

EDITOR'S NOTE

Following passage of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, many law journals began planning for a symposium and/or issue devoted to the Act's provisions. The Editorial Board of the *Federal Communications Law Journal*, in consultation with the Federal Communications Bar Association's Editorial Advisory Board, decided instead to embark on a much more ambitious, multivolume focus on the Act, its implementation by the Federal Communications Commission, its review by the courts, and its impact on communications industries and consumers.

This issue marks the first in that series. Dean Thomas G. Krattenmaker provides a far-reaching analysis and assessment of the Act, and helps set the stage for future articles, essays, and notes addressing more specific parts of the Act. Dean Krattenmaker's article is also appearing in the *Connecticut Law Review*, along with commentary by other distinguished academics and practitioners. This co-publishing arrangement is unusual, and reflects a cooperative effort to expand the audience for this important article to include both specialists in telecommunications law and the readers of generalized law journals. We are grateful to Dean Krattenmaker and to the Editors of the *Connecticut Law Review* for their cooperation in this endeavor.

Robert Cannon's article examines the legislative history of perhaps the most publicly controversial section of the Act, the Communications Decency Act. That article is followed by a commentary by the principal author of the CDA, Senator Jim Exon. An essay by Peter Johnson helps to place the debate over the CDA in a broader historical and technological context. Joseph Farrell's speech examines some the obstacles facing creation of true competition in the local telephone network.

Although the Act is both broad and important, the *Journal* will of course continue to publish material that addresses important telecommunications issues, even if not directly covered by the Act. In this issue, we are pleased to include Charles Lubinsky's article on retransmission consent, Stephen Sewell's examination of the Commission's response to hostile tender offers for companies holding FCC licenses, and Nicole Daniel's note on "slamming."

We are grateful to each of these authors, and we appreciate the continued support of our readers. We promise you our continued best efforts to publish the highest quality, timely analysis of a wide range of pressing communications law and policy issues. We are increasing the number of pages in each issue to provide more opportunity to address these issues. We have substantially altered our notes-writing process, to expand the range of timely, practical notes and to facilitate greater contact between student writers and members of the bar. We are soliciting more articles to ensure that these pages present diverse viewpoints on a wide range of topics--for the next issue, for example, we have asked Professor Michael Meyerson to provide his analysis of the Act. And we eagerly welcome inquiries and submissions concerning any issue raised by the Act and its implementation, or any of the many other pressing issues of interest to the communications bar. As always, we welcome your input.

Randall W. Sifers

Editor-in-Chief