REPORT from the Capital

Magazine of the
Baptist Joint Committee
for Religious Liberty

Vol. 71 No. 6

June 2016

INSIDE:

- No religious test . 3
- Legislation update . .6
- New staff member . .7
- New look for RFTC . 8

Connect with the BJC

BJConline.org

BJConline.org/Blog

Facebook.com/ReligiousLiberty

@BJContheHill

SCOTUS sends contraceptive mandate cases back to lower courts

Unanimous, unsigned opinion avoids ruling on RFRA

WASHINGTON — In an unexpected move, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a short, unsigned opinion on May 16 that sends the contraceptive mandate cases back to the lower courts.

The Court's *per curiam* opinion in *Zubik v. Burwell* did not rule on whether the accommodation for religious employers violates the 1993 Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), but it instead provided instruction based upon the supplemental briefing ordered by the Court in March. That order asked the religiously affiliated nonprofits and the government to address how the organizations' employees could receive seamless contraceptive coverage without the organizations providing separate notification of their objection.

In *Zubik*, religiously affiliated nonprofits challenged the government's accommodation procedure designed to allow them to avoid paying or contracting for contraception. The Baptist Joint Committee for Religious Liberty filed a brief in the case supporting the government's effort to accommodate religion.

"Today's decision does not resolve the controversy, nor will it necessarily change the results in the lower courts that previously ruled in favor of the government," said Holly Hollman, general counsel of the Baptist Joint Committee. "It does, however, allow the parties to further refine their arguments about notice requirements and how employees will be covered."

The BJC's brief explained how, under RFRA, the far-reaching claims of the nonprofits can harm religious liberty.

"The government provided a process that allows objecting employers to avoid paying or contracting for contraceptives while ensuring that employees still would receive those benefits," Hollman said. "Instead of ruling on whether this accommodation satisfies the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, the Court is directing the lower courts to reconsider the question in light of the parties' supplemental arguments."

In its decision, the Court did not interpret RFRA's provisions. The opinion states: "In particular, the Court does not decide whether petitioners' religious exercise has been substantially burdened, whether the Government has a compelling interest, or whether the current regulations are the least restrictive means of serving that interest."

In a concurring opinion, Justice

ZUBIK CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

New Jersey appellate court invalidates grants to religious institutions on church-state grounds

An appeals court in New Jersey ruled that capital improvement grants awarded to the Princeton Theological Seminary and Beth Medrash Govoha (a yeshiva) are unlawful because the state funds will be used in support of religious instruction. Even if the U.S. Constitution may permit such funding, the court ruled, the state "has a rich tradition" of protecting individual rights "more broadly" than federal law requires.

Article I, Paragraph 3 of the New Jersey Constitution states that "no person shall be ... obliged to pay tithes, taxes, or other rates for building or repairing any church or churches, place or places of worship, or for the maintenance of any minister or ministry ... ." Plaintiffs argued successfully that because the seminary and the yeshiva are sectarian institutions, the constitutional provision disallows the state grants.

In the opinion, the court described the importance of a 1978 New Jersey Supreme Court case, *Resnick v. East Brunswick Township Board of Education*. In *Resnick*, the plaintiffs challenged a school's practice of allowing religious organizations, along with other local groups, to rent public school facilities below cost. In the decision in this case, the court referred to the *Resnick* opinion and noted it said that particular provision of the state constitution should not be carried to an extreme "and the State need not withhold police or fire protection because of a property's sectarian use." The court also noted that *Resnick* did not provide a further analysis, but

the court repeated *Resnick*'s holding that "the state constitution does require that religious organizations be singled out among nonprofit groups in general as being ineligible for certain benefits which are partly subsidized by tax-generated funds ... " (emphasis added in the new decision).

The court said that "it was the sectarian nature of the groups renting the space for such instruction that was of primary concern" for them to strike down the subsidized arrangement.

At first glance, it may seem as if government funding for building improvements, if awarded through a religiously neutral process, would not pose a threat to church-state separation. In fact, awarding money directly to sectarian institutions for use on facilities that further their religious mission does undermine the wall of separation.

As the BJC's Brent Walker said in a 2013 column, "Simply put, we do not allow taxpayer dollars to build churches; we should not allow taxpayer dollars to be used to *rebuild* churches either."

—Don Byrd, BJC Blogger

ZUBIK continued from page 1

Sonia Sotomayor, joined by Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, noted that the Court's opinion should not be interpreted as supporting the nonprofit organizations' position that anything short of a "separate policy, with a separate enrollment process" would be unacceptable. It reminds the lower courts that they may reach the same conclusion they reached before or a different conclusion.

The decision is the latest in a case full of unusual developments. The Court's March 29 order for supplemental briefs came six days after the oral argument. The order asked the parties to file additional briefs addressing whether and how their employees can obtain contraceptive coverage through the organizations' insurance companies "in a way that does not require any involvement of [the organizations] beyond their own decision to provide health insurance without contraceptive coverage to their employees." Those briefs led to the Court's decision.

RFRA provides legal protection against government actions that substantially burden the exercise of religion. The BJC chaired the diverse coalition of organizations that pushed for the legislation, providing a high legal standard for all free exercise claims without regard to any particular religious practice. The statute was intended to restore the "compelling interest" standard, which the Supreme Court used prior to its decision in *Employment Division v. Smith* (1990). The law creates a delicate balancing test between substantial burdens on religion and the compelling interests of the government.

Zubik v. Burwell is the official name for the consolidated cases, which include religiously affiliated hospitals, schools and other nonprofit charities (including Little Sisters of the Poor, which is often mentioned in news coverage of the cases) challenging the government's religious accommodation. The BJC's brief was written by law professor and religious liberty advocate Douglas Laycock, and it was mentioned several times during the March 23 oral argument. Visit our website at **BJConline.org/Zubik** to read the BJC's brief and access additional information about the case.

—BJC Staff Reports

REFLECTIONS

An oft-neglected religious liberty protection

J. Brent Walker
Executive Director

This is the latest in Walker's series on indispensable principles that inform his understanding of the proper relationship between church and state.

Article VI of the U.S. Constitution — banning any religious test for public office — is an important, but oft-overlooked, protection for religious liberty.

We usually focus on the First Amendment's two Religion Clauses, and properly so. The Religion Clauses protect religious liberty by requiring the separation of church and state; the clause banning a religious test works hand in glove with the First Amendment by addressing the relationship between religion and politics.

The "no religious test" clause represented a radical departure from the legal requirements in most of the colonies. For example, in Pennsylvania one had to "believe in one God, the creator and governor of the Universe … and … acknowledge the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by Divine inspiration." In Delaware, government leaders were obliged to "profess faith in God the Father and in Jesus Christ his only son and in the Holy Ghost." In Georgia and New Hampshire, one simply had to "be of the Protestant religion." The wise Founders (most of them, anyway, because a few favored imposing religious requirements) said "no" to conditioning citizens' participation in the political process on their willingness to sign on the dotted line of a theological confession.

This provision in Article VI ensures religious liberty in several ways. It helps us properly understand the Establishment Clause. It powerfully reinforces the critique of the notion that America is a "Christian nation," legally and constitutionally. If our Founders had wanted to set up a Christian nation — or even to gently privilege Christianity — they would have required, not forbidden, a religious test demanding a profession of some brand of Christianity in doctrine or denominational affiliation. Article VI also dovetails with the Free Exercise Clause, as well as notions of fundamental fairness in our political culture. We should encourage participation by all citizens — representing the many precincts of our religiously plural landscape, including those who are religiously unaffiliated (nearly a quarter of the current population).

Indeed, the fruit of this aspiration is becoming apparent. The presidential and vice presidential nominees of the two major parties in 2012, for the first time in our nation's history, did not include a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant. We had an African-American Protestant, a Mormon and two Catholics. Also telling is the fact that no Protestants are currently serving on the U.S. Supreme Court. Rather, we have five Catholic and three Jewish justices. In Congress, we have elected two Muslims, two Buddhists, one Hindu, and at least one who admits to being religiously unaffiliated.

To be sure, the test clause technically only bans legal requirements for qualifying for office and constrains only government. But we should make every effort, as good citizens, to live up to the spirit along with the letter of Article VI. That is to say, a candidate's or government leader's religion is a part of who he or she is and needs not be ignored, but we should never impose a religious litmus test in deciding who would best lead our country in public office. And, if a candidate's religion is discussed, we must always ask the follow-up "So what?" question. What difference will religious belief and practices make in the candidate's ability to serve in public office? We need a tight fit between talk about religion and issues that matter in public service. Otherwise, it's just theological voyeurism at best or an invitation to play the religion card for political advantage at worst.

It seems to me we are doing pretty well in how we are starting to think about religion and politics overall. Of course, we still have a lot of work to do. In this political season, the fitness of a Muslim to be president has been gainsaid by a candidate who embraces Seventh-day Adventism and others have woven God-talk into stump speeches to a degree that suggests pandering to a certain constituency. Many still think we are a "Christian nation" in law, not just demographically. And, Islamophobia and other forms of religious bigotry abound.

But voices resounded across the political spectrum decrying the unfortunate demeaning of Islam in the presidential primaries, and increasingly we view with jaundiced eyes the abuse of religious rhetoric for political advantage. The fact that an overwhelmingly Christian majority has been willing to elect leaders who reflect some of our astonishing religious diversity suggests that we are making considerable progress in embracing the principle behind the "no religious test" clause in Article VI: the most religious candidate — even if he or she can be identified — has not been and is not now necessarily the best qualified person to lead our secular government.

Jimmy Carter pushes for Baptist cooperation across racial and denominational lines

Several supporting bodies of the Baptist Joint Committee involved in Carter's movement

Pastors Frederick Haynes and George Mason both lead Baptist churches in Dallas, but they had never met until the not-guilty verdict in the death of Florida teen Trayvon Martin brought them together in 2013.

Now the two men — one the leader of a predominantly black megachurch, the other of a mostly white congregation — have signed a "covenant of action" spearheaded by former President Jimmy Carter.

Carter, now 91, has long been known for building bridges between divided parties. But his work to bring Baptists of different races together on a national level is morphing into grassroots attempts to address community needs.

About a dozen partnerships have been created by groups of Baptists from Alabama to Oklahoma — renovating campgrounds, mentoring youth, packing boxes at a food bank. The former president and a younger cohort of leaders are hoping the movement will grow to 100 by 2018.

"What we are trying to do now with the New Baptist Covenant is to pair up African-American-dominated churches and white churches in the same community — or sometimes on the same street almost — to work together on projects that are good for the low-income people in that neighborhood," Carter said in an interview.

Haynes and Mason have co-authored an op-ed on reducing payday loan businesses in Dallas. Recently, staffers of Haynes' mostly black church, which once had some 20 payday loan businesses within a five-mile radius, trained Mason's historically white church on ways to block them. And now they are spending time together on racial reconciliation activities, including studying the Bible and sharing a meal that emphasized privilege.

"There were some who received more food than others and some received nothing and I think that was an eye-opening piece for many who were there," said Haynes, who said the work of the two churches has moved beyond "feel-good" experiences. "What makes this effort different is that we are refusing to settle for a kumbaya moment."

Carter, who is scheduled to keynote a training meeting of the New Baptist Covenant in Atlanta in mid-September, said he was moved originally to bring black and white Baptists together because they once met together in the Triennial Convention in the 1800s, before the Southern Baptist Convention broke off in a dispute over slaveholding missionaries. As a child, he grew up with African-American playmates who helped him gain an understanding of "some of the problems of legalized racial segregation."

New Baptist Covenant Dallas Covenant of Action partners from left: George Mason, Danielle Ayers, Heather Mustain and Frederick Haynes. Photo courtesy of Wes Browning/Sema Films

After leaving the White House, Carter later quit the Southern Baptist Convention over its 2000 decision to bar women from the pastorate. He has worked with more moderate Baptist leaders to found the New Baptist Covenant movement, bringing 15,000 people together for an Atlanta meeting in 2008. Many of the participants in the movement are connected to supporting bodies of the Baptist Joint Committee for Religious Liberty, including the Cooperative Baptist Fellowship and Progressive National Baptist Convention.

Carter's continuing hopes for greater Baptist and interracial cooperation come, he said, after the country may have prematurely thought racial reconciliation was achieved after the civil rights movement victories of the 1960s.

"I think that was a sigh of relief too early because we rested on our laurels and now we've found out in the last year or two, very vividly with the police attacks on innocent black young people, that we still have a long way to go in this country," Carter said.

Carter and other leaders say the fact that many churches have not worked together — across racial or other lines — is often more a matter of inertia than of animosity.

"We actually know each other but we don't cooperate with each other," said Carter, citing the example of the 11 churches in his hometown of Plains, Georgia, that tend to come together mostly for Christmas concerts.

The Rev. James C. Perkins, president of the historically black Progressive National Baptist Convention, said he will be encouraging greater participation of his churches with New Baptist Covenant to achieve more social justice progress and foster improved racial understanding.

"The more we come together to get to know one another," he said, "the easier it becomes to talk about these touchy, volatile issues that impact the quality of life, not just in our congregations but across the nation."

About half a dozen predominantly black PNBC congregations have committed to covenants of action. A PNBC state convention in Georgia and its counterpart in the mostly white Cooperative Baptist Fellowship are working together to repair an interfaith campground for joint youth retreats. And Oklahoma members of both of those national groups have joined with the Oklahoma Indian American Baptist Association to provide tablet computers to elementary schools.

Hannah McMahan, executive director of New Baptist Covenant, works in an office the movement leases from the PNBC at its Washington headquarters. She'll be traveling to annual meetings of some Baptist groups this summer to encourage expanded involvement.

Mason said he expects the movement will grow in part because of the inspiration and motivation by Carter.

"His vision of the Baptist movement is that it be a movement of reconciliation," said Mason. "It's easier to get a lot of people to the table when he's the convener."

—Adelle M. Banks, Religion News Service with BJC Staff Reports

Study: More churches participating in service-related activities, fewer in political activities

BLOOMINGTON, Ind. — The percentage of politically active churches is decreasing, according to a first-of-its-kind national study by Indiana University that also reveals an increase in the percentage of churches engaged in service activity.

This research draws on three waves of data from the National Congregations Study to provide the first national scale study to identify trends among churches addressing social needs.

Between 1998 and 2012, the percentage of churches participating in at least one type of service-related activity increased from 71 percent to 78 percent, while the percentage of churches participating in at least one type of political activity decreased from 43 percent to 35 percent.

"The trends suggest a significant change is underway in how churches seek to address social needs," said researcher Brad Fulton of IU's School of Public and Environmental Affairs.

This study also examines trends among subpopulations of churches grouped by their religious tradition, ethnoracial composition and ideological orientation. (Terms used for a church's theological and political orientation are based on self-identification.) Among most types of churches, participation in service-related activities is substantial and increasing, while political participation is less substantial and decreasing.

Fulton found that the most substantial decrease in political participation has occurred among white evangelical churches. For example, between 1998 and 2012, the percentage of evangelical churches that distributed voter guides decreased from 19 percent to 11 percent, and the percentage promoting opportunities to participate politically decreased from 21 percent to 7 percent.

Meanwhile, the political participation rate among liberal churches has been substantial and increasing. In 2012, 80 percent of liberal churches participated in at least one type of political activity, making them three times more likely than conservative churches to be politically engaged.

"This trend of fewer conservative churches and more liberal churches participating in political activities runs counter to popular perceptions," Fulton said. "These perceptions are fueled by media outlets and political pundits, whose coverage of religion and politics tends to focus almost exclusively on the religious right and rarely even mentions religious progressives."

Also deviating from the general downward trend in political participation among most types of churches are Catholic and predominantly Hispanic churches, whose participation rates have been increasing. For example, between 1998 and 2012, the percentage of Catholic churches that lobbied an elected official increased from 12 percent to 24 percent, and the percentage of predominantly Hispanic churches that participated in a demonstration or march increased from 1 percent to 17 percent. Even though participation rates are increasing among these types of churches, they represent a small percentage of all churches.

Overall, the substantial and increasing participation rates in service-related activities among most types of churches supports the view that service provision is an institutionalized and nearly universal practice of churches. In contrast, the trends in church-based political participation suggest that political engagement is becoming a niche practice among a few types of churches.

"The general decline in political participation among churches has implications for the role churches can play in addressing social needs," Fulton said. "Relieving immediate needs through service provision without also pursuing long-term solutions through political participation can limit churches' ability to comprehensively address social needs. When churches combine acts of service with political engagement, they can provide short-term relief while at the same time advocating to improve social conditions."

Fulton's research was published in May in the journal *Religions* in the article "Trends in Addressing Social Needs: A Longitudinal Study of Congregation-Based Service Provision and Political Participation."

—Information provided by Indiana University

Questions about churches and political campaigns?
Visit the BJC's website for resources and handouts:
BJConline.org/electioneering

K. Hollyn Hollman
General Counsel

Hollman REPORT

Religious liberty legislation in Congress

Current political rhetoric seems trapped in a death spiral that laws can either protect religious liberty or LGBT civil rights, but not both. It seems a growing number of "culture wars" are being fought on the platform of religious liberty, threatening the public's understanding. We are clearly in the midst of significant social, cultural and legal changes as well as an election season, but this stark state of affairs need not remain. For much of our history, religious liberty has been a unifying value persisting through societal changes.

The BJC is involved in numerous policy debates as state legislatures continue to consider measures about religious exemptions and LGBT rights. Congress, likewise, has the opportunity to alter the legal landscape on these and other church-state matters.

Between June 1 and December 31, the U.S. House of Representatives is scheduled to be in session for a total of 54 days. Many of those days likely will be devoted to passing an appropriations bill to keep the federal government open. While the prospect of other significant legislation passing is slim, the BJC will continue to evaluate and monitor religious liberty legislation pending in Congress that represents important policy debates and current partisan divisions.

The BJC is one of more than 100 organizations supporting the bipartisan **Freedom of Religion Act** (H.R. 5207). This legislation, recently introduced by Rep. Don Beyer, D-Va., simply prohibits the use of an immigrant's or alien's religious belief or nonbelief as grounds for denying entry into the U.S. At a press conference announcing the bill, Rep. Beyer pledged to continue outreach to expand co-sponsorship, particularly seeking more Republican sponsorship.

The **Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act** (H.R. 1150/S. 2878) is the latest effort to reform the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, the legislation that established the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom. This proposal would change how the ambassador-at-large coordinates with other agencies and projects, require training for all Foreign Service officers and alter how "countries of particular concern" are designated. The bill passed the House of Representatives on May 16 and now awaits action by the Senate.

Other federal legislative efforts have developed in response to U.S. Supreme Court decisions affecting religious liberty. Following the Court's 2014 decision upholding the application of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to a for-profit corporation in *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby*, as well as highly publicized attempts to use state RFRAs for exemptions to nondiscrimination laws, the **Do No Harm Act** (H.R. 5272) was introduced to amend the federal RFRA. The legislation would exempt several categories of law from RFRA's balancing test. These categories include laws protecting civil rights, employment and health care. The BJC does not support this bill. RFRA, though not perfectly applied in every case, has provided much-needed protection against governmental interference with the exercise of religion.

Another bill that pertains to RFRA is the **Equality Act** (H.R. 3185/S. 1858), the omnibus LGBT civil rights proposal that expands the list of protected categories in federal statutes to include sex (where currently not included), sexual orientation and gender identity. Additionally, the legislation provides that RFRA does not apply to those statutes. The BJC is monitoring this bill and does not support that RFRA carve-out. RFRA was passed with the broad, bipartisan idea that it applies to all legislation, allowing courts to balance burdens on religious exercise and compelling governmental interests.

Lastly, the **First Amendment Defense Act** (H.R. 2802/S. 1598), known as "FADA," would prohibit the government from taking "discriminatory action" against a person (individuals, nonprofits and for-profits) for acting in accordance with a religious belief that marriage is between one man and one woman and that sexual relations are properly reserved to such a marriage. "Discriminatory action" includes (but is not limited to): altering tax exemption; disallowing charitable deductions; withholding or changing a federal grant, contract, loan, license, accreditation, employment, etc. or otherwise diminishing any benefit in a federal benefit program. The legislation was first proposed in anticipation of the Supreme Court's decision in *Obergefell v. Hodges* recognizing same-sex marriage and its potential impact on various religious nonprofits, including schools, hospitals and social service providers. Several states have introduced versions of FADA that apply either to a subset of religious nonprofits or to all of them that interact in some way with the state government.

While many of these congressional efforts will likely remain stalled, the BJC will continue to monitor them and engage the issues they represent with members and staff, coalition partners and our constituents. Despite significant challenges, if we focus on our first principles and work hard to find common ground, religious liberty will win.

New office manager joins BJC staff in Washington

Tunon

Jessica Tunon, a native of South Florida, is the office manager for the Baptist Joint Committee, following the retirement of Kathleen Lansing.

Before joining the BJC staff, Tunon worked as a consultant in a wide variety of corporate and nonprofit settings in finance and operational management, including Franklin Templeton Investments and MITRE. She is the founder of Netwalking, a company that organizes walks and guides participants to network while walking, and she is a speaker on the topic of walkability at events focused on workplace mobility and green solutions.

Tunon earned a bachelor's degree in business management from Lynn University in Boca Raton, Florida. She serves as an at-large member of the D.C. Pedestrian Advisory Council, a philanthropy expert for SheSource, and a committee member of the Healthy for Good initiative with the American Heart Association of Greater Washington.

BJC welcomes summer interns

Two new interns recently began working alongside the Baptist Joint Committee staff in Washington, D.C.

Burreson

Maggie Burreson of St. Louis, Missouri, graduated from Texas Christian University in May with a Bachelor of Arts degree, double-majoring in religion and political science. She wrote her senior honors thesis on the roots of the First Amendment and Martin Luther's role in the development of the separation of church and state. She is the daughter of Kent Burreson, a professor and Lutheran pastor, and Cindy Burreson, a Lutheran high school counselor. Following her internship, Burreson will attend Washington University School of Law in St. Louis this fall.

Johnson

David Johnson Jr., a native of Memphis, Tennessee, is currently pursuing a Master of Divinity and Master of Business Administration dual degree at the Howard University Schools of Divinity and Business. In 2013, Johnson graduated Howard University with an undergraduate degree in psychology. He is the son of David Johnson Sr., a retired schoolteacher, and Jennifer Johnson, a retired Army chaplain. Following his internship, he plans to continue his education with the hopes of one day serving as a pastor.

White House releases faith-based advisory council appointments

This year, the Obama administration added six individuals to the list of those who will serve on the third and final President's Advisory Council on Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships. These six are in addition to the 18 names released in September.

In May, the administration announced three individuals who would join the council: Barbara Satin, Manjit Singh and Naseem Kourosh.

Satin is the assistant faith work director for the National LGBTQ Task Force. A member of the United Church of Christ, she is the first transgender woman to serve on the council. Singh is co-founder and board chairman of the Sikh American Legal Defense and Education Fund. Kourosh is the human rights officer at the U.S. Baha'i Office of Public Affairs. In that role since 2011, she has worked to address international religious freedom and to advance the rights of persecuted Baha'i communities.

In January, the White House announced three other appointments: Rachel Held Evans, author of a popular blog and books including *A Year of Biblical Womanhood*; the Rev. Traci Blackmon, acting executive minister of the United Church of Christ's Justice and Witness Ministries; and the Rev. Adam Hamilton, founding pastor of the United Methodist Church of the Resurrection in Leawood, Kansas – the largest Methodist congregation in the United States.

The six announced this year are in addition to the 18 named in September, which included a mix of religious and nonprofit leaders. Some of the September appointees were Bishop Carroll Baltimore, former president of the Progressive National Baptist Convention; the Rev. David Beckmann, president of Bread for the World; the Rev. Jennifer Butler, CEO of Faith in Public Life; Rabbi Steve Gutow, president of the Jewish Council for Public Affairs; David Jeffrey, National Commander of the Salvation Army USA; Stephen Schneck, director of the Institute for Policy Research and Catholic Studies at the Catholic University of America; and Jasjit Singh, executive director of the Sikh American Legal Defense and Education Fund.

The Obama administration created the President's Advisory Council on Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships in February 2009, which makes recommendations to the administration on how to improve partnerships. The inaugural council was chaired by Melissa Rogers, who now serves as the executive director of the White House Office of Faith-based and Neighborhood Partnerships.

–BJC Staff Reports with Religion News Service

Editor's note: In last month's magazine, a page 7 story on the case of *Islamic Society of Basking Ridge v. Township of Bernards* did not contain the complete case name.

BAPTIST JOINT COMMITTEE
FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

200 Maryland Ave., N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002-5797

Phone: 202.544.4226
Fax: 202.544.2094
Email: bjc@BJConline.org
Website: www.BJConline.org

Non-profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Riverdale, MD
Permit No. 5061

Baptist Joint Committee
Supporting Bodies

- Alliance of Baptists
- American Baptist Churches USA
- Baptist General Association of Virginia
- Baptist General Convention of Missouri
- Baptist General Convention of Texas
- Converge Worldwide (BGC)
- Cooperative Baptist Fellowship
- Cooperative Baptist Fellowship of North Carolina
- National Baptist Convention of America
- National Baptist Convention USA Inc.
- National Missionary Baptist Convention
- North American Baptists Inc.
- Progressive National Baptist Convention Inc.
- Religious Liberty Council
- Seventh Day Baptist General Conference

REPORT from the Capital

J. Brent Walker
Executive Director

Cherilyn Crowe
Editor

Jordan Edwards
Associate Editor

Report from the Capital (ISSN-0346-0661) is published 10 times each year by the Baptist Joint Committee. For subscription information, please contact the Baptist Joint Committee.

Changes are coming to *Report from the Capital,* starting with the next edition

BJC's flagship publication is getting a new look, schedule

Watch your mailbox for the July/August edition of *Report from the Capital* — the magazine will have a different look, but it will contain the same quality content you have come to expect from the Baptist Joint Committee.

The new format includes a rectangular logo on the cover along with a photo that will change with each edition, and the interior pages will have a more modern feel. We also are increasing the amount of analysis and original content that appears in each publication. For example, you can expect to see more columns and regular features on our education work and projects.

The new production schedule means that the magazine will be produced six times a year instead of 10, but each edition will be at least 12 pages in length as it covers two months of information.

If you are reading this but do not currently subscribe to *Report from the Capital*, subscriptions are provided to those interested at no cost. Send us your address at **bjc@BJConline.org** and tell us if you prefer it mailed to you or if you want to receive emails when each edition is available online. You can also call the office at 202-544-4226 to sign up. If you are not currently a donor to the BJC, consider making a monetary gift to allow us to continue to provide *Report from the Capital*.

An example of the new cover

More details about the history and new design of the magazine will be featured in the July/August edition.