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This study investigates the ethical implications of American newspaper policies that call for the automatic rejection of anonymous submissions to “letters to the editor” forums. The investigation is a qualitative analysis of more than 30 practitioner essays printed in journalism trade journals in the mid-to-late 20th century and interviews conducted with editors from 16 U.S. newspapers. The analysis found that contemporary American editors exhibited a blind spot toward anonymous commentary that seems to be in contention with certain tenets of codes of ethics. Although editors took some steps toward making ethical arguments in favor of those policies, they either truncated or skipped some steps—such as considering all of the facts, considering journalistic principles, and acknowledging their personal biases toward anonymity—in making ethical decisions. The study concludes that editors who make ethical arguments in favor of “must-sign” policies should reconsider either their ethical justifications for those policies or the utility of the policies themselves.

The debate over the use of anonymous sources in news articles is one of the more pervasively contested ethical issues in modern American journalism, one that is often debated after particularly notorious ethical breaches involving the use of unnamed sources. In such cases, the ethical principle of revealing sources of information comes into conflict with the principle of giving “voice to the voiceless,” or at the least, those who wish to be unnamed voices (Foreman, 1984; Gassaway, 1988; Smith, 2003).

Although those same ethical considerations could be applied to the considerably different journalistic practice of handling unsigned or anonymous letters to the editor, evidence suggests that little debate is taking place. Although a flurry of professional essays on the topic can be found from the 1950s and 1960s, considerably fewer can be found from the years since. That lack of attention could be based on perceptions that the issue is benign or banal, or it could be because there have been few high-profile cases in which authorship of letters to the editor generated ethical concerns.
The vast majority of newspapers automatically reject anonymous letters, and about 85% require names to be published with the letters (Kapoor, 1995). However, a recent national survey found that 35% of respondents who had not written letters to the editor said they would want to do so if their names would not be published; among those respondents, women, racial minorities, and urban residents figured prominently (Reader, Stempel, & Daniel, 2004). In light of those findings, editors who argue that letters to the editor fulfill an important journalistic responsibility—to provide a forum for diverse perspectives, or at least “Support the open exchange of views …” (Society of Professional Journalists [SPJ], 2004)—might be blocking a large number of potential voices from participating in letters-section discourse.

Although past studies have shown that editors often use normative ethical standards to manage their letters forums, those standards are applied mostly in terms of judging the content of letters and editing the letters selected, such as verifying statements of fact (accuracy) or rejecting unfair personal attacks (fairness; Clark, 2001; Renfro, 1979; Wahl-Jorgensen, 1999). Editors also distinguish between letters submitted without names and letters submitted with requests to withhold the writers’ names. The distinctions between purely anonymous letters and “please don’t print my name” letters are moot for purposes of this article, however, given that so many newspapers automatically require letters to be published with writers’ names (Kapoor, 1995). As such, the substantive considerations of a letter’s value cannot be assessed if that letter is automatically rejected.

The problem with “must-sign” policies is that the lack of ongoing debate may have allowed normative practices to evolve that are distanced and perhaps even contradictory to the reasons those policies were first drafted. At the very least, those policies may violate journalistic principles that suggest journalists should support the expression of diverse viewpoints, that journalists must thoroughly investigate issues before making judgments, and that journalists should suppress their personal biases when practicing journalism.

Editors’ justifications for rejecting anonymous letters may be based less on evidence-supported arguments than on knee-jerk biases.

The concern is not about contradictory behavior. By regularly using unnamed sources in news stories but rejecting unsigned letters to the editor,
American newspapers may seem to exhibit a double standard. However, considering the many differences between the two forms of unattributed commentary (one is solicited, the other unsolicited, to give just one example), it might be better to consider the bias against anonymous letters more of a “blind spot” than outright hypocrisy. Although journalists can understand and even enumerate the pros and cons of using unnamed sources in news articles, they may be less able (or willing) to fully weigh the pros and cons of publishing anonymous letters. Moreover, editors’ justifications for rejecting anonymous letters may be based less on evidence-supported arguments than on knee-jerk biases against anonymous opinions, reactions that could be in contention with ethical decision-making practices.

For this analysis, I evaluated arguments used by editors to characterize and justify must-sign policies that were found in relevant professional essays and research articles published in the mid-to-late 20th century. I also analyzed statements gathered in interviews with editors from 2000 through 2003. All of those statements were then compared to the tenets of one of the most high-profile ethics codes in journalism, that of the SPJ. Although the efficacy of such codes in affecting behavior is highly debatable, many scholars agree that codes outline ethical ideals or help outline the basic ethical issues journalists are likely to face (Boeyink, 1998; Elliott-Boyle, 1985–1986; Son, 2002). The analysis is conducted in the spirit of viewing codes as ideals rather than norms that are universally followed. In addition, the findings clearly show that the ethical arguments made by editors to justify must-sign policies are far from ideal.

Newspaper Policies and Ethics

Policies governing letters forums—indeed, all newsroom policies—should be tested and evaluated constantly if a policy is to “remain applicable to an often changing environment” (Bivins, 2003, p. 20). The justifications for and challenges to such policies evoke all manner of ethical considerations—from fairness to balance to impartiality—that help journalists make moral decisions.

The use of unnamed sources in news articles routinely undergoes the same review. Supporters of the use of anonymous sources argue that the granting of anonymity is essential if journalists want to get sensitive or controversial information from vulnerable sources (Boeyink, 1990; C. N. Davis, 1997). Detractors have argued that the practice promotes the distortion of “truth” and hurts the credibility of both the sources and the journalists who quote them (Blankenburg, 1992; Foreman, 1984; Neuharsh, 2004). Despite concerns about such abuse, newspapers are quite willing to withhold the names of news sources: One study found that 24.6% to 37.5% of news articles analyzed contained anonymous attribution (Blankenburg, 1992), whereas a
more recent study found that as many as 34.8% of paragraphs analyzed contained anonymous attribution (Williams & Goodsell, 1996).

The debate over anonymous sources can perhaps best be examined by applying two social theories: the first, Habermas’s (1962/1989) “public sphere” (p. 227), the second, Noelle-Nuemann’s (1993) “spiral of silence” (p. 93). The public sphere theory, as applied to anonymous news sources, would argue that the devolution of public discourse is a symptom of social inequities, and that the right to free speech of some is compromised because “[t]he public is no longer one composed of persons formally and materially on equal footing” (Habermas, 1962/1989, p. 227). Those inequities could be aggravated by the “spiral of silence” (Noelle-Nuemann, 1993, p. 93), in which those who believe their personal opinions contradict the majority opinion may not be willing to speak freely for fear of being isolated, and in which “public opinion” is established by “men whose judgments command respect” (Noelle-Nuemann, 1993, p. 93). Even journalists who hold their noses as they offer anonymity to “a high-ranking official” might recognize that anonymity can be a powerful tool to give voice to the voiceless, as in the case of whistleblowers.

That recognition does not seem to carry over to unsolicited opinions from the public itself, however. Specifically, many journalists view unsigned letters to the editor and anonymous call-in forums as heretical to the ethical ideals of journalism, if not heretical to the ethical ideals of democracy itself (Aucoin, 1997; Dalton, 1991; Lauterer, 2000; Phillips, 1989–1990). Although anonymous letters are no longer published by the majority of American newspapers (Kapoor, 1995), some newspapers run anonymous “call-in” forums for readers to submit short comments. Those forums tend to be “ghettoized” by being separated—and treated differently—from signed letters to the editor columns, and those forums often are derided by other journalists and journalism scholars (Aucoin, 1997; Dalton, 1991; Phillips, 1989–1990; Reader, 2001). Even some supporters of anonymous forums admit that some opinions posted to the forums can tread on ethically shaky ground, particularly in the form of personal insults and crude language (Aucoin, 1997; R. Brown, personal communication, August 2000; J. Sachetti, personal communication, October 1997; A. Walzer, personal communication, October 1997).

It was not until the mid-20th century that newspapers began to curb the publication of unsigned letters. The New York Times published unsigned letters into the 1930s, and letters signed only by initials can be found into the 1960s in both the Chicago Tribune and Los Angeles Times (Reader, 2001). During the 1950s and 1960s, the issue came up in several essays in The Masthead, the journal of the National Conference of Editorial Writers. The rhetoric used by the editors who wrote those essays reveals that many editors considered anonymous letters the work of crackpots or hotheads with pointless or selfish personal agendas. Many
editors apparently grew to feel that anonymous letter writers did not deserve accommodation (Andrews, 1968; Bingham, 1951; Carpenter, 1967; Markham, 1953; Meek, 1968).

Some editors reported receiving more letters than they could publish, and said rejecting unsigned letters was a convenient and quick way to cull submissions (Meek, 1968). Some noted that the rejection of unsigned letters resulted in higher quality of opinions. “Experience has shown that the rule is a good one,” one editor wrote. “The column is more interesting” (Markham, 1951, p. 33). Another editor wrote: “For every writer we lost by ordering names and addresses printed, we gained a dozen new ones (with signatures)” (Carpenter, 1967, p. 80).

Another editor discussed the issue of appealing to readers: “The average reader detests letters from ‘Observant Citizen’ or ‘A Reader’ who apparently lacks guts to put his name to his opinions” (Andrews, 1968, p. 12).

Despite such negative attitudes toward anonymous commentary, one can see that the publication of unsigned letters is not an intrinsic violation of ethical standards. Rather, unsigned letters may expand the types of topics discussed in newspaper forums by encouraging criticism of government or quasi-public institutions and by giving more people an opportunity to participate in public discourse, both of which are considered socially valuable functions of letters to the editor forums (Euben, 1993; Grey & Brown, 1970; Hulteng, 1973).

The publication of unsigned comments might also expand the types of opinions submitted to the forums, which can help journalists to gauge public opinion (Herbst, 1990); to make editorial decisions (H. Davis & Rarick, 1964; Pritchard & Berkowitz, 1991); and to boost readership (Ryon, 1992). Moreover, many journalists and scholars contend that a robust letters section is important to the vitality of a newspaper and gives the newspaper credibility (Forsythe, 1950; Hynds, 1991; Lauterer, 2000; Shaw, 1977).

If a blind spot exists toward anonymous letters, it could be based on a mythology created and expressed by journalists.

Finally, the publication of anonymous commentary is strongly rooted in the American journalistic tradition, from such high-minded essays as the “Letters of Junius” or “Silence Dogood” in the Colonial press (Hohenberg, 1971) to mundane letters signed with pseudonyms or initials published well into the mid-20th Century (Kaminski & Saladino, 1981; Reader, 2001; Storing, 1981).
Still, editors from the mid-20th century on have held anonymous letters in very low regard and have been unwilling to consider either the potential value of such letters or editors’ obligations to the writers of such letters.

If a blind spot exists toward anonymous letters, it could be based on a mythology created and expressed by journalists. Such myths would be evidenced most simply by statements of “fact” that contradict historical context.

Method

The study began with a critical content analysis of essays regarding letters to the editor that were written by American newspaper editors who managed letters sections. The second approach was to analyze comments gathered in interviews with editors about their newspapers’ policies and practices toward letters sections. Neither the essays nor the interviews can be seen as representing generalized opinions of editors. The intention of the study was not to test frequency, but rather to look for evidence that a phenomenon exists; to that end, the two samples, considered as a whole, provided substantial evidence and considerable data for analysis.

For the first stage, analysis was performed on essays about letters forums in trade journals, including *Editor & Publisher, Quill,* and *The Masthead.* In all, more than 30 such essays, published from the 1930s through 2002, were analyzed.

For the second stage, procedural interviews (all participants were asked the same questions in the same order) were conducted with 16 midlevel or senior editors at U.S. newspapers of varying sizes. Editors were chosen for their authority to discuss and evaluate their newspapers’ policies and procedures as applied to letters to the editor and other opinion forums. Interview notes were analyzed with a focus on statements regarding aspects of letter selection, letter evaluation, letter handling, and characterizations of letters and letter writers, as well as with a focus on statements regarding unnamed news sources.

Data gathered from both essays and interviews were then compiled and reviewed for commonalities and grouped into “themes” for purpose of analysis. Those themes were then evaluated against various steps used to make ethical decisions: Gather the facts, consider precedent, consider journalistic principles, consider who benefits and who does not, consider alternatives, consider personal biases, and articulate the decision. The commonalities were further compared to some tenets of the SPJ Code of Ethics (2004), which was used to determine some of the journalistic principles in the third step.
Findings

A dominant theme that emerged from the data was the sense that letters forums were primarily sites for public dialogue in the democratic traditions, articulated specifically as “a place to share ideas,” “a place to debate issues,” a way “to allow people to participate in the public dialogue,” and “hopefully, they serve the role of the old-fashioned New England town meeting.” Another theme was the sense that letters forums provide a customer service, primarily in the sense of building rapport between readers and newspapers. “The most important role is reader trust,” said one interviewee. Said another: “It makes the paper more open and sensitive to the community.”

On the issue of anonymous opinions, editors distinguished between letters submitted without names (hereafter referred to as “anonymous letters”) and signed letters that writers wanted published without their names (hereafter “unsigned letters”). That distinction was most often expressed in terms of perceptions about writers’ personal risks and writers’ motives. By and large, the editors seemed to give some consideration to unsigned letters if writers were perceived to have “good” motives and were taking substantial risks, particularly if the writers were crime victims or were public employees essentially “blowing the whistle” on official malfeasance. “The benefit is to allow more of the people who would feel otherwise restricted, because of job security, fear of getting beaten up, fear of having graffiti sprayed on their houses, to speak up,” one editor said.

Another said granting anonymity might reveal a public safety hazard. Said another: “In this government town, employees are sometimes fired for speaking out … one as recently as this winter for sending us a letter to the editor.” However, editors at newspapers with strict must-sign policies who saw some value in publishing unsigned letters still said they would not publish such letters.

Among the editors interviewed, six published separate forums for anonymous opinions submitted via telephone. Those six editors made distinctions between letter writers and people who submit anonymous opinions via phone, mail, or e-mail. One editor said: “[The anonymous forum] gives a lot of people who wouldn’t write letters a chance to put in their two cents. … People who call are not the kind who would write letters.” Another said: “This opens up the forum for people who have something to say but feel they’d lose their jobs if identified.” Another said: “It gives readers who feel disenfranchised from society a chance to sound off.”

Editors tended to view the comments in anonymous forums as somewhat tawdry and shallow, while viewing opinions in signed letters forums as somewhat more noble and intelligent. Said one editor: “We seek a higher standard for the newspaper. We want a greater level of reasonable-
ness than you’d find on talk radio.” Said another: “I think (anonymity) cheapens the forum that a newspaper provides.” Another said: “The call-in is often trivial. … It’s not earth-shattering or in-depth stuff. It’s more of an amusement.”

Editors tended to view the comments in anonymous forums as somewhat tawdry and shallow, while viewing opinions in signed letters forums as somewhat more noble and intelligent.

Most of the editors expressed strongly negative opinions toward anonymous letters—which some characterized as “cheap shots” or “mean-spirited”—and those who submit them—referred to by some as “haters and hollerers,” “linguistic infidels,” “malcontents and whiners,” “mischievous,” and “abusive.” One interviewed editor said: “There’s a difference between somebody who’s writing a letter saying ‘Don’t use my name’ and an anonymous letter. In the first example, the person might be afraid he’ll lose his job. In the second example, it’s just garbage.”

Another common theme was that only those who are willing to sign their names are believed to deserve to participate in the forums, and that identifying oneself is a foundation of democratic speech. “If they don’t have guts enough to sign their name, why should they be given any credibility?” asked one editor. Another said: “It undermines the principles of democratic dialogue. If you have something to say, put your name to it.” Another said: “We feel very strongly that if you have an opinion worthy of publication, you should be identified.” Said another: “Part of the debate is who they are. That’s an important part of democracy.”

Editors also expressed ethical concerns, particularly regarding “credibility” and “responsibility.” Editors assigned considerable moral value to the act of signing a letter, arguing that the act gave the opinion more credibility. Some examples: “I have rarely seen any anonymous comment that would not have been more credible … if it had a name attached”; “[Anonymity] lowers the credibility of the commentator and, I think, of the newspaper”; “A letter has no value if printed under a pen-name.” Editors also argued that must-sign policies encouraged responsibility. Some examples are “There is no way to check for accuracy or hidden agendas”; “[We] cannot ask people, editorially, to stand up and be counted on all the issues.
of anger and fear and demagoguery today, but then permit those same people to hide behind anonymity when they write letters to the editor”; “In general, one signed letter is worth two from DISGUSTED.”

In regard to using unnamed sources in news articles, the general theme was that the process was a “necessary evil” to be used reluctantly and with great care. The editors acknowledged that the use of unnamed sources could be seen as problematic among readers. One editor noted: “I hate to do it, but I think it’s a responsibility we should stand up to. Ninety percent of the public would say that we’re wrong, but we have to do what we think is right. Otherwise, some things won’t get said or something important doesn’t get done.” Another said: “We do it only if the information is verified and only if the issue is important enough to bring to the attention of the public.”

As they did for people offering anonymous opinions, editors expressed distrust and disdain toward news sources who seek anonymity: “I don’t have a lot of respect for people who want to remain anonymous,” said one; another said “It’s a fucking disease. ... There’s no reason to give [an official] anonymity just so he can dump on his boss.” Many of the editors who were interviewed made distinctions between using unnamed sources and publishing unsigned or anonymous letters. One poignant example: “[T]he reporter and, sometimes, the editors can judge the credibility of the source. If we are not convinced of the accuracy of the information, we should not run it. Anonymous commentary from someone the paper does not even know is a completely different story.”

Editors all seem to take their policies very seriously, and they enforce them with the best of intentions.

One common theme to come out of the interviews conducted for this study that was not previously mentioned was the following: Regardless of whether editors publish anonymous comments, they all seem to take their policies very seriously, and they enforce them with the best of intentions. The sense of moral certitude, professional responsibility, and fairness was universal in all of the interviews and in nearly all of the analyzed essays.

Analysis

All of the themes described previously were then compared to the aforementioned steps of making ethical decisions and the tenets of the SPJ Code of Ethics (2004). In general, the analysis reveals considerable shortcomings in the ethical arguments on which editors appear to base
their policies to reject anonymous and unsigned letters. Here is how the analysis played out:

**Step 1: Gather the Facts**

Before instituting and enforcing a policy, the editor would consider the true nature of anonymous letters as well as the historical context under which anonymous letters have either been published or rejected. Based on historical evidence (outlined previously), the argument that publishing anonymous opinions somehow violates journalistic tradition is not consistent with historical fact.

**Step 2: Consider Precedent**

The fact that many newspapers publish must-sign policies in their letters forums and automatically reject anonymous submissions indicates that this step is both considered and taken.

**Step 3: Consider Journalistic Principles**

This step often involves a review of codes of ethics such as the one adopted by the SPJ (2004). In regard to letters forums in general and anonymous letters in particular, the following tenets of that code may be applied:

- “Journalists should ... identify sources whenever feasible. The public is entitled to as much information as possible on sources’ reliability” (SPJ, 2004). The operative phrase is “whenever feasible.” If the editor is not provided with a name in a letter, then providing a name is not feasible. In regard to the public’s right to know, the public cannot judge the reliability of a source, even an anonymous source, if the information from that source is not published. An additional argument is that the absence of a name is a form of information, and could influence how readers view an opinion. Editors who reject anonymous letters based on the first part of the tenet might not consider the second part, and as such may be discounting the principle.
- “Journalists should ... examine their own cultural values and avoid imposing those values on others” (SPJ, 2004) and “Journalists should ... support the open exchange of views, even views they find repugnant” (SPJ, 2004). Many editors seemed to automatically assume negative motives prompt anonymous and unsigned letters, even without any evidence that the writers might have any “evil” motives.
- “Journalists should ... give voice to the voiceless; official and unofficial sources of information can be equally valid” (SPJ, 2004). Demographic studies of letter writers indicate that most published letters have been writ-
ten by people in middle to upper socio-economic classes (Grey & Brown, 1970; Reader et al., 2004; Rosenthal, 1969; Sparks & Perez, 1991; Tarrant, 1957; Vacin, 1965; Wahl-Jorgensen, 1999). As such, must-sign policies could deter submissions from people who fear speaking out will cost them their jobs or put themselves or their families at risk of harassment or retaliation.

**Step 4: Consider Who Benefits and Who Does Not**

The rejection of unsigned and anonymous letters has a pragmatic benefit in that it saves the editors some time when they select letters to publish. Many editors also contend that the rejection of anonymous letters improves what they perceive as the quality of the forums. The benefits, then, go to the editors, some of their readers, and to those willing to sign their names, whereas those who want their opinions published anonymously do not benefit. Regardless of the possible unfairness of the outcome, the editors in question clearly have taken this step.

**Step 5: Consider Alternatives**

Some editors take this step, as evidenced by the fact that some provide separate forums for anonymous comments and that most interviewed editors said they would at least read unsigned letters and possibly assign reporters to investigate newsworthy claims stated in the letters. Even so, few seem willing to consider the alternative of publishing purely anonymous letters, let alone modifying their policies to allow thoughtful anonymous opinions to be published.

**Step 6: Consider Personal Biases**

Only two of the editors interviewed for this study acknowledged their personal biases on the issue of anonymity. There was little evidence that editors who reject unsigned and anonymous letters were considering how their personal feelings about the issue affected their decisions. In fact, most of the editors used language that expressed their moral certitude toward their positions. Only a small number of the editors took this step, but only to the point of expressing their biases without questioning them. Of all the levels of analysis, this one perhaps provides the most convincing evidence of an ethical “blind spot” journalists may have toward anonymous letters.

**Step 7: Articulate the Decision**

All of the editors took this step, as they were willing (some even eager) to discuss their policies and procedures regarding unsigned and anony-
mous letters. All of them discussed the policies in terms of seriousness, strictness, and consistency. Many said they often have to explain their policies to readers as well.

**Discussion**

This article argues that editors have a blind spot that prevents them from seeing how must-sign policies might conflict with ethical ideals. That in no way suggests that the rejection of anonymous letters is “good” or “bad” from a moral standpoint, but rather that editors’ decisions about whether to publish anonymous or unsigned letters are not based on a thorough (indeed, methodical) consideration of the ethics of those policies.

The first dimension that some editors did not fully examine was, simply, the facts of the case. For example, some editors believed that the publication of anonymous opinions violates the free-speech traditions of the United States, when the reverse is true. In addition, some editors felt that publishing anonymous opinions isn’t fair to readers, but those editors did not even seem interested in considering what is fair for the writers. By not considering such facts, editors not only undermine the soundness of their arguments, but also perpetuate and perhaps exacerbate a mythology by which journalists assume moral certitude when denigrating missives from the masses.

Moreover, editors may not fully consider the role anonymity plays in enhancing free speech in other venues, such as anonymous tip lines to report crimes or seek counseling, witness protection programs, scientific research involving anonymous human subjects, and the voting booth, where the anonymous vote becomes the definitive act of democracy (Marx, 1999; Taylor & Mosher, 1951). In painting anonymity as “bad,” many editors fail to see how anonymity can also be used for good.

The second dimension overlooked by editors is that of the journalistic principles involved. In that regard, the blind spot leaves the field scattered with casualties, especially the principle that journalists should promote the free exchange of views, including views they find repugnant—or, if you will, views submitted in a manner they find repugnant. Editors who reject anonymous letters out of revulsion for anonymity not only violate that journalistic principle, but also perpetuate another myth: that letters
submitted anonymously have little potential value and are submitted by people who do not deserve to participate in public discourse. That, in turn, violates another ethical principle, that journalists should “give voice to the voiceless.”

The very fact that some editors now provide different forums for would-be anonymous writers indicates that the blind spot is not universal. However if we assume that the vast majority of newspapers still will not publish letters without names, then those anonymous forums can be seen as segregated affairs. That many editors hold such forums in low regard cannot be denied—the genuinely venomous language used by some editors to describe such forums is evidence enough of that. However, editors who do see value in relaxing must-sign policies in their letters sections, but who are unsure how to proceed, might consider the following policy changes:

- Select letters based on content, first and foremost. A good letter is a good letter, regardless of whose name appears at the bottom. Must-sign policies often will force editors to publish a substandard signed letter while forcing them to reject an excellent letter with a “name withheld” request.
- Evaluate anonymous letters exactly as you would anonymous sources—that is, consider whether the opinions are of public value and the writers’ reasons for wanting to remain anonymous are justified. Insist that the writer reveal his or her name to the editor.
- Educate your readers. Many newspapers publish short policy statements regarding criteria for letters to the editor. Those policies could be amended with language such as “So long as anonymity is not abused to make unfair attacks or false claims, the editor will consider requests to withhold the names of letter writers,” or “Many historic champions of freedom and justice expressed their ideas anonymously. Poignant and thoughtful letters submitted without names will be considered, but cheap shots—whether signed or anonymous—will be discarded.”

There are many pragmatic reasons editors might reconsider their must-sign policies, but the ethical reasons for rethinking the ban on anonymous and unsigned letters is clear: The “New England town meeting” editors claim to provide through their letters forums is a myth, and in reality the forums have become places where only those comfortable enough to sign their names may stand up and be heard and where the voiceless can only watch in silence.
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