The Center for Individual Rights

is a non-profit public interest law firm and a tax-exempt charitable organization under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

CIR’s purpose is the defense of civil rights against the increasingly aggressive and unchecked authority of federal and state governments. CIR provides free legal representation to deserving clients who cannot otherwise obtain or afford adequate legal counsel and whose individual rights are threatened.

In light of its limited resources, CIR can provide legal counsel in only a restricted number of cases. In selecting cases for litigation, CIR applies several criteria, including the following: the prospective client’s need, the “fit” of the prospective case with both CIR’s principles and its expertise, the legal and especially the constitutional ramifications of the case, and the likely costs of the case and its impact on CIR’s ongoing public interest work.
About CIR:
“CIR has proven that a small but determined organization can use the law - and the truth - to right a pervasive wrong.”
Stanley Kurtz, National Review

About AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORP. V. CITY OF FRESNO:
“The exercise of these [First Amendment]… rights is not deprived of protection if the exercise is not politically correct and even if it is discriminatory against others. Provided that the exercise of these rights does not incite imminent violence, it is free from governmental suppression or sanction even if the speakers advocate violation of law.”
Judge John T. Noonan

About MCCONNELL V. LE MOYNE COLLEGE:
“Politically, however, Le Moyne’s education program is now exposed as little more than thought camp.”
David Holman, The American Spectator
The past year has reaffirmed our conviction that liberty needs a vigorous advocate and demonstrated that the task of restraining government through targeted litigation, though difficult, is by no means quixotic.

Perhaps the most significant constitutional victory CIR achieved was the Ninth Circuit’s ruling in *Affordable Housing Development Corp. v. City of Fresno*. CIR prevailed in contending not only that our client had a right to express his views about the Wellington Place housing project, but that he should not have had to spend a decade of his life defending that right in court.

It is rare when a judge -- himself a member of the legal fraternity -- declares a long running lawsuit to have been frivolous from the beginning. All the more remarkable was the determined tone of Judge John Noonan’s opinion, which squarely put to rest the idea that an ordinary citizen can *ever* be sued by *anyone* based solely on the point of view he happens to express in a public debate.

*Affordable Housing* will help resurrect long-forgotten constraints on the ability of the government to regulate public expression in order to further any number of the government’s increasingly ambitious ends.
CIR also helped to advance the principle of individual rights in the case of *McConnell v. Le Moyne College*. Scott McConnell woke up one day to learn he had been expelled from a graduate program in education because of a course paper he wrote on the subject of classroom management. It seems his Dean decided he had the wrong “attitude” to be a teacher.

As we explained to the New York Appellate Division, though, Le Moyne explicitly protected the right of its students to express unorthodox views. Either that right means the same thing for all points of view, or it means nothing. Thankfully, the Appellate Division decided it meant the latter and ordered Le Moyne to re-instate McConnell forthwith.

This was the first successful legal challenge to so-called “dispositions” theory -- the idea that a school can evaluate a student’s attitudes, including his commitment (“disposition”) to social justice and progressive politics. This is one of the more noxious fads in higher education and we were more than pleased to force officials to defend it in court and under oath, where the fine judges of New York State could give it the send-off it truly deserved.

As *Affordable Housing* and *McConnell* demonstrate, CIR provides much needed legal assistance to average citizens who cannot afford skilled legal counsel in cases raising significant constitutional issues. We do this not only because our clients deserve our help, but because these kind of cases are the best way to permanently resurrect principles of limited government and establish a legal barrier against increasingly politicized efforts to regulate individuals.

*Affordable Housing* and *McConnell* made permanent changes to the law that will protect individuals for years to come. Setting precedents like these can be time-consuming. It took over nine years for CIR to obtain justice for Travis Compton, our client in *Affordable Housing*. And indeed, much of CIR’s other litigation activities in 2005-2006 were devoted to time- and resource-intensive pre-trial work. The most notable examples are two pending cases over race-based government hiring and contracting.

In the case of *Worth v. Jackson, et al.* CIR is challenging an exceptionally mechanical system of hiring and promotion preferences at the U.S.
Department of Housing and Urban Development. Though HUD claims its preferences are limited to jobs where there is a “conspicuous absence” of minority employees or jobs that show a “manifest” imbalance with the proportion of minorities in the workforce, HUD defines these terms to include any statistical disparity in minority representation, even as slight as 1%.

Another important example of CIR’s civil rights litigation is Dynalantic Corp. v. U.S. Dept. of Defense, et al., an attack on the so-called “8(a)” program, the hard-core of the federal government’s race based contracting and set-aside programs. Significantly, the case addresses the constitutionality of the entire “8(a)” program, not just the particular contract challenged by our client, a small manufacturer of flight simulators for the U.S. Air Force.

Pre-trial and trial work on these cases has consumed hundreds of thousands of dollars and countless work hours over the last several years. Though each case is nearing an important decision on the merits, both will be appealed almost regardless of the outcome and a final resolution still may take several more years. In the meantime, our generous supporters must take our opponents’ conduct as a measure of the importance of our work: the government defendants are fighting each of these cases as if it was the last stand for government sponsored racial engineering. By that yardstick, a win in either would be a tremendous step forward.

As we enter 2006-2007, several important CIR cases are moving towards the federal appellate level. In addition to Worth, United States v. New York City Board of Education is nearing a decision by the district court after which it almost certainly will head to the Second Circuit. New York City Board is an exceptionally strong challenge to the Bush Administration’s efforts to impose hiring and promotion preferences on the New York City school system by means of consent decrees imposed on local officials.

In addition to fighting for free expression and civil rights, CIR is attempting to impose constitutional restraint on state child protection agencies. CIR soon will complete discovery in Mueller v. Auker, et al., in which we’re representing a family whose five week old child was seized by the state in order to administer a spinal tap. This though the child was not in imminent danger
and the spinal tap was unwanted and unneeded. Our goal is to pierce the numerous layers of immunity that shield state child protection workers from accountability. Summary judgment motions soon will be heard and we expect a decision by the end of the year.

This report attests to a solid record of success in the defense of individual rights. We owe our accomplishments, as always, to the generosity and dedication of the law firms and attorneys who have provided CIR with millions of dollars worth of pro bono time; to the courage and generosity of our donors and contributors; and to our hardworking staff. To all of them, we extend our warmest thanks.

Terence J. Pell
President

Jeremy Rabkin
Chairman of the Board
Freedom of Speech and Religion

Political liberalism once championed the First Amendment; now it views free speech as a potential threat to efforts to promote a supportive, diverse, sensitive, and non-hostile environment. This perspective informs, for example, college speech codes, harassment regulations, and other speech-related regulations that infringe on all manner of protected speech.

Over the last sixteen years, CIR has established an impressive string of legal victories against the selective use of speech codes to suppress expression of certain points of view. Among CIR’s academic freedom precedents are Levin v. Harleston (Second Circuit, 1992); Iota Xi Chapter of Sigma Chi v. George Mason University (Fourth Circuit, 1993); and Silva v. University of New Hampshire (District Court, New Hampshire, 1994); Sypniewski v. Warren Hills School District (Third Circuit, 2002); Hinkle v. Baker (Central District, California, 2004).

In recent years, the ideological assault on campus speech has spread beyond colleges and universities. Of particular concern to CIR has been the increasing tendency of government agencies to suppress points of view that undermine
government policies, whether constructing new low-income housing or increasing the efficiency of tax collection efforts. Civil libertarians who, in the past, filed suit over relatively tame expressions of religious sentiment have stood by while federal agencies suppress protected speech of every other kind, seemingly with impunity.

CIR’s effort to block the use of federal housing discrimination law to frustrate ordinary citizens from speaking out against proposed land use and zoning policies took a big step forward with the January, 2006, decision by U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in Affordable Housing Development Corp. v. Fresno. The court ruled not only that citizens have a right to speak out, but that they shouldn’t have to spend a decade in court defending that right. To give teeth to its ruling, the court ordered the plaintiff-housing developer to pay the attorneys’ fees of our client.

CIR’s victory in Affordable Housing reinforces a string of earlier CIR victories, including, White v. Lee (Ninth Circuit, 2000); Southeast Citizens v. Boys Town (District of Columbia, 2002); Perez v. Posse Comitatus (Eastern District, New York, 2002); Hendrickson v. IRS (Northern District, California, 2005); Hart v. IRS (Northern District, California, 2005).

CIR achieved notable recent success in restoring a principled conception of free speech on campus – one that protects all points of view on the same terms. In 2005, CIR filed suit against Le Moyne College in Syracuse, New York for expelling a graduate student in education solely because of a paper about classroom management. Though the student was permitted to express his views (and even received an “A minus” on the paper), the school purported to exercise its educational judgment in removing him from the program based solely on the point of view he expressed. In January 2006, the Appellate Division of the New York Supreme Court ordered Le Moyne College to reinstate the student. McConnell was the first successful legal challenge to the idea that professional schools of education properly may evaluate the political “disposition” of their students.
Civil Rights

CIR’s civil rights cases are designed to get the government out of the business of granting preferential treatment to members of favored racial groups. Just as the First Amendment prohibits the government from favoring the expression of certain points of view, the 14th Amendment prohibits the government from enforcing its laws, rules, and policies differently solely on account of the race of an individual.

CIR’s civil rights agenda reflects the reality that the American civil rights movement has all but collapsed. Whereas civil rights leaders formerly sought equality of treatment and redress for discrimination, now the movement is consumed with achieving proportional representation in all areas of American life, increasingly using the slippery idea of “diversity.”

Instead of judging individuals by the same standard regardless of race, civil rights organizations now pressure state run schools, and government agencies to employ separate, race-based standards calculated to produce racially proportional outcomes in university admission, government employment and government contracting.

Almost alone among civil libertarian law firms, CIR has waged a comprehensive legal campaign against all major forms of racial double standards. For more than a decade, CIR has brought a series of high-profile cases challenging the constitutionality of racial proportionalism, exposing the extent to which racial double standards have become embedded in government programs, and demonstrating the harms caused to individuals of all races by these policies.

Following its 1996 victory in Hopwood v. Texas, which struck down the dual admissions systems of the University of Texas Law School, CIR challenged similar policies at the University of Washington (Smith v. University of Washington) the University of Michigan Undergraduate College of Literature, Sciences and the Arts (Gratz v. Bollinger), and the University of Michigan Law School (Grutter v. Bollinger). CIR’s goal was to put the issue of racial double standards before the U.S. Supreme Court.

In split rulings released in June 2003, the Supreme Court held that schools may take race into account to achieve diversity using an admissions system tailored after the UM Law School system. However, the Court struck down
the UM undergraduate racial preferences on the grounds that they awarded excessive and mechanical weight to race.

In CIR’s view, the Michigan decisions are contrary to the legal standard of strict scrutiny that the Supreme Court applies to almost all other racial classifications. The idea that the state may apply different standards of evaluation to members of certain racial groups is flatly inconsistent with the notion of individual rights embodied in the Constitution, most particularly in the 14th Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause. Accordingly, CIR continues to seek strong cases with which to challenge the idea that racial diversity ever is a constitutionally sufficient basis for discriminating on the basis of race.

In addition to cases challenging race preferences in college admissions, CIR continues its campaign of litigation against the use of racial preferences in government hiring and promotions in *Worth v. Jackson*, as well as in government contracting in *Dynalantie v. DOD*. Finally, CIR is actively challenging the use of consent decrees by the U.S. Department of Justice to force state and local police, fire, and education agencies to employ what amount to permanent hiring and promotion preferences.

*Gratz v. Bollinger* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* challenged the use of racial preferences in admissions at the University of Michigan undergraduate college and law school respectively. In June 2003, the Supreme Court struck down the use of mechanical racial preferences such as separate admission tracks. In *Grutter*, a slim majority of the Court ruled that schools may take race into account in limited ways in order to achieve diversity. Shown here, CIR clients Jennifer Gratz (right) and Barbara Grutter (left) address the media after oral arguments at the U.S. Supreme Court in the Spring of 2003.
Limits on Federal and State Government

Our constitutional form of government is built on the idea of limited authority: believing that a government that is dispersed protects freedom best, the Constitution grants to the federal government only certain, enumerated powers. All other power is reserved to the states and to individuals.

For some time, CIR has sought to restore a principled conception of the constitutional limits on the federal government. Called “federalism,” this idea sometimes is described as “states’ rights.” But for CIR, federalism is not about whether federal or state governments will regulate the lives of citizens, nor is it driven by any particular ideology: it is simply about restoring the proper limits to all levels of government.

For decades, the federal government’s legislative activities have exceeded the powers given to it by the Constitution. There simply is no support in either the letter or spirit of the Constitution for national laws regulating vast parts of citizens’ lives. For example, in 1994, Congress enacted subtitle C of the Violence Against Women Act, which created a federal tort remedy for female victims of violence. Congress claimed authority to do so under the “commerce clause,” which permits it to regulate commerce among the states.

CIR mounted a constitutional challenge to subtitle C on behalf of a student at Virginia Polytechnic School. In 2000, the Supreme Court struck down this portion of the Violence Against Women Act. *U.S. v. Morrison* is one of the decade’s most important constitutional precedents, restoring critical, constitutional limits on Congress’ power to regulate individual conduct.

CIR has advanced its federalism agenda in other cases too, notably in *Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, et al.* (2000) and *Scheidler v. NOW* (2006) (*amicus brief*).

Just as the federal government is limited to those enumerated powers in the constitution, state government agencies also are accountable to constitutionally protected rights. By defending strict limits to state interference with churches, schools and families, we are helping to revive
the idea of self-government based on the right of individuals to control their own lives. To this end, CIR is working to restore accountability in child welfare laws. In *Mueller v. Auker*, for example, we are representing parents whose infant child was seized by the state because the mother did not immediately agree with hospital personnel about the need to perform a medical procedure. We want to make clear that state child welfare officials may not interfere with the constitutional right of families to make important medical decisions unless the state has clear evidence of neglect or the child is in imminent danger.
Supreme Court

Rumsfeld, et al. v. FAIR, et al., 126 S. Ct. 1297 (2006). Freedom of Speech. Filed an amicus brief challenging a group of law professors and law schools that asserted their First Amendment rights were violated by the Solomon Amendment which requires colleges and universities to provide equal access to military recruiters as a condition of receiving federal funds.

OUTCOME: Victory.

Federal Appellate Courts

Affordable Housing Development Corp. v. City of Fresno, No. F-97-5498 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 31, 2000); aff’d in part and rev’d in part, 433 F.3d 1182 (9th Cir. 2006). Freedom of Speech. Defended neighborhood homeowner, Travis Compton, sued by housing developer for federal housing discrimination because of statements made regarding proposed housing project.

OUTCOME: Victory. U.S. District Court granted summary judgment in favor of Compton but denied attorney’s fees. CIR’s appeal of District Court’s denial of attorney’s fees for Compton was also successful when the Ninth Circuit reversed that judgment and remanded for an award of fees.

STATUS: Pending. CIR appealing U.S. District Court’s dismissal of case to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit.

Federal District Courts

Brennan v. Ashcroft, No. 02-0256 (E.D. N.Y. filed Jan. 11, 2002).

United States v. New York City Board of Education, 260 F.3d 123 (2nd Cir. 2001). Civil Rights; Equal Protection. Representing white males challenging preferential benefits provided to minorities and women in settlement agreement in litigation in which U.S. Department of Justice charged New York City Board of Education with discrimination in hiring and promotion of school custodians.

STATUS: Pending. CIR prevailed in the Second Circuit on the question of whether non-preferred custodians have the right to intervene, and the court vacated the order approving the settlement agreement. The Board of Education continues to apply the discriminatory settlement agreement in promoting its school custodians.


STATUS: Pending. Oral arguments on cross motions for summary judgment were heard on August 18, 2004. Judge Sullivan subsequently requested *Amici Curiae* submissions, which were submitted in early 2005.


STATUS: Victory in U.S. Supreme Court. District Court Judge ordered UM to pay CIR and co-counsel fees and expenses. Motion for injunctive/declaratory relief and class wide consideration of damages for individuals unfairly denied admission because of their race during the years 1995-2003 pending.
Corissa Mueller and her daughter Taige. CIR’s case on behalf of Boise, Idaho resident Corissa Mueller and her family seeks to strengthen a federal constitutional right of families to make important medical decisions without state interference. During a visit to the hospital, Taige was seized by child welfare workers in order to perform a lumbar puncture over her mother’s objections. Tape recordings made by Boise police revealed that state officials knew at the time they did not have a legal basis for assuming custody of the infant.

Federal District Courts, continued


OUTCOME: Victory.

**Mueller v. Auker, et al.**, Case No. CIV 04-399-S-BLW (D. Idaho filed Aug. 4, 2004). Civil Rights; Due Process. Representing parents whose infant daughter was seized by child welfare authorities in order to administer a medical procedure to which the mother had not consented.

STATUS: Pending. Parties are currently in discovery.

**Sypniewski v. Warren Hills Regional Board of Education**, 307 F.3d 243 (3rd Cir. 2002), cert. denied, 538 U.S. 1033 (2003). Freedom of Speech. Representing student who was suspended for wearing a T-shirt with the word “redneck” in a First Amendment challenge to the school district’s dress code and racial harassment policy.

STATUS: Victory. Plaintiff’s motion to dismiss remaining claims was granted in January 2006. Plaintiff’s motion for attorneys’ fees is pending.
State Appellate Courts

Freedom of Speech. Filed an amicus brief recommending that the California Supreme Court review a lower court decision that lewd banter during script writing sessions for the TV show “Friends” constituted a hostile working environment.

OUTCOME: Victory

Freedom of Expression; Academic Freedom; Due Process. Challenged expulsion of student from graduate teaching program at Le Moyne College based solely on the point of view expressed in a term paper on the question of classroom discipline.

OUTCOME: Victory. New York Supreme Court, Appellate Division ordered McConnell reinstated in teaching program.

Administrative Proceedings

Limited government; Due Process. Defending a small composting business in New Mexico that was fined by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for violating the Clean Water Act despite a good faith effort to comply with all environmental regulatory requirements and absent an investigation.

OUTCOME: Victory. EPA withdrew the complaint.
### Financial Information

**Statements of Financial Position**

**March 31, 2006 and 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>$ 1,760,854</td>
<td>$ 1,219,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>771,204</td>
<td>886,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>254,321</td>
<td>520,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Expenses</td>
<td>9,987</td>
<td>7,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and Equipment (Net)</td>
<td>20,748</td>
<td>29,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>18,620</td>
<td>18,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,835,734</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,681,023</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities and Net Assets</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable and Accrued Expenses</td>
<td>$ 33,066</td>
<td>$ 19,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Rent, Current Portion</td>
<td>3,975</td>
<td>3,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Rent, Net of Current Portion</td>
<td>67,396</td>
<td>65,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Assets—Unrestricted</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,490,710</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,391,430</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets—Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td><strong>240,587</strong></td>
<td><strong>200,811</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,731,297</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,592,241</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities And Net Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,835,734</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,681,023</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Liabilities and Net Assets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions And Grants</td>
<td>$ 1,143,311</td>
<td>$ 1,535,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys’ Fees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>352,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment, Rent &amp; Other Income</td>
<td>123,552</td>
<td>63,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Support</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,266,863</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,951,893</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>$ 615,453</td>
<td>$ 608,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications/Education</td>
<td>155,128</td>
<td>132,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 770,581</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 741,374</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>99,869</td>
<td>111,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>257,357</td>
<td>184,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,127,807</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,037,216</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change In Net Assets</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets—Beginning</td>
<td>2,592,241</td>
<td>1,677,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets—Ending</td>
<td><strong>$ 2,731,297</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,592,241</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures are excerpted from the audited financial report. Center for Individual Right’s complete audit is available upon request from the Center’s Washington, D.C., office.*
CIR’s cases attract broad public attention. Many of CIR’s cases have been featured prominently on TV and radio programs such as 60 Minutes and NPR’s All Things Considered. Each year CIR’s cases are written about in newspapers, magazines and trade publications across the country. And, regularly CIR staff are asked to speak to groups all over the country on issues related to CIR’s litigation. Here Terry Pell, CIR’s President, speaks to The City Club of Cleveland.
News Coverage

CIR and its cases were covered in numerous articles and editorials. A sample of these follow:


The Center for Individual Rights

CIR Board of Directors

**Professor Jeremy A. Rabkin (Chairman)** is a professor of Government at Cornell University. Professor Rabkin is an expert in government regulation, bureaucracy, public law and policy, and the judiciary. Professor Rabkin received his Ph.D. in Government from Harvard University in 1983.

**Dr. Larry P. Arnn** is President of Hillsdale College. Dr. Arnn previously served as the President of the Claremont Institute in Southern California. While there he was the founding chairman of the California Civil Rights Initiative (Proposition 209), which prohibits race preferences in state hiring, contracting and admissions. Dr. Arnn has a Masters and Ph.D. in Government from the Claremont Graduate School.

**Dr. Robert P. George** is McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence and Director of the James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions at Princeton University. In 2005, Dr. George won a Bradley Prize for Intellectual and Civic Achievement and the Philip Merrill Award for Outstanding Contributions to the Liberal Arts of the American Council of Trustees and Alumni. He is a graduate of Swarthmore College and Harvard Law School and earned a doctorate in philosophy of law from Oxford University.

**James B. Mann, Esq.** is Director of Derivative Products Group of Société Générale. Previously, Mr. Mann served as Deputy Assistant Attorney General of the Tax Division of the U.S. Department of Justice and General Counsel of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. He received an M.B.A. from Columbia University Graduate School of Business and a J.D. from Harvard Law School.

**Arthur Stephen Penn, Esq.** is President of Elmrock Capital, Inc. Prior to the founding of Elmrock, Mr. Penn was a practicing attorney in New York City. He earned his J.D. degree from New York University School of Law in 1961 and his B.A. from Cornell in 1956.

**Dr. James Piereson** is President of the William E. Simon Foundation. He is the former executive director and trustee of the John M. Olin Foundation. Before joining the foundation in 1981, Mr. Piereson was a member of the political science faculty at the University of Pennsylvania.

**Gerald Walpin, Esq.** is a retired senior partner and currently serving as of counsel for KMZ Rosenman, formerly Rosenman & Colin, in New York. Mr. Walpin also serves on the Board of Visitors for the Federalist Society. He received his law degree from Yale Law School.

**Terence J. Pell, Esq.** is President of CIR. Prior to working for CIR, Mr. Pell served as General Counsel and Chief of Staff at the Office of National Drug Control Policy. From 1985-1988, Mr. Pell was a Deputy Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights in the U.S. Department of Education. He received his law degree from Cornell University, a Ph.D. in Philosophy from the University of Notre Dame, and a B.A. from Haverford College.
Staff

Terence J. Pell (Ph.D., Notre Dame, 1996; J.D., Cornell Law School, 1981; B.A., Haverford College 1976) is CIR’s President. He is a member of CIR’s Board of Directors.

Michael E. Rosman (J.D., Yale Law School, 1984; B.A., University of Rochester, 1981) is CIR’s General Counsel. Formerly a litigator with the firm of Rosenman & Colin, he joined CIR in 1994.

Christopher J. Hajec (Ph.D., University of Miami, 1998; J.D., University of Pennsylvania Law School, 1990; B.A., University of Michigan, 1987) is one of CIR’s Associate Counsels. Formerly served in the Judge Advocate General Corps of the U.S. Navy as a defense attorney and appellate government counsel, he joined CIR in 2004.

Michelle A. Scott (J.D., Drake University Law School, 1995; B.A. Illinois Wesleyan University, 1992) is one of CIR’s Associate Counsels. Formerly a litigation associate with Shapiro, Lifschitz & Schram, P.C., she joined CIR in 2005.

N. Joy Jones (M.P.P., American University, 2004; B.A., Taylor University, 1998) is CIR’s Director of Development. She joined CIR in 1998.

Kalli Kokolis (B.A., University of Virginia, 2003) is CIR’s Legal Assistant. She joined CIR in 2004.

Law Clerks and Interns, 2005-2006

Nicholas Matich (University of Notre Dame)

Robert Lyman (University of Virginia Law School)

Christina Mahoney (Georgetown University Law School)

Michael Stout (Georgetown University Law School)

Eric Wang (University of Virginia Law School)