

2-20-1971

## 01-20-1971 Justice Marshall, Concurring

Thurgood Marshall  
*US Supreme Court Justice*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/connellvhiggin>



Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Marshall, T. Justice Marshall, Concurring, *Connell v. Higginbotham*, 403 U.S. 207 (1971). Box 367, Harry A. Blackmun Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

This Opinion is brought to you for free and open access by the U.S. Supreme Court papers, Justice Blackmun at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Connell v. Higginbotham*, 403 U.S. 207 (1971) by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact [ISURed@ilstu.edu](mailto:ISURed@ilstu.edu).

To: The Chief Justice  
Mr. Justice Black  
Mr. Justice Douglas  
Mr. Justice Harlan  
Mr. Justice Brennan  
Mr. Justice Stewart  
Mr. Justice White  
Mr. Justice Blackmun

2nd DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
Author: Marshall, J.

No. 79.—OCTOBER TERM, 1970

Circulated: JAN 20 1971

Recirculated:

Stella Connell, Appellant, } On Appeal From the United  
v. } States District Court for  
James M. Higginbotham } the Middle District of  
et al. } Florida.

[January —, 1971]

MR. JUSTICE MARSHALL, whom MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS  
and MR. JUSTICE BRENNAN join, concurring.

I agree that Florida may require state employees to affirm that they "will support the Constitution of the United States and of the State of Florida." Such a forward-looking, promissory oath of constitutional support does not in my view offend the First Amendment's command that the grant or denial of governmental benefits cannot be made to turn on the political viewpoints or affiliations of a would-be beneficiary. I also agree that Florida may not base its employment decisions, as to state teachers or any other hiring category, on an applicant's willingness *vel non* to affirm "that I do not believe in the overthrow of the government of the United States or of the State of Florida by force or violence."

However, in striking down the latter oath, the Court insists that "beliefs are by no means irrelevant to action or the prediction of future acts." This language suggests that the Court's objection runs, not against Florida's determination to exclude those who "believe in the overthrow," but only against the State's decision to regard unwillingness to take the oath as conclusive, irrebutable proof of the proscribed belief. But in my view it simply does not matter what kind of evidence a State can muster to show that a job applicant "believes in the overthrow." For state action injurious to an individual cannot be