

Maurer School of Law: Indiana University Digital Repository @ Maurer Law

Federal Communications Law Journal

Volume 53 | Issue 3

Article 1

5-2001

Editor's Note

Robyn M. Holtzman Indiana University School of Law

Follow this and additional works at: https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/fclj



Part of the Communications Law Commons

Recommended Citation

Holtzman, Robyn M. (2001) "Editor's Note," Federal Communications Law Journal: Vol. 53: Iss. 3, Article

Available at: https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/fclj/vol53/iss3/1

This Special Feature is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School Journals at Digital Repository @ Maurer Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Federal Communications Law Journal by an authorized editor of Digital Repository @ Maurer Law. For more information, please contact rvaughan@indiana.edu.



EDITOR'S NOTE

Welcome to the third and final issue of Volume 53 of the *Federal Communications Law Journal*. The pieces in Issue 3 reflect the variety of issues we have covered this year, from the practicality of particular regulations to the constitutional dimensions of the FCC's delegated authority.

In the first of this issue's Articles, Andrew Cotlar examines the First Amendment implications of the Satellite Home Viewer Improvement Act, which provided advantages to direct broadcast satellite providers competing in the television video market. The second Article, by Randolph May, discusses whether the "public interest" standard—a cornerstone of FCC authority and policy—can withstand constitutional scrutiny under the nondelegation doctrine, and argues that Congress should now take a lead role in clearly defining the "public interest" to be advanced through FCC regulation. Finally, David Silverman and David Tobenkin analyze the impact of the FCC's "main studio" rule, and whether its revision or abolition would better serve broadcasters and the FCC.

In the first of our two student-written Notes, Ian Stewart argues that arbitration decisions have undermined the original intent behind the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, but that the Policy can still be saved by restraint on the part of ICANN's dispute resolution providers. In the second Note, Jean Walker contends that legislation granting interLATA data relief to RBOCs defeats the purpose of the 1996 Act and harms consumers by inhibiting competition in the local exchange market. Finally, Brooke Barnett presents the results of a study illustrating the ways in which television and newspaper journalists use public records databases.

The Editorial Board of Volume 53 has thoroughly enjoyed its work on the *Journal* this year, and wishes continued success to the Board of Volume 54. Of course, we must thank the student staff for unparalleled dedication and attention to detail. We must also thank Professor Fred Cate; this year would not have been nearly as enjoyable without his tireless support and cheerful attitude. Finally, we would like to thank the members of our Advisory Board—James Casserly, Stuart Shorenstein, and David Siddall—for their invaluable input and continued support. Working with such gifted individuals has truly been a privilege.

The Editorial Board would also like to thank all of the Authors for their contributions. We are committed to providing our readers with broad coverage of timely and important communications issues, and we sincerely appreciate the continued support of contributors and readers alike. As always, we actively welcome your comments and submissions concerning any issues of interest to the Communications Bar. The *Journal* can be contacted at Indiana University School of Law—Bloomington, 211 South Indiana Avenue, Bloomington, Indiana 47405; telephone (812) 855-5952; facsimile (812) 855-0555; and e-mail fclj@indiana.edu.

Robyn M. Holtzman *Editor-in-Chief*