Membership Chairpersons Honored at Supreme Court Dinner

On October 24, 1989, Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist joined Society Trustees for a dinner in honor of the membership chairpersons of the Supreme Court Historical Society. Under the direction of Membership Chairman Frank C. Jones, of King and Spalding in Atlanta, a national network of state chairpersons has been established. Mr. Jones has selected respected lawyers to represent the Society in each state. These individuals have agreed to serve as their states’ chairperson and are working to meet the membership goals that have been set for their states. Some of the chairpersons have already met their annual membership goals. All of the chairpersons and their spouses were invited to attend a special evening of events to be held at the Supreme Court to honor their efforts on behalf of the Society. Twenty-three of the chairpersons, as well as some of the major contributors to the endowment campaign, attended the Supreme Court membership dinner.

The evening began with a reception held in the West Conference room of the Supreme Court. This allowed the chairpersons to meet with their colleagues as well as the Chief Justice and Endowment Fund donors. The group then moved to the East Conference Room where dinner was served.

After the guests were seated, Society Chairman Erwin N. Griswold welcomed the gathering and introduced Chief Justice Rehnquist, who had graciously offered to make the building available for the event. Dean Griswold remarked that, in this building, one need not make a formal introduction of the Chief Justice; one need only stand and say “The Chief Justice of the United States.” He then laughed and proceeded to make a more lengthy introduction of Chief Justice Rehnquist. The Chief Justice, after welcoming the assemblage to the Court, noted in his remarks that there were only 384 persons who worked at the Court, which was a particularly small number for a co-equal branch of the federal government. He expressed his gratitude to the Society for the vital support that it gives to the Court, observing that, without the Society, the Court would be unable to afford many of the supplementary enrichment activities that benefit visitors and special guests of the Court. Chief Justice

Frank C. Jones, National Membership Chairman and Trustee, receives an award from the Chief Justice in recognition of his achievements and continuing efforts on behalf of the Society.

Rehnquist concluded his comments by proposing a toast to the President of the United States.

After dinner, Society President Justin Stanley thanked the Chief Justice for his remarks, noting how encouraging it was to hear the Chief Justice express his appreciation of the Society.

Annual Meeting Date Set

The date for the Society’s Fifteenth Annual Meeting has been set for Monday, May 14, 1990. As in past years, the activities will include the annual lecture, a tour of the Supreme Court building, an open house at the Society’s headquarters, the annual membership meeting and the black tie reception and dinner. The annual lecture will be given by Retired Associate Justice Lewis F. Powell, Jr. in the Supreme Court chamber. In early April, each member will receive an invitation with further details of the events and a reservation card for the reception and dinner.
A Letter from the President

Minneapolis - St. Paul, Milwaukee, Richmond, New York, Washington, D.C., Baltimore and Chicago. Since this is the first year we have been to Philadelphia, St. Louis, and San Francisco. Chief Justice Burger accompanied me to New York and to Philadelphia. Society Trustee John C. Sheets attended the St. Louis’ luncheon and Trustee Charles B. Renfrew hosted two luncheons in San Francisco, one for corporate counsel and one for law firms. Still on the docket are planned trips to Los Angeles, Houston, Dallas and Atlanta. It will be a busy Spring. If any members can be of help by way of suggesting likely donors or centers which should be visited, that help will be welcome.

Of course, an integral part of our presentation in each city involves convincing our guests that their donations will be put to good use by funding worthwhile programs. I am happy to report that the Society is now pursuing several exciting prospects for expanding its program commitments. The Program Committee, chaired by J. Roderick Heller, Ill., has appointed an ad hoc subcommittee, chaired by Professor Geoffrey C. Hazard, to determine what role, if any, the Society might assume in developing oral history resources on the Supreme Court. Mr. Heller is also exploring the possibility of establishing a new judicial
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Chief Justice Bahnson, shown above with Mr. and Mrs. Don Slutz, expressed his gratitude to the Society for the vital support that it gives to the Court. Mr. Slutz is the South Dakota state Membership Chairman.
Roots of the Judiciary Act of 1789: A Conference Celebrates Its Evolution

system as a major defect of the Articles of Confederation. In The Federalist he observed:

"Laws are a dead letter, without courts to expound and define their true meaning and operation. The treaties of the United States, to have any force at all, must be considered as part of the law of the land. Their true import, as far as respects individuals must, like all other laws, be ascertained by judicial determination. To produce uniformity in these determinations, they ought to be submitted, in the last resort, to one Supreme Tribunal. And this tribunal ought to be instituted under the same authority which forms the treaties themselves."

James Madison expressed his feelings in a letter dated April 16, 1878 to George Washington in which he said:

"The National supremacy ought also to be extended, as I conceive, to the judiciary department. If those who are to expound and apply the laws are connected by their interests and their oaths with the Union, the participation of the Union in the making of the laws may be possibly rendered unlawful. It seems, at least, necessary that the oaths of the judges should include a fidelity to the general, as well as to local, Constitution; and that an appeal should be to some national tribunal in all cases to which foreigners, or inhabitants of other States, may be parties. The admiralty jurisdiction seems to fall within the purview of the National Government."

Given the views of these leading political figures of the time, it is not surprising to find that the first discussion of a proposed federal judiciary at the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention in 1787 included a clause implementing these ideas. The clause of the "Virginia Plan," which described the proposed judicial branch, read:

"That a National judiciary be established; to consist of one or more supreme tribunals, and of inferior tribunals; to be chosen by the National Legislature; to hold their offices during good behavior, and to receive punctually, at stated times, fixed compensation for their services, in which no increase or diminution shall be made so as to affect the persons actually in office at the time of such increase or diminution. That the jurisdiction of the inferior tribunals shall be to hear and determine, in the first instance, and of the supreme tribunal, in the dernier resort, all piracies and felonies on the high seas; captures from an enemy; cases in which foreigners, or citizens of other States, are applicants; or disputes may be interested; or which respect the collection of the National revenue, impeachment of any National officer, and questions which may involve the National peace and harmony."

The Virginia Plan was only the first of several plans discussed on the floor of the Convention. The rival New Jersey Plan, presented by William Paterson, called for a judicial branch that differed considerably from the judiciary proposed in the Virginia Plan. The New Jersey Plan established only one Supreme Court and did not provide for the creation of any inferior courts. It included a provision that no member of the judiciary should be capable of receiving or holding any other office or appointment during the time of his service on the bench, and for an unspecified time after he left the bench. Like the Virginia Plan, the New Jersey Plan called for tenure based on good behavior, and a fixed and immutable compensation. When the Convention actually voted on the judiciary clauses of these plans, a resolution that a national judiciary be established passed unanimously. After heated debate, a clause that the judiciary should "consist of one supreme tribunal and of one or more inferior tribunals" passed in the affirmative. But several days later the words "one or more" were stricken. The delegates agreed upon the need for a national judiciary rather easily, but the debate over inferior courts was possibly the most hotly contested issue involving the judiciary at the Convention. The delegates were so divided that they left the details of the judicial system to be established by the legislature.

This difficulty in resolving the details of the principles of the system was to be symptomatic of the entire Convention. While the delegates almost readily agreed upon a government composed of three separate branches, the definition of those branches was very difficult to resolve. Questions concerning the nature of the executive, the mechanism of determining representation in the legislature, and the role and jurisdiction of the judicial branch were hotly debated.

The records of the Convention reflect that there was a great deal of discussion concerning both the legislative and the executive branches of the government, but relatively little concerning the exact duties and nature of the judicial branch. In part, this might be attributed to the fact that so much time had been expended defining the other branches that the delegates simply did not have the time to debate the judicial branch any further.
Judiciary Act (continued from page five)

As the authors point out later in their article, inherent in the controversy surrounding the nature and structure of the new judicial branch were the fears of a repressive judicial system and the concerns about the new national system undermining or subsuming the state courts. British justice, as dispensed in the colonies, had created a deep distrust of judges and courts, and to some extent, the entire legal community. This heritage of distrust was a liability that the Federalists had to consider. In addition, there were fears that a judicial system would prove costly to the nation, as well as to the individual litigants who might be called upon to travel great distances to the seat of the national courts.

Whether by design or default, it became the task of the newly created legislative branch to give form to the third branch. This was undertaken during the first session of Congress. On April 7, 1789, the House of Representatives considered the important matter of duties on imports, while the Senate appointed a committee to consider the creation of the judicial branch.

The Senate committee appointed to draft a judiciary bill was composed of the following: Oliver Ellsworth, William Paterson, William Maclay, Charles Carroll, Ralph Izard, Caleb Strong, Richard Henry Lee, Richard Bassett, William Few and Paine Wingate. The committee drafted a bill entitled "An Act to establish the Judicial Courts of the United States," commonly referred to as the Judiciary Act of 1789. The bill was written principally by Ellsworth with assistance from Paterson. In its final form, it was replete with a plethora of provisions that would set the federal court system in order.

II An Introduction to the Bicentennial Conference

As part of the bicentennial celebration of the Judiciary Act of 1789, Georgetown University, in cooperation with the Judicial Conference of the United States and the Society, sponsored a conference that contemplated the background, history and development of the federal court system and the act that created it. Dr. Maeva Marcus, Editor of The Documentary History of the Supreme Court of the United States: 1789-1801, a project sponsored by the Society, the Supreme Court and the National Historical Publications and Records Commission served as the coordinator of the Conference.

In explaining the purpose and mission of the Conference, Dr. Marcus traced the history of research dealing with the Judiciary Act itself, noting that the first scholarly article dealing with the entire Act was written by Charles Warren and published in 1904. This article dealt with "the meanings of particular sections of the act as revealed by the many amendments proposed in the course of enacting the legislation." Dr. Marcus pointed out that one of the most recent treatments appears in Julius Goebel's Antecedents and Beginnings to 1801, which is the first volume in the Oliver Wendell Holmes Distinguished History of the Supreme Court of the United States, Vol. 1, 1977. Contemporary correspondence reveals, however, that scholars engaged in the drafting of the Act paid less attention to the constitutional language, which was ambiguous at best, than to contemporary political necessities. Members of the First Congress solicited advice from prominent lawyers and judges in their respective states, who expressed concerns ranging from the expense that a system of federal courts would entail, to the fear that a federal court system would engulf the state courts. Moreover, tough political issues that the Constitutional Convention deliberately avoided the question of whether the English common law would be the basis of federal jurisprudence, the protection of the common law rights of individuals within the legal system—survived the ratification debates to plague the members of the First Congress.

"In the aftermath of those debates, the drafters of the Judiciary Act overwhelmingly concerned themselves with creating a judicial system that safeguarded federal interests without antagonizing those who favored a strong role for the states. Meeting the challenge of resolving this issue, in practical terms, left the First Congress little time or inclination to muse on the sparse and essentially utilitarian language of Article III. Thus it is hazardous to rely on the Judiciary Act as evidence of the 'original understanding' of Article III. In answering the large questions as well as setting forth the details of the federal judiciary, the First Congress' resolutions reflected not so much the powers granted by the Framers in 1787 as the powers that were acceptable to the nation in 1789."

Dr. Marcus further commented that while many articles in law reviews cover the ramifications of specific provisions, "no one has taken an in-depth look at the Judiciary Act from a political and economic as well as a legal perspective." This became the objective of the Bicentennial Conference.

The Conference included the presentation of papers written by academics from across the country. The papers considered various provisions of the Judicial Act and how they have evolved. Several papers focused upon how the attitudes of the framers and the Constitution could be revealed by studying the Act and its interpretations.

In "Carrying Justice...To Every Man's Door: Commentaries on the Judiciary Act of 1789," written by Dr. Marcus and Natalie Wedder, Associate Editor of The Documentary History of the Supreme Court of the United States: 1789-1800, the authors considered the creation of the act itself. This paper serves as an introduction to the Conference.

"The Judiciary Act of 1789, which set up the nation's first federal court system, has often been viewed as the embodiment of Article III of the United States Constitution. Contemporary correspondence reveals, however, that the Framers engaged in the drafting of the Act paid less attention to the constitutional language, which was ambiguous at best, than to contemporary political necessities. Members of the First Congress solicited advice from prominent lawyers and judges in their respective states, who expressed concerns ranging from the expense that a system of federal courts would entail, to the fear that a federal court system would engulf the state courts. Moreover, tough political issues that the Constitutional Convention deliberately avoided the question of whether the English common law would be the basis of federal jurisprudence, the protection of the common law rights of individuals within the legal system—survived the ratification debates to plague the members of the First Congress.

"In the aftermath of those debates, the drafters of the Judiciary Act overwhelmingly concerned themselves with creating a judicial system that safeguarded federal interests without antagonizing those who favored a strong role for the states. Meeting the challenge of resolving this issue, in practical terms, left the First Congress little time or inclination to muse on the sparse and essentially utilitarian language of Article III. Thus it is hazardous to rely on the Judiciary Act as evidence of the 'original understanding' of Article III. In answering the large questions as well as setting forth the details of the federal judiciary, the First Congress' resolutions reflected not so much the powers granted by the Framers in 1787 as the powers that were acceptable to the nation in 1789."

III Details of the Conference Events

To commemorate the bicentennial of the Judiciary Act of 1789, Georgetown University, The Bicentennial Committee of the Judicial Conference of the United States, and the Supreme Court of the United States hosted a Conference on the history and present status of the federal courts and the act that created them.

The Conference was held over a two-day period, September 21 and 22, 1989, with sessions taking place in the Great Court Room of the Georgetown University Law Center. Special sessions were held in the Supreme Court and the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The opening day of the Conference included the presentation of scholarly papers followed by discussion and commentary. The initial session focused on the Judiciary Act of 1789. The first paper presented, entitled "Carrying Justice...To Every Man's Door: Commentaries on the Judiciary Act of 1789," was written by Maeva Marcus and Natalie Wedder. The second paper was entitled "Recovering Contermorum Power Theory: The Lost Dimension of Marshall Court Sovereignty Cases" and was written by G. Edward White, Professor of Law, University of Virginia School of Law. The third paper presented in the morning session, entitled "The Two-Tiered Structure of the Judiciary Act of 1789," was written by Ahkil Amar, Associate Professor of Law, Yale Law School. Harry Scheiber, Professor of Law, Boalt Hall, served as the moderator of the discussion of the papers and introduced the speakers. Following the presentations, Gerald Gunther, Professor of Law, Stanford Law School, comments upon the papers.

The afternoon session focused on the topics of economies and society in the early National period. The moderator for the afternoon session was Barbara Black, Dean of Columbus University School of Law. The first paper presented in the afternoon session was entitled "Debtor's Creditors, and Republicanism after the American Revolution," and was written by Bruce H. Mann, Professor of Law and History, University of Pennsylvania Law School. The second paper, written by Robert Weilberg, Professor of Law, Stanford Law School, was entitled "Debt Crises, Commercial Morals, and Bankruptcy Laws: 1789 and 1889." These papers were followed by commentary from Warren Schwartz, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, and John Murrin, Professor of History, Princeton University.

The activities of the first day ended with a plenary session held at the Supreme Court. The special meeting began with an introductory address by William H. Rehnquist, Chief Justice of the United States. The plenary address, on the topic of "The Judiciary Act of 1789," was delivered by Robert Carter, Provost, University of Chicago. A reception in the Great Hall of the Supreme Court concluded the first day.

The second day of the Conference began with a session focusing upon the enactment of the Judiciary Act. Kenneth W. Starr, Solicitor General of the United States, served as the moderator. The first paper to be presented was entitled "Dual Office Holding and the Courts: A View from Hayburn's Case," and was written by Mark Turush, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center. The second paper, "Murdock v.
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Mr. Stanley then introduced National Membership Chairman Frank Jones.

Mr. Jones called upon each state chairperson who was present to stand in place and to present a short report on the progress being made in his or her state. Sam Adams, the Massachusetts Chairman, was the first to speak. He promised to spread interest in the Society, even if we have to burn a tree, ring a bell or throw tea in the harbor. We will do it.”

Nebraska Chairman Dick Kaunseln drew appreciative laughs when he quipped, “I’d like a continuous.” He has since surpassed the annual goal for his state.

Bill Haight, one of two chairpersons for California, said that “Frank [Jones] had the toughest job, to call and make us feel important. He handled it well.”

George P. Hewes, III, the Mississippi Chairman, stated that his work provided a “classic example of where bigger is not necessarily better.” Because Mississippi was a less populous state, it had a lower membership goal. Therefore, he was able to achieve the more modest goal that was set for a state of that size.

Mr. Hewes was one of ten chairpersons to receive awards for meeting the interim membership targets that had been established. Each membership chairperson who had met the interim goal by the time of the membership dinner received a small token from the Society in recognition of his efforts. These awards, homemade walnut boxes, were presented during the membership reports by the Executive Director of the Society, David T. Pride. In addition to Mr. Hewes, the following also received the interim award: Harvey C. Koch of Louisiana, Thomas E. Deary, Jr. of Missouri, Hector Rechquist of Puerto Rico, Ralph I. Lancaster, Jr. of Maine, Bill Haight of California, Ralph M. Stockton, Jr. of North Carolina, John T. Marshall of Georgia, Ben Lampkin of Oklahoma, and George Apostol of Wyoming, who accepted the award for that state’s Chairman, William H. Brown. At the close of the chairpersons’ reports, Mr. Jones noted that Wayne Hillard of Oregon, Patrick T. Ryan of Pennsylvania, and Robert V.F. Waterman, Jr. of Iowa had earned the interim award as well, but were unable to attend the dinner.

Frank Jones then described a special award that would be presented to chairpersons who had met their annual membership goals. The awards are polished marble paperweights crafted from stone taken from the Supreme Court building. Several changes have been made in the design over the years. The marble chairperson who had met the annual goal for his state to approach the speaker’s podium in order to receive the special award from the Chief Justice. Those present who received those special awards were: George P. Hewes, III, Harvey C. Koch.
### Arizona
- John D. Carter, San Francisco
- Howard Golub, San Francisco
- Thomas J. Killgore, San Francisco
- James Lee Warren, San Francisco
- Gary A. Bague, Santa Ana
- James Loveland, Santa Ana
- Michael Leahy, Santa Monica
- Elliott Olson, Santa Monica
- Gary C. Ottino, Santa Monica
- Wayne Peterson, Santa Monica
- Morton Rosen, Santa Monica
- John W. Sheller, Santa Monica
- Roy Weatherup, Santa Monica
- David B. Caselman, Tarzana
- Herbert Zisman, Van Nuys
- Robert L. Kaufman, Westlake Village

### Colorado
- Raphaël J. Moses, Boulder
- Roy N. Rolond, Denver
- Walter A. Stevens, Denver

### Connecticut
- University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport
- Richard T. Meenan Sr., Shelton

### Delaware
- Charles S. Crompton Jr., Wilmington
- Richard G. Elliott Jr., Wilmington
- Stephen E. Herrmann, Wilmington
- Walter L. Pepperman II, Wilmington

### District of Columbia
- Ralph T. Berello
- Joseph R. Guerra
- Peter Koidler
- Larry Pressler
- Gregory L.A. Thomas

### Florida
- R. Brady Osborne Jr., Boca Raton
- Mrs. & Mr. C. Clyde Askie, Coral Gables
- Maria J. Chiro, Hollywood
- George D. Gabr Jr., Jacksonville
- Rachael S. Blechman, Miami
- Dean C. Culman, Miami
- David L. Dechi, Miami
- Lawrence A. Kellogg, Miami
- Craig C. Villani, New Port Richey
- James M. Russ, Orlando
- Glen D. Wieland, Orlando

### Georgia
- Bruce W. Baker, Atlanta
- Emmett J. Boudourid, Atlanta
- Dean Booth, Atlanta
- J. Kevin Butler, Atlanta
- David L. Colker, Atlanta
- Dwight L. Davis
- Walter Draper Jr., Atlanta
- Robert H. Hall, Atlanta
- Edward J. Hawsie, Atlanta
- William A. Hollis, Atlanta
- Hugh H. Howell Jr., Atlanta
- Daniel D. King, Atlanta
- John T. Marshall, Atlanta
- John R. Meyer, Atlanta
- David C. Nuteri, Atlanta
- Richard A. Schneider, Atlanta
- Richard L. Shankford, Atlanta
- Charles M. Shaffer Jr., Atlanta
- Horace H. Shibley, Atlanta
- Larry D. Thompson, Atlanta
- W.T. Walsh, Atlanta
- James H. Wildman, Atlanta
- Wilfried M. Pulcher, Augh
- Jesse G. Bowles, Chubbert
- G. Hughe Harrison, Lawrenceville
- John B. Miller, Savannah
- Paul W. Painter Jr., Savannah

### Hawaii
- Ralph D. Saucer, Davenport
- Donald H. Sitte, Davenport
- Robert A. Van Voor, Davenport
- Robert W. Vepretto, Davenport
- Thomas D. Waterman, Davenport
- Francis Fitzgerald, Des Moines
- Maurice B. Nieland, Sioux City
- Edward J. Gallagher Jr., Waterloo

### Louisiana
- F.A. Little Jr., Alexandria
- John S. Baker Jr., Baton Rouge
- John N. Dimos, Baton Rouge
- Shannon Hardy, Baton Rouge
- Kirk Landry, Baton Rouge
- Kirk Reasnowski, Metairie
- Jennifer E. Began, New Orleans
- Bob Eitel, New Orleans
- Mark Hamon, New Orleans
- Charles E. Hamilton III, New Orleans
- John R. Kramer, New Orleans
- R.D. Kuhlroth, New Orleans
- Frank E. Lamothe III, New Orleans
- Harry T. Lemmon, New Orleans
- Howard Marks, New Orleans
- Henry A. Marte Jr., New Orleans
- Niala H. Ratner, New Orleans
- Gary J. Rousse, New Orleans
- Sal Scania, New Orleans
- John M. Wilson, New Orleans
- Alan Wolf, New Orleans

### Maine
- Kenneth M. Curtis, Canton
- Howard H. Dana Jr., Portland
- Eugene G.E. MacMahon, Portland
- Joel C. Martin, Portland
- Harrison L. Richardson, Lincoln
- Carl R. Wright, Skowhegan

### Maryland
- Edward J. Bierante Jr., Baltimore
- David Corvid, Baltimore
- Lee Melville Turbyne, Chevy Chase
- Cornfield and Chicago
- Mr. and Mrs. P. A. Conner, New York

### Massachusetts
- James C. Farney, Indianapolis
- Jack Wickes, Indianapolis

### Nebraska
- Hans J. Holzefel, Gering
- Denzel R. Buick, Grand Island
- Bernard B. Smith, Lexington
- C. Arlan Binum, Lincoln
- Robert B. Crosby, Lincoln
- Thomas M. Davies, Lincoln
- William A. Harding, Lincoln
- Warren C. Johnson, Lincoln
- Frederic H. Kaufman, Lincoln
- Richard A. Knudson, Lincoln
- Richard Roth, Lincoln
- Daniel J. Jewell, Norfolk
- Milton R. Abrahams, Omaha
- Charles R. Burke, Omaha
- Donald H. Erickson, Omaha
- Charles F. Gotch, Omaha
- Deryl F. Hamann, Omaha
- Jack J. Ineza, Omaha
- Herbert S. Garten, Omaha
- Roy L. Mason, Omaha
- Thomas J. Jannett, Omaha
- Bruce L. Seflon, Cheyney Chase
- James J. Doyle III, Timonovan

### New Hampshire
- Leo B. Lied Jr., Concord
- Richard E. Boyer, Nashua

### New Jersey
- Carl D. Peleg, Cherry Hill
- Edward A. Zinz Jr., Morristown
- Robert N. Wilentz, Oakhurst

### New Mexico
- Lyman G. Sandy, Albuquerque

### New York
- Michael J. Lanz, Brooklyn Heights
- Deirdre A. Burgman, New York
- Thomas F. Curnin, New York
- Raymond L. Salt, New York
- Lawrence S. King, New York
- Denis McFarren, New York
- Jed S. Raskoff, New York
- Taryn V. Shelton, New York
- Michael P. Tierney, New York
- Timothy L. Barnes, Newark
- Henry G. Miller, White Plains

### North Carolina
- William S. Byassee, Greensboro
- James E. Bount Jr., Raleigh
- Jimmy H. Barnhill, Winston-Salem

### Oklahoma
- Jack L. Freeman, Edmond
- Gloria G. Truss, Oklahoma City
- William E. Woodson, Norman
- Robert M. Behlen, Oklahoma City
- H. Blanton Brown, Oklahoma City
- Jack W. Cook, Oklahoma City
- John A. Clark, Oklahoma City
- J.W. Coyle III, Oklahoma City
- James D. Frank, Oklahoma City
- Jerry W. Foshee, Oklahoma City
- John C. Keesy, Oklahoma City
- William Murphy Jr., Oklahoma City
- Larry L. Oatway, Oklahoma City
- Robert R. Robles, Oklahoma City
- John Vitali, Oklahoma City
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Oregon
Randall B. Kester, Portland
Peter C. Richter, Portland

Pennsylvania
Arthur Newbold, Malvern
Paula T. Ryan, Merion
Richard M. Bernstein, Philadelphia
Mark M. Bridge, Philadelphia
Stephen A. Cozen, Philadelphia
John W. Frazier III, Philadelphia
Lawrence T. Hoyle Jr., Philadelphia
David H. Marion, Philadelphia
Manny Pokotilow, Philadelphia
Richard M. Rosenbleeth, Philadelphia
David J. Armstrong, Pittsburgh
George M. Weiss, Pittsburgh

Rhode Island
Edward T. Hogan, East Providence
Michael P. DeFanti, Providence
Robert B. Gates, Providence

South Carolina
Robert N. Rosen, Charleston
C.E. Singletary, Charleston
Herbert A. Johnson, Columbia
Charles Porter, Columbia
John E. Johnston, Greenville
John W. Kittredge, Greenville

South Dakota
William F. Day Jr., Sioux Falls

Tennessee
John W. Wheeler, Knoxville

Texas
Gaylord Armstrong, Austin
C. Morris Davis, Austin
John M. Harman, Austin
Charles A. Spain Jr., Austin
Pamela Karum, San Antonio
Deborah L. Miller, Universal City

Vermont
Norwich University, Northfield

Virginia
H. Richard Chew, Arlington
Robert W. Mann, Martinsville
Ben Cotten, McLean
John S. Stump, McLean
Norman F. Slender, Merrifield
Robert P. Buford, Richmond
William R. Coger, Richmond

Washington
Julian C. Dewell, Everett
David A. Wells, Mt. Vernon
J. David Andrews, Seattle
William L. Dwyer, Seattle
James R. Ellis, Seattle
H. Weston Foss, Seattle
Keith Gerrard, Seattle
D. Wayne Gittinger, Seattle
Sam L. Levinson, Seattle
Roy J. Moceri, Seattle
Jack R. Dean, Spokane
F. Ross Burgess, Tacoma
Patrick C. Comfort, Tacoma
Katherine H. O’Neil, Vancouver

West Virginia
Milton T. Herndon, Charleston
James R. Bailes, Huntington
Luther Woods, Huntington
Clarence E. Martin III, Martinsburg

Wyoming
George M. Apostolos, Casper
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