

J 395 Communication Policy 09129 Also INF 390N (27954) and PA 388K (60214)

Class: Tu 2:00-5:00, DMC 4.378A

Dr. Sharon Strover, office: BMC 3.368

Office Hours: TBD

Course Description

This course examines communication policy in light of domestic and international structural, economic and technological changes. While it is U.S.-centric in many readings, our efforts will endeavor to frame the U.S. experience in terms of global models and approaches. We will investigate how notions of control, access and expression have changed during the 20th and the 21st centuries, examining communication policies and regulation against a backdrop of technological innovation. The field of communication is broad and influential, and our work will range across matters of cultural heritage, the case of special audiences such as children, the evolution of platforms, and authoritarian censorship. The definitions and controversies around what constitutes the public interest intersect with policies for specific media systems including broadcasting, cablecasting, the Internet and social media, and even AI, among others. At the current moment, issues around privacy, large tech companies and their role in contemporary life, the limits and authority of regulation, and of course social media and ‘big data’ dominate many political and research agendas. Our goal will be to understand the backgrounds and foundations that bring us to these concerns and to frame them in critical ways.

The course begins by examining some of the histories about events and technology systems that established expectations about how communications systems should function in American society. We pursue the events and shifts in technologies from broadcasting, cable and telephony in the 20th century to networked communication (particularly the Internet) systems and their histories in order to discover how original conceptualizations have become wedded to the marketplace notions that are now dominant.

One core element of this course will be to demonstrate the interaction of technological change, regulation and policy. We will evaluate recent judicial, social, technological, market-driven and legislative initiatives addressing communication systems, especially those now associated with Internet and networked surveillance issues, in terms of what they mean for both the conduct of policy as well as public goals. We also attend to public forum and ideas about speech rights, First Amendment values and possibilities, and privacy and security. In particular, we will examine trade barriers, disinformation efforts and democratic movements and their import for communication systems in industrialized and developing countries, in democracies and in authoritarian regimes.

Readings and Reference Materials

This semester I am making all readings available online in Canvas except for two books required for this course: Tim Wu’s The Curse of Bigness (2018); and Victor Pickard’s America’s Battle for Media Democracy (2014). I have reproduced chapters from

Horwitz, R., [The Irony of regulatory reform](#) and made them available to you on canvas, and his book – a masterful history of the U.S. system through the 1980s - is also in the library. **Please check our canvas files for the readings each week.**

Numerous books discuss the straightforward *technologies* of cable, satellite communications, the Internet, the collection of technologies referred to collectively as ‘AI’ and so on, and you may wish to obtain a general primer on communication technologies in order to understand how they work. The FCC web site at www.fcc.gov is extremely useful for contemporary policy issues; I recommend you check it frequently. The Benton foundation also operates a listserv that features daily highlights on communication policy matters. You can subscribe to it at [www. Benton.org](http://www.Benton.org). There are several advocacy organizations that maintain informative White Papers on their sites. [Public Knowledge](#), [Free Press](#), the [Electronic Frontier Foundation](#), and the [Electronic Privacy Information Center](#) are ones I frequently check. [Brookings](#) (somewhat liberal) and the [Information Technology & Innovation Foundation](#) (business- and market-oriented, conservative) also can be useful on occasion, although their topics range broadly. These sites have certain political perspectives, of course, but can provide useful information and arguments. Certain material from various court cases will be available on our Canvas site or from the library.

Requirements and Grading

This is a reading course. Students are expected to complete the assigned readings and to think about them in advance of class so that the seminar can proceed with informed participation. Please attend to the questions or topic listings for each class session so that you come to class prepared to contribute.

We will use a forum on our class Canvas site to frame questions and have some preliminary discussions each week. Please plan on composing something related to the course readings and the questions/observations that are prepared for each week and posting your thoughts in the course forum. Also, each student (or duos) will prepare a “highlights” discussion on one topic in a class – i.e., one student or a group of two students in each class session will initiate discussion on that topic.

Our sessions together will focus not only on reviewing the key points of the readings but also on critically digesting the material and composing a context for understanding its meaning and significance. Since this is designed to be an overview class, the breadth of literature you will encounter is extensive. Our job in part will be to contextualize different developments and events and to maintain a focus on the larger patterns that describe the process of communication policy and the trajectories of some of the major issues.

A final term paper (approx. 20 pages) will account for 65% of your grade. Another 20% will be based on the discussion questions or comments you contribute on our course forum, and the presentation of the highlights or “forum” topics to the class. I will ask you to sign up for a topic during one of our early classes so that you can prepare for this.

I encourage you to meet with me in advance of your date so that we can talk about your ideas.

The remaining 15% of your grade will be based on your in-class contributions.

All of your written work must be original to this course; any incidence of plagiarism, cheating, or use of work written for another course will be penalized with a failing grade for the course. Please use a formal citation style, preferably APA, in your written work.

Schedule

8/30 (rescheduled class for this week only) Meet in the Journalism Conference Room, DMC 3.378A!

Introduction to the course; developing analytic frameworks

What is policy? Media policy frameworks and their cycles and challenges. Status of media industries today, and discussion of contemporary challenges.

Take a look at the article on The Big Tech Extortion Racket (Lynn, B., September 2020, *The Atlantic*) or Silicon Valley is Coming Out in Force (Nyce, August 2024) and bring your thoughts into class on Friday. The longer and scholarly article by Couldry and Turow would also be helpful and is recommended.

9/3 Week 2

Background to U.S. Communication Policy & Regulation, the First Amendment, Human Rights

Foundations of U.S. communication policy: First Amendment; Human rights discourses and the EU; regulatory systems; political values and assumptions of freedom and democracy

Readings:

Horwitz (1988) ch. 1-3;

Streeter, T. *Selling the Air* (1996), ch.2 (Liberalism, corporate liberalism);

Recommended: Just and Puppis (2012), *Communication policy research: Looking back, Moving Forward*, chapter 2 in Puppis, M. and Just, N (Eds.) (2012), *Trends in communication policy research: New theories, methods and subjects*.

9/10 Week 3

Historical frameworks for electronic communication systems; common carrier status

The 1934 Communication Act; industry histories and developments: organizations, consumers, advertising, and programming; regulatory issues: ownership, control, antitrust as structural issue. How are these issues related to net neutrality?

Readings:

Horwitz (1988), ch. 4;

Streeter (1996), ch. 3 (A Revisionist history);

Harari, Y. (October 2018). Why technology favors tyranny. *The Atlantic*, 15 pages; Start Pickard book.

Recommended: Horwitz, Chapters 5-6;

Steen-Johnsen and Sundet (2024) Theories of the policy process. In Puppis, M., Mansell, R., and Van den Bulck (2024), *Handbook of Media and Communication Governance*, Elgaronline.com.

9/17 Week 4

Mass media: influence and control.

Development of new distribution systems and the legacies of broadcasting; the growth of programming industries; satellites and new struggles for control; new media systems: satellites and cable television as threats to regulatory order; the emerging discourses of the Information Society and innovation.

Readings:

Rest of Pickard book;

Newton Minow speeches (1991 and 1961);

Aufderheide, P. (1999) *Communications policy and the public interest: The Telecommunications Act of 1996*. New York: The Guilford Press, chapter 1;

Puppis, Simpson and Van den Bulck (2016), Contextualizing European Media Policy in the Twenty-first Century, in Simpson, S., Puppis, M., and van den Bulck, H. (2016), *European Media Policy for the Twenty-First Century: Assessing the Past, Setting Agendas for the Future* (New York: Taylor and Francis);

Recommended: Streeter, T. (1988). The Cable fable revisited: Discourse, policy and the making of cable television. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 4, 174-200;

9/24 Week 5

Competition and market structure

Technological convergence; deregulation theory and practice; information systems' role in capitalist economies; the cases against Google (2024) and Microsoft (2001)

Readings:

Fowler, M. and Brenner, D (1982), A Marketplace approach to broadcast regulation. *Texas Law Review* 60, 207-257;

Garnham, N. (1990). The Media and the public sphere. From *Capitalism and Communication*, London: Sage, 104-114.

Napoli, P. (2019), The Public interest principle in media governance, in *Social media and the public interest: Media regulation in the disinformation age* (2019), New York: Columbia University Press.

Examine materials related to the Google and [Microsoft](#) cases.

Recommended:

Kahn, A. The Passing of the public utility concept: A Reprise. In Noam, E. (Ed.) (1985), *Video Media Competition*, 3-37.

Blumler, J. and Hoffmann-Riem, W. (1992). New roles for public television in Western Europe: Challenges and prospects. *Journal of Communication*, 42(1) Winter, 20-35;

10/1 Week 6 Deregulation

Possible class visit with Dr. Richelle Crotty on the history of mobile cell services.

AT&T's development and divestiture; reformulating the telephone company structure; new regulatory systems at the federal and state levels; Internet “un-regulation;” an alternative approach in the EU

Readings:

Horwitz, R. (1991) The First Amendment meets some new technologies, *Theory and Society*, 20(1), 21-72;

Case: The AT&T divestiture, excerpt in Brotman, 245-248.

Horwitz, ch. 8-9

Noam, Deregulation and market concentration an analysis of post-1996 consolidation

10/8 Week 7

More perspectives on deregulation and policy; the 1996 Telecommunications Act

What is “enough” competition? What public goods and services do we exchange for a competitive marketplace? Where does rhetoric about competition diverge from reality? Why was Section 230 enacted?

Readings:

Noam, E. (1987). The Public Telecom Network: A Concept in transition. *Journal of Communication*, Winter 30-48.

Summary of 1996 Telecom Act – compiled;

Horwitz, R., (2005) On media concentration and the diversity question. *The Information Society*, 21, 181-204;

Goldsmith, J. and Woods, A. (April 25, 2020). Internet speech will never go back to normal. *The Atlantic*, 11 pages.

See [What you should know about Section 230, the rule that shaped today's internet | PBS News](#)

Congressional Research Service report on Section 230

10/15 Week 8

The Information Society, convergence, platforms

The National Information Infrastructure (NII); Internet “unregulation;” Computer Inquiries and the birth (and death?) of net neutrality. Platforms and the cultural sector.

Readings:

Castells, M. (2002), *The Internet Galaxy*, The network is the message;

Goldsmith, J. and Wu, T. (2006), *Who Controls the Internet: Illusions of a borderless world*, The God of the Internet chapter. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 29-42;

Court decision on the net neutrality cases (Verizon v. FCC, 2014) and varying FCC language including The Open Internet decision, 2005.

10/22 Week 9

Infrastructure: toward the cloud

History of the Internet; revisiting the utopian discourse; regulatory and policy challenges: privatization, valuation and freedom. Rights of way, franchising, ISPs and mobile media; and discourse of innovation.

Readings:

DeNardis, L. (2020), *The Internet in Everything: Freedom and security in a world with no off switch*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 3-24 and 132-159;

Lessig, L. (2001) *The Future of ideas: The fate of the commons in a connected world*. New York: Random House, chapter Commons, Wire-less, 73-84;

Horst, H. The Infrastructures of mobile media: towards a future research agenda

Recommended:

Star, S. The ethnography of infrastructure

van Schewick, B. (2010). *Internet Architecture and Innovation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, chapters 6 and 7, 215-280;

Finley, K. (October 03, 2016). The Internet finally belongs to everyone. *Wired Magazine*.

10/29 Week 10

Citizens become Consumers. The Public Interest: digital divides, universal service

Rural areas and telecommunications; telecommunications and economic development; universal service' access

Readings:

Mansell, R. (2002). From digital divides to digital entitlements in knowledge societies, *Current Sociology*, 50, 407-426. DOI: 10.1177/0011392102050003007;

Jayakar, K. and Sawhney, H. (2004). Universal service: Beyond established practice to possibility space. *Telecommunications Policy* 28, 339-357;

Strover (2009) America's forgotten challenge: rural access. In *...And Communications for All*, 203-220.

Recommended:

Schudson, M. The Rise of the Right to Know;

Strover. S. (2014), The U.S. Digital Divide: A Call for a new philosophy. *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 31(2), 114-122.

11/5 Week 11

Media concentration, media diversity

From localism to diversity; trends in media crow-ownership and joint ventures.

Readings:

Brown, J. (2018) Revisiting the Telecommunications Act of 1996

Read all of Wu, T. (2018). *The Curse of Bigness: Antitrust in the New Gilded Age*. New York: Columbia Global Reports.

Gillespie, T., Regulation of and by platforms

Recommended:

[Federal Communications Law Journal](#), 58 (2006). *Reflecting on Twenty Years under the Telecommunications Act of 1996: A Collection of Essays on implementation*. Read

articles by Gigi Sohn, Kevin Werbach, John Windhausen

Re-Scan the Google decision from the DC Court of Appeals (2024)

11/12 Week 12

Copyright, open source, and intellectual property

Reading:

Sony-Betamax decision

Bracha, O. and Syed, T. (2014). Beyond efficiency: Consequence-sensitive theories of copyright. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, 29, 229-316;

Streeter, T. (2010). *The Net Effect: Romanticism, capitalism and the Internet*. Chapter on Open source, the expressive programmer and the problem of property;

Gillespie, T. (2007) *Wired Shut: Copyright and the shape of digital culture*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 105-135;

review Napster and Grokster Court decisions (available in CANVAS);

Recommended:

Waddell, K. (2016, Feb. 9). The Research Pirates of the Dark Web, *The Atlantic*, 6 pages. (Canvas).

11/19 Week 13

Privacy, surveillance, control

Readings:

Gandy, O. (2016). Surveillance and the formation of public policy. *Surveillance & Society* 15(1), 158-171.

Citron and Solove, Privacy harms

Fuchs, C. (2011). Towards an alternative concept of privacy. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, 9(4), 220-237;

Vaidhyanathan, excerpt from [The Googlization of Everything](#);

Video – Manuel Castells talk in Berlin, 2017.

Recommended:

Kemp, K. Concealed data practices and competition law: why privacy matters

Zuboff, S. (2015). Big other: surveillance capitalism and the prospects of an information civilization. *Journal of Information Technology*, 30(75), 75-89;

Andrejevic, A. (2017). To Preempt a thief. *International Journal of Communication*, 11, 879-896;

Wu, T. (2010). The Master Switch, Part V (chapters 19-21);

11/26 FALL HOLIDAY

12/3 Week 15

Student research presentations

Final papers due Friday, 12/6

POLICIES AT UT

Religious Holy Days

By UT Austin policy, you must notify your instructor of your pending absence at least 14 days prior to the date of observance of a religious holy day. If you must miss a class, an examination, a work assignment, or a project in order to observe a religious holy day, you will be given an opportunity to complete the missed work within a reasonable time before or after the absence if you give the required advance notification.

Absence for Military Service

In accordance with section 51.9111 of the Texas Education Code, a student is excused from attending classes or engaging in other required activities, including exams, if he or she is called to active military service of a reasonably brief duration. The maximum time for which the student may be excused has been defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board as “no more than 25 percent of the total number of class meetings or the contact hour equivalent (not including the final examination period) for the specific course or courses in which the student is currently enrolled at the beginning of the period of active military service.” The student will be allowed a reasonable time after the absence to complete assignments and take exams. Policies affecting students who withdraw for military service are given above.

<https://catalog.utexas.edu/general-information/academic-policies-and-procedures/attendance/>

Use of Email for Official Correspondence to Students

Email is recognized as an official mode of university correspondence; therefore, you are responsible for reading your email for university and course-related information and announcements. You are responsible to keep the university informed about changes to your e-mail address. You should check your e-mail regularly and frequently—to stay current with university related communications, some of which may be time-critical. You can find UT Austin’s policies and instructions for updating your e-mail address at

<https://catalog.utexas.edu/general-information/appendices/appendix-m/>

Documented Disability Statement

The University of Texas at Austin provides upon request appropriate academic accommodations for qualified students with disabilities. For more information, contact Services for Students with Disabilities at 471-6259 (voice) or 232-2937 (video phone). Students with Disabilities Please

notify your instructor of any modification/adaptation you may require to accommodate a disability-related need. You will be requested to provide documentation to the Dean of Student's Office in order that the most appropriate accommodations can be determined. Specialized services are available on campus through Services for Students with Disabilities.

<https://diversity.utexas.edu/disability/>

Behavior Concerns Advice Line

If you are worried about someone who is acting differently, you may use the Behavior Concerns Advice Line to discuss by phone your concerns about another individual's behavior. This service is provided through a 6 partnership among the Office of the Dean of Students, the Counseling and Mental Health Center (CMHC), the Employee Assistance Program (EAP), and The University of Texas Police Department (UTPD). Call 512-232-5050 or visit <https://safety.utexas.edu/behavior-concerns-advice-line>

Title IX Reporting

Title IX is a federal law that protects against sex- and gender-based discrimination, sexual harassment, sexual assault, sexual misconduct, dating/domestic violence and stalking at federally funded educational institutions. UT Austin is committed to fostering a learning and working environment free from discrimination in all its forms. When sexual misconduct occurs in our community, the university can:

1. Intervene to prevent harmful behavior from continuing or escalating.
2. Provide support and remedies to students and employees who have experienced harm or have become involved in a Title IX investigation.
3. Investigate and discipline violations of the university's [relevant policies](#).

Faculty members, teaching assistants and peer tutors are considered "Responsible Employees" or "Mandatory Reporters," which means that they are required to report violations of Title IX to the Title IX Coordinator. I am a Responsible Employee and must report any Title IX related incidents that are disclosed in writing, discussion, or one-on-one. Before talking with me, or with any faculty or staff member, teaching assistant or peer tutor about a Title IX-related incident, be sure to ask whether they are a responsible employee. If you want to speak with someone for support or remedies without making an official report to the university, email advocate@austin.utexas.edu. For more information about reporting options and resources, visit titleix.utexas.edu or contact the Title IX Office at titleix@austin.utexas.edu.

Emergency Evacuation Policy

Occupants of buildings on the UT Austin campus are required to evacuate and assemble outside when a fire alarm is activated or an announcement is made. Please be aware of the following policies regarding evacuation:

- Familiarize yourself with all exit doors of the classroom and the building. Remember that the nearest exit door may not be the one you used when you entered the building.
- If you require assistance to evacuate, inform me electronically during the first week of class.
- In the event of an evacuation, follow my instructions or those of class instructors.

Do not re-enter a building unless you're given instructions by the Austin Fire Department, the UT Austin Police Department or the Fire Prevention Services office.

<http://www.utexas.edu/safety/preparedness/>

Writing and Other Support

In addition to the [Moody Writing Support Program](#), the University of Texas has additional resources to provide assistance and support for your learning, including:

- The Sanger Learning Center: <https://ugs.utexas.edu/slc>
- Various writing workshops organized by the Journalism and Media Program – watch for announcements!
- Counseling & Mental Health Center: <http://cmhc.utexas.edu/>
- UT Food Pantry and Career Clothes Closet: <https://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/emergency/utoutpost.php>

Readings and Area Resources

Andrejevic, A. (2017). To Preempt a thief. International Journal of Communication, 11, 879-896.

Aspen Institute (2000). Six degrees of competition: Correlating regulation with the telecommunications marketplace. A report of the 14th Annual Aspen Institute Conference on Telecommunications Policy, Robert Entman, rapporteur.

Aufderheide, P. (1999). Communication policy and the public interest: The Telecommunications Act of 1996. New York: Guilford.

Aufderheide, P. (1992). Cable television and the public interest. Journal of Communication, 42 (1).

Aufderheide, P. (2006). The 1996 Telecommunications Act: Ten Years Later. Federal Communications Law Journal, 58, 407. Retrieved from <http://www.lexisnexis.com/lxacui2api/api/version1/getDocCui?lni=4KTM-W460-00CW-800T&csi=147867&hl=t&hv=t&hnsd=f&hns=t&hgn=t&oc=00240&perma=true> .

Auletta, K. (1991). Three blind mice: How the TV networks lost their way. New York: Vintage.

Bagdikian, B. (1987). Media Monopoly. Boston: Beacon Press.

Bell, D. (1973). The information society: The social framework of the information society. In Forester, T. (1983). The microelectronics revolution. Cambridge: MIT Press, 500-549.

- Blumler, J. (1989). The role of public policy in the new television marketplace. Washington, D.C: Benton Foundation.
- Blumler, J. (1992). New roles for public television in Western Europe: Challenges and prospects. Journal of Communication, 42 (1) 20-35.
- Bracha, O. and Syed, T. (2014). Beyond efficiency: Consequence-sensitive theories of copyright. Berkeley Technology Law Journal, 29, 229-316.
- Braman, S. (1989). Information and socioeconomic class in U.S. constitutional law, Journal of Communication, 39, 3, 163-179.
- Braman, S. (September, 1989b). Defining information: An approach for policymakers. Telecommunications Policy, 233-242.
- Branscomb, A. (1994). Who owns information? From privacy to public access. New York: BasicBooks.
- Brenner, D. and M. Price (1986). Cable television and other nonbroadcast video - law and policy. New York: Clark Boardman Company, Ltd.
- Brock, G. (1997). Local competition policy maneuvers. In Rosston, G. and Waterman, D. (Eds.) (1997), Interconnection and the Internet - Selected papers from the 1996 Telecommunications Policy Research Conference, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, pp. 1-14.
- Brock, G. (1994). Telecommunications policy for the information age: From monopoly to competition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brotman, S. (1987). Telecommunications deregulation sourcebook. Norwood, MA: Artech House, Inc.
- Camp, L., and Riley, D. (1997). Bedrooms, barrooms, and boardrooms on the Internet. In Rosston, G. and Waterman, D. (Eds.). (1997). Interconnection and the Internet - Selected papers from the 1996 Telecommunications Policy Research Conference, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 205-223.
- Carey, J. (1992, Winter). The press and the public discourse. Kettering Review, 9-22.
- Castells, M. (2001). The Internet Galaxy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cate, F., D. Fields, and J. McBain (Winter, 1994). The right to privacy and the public's right to know: the "central purpose" of the Freedom of Information Act. Administrative Law Review, 41-74.

Chamoux, J. (1998). Free speech and property rights: The free flow dilemma. In Lamberton (ed.), Communication and Trade: Essays in Honor of Meheroo Jussawalla, Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press Inc., 205-218.

Cherry, B. and S. Wildman (1999). Review of federal universal service policy in the U.S. In Cherry, B., S. Wildman and A. Hammond (Eds.), Making universal service policy. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 167-177.

Cole, B. (Ed.) (1991). After the break-up - Assessing the new post-AT&T divestiture era. New York: Columbia University Press.

Compaine, B. (1979). Who owns the media? White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industry Publications.

Crawford, S. (2013). Captive Audience: The telecom industry and monopoly power in the new gilded age. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Crawford, S. (2019). Fiber: The Coming Tech Revolution and Why America Might Miss It. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Curtis, T. (1998). Broadband network policy in developing countries: Innovation, standardization, and industry structure. In Lamberton (ed.), Communication and Trade: Essays in Honor of Meheroo Jussawalla, Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press Inc., 119-146.

Curtis, T. and Schement, J. (1995). Communication rights. In Firestone, C. and Schement, J. (Eds.), Toward an information bill of rights and responsibilities, Washington, D.C.: The Aspen Institute, 39-60.

DeNardis, L. (2020), *The Internet in Everything: Freedom and security in a world with no off switch*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Diebert, R., Palfrey, J., Rohozinski, R., Zittrain, j. (Eds.) (2010). Access Controlled: The Shaping of power, rights and rule in cyberspace. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Dillman, D. (1985). The social impacts of information technologies in rural North America. Rural Sociology, 51 (1), 1-26.

Dordick, H. (1986). Understanding modern telecommunications. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Dutton, W. (2014). Society and the Internet: How Networks of information and communication are changing our lives. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Entman, R. (1993). Competition at the local loop: Policies and implications. (Monograph) Forum Report of the Seventh Annual Aspen Conference on Telecommunications Policy. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.
- Faulhaber, G. (1978). Telecommunications in turmoil. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing.
- Federal Communications Commission (2010). The National Broadband Plan: Connecting America. Retrieved from <http://www.broadband.gov/>.
- Fowler, M. and D. Brenner (1982). A marketplace approach to broadcast regulation, Texas Law Review, 60, 207.
- Fuchs, C. (2011). Towards an alternative concept of privacy. Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society, 9(4), 220-237.
- Gandy, O. (1982). Beyond agenda-setting. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Gandy, O. (1992). Infrastructure: A chaotic disturbance in the policy discourse. In Institute for Information Studies, A National information network: Changing our lives in the 21st century. Wye, MD: Institute for Information Studies.
- Gandy, O. (2016). Surveillance and the formation of public policy. Surveillance & Society 15(1), 158-171.
- Garnham, N. (1990). The Media and the public sphere. Originally published in Capitalism and communication. London: Sage, 104-14.
- Geller, H. (1989). The federal structure for telecommunications policy. Washington, D.C.: Benton Foundation.
- Geller, H. (1991). Fiber optics: an opportunity for a new policy? (Monograph) Washington, DC: The Annenberg Washington Program.
- Geller, H. (1995). 1995-2005: Regulatory reform for principal electronic media. (Monograph) Washington, DC: The Annenberg Washington Program.
- Gillespie, A. and K. Robins (1989). Geographical inequalities, Journal of Communication, 39, 3, 7-18.
- Gillespie, T. (2007). Wired Shut: Copyright and the shape of digital culture. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Goldsmith, J. and Wu, T. (2006). Who controls the Internet? Illusions of a borderless world. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Gomery, D. (1988, Spring). Hollywood's hold on the new television technologies. Screen, 29 (2), 82-88.
- Harris, R. and S. Milkis (1989). The politics of regulatory change. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Havick, J. (1983). Communications policy and the political process. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Hepworth, M. (1990). Geography of the Information Economy. New York: Guilford Press.
- Hepworth, M. and Robins, K. (1988). Whose information society? A view from the periphery. Media, Culture and Society, 10, 323-343.
- Hill, J. (1991). The democracy gap. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Horwitz, R. (1989). The Irony of regulatory reform. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Horwitz, R. (1991). The First Amendment meets some new technologies. Theory and Society, 20, 21-72.
- Horwitz, R. (2005) On media concentration and the diversity question. The Information Society, 21: 181-204. DOI: 10.1080/01972240490951908
- Hsiung, J. (1988, March). C-band DBS. Telecommunications Policy, 77-86.
- Huber, P. (1987). The Geodesic Network. Washington, DC: US GPO.
- Huber, P., Michael Kellogg and John Thorne (1993). The Geodesic Network II. Washington, DC: The Geodesic Company.
- Hudson, H. (1990). Communication Satellites: Their development and impact. New York: Free Press.
- Hulten, O. and K. Brants (1991). Public service broadcasting and commercialization, forthcoming in McQuail, D. and K. Siune (Eds.), The dynamics of media politics, Newbury Park: Sage.
- Introna, L. and H. Nissenbaum (2000). Shaping the web: why the politics of search engines matters. The Information Society, 16 (3), 169-185.
- Kahn, A. (1985). The passing of the public utility concept: a reprise. In Noam, E. (ed.), Telecommunications regulation today and tomorrow. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 3-37.

Kahn, A. (1990, Summer). Deregulation: looking backward and looking forward. Yale Journal on Regulation.

Kalil, T. (1996). The Clinton-Gore National Information Infrastructure initiative. In Kubicek, H. and Dutton, W. (Eds.). (1997). The Social shaping of information superhighways: European and American roads to the information society. New York: St. Martin's Press, pp. 45-59.

Kling, R. (Ed.). (2nd ed.). (1996). Computerization and controversy: Value conflicts and social choices. San Diego: Academic Press.

Kling, R. (1996b). Information technologies and the shifting balance between privacy and social control. In R. Kling (Ed.), Computerization and controversy: Value conflicts and social choices (pp. 614-636). San Diego: Academic Press.

Kling, R. (1996c). Hopes and horrors: Technological utopianism and anti-utopianism in narratives of computerization. In R. Kling (Ed.), Computerization and controversy: Value conflicts and social choices (pp. 40-58). San Diego: Academic Press.

Korsching, P., P Hipple and E. ACanvasott (2000). Rural America and the information and communications revolution. In Korsching, P. , P. Hippe and E. ACanvasott (Eds.), Having all the right connections: Telecommunications and rural viability, Westport: Praeger, 3-22.

Kubicek, H. and Dutton, W. (1997a). The social shaping of information superhighways: An introduction. In Kubicek, H. and Dutton, W. (Eds.). (1997). The Social shaping of information superhighways: European and American roads to the information society. New York: St. Martin's Press, 9-44.

Kubicek, H. and Dutton, W. (Eds.). (1997). The Social shaping of information superhighways: European and American roads to the information society. New York: St. Martin's Press.

LeDuc, D. (1987). Beyond Broadcasting. White Plains, N.Y.: Longman.

Lessig, L. (2001). The future of ideas: the fate of the commons in a connected world. New York: Random House.

Linowes, D. (1996). Your personal information has gone public. In R. Kling (Ed.), Computerization and controversy: Value conflicts and social choices (pp. 637-642). San Diego: Academic Press.

Machlup, K. (1962). The production and distribution of knowledge. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

- Mansell, R. (2002). From digital divides to digital entitlements in knowledge societies. Current Sociology, 50 (3): 407-426. doi: 10.1177/0011392102050003007
- Mazzoleni, G. and Michael Palmer (1992). The building of media empires. In Siune, K. and Wolfgang Truetzschler (Eds.), Dynamics of media politics, 26-41. London: Sage.
- McQuail, D. and Karen Siune (Eds.) (1986). New Media Politics. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Minow, N. (1991). How vast the wasteland now? Gannett Foundation Media Center. [includes 1961 speech The "Vast Wasteland"].
- Mosco, V. and J. Wasko (1988). The political economy of information. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Mosco, V. (1988). Toward a theory of the state and telecommunications policy, Journal of Communication, 38 (1), 107-124.
- Mosco, V. (1996). The political economy of communication. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Moss, M. and A. Townsend (2000). The Internet backbone and the American metropolis. The Information Society, 16 (1), 35-47.
- Murdock, G., and P. Golding (1989). Information poverty and political inequality: citizenship in the age of privatized communication, Journal of Communication, 39, 3, 180-195.
- Noam, E. (Ed.) (1983). Telecommunications regulation today and tomorrow. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Noam, E. (Ed.) (1985). Video media competition. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Noam, E. (1987). The public telecommunications network: a concept in transition, Journal of Communication (winter), 30-48.
- Noam, E. (2006). Deregulation and market concentration: An analysis of post-1996 consolidations. Federal Communications Law Journal, 58, 539.
<http://www.lexisnexis.com/lxacui2api/api/version1/getDocCui?lni=4KTM-W460-00CW-8014&csi=147867&hl=t&hv=t&hnsd=f&hns=t&hgn=t&oc=00240&perma=true>
- Paper, L. (1996). Getting personal: the politics of the wireless revolution. In Institute for Information Studies, The Emerging world of wireless communications. Queenstown, MD: The Institute for Information Studies, pp. 21-47.
- Parker, E. (2000). Closing the digital divide in rural America. Telecommunications Policy, 24, 281-290.

- Parker, E., H. Hudson, D. Dillman and Andrew Roscoe (1989). Rural America in the information age: Telecommunications policy for rural development. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Pickard, V. (2014). American's Battle for Media Democracy: The Triumph of Corporate Libertarianism and the Future of Media Reform. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Powe, L. (1987). American broadcasting and the First Amendment. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Raboy, M. (1999) Communication policy and globalization as a social project. In Calabrese, A. and J. Burgelman (Eds.), Communication, Citizenship and Social Policy: Rethinking the limits of the welfare state, New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 293-310.
- Rogers, E. (1986). Communication technology: The new media in society. New York: Free Press.
- Rosston, G. and Waterman, D. (Eds.). (1997). Interconnection and the Internet - Selected papers from the 1996 Telecommunications Policy Research Conference, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Sawhney, H. (2003). Universal service expansion: Two perspectives. The Information Society, 19 (4), 327-332.
- Schejter, A. (2009) (Ed.). ...And communications for all: A policy agenda for a new administration. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Schement , J. and L. Lievrouw, "A behavioural measure of information work," Telecommunications Policy, December, 1984, 321-334.
- Schement, J. and L. Lievrouw (1987). Competing visions, complex realities. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Schement, J. (2009). Broadband, Internet, and universal service: Challenges to the social contract of the twenty-first century. In Schejter, A. (2009) (Ed.). ...And communications for all: A policy agenda for a new administration. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 3-28.
- Schiller, H. (1989). Culture, Inc. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schudson, M. (2015). The Rise of the Right to Know. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Slack, J. (1984). Communication technologies & society: Conceptions of causality and the politics of technological intervention. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Shooshan, H. and L. Arnheim (1989). Public broadcasting. Washington, D.C.: Benton Foundation.

Snow, M. (1986). The marketplace for telecommunications. New York: Longman.

Streeter, T. (1987). The cable fable revisited: discourse, policy and the making of cable television. Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 4, 174-200.

Streeter, T. (1994). Selling the air: property and politics of US commercial broadcasting. Media, Culture and Society, 16, 91-116.

Streeter, T. (1996). Selling the air: A critique of the policy of commercial broadcasting in the United States. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Streeter, T. (2011). The Net effect: Romanticism, capitalism, and the Internet. New York: New York University Press.

Strover, S. (2009). America's forgotten challenge: Rural access. In Schejter, A. (2009) (Ed.). ...And communications for all: A policy agenda for a new administration. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 203-222.

Strover, S. (2014). The U.S. Digital Divide: A Call for a new philosophy. Critical Studies in Media Communication, 114-122. DOI: 10.1080/15295036.2014.922207.

Sussman, G. (1997). Communication, technology, and politics in the information age. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

U.S. Congress, Committee on Energy and Commerce (1981). Telecommunications in transition: the status of competition in the the communications industry. Washington, D.C.: GPO.

U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment (1990). Critical Connections. Washington, D.C.: GPO.

U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment (1991). Rural America at the crossroads: Networking for the future. Washington, D.C.: GPO.

U.S. Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (1989). Telecom 2000. Washington, D.C.: GPO.

Vaidhayanathan, S. (2011) The googlization of us: universal surveillance and infrastructural imperialism. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- van Schewick, B. (2010). Internet architecture and innovation. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Waddell, K. (2016, Feb. 9). The Research Pirates of the Dark Web, *The Atlantic*, 6 pages.
- Waterman, D. (1988, June). World television trade, Telecommunications policy, 141-151.
- Waterman, D. and Rogers, E. (1994). The economics of television program production and trade in Far East Asia. Journal of Communication, 44 (3), 89-111.
- Whiteside, T. (1985). "Onward and Upward with the Arts: Cable I, II and III," New Yorker (May 20, May 27, and June 3 issues).
- Wildman, S. (1994). One-way flows and the economics of audiencemaking. In Ettema, J. and C. Whitney (Eds), Audiencemaking: How the media create the audience. Newbury Park: Sage, 115-141.
- Wildman, S. and B. Owen (1985). Program competition, diversity, and multichannel bundling in the new video industry. In Noam, E. (ed.), Video Media Competition. New York: Columbia University Press, 244-273.
- Wilson, E. (2009). Digital media, modern democracy, and our truncated national debate. In Schejter, A. (2009) (Ed.). ...And communications for all: A policy agenda for a new administration. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 29-40.
- Wu, T. (2010). The Master Switch. New York: Knopf.
- Wu, T. (2018). The Curse of Bigness. Antitrust in the new gilded age. New York: Columbia Global Reports.