





international law of contemporary media

session 5 (interactive): should and can cyberspace be regulated?

mira burri, dr.iur.,
spring term 2011, 5 april 2011

The Institute of Law and Economics of the University of Bern is a member of the Swiss Institute of Law and Economics (SILE) and the European Association of Law and Economics (EALE).









moot court: the rules of the game

- 15 minutes per group for the presentation of the arguments
- 5 minutes per group for counter-arguments (i.e. arguments that “destroy” the arguments of the opposing party)
- 2 minutes for in-group discussion and tactic-building
- 5 minutes for rebutting these counter-arguments
- the honourable jury decides on the case
- follow-up discussion.

The Institute of Law and Economics of the University of Bern is a member of the Swiss Institute of Law and Economics (SILE) and the European Association of Law and Economics (EALE).








structuring the debate

- 2 questions asked: should and can cyberspace be regulated?
- sum-up of arguments
- cyber-libertarians versus cyber-realists (as broadly defined schools of thought)
- cyber-skepticism (exceptionalism) versus cyber-unexceptionalism
- Johnson & Post versus Goldsmith

The Institute of Law and Economics of the University of Bern is a member of the Swiss Institute of Law and Economics (SILE) and the European Association of Law and Economics (EALE).

cyber-libertarians *versus* cyber-realists

- Johnson & Post:
- cyberspace destroys the link between geographical location and: (1) the **power** of local governments to assert control over online behaviour; (2) the **effects** of online behaviour on individuals or things; (3) the **legitimacy** of a local sovereign's efforts to regulate global phenomena; and (4) the ability of physical location to give notice of **which sets of rules apply**
- content providers in cyberspace subject to **multiple regulation in multiple jurisdictions**
- cyberspace should be taken as a separate space, a "jurisdiction" on its own

4

cyber-libertarians *versus* cyber-realists

- Goldsmith:
- territorial sovereignty supports **national regulation of persons** within the territory who use the Internet; supports **national regulation of the means of communication** (Internet hardware and software) located in the territory; finally, a nation's prerogative to control events within its territory entails the **power to regulate the local effects of extraterritorial acts**
- regulation need not be perfect to be effective (i.e. heighten the costs of activity sufficiently to achieve acceptable control)

5

cyber-libertarians *versus* cyber-realists

- Goldsmith (cont'd):
- although some harmful effects cannot be intercepted at the border, they **can be regulated ex post through legal sanctions** (or **ex ante** through the threat of such sanctions)
- nation state retains the ability to **regulate the extraterritorial sources local harms through regulation of persons and property within its territory** (indirect extraterritorial regulation)
- enforcement?

6

regulation in real- and in cyber-space

- **4 modalities of regulation (Lessig):**
- **law**
- **social norms**
- **markets**
- **architecture**
- architecture in cyberspace is not given; code can be modified
- e.g. passwords/no passwords; monitoring/no monitoring; open access/ restricted access, etc.

regulation in real- and in cyber-space

- **code displaces law (example: intellectual property law and digital rights management systems, DRM)**
- e.g. book vs. ebook and click-wrap contracts vs. normal contracts
- **the most effective way to regulate cyberspace can be through code or through the institutions that produce that code**
- **but is this right? is it legitimate and transparent?**

case study: *Yahoo!* (1)

- ***La Ligue Contre le Racisme et l'Antisémitisme v. Yahoo!, Inc.*, Superior Court of Paris, 22 May 2000**
- **facts of the case:**
 - Nazi items available on Yahoo.com auction site through which various private parties could purchase items from each other
 - the Jewish Students' Union of France (UEJF) and the League Against Racism and Antisemitism (LICRA) sued Yahoo! for violating the French Penal Code which prohibits the public display of Nazi-related objects

case study: Yahoo! (2)

The Presiding Judge, Jean-Jacques Gomez:

“Whereas by allowing the viewing of these items in France and by allowing the eventual participation of a surfer in France in such an exhibition-sale, **Yahoo!, Inc. commits a wrong on French territory** – the unintentional nature of which is apparent, but which causes the damage to LICRA and the UEJF, both of which have as their mission to pursue in France any form of trivialization of Nazism – notwithstanding that the activity at issue is marginal in relation to the general activity of the auction services that *Yahoo.com* offers on its site; Whereas **damage was suffered in France, and we are therefore competent to exercise jurisdiction over the present dispute [...]**”

10

case study: Yahoo! (3)

- Yahoo! was ordered to take all measures to prevent access to the auction service for Nazi items or any other service that constitutes an apology for Nazism or questions Nazi crimes
- **enforcement of the judgment?**
- ***Yahoo!, Inc. v. La Ligue Contre le Racisme et l'Antisémitisme***, US District Court, 2001, 169 F.Supp.2d 1181
- Yahoo! stated that banning Nazi-materials would infringe its rights under the First Amendment
- Yahoo! sought a declaratory judgment that the French Court's orders are **not cognizable nor enforceable** under US law

11

case study: Yahoo! (4)

- **the extent to which the US honours the judicial decrees of foreign nations is a matter of choice governed by “the comity of nations”** (which is “neither of matter of absolute obligation, on the one hand, nor a mere courtesy and good will, upon the other” (*Hilton v. Guyot*, 159 US 113 (1895)))
- “absent a body of law that established int'l standards with respect to speech on the Internet (...), **the principle of comity is outweighed by the Court's obligation to uphold the First Amendment**”.
- In 2006, this judgment was **reversed by the US Court of Appeals** – not on First Amendment grounds; dismissal for lack of jurisdiction.

12

post-Yahoo Qs

- forum-shopping (JHH Weiler case)
- libel tourism in the UK
- general questions regarding standards applying on the int'l level:
 - with Yahoo, we encounter the "lowest common denominator" argument: if websites are subject to the laws of *all jurisdictions* from which they can be accessed, the *legal norms of the most restrictive community will prevail*
 - **reversely**: if foreign courts cannot reach websites located in other jurisdictions, will the legal norms of the least restrictive community prevail? In the context of Yahoo, if foreign courts cannot reach US-based entities, has the US then imposed its relatively unrestrictive First Amendment on global Internet speech? Is this also problematic?

13

extending jurisdiction

- **US doctrine applied:**
- A state may exercise personal jurisdiction over an out-of-state defendant, so long as that defendant has "**sufficient minimum contacts**" with the forum state, from which the complaint arises, such that the exercise of jurisdiction "**will not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice**" (*International Shoe*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945)).
- the Zippo test: a three prong (sliding) test: "**likelihood that personal jurisdiction can be constitutionally exercised is directly proportionate to the nature and quality of commercial activity that an entity conducts over the Internet**" (*Zippo Manufacturing Company v. Zippo Dot Com, Inc.*, 952 F.Supp. 1119 (1997)).
