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He will make your righteousness shine like the dawn,
the justice of your cause like the noonday sun.

Psalm 37:6 (NIV)
Attacks on religious freedom happen every day. The National Litigation Academy (NLA) is a one-of-a-kind program that provides the legal training for attorneys to successfully engage the culture. Here you will develop the knowledge and skills to defend the sanctity of life, preserve marriage and the family, and protect the rights of Christians to freely express their faith in public.

NLA sessions are five days in length and qualify for mandatory continuing legal education credit. If eligible, accepted applicants may qualify for a scholarship which covers tuition, airfare, lodging, and materials.

Demonstrative evidence is an obvious area of interest to me as a trial lawyer because of the way a jury often seems to be persuaded by what it sees more so than by just what it hears. So it only makes sense that the same process of persuasion must surely affect how others think about us as Christians and, in particular, Christian lawyers. People likely reach conclusions about our faith, not so much by what we say but by what they see in our lives, our practices, and our associations.

This, in part, is why Christian Legal Society encourages its members to live, serve and practice law in a manner pleasing to the Lord. We must represent our clients well, pursue what is right and still treat our opponents fairly. In sum, we seek justice with the love of God. And assuming this goal is equally true for CLS as an organization, it is fair to wonder how well we do when we corporately provide service to others through the protection of religious liberty and provision of legal service to the poor.

Grounded in 35 years of legal excellence with a reputation for caring and integrity, our Center for Law and Religious Freedom continues to respond efficiently and fairly to the numerous legal challenges to religious freedom around the country. The fine work of the Center is exemplified in CLS’s current appeal of the Ninth Circuit’s ruling against the student chapter at the University of California Hastings. The Supreme Court’s grant of certiorari allows the Center to argue and, prayerfully, the Court to conclude, that a public university law school should not be allowed to exclude a religious student organization from a forum for speech solely because the group requires its officers and voting members to share its core religious commitments. Though involving a CLS student chapter, the case has important ramifications well beyond the interests of CLS and it represents only a small portion of what the Center has done over the years to preserve religious freedom for all citizens, including the freedom to believe differently than we do. The Center seeks justice but with the love of God.

On a completely different front, CLS also continues to expand efforts to provide caring and quality legal representation to those least able to afford it. Legal Aid Ministries now associates 62 Christian legal aid programs around the country and the world. There are simply no other groups of people like those who work with these clinics. They include hundreds of volunteer lawyers and others who commit and donate many thousands of hours of free legal advice and service to the poor and homeless each year. The need for those services often stems from life choices that reflect a greater need for a relationship with Jesus and the volunteers are equally desirous to share about how to find that relationship.

As President of CLS over the last 18 months, I have seen, more than ever, how CLS and its members seek constantly to be demonstrative and therefore persuasive evidence of Jesus to the world. While we are far from perfect, we pray and trust that our service, both in method and purpose, ultimately seeks justice and indeed does so while demonstrating the love of God.
Dear Editor:

Re: Is this Email for you?

I have enjoyed reading CLS’ e-mailed devotional and have often thought I should send it to other Christians who may not be CLS members. So recently, at the end of a long day when my mental batteries were running low, I did it. Boy did I ever! Instead of sending the e-devotional to all my “safe” Christian friends, I sent it by mistake to my entire work email list. OOPS!

God’s Word did not return empty. (And I had the wonderful opportunity for some fervent prayers.) No one complained or objected. Instead, many wrote to express appreciation for the message. Others wrote to inquire about joining CLS. Still others wrote simply to reconnect – what a joy! I thank God for CLS and all of the unexpected ways He enables us to sow His seeds of hope, comfort, and salvation.

— Sally Wagenmaker, Chicago

APOLOGIES:

In the SPRING 2010 issue of The Christian Lawyer magazine, we failed to give proper recognition to the photographers whose photographs from the CLS National Conference in San Diego appear on pages 12 and 13.

The photo on top left of page 12 (building), fourth photo down (Bruce DiCicco, Ray Dague and Art Hopkins), and photo of the pier on bottom right on page 13 were taken by or provided by CLS member Raymond Dague. The background photo of the Mt. Soledad cross was taken by Brent McBurney. All other photos on pages 12 and 13 were taken by Marjorie Bancroft, wife of CLS member John Bancroft.

Thanks again to our photographers and our apologies for failing to recognize your beautiful photos.

— The Editor

Member Service: E-Devotionals

www.clsnet.org/membership/publications/e-devotionals

CLS sends out bi-weekly devotional emails to our members. Written by various CLS members, these E-Devotionals have been well received. If you haven’t been getting the devotionals and would like to receive them by email, please make sure the CLS has your most current email address by updating your member profile at www.clsnet.org or by emailing us at memmin@clsnet.org.

The Christian Lawyer welcomes letters, comments and suggestions from our readers. We’d like to hear how God is moving in your life, law practice, CLS chapter or law school. Letters may be edited to suit the format of the magazine. Mail to: Editor, Christian Legal Society, 8001 Braddock Road, Suite 300, Springfield, VA 22151 or e-mail your submissions to memmin@clsnet.org.
‘This is the first time CLS itself has been the actual party before the Supreme Court.’

April 19th was a first in CLS’s history. On that morning, the United States Supreme Court heard oral argument in Christian Legal Society Chapter of University of California, Hastings College of the Law v. Martinez, et al., No. 08-1371. Since 1977, CLS has filed scores of briefs in the Supreme Court, but this is the first time CLS itself has been the actual party before the Supreme Court. A decision is expected by the end of June.

At issue is whether the Constitution permits a public law school to exclude a CLS chapter from its forum for student groups solely because CLS requires its leaders and voting members to sign its Statement of Faith. Hastings College of the Law in San Francisco claims that CLS’s Statement of Faith requirement constitutes unlawful discrimination on the basis of religion and sexual orientation. The case arose in 2004 when Hastings refused to recognize the CLS student chapter.

CLS chapters, of course, welcome all students to attend and participate in their meetings and activities. But to be officers or voting members—and to lead Bible studies—students must affirm their commitment to the group’s core beliefs by signing the national CLS Statement of Faith. Broad enough for Christians from Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox faiths to affirm, the Statement reflects the essence of Christian teaching and witness. Recognizing that all of us are sinners, CLS interprets the Statement to require its leaders and members to try to lead lives in conformity with scriptural standards of conduct, including sexual conduct.

Supreme Court Precedent Protects Religious Student Groups on Campus

Among CLS’s earliest briefs in the Supreme Court was its 1981 brief in support of a religious student group at the University of Missouri (see p. 27). The university denied the religious student group recognition as an official group because it would not promise to delete religious worship and religious instruction from its meetings. Granting the student group victory in Widmar v. Vincent, the Supreme Court held that religious worship and instruction are forms of free speech and expressive association protected by the First Amendment. The Court further held that recognition of the group did not create the appearance that the university endorsed the group’s religious speech.

The issue in CLS v. Martinez mirrors the Widmar case: May a public university deny a religious student group official recognition because it will

CLS STATEMENT
OF FAITH

Trusting in Jesus Christ as my Savior, I believe in:

• One God, eternally existent in three persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.
• God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.
• The Deity of our Lord, Jesus Christ, God’s only Son, conceived of the Holy Spirit, born of the virgin Mary; His vicarious death for our sins through which we receive eternal life; His bodily resurrection and personal return.
• The presence and power of the Holy Spirit in the work of regeneration.
• The Bible as the inspired Word of God.
not promise to delete its religious criteria when selecting its leaders and voting members? The CLS students have urged the Court to hold that a religious group’s selection of its leaders is a form of free speech and expressive association protected by the First Amendment.

When the Supreme Court ruled that religious groups had a free speech right to be recognized as official student groups on public university campuses in the 1981 *Widmar* case, it required university officials to give religious groups equal access to meeting space and campus channels of communication in order to publicize their meetings and message to other students. And in 1995, the Supreme Court ordered the University of Virginia to fund a religious student publication from student activity fees, just as it funded nonreligious student publications.

When a student group loses official recognition, it loses the ability to reserve meeting space at the law school and is barred from the normal channels of campus communication. Lost is the ability to post flyers on bulletin boards, send mass emails to the student body, participate in the student activity fair, and place the group’s contact information on the university website and other official publications. Such access is essential to any student group that wishes to attract new students to its meetings and carry its mission to the university community. Recognition usually also triggers a group’s eligibility to apply for its fair share of the student activity fees paid by all students and divvied up among recognized student groups.

**A 15-Year Struggle by CLS and other Campus Ministries**

Around 1993, CLS student chapters and other campus ministries, including InterVarsity Christian Fellowship and Campus Crusade for Christ, began to experience harassment from campus administrators based on their faith requirements for officers and members. The University of Minnesota made the novel claim that CLS’s Statement of Faith, used to define CLS’s mission and membership, constituted religious discrimination. The University of Illinois (my undergraduate alma mater) withdrew recognition from a CLS chapter when the students refused to agree that a person’s sexual conduct was not a factor in determining whether a person could serve as a CLS leader. For the first time, a university claimed this to be sexual orientation discrimination.

Fortunately, at both schools, the CLS chapter advisors, both highly respected law professors, stepped into the gap and persuaded the law school officials to restore recognition of CLS. According to their scholarship, application of a nondiscrimination policy to prohibit a religious group from using religious criteria to choose its leaders violated the First Amendment’s protection of free speech, expressive association, and free exercise of religion.²

From 1993 until now, the Center has represented dozens of religious student chapters—from InterVarsity, Campus Crusade, Rejoyce in Jesus Ministries, Beta Upsilon Chi, and other Christian groups, as well as a score of CLS chapters—when their recognition has been threatened. All of these groups have successfully regained recognition from dozens of public universities—until this case.

**Should a Law School Require CLS to Allow a Non-Christian to Lead its Bible Studies?**

When the Supreme Court held in 2000 that the Boy Scouts had a First Amendment right to preclude homosexual men from serving as scoutmasters, the right seemed secure for a group to select its leaders according to its moral criteria. But not so.

Instead, the problems for CLS chapters and other campus ministries intensified. For example, Washburn University Law School revoked the CLS student chapter’s recognition after a student of another faith (who readily admitted he could not sign CLS’s Statement of Faith) filed a religious discrimination complaint because CLS would not allow him to lead its Bible study. The InterVarsity chapter at Tufts University (a private college) was derecognized because it insisted that an unrepentant lesbian student step down from leadership. Ohio State University derecognized the CLS student chapter after students, who were associated with the officially recognized homosexual group Outlaw, lodged a complaint with the law school about CLS’s religious requirements for its leaders and voting members. Washburn, OSU, Arizona State and other law schools restored recognition, but sometimes only after a lawsuit was filed on behalf of the religious group.

‘CLS became the only student group ever denied recognition by Hastings.’

Continued on page 6.
American discrimination by the government. Discrimination policy to a religious group is itself religious.

Awake and Alpha

American Center for Law and Justice, Fellowship of Christian Athletes, InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, Campus Crusade for Christ, The Navigators, ReJOYce in Jesus Ministries, Inc., Fellowship of Catholic University Students, Campus Bible Fellowship International, Chi Alpha Campus Ministries, Young Life, Alpha Delta Chi, and Alpha Gamma Omega, Bridget Mergens, Wide Awake Productions, Choose Him: Application of a non-discrimination policy to a religious group is itself religious discrimination by the government.

American Islamic Congress, Coalition of African-American Pastors, National Council of Young Israel, National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference, Project Nur, Sikh American Legal Defense and Education Fund, and Sikh Coalition: Becket Fund explains that the right of religious association protects religious groups from governmental interference in their internal affairs, including religious groups’ right of self-governance to select their leaders and members.


Attorneys General Brief of States of Michigan, Alabama, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Louisiana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, and West Virginia: CLS’s First Amendment rights were violated by Hastings’ application of its policy.

American discrimination by secular organizations. Organizations fundamentally differ from invidious religious

Beta Upsilon Chi, Christian Medical and Dental Association, CLS Chapters’ Former Officers: Liberty Legal Institute’s brief details CLS chapters’ denial of recognition at several campuses, explaining that a religious student group’s recognition cannot be conditioned on forfeiture of expressive association rights.

Boy Scouts of America: Free speech and expressive association protect the right of an organization to choose its leaders.

Cato Institute: The doctrine of unconstitutional conditions prohibits Hastings from conditioning CLS’s access on surrender of its expressive rights of intimate association, speech, and religion.

Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence: The history of the early Republic, including early state constitutions and the Founders, indicates an intention to protect public expression of religious views.

Christian Services Charities and Pacific Justice Institute: Religious service providers’ access to state and federal employees’ charitable giving campaigns could be threatened by use of nondiscrimination policies to exclude religious groups from participation.

College Republicans National Committee, Students for Life America, and Republican National Lawyers Association: The decision below threatens political associations as well as religious ones.

Commissioned II Love, Cornerstone at Boise State University, and Kappa Upsilon Chi: National Legal Foundation explains that Hastings’ policy violated the unconstitutional conditions doctrine.

Eagle Forum Education & Legal Defense Fund: Hastings is imposing the equivalent of a heckler’s veto on first amendment rights; its exclusion of CLS is prohibited by Dale.

Twenty-two friend-of-the-Court briefs from across the religious, social, and ideological spectrum were filed in support of the Christian Legal Society chapter at Hastings. The briefs can be found at http://www.clsnet.org/center/litigation/cls-v-martinez-amicus-curiae-briefs-support.cls.

The amici and their primary arguments were:

Advocates International: The impact of an adverse decision on international religious liberty will be harmful.

Agudath Israel of America: The government may not relegate a religious group to second-class status because it uses religious criteria to choose its officers and voting members.

American Center for Law and Justice, Fellowship of Christian Athletes, InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, Campus Crusade for Christ, The Navigators, ReJOYce in Jesus Ministries, Inc., Fellowship of Catholic University Students, Campus Bible Fellowship International, Chi Alpha Campus Ministries, Young Life, Alpha Delta Chi, and Alpha Gamma Omega, Bridget Mergens, Wide Awake Productions, Choose Him: Application of a non-discrimination policy to a religious group is itself religious discrimination by the government.

American Islamic Congress, Coalition of African-American Pastors, National Council of Young Israel, National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference, Project Nur, Sikh American Legal Defense and Education Fund, and Sikh Coalition: Becket Fund explains that the right of religious association protects religious groups from governmental interference in their internal affairs, including religious groups’ right of self-governance to select their leaders and members.


Attorneys General Brief of States of Michigan, Alabama, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Louisiana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, and West Virginia: CLS’s First Amendment rights were violated by Hastings’ application of its policy.

Beta Upsilon Chi, Christian Medical and Dental Association, CLS Chapters’ Former Officers: Liberty Legal Institute’s brief details CLS chapters’ denial of recognition at several campuses, explaining that a religious student group’s recognition cannot be conditioned on forfeiture of expressive association rights.

Boy Scouts of America: Free speech and expressive association protect the right of an organization to choose its leaders.

Cato Institute: The doctrine of unconstitutional conditions prohibits Hastings from conditioning CLS’s access on surrender of its expressive rights of intimate association, speech, and religion.

Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence: The history of the early Republic, including early state constitutions and the Founders, indicates an intention to protect public expression of religious views.

Christian Services Charities and Pacific Justice Institute: Religious service providers’ access to state and federal employees’ charitable giving campaigns could be threatened by use of nondiscrimination policies to exclude religious groups from participation.

College Republicans National Committee, Students for Life America, and Republican National Lawyers Association: The decision below threatens political associations as well as religious ones.

Commissioned II Love, Cornerstone at Boise State University, and Kappa Upsilon Chi: National Legal Foundation explains that Hastings’ policy violated the unconstitutional conditions doctrine.

Eagle Forum Education & Legal Defense Fund: Hastings is imposing the equivalent of a heckler’s veto on first amendment rights; its exclusion of CLS is prohibited by Dale.

Continued on page 7.
**One Small Request Leads to a Major Supreme Court Case**

In September 2004, a group of Christian students at Hastings College of the Law decided to affiliate officially with CLS but were denied recognition because school officials deemed CLS’s Statement of Faith to be religious discrimination and its requirement that officers and voting members try to adhere to biblical standards for sexual conduct to be sexual orientation discrimination.

CLS explained that all students are welcome at its meetings and activities. CLS explained that it is unconcerned with a person’s sexual orientation but does insist that a person not engage in unrepentant sinful sexual conduct—heterosexual or homosexual—outside of traditional marriage.

CLS became the only student group ever denied recognition by Hastings. Every year, Hastings recognizes approximately 60 student groups that meet on a broad range of subjects, including the Democratic Caucus, Hastings Republican, a pro-life group, a pro-abortion group, Muslim Law Students, Jewish Law Students, Amnesty International, the Student Animal Legal Defense Fund, the Black Law Students, La Raza Law Students, and a multitude of ethnic groups.

**The Seventh Circuit and Ninth Circuit Clash**

Almost simultaneously, Southern Illinois University denied a CLS chapter recognition, claiming it discriminated on the basis of religion and sexual orientation. But that case quickly reached the Seventh Circuit, which ruled in CLS’s favor in 2006 in *Christian Legal Society v. Walker*. The Seventh Circuit held that the university had violated the CLS students’ free speech and expressive association rights to choose leaders who affirmed CLS’s religious beliefs.

The Hastings case moved much more slowly in the Ninth Circuit. The Hastings Outlaw chapter joined forces with the university as an official party opposed to CLS. The district court ruled that CLS’s speech would not be affected if non-Christians or unrepentant homosexual persons led its meetings. The district judge further ruled that even if CLS’s speech were affected, Hastings had a compelling interest in forcing CLS to allow any student to be its leader. On appeal, the Ninth Circuit affirmed in a two sentence memorandum decision after CLS waited three years for its case to be heard.

**The Supreme Court Agrees to Hear the Case**

The United States Supreme Court decides only about 80 cases a year out of about 5000 cases it is asked to review. But on December 7, 2009, the Court agreed to review the Ninth Circuit’s decision against CLS.

On January 28th, we filed our brief on the merits, a masterful piece of writing by Professor Michael McConnell, former judge on the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals and one of the foremost religious liberty scholars in the country. All briefs are available on the CLS website.

A week later, 22 friend-of-the-court briefs were filed in support of CLS by groups across the religious, political, and social spectrum. [See p. 5 & 7]. Almost every leading religious liberty scholar and practitioner authored one of these briefs, arguing that a religious group’s right to choose its leaders is a right at the core of the First Amendment’s protection.

We conclude our brief with a plea for a proper understanding of the First Amendment under which all organizations—religious, political, cultural, and social groups, including homosexual rights groups—share common ground in the need for freedom of association. We urge the Court not to permit the government to drive religious groups from the public square in the name of enforcing nondiscrimination laws—laws meant to protect religious groups, not suppress them.

---

1 [http://www.clsnet.org/sites/default/files/center/litigation/08-1371%20tsac%20EvangelicalScholars.pdf](http://www.clsnet.org/sites/default/files/center/litigation/08-1371%20tsac%20EvangelicalScholars.pdf)

Evangelical Scholars (including 24 former presidents of the Evangelical Theological Society), Evangelicals for Social Action, and National Association of Evangelicals: CLS’s Statement of Faith, including its standards of conduct for leaders and voting members, is anchored in the Bible as interpreted by Christians over the past two millennia.

Foundation for Individual Rights in Education: Widespread campus hostility exists toward conservative groups, both religious and nonreligious.

Gays and Lesbians for Individual Liberty: Freedom of association provides vital protection for all minority voices, including gay and lesbian Americans.

Justice and Freedom Fund: Expressive association is violated by Hastings’ application of its policy to CLS.

Liberty Counsel, Child Evangelism Fellowship, and Lamb’s Chapel: Nondiscrimination policies will be used by school districts to circumvent religious community and student groups’ right of equal access for after school meetings in elementary and secondary schools, including churches’ use of school facilities on weekends.

The Rutherford Institute: The early historical record regarding public universities (particularly Thomas Jefferson’s University of Virginia) reveals a pattern of freedom of association for student organizations, including religious ones.

Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America: An adverse decision will harm religious liberty for all religions.

United States Conference of Catholic Bishops: The state’s interest relating to sexual orientation should be described and examined in this case carefully.
Executive Director Musings

By Fred L. Potter

My regular devotional reading took me to these verses from Proverbs in the middle of our moot court preparation leading up to the oral argument at the U.S. Supreme Court in CLS v. Martinez.

I was struck by the power and practicality of these verses as I observed and occasionally contributed to the first rate work being done by the CLS legal team. I also observed the team members themselves, as persons. I repeatedly was struck by how much their careful, deliberate, and thorough preparation was punctuated by graciousness and kindness, both with each other and with our opponents. Readers can see the evidence of this in the written briefs as well as the tone and conduct of the oral argument itself. It also was pervasive in the unseen parts of the preparatory work.

My admiration for CLS member Michael McConnell increased through this process. I had heard of his outstanding work and reputation as he consistently bubbled to the top of everyone’s short list of best leaders for the CLS Supreme Court team. Then, in a wide variety of contexts, I observed first-hand the qualities lauded in these Proverbs displayed in their practical working out by this skilled craftsman as he finalized briefs and refined oral arguments in the defense of student religious liberties.

Thankfully, the same can be said for the Hastings Law CLS student chapter leaders who stood in the gap both when the case first arose and today. My first-hand field report to readers of this column, from observing both the students’ careful and thoughtful participation in (and prayers for) this effort and their actual conduct with fellow students and the media, is that you should have great hope for the future. These women and men are deeply committed to the Christ-walk in their profession, starting even in the largely hostile and philosophically “foreign land” of Hastings. They are to be commended. And you, CLS members nationwide, are to be thanked.

Your faithful support, path breaking and exemplary Christian walk, and prayers enabled CLS’s Law Student Ministries then and now to take steps toward even greater effectiveness.

These students and our advocacy team have committed this work to the Lord. I invite and encourage you to do likewise. Please be in prayer for the members of the Supreme Court and their clerks and other support staff as they render a decision which could shape the religious and First Amendment rights of students for decades.

Finally, the support of those 100+ individuals and organizations who signed on to one of the many amicus briefs advancing the principles we advocated was remarkable. This is a clear example of the Body of Christ coming together for common good. The consistency of the work and the prior ministry effectiveness of these organizations also brought support from other high quality professionals who, even though they do not share all of our beliefs, respect the way CLS advanced principled arguments in support of important liberties. Thanks to each one of those supporters as well.
**Clients Served**

We serve a great variety of nonprofit organizations including:

- Churches
- Parachurch ministries
- Denominational organizations
- Youth service organizations
- Arts organizations
- Rehabilitation organizations
- Museums
- Private schools
- Political organizations
- Radio and television broadcasting organizations
- Mission organizations
- Relief organizations
- Private foundations
- Supporting organizations
- Charitable trusts
- Nature preservation organizations
- Trade and professional associations
- And many more

**Services Offered**

We provide the following services to nonprofit organizations and their affiliates:

- Audits of financial statements
- Analysis of internal controls and risk assessment
- Tax compliance and planning services
- Facilitation of corporate structure planning
- Board governance advisory services
- Representation before the IRS, Department of Revenue or other taxing authorities
- Executive compensation analysis
- Other related services

**Multiple-Entity Structure Services**

We serve numerous nonprofit clients with complex corporate structures including organizations with:

- Taxable subsidiaries
- Title-holding corporations
- Controlled nonprofit organizations
- Operating local chapters
- Integrated auxiliaries
- Contractual affiliations
- Disregarded single-member limited liability companies (LLCs)
- Foreign affiliates

Our highly-experienced team also assists clients in establishing and maintaining multiple-entity structures.
Two years ago I visited China. For several years leading up to that adventure, I sensed God drawing my attention there. He had something there for me, something to teach me, something to show me. After being introduced to the Bible League’s Steve Chittenden over lunch and being told that he regularly smuggles Bibles into China, I knew that I was to go. Leading up to the trip, my anticipation and my appetite for the coming lesson grew with each new book I blazed through. These included Randy Alcorn’s Safely Home, Paul Hattaway’s Back to Jerusalem, and Brother Yun’s The Heavenly Man. Once in China, I discovered that “something” that God had for me—it was all about trust.

In my previous installment [See TCL – Winter 2010], I noted that trust is the only pathway to pleasing God; that trust is the means to freedom and victory; and that trust can unleash the miraculous power of God in our lives. It is that last one that always made me a bit uncomfortable—that miraculous power stuff. Most of my life, when I heard a message about faith and miracles, I squirmed in my chair. I knew that God can and does perform miracles. I just didn’t see any role for me in those events and I cringed a little at the suggestion that the measure of my faith had any relevance. As I think about it, it occurs to me that I never witnessed any miracles. They all came to me as great stories—but always other’s stories—never my own.

Where does trust come from?

A trusting heart brings with it incredible treasures. That’s what we saw plainly last time. Yet, for many of us, it is a great struggle. We would like to trust God, but it seems we just cannot muster it when we most need to. We wrestle with anxiety and control and fear. It is essential for us to know where the ability to trust God comes from. It is not genetic. It is not a personality style. And it is not predetermined. You are not destined to live with the status quo the rest of your life. Faith comes to us from Jesus. He is the author of our faith.¹ The writer of Hebrews tells us that He is both the author and perfecter. The Greek word translated “author” is “archegos,” a word that is used one other time in the Book of Hebrews. In chapter two, verse ten, Jesus is called the “author [archegos] of their salvation.”² Archegos comes from the Greek root “arche,” which is often translated as “origin” or “beginning.”³ For example, John 1:1–2 reads: “In the beginning [arche] was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was with God in the beginning [arche].”⁴ And now the Word, who was from the arche, dwells in us as our archegos.

So, with all of that in view, where is faith? Where can we find trust in our Heavenly Father? It’s right here within us, available for our use. The Author and Perfecter of my faith, “Christ in [me],”² has made available to me “every spiritual blessing in Christ.”³ Jesus trusts the Father, Jesus trusts the Father, Jesus trusts the Father. And He can do that through us. What a Savior!

How do we become more trusting?

Let me offer three suggestions. First, we should embrace trials and suffering. These are the purifiers of our faith. Pain, affliction, injustice, sorrow and loneliness are the tools that God is using to perfect our faith. The Apostle Paul says that he rejoices in his sufferings.⁴ This really seems crazy. Why would anyone do that? Well, because he says it produces perseverance,⁵ much like weight training strengthening the “trust muscle.” Paul tells us character produces hope.⁶ Author Bob Sorge says that “[h]ope is what happens when we see God changing us.”⁷ And recall that hope, that confident expectation of a promise fulfilled, is the second element of trust along with the first, belief. So, rather than camp in self-pity, which Brennan Manning calls “the archenemy of trust,”⁸ let’s embrace, even rejoice, because of our trials.

Secondly, in order to grow in trust, we must release our demand for clarity and understanding. Manning tells the story of a man who traveled to Calcutta to work with Mother
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The spirit of our times, according to Francis Schaeffer, is
naturalism. He writes: “If we are not careful, even though we
say we are biblical Christians and supernaturals, nevertheless
the naturalism of our generation tends to come in upon us.
It may infiltrate our thinking without our recognizing its
coming, like a fog creeping in through a window opened only
half an inch.” C.S. Lewis, in his essay Miracles, reveals
the byproduct of this worldview. He writes: “Whatever
experiences we may have, we shall not regard them as
miraculous if we already hold a philosophy which excludes
the supernatural.”

For too long I, and most of my generation, and nearly
everyone in our profession, have been dulled by the noxious
spirit of naturalism. I am like Elisha’s servant in need of
a prophet’s prayer that my eyes be opened to the unseen
reality. The supernatural presence of the Lord’s army wasn’t
far off. It was right there. All that Elisha’s servant needed was
better vision.

So, with an eye for the miraculous power of God, let’s
bring our trust to bear. To illustrate this battle of faith,

Teresa in search of answers. She asked him what she could
do for him, and he replied that he would like her to pray for
him. “For what?” she asked. “For clarity.” She refused. “No,
I will not do that.” Undoubtedly surprised by her response,
he asked her why, to which she answered, “Clarity is the last
you are clinging to and must let go of . . . I will pray
that you trust God.”

In the face of our obsession for answers for some
explanation of why we’re going through trials, Solomon
counsels us: “Trust God from the bottom of your heart; don’t
try to figure out everything on your own.”

Third, to grow in trust, let’s learn, and I mean really learn,
to pray. Andrew Murray says: “It is in prayer that Jesus teaches
and inspires faith.”

Hudson Taylor, the father of the faith
mission movement, understood this principle at just 19 years
of age. By then he had already set his sights on China, but he
wondered whether his trust in the Lord was strong enough
for this monumental undertaking. He writes: “When I get out
to China . . . I shall have no claim on any one for anything.
My only claim will be on God. How important to learn,
before leaving England, to move man through God by prayer
alone.”

Time after time, Taylor witnessed God answer his
very specific prayers. Over time, Taylor was able to trust God
more and more.

How can we put our trusting hearts into
battle to witness the miraculous?

I mentioned previously that I am reading the biography
of George Whitefield. Author Robert Philip points out
that Whitefield supported the right of Colonial Georgians
to own slaves and even became a slave owner himself.
Yet Philip exonerates Whitefield with these words: “But then,
[Whitefield] was not wiser than his times, on the subject of
slavery.”

Every age is characterized by a predominant spirit.
Our generation is no exception. The question is whether we
are blinded like Whitefield to that spirit and have, in any way,
“conformed to this world.”

For too long I, and most of my generation, and nearly
everyone in our profession, have been dulled by the noxious
spirit of naturalism. I am like Elisha’s servant in need of
a prophet’s prayer that my eyes be opened to the unseen
reality. The supernatural presence of the Lord’s army wasn’t
far off. It was right there. All that Elisha’s servant needed was
better vision.

So, with an eye for the miraculous power of God, let’s
bring our trust to bear. To illustrate this battle of faith,
consider Jehoshaphat, King of Judah. After his prayer, he
listened, and a prophet spoke for God saying, “[T]he battle
is not yours, but God’s. Go out to face them tomorrow, and
the Lord will be with you.” Jehoshaphat trusted this word
from God and implored the people of Judah to do the same.
So great was his confidence in God’s deliverance that he sent
the praise and worship team to the front of his army to thank
God for the victory even before it came to pass. God then
arranged the total slaughter of Jehoshaphat’s enemies, every
single one of them, without the army of Judah even so much
as lifting a sword. I encourage you to take some time to read
2 Chronicles chapter 20, and consider how Jehoshaphat
moved from fear to outrageous courage, and ultimately, to
miraculous victory.

I cannot here describe any of my adventures smuggling
Bibles. I will say, though, that God drew me to His work in
China to show me how little I trust Him and how much
more was available to me in this life, if I would. Specifically,
in China, He showed me His miraculous wonders. And it is
that power so frequently on display there which has fueled
the explosive growth in the Chinese church, from fewer than
a million Protestants in 1950 when Chairman Mao took
command to 100 million today.

Is it any wonder that revival has swept through China over
the last three decades? How about you? Has revival swept
over your heart? Can you trust Him for the perfectly-placed,
perfectly-timed lightning strike in your life, so that the power
of God might be revealed and many might come to salvation—
even those who would destroy you?

1 See Hebrews 12:2
2 See Colossians 1:27
3 See Ephesians 1:3
4 See Romans 5:3
5 See Romans 5:4
6 See Romans 5:4
7 Bob Sorge, The Fire of Delayed Answers (Kansas City, MO: Oasis House, 1996), p. 60
9 Ibid., p. 5
10 Proverbs 3:5 (The Message)
12 Howard Taylor, Hudson Taylor in Early Years (Singapore: OMF International, 1998), p. 131
14 See Romans 12:2 (NASB)
15 Francis A. Schaeffer, True Spirituality (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 1971), p. 60
17 See 2 Kings 6:16-17
18 See 2 Chronicles 20:15-17

Andy Toles is a partner with Ellis, Li & McKinstry in Seattle. He is a former CLS Board Member and founder of Open Door Legal Services, a ministry of Seattle’s Union Gospel Mission.
The Long-Term Benefits of Short-Term Mission Trips: One Lawyer’s Story

By Thomas Keiffer

By the look on Octavia’s face, it was as if my translator had introduced me as the devil himself. “Christian attorney” was at best an oxymoron for Octavia, a thickly muscled 60-something-year-old villager in post-communist Romania. She could not fathom how someone in a socioeconomic position so removed from her own could possibly care about her well-being. But when American lawyers step out of their comfort zones and into the foreign mission field, not only do they impact others with the love of Christ—they return forever changed.

Would you like to go on a short-term mission trip? When asked this question eight years ago, my response was that “I’d rather stay home and cut the grass, but I’ll help you go.” And so, I funded my friend’s mission trips for a couple of years. Little did I know of the consequences of such an investment.

“For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also.”

Matthew 6:21

For over 20 years, I have worked in various law firms and served as in-house counsel for a large corporation. But I was gripped by Ephesians 2:10, “[f]or we are God’s workmanship, created in Christ Jesus to do good works, which God prepared in advance for us to do.” Applying general rules of contract construction, I read this verse in context with other scriptures (see, e.g., 1 Corinthians 3:8 & John 15:5) and concluded that in addition to eternal life, God promises to reward us for what He does through us. That is a good deal. I had to find out what good works God had prepared for me to do.

I prayed, studied scripture, sought counsel and even fasted. No answers, until my missionary friend invited me a third time to experience the harvest field in Romania.

Did you ever dream of being in court when your case is called, but you are totally unprepared? That’s how I felt as I was walking into the village of Lacu Sarat (Lake of Salt) in southeastern Romania. Why had I not memorized more scripture? How can I explain the Bible, much less through a translator? God, you better do something, because I can do nothing. We are weak but God is strong.

When I entered the village and saw the people, I was given compassion for them. I did not have compassion before I went. I went, I saw, and then I had compassion. It was as if God had the gift of compassion waiting for me to receive when I arrived in the village and saw the people. I saw them through God’s eyes and fell in love with them. There is an important sequence that must not be overlooked: go, see and have compassion. It is one thing to see the aftermath of the earthquake in Haiti on television, and it is quite another to go there and see the people and have compassion for them in person. “And when He approached [Jerusalem], He saw the city and wept over it ….” Luke 19:41 (emphasis added as we attorneys like to say).

Back to Octavia: she looked like she wanted to stone me out of fear that I was a cult member trying to infiltrate her village. A crowd was forming. My translator was getting nervous and wanted to leave. But I had come halfway around the world, and like any good attorney I wanted to ask a few questions. I told Octavia that if what she believed about God was true, then those beliefs could stand up to scrutiny.

“Da” (yes), she agreed with arms crossed. I then informed her, “With your permission, I am going to ask you several questions. Please respond ‘yes’ or ‘no.’ You will be given an opportunity to elaborate. Are you ready to proceed?” Sheepishly, she said “da.” As the crowd and the drama mounted, I asked her these questions:

Q. Octavia, one day you are going to die?
A. Da.

Q. When you die, you would rather go to heaven than to hell?
A. Da.

Q. In order to enter into heaven, you have to be a “good person”—isn’t that right?
A. Da.

Q. If God’s standard for being “good” is perfection, do you have a problem?

The conviction of the Holy Spirit is a tremendous blessing to witness in a person’s life. Octavia saw the problem that her...
religion could not solve. Understanding the bad news perhaps for the first time in her life, she responded softly, “Da” (I have a problem). Our eyes locked as I told her that the only reason I was in her village was to share the Gospel of Jesus Christ. If she would put her faith in Him, He would put His life in her as a free gift. On this basis, she could enter heaven. She said that no one had ever told her this good news. Octavia was born again that day. She kissed my hands and hugged me with tears streaming down her cheeks as we said our goodbyes.

It was through my experiences in the mission field that I came to learn about the good works that God has prepared for me. My gifting and passion intersected with God’s purpose and plan. I also learned that planting a church is not building a building—it’s nurturing another part of the body of Christ wherever the Gospel takes root.

Notwithstanding much fear and trepidation, I recently decided to close down my solo practice and to accept a staff position with a church planting ministry. In addition to leading short-term mission trips, I will serve as liaison for foreign counsel on non-governmental organization (NGO) permitting issues and assist with making grant proposals to Christian foundations. I also reactivated my dormant membership with the Christian Legal Society, and look forward to encouraging others in or entering our profession to consider the long-term benefits of short-term mission trips.

Have you discovered the answer to the Ephesians 2:10 question? A short-term mission trip can serve as a catalyst in your life, yielding long-term (and eternal) benefits. You can grow in the Lord and at the same time learn how He intends for your calling to be integrated in the legal profession. Leave your comfort zone and discover God’s adventure for your life.

Thomas Keiffer is a Church Planter with e3 Partners Ministry. He resides in Mandeville, Louisiana, and can be reached at 985-624-2992. For more information, visit www.e3partners.org/thomaskeiffer.
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Internet Marketing: Best Practices for Law Firms

By Steve Hoeft

Your clients no longer surf the web—they search for solutions. With more than 250 million searches per day, how do you compete, knowing you have the best marketing plan and are spending the least amount possible? Let us help you learn about the available internet technologies, including social media, and the solutions that provide the highest Return on Investment, specific to law firms (yes, you are different). For example, although we will rank order the top five social media options e.g., Blogs, YouTube, twitter, etc., there are two that have historically provided the best return per dollar spent.

The bottom line is law firms who understand these internet and social media solutions can generate new business and deepen existing client relationships in ways that are much more cost effective and less expensive than traditional marketing.

Integrated Marketing Approach

Your goals may include increased awareness and traffic, converting quality leads to clients, retaining and cross selling existing clients across multiple practice groups. If you want 3 new clients a quarter, do you need 30 new leads, or do you need to convert twice as many existing leads? It’s always a combination of factors that produce the best performance. The most effective marketing campaign integrates Acquisition, Conversion, Retention/Cross-sell to achieve breakthrough results.

Integrated Marketing Solution

Most law firms manage their marketing campaigns as projects, which misses the opportunity for an integrated approach combined with accountability, testing and learning. The following illustrative example is a multi-month plan that allocates costs through time and provides the framework for building new business results in a solid, steady manner. The highest return on investment is #1) SEO with appropriate social media; #2) e-Mail and #3) pay per click advertising (The Marketing Sherpa as reported in eMarketer.com).
If you are thinking about a legal career or know someone who is—please visit law.liberty.edu/info, call 434-592-5300, or email lawadmissions@liberty.edu.

Liberty law students and alumni are high achievers: championship competitive teams, high bar passage rates, and legal positions in every sector.

At Liberty University School of Law, law is studied in the context of the Western legal tradition and the Christian worldview. Students learn professional skills in one of the most innovative lawyering skills programs anywhere. The culture at Liberty encourages faith and the desire to do justice, as well as career preparation and success.

SEARCH ENGINE OPTIMIZATION: SEO
- add one landing page per month to dramatically increase organic search engine results (this is the #1 SEO strategy for results) Research: 71% of traffic from search engines go to a landing page, not your home page. Source: Marketing Sherpa, 10/07
- optimize and update each website landing page, every quarter, with keywords and descriptions specific to that page
- review competitive law firms use of pay per click; ad spending; and keywords. Note: the goal is not to know what they are doing so you can follow their lead, but to understand the competitor’s tactics, so you can leverage what they aren’t doing
- add one optimized press release per quarter

SOCIAL MEDIA
- add blog and two posts per week
- add LinkedIn accounts for lawyers who understand it

PAY PER CLICK
- set up pay per click in geographic area where law firm does business
- analyze results monthly

E-MAIL
- set up 6 ‘touch point’ events over a 15 month period
- communication content may include:
  — news and updates
  — breakfast briefing
  — VIP speaker series
  — special event invitation
  — attorney announcements
  — PR releases
  — surveys
  — holiday greetings

ANALYTICS
- monthly reporting on progress, trends, insight
The illustrated internet marketing plan above recommends the Social Media ‘must-have’ components, Blogs and LinkedIn. Law Firms are using every social media option (limited examples below), and your decision is based on where your target audience is most active. The following tutorial provides a description, reasons for using the media, and law firm examples. The Social Media options are ranked by their importance to the legal industry:

**BLOGS:** A blog (a contraction of the term “web log”) is a type of website, or included within a website to allow regular commentary on a particular subject(s). A typical blog combines text, images, and links to other blogs and may allow an interactive format. “Blog” is also used as a verb meaning to “maintain or add content.”

- **Reasons to Consider a Blog:**
  - allows clients to know more about your specialty and how you think
  - at its core, a blog is a mini-website, and can be easily distributed, shared and referenced
  - although many of the “Virtual Law Office” websites are blog websites, many traditional law firms opt for a separate blog with links to their website due to interpretations on the model rules for professional conduct
  - blogs deliver timely, relevant content; it is your ‘instant newsletter’
  - blogs allow law firms to connect with clients who share similar interests on particular topics
  - blogs help your organic search engine rankings

**LinkedIn** is a business-focused social networking site used for professional networking. As of January, 2010 LinkedIn had more than 55 million registered users spanning more than 200 countries worldwide. Registered users maintain a list of contact details of people they know and trust. The ‘gated-access’ approach (where contact with any professional requires either a pre-existing relationship or the intervention of a contact of theirs) has built trust among LinkedIn users and is the main reason it has become the preferred social portal for professionals.

**Reasons to Consider LinkedIn:**
- to gain an introduction to someone you wish to know through a mutual, trusted contact
- to find jobs and business opportunities
- to ask a trusted friend if they know a professional who can help them in a given situation
- to list jobs
- to review a person’s profile before doing business with them

**Facebook** lets you connect with people who have similar interests. It has come a long way since its original use as a network for college students. What makes Facebook different from other social networks is its extensive privacy controls and its sheer size. With over 350 million users worldwide, Facebook has surpassed e-mail as the most frequently used tool online.

**Reasons to Consider Facebook:**
- many attorneys are providing a facebook link from their law firm’s attorney profile, for the SEO benefits.
- some law firms have a facebook account and use it to share articles and news with their ‘fans,’ and conduct polls on services, trends, stats, etc.

**YouTube** is the leader in online video, and the premier destination to watch and share original videos worldwide. YouTube allows people and companies to easily upload and share video clips through websites, mobile devices, blogs, and email.

**Reasons to Consider YouTube:**
- video version of your firm’s blog posts
- testimony
- provide insights on specialty, “Top Ten Tips before you meet with a Bankruptcy Attorney”
Twitter is an online portal for continual (think daily) updates, where people stay connected through the exchange of one simple question “What’s happening?” “Tweets” are text-based posts of up to 140 characters. Its inherent nature as a real time news feed, its ever-growing population (8 million plus users in March 2009) and its low cost of use (it’s free only cost is resources) makes it an ideal business tool.

REASONS TO CONSIDER TWITTER:
• to demonstrate your expertise and authority on a topic(s)
• to provide quick news, with links to your website
• to conduct research and ask questions and get answers
• to build SEO
• to build trust and a loyal community

Conclusion
There are an estimated 250 million online searches each day. eMarketer predicts 96.2 million U.S. internet users will visit social networking sites at least once a month in 2010. Google estimates that consumers search online for legal services 27% of the time, but law firms spend only 5% on online marketing, resulting in a significant untapped audience. As you consider internet marketing and social media, the important thing is to get involved, as wisely as possible, as inexpensively as possible, and learn from it. The bottom line is law firms who understand these internet and social media solutions can generate new business and deepen existing client relationships in ways that are much more cost effective and less expensive than traditional marketing.

Steve Hoeft is the president of Raising The Standard, LLC, in St. Louis, MO. RTS is a member of CLS and led a workshop at our 2009 National Conference. You can reach Steve at SteveHoeft@RaisingTheStandard.com, or 636-482-4200. His website is www.RaisingTheStandard.com
**Christian Legal Aid Clinics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Clinic Name</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARIZONA</strong></td>
<td>Phoenix Christian Legal Aid</td>
<td>Steve Keist, Director</td>
<td>(602) 937-9799 <a href="mailto:skeist@keistlaw.com">skeist@keistlaw.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Arizona Chapter Christian Legal Aid Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>(520) 694-4445 <a href="mailto:jimmegrichardson@msn.com">jimmegrichardson@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td><em>Christian Legal Aid Office</em></td>
<td>William Crosby, President</td>
<td>Intake Line: (714) 769-7900 <a href="mailto:help@christianlegalaidoffice.com">help@christianlegalaidoffice.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Christian Legal Aid of Los Angeles</em></td>
<td>Sarah Na Olney, Executive Director</td>
<td>(323) 319-3559 <a href="mailto:christianlegalaid@yahoo.com">christianlegalaid@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Pepperdine University Legal Aid Clinic</em></td>
<td>Brittany S. Otey, Director</td>
<td>(213) 347-6300 <a href="mailto:Brittany.Stringfellow@pepperdine.edu">Brittany.Stringfellow@pepperdine.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLORADO</strong></td>
<td>Christian Legal Clinic of Metro Denver</td>
<td>Jim Helfrich</td>
<td>(720) 214-2793 <a href="mailto:jh@ghlawoffice.com">jh@ghlawoffice.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecumenical Christian Legal Services of Colorado Springs</td>
<td>Steve Ezell</td>
<td>(719) 471-4511 <a href="mailto:estevene@aol.com">estevene@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DELWARE</strong></td>
<td>Mission Legal Aid Clinic</td>
<td>Rev. Tom Laymon, Executive Director</td>
<td>(302) 652-8314 <a href="mailto:tlaymon@sundaybreakfastmission.org">tlaymon@sundaybreakfastmission.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</strong></td>
<td>Archdiocesan Legal Network</td>
<td>James Quinn, Clinic Coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:appalawclinic1@yahoo.com">appalawclinic1@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEORGIA</strong></td>
<td>Diakonia Christian Legal Services, Inc.</td>
<td>Jason Waymire, Executive Director</td>
<td>(706) 208-1220 <a href="mailto:jcowaym@yahoo.com">jcowaym@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILLINOIS</strong></td>
<td>Christian Legal Aid of Covenant Life Church</td>
<td>Christy Sullivan, Clinic Coordinator</td>
<td>(301) 869-2800 ext. 295 <a href="mailto:csullivan@covlife.org">csullivan@covlife.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KANSAS</strong></td>
<td>Wichita Christian Legal Aid Clinic</td>
<td>Craig Shultz</td>
<td>(316) 269-3284 <a href="mailto:craig@shultzlaw.net">craig@shultzlaw.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARYLAND</strong></td>
<td>Legal Aid Ministry of Baltimore, Inc.</td>
<td>Matt Paavola, Interim Director</td>
<td>(410) 574-8000 <a href="mailto:mtpaavola@legalaidbaltimore.org">mtpaavola@legalaidbaltimore.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MICHIGAN</strong></td>
<td>Christian Legal Aid of Southeast Michigan</td>
<td>Douglas L. Toering, Director</td>
<td>(248) 269-2020 <a href="mailto:dttoering@aol.com">dttoering@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian Legal Aid of Southwest Michigan</td>
<td>Michael Willis</td>
<td>(269) 492-1040 <a href="mailto:mjwillis@vwwplc.com">mjwillis@vwwplc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MINNESOTA</strong></td>
<td><em>Staffed CLA clinics; others are all-volunteer clinics.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Staffed CLA clinics; others are all-volunteer clinics.
‘Without opportunity on the part of the poor to obtain expert legal advice, it is idle to talk of equality before the law.’
— Charles Evans Hughes, former U.S. Supreme Court Justice and Legal Aid Society president, 1917–1920
missing some vague point, or a precedent case, or a nuance of a law, or a judge with a stomach ulcer.

A Baptist should make a good lawyer because the law demands total immersion. A lawyer will not see a clock, hear their stomach growl, or remember an anniversary, birthday, or dental appointment when they are in the trenches. Accordingly, a lawyer’s spouse must be a combination of Mother Teresa, Clara Barton, and Molly Pitcher. They must have thick skin and a tender spirit.

After your lawyer has spent the day slogging around in the muck and mire of conflict, be ready to “wash his or her feet” as they come home. Help them find a sanctuary in the Presence of God. Be ready to bind wounds to their ego as well as to their spirit.

The lawyer’s spouse will need to be a listener, even if it extends into pillow talk time. You don’t need to understand the current case. You do need to understand your spouse. Pray often for your lawyer spouse during each day, and pray for those they encounter in the court room. Be sure to send your lawyer spouse back into the trenches each day with words of love, encouragement and confidence.

The following remarks were adapted from a presentation to young lawyers’ wives at a conference of The Christian Legal Society in the Ozark area of Arkansas and Missouri in 1997.

On my wedding day in 1953 the only lawyers I knew were my groom and his law school friends. I had heard one or two lawyers discussed in my parent’s home, but I had never met one. I was not even sure what a lawyer did. I knew that lawyers were right up there with the doctors when it came to prestige. I also knew that lawyers were sometimes objects of unkind remarks.

Even as a recent college graduate, I hadn’t known a lawyer personally until the brother of my friend, Virginia, came home from law school. Even though I had heard bad as well as good about lawyers, I decided invoking the name of a lawyer was good for mileage in most situations. Since Ken Peery had been practicing for a whole year in our home-town and we attended the same church, I used him for a character reference as I prepared my teaching credentials for the Placement Office. Ken complied and wrote a wonderful recommendation for me. Then he convinced himself that I could be as good a wife as a teacher. I set out to teach him that he was right.

The first thing I learned about lawyers: They are unteachable.

Over the years I have learned other things: Lawyers do more than just send letters to intimidate people. Lawyers will spend hours pouring over books containing pages with double “esses” stacked one on top of the other. They spend days preparing the exact wording of each plea and document. They become respecters of persons. Their days are full of conflict. They wage wars in shallow trenches protected only by the extent of their research. They are caught in a trap of being fearless defenders of clients while being fearful of
Advocates International is mobilizing advocates worldwide for the following seven task forces:

- **Rule of Law Global Task Force** works to secure judicial independence and prevent government corruption.
- **Justice for the Poor Global Task Force** works to ensure equal access to justice for the poor and oppressed.
- **Peace and Reconciliation Global Task Force** works to foster forgiveness and restoration within individuals, families, communities, and nations.
- **Prayer Global Task Force** works with pre-existing prayer networks to intercede on behalf of each Global Task Force all over the world.
- **Family and Community Global Task Force** works to preserve the Biblical foundations necessary for effective marriages and communities.
- **Religious Freedom Global Task Force** works to establish religious freedom for all, particularly the most persecuted.
- **Sanctity of Life Global Task Force** works to defend the dignity of human life from conception to natural death.

*Please visit our website to find out how you can join or support a task force and make a difference.*
eNgage: A Ministry

By Jerald Monson & Christopher Rhyme

With couches circled at the center of a campus community room, coffee cups and Bibles in hand, we began our first early morning meeting by handing out pencils and blank sheets of paper. We challenged the dozen men gathered to scribble their greatest struggles down before folding their page and placing it in a small cardboard box. Sheltered by the security unique to anonymity, they responded by revealing some of the most vulnerable areas of their lives. As the last paper slid into the box, the group sat as intelligent, successful, and outwardly impressive individuals cloaked by an uncomfortable anxiety. We had each just admitted to realities we worked hard to hide from the world—often even from ourselves. However, as each paper was unfolded and read, truth chased the anxiety away. In its place was relief and peace in knowing that these struggles were universally experienced though seldom discussed. This first show of courage pried open the door of isolation that law school is particularly adept at pounding shut. As a result, God’s Spirit has transformed many of us. It is for that reason that we compose this article—to encourage those of you with a similar burden for deep, legitimate connection and to rouse that same courage within you to enjoy its fruit.

‘EVERYONE NEEDS ARMOR BEARERS—NOT JUST LAW STUDENTS.’

is particularly adept at pounding shut. As a result, God’s Spirit has transformed many of us. It is for that reason that we compose this article—to encourage those of you with a similar burden for deep, legitimate connection and to rouse that same courage within you to enjoy its fruit.

eNgage found its beginning in our individual burdens for deep, purposeful relationships. As I traversed the country in my fully loaded sedan making the move to attend law school, I found myself lamenting one particular situation. My decision to relocate for school resulted in an inability to live daily life in a close, transparent way with several significant friends. Chris has a similar story. He left a remarkable discipleship group led by one of his undergraduate theology professors and so left a gaping hole in his heart for meaningful relationships. Over the weeks that followed, Chris and I became increasingly aware of this void as it weighed on our individual hearts. Buried in case law, we also perceived law school’s unique contribution to the void. More alarming to us both, however, was the resurgence of a variety of temptations we each thought conquered years before. Social options loomed around us offering opportunities to drown stress and anxiety.
发展趋势

Fortune said, “He was never a man, but he was a man who was never a beggar.”

The results of such initiative are best related through the words of the committed men who make eNgage the life changing and God-glorying resource that it is. As Aaron E. describes, eNgage has provided for “spiritual growth at a time when many people shut out the outside world and neglect their spiritual life, assuming they can pick things up after law school is over.” Similarly, Craig notes that “it is easy for law students to feel justified in making compromises in their relationship with Christ.” However, both have found a committee among the members of eNgage that Craig says “allows for a bond of unity and trust [he] would never have thought possible among law students.” Jeremiah describes it as “a haven of spiritual connection” that “defeats law school’s isolating tendencies.” He has found in the men of eNgage “the desire to be servants of God willing to place aspirations and abilities behind his grace.” Brent says that such willingness has allowed for his “closest law school relationships” to be formed. He calls law school’s innate competitive nature its “primary social limitation” and observes that it “constrains relationships to superficiality.” But, Brent has shared with the members of eNgage things that he has never spoken of before law school.

What’s the secret? As Nate observes, “In a culture that pushes individuality, Christ followers ‘bear one another’s burdens’ (Gal. 6:2). In a society that says, ‘keep it to yourself,’ Christians ‘confess their sins to one another’ (James 5:16). The Biblical prescription for spiritual advancement is community and this is the purpose of eNgage: to interlock, to mesh together.”

More specifically, Aaron W. explains that it’s more than “friendship rounding the corner of accountability.” He says, “Every Wednesday morning, I knew there would be twelve other guys who expected me to join them in prayer on our knees… eNgage vividly proved to me the truth of Jesus Christ’s promise in Matthew 6:33.”

As all these men relate, by seeking God together in transparency they have become armor bearers to one another. Our prayer is that men and women across the country are similarly inspired to walk into meaningful community. Everyone needs armor bearers—not just law students. Where applicable, use eNgage as a template, and reach out to us with thoughts, opportunities, or questions as to our success and struggles.

---

Jer Monson is originally from Owatonna, Minnesota, and completed his undergraduate studies at Carthage College. He is in his second year of a joint J.D./M.B.A. program at Pepperdine. Chris Rhyme is from Denver, Colorado, and completed his B.A. at Seattle Pacific University. He is a second year Pepperdine Law student and a Palmer Fellow. E-mail Jer at Jared.Monson@Pepperdine.edu or e-mail Chris at Christopher.Rhyme@Pepperdine.edu.
Muzzled!

By Sam Ericsson

Muzzled! No one likes to be muzzled. None of us like to be told to be quiet about what we believe.

MUZZLING JESUS FAILED:
Muzzling believers is nothing new. In fact, they tried to muzzle Jesus. They thought his crucifixion would be the ultimate muzzle. But Jesus told his disciples, “If I be lifted up [crucified], I will draw all men to me!” The Cross has been The Symbol everywhere.

MUZZLING JESUS’ FOLLOWERS FAILED:
Jesus charged his disciples to be his witnesses. They refused to be muzzled. The Acts of the Apostles are stories of men and women who were told to stop sharing the Good News and were threatened with prison and death. They refused to be muzzled: “We must obey God, rather than man.” For 2,000 years, the Adversary tried to muzzle Christians by persecution but this simply added fuel to their witness.

THE GOLDEN THREAD:
Freedom of expression is the thread weaving together basic rights. Freedom of conscience is empty if all you can do is keep your beliefs parked in your brain. Freedom of religion is meaningless if the right to express those beliefs is denied. What value is the freedom of association if one can’t meet with those of like mind? Freedom of the press is another manifestation of the freedom of expression.

MUZZLING LOCAL CHURCHES FAILED:
My first religious liberty case was in 1973 when three atheists circulated a petition to prevent Grace Community Church in Los Angeles from building a new worship center. As a member of the Board of Elders, I met with each atheist to hear their concerns. The building was not the real issue. The Church’s beliefs were. Elders and deacons went two-by-two, house-by-house sharing our plans. We invited input on landscaping, parking and even the height & color of the concrete-block fences. 321 of the 327 neighbors switched from the atheists’ petition to ours. The Los Angeles City Council gave Grace its permit, along with a calligraphy commending Grace for “loving its neighbors.”

MUZZLING CHURCH COUNSELORS FAILED:
In 1980, Grace Church and four pastors were sued in the first-ever “clergy malpractice” case. The lawyer who sued the church told me that pastors were not competent to counsel unless they had psychology degrees. The nine-year case ended with a historic decision by California’s Supreme Court barring suits against church counselors, as well as all non-licensed therapists. The decision has been followed everywhere.

MUZZLING HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS:
In 1975, six students in Huntington Beach, California were told that it was illegal to meet for student-led Bible studies at lunchtime. The Supreme Court had barred state-initiated, school-sponsored and teacher-
‘CLS HAS BEEN INVOLVED IN 17 LAWSUITS AGAINST LAW SCHOOLS DENYING EQUAL ACCESS TO STUDENTS … CLS HAS WON EVERY CASE.’

led devotional exercises, but not student-initiated, student-led meetings with religious content. CLS launched the Center for Law & Religious Freedom in 1976 and the student “equal access” battle has been a defining issue for CLS ever since.

MUZZLING UNIVERSITY STUDENTS FAILED:
In 1976, a group of students at the University of Missouri were barred from a Bible study on the campus lawn. CLS member James M. Smart, III, had just hung out his law office shingle but had no clients. The students had no money. It was a perfect match! On December 8, 1981, the Supreme Court ruled 8-1 in Widmar v. Vincent that public universities cannot deny “equal access” to student-led Bible studies.

REMOVING MUZZLES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS:
I joined the CLS staff as Director of its Center in 1980. Kim Colby, a 1981 Harvard grad, joined our staff as a volunteer in October 1981. We wrote a 7-page memo for Senator Mark Hatfield urging application of Widmar to high schools. On June 2, 1982, Hatfield presented the memo to Congress as the answer to the decades-long school prayer controversy. After a two-year battle in Congress we won and President Reagan signed the Equal Access Act on August 11, 1984. On June 4, 1990, the Supreme Court upheld the students’ right to meet. Millions of students have benefited since 1984.

REMOVING THE MUZZLES ON LAW STUDENTS:
CLS and other groups have gone to court hundreds of times representing students barred from holding campus Bible studies. CLS has been involved in 17 lawsuits against law schools denying equal access to students because the CLS Standard of Conduct limits sexual activities to a man and woman who are married. Adultery, fornication and other sexual relations are out for leaders. CLS has won every case.

THE CURRENT SUPREME COURT CASE:
In Christian Legal Society Chapter of University of California, Hastings College of Law v. Leo P. Martinez, a student Chapter was barred from campus because of the CLS Standard of Conduct. The District Court and the 9th Circuit ruled against the students. The Supreme Court granted review. In January, 2010, Kim Colby, now directing the Center, along with three former Center staff counsel (now working for ADF), and former Federal Appeals Court Judge, Michael W. McConnell (who helped CLS in the 1980s and 1990s), filed a powerful brief in the Supreme Court.

ADVOCATES’ BRIEF IN THE SUPREME COURT:
Advocates International filed a Friend of the Court brief in CLS v. Martinez, underscoring the global impact if law schools can muzzle freedom of expression. Our brief, written in by AI’s General Counsel, Sam Casey, offers a perspective that AI is uniquely positioned to articulate. Sam 2 was CLS Executive Director when Martinez was filed. In 20 of the cases cited in the main brief, CLS played a significant role. It’s been a great run!

MUZZLING BIBLE PUBLISHING IN MALAYSIA:
On December 31, 2009, a Malaysian court ruled that the Malay Bible could use the Malay word “Allah” as their word for God. Religious extremists retaliated by firebombing a dozen churches, including the one of Advocates Asia’s regional leader and AI Board member, Min Choon Lee. The decision is under review. Malaysia’s Christian lawyers seek to prevent muzzling the Gospel. AI’s network is engaged.

MUZZLING CONTRARIAN VIEWS:
In Holland, a politician faces a criminal trial for violating Holland’s “Hate Speech Law.” He’s expressed concerns as to the threat to Holland and its culture by the huge influx of Muslim immigrants and their refusal to assimilate or embrace Dutch values. The Politically Correct mindset in Holland, and voices within the Muslim community, want to muzzle contrarian views on Islam and immigration. AI’s network is engaged.

THANK GOD!
In sum, the freedom of expression – weaving together the freedoms of conscience, religion, association and press – is a God-endowed gift that we often take for granted. Let’s thank God for the freedom we have as advocates engaged in protecting this freedom for now and future generations.

Sam Ericsson is a graduate of Harvard Law School and is the president of Advocates International, which he launched in the early 1990s.
CLS regularly advances the causes of public justice, and has served the common good by advocating for religious freedom. This is not, as some might think, firstly looking out for our own freedoms, but, rather, an insistence that religious liberty is one of the foundational freedoms of any civil society. While there are flamboyant books from various extreme quarters, here are some for the thoughtful legal theorist, practicing attorney, student, or anyone wanting a judicious perspective from a mature Christian worldview.

The Case for Civility: And Why Our Future Depends on It Os Guinness (HarperOne) Christians above all people should be respectful and well-mannered, showing forth the fruits of God’s Spirit, even as we debate robustly in public. This remarkable book goes much further than calling for good manners in our public discourse. Guinness uses his considerable political knowledge to show how freedom of (and from) religion was a genius idea of the founders of our nation.

Using the second amendment, Guinness shows how we can forge a structure that takes religion seriously, allowing for full rights of expression, yet refrains from religious take-overs or impositions. He wisely compares the secularizing “naked public square” and the religious “sacred public square” and invites us to a better framework—the “cosmopolitan public square” that is civil and pluralistic. “Let America be America,” he writes, helping keep the world (as JFK put it) “safe for diversity.”

Between Relativism and Fundamentalism: Religious Resources for a Middle Position Peter Berger, editor (Eerdmans) This sophisticated collection offers fabulous insights about the nature of both sides of the modernist coin, relativism and fundamentalism. Written by evangelical, Catholic, and Orthodox Christians, and a conservative Jewish scholar, these essays bring to light the ways in which faith can help us navigate the conundrums of pluralism in a deeply divided world. Chapters include authors such as Craig Gay (whose piece describing different evangelical perspectives on political thinking is worth the price of the book), James Davison Hunter, Os Guinness and others who plumb the relationships between religion, culture, and law. Berger is an esteemed sociologist at Boston University.

The Freedom of Faith-Based Organizations to Staff On A Religious Basis Carl Esbeck, Stanley Carlson-Thies and Ronald J. Sider (Center for Public Justice) CLS member, law professor and former government official Carl Esbeck helped draft what has come to be known as Charitable Choice. Stanley Carlson-Thies now runs a consulting ministry helping organizations or local governments apply and conform to legal statutes about non-discrimination and freedom of religion. This monograph adds light to heated debates by examining the legal, constitutional, and policy dimensions of this practical issue. This is the best brief book on the topic.

Catholicism and Religious Freedom: Contemporary Reflections on Vatican II’s Declaration on Religious Liberty edited by Kenneth Grasso and Robert Hunt (Rowman & Littlefield) The scholarly traditions on religious freedom from within the Roman Catholic community are serious and profound. This is doubtlessly one of the best collections of thinking about this issue yet done. A few non-Catholics weigh in as well, including some scholars well known in CLS circles. Few know much about Dignitatis Humanae and this splendid resource can help change that.

A Season for Justice: Defending the Rights of the Christian Home, Church, and School David French (Broadman Holman) French is a graduate of Harvard Law and edited Harvard Journal of Law. He specializes in First Amendment litigation and serves on the InterVarsity Religious Freedom Crisis Team. This is written from the trenches, offering glimpses of the legal battles within these arenas. It is passionate, clear, and very informative about the legal attacks on people of faith.
**Ecclesiastes 1:9**

"What has been will be again, what has been done will be done again; there is nothing new under the sun."

---

**Editor's Note:** This report was originally published in the CLS Quarterly magazine, Volume III, Nos. 1 & 2, 1982, in the debut of Center Piece, “a feature of the Society’s Center for Law and Religious Freedom.” Thomas Brandon, Jr. served CLS as General Counsel and Assistant Executive Director in the 1980s.

---

**Supreme Court Grants Students Right to Meet on Campus**

*Widmar v. Vincent* Hailed as Landmark Decision for Religious Freedom

By Thomas Brandon, Jr.

On December 8, 1981, the U.S. Supreme Court announced its decision in *Widmar v. Vincent*. The decision could well prove to be one of the Supreme Court’s most important decisions in the First Amendment area. The Supreme Court held that any state university which makes its facilities available to student groups must make those facilities equally available to religious student groups. While the wisdom of this evenhanded rule seems obvious, most lower court decisions had gone the other way.

In the early stages of the *Widmar* case, a federal district court held that the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment not only permitted but required the University of Missouri to prevent the use of University buildings and grounds “for purposes of religious worship or teaching.” As a result the University was at first able to ban an active group of Christian students, called “Cornerstone,” from meeting for worship, prayer, and Bible study in the community where they lived, the college campus.

The Center for Law and Religious Freedom notes that other courts have tolerated similar infringements on the free exercise of religion by students. In Seattle a federal judge allowed Western Washington State University to restrict religious student groups to only two on-campus meetings per semester. (*Dittman v. Western Washington State University*). In California, a state court held that high school students could not meet in a Bible club on an equal basis with other school clubs (*Johnson v. Huntington Beach Union High School District*). The Supreme Court’s *Widmar* decision, says CLS Executive Director Lynn Buzzard, “blunts a serious threat to religious liberty.”

The constitutional principle involved in these cases, he says, is “crucial” to First Amendment liberties. Buzzard explains:

> “The Establishment Clause was originally intended to guarantee government neutrality toward religions, but it has been misused at times to drive religion out entirely from public institutions in the name of an absolutist concept of separation of church and state. By striking a blow for government neutrality toward religion, *Widmar* helps to restore the First Amendment as a shield protecting religious liberty rather than a sword attacking it.”

The Center participated in the *Widmar* case by filing a “friend of the court” brief in favor of the Cornerstone group. Representing the students at oral argument before the Supreme Court was CLS and Center member James M. Smart, an attorney from Kansas City. The Center now plans to analyze the effects of the *Widmar* decision on a broad range of religious freedom cases which have arisen frequently on state school campuses in recent years. *Widmar v. Vincent* is expected to have a dramatic effect on the many state universities that have restricted Christians and other student religious groups by preventing meetings on campus, limiting evangelism on campus, and preventing speakers from talking about religion.

Individual Christians, churches, and parachurch groups can now be assured that they will enjoy on campus the same rights to speak and assemble that non-religious and anti-religious groups enjoy. Any denial of equal rights for religious speech must be struck down under the holding of the *Widmar* decision since such regulation “violates the fundamental principle that a state regulation of speech should be content-neutral.”

While the Court terms the basis of its decision “narrow,” it should be observed that the decision rests on a principle of utmost importance and it will therefore go far to protect religious freedom in this country.

*Widmar helps to restore the First Amendment as a shield protecting religious liberty rather than a sword attacking it.*
What is the Sound of One Hand ________?

By Brent McBurney

There is a traditional Zen riddle which asks, “What is the sound of one hand clapping?” Naturally, such a question is designed to make the hearer meditate on an answer. I found numerous hits when I did an online search for this well-known question, some of which try to explain the answer that they came up with. Other results simply suggest that such questions “must be answered from within the realm of one’s personal experiences.”

While you may have never taken the time to contemplate the answer to that riddle, you may have wondered whether some of your law professors weren’t asking similar unanswerable questions with their typical Socratic method of teaching. Or perhaps a client or judge asked you a question that likewise made you think twice before even attempting to answer. Let’s contemplate some other similar questions.

What is the sound of one hand being healed? In Mark chapter 3 (see also Matthew 12 and Luke 6), we read this story about Jesus healing on the Sabbath.

1 Another time [Jesus] went into the synagogue, and a man with a shriveled hand was there. 2 Some of the [Pharisees] were looking for a reason to accuse Jesus, so they watched him closely to see if he would heal him on the Sabbath. 3 Jesus said to the man with the shriveled hand, “Stand up in front of everyone.” 4 Then Jesus asked them, “Which is lawful on the Sabbath: to do good or to do evil, to save life or to kill?” But they remained silent. 5 He looked around at them in anger and, deeply distressed at their stubborn hearts, said to the man, “Stretch out your hand.” He stretched it out, and his hand was completely restored.

We are not told what the healed man’s response was. However, the very next verse tells us that “the Pharisees went out and began to plot with the Herodians how they might kill Jesus.” Clearly, there are two possible responses to the sound of one hand being healed. On the one hand, no pun intended, the man could have responded like the Samaritan leper in Luke 17 who, “when he saw he was healed, came back, praising God in a loud voice,” thanking Jesus. On the other hand, the Pharisees responded with silence, followed by anger and malice toward Jesus. Hopefully, our response to the working of the God in our lives will mirror that of the Samaritan leper and others we read about in the Gospels whose hearts were filled with joy and gratitude.

Here’s another: what is the sound of one hand helping others? As attorneys, we have a professional responsibility to provide pro bono legal services to those who cannot afford them. We are commanded by God’s word to help the poor and needy, and thus, that responsibility for Christian attorneys is not merely professional, but becomes “confessional.” Proverbs 31:8-9 tells us to “Speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves, for the rights of all who are destitute. Speak up and judge fairly; defend the rights of the poor and needy.”

Christian legal aid clinics, located in 26 states and 50 cities, offer many CLS members the opportunity to find out what one hand helping others sounds like. That sound is often a voice raised on behalf of a homeless client as a CLS volunteer represents him or her in court.

It may also be the sound of a telephone ringing when a volunteer lawyer makes a call to the electric company on behalf of a widow in Pittsburgh, holding in her hand a cancelled check for payment—followed by the familiar sounds of her appliances once again humming as that simple call from the CLA clinic is successful.

It is sometimes the sound of the client’s question, like the one at our clinic in DC who asked me to spell the names of the volunteer attorneys with whom he had just met. His pen scratched their names in the front of his well-read Bible so that he could pray for them. I encourage you to get involved at a CLA clinic in your city, or help to start one, so that you too can experience the sound of one hand helping.

Finally, what is the sound of one hand tickling? For those of you who are parents, I sincerely hope that you have an answer. I can tell you from my own experience that laughter, squealing and breathless sighs of delight are the likeliest sound of one hand, or two, tickling your children. And nothing will draw you closer to your loved ones that just spending time together, having fun.

Too often, our practices keep us at the office or on the road for far too long, and we may not have the energy we need when we are with family to be able to give them that special healing that comes through the gift of our time and attention.

This week, take the time to contemplate “what is the sound of one hand tickling?” Or perhaps, “what is the sound of one hand holding the hand of your loved one?” It might be that you need to ask “what is the sound of one hand not typing or texting?” Whatever your question, my prayer for you is that the answer you hear is the sound of healing.

Brent McBurney is the Director of Legal Aid Ministries and Attorney Ministries for the Christian Legal Society. He also holds the horrid title of “Merciless Tickle-Monster” and loves to hear the sounds of one hand tickling.
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