The Courts must declare the sense of the law; and if they should be disposed to exercise will instead of JUDGMENT, the consequences would be the substitution of their pleasure for that of the legislative body.

The Federalist 78
Law schools and the legal profession are currently strongly dominated by a form of orthodox liberal ideology which advocates a centralized and uniform society. While some members of the academic community have dissented from these views, by and large they are taught simultaneously with (and indeed as if they were) the law.

The Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy Studies is a group of conservatives and libertarians interested in the current state of the legal order. It is founded on the principles that the state exists to preserve freedom, that the separation of governmental powers is central to our Constitution, and that it is emphatically the province and duty of the judiciary to say what the law is, not what it should be. The Society seeks both to promote an awareness of these principles and to further their application through its activities.

This entails reordering priorities within the legal system to place a premium on individual liberty, traditional values, and the rule of law. It also requires restoring the recognition of the importance of these norms among lawyers, judges, law students and professors. In working to achieve these goals, the Society has created a conservative intellectual network that extends to all levels of the legal community.
“The Federalist Society’s educational programs encourage discussion about the Constitution and the law and reflect a commitment to vigorous and open debate.”

Chief Justice John Roberts of the U.S. Supreme Court, from the Federalist Society’s 25th Anniversary Tribute video.

“The Federalist Society does not take policy positions, as the ABA does. It does not litigate or lobby unlike the ACLU, and its leaders and staff distance the organization from the individual achievements (or failures) of its members. They measure success, they say, by the vitality of the society’s ideas in public discourse. It is a debate club, they say—perhaps, the debate club.”

*Legal Times*, November 19, 2007

“I never imagined that there would be a chapter at every major law school in America. We thought we had planted a wildflower in the weeds of academic liberalism. Instead, it was an oak.”


“The founding of the Federalist Society is one of the most important developments, perhaps the most important development, in law in the last 25 years.”

Judge Robert H. Bork

“The organization flexes its muscle not through lobbying or endorsing judicial nominees, but through something even more potent: standing for principles and defending them in open and robust debate...At a time when so much of what passes for public discourse is poisonous and extreme, the Federalist Society’s commitment to fostering dialogue and intellectual diversity is a priceless resource.”

A QUARTER-CENTURY OF BUILDING

Dear Friends and Supporters:

Last November the Federalist Society celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of its founding. It was an exhilarating experience to pause and acknowledge all that has been accomplished by this organization. In 1982 it was ignited by the spark of a handful of conservative and libertarian law students who wanted their education to include more than the liberal orthodoxy they were receiving in their classes at some of America’s most distinguished law schools. This report highlights many of the events the Society conducted commemorating that milestone.

There is little argument, even from our critics, that the Federalist Society has profoundly influenced the legal culture. We have established a Student Chapter at every ABA-accredited law school in America, a Lawyers Chapter in every major metropolitan area, national Practice Groups in fifteen areas of the law which focus on cutting edge legal issues, and a community of thousands of active citizen-lawyers utilizing traditional legal principles to contribute to their communities and the nation. The Federalist Society is more than ever a unique source for vigorous and civil debate, and has the opportunity, given our increasing press attention and resources, to increase dramatically the number of people we reach with our programs.

It was gratifying to hear U.S. Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia reflect in characteristically eloquent fashion at our 25th Anniversary Gala, “I never imagined that there would be a chapter at every major law school in America. We thought we had planted a wildflower in the weeds of academic liberalism. Instead, it was an oak.”

My profound thanks to all those involved with the Federalist Society for what you have done.

Now is the time to look forward to the next twenty-five years. Whatever the Federalist Society has accomplished is small compared to the new opportunities that lay before us. Successfully seizing these opportunities will vastly enrich the legal culture. Obviously the development of our chapters has created many of these opportunities. In addition, two other very exciting developments are the expansion of the Faculty Division and the implementation of the State Courts Project.

The expansion of our Faculty Division aims to foster intellectual diversity within law faculties and to enhance the prospect that opposing views will get a respectful hearing in the academic community. New initiatives will establish mentoring structures between older faculty, younger faculty, and law students interested in the academy. We will encourage talented law students to consider the academy as a career. We will provide young scholars with ample opportunities to hone their research skills and increase their number of published articles. We will also seek out faculty who are interested in traditional legal principles but who are not presently involved with the Federalist Society’s programs.

In its second year, our State Courts Project is developing exactly as we had hoped it would, contributing to the understanding of our courts and the rule of law at the state level. We are encouraged to continue to find highly qualified and motivated citizen-lawyers in each state to help us focus on state courts. Our constitutional structure requires taking federalism seriously and being just as concerned about the proper role of courts in the states as at the federal level.

As we look forward to pursuing these new challenges and sustaining our long-term efforts with another generation of law students and young lawyers, we wish to thank our supporters for their help in our effort to promote the principles of limited government, the separation of powers, and the rule of law. Without our donors and our volunteers, none of what the Society has accomplished would have been possible. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Eugene B. Meyer
President

From The President

Federalist Society President Eugene B. Meyer (second from right) and Executive Vice President Leonard A. Leo (far right) with U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice John Roberts and co-founders Lee Liberman Otis (far left) and Steven G. Calabresi (second from left) at the 2007 Annual Lawyers Convention.
STUDENT CHAPTERS THRIVE ACROSS COUNTRY

The 2006-2007 academic year was an unparalleled success for the Federalist Society’s Student Chapters.

- Student Chapters hosted a record 998 events, up from 825 the previous year.
- Total attendance was over 46,000 people at Student Chapter events, with each event averaging an audience of approximately fifty.
- The 26th Annual Student Symposium on “Law and Morality” at Northwestern attracted about 1,000 attendees. As a result of the Symposium, the Northwestern chapter was awarded the University’s ‘Robert Bennett Outstanding Student Organization Award’ for its efforts.

Student Chapters hosted events addressing a number of pertinent legal issues over the course of the year. The War on Terror and national security remained popular topics for student chapters to address. In September, Victor Davis Hanson of the Hoover Institution delivered a speech on the Iraq War to a crowd of 260 at Minnesota. Ambassador Robert Pearson, the former Director General of the Foreign Service, spoke on “Democracy, Islam, and the War on Terror” before fifty people at Vanderbilt. In addition, Harvard hosted a panel on the tension between freedom and security after 9/11 with Northwestern Prof. Steven G. Calabresi and Harvard Profs. Charles Fried and Laurence Tribe. George Washington Profs. Jonathan Turley and Gregory Maggs debated Hamdan v. Rumsfeld at George Washington, while Berkeley Prof. John Yoo and New York University Prof. Burt Neuborne debated the case at New York University. Akron, Florida Coastal, George Mason, and Ohio State sponsored debates on ACLU v. NSA and the legality of the NSA’s warrantless wiretapping program; and 150 people attended a debate at California-Davis on national security featuring Ronald Cass, Dean Emeritus of Boston University School of Law, and President of Cass & Associates, PC.

International legal issues continued to interest student chapters this past year as well. Ohio State hosted a debate between Northwestern Prof. John McGinnis and Ohio State Prof. John Quigley on international law in American constitutional adjudication. Prof. McGinnis also debated Creighton Prof. Michael Kelly at Creighton on “Should U.S. Courts Look to International Law When Making Decisions?” Similarly, U.S. Congressman Thaddeus McCotter of Michigan debated Prof. Paul Dubinsky at Wayne State on the application of international law in the United States.

National fervor over immigration inspired a number of student chapter events. Western State hosted Chapman Dean John Eastman to debate Western State’s Prof. David Brennan before seventy people. Dean Eastman also debated James Ho of Gibson Dunn & Crutcher LLP on birthright citizenship at Southern California. In February, Arizona hosted eight legal and immigration experts for a symposium on immigration reform, and West Point Prof. Margaret Stock debated Marquette Prof. Ed Fallone on “Fences, Amnesty, and Aliens” at Marquette.

[Image: Judge Janice Rogers Brown of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit talks with Craig Chosid, president of the University of Michigan Law School Chapter at the National Lawyers Convention.

[Image: Solicitor General of Texas R. Ted Cruz meets with Harvard Federalist Society members after mootling Medellín v. Texas before his argument in front of the U.S. Supreme Court as part of the Chapter's Supreme Court Advocacy Project.]
Many chapters sponsored events on affirmative action and the use of race in education. Texas Prof. Lino Graglia debated Loyola-New Orleans Prof. James Viator at Loyola-New Orleans and Louisiana State Prof. John Devlin at Louisiana State on affirmative action in higher education. Over sixty people attended each debate. An affirmative action debate at Harvard between author Dinesh D’Souza and Harvard Prof. Charles Ogletree attracted a crowd of 150. California-Davis hosted a panel on California’s Proposition 209, the 1996 ballot initia-

during the 2006-2007 school year. A debate at Baylor between Kevin J. Hasson of the Becket Fund for Religious Liberty and the ACLU’s Dr. Jeremy Gunn attracted an over-
flow crowd of 175 people, local media, and even a crew from a Brazilian television station. Hasson also participated in similar religious liberty debates at Cardozo, Columbia, DePaul, Nebraska, Northwestern, Pepperdine, Richmond, Southern Methodist, Texas Wesleyan, and Toledo. In October, Jordan Lorence of the Alliance Defense Fund participated in two well-attended debates at Marquette and Wisconsin on same-sex marriage, while Boston College hosted Maggie Gallagher of the Institute for Mar-
riage and Public Policy to debate Arline Isaacson of the Massachusetts Gay and Lesbian Political Caucus on the topic, “Is Same-Sex Marriage a Civil Right?” Similarly, Brigham Young Prof. Lynn Wardle participated in a debate on Citizens for Equal Protection v. Bruning, a case concerning the legal rights of same-sex couples, at Nebraska before 100 students.

Controversies and cases in election law prompted student chapters to hold events on campaign finance and the Voting Rights Act. Seton Hall sponsored a debate on “Paying for Elections: Are We Restricting the Flow of Money or Speech in Politics?” between at-
torney James Bopp and Brenda Wright of the National Voting Rights Institute. Bopp also debated New York University Prof. Samuel Issacharoff on “Campaign Finance in the Aftermath of Randall v. Sorrell” at New York University. Similarly, Texas hosted Federal Election Commissioner Michael Toner, who spoke on “The Effect of McCain-Feingold Campaign Finance Reform on Politics” before sixty people. Abigail Thernstrom of the Manhattan Institute and the U.S. Com-
mission on Civil Rights debated Pace Prof. Randolph McLaughlin at Pace and Harvard Prof. Charles Ogletree at Yale on the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the reauthorization of its temporary provisions.

Other highlights from 2006-2007 include lectures by many prominent judges and gov-
ernment officials. U.S. Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia met with chapters at San Diego, St. Thomas-Minnesota, Texas, and Yale; and U.S. Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas spoke to the chapter at Georgia. Former U.S. Attorney General Edwin Meese III spoke to the Campbell and George Mason chapters, while former U.S. Attorney General Richard Thornburgh delivered an address on “Corporate Investi-
gations and the Thompson Memorandum” to 100 students at Vanderbilt. Former U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft spoke to Marquette and North Carolina, where he drew a crowd of 1,100. In October, U.S. Department of Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff spoke at Harvard; and former U.S. Department of Energy Secretary
and Federalist Society co-founder Spencer Abraham spoke at Thomas Cooley–Oak–
land. U.S. Solicitor General Paul Clement
spoke before large crowds at Michigan, New England, Suffolk, and Virginia; while
Richmond hosted both Virginia Attorney General Bob McDonnell and Virginia So-
lician General William Thro. As one of the
attorneys arguing against the D.C. Gun Ban
before the U.S. Supreme Court, Robert A.
Levy of Cato presented his views of the case
to several law schools, including Northwestern, Chicago, Illinois and Loyola–Chicago
in a speech titled, “Second Amendment in the Cross–Hairs.” Once again, popular speaker
Roger Pilon of the Cato Institute was warmly
received by law schools across the country.
One of his themes this year was “Liberalism
and the Fourteenth Amendment: How
Both Liberals and Conservatives Got It
Wrong.” Georgetown Prof. Randy Barnett
drew large crowds for his speech on “Indi-
vidualism and the State” at Chicago, Stetson
and Florida State.

Selected Student Chapter Speakers

Hon. Spencer Abraham, Former U.S. Secretary of Energy
Hon. Alexander Acosta, U.S. Attorney, Southern District of Florida
Prof. Jonathan Adler, Case Western Reserve University School of Law
Hon. John Ashcroft, Former U.S. Attorney General
Prof. John Baker Jr., Virginia Law School
Prof. Randy Barnett, Georgetown University Law Center
Hon. Bev Bar, Former U.S. Congressman
Judge Carlos Beu, U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit
Judge Dena Benton, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit
Clint Bolick, Alliance for School Choice
Prof. Gerard Bradley, Notre Dame Law School
Hon. Rachel Brand, Former U.S. Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Policy
Scott Bullock, Institute for Justice
Prof. Steven G. Calabresi, Northwestern University School of Law
Judge Ed Carnes, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit
Hon. Paul Clement, U.S. Solicitor General
Ward Connerly, American Civil Rights Institute
Justice Mauno D. Corrigan, Michigan Supreme Court
Prof. Richard Epstein, University of Chicago Law School
Steve Forbes, Cato, Forbes, Inc., Former Presidential Candidate
Prof. Charles Fried, Harvard Law School
John Fund, The Wall Street Journal
Prof. Nicole Garnett, Notre Dame Law School
Prof. Rick Garnett, Notre Dame Law School
Judge Neil Gorsuch, U.S. Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit
Michael Greve, American Enterprise Institute
Judge Thomas Griffith, U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit
Judge Raymond Grunder, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit
Kevin J. Hasson, The Becket Fund for Religious Liberty
Judge Edith Jones, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit
Hon. Gregory Katsas, U.S. Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division
Judge Brett Kavanaugh, U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit
Prof. Orin Kerr, Georgetown University Law Center
Judge Alex Kozinski, U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit
Robert A. Levy, Cato Institute
Justice Stephen Limbaugh, Missouri Supreme Court
Justice Stephen Markman, Michigan Supreme Court
Judge Michael McConnell, U.S. Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit
Senator Mitch McConnell, U.S. Senate, Kentucky
Hon. Bob McDonnell, Virginia Attorney General
Prof. John McGinnis, Northwestern University School of Law
Hon. David M. McIntOSH, Mayer Brown LLP, Former U.S. Congressman
Hon. Edwin Meese III, Former U.S. Attorney General
Clark Nelly, Institute for Justice
Judge Paul Niemeyer, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit
Judge Diarmuid O’Scanlairn, U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit
Roger Pilon, Vice President for Legal Affairs, Cato Institute
Ramesh Ponnuru, National Review
Judge Richard Posner, U.S. Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit
Judge William Pryor Jr., U.S. Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit
Justice Antonin Scalia, U.S. Supreme Court
Judge David Sentelle, U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit
Justice Laurence Silberman, U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit
Christina Hoff Sommers, American Enterprise Institute
Dean Kenneth Starr, Pepperdine University School of Law
Prof. Margaret D. Stock, Department of Law, U.S. Military Academy, West Point
John Stossel, ABC News
Judge Jeffrey Sutton, U.S. Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit
Judge Diane Sykes, U.S. Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit
Judge Dannell Reece Tacha, U.S. Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit
Justice Clarence Thomas, U.S. Supreme Court
Hon. Dick Thornburgh, Former U.S. Attorney General
Judge Gerald Bard Tjoft, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit
Commissioner Hans von Spakovsky, Federal Election Commission
Judge Clifford Willaars, U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit
Prof. Amy Wax, University of Pennsylvania Law School
Edward Whelan III, Ethics and Public Policy Center
Prof. John You, University of California, Berkeley School of Law – Boalt Hall
Justice Robert Young, Michigan Supreme Court

Overall, 2006–2007 was a remarkably
successful year for the Federalist Society’s
Student Chapters. Their efforts to advance
the rule of law and foster debate on impor-
tant issues will continue to influence the legal
culture on their campuses and in their com-
munities for years to come.
• The Lawyers Chapters in 65 cities across the nation are the cornerstone of activity in the Lawyers Division. The constant high quality of programming in the local chapters is crucial to maintaining a strong community presence.
• In 2007, the Lawyers Chapters held a record 290 events.
• Over 20,000 attended lawyers chapters events, averaging over 70 attendees per event.

The lawyers chapters focus their programming on topics of both national and local interest. Topics addressed include the War on Terror, state judicial selection, federal judicial confirmations, eminent domain, immigration reform, same-sex marriage, racial preferences, the Second Amendment, the role of state attorneys general, climate control, tort reform, and many others.

Some of the significant programs this year include:
• Several visits by U.S. Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas to lawyers chapters were the highlight of the programming year.

Chapters in New York City, Atlanta, Nebraska, Chicago, Dallas, and Orange County attracted crowds of several hundred to more than a 1,000 lawyers each at events co-sponsored by the Heritage Foundation in each city. Justice Thomas reflected on his new book, My Grandfather’s Son: A Memoir. The book and his remarks revealed his fractured childhood, his early struggles through college and law school, and his career and personal life through his confirmation to the U.S. Supreme Court. Following his brief remarks, Justice Thomas answered questions from the audience, often engaging the audience for an hour or more. Questions ranged from his views on judicial philosophy, what advice he would offer to individuals preparing for college as well as law school, how he recruits law clerks, and how he regarded his time on the bench. After each program, Justice Thomas signed books for attendees.

U.S. Supreme Court Justice Samuel Alito attended a gathering of Los Angeles Federalist Society leaders in August. About 80 lawyers, local judges, and student leaders attended this reception. The event was graciously hosted by John and Mary Lee Malcolm. Justice Alito delivered brief remarks about his confirmation to the Court and then took questions. U.S. Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia attended a lunch meeting with the Colorado Chapter in October and a breakfast meeting with San Diego Federalists in September.

• The Southern California Chapters jointly sponsored a day-long conference at the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library in Simi Valley in late January. The conference honored the service of former U.S.
Attorney General Edwin Meese III and the legacy of the Department of Justice that he led. Former U.S. Solicitor General Theodore Olson offered the luncheon remarks. Judge Lois Haight of the California Superior Court, Claremont McKenna Prof. Michael Uhlmann, Michigan Supreme Court Justice Stephen Markman, University of San Diego Law Prof. Michael Rappaport, and William Bradford Reynolds of Howrey LLP offered their recollections of their time working for General Meese at the Justice Department.

The Sacramento Chapter hosted a reception for members of the California Supreme Court. Guests included Superior Court Judge Raoul Thornbourne, his wife Vivian, and U.S. District Court Judge Morrison England (right).

University of San Diego Law Prof. Gail Heriot interviewed General Meese about his time in office and his reflections on President Reagan. A final panel discussed the development of “Originalism.” Over 200 lawyers and students from throughout California attended the program, which marked the First Western Chapters Lawyers Conference, which has become an annual event.

• Several chapters considered the very timely issue of commander-in-chief authority last spring. As members of Congress attempted to place a timetable for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq, the Society’s lawyers chapters held a number of panel discussions concerning the separation of powers issues involved. Discussions were held in Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Columbus, Miami, Orlando, Houston, Phoenix, Louisville, Chicago, Macon, Little Rock, and Denver. Featured speakers included Chapman University Dean John Eastman, David Rivkin of Baker & Hostetler, national security commentator Glenn Sulmasy, LSU Prof. John Baker Jr., James Carafano and Mackenzie Eaglen from the Heritage Foundation, Andrew McCarthy from the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, and Ronald Cass, Dean Emeritus of Boston University School of Law, and President of Cass & Associates, PC. Some chapters included Iraqi war veterans as participants in the panel discussion, such as Major William Fay, who participated in the Phoenix Chapter’s program.

• Nearly 500 lawyers attended the Boston Chapter’s annual Shakespeare performance. Under the direction of Chapter Chairman Dan Kelly, leading community opinion leaders, judges, and lawmakers performed a staged reading of “Measure for Measure.” Actors included U.S. District Court Judges Nancy Gertner, Nathaniel Gorton, Rya Zobel, Dennis Saylor, Mark Wolf, Patti Saris, and Douglas Woodlock; U.S.Civil Rights Commission Member Jennifer Braceras; Massachusetts Attorney General Martha Coakley; and Associate Massachusetts Supreme Court Justices Robert Cordy and Judith Cowin. ABC News Legal Correspondent Jan Crawford Greenberg and Daniel J. Kornstein, author of Kill All the Lawyers: Shakespeare’s Legal Appeal, moderated the discussion after the play. The discussion following the play addressed the judicial selection process, whether political or social predispositions affect judicial decisions, the fairness of labeling a judge as “conservative” or “liberal,” and how far a judge could or should go when he or she believes that strict enforcement of the law will produce an unfair result.

• Solicitor General Paul Clement delivered the Philadelphia Chapter’s fourth an-
nual U.S. Supreme Court Round-up to more than 270 attendees at the Union League. Clement discussed the major cases of the term, while emphasizing several of the term’s business cases. Solicitor General Clement also spoke to the Pittsburgh and Milwaukee Chapters, previewing the 2007 Supreme Court term. Several other chapters held U.S. Supreme Court Round-ups over the summer. The Houston Chapter featured a panel discussion with Judge Edith Jones of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, Texas Solicitor General R. Ted Cruz, and Professor Lino Graglia of the University of Texas Law School. Kannon Shanmugam of the U.S. Solicitor General’s office spoke to both the Kansas City and Wichita Chapters. And, of course, former U.S. Solicitor General Theodore Olson presented his annual reprise of the term to more than 500 at the Washington, D.C. Chapter.

• The Birmingham Chapter hosted former U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft at a September dinner. General Ashcroft was introduced by U.S. Senator Jeff Sessions of Alabama. Attendees included Judge William Pryor Jr. of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit, U.S. Attorney Alice Martin, and Alabama Supreme Court Justice Harold See. General Ashcroft offered his observations about his time at the Justice Department. He took several questions, commenting on the War on Terror, immigration policies, and the future of the U.S. Supreme Court after the 2008 elections.

• The lawyers chapters have taken critical roles in organizing State Court Project initiatives. Chapters in Milwaukee, St. Louis, Nashville, Memphis, and Kansas City were among those that took leading roles in 2007 in hosting programs with state and appellate court judges, drafting white papers and articles on state jurisprudence for Docket Watch, identifying media experts and local scholars, and taking a leading role in the discussion on what the proper role of the state courts should be. Several other chapters sponsored programs debating state judicial selection methods, judicial free speech restrictions, and judicial activism versus judicial restraint.

• Federalist Society Board of Visitors member Robert A. Levy spoke before the D.C. lunch in December on the District of Columbia v. Heller case which is before the U.S. Supreme Court this term. Attorney Alan Gura, who argued the gun ban case, has spoken about it to the Michigan, North Coast, San Diego, Orange County, Philadelphia, Puget Sound and Minnesota Chapters.

Selected Lawyers Chapters Speakers

| Justice Samuel Alito, U.S. Supreme Court |
| Hon. John Ashcroft, Former U.S. Attorney General |
| Hon. Paul S. Atkins, U.S. Securities & Exchange Commission |
| Hon. Haley Barbour, Governor, Mississippi |
| Michael Barone, U.S. News and World Report |
| Judge Carlos Beal, U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit |
| Hon. Matt Blunt, Governor, Missouri |
| Judge Robert H. Bork, Ave Maria School of Law |
| Judge Pasco Bowman, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit |
| Hon. Rachel Brand, Former U.S. Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Policy |
| Justice Stephen Breyer, U.S. Supreme Court |
| Judge Janice Rogers Brown, U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit |
| Hon. Paul Clement, U.S. Solicitor General |
| Ward Connerly, American Civil Rights Institute |
| Jay Cook, President, State Bar of Georgia |
| Prof. Richard Epstein, University of Chicago Law School |
| Prof. Robert George, Princeton University |
| Michael Horowitz, Senior Fellow, The Hudson Institute |
| Judge Edith Jones, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit |
| Bill Kristol, The Weekly Standard |
| Robert A. Levy, Cato Institute |
| Judge James B. Loken, Chief Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit |
| Heather MacDonald, John M. Olin Fellow, Manhattan Institute |
| Hon. Bill Marshall, Solicitor General, Ohio |
| Alice H. Martin, U.S. Attorney, Northern District of Alabama |
| Justice Elliott Maynard, West Virginia Supreme Court |
| Andrew McCarthy, Foundation for Defense of Democracies |
| Senator Mitch McConnell, U.S. Senate, Kentucky |
| Hon. Edwin Meese III, Former U.S. Attorney General |
| Chip Mellor, President, Institute for Justice |
| Shannon P. Minter, National Center for Lesbian Rights |
| Hon. Michael B. Mukasey, U.S. Attorney General |
| Hon. Gale Norton, Former Secretary of the Interior |
| Hon. Theodore Olson, Former U.S. Solicitor General |
| Roger Pilon, Vice President for Legal Affairs, Cato Institute |
| David Riklin, Baker Hostetler LLP |
| Prof. Paul Rubin, Emory University |
| Deirdre Cummings, Massachusetts PIRG |
| Justice Antonin Scalia, U.S. Supreme Court |
| Justice Harold See, Alabama Supreme Court |
| Dean Kenneth Starr, Pepperdine University School of Law |
| Justice Clarence Thomas, U.S. Supreme Court |
| Prof. Eugene Volokh, UCLA School of Law |
| Judge J. Clifford Wallace, U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit |
| Edward Whelan III, Ethics & Public Policy Center |
| Prof. John Yoo, University of California, Berkeley School of Law-Boalt Hall |
| Justice Robert Young, Michigan Supreme Court |
In recognition of the Federalist Society’s Silver Anniversary, President George W. Bush addressed the organization’s 25th Anniversary Gala on November 15th during the 2007 National Lawyers Convention in Washington, D.C. He stressed two of the Society’s areas of interest: interpreting the Constitution as the founders wrote it, and the judicial confirmation process.

Although most events took place, as usual, at the Mayflower Hotel, the Gala was held at the elegant and historical Washington Union Station on the first night of the convention. More than 1,700 people attended the black tie event, which, in addition to the President of the United States, featured brief comments by U.S. Supreme Court Justices Antonin Scalia, Clarence Thomas and Samuel Alito, and former U.S. Attorney General Edwin Meese III. Former U.S. Solicitor General Theodore Olson served as Master of Ceremonies.

Besides the Gala, other highlights of the convention included the Barbara K. Olson Memorial Lecture given on Friday night by U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice John Roberts. His speech touched on issues of judicial independence, using as a backdrop the Supreme Court appointments of President James Madison. One of the other popular convention programs was the address, question period, and book signing on Thursday morning by U.S. Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas about his newly released book *My Grandfather’s Son: A Memoir*.

The theme for the plenary sessions of this 25th Anniversary Convention was “Shining City Upon a Hill: American Exceptionalism.” Showcase panels were entitled: “Beacon of Freedom: Does America Have a Special Mission?” “Is America Different from Other Major Western Democracies?”

More than 1,500 guests attended one or more of the convention’s 22 different panels and other programs involving over 60 distinguished speakers from the bench, bar, legal academy, and business world. The wide array of speakers included former U.S. Solicitor General Theodore Olson, U.S. Supreme Court Justices Antonin Scalia, Clarence Thomas, and Samuel Alito, former U.S. Attorney General Edwin Meese III, and President of the United States George W. Bush, among many others.
Stephen Reinhardt, both of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, debated on the subject of “Property Rights in the United States,” with James S. Burling of the Pacific Legal Foundation moderating. Former Mayor of New York City Rudy Giuliani addressed the convention Friday afternoon.

The Convention Luncheon on Saturday was a retrospective look at the founding of opinions expressed by featured speakers ensured lively debate and standing-room-only crowds for many sessions. The convention was heavily covered by the national press and some portions of the program were taped by C-SPAN.

The Convention opened with an address by President Bush’s appointment to the European Union, Ambassador C. Boyden Gray, who is a former member of the Federalist Society’s Board of Visitors. Kicking off the theme of American Exceptionalism, the first showcase panel featured Michael Barone of U.S. News and World Report, Prof. Richard Epstein of the University of Chicago Law School, Prof. Charles Fried of Harvard Law School, and Prof. Gordon S. Wood of Brown University. The panel was moderated by Hon. J. Harvie Wilkinson III, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit.

On Friday, after an address by U.S. Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, federal judges Alex Kozinski and Judge William Pryor Jr. of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit talks to Prof. Nadine Strossen of New York Law School and president of the ACLU at the National Lawyers Convention.

Constitutional law judge Judge William Pryor Jr. is shown with Professor Nadine Strossen of the ACLU. The convention was heavily covered by the national press and some portions of the program were taped by C-SPAN.

And development of the Federalist Society featuring Former U.S. Attorney General Edwin Meese III, who is now chairman of the Heritage Foundation’s Center for Legal & Judicial Studies; Manuel Klausner of the Reason Foundation; Alfred Regnery of the American Spectator, and Spencer Abraham, former U.S. Senator and U.S. Secretary of Energy and co-founder of the Federalist Society. Abraham also offered some remarks about the founding of the Society’s anchor journal, the Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy Studies, which he helped to establish.

Judith Jacobs of New York and her husband Judge Dennis Jacobs, U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, peruse the on-site brochure before the National Lawyers Convention begins.
Student Symposium
Attendance Soars

The question of the role of morality in the law is no longer solely one for legal academics and philosophers. With emotions running high and advocacy groups spending millions to mobilize their infantries in the so-called “culture wars,” the questions surrounding morality’s role in the law have assumed a central position within the national dialogue. The Federalist Society’s 2007 Student Symposium hosted by Northwestern University School of Law in Chicago sought to explore this issue of “Law and Morality” with about 1,000 law students from across the country in attendance.

Several federal judges were asked to serve on or moderate panels. They included: Judge Frank H. Easterbrook, U.S. Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit; Judge Michael McConnell, U.S. Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit; Judge David Sentelle, U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit; Judge Carlos Bea, U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit; Judge Stephen F. Williams, U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit; Judge Janice Rogers Brown, U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit; Judge Jerry E. Smith, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit; Judge Edith Jones, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit; and Judge Brett Kavanaugh, U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit.

Interest in attending the Federalist Society’s Student Symposia by American law students has been climbing steadily over the past three years. After attracting about 600-700 students for several years, more than 900 people attended the Student Symposium at Harvard in 2005 and participation has been even stronger ever since. The next year more than 1,200 signed up for the event at Columbia Law School and again this year there were nearly 1,000 participating in the 2007 Symposium at Northwestern School of Law. The rise in attendance can be, in large part, attributed to the fact that more students at more law schools are being exposed to Federalist Society programs. There is now a Federalist Society Student Chapter at every accredited law school in America.

The debates and panels on “Religion in the Public Square,” “The Philosophical and Theological Foundations of Moral Debate,” “Moral Choices and the Eighth Amendment,” “Same-Sex Marriage, Public Policy, and the Constitution,” “Government Promotion of Moral Issues,” and “Morbidity of First Amendment Jurisprudence” served as useful vehicles to explore this topic.

The introductory debate on “Religion in the Public Square” on Friday evening pitted Kevin J. Hasson of the Becket Fund for Religious Liberty against Michael Newdow, best known for his Supreme Court case challenging the constitutionality of the...
words “under God” in the U.S. Pledge of Allegiance. Federalist Society co-founder Hon. David M. McIntosh of Mayer Brown LLP moderated the lively exchange.

Distinguished speakers from the legal academy showcased by the Symposium included: Prof. Ronald J. Allen of Northwestern University School of Law; Prof. John Baker Jr. of Louisiana State Law School; Prof. Randy Barnett of Georgetown University Law Center; Prof. Lillian R. BeVier of the University of Virginia School of Law; Prof. Robert Burns of Northwestern University School of Law; Prof. Steven G. Calabresi of Northwestern University School of Law; Prof. Laurence P. Claus of University of San Diego School of Law; Prof. G. Marcus Cole of Stanford Law School; Prof. Richard W. Garnett of Notre Dame Law School; Prof. Lino A. Graglia of University of Texas School of Law; Prof. Andrew Koppelman of Northwestern University School of Law; Prof. Steven Lubet of Northwestern University School of Law; Prof. Michael S. Moore of University of Illinois College of Law; Prof. Louis Michael Seidman of Georgetown University Law Center; Prof. Geoffrey Stone of University of Chicago Law School; and Prof. Amy Wax of University of Pennsylvania Law School.

Panels were moderated by Judge Timothy M. Tymkovich, U.S. Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit; Judge Diane Sykes, U.S. Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit; Prof. Steven G. Calabresi of Northwestern University School of Law and co-founder of the Federalist Society; and Prof. Orin S. Kerr of The George Washington University Law School.

The Symposium concluded with a moving address on the question of whether people of faith can be objective judges, delivered by Judge William Pryor Jr., U.S. Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit. Before he was finally confirmed on June 9, 2005, Judge Pryor was opposed and attacked by some for his devout Catholicism.

Convention Luncheon speakers Manuel Klausner of Reason Foundation and Alfred Regnery of The American Spectator recapped the history of the founding of the Federalist Society.

Two legal legends, former U.S. Attorney General Edwin Meese III (left) and Justice Antonin Scalia of the U.S. Supreme Court, take a minute to greet each other at the Federalist Society's 25th Anniversary Gala.

Conference Inspires New Student Leaders

One clear indication of the Student Division’s development has been the growth, in terms of participation and importance, of the Student Leadership Conference held in Washington, D.C. each July. In two intensive days, the Society covers the cost to bring all our upcoming chapter presidents to Washington, D.C. for a crash course on how to run a successful chapter. They also hear from inspiring national legal experts and meet other chapter presidents from all over the country – new friends with whom they can consult during the school year. We attribute part of the remarkable success of our chapters in the last three or four years to these meetings. Most of the 195 accredited law school chapters in the U.S. sent student participants to this year’s conference which took place the weekend of July 13-15. Students heard
National Conferences

ANNUAL CONFERENCE MAJOR PART OF EXPANDING FACULTY DIVISION

The 10th Annual Faculty Division Conference was held in New York City on January 3-4, 2008. The 60 faculty members who attended contributed to the thoughtful discussion prompted by panels on “Executive Discretion & the Rule of Law,” “Post-Kelo Reform,” and “American Law Schools: Envy of the World or General Motors Before the Fall?” Video and audio of the panels, debates, and speeches may be found at http://www.fed-soc.org/publications/id.499/default.asp.

The conference also featured a debate entitled “Is the D.C. Gun Ban Unconstitutional?” between Prof. Nelson Lund of George Mason University Law School and former law professor and New York City Council Member David Yassky, which was moderated by Prof. Randy Barnett of the Georgetown University Law Center. Brooklyn University History Prof. K.C. Johnson, who recently co-authored Until Proven Innocent, a book on the Duke Lacrosse Case, with Brookings fellow and Newsweek/National Journal legal correspondent Stuart Taylor, delivered an address on “The Duke Lacrosse Case and the Academy.”

Finally, eight, mostly younger, scholars gave seven-minute presentations on works in progress addressing topics ranging from “Originalism and the ‘Problem of Change’: The Many Mechanisms by Which Originalism Accommodates Change” to “The Use of Actuarial Data in Interpreting Insurance & Other Contracts.”

For the first time, the Faculty Division also held its own event at the 25th Annual Lawyers Convention, in Washington, D.C. this past November. Some thirty-five faculty members attended a special Division breakfast at which they discussed a wide variety of topics relating to the Division’s activities. In addition, the Faculty Division took the lead in establishing another new Federalist Society project at the Convention. The Division organized twelve breakfasts for twelve different law schools. The breakfasts were attended by alumni, faculty, and students from those schools, and provided a great opportunity for different generations of Federalists to get to know each other, and for alumni to catch up with their former professors and discuss developments at their law schools. In upcoming months, the Society anticipates following up with additional events of this type, as well as updating its database to reflect members’ law schools in order to notify them of events of this type in the future.

Feedback from Faculty Division Conference attendees continues to affirm the immense value of the conference for the scholars. They report their scholarship has been significantly improved by the interchange of ideas with other academics at the conference. These annual meetings energize the faculty members, who must daily address the biases that exist in the legal academy. Most importantly, they offer the opportunity for the interchange of ideas and review of each other’s work that is invaluable for scholars. The Faculty Division Conference provides an opportunity for these professors to share ideas and scholarship with each other that will facilitate the intellectually serious discussions we hope to promote in an effort to advance traditional legal principles in the legal academy and beyond.

from Rachel Brand, former U.S. Assistant Attorney General in the Office of Legal Policy, who gave an insider’s view of the two Bush Administration Supreme Court nominations. The sessions of the conference led by Student Division Director Peter Redpath and Federalist Society President Eugene Meyer focused mainly on helping students learn the nuts and bolts of running a strong, successful chapter at their law school by instructing them how to use the resources of the national organization to produce results. The highlight of the weekend was a summer party Saturday evening at the home of former U.S. Solicitor General Theodore Olson, a longtime friend and mentor of the Society.

Feed back from Faculty Division Conference attendees continues to affirm the immense value of the conference for the scholars. They report their scholarship has been significantly improved by the interchange of ideas with other academics at the conference. These annual meetings energize the faculty members, who must daily address the biases that exist in the legal academy. Most importantly, they offer the opportunity for the interchange of ideas and review of each other’s work that is invaluable for scholars. The Faculty Division Conference provides an opportunity for these professors to share ideas and scholarship with each other that will facilitate the intellectually serious discussions we hope to promote in an effort to advance traditional legal principles in the legal academy and beyond.
With the appointment of Federalist Society co-founder Lee Liberman Otis as the full-time director of the Faculty Division, we anticipate being able to further develop our ability to serve as the center of a vigorous community of faculty members who are dedicated to adding to the discussion in the legal academy.

CONFERENCE DISCUSS LEGAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF JUDGE ROBERT H. BORK

As part of its twenty-fifth anniversary commemoration, the Federalist Society honored Judge Robert H. Bork in a day-long conference discussing his achievements and contributions to the legal culture. The Conference was a fitting tribute to Judge Bork and was very well attended. It included many who have worked with Judge Bork over his many years of public service.

The Conference, held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C. on June 26th, began with an opening address by Prof. Steven G. Calabresi of Northwestern University School of Law, who is Chairman of the Federalist Society’s Board of Directors. The Conference continued with four panels discussing some of the topics that Judge Bork has written about, beginning with a panel on judicial philosophy and originalism, based on principles in Judge Bork’s book The Tempting of America: The Political Seduction of the Law. The panel included Prof. John C. Harrison of University of Virginia School of Law, Prof. Kurt T. Lash of Loyola Law School, Prof. Saikrishna B. Prakash of University of San Diego School of Law, and Prof. Jonathan R. Turley of The George Washington University Law School. The panel was moderated by Hon. Edwin Meese III of the Heritage Foundation. The next panel discussed competition law and the free market, and Judge Bork’s book The Antitrust Paradox: A Policy at War with Itself. Panelists included Judge Frank H. Easterbrook of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit, Judge Douglas H. Ginsburg of the U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit, and Prof. George L. Priest of Yale Law School. Dean Bernard Dobranski of Ave Maria School of Law served as moderator.

The Conference lunch was opened by the Hon. Theodore Olson, former U.S. Solicitor General, and featured “A Conversation with Judge Robert H. Bork” conducted by Judge A. Raymond Randolph of the U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit. The luncheon also featured a documentary video produced by the Federalist Society discussing Judge Bork’s life and achievements.

The Conference continued with a panel discussing law and culture issues raised in Slouching Towards Gomorrah: Modern Liberalism and American Decline. The panel included Prof. Steven G. Calabresi, Prof. Robert George from the Department of Politics at Princeton University, Prof. Ilya Somin of George Mason University School of Law, with the Hon. Daniel E. Troy of Sidley Austin serving as moderator. The Conference concluded with a panel discussing international law and Judge Bork’s book, Coercing Virtue: The Worldwide Rule of Judges. The panel featured Prof. Gregory Maggs of The George Washington University Law School, Prof. Jeremy A. Rabkin of George Mason University School of Law, and Prof. John Yoo of University of California, Berkeley School of Law–Boalt Hall. Robert J. Giuffra Jr. of Sullivan & Cromwell served as moderator.
Practice Groups Examine Emerging Legal Issues

The Federalist Society’s 15 Practice Groups have developed into an efficient mechanism for disseminating traditional legal ideas through events and scholarship on nearly every current legal subject. In 2007, this work continued, as the nationwide Practice Groups reached even greater numbers of interested participants.


The Federalism & Separation of Powers Practice Group also hosted a timely panel discussing the U.S Attorney firings. The panelists included Mark D. Agrast, Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress, Andrew McCarthy, Foundation for Defense of Democracies, Prof. Jonathan Turley of The George Washington School of Law, and Edward Whelan III, President of the Ethics and Public Policy Center.

The Administrative Law & Regulation Practice Group hosted a conference in October at the University of Minnesota School of Law entitled “The Future of Tax Shelters.” The conference brought together top tax scholars and professionals as well as scholars from other disciplines to evaluate the present and future of tax shelters. The Virginia Tax Review published the symposium essays. The program was co-sponsored by Deloitte Tax LLP and the University of Minnesota Institute for Law & Economics, and was organized by Prof. Kristin Hickman of the University of Minnesota Law School.

The Administrative Law & Regulation and the Environmental Law & Property Rights Practice Groups, co-sponsored a panel entitled “Renewable Energy: Practical Alternatives or Costly Diversion of Resources?” in Raleigh, North Carolina, in early June. As renewable energy has become a buzzword for policymakers, this panel addressed how the state and federal government have advocated renewable energy. Jeffrey Clark of Kirkland & Ellis LLP, Kenneth Green of the American Enterprise Institute, and Sam Watson, Senior Staff Attorney for the North Carolina Utilities Commission explored these questions.

In addition to co-sponsoring the panel on renewable energy, the Environmental Law & Property Rights Practice Group also hosted a live web cast entitled “Pluralities and Concurrences—How Should the Courts Interpret Split Decisions?” in late June. The Supreme Court occasionally renders plurality opinions, which may involve 4-1-4 decisions or any number of other formulations of justices where no clear majority on particular issues emerges. These plurality opinions often address significant issues, yet, due to the lack of a clear majority, are difficult for both the lower courts and the regulated community to interpret and apply. Various perspectives were offered by Prof.
The Corporations, Securities & Antitrust Practice Group hosted a conference in New York entitled “Does Procedure Dominate Substance?: Of Class Actions and Pretrial Motions” in September. The first panel examined the standards for certifying a class in class actions. The panel was moderated by David S. Evans, Chairman of eSapience, Ltd., and included Prof. Richard Epstein of the University of Chicago Law School, Prof. Samuel Issacharoff of New York University School of Law, and Prof. Richard Nagareda of Vanderbilt University Law School. The second panel, on pretrial motions to dismiss and summary judgment, included Prof. Keith Hylton of Boston University School of Law, Prof. Geoffrey Miller of New York University School of Law, and J. Douglas Richards of Milberg Weiss. The moderator was Prof. Jack H. Friedenthal of The George Washington University Law School. The conference concluded with a lunchtime address by David Boies, Chairman of Boies, Schiller & Flexner.

Case Western University School of Law joined with the Corporations, Securities & Antitrust and the Litigation Practice Groups to host an October conference entitled “Scheme Liability, Section 10(b), and Stoneridge Investment Partners v. Scientific Atlanta.” The conference, which included a live video broadcast through the Case Western website, consisted of two panels and a debate. The first panel focused on the legal questions underlying the Stoneridge case, while the second panel focused on the policy questions at issue in Stoneridge, with a particular emphasis on how this case could affect the interests of shareholders, consumers, the business community, and U.S. competitiveness. For the debate, Eric Isaacson of Coughlin Stoia et al., and Ashley Parrish of Kirkland & Ellis each had the opportunity to present the strongest case for their respective firms’ position on Stoneridge.

Along with the Heritage Foundation, the Corporations, Securities & Antitrust, and the Criminal Law & Procedure Practice Groups hosted a panel entitled “The Future of the Attorney-Client Relationship in White-Collar Prosecutions.” The program analyzed the issues surrounding the Justice Department’s current policies and practices for investigating and prosecuting business organizations. Under current policy, corporations that agree to waive the attorney-client privilege are deemed to be “cooperating,” and therefore entitled to special consideration during investigation and even sentencing. The Heritage Foundation’s Hon. Edwin Meese III, Former U.S. Attorney General, delivered the introductory remarks. The panel included the Hon. George Terwilliger III, former U.S. Deputy Attorney General and member of the Practice Group Executive Committee, and the Hon. Larry D. Thompson of Pepsico, also former U.S. Deputy Attorney General.

At the beginning of April, the Civil Rights Practice Group hosted a pair of panels analyzing “Alternatives to Affirmative Action After the Michigan Civil Rights Initiative.” The program took place at Michigan State Law School and was repeated at the University of Michigan Law School. The panels considered the legal and policy questions surrounding Michigan law schools’ plans to revise admissions criteria in order to limit the percentage of white and Asian students who are admitted; whether the U.S. Constitution or other federal laws might prohibit this after the Grutter and Gratz decisions; and, whether basing admissions decisions on whatever factors can be found to correlate with race will undermine the quality of the students admitted to the universities.

In April 2007, the International & National Security Law Practice Group sponsored a showcase panel on “The Constitution & American Exceptionalism: Citation of Foreign Law.” Judge Frank H. Easterbrook, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and Prof. Nicholas Quinn Rosenkranz of Georgetown Law Center and a Federalist Society Board of Visitors member participated in the panel discussion.
explored the practice of American businesses, having received an unfavorable outcome in U.S. courts or agencies, particularly in anti-competition cases, taking their disputes to multinational authorities (such as the EU) or to foreign courts and other international bodies. The panel participants were Ronald Cass, Dean Emeritus of Boston University School of Law, and President of Cass & Associates, PC; Albert A. Foer, President, The American Antitrust Institute; Prof. Keith Hylton, Boston University School of Law; R. Hewitt Pate, Hunton & Williams; and Loraine Woellert, *Business Week*, who served as moderator.

In late September, this Practice Group, in conjunction with the American Enterprise Institute, co-hosted a conference on the U.S. Supreme Court case, *Medellín v. Texas*, concerning the extent of executive authority to enforce non-self-executing treaties (in this case, the United Nations Charter, to which the U.S. is a signatory). Two panels examined this question. The first, composed of The George Washington University Law School Prof. Michael J. Matheson, Northwestern University School of Law Prof. John McGinnis, and Catholic University of America Columbus School of Law Prof. Peter B. “Bo” Rutledge, considered whether decisions of the International Court of Justice were binding on the United States. University of California at Berkeley School of Law Professor and former Deputy Assistant U.S. Attorney General John Yoo moderated the panel. The second panel, consisting of Texas Solicitor General R. Ted Cruz, University of San Diego School of Law Prof. Michael D. Ramsey, and The George Washington University Law School Prof. Edward T. Swaine, considered the legal rationale for the Bush Administration’s position and the specific extent of and limitations on presidential authority to act, pursuant to his diplomatic affairs powers. Moderating the second panel was former U.S. State Department Legal Adviser Edwin D. Williamson, now of Sullivan & Cromwell.

The International & National Security Law Practice Group also sponsored a program discussing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in late June at the Heritage Foundation. The panel featured Frank Gaffney of the Center for Security Policy; Prof. John Norton Moore of the University of Virginia School of Law, and Director of the Center for National Security Law and the Center for Oceans Law and Policy; Baker Spring, F.M. Kirby Research Fellow in National Security Policy, The Heritage Foundation, and Rear Admiral William D. Baumgartner, Judge Advocate General, U.S. Coast Guard.

The Practice Group also partnered with the LSU Law Center and USAID to sponsor a two-part series on U.S. Security, Trade and Development. The series began with a keynote address by Ambassador John R. Bolton, American Enterprise Institute, and was followed by a panel discussion on property rights. The second installment in the series featured a keynote address by William Kristol, editor, *The Weekly Standard*. The program continued with a panel discussion on “Business Organization and De-regulation,” which was followed by a luncheon address by Everett Eissenstat, Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for the Americas, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative and a concluding panel discussing “Commercial Conflict Resolution: the Court Systems and Arbitration.”

The Labor & Employment Law Practice Group hosted a very timely debate in January on the Washington State statute banning the use of union dues collected from non-profit employees for political activities without the individual employee’s express consent. Washington State enacted its statute via public referendum, but the statute was overturned by the Washington Supreme Court on constitutional grounds. Washington State appealed the ruling to
the U.S. Supreme Court. This panel was co-sponsored by the Free Speech & Election Law Practice Group and included Washington Attorney General Rob McKenna who argued Washington v. Washington Education Association before the U.S. Supreme Court.

In March, the Labor & Employment Law Practice Group held a panel discussion on Capitol Hill considering the merits of the Employee Free Choice Act, which would codify the practice of allowing union organizers to submit a union certification application to the National Labor Relations Board after procuring enough signatures on union membership cards to constitute a majority of workers in a given unit. Currently, such practices violate NLRB requirements for a secret ballot election. Charlotte Montiel of the U.S. Senate Republican Steering Committee and former NLRB member John N. Raudabaugh maintained that there was potential for abuse and intimidation by union organizers under the EFCA proposal. Brian V. Kennedy, the General Counsel of the U.S. House of Representatives’ Committee on Education and Labor and former NLRB member Sarah M. Fox both defended the proposal as a more effective way for employees to exercise their rights to form a union and collectively bargain without employer intimidation. Former NLRB General Counsel John S. Irving moderated and offered some of his own perspectives from his days at the NLRB.

In July, the Labor Practice Group arranged a panel entitled “Labor: The Labor Movement, NGOs, International Labor Standards and American Values,” which was moderated by Judge David Sentelle, U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. Participating were Equal Employment Opportunity Commission General Counsel Ronald S. Cooper, National Labor Relations Board General Counsel Ronald E. Meisburg, and the Acting U.S. Department of Labor Solicitor Jonathan L. Snare. Moderating the briefing was a participant in the original Labor Briefing, former U.S. Department of Labor Solicitor Eugene Scalia.

The Litigation and the Professional Responsibility & Legal Education Practice Groups co-sponsored a panel discussion in October on “Mass Fraud in Mass Torts.” Cardozo School of Law Prof. Lester Brickman presented a paper documenting various instances where science has been manipulated by expert witnesses and plaintiffs’ counsel to portray a distorted picture of causation and defendants’ liability. He was joined in making his argument by Patrick M. Hanlon of Goodwin Procter LLP. Joseph F. Rice of the firm of Motley Rice argued that the legal system operated effectively to mediate competing scientific claims, and asserted that discoveries of fraud only proved the efficacy of the system in sorting out the facts. Duke Law School Prof. Francis E. McGovern weighed in on the side of the existing regime. D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals Judge Douglas H. Ginsburg served as the moderator.

In June, the Litigation and the Professional Responsibility & Legal Education Practice Groups also co-sponsored a pair of panels on the ethical considerations of plaintiff’s counsel accepting cases on a contingency fee basis, particularly in light of the huge awards often given in class action cases, where some argue the plaintiff’s attorneys become an interested party in the settlement. The panels were co-hosted by our Lawyers Chapters in Austin and Houston, Texas.

The Religious Liberties Practice Group continued its panel discussion series in partnership with the Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life. In September, the two groups, along with the American Constitution Society, hosted a debate titled “Conscience Clauses: First Amendment Right or Unconstitutional Barrier to Medical Care?” The debate between Becket Fund for Religious Liberty Founder and Chairman Kevin J. Hasson and National Women’s Law Center Senior Counsel Jill Morrison considered the merits of statutes that authorize pharmacists to refuse to fill prescriptions or refer patients in contravention of their consciences, as informed by their religious beliefs. In November, the three groups joined again to present a preview of two partial-birth abortion cases (Gonzales v. Carhart and Gonzales v. Planned Parenthood) on the eve of their argument in the U.S. Supreme Court. After the decision was issued...
In May the **Financial Services & E-Commerce Practice Group** hosted a half-day program on “Basel Risk-Based Capitol Standards: Are they Workable?” U.S. Senator Chuck Hagel delivered the luncheon keynote address. The program began with a panel detailing the background of Basel. The second panel discussed the ideal Basel with panelists Wayne A. Abernathy of the American Bankers Association and former Assistant Secretary for Financial Institutions, U.S. Department of Treasury, Karen Shaw Petrou of Federal Financial Analytics, Michael Roster, Former Executive Vice President and General Counsel at Golden West Financial Corporation, and Charles Taylor, Director, Operational Risk of the Risk Management Association. Prof. Keith R. Fisher, Michigan State University College of Law, served as moderator. This program was co-sponsored by the American Bankers Association.

The **Free Speech & Election Law Practice Group** co-sponsored a discussion, with the Columbus, Ohio Chapter, entitled “Journalists’ Privilege” last March. Panelists included Prof. Susan Gilles of Capitol University Law, Darrell Heckman, Former Campaign County Prosecuting Attorney, and Jane Kirtley, Professor of Media Ethics and Law at the University of Minnesota. Judge Jeffrey Sutton, U.S. Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, served as moderator.

In March, the **Intellectual Property Practice Group** hosted “Are Patents ‘Private Property’ Under the Fifth Amendment?” discussing doctrinal, policy, and historical issues raised by the increasingly important constitutional question of whether patents are secured under the Takings Clause as “private property.” The panel included Prof. Shubha Ghosh, Southern Methodist University, Dedman School of Law, Michael A. Gollin of Venable LLP, Dean A. Monco of Wood Phillips, and Prof. Adam Mossoff of Michigan State University College of Law. Hon. Loren A. Smith, U.S. Court of Federal Claims, served as moderator.

The **Telecommunications & Electronic Media Practice Group** hosted a keynote address early in the year by Hon. Deborah Taylor Tate of the Federal Communications Commission on the future of Universal Service, the ten percent fee phone customers are obliged to pay. The $7 billion a year garnered by the fee is designed to guarantee affordable telephone service to rural and low-income Americans, to reduce Internet connection costs for schools and libraries, and to enhance connectivity for rural health care providers. After her address, a roundtable discussion of leaders from Capitol Hill and various industry sectors explored solutions to the problem of reshaping Universal Service for the digital age.
**Volunteers Focus on State Courts**

In 2007, the State Courts Project expanded its portfolio to include several states where judicial selection system reforms were being introduced by the state legislature and discussed by the press and the public, including Missouri, Tennessee, and Kansas. Wisconsin was also an important focus of attention, as there was an impending judicial election of some consequence that could be used as a vehicle for debating role of court issues.

The approach in each of these states consists of three elements: an in-state earned media push involving media training and booking of local legal experts; events in various cities throughout targeted states; and unique scholarship on the state of state supreme court jurisprudence written by top law professors and practicing attorneys. The purpose of these efforts remains the same: to provide accessible information to the press and the public that will serve as a catalyst for real, meaningful debate and discussion about state constitutional and general legal jurisprudence; and to condition the environment for more productive attention to the role of state supreme courts and the judiciary more generally in our constitutional system, both now and in the future.

**Wisconsin**

Judicial elections provide prime opportunities to focus public attention on state court jurisprudence. Prior to the April 2007 Wisconsin State Supreme Court election, the State Courts Project launched a statewide educational program to foster debate and discussion about the Wisconsin Supreme Court. The Project recruited a team of local legal experts to talk to the press about current and future work of the supreme court and the proper role of judges. The purpose of the program was to spark a more balanced and intelligent debate about whether the Wisconsin Supreme Court has been respecting its limited constitutional role. The following were the project components:

- Media-trained local legal experts, speaking for themselves, were made available to the press for commentary on the Wisconsin Supreme Court’s jurisprudence and the proper role of the Court. The legal experts were featured on radio, were quoted in newspapers, and published op-ed articles.
- The Federalist Society hired a polling firm (the polling company™, inc.) to conduct a pre-election survey of Wisconsin citizens.

The survey tested the awareness and understanding of the process by which state supreme court justices are elected as well as citizens’ familiarity with the candidates and general opinion of the Wisconsin Supreme Court and its decisions. One result showed that 72% of Wisconsin citizens believe judges should interpret the law as it is written and not take into account their own viewpoints and experiences. There was extensive coverage of the poll results from many media outlets, including Wisconsin Public Radio, and release of the poll results generated additional media interest in the legal experts being made available by the Federalist Society to comment on the supreme court race.

- A Wisconsin Supreme Court white paper acted as a news peg and was promoted to media throughout the state. The author, Prof. Rick Esenberg, was made available to the press for commentary, and the paper itself served as a useful reference resource for press covering the supreme court election. In fact, John Fund noted in *The Wall Street Journal* that Wisconsin business groups “widely distributed ‘A Court Unbound?’ a critique of [the court’s] decisions by a prominent Wisconsin lawyer which was published by the Federalist Society.” The Federalist Society white paper, its author, and pre-
The week before the election, the Milwaukee Chapter of the Federalist Society sponsored a luncheon event at the Milwaukee Bar Association. Milwaukee County Circuit Court Judge Michael Brennan introduced Prof. Esenberg who discussed the recent rulings of the Wisconsin Supreme Court. The audience included many state court judges, leaders of the bar, and representatives from local policy organizations.

**Missouri, Tennessee, and Kansas**

In addition to fostering dialogue surrounding state judicial elections, the State Courts Project has entered the debate over state judicial selection methods. State appellate court judges are selected by different processes in different states: some by elections, some by gubernatorial appointment, and some by “merit selection,” a process where a judicial nominating commission submits a list of judicial candidates from whom the governor must choose to fill a court opening. Several states are considering changing how judges are selected for their highest courts, and the Federalist Society has encouraged and strengthened discussion of judicial selection issues in these states.

The process of “merit selection” was developed in Missouri and has since been known as the Missouri Plan. Since the initial passage of the Missouri Plan in 1940, twenty other states and the District of Columbia have adopted some form of the Plan. Critics of the Missouri Plan contend that the Missouri judicial selection commission is devoid of any executive or legislative check, and therefore among the most insulated from public input and least accountable in the country. Proponents of the Plan, however, contend that judicial applicant quality is improved by having this pre-appointment screening process involve state bar lawyers, and that the influence of partisan politics is diminished. Our Missouri effort — which has resulted in three *Wall Street Journal* editorials — included:

- The Federalist Society commissioned a poll of Missourians to survey their knowledge of the Plan and to probe their views about the judicial function. Local press outlets that covered the poll results included the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, *Jefferson City News Tribune*, and the *Missouri Lawyers Weekly*.

- Similar to the Wisconsin State Courts Media Program, the Federalist Society facilitated statewide media appearances by local legal experts. These media-trained attorneys, speaking for themselves, were made available to press for commentary on proposed reforms to the Missouri Plan, recent jurisprudence of the Missouri Supreme Court, and the proper role of the courts and judges. The legal experts were featured on radio, were quoted in newspapers, and produced op-ed articles. For example, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* and *Jefferson City News Tribune* quoted Federalist Society legal experts and poll results in their articles on Missouri Plan reform.

- The Federalist Society organized a number of events in both St. Louis and Kansas City. Several of these were styled as debates, and featured a number of distinguished speakers, including Governor Matt Blunt, Circuit Court Judge Robert H. Dierker Jr., and Douglas Copeland, former president of the Missouri Bar Association, and former Governor Bob Holden. A number of media outlets covered the events, including the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *Kansas City Star*, and *Kansas City Daily Record*.

- The Federalist Society published a white paper on Missouri Supreme Court jurisprudence over the last fifteen years and the status of the current court. The paper, *The Consequences of Judicial Selection: A Review of the Supreme Court of Missouri, 1992-2007*, is co-authored by Prof. William Eckhardt of the University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law, and John Hilton, former clerk to Judge Duane Benton of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit. The white paper and its authors have received extensive state and national press coverage.

As in Missouri, judges in Tennessee and Kansas are also selected by “merit selection” and proposals for reform are being discussed in these states. The Federalist Society’s programs and white papers have garnered significant attention in these states as well. All of the major newspapers in both states have covered these events and papers, as well as a survey of citizens about the role of courts and judicial selection issues in Kansas.

As a result of all of the published white papers, event programming, educational polls, and outreach to media undertaken by the Federalist Society’s State Courts Project in 2007, issues of state court jurisprudence are receiving a greater amount of attention from government officials, the media, and the public than ever before. This is evidenced by the press attention garnered, which amounted to $2 million in publicity value in just a few months.
Society Expands Monitoring of International Organizations

Sovereignty is a simple principle – namely, that a community should be free as an independent political entity to make its own laws. Some have questioned whether the principle of American sovereignty, and its attendant benefits to individual freedom, is threatened by efforts to use international and foreign sources of law as a means of securing a policy agenda here at home that otherwise could not be achieved. There is a trend among American judges to invoke international sources of law to interpret our Constitution and other U.S. laws. Some also have pressed the United States to adopt and comply with the soft norms of international law that are the hallmarks of the United Nations and other multilateral organizations. The Federalist Society continues to study and monitor these concerns through its International Law and Sovereignty Project.

The Project has two main goals. The first is to monitor attempts to incorporate international law into the American legal system. The Federalist Society and its European volunteers observe and participate in various meetings convened by the United Nations and other international organizations, generating reports on the activities and the agendas that are pushed. Other volunteers track U.S. court cases. In the effort to make this quiet process transparent, information collected is transmitted to policy leaders, think tanks, businesses, scholars, and the press, with the idea that more awareness will help ensure that no potentially damaging legislation will pass unnoticed. The second goal of the Project consists of balancing the debate about adopting international legal norms, by adding another voice to an often one-dimensional discussion, a voice which reminds people of the indispensability of sovereignty principles. We take action by sponsoring speeches, panels, and debates, as well as by publishing articles and scholarship meant to provoke thought and encourage dialogue. Importantly, since earned media has a multiplier effect, we prioritize the media training and mobilization of experts who can articulate the impact of these legal trends, thereby disseminating much-needed, timely information.

The Federalist Society’s chapters in Europe – presently in Paris, London, and Brussels – are invaluable resources for accomplishing the stated purposes of the project. These chapters have been instrumental in the forging of a trans-Atlantic coalition of Europeans who share Federalist Society ideas, including a commitment to the principles of limited government, the rule of law and sovereignty. The work of these chapters also helps us identify interested individuals who can aid us in monitoring and media outreach. Our Paris chapter has been particularly active this year. Under the leadership of François-Henri Briard, the French Government relied heavily upon the Paris group to help organize Chief Justice John Roberts’ visit to France in July 2007. Similar collaboration occurred in October with a visit from California jurists.

The Federalist Society remains very active in the monitoring of activities of various

Chief Justice John Roberts and other U.S. Supreme Court justices meet with French President Nicolas Sarkozy in Paris in September. François-Henri Briard of the Federalist Society was instrumental in arranging the visit.

A large component of the International Law and Sovereignty Project, the Global Governance Watch website launched with this accessible homepage in late March.
international organizations in order to ensure that there is a fair hearing for such issues as intellectual property protection principles. We continue to make use of our media trained experts to help combat unquestioning acceptance of diluted intellectual property rights by providing a diversity of media coverage. The Society was present at the World Health Organization’s 120th Executive Board Session in Geneva in January 2007. The Society has permanent observer status at the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), and was able to have a presence at the Assemblies meeting in late September 2007. We remain interested in any developments at the Council on Human Rights and other, similar organizations. Daily Reports from these meetings can be accessed on the Federalist Society’s website.

Society representatives have opened a dialogue with members of the European Parliament, as well as with U.S. missions to the UN, UNESCO, and the EU, with the purpose of ensuring that intellectual property issues are the subject of a balanced dialogue. In October 2007, in preparation for the World Health Organization’s (WHO) Intergovernmental Working Group (IGWG) meetings in November, the Society helped to organize visits to several key missions to the UN by a group of experts. These experts briefed the trade officials at the missions on the IGWG report that was published in late July 2007, and which has been said to greatly overstep the mandate of the WHO. Former USAID General Counsel John Gardner also authored two important papers for the Federalist Society that explored the problems with the IGWG report, which were sent to all of the permanent missions to the UN in Geneva, as well as to key pharmaceutical industry players. In addition, during the WHO’s IGWG meetings in the fall, Ronald Cass, Dean Emeritus of Boston University School of Law, and President of Cass & Associates, PC, gave a briefing to mission and other international and pharmaceutical organization representatives entitled, “Compulsory Licensing, Patent Pools and Public Health.”

Finally, in early December 2007, the Federalist Society hosted a briefing to discuss the recent draft of “Human Rights Guidelines for Pharmaceutical Companies in Relation to Access to Medicines” by Paul Hunt, UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Health.

The Federalist Society, in partnership with the American Enterprise Institute (AEI), is in the process of restructuring its NGOWatch website. Over the past year, both organizations have come to believe the need that NGOWatch sought to fill had shifted from one of simply monitoring various NGOs to one of monitoring the global governance movement as a whole. The new Global Governance Watch website, which focuses on four topical issue areas – Human Security, National Security, Global Regulation, and Development – seeks to provide its visitors with a greater understanding of what constitutes global governance, and why it is important. The new website can be accessed at www.globalgovernancewatch.org.
SPECIAL PROJECTS
COMMENORATE
SILVER ANNIVERSARY

2007 SEPERATION OF POWERS
COURSE REMAINS POPULAR

U.S. Supreme Court Justice Antonin
Scalia and Prof. John Baker Jr. of the
Paul Hebert Law Center of Louisiana State
University presented their biennial Separa-
tion of Powers CLE Course on September 10
and 11, 2007. The 10 hour CLE course was
offered at the Ritz-Carlton, Bachelor Gulch
in Avon, Colorado. The course was extremely
popular and offered a unique opportunity for
attendees to receive instruction directly from
a Supreme Court Justice.

FEDERAL SOCIETY ORGANIZES
IRAQI JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

At the request of the State Department,
the Federalist Society hosted approximately
twenty members of the Iraqi and Kurdish Bar
Associations in Washington, D.C. for a day-
long conference in November designed to
explore how the rule of law and the integrity
of the legal profession can be fostered through
the formation of bar associations. Several
legal academics, distinguished attorneys,
and senior Federalist Society staff addressed
theoretical concepts and principles, as well as
practical opportunities for structuring the bar.
Presentations stressed the merits and stability
of a legal community unified by profession
rather than by religious or political affili-
ation, and emphasized the power that such a
unified body, free from governmental control
and intervention, can wield to effect positive
change in the legal system. These ideas were
presented as a contrast to the current state of
fragmentation in the Iraqi and Kurdish legal
systems, in which there is little to no con-
nection or communication between lawyers,
judges, law students, and law professors.

25TH ANNIVERSARY VIDEO
TELLS SOCIETY’S STORY

As part of the Federalist Society’s an-
niversary celebration, the Society produced
a twelve minute video that highlights the
achievements of the Society over the last 25
years. The stirring video includes interviews
from U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice John
G. Roberts and Justices Antonin Scalia, Clar-
ence Thomas and Samuel Alito, and a number
of Society participants. The video features an
interesting look at the Society’s history, with
clips from each of the founders, and a discus-
sion of what the Society has accomplished,
by many who have supported its efforts since
its inception. The 25th Anniversary Video can
be found at our website, www.fed-soc.org.
By assisting with the placement of editorials and the arrangement of media interviews for select legal experts with television, print, radio, and online news reporters, the Federalist Society has raised public awareness on important legal issues of the day through significant media coverage. The graph above illustrates the results of this effort.
Publications and Web Site Deliver Message

The Federalist Society has always placed a very high premium on its ability to bring debate and scholarship to the public. To that end, the publications arm of the organization has grown space with the organization itself, so that there are now three regular newsletters dealing with various legal institutions and phenomena, a scholarly journal of considerable length, a member magazine and frequent white papers on a variety of topics. The organization screens its publications rigorously, feeling an obligation to its members in law school, the bar, the judiciary and elsewhere, to provide quality material that is informative, relevant, and balanced; for that reason, when Society publications stake out opinions, the reader is directed to contrary viewpoints.

In observance of its twenty-fifth anniversary, the Federalist Society worked with Eagle Publishing to produce a book titled Originalism: A Quarter-Century of Debate, an impressive collection of speeches, panel discussions, and debates on the subject from some of the greatest and most prominent legal experts of the last twenty-five years. The book features an introduction by Federalist Society co-founder Prof. Steven G. Calabresi, a foreword by U.S. Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia and an epilogue by former U.S. Solicitor General Theodore Olson.

Engage. The flagship of Federalist Society publications, Engage has until last year appeared twice a year in print-bound version. We are pleased to say that a third hardcover issue has been added. Ideas are generated by our fifteen Practice Group executive committees. Articles in 2007 discussed climate change litigation, the Vienna Convention, universal jurisdiction, NSA surveillance, the Carhart decision, the Seattle Schools case, the Roberts Court’s mental health and antitrust rulings, attorneys’ fees in class actions, gasoline regulation and many exciting book titles and other topics. Transcripts from the 2007 National Lawyers Convention will appear in more than twelve law reviews in 2008.

ABA Watch. One of the Society’s most popular publications, ABA Watch, is a semi-annual newsletter, timed to coincide with the American Bar Association’s mid-year and annual meetings, and is meant to help readers form an independent opinion of the organization. The winter issue featured testimony from the dispute over ABA procedures connected with the Michael Wallace nomination to the U.S. Court of Appeals, articles on the ABA’s various stances on the War on Terror, and recommendations on judicial conduct, gun control, law student participation in pro bono activities, Katrina, state secrets privilege, and judicial independence. ABA Watch will continue to provide information on the

www.fed-soc.org The continually evolving Federalist Society website is a wealth of information on legal topics and current events, and a valuable resource for lawyers, professors, and law students. Visitors can browse the event calendar to learn of chapter activity and functions around the country and register for upcoming events. The multimedia archive features audio and video from conferences, panels, and speeches. It also spotlights “Originally Speaking,” a monthly online written debate, which offers legal experts an opportunity to discuss a wide gamut of current legal and judicial issues. When the Supreme Court is in session, new SCOTUScasts are posted nearly every day, in which prominent legal minds discuss the ramifications of oral argument and of decisions handed down by the Court. Every scholarly Federalist Society publication is available online, and additional resources such as suggested reading lists and bibliographies are also offered. The website is an invaluable tool to assist research, stimulate discussion, provoke thought, and increase interest in legal and public policy concerns.
Association, to assist others in making a grounded assessment of its role and influence in American jurisprudence.

**State Court Docket Watch.** This newsletter, appearing four times in the year and largely composed by members of the Society’s nationwide Lawyers Chapters, reports on noteworthy trends, interesting decisions, and controversial cases that are of interest outside their respective jurisdictions. For that reason, the newsletter is mailed to every state appellate judge and state attorney general, many trial judges, and an extensive list of corporate general counsels. Issues covered this year include same-sex marriage, state abortion laws, public school funding, judicial speech and elections, union legal fees and collective bargaining rights cases, and asbestos litigation, among others.

**Class Action Watch.** Published to apprise both Society membership and the public at large of recent trends and cases in class action litigation, *Class Action Watch* has reported this year on the ALI’s Principles project, Vioxx litigation, the use of fluid recovery as common proof, the subsidence of welding fume mass torts, omissions in FACTA, the Milberg Weiss indictments, and state supreme court lead paint rulings, among other topics.

**The Federalist Paper.** The in-house magazine of the Federalist Society, the *Federalist Paper* comes out in the winter, summer and fall. Highlighting some of the activities and events of Society Chapters, Practice Groups, and individual members, the magazine is meant to give members a sense of the kind of engagements occupying particularly active chapters, students, and lawyers. Each division of the Society reports on some of the more noteworthy events of the past season, including such things as the annual Student Symposium and National Lawyers Convention. The State Courts Project and Faculty and International Law Divisions provide updates on their respective doings as well.

**White Papers.** The Federalist Society increasingly turns out high level white papers focused on particular issues or areas of interest. As a continuation of a State Courts Project last fall, a number of white papers appeared on the jurisprudence of state supreme courts this year, including Kansas, Missouri, Tennessee, and Wisconsin. These discussed the past orientation and change in direction of the jurisprudential philosophy of these courts, in an effort to raise awareness of some of the issues at stake in state judiciaries. A number of white papers on other subjects appeared as well, including papers on Intellectual Property, civil rights and climate change litigation. These white papers are meant to generate a higher level of debate about important matters of law and policy.

Though the organization seeks to produce material that will encourage discussion over timely legal and public policy developments, it is important to note that the Society takes no position on particular issues. Opinions expressed in the organization’s publications are those of the authors, not of the Society itself, and readers are encouraged to respond to what appears in those publications and to submit ideas or articles about trends and developments in the law themselves.
Donors Increase Contributions, Society Expands Programs

The Federalist Society continues to grow at a fast pace – in number of chapters, in number of people involved in our community, in number of people exposed to our ideas. None of this would be possible if our revenue didn’t continue to grow as well. As a matter of fact, it is the revenue growth that determines how many additional volunteers we can support to plan and produce our programming across the country and how many events we can ultimately add to our schedule. The increasing number of programs determines how many people the Federalist Society can actually reach with its message of traditional legal values such as limited government, the separation of powers, individual liberty and responsibility, and the rule of law.

Fortunately, our revenue has been increasing steadily since 2003. In fact, we reached an all-time high of $9.2 million in fiscal year 2007, a 26.4 % increase over 2006. This increase in revenue is, in part, due to more and more people being exposed to the work of the Federalist Society, and subsequently wanting to support us financially because they believe we are successfully working to change the legal culture.

We are extremely grateful for these new donors. As we develop into a bigger organization and become better known we are attracting larger contributions. But even though these significant contributions have allowed the Society to expand rapidly there is no way we can adequately thank those who have been with us from the beginning, some since their law school days. Many of these long-time supporters are now members of the James Madison Club. Membership in the James Madison Club is open to those who contribute $1,000 or more annually to the Federalist Society. In recognition of the commitment of these individuals, foundations and corporations, a list of the current members of the James Madison Club appears below:

2007 James Madison Club Roster

Madison Club Platinum ($100,000 or more)
Anonymous (1)
American Justice Partnership
Lawrence Auriana
Lynde & Harry Bradley Foundation
Cortopassi Institute
E.L. Craig Foundation
Donors Capital Fund
Frank and Sally Hanna
The Holman Supporting Foundation
David Koch
Koch Industries
Mr. and Mrs. Robert A. Levy
Lilly Endowment, Inc.
The Marcus Foundation, Inc.
Microsoft
Pfizer Inc
Sarah Scaife Foundation
Seagle Freedom Trust
William E. Simon Foundation
Paul Singer
The Thomas W. Smith Foundation
Trof, Inc.

Madison Club Gold ($50,000 to $99,999)
Anonymous (4)
BakerHostetler LLP
Brian Brille*
Castle Rock Foundation
Coca-Cola Bottlers’ Association
George and Kellyanne Conway*
The Shelby Cullom Davis Foundation
Edward Diefenthal
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher Foundation
IFPMA
JM Freedom Foundation
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation
The F.M. Kirby Foundation, Inc.
Charles G. Koch Charitable Foundation

Law Enforcement Legal Defense Fund
Roger Milliken
The John William Pope Foundation
The Rosenkranz Foundation

*Member of the Federalist Society Board of Visitors

Federalist Society Board of Visitors members Robert A. Levy (right) and Prof. Lillian BeVier, and her son Nicolas Altree, socialize before the Annual Dinner.
Madison Club Benefactors
($10,000 to $24,999)

Anonymous (7)
Achelis Foundation
AFLAC
Alston & Bird, LLP
ALTHA
Anschutz Foundation
Bancroft Associates
Brauer Charitable Trust
Joseph Canizaro
Ceres Foundation
Chase Foundation
of Virginia
Civil Justice Reform Group
Cooper & Kirk, PLLC
Douglas R. Cox
DaimlerChrysler LLC
The Hugh and Hazel
Darling Foundation
Richard and Helen
DeVos Foundation
Dickstein Shapiro LLP
DLA Piper
The William H. Donner
Foundation
ExxonMobil Corporation
Goodwin Proctor
Greenberg Traurig
Gulton Foundation
Christopher Damon Haig
Grover Hermann
Foundation
Margaret M. Hill
Foundation
Hogan & Hartson LLP
Hunton & Williams LLP
Jewish Communal Fund
Jones Day

Michael and Rosalind
Keiser Charitable Trust
Kirkland & Ellis Foundation
Lakeside Foundation
The Lehrman Institute
Mayer Brown LLP
McCarter & English LLP
The Modzelewski
Endowment
National Mining
Association
Joe O’Donnell
Ogletree Deakins
Patton Boggs LLP
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky &
Walker LLP
Mitt and Ann Romney/
Goldman Sachs
Daniel Shuchman
Sidley Austin LLP
Robert S. and Dian G.
Smith*
Spriggs & Hollingworth
Steptoe & Johnson LLP
The Hatton Summers
Foundation
Nicholas J. Swenson

Madison Club Sustaining Members
($5,000 to $9,999)

Akin Gump Strauss
Hauer & Feld LLP
Emil Arca
The Armstrong Foundation
Lily Auchincloss
Foundation, Inc.
Bartlit Beck Herman
Palenchar & Scott LLP
Gregory Barton
Wendell Bird
Susan Braden
Roger Brooks
Brownstein, Hyatt &
Farber LLP
William Carey
The Challenge Foundation
Ying Chen
ChevronTexaco
Coca-Cola Bottling
Company United
G.L. Connolly Foundation
Contran Corporation
Covington & Burling

TimeWarner
Troutman Sanders LLP
Venable LLP
Sheila Walpin*
Wiley Rein LLP
Partners of Wilkie,
Farr & Gallagher LLP
WilmerHale
Wilson Sonsini
Goodrich & Rosati
Winston & Strawn LLP
Wyeth Pharmaceuticals
Fred Young Jr.

Erika Birg and Susanna Dokupil, both
James Madison Club members, meet at
the National Lawyers Convention.
Recent Harvard grads and James Madison Club members Hashim Mooppan and Lee Rudofsky converse with Justice Richard Sanders of the Washington State Supreme Court at the Annual Dinner.

Dick & Betsy DeVos Foundation*
J. Christopher Donahue
The William F. Donner Foundation
Donor’s Trust
Howrey LLP
The Kriebel Foundation
Latham & Watkins
Joseph McLaughlin
Joanne and Fred Medero Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP
Carl Nuessle
William and Lee Otis*
Raytheon
The Rodney Fund
The Roe Foundation
Adam and Tara Ross
Joseph and Mary Smith
Swire Coca-Cola, USA
The John Templeton Foundation
Herbert W. Vaughan*

Madison Club Supporting Members ($2,000 - $4,999)
Anonymous (3)
Amgen Inc.
Edward C. Anderson
Jodi Balsam
H. Christopher Bartolomucci
Erika Birg
Ron and Suzie Cass
Will Chou
Gregory S. Coleman
Theodore M. Cooperstein*
Richard Cummins
Nina Cunningham
Jack David
Antoinette and Paul DeCamp
Robert J. Ernst III
Daniel Finley
Georgia Community Foundation
John and Lois Herrington*
Karl Hirshman
Mark Holmes
Judith Jacobs*

Kaplan, Inc.
John and Mary Lee Malcolm
Douglas Kirk Mayer
William Mumma
Barbara R., and
Richard C. Neal
Thomas P. Ogden
D. Joseph Olson
San Orr
Robert Parker
Mark Perry
Thomas Phillips
Roger Pilon
Paul Pisano
Sara Church Reese
Wm. Bradford Reynolds*
Leslie Rose*
Sheldon Rose*
Shook, Hardy & Bacon LLP
Andrew Siff*
Paula Stannard*
Frank B. Strickland
Peter A. Thiel
Bonnie Wachtel*
Lynn Wardle
J. Michael Wiggins
Richard Willard*
Daniel J. Woodring
Zappala Family Foundation
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Alden F. Abbott
Mike K. Ain
Douglas W. Anderson
Fred Anton III
David L. Applegate
Adrienne Atkinson

Austin Community Foundation
John S. Baker Jr.
Randy E. Barnett
Bob Barr
James T. Barry III
Gregory Barton
Charles Bell
Brad Berenson
Jan Cox Berlage
George W. Bermant
Heidi Bernheim
Lawrence Bernheim
Ryan C. Berry
Stuart R. Birn
Thomas Bishop
Francis Blake*

C.H. Boyle Foundation
William Brooke
Barbara Bruin
John Stewart Bryan III*
W. Stephen Cannon
Willard Z. Carr Jr.
Paul Cellupica
Ernest S. Christian
Roger Clegg
Andrew Richard Cochran
Jonathan Cohn and
Rachel Brand
George E. Coleman
Foundation
Sean C. Conners
Charles J. Cooper
Trevor K. Copeland
Ralph Coti
Stephen John Cox
Carol T. Crawford
Paul Dans
Anthony D’Auria
J. Kennerly Davis
John and Karen Dodd
Susanna Dokupil
Elizabeth Dorminey
Pete and Elise duPont
Chris Ekren
Anne Eldridge
William J. Emanuel
L. Jackson Etheridge*
Nolly S. Evans
R. Scott Feldmann
Fred Fielding
Michael C. Flynn
Margaret Foran
David C. Forte
Theodore Frank
Tim Franzen
George S. Frazza
Sandra Froman
Christopher and
Courtenay Gabriel
Paul V. Gadola
Curtis E. Gannon
William R. Garwood
Cary Gaylord
Thomas F. Gede
Stuart M. Gerson
George Gillespie III
Charles P. Gilliam
Robert J. Giuffra Jr.
Paul Glencur
Elizabeth Gobeil
Shannon L. Goessling
James L. Graham
Dorothy Gray*
Geoffrey L. Graybill
Thomas P. Griesa
Gregory Grimsal
Eric D. Hargan*
R. Britt Harris Jr.
Marion Edwyn Harrison
Steve Hartung
Brent O. Hatch
Robert C. Hawk
Jim Haynes
Sandra Hecker
Gail Heriot
Karl Hirshman
Robert H. Hishon
James and Allyson Ho
James Huffman
J.C. Huizenga
William T. Huston*
Charles Hwang
Nancy Iredale
Erik S. Jaffe
William Jernigan
Christine Johnson
James Johnson
Paul Jones
Clark Judge
Paul J. Kaleta
Shahab S. Karmely
Thomas J. Kavaler
Lawrence Keane
James P. Kelly III
Orin S. Kerr
Manny Klausner
Howard J. Klein
Alex Kozinski
Vernon K. Kriebel
Foundation
Jeffrey Kubin
William Kuntz
Raymond Lajeunesse Jr.
Grant Lally*
Kenneth K. Lee
Brian J. Leske
Andrew Lester*
Raymond Wm. Leyden
Marc R. Lisker
Robert L. Lofts
Wendy Long
Karen Lugo
Letty Lutzker*
Gregory Maier
Donald Malinak
MaryRose Manczak
Karen L. Manos
Edmund Manwell
David Martin
Michael Massengale
Steve A. Matthews
Letty McAdams
Sean C. McAvoy
Jennifer McCain
John McGinnis
Simone Mele
Francis J. Menton Jr.*
Matthew D. Michael
Mark Mittleman
Hashim Mooppan
Edward A. Moritz
Richard T. Morrison
Peter Mulloney
David Murray
National Beer Wholesalers
Association
Jeffrey T. Neilson
Douglas Nelson
David Novak
Coleman A. Nutter*
James O’Connell
Thomas P. Ogden
Ian Marshall Ogilvie
Theodore Olson*
John O’Neill
Dwight D. Opperman
John C. O’Quinn
Kevin O’Scannlair
Hugh Overholt
Donald Padgitt
Scott M. Pearson
Eric J. Pelton
Lovett Peters
Charles W. Pickering
Holly Pierson
Stephen D. Poss
George Priest
Alfred W. Putnam Jr.
Alan Charles Raul
Alfred S. Regnery
Richard Rideout

Nat and Abby Moffat (left) and Diana Spencer (right) of the Shelby Cullom Davis Foundation visit with Federalist Society President Eugene B. Meyer and his wife, Lori, (center) after the Barbara K. Olson Memorial Lecture.
Benefactors

David Weinstein
Hill B. Wellford
Steadman Westergaard
Rando Wick
Richard E. Wiley
Michael F. Williams
William Reynolds
William*  
John Witten
Woodford Foundation
Christopher A. Wray
Moin A. Yahya
James W. Ziglar
Julius J. Zschau

Federalist Society Patrons
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James E. Anklam
William W. Barrett
Warren Belmar
Tanya Bidwell
H. Michael Biscan
Mark Brnovich
David R. Brown
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Edmund Carpenter
Christian Castle
Adam H. Charnes
Jeffrey Bossert Clark
John T. Delacourt
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Stephen W. Erickson
John Evangelakos
Daniel Tyrone Fahner
Paul R. Farago
Charles Fried
Jerry B. Fulmer
Sean Gallagher
Patrick Garry
Garvey Kansas Foundation
Arthur Gollwitzer III
A. William Goodwyn Jr.
Mark S. Goracy
John S. Hahn
Michael F. Harron
R. Charles Henn Jr.
Huizenga Foundation
Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Kniffen
Michael I. Krauss
Jack Kress

W. Thomas Haynes of Atlanta escorts his daughter, Megan Haynes, to the James Madison Club Reception.
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James F. Rill*  
David B. Rivkin
James M. Rockett
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Lee and Soraya Rudofsky
John L. Ryder
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Gene Schauer
Peter Carey Schaumber
Donald Shaver
Robert P. Sheils Jr.
Douglas G. Smith
Loren Smith
Mark W. Smith
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John J. Soroko*  
Jeffrey Spears
Kenneth W. Starr*  
Nicholas John Stathis*  
Charles Henry Still
James M. Stoneman
Charitable Fund
Robert L. Strickland*  
J. Robert Suffoletta Jr.
Thomas Milburn Sweeney
Glenn Sulmasy
Heath Price Tarbert
Michael Thilen
David H. Thompson
Larry D. Thompson
Michael and Janet Tierney
Grey Till Jr.
Eric W. Treene
Charles J. Vasilius
G.L. Jidge Verity
Vincent Vitkovsky
David J. Volk
Michael B. Wallace
John L. Warden
Donn Weinberg

Steven J. Law
Nicholas Lowe
Brian J. Maas
Perry E. Maguire
Adam Meyerson
Joseph W. Morris
Adam Mortara
Glen Nager
Mary B. Neumayr
Dennis R. Nolan
Charles M. Oellerman
Robert R. Orellana
John J. Park Jr.
Robert and Gene Pratter
Charles J. Queenan
Larry E. Ribstein
Michael E. Rosman*  
Maimon Schwarzchild
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Edward E. Steiner
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* Denotes individuals who are Founding Members of the James Madison Club.
REPORT OF INDEPENDENT AUDITORS

Board of Directors
The Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy
Arlington House
17th & F Sts, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-3000

We have audited the accompanying statements of financial position of The Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy Society as of September 30, 2007 and 2006 and the related statements of revenues and expenses for the years then ended. These financial statements and the report of the Society’s independent auditors, provide the expressed opinion on these financial statements.

We conducted the audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards in the United States of America. These standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, among other things, evidence concerning the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation, structure and content of the financial statements.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly the financial position of The Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy Society as of September 30, 2007 and 2006, and the changes in its net assets, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

[Signature]
[Title and Firm]
January 28, 2008
### THE FEDERALIST SOCIETY FOR LAW AND PUBLIC POLICY STUDIES

**STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL POSITION**  
**SEPTEMBER 30, 2007 AND 2006**

#### ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENt ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>$733,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANT AND CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVABLE - LONG-TERM</strong></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIXED ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office furniture</td>
<td>$92,000</td>
<td>$92,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L I A B I L I T I E S AND NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENt LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>$3,740,000</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>$3,740,000</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>$3,740,000</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,670,000</td>
<td>$3,450,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THE FEDERALIST SOCIETY FOR LAW AND PUBLIC POLICY STUDIES
#### STATEMENTS OF ACTIVITIES
FOR THE YEARS ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 2007 AND 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td>Permanently Restricted</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>526,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>526,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,567,916</td>
<td>104,400</td>
<td>113,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>1,967,786</td>
<td>124,069</td>
<td>1,843,717</td>
<td>3,135,572</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services - Private</td>
<td>1,785,703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,785,703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102,083</td>
<td>124,069</td>
<td>1,783,717</td>
<td>3,135,572</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Services</td>
<td>69,875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69,875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance services</td>
<td>1,395,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,395,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>77,074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77,074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,472,079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,472,079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>1,541,954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,541,954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNREALIZED NET INCOME</strong></td>
<td>2,861,705</td>
<td>114,055</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,975,760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,072,443</td>
<td>114,055</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,186,498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET INCOME</strong></td>
<td>3,072,443</td>
<td>114,055</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,186,498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET INCOME</strong></td>
<td>3,072,443</td>
<td>114,055</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,186,498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHANGES IN NET INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,072,443</td>
<td>114,055</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,186,498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHANGES IN NET INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHANGES IN NET INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET ASSETS AT BEGINNING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,072,443</td>
<td>114,055</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,186,498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET ASSETS AT END</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,072,443</td>
<td>114,055</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,186,498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cash Flows from Operating Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue and gross profits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less operating expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and wages</td>
<td>36,429</td>
<td>36,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and fringe benefits</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>1,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating expenses</td>
<td>43,529</td>
<td>37,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating income loss</td>
<td>43,529</td>
<td>37,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income tax expense</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in accounts receivable</td>
<td>3,131</td>
<td>3,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in prepaid expenses</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net decrease in working capital</td>
<td>5,131</td>
<td>5,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash provided by operating activities</td>
<td>5,131</td>
<td>5,112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cash Flows from Investing Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of fixed assets</td>
<td>51,644</td>
<td>12,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from sale of investments</td>
<td>80,100</td>
<td>11,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from maturities</td>
<td>13,720</td>
<td>13,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash used in investing activities</td>
<td>15,571</td>
<td>12,176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Increase (Decrease) in Cash and Cash Equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of year</td>
<td>2,564,373</td>
<td>1,003,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of year</td>
<td>2,619,944</td>
<td>2,516,762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Financial Statements

### Balance Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Income Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS