

# Telecommunications Law and Policy

*Carolina Academic Press  
Law Casebook Series  
Advisory Board*



Gary J. Simson, Chairman  
*Dean, Mercer University School of Law*

John C. Coffee, Jr.  
*Columbia University Law School*

Randall Coyne  
*University of Oklahoma College of Law*

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*

Michael A. Olivas  
*University of Houston Law Center*

Kenneth L. Port  
*William Mitchell College of Law*

H. Jefferson Powell  
*George Washington University Law School*

Michael P. Scharf  
*Case Western Reserve University School of Law*

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

Emily L. Sherwin  
*Cornell Law School*

John F. Sutton, Jr.  
*Emeritus, University of Texas School of Law*

David B. Wexler  
*James E. Rogers College of Law, University of Arizona  
University of Puerto Rico School of Law*

# Telecommunications Law and Policy

---

THIRD EDITION

**Stuart Minor Benjamin**

DUKE UNIVERSITY

**Howard A. Shelanski**

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

**James B. Speta**

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

**Philip J. Weiser**

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2012  
Carolina Academic Press  
All Rights Reserved

ISBN 978-1-59460-892-6  
LCCN 2011942381

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

Printed in the United States of America

*For Arti, Isaac, Denise and Heidi*



# Contents

---

Table of Materials	xvii
Copyright Permissions	xxi
Preface	xxiii

## INTRODUCTORY MATERIALS

---

<b>Chapter One · Introduction to Telecommunications Regulation</b>	<b>3</b>
§ 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	11
§ 1.A.2. Basic Regulatory Tools	12
§ 1.A.3. The Challenges of Regulation	14
§ 1.B. A Policy Analysis Framework	16
<b>Chapter Two · Telecommunications Policy in Institutional Perspective</b>	<b>19</b>
Introduction	19
§ 2.A. The Institutional Dimensions of Telecommunications Policy	19
§ 2.B. The Federal Communications Commission	22
§ 2.C. Regulatory Integration Under the 1934 Act	23
§ 2.D. Institutional Structure and the FCC	25
§ 2.E. The FCC in a Functional Perspective	27
§ 2.E.1. Command and Control	27
§ 2.E.2. Rulemaking versus Adjudication	28
§ 2.E.3. Licensing	31
§ 2.E.4. Norm Entrepreneur	32
§ 2.E.5. Standard Setting	32
§ 2.F. The Statutory and Broader Institutional Context	34
§ 2.F.1. The Structure of the 1934 Act	34
§ 2.F.2. Other Relevant Statutes and Agencies	36
§ 2.F.3. FCC Discretion and Its Constraints	37

**PART ONE**  
**SPECTRUM**

<b>Chapter Three · Regulating the Spectrum</b>	<b>43</b>
Introduction	43
§ 3.A. Defining Spectrum	44
§ 3.A.1. Characteristics of Radio Waves	44
§ 3.A.2. Transmitting Through the Air	46
§ 3.A.3. Transmitting Using Wires	46
§ 3.A.4. Signal Modulation	47
§ 3.A.5. Newer Wireless Technologies	49
§ 3.A.6. The Spectrum as a Resource	51
§ 3.B. A Brief History of Early Spectrum Regulation	52
§ 3.C. Rationales for Regulation	56
§ 3.C.1. Scarcity/Interference	57
Coase, Why Not Use the Pricing System in the Broadcast Industry?	61
§ 3.C.2. Special Interest Protectionism	64
Hazlett, The Rationality of U.S. Regulation of the Broadcast Spectrum	64
§ 3.C.3. Consumer Preferences	71
§ 3.D. An Overview of Spectrum Management	73
§ 3.E. Regulatory Tradeoffs and Allotment	75
<b>Chapter Four · Zoning the Spectrum</b>	<b>77</b>
Introduction	77
§ 4.A. Models of Spectrum Control	77
Spectrum Policy Task Force Report	80
§ 4.B. Implementing Flexibility	88
Redevelopment of Spectrum to Encourage Innovation in the Use of New Telecommunications Technologies	90
§ 4.C. Dedicating Spectrum to Unlicensed Uses	98
Benkler, Some Economics of Wireless Communications	99
§ 4.D. Approaches to Unlicensed Access	105
Unlicensed Operation in the TV Broadcast Bands and Additional Spectrum for Unlicensed Devices Below 900 MHz and in the 3 GHz Band	106
§ 4.E. Dynamic Spectrum Use	113
§ 4.F. Spectrum Leasing and Private Commons	114
Promoting Efficient Use of Spectrum Through Elimination of Barriers to the Development of Secondary Markets	115

**PART TWO**  
**BROADCASTING**

<b>Chapter Five · Structuring and Assigning Licenses</b>	<b>123</b>
Introduction	123
§ 5.A. License Renewal and Transfer	124
§ 5.A.1. License Renewal	124
§ 5.A.1.a. Early History	124
§ 5.A.1.a.1. The <i>Shuler</i> Case	126



§ 5.A.1.a.2. The <i>Brinkley</i> Case	126
§ 5.A.1.a.3. The Judicial Response	127
§ 5.A.1.b. More Recent Developments	128
§ 5.A.2. License Transfer	131
§ 5.A.2.a. Format Changes	133
Changes in the Entertainment Formats of Broadcast Stations	134
§ 5.A.2.b. A Reversal, and a Reversal of That Reversal	135
FCC v. WNCN Listeners Guild	136
§ 5.B. Merit-Based Hearings	138
§ 5.B.1. Comparative Hearings	139
§ 5.B.1.a. Basic Comparative Hearing Criteria	139
Policy Statement on Comparative Broadcast Hearings	140
§ 5.B.2. Licensing Case Study	143
Simon Geller	143
§ 5.B.3. Special Considerations for Racial Minorities and Women	148
§ 5.B.3.a. Minority Preferences before <i>Adarand</i>	149
Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC	149
§ 5.B.3.b. Preferences for Women	155
§ 5.B.3.c. <i>Adarand</i> (Metro Broadcasting Overruled)	155
§ 5.B.3.d. Equal Employment Opportunity Regulations	157
Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod v. FCC	157
§ 5.C. Transition to Lotteries, Auctions	162
§ 5.C.1. Reform of the Licensing Process	162
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	162
§ 5.C.2. Lotteries and Auctions	165
Kwerel and Felker, Using Auctions to Select FCC Licensees	166
§ 5.C.3. Initial Assignment by Auction	171
Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act —	
Competitive Bidding for Commercial Broadcast and Instructional	
Television Fixed Service Licenses	172
<b>Chapter Six · Public Trustee Obligations</b>	181
Introduction	181
§ 6.A. The Fairness Doctrine and Related Obligations	182
§ 6.A.1. <i>Tornillo</i> and <i>Red Lion</i>	182
Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo	182
Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. FCC	184
§ 6.A.2. The FCC Abandons the Fairness Doctrine	191
§ 6.A.2.a. The Fairness Doctrine Report	191
Inquiry into the Commission’s Rules and Regulations Concerning the	
General Fairness Doctrine Obligations of Broadcast Licensees	191
§ 6.A.2.b. <i>Syracuse Peace Council</i>	198
§ 6.A.3. The Personal Attack and Political Editorial Rules	201
§ 6.A.4. Political Broadcasting	204
Request of ABC, Inc. for Declaratory Ruling	205
§ 6.A.5. The Scarcity Rationale in Other Media	214

Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC (1996)	215
Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC (1997)	217
§ 6.B. Indecent Broadcasts	220
FCC v. Pacifica Foundation	220
Action for Children’s Television v. FCC [ <i>ACT III</i> ]	230
Complaints Against Various Broadcast Licensees Regarding Their Airing of the “Golden Globe Awards” Program	244
FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc.	248
Fox Television Stations, Inc. v. FCC	257
§ 6.C. Televised Violence and Blocking Unwanted Material	262
Violent Television Programming and Its Impact on Children	265
§ 6.D. Children’s Television	275
Children’s Television Programming and Advertising Practices	275
Policies and Rules Concerning Children’s Television Programming (1991)	280
Policies and Rules Concerning Children’s Television Programming (1996)	282
<b>Chapter Seven · Digital Television</b>	297
Introduction	297
§ 7.A. Making Room for HDTV	298
Advanced Television Systems and Their Impact upon the Existing Television Broadcast Service (1991)	299
§ 7.B. Choosing a Standard	304
Advanced Television Systems and Their Impact upon the Existing Television Broadcast Service (1996)	305
§ 7.C. Rules for DTV Spectrum	312
Advanced Television Systems and Their Impact upon the Existing Television Broadcast Service (1997)	312
§ 7.D. Hastening the Transition	320
§ 7.E. Public Interest Obligations	321
Charting the Digital Broadcasting Future: Final Report of the Advisory Committee on Public Interest Obligations of Digital Television Broadcasters	321

### **PART THREE**

### **TELEPHONY**

<b>Chapter Eight · An Introduction to Telephone Regulation</b>	331
Introduction	331
§ 8.A. Telephone History	331
§ 8.B. Infrastructure	336
§ 8.B.1. Telephone System Vocabulary	336
§ 8.B.2. Telephone Economics	337
§ 8.C. Telephone Regulation	339
§ 8.C.1. Categories of Regulation	339
§ 8.C.2. Who Regulates	339
<b>Chapter Nine · Defining the Telephone Monopoly</b>	343
Introduction	343
§ 9.A. Precursors to Divestiture	344

§ 9.A.1. Competition in CPE	344
Huber, Kellogg, and Thorne, Federal Telecommunications Law	344
§ 9.A.2. Competition in Long Distance Telephony	346
§ 9.A.3. Communications and Computer Convergence	347
§ 9.B. Breaking Up Bell: The 1984 Divestiture	349
§ 9.B.1. The MFJ	350
United States v. American Telephone & Telegraph Co.	350
§ 9.B.2. Discussion of the Government's Theory	356
<b>Chapter Ten · Rate Regulation and Universal Service</b>	<b>363</b>
Introduction	363
§ 10.A. Rate Regulation	363
§ 10.A.1. Rate of Return Regulation	364
§ 10.A.2. Price Cap Regulation	366
§ 10.A.3. Rate Regulation as Markets Become Competitive	366
§ 10.B. Universal Service	368
§ 10.B.1. Origins	368
§ 10.B.2. Equity and Efficiency in Subsidizing Universal Service: Ramsey Pricing versus Distributional Policy	370
§ 10.B.3. Universal Service After Divestiture	373
§ 10.B.4. Universal Service After the 1996 Act	374
Access Charge Reform	375
Connect America Fund	380
<b>Chapter Eleven · The Telecommunications Act of 1996</b>	<b>385</b>
Introduction	385
§ 11.A. The Local Competition Provisions	386
Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996	388
§ 11.B. Jurisdiction to Implement the 1996 Act: Local Competition, National Regulation	393
United States Telecom Ass'n v. FCC [ <i>USTA II</i> ]	397
<b>Chapter Twelve · Unbundling, Interconnection, and Line-of-Business Regulation Under the 1996 Act</b>	<b>399</b>
Introduction	399
§ 12.A. Identifying UNEs	399
§ 12.A.1. <i>Iowa Utilities Board</i>	399
AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Bd.	399
§ 12.A.2. After <i>Iowa Utilities Board</i>	403
United States Telecom Ass'n v. FCC [ <i>USTA II</i> ]	406
§ 12.A.3. FCC Response to <i>USTA II</i>	413
Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers	413
§ 12.B. Pricing Network Elements	416
Verizon Communications Inc. v. FCC	418
§ 12.C. Interconnection	427
§ 12.D. BOC Line of Business Restrictions	431

**PART FOUR**  
**MULTICHANNEL VIDEO**

<b>Chapter Thirteen · Multichannel Video Foundations</b>	435
Introduction	435
§ 13.A. Paying for Television	435
Coase, Why Not Use the Pricing System in the Broadcast Industry?	437
§ 13.B. Why Regulate? Are There Natural Monopolies?	440
§ 13.C. Why Regulate? Implications for Broadcast	441
Besen and Crandall, The Deregulation of Cable Television	442
Establishment of Rules and Policies for the Digital Audio Radio Satellite Service Band	452
§ 13.D. Who Regulates Cable Television	456
§ 13.E. Promoting Competition in MVPD Markets	461
Alliance for Community Media v. FCC	462
§ 13.F. “Over the Top” Online Video Competition	469
Applications of Comcast Corp., General Electric Co. and NBC Universal, Inc. for Consent to Assign Licenses and Transfer Control of Licenses	470
 <b>Chapter Fourteen · Shared Content</b>	 479
Introduction	479
§ 14.A. Individual Programs	479
§ 14.A.1. Copyright Law	479
§ 14.A.2. Syndicated Exclusivity and Network Nonduplication	482
§ 14.A.3. Direct Broadcast Satellite: <i>PrimeTime 24</i> and Its Aftermath	484
§ 14.B. Programs Grouped into Signals	488
§ 14.B.1. Retransmission Consent	488
Amendment of the Commission’s Rules Related to Retransmission Consent	489
§ 14.B.2. Must-Carry	497
§ 14.B.2.a. First Amendment Challenges to Cable Must-Carry	498
Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC [ <i>Turner I</i> ]	498
Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC [ <i>Turner II</i> ]	511
§ 14.B.2.b. DBS Carry One, Carry All	525
§ 14.C. Programming Delivered à la Carte	529
§ 14.D. The FCC’s Role in Digital Copyright Policy	530
 <b>Chapter Fifteen · Cable Indecency</b>	 533
Introduction	533
§ 15.A. <i>Denver Area</i>	534
Denver Area Educational Telecommunications Consortium, Inc. v. FCC	534
§ 15.B. <i>Playboy Entertainment</i>	550
United States v. Playboy Entertainment Group, Inc.	550

**PART FIVE**  
**ANTITRUST AND STRUCTURAL REGULATION OF MEDIA**

<b>Chapter Sixteen · Structural Regulation of Media</b>	565
Introduction	565

§ 16.A. Structural Regulation of Broadcasting	566
§ 16.A.1. Television Networks and Vertical Integration	566
Schurz Communications, Inc. v. FCC	568
§ 16.A.2. Ownership Restrictions	576
Prometheus Radio Project v. FCC [ <i>Prometheus I</i> ]	580
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	595
§ 16.B. Structural Regulation of Cable Providers	605
§ 16.B.1. Judicial Review of the FCC’s Cable Ownership Rules	606
Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC [ <i>Time Warner II</i> ]	607
Comcast Corp. v. FCC	614
§ 16.C. Regulation of Vertical Foreclosure by MVPDs	618
§ 16.C.1. The Initial Program Access Rules	619
§ 16.C.2. Extensions of the Program Access Rules	620
§ 16.C.3. Expansion of the Program Access Theory	620
§ 16.C.3.a. Extension of the Program Access Rules to DirecTV	621
General Motors Corp. and Hughes Electronics Corp., Transferors, and the News Corp. Ltd., Transferee	621
§ 16.C.3.b. MVPD Access to Buildings	628
National Cable & Telecommunications Ass’n v. FCC	628
§ 16.C.3.c. Extension of the Program Access Rules to Terrestrially Distributed Programming	633
Review of the Commission’s Program Access Rules and Examination of Programming Tying Arrangements	633
Cablevision Systems Corp. v. FCC	642
§ 16.D. Choice	647
§ 16.D.1. Is More Always Better?	648
Sunstein, The First Amendment in Cyberspace	648
Posner, Bad News	654
§ 16.D.2. What Could the FCC Do About It?	662
Waldman et al., The Information Needs of Communities: The Changing Media Landscape in a Broadband Age	662
<b>Chapter Seventeen · Antitrust and Merger Review</b>	667
Introduction	667
§ 17.A. Merger Enforcement and Telecommunications Regulation	668
§ 17.A.1. Background on Merger Policy	668
Applications of Comcast Corp., General Electric Co. and NBC Universal, Inc. for Consent to Assign Licenses and Transfer Control of Licensees	670
§ 17.A.2. The SBC/Ameritech Proceeding	671
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	672
Separate Statement of Commissioner Harold Furchtgott-Roth Concurring in Part, Dissenting in Part	676

§ 17.A.3. Reconsidering the FCC's Merger Review Process	681
§ 17.A.4. The FCC's Own Institutional Reforms	682
§ 17.A.5. The Elusive Effort to Restrict the Scope of FCC Merger Review	684
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.	686
Commission Approves Transaction Between Sirius Satellite Radio Holdings Inc. and XM Satellite Radio Holdings, Inc. Subject to Conditions	689
§ 17.A.6. The Comcast/NBCU Proceeding	691
Applications of Comcast Corp., General Electric Co. and NBC Universal, Inc. for Consent to Assign Licenses and Transfer Control of Licensees	692
§ 17.B. Antitrust in a Regulatory Thicket	704
Verizon Communications Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP	705

## **PART SIX**

### **THE INTERNET**

<b>Chapter Eighteen · The Internet</b>	713
Introduction	713
§ 18.A. The History and Architecture of the Internet	713
§ 18.A.1. Basic Characteristics	715
§ 18.A.2. Network Elements	717
§ 18.A.3. Packet Switching and Addressing	718
§ 18.A.4. Services	719
§ 18.A.5. Layers	720
§ 18.B. Internet Regulation	721
§ 18.B.1. The Principles of Internet Policy	722
A Framework for Global Electronic Commerce	722
Communiqué on Principles for Internet Policy-Making: OECD High Level Meeting on the Internet Economy	724
§ 18.B.2. Unbundling, Interconnection, and Advanced Services	727
Core Communications, Inc. v. FCC	733
§ 18.C. Broadband Universal Service	737
Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service	738
National Broadband Plan: Connecting America	741
Connect America Fund	744
 <b>Chapter Nineteen · Broadband Jurisdiction and Structural Regulation</b>	 753
Introduction	753
§ 19.A. The Ancillary Jurisdiction Doctrine and the Past as Prologue?	754
United States v. Southwestern Cable Co.	755
FCC v. Midwest Video Corp. [ <i>Midwest Video II</i> ]	757
§ 19.B. Regulatory Characterization of Broadband Services	761
AT&T Corp. v. City of Portland	762
National Cable & Telecommunications Ass'n v. Brand X Internet Services	765
§ 19.C. Network Neutrality	780
§ 19.C.1. The Broadband Internet Access Marketplace	780
National Broadband Plan: Connecting America	781

§ 19.C.2. Network Neutrality Policy (and Jurisdiction, Again)	786
Appropriate Framework for Broadband Access to the Internet over Wireline Facilities	786
Service Rules for the 698–746, 747–762 & 777–792 MHz Bands	789
Comcast Corp. v. FCC	795
Preserving the Open Internet	800
§ 19.D. Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP)	816
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission v. FCC	818
Nuvio Corp. v. FCC	823
American Council on Education v. FCC	826
<b>Chapter Twenty · Regulation of Internet Indecency</b>	<b>831</b>
Introduction	831
§ 20.A. Regulation of Indecency	832
§ 20.B. Indecent Communication via Telephone	832
Sable Communications of California, Inc. v. FCC	832
Regulations Concerning Indecent Communications by Telephone	837
§ 20.C. Indecent Communications over the Internet	840
Reno v. ACLU	840
Ashcroft v. ACLU [ <i>Ashcroft II</i> ]	847
ACLU v. Mukasey	854
<b><u>EPILOGUE</u></b>	
<b>Chapter Twenty-One · Why an FCC?</b>	<b>865</b>
Introduction	865
A New Federal Communications Commission for the 21st Century	866
Huber, Abolish the FCC and Let Common Law Rule the Telecom	869
Lessig, Reboot the FCC	874
Statutory Appendix	879
Conceptual Index and Telecommunications Glossary	941





# Table of Materials

---

- Access Charge Reform (1997), 375
- ACLU v. Mukasey (2008), 854
- Action for Children's Television v. FCC [ACT III] (1995), 230
- Advanced Television Systems and Their Impact upon the Existing Television Broadcast Service (1991), 299
- Advanced Television Systems and Their Impact upon the Existing Television Broadcast Service (1996), 305
- Advanced Television Systems and Their Impact upon the Existing Television Broadcast Service (1997), 312
- Alliance for Community Media v. FCC (2008), 462
- American Council on Education v. FCC (2006), 826
- 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), 672
- Separate Statement of Commissioner Harold Furchtgott-Roth Concurring in Part, Dissenting in Part (1999), 676
- Applications of Comcast Corp., General Electric Co. and NBC Universal, Inc. for Consent to Assign Licenses and Transfer Control of Licenses (2011), 470, 670, 692
- Appropriate Framework for Broadband Access to the Internet over Wireline Facilities (2005), 786
- Ashcroft v. ACLU [Ashcroft II] (2004), 847
- AT&T Corp. v. City of Portland (2000), 762
- AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Bd. (1999), 399
- Benkler, Some Economics of Wireless Communications (2002), 99
- Besen and Crandall, The Deregulation of Cable Television (1981), 442
- 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), 595
- 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), 162
- Cablevision Systems Corp. v. FCC (2011), 642
- Changes in the Entertainment Formats of Broadcast Stations (1976), 134
- Charting the Digital Broadcasting Future: Final Report of the Advisory Committee on Public Interest Obligations of Digital Television Broadcasters (1998), 321
- Children's Television Programming and Advertising Practices (1983), 275

- Children's Television Programming, Policies and Rules Concerning (1991), 280
- Children's Television Programming, Policies and Rules Concerning (1996), 282
- Children's Television Programming, *see also* Violent Television Programming
- Coase, Why Not Use the Pricing System in the Broadcast Industry? (1959), 61, 437
- Comcast Corp. v. FCC (2009), 614
- Comcast Corp. v. FCC (2010), 795
- Comcast Corp., *see also* Applications of Comcast Corp.
- Communiqué on Principles for Internet Policy-Making: OECD High Level Meeting on the Internet Economy (2011), 724
- Comparative Broadcast Hearings, Policy Statement on (1965), 140
- Competitive Bidding for Commercial Broadcast and Instructional Television Fixed Service Licenses, Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act — (1998), 172
- Connect America Fund (2011), 380, 744
- Core Communications, Inc. v. FCC (2010), 733
- Denver Area Educational Telecommunications Consortium, Inc. v. FCC (1996), 534
- Digital Audio Radio Satellite Service Band, Establishment of Rules and Policies for the (1997), 452
- FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc. (2009), 248
- FCC v. Midwest Video Corp. [*Midwest Video II*] (1979), 757
- FCC v. Pacifica Foundation (1978), 220
- FCC v. WNCN Listeners Guild (1981), 136
- Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service (1997), 738
- Fox Television Stations, Inc. v. FCC (2010), 257
- Framework for Global Electronic Commerce, A (1997), 722
- Furchtgott-Roth, Harold, Separate Statement of (Concurring in Part, Dissenting in Part) (1999), 676
- General Fairness Doctrine Obligations of Broadcast Licensees, Inquiry into the Commission's Rules and Regulations Concerning the (1985), 191
- General Electric Co., *see* Applications of Comcast Corp.
- General Motors Corp. and Hughes Electronics Corp., Transferors, and the News Corp. Ltd., Transferee (2004), 621
- "Golden Globe Awards" Program, Complaints Against Various Broadcast Licensees Regarding Their Airing of the (2004), 244
- Hazlett, The Rationality of U.S. Regulation of the Broadcast Spectrum (1990), 64
- Huber, Abolish the FCC and Let Common Law Rule the Telecosm (1997), 869
- Huber, Kellogg, and Thorne, Federal Telecommunications Law, 344
- Indecent Communications by Telephone, Regulations Concerning (1990), 837
- Kwerel and Felker, Using Auctions to Select FCC Licensees (1985), 166
- Lessig, Reboot the FCC (2008), 874
- Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Implementation of the (1996), 388
- Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod v. FCC (1998), 157
- Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC (1990), 149
- Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo (1974), 182
- Minnesota Public Utilities Commission v. FCC (2007), 818
- National Broadband Plan: Connecting America (2010), 741, 781
- National Cable & Telecommunications Ass'n v. Brand X Internet Services (2005), 765
- National Cable & Telecommunications Ass'n v. FCC (2009), 628
- NBC Universal, Inc., *see* Applications of Comcast Corp.
- New Federal Communications Commission for the 21st Century, A (1999), 866
- Nuvio Corp. v. FCC (2006), 823
- Posner, Bad News (2005), 654
- Preserving the Open Internet (2010), 800

- Program Access Rules and Examination of Programming Tying Arrangements, Review of the Commission's (2010), 633
- Prometheus Radio Project v. FCC [*Prometheus I*] (2004), 580
- Promoting Efficient Use of Spectrum Through Elimination of Barriers to the Development of Secondary Markets (2004), 115
- Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. FCC (1969), 184
- Redevelopment of Spectrum to Encourage Innovation in the Use of New Telecommunications Technologies (1992), 90
- Reno v. ACLU (1997), 840
- Request of ABC, Inc. for Declaratory Ruling (1999), 205
- Retransmission Consent, Amendment of the Commission's Rules Related to (2011), 489
- Sable Communications of California, Inc. v. FCC (1989), 832
- Schurz Communications, Inc. v. FCC (1992), 568
- SBC Communications, Inc., *see* Applications of Ameritech Corp.
- Service Rules for the 698–746, 747–762 & 777–792 MHz Bands (2007), 789
- Simon Geller (1985), 143
- Sirius Satellite Radio Holdings Inc. and XM Satellite Radio Holdings, Inc. Subject to Conditions, Commission Approves Transaction Between (2008), 689
- Sirius Satellite Radio Inc., *see also* XM Satellite Radio Holdings Inc.
- Spectrum Policy Task Force Report (2002), 80
- Sunstein, The First Amendment in Cyberspace (1995), 648
- Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC (1996), 215
- Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC (1997), 217
- Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC [*Time Warner II*] (2001), 607
- Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC [*Turner I*] (1994), 498
- Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC [*Turner II*] (1997), 511
- Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, Review of the Section 251 (2005), 413
- United States Telecom Ass'n v. FCC [*USTA II*] (2004), 397, 406
- United States v. American Telephone & Telegraph Co. (1982), 350
- United States v. Playboy Entertainment Group, Inc. (2000), 550
- United States v. Southwestern Cable Co. (1968), 755
- Unlicensed Operation in the TV Broadcast Bands and Additional Spectrum for Unlicensed Devices Below 900 MHz and in the 3 GHz Band (2008), 106
- Verizon Communications Inc. v. FCC (2002), 418
- Verizon Communications Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP (2004), 705
- Violent Television Programming and Its Impact on Children (2007), 265
- Waldman et al., The Information Needs of Communities: The Changing Media Landscape in a Broadband Age (2011), 662
- 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), 686
- 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 Reboot the FCC, Newsweek (December 22, 2008).

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 Law & Economics, and Thomas W. Hazlett for permission to excerpt Thomas W. Hazlett, The Rationality of U.S. Regulation of the Broadcast Spectrum, 33 J. Law & Econ. 133 (1990). Copyright 1990 by the University of Chicago.

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 anti-competitive 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 radio, 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 plant and the traditional cable plant—can provide very similar and substitutable services, ranging from telephone service, cable TV, 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 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 TV 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 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 continually struggle 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. We also thank Doug Lichtman who was on the earlier two editions and is now replaced by Jim Speta. Karl Auerbach, 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: Balfour Smith from Duke Law School and Duke Law students Jason Miller, Chase Anderson, and Andrew Jennings.

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 to be a rewarding one.

*Stuart Benjamin*  
*Howard Shelanski*  
*Jim Speta*  
*Phil Weiser*