Retired Justice Byron R. White Dies

Justice Byron R. White

Byron R. White, the first individual to have served as a Supreme Court clerk and subsequently receive an appointment to the Court, died on April 15, 2002 in his home state of Colorado. A man of many talents, White was appointed to the Supreme Court in 1962 by President John F. Kennedy and served 31 years on that bench, one of the longest terms of service on the Court to date, retiring in 1993. For most of the years following his retirement, White maintained chambers in the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, taking an active role in judicial duties at the circuit level. Eventually, failing health dictated that his schedule be curtailed, and about a year ago he returned to his native state of Colorado. His death leaves no living retired members of the Supreme Court.

St. John’s Cathedral in Denver was the setting for a memorial service held on April 22, 2002. Approximately 700 mourners met to remember and celebrate the life and many accomplishments and contributions of Justice White. Five Supreme Court Justices, John Paul Stevens, Antonin Scalia, Clarence Thomas, David Souter and Stephen Breyer, attended the service. A cadre of almost 50 former law clerks to the Justice filed into the church in the order in which they had worked for him. Other notables included Ethel Kennedy, widow of Robert F. Kennedy, and Sen. Edward Kennedy. Rev. Eaton, who conducted the service, recalled that Mrs. Kennedy had accompanied Byron White to his confirmation hearings. White’s family issued a brief statement observing that “[t]hrough his quiet influence, love and companionship, we learned the importance of working hard and of balancing that hard work with exercise and good humor. We came to appreciate the value of friendship, responsibility, the right fishing knots and a long spiral pass.”

The family statement gives some indication of the diversity of White’s interests and pursuits in the course of his lifetime. An able and talented scholar, he was also an exceptional athlete, at one point concurrently attending Yale University while playing professional football on the weekends. He served in the U.S. Navy during World War II, and after returning to civilian life, clerked for the Chief Justice of the United States before entering private practice. His public service also included an appointment to the Justice Department prior to his nomination to the Supreme Court.

The breadth of his career is also reflected in comments made by current members of the Court. All nine sitting Justices issued statements concerning Justice White and the significance of his service. The Chief Justice made his statement from the bench on the morning of April 16, 2002 prior to the commencement of regularly scheduled business. Only two of the current members of the Court, Justices Ginsburg and Breyer, did not serve with Justice White on the Court. Indeed, Justice Ginsburg was appointed to the Court to fill the vacancy created by White’s retirement. Accordingly, many of the comments made by the Justices reflect personal associations and memories. The text of the statements issued by each member of the Court appears below.

Continued on page 8
A Letter from the President

June of 2002 marks a time of transition for the Supreme Court Historical Society, the end of one era, and the beginning of another. On June 3, Leon Silverman, President of the Society for the past twelve years, resigned his office and was elected Chairman of the Board of Trustees. Frank C. Jones, a Vice President of the Society for more than ten years, was nominated to become the next President. Therefore, in this issue of the Quarterly, this column will provide communication from the outgoing President, and a brief sketch of our incoming President.

This, as most of you know, has been a difficult year for the country and for the Society. We began the year with a strong first quarter, only to face significant problems stemming from the acts of terrorism committed on September 11th and throughout the fall.

Like every other institution possessed of endowment funds, the Society suffered a serious financial setback in the post-9/11 economic environment. However, thanks to prudent investment strategies we achieved a level of equilibrium by the end of the third quarter, even posting some modest growth.

Membership too has been affected, as much of the Nation's charitable focus was redirected toward relief efforts for the victims of the World Trade Center and Pentagon tragedies. As a consequence, despite the calamities of last fall, it appears likely the Society will close its books on fiscal year 2002 at or near budget and with some modest growth in the endowment.

Dr. Marcus and her staff are now turning their attention to the Project's eighth and final volume, the completion of which will be a landmark in the Society's history—and without doubt the most significant of its accomplishments to date is collecting and preserving the history of the Court.

This past year the Society also published in a special issue of the Journal of Supreme Court History, the memoirs of Malvina Shantlin Harlan, wife of the first Justice John Marshall Harlan. The original manuscript had languished with little notice for many years, and was brought to the Society's attention by Justice Ginsburg, who championed its publication.

The special issue of the Journal containing the memoir received very favorable reviews and as a result, several major publishers became interested in republication of the work for a popular audience. Modern Library, a division of Random House, approached the Society and the Harlan family last fall seeking permission to reprint the work, and a few weeks ago it was released with considerable fanfare in bookstores across the country.

During the fall of 2001, the eighth annual lecture series was completed, with several of the programs rebroadcast by C-Span. The series commemorated the service of the Great Chief Justice, John Marshall. Other ongoing programs include the Summer Institute for Federal Judges and the Harlan family's annual program for secondary school teachers. This summer, sixty teachers will gather in Washington to learn about the Court at first-hand. The third summer session of the Institute for Constitutional Studies also convenes this summer. The seminar has been extremely helpful in providing junior faculty members and graduate students an opportunity to study with some of the most accomplished scholars in the field.

I could go on at much greater length about the activities of the program, but I will desist. As my term comes to a close, I want to thank you all from the bottom of my heart for according me the honor of serving such a proud institution as President of this distinguished organization. Together we have accomplished much, and I think laid a foundation on which we can build a Society that is even more productive than it has been to date. As I turn over the mantle to Frank, I believe it is not an overstatement to say the Society is on a firm financial footing.

Further, the Society is conducting the kinds of programs, and producing the quality of publications, that fulfill and possibly even exceed the aspirations of Chief Justice Burger when he created the Society in 1974.

I would like to say a few words about my successor. Frank Jones has been involved with the Society for many years. In the mid-1980s he conducted the most successful membership campaign in the Society's history, and in 1986 was elected to the Board of Trustees.

Subsequently, in 1990, Frank joined the Executive Committee on his election as Vice President—an office he has held for twelve years. Throughout that time he has undertaken a wide variety of committee assignments, including his current position as Chair of the Development Committee.

Some of you may know that earlier this year Frank suffered a life-threatening health problem that restricted his activities for several months. Nevertheless, it is a measure of his mettle that despite his own difficulties, and the challenges facing many charitable organizations in the post-9/11 giving environment, the Society's development efforts are meeting and in some cases exceeding their goals for fiscal year 2002.

Frank's ability to expand membership support and his fundraising skills alone would recommend him as your next President. In addition, as I have counted him among my close friends for many years in the American College of Trial Lawyers, I can tell you he is a man of honor and diplomacy, possessed of an insightful mind and an energetic spirit. The Society could not do better than Frank Jones for its next President.

Important recent acquisitions in the Society's collection include this original carte-de-visite photograph of Justice Nathan Clifford taken by Brady's National Portrait Studio. The handwritten signature of the Justice appears on a small card underneath the photograph. These items were part of a collection of photographs and autographed materials donated by Dorothy Tapper Goldman.

WANTED

In the interest of preserving the valuable history of the highest court, The Supreme Court Historical Society would like to locate persons who might be able to assist the Society's Acquisitions Committee. The Society is endeavoring to acquire artifacts, memorabilia, literature and any other materials related to the history of the Court and its members. These items are often used in exhibits by the Court Curator's Office. If any of our members, or others, have anything they would care to share with us, please contact the Acquisitions Committee at the Society's headquarters, 224 East Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20003 or call (202) 543-0400. Donations to the Acquisitions fund would be welcomed. You may also reach the Society through its website at www.supremecourthistory.org.
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When scholars attempt to assess or rank the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, it is difficult to be completely objective. Just as Justices at times inject their personal values into their decisions, so do scholars when making their evaluations. I first became interested in the topic when I read The First One Hundred Justices: Statistical Studies on the Supreme Court of the United States (Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String Press [Archon Books, 1978] by Albert P. Blasiens and Roy M. Mersky). They looked at Justices who had served on the Court from 1789 to 1969, and grouped them into five categories: great (12 Justices); near great (15); average (55), below average (6), and failures (8). Sixty-five reputable academicians in the area of judicial process supplied the ratings. I questioned the validity of listing the eight as failures in an article in Yearbook 1985 published by the Supreme Court Historical Society. My interest in the topic was renewed when I was recently asked to participate in a survey of judicial scholars. We were asked to rate the twentieth century Justices as excellent, good, average, poor or failures.

One of the eight listed as a failure in the 1978 book was James C. McReynolds, and my “knee-jerk” reaction in the recent survey was to call him poor, but not a failure. Then I noticed when the results came back that out of fifty-two Justices he finished fifty-first in the mean rating, above only Justice Whittaker. That led me to question why McReynolds always seems to fare so poorly in this type of exercise. I decided to look at his major opinions and dissents during his twenty-seven years on the Court to see if the assessment of him is based solely upon those, or if perhaps scholars are injecting too much personal bias when they rank him.

In reviewing the cases there were choices to be made. Should my examination be topical or chronological? In the dissents, should I look at those where he joined others, or only those he wrote? I opted for a straight chronology from his first major opinion to his last, with his dissenters included in the chronology, but only those dissenters he actually wrote. I chose this approach because I find that one is able to get a better feel for a Justice when one sees how that person develops over time. The times change, but does the person? In the case of McReynolds one is predisposed to say no.

ASSESSING JUSTICE McREYNOLDS
By Prof. Robert Langra

James C. McReynolds, and my “knee-jerk” reaction in the recent survey was to call him poor, but not a failure. Then I noticed when the results came back that out of fifty-two Justices he finished fifty-first in the mean rating, above only Justice Whittaker. That led me to question why McReynolds always seems to fare so poorly in this type of exercise. I decided to look at his major opinions and dissents during his twenty-seven years on the Court to see if the assessment of him is based solely upon those, or if perhaps scholars are injecting too much personal bias when they rank him.

In reviewing the cases there were choices to be made. Should my examination be topical or chronological? In the dissents, should I look at those where he joined others, or only those he wrote? I opted for a straight chronology from his first major opinion to his last, with his dissenters included in the chronology, but only those dissenters he actually wrote. I chose this approach because I find that one is able to get a better feel for a Justice when one sees how that person develops over time. The times change, but does the person? In the case of McReynolds one is predisposed to say no.

In reviewing the cases there were choices to be made. Should my examination be topical or chronological? In the dissents, should I look at those where he joined others, or only those he wrote? I opted for a straight chronology from his first major opinion to his last, with his dissenters included in the chronology, but only those dissenters he actually wrote. I chose this approach because I find that one is able to get a better feel for a Justice when one sees how that person develops over time. The times change, but does the person? In the case of McReynolds one is predisposed to say no.

One of the eight listed as a failure in the 1978 book was James C. McReynolds, and my “knee-jerk” reaction in the recent survey was to call him poor, but not a failure. Then I noticed when the results came back that out of fifty-two Justices he finished fifty-first in the mean rating, above only Justice Whittaker. That led me to question why McReynolds always seems to fare so poorly in this type of exercise. I decided to look at his major opinions and dissents during his twenty-seven years on the Court to see if the assessment of him is based solely upon those, or if perhaps scholars are injecting too much personal bias when they rank him.

In reviewing the cases there were choices to be made. Should my examination be topical or chronological? In the dissents, should I look at those where he joined others, or only those he wrote? I opted for a straight chronology from his first major opinion to his last, with his dissenters included in the chronology, but only those dissenters he actually wrote. I chose this approach because I find that one is able to get a better feel for a Justice when one sees how that person develops over time. The times change, but does the person? In the case of McReynolds one is predisposed to say no.

In the second case, Pierce v. Society of Sisters (1925), the Court in general and McReynolds in particular had a demonstrable business focus often involving cases where business challenged government restriction or regulation. McReynolds was always wary of such governmental action. For example, in Adams v. Tanner (1917), the Court, speaking through McReynolds, struck down a Washington law prohibiting employment agencies from charging fees. Manifestly, that would put them all out of business without adequate social justification for the restriction, a Fourteenth Amendment due process violation. He also wrote the opinion for a unanimous Court in United States v. Colgate (1919). This opinion upheld resale price maintenance agreements made by a company with its dealers, and the Court found this monoplastic intent. Thus, a company may decide with whom to deal, and may announce the circumstances under which it will refuse to deal. In like manner, writing the opinion in FTC v. Gratz (1920) he again ruled against the government in its attempt to stop a company from refusing to sell a product unless prospective purchasers bought with it another of the company's products. He expressed his opinion that it was up to the courts to decide what is unfair competition. The ruling found that since the company sold at fair prices to those willing to take the terms, the public did not suffer injury.

McReynolds showed his usual anti-government tendencies when he cast the lone dissent in a case upholding the Packers and Stockyards Act (1921), giving the Secretary of Agriculture the power to prescribe rates for the meat packing industry. The case was Swift & Co. v. Wallace (1922). He came back to the majority immediately, however, in FTC v. Curtis Publishing Company (1923). This case ruled against the government's attempt to stop a consignment contract between a publisher and a distributor requiring the distributor to act as an exclusive agent, carrying no other publisher's materials. He found instead an orderly development of business without an unlawful motive, said again that the courts are the ultimate determiners of unfair competition, and concluded that courts could look at the record of a case to see if there were any material facts not reported by the Federal Trade Commission. McReynolds even wrote a unanimous opinion upholding the right of four gasolene manufacturers to lease underground tanks with pumps to retailers, but only to be used with gasoline supplied by them. In FTC v. Sinclair Refining (1923), he wrote that those who give time, skill, and capital should expect to have a large degree of latitude in the conduct of their affairs. Finally, in 1923 he wrote another unanimous opinion in United States v. American Linseed Oil Company, this time finding in favor of the government. He ruled against twelve corporations who had entered into agreements to suppress competition in trade. Each company had to reveal all the intimate details of its business affairs. McReynolds stated this was not bona fide competition; rather it was destroying the kind of competition to which the public had long looked for protection.

As should be apparent from these cases, McReynolds was
A VISIT TO THE LAZY B RANCH

*By Professor James B. O'Hara*

As visitors to bookstores and viewers of C-Span television already know, there is a new and most unusual book by a sitting Justice of the Supreme Court. Justice Sandra Day O'Connor has joined with her brother, H. Alan Day, in the writing of *Lazy B—Growing up on a Cattle Ranch in the American Southwest* (Random House, 2002).

Apart from the interest guaranteed because of its author, *Lazy B* will be for most of its readers a fascinating introduction to a bit of Americana generally known only through not-so-accurate Western films. Here, in these pages, the reader will find a taste of the ordinary daily hardships of a cattle ranch: the searing heat of the days, the constant concern for water, the long working hours, the primitive living conditions. Visitors to bookstores and viewers of C-Span television will also find more than the interest guaranteed because of its author. Apart from the interest guaranteed because of its author, *Lazy B* will be for most of its readers a fascinating introduction to a bit of Americana generally known only through not-so-accurate Western films. Here, in these pages, the reader will find a taste of the ordinary daily hardships of a cattle ranch: the searing heat of the days, the constant concern for water, the long working hours, the primitive living conditions.

About the ranch; the searing heat of the days, the constant concern for water, the long working hours, the primitive living conditions.

There are vignettes of ranch life like riding the trail to Mexico, making the rounds, the pets, the roundup, and a chap

This book is an easy read. There are pictures and maps and each chapter begins with a wonderfully apt quotation, sometimes from a family letter, often from an earlier book about western life, even one from an ode by Shelley. Readers will enjoy a book filled with such nostalgia and charm.

Justice O'Connor's recent book, The Lazy B, is a charming autobiographical remembrance of her life growing up on a ranch in Arizona. The future Justice was an accomplished horsewoman. This picture was taken when she was in the third grade. A VISIT TO THE LAZY B RANCH
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Before we begin this morning, I want to pay tribute to our friend and colleague Byron R. White, a retired Justice of this Court, who died yesterday morning in Colorado. Byron White was nominated to the Court by President Kennedy on April 3, 1962, and was confirmed by the Senate eight days later. He took the oath of office 40 years ago today, on April 16, 1962. He was the 93rd Justice to serve on this Court.

Justice White was born and raised in Colorado. He was a rare combination of brilliant scholar and gifted athlete. He attended the University of Colorado, earning 10 varsity letters and winning a Rhodes scholarship to Oxford. Before attending Oxford, Justice White played professional football for the old Pittsburgh Pirates. When he returned from Oxford, Justice White attended Yale Law School while playing football for the Detroit Lions on weekends. He served as an intelligence officer for the Navy during WWII.

Justice White was graduated from Yale Law School, earning the Cullen Prize for high academic grades. He clerked for Chief Justice Vinson and then returned home to Colorado where he practiced law for 14 years, before joining the Justice Department. Less than a year later, President Kennedy named Justice White to the Court.

Justice White was an able colleague and a good friend. He came as close as any of us to meeting Matthew Arnold’s encomium: “saw life steadily and saw it whole.” All of us who served with him feel a sense of personal loss. Our condolences go out to his wife, Marion, his two children and their families.

At an appropriate time in the fall, the traditional memorial observance of the Court and the Bar will be held in this Courtroom.

Justice John Paul Stevens

Byron White was already a national hero to sports fans when I first met him in Pearl Harbor during World War II. I knew immediately that he was the kind of person that I would want as a friend. One of the greatest blessings of my appointment to this Court was the fruition of that wish. His friendship is one of the treasures of this tour of duty. He was the kind of person for whom respect, admiration and affection continue to increase as you learn more about him. He was a true hero during his naval service, a brilliant student and law clerk, an outstanding member of the profession, both in private practice and as a public servant, and a great judge. He was also blessed with an exceptionally loving bride and a fine family of which he was justly proud. I will miss him.

Justice Antonin Scalia

Anyone who ever met Byron White will recall his painfully firm handshake: you had to squeeze back hard or he would hurt you. I always thought that was an apt symbol for his role on the Court: he worked hard and well, and by doing so forced you to do the same. If there is one adjective that never could, never would, be applied to Byron White, it was wishy-washy. You always knew where he stood; knew that he was not likely to be moved; and hoped he was lining up on your side of scrimmage. His former colleagues have missed him since his retirement nine years ago; we will miss him more now. May he rest in peace.

Justice Anthony Kennedy

The Court must strive in all it is and all it does to reflect the integrity and the strength of a Nation dedicated to the cause of freedom. Byron White was himself a remarkable personification of these values and this purpose. His physical strength and stature were powerful reminders of an even greater strength of character, character marked even from his youth by an unyielding dedication to America and its historic mission. Byron White honored the Court and the law by his service here. He honored the United States and its people by his splendid, vibrant human spirit.

Justice David Souter

Justice White was a welcoming colleague and a solid friend. Like the others here, I will miss him.

Justice Clarence Thomas

I am deeply saddened to learn of the death of Justice White. He was a great man, an outstanding member of the Court, and a wonderful friend. Virginia and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to Marion and her family. We will keep them in our thoughts and in our prayers.

Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg

At the hearings on my nomination in July 1993, a senator asked: "In what ways do you think you might be like or different from Justice White?" I answered: "The differences are obvious; he is very tall and I am rather small and surely I do not have his athletic prowess." But "I hope I am like Justice White in dedication to the job and readiness to work hard at it." I hold that hope high to this very day.

I have a special fondness for and appreciation of Justice White for another reason. In my days as an advocate of equal rights for men and women, I argued six cases in the Supreme Court and prevailed in five. If it had been up to Justice White, I would have prevailed in all six. He voted for the precise position I advocated every time. He was the only Justice who did.

Justice Stephen Breyer

I was lucky to have come to know Justice White in his later years. Justice White was a great judge and a thoroughly decent man—forceful, engaging and strongly committed to public service.

As noted in the remarks made by the Chief Justice, some time in the fall, a special session of the Bar will commemorate the Justice’s career and contributions to the legal community and the jurisprudence of the Court. Following that session, a special session of Court will be convened at which time the Court will hear formal resolutions memorializing his life and work. Traditionally, the Solicitor General of the United States is charged with planning and organizing such a memorial. Under the direction of the Solicitor General, the former clerks to Justice White will select speakers and draft resolutions commemorating the Justice’s career and life. After adoption and presentation to the Court, these resolutions will become a permanent part of the records of the Court.

As Justice Stevens observed, "Byron White was already a national hero to sports fans when I first met him in Pearl Harbor during World War II. White played professional football for the Pittsburgh Pirates and the Detroit Lions. He later served as an intelligence officer in the Pacific Theater during World War II, receiving a Bronze Star."
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Comments of Chief Justice Rehnquist, made from the Bench
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Court struck down another state law that required that all children between the ages of eight and sixteen must attend public schools, effectively closing parochial and private schools. McReynolds wrote that the law took away liberty and property without due process in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. The liberty involved was once again that of parents to send their children to an approved school of their choice, and the property was that of the persons who owned the schools that were being forced out of business. It would be difficult to find fault with these two decisions, and surely they would not count toward giving McReynolds a low evaluation as a Justice. Even the dissent in his next case would seem legitimate; the other dissenters were Holmes and Brandeis. The case, Myers v. United States (1926), was one in which the majority upheld the President's right to remove presidentially appointed persons in the executive branch without having to seek Senate permission.

New Deal Era

It seems, therefore, that it must be McReynolds' opinions from the New Deal era that have caused scholars to hold him in such disrepute. McReynolds was in regular opposition to key New Deal legislation. His opposition actually began with a state case, Nebbia v. New York (1934), wherein the Court upheld a state law designed to aid its dairy farmers. The dairy industry a public interest one, the law created a minimum sales price and a maximum retail price of milk. The majority opinion found that any business at any time could be considered in the public interest and subject to regulation if conditions so warranted. The courts could only intervene if there were arbitrariness on the part of the state imposing the regulation. McReynolds, speaking for himself and three others (Van Devanter, Sutherland and Butler), laid the case of the public interest concept. McReynolds, Van Devanter, Sutherland and Butler held similar views and frequently voted together against the New Deal statutes. They dubbed them "The Four Horsemen," likening them to the famous defensive players on the Notre Dame football team who were noted for not allowing anything to get past them on the field.

Next, McReynolds took aim at Franklin Roosevelt's financial policies, commencing with two cases dealing with the gold standard. Roosevelt had taken the country off the gold standard, and Congress passed a joint resolution that rescinded any claim of contracts or government bonds that called for payment in gold. In the same five-to-four split occurring in the previous case, the Court sustained the resolution. The Court justified the section dealing with private contracts on the grounds that Congress had the power to regulate the currency. Accordingly, it had the right to define what constituted legal tender (Norman v. Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Co. (1925)). In upholding the section dealing with government bonds, the Court actually expressed the opinion that the government had acted unconstitutionally when it had pledged to pay in gold when the bonds were sold. However, it disallowed the suit because the difference in the amount the plaintiff would have received in gold and what he would actually receive from the bond was so negligible that he suffered no real damage and thus had no legal standing (McReynolds v. United States 1935). McReynolds, in dissent, expressed his belief that the sanctity of contractual obligations must be maintained. Indeed he felt so strongly about it that he wrote, "shame and humiliation are upon us."

McReynolds was a harsh critic of President Roosevelt, and opposed most of the New Deal legislation. His dissents often contained personal attacks on his political adversaries, and one on occasion, McReynolds went so far as to describe FDR as "an utter incompetent."

It had pledged to pay in gold when the bonds were sold. However, it disallowed the suit because the difference in the amount the plaintiff would have received in gold and what he would actually receive from the bond was so negligible that he suffered no real damage and thus had no legal standing (McReynolds v. United States 1935). McReynolds, in dissent, expressed his belief that the sanctity of contractual obligations must be maintained. Indeed he felt so strongly about it that he wrote, "shame and humiliation are upon us."

McReynolds was able to write one majority opinion invalidating a New Deal law. In the ruling in Ashton v. Cameron National Bank, (1936), he struck down the 1934 Federal Municipal Bankruptcy Act that had allowed subdivisions of states to file voluntary bankruptcy petitions. McReynolds reasoned that the law invaded the areas of state finances and state sovereignty. However, he found himself dissenting again in United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation (1936), when the Court upheld a 1934 joint resolution giving the President the right to place an embargo on the sale of weapons to two warring countries if he thought such an action would help bring about peace. Congress had given specific enforcement power to the President in its resolution. The Court, in a sweeping decision, declared that "the President's power to regulate commerce, but who by extension belonged to an interstate industry, the clothing industry.

The zenith of McReynolds' opposition to the New Deal occurred when he wrote in Davis v. Davis (1937), upheld the unemployment compensation part of the statute. Under the new program of Social Security was created. The NLRB was further charged with conducting elections in instances where employees wished to unionize. In its ruling, the majority of the Court revived the "stream of commerce" theory to justify Congress's passing a law in the field of labor-management relations, and in this particular case upheld the use of the law against a company because of the interstate nature of that company. McReynolds, once more speaking for the so-called "Four Horsemen," thought there was no interstate commerce involved and therefore the act infringed upon the reserved powers of the states expressed in the Tenth Amendment. He dissented likewise in a companion case, National Labor Relations Board v. Friedman.

Harry Marks Clothing Company, where the same five-to-four majority upheld the use of the statute against a small clothing manufacturer who himself did not engage in interstate commerce because the suit was against a state government that belonged to an interstate industry, the clothing industry.

The zenith of McReynolds' opposition to the New Deal surfaced again when the Court upheld the 1935 Social Security Act. The Court's ruling in the first case, Stewart Machine Company v. Davis (1937), upheld the unemployment compensation part of the statute. Under the new program of Social Security was created.

The majority ruled that unemployment was such a serious problem it had to be attacked by the federal and state governments cooperating with one another. The states were not coerced into entering the program and therefore it was a legally acceptable action. The Court's ruling in the second case, Helvering v. Davis (1937), upheld the old-age benefits portion of the statute. Under the statute, employees paid into a program which would give them money at sixty-five. McReynolds found that Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution gave Congress the right to provide for the general welfare of the United States. As the Depression was a national problem, the federal government had the right to take measures to tackle the problem.

Last Years

McReynolds' opposition to so many New Deal initiatives is probably partly responsible for his low ratings, but some scholars have rated Sutherland and Van Devanter much higher, their similar votes and philosophies notwithstanding.

Even though the other three reliable anti-New Deal Justices had died or retired before him, McReynolds was able to garner majority support in one more notable opinion before his retirement. It was a case of a federal officer who had been removed by McReynolds, writing for the Court, struck down a state law which provided that any vehicle coming into the state with more than thirty gallons of gasoline had to pay the state gas tax on the excess. He found this was a tax on interstate commerce, and therefore unallowable.

Personality

Were his opinions enough to warrant the low assessment given him in scholarly polling? That is an arguable point, and there may be one or more of the five to four who were less reliable than McReynolds. However, it does appear that his rating is based not on his votes but on his abrasive, imperious, unappealing personality. He was an anti-Semite, and would leave the room when Justice Brandeis spoke in conference. There was no group picture of the Court taken in 1924 when Cardozo joined the Court because McReynolds refused to sit next to Cardozo for such a photograph. McReynolds was an ardent follower of President Roosevelt and an ardent opponent of anything the President did.
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matters, McReynolds was sexist in his attitude toward women advocates appearing before the Court and to women employed by the Court. In a recent article, Women Advocates Before the Supreme Court, published in the Journal of Supreme Court History 26:1 (2001), a story is recounted of a female employee who worked in the office of the Clerk of the Court who would hide each time McReynolds approached the office, rather than suffer his insults.

These acts of incivility on the part of McReynolds may indeed have helped earn his low rating, but McReynolds had another, softer side, as some biographers have pointed out. For example, he supported thirty-three young children who were victims of the Nazi Blitzkrieg in World War II, and his pledge of $10,000 was the initial pledge to the “Save the Children Campaign.” His will provided that the bulk of his estate be distributed to charities, including Children’s Hospital and the Salvation Army.

Since his acts of kindness were often concealed, is it fair to include in a balanced assessment of McReynolds these acts of his better nature? One might argue that the better known acts of incivility related to his service as a Justice and thus should be weighted. That is perhaps a valid argument, and is analogous to Pete Rose’s exclusion from the Hall of Fame for his alleged betting on sporting events, despite his having the most hits in the history of baseball. Admittedly, McReynolds’ record on the Court did not match Rose’s record on the diamond, but there is a similarity. In each case, the assessment combines the elements of personal and professional life.

Conclusion

I would argue that Justice McReynolds has been rated lower than his performance would dictate. He was a person who espoused a conservative point of view and held on to it, even though he surely realized that his viewpoints did not coincide with the changing times of the New Deal. Were his decisions good ones? I personally do not agree with many of them, but that should not cause me to rank him at or near the bottom of all those who have served on the Court. It would seem that scholars who disagree with his decisions inject into their assessment his personal failings which when factored in with his unfashionable judicial philosophy, result in a very low assessment. I contend that one’s personal life should not be taken into account when a scholar is asked to evaluate a person’s professional career. If that standard were to be applied to McReynolds, even though it would not put him into the Supreme Court elite, it would also not rank him where he seems to have been mired. A reevaluation would seem to be in order.

SUPREME COURT FELLOWS PROGRAM

The Supreme Court Fellows Committee invites applications for the 2003-2004 Fellows Program. Fellows spend one calendar year in Washington, D.C., based at the Supreme Court of the United States, the Federal Judicial Center, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, or the United States Sentencing Commission, working on projects related to the federal court system and the administration of justice.

Chief Justice Burger established the Supreme Court Fellows Program in 1973 seeking to offer a highly select group of individuals a unique opportunity to contribute to the federal judiciary. For almost thirty years, the program has provided fellows a rare look at the inner workings of the federal judiciary and the dynamics of inter-branch relations by bringing them face to face with major issues confronting the federal court.

Upon his death, many were surprised to learn that McReynolds had left the bulk of his estate to charity. His charitable interests included support of the Save the Children Campaign. Indeed, he was one of the original contributors to this charity. The drawing above is the original logo of the foundation.
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SETH P. WAXMAN RECEIVES JEFFERSON MEDAL IN LAW

On March 27, 2002, the University of Virginia announced that the Honorable Seth Waxman, former Solicitor General of the United States, would receive the Thomas Jefferson Medal in Law. The medal is the highest outside award offered by the University of Virginia, which grants no honorary degrees. The medal is “conferred upon recipients who, like Mr. Jefferson, have combined legal distinction with public service.” Sponsored jointly by the University and the Thomas Jefferson Foundation Inc., the award is conferred as part of the University’s Founder Day celebration, and was presented on April 12, 2002.

Traditionally, award winners present a public lecture, and Mr. Waxman spoke on April 11 on the topic “On Ruby Ridge: Federalism, Law Enforcement and the Supremacy Clause.”

Mr. Waxman, currently a partner in the law firm Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, served as the 41st Solicitor General of the United States under President Clinton. He has also held several other senior positions in the United States government, including service as acting attorney general.

In describing Waxman’s performance as Solicitor General of the United States, John C. Jeffries, Dean of the University of Virginia School of Law, commented that Mr. Waxman “…discharged that responsibility with skill, integrity and dedication.”

Mr. Waxman was elected to the Board of Trustees of the Supreme Court Historical Society immediately following his service in the Department of Justice. During his tenure as Solicitor General, he presented the Annual Lecture in 1998, introduced speakers in lecture series programs, and graciously provided additional information, an online application and complete instructions are available at www.fellows.supremecourts.gov or by contacting the Administrative Director, Supreme Court Fellows Program, Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D.C. 20543, or by telephoning (202) 479-3415

Mr. Waxman’s work includes awards such as the Edmund J. Randolph Award conferred by the Department of Justice, and the Pro Bono Publico Award given by the American Bar Association.

During his career, Waxman has represented a variety of individuals and entities ranging from international corporations and corporate officers to senior federal and state government officials, including former President Richard M. Nixon.

Mr. Waxman joins a prestigious group of individuals who are previous recipients of the award, including: Dean Erwin N. Griswold, Justice Lewis F. Powell, Jr., Judge Griffin Bell, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist, Judge Richard A. Posner, Dean Rex E. Lee and Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg.
A Justice at Work: 1940 Style
By Bennett Boskey*

Recently, the District of Columbia Circuit sustained the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's assertion of jurisdiction over licensing a hydroelectric project in Maine on the ground that FERC had lawfully determined the Messalonskee Stream to be "navigable." Reading the opinion, I thought the question of navigability is to be assessed seriously of events during my earliest days in Washington.

My wife and I had come to Washington in August 1940, about a month after our marriage, so that I could serve (with an avowed intention of staying in Washington for about one year) as Justice Stanley F. Reed's law clerk during October Term 1940. Justice Reed at that point had met me exactly twice. In the spring of 1940, while I was Judge Learned Hand's law clerk, I had been recommended to Justice Reed by Justice Frankfurter and by Philip L. Graham, who was then the Reed law clerk (and the next term became the Frankfurter law clerk), and Justice Reed had nevertheless taken the precaution of asking me to come down to be interviewed, and also the struggle to sharpen and improve the text as the opinion was developing. Justice Reed did not write with the easy fluency or stylistic brilliance of a Holmes or a Cardozo or a Learned Hand or a Bob Jackson. For Reed the written word emerged with much more difficulty, sometimes with almost a stutter, but he was perfectly willing to put in the time and the energy to make it come out right in the end. He did this, without whatever laboriousness was required. If, as happened on occasion, he

When asked why he thought the Supreme Court commanded more respect than any other institution in Washington, Justice Louis Brandeis responded: "Because we do our own work." *Mr. Boskey is a member of the District of Columbia and Supreme Court Bars; Treasurer of the American Law Institute; and author of various books and articles relating to the Supreme Court.
New Members continued

**Maine**
Richard Cohen, Cape Elizabeth

**Maryland**
Marian Brown, Upper Marlboro
Millard Cass, Bethesda
Gregory Gerard Greer, Rockville
Eric R. Harlan, Baltimore
D. Gregory Howard, Owings Mills
Gertrude Emma Jones, Silver Spring
Kelly Jones, College Park
Monica Jones, Greenbelt
Hsien-Yiing Lin, Severna Park
Lee McRae, Bowie
Cheryl Mitchell, Suitland
Edward S. Northrop, Baltimore
Lorraine Philyaw-Weans, Fort Washington
Stephen H. Sachs, Baltimore
Frederic N. Smalkin, Baltimore
Richard P. Taylor, Germantown

**Massachusetts**
Nelson P. Lovins, Woburn

**Michigan**
Richard Bisio, Detroit
Jonathan Tukel, Detroit
Peter H. Webster, Royal Oak

**Missouri**
Douglas A. Rothermich, St. Charles

**Nevada**
Barbara S. McCarthy, Sparks

**New Jersey**
Richard D. Huxford, Roselle Park
Kathryn Lautiello, Westmont
Matthew J. O'Mullan, Gillette
Charles P. Tivenan, Brick

**New York**
Christine Angie, New York
Philip J. Bergan, New York
Rolande Culmer, New York
Heather E. Fralick, Watertown
James Harlow, Stony Brook
John R. Howard, Mount Vernon
Stephen E. Kaufman, New York
Diane Knox, New York
Thomas P. Lynch, New York
Marc Rowin, New York
Charles A. Stillman, New York
Nemesio Vera, Woodside
Harvey K. Watkins, New York
Frank H. Wohl, New York

**Ohio**
K. William Bailey, Wooster
Louis Michael Benedict, Bowling Green
Michael R. Merz, Dayton
Mark A. Miller, Cleveland Heights
Charles L. Rater, Hamilton
Talbot Ziegler, Dayton

**Oklahoma**
Meagan Brooking, Norman
Micah M. Caldwell, Norman
Ben Dyson, Norman
Patrick M. Garrison, Edmond
Lisa Hughes, Altus
Debra Loefelholz, Norman
John Maley, Okmulgee
Thomas H. Odom, Oklahoma City
Melanie S. Simmons, Lawton
Andrew Slater, Norman
Cassandra Wilkinson, Tulsa
Melody Wirz, Oklahoma City
Rana Wycoff Womack, Duke

**Pennsylvania**
E. Craig Kalemian, West Chester
Craig Wilson, Hershey

**Rhode Island**
Mark B. Decof, Providence

**South Carolina**
M. Craig Garner Jr., Columbia

**Tennessee**
Quenton White, Nashville

**Texas**
Stephen F. Malouf, Dallas
Adam B. Ross, Grand Prairie

**Virginia**
H. Beau Baez III, Manassas
Timothy P. Blodgett, Sterling
Michael P. Carlin, Springfield
Tilahun Dejene, Fredericksburg
Richard R. G. Hobson, Alexandria
Bruce Jennings, Fairfax
John T. Jessee, Roanoke
Candace S. Kovacic-Fleischer, McLean
Thomas M. Moncure Jr., Falmouth
David Schwengel, Springfield
John D. Sharer, Richmond
Phillip Sorrentino, Mechanicsville
Rex B. Wackerle, Arlington

**Wisconsin**
Richard A. Rodriguez, Wausau
Martin S. Ryan, Fond Du Lac
Raymond P. Taflora, Madison

---
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