



# clocket CIR report

Spring 2004

## CIR Joins with FIRE to Confront California Polytech Attack on Free Speech

Steve Hinkle never dreamed that administrators at California Polytechnic State University (located in San Luis Obispo) would punish him for peaceably trying to post a flyer that announced a campus event on a public bulletin board at his school. But that is what happened.

Hinkle's Kafkaesque ordeal began in November 2002 when he entered a public lounge at the school's Multicultural Center. His flyer contained the name of the speaker, the title of the speaker's book, and the time and place of the upcoming lecture. The speaker was Mason Weaver, author of *It's OK to Leave the Plantation: The New Underground Railroad* (1998). Weaver is well-known for arguing that dependence on government programs has been harmful to American blacks. Not everyone agrees with him of course, but universities are supposed to teach students how to engage in debate about controversial ideas.

Apparently, several students in the lounge found the idea of an advertisement for Mason Weaver's lecture intolerable. They forcefully told Steve that they considered his flyer "disrespectful" and that he was in violation of university posting policies. One of the students asked Steve to leave. Although Steve thought that he was in compliance with the university's rules on postings, he wasn't absolutely certain, so he decided to leave the premises without putting his flyer up. Subsequently, he verified that he was not in violation of posting regulations.

In the meantime, however, one of the students who objected to the flyer had summoned the campus police! According to the police report, the officers called to the lounge arrived expecting to investigate "a report of a suspicious white male passing out literature of an offensive racial nature."

Steve had not intended to set off such a furor, but he also knew that he had done nothing wrong. He thought the matter would be cleared up quickly.

But Steve hadn't considered how intolerant the political culture of higher education has become. In January 2003, Cal Poly formally charged Steve with "disruption" of a "campus event." After a seven-hour formal hearing in February, the Hearing Officer announced in March that Hinkle was guilty of "disruption" and recommended that Steve be required to "express an apology in writing" to the students who were "offended" by his actions.

*continued on page 2*

### IN THIS ISSUE

NYC Custodians Battle  
Bush Administration  
page 3

Quickly Noted  
page 6

A New Role for  
Jennifer Gratz  
page 8

Letter from  
President Pell  
page 11

*continued from page 1*

Fortunately, Steve’s hearing was taped. The audiotape shows clearly, based on the testimony of those present at the incident in the lounge, that there never was any “disruption.” There was, however, a group of students who felt “offended” by the flyer. At the hearing, Director of Judicial Affairs Ardith Tregenza, who was prosecuting the case, asked Hinkle, “Can you help me to understand how you could have a poster like that and walk into a room full of African-American students and not think that there might be people who would find that offensive or that they might not take kindly to you posting that policy [sic] in what they consider to be a safe and comfortable environment?”

University administrators, instead of explaining to students that education requires facing new ideas, accepting controversy, and engaging in rational debate, decided to prosecute Steve Hinkle

for what they called “disruption”—but what was really nothing more than posting a notice that, because of its content, offended other students.

Strange. The elites who administer our universities are adamant on the need for racial preferences

to create “diversity” on campus. But what exactly do they mean by “diversity”? These same administrators actually punish students for trying to express a diverse opinion.

In April 2003, an organization dedicated to defending free speech at American campuses, the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), came to Steve’s aid. Full transcripts of Steve’s hearing and FIRE’s correspondence with the Cal Poly administration, can be read at their web site: [www.thefire.org](http://www.thefire.org).

Steve’s case attracted publicity. Fox News and other media outlets gave his case attention. Even in their insulated little world of the campus, education bureaucrats understood that they had taken a beating in the court of public opinion. In July 2003, a letter from Provost Paul J. Zingg to Steve indicated that the university administration had decided to back off a little bit: “...it is in the best interest of all parties to conclude this matter. Therefore, Cal Poly will close the judicial affairs case against you, seal the

**“It’s OK to Leave the Plantation”**

Come hear  
**Mason Weaver**

~  
**Wed. Nov, 13<sup>th</sup>  
Business Silo  
02-213  
7:30 PM**

*Steve Hinkle’s “disruptive” poster at Cal Poly*

**A question for Steve Hinkle from Director of Judicial Affairs Ardith Tregenza:**

“Can you help me to understand how you could have a poster like that and walk into a room full of African-American students and not think that there might be people who...might not take kindly to you posting that policy [sic] in what they consider to be a safe and comfortable environment?”

record and not pursue it any further.”

FIRE does not believe that the University has gone nearly far enough to make amends for its unjust prosecution of a student exercising his right to free speech. Steve is concerned that the university has not rescinded his conviction for “disruption” and has not expunged the conviction from his educational record.

FIRE does not sue universities or litigate, which is why the organization contacted CIR. According to FIRE spokesman, Greg

Lukianoff, the Hinkle case could become one of many: “The use of the disruption charge to prosecute Steve is part of an increasingly common abuse of the term ‘disruption’ which some schools now use to punish protected speech they dislike.”

Fortunately, there is a substantial body of case law establishing that the First Amendment applies with the same force on a college campus as it does in society at large. When Carol Sobel (our co-counsel) showed up in court for a preliminary

hearing in the case, the judge cut the proceeding short. He said he’d read everything connected with the matter and he thought the parties ought to work out a settlement that would protect Steve’s right to post flyers on the same terms as all other students, regardless of his point of view. Settlement discussions are ongoing. University administrators need to learn that the Constitution protects everyone, not just liberals like themselves. The Center for Individual Rights is pleased to help.

## New York City Custodians Battle the Bush Administration...

**C**IR continues to fight an uphill battle against civil rights lawyers in the Bush Justice Department who are aggressively expanding the use of numerical quotas in hiring and promotion by local police, fire, and school districts.

Somewhere near the cutting edge of their effort are dozens of civil rights investigations started by the Clinton administration. These cases roll on seemingly without end because of the Bush Administration’s “hands off” attitude towards civil rights. While the Administration won’t expand civil rights enforcement, neither will it rein in cases already under way.

And Clinton’s pending cases offer plenty of opportunities for ideologues at lower levels to advance their agenda largely below the radar of senior Bush appointees. Their goal is to replace objective standards of merit with strict racial proportionality in as many areas of employment as they can.

As it happens, one of the most egregious examples of the misuse of Clinton-era civil rights investigations is CIR’s New York City Custodians case. In 1996, the Clinton Justice Department—alleging racial and sexual discrimination in the recruitment and hiring of public school custodians—decided to sue the

city of New York and its Board of Education.

The Justice Department complained that black and Hispanic candidates who took the civil service custodian exam failed in “disproportionate” numbers. Normally, numerical disparity in test results just means you have to look closely at the test to see whether it’s “job-related.” If the test measures skills that are important to the job, then it stays. If it doesn’t, the test is presumed to be a pretext for racial discrimination and is eliminated.

Needless to say, civil rights lawyers have had a field day over the years striking down this, that, or the other test because

*continued on page 4*

*continued from page 3*

it purports to measure skills that are unrelated to job performance. In the Custodians case, the Justice Department is trying to make it even easier to shoot down employment tests. Instead of having to wrangle over what is or what is not job-related, DOJ wants to strike down every test that produces racially disparate results, whether or not the test is job-related.

The reason DOJ's approach is at all plausible is that years of attacks against civil service exams have left many with the impression that they are a joke. But in this case, they are not. The civil service examination questions (see sidebox) were clearly related to job performance in an important and very responsible position.

In New York City, "building custodian" is not just a pretentious title for a glorified janitor. Custodians are skilled managers responsible for the maintenance and safety of each school's physical plant.

They hire, train, and supervise the employees who clean and maintain the schools. Custodians must oversee large expenditures for such things as payroll, supplies, and insurance. They have to understand Board of Education personnel policies and union contracts. Their duties go well beyond mundane administrative management, important as that is. Children will not be safe in school if the people on the job don't know their stuff—for example,

how to operate a coal-fired boiler.

But that isn't all. In addition to this frontal assault on the legitimacy of hiring tests, Justice Department lawyers are using the case to promote a novel theory of what it calls "recruitment discrimination." According to this view, an employer is responsible for making sure that racially proportionate numbers of applicants apply for a job in the first place.

And so, Justice Department officials contend that not "enough" women and minorities applied to take the civil service exam to be school custodians. But the officials at Justice never identified any recruiting practice (the city mainly posted notices and put announcements in a widely-read civil service newspaper) that caused this "deficiency." Nor did the Justice Department even consider the possibility that, just maybe, members of some groups simply did not want to work in city schools as custodians in exactly the proportions that the Department thinks is ideal for that group.

The Justice Department under President George W. Bush has not backed away from this lawsuit. The Justice Department argued—and apparently will continue to argue—that discriminatory benefits can be handed out in a settlement so long as it can show that a hiring test had a "disparate impact" on racial or ethnic minorities. The Department's position is that a violation of Title

VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act can be demonstrated simply by showing that not "enough" minorities and women bothered to apply for a particular position.

This is outrageous. The implications of these legal arguments are staggering. All legitimate hiring criteria that have a disparate impact on minorities (or women) are fair game to be the basis for preferential treatment. And any failure to achieve the correct breakdown by race, ethnicity and sex among the applicants for a job can provide the basis for remedial discriminatory hiring.

These two cases—*United States v. New York City Board of Education* and *Brennan v. Ashcroft*—are important if workers (a category that includes almost all Americans at some stage of their lives) are to be treated fairly. CIR is pursuing these cases in order to demonstrate to elected officials that they must never sacrifice the rights of innocent workers in order to settle lawsuits falsely alleging racial or other discrimination. Looking to the future, it is imperative to resist the novel legal doctrine that race, ethnic and sex preferences in hiring and promotions are proper remedies for employment disparities that did not arise from discrimination.

If the Bush Administration can't summon the will to stand up to this, CIR will do its best to fill the gap.

# Take the Test

## Do You Know Enough to be a Custodian?

Below are some questions culled from the January 30, 1993 version of the School Custodian Exam, administered by the New York City Department of Personnel. Our selection of questions (printed here with their original numeration) is not random--in the interest of economizing on space, we have discriminated in favor of the shorter questions. (Calculators allowed)

7. Of the following that are tested by a Custodian, which one must be tested every day prior to occupancy?
- (A) Emergency boiler shut off switch
  - (B) Intrusion alarm system
  - (C) Sprinkler alarm
  - (D) Interior fire alarm
8. You are making an inspection of your boiler room and find one of your employees drinking a glass of wine while having his lunch. In this situation, you should
- (A) reprimand him and bring him up on charges
  - (B) do nothing as he is on a scheduled lunch break which is on his own time
  - (C) inform him that alcoholic beverages are forbidden in the building
  - (D) fire him immediately, as this is justifiable grounds for dismissal.
12. In the event that a fire occurs in the school building, the Custodian should ensure that
- (A) all exhaust fans are operating in order to vent any smoke
  - (B) the custodial force is safely evacuated
  - (C) the standpipe is shut down to prevent water damage
  - (D) boilers are shut down and fuel lines are secured.
13. Which one of the following agents is the most effective ingredient to include in cleaning solution in order to remove the smell of urine in a bathroom?
- (A) Disinfectant
  - (B) Ammonia
  - (C) Muriatic acid
  - (D) Trisodium phosphate
18. An electrical appliance requires 120 volts and draws 2,520 watts. The one of the following that is the smallest fused circuit you should hook this appliance up to is
- (A) 15 amps
  - (B) 20 amps
  - (C) 30 amps
  - (D) 40 amps
30. After stripping the floor finish from an asphalt tile floor, it is important to
- (A) roughen the floor with a black pad to improve the adhesion of the new finish
  - (B) apply the new finish while the floor is still damp
  - (C) seal the floor with two coats of polyurethane
  - (D) neutralize the floor PH by proper rinsing
42. The purpose of the pre-purge cycle on an oil burner boiler is to
- (A) cool the combustion chamber down
  - (B) make sure the fan is working properly
  - (C) remove any combustible gas that may be in the boiler
  - (D) increase the carbon dioxide in the combustion chamber
90. A custodial employee receives 25 days vacation yearly which are prorated for those who work less than 5 days per week. One of your employees works 3 days per week. How many vacation days is he entitled to for the year?
- (A) 11
  - (B) 15
  - (C) 20
  - (D) 25
97. A child vomits in a classroom. What is the proper procedure for cleaners to follow in this situation?
- (A) Mop the area with clear water.
  - (B) Throw down sawdust to absorb the liquids and then sweep up.
  - (C) Use a wet/dry vacuum with a sanitary filter to pick up the vomit.
  - (D) Wear protective gloves and wash down the area with a disinfectant.

## Quickly Noted ....

### University of Minnesota settles with Professor Ian Maitland

After more than a decade in the federal courts, the case of *Ian Maitland v. University of Minnesota* has at last been settled.

Ian Maitland, a Professor at the University's Carlson School of Management, challenged a 1989 court-ordered consent decree and salary settlement agreement that gave all female academic employees at the University a salary increase. In fighting Maitland's lawsuit, the University claimed that University Regents enjoy virtually blanket immunity from lawsuits (on the grounds

that their "legislative acts" should enjoy immunity). The University also argued that white males are not protected by Title VII from discrimination by state actors like the University of Minnesota.

The settlement, approved by U.S. Magistrate Judge Arthur J. Boylan, includes:

- (1) a commitment from the University not to favor or disfavor any employee on the basis of sex with respect to their pay, and
- (2) A payment to Professor Maitland of \$225,000.

Professor Maitland is particularly gratified by the non-discrimination clause in the Agreement, because it means that any use of sex by the University as a factor in setting pay will be a breach of the University's contractual obligation to him. In effect, the settlement constitutes Maitland a "private attorney general" with oversight over sex equity in salary decisions at the University of Minnesota, and gives him the right to seek a court injunction to bar any future pay discrimination on the basis of sex.

### CIR fights against nuisance lawsuits that attack free speech

In September 2002 CIR won an important victory in federal district court on behalf of a community organization sued by activist lawyers seeking to silence public opposition to illegal immigration. CIR went on to appeal a separate part of the ruling denying CIR's request for sanctions against the lawyers filing the frivolous claim.

CIR represents a Long Island community group called the "Sachem Quality of Life Organization," which has urged public officials to enforce immigration laws more rigorously. Apparently, some advocates for illegal immi-

grants believe that attacking the freedom of speech of Americans will benefit their cause. An activist lawyer sued the Sachem Quality of Life Organization for allegedly creating a public climate of fear that, the plaintiffs argued, led to the brutal beating of two Hispanic laborers.

The judge agreed with CIR that the Sachem organization had no connection whatever with the beating and was acting entirely within its First Amendment right of free speech. However, the judge denied CIR's motion for "Rule 11" sanctions against the lawyer and law firm

that brought the suit—despite the evidence that this was a nuisance lawsuit brought simply to harass and silence the Sachem community organization.

CIR believes it is important to discourage the filing of such lawsuits in the first place. Neighborhood groups often operate with very limited resources, and the threat of expensive litigation brought by well-funded opponents can be enough to chill their ability to speak out.

For more information, go to: [www.cir-usa.org/recent\\_cases/perez\\_v\\_posse.html](http://www.cir-usa.org/recent_cases/perez_v_posse.html).

## CIR's challenge to preferences at HUD moves forward

In a decision issued on January 5, 2004, Judge Reggie Walton rejected the federal government's contention that CIR's lawsuit against HUD and the EEOC should be dismissed. This class action lawsuit, *Worth v. Jackson* (formerly *Worth v. Martinez*), challenges employment goals and preferences for women and minorities at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and in other federal agencies.

The decision means the Bush Administration has to deliver on its promise to get rid of hiring quotas in federal agencies. Shortly after CIR filed this case, the Bush Administration issued new guidelines for the agencies, stripping them of the power to set the kind of numerical goals that function like quotas in practice.

As important as it was, that reform wasn't good enough for Judge Walton, who wants to make sure HUD has implemented the new guidelines and has eliminated all the unconstitutional practices alleged in CIR's suit.

Without this important case, it's safe to say that the Bush Administration would never have



*Federal employee Dennis Worth, lead plaintiff in Worth v. Jackson, is counting on CIR's help in his battle to be judged as an individual.*

issued the new guidelines. And with Judge Walton's decision on the books, it means the agencies have to get serious about getting race out of hiring and promotions.

For more information, go to: [www.cir-usa.org/recent\\_cases/worth\\_v\\_martinez.html](http://www.cir-usa.org/recent_cases/worth_v_martinez.html).

# A New Role For Jennifer Gratz

**W**hen Jennifer Gratz received a letter from the University of Michigan rejecting her application for admission, she decided to fight the system that classifies and judges applicants based on skin color.

And in the face of the UM's dogged efforts to defend racial double standards over the ensuing six years of litigation, Jennifer only became more determined. She stood in front of TV cameras to explain how the University of Michigan ran a segregated, two-track admissions system. She put a human face on the battle over racial preferences.

Jennifer is not the sort of person who likes to wallow in victimhood. She does not hesitate to tell how she got on with her life—she attended a different school, got a good job, married a wonderful man.

When the Center for Individual Rights won her case against the University of Michigan, no one was more joyful than Jennifer. The Supreme Court ruling in *Gratz* struck down the racial grid system that denied her admission based on classifying her as “white.” The ruling will serve to protect millions of young Americans from admissions systems

that inquire into the racial background of applicants and penalize those with the “wrong” or “over-represented” racial ancestry.

But the Supreme Court's decision was not a principled one. Inexplicably, the Court left standing the law school admissions system that even the trial judge conceded was the functional equivalent of a quota. As Jennifer knows better than anyone, in the area of race, principles are important.

So Jennifer wasn't satisfied that the result in her own court case was a legal victory. She wanted the principle of fair treatment to be extended to all students. She looked for an opportunity to continue the fight that she and CIR had begun in 1997. How could she build on the success of her case, on the success

of CIR's aggressive campaign to turn public opinion against racial preferences and on the public outrage against the O'Conner decision in CIR's *Grutter* case?

The result, for Jennifer, is a new job and a return to her home state of Michigan to serve as Executive Director of the Michigan Civil Rights Initiative—Ward Connerly's campaign to amend the Michigan Constitution to eliminate racial preferences.

Given her experience fight-



*Jennifer Gratz is now Executive Director at the Michigan Civil Rights Initiative*



ing against racial preferences, her perseverance in the face of dogged opposition, and her willingness to do what is right, Jennifer is perfectly situated to become the primary public voice of the campaign.

Over the next ten months,

Jennifer will put her heart and soul into the difficult task of putting to the voters the question of whether their government should be classifying, rewarding, and penalizing people according to their race. She will build on CIR's achievements to let the citizens of

Michigan do the right thing where some members of the Supreme Court would not. And with over 60 per cent of voters currently in support of the measure, Jennifer has a good chance of winning her battle against racial preferences.

## CIR Keeps Fighting

### The Damages Phase of the Gratz Case

**B**ack in June of 2003, officials at the University of Michigan probably breathed a sigh of relief when they read Justice O'Connor's opinion in CIR's *Grutter* case. After all, the Court seemed to give schools like Michigan the all-clear to continue using racial double standards in admissions.

"Finally," they must have said to themselves, "CIR will get off our back."

But the University will have to work to catch its breath when it sees what CIR has in store for the damages phase of the UM cases.

Although the University of Michigan doesn't talk about it much, CIR won a major victory with *Gratz v. Bollinger*. The Court struck down the school's undergraduate admissions system in its entirety. This was a victory with substantial long-term benefits for CIR's battle against racial preferences.

The Supreme Court's ruling in *Gratz* exposes the University to damage suits filed by the applicants whom the UM acknowledges were

denied admission solely because of their race. And that amounts to hundreds—perhaps thousands—of young people, each of them capable of filing suits against the university for monetary damages—and of winning. Especially with CIR providing crucial information and support.

Of course CIR would prefer to avoid flooding the court with thousands of damage claims that all raise essentially the same issue. To that end, we will ask U.S. District Court Judge Patrick Duggan to certify the class for purposes of damages. If we are successful, this could provide a basis for quickly compensating victims of the UM's years of discriminatory admissions procedures without the need for each and every individual to file a separate claim.

Getting meaningful relief for the thousands of applicants unfairly denied admission will have substantial long-range benefits for the fight to end racial preferences. Not only will this effort make clear who is harmed by racial preferences, but it also will highlight the real financial risks colleges run when they judge individuals according to their racial ancestry.

## A Recent Letter from One of Our Supporters

David L. Kaplan

Center for Individual Rights  
1233 20<sup>th</sup> Street NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20036

Terence J. Pell,

I am sorry it has taken me six months to get back to you. For that is the time it has taken me to overcome the shock and dismay caused by the Supreme Court's contempt for the laws and ideals of the United States. I am not a lawyer, but I nonetheless thought I knew enough about the Constitution, its principles and its judicial system to believe that the U of M cases would end my personal 25+ year battle against reverse discrimination once and for all. Boy was I ever wrong!

I appreciate the many letters you have sent since June, 2003. The Grutter result was an utter disgrace and the Gratz opinion was a request for greater dishonesty and deception to conform to Grutter. The word has gone from "quota" to "goal" to "diversity" but the objective and intent of the pro-preference crowd has never changed. No matter what CIR said about the U of M's "diversity" defense, it is unclear that the Supreme Court outcome would have been any different. Nevertheless, "diversity" is the current feel-good buzz word that is the law of the land. It is time to more rigorously challenge the "diversity" argument.

A few questions to start with: Does diversity refer to race, ethnicity, and religious affiliation or does it apply to a persons political beliefs, their values, their life's experiences and their outlook on life? Who evaluates the diversity points to give to mixed races, mixed ethnicity, and mixed religious affiliation? How are the diversity police or diversity decision makers selected? Are they themselves a diverse body and if so then in what way—racial, religious, political...?

What I have learned is that it only takes five individuals, appointed to a job for life, to trash the Constitution and the principles I grew up believing in. I am not interested in letting "People for the American Way," "ACLU," Senator Ted Kennedy, Senator Patrick Leahy, etc. continue to be the gatekeepers to the Supreme Court. The time has come for me to confront this battle on several fronts. I will resume supporting Ward Connerly's efforts, support people running for the Senate who have the courage to take on this issue, and find and support like-minded organizations to ensure that people of principle and courage get to the Supreme Court, and naturally I will continue to support CIR.

I hope that the CIR will continue to vigorously pursue this issue and never lose sight of the fact that you are fighting for the rights of real flesh-and-blood individuals.

With deepest regards to the entire CIR staff,

David L. Kaplan

# Letter from President Terry Pell

## A Decade and a Half of Fighting for Freedom

2004 marks CIR's 15th birthday. As we look back on that comparatively short history, we can take great satisfaction in many accomplishments. CIR has won four major Supreme Court victories outright and set several dozen major precedents at the Courts of Appeals. Each of these victories made fundamental changes to constitutional law that have measurably increased individual freedom.

CIR's 1995 victory in *Rosenberger v. University of Virginia* started the Supreme Court down the road of government "neutrality" towards religion—neither including nor excluding religious organizations from government programs solely on the basis of their point of view. In *U.S. v. Morrison*, CIR helped restore vitality to the commerce clause, which is designed to limit Congress to regulation of truly national—not local—concerns. And CIR's various free speech cases, starting with *Silva v. New Hampshire*, were some of the first

successful challenges to draconian college speech, dress, and harassment codes.

At CIR, we measure our success not by the number of cases we win but by the distance we move our agenda. Our goal is to press back constantly against the forces that inject law into every nook and cranny of daily life. Doing that requires big, bold legal efforts that challenge not just some small point of law, but the broader social orthodoxy on which legal doctrines threatening to individual liberty rest.

CIR's ten-year effort to abolish race preferences in college admissions started with our 1996 victory in *Hopwood v. Texas*. Continuing with our victory last summer in *Gratz*, we have almost singlehandedly set the country on a course away from these pernicious policies—a course that it remains on today, despite Justice O'Connor's discouraging case of cold feet in *Grutter*.

CIR's cases routinely challenge very powerful institutions to live up to the

promise of individual liberty built into the Constitution. Sometimes those institutions are up to the challenge and sometimes they are not. In the case of race preferences, an occasional partial setback reflects the dependence many now feel on big institutions to hold society together during a time of uncertainty in the world.

But it is at just such times that CIR needs to press forward on its various fronts. Although quick legal victories now are more difficult (but definitely *not* impossible as proven most recently by the *Hinkle* case, see our story on pages 1-3), high-stakes fights to recapture the constitutional terrain lost through years of neglect are more important than ever.

Particularly important right now are CIR's efforts to remind state universities that, yes, the First Amendment does apply to their institutions, and yes, it does protect all speech, not merely the speech of favored constituencies. The *Hinkle* case reflects what is going on at far too many of our nation's most elite



schools. The idea that certain races have privileged speech status is an unfortunate extension of the idea that schools must carefully manage racial outcomes in admissions. It's the same fight, but on different terms.

With your continued support, we will push as hard in the next fifteen years to re-establish principled, limited government based on the structure set forth in the Constitution.

## Resources for the Future

The Center for Individual Rights has defended free speech and opposed racial preferences since 1989 as part of an ongoing effort to defend the Constitution and to restore government to its traditional limits.

This focus on specific legal areas has helped the Center win an impressive 80 per cent of its cases to date. Our record of success reflects CIR's efficiency and effectiveness in advancing the cause of liberty—now and for many years to come.

Planned gifts, such as an annuity, charitable trust, or outright bequest (of stock, real estate, life insurance or cash), give CIR the guaranteed resources to continue fighting—and winning—a carefully chosen strategic handful of legal campaigns.

These gifts take many forms, each one created specifically to serve your individual goals. Each form ensures maximum control over the future use of the gift. And each gift ensures that CIR can continue to work for your goals.

For CIR's supporters, a planned gift is the perfect way to ensure every dollar is spent according to your wishes. If you would like to speak with someone regarding a planned gift to the Center for Individual Rights, please call Joy Jones, toll free at 1-877-426-2665.

---

CENTER FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS  
1233 20th St, N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20036

e-mail: [cir@cir-usa.org](mailto:cir@cir-usa.org)

web: [www.cir-usa.org](http://www.cir-usa.org)

Nonprofit Organization.  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Washington, D.C.  
Permit No. 5633

docket report

