What you propose to do is unconscionable. Although much of the original Communications Act of 1934 is outdated, one thing that is still relevant is the notion that the airwaves belong first and foremost to the public and that licensees are not owners of those airwaves but trustees, required to serve the public interest.
How is what you propose in the public interest? It might be in the best (i.e., greedy) interests of Hollywood, but it certainly is not in the best interests of those who do not own stock in any of the entertainment conglomerates.

I am not opposed to the entertainment industry making money, but let it do that by creating quality products at prices that don't require a pound of flesh, not by controlling what individuals can do with the products they legally possess.

If the FCC wants to engage in protectionism, let it subsidize the entertainment industry as the government subsidizes farmers. (I don't see the USDA moving to ban home gardens in order to protect the interests of commercial farmers.) This smacks of information control. We all know that information is power, but that power should not be concentrated in the hands of an elite few, and attempts to do so are not democratic and are, quite-frankly, anti-American.