Why protect radical speakers?

I have just read the account (Oct. 28) in which U.S. District Court Judge Gerhard Gesell ruled that the House report on radical campus speakers cannot be distributed. I am appalled! Why should the government, which these radicals seek to overthrow, protect them? Why should they not be exposed for what they are?

Judge Gesell appears to base this outrageous perversion of constitutional law on the "right" of these anarchists under the First Amendment to the Constitution to say what they please, regardless of the consequences to the law-abiding citizens, calling it freedom of speech. It is unfortunate that these unelected federal "jurists" are unfamiliar with the legal meaning of the phrase freedom of speech.

As Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once so clearly put it: This constitutional right does not permit a person to get up in a crowded theatre and shout "fire." These are the same jurists too who have prevented the states from prosecuting those who have been distributing the most abominable pornography under the guise of freedom of the press, but they would burn the books which expose the radicals who are leading our young people into anarchy.

I have not yet read that the Government Printing Office has been enjoined from distributing, at government expense, the manual on the use of firearms and ways of constructing bombs which these same radicals are using to disrupt and kill. . .

I have almost completed reading "Witness Whittaker Chambers" and I suggest it as required reading for all the liberals who are unwittingly, or otherwise, fostering the overthrow of our government. For those who are not familiar with this writing, Whittaker Chambers was at one time a Communist working in the underground. He became disenchanted with the Party and subsequently appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This Committee was comprised of four gentlemen, one of whom was President Nixon, at that time a member of the Senate. . .

Lorraine G. LeBouef