Bicentennial of Constitution is Worldwide Celebration

The American Constitution is an international document. It has inspired countries around the world in writing and rewriting their own fundamental laws. During the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution period, the United States Information Agency (USIA) has launched an impressive program to share America's constitutional heritage with supreme courts, ministries of justice, law schools, and bar associations around the world.

Under the direction of senior foreign service officer Frederick Quinn, USIA's Office of the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution has organized exhibits, lectures and activities in many countries throughout the world. In discussing USIA's activities, Dr. Quinn said that the objective of the commemoration has been to make the projects substantive, rather than simply nostalgic. As a result of political and economic upheaval throughout much of the world, many countries are reexamining their fundamental governmental concepts, which include their legal systems. Emphasizing the fact that this is a period of transition for many countries, Dr. Quinn said that "most of the world's 220 countries have written constitutions, sixty percent of them written since 1970. Only fourteen antedate World War II." These statistics underscore why the Constitution of the United States of America, with its two hundred year history, has become a model for serious study by constitutional scholars throughout the world.

One of the primary projects of the USIA Bicentennial Office has been the publication and distribution of the text of the Constitution. This has been published in an illustrated and annotated sixty-page pamphlet, printed in English, Spanish, French and Arabic. The Agency has also published copies in Korean, Japanese, Dutch, Turkish, Indonesian, Finnish and Nepalese. Dr. Quinn pointed out that the Constitution had been translated by the USIA and other organizations, including commercial publishers, into another twenty languages, including Russian and Chinese, thus making it available to millions of people. Since 1956, the USIA has also sponsored the translation of "The Federalist Papers" into eleven languages.

Another focal point of the USIA's Bicentennial programs is a fifty-panel poster exhibit entitled "We the People." This exhibit traces aspects of the development of the Constitution, including such major landmarks as the Magna Carta and the Mayflower Compact, as well as outlining the fundamental principles incorporated in the document. The exhibits are printed in Manila, P.I., in English, Arabic, French and Spanish and circulated throughout the world to U.S. embassies. A pamphlet distributed to visitors to the exhibit contains a time-line tracing the events culminating in the ratification of the Constitution.

The Supreme Court Historical Society assisted the USIA by making the formal group photograph of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States available for distribution to American embassies throughout the world. The photograph was furnished to embassies in slide, print and transparency formats making it possible to use the picture in slide shows, publications and displays. The Society has also donated 2,000 copies of its thirty-two-page informational brochure about the Supreme Court of the United States and its work. These were then distributed to U.S. Embassies throughout the world to be used in their activities.

Perhaps the most ambitious aspect of the international celebration of the Constitution has been the speakers program. This program has enabled many U.S. constitutional experts to lecture and teach about the creation and implementation of the Constitution.

Annual Meeting Date Set

The date for the Society's fourteenth Annual Meeting has been set for Monday, May 15, 1989. As in past years, the day's activities will include the annual lecture, a tour of the Supreme Court Building, and an open house at the Society's headquarters. The evening's activities will include the annual meeting of the membership, followed by a black tie reception and dinner at the Supreme Court. The Annual Lecture will be given by Associate Justice Anthony M. Kennedy in the Supreme Court Chamber. Further details will follow in the next issue of the Quarterly and each member will receive a separate invitation and reservation card for reservations to the reception and dinner. Invitations will be delivered to all members by April tenth.
A Letter from the President

Once again this letter to you will be confined largely to a report on our committee activities. In the next issue of the Quarterly I will talk to you primarily about our fund-raising efforts and where we stand. First, the committees and their work:

Acquisitions Committee

The Acquisitions Committee, chaired by Mrs. Patricia Collins Dwinell, held its last meeting on November 14, 1988, at which time it welcomed its newest member, Mr. Howard Goldman. Pursuant to discussions at the last Executive Committee meeting, the Acquisitions Committee is assuming responsibilities beyond its traditional role of screening items being considered for the Society's collection of antiques and artifacts. The new duties include the development and implementation of a systematic and coherent acquisitions program. At its last meeting, the Committee reviewed proposals for raising the considerable funds which an ambitious acquisitions program might require.

Annual Meeting Committee

Chief Judge Howard Markey, who also served as last year's Annual Meeting Chairman, has graciously agreed to attempt a repeat performance of that very successful effort. Judge Markey's appointment to this post brings with it his considerable experience as well as a frugal administration since the Chief Judge will likely serve without appointing additional members to his Committee. Among the events already arranged, the Society is proud to have Associate Justice Anthony Kennedy as this year's annual speaker. The Annual Meeting will be held on Monday, May 15th and invitations will be delivered to members by April tenth.

Facilities Committee

The ad hoc Facilities Committee, chaired by Frank Gilbert, held its first meeting on November 10, 1988. The Committee was empowered by the Executive Committee to oversee the Society's headquarters building and its gift shop in the Supreme Court Building. The Executive Committee will propose an amendment to the Society's By-laws at the Annual Meeting next May to establish this committee on a permanent basis.

At its first meeting the Facilities Committee focused its attention primarily upon the status of the Society's headquarters building. The Committee assessed what repairs the building would require in the months ahead. The Committee also discussed which changes or additions might be made to the structure to better improve the building's utility to the Society and to facilitate the work of the Society's staff. Finally, the Committee determined the need to establish an annual budget for the Society's headquarters which would anticipate maintenance and replacement costs.

The Committee also discussed the progress being made on relocating and improving the displays in the Society's gift shop in the Supreme Court Building. The project, which the Court and the Executive Committee approved earlier this year, is expected to be completed within the next few weeks. It will provide the Society with expanded and improved display space which will better serve the needs of those touring the Court.

Membership Committee

George Bush and Frank Jones will have something in common during the next month or two as each undertakes to appoint qualified and motivated individuals to fill vacant posts within their respective administrations. Mr. Jones succeeded John Shepard as Chairman of the Membership Committee on January 1st and will be devoting much of his time toward reorganizing the Society's State Membership Chairmen's network.

The State Membership Chairmen are responsible for conducting a person-to-person membership campaign within their respective states, which has accounted for a major proportion of the Society's growth in the past few years. The Committee has established a goal of 4,000 members. The Society's current membership numbers approximately 2,500,

Nominating Committee

The Nominating Committee will meet in February to determine whom it will recommend for nomination as Officers and Directors of the Society at its Annual Meeting. The Annual Meeting is scheduled for May 15, 1989 in the Supreme Court Building in Washington and all members are urged to attend. Suggestions for nominees should be directed to Nominating Committee Chairman Virginia Warren Daly at the Society's headquarters.

Program Committee

Program Committee Chairman J. Roderick Heller, III delivered a report at the Executive Committee meeting on October 19, 1988 proposing funding for a list of one-time projects which it recommended that the Society undertake. The Program Committee worked closely with Society Treasurer, Peter Knowles, and the Budget and Finance Committee to establish a budget for new program expenditures of between $36,000 and $50,000. This budget proposal was approved.

Mr. Heller consulted with other committees, Trustees, Court personnel, and staff members seeking suggestions for new program activities. The resulting report to the Executive Committee included a statement in principle endorsing expanded program activities and a list of six specific projects for which funding was sought. The Executive Committee approved immediate funding for three of the proposals and approved the other three in principle pending estimates of their scope and feasibility. The six programs are listed below:

- A triennial prize of $5,000 was established to be awarded to the author(s) of the best book published on Supreme Court history during the preceding three years. The Committee is preparing eligibility requirements and judging criteria for submissions which it hopes to announce in early February through notices in various professional journals.

- The Documentary History Project was voted $10,000 for the purchase of computer equipment. This equipment is expected to facilitate preparation of the subject indexes on some of the volumes now being prepared for publication.

- Annual prizes of up to $1,500 were approved which will be awarded to the authors of outstanding original contributions to the Yearbook. This program is discussed in more detail in the report of the Publications Committee which will supervise the award.

- A triennial prize of $5,000 was established to be awarded to the author(s) of the best book published on Supreme Court history during the preceding three years. The Committee is preparing eligibility requirements and judging criteria for submissions which it hopes to announce in early February through notices in various professional journals.

- The Cincinnati Law Review was given $10,000 for the publication of a volume, full-color publication totaling approximately 330 pages. The Committee and the Publications Committee to promote scholarly interest in writing articles on the Court's history. Announcement of the awards are being sent to various law, history, and education-related journals. A deadline for submissions is considered for the 1989 edition has been set at September 1, 1989.

- The collection of illustrated biographies of the Justices is still in the planning stages, but is anticipated to be a two-volume, full-color publication totaling approximately 2,500 pages. The Committee is exploring the possibility of soliciting articles on each of the Court's 104 Justices from various scholars under the direction of a professional editor. This was one of six projects endorsed by the Program Committee.

Special Gifts Committee

The Special Gifts Committee, chaired by Vincent C. Burke, Jr. is devoting its efforts to building an endowment. Its goal is $25,000 over a five-year period and, if it is achieved, this endowment by an additional gift of $25,000. The Committee is exploring the possibility of soliciting articles on each of the Court's 104 Justices from various scholars under the direction of a professional editor. This was one of six projects endorsed by the Program Committee.
The decision to meet in Philadelphia was not popular with all delegates to the Constitutional Convention. Prices were high and taverns often crowded. There were serious economic problems; the shipbuilding industry and related crafts had declined sharply in the wake of British trade restrictions, causing serious unemployment and insecurity. Crime was heavy, and there were frequent fires and epidemics. The city's main attraction as a meeting place was its geographic location, roughly in the center of the country, north to south. It was especially popular with those from South Carolina and Georgia, as they preferred sea voyages around perilous Cape Hatteras to trips across the wilderness and rivers of the land.

Expectations for the convention were low. In a letter written to his father in April 1877, James Madison explained that, "the probable diversity of opinions and prejudices, and of support or real interest among the states renders the issue [the upcoming convention] totally uncertain."

Madison and the rest of the Virginia delegation arrived early in Philadelphia. The Virginians traveled to the State House every day to meet newly-arrived men and make acquaintance. While waiting for the arrival of their fellow delegates, the Virginia delegation met two to three hours each day, wrote George Mason, "in order to form a proper correspondence of sentiments," necessary for establishing a plan of government that would be mutually acceptable.

The Virginians anticipated unanimity among the large states and obstructions from the small. George Mason, in letter written to his son, is evident that Mason considered the greatest problem facing the convention that of preserving enough power for the States to justify the continued existence of the State governments. He said the problem could be not to operate as a Committee of the Whole.

When enough delegates had arrived in Philadelphia to attain a quorum of seven states, the assembly was convened. After electing George Washington to preside, the rules were established; the most important of these rules concerned secrecy. George Mason wrote to his son that "All communications of the proceedings are forbidden during the sitting of the Convention; I think this is a necessary precaution, to prevent misrepresentations or mistakes; there being a material difference between the appearance of a subject in its first indigested form, and after it shall have been properly matured and arranged." So completely did the delegates abide by the rule of secrecy adopted by the Convention that newspapers like the Pennsylvania Mercury and Universal Advertiser, which are included in the exhibit, were left with little to report, other than the names of those delegates in attendance.

Once called into session, the delegates frequently reported to operating as a Committee of the Whole, a parliamentary procedure which allowed a more informal discussion of controversial issues. The first of these issues was the Virginia Plan. Presented by Edmund Randolph, the proposal outlined an entirely new system of government, despite the initial resolution of the conference that the Articles of Confederation were to be "corrected and enlarged."

Charles Cotesworth Pinckney submitted his own plan for the Federal Constitution on the same day as the Virginia Plan, and although it, too, was referred to the Committee of the Whole for consideration, it was lost. Most of the delegate's time was spent on the Virginia Plan.

The Virginia Plan, as presented by Randolph, outlined a central government with three branches; the first of these was the executive branch, with a one-person executive. George Mason delivered a speech outlining his idea of revising the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union. "And I think it is expedient that on the second Monday in May next a Convention of the whole American States be held in Philadelphia for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union."

In all, sixty-five delegates were appointed to the convention, but only fifty-five actually attended the debates. Many of the delegates, for one reason or another, were unable to attend regularly, and a few left early. Most of the design and framing of the Constitution was accomplished by about twenty members. John Dickinson spoke for the need to make the three branches of government as independent as possible, yet he found the kind of executive proposed by Randolph to be incompatible with his idea of how the republic should operate. James Madison noted that "He [Mr. Dickinson] went into a discourse of some length, the sum of which was, that the Legislative, Executive, and Judiciary departments ought to be made as independent as possible, but that such an Executive as some seemed to have in contemplation was not consistent with a Republic, that a firm Executive would only exist in a limited monarchy."

Alexander Hamilton, in his speech of May 18, advocated a form of new monarchy, or federal government. This speech is probably the most famous of his political career but it is renowned more for its presentation of Hamilton's political philosophy than for its effect upon members of the Convention. As James Madison noted in his Journal, when Hamilton took his seat, "the Committee rose and the House adjourned." The delegates had no interest in forming a national executive.

After electing George Washington to preside, the rules were established; the most important of these rules concerned secrecy. George Mason wrote to his son that "All communications of the proceedings are forbidden during the sitting of the Convention; I think this is a necessary precaution, to prevent misrepresentations or mistakes; there being a material difference between the appearance of a subject in its first indigested form, and after it shall have been properly matured and arranged." So completely did the delegates abide by the rule of secrecy adopted by the Convention that newspapers like the Pennsylvania Mercury and Universal Advertiser, which are included in the exhibit, were left with little to report, other than the names of those delegates in attendance.

Once called into session, the delegates frequently reported to operating as a Committee of the Whole, a parliamentary procedure which allowed a more informal discussion of controversial issues. The first of these issues was the Virginia Plan. Presented by Edmund Randolph, the proposal outlined an entirely new system of government, despite the initial resolution of the conference that the Articles of Confederation were to be "corrected and enlarged." Charles Cotesworth Pinckney submitted his own plan for the Federal Constitution on the same day as the Virginia Plan, and although it, too, was referred to the Committee of the Whole for consideration, it was lost. Most of the delegates' time was spent on the Virginia Plan.

The delegates spent the first two weeks of June meeting and debating. It was at this time that the delegates turned to the most difficult problem they were to encounter: the issue of representation in the national legislature. As outlined in the Virginia Plan, the second branch of government would be composed of a national legislature.

During the debate concerning the method by which members of the first house of the national legislature would be chosen, the delegates listened to a long argument by James Madison on minority rights. Madison argued that in every instance where a majority of the people became united by a common interest or passion, the rights of the minority were in danger. Madison continued, "Respect for the character is always diminished in proportion to the number among whom the blame or praise is to be divided. Where a majority are united by a common sentiment and have an opportunity, the rights of the minor part become insecure. The only remedy he saw was to "enlarge the sphere" by dividing the community into so many interests and parties that no one group could obtain a majority with a common interest separate from the whole. The subject of a popularly elected national legislature was referred to a special committee that would work out the details of the proposal. Like many other delegates, John Dickinson at first agreed with the proposed system, but later declared it would not work, fearing that the individual states would be without representation in the system.

After the Committee submitted its report on the Virginia Plan, the delegates turned to the most difficult problem they were to encounter: the issue of representation in the national legislature.
The New Jersey, or small state plan was presented by Paterson and returned the focus to the small states’ position that the Union was a company of States, not a united government. The central government, Washington noted, was a “pastoral” one, where the States were to be “omnipotent over the franchise.” Small states believed that the Union was a company of States, not a united government. The central government, Washington noted, was a “pastoral” one, where the States were to be “omnipotent over the franchise.” Small states believed that the Union was a company of States, not a united government. The central government, Washington noted, was a “pastoral” one, where the States were to be “omnipotent over the franchise.” Small states believed that the Union was a company of States, not a united government. The central government, Washington noted, was a “pastoral” one, where the States were to be “omnipotent over the franchise.” Small states believed that the Union was a company of States, not a united government. The central government, Washington noted, was a “pastoral” one, where the States were to be “omnipotent over the franchise.” Small states believed that the Union was a company of States, not a united government. The central government, Washington noted, was a “pastoral” one, where the States were to be “omnipotent over the franchise.” Small states believed that the Union was a company of States, not a united government. The central government, Washington noted, was a “pastoral” one, where the States were to be “omnipotent over the franchise.” Small states believed that the Union was a company of States, not a united government. The central government, Washington noted, was a “pastoral” one, where the States were to be “omnipotent over the franchise.” Small states believed that the Union was a company of States, not a united government. The central government, Washington noted, was a “pastoral” one, where the States were to be “omnipotent over the franchise.” Small states believed that the Union was a company of States, not a united government. The central government, Washington noted, was a “pastoral” one, where the States were to be “omnipotent over the franchise.” Small states believed that the Union was a company of States, not a united government. The central government, Washington noted, was a “pastoral” one, where the States were to be “omnipotent over the franchise.” Small states believed that the Union was a company of States, not a united government. The central government, Washington noted, was a “pastoral” one, where the States were to be “omnipotent over the franchise.” Small states believed that the Union was a company of States, not a united government. The central government, Washington noted, was a “pastoral” one, where the States were to be “omnipotent over the franchise.” Small states believed that the Union was a company of States, not a united government. The central government, Washington noted, was a “pastoral” one, where the States were to be “omnipotent over the franchise.” Small states believed that the Union was a company of States, not a united government. The central government, Washington noted, was a “pastoral” one, where the States were to be “omnipotent over the franchise.” Small states believed that the Union was a company of States, not a united government. The central government, Washington noted, was a “pastoral” one, where the States were to be “omnipotent over the franchise.”
Bicentennial Abroad (continued from page one)

Constitution in nations which are currently reexamining their own governing principles. The USIA reports that lectures and symposia on the Constitution and related subjects have been given in more than 120 countries during the past two years. For example, Voice of America has broadcast many programs on Constitutional subjects, including the 26-part series "We the People". Constitutional experts have appeared on programs for WORLDNET, a television service which is seen worldwide. Retired Chief Justice Burger has appeared on several programs for WORLDNET and has been involved with many international activities, as has Betty Southard Murphy, a well-known Washington attorney who heads the Commission's International Advisory Committee.

Many experts in Constitutional Law have shared their expertise in these programs. One of these authorities is Professor A. E. Dick Howard of the University of Virginia. Professor Howard's viewpoint is especially interesting as he was the chief architect of the Spanish Constitution. Howard has lectured in person in Austria, Belgium, Spain, Brazil, Hong Kong, Sweden, the Philippines, England and the Federal Republic of Germany. Professor Howard's participation in the Philippines was particularly appropriate as the Filipinos were in the process of creating a new Constitution.

One of the concepts Professor Howard has espoused is that throughout history, constitutions have incorporated ideas taken from constitutions drafted in other countries. Howard cited the example of the influence of the U.S. Constitution on the Spanish Constitution. Howard said that a Venezuelan had translated the U.S. Constitution into Spanish while he was living in Philadelphia. His translation finally made its way to Caracas by way of the Spanish Consulate. Howard said that the Spanish Constitution was a copy of the U.S. Constitution.

Howard said one aspect of the United States Constitution which is particularly pertinent to modern nations is the concept of the separation of powers. Howard detailed its relevance in an interest of improving the judicial procedures and systems of all nations.

In clarifying this idea Professor Howard said: "Could there be a more central concept in any modern state which aspires, on the one hand, to stability and durability and, on the other, to some kind of democratic, open, free society? [How does a nation make the executive strong enough to deal with agonizing problems of poverty and economic growth and at the same time not deliver itself into the hands of a tyrant?"

Howard also noted that, "If there is one unique dimension to American constitutionalism, it is judicial review." He explained the statement by saying that almost all constitutions contain a Bill of Rights, but that the United States' Bill of Rights is effective because it prohibits the government from taking certain actions against individuals. Because of this focus, it becomes more enforceable. Howard also noted that many countries have very detailed bills of rights in their constitutions, but because their judicial branches are not sufficiently independent, they are not able to enforce them effectively.

Representing another aspect of constitutional and legal expertise, Justice Brennan lectured in the Federal Republic of Germany and Howard lectured in Venezuela, the Philippines, England and France. Judge Wallace pointed out that "many countries are developing legal concepts in which American law can be of assistance. For example, patent, copyright, and trademark law have become important in Indonesia, the Philippines, Russia, Korea, the Republic of China, and Korea. Under the new Korean Constitution, a type of due process right has been guaranteed." He further commented that "Asian countries are interested in our judicial administration problem-solving ability. It is a critical time for Asia to strengthen legal systems as the countries move from strong executive to more democratic systems. Important progress is being made in the judicial systems of Asian countries."

In discussing his actual participation in these programs, Judge Wallace said, "There are dozens of law programs operating in each country. I attempt to find the next step that a country should consider taking. For example, four years ago the next step in Pakistan was to encourage visits of Pakistani judges to the United States. This year it was the establishment of a new Judicial Training Academy and development of a plan for overcoming backlog in the courts. On my last trip to the Peoples Republic of China, it was the development of "economic law" and "economic courts so that foreign investments could be attracted. In Malaysia, it was the establishment of a small claims court."

Summarizing his work, Judge Wallace reported that "Asia-wide programs have been especially fruitful . . . . The interaction among judges is accelerating. We are building bridges between the United States and Asian judges that will have long-term importance. . . . We are accepted because our only interest is in improving the administration of justice."

Many other members of the American legal community have participated in the Bicentennial celebrations, sharing their time and expertise with other nations. Despite the demands on their time, many members of the Supreme Court of the United States have lectured and worked abroad during the last two years under the auspices of a variety of organizations. Justice William J. Brennan lectured in the Federal Republic of Germany and Justice Anton Scalia lectured in Canada, Brazil, Argentina, Justice Sandra Day O'Connor lectured in Madagascar under the sponsorship of the State Department and at the Paris-American Anglo Legal Exchange. Justice Anthony Kennedy taught in Salisbury, Australia under a program sponsored by McGeorge University. Justice Kennedy taught a class in constitutional law at McGeorge University for many years before joining the Supreme Court. Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist attended meetings and lectures in Australia this past summer. The focus of all of these programs has been the free exchange of ideas and expertise in the interest of improving the judicial procedures and systems of all nations.

Plans call for continued international programs in celebration of the U.S. Constitution during the next three years. The programs will commemorate several important events of 1789, including Washington's presidency, the first federal elections, the first meeting of Congress and the formation of an independent judiciary. The programs will also commemorate the ratification of the Bill of Rights in 1791. Professor Howard emphasized the importance of such efforts by saying, "The constitutional framework is a mirror of social life, politics, history, the whole milieu of a country, and it is particularly appropriate that nations throughout the world will have further opportunities to focus their attention on the bicentennial celebration of the United States Constitution."

One of the Primary projects of the United States Information Agency (USIA) Bicentennial Office has been the publication and distribution of the text of the Constitution. This has been published in an illustrated and annotated sixty-page pamphlet, printed to commemorate the Bicentennial of the Constitution, which spans the period from the drafting of the Constitution in 1787 and ratification in 1788, to the adoption of the Bill of Rights in 1791. This publication has been printed in eleven languages, including Spanish, Nepali, Korean, Japanese, Dutch, Indonesian, and Finnish. The Pamphlet to the Constitution is printed above in English, French, Turkish, and Arabic. Through the efforts of the USIA and other organizations, including commercial publishers, the Constitution has been translated into more than twenty languages, including Russian and Chinese, thus making it available to virtually millions of persons around the world.
Dean Erwin N. Griswold Honored in Harvard Law School Retrospective

Harvard Law School recently hosted an exhibition honoring the career of Erwin Nathaniel Griswold entitled Erwin N. Griswold: Illustrious Alumnist. Griswold's career has encompassed many aspects of the law and legal education including his tenure as a member of the faculty of the Harvard Law School, twenty-one years of which he served as Dean. In addition, he has worked as a private practitioner of the law, an attorney in the Office of the Solicitor General of the United States, and as Solicitor General of the United States. During his career, Griswold has argued 127 cases before the Supreme Court of the United States and he currently holds the record for the most cases argued before the Court by any living member of the Supreme Court Bar. This impressive record is particularly noteworthy as it has only been surpassed by several nineteenth century practitioners in a time when there were few members of the Supreme Court Bar and when travel conditions and limitations frequently necessitated choosing an attorney in close physical proximity to Washington. In addition to his immediate professional accomplishments, Griswold served as president of the American Bar Foundation, president of the Association of American Law Schools, as well as trustees for such organizations as Oberlin College, Bradford Junior College and the Supreme Court Historical Society.

The exhibit is divided into fourteen categories and features more than 260 documents and photographs, covering Griswold's public and personal achievements and interests. The first few sections cover Griswold's life at Harvard, both as a student and a member of the faculty, while two sections concern themselves with his tenure as Dean of the Law School. One section is devoted to his public service, another to his writings and speeches in general, honors and awards, hobbies and friendships. Of course no exhibit about Dean Griswold would be complete without touching upon the life and accomplishments of his wife, the late William W. Crawford, Glenview, Illinois. The following members have joined the Supreme Court Historical Society between September 16 and December 31, 1988.

Dean Griswold's interests also encompassed international law and legal education and the exhibit contains materials concerning his travels to Nigeria and Liberia where he was concerned with problems of legal education, specifically, and the developing educational systems of the African nations in general. His interests in legal education have focused particularly on Great Britain and other member nations of the Commonwealth, and he has lectured and traveled frequently in Great Britain, Canada and Australia. While he was at Harvard, he brought lecturers from Commonwealth countries to lecture at his law school. Griswold has also been actively involved in the Lawyers Alliance for Nuclear Arms Control. Paul Freind observed in his article in the exhibit catalog that "the efficiency of the man has been an unending object of admiration for those who have observed him at close range. I have often commented on to cite one example where Griswold wrote to an Australian diplomat who had telephoned with a matter requiring immediate attention. Since I had a class until noon, I have had to wait until this afternoon to answer it. Certainly the accomplishments reflected in this exhibit would bear that observation out. Freind also mentioned that it was during Griswold's administration as dean that women were first admitted to the law school. Griswold himself stated about the exhibit, "I have always displayed modesty and a sense of humor when he said he thought one of his greatest accomplishments at the law school was the replacement of the dean of the school who was "a genius at insulting people who asked for information."

The exhibit pays tribute to an individual who has dedicated his life to the law and to those ideals and goals he feels to be of importance. He summarized Griswold's standing in the legal community best when he said: "One need only recall that when, in October 1985, the Supreme Court celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of its palatial home, it was Erwin Griswold who spoke at the ceremony for the Bar of the Supreme Court. Catalogs of the exhibit are available by contacting the University of Virginia, Special Collections of the Harvard Law Library.

Membership Update

The following members have joined the Supreme Court Historical Society between September 16 and December 31, 1988.

California
Gary Shinaver, Fresno
Eric B. Rasmussen, Irvine
William R. Emmons, Long Beach
Leon H. Brusck, Los Angeles

District Of Columbia
Mr. and Mrs. Nicholas S. McConnell

Florida
Lucy Rito, Bal Harbour
James Caldwell, Sunrise

Illinois
William W. Crawford, Glenview

Kentucky
Donna J. Catlett, Louisville

Maryland
W. Shepherdson All6, Chest Chassy

Missouri
Bradford E. Ellsworth, Cabool

New York
Robert Kacwarzky, New York
James B. Lewis, Essex, New York
John R. Spencer, New York

Pennsylvania
Ben J. Sewell, South Falls, Philadelphia

Virginia
Gary A. Day, Arlington
Frank Emmett Howard Jr., Fairfax
Cynthia Dunn, Harrisonburg
Joanne V. Mcegan, Harrisonburg

North Carolina
Peter G. Fish, Durham

Oregon
Donald M. Haskell, Astoria

Pennsylvania
Ben J. Sewell, South Falls, Philadelphia

Virginia
Gary A. Day, Arlington
Frank Emmett Howard Jr., Fairfax
Cynthia Dunn, Harrisonburg
Joanne V. Mcegan, Harrisonburg
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Constitution Exhibit (continued from page seven)

Monday, September seventeenth marked the last session of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. The engrossed Constitution was read, and Benjamin Franklin moved that the Constitution be signed by all delegates. Before any signatures were affixed, Nathaniel Gorham requested that the number of citizens per representative in the lower house be reduced from forty to thirty thousand. George Washington rose to present the question and, for the first time in the Convention, entered the debate by expressing his support for the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

While the last delegates signed their names to the Constitution, Benjamin Franklin observed that he had often puzzled over the picture of the sun that was painted on the back of the President's chair. He had been unable to determine if it were a setting or rising sun, "but now, at great length, I had the happiness to know, that it is a rising, and not a setting, sun."

The following day, the Pennsylvania Packet and Daily Advertiser announced that the Convention was adjourned, and reported that "Major W. Jackson, the Secretary of that honourable body, leaves this city for New-York, this morning, in order to lay the great result of their proceedings before the United States in Congress."

The third and final installment of this series recounts the events of the ratification sequence and subsequent celebrations throughout the new nation. Part three of this article will appear in the next issue of the Quarterly.

Supreme Court Historical Society
111 Second Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20002

Benjamin Franklin was in such poor health from kidney stones and gout that he was carried to the Convention each day on a pallet hoisted by four prisoners from the crowded jail opposite the State House.