



**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Fred B. Allyn, III, Mayor, Town of Ledyard

FROM: Matt Ritter and/or Dori Pagé Antonetti

RE: Municipal Displays of Flags and the First Amendment

DATE: September 10, 2024

---

You recently shared that the Town of Ledyard (“Town”) currently flies only the United States, State of Connecticut, and military flags on Town flagpoles, and that the Town Council is considering whether to adopt an ordinance regarding the flying of flags on Town property. You asked for legal advice regarding flag-flying policies and the legal issues regarding same.

**I. BACKGROUND**

It is our understanding that the Town currently does not maintain a written policy or ordinance regarding flag flying but has consistently and uniformly permitted only the United States, State of Connecticut, and military flags (“Official Flags”) to be flown on Town flagpoles (“Town Flagpoles”). Recently, the Town received requests that the Town also raise affinity flags. It is our further understanding that the Town is still considering these requests, and as part of the process, the Town’s Administration Committee has the following item on its September 11, 2024 agenda: “Discussion and possible action to draft an Ordinance regarding the raising of Unofficial-Third-Party Flags on Town Property.”

**II. MUNICIPAL FLAG-FLYING**

As a threshold matter, given its current and longstanding practice, the Town has no legal obligation to fly any “unofficial third party flags” on Town Flagpoles. Therefore, the question is whether the Town wishes to permit flags other than the Official Flags to be flown on Town Flagpoles.

If the Town wishes to fly flags other than the Official Flags, it may choose to do so in either of two ways: (1) as government speech (in which case the flags are no longer unofficial third party flags, but express the views of the government on a particular matter), or (2) as private speech (in which case the flags represent private views but are allowed to be flown in a forum that has been opened for that purpose). If flags are flown as government speech, then the Town can choose what flags to fly, and what flags not to fly; in other words, the Town could refuse a flag based on its viewpoint. If, however, the Town creates a limited public forum for

private expression, then the government is constrained by the First Amendment. *See Amer. Italian Women v. City of New Haven*, 2022 WL 1912853, and \*8 (D. Conn. 2022).

In *Shurtleff v. City of Boston, Mass. et al.*, 596 U.S. 243 (2022), the United States Supreme Court recently considered the issue of flag-flying pursuant to a government-sponsored program. On City Hall Plaza, the City of Boston hoisted flags on three flagpoles: (1) the American flag, (2) the Commonwealth of Massachusetts flag, and (3) (usually) the City of Boston's flag. The City also allowed groups to hold ceremonies on the plaza, during which groups were permitted to hoist their own flag (rather than the City of Boston flag) on the third flagpole. Over a twelve-year period, the City of Boston permitted the flying of fifty unique flags in almost 300 different ceremonies. However, it refused the request of a group to fly the "Christian Flag." When the group making the request sued, alleging a violation of its First Amendment rights, the City defended its actions on the basis that its decisions as to what flags would fly above City Hall constituted government speech. If the City was successful in making this argument, the City would be within its rights to prohibit certain flags based on their viewpoint.

In analyzing the City's argument, the Court clarified the scope of "government speech". As explained by the Court, the First Amendment does not prohibit the government from declining to express a view. "When the government wishes to state an opinion, to speak for the community, to formulate policies, or to implement programs, it naturally chooses what to say and what not to say." *Id.* at 251. The Court also noted that "the line between government speech and private expression can blur when ... a government invites the people to participate in a program." *Id.* at 252. In reviewing such speech, the Court noted that there must be a fact-specific inquiry to determine whether the government is speaking for itself or creating a forum for private speech. *See id.* This inquiry involves an examination of: (1) the history of the expression at issue (here, flag flying on a government plaza as part of a flag-flying program); (2) whether the public would tend to view the speech as attributable to the government or a private citizen/organization; and (3) the extent to which the government controlled the flag flying and shaped the messages being sent.

After reviewing these factors, the Court found that the first two were non-dispositive, but as to the third, the City did not engage in any meaningful consideration of the various requests to fly flags until the petitioner's request. Indeed, the City had no "meaningful involvement in the selection of flags or the crafting of their messages," and therefore the Court rejected the claim that the flags permitted to fly over City Hall should be considered government speech. Instead, the practice of permitting various flags to fly over City Hall was considered a limited public forum, and the Court concluded that the City violated the First Amendment, and engaged in impermissible viewpoint discrimination, by refusing to allow the petitioner to access to that forum and fly its "Christian Flag."

This case provides helpful guidance in evaluating three options that the Town may consider as related to flag flying on Town Flagpoles: (1) maintain the Town's current approach of flying only Official Flags as government speech, (2) allow additional flags to be flown as government speech, or (3) create a limited public forum and allow citizens to fly flags as an

expressions of their private speech. Each of these options involves different legal considerations and practical concerns, and we address each in turn below.

### **III. OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION**

#### **A. Option One: Maintain Current Approach and Display Only Official Government (U.S., State, and Military) Flags**

The government (here, the Town of Ledyard) has the right to express its views on a particular matter and engage in government speech. Courts have held that government speech that expresses the view of government officials on particular topics does not create a limited forum for other speech.

As noted above, our understanding is that the Town currently does not maintain a written policy or ordinance regarding flag flying but has consistently and uniformly permitted only the Official Flags to be flown on Town Flagpoles. Consistent with the First Amendment, the Town may continue with this practice and deny requests by other organizations to fly flags on Town property.

This approach offers little legal exposure, as long as it is consistently and uniformly followed. In light of *Shurtleff*, however, if the Town wishes to maintain this approach, it may wish to adopt a resolution or ordinance to make clear that only the Official Flags will be flown on Town Flagpoles, and that the Town Flagpoles are in no way intended as a forum for speech.

#### **B. Option Two: Allow Additional Flag(s) to be Flown as Government Speech and Display Only Those Flags Selected by the Town**

The Town may choose to adopt an ordinance or pass a resolution that identifies the Official Flags – and other flags identified by the Town -- to be flown on Town Flagpoles as government speech. If the Town decides to pursue this approach, the Town is well advised, in light of *Shurtleff*, to ensure that it engage in meaningful consideration and active control of any flags proposed to be flown on Town property. These options are recommended for two reasons: (1) to ensure that no limited public forum (as discussed below) is inadvertently created, and (2) to ensure that the Town wishes to endorse each flag approved to be flown as its own speech.

If the Town wishes to pursue this approach, it should consider whether it will adopt an ordinance or resolution identifying, at the outset, the flags that will be flown as government speech or whether it will establish a policy and process for determining whether and how flags will be considered for approval as government speech. Such policy and procedure would need to be carefully written, and consistently implemented, to ensure that the Town engaged in meaningful consideration and active control of which flags were approved, lest it inadvertently open up a forum for other speech (in which case the limited public forum analysis, below, would apply).

This approach would allow the Town to express messages in a symbolic way. Practically, however, this approach raises a number of considerations, including but not limited

to: (1) the possibility that the process of determining whether certain flags should be flown as an expression of the government's views could, in and of itself, become divisive and/or consume Town resources and attention;<sup>1</sup> (2) whether and what types of restrictions and guidelines would be in place for flags other than the Official Flags (*e.g.*, size, quality, duration of display, etc.); and (3) how requests would be processed and approved by the Town.

### **C. Option Three: Create a Limited Public Forum by Allowing Citizens to Fly Flags on Town Flagpoles as Private Speech**

The Town may choose to create a limited public forum and allow outside organizations to fly flags in order to express their own private speech. In such instance, the First Amendment would prohibit the Town from discriminating against citizen speakers based on their viewpoint, including religious viewpoint, and may prohibit the Town from excluding certain classes of speech. *Rosenberger v. Rector and Visitors of Univ. of Virginia*, 515 U.S. 819 (1995) (“Once it has opened a limited forum, however, the State must respect the lawful boundaries it has itself set. The State may not exclude speech where its distinction is not “reasonable in light of the purpose served by the forum,” nor may it discriminate against speech on the basis of its viewpoint.”) (further citations omitted).

When considering this option, the Town is advised to be mindful that individuals and organizations may request a wide variety of viewpoints and perspectives to be placed on display on the Town Flagpoles, and determining whether and when any restrictions could lawfully be implemented could be time-consuming, disruptive, and costly.

\* \* \*

We hope that this analysis is helpful to you. Please let me know whether and how we may be of further assistance as the Town considers these important issues. Thank you.

---

<sup>1</sup> *See, e.g.*, Jane Caffrey, “Dozens speak out amid debate over flying the ‘Thin Blue Line’ flag at Wethersfield town hall” (June 18, 2024), available at <https://www.nbcconnecticut.com/news/local/dozens-speak-out-amid-debate-over-flying-the-thin-blue-line-flag-at-wethersfield-town-hall/3315859/>.