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 did the crucial legal work that kept MCRI on the ballot, and did it all pro bono.... Connerly and CIR are the organizational basis of the movement against preferences. Conservatives need to buck up both to keep the Michigan momentum going.”

Stanley Kurtz, NATIONAL REVIEW

About U.S. v. New York City Board of Education:
“Judge Block determined that previous courts have already struck down such lay-off affirmative action as running afoul of the both the Civil Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment. The ruling should have been foreseen.”

Editorial, THE NEW YORK SUN

About Smith v. VCU:
“But some of the schools just haven’t gotten the message—or, apparently, read the Supreme Court’s 2003 University of Michigan decisions, which make clear that such a heavy-handed use of race is illegal.”

Roger Clegg, NATIONAL REVIEW
This report of activities and accomplishments bears testimony to the continued value of highly focused litigation in restoring constitutional limits on federal and state government.

Without question, the most significant victory last year was the Sixth Circuit’s decision in late December that the federal courts could not suspend Michigan’s new state amendment barring the use of racial preferences (BAMN v. Granholm, et al.). That decision overturned a court-approved agreement among various high-placed Michigan officials to delay the law for a year. It also added to the growing body of federal case law that holds (as it should) that efforts to end racial preferences do not themselves violate federal anti-discrimination laws or the U.S. Constitution.

Because of the December decision, the new amendment went into effect pending consideration of the legal challenges filed by its opponents. With the assistance of lead counsel Charles Cooper of Cooper & Kirk, LLC, CIR will vigorously defend the new amendment in the next year against a raft of these challenges, lest the district court seize on some new ground to invalidate the amendment.
The December victory followed by several months another victory by CIR, this one reinforcing the First Amendment right of citizens to mount ballot initiatives in states that permit them. In August, CIR successfully argued that the Michigan Civil Rights Initiative sponsors did not commit fraud under the federal Voting Rights Act during the petition process when they described the initiative as ending “racial preferences” rather than “affirmative action,” the term preferred by its opponents (*Operation King’s Dream* v. *Ward Connerly, et al.*).

The plaintiffs—a rabble-rousing organization called “By Any Means Necessary”—promptly appealed the August decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. That court roundly rejected their appeal, and the initiative appeared on the ballot. After the amendment passed, the plaintiffs asked the Sixth Circuit to void the election results.

So now CIR will use the case to broaden the August victory. Our goal is to re-establish First Amendment protection for ballot petition speech so that noisy interest groups cannot use the federal courts as a platform to decry the “fraudulent” statements of their political opponents.

The intense litigation spawned by the Michigan Civil Rights Initiative reveals the close connection between efforts by the state to classify individuals by race and parallel efforts to regulate speech. That’s because the effort to defend racial preferences depends on enforcing a kind of Orwellian “doublespeak” by which “equal” comes to mean “preferential” and “freedom of speech” comes to mean “freedom for correct speech.” Both distortions are fundamentally opposed to the ideal of self-government by individuals.

As CIR’s success attests, the courts are an effective way to puncture this kind of irrationality. Sometimes all it takes is the filing of a lawsuit. In January, the Dow Jones Newspaper Foundation agreed that henceforth, its popular “Urban Journalism Workshops” would be open to high school students of all races.

This was a sweet—and early—end to *Smith v. Virginia Commonwealth University, et al.*, a case CIR filed several months earlier on behalf of Emily Smith, who had her acceptance revoked after program officials discovered she was white. As a condition of settlement, Dow Jones agreed to publicize the change in policy in all advertising material.
In recent years, CIR has expanded its docket of cases beyond unconstitutional race and speech “preferences” to include other government interference with the ability of individuals to govern their own affairs. In *Mueller v. Auker, et al.*, we’re representing a family whose five-week-old child was seized by the state in order to administer a spinal tap.

In February, the federal district judge hearing the case said what should have been said long ago—the state has no basis to displace the right of parents to make difficult medical decisions unless the parents are ignoring a clearly less risky alternative.

The decision drew immediate appeals from all parties and now appears headed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. There, CIR hopes to broaden and strengthen constitutional presumptions in favor of the right of families to make important medical (and other) decisions without state interference, particularly those decisions involving matters of judgment with no clearly reasonable (or unreasonable) choice either way.

CIR emphasizes original litigation on behalf of our own clients designed to establish significant legal precedents. We are not an advocacy group and we do not represent “causes” however appealing they might be. For that reason, we eschew filing friend of the court briefs in cases being litigated by others. However, when significant cases raise issues that are directly relevant to our clients, we do not hesitate to bring to the Court’s attention arguments and facts that other litigants are unlikely to raise.

This past year, we filed *amicus* briefs in two such cases before the U.S. Supreme Court: *Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1*, Case No. 05–908 (2006) and *Morse, Juneau School Board v. Joseph Frederick*, Case No. 06–278 (2006).

In *Parents Involved v. Seattle*, we urged the Court to rule that Seattle’s race-based school assignment plan was, in essence, a racial balancing plan unrelated to any legitimate state objective. Together with a companion case involving the Louisville, Kentucky, school system, the case was an
excellent opportunity for the new Roberts Court to put principled limits on the so-called “diversity” rationale for the use of racial preferences.

In *Morse v. Frederick*, we urged the Court to overturn a Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals decision upholding the authority of school officials to regulate off-campus speech deemed contrary to the school’s anti-drug policies. The case reinforces CIR’s effort to get the government out of the business of punishing speech solely because it expresses a point of view deemed contrary to government policies or favored interest groups.

Much of CIR’s other litigation activities in 2006–2007 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, *United States v. New York City Board of Education* and *Dynalantic Corp. v. U.S. Dept. of Defense, et al.*

In sum, CIR racked up another solid—and sometimes spectacular—year 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
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 eighteen 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); Silva v. University of New Hampshire (District Court, New Hampshire, 1994); Sypniewski v. Warren Hills School District (Third Circuit, 2002); and 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); and 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 Fourteenth 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 Fourteenth 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 *Dynalantic 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.

BAMN protesters pursue CIR client Jennifer Gratz outside the Federal Courthouse in Detroit during a break in case challenging efforts of Ward Connerly, Gratz, and others to place a referendum on the Michigan ballot forbidding the use of racial preferences. CIR’s successful defense enabled the referendum to go forward as scheduled. After the initiative passed, CIR successfully defended the new constitutional amendment against a legal effort to enjoin its enforcement until the 2009 college admissions cycle. And CIR continues to defend the amendment against several ongoing federal constitutional challenges (*Operation King’s Dream v. Connerly, BAMN v. Granholm*).
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 Congress 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 powers enumerated 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.
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, daughter Taige was seized by child welfare workers in order to perform a lumbar puncture over her mother’s objections. In February 2007, a federal district judge ruled that “[a] difficult choice—a choice that poses risks either way—should never trigger intervention by the state. With no safe alternative, the State...loses all claim to make decisions for the child.” The case is ongoing.
U.S. Supreme Court

*Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1, et al.*, Case No. 05-908 (2006). Civil Rights; Equal Protection. Filed an *amicus* brief on behalf of parents of public school students challenging a racially based high school assignment scheme that seeks to achieve a racial composition in over-subscribed schools mirroring that of the student population as a whole.

**STATUS:** Pending. The U.S. Supreme Court heard oral arguments in the case in December 2006, and is expected to issue its decision in 2007.

*Morse, Juneau School Board v. Joseph Frederick*, Case No. 06-278 (2006). Free Speech. Filed an *amicus* brief on behalf of high school student Joseph Frederick, arguing that the school is precluded from punishing students from the content of their speech unless it is clearly disruptive.

**STATUS:** Pending. The U.S. Supreme Court heard oral arguments in the case on March 19, 2007.

Federal Appellate Courts


**STATUS:** Victory. Case dismissed and Proposal 2 kept on the ballot. Proposal 2 subsequently won in the November election. Case is currently on appeal to the Sixth Circuit.


**OUTCOME:** Loss. U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

Federal District 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 attorneys’ fees. CIR’s appeal of District Court’s denial of attorneys’ fees for Compton was also successful when the Ninth Circuit reversed that judgment and remanded for an award of fees. CIR has filed its attorneys’ fee request with the District Court, and it is pending.

*BAMN v. Granholm*, Case No. 2:06-CV-15024, temporary stay granted, 473 F.3d 237 (2006). Civil Rights; Equal Protection. CIR filed a motion to intervene on behalf of Eric Russell, a Michigan resident who has applied
to the University of Michigan law school this year, and Toward a Fair Michigan, a 501(c)(3) corporation seeking to educate and advise the public on civil rights issues. Multiple parties are seeking to challenge and/or delay Michigan’s Proposal 2, a ballot initiative passed by the voters of Michigan in November 2006, outlawing racial and gender preferences. When the Governor and Attorney General of the State of Michigan, as well as the governing bodies of three universities, all stipulated to the suspension of Proposal 2’s application to the universities’ admissions and financial aid policies until July 2007, and the district court entered an order pursuant to that stipulation, CIR appealed the order to the Sixth Circuit and procured a temporary stay of the suspension order.

STATUS: Pending.

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), rem’d 448 F.Supp.2d 397 (E.D.N.Y., 2006). Civil Rights; Equal Protection. Representing school custodians 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. continued on the next page
Federal District Courts, continued

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. In September 2006, the district court issued an opinion and order finding some of the promotions and awards granted under the settlement agreement illegal, and other promotions and awards legal. Various motions to reconsider and other proceedings are currently pending. CIR has filed another claim on behalf of Ruben Miranda, a Hispanic custodian injured by the settlement agreement, captioned *Miranda v. New York City Department of Education*, Case No. 06 CV 2921.


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


STATUS: Pending. The District Court conducted trial, resulting in a hung jury and a mistrial. The District of Columbia has filed a motion for judgment as a matter of law which is pending before the court.


OUTCOME: Victory in U.S. Supreme Court. District Court Judge ordered UM to pay CIR and co-counsel fees and expenses. Settlement was entered on January 31, 2007.


STATUS: Pending.
Jane Smith, et al. v. Virginia Commonwealth University, et al., Case No. 3:06-cv-638. Civil Rights; Equal Protection. Challenging a summer journalism workshop for high school students, operated by Virginia Commonwealth University and co-sponsored by the Richmond Times Dispatch and the Dow Jones Newspaper Fund, which limited participation to minority students.

OUTCOME: Victory/Settlement. Defendants agreed to allow plaintiff to attend the workshop and further agreed to apply race-neutral criteria to all sponsored programs. CIR obtained damages and attorneys’ fees.

Mueller v. Auker, et al., 2007 WL 627620 (D.Idaho, 2007). 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. District court judge ruled that city and state officials in Boise violated the constitutional rights of the Muellers when they assumed custody of their five-week-old daughter in order to forcibly administer a spinal tap. The ruling deferred certain issues for trial, including the question of whether the Muellers’ daughter was in imminent danger when officials assumed custody.

State Appellate Courts

Russell v. Brandon, et al., Case No. 07-1-AZ. Civil Rights; Equal Protection. CIR filed a class action lawsuit in Washtenaw County on behalf of Toward a Fair Michigan, Eric Russell, and all other similarly situated individuals applying to Michigan state schools this year. CIR asked the state court to issue a preliminary injunction immediately enforcing newly enacted Article 1, Section 26 of the Michigan Constitution, which bars the use of race in any decisions relating to public education, public employment, and public contracting.

OUTCOME: Dismissed. CIR filed a stipulated order to dismiss in the wake of University of Michigan’s recent decision to immediately comply with the new amendment by eliminating race and gender as factors in admission and financial aid.
## Financial Information

**Statements of Financial Position**  
March 31, 2007 and 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>$1,891,537</td>
<td>$1,760,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>941,820</td>
<td>771,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>254,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Expenses</td>
<td>7,895</td>
<td>9,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property &amp; Equipment (Net)</td>
<td>19,624</td>
<td>20,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>19,166</td>
<td>18,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$2,975,042</td>
<td>$2,835,734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities and Net Assets</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable and Accrued Expenses</td>
<td>$ 28,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Rent, Current Portion</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Deposit</td>
<td>3,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Rent</td>
<td>75,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets - Unrestricted</td>
<td>2,771,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets - Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td>95,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>$2,867,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>$2,975,042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statements of Activities**  
March 31, 2007 and 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions and Grants</td>
<td>$ 1,180,150</td>
<td>$ 1,143,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys’ Fees</td>
<td>110,218</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment, Rent &amp; Other Income</td>
<td>191,724</td>
<td>123,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Support</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,482,092</td>
<td>$ 1,266,863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>$ 683,465</td>
<td>$ 615,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications/Education</td>
<td>292,853</td>
<td>155,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$ 976,318</td>
<td>$ 770,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>$ 110,635</td>
<td>$ 99,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>250,723</td>
<td>257,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,346,104</td>
<td>$ 1,127,807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Net Assets</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 135,988</td>
<td>$ 139,056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Assets - Beginning</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 2,731,297</td>
<td>$ 2,592,241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Assets - Ending</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 2,867,285</td>
<td>$ 2,731,297</td>
<td></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.*
Public Education and Outreach

Staff Articles

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


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.

Public Appearances

Federalist Society National Convention † Heritage Foundation † “Monday Meeting” New York City † National Association of Scholars Convention † North Oakland Republican Club

CIR representatives also discussed CIR’s cases on numerous radio and television programs, including:

- Lou Dobbs Tonight † Hannity and Colmes
- Oakland Right Cable TV Show † Michigan Public Radio † National Public Radio “News and Notes” † National Public Radio “Justice Talking” † Bob Dutko Show, Detroit † Paul Miller Show † WJNZ-FM The Beat of Grand Rapids † WIBA AM The Vicki McKenna Show, Madison, WI † WRVA Mark Watson Show, Richmond, VA † Mancow Muller Show, Chicago, IL † Ron Thulin Show † Janet Parshell’s America † Bill Bennett’s Morning in America † Ron Smith Show, Baltimore † Todd Feinberg Show † Carl Wigglesworth Show † Sean and Mike Show, Baltimore † CBS Radio † David Allen Show, Jacksonville, FL † John Gambling Show † Lars Larson Show † Victoria Taft Show, Portland, OR † WTPF-AM Morning Show North Carolina † Martha Zoller Show † Midday with Charlie Sykes, Milwaukee, WI † KZIM Morning Meeting, Cape Girardeau, MO † WJR-AM Frank Beckman Show, Detroit † WKLV-AM Paul Edwards Show † WAAM News, Ann Arbor, MI † WKZO Midmorning Show with Jay Morris, Kalamazoo, MI † KMED Medford, OR † KCOL-FM The James Gang, Northern CO † WRVC-AM The Jean Dean Show, Huntington, WV † WBIG The Big Morning Show.
CIR Board of Directors

Professor Jeremy A. Rabkin (Chairman) is a professor of International Law at the George Mason Law School. 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.
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