

O-WS
split lines

(2)

[REDACTED]
Danbury, CT 06811
November 6, 1996

Dear Mr. Lamb,

If I understood you correctly, this morning, you intend to keep your telephone lines designated for Democrat, Republican, Other.

In my mind, the previous policy of two lines or three lines designated for areas of the country rather than for parties more adequately represented the thinking of the people of this country.

These "area" lines present equal opportunity for all to express themselves. "Party" lines present a managed outcome.

You used the word "fair." In the past you prided yourselves on not screening calls. This pride was justified.

This country is not evenly divided Democrat and Republican. "Party" lines give the impression that it is. This is neither accurate nor fair.

To "join in the discussion," which is your invitation, access should be random.

Your reasoning for "Party" lines during the months preceding the elections is something I reluctantly accepted, but disagreed with. Now that you are seriously considering maintaining the policy, I am very disappointed. The very same reasoning could be applied to separate lines for "fairness" for Blacks, Whites, Others or Protestant/Catholic/Jew/Others, etc. It's artificial, it's divisive, it's mis-leading.

I do hope you re-consider.

Sincerely,

