

43.3  
Spring 2015

# Media Law Notes

## AEJMC Law & Policy Division

## Articulating many benefits of AEJMC membership



### Head Notes

**Chip Stewart**

Texas Christian University  
d.stewart@tcu.edu

Earlier this year, I was talking to a department chair at a journalism school, and in the course of our conversation, the topic turned to AEJMC. After years of service in the Law and Policy Division, I'm obviously a bit biased on the topic, so I admit to being taken slightly aback when the director commented, "I have no use for AEJMC."

It was an uncomfortable close to an otherwise pleasant discussion, but it continues to gnaw at me. AEJMC has been the most significant source of connection for me in my academic career, to the point that I really can't imagine doing what I do without being an active member of our organization. As such, being confronted with this opposing worldview -- at a high level, from someone whom I respect -- was a bit of a shock.

So I thought I would take this space in Head Notes to talk about the response I should have given back then. The words I wish I had said.

Look, I know that AEJMC has its detractors. We're sometimes a punching bag for those from who think academics have led journalism and mass communication education astray or that we're part of a cabal

that slows efforts to reform. That makes AEJMC an easy straw man for those who see higher education as a collection of pointy-headed know-it-all who do worthless research, bask in the lazy glow of the tenured professor lifestyle, and don't understand the toil and strife of hard-working folk in the trenches.

It's a caricature not restricted to journalism and mass communication education -- all fields of the academy feel the brunt of this, a favorite canard of politicians who gleefully cut higher education spending and think academic freedom is great as long as you agree with them. That the caricature of scholars is almost entirely inaccurate is beside the point; it's a useful image for those who want to radically remake the academy to their own designs.

That's their prerogative, and that's fine. They want to throw out those in charge and put themselves in their place.

Let's not pretend it's something it isn't. But it comes from a perspective that believes that AEJMC -- the oldest and most significant journalism and mass communication education organization in the country -- and its members are somehow unaware of the challenges facing journalism and mass communication professionals and students today, or are powerless to

do anything about it.

We are aware. It's our job. We, who have spent our post-industry careers teaching students, working with student newspapers and websites and broadcasts and ad agencies, generating relevant scholarship, mentoring the next generation of faculty, redesigning curriculum, talking to our colleagues in the profession, helping our students get jobs, thrilled with the chance to serve as educators and scholars. We get it.

AEJMC is where we go to share our experiences and learn how to face the challenges of our field, preparing students for the world ahead and engaging in scholarship to inform their and our adventures in that world.

For me, the light clicked on in San Francisco, my first AEJMC conference back in 2006. I'd worked as a lawyer and as a news editor and

*See Head Notes, 2*

## In This Issue

### Legal bibliography

Reviews on libel, campaign finance, IIED, compelled speech, and privacy 3-4

### Leadership call

Grad student liaisons sought 4

### Conference schedule

Complete details on all division conference sessions 5-6

writer for most of the previous decade, and I'd taught some journalism courses, but I still wasn't certain where my professional life would lead. I'd never been to the AEJMC conference before, and I knew very few people there -- a handful of professors and students from the University of Missouri, where I was just about to begin the doctoral program. On a lark, I'd submitted a legal research paper I had been working on in the law school, and it was accepted in the Law & Policy Division.

I remember the first session I attended -- it was on great ideas for teaching an introduction to mass communication course, and I would use several of those in the next year when I taught the intro lecture course as a grad student.

Another session, from our division, was on assignments for teaching the First Amendment in interactive ways, and it opened my eyes for ways to engage our students. I attended several research sessions to learn what scholars were working on, what were the hot topics in the field, and new ways of thinking about how legal research could be done. I met several grad students, some also at their first AEJMC conference, who would go on to become important connections outside of the media law area as I grew in my career.

I also remember making several other important connections at the end of each day, learning about being a professor and balancing that with family life, getting to know people who would be essential to my development as a scholar.

It wasn't in sessions, necessarily, but in going to a Giants game, having a cup of coffee, or walking through Chinatown with other professors and grad students where these connections were forged. That conference sealed it -- this was the path for me.

Between the national conference and the Southeast Colloquium, where the Law & Policy Division always has an enormous presence, I got to know the colleagues who would shape who I am as a teacher and scholar. When Tony Fargo realized we were basically doing research on the same topic, he reached out to me to work on a co-authored piece that would be my first major peer-reviewed publication, and I remember Wat Hopkins at a Southeast Colloquium in Oxford, Miss., encouraging me to send it to him at Communication Law & Policy.

After leaving the annual conference in Denver, I remember thinking, it's time to get a book out there on social media law -- and every one of the 10 contributors I pulled together were people I'd gotten to know through AEJMC.

When I've needed a letter of support or recommendation, I've gotten it from gracious AEJMC colleagues willing to do me a favor, whom I look forward to seeing every year at the conference. When I went up for tenure, several of the external reviewers were people I knew as esteemed senior professors in our field from AEJMC.

I remember the kindness of those faculty members who reached out to me as a grad student or junior colleague, giving me time and critique and mentorship and support, and I can only hope to pay that forward to the students and new faculty joining our ranks.

So, when I think back to what my life, my academic career, would be without AEJMC, it's a bit like thinking of what Bedford Falls would be like if George Bailey had never been born. You, as members of AEJMC, have made my life and career wonderful. It's why when I was in Denver for an American Bar Association conference a few years ago, a highlight was when

I got to sneak away and have lunch with Derigan Silver. It's why I was so excited this spring to have a few moments to grab breakfast with Tori Ekstrand while we were in Austin for South by Southwest Interactive.

These lifelong connections to peers in our field are why I have committed my time and energy to AEJMC, and why I will continue to attend and serve.

I'm not trying to suggest that AEJMC is perfect -- I've been a bit of a thorn in the Research Committee's side for years now -- but I do want to be a part of it as it grows and adjusts to meet the needs of journalism and mass communication educators and scholars. Not engaging with AEJMC is not an option. To me, saying "I have no use for AEJMC" is like saying "I have no use for oxygen."

This may seem like a farewell-at-the-end-of-my-term column, but it's not. I still have one more of these to write. But it's what was on my mind for this issue, and what has been on my mind as we wrap up the preparations for the annual conference as it returns to San Francisco this year. As I was putting together our division's annual report, I was realizing what a terrific (and busy) year it has been for us, with more to come in the very near future.

We'll be announcing the inaugural Harry W. Stonecipher Award for top research in communication law in July, and we have several terrific teaching, professional responsibility and freedom, and research sessions on tap at the conference. And after our division business meeting on Friday, Aug. 7, we will retreat to a location (TBA soon) for a social.

Last year, that's where a few of our panel ideas started to come together, and I encourage you to join us for some time with your friends and friends-to-be in the Law and Policy Division at AEJMC.

## Legal Annotated Bibliography: Spring 2015



**David Wolfgang**  
Doctoral Student  
University of Missouri  
jd Wolfgang@mail.missouri.edu

### **INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**

**Eisenberg, A.K. (2015). "Criminal  
Infliction of Emotional Distress." 113  
Michigan Law Review 607.**

In Florida, two middle school-age girls were charged with a felony of aggravated stalking after they Facebook messages allegedly caused a classmate to suffer emotional distress that led to her suicide. This case involved a criminal statute that imposes liability for causing another person emotional harm. It is part of a growing trend; in recent years, thirty states and the District of Columbia have criminalized the infliction of emotional harm independent of any physical harm or threat of physical injury. This article defines a new category of criminal infliction of emotional distress ("CIED") statutes, which include laws designed to combat behaviors such as harassing, stalking, and bullying. In contrast to tort liability for emotional harm, which is cabined by statutes and the common law, CIED statutes allow states to regulate and punish the infliction of emotional harm in an increasingly expansive way.

In assessing harm and devising punishment, the law has always taken nonphysical harm seriously, but traditionally it has only implicitly accounted for emotional harm; it has not made emotional harm an element of criminal liability. CIED statutes represent a break in this narrative. The article uses these statutes as an entry point to examine the role that victim emotion does and should play in substantive criminal law, and it finds that CIED statutes may endanger free expression and equality and provide insufficient notice to defendants.

These statutes thus offer a cautionary tale, illustrating problems that can arise when victim emotion plays an explicit role in criminal culpability. CIED statutes also reveal the comparative benefits of the implicit approach, which acknowledges the significance of nonphysical harm yet does not predicate criminal liability on the existence of

emotional harm.

The author argues that we should resist assuming that, to account adequately for emotional harm, we must explicitly criminalize the infliction of emotional distress. While that view is perhaps an outgrowth of the broader impulse to bring emotions to the forefront in law, it is too extreme. Instead, the author contends that we should work within the implicit approach's system of compromise to identify conduct that causes severe emotional harm and to explicitly prohibit such behaviors. Otherwise, we risk upsetting the precarious balance between protecting the safety and well-being of citizens and preserving core values such as free expression and notice to defendants.

### **LIBEL**

**Usman, J.O. (2014). "Finding the Lost  
Involuntary Public Figure." 2014 Utah Law  
Review 951.**

Considering how judges have inconsistently approached the presence of involuntary public figures, the author looks to redefine how the understanding of the involuntary public figure should be perceived going forward.

The author begins with a historical approach to libel through an analysis of the development of the public figure / private individual distinction that emerged through *New York Times v. Sullivan* and *Gertz v. Welch* and then discusses Justice Brennan's dissent in *Gertz*, which questions the existence of a truly "private" individual for libel purposes.

The author ultimately argues that misuse of the involuntary public figure has led instead to a focus on the concept of "voluntariness," which serves to distinguish between the public and private nature of a person's classification for libel purposes.

The author suggests that an involuntary public figure should be distinguished from a private individual by assessing whether the individual is integrally intertwined with official conduct or qualifications for office of a public official; the actions of a public figure in regard to a matter of public concern; or a matter of public concern itself.

### **CAMPAIGN FINANCE**

**Moshirnia, A.V. & Dozeman, A.T. (2015).  
"In All Fairness: Using Political Broadcast**

**Access Doctrine to Tailor Public Campaign  
Fund Matching." 48 University of Michigan  
Journal of Law Reform 641.**

Recent United States Supreme Court decisions have undermined the viability of campaign public financing systems, a vital tool for fighting political corruption. First, *Citizens United v. FEC* allowed privately financed candidates and independent groups to spend unlimited amounts of money on campaigning. Publicly financed candidates now risk being vastly outspent. Second, *Arizona Free Enterprise Club's Freedom PAC v. Bennett* invalidated a proportional fund matching system whereby privately financed candidates' or independent groups' spending triggered funds to publicly funded candidates. These decisions effectuate a libertarian speech doctrine: all speakers, individual or corporate, must be absolutely unburdened.

The author argues that to combat this issue, lawmakers and policymakers should consider how to tailor public financing to reduce its monetary correlation with, and corresponding burden on, privately funded speech. This article proposes matching broadcast advertising access costs as a measured solution. The proposed system does not burden privately funded speech, and it increases media availability: if a privately financed candidate or independent group purchases advertising time, the publicly financed candidate is provided funds to purchase equivalent time. Matching access costs reduces any burden on speakers while importing First Amendment jurisprudence and telecommunications law to support the constitutionality of this system. These laws recognize the First Amendment rights of the electorate, the problem of political advertising market saturation, and the values of an informed citizenry. Matching broadcast access costs increases available information, comports with the Court's jurisprudence, and mitigates the damaging effects of *Citizens United*.

### **COMPELLED SPEECH**

**Sawicki, N.N. (2014). "Compelling  
Images: The Constitutionality of  
Emotionally Persuasive Health**

*Continued on 4*



*Bibliography, continued from 3.*

**Campaigns.” 73 Maryland Law Review 458.**

Legislation requiring the display of emotionally compelling graphic imagery in medical and public health contexts is on the rise - two examples include the Food and Drug Administration’s recently abandoned tobacco labeling regulations, which would have imposed images of diseased lungs and cancerous lesions on cigarette packaging, and state laws requiring physicians to display and describe ultrasound images to women seeking abortions.

This article highlights the disconnect between the constitutional challenges to these laws, which focus on the perils of compelling speakers to communicate messages with which they may disagree, and the public’s primary objections, which are grounded in ethical concerns about the state’s reliance on emotion to persuade. This article argues that, despite inconsistent judicial precedent in the tobacco and ultrasound contexts, concerns about the emotional impact of government-mandated images on viewers can and should be incorporated in First and Fourteenth Amendment analyses. In making this argument, the article relies on the body of First Amendment jurisprudence

in which the Supreme Court suggests that images are uniquely dangerous because they are less rational, less controllable, and more emotionally powerful than textual communications.

**PRIVACY**

**Desai, D.R. (2014). “Constitutional Limits on Surveillance: Associational Freedom in the Age of Data Hoarding.” 90 Notre Dame Law Review 579.**

The recent revelations of the NSA’s PRISM surveillance project and other government spying programs provide evidence of how the government threatens freedom through circumventing the Fourth Amendment. With access to a myriad of records, law enforcement or intelligence services have an almost perfect picture of activities and associations regardless of whether the individual is a criminal. Once created, a hoard of data can be continually rifled to investigate without any effective oversight. In short, data hoards present new ways to harm associational freedom.

In the face of these new surveillance threats, the current understanding of associational freedom is thin. The author argues that there is an over-focus on speech and the importance of the precursors to speech is missed - the ability to meet or network and

to share, explore, accept, and reject ideas and choose whether to speak. Recent work shows that the Constitution protects associational activities, because they enable self-governance and foster the potential for speech. That work has looked to the First Amendment. The author shows that these concerns also appear in Fourth Amendment jurisprudence and work to protect from surveillance regardless of whether an act is speech or is shared with others.

This article examines the implications of the growing technology of backward-looking surveillance for Fourth Amendment jurisprudence. Notably, the article argues that warrant procedures should be updated, building especially on the idea of return, which requires the government to return items taken as part of an investigation once they are not needed.

In our new era of backward-looking surveillance, the idea of return requires deletion of data after an investigation. This shift will allow access to data but limit the ability to overreach and threaten associational freedom. When new surveillance techniques threaten associational freedom, they must be subject to proper constitutional limits. This article explains why those limits are needed, when they must be in place, and how they should operate.

## Law & Policy Division Officers

Head

Daxton “Chip” Stewart  
Texas Christian University  
817-257-5291  
d.stewart@tcu.edu

Teaching Chair

Jonathan Peters  
University of Kansas  
785-864-0611  
jonathan.w.peters@ku.edu

Vice Head/Program Chair

Dan Kozlowski  
Saint Louis University  
314-977-3734  
dkozlows@slu.edu

PF&R Chair

Jasmine McNealy  
University of Kentucky  
859-218-2297  
jemcnealy@uky.edu

Research/Paper Competition Chair

Courtney Barclay  
Jacksonville University  
904-256-7114  
barclay@ju.edu

Southeast Colloquium Chair

Michael T. Martinez  
University of Tennessee  
865-974-1567  
mtmartinez@utk.edu

Clerk/Newsletter Editor

Jason Martin  
DePaul University  
312-362-7396  
jmart181@depaul.edu

Webmaster

Matthew Telleen  
Elizabethtown College  
717-361-1272  
telleenm@etown.edu

## Call for Graduate Student Liaisons

The Law and Policy Division will appoint two graduate students to serve as liaisons for the division for the 2015-16 academic year. The purpose of these liaisons is to work with the division leadership to reach out to graduate students who may be interested in becoming members of the division.

Activities include service at the annual conference, contributing to the quarterly newsletter Media Law Notes, and outreach efforts throughout the year to let graduate students know the benefits of being a part of the Law and Policy Division community.

Law and Policy Division faculty members are encouraged to nominate top graduate students for these roles, and graduate students may apply if they are interested.

Contact Chip Stewart, d.stewart@tcu.edu, to make nominations or for more information about applying.

# Division schedule finalized for San Francisco conference

Below is the division schedule for the AEJMC conference. It's going to be a great few days! Be sure to come early for our pre-conference sessions on Wednesday, Aug 5. We're thrilled that Chief Judge Alex Kozinski of the 9th Circuit will be speaking on one of the pre-conference panels.

See you in San Francisco!  
Dan Kozlowski, Vice Head/Program Chair

## **Law and Policy Division 2015 AEJMC Conference San Francisco, CA August 5-9, 2015**

### **Wednesday, August 5 Pre-conference sessions 1:15-2:45 p.m.**

Blurred Lines, Facebook Rap, and Journalists in Jail: Bringing Major Communication Law Cases From the Past Year to the Classroom

Panelists:

David Greene, civil liberties director, Electronic Frontier Foundation  
Joseph Russomanno, Arizona State  
Amy Kristin Sanders, Northwestern-Qatar  
Chip Stewart, Texas Christian  
Moderator: Jonathan Peters, Kansas

### **3-4:30 p.m.**

Privacy, Right of Publicity, and Free Speech in the Digital Age

Panelists:

Cathy Gellis, technology lawyer  
Alex Kozinski, Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit  
Peter Scheer, California First Amendment Coalition  
William Turner, UC Berkeley School of Law  
Moderator:

Ashley Messenger, Senior Associate General Counsel, National Public Radio

### **Thursday, August 6**

**8:15-9:45 a.m.**

**PF&R Panel:** Just Off the Vine: Instantaneous Image Sharing and New Challenges to Copyright Law, Media Practices and Marketing (co-sponsored with Visual Comm.)

Panelists:

Margo Berman, Florida International

Leslie-Jean Thornton, Arizona State  
Ashley Messenger, Senior Associate General Counsel, National Public Radio  
Kathy Olson, Lehigh  
Moderator: Derigan Silver, Denver

### **10-11:30 a.m.**

**Teaching Panel:** Approaches to Social Media Assignments Based on the Ethical Considerations and Legal Limits Every Faculty Member Should Know (co-sponsored with Public Relations)

Panelists:

Melissa Dodd, Central Florida  
Karen Freberg, Louisville  
Jeremy Harris Lipschultz, Nebraska-Omaha

Chip Stewart, Texas Christian  
Moderator: Mitzi Lewis, Midwestern State

### **11:45 a.m. – 1:15 p.m.**

#### **Refereed Research Paper Session**

First Amendment Perspectives  
Begging the Question of Content-Based Confusion: Examining Problems With a Key First Amendment Doctrine Through the Lens of Anti-Begging Statutes  
Clay Calvert, Florida

Access to Information About Lethal Injections: A First Amendment Theory Perspective

Emma Morehart, Kéran Billaud, and Kevin Bruckenstein, Florida

First Amendment Protection or Right of Publicity Violation? Examining the Application of the Transformative Use Test in Keller and Hart  
Sada Reed, Arizona State

Examining the Theoretical Assumptions Found Within the Supreme Court's Use of the Marketplace Metaphor  
Jared Schroeder, Augustana College

Moderator: Brian Steffen, Simpson College  
Discussant: Jane Kirtley, Minnesota

### **1:30-3 p.m.**

#### **Refereed Research Paper Session**

The Right to Privacy  
The "Right to be Forgotten" and Global Googling: A More Private Exchange of Information?

Burton Bridges, Memphis

A Theory of Privacy and Trust  
Woodrow Hartzog, Samford University's Cumberland School of Law, and Neil Richards, Washington University School of Law

Differential Reasonableness: A Standard for Evaluating Deceptive Privacy-Promising Technologies  
Jasmine McNealy, Florida

The Digital "Right to Be Forgotten" in EU Law: Informational Privacy vs. Freedom of Expression

Kyu Ho Youm, University of Oregon, and Ahran Park, Seoul National University

Moderator: William Davie, Louisiana Lafayette  
Discussant: Paul Siegel, Hartford

### **5-6:30 p.m.**

**PF&R Panel:** Online Security: Hacking, Framing, News, and Citizen Privacy (co-sponsored with Electronic News)

Panelists:

Lin Allen, Northern Colorado  
Sandra Chance, Florida  
Dale L. Edwards, Northern Colorado  
Jane Kirtley, Minnesota

Moderator:

Dale L. Edwards, Northern Colorado

### **Friday, August 7**

**8:15-9:45 a.m.**

#### **Refereed Research Paper Session**

Analyzing Protections for "Harmful" Speech  
The Angry Pamphleteer: Borderline Political Speech on Twitter and the True Threats Distinction Under *Watts v. United States*  
Brooks Fuller, North Carolina at Chapel Hill

*Feiner v. New York:*

How the Court Got it Wrong  
Roy Gutterman, Syracuse

The Value and Limits of Extreme Speech in a Networked Society: Revitalizing Tolerance Theory  
Brett Johnson, Missouri

Racial Slurs and 'Fighting Words': The Question of Whether Epithets Should Be Unprotected Speech  
William Nevin, West Alabama

*Continued on 6*

Moderator: Jon Bekken, Albright College  
Discussant: Alexa Capeloto, John Jay  
College of Criminal Justice

**1:30-3 p.m. AEJMC Global  
Connections Special Session:  
Obscurity and the Right to Be  
Forgotten: The Promise and Peril of  
Digital Ephemera** (co-sponsored with  
Communication Technology)

Panelists: Kashmir Hill, Senior Editor,  
Fusion's Real Future

David Hoffman, Director of Security  
Policy & Global Privacy Officer, Intel  
Corporation

Rigo Wenning, Legal Counsel, World  
Wide Web Consortium (W3C)

Moderator: Woodrow Hartzog, Samford  
University's Cumberland School of Law

**3:15-4:45 p.m. PF&R Panel**

The Josh Wolf Case: Lessons & Legacy  
for Reporter's Privilege and Participatory  
Journalism (co-sponsored with  
Participatory Journalism Interest Group)

Panelists: Anthony Fargo, Indiana  
Nikhil Moro, Consultant in Internet Law  
Debra Saunders, Columnist, San  
Francisco Chronicle

Josh Wolf, Editor-at-Large, Journalism  
That Matters

Moderator: Patrick File, Nevada, Reno

**5-6:30 p.m.**

**Refereed Research Paper Session  
Law & Policy Top Papers Session**

Difficulties and Dilemmas Regarding  
Defamatory Meaning in Ethnic Micro-  
Communities: Accusations of Communism,  
Then and Now\*  
Clay Calvert, Florida

A First Amendment Right to Know For the  
Disabled: Internet Accessibility Under the ADA\*\*  
Victoria Ekstrand, North Carolina at  
Chapel Hill

Injunction Junction: A Theory- and  
Precedent-Based Argument for the  
Elimination of Speech Codes at American  
Public Universities\*\*\*\*  
Barry Parks, Memphis

FoIA in the Age of "Open.Gov": A  
Quantitative Analysis of the performance of  
the Freedom of Information Act under the  
Obama and Bush Administrations\*\*\*\* ^  
Ben Wasike, Texas at Brownsville

Moderator: Matt Duffy, Kennesaw State  
Discussant: Joseph Russomanno, Arizona St.

\* Top Faculty Paper

\*\* Second Place Faculty Paper

\*\*\* Third Place Faculty Paper

^ Top Debut Faculty Paper Award

\*\*\*\* Top Student Paper

**6:45-8:15 p.m.**

**Division Membership Meeting**

**8:30 p.m.**

**Off-site Division Social, Location:  
TBA**

**Saturday, August 8**

**12:15 – 1:30 p.m.**

**Refereed Research Paper Session**

A First Amendment Potpourri

To Pray or Not to Pray: Sectarian Prayer in  
Legislative Meetings

Mallory Drummond, High Point

Scrutinizing the Public Health Debates  
Regarding the Adult Film Industry: An In-Depth  
Case Analysis of the Health-Based Arguments in  
*Vivid Entertainment, LLC v. Fielding*  
Kyla Garret, North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Facebook's Free Speech Growing Pains:  
A Case Study in Content Governance  
Brett Johnson, Missouri

A right to violence: Comparing child rights  
generally to child First Amendment freedoms  
William Nevin, West Alabama

This is Just Not Working For Us: Why After Ten  
Years on the Job - It Is Time to Fire Garcetti  
Jason Zenor, SUNY at Oswego

Moderator: Dean Smith, High Point  
Discussant: William Lee, Georgia

**1:45-3:15 p.m.**

**PF&R Panel: State Laws Protecting  
Student Free Expression Revisited** (co-  
sponsored with Scholastic Journalism)

Panelists:

Genelle Belmas, Kansas

Steve Listopad, Valley City State

Frank LoMonte, Student Press Law Center

Sarah Nicholls, Whitney High School

Wayne Overbeck, Cal State Fullerton

Moderator: Mark Goodman, Kent State

**3:30-5 p.m.**

**Teaching Panel: Teaching Taboo**  
Topics: Practical Lessons for Teaching on  
the Edge (co-sponsored with ESIG)

Panelists: Clay Calvert, Florida  
Joel Campbell, Brigham Young  
Philippe Perebinosoff, Cal St-Fullerton  
Kathleen Fearn-Banks, Washington  
Moderator: Eric Robinson, Louisiana State

**Sunday, August 9**

**11 a.m.-12:30 p.m.**

**Refereed Research Paper Session**

Restricting Speech and Access  
Calling Them Out: An Exploration of Whether  
Newsgathering May Be Punished As Criminal  
Harassment

Erin Coyle & Eric Robinson, Louisiana St.

Native Advertising: Blurring Commercial  
and Noncommercial Speech Online\*  
Nicholas Gross, North Carolina Chapel Hill

Cultural Variation on Commercial Speech  
Doctrine: India Exhibits Stronger Protections  
than the U.S. \*\*

Jane O'Boyle, South Carolina

The Government Speech Doctrine &  
Specialty License Plates: A First Amendment  
Theory Perspective

Sarah Papadelias, Tereshone Phillips, and  
Rich Shumate, Florida

Moderator: Laurie Lee, Nebraska at Lincoln  
Discussant: Jason Shepard, California State  
University at Fullerton

\* Second Place Student Paper

\*\* Third Place Student Paper

**12:45-2:15 p.m.**

**Refereed Research Paper Session**

Internet Governance, Network Neutrality  
and Consumer Demand for "Better Than Best  
Efforts" Traffic Management

Rob Frieden, Pennsylvania State

ISP Liability for Defamation: Is Absolute  
Immunity Still Fair?

Ahran Park, Seoul National University

A Contextual Analysis of Neutrality: How  
Neutral is the Net?

Dong-Hee Shin, Hongseok Yoon, and  
Jaeyeol Jung, Sungkyunkwan University

Internet Governance Policy Framework,  
Networked Communities and Online  
Surveillance in Ethiopia

Tewodros Workneh, Oregon

Moderator: Barton Carter, Boston  
Discussant: Michael Martinez, Tennessee at  
Knoxville