Utilities Commission v. FCC | 655 |
| Nuvio Corp. v. FCC | 660 |
| American Council on Education v. FCC | 664 |
| § 14.E. “Over the Top” Online Video Competition | 668 |

PART SIX

DIRECT REGULATION OF CONTENT

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter Fifteen · Direct Regulation of Content Deemed Valuable | 675 |
| Introduction | 675 |
| § 15.A. The Fairness Doctrine and Related Obligations | 676 |
| § 15.A.1. <i>Tornillo</i> and <i>Red Lion</i> | 676 |
| Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo | 676 |
| Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. FCC | 678 |
| § 15.A.2. The FCC Abandons the Fairness Doctrine | 685 |
| § 15.A.2.a. The Fairness Doctrine Report | 685 |
| Inquiry into the Commission’s Rules and Regulations Concerning the General Fairness Doctrine Obligations of Broadcast Licensees | 685 |
| § 15.A.2.b. <i>Syracuse Peace Council</i> | 693 |
| § 15.A.3. The Personal Attack and Political Editorial Rules | 696 |
| § 15.A.4. Political Broadcasting | 699 |
| Request of ABC, Inc. for Declaratory Ruling | 700 |
| § 15.A.5. The Scarcity Rationale in Other Media | 710 |
| Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC | 710 |
| Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC | 712 |
| § 15.B. Children’s Television | 715 |
| Children’s Television Programming and Advertising Practices | 716 |
| Policies and Rules Concerning Children’s Television Programming | 721 |
| Policies and Rules Concerning Children’s Television Programming | 723 |
| Chapter Sixteen · Direct Regulation of Content Deemed Harmful | 739 |
| Introduction | 739 |
| § 16.A. Indecency | 740 |
| § 16.A.1. Regulation of Broadcast Indecency | 740 |
| FCC v. Pacifica Foundation | 740 |
| Action for Children’s Television v. FCC [<i>ACT III</i>] | 750 |
| Complaints Against Various Broadcast Licensees Regarding Their Airing of the “Golden Globe Awards” Program | 764 |
| FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc. | 768 |
| FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc. | 777 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| § 16.A.2. Regulation of Cable Indecency | 780 |
| § 16.A.2.a. <i>Denver Area</i> | 781 |
| Denver Area Educational Telecommunications Consortium, Inc. v. FCC | 782 |
| § 16.A.2.b. <i>Playboy Entertainment</i> | 797 |
| United States v. Playboy Entertainment Group, Inc. | 798 |
| § 16.A.3. Regulation of Indecency via Telephone | 809 |
| Sable Communications of California, Inc. v. FCC | 809 |
| Regulations Concerning Indecent Communications by Telephone | 814 |
| § 16.A.4. Regulation of Internet Indecency | 817 |
| Reno v. ACLU | 818 |
| Ashcroft v. ACLU [<i>Ashcroft II</i>] | 825 |
| ACLU v. Mukasey | 832 |
| § 16.B. Violent Programming | 839 |
| Violent Television Programming and Its Impact on Children | 843 |

EPILOGUE

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter Seventeen · Why an FCC? | 855 |
| Introduction | 855 |
| A New Federal Communications Commission for the 21st Century | 856 |
| Huber, Abolish the FCC and Let Common Law Rule the Telecosm | 859 |
| Lessig, It's Time to Demolish the FCC | 864 |
| Statutory Appendix | 869 |
| Conceptual Index and Telecommunications Glossary | 943 |

Table of Materials

- ACLU v. Mukasey (2008), 832
- Action for Children's Television v. FCC [ACT III] (1995), 750
- Unbundled Access to Network Elements: Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (2005), 248
- Alliance for Community Media v. FCC (2008), 295
- American Broadcasting Companies, Inc. v. Aereo, Inc. (2014), 310
- American Council on Education v. FCC (2006), 664
- Applications of Ameritech Corp., Transferor, and SBC Communications, Inc., Transferee, for Consent to Transfer Control of Corporations 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 (1999), 492
- Separate Statement of Commissioner Harold Furchtgott-Roth Concurring in Part, Dissenting in Part (1999), 496
- Applications of Comcast Corp., General Electric Co. and NBC Universal, Inc. for Consent to Assign Licenses and Transfer Control of Licenses (2011), 490, 510
- Appropriate Framework for Broadband Access to the Internet over Wireline Facilities (2005), 620
- Ashcroft v. ACLU [*Ashcroft II*] (2004), 825
- AT&T Corp. v. City of Portland (2000), 596
- AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Board (1999), 235
- Benkler, Some Economics of Wireless Communications (2002), 90
- Besen and Crandall, The Deregulation of Cable Television (1981), 278
- Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 2006 Quadrennial Regulatory Review—Review of the Commission's (2008), 397
- Broadcast Renewal Applicants, Competing Applicants, and Other Participants to the Comparative Renewal Process and to the Prevention of Abuses of the Renewal Process, Formulation of Policies and Rules Relating to (1989), 165
- Cablevision Systems Corp. v. FCC (2011), 441
- Changes in the Entertainment Formats of Broadcast Stations (1976), 136
- Children's Television Programming and Advertising Practices (1983), 716
- Children's Television Programming, Policies and Rules Concerning (1991), 721
- Children's Television Programming, Policies and Rules Concerning (1996), 723
- Children's Television Programming, *see also* Violent Television Programming

- Coase, Why Not Use the Pricing System in the Broadcast Industry? (1959), 59, 273
- Comcast Cable Communications, LLC, v. FCC (2013), 447
- Comcast Corp. v. FCC (2009), 414
- Comcast Corp. v. FCC (2010), 628
- Comcast Corp., *see also* Applications of Comcast Corp.
- Commercial Operations in the 3550–3650 MHz Band, Amendment of the Commission’s Rules with Regard to (2012), 111
- Communiqué on Principles for Internet Policy-Making: OECD High Level Meeting on the Internet Economy (2011), 540
- Comparative Broadcast Hearings, Policy Statement on (1965), 142
- Competitive Bidding for Commercial Broadcast and Instructional Television Fixed Service Licenses, Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act—(1998), 174
- Denver Area Educational Telecommunications Consortium, Inc. v. FCC (1996), 782
- Digital Audio Radio Satellite Service in the 2310-2360 MHz Frequency Band, Establishment of Rules and Policies for the (1997), 285
- FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc. (2009), 768
- FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc. (2012), 777
- FCC v. Midwest Video Corp. [*Midwest Video II*] (1979), 591
- FCC v. Pacifica Foundation (1978), 740
- FCC v. WNCN Listeners Guild (1981), 138
- Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service (1997), 562
- Framework for Global Electronic Commerce, A (1997), 539
- General Fairness Doctrine Obligations of Broadcast Licensees, Inquiry into the Commission’s Rules and Regulations Concerning the (1985), 685
- 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 (2004), 423
- “Golden Globe Awards” Program, Complaints Against Various Broadcast Licensees Regarding Their Airing of the (2004), 764
- Huber, Law and Disorder in Cyberspace: Abolish the FCC and Let Common Law Rule the Telecosm (1997), 859
- Huber, Kellogg, and Thorne, Federal Telecommunications Law, 198
- In re FCC 11-161 (2014), 553, 567
- Indecent Communications by Telephone, Regulations Concerning (1990), 814
- Key Internet Domain Name Functions, NTIA Announces Intent to Transition (2014), 543
- Kwerel and Felker, Using Auctions to Select FCC Licensees (1985), 168
- Lessig, It’s Time to Demolish the FCC, (2008), 864
- Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Implementation of the (1996), 225
- Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod v. FCC (1998), 160
- Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC (1990), 151
- Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo (1974), 676
- Minnesota Public Utilities Commission v. FCC (2007), 655
- Mobile Spectrum Holdings: Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum through Incentive Auctions, Policies Regarding (2014), 453
- National Broadband Plan: Connecting America (2010), 565, 615
- National Cable & Telecommunications Ass’n v. Brand X Internet Services (2005), 600
- National Cable & Telecommunications Ass’n v. FCC (2009), 428

- NBC Universal, Inc., *see* Applications of Comcast Corp.
- New Federal Communications Commission for the 21st Century, A (1999), 856
- Nuvio Corp. v. FCC (2006), 660
- Posner, Bad News (2005), 474
- President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, Realizing the Full Potential of Government-Held Spectrum to Spur Economic Growth (2012), 107
- Program Access Rules and Examination of Programming Tying Arrangements, Review of the Commission's (2010), 433
- Prometheus Radio Project v. FCC [*Prometheus I*] (2004), 383
- Promoting Efficient Use of Spectrum Through Elimination of Barriers to the Development of Secondary Markets (2004), 119
- Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. FCC (1969), 678
- Redevelopment of Spectrum to Encourage Innovation in the Use of New Telecommunications Technologies (1992), 81
- Reno v. ACLU (1997), 818
- Request of ABC, Inc. for Declaratory Ruling (1999), 700
- Retransmission Consent, Amendment of the Commission's Rules Related to (2011), 322
- Retransmission Consent, Amendment of the Commission's Rules Related to (2014), 328
- Sable Communications of California, Inc. v. FCC (1989), 809
- Schurz Communications, Inc. v. FCC (1992), 372
- SBC Communications, Inc., *see* Applications of Ameritech Corp.
- Service Rules for the 698–746, 747–762 & 777–792 MHz Bands (2007), 622
- Simon Geller for Renewal of License of WVCA-FM and Grandbanke Corporation for Construction Permit, Applications of (1985), 146
- Sirius Satellite Radio Holdings Inc. and XM Satellite Radio Holdings, Inc. Subject to Conditions, Commission Approves Transaction Between (2008), 508
- Sirius Satellite Radio Inc., *see also* XM Satellite Radio Holdings Inc.
- Spectrum Policy Task Force Report (2002), 72
- Sunstein, The First Amendment in Cyberspace (1995), 468
- Technology Transitions (2014), 578
- Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC (1996), 710
- Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC (1997), 712
- Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC [*Time Warner II*] (2001), 407
- Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC [*Turner I*] (1994), 332
- Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC [*Turner II*] (1997), 345
- United States Telecom Ass'n v. FCC [*USTA II*] (2004), 233, 242
- United States v. American Telephone & Telegraph Co. (1982), 204
- United States v. Playboy Entertainment Group, Inc. (2000), 798
- United States v. Southwestern Cable Co. (1968), 589
- Unlicensed Operation in the TV Broadcast Bands and Additional Spectrum for Unlicensed Devices Below 900 MHz and in the 3 GHz Band (2008), 98
- Verizon Communications Inc. v. FCC (2002), 254
- Verizon Communications Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP (2004), 522
- Verizon v. FCC (2014), 632
- Violent Television Programming and Its Impact on Children (2007), 843
- Waldman et al., The Information Needs of Communities: The Changing Media Landscape in a Broadband Age (2011), 482
- XM Satellite Radio Holdings Inc.'s Merger with Sirius Satellite Radio Inc.,

Statement of the Department of
Justice Antitrust Division on Its
Decision to Close Its Investigation of
(2008), 505

XM Satellite Radio, *see also* Sirius
Satellite Radio

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 by Peter W. Huber, Michael K. Kellogg, and John Thorne. Copyright 1992 by Peter W. Huber, Michael K. Kellogg, and John Thorne. All rights reserved.

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 & T.V. 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 text, Regulating Broadcast Programming (1994). All rights reserved.

Lawrence Lessig for permission to reprint It's Time to Demolish the FCC, Newsweek (December 22, 2008, updated March 13, 2010).

Oxford University Press and Peter Huber for permission to excerpt Law and Disorder in Cyberspace: Abolish the FCC and Let Common Law Rule the Telecom. Copyright 1997 by Oxford University Press, Inc. 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. 1757–1804 (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 telecommunications book, 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 telecommunications law is particularly interesting and important today because of technological convergence. 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 telecommunications 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 telecommunications in isolation. It is the combination of broadcast, cable, telephone, and Internet regulation that together determine how wire, air, and other telecommunications resources are allocated between all their myriad competing uses. Because almost any telecommunications resource can be put to more than one telecommunications use, telecommunications topics are necessarily interconnected. And, as noted above, today's decisionmakers 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 telecommunications 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 telecommunications policy issues, Chapters One and Two begin with the basic economic and institutional issues that will be discussed throughout the book.

Now, some acknowledgments. This book grew out of an earlier book written by Tom Krattenmaker, and so first and foremost our thanks to Tom for getting us started back in 2001. Howard Shelanski and Phil Weiser were on previous editions, and their ideas and analyses remain in these pages, for which we are deeply indebted. We also thank Doug Lichtman who was on the first two editions. Jack Balkin, Dale Hatfield, Karl Mannheim, Preston Padden, John Roberts, Peter Shane, and Doug Sicker also have contributed significantly to this project over the years. We owe each sincere thanks for helping us think through issues. 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: Julie Moushon and Balfour Smith from Duke Law School and Duke Law students Ben Chalfin, Matthew Craig, Daniel Stockton, and Bill Warren.

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 telecommunications law to be a rewarding one.

Stuart Benjamin and Jim Speta