Curb on Threats to President Backed, but Suspect Is Freed

WASHINGTON, April 21 been threatening President (AP)—The Supreme Court up- Johnson and it set aside his held today a Federal law that conviction. makes it a crime to threaten the life of the President or Vice President.

Mr. Watts's remarks were made while he attended a meeting of W.E.B. Du Bois

cautioned that the law could not be used to suppress "political hyperbole" and said that signed. The five members who

The ruling was given on an and Thurgood Marshall. appeal by Robert Watts, a 21-year-old New Yorker who had tion undoubtedly has a valid,

in my sights is L.B.J." without interference from threats of physical violence. court in the District of Columcourt in the District of Columsentence.

decided without holding a protected speech."
hearing that the law was valid But on a 5-to-4 vote it ruled Potter Stewart, Byron R. White that Mr. Watts had not really and Abe Fortas dissented.

At the same time the Court Clubs on the Washington Mon-

prosecutors must prove the excombined to upset the convicistence of a real threat of tion were Chief Justice Earl physical violence. It upset a Warren and Associate Justices conviction that had been made Hugo L. Black, William O. under the law. Douglas, William J. Brennan Jr.

been convicted for declaring that if he were forced to enter that if he were forced to enter the Army and to carry a rifle the first man I want to get in my sights is L.B.J."

This was taken by the first will be a real to make the first man I want to get in my sights is L.B.J."

This was taken by the first will be a valid, even an overwhelming interest in protecting the safety of its Chief Executive and in allowing him to perform his duties without interference from

bia to constitute an unlawful as this one, which makes crimthreat on the life of President inal a form of pure speech, Johnson, and Mr. Watts was must be interpreted with the given a four-year suspended commands of the First Amendment clearly in mind. What is The Supreme Court, ruling a threat must be distinguished for the first time on the law, from what is constitutionally