Supreme Court Voids Arizona Loyalty Oath

By JAMES ROSS

WASHINGTON - The Supreme Court voided the Arizona loyalty oath, a much-publicized attempt by Arizona to curb the influence of the Communist party or other organizations deemed alien to the state today. The court's ruling, 5-3, found that the oath was a violation of the First Amendment's prohibition against abridgment of the freedom of speech and association.

Justices William O. Douglas and Hugo L. Black dissented, urging the court to strike down the loyalty oath as a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of due process.

The Arizona statute required state employes to sign and swear under oath that they had not been members of the Communist party or other organizations deemed alien to the state. The oath was designed to prevent the influence of the Communist party on state employees. The statute was challenged in the courts by Mrs. Elfbrandt, who had been fired from her job as a state employee.

Justice Douglas, in his dissent, said that the oath was a violation of the First Amendment's guarantee of freedom of speech and association.

Justice Black, in his dissent, said that the oath was a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of due process.

The Arizona statute was challenged in the courts by Mrs. Elfbrandt, who had been fired from her job as a state employee. The statute was upheld by the court in 1952, but the Supreme Court reversed the decision in 1957.
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