

499. *Speiser v. Randall*, 357 U.S. 513 (1958).

The California statutory provisions exacting as a prerequisite for property tax exemption that applicants therefor swear that they do not advocate the forcible overthrow of federal or state governments or the support of a foreign government against the United States during hostilities are unconstitutional insofar as they are enforced by procedures placing upon the taxpayer the burden of proving that he is not guilty of advocating that which is forbidden. Such procedures deprive the taxpayer of freedom of speech without the procedural safeguards required by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Justices concurring: Black, Frankfurter, Douglas, Burton, Harlan, Brennan, Whitaker

Justice dissenting: Clark

*First Unitarian Church v. City of Los Angeles*, 357 U.S. 545 (1958). *Enforcement of the same oath requirement through statutory procedures that place upon taxpayers the burden of proving nonadvocacy violates the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.* Same division of Justices as in *Speiser v. Randall*.

500. *Bibb v. Navajo Freight Lines*, 359 U.S. 520 (1959).

An Illinois statute that requires trucks and trailers operating on state highways to be equipped with specified type of rear fender mudguard, which is different from those permitted in at least 45 other states, and which would seriously interfere with "interline operations" of motor carriers, cannot validly be applied to interstate motor carriers certified by the Interstate Commerce Commission because to do so unreasonably burdens interstate commerce.

Justices concurring: Harlan (separately), Stewart (separately)

501. *State Athletic Comm'n v. Dorsey*, 359 U.S. 533 (1959).

A Louisiana statute prohibiting athletic contests between Negroes and white persons violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

502. *Kingsley Pictures Corp. v. Regents*, 360 U.S. 684 (1959).

As construed and applied, the New York Education Law, which requires denial of a license to show a motion picture "presenting adultery as being right and desirable for certain people under certain circumstances," is unconstitutional. Refusal of a license to show a motion picture found to portray adultery alluringly as proper behavior violates the freedom to advocate ideas guaranteed by the First Amendment and protected by the Fourteenth Amendment from infringement by the states.