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SUMMARY


This thesis evaluates the Edinburgh 1910 World Mission Conference, the ecumenism that flowed from Edinburgh 1910, and its relationship to the ecumenical trends that exist within the Lausanne movement. Additionally, this thesis determines how ecumenism has attributed to a theological convergence, and then examines the impact of such theological convergence on the global church through parachurch organizations. It begins by laying the foundation for any theological convergence that existed at Edinburgh 1910. It then examines ecumenism within the Lausanne movement, theological significance of ecumenism, and its impact on the global church. Finally, the thesis explores the theological convergence within select parachurch organizations since Lausanne 1974 and analyzes the impact of theological convergence on the global church.

The researcher of this thesis has surveyed several sources to determine the originality of this topic through search engines World Cat, WorldCat Dissertations, Dissertations, Article First, ATLA Religion, Humanities Index, Humanities Abstract, Christian Periodical Index, Worldscope, and also significant works about Lausanne 1974. The search revealed nothing substantial concerning Lausanne’s impact on the Global Church through parachurch organizations, the researcher deems this thesis to be an original work.

Key Terms: Convergence, Edinburgh 1910, Ecumenism, Ecumenical, Evangelical, Lausanne, Lausanne Movement, Missions, Mission Societies, ParaChurch, Theological.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Abstract
1.2 Research Methodology
1.3 Thesis
1.4 Definition of Terms
1.5 Acronyms
1.6 Thesis Outline
1.1 Abstract

The researcher of this thesis has studied the Lausanne Movement and become well acquainted with writings from Edinburgh 1910 and Lausanne. He found no writings dealing with this particular topic. Therefore, he surveyed several sources to determine the uniqueness and originality of this thesis. This survey included such engines as World Cat, World Cat Dissertations, Dissertations, Article First, ATLA Religion, Humanities Index, Humanities Abstract, Christian Periodical Index, Worldscope, and also significant works about Edinburgh 1910 and the Lausanne movement. The researcher investigated combined topics such as Edinburgh + Lausanne; Edinburgh + Lausanne + Ecumenism; and Lausanne + Ecumenism. There were over thirty hits, but none dealt with the topic of this paper. Typical topics were: Making Christ Known: Historic Mission Documents From the Lausanne Movement 1974-1989, Mission Imperatives for the 1990's: Implications from the Lausanne Covenant—An Introductory Mission Curriculum for Christ Church, West Chester, Pa and William Adams Brown and the New World Order in the Church: Liberal Theology and the Modern Ecumenical Movement, none of which address the issues of this proposed thesis.

There are some dissertations that are remotely related. For example Twentieth-century mission theology: Conciliar and evangelical streams in conversation a dissertation by Elias Dantas Filho is a reference on major global mission conferences including Edinburgh and Lausanne. However, his focus is on understanding the dynamics of Protestant missions in evangelism and social work. A secondary focus of that paper centers around the relationship between Christian faith and other faiths.
Additionally, “The Significance of Lausanne” (an article by John Stott published in the International Review of Mission #64 July 1975 pages 288-294) addresses similar topics related to this thesis. Stott offers an assessment of the Lausanne conference of 1974. He points out that the Lausanne Covenant and the clarification of “mission” were two of Lausanne’s more significant contributions to the missions world. He also admits that Lausanne 1974 forced many evangelicals to grapple with contemporary missiological issues of the day.

Finally, Efiong S. Utuk’s article “From Wheaton to Lausanne: The Road to Modification of Contemporary Evangelical Mission Theology” (Published in Missiology 14 #2 in April 1986 pages 205-220) deals with the changes in evangelical thought from Wheaton 1966 through Berlin 1966 and then to Lausanne 1974. The focus is on the correlation between evangelism and social action. Utuk argues that Lausanne 1974 was the “turning point” for evangelical mission theology. However, this work does not directly address the topic of this thesis.

Therefore, since Duke University Theological Library, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary Library, the Internet, and the interlibrary search revealed that nothing substantial has been written concerning “Ecumenism and Theological Convergence: A Comparative Analysis of Edinburgh 1910 and the Lausanne Movement,” the researcher deems this thesis to be a unique topic and an original work.
1.2 Research Methodology

The primary research location for this thesis will be Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary (SEBTS) in Wake Forest, NC, as it has extensive literary holdings in missions. Numerous books, periodicals, and journals are available for research for this thesis. To supplement the numerous missiological works on location, SEBTS provides the services of Inter-Library Loan (ILL). ILL is an efficient way of acquiring texts and articles not held by SEBTS. In addition, SEBTS offers numerous indexes to assist in the ILL process. Among those indexes are World Cat, ATLA, Humanities Index, Humanities Abstract, Christian Periodical Index, and University Microfilms International Database (online).

Located within a forty-five minute drive of SEBTS are Duke University and the University of North Carolina. The library at Duke Divinity School is a superior source of theological works. Another source is the archives of the International Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention located in Richmond, Virginia.

Additionally, the Internet provides numerous websites which deal with this paper’s subject. Oral interviews with significant mission agency leaders will also be utilized.

Finally, since this author has worked with parachurch organizations in sixty-four countries, he will rely on his personal observations from the past ten years. His interactions, written and oral interviews, and conversations with mission agency leaders make this empirical data a vital part of this research. The author of this thesis will use all of the aforementioned avenues of research as he finds them adequate to the task of writing this thesis.
1.3 Thesis

This thesis argues that a theological convergence developed out of the ecumenism that existed within the Edinburgh 1910 Global Missions Conference, and that this ecumenism grew from Edinburgh 1910 until the Lausanne Movement that began in 1974, at which point it began to flourish. This thesis further argues that the theological convergence that emerged from such ecumenism has made an impact on the global church. Missiologists like David Hesselgrave, Todd Johnston, Stan Nussbaum, Tom Steffen, and Ralph Winter view this theological convergence very differently. Some view it as a positive result of ecumenism’s influence; yet others view it as a negative result. This thesis traces ecumenical thought through select missiologists from Edinburgh 1910 through the Lausanne Movement, assesses the convergence of evangelical theology and ecumenical theology that grew out of this movement, and analyzes its impact on the global church.

1.4 Definition of Terms

The definitions below are based on the definitions used in the Evangelical Dictionary of World Missions (2000) edited by Scott Moreau, Webster’s Dictionary, Dictionary.com, American Heritage Dictionary, and/or The Free Dictionary by Farlex unless otherwise noted.

A.D.2000 and Beyond: At the beginning of this decade, researchers reported that more than two thousand different evangelization plans by Christian organizations and denominations focused on the year 2000. The A.D.2000 & Beyond Movement first gained attention at the international missions conference Lausanne II in Manila in 1989. The
Movement then spread rapidly around the globe to help catalyze evangelism plans that focus on the year 2000.\textsuperscript{1}

Contextualization: This means the worldview of a particular people provides the framework for communication, the questions and needs of that people are a guide to the emphasis of the message, and the cultural gifts of that people become the medium of expression. One must also understand a culture’s social, economic, and political context as being a co-determinant for proper interpretation and communication. Contextualization is grounded in the Christian understanding of the incarnation of Jesus Christ as described in John 1:14.

Convergence: Refers to the occurrence of two or more things coming together. It is the process of coming together or the state of having come together toward a common point. It is a representation of common ground between theories or phenomena.

Dawn Ministries: Refers to the organization founded in 1985 by Jim Montgomery.

DAWN: Is an acronym (Discipling A Whole Nation) and a term that refers to the church planting model used by Dawn Ministries. The DAWN model has become a global movement within one hundred fifty-five countries.

Ecumenical/Ecumenism: In its broadest meaning it refers to a set of beliefs and initiatives aimed at worldwide

religious unity. In a narrower sense it refers to the movement towards unity among Christians. In an even more narrow sense ecumenism is based on the idea that there should be a single Christian church, a single Christian faith.

Edinburgh 1910: The 1910 World Missionary Conference, or the Edinburgh Missionary Conference, was held June 14 to 23, 1910. Some have seen it as both the culmination of nineteenth-century Protestant Christian missions and the formal beginning of the modern Protestant Christian ecumenical movement. Major Protestant denominations and missionary societies, predominantly from North America and Northern Europe, sent 1,200 representatives to Edinburgh, Scotland.

Enlightenment: An intellectual movement of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries marked by a celebration of the powers of human reason, a keen interest in science, the promotion of religious toleration, and a desire to construct governments free of tyranny. Some of the major figures of the Enlightenment were David Hume, Immanuel Kant, John Locke, the Baron de Montesquieu, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and Voltaire.

Ethnocentrism: Refers to the belief that one’s own people or cultural ways are superior to others.

Evangelical: In the BROAD SENSE of the word, an evangelical is a person who believes in salvation by faith in Christ alone, and presents that gospel to others. Beyond this definition there are numerous more narrow meanings.
Evangelism: Announces that salvation has come. The verb “evangelize” means to “bear good news.”

Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization: Seeks to serve leaders worldwide by providing a place for theological discussion and development of practical strategies to address the seminal issues facing the church and world today with respect to global missions. Lausanne also seeks to encourage and stimulate the involvement of churches, denominations, ministries, networks and individuals in the cause of world evangelization by producing documents and holding leadership gatherings that equip and call Christians together for the task of evangelism.²

Lausanne 1974: The International Congress on World Evangelization held in Lausanne, Switzerland, in 1974. The gathering was called by a committee headed by Billy Graham; 2,300 evangelical leaders attended from 150 countries.

Lausanne Movement: The Lausanne Movement is a global network of Christian leaders from missions, churches and educational and training institutions who share a commitment to world evangelization. The movement was launched at the prompting of Billy Graham at the 1974 International Congress on World Evangelization (Lausanne I) in Lausanne, Switzerland.

Missiology: Is the conscious, intentional, ongoing reflection on the doing of mission. It includes theories of mission, the study and teaching of mission, as well as the research, writing and publication of works regarding mission.

ParaChurch Organization: A vehicle by which evangelical Christians work collaboratively both outside and across their denominations to engage with the world in mission, social welfare and evangelism. Through many decentralized organizations, parachurch organizations function to bridge the gap between the church and culture. These are organizations "alongside" (Grk: para-) church structures, and often seek to be less institutional. However, over time with growth and success and in response to environmental pressures they can become more institutional.

Saturation Church Planting: A methodology that takes seriously the Great Commission’s injunction to make disciples of all nations (Matt 28:18-20). It adopts the strategy of mobilizing the entire body of Christ in whole countries in an effort to reach the goal of the Great Commission in each country by providing an evangelical congregation for every village, neighborhood, and kind and condition of people in the population.

Social Gospel: A religious movement that arose in the United States in the late nineteenth century with the goal of making the Christian churches more responsive to social problems, such as poverty and prostitution. Leaders of the movement argued that Jesus' message was as much about social reform as about individual approaches to salvation.
Theological Convergence: Refers to the occurrence of two or more theological systems of belief coming together. It includes the process of blending together and of having come together toward a common point of agreement. It is a representation of the common ground between theological theories and practice.

Universalism: Proposes that salvation is universal in its nature and scope; salvation is not only available to all, but also is applicable to all and ultimately will be reached by all.

Worldview: A cultures whole constellation of assumptions and beliefs about what is real, how things fit together, and how things happen. These assumptions are passed on to future generations as the inherited reality of explaining interaction with the world in which they live.

1.5 Acronyms

(DAWN) Discipling A Whole Nation
(EFMA) Evangelical Foreign Missions Association
(GCOWE) Global Consultation on World Evangelization:
  Seoul, South Korea (May 17-26, 1995); Pretoria, South Africa (June 30-July 5, 1997).
(IFMA) The Interdenominational Foreign Mission Association
(IMB) International Mission Board (Southern Baptist)
(IMC) The International Missionary Conference
(IVCF) InterVarsity Christian Fellowship
(OMF) Overseas Missionary Fellowship: In 1964 O.M.F. succeeded the China Inland Mission, which had been founded in 1865 by James Hudson Taylor.
(WCC) The World Council of Churches
(YWAM) Youth With A Mission
1.6 Thesis Outline
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Chapter 2

Evangelicalism and Ecumenism: Early Development

Beginning with the premise that ecumenism found expression within the World Missions Conference at Edinburgh 1910, the development of ecumenism prior to Edinburgh 1910 must first be established and traced through the thoughts of those who sponsored the event. This chapter will define evangelicalism and ecumenism and then briefly trace the development of ecumenical thought prior to the Edinburgh Conference, thereby showing the stage was set for the further expansion of ecumenism into the evangelical world through the topics selected by the Edinburgh conveners and through the papers presented at the event.

2.1 Defining Evangelicalism to Establish a Baseline to Differentiate their Theological Perspectives and Missional Practices from those of Ecumenicals

Defining evangelicalism will be an arduous task as evangelicals have a tendency to divide rather than unify. David Bosch makes it clear that the lack of unity dates back prior to Edinburgh 1910. He describes how evangelical unity that emerged from the “Awakenings” quickly turned into division from an evangelicalism in which a commitment to social reform was a corollary of the inherited enthusiasm for revival...[to] the broad river of classical evangelicalism divided into a delta, with shallower streams emphasizing ecumenism and social renewal on the left and confessional orthodoxy and evangelism on the right.¹

Perhaps one of the major factors for division was Enlightenment thought that crept into evangelicalism. By the late nineteenth-century, some evangelicals had already abandoned the idea that God’s Kingdom exists in the future for the concept of God’s kingdom as here and now. The return of Christ was being denied by some evangelicals, and there appeared to be no urgency for evangelism among those who no longer “believed that those untouched by the Gospel would go straight to hell.”² Yet, other evangelicals deemed proclamation of the Gospel as the primary focus of evangelical life.³

Millennial views were another contributing factor in the early fractures of unity. Bosch points out how the premillennialist movement focused on “soteriology,” while the postmillennialists focused more on “humanization.” He states, “As revivalism and evangelicalism slowly adopted premillennialism the emphasis shifted away from social involvement to exclusively verbal evangelism.”⁴ This change of emphasis made any type of social concern suspect among conservative evangelicals.

Therefore, in order to begin to define evangelicalism it is necessary to note that the term as understood today has a plethora of meanings. In the broad sense of the word, an evangelical is a person who believes in the eternal salvation of man’s soul by faith in Jesus Christ alone, and proclaims that same message to others. Beyond this definition, there are numerous more narrow meanings. For

² Ibid.
³ Ibid., 284.
⁴ Ibid., 318.
example, in April 1998 the editor of the *Church of England Newspaper* shared his belief that there were “57 varieties of evangelicals.”\(^5\) Roland Croucher identifies sixteen distinct groups; Clive Calver narrows the field to twelve; and Peter Beyerhaus reduces the number to six.

This thesis will utilize Peter Beyerhaus’ six categories of evangelicals as a guideline for establishing contemporary evangelical groupings. In 1975 Beyerhaus viewed evangelicals as Strict Fundamentalists; New Evangelicals; Confessing Evangelicals; Pentecostals and Charismatics; Radical Evangelicals; and Ecumenical Evangelicals.\(^6\) Each of these six groups have their own distinct understanding and interpretation concerning evangelism. Therefore, when attempting to define an evangelical, one must ask, “What commonality is there between these six groups?”

J. I. Packer claims that in order to be a genuine evangelical there are four general claims and six particular convictions that must be affirmed. Packer believed that “pure Christianity” (nothing added to Christian faith), “practical Christianity” (a lifestyle which is totally committed to the Lord), “rational Christianity” (not too preoccupied with the experiential aspect of faith), and “unitive Christianity” (unity that comes from a common commitment to the Gospel truth) were

---


\(^{6}\) A definition of these six categories of evangelicals are cited by John Stott in *Evangelical Truth* on page 22. In 1993 Gabriel Packre published a similar list containing six categories of evangelicals.
necessary claims that must be affirmed in order to be an evangelical.

Additionally, Packer believed that beyond the general claims there are six evangelical fundamentals that must be affirmed. The supremacy of Holy Scripture, the majesty of Christ, the lordship of the Holy Spirit, the necessity of conversion, the priority of evangelism, and the importance of fellowship are all required particulars of evangelicalism. Therefore, by Packer’s definition, anyone not affirming the four general claims and the six particular fundamentals would not be considered an evangelical.

2.1.1 Beyerhaus’ Six Categories of Evangelicals

Packer is correct that there must be some essentials that all evangelicals accept in order to be considered evangelical. All six of Beyerhaus’ basic categories of evangelicals find commonality with Packer’s four general claims and six evangelical fundamentals. Moreover, while there is a certain amount of latitude within that commonality, there are some very real differences between the six categories. They differ in their understanding of Scripture and in their application of Scripture. They also differ in methodology and practice.

---


8 In 1989 David Bebbington published *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain* and asserted that four main characteristics of evangelicalism were conversionism, activism, biblicism, and crucicentrism.
2.1.1.1 Strict Fundamentalists

Strict Fundamentalists are most recognized by their unwillingness to compromise and their separatist attitude.\textsuperscript{9} It is important to remember that even though today fundamentalism is most often used as a derogatory term, this has not always been the case. In fact, at one time the term fundamentalist was synonymous with evangelical.\textsuperscript{10} Originally, Strict Fundamentalists based their beliefs on the fundamentals of the Christian faith (Authority of Scripture, Man’s sin and need for a Savior, Christ’s atoning death, Physical return of Christ, Bodily resurrection, Judgment, Missions and evangelism based on the Great Commission,)\textsuperscript{11}

Yet, in the twenty first century there are those who call themselves fundamentalists, but package the term rather differently. Brian D. McLaren claims to be a fundamentalist. However, he holds to only two fundamentals of the faith, and those two fundamentals are questionable to fundamentalist teachings.\textsuperscript{12} To the strict fundamentalist

\textsuperscript{9} Stott, Evangelical Truth, 22.

\textsuperscript{10} See Carl Henry’s The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism, which was published in 1947. However, by 1950 Henry rejects fundamentalism for a new evangelicalism.

\textsuperscript{11} For complete list see The Fundamentals, a twelve-volume work published by Lyman and Milton Stewart from 1909 to 1915.

\textsuperscript{12} In Brian McLaren’s A Generous Orthodoxy: Why I am a missional + evangelical + post/protestant + liberal/conservative + mystical/poetic + biblical + charismatic/contemplative + fundamentalist/Calvinist + Anabaptist/Anglican + methodist + catholic + green + incarnational +depressed-yet-hopeful + emergent + unfinished Christian, he claims to be a fundamentalist, but holds to only two fundamentals. He believes that “to love God” and “to love man” are the two fundamentals of the faith. However, he does not affirm that “to love God” is the same God as the fundamentalist would define God. McLaren will not say if God is the God of the Baptist, Methodist, Muslim, or Jew. He simply says the “Whichever God Jesus was referring to.”, 206. Statements like this lead
who is so quick to have a separatist attitude and unwillingness to compromise, McLaren’s inclusive fundamentalism is little more than a backhanded slap in the face.

2.1.1.2 New Evangelicals

The term New Evangelicals dates back as early as the 1940s when men like Billy Graham, Carl F. H. Henry, and Harold J. Ockenga began to reject denominational separatism and moved from the isolationism of fundamentalism. These men became the spokesmen for the New Evangelicals. New Evangelicals are quick to distance themselves from the Fundamentalist Evangelicals. This distancing can be seen in their view of politics. The top news article from The United Press on November 15, 2007, entitled “New evangelicals retreat from politics” states that “[a] paradigm shift among evangelical Christians in the United States is turning the once-influential group away from the political sphere.” The article makes it clear that many New Evangelicals are “tired of the hard-edged politics” of past generations and are steering clear of the political agendas of their predecessors. One of the distinguishing marks of a New Evangelical is that rather than fight over political agendas or theological controversies, New Evangelicals to reject McLaren and lead some to view him as heretical.


15 Ibid.
Evangelicals strive for the maximum amount of collaboration among themselves.\textsuperscript{16}

2.1.1.3 Confessing Evangelicals

Confessing Evangelicals reject what they consider contemporary theological errors. They adhere to confessions of faith. There is an alliance of Confessing Evangelicals.\textsuperscript{17} The alliance has notable members such as John Piper, Albert Mohler, Mark Dever, Donald Carson, C. J. Mahaney, and John MacAuthur. These men stand firmly on the Bible as God's inspired, infallible, and authoritative Word. They claim it to be the final rule for all faith and practice. The members of this organization founded in April 1996 represent a cross section of confessional evangelicalism. They view historic documents such as the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Baptist Confessions, and the Lutheran Book of Concord as accurate summaries of the key teachings of the Christian faith.\textsuperscript{18}

The Alliance of Confessing Evangelicals desires to bring together representatives from a variety of confessional traditions. The Confessing Evangelicals believe that biblical essentials are being undermined in the twenty-first century church. The Alliance’s goal is to make a common witness to the evangelical essentials in the twenty-first century and to assist the church in reestablishing biblical essentials.

\textsuperscript{16} Stott, Evangelical Truth, 22.

\textsuperscript{17} http://www.alliancenet.org. (accessed 12/5/2007).

2.1.1.4 Pentecostals and Charismatics

Evangelicalism experienced continued growth during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. However, one of the fastest growing segments of the wider evangelical movement has been its Pentecostal branch. Pentecostalism as a movement came into being in the early 1900s in a series of separate revivals. The new movement embodied an evolving body of teachings from itinerant evangelists and Bible teachers such as Charles Parham, William Seymour, and A. J. Tomlinson on the end-times, signs and wonders, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit.19

Traditionally the Pentecostal movement has been associated with the impoverished margins of American culture. However, its "influence began to spread during the 1950s through the visibility of healing evangelists like Oral Roberts, groups like the Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship."20 By the 1960s, Pentecostalism began to surface within mainline Protestant churches. When Dennis Bennett, an Episcopal priest in Van Nuys, California, publicly announced to his congregation that he spoke in tongues, the Pentecostal movement quickly spread to other mainline denominations. By the 1970s and 1980s Pentecostalism had spread and vigorous independent networks of charismatic churches and organizations emerged, including churches such as the Vineyard Christian Fellowship.

Some claim that the most significant contemporary impact of these movements is the effect they have had outside the United States. Many evangelicals refer to global Pentecostalism as "world evangelicalism."

Pentecostalism is growing globally, especially in Latin America. However,

In many parts of the Third World Pentecostalism has made significant numbers of new converts. In fact, many analysts speculate that within the next decade Pentecostalism may even overtake the Roman Catholic Church as the largest Christian presence in Latin America.21

A defining mark of Pentecostalism is the placing of special emphasis on the direct personal experience of God through the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Pentecostalism is similar to the Charismatic movement. Whereas Pentecostalism developed earlier and began apart from mainstream denominations (although it made its way into the mainline churches in the 1960s), the Charismatic movement sprouted within already existing denominations and tended to remain in those denominations. Many Pentecostals believe that “The writings of John Fletcher were influential in beginning this [Pentecostal] movement, which was sparked by the Azusa Street Revival in California, which took place in 1906.”22 While the roots of charismatic theology can be traced to the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition, twenty-first century Charismatics are found within numerous theological movements and in multiple denominations.23

2.1.1.5 Radical Evangelicals

Defining radical evangelicals will be a difficult task as the term has been interpreted quite differently from person to person. For example, Grant Wacker in his book


Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture\textsuperscript{24} uses the term “radical evangelicals” to describe a smaller movement within the larger Pentecostal movement. Wacker points out that some modern day Pentecostals inherit their theology of healing from their radical evangelical parents. Another example is Frank Turner’s \textit{John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion}\textsuperscript{25} which refers to the Recordites as radical evangelicals. However, for the purpose of this thesis the term “radical evangelical” is used as understood by Peter Beyerhaus. Therefore, a radical evangelical is one who believes that the Gospel has a sociopolitical commitment component, strives to unite an evangelical witness, and is committed to social action.

\subsection*{2.1.1.6 Ecumenical Evangelicals}

In the twenty-first century, the terms “ecumenical” and “evangelical” are not exclusive terms. Many “ecumenicals” are theologically evangelical and many “evangelicals” are ecumenical in practice. Both terms lack theological precision and accuracy. For some these terms have become a way to brand those considered their opponent. Historically ecumenicals have sought unity of the church and the transformation of society, while evangelicals have placed their main emphasis on evangelism and personal conversion. This blending of ecumenism and evangelicalism has led to a new category known as ecumenical evangelical.

Simply put an ecumenical evangelical is one who deems it necessary to develop participation in the ecumenical movement. One such method of involvement for ecumenical

evangelicals is membership in the World Council of Churches (WCC). The WCC continues to seek to expand its membership by targeting evangelicals who are open to ecumenical thought. On February 15, 2006, the WCC began a campaign to target Pentecostals. In an effort to increase membership, the WCC is opening its doors to Pentecostals and Evangelicals, and at no better time. The Christian landscape is rapidly changing and the once-dominant mainline churches that make up most of the Council’s membership is diminishing in strength and influence around the world. The Council is therefore wise in tapping the network of fast-growing Evangelical-style churches while it still has the chance. But dialogue alone will not be enough to bridge the rift that has already formed between the liberal-ecumenical and conservative-evangelical movements.26

The distinguishing mark of an ecumenical evangelical is his passion for unity. The task of evangelical ecumenicals is unifying the body of Christ into one global witness.

Each of Beyerhaus’ six categories of evangelicals conform to J.I. Packer’s four general claims and the six particular fundamentals. Many evangelicals in the twenty-first century accept Packer’s claims and fundamentals.27

26 This article is not describing evangelical ecumenicals, but it does show how the WCC can be an instrument of ecumenical evangelicals to increase their membership. http://www.christianpost.com/article/20060215/6625_Bridging_the_Ecumenical-Evangelical_Divide.htm (accessed 12/7/2007).

27 Packer’s six evangelical fundamentals: The supremacy of Holy Scripture; the majesty of Christ; the lordship of the Holy Spirit; the necessity of conversion; the priority of evangelism; and the importance of fellowship. Packer’s four general truths: “pure Christianity” (nothing added to Christian faith); “practical Christianity” (a lifestyle which is totally committed to the Lord); “rational Christianity” (not to preoccupied with the experiential aspect of faith); and “unitive Christianity” (unity that comes from a common commitment to the Gospel truth). See page 3 for reference notation.
However, some evangelicals like John Stott are uneasy placing activities like evangelism and fellowship on the same level as the supremacy of Holy Scripture and the majesty of Christ. Stott argues that evangelicals must distinguish between the divine and human activities and that which is primary and secondary. He finds it necessary to divide the six fundamentals into three essentials that relate to the ministries of God and three that are the work of man.  

Stott believes that the supremacy of Holy Scripture, the majesty of Christ, and the lordship of the Holy Spirit are sufficient for defining evangelicalism, and that the necessity of conversion, the priority of evangelism, and the importance of fellowship “will find an appropriate place somewhere under this threefold or Trinitarian rubric.”

2.1.2 Evangelical Gospel

Understanding the Gospel of Jesus Christ is essential in understanding evangelicalism. Evangelicals take their understanding of the Gospel from Scripture. There are different interpretations of the Scriptures (which will be discussed later), nevertheless, evangelicals are known for their high view of God’s written Word.

One of the major issues dividing evangelicals is how to apply the Gospel of Christ. The two main streams of evangelical thought find it difficult to agree on the topic of evangelism. For some evangelicals the focus of the Gospel is on the proclamation of its “Good News” to those

---


29 Ibid., 25.
who have never heard. Yet, for others the focus is on administering the "Whole Gospel to the Whole World."

2.1.3 Evangelical Evangelism:

Evangelism within evangelicalism became divisive early in the movement. Evangelicals who hold to the view that the physical return of Christ will take place in the future, and believe that there was an urgency for evangelism since those untouched by the Gospel will face eternal judgment, proclaim the Gospel of Christ in order to change man’s eternal destiny. These evangelicals considered themselves conservatives. Yet, not all conservative evangelicals view evangelism in this manner. One such example is John R. Mott, chairman of the Edinburgh 1910 World Missions Conference.

Mott believed that it was a Christian’s first priority to proclaim the Gospel of Christ, but not in order to save man’s eternal soul. Mott believed that evangelism would lead a man to enthroning Christ in his individual life which would affect his family life, social life, and ultimately national life.\textsuperscript{30} This type of thinking infuriated the fundamental evangelicals, as they perceived Mott’s view to be little more than a social gospel. David Bosch states that, “By the end of the nineteenth century the rift between conservative (or fundamentalist) missions advocates on the one hand and liberals (or social gospellers) on the other was becoming wider.”\textsuperscript{31}

Evangelicals continue proclaiming the Gospel, but for vastly different reasons. While some evangelicals proclaim the Gospel in hopes of changing man’s destiny, others do so

\textsuperscript{30} Bosch. \textit{Transforming Mission}, 296.

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 297.
with the intent of changing society. Yet, there are those evangelicals who proclaim the Gospel and do so intent on changing man’s destiny and man’s society.

2.1.4 Evangelism or Evangelization

One of the major points of contention between evangelicals, and also a dividing point between evangelical and ecumenicals, is the issue of evangelism versus evangelization. Too often these two terms are used interchangeably, but each term is packed with very different meanings.

For many conservative evangelicals evangelism is the Christian practice of preaching the Gospel of Jesus to non-Christians. Historically, most evangelicals have preached this Gospel to effect a person’s conversion to Christianity. For many evangelicals evangelism is their response to the Great Commission per the instruction of Jesus as recorded in the New Testament. There is a growing number of evangelicals who use the term “evangelization” and package it with meaning much the same as evangelism.

However, the term “evangelization” includes much more than the proclamation of the Gospel. At the very least many evangelicals and ecumenicals alike believe that evangelization combines proclamation of the Gospel of Christ for eternal salvation along with the social responsibilities of the Gospel. The Lausanne Covenant states:

Although reconciliation with other people is not reconciliation with God, nor is social action evangelism, nor is political liberation salvation, nevertheless we affirm that evangelism and socio-political involvement are both part of our Christian duty.\(^{32}\)

\(^{32}\) See Addendum A – The Lausanne Covenant: Section 5.
Many in the Lausanne Movement stress the importance of social responsibility in the Gospel. J. Raymond Knighton’s “Social Responsibilities of Evangelization Report” delivered at the Lausanne Congress 1974 states, “We believe that the meeting of human need in whatever form it confronts us is simply obedience to the command of God and a faithful confession of the Gospel of Christ.”

George Hoffman noted that,

As Christians for whom the Bible is authoritative, we have just as much (if not more) right to be concerned for man’s total development as anyone. Unfortunately, in the debate on development, the evangelical voice has seldom been heard, largely through our own fault..."

Hoffman further explains that he believes evangelicals have been too “preoccupied with man’s horizontal development” at the expense of his total welfare. Many evangelicals are deeply concerned with this type of thinking, and this concern has caused evangelicals to be skeptical of one another. The placing of social responsibilities at the same level of importance as the Gospel directed at man’s eternal soul has caused division between evangelicals themselves as well as evangelicals and ecumenicals.

---


Due to the fact that evangelization is often used interchangeably with evangelism and with the lack of clarity with the term “evangelization,” it seems best to give each term separate more precise meanings. Perhaps evangelism should be used when referring to the proclamation for the Gospel message aimed at the conversion of man’s eternal soul. Evangelization might best be used when referring to the Gospel’s social responsibility to mankind alone or in conjunction with any other aspect of the Gospel message.

2.1.5 Summary of Evangelicalism

The descriptions within each of the six categories above are in no way comprehensive of each type of evangelicalism. These are but a brief introduction to inform the reader that the term “evangelical” is a complex term. In order to determine the impact of ecumenism on evangelicalism, it is necessary to point out the differing views of evangelicalism. Later in section 2.3 the historical development of evangelicalism will be traced and will provide a foundational evangelicalism from which these six types of evangelicalisms have arisen.

2.2 Defining Ecumenism to Establish a Baseline to Differentiate their Theological Perspectives and Missional Practices from those of Evangelicals.

The term “ecumenical” was coined into English in 1570 as an ecclesiastical word. The term came into English from Greek which at the time was used to refer to the inhabited world as perceived by the ancient Greeks. The term gained popularity as pertaining to a movement among Protestant groups in the 1800s. The goal was to achieve “universal


(accessed 12/21/2007).
Christian unity and church union through international interdenominational organizations that cooperate on matters of mutual concern."\(^{36}\) The World Council of Churches (WCC), one of the leading proponents of the ecumenical movement, has a stated goal of the "visible unity in one faith and in one eucharistic fellowship."\(^{37}\) This unity of faith and fellowship has faced significant challenges from its inception. These challenges continue to exist today.

Nikos Nissiotis brings awareness to the fact that many people in the early 1980s were seeking unity through other expressions than the "official expressions" of ecumenism. He believes that if the "Church" can come to common agreement on "Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry," then ecumenism will become more acceptable and thereby provide unity for the body of Christ. Nissiotis acknowledges that there are differing beliefs and practices concerning Baptism and Eucharist. However, he is quick to point out (his belief) that it is the churches differing beliefs and practices concerning ministry that is at the core of the disunity plaguing ecumenism.\(^{38}\) He also attributes the lack of unity to theological concerns. Nissiotis asserts, "In conservative ecclesiastical circles, in almost all of the churches, there is the suspicion that a certain kind of interconfessional syncretism has crept into ecumenical

\(^{36}\) Ibid., (accessed 12/21/2007).


theological work." There have been multiple attempts (which will be discussed in chapter 4) to lay the suspicions to rest.

Historically while evangelicals have focused on the salvation of man’s eternal soul, ecumenicals have tended to focus on a more holistic approach to relieving humanity’s illnesses. Ecumenism seeks to unite the whole body of Christ to rescue humanity from illness, oppression, and persecution. Ecumenism has developed into a global movement, and there are many denominations and movements who continue to spread ecumenist thought and practice. In an effort to achieve unity with all evangelical churches ecumenicals began to deal with doctrinal issues like the relationship between the Scripture and tradition and baptism and Eucharist. William H. Lazareth and Max Thurian believe that,

The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, held in Montreal in 1963, was a turning point in the history of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches and, it is fair to say, also in the history of ecumenical theology.

Even greater strides toward unity were made after the Faith and Order meeting in Bristol 1967 where the WCC decided to begin writing tests “showing the doctrinal convergence of the churches throughout the history first of the Faith and Order movement, then the World Council of Churches.”

---

39 Ibid., vii.


41 Ibid.
The Roman Catholic Church is one of the main proponents of ecumenism. However, for Rome participation in the ecumenical movement means to return to "mother Rome." This is one of the reasons that the RCC cannot become a full member of the WCC. The Episcopal Church also seeks to further ecumenism. The Episcopal Church produced a handbook designed to better equip their bishops, diocesan ecumenical officers, and other church officers in ecumenical and interfaith relations. The World Council of Churches seeks to unite Christians under the umbrella of ecumenism as does the Promise Keepers Movement.

2.2.1 Fundamentals of Ecumenism

This section will briefly describe four of the basic fundamentals of ecumenism: the organic unity of the church, reciprocal recognition of baptism, Eucharist and ministry, and the vocation of the church to social justice.

---

42 The Directory for the Application of Principles and Norms on Ecumenism states, "The ecumenical movement seeks to be a response to the gift of God's grace which calls all Christians to faith in the mystery of the Church according to the design of God who wishes to bring humanity to salvation and unity in Christ through the Holy Spirit. This movement calls them to the hope that the prayer of Jesus 'that they all may be one' will be fully realized. It calls them to that charity which is the new commandment of Christ and the gift by which the Holy Spirit unites all believers. The Second Vatican Council clearly asked Catholics to reach out in love to all other Christians with a charity that desires and works actively to overcome in truth whatever divides them from one another. For the Council, Catholics are to act in hope and in prayer to promote Christian unity. They will be prompted and instructed by their faith in the mystery of the Church, and their ecumenical activity will be inspired and guided by a true understanding of the Church as "a sacrament or instrumental sign of intimate union with God, and of unity of the whole human race." http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/document s/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_25031993_principles-and-norms-on-ecumenism_en.html (accessed 12/21/2007).

43 The 75-page Episcopal Church Handbook for Ecumenism March 2007 edition can be downloaded from http://www.episcopalchurch.org/eir.htm or a copy can be attained by writing to the Office of Ecumenical and Interfaith Relations, 815 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
The organic unity of the church is one of the more baseline fundamentals of ecumenism. Based on the concept that all organisms, despite distinctions, are one interrelated whole, ecumenism seeks unity within the entire global church. The belief is that since the church is organically united with Christ, there should be a unity among its members and that those members should work together despite their distinctions.

Likewise, reciprocal recognition of baptism is an important fundamental belief. Ecumenicals are not as concerned with the mode of baptism as they are a person be baptized. While some churches baptize by various methods after conversion, and yet others baptize infants, ecumenism is concerned that all churches adhere to a reciprocal recognition of baptism within the global body.\textsuperscript{44}

The Eucharist and ministry are closely related. Essentially, the Eucharist is a sacrament of what is believed to be a gift which God gives to members of the church in Christ through the power of the Holy Spirit, while ministry denotes devoted service to God which is the obligation of all the people of God. This includes individuals, local communities, and the universal Church. Ecumenicals believe that every Christian receives salvation through communion in the body and blood of Christ. The Eucharist meal is the eating and drinking of the bread and wine. It is believed that Christ grants communion with himself through the partaking of the Eucharist. The

Eucharist affects all areas of life and requires reconciliation between those considered to be brothers and sisters. The Eucharist and ministry are best demonstrated when God’s people who are saved through the Eucharist work together in unity to fulfill the ministry God has assigned to them. Christ is the best model for ministry in that He ministered to the whole person not just the spiritual aspect of man.45

The issue of the vocation of the church to social justice is an extremely complex topic. In broad terms, it refers to the responsibility of the global church as well as personal responsibility to minister to the need of the oppressed. For ecumenicals, social justice is a vital part of ministry. They reference passages in Scripture where Jesus ministered to the poor and oppressed, and they attempt to minister likewise today. Ecumenicals see political oppression, economic oppression, and judicial oppression as legitimate ailments that need to be alleviated from the world that man might truly be free.46

2.2.2 Ecumenism’s Past Divisions

Like evangelicalism, ecumenism has had its divisions too. Ecumenical historian Jacques Desseaux traces ecumenism’s division back to the year 1054 when Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida placed an excommunication on the altar of the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople (Istanbul). Most historians agree that this excommunication did not cause an immediate rift in the ecumenical world. The division came over time. It was during the Council of


Florence (1430–1439) that the date of 1054 was assigned as
the official date for the division between the church of
the East and the church of the West.\(^47\) While the event in
1054 may have been pinpointed as the cause for division,
there were concerns and factions long before the event.

2.3 Historical Development of Evangelical and Ecumenical
Theological Perspectives and Missional Practices prior to
Edinburgh 1910

Evangelicalism and ecumenism were in existence long
before the Reformation. However, since the body of this
work focuses on Edinburgh 1910 to present this section will
only give a brief historical sketch of these two streams of
thought from the Reformation to Edinburgh 1910. Part one of
this section will begin with the historical development of
evangelicalism as a movement. It will focus on
evangelicalism from the Reformation to Edinburgh 1910 to
establish evangelical perspectives prior to Edinburgh’s
influence. Part two of this section will begin with the
historical development of ecumenism as a movement. It will
focus on ecumenism from the Reformation to Edinburgh 1910
to establish evangelical perspectives prior to Edinburgh’s
influence.

2.3.1 Historical Development of Evangelicalism

Andrew Walls states that historic evangelicalism “is a
religion of protest against a Christian society that is not
Christian enough.”\(^48\) Walls points out that evangelicalism

\(^{47}\) Jacques Desseaux, *Twenty Centuries of Ecumenism*, Matthew J.

\(^{48}\) Andrew Walls, “The Evangelical Revival, The Missionary
Movement, and Africa” in *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular
Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Beyond, 1700–
1900.* ed. Mark A. Noll, David W. Bebbington, and George A. Rawlyk (New
has a long tradition which he dates back to the fourth century when Christianity combined itself with self-indulgence. He believes that Saint Antony the Copt might have been the first evangelical. However, this thesis will begin after the Protestant Reformation.

After the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century, Lutheran churches in Europe were known as "Evangelical" churches. From the seventeenth century onward, the Puritan party in the Church of England became known as the evangelical party because they sought to identify with the Reformed movement that stemmed from the Reformation.

During the eighteenth century, the Wesleyan revival took place within the Church of England. The revival brought together pietistic Anglicans, whose descendant movement became known as the "Evangelical party".

The foundation of what is most commonly called "evangelicalism" in the United States can be traced back to the first Great Awakening. The United States experienced the preaching and passion of men like Jonathan Edwards. He and the "New Lights" (revival Calvinists) were opposed by "Old Lights" (confessional Calvinists). George Whitefield expanded this pietistic "New Light" revivalism together with the non-Calvinist, Arminian Methodist movement. By the nineteenth century, Protestantism had taken root in Europe

---

49 The First Great Awakening is the name given to a period from the 1730s–1740s when there was a heightened sense of religious activity in Great Britain and North America. The Great Awakening was influential among many Congregationalists in the northeast of North America and among the "Backcountry" regions of the southern states as well as the Presbyterians and other dissenting Protestants.
and in the United States, and evangelicals were focused on revivalism, evangelism, and social activism.\textsuperscript{50}

The dominant form of eighteenth century North American evangelicalism was Calvinistic in that most evangelicals including Jonathan Edwards and George Whitefield believed that salvation was strictly the work of God. However, North American evangelicalism took a radical theological shift early in the nineteenth century. Through the influence of men like Charles Grandison Finney, Lyman Beecher, and Francis Asbury, evangelicalism (though still focused on man’s eternal destiny) began to focus on sin as a human action and man’s responsibility to repent of those actions. The theological shift produced widespread revivals as mankind began to take their sinfulness seriously. The new evangelicalism produced a devotion to Christ which led to a powerful revival movement and eventually became an important element of North American life.\textsuperscript{51}

By the 1820s evangelical Protestantism was the dominant expression of Christianity in the United States. Perhaps, this was due in part to the fact that,

The concept of evangelism and the revival—codified, streamlined, and routinized by evangelists like Charles G. Finney (1792-1875)—became "revivalism" as evangelicals set out to convert the nation. By the decades prior to the War Between the States, a largely-evangelical "Benevolent Empire" (in historian Martin Marty's words) was actively attempting to reshape American society through such reforms as temperance, the early women's movement, various

\textsuperscript{50} Wikipedia has a brief but interesting history of evangelism at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evangelicalism#Roots_of_the_evangelical_movement.

\textsuperscript{51} http://nationalhumanitiescenter.org/tserve/nineteen/nkeyinfo/nevanrev.htm (article by Donald Scott accessed 1/31/2008).
benevolent and betterment societies, and—most controversial of all—the abolition movement.\textsuperscript{52}

During the second half of the nineteenth century evangelicalism began to fragment over various issues. Evangelicals were forced to deal with numerous cultural and religious crises. They experienced an onslaught of evolutionism, biblical criticism, and an increase in immigration. Divisions arose in the form of “conservative” versus “liberal,” “traditional” versus “progressive,” and “resistant” versus “adaptationist” forms.\textsuperscript{53}

Nineteenth century North America and Europe were not the only places experiencing the spread of evangelicalism. South America was also coming to terms with evangelical thinking. Additionally, Africa was seeing an influx of evangelical missionaries.\textsuperscript{54}

\textbf{2.3.1.1 Summary of Evangelicalism prior to Edinburgh 1910}

Sydney E. Ahlstrom believes that “Evangelicalism is a battle-torn flag that has waved over many different Protestant encampments ever since the Reformation.”\textsuperscript{55} It has been viewed by some like Sydney Ahlstrom as somewhat

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
militant and exclusive. Historically evangelicals have held a high view of scripture even though they have disagreed on interpretation and application. Evangelicalism prior to Edinburgh 1910 focused predominately on man’s eternal destiny and paid little attention to man’s earthly needs. The passion for this emphasis was passed down to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries from early evangelicals like George Whitefield, John Wesley, and Jonathan Edwards.

Even though there have been divisions within the broader evangelical camp, and has undergone considerable changes, as a whole evangelicalism prior to Edinburgh 1910 maintained its identity as a unified tradition. Modern evangelicalism beliefs can be traced back to the early Puritan movement of Western Europe. Historically evangelicals have stressed the importance of an inward experience with God.56

The Great Awakenings of North America played a significant role in the spread of evangelicalism to North America and beyond as evangelical preachers and missionaries passionately carried the evangelical spirit with them. While there were some who continued to stand in a more Calvinistic theological framework, the Second Great Awakening introduced an Arminian theology and brought about what some believed to be a more theologically balanced evangelicalism.57

---

56 Ibid., 269-74.

57 In his paper on “Revival and Revivalism: The Second Great Awakening in America” David Calhoun attributes the infusion and growth of Arminian theology into evangelicalism through the preaching of Charles Finney. The paper can be downloaded at: www.covenantseminary.edu/worldwide/en/CH320/CH320_T_27.pdf — (accessed 3/19/2008).
As the nineteenth century closed, evangelicals were beginning to feel the pressures of biblical criticism from institutions of higher learning. They were forced to face the imported German philosophical ideas and scientific discoveries. Ideas of evolution and natural selection were among the many teachings that threatened evangelicalism at the beginning of the twentieth century.\(^5^8\) The stage was being set for Edinburgh 1910. Evangelicalism already had its hands full. Were they ready to deal with the ecumenism of Edinburgh?

**2.3.2 Historical Development of Ecumenism**

While most people in the twenty-first century who know the name “Martin Luther” reference it to the nailing of the ninety-five theses to the Wittenberg door, Luther actually desired for the “true Church” to be united. He stated,

> I believe that there is upon this earth a holy congregation and communion of pure saints ruled under one Head, Christ, called together by the Holy Spirit in one pure faith, in the same mind and understanding, furnished with multiple gifts yet in one love and in all respects harmonious, without sects or schisms.\(^5^9\)

Luther was not alone in his desire for a unified “Church.” Huldrych Zwingli, John Calvin, and Henry Bullinger alike believed in the “Holy Catholic Church” as a unified body of Christ. Their use of the term “Catholic Church” was not meant to demonstrate their allegiance to

---


the Catholic Church in Rome. For the reformers, the term “Holy Catholic Church” was a reference to those people who were committed to the teachings of Jesus Christ and were attempting to live out those teachings through their daily lives.

These men’s convictions for a unified pure church inspired them to write confessions and creeds. The first section of Luther’s Augsburg Confession written in 1530 begins with the necessity of unity;

...that for the future one pure and true religion may be embraced and maintained by us, that as we all are under one Christ and do battle under Him, so we may be able also to live in unity and concord in the one Christian Church.60

There was also Calvin’s Geneva Confession in 1536.61 Additionally, The First Helvetic Confession also known as the Second Confession of Basel was written in 1536 by Henry Bullinger and Leo Jud of Zurich, and the Second Helvetic Confession was written entirely by Bullinger in 1562. Add to these men Georg Witzel (German theologian), George Cassander (Flemish scholar), Thomas Cranmer (Archbishop of Canterbury), Martin Bucer (German Protestant reformer), Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus (Dutch humanist theologian),

60 www.lcms.org/graphics/assets/media/LCMS/augsburg.pdf (accessed 3/20/2008). Philip Melanchthon prepared a text to be presented at the Diet of Augsburg, based on an earlier set of doctrinal articles prepared by Martin Luther and his colleagues in the city of Torgau. Melanchthon’s draft was sent to Luther for his consideration and possible revision. After Luther’s approval was obtained, Melanchthon prepared the final text. The German version of what became known as the Augsburg Confession was read on Saturday afternoon, June 25, 1530. Ibid. (3/20/2008).

61 Historically, the Geneva Confession has been credited to John Calvin. Believed to be written in 1536. It was written as a formula of Christian doctrine for the church at Geneva. However, some more recent scholars attribute the document to William Farel. Others believe Calvin and Farel each took part in the writing.
and others, who launched the quest for unity during the time of the Protestant Reformation.

Daniel Ernest Jablonski, a Polish born Oxford educated theologian, spent much of his life attempting to reconcile the Calvinists and the Lutherans in Germany during the late 1600s and early 1700s. Likewise, there was Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf und Pottendorf who was the Imperial Count of Zinzendorf and Pottendorf. This German religious and social reformer became the bishop of the Moravian Church and spent much of his life during the 1700s expanding the Moravian Church while promoting unity. In fact, he sailed to North America in an effort to promote Christian unity. It is evident that,

Zinzendorf was quite upset with the divisive conditions among Christians in the colonies. He felt his main purpose in coming to America was to work for the oneness of the believers, and on seven different occasions he tried to bring brothers and sisters together.

Ecumenism expanded when Calvinist William of Orange through the Revolution settlement ascended to the throne of England. It made further expansions under Queen Anne, a zealous Anglican and her Lutheran husband Prince George of Denmark. The Act of Settlement of 1701 made provision for Protestant succession to perpetuate the throne of England.

---


There were additional attempts at unity during the 1700s. One such attempt can be seen in the 1712 visit of Greek Bishop Arsenius, Metropolitan of Thebias to Queen Anne of England. Patriarch Symeon Capsoules reason for sending Arsenius to England was to bridge the Church of the East and the Church of the West. However, the debate over the doctrine of the Eucharist caused such a controversy that unity never resulted from the visit.65

There were multiple attempts to secure ecumenism during the 1800s as well. Russian Emperor Alexander I’s famous Holy Alliance of 1815 is one such example. The monarchs of Austria, Prussia, and Russia tried to produce a utopian Christian nation without denominational boundaries regardless of confessional differences. These monarchs believed in unity without union. This attempt to create a federation of Christians into one holy nation failed also.66

Continued efforts at unity throughout the 1800s did finally bring a unity of sorts between the Church of the East and Church of the West. At the Third Lambeth Conference held in 1888, the Archbishop of Canterbury, as well as other Anglican Bishops, together with some Eastern Patriarchs and Bishops signed a resolution to be in friendly communication one with the other.

American Christianity had its proponents for unity also during the 1800s with men like William Augustus Muhlenburg, Thomas Hubbard Vail, and Elias B. Sanford. Yet, “the most influential of the Episcopalian advocates of


66 Ibid., 193-94.
Christian unity in the 19th century was William Reed Huntington.” Huntington believed that it was the Protestant Episcopal Church’s new mission to bring Christian unity to the American Church. He advocated a National Church that would allow all Christian groups to join. It was to be known as “The Catholic Church of America.”

However, nineteenth century American Christianity faced its own perils to unity. Biblical criticism, Calvinism, political differences in the aftermath of the Civil War, Deism, Social Gospel, and slavery were all points of disunity among and within American denominations of the 1800s. Churches split and denominations divided over these issues and more. Unity for the American Church seemed hopeless by the early 1900s. Evangelicals and Eumenicals alike lacked unity.

2.3.2.1 Summary of Ecumenism prior to Edinburgh 1910

To conclude, then, Church leaders during and immediately following the Reformation tended to focus on purity and unity. European Christians struggled during those years to define and then mold Christian unity. However, “The 17th and 18th centuries, as compared with the century of the Reformation, brought about many great changes in ecumenical thought.” Christians that grew out of the Reformation considered themselves the pure church due in part to the recovery of the proclamation of the

---


68 Ibid., 250.

Gospel. Whereas the church in the sixteenth century may have felt it necessary to abandon the formal legalistic line of apostolic succession, and perceive the true church as consisting of those who in purity hold to the faith, the church of the seventeenth and eighteenth century appeared to return to a more medieval understanding of church which understood the church to be more of an organization governed by laws and ordinances. Church leaders in the sixteenth century sought unity among faithful “spiritual church”, but the seventeenth and eighteenth century trailblazers were attempting to unify the physical body of Christ.\(^7\)

The nineteenth century had its share of ecumenical attempts at unity. Ultimately most efforts were considered failures. At its best Christian unity was mere cordial conversation between the established church of the East and West. George Florovsky states that,

\[\text{Many 19th-century events and tendencies will be seen to converge on the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910, as a watershed between miscellaneous ecumenical strivings and the integrated ecumenical movement of more recent times.}^{71}\]

Nineteenth century American Christianity experienced fragmentation in unity, as did the rest of the Christendom. By the early 1890s, the American church was comprised of 143 different denominations. While there were obvious differences in their doctrines, one of the major reasons for failure in their endeavors for unity was due to the

\(^{70}\) Ibid., 119.

\(^{71}\) Florovsky, “The Orthodox Churches and the Ecumenical Movement Prior to 1910,” 217.
importation of the schisms from Europe.\textsuperscript{72} Add to these schisms the pressures of immigration, transplantation of nationalism, combined with the western frontier individualist mentality, and ecumenism’s desire for Christian unity outside of denominational structures faced significant barriers. This was the environment of the late 1800s and early 1900s, thus setting the stage for Edinburgh 1910.

\textsuperscript{72} Yoder, “Christian Unity in Nineteenth-Century America,” 221.
Chapter 3

Edinburgh 1910

Edinburgh and the Ecumenical Movement

The World Missionary Conference that met in Edinburgh, Scotland June 3-23, 1910 was one of those events that so impacted the evangelical/ecumenical world that the mere mention of Edinburgh draws attention back to this momentous event. Immediately following Edinburgh, John R. Mott stated that the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh was “The most significant gathering ever held in the interest of the world’s evangelization.”¹

And in 1985 William G. Rusch reminds the church that “This conference summed up and brought into focus much of the nineteenth century’s movement for uniting Christians to give the gospel to the world.”²

3.1 Edinburgh 1910: Its background, Inception, and Founders

Kenneth Scott Latourette states that “Edinburgh 1910 was the outgrowth and climax of earlier gatherings through

¹ John R. Mott, The Decisive Hour of Christian Missions (Reformed Church in the United States, 1911), v.


Ralph Winter believes that Edinburgh 1910 is so well remembered because it was based on William Carey’s paradigm. The paradigm was not based on church leaders with indirect connection to missions, but instead focused solely and exclusively on delegates who were sent by mission agencies. Winter feels that Edinburgh 1910 was a success, but its greatest contribution may be the fact that it was the first world missions conference that truly consisted of mission agency delegates and that they focused on the “unoccupied fields.” For more info see: Ralph Winter, “Thy Kingdom Come: The Story of a Movement,” Mission Frontiers 17, nos.9-10 (Sept/Oct 1995): 44-51.
which protestants had been drawing together in their purpose to give the Gospel to the world. The meetings in London and New York in 1854, as well as the Liverpool 1860 and London 1860 and 1878 were all important events promoting Church unity. The Grindelwald conferences of the 1890s also sought unity. All of these events sought unity to some degree. Yet, even with Edinburgh’s precursor, the Ecumenical Missionary Conference of 1900 held in New York, the ecumenical movement needed a catalyst to spread its vision of unity globally.

The vision for a global missions conference was not a new concept. William Carey in 1806 proposed a world level missions conference be held at the Cape of Good Hope in 1810, but it was dismissed as just one of Carey’s “pleasing dreams.” The dream did not die but was simply delayed one-hundred years until its time for unveiling had come. The global meeting needed a man like John R. Mott to pioneer the way and spearhead the charge. By 1906 Mott had become extremely influential among global mission leaders. His mission endeavors abroad and his passion for world

---


4 Thomas A. Askew, “Ecumenical Missionary Conference (New York 1900)” in The Evangelical Dictionary of World Missions, (ed. A. Scott Moreau, et al. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000), 300. The Ecumenical Missionary Conference held at Carnegie Hall was the largest ten-day event in American life to that date. The sixty plus papers delivered over those ten days were heard by notables like U. S. President William McKinley and Governor of New York City Theodore Roosevelt, China Inland missionary J. Hudson Taylor, and future chairman of Edinburgh 1910 World Missionary Conference John R. Mott. The 170,000 to 200,000 attendants filled the 4000-seat Carnegie Hall session after session. Yet, it was viewed by some as a conference for inspiration and information rather than a conference to legislate policies of unity.

5 Winter, “Thy Kingdom Come: The Story of a Movement,” 44.
evangelization earned him the respect of missionaries and mission leaders alike. Mott announced his intention to “head off” another meeting planned for 1910 and decided to transform it into a radically different meeting. This meeting was to become the Edinburgh 1910 World Missions Conference.6

Mott needed help and the Student Christian Movement (S.C.M.) was ready for the assignment and was instrumental in laying the foundation for the Edinburgh conference. The relationships developed within the S.C.M. structure provided an impetus for change. The modern ecumenical movement was in its infancy and ready for launching at Edinburgh. Ruth Rouse points out just how strategic Edinburgh really was as it became, “the focusing point of the ideas and inspiration which made the new ecumenical movement possible was the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference 1910. It was the watershed between two eras of Church history.”7

John R. Mott, a Methodist layman, and Joseph H. Oldham, both of whom had come out of the Student Christian Movement (also known as the Student Volunteer Movement) were instrumental in the planning for Edinburgh 1910. During the Edinburgh conference a continuation committee was formed which was instrumental in the growth of ecumenism that stemmed from the conference. William G. Rusch believed that “The formation of this committee

6 Ibid., 44.

developed a precedent for the organization later of the ecumenical movement."\(^8\)

It was the men like Mott, Oldham, Robert Wilder, W. A. Visser, Wilber Patton, Stafan Zankov, and others all members of the S.C.M. who were responsible for the rapid spread of ecumenism during the early 1900s. Ruth Rouse states that “The pioneering role of the S.C.M. in the ecumenical movement can clearly be discerned if the career of John R. Mott is studied.”\(^9\) Mott’s life work seems to have been inspired from the moment he joined the S.C.M. at the Mount Hermon Student Conference in 1886 where his passion for missions was fueled. His work from that time until 1910 made him the obvious choice to be the chairman of the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh.\(^10\)

Mott’s desire for an interdenominational Christian organization stemmed from his involvement with the S.C.M. His desire was that Christians would unite for missions rather than choose a nondenominational structure. Mott’s ecumenical vision and passion not only landed him the chairmanship of Edinburgh 1910 but also the chairmanship of the International Missionary Council in 1921 which later led to conferences in Jerusalem and Tambaram.

\(^8\) Rusch, Ecumenism: A Movement Toward Unity, 27.


\(^10\) Ibid., 342-344 Rouse explains how the men and women who were influenced by the Student Christian Movement came from strong evangelical families. However, their deep desire to share Christ with others allowed them to “escape the dangers of evangelical narrowness”(343) that had so infected their parents. The Student Christian Movement provided “experimental laboratories in which new ecumenical attitudes, individual and corporate, were produced”(343-44).
3.2 Evaluation of the Ecumenism of Edinburgh 1910 and how it Resulted in Theological Convergence

As stated earlier in this chapter, many evangelicals look back on Edinburgh with great favor. However, over the years there has been a growing concern among some evangelical scholars that perhaps Edinburgh may have produced some negative results. While on the one hand Edinburgh has been praised for its ability to produce unity within evangelical Christianity, it also has its skeptics as to the cost of such a unity. What really happened at Edinburgh? Was the unity that proceeded from Edinburgh beneficial or detrimental to evangelicalism? Were there theological compromises at the foundations of this event? Has there been a theological convergence as a result of Edinburgh and its quest for unity?

Due to the limited focus and space of this work, only one of the eight commissions at Edinburgh will be examined. Commission Four studied “The Missionary Message in Relation to the Non-Christian Religions.” The eighteen person committee was led by Reverend Professor David Cairns of Aberdeen and Reverend Doctor Robert Speer. The committee prepared their 280-page report from the written submissions of 125 field missionaries. The report dealt with Animistic Religions, Chinese Religions, Japanese Religions, Hinduism, Islam, and Baha’i.

3.2.1 Concerns over a Possible Theological Convergence

Since the Edinburgh conveners had adopted the policy that no resolution would be allowed that involved doctrine

---

11 Theological Convergence refers to the occurrence of two or more theological systems of belief coming together. It includes the process of blending together and of having come together toward a common point of agreement. It is a representation of the common ground between theological theories and practice.
or church policy, the leadership of Commission Four found themselves with a theological challenge. Arthur P. Johnson asserts that “The conference was thereby limited in its doctrinal position and pronouncements to the breadth of the theologies represented by the various delegates.”¹² With the challenge before this committee it should be no surprise that concerns would be raised, but what would cause those concerns? Professor Cairns himself had concerns as he reflected on the theological challenge that this large theologically diverse group would present. He asked serious questions before the conference convened. Perhaps the question that has raised so much concern for evangelicals was Cairn’s question,

Do we not need the broadening and deepening of all our conceptions of the Living God, the deepening and liberating of all our thoughts of what He has done for us in Christ, of what by His Providence and His Spirit He is ready to do for us today?¹³

Cairns concluded, “For us this can only mean a new discovery of God in Christ.”¹⁴ And Robert Speer (committee vice-chairman) while he affirmed that Christians were the bearers of the true faith, concluded that Christians do not

---

¹² Arthur P. Johnson, The Battle for World Evangelism (Wheaton Il: Tyndale House, 1978), 44. An example of this type of thinking was expressed by the Bishop of Birmingham, the Right Reverend C. Gore, when during the introduction of the Commission Report he stated, “documents like the Thirty-Nine Articles or the Westminster Confession are full of controversies, which are partial, which do not belong to the universal substance of our religion.” Ibid.


¹⁴ Ibid.
have the “whole Christian truth.” It was these types of questions and conclusions that concerned evangelicals. If the conveners had permitted theologians to discuss such issues, it might have laid to rest the fears of evangelicals. However, theology was considered divisive and thereby not permissible, thus sparking concerns within the evangelical community.


Mark A. Noll notes, “At Edinburgh voices were heard speculating whether Christianity should be considered the absolutely final revelation from God or merely the best revelation from God.” This statement alone demonstrates the convergence of theological thought and further raises concerns for many evangelicals and ecumenicals alike. Noll’s acknowledgement that there were those at Edinburgh who questioned the historical evangelical perspective of God’s revelation is not the only concern surrounding Edinburgh.

Keith Eitel is equally concerned that Edinburgh’s quest for unity may have contributed to theological convergence. He states, “There was a palpable desire to

---

15 Ibid., 2.

16 Johnson, Battle for World Evangelism, 34.


18 Keith E. Eitel, “Evangelical Agnosticism: Crafting a Different Gospel,” in Southwestern Journal of Theology 49 (2): 150. Eitel makes it clear that he believes that the Edinburgh conveners made a conscious decision to overlook theological differences for the sake of unity at Edinburgh 1910. He demonstrates how this decision has resulted in
see the historic branches of Christianity coalesce around the cause and causes of God’s grand commission to His church, which He had left in the world to complete the task."^{19}

Eitel’s work demonstrates how some of the postmodern evangelicals of the twenty-first century have strayed from the biblical text in regards to the contextualizing of the Gospel. He believes that this departure has turned many evangelicals into “evangelical agnostics.”^{20} Eitel attributes this agnosticism to the fact that Edinburgh opened the door for evangelicals to come into union with ecumenicals without having well “defined doctrinal moorings.” He asserts,

> 2010 will be a monumental year in that it marks a century of Missiological practice that has evolved since the Edinburgh conference, where theological convictions were sacrificed on the modernistic altar of cooperative unity.^{21}

Eitel’s concern is echoed by David Hesselgrave in his paper “The Edinburgh Error.”

Hesselgrave writes,

> No other missionary gathering impacted the twentieth century missions as did the World Missionary Conference held in Edinburgh, Scotland in 1910. No

mainstream evangelicalism adopting a bottom up methodology for constructing contextualized theologies. These theologies have resulted in a manmade reshaping and transforming the meaning of biblical text rather than being reshaped and transformed themselves.

^{19} Ibid., 166.

^{20} Eitel is not referring to “agnostics” in the normal sense of the term as one who questions the existence of God. He is using the term in the sense that postmoderns question if mankind can know genuine full truth.

^{21} Ibid., 151.
single error was as significant as the Edinburgh error.\textsuperscript{22}

The “error” to which Hesselgrave is referring is the decision of the Edinburgh conveners to not allow theology into the conference discussions. Hesselgrave scolds Mott and those who made that decision. He believes that those planning the event were wrong to avoid theological discussions. In fact, he states “They should have insisted on including doctrinal discussion both when planning and when guiding conference proceedings.”\textsuperscript{23}

3.2.2 Evidence of Theological Convergence

In order to determine if there was theological convergence that proceeded from Edinburgh, it is necessary to examine evangelical theology from several perspectives. Due to the limited focus of this work it will briefly examine four basic areas; Christology, Ecclesiology, authority of Scripture, and Christian faith. Evangelicals hold to their theology as the lifeblood of their existence, yet many ecumenicals seek to broaden theological distinctives. Did Edinburgh minimize the theology of the evangelical?

Marcellus J. Kik affirms, “Theology has been termed the great divider. Ecumenists evidence chariness of theology since it has separated great bodies of people into different denominations.”\textsuperscript{24} Ecumenicals have accused denominations as being divisive to unity due to their

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22} David J. Hesselgrave, “Will We Correct the Edinburgh Error? Future Mission in Historical Perspective,” in \textit{Southwestern Journal of Theology} 49 (2): 121.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 124.
\end{itemize}
theological exclusiveness. Yet they fail to acknowledge that denominations like Baptists, Episcopals, Lutherans, Methodists, and Presbyterians have united large numbers of people around their theological distinctiveness.\textsuperscript{25}

\subsubsection{Christology}

Most evangelicals prior to Edinburgh 1910 believed that the message of Jesus Christ and its exclusive claims was the only means by which mankind could find peace with God. They viewed non-Christian religions as inventions from hell or specimens of error. Non-Christian religions were not examined for evidence of truth claims, but were discounted and often ridiculed by Christians. However, that changed at Edinburgh.

The report on the “missionary message in relation to the non-Christian religions” determined that after a more thorough examination of Scripture, non-Christian religions had truth claims and these truths could be beneficial to the Christian church. After the committee’s report missionaries went back to their fields of service with the understanding that non-Christian religions were religions “with broken lights of a hidden sun.”\textsuperscript{26} It was further stated that this being true, “Christianity, the religion of the Light of the World, can ignore no lights however ‘broken’ – it must take them all into account, absorb them all into its central glow.”\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 14. Kik states that the theological emphasis has been a rallying point and not divisive... Contrary to popular opinion, theology has manifested itself as a unifying influence. Ibid.


\textsuperscript{27} Ibid.
One aspect of the missionary message that flowed from Edinburgh 1910 was that by going into all the world Christ’s Church may recover all the light that is in Christ and become, like her Head, as it is His will she should become. Such was the working principle which guided the spiritual enterprise and quest now set forth in the pages of the Report of this Commission.\textsuperscript{28}

The shift in viewing non-Christian religions as inventions from hell or specimens of error to accepting them as carriers of light and truth provides evidence of theological convergence. Evangelicals prior to Edinburgh had long held that the true light came from the Word of God and that it was sufficient for mankind. Searching for and adding truths from other religions into the corpus of Christian teachings is evidence of convergence and deepens the basic concerns of evangelicals.

Evangelicals want to know, “What think ye of Christ?” Kik affirms, “The greatest misgiving of the evangelical concerns the conception of Christ. To what Christ will ecumenicity cleave?”\textsuperscript{29} Evangelicals prior to Edinburgh held to a biblical Christ, but feared that ecumenism might sway some to a non-biblical Christ. J. Marcullus Kik believed that close unity with ecumenicals might produce a Christology in which Christ would be stripped of all supernatural ability or even a view of Christ similar to Bultmann and Tillich (who were still children in 1910) where Christ was a human who became divine. Certainly adding light from non-Christian religions was a step in the direction of a non-biblical Christology.

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 138.

\textsuperscript{29} Kik, \textit{Ecumenism and the Evangelical}, 11.
3.2.2.2 Ecclesiology

Evangelicals have a long history of being exclusivists when it comes to ecclesiology. To them church doctrines and denominational confessions are important. Edinburgh opened the door of ecumenical inclusiveness. While there are concerns over minor doctrines the major concern focuses on the evangelical’s exclusive understanding of the nature of salvation. Kik understands this and asks, “How can the church tolerate differences of belief concerning that which the New Testament has declared vital for salvation?”

Historically, evangelicals held to the view that salvation referred to mankind’s eternal destiny and that his destiny was a literal hell. One important necessary factor in changing humanity’s destiny was the concept of the blood of Christ. These same evangelicals have preached that salvation was provided through the vicarious substitutionary atonement of Christ. Edinburgh opened the door for those who abhor such teaching and preaching which would ultimately affect the preaching of the evangelicals in the pursuit of unity.

The concept of what actually constitutes the Church was at stake. Evangelicals have maintained that the Church is composed of those who were the “called out” believers in Christ and that these believers lived out their lives through faith in their decision to follow the teachings of a biblical Christ. Some ecumenicals regard the Church as an visible society such as the Roman Catholic Church or as a external organization. The fear has been that this type of a view of the nature of the Church would lead to an earthly figurehead such as the Pope who speaks for all

---

30 Ibid., 15.
Christianity. Evangelicals fear that “The reigning Christ, head over all things to the church, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, the Gospel of power seem relatively unimportant to the master architects and builders of the monolithic church.”

By inviting such a diverse group of delegates Edinburgh opened the door for various views of the Church that challenged the evangelicals long held understanding. The years following Edinburgh produced a number of evangelical streams some of which no longer hold to the traditional view of the Church. Therefore, Edinburgh did contribute to theological convergence in the area of ecclesiology.

3.2.2.3 Authority of Scripture

The authority of Scripture was challenged long before Edinburgh. However, prior to the 1910 World Missionary Conference evangelicals prided themselves in the fact that they tightly held to and unashamedly affirmed the authority of the Scriptures. Evangelicals believed, “Without being questioned, the authority of the Old Testament of the Jewish church passed over, in the teachings of Jesus and the apostles, into the Christian church.” Evangelicals are quick to say that the authority of God’s Word surpasses all other authority. They believe that the Christian Scriptures have no equals when it comes to authority concerning the Christian faith.

31 Ibid., 17. Kik believes that the ecumenical “hysterical plea for unity” makes the church appear to be dependent on human institution rather than dependent on God which appears to leave Him helpless. The salvation of mankind becomes the achievement of the “ecclesiastical machine.” Ibid.

32 Ibid., 29.
When the conveners of Edinburgh chose to ignore theology for the sake of unity they permitted delegates with differing authority structures to influence the evangelical world. For some, the authority of experience equals the same level of authority as Scripture, and others affirm the position of agnosticism. One of the primary questions from such proponents is, “Can one shrug off the religious experience of the evangelical?” The superficial answer is “no.” Although religious experience cannot be dismissed, according to evangelicals it should be measured by the Scriptures. Evangelicals protest the elevating of experience to that of Scripture since it is their firm conviction that all experience be subject to God’s Word for authentication, value, and truth. When religious experience is elevated to the position of religious authority the ultimate judge of religious truth is not God but humanity.

Since theology was considered to be divisive and not to be permitted at Edinburgh, it was a safe haven for the convergence of competing ideas as to proper authority for faith and practice. Arthur P. Johnson speaks out concerning the attitude toward the authority of Scripture at Edinburgh. He makes it clear that even though the World Mission Conference was “An epoch-making conference.... Its inclusive nature sowed seeds of a progressive theology so evident later on in Life and Work, Faith and Order, and especially in the International Missionary Council.”

In addition to a convergence of theology of Christology and Ecclesiology there was also a convergence in the very understanding of the authority of Scripture.

---

33 Ibid., 33.

34 Johnson, Battle for World Evangelism, 36.
Some evangelicals believe that this convergence resulted in the founding of the World Council of Churches and attributed to its inclusive theological basis.\textsuperscript{35}

\subsection{3.2.2.4 Christian Faith}

The issue of faith has also been a topic of heated debate between evangelicals and ecumenicals. Ecumenicals believe that one common faith is necessary for unity, but have been slow to define that faith. Evangelicals are in agreement that there is a need for one common faith, but that faith must be defined within biblical parameters. They insist on an objective faith that is based on and consists of sound biblical doctrine.

Evangelicals maintain that objective biblical faith is a requirement for salvation. They believe that genuine Christian faith comes from the Gospel of Christ. Therefore, any other faith would be driven by another gospel and not be sufficient for salvation. For the evangelical, “the specific purpose of the content of the Christian faith is to point to the person of Jesus Christ as the only way to save the soul of sinful man.”\textsuperscript{36}

Ecumenicals strongly disagree with this understanding, and, therefore, permit a broader diversity of faith than most evangelicals. Some ecumenicals hold to an objective biblical faith, but others adhere to a faith that is more experiential and subjective. They view Christian faith more as a unifier of the church and not as something that constitutes the essence of Christianity.

Edinburgh contributed to a theological convergence by bringing together delegates from differing understandings

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 36.

\textsuperscript{36} Kik, \textit{Ecumenism and the Evangelical}, 66.
of faith into an arena where their faiths clash, and did not provide a venue for discussion of these differences in the belief structures. In their quest for unity the conveners opted to not deal with the issue of what actually constitutes the very essence of Christian faith. Their decision not to deal with this issue still plagues evangelicals and ecumenicals today.

### 3.3 Factors That Contributed to Theological Convergence

There were many factors that may have attributed to theological convergence at Edinburgh 1910. Due to the limited space and focus of this thesis, only a few factors will be examined. The Conference was strategically and carefully planned from the choosing of John R. Mott to head the preparatory commission to the selection of delegates and the selection of topics to be discussed.  

#### 3.3.1 Selection of John R. Mott

As one gets to know John R. Mott through his writings and those writings about him, it quickly becomes evident that Mott had a deep concern for the souls of the nations. His desire for man’s salvation and his belief that Christian unity was required to accomplish the task of global evangelization motivated him to press for unity at Edinburgh 1910. Could conservative evangelical delegates at Edinburgh have genuine unity with anyone questioning God’s revelation to the Christian church? What was the cost of that unity?

Mott’s involvement in the Student Christian Movement and his desire to spread the Christian message to the

---

nations prepared him to become part of a new era of ecumenism. It is believed that,

“The world mission conference held in Edinburgh in 1910 in the mood of the student movement’s watchword of ‘the evangelisation of the world in this generation’ is considered the symbolic starting point of the contemporary ecumenical movement.”

3.3.2 Selection of Topics and Unity

The Commission on Cooperation and the Promotion of Unity made it clear in their report to the World Missionary Conference that the non-Christian world was awakening and ready to receive the Gospel. It was that report which demanded Christian unity in order to accomplish the task of global evangelization that helped convince Mott that unity was key to getting the Gospel to the world.39

Mott and the committee determined that there would be eight topics which would be discussed at Edinburgh. Carrying the Gospel to all the non-Christian world, the church in the mission field, education in religion to the Christianization of national life, the missionary message in relation to non-Christian religions, the preparation of missionaries, the home base of missions, missions and governments, and cooperation and the promotion of unity were the select topics. The fact that Mott choose to ignore theological implications in each of these areas of discussion for the sake of unity was a contributing factor to theological convergence.

39 Mott, The Decisive Hour of Christian Missions, 122-123.
3.3.3 Selection of Delegates

The delegates were carefully selected. Kyo Seong Ahn states it matter-of-factly when he asserts, "To put it bluntly, most of the participants of the Edinburgh Conference could be labeled as ecumenical evangelicals."  

Additionally delegates were invited from mission agencies only if those agencies were operating among non-Christian peoples. Any mission society that had missionaries working among groups considered by the conference planners to already be Christian did not receive an invitation. The field of delegates had to be limited in order to remain focused on the desired topics and not become a conference of widely scattered objections. Plans were in place and,

The narrowing of the scope of the Conference to missions among non-Christian peoples made it possible to bring in a larger number of societies and a greater variety of ecclesiastical and theological convictions than had been represented in any previous gathering. Largely because of the influences which issued from Edinburgh 1910, the ecumenical movement became widely inclusive.  

The selection of delegates was well planned and deliberate. Mott and the committee were careful in their selection process. The constituency was enlarged in order that the Anglo-Catholics could actively participate in the

---


conference.\textsuperscript{42} The selection of delegates contributed to theological convergence.

\textbf{3.3.4 The Selection of Unity/Ecumenism}

Mott and the planning committee had difficult choices to make as to the direction of this conference. Earlier conferences had failed to include many Christian organizations with field missionaries. The decision was made to be as inclusive as possible. That required ecumenism at any cost. Andrew F. Walls believes the Edinburgh organizers intended to correct one of the major lacuna of past conferences. He asserts,

The organizers had aimed at theological inclusiveness: The more 'catholic' expressions of Angelicanism, though to a significant degree involved in missions, had not been officially represented at earlier mission conferences, and the general theological climate of the time did not make such a meeting easy.\textsuperscript{43}

Walls further asserts that the conference organizers exercised "great diplomacy" in avoiding "flashpoints" where differing traditions might possibly conflict. That diplomacy required a strong commitment to ecumenism.

Ecumenism was a primary focus of Edinburgh from the preplanning of the preparatory committee throughout the conferences that followed Edinburgh 1910. Kenneth Scott Latourette states that Edinburgh 1910 "became a landmark in the history of the Ecumenical Movement."\textsuperscript{44}

Theological convergence has been established as existing in and proceeding from Edinburgh 1910. There were

\textsuperscript{42} Johnson, \textit{Battle for World Evangelism} 44.


many contributing factors to that convergence. However, the dominating factor in the process is unity. The desire for unity was the motivating force behind most other factors.

3.3.5 Other Factors

Certainly there were other factors that attributed to the atmosphere of Edinburgh and in some way may have contributed to theological convergence. One of those factors was the times. Kyo Seong Ahn makes it clear that the 1910 conference was held in “The Era of Innocence.” He believes that Edinburgh “was held at the prime time of this era...”45 This Era of Innocence was a time of great missionary passion and enthusiasm. Missions was becoming more organized and well invested.

Another factor grew from the fact that Edinburgh was planned and guided predominately by westerners. Ahn states that,

in the documents of the Edinburgh Conference, we can repeatedly witness the exclusive usage of we... From the perspective of the non-westerners, the Edinburgh Conference was ‘theirs’, not ‘ours’ The Edinburgh Conference was a conference of the westerners about what and how to do missions and it was a message from the western Christians to the non-Westerners, whether they were Christian or not.46

It is apparent that some of the non-Westerners at Edinburgh felt left out and belittled. Had they been asked their opinion and allowed to contribute, they might have desired to speak on theological issues and may have affected the


46 Ibid., 4-5.
outcome of theological convergence that stemmed from the Conference.

Another factor may have been apathy within the missionary sending churches of the West. John R. Mott makes it clear that the missionaries who attended the World Missionary Conference were troubled by “the state of the home Church.”47 After conducting hundreds of interviews Mott concluded “They [missionaries] feel that the apathy and indifference manifested to-day among Christians at home are the greatest discouragement and hindrances to the extension of the missionaries’ work.”48

When missionaries feel abandoned or unappreciated they may tend to partner with other missionaries who hold differing theological perspectives. Had these missionaries had a strong passionate encouraging base of support, they may have not embraced theological convergence as quickly.

Finally, the ecumenical motives may have also contributed to theological convergence. J. Marcellus Kik lists six primary motives for ecumenicals.49 These motives, as pure as they may have been, did indeed influence the Edinburgh conveners to strive for unity at the expense of theology, thus attributing to theological convergence.

47 Mott, The Decisive Hour, 127.

48 Ibid.

49 Kik, Ecumenism and the Evangelical, 4-8. Kik’s six primary motives “the world situation presents a powerful incentive to act with Christian unity; the conquest of the heathen world forms a powerful drive for the Christian church to become united; prevalent secularism; the growing power and influence of the Roman Catholic Church creates a motive for a united Protestant church; a common complaint expresses concern that divided Protestantism cannot speak with one voice and act with united purpose;” and the most powerful motive for the establishment of a world-wide church is the conviction that “God desires his worshippers to be within the framework of one ecclesiastical structure.”
3.3.6 Brief Analysis

There is sufficient evidence to support the claim that ecumenism within the Edinburgh World Missions Conference of 1910 attributed to theological convergence. Prior to Edinburgh there were two distinct streams of Christianity seeking global evangelization. However, Edinburgh provided the venue, content, and atmosphere for these two streams to converge. One of the ways they converged was in their theology. Evangelicals seem to be the group that converged into the stream of ecumenism. While most ecumenicals and many evangelicals look back on the World Missions Conference as a time of great accomplishment toward unity, there are those who question any such accomplishment.50

The problem of theological convergence is not a recent concern. It was recognized as early as 1921 when it became apparent to the International Missionary Council that theological controversies led the China Inland Mission to withdraw in 1916. Later the Christian and Missionary Alliance would also withdraw after the controversial Hocking Report. Arthur P. Johnson states,

Edinburgh 1910 hoped to harness the global forces of Christianity, to complete world evangelization, and to introduce the coming Kingdom of God upon the earth. It served rather to hinder evangelism by what it did not say concerning the authority of scripture, and what it did through the agencies which grew out of it.51

---

50 As presented earlier in this chapter, Keith Eitel and David Hesselgrave both question the value of any such unity produced at Edinburgh. Their claim is that theological convergence took place at Edinburgh due to the driving force of unity centered pragmatism.

51 Johnson, Battle for World Evangelism, 43. Johnson makes it clear that "it has been long believed by the non-theologically-oriented youth leadership that doctrinal statements hindered their interdenominational programs." 43.
The concerns over theological convergence has continued to escalate throughout the years. As the evangelical world looks toward Edinburgh 2010 some evangelicals are asking questions like “While unity centered pragmatism at nearly all costs eventually won the day in 1910, is it time now to rethink our theological identities and test the security of our tether to biblical truth?”

Eitel believes that there is a possibility of unity for the sake of missions, but that such a unity must be based on biblical truths and scrutinized by the Word of God. Otherwise, unity between differing theologies are likely to be affected by theological crosscurrents which will erode into less than biblical theology.

While many ecumenicals are looking toward Edinburgh 2010 as a monumental year which marks a century of great missiological accomplishments, many evangelicals would agree with Keith Eitel that perhaps 2010 is a year to come full circle and return to the inerrant truth which was once delivered unto the saints. The fear is that if there is no discussion of biblical doctrine concerning Christian unity, then Christian Missiology evangelicalism will find itself adrift even further from its biblical moorings.

David Hesselgrave also offers suggestions as evangelicals and ecumenicals fast tract to Edinburgh 2010. He points out that Edinburgh was responsible for launching a movement where evangelicals and ecumenicals cooperated in

---

52 Eitel, “Evangelical Agnosticism,” 152.
53 Ibid.
54 Ibid., 151-52.
the evangelization of the world without prior doctrinal consensus. He asserts that the problem is not so much with the acceptance of one another, but is problematic in the fact that they set out on a journey together without putting their doctrinal beliefs to the test. For Hesselgrave the test is the Word of God. He affirms that,

Only a knowledge of and a commitment to, the revealed truth of God will sustain the church and its missions in the years ahead. The most crucial challenges of this century and until our Lord returns will not have to do first and foremost with our innovative strategies but with our basic beliefs—what those beliefs really are and with how deeply they are actually held. The response of the church and mission leaders to the challenges of postmodernism and globalization must be the exact opposite of the Edinburgh response.55

Hesselgrave urges those planning for centennial celebrations carefully to consider Christian doctrine as they plan for Edinburgh 2010. He is instructive and reminds them that every phase of the celebration must be biblically grounded, and that no vision, passion, or compassion should be allowed to preempt the primacy of God’s Word.56

Finally, only time will tell if the 2010 centennial celebrations will be a celebration of the past one hundred years, a time for reflection and redirection, or both. Most ecumenicals are proud of the achievements and progress from Edinburgh until today and see no need for a change in direction. Today some evangelicals like Eitel and Hesselgrave are concerned with what they perceive as a theological convergence between traditional conservative evangelical theology and ecumenical theology. The

55 Hesselgrave, “Will We Correct the Edinburgh Error?,” 142.
56 Ibid.
accusation from such evangelicals is that this convergence has resulted in a theology that is less biblical and less pure than it was prior to Edinburgh 1910. Their concerns are genuine and need to be addressed from biblical parameters because the future of world evangelization is at stake.
Chapter 4

Ecumenism from Edinburgh to Lausanne

Evangelicals have asserted that a theological convergence began at Edinburgh 1910 and that it has continued to affect evangelical theology to this day.\(^1\) Chapter three provided evidence that there was a convergence of theologies that took place at the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in 1910 when evangelicals and ecumenicals sought unity for the sake of world evangelization. This chapter will explore the ecumenism that flowed from 1910 to 1974, will analyze its impact on evangelical theology, and will determine if any missiological practices emerged as a result.

Was there one main cause for the convergence or multiple causes? David Hesselgrave asserts that “from the time of Edinburgh the modern ecumenical movement has been characterized more by organizational togetherness than theological consensus.”\(^2\) Hesselgrave as well as other evangelicals attribute much of the convergence to a lack of adherence to biblical theology, which in turn leads to less than biblical missiological practices. This chapter will explore these claims.

\(^1\) Convergence: Refers to the occurrence of two or more things coming together. It is the process of coming together or the state of having come together toward a common point. It is a representation of common ground between theories or phenomena. In this context it refers to the coming together or blending of differing theologies.

However, before delving into these assertions, it must be noted that there were a plethora of contributing factors to theological convergence from Edinburgh to Lausanne. Charles E. Van Engen asserts that as

North American Evangelicals experienced new sociocultural strength and confidence, changes in ecumenical theology of mission, and developments in evangelical partner churches in the Third World, they responded with a broadening vision of an evangelical theology of mission that became less reactionary and more holistic without compromising the initial evangelical élan of the ‘spirit of Edinburgh 1910’. ³

Van Engen further points out that 1940s and 1950s evangelicals were influenced theologically by the threat of communism, war, a pessimism over humanity and the human condition, as well as the “essential emptiness of the old social-gospel mentality.”⁴

Wilber R. Shenk states that by 1966 there was a convergence stemming from “Third World Evangelicals’ concerns for an identity that included social justice and cultural integrity.”⁵ It is likely that convergence resulted as Western Evangelicals and Third World Evangelicals interacted at mission gatherings like Wheaton 1966, Berlin 1988, and Lausanne 1974.

Additionally, While Daniel W. Hardy never actually uses the term “theological convergence,” he makes a strong case

---
⁴ Ibid., 206.
for convergence as a result of the transition from "Enlightenment" thinking and "Modernity." As Christian theologians, laymen, and missionaries (holding reconstitution, instrumentalization, and/or conciliatory views) transitioned into modernity, certainly theological orthodoxy was altered. These changing views did not exist in a vacuum. The views "coexisted and interacted, often within the same churches or mission organizations, stimulated as much by each other as by anything outside."  

Other factors influenced twentieth century evangelicalism as well. The West faced economic collapse after the 1929 Wall Street Stock Market Crash and the Great Depression that followed. There was also a deep pessimism resulting from incredible destruction of war as Germany and Britain unleashed devastation upon humanity. These are but a few of the possible influences that may have contributed to convergence as evangelicals and ecumenicals hammered out the road to world evangelization in the twentieth century. While there were indeed numerous factors, the fact that there was theological compromise or convergence away from the moorings of biblical absolutism is still evident, and further analysis of that phenomenon is pertinent.

4.1 Ecumenism that flowed from Edinburgh 1910 to Lausanne 1974

There were three major movements that emerged from Edinburgh 1910. The first movement resulted in the formation of the International Missionary Council (IMC) in 1921 (also known as the Missionary Conference Movement). John R. Mott (chairman of Edinburgh 1910) was named

---

chairman of the council. J. H. Oldham (who served on the Edinburgh Continuation Committee) was appointed as Mott’s assistant. The IMC was formed to study and coordinate the non-Roman Catholic Christian missions into a more unified and harmonious organization. The second movement formed the Stockholm Continuation Committee. The committee existed to engage the non-Roman Catholic churches in an effort to implement what they considered essential documents from Edinburgh. The committee was founded on practical and social bases which were established at the Edinburgh World Missions Conference. This movement established the “Life and Work Movement” which originally focused on issues of peace and justice, but later broadened its work to include economic, social and moral issues. The Life and Work Movement held conferences in Stockholm, Sweden, in 1925 and in Oxford, England, in 1937.

The third movement found expression in the Lausanne Continuation Committee. This committee was committed to matters of faith and order. They worked to achieve authentic unity by establishing a communion of faith and common doctrine of ministry. Since this work is most applicable to a correlation between Edinburgh and Lausanne, this chapter will briefly examine the first two movements, but will concentrate primarily on the third movement.

The first movement, known as the International Missionary Council, formed in 1921, organized several mission conferences that followed Edinburgh 1910, one of these was the second World Mission Conference which was held in Jerusalem in 1928, and was quite different from

---

that of Edinburgh. The two main topics that arose from the Jerusalem conference dealt with the relation of the Christian message and other religions, and theological interpretations of Christian social and political responsibilities. No consensus emerged from Jerusalem 1928.\(^8\) One reason it created controversy and divergence may have been due to its strong relativistic accent. In fact that the Jerusalem conference was held at the apex of the relativistic position that all paths led to God.

According to some evangelicals, the trend of Jerusalem 1928 was toward "the social gospel, the ethnic concept of religion in which Christianity was denominated as differing in degree rather than in kind from other religions.\(^9\) John D. Rockefeller, Jr. financed a report on "Rethinking Missions" by the Laymen's Committee. William Earnest Hocking, professor at Harvard University, was selected as chairman of the committee. He also served as co-editor of the report. The report was rejected by most delegates.

Another conference that the IMC hosted was in 1938 in Tambaram, India (also referred to as Madras 1938), commonly known as the third World Mission Conference. It was largely represented by the West, but was represented by a growing number of leaders from the “younger” churches. The


\(^9\) [http://bible.ovu.edu/missions/guidelines/chap1.htm](http://bible.ovu.edu/missions/guidelines/chap1.htm) (George P. Gurganus; accessed 2/16/2009). The debate centered around the committee's five conclusions that: 1. An eventual transfer of all authority in the churches and the institutions from the missionaries to the natives; 2. Non-Christian religions should not be debated by missionaries; 3. A positive presentation of Christian principles should be made; 4. A sharing should take place between Christianity and non-Christian religions. Each should adopt the good points of the other; 5. Ultimately, the missionary should become an advisor or minister in the service of the native church.
“younger” church leaders were conservatives and they defended the Christian message as far as it pertains to other religions, but also advised missionaries to dialogue openly with other religions. The World Missionary Conference at Madras differed from Jerusalem in that it was characterized more or less from the study of the relationship between missions and the cultural context and the role of missionaries as carriers of culture. Some missiologists attribute the development of intensive research in cultural anthropology back to this conference.10

Tambraram is also remembered as a time when German theologians and missiologists rejected their more liberal American and British counterparts and actually drafted their own statement.

By 1947 when the International Missionary Council (IMC) held its conference in Whitby, Canada, the use of Christian vs. non-Christian language (when referring to peoples and/or countries) had been dropped. By the end of the conference the door had been opened for “new paths in mission theology.”11 Within thirty-seven years of Edinburgh 1910 a convergence was well under way in this first movement that flowed from Edinburgh.

New Delhi 1961 was a turning point as the IMC and the World Council of Churches (WCC) became effective when mission councils who had been affiliated with the IMC aligned with the WCC and the IMC ceased to exist. From the time of the New Delhi Conference, “World mission conferences could really be called ecumenical because of


the much larger denominational participation, including Orthodox churches and soon after the Second Vatican Council also Roman Catholic observers."\(^\text{12}\)

One of New Delhi’s speakers was a deeply committed Lutheran named Joseph Sittler. Sittler was a key leader unafraid to address issues of ecumenism and Christian unity. Widely known for his keynote speech, “Called to Unity,” delivered at the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches in New Delhi 1961, Sittler may have set the tone for Uppsala and Bangkok. Sittler’s interest in Eastern Orthodox thinking contributed significantly to his own theological stances and weighed heavily in his New Delhi speech. His speech on unity and his contribution on the Cosmic Christ are still remembered by some.

Sittler argued that God calls the “Christian churches to unity, and that ‘this relentless calling [that] persists over and through all discouragements ... is what engendered the ecumenical movement among the churches, and steadily sustains them in it.’”\(^\text{13}\) For Sittler, Cosmic Christology affirmed to mankind that the gift of God in Jesus Christ was for all of creation. Cosmic Christ stems from God’s cosmic plan based on Scriptures including Genesis, Psalms, and Proverbs. The central passages for cosmic Christology begin with John 1:1-14 and include Mark 16:15, Col 1:15-20 and Eph 1:3-4 and 9-10. Other verses are in Romans and 2 Corinthians.

Other conferences were held between 1961 and 1973. However, theological convergence was clearly evident at

\(^\text{12}\) Ibid.

Bangkok 1973 when the Commission on World Mission and Evangelism (CWME) held its conference under the theme of “Salvation Today.” The terminology which had been inspired by liberation theology took center stage in Bangkok and promoted social, political, and economic justice as well as racism and environmental issues. Salvation which once referred to mankind’s spiritual life had become holistic and concerned with his earthly existence as well. Throughout the years the same terminology would undergo transition even more and focus on existential issues and personal experiences of the individual.\textsuperscript{14} This theological shift deeply concerned some within evangelicalism. Whereas historically evangelicalism has considered “salvation” as referring primarily to man’s spiritual life, the CWME under the World Council of Churches repeatedly held conferences focusing on soteriological themes inclusive of all areas man’s life.\textsuperscript{15}

The second movement that stemmed from Edinburgh which had formed the Stockholm Continuation Committee and later began the Life and Work Movement first found expression through the Universal Christian Conference. Originally designed to focus on issues of peace and justice, the movement quickly broadened its scope to include economic, social and moral issues. The Life and Work Movement found expression in several other conferences from 1925 to 1937


\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 6. In the latter part of the twentieth century the WCC and/or the CWME held assemblies in Mexico City 1963; Uppsala 1968; New Delhi 1972; Bangkok 1973; Nairobi 1975; Melbourne 1980; Vancouver 1983; Canberra 1991; Salvador 1996; and Harrare 1998.
until it was absorbed into the preliminary stages of the WCC in 1938 prior to its official inception in 1947.¹⁶

When in 1938 the movements ‘Life and Work’ and ‘Faith and Order’ decided to form a World Council of Churches, a connection-committee to the IMC was set up under the guidance of John Mott and William Paton. And from the very beginning of the WCC in 1948 both councils were associated with each other and maintained joint enterprises.¹⁷

Today the WCC promotes the work of the Life and Work Movement and the ideals of the Faith and Order Movement. The ideals and work of WCC will be examined later in this chapter since all three movements have become so interwoven into the WCC that they now appear to be one broad movement interwoven with the World Evangelical Alliance and Lausanne.

The third movement and focus of this chapter found expression through the Lausanne Continuation Committee. This committee urged churches to study the difficulties raised by theological differences. Their objective was for the churches to overcome their theological differences, thus, promoting Christian unity. One of the committee’s achievements was the organization of the Faith and Order Movement which held its first conference in Lausanne, Switzerland, in 1927.

---

¹⁶ The Life and Work Movement found expression in the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work (Stockholm 1925); The Continuation Committee of the Conference (1926-1930); The Universal Christian Council for Life and Work (1930-1938); and The Oxford Conference on Church, Community, and State (1937).

4.1.1 Faith and Order: Origin and Beginnings

The idea for a conference on faith and order was first proposed by Episcopal Bishop Charles H. Brent at the World Missionary Conference in 1910, but it did not take place until 1927. The task of the Faith and Order Movement was to study diversities of belief, liturgical practice, polity, and ministry within Christianity. The hope was that a better understanding of such diversities might enable good will and cooperation between differing denominations.

4.1.2 Faith and Order: Vision, Purpose, and Growth

At the heart of the agenda of Lausanne 1927 was the call for unity. The Faith and Order Movement was part of the larger ecumenical movement that stressed an agreement on faith that was accompanied by a shared mission. The Faith and Order Movement became a Commission in 1948 when it joined with the World Council. The World Council “became a principal context for the faith and order conversations focused in the Commission on Faith and Order.”\(^ {18} \) The World Council of Churches has made many structural changes over the years. However, the Faith and Order Commission has remained and is today the most comprehensive forum for debate on the subject. The 120-member commission has continued to expand its vision steadily to become more inclusive. It has even received approval from the Pope. While the Roman Catholic Church has never officially become an active member of the World Council of Churches, it did become a full member of the Faith and Order Commission after Vatican II.\(^ {19} \)


\(^ {19} \) Ibid., 3.
Lausanne 1927 was the first of many conferences on Faith and Order. Other conferences included Edinburgh 1937, Lund 1952, Montreal 1963 and Santiago de Compostela 1993. On August 5, 2002, the Faith and Order Movement celebrated its seventy-fifth anniversary in Lausanne. The commission continues to carry out its mission to proclaim the oneness of the Church of Jesus Christ and to call the churches to the goal of visible unity in one faith and one Eucharistic fellowship expressed in worship and in common life in Christ, in order that the world may believe.  

4.1.3 Faith and Order: Achievements

On August 25, 2002 Mary Tanner delivered a paper at the seventy-fifth Lausanne 1927 Anniversary celebration that encapsulates some of the milestones of the Faith and Order Movement. Speaking of Lausanne 1927 she states,

That meeting saw so clearly the necessity of expressing agreement in faith if churches were to come together and stay in mission and service to God’s world. The meeting identified an agenda on which agreement was deemed to be required for the unity of the Church and it made advances in understanding by comparing positions held by different churches in some of those areas. So, Lausanne began an ecumenical theological conversation which has gathered momentum in the last 75 years, in multilateral conversations within the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches and also outside the World Council in many bilateral discussions which have blossomed, particularly with the entry into the conversation of the Roman Catholic Church after Vatican II. We rightly celebrate its fruits of the conversations: the convergences, even consensus, reached between churches in areas that were causes of division and which once seemed intractable. And we celebrate the fact that this theological conversation has gone in an ever more inclusive circle and amidst increasing friendships of trust and confidence. The conversation has continued,

---

20 Ibid., 3.
together with the other crucial endeavors of the ecumenical movement: shared mission, education, witness, the search together in this broken world for justice and peace, for the overcoming of violence, and for the establishment of an inclusive and participatory community.  

Tanner makes it clear that the Faith and Order Movement was intentionally ecumenical and that there were great achievements from its inception in 1927 until 2002. She boasts that the theological conversations led to theological convergence and even consensus as a result of gaining the trust and confidence of the differing denominations.

4.1.4 Rise of the World Council of Churches

The Life and Work conferences and the Faith and Order conferences of the 1920s and 1930s were considered fruitful by some, but by the 1940s “there was a growing realization that the life-and-work was inevitably theological, and consequently, could not be kept in isolation from faith- and-order considerations.” When the World Council of Churches held its founding assembly in Amsterdam, Holland, in 1948 the Life and Work Movement and the Faith and Order Movement came together and found their new expression. The two movements were formalized into a union and became known as the World Council of Churches. After the joining of the

---


23 Ibid.
two movements in 1948 the Life and Work Movement ceased to exist. However, the Faith and Order continued as a distinct movement within the WCC.

The WCC grew in membership and influence. By 1957 the Free Methodist Church sent Donald Demaray to work with the “Baptism Into Christ” committee. Indirectly, James Royster represented the Church of God (Anderson) at that meeting, although John W. V. Smith worked with the committee on “Doctrinal Consensus and Conflict.” By 1963 the Church of God (Anderson) was sending delegates and observers to attend the WCC conferences. Gene W. Newberry was a delegate to the Montreal 1963 Conference along with Louis Meyer and John W. V. Smith as observers. The Salvation Army also sent their first two delegates, Commissioner S. Hepburn and Lt-Col. Kaiser.24

The Wesleyan Theological Society had been indirectly participating with the WCC, but in 1985 they began officially working with the WCC with the appointment of Dayton and David Cubie of the Church of the Nazarene. Today there are a wide range of churches cooperating with the WCC. Most are full members such as the Church of God (Anderson), the Church of God (Cleveland), Mennonites, International Evangelical Church, Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, Independent Christian Churches, Christian Reformed Church, Cooperative Baptist Fellowship. Additionally, there are churches and organizations that participate, but do not hold membership.

The WCC grew in membership and influence from its inception throughout the 50s, 60s, and 70s. However, it did so in spite of controversy from conservative evangelicals.

24 Ibid., 3.
Some evangelical leaders feared that the WCC’s involvement with social, economic, and political agendas distracted the Church from her mission of evangelization through the preaching of the Gospel of Christ.\textsuperscript{25}

### 4.2 Ecumenism’s Relationship to Theological Convergence from 1910 to 1974

Ecumenism has been closely connected to theological convergence from the day of its infusion into the Edinburgh 1910 World Missions Conference. The desire for Christian unity at whatever cost has prevailed from that time until now, and as a result (direct or indirect) attributed to convergence. Charges have been leveled by conservative evangelicals that the authority of Scripture has been challenged for the sake of being more inclusive. One example is that the gospel of eternal salvation has been overshadowed by a social gospel. Some believe that after Edinburgh 1937 and Madras 1938 the Bible has been viewed as a book with human limitations and the authority of the Church to proclaim the gospel of salvation has been undermined and called into question.

The issue of unity was so pressing on the hearts and minds of the Edinburgh conveners that they set plans into place to ensure its eventual outcome. Lesslie Newbigin asserts,

> The most important thing about the Edinburgh Conference, so far as concerns our present subject [cooperation and unity], was not what it said but what it did. By creating a continuation committee with J.H. Oldham as its secretary, it ensured that international and interdenominational missionary co-operation should

move from the stage of occasional conferences to that of continuous and effective consultation.26

The quest for unity appeared to be on the road to success within eighteen short years of Edinburgh. By the time of the Tambaram Conference in 1938 the subject of unity and cooperation was not a separate topic, but had been integrated into the conference dynamics as a whole. In fact, at Tambaram there were only thirty pages written on unity.27

4.2.1 Convergence Dynamics

Evidence will support the fact that theological convergence has taken place. Before the evidence is examined, it might be beneficial to explore some possible dynamics that may have contributed to convergence.

Some evangelicals and ecumenicals alike believe that the major problem in achieving unity is a failure on the part of all involved to define adequately who they are. This can be seen as early as 1949. Concerning the 1948 Amsterdam Conference, when C. H. Dodd felt that no one was addressing the real problem of unity, he states,

In section 1 at Amsterdam one of the most striking things was the failure to define the differences between what we were pleased to call the ‘Catholic’ and the ‘Protestant’ positions in any way that both parties could accept. When Protestants define their own position over against Catholicism, Catholics refused to accept the implied definition of their position and vice versa.28


27 Ibid., 69-70.

Dodd was not satisfied with the results of the conference findings. He knew there were deep issues that separated Protestants and Catholics and believed that those issues needed to be addressed, but the conference was allowed to close without any genuine resolution. He expressed his displeasure by stating, “I should be reluctant, though to accept this as final, in its full implications, but will let it pass.”

Dodd was at least partially correct. Conservative evangelical Protestants in the first part of the twentieth century had serious reservations concerning partnering with Catholics. The theological issues should have been dealt with and allowed to come to some sort of general consensus between the two groups. It may have threatened unity within the conference, but it may have also prevented or at least lessened theological convergence as some conservative evangelicals today have little or no difficulty working with Catholics. Since Catholics continue to hold to their historical sacred beliefs and yet now partner with many evangelicals, it appears that theological convergence has been primarily from within the evangelical camp.

A second possible dynamic may be denominational loyalties, and/or commitments to sacred traditions and historic confessions. Dodd suspects that part of the problem that prevented unity at Amsterdam 1948 was an “unavowed motive” to hold on to confessions, and historic or denominational principles. Dodd states, “We all feel constrained to insist on certain convictions because we must be true to our sacred traditions or our historic

29 Ibid., 53.
principles, which we must on no account compromise." 30

Evangelicals and ecumenicals alike have deep rooted convictions to which they are genuinely committed, and all too often these strike at the very heart of unity.

Again, Dodd is partially correct. However, he fails to mention those who fail to unite over perceived biblical convictions and commitments. Almost every denomination, sect, and faith has doctrines and traditions that make them distinctly unique, and to a degree those who proclaim to be adherents to such beliefs should hold tightly to those teachings. However, every Christian, evangelical and ecumenical alike, must determine by which standard they will live. If their faith is in their commitment to a denomination, doctrine, or tradition, then live or die by them. However, if the Bible, God’s written Word to humanity, is the standard for their life, they must closely examine their beliefs and commitments by God’s Word and see if those traditions and doctrines are biblical. God’s Word is clear concerning God’s desire for Christian unity and fellowship. Man should never allow denominationalism, doctrine, or confessions to stand in the way of Christian unity, unless they are biblical and can be solidly affirmed by Scripture.

A third possible dynamic is the blurring of mission fields. During the Edinburgh era defining mission fields was much easier. Those lands that lived by Christian principles were considered Christendom, and all other lands were pagan. However, many countries that send Christian missionaries today have nearly the same beliefs and

30 Ibid., 53.
practices as pagan countries. Upon reflecting back on the Edinburgh era G. M. Setiloane recalls,

The boundaries between Christendom and heathen lands are no longer so easily defined. The darkness and the light interchange everywhere so much that we are struck by the naïve innocence of this age which produced the report.\textsuperscript{31}

A closer look at Europe and North America reveals that they look much more pagan than in the late 1800s and early 1900s, and many of the pagan lands have enough Light to reflect a glimmer of Christianity, thus blurring the distinction of the two. This increased acceptance of pagan virtues and practices in Christian lands has made its impact on Christian philosophy, missionary methodology and theology, and has contributed to convergence.

One additional possible dynamic contributing to theological convergence from Edinburgh to Lausanne was the spiritual condition of the American missionaries. Troubles at home affected their effectiveness even in Asia. As older missionaries returned home and were replaced by younger ones, theological convergence could be witnessed in places like the Philippines. Valentin G. Montes states,

The first world war and its resultant moral and spiritual chaos in America, followed by the Wall Street crash in 1929, which seemed to confirm the condemnation by the conservatives of the ineffectual and destructive effects of modernism in theology, had its very strong effect upon missionary effort in this country. For the missionary church of that era was nothing if not other-worldly.\textsuperscript{32}


Montes follows up his statement and makes it clear that as the older missionaries “faded away” and as Asia began to govern herself, theological changes took place. He further asserts that there existed “in her younger leadership a new awareness of social and economic trends.”

4.2.2 Convergence through the Life and Work Movement

There is a direct correlation between the Life and Work Movement and theological convergence. From the first meeting held in Stockholm in 1925 convergence has been taking place. Evangelicals prior to Stockholm tended to focus on man’s eternal destiny, but also attempted to minister to the whole person. Some advocates of the Life and Work Movement between the years 1925 and 1975 led the more moderate evangelicals to believe that evangelicals were overly interested in man’s souls. Many set out on a spiritual journey for a more holistic evangelism which was enforced by a revival of mystical experiences. This journey led to a change in evangelical thought from “an authority of Scripture” worldview to “an authority of Christ” worldview. This shift in worldview allowed for a more mystical inclusiveness.

Additionally, evangelical German Baptist, Walter Rauschenbusch, after adopting liberal views of Scriptures, eloquently pleaded with evangelicals to stop being so overly concerned with the souls of men and pressed for social and political reform. The salvation of man’s soul became irrelevant during the years following Jerusalem 1928, and the “Social Gospel” became the focus of Christian

---

Ibid., 38.

ministry. After the death of D. L. Moody, Rauschenbusch wrote an article entitled “The New Evangelism,” which replaced the old evangelism that tended to focus on man’s eternal destiny with a gospel concerned with social justice and reform.35

4.2.3 Convergence through the Faith and Order Movement

Ecumenical theology within the Faith and Order Movement has converged with evangelical theology in several areas. Baptism is one arena where ecumenicals have continued to press for unity. Many evangelicals have changed their policy on baptism for the sake of Christian unity. One example is the accepting of people of differing denominations where different modes of baptism have been exercised. One such case took place in Union, South Carolina, when a conservative Southern Baptist church was willing to accept a Presbyterian into its membership without believer’s baptism as understood by Southern Baptists.36

Another place of convergence has been in the Eucharist or Lord’s Supper. A prime example was witnessed at the Promise Keepers Pastors Conference held in Atlanta, Georgia, in the early 1990s. Over twenty thousand pastors converged on the Georgia Dome and fellowshipped. At the closing session each pastor shared communion with others,


36 The Southern Baptist Church referenced is Philippi Baptist Church in Union, South Carolina. The event took place in 1995 when a Presbyterian joined the church. The church body and leadership (except the pastor) saw no need for baptism by immersion, even though this person had never experienced believer’s baptism. The individual was eventually baptized after some conversations with the pastor.
Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterian, Episcopal, Catholic, Brethren, Assembly of God, Four Square Church, and others.

A third sign of convergence is found in ministry practices. Prior to Edinburgh 1910 evangelicals did not partner with ecumenicals in ministry. However, over the years after Edinburgh there has been an ever growing cooperation in ministry between the two groups. Today, evangelicals and ecumenicals participate in ministry together. This participation can be seen as Southern Baptists partner with Great Commission Christians (GCC) globally in an effort to evangelize the world.37 GCCs hold to differing theologies concerning baptism, the Lord’s Supper, women’s role in ministry, salvation, and spiritual gifts to name a few. Even though they hold differing views on important theological issues many GCCs work together in an effort to evangelize the world. Often this practice results in theological convergence.

4.3 Evangelical Practices that Emerged from 1910 to 1974 as a Result of Ecumenism

Mission strategies and methodologies have continually changed from the beginning of the Protestant mission movement. Few would argue that these would continue to change after Edinburgh even without theological convergence. Therefore, the real question that needs to be addressed is, “what changes have taken place as a result of or due to the influence of theological convergence since

---

37 This writer uses the term “Great Commission Christian” in reference to people who take the "Great Commission" of Jesus Christ seriously and attempt to share their interpretation of the Gospel of Christ to those who have never heard. GCCs include Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Evangelical Catholics, Four Square Gospel Church, Full Gospel Church, Anglicans, Mormons, Jehovah Witnesses, Campus Crusade for Christ, Dawn Ministries to name a few.
Edinburgh?” The limited space and scope of this work will not permit a thorough examination of every change that has taken place since Edinburgh. Therefore, only three areas will be examined – changes in ecclesial practices, changes in missiological practices, and changes in organizational structures. While the period from Edinburgh 1910 to Lausanne 1974 is the general scope of this chapter, this section on “changes” will focus primarily on the twenty years preceding Lausanne 1974. This should provide a better vantage point from which to examine the changes as they have had time to begin maturing and become part of evangelicalism.

4.3.1 Changes in Ecclesial Practices

Mary Tanner tells how the ecclesial landscape has changed due to the direct influence of what began at Lausanne 1927. The change in church practice provides evidence that the Church of England has experienced convergence in that their ecumenical conversation has provided a theological basis in regard to baptism, eucharist, and ministry. The Church of England passed Ecumenical Cannons that govern these three areas as they form partnerships with local ecumenical leaders in towns and villages.

Additionally, theological convergence has taken place as churches and denominations created documents together that act as instruments for closer relations in ministry. This can be seen in the working relationship between the Reformed Churches in Europe and the Lutherans as they signed the Leuenberg Agreement on March 16, 1973. Another alliance was created when the Evangelical Church in Germany and the Church of England signed the Meissen Agreement. Other working alliances were created between the French
Reformed and Lutheran churches of France, and also the Anglican churches of Great Britain partner with the Irish churches through their Reuilly Agreement of 1999. The Lausanne 1927 Anniversary conference that met in 2002 celebrated “the fact that the fruits of theological conversation that begun at Lausanne 1927 have been used by churches as instruments of internal reform and renewal.”

On a more practical level the transition from a salvation focused on mankind’s eternal destiny to a more social transformation Gospel has attributed to stress and caused confusion in the local church. One example was the church in the Philippines as early as 1962. During the late 1950s and early 1960s new emerging leaders within the Filipino church were pressing the church to take more responsibility concerning social transformation. However, the church was slow to respond. Montes concludes that,

Because the church herself has not been a leader in social thought and concern, her laity, with very few exceptions, are hardly, aware of the social implications of their faith. Therefore in spite of their considerable social and political prestige, they can hardly be expected to influence fundamentally the larger social order toward the realization of a more equitable and just development of the body politic, towards better and higher standards for all, towards the re-designing of the social structure to enable all people to achieve the abundant life.


39 Ibid., 3.

40 Montes, “Social Thinking of the Churches in the Philippines,” 42.
The local church struggled with this shift in theological emphasis. Even in America during the late 1960s the Western church struggled with its call to missions. Glasser recalls,

It was now 1968. Apparently, the IMC transfusion has not been successful. Uppsala [the WCC Assembly in Uppsala, Sweden] uncovered ‘widespread defeatism in churches about the work of evangelism and missions’, attributed variously to the process of secularization in society, the resurgence of non-Christian religions, and a deep confusion in the churches about the nature of the Christian faith itself.  

This debate concerning the biblical nature of evangelism and missions continues well into the twenty-first century. The struggle within many churches continue to this day.

The debate at times has proved to be quite intense. Ilion T. Jones refers to the shift toward a more social ministry as "The Church’s Defection From a Divine Mission." He states,

Among the changes taking place in Christendom in recent decades, none is more radical, or more controversial, or fraught with more serious consequences, than the Church’s understanding of its role in society. Traditionally the Christian Church has devoted its resources to the evangelization of individuals. But recently a number of church leaders, both ministers and laymen, have embarked on a campaign to persuade churches to use their resources to bring about a social revolution.

---

41 Arthur F. Glasser, “What has been the Evangelical stance New Delhi to Uppsala?” Evangelical Missions Quarterly, nos.5-6. (1968-70): 131.
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Ilion’s fear was that the new direction in ministry was designed to change social structures rather than change mankind’s heart.44

4.3.2 Changes in Missiological Practices

Ecumenism has made its impact on missiological practices in several ways. First, the Roman Catholic Church has been working with Anglicans to discover new forms of committed life and mission. They are seeking how to implement a substantial agreement in faith for baptism, eucharist, and ministry.

Second, Valentin G. Montes is quick to point out that the church in the Philippines originally focused on man’s eternal salvation as its mission. They were committed to evangelizing the Philippines because “salvation was thought of in terms of escape from this world.”45 He attributes the slow move of the Philippine church to accept social responsibility to the conflict between evangelicals and ecumenicals, stating,

The social lag of the Philippines church is rooted in historical causes. Protestantism came to this country from America at the turn of the century when the sharp conflict between the proponents of the so-called ‘Social Gospel’ and of the conservative anti-evolutionist, literal-inspiration-believing Christians was raging.46

---

44 Ibid., 5. Ilion concluded that “social engineers are not going to devise a better social order without making better men. Educators are not going to make better men without spiritual motivation of religion. Socially effective religion is not going to be generated without the unique work of the Church.” 5. For Ilion the work of the church was the proclamation of the Gospel.
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After defending the Filipino Church for their slow entrance into the world of social change, Montes makes the point that it was after the older missionaries had retired and the younger more theologically open leaders emerged that the focus shifted from salvation of man’s eternal soul and was redirected to the social needs of the day. Montes believed that,

As more and more Filipino leaders became involved in the inter-national and inter-church activities of the ecumenical movement, they acquired a new sense of the importance of rethinking the mission of the church, of her renewal and her role in society.47

Then Montes demonstrates that convergence has taken place by listing the social work of the Methodists who became involved in experimental rural farming, the United Church who also provided ministry in rural farms, and the Baptist Convention who actually started a university and a college of agriculture.48 The social-gospel ministry was in high gear by 1960. He illustrates his point by showing that “In 1960 the United Church General Assembly hammered out her hopes and aspirations concerning industrialization, rural and urban development, and population growth in a ‘Statement of Social Concern’49

Third, ecumenism has influenced the practice of Southern Baptist missions through the International Mission Board (IMB). This is best evidenced in the difference in nomenclature between the “IMB Mission Statement” and “IMB Vision Statement” from 1999 to 2009. In an effort to 

47 Ibid., 38.
48 Ibid., 39.
49 Ibid., 40.
broaden the IMB’s global impact President Jerry Rankin has chosen to partner with other GCCs. This shift has resulted in more relaxed vision and mission statements that are not as Baptist focused. A careful reading of both works reveals that partnering with GCCs requires a shift in language.\footnote{Office of Overseas Operations, “Something New Under the Sun: Strategic Directions at the International Mission Board,” Richmond. (January 1999: pp-40m-2/02-p2962-e). 52; Jerry Rankin, “The International Mission Board, SBC, Vision for Global Advance” IMB. Richmond. (January 2009: imb-1m-1/09-p5802). 18; The 1999 mission statement focused on “the Mission of the International Board, SBC, is to lead Southern Baptists in international missions efforts to evangelize the lost, disciple believers, develop churches and minister to people in need.” 52. Whereas the 2009 mission statement “is to make disciples of all peoples in fulfillment of the Great Commission.” 18. Additionally, the vision statement has changed from “we will lead Southern Baptists to be on mission with God to bring all peoples of the earth to saving faith in Jesus Christ.” (1999 statement). 52. and has been replaced with the 2009 vision of “a multitude from every language, people, tribe, and nation knowing and worshipping our Lord Jesus Christ.” 18.}

The focus is no longer on assisting local Southern Baptist churches and their members in engaging in missions. The focus seems to have broadened to working with GCCs. While it is true that the shift in vision has not been documented until recently, it is believed that the reason for the shift away from Southern Baptists began prior to Lausanne 1974 when Jerry Rankin was a field missionary. His involvement with Lausanne (examined in Chapter 6) will further illustrate Rankin’s ecumenical tendencies. Chapter six will analyze Rankin’s ecumenical tendencies. Chapter six will analyze Rankin’s ecumenism to determine if theological convergence has resulted in the IMB as proposed by Keith Eitel who in 2003 stated, “I am concerned that evangelism, church planting and discipleship are in the hands of theological novices.”\footnote{Keith Eitel is a former two-term missionary himself and has served as a professor of missions for 20 plus years. The quote above is from page 4 of paper commonly referred to as the “Eitel Vision Assessment.” This eight page document was written after Eitel’s}
A fourth way in which ecumenism has contributed to theological convergence is in the manner in which the Gospel of Christ is presented to those who have never heard. Donald McGavran asserts, “Recently [1970], the word proclamation has seemed to some in ecumenical circles ‘too harsh, direct, and ineffective’, and they have begun to use the word presence.” McGavran believes that proclamation needs little or no explanation as it is a biblical concept and is clearly understood by all. However, “presence” on the other hand, “is so new and so fashionable that it is used in many ways and with many meanings.”

While McGavran does not use the term “theological convergence” he does attribute to it the fact that even the term “Christian Mission” has become ambiguous at best over the past twenty to thirty years [prior to 1970]. Additionally he believed that,

The unfortunate turn of events of the last twenty years, by which mission is taken by many to mean, ‘everything Christians do outside the four walls of their church’, contributes nothing but confusion. Today [1970], according to these apostles of obscurantism, the church doing anything at all which may be considered the will of God is dubbed ‘the church in mission’. What our fathers called simply ‘doing God’s will’ is today in grandiose phrase called ‘sharing in the mission Dei.’

---
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It is this type of theological convergence that led McGavran to write that some “missiologists advocate presence as the only safe stance. Christians are tiny minorities in many lands and will remain so-they-think-for generations.” Many of these missionaries are not allowed to share the Gospel through proclamation in any shape or fashion. For McGavran this was a travesty.

4.3.3 Changes in Organizational Structures

As mentioned in the introduction of this chapter, the three major movements that emerged from Edinburgh 1910 were separate movements with differing agendas until the Life and Work Movement and the Faith and Order Movement came together in 1948 and formalized into a union which became known as the World Council of Churches. However, in 1961 the WCC was joined by the third movement when the International Missionary Council joined the ranks. All of the programmatic work and responsibilities of the IMC were turned over to the WCC. With all three movements now under the control of the WCC, a three-fold structure was created: (1) was the Conference on World Mission and Evangelism; (2) was a Commission on World Mission and Evangelism (CWME); (3) was a staff group to handle matters concerning the CWME.

The CWME Commission is composed of twenty-five members and has experienced a broader ecumenism which includes cooperation with the Roman Catholic Church as well as evangelical and Pentecostal churches. The WCC website states that, “Roman Catholics, evangelicals and

56 Ibid., 100.
Pentecostals are full members of the CWME commission and participate in all its activities.”⁵⁷

There is a theological convergence taking place in the WCC. One primary example of it is in one of their major thematic foci as they anticipate Edinburgh 2010. The topic will center on the theology of evangelism in a world of religious plurality. The website assures the reader that,

This will involve a new reflection on the significance of evangelism and on methods of sharing the gospel. CWME is also participating together with other programs of the WCC and the Roman Catholic Church, the World Evangelical Alliance and Pentecostals in the search for a code of conduct on conversion.⁵⁸

Evangelism is one of the “critical issues” for conservative evangelicals. It concerns them greatly when topics of such magnitude are being discussed with people of faith who hold to such different understandings on the topic. It remains to be seen what Edinburgh 2010 will produce in the way of theological convergence. However, if the Roman Catholics, Pentecostals, and evangelicals come together and actually agree on a “code of conduct on conversion” it has the potential to contribute greatly to even more of a theological convergence.

Perhaps this is what Peter Ainslie had in mind on September 22, 1927, when he allowed his article “The Rapprochement of the Churches” to be published in the Christian Century. He states,

Lausanne marked the passing of uniformity and the coming of diversity within unity. The equality of all Christians before God must find its embodiment in the


ecclesiastical order. The next conference will go beyond this conference. If there could be a conference without officially appointed delegates and constituted of younger groups, the interpretations would go far in advance of our denominational conservatism. There is room in these times for adventurers, and the adventurers will come.\textsuperscript{59}

Thus far this work has merely touched the “hem of the garment” concerning theological convergence. Convergence has occurred. But why does that concern conservative evangelicals? Perhaps, a closer look at the Uppsala Assembly might shed better light on their concerns.

\textbf{4.4 Convergence: The Evangelicals Concern}

The Uppsala Assembly (WCC Fourth Assembly) of July 4-19, 1968 was highly anticipated by many ecumenicals to be the pinnacle of mission assemblies. Evangelicals and ecumenicals gathered in Uppsala, Sweden for the WCC’s Fourth Assembly. For a few it was considered a success, but for the majority it was a disappointment. It has even been referred to as “a five-ring circus.”\textsuperscript{60} What happened at Uppsala? Albert H. van der Heuvel asserts that,

Uppsala was to be the first Assembly to the WCC after the incorporation of the International Missionary Council into its structure seven years previously. Before New Delhi (1961) missiologists argued that an IMC-WCC merger would make possible an end to the nineteenth century distortion that placed church tension with mission. The ecumenical slogan ‘The Church in Mission’, would then be realized in actuality. The worldwide mission of the church would


be transformed from a peripheral activity to its central theme.⁶¹ Glasser brings to light the depth of disappointment Uppsala was for ecumenicals and evangelicals alike. The Church was struggling with the concept of what actually constitutes biblical missions and evangelism and was looking for answers. The WCC had hoped that Uppsala would be to the ecumenical movement what Vatican II was to the Roman Catholic Church, but evangelicals were looking for dialogue with ecumenicals concerning the issues within the churches. Evangelicals “were disappointed when the actual Assembly agenda began to unfold.”⁶²

Many evangelicals felt that open dialogue with ecumenicals at Uppsala was not even a possibility. The WCC had planned well for their Assembly. Delegates and speakers were carefully selected. Studies and documents were produced in hopes of unifying the two sides, but to no avail. Prior to Uppsala the WCC held the Geneva Conference on Church and Society in July 1966. Glasser believes that,

On the surface the [Geneva] conference was a representative group of experts ‘charged with advising the churches and the WCC on their ministry in a world undergoing revolutionary social change’. But its delegates had been so artfully selected beforehand that evangelicals were quick to protest.⁶³

Documents were prepared for Uppsala from the Geneva Conference findings. If there was one primary criticism of

---
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the Fourth Assembly it was its documents. Henry and many others were outraged over the documents. The WCC Department of Studies in Evangelism produced ‘The Church for Others (by Europeans) and the ‘Church for the World’ (by North Americans). To read these studies is to find oneself in a strange world in which familiar themes are discussed in anything, but conventional terms. Although two or three years in preparation involving major revisions, these documents are almost totally silent on the great basics of the ‘faith once delivered to the saints’.64

Harold Lindsell recalls the massive amount of reading and asserts to “the making of documents, even prior to the assembly, there was no end.”65

Again, conservative evangelicals felt betrayed and isolated. They felt as though they had no real voice in WCC matters. As some evangelicals accepted the Geneva documents and would also accept the Uppsala documents, the evangelicals as a whole were beginning to fragment. Some saw value in what would become known as “Renewal in Mission,” but others would remain skeptical. The most telling documents are the actual Uppsala documents themselves (not the ones prepared at Geneva). The WCC had hoped that this Fifth Assembly would explode upon Protestantism with much the same basic affect that Vatican II had upon the Roman Catholic Church. The documents were “hailed as the ‘precise issues’ the WCC regards as most relevant to the contemporary situations and tasks of the

---
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Ecumenical Movement.\textsuperscript{66} These documents were encased in the theme of “All Things New.”

Glasser points out that even the most basic casual reader who reads the Uppsala documents will quickly see that they are introducing a major shift in ecumenical thinking. He further states, “Here is a call for a new theology and a new methodology to support a radically new objective for the Christian Church.”\textsuperscript{67}

Carl F. H. Henry quickly picks up on this shift in thinking and asserts that this shift is,

a radically new emphasis that could move the institutional church away from its primary, Christ-commanded task of preaching the biblical gospel that men of all nations and races might become disciples of Jesus Christ.\textsuperscript{68}

John R. W. Stott (one of the architects of Lausanne 1974) condemned portions of the documents. Referring to Section II he stated that it was a “hotchpotch, a compromise document, a variegated patchwork quilt sewn together out of bits and pieces contributed by delegates and advisors whose convictions were in fundamental disagreement.”\textsuperscript{69}

Donald McGavran referred to this “Renewal in Mission” shift as “a betrayal of the two billion who either have never heard of Jesus Christ or have no real chance to

\textsuperscript{66} Glasser “What has been the Evangelical stance New Delhi to Uppsala?” 139.

\textsuperscript{67} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{68} Ibid. Even after reading the pre-Uppsala documents Henry warned evangelicals within and without the WCC to carefully evaluate all the documents with great discernment and caution. Ibid., 140.

\textsuperscript{69} Ibid., 147.
believe on Him as Savior and Lord.”70 McGavran wholeheartedly endorsed Christian responsibility to meet humanity’s need. However, it was his judgment that the “Renewal in Mission” was a shift in mission that was contrary to Scripture. He pressed the issue at Uppsala and called the shift, “a deliberate attempt to divert attention away from man’s need to hear the Gospel of salvation.”71 Perhaps the last articulation of the old WCC was voiced by W. A. visser’t Hooft when he stated,

There is a great tension between the vertical interpretation of the gospel as essentially concerned with God’s saving action in the life of individuals and the horizontal interpretation of it mainly concerned with human relationship in the world. A Christianity that has lost its vertical dimension has lost its salt, and is not only insipid but useless for the world; but a Christianity that would use vertical dimensions as a means of escape from its responsibility in the common life of man is a denial of the incarnation of God’s love for a world manifested in Christ.72

Albert H. van der Heuvel gives an accurate assessment of the attitude and atmosphere of Uppsala;

Commentators on the Fourth Assembly seem to say: this assembly was an important moment in the ongoing history of the ecumenical movement. It marks a highlight in the light of discovery of the services and witness of the Church in the world. It also was very representative of the membership of the whole Christian community and in a new way for some of its parts, namely the Orthodox churches in the WCC and the Roman Catholic Church increasingly co-operative with it.... It was representative in that it invited non-Christians to its meetings and to its platforms. It

70 Ibid., 140.
71 Ibid.
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was also representative of some of the diseases of the churches: its over-emphasis on the ordained, on men, on ripe age... From now on we need a better representation, a chance to really discuss in depth the issues the churches are facing. Restructuring of the Assembly is needed to keep the movement on the move.\(^73\)

After Uppsala the WCC shifted its primary focus from hosting large assemblies reaching upwards of twenty-five hundred to working through smaller venues. They became part of commissions, committees, and consultations during and between other assemblies.\(^74\)

Concerning the Uppsala Assembly as a whole, perhaps the secular press had some insight as to how the secular world viewed the event. Secular press had their opinions also, which became evident when "Time Magazine characterized Uppsala as 'more like a meeting of the New Left than a meeting of the Christian Church.'"\(^75\) To the outside unregenerate world Uppsala may have looked like a five-ring circus or a gathering of new radicals, but for the evangelicals there was much at stake. The Uppsala documents could be dismembered and rewritten a thousand times and still there would be a fundamental problem standing between the evangelicals and ecumenicals. The White Elephant in the room is authority. Who and/or what has absolute authority. This was the real baseline question for conservative evangelicals.


\(^74\) Glasser "What has been the Evangelical stance New Delhi to Uppsala?" 142.

\(^75\) Ibid., 144.
4.4.1 Evangelical Concern over Authority

Generally speaking, conservative evangelicals have always been deeply concerned over the issue of biblical authority. Ultimately, authority determines truth. Evangelicals maintain that God as He has spoken through His written Word has absolute authority and thereby has absolute truth.

Carnegie Samuel Calian addressed the issue of authority in 1970 when he foresaw tumultuous times ahead for the church. He warned Christians,

We are at the beginning of a traumatic metamorphosis with emerging patterns still-off-stage preparing to make their début. As a consequence, traditional lines of authority for Protestants, Catholics, and Orthodox are under question and attack.76

Would the church be ready for the attacks that were to follow the 1970? While conservative evangelicals had settled the issue of authority long ago, Calian admits that “authority [was] the unresolved ecumenical issue of the past as well as the present.”77 Evangelicals were quick to dismiss absolute authority as being beyond human attainment. For them absolute authority lodged in the revelation of God in Jesus Christ.78 The ecumenical inability or unwillingness to confess that their view of Scripture was the same as conservative evangelicals deepened the rift between them.
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76 Carnegie Samuel Calian, “Is there a common authority for Christians? Protestant Expectations,” The Ecumenical Review, XXII, no.1 (January 1970): 29. Calian points out that Protestants have been under “massive attack” by critical biblical scholars concerning the authority of the Bible since nineteenth century. 29.
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Many evangelicals refused to accept Uppsala’s shift in mission because they felt it was not based on truth as revealed by God’s Word. Glasser states,

One has only to read the ‘official’ document of Uppsala and he will encounter again and again statements built upon the fatal premise that God has not disclosed Himself to man in any real sense. No word has come to man from beyond himself. God has displayed no objective authority by speaking to His church.\(^79\)

Evangelicals either failed to or were prohibited from defining the very nature of truth as revealed by God. That allowed Uppsala to become a Babel of two groups. The “horizontalists and the verticalists were politely in session together, but no real headway was made on either side.”\(^80\) Some think that the rift over authority and whether or how God reveals Himself was superficial. However, one’s understanding of authority and truth does affect his views theologically and missiologically.

One example of this can be seen in Patricia Budd Kepler’s theological understanding of women’s role in ministry. While traditional evangelicalism has long held that only men should hold the office senior pastor and be responsible for guiding the flock of God, many ecumenicals (men and women), like Kepler, and a growing number of evangelicals hold to a “new theology.” Kepler reminds the church that it does not minister in a day where people

\(^79\) Glasser, “What has been the Evangelical stance New Delhi to Uppsala?” 148-149. The Uppsala documents refer to Scripture, but it is not taken at face value. Scripture is considered non-literal and used existentially. It is quoted and applied to promote social action and is not considered to be the normative Word of God directed towards His people. Ibid., 149.

\(^80\) Ibid., 149.
believe that the sun rotates around the earth. The church lives in a world where women are equal in every sphere of life (or should be). She asserts that “in its deepest expressions, the women’s movement has implications for the liberation of the human race.”  

Kepler’s call for a “New Theology” is a “theology of the present” and it “must be a theology based on love, based on faith, looking toward hope; but wrestling with values, and accepting the reality of the moment.”  

Such a theology must face the reality of pluralism, the gift of diversity, the depth of alienation, the necessity of conflict; such a theology must measure authority and accept it on new terms; such a theology must be able to feel as well as reason and such a theology must be prepared by women as well as men, blacks as well as whites.

Obviously this “New Theology” sounds an alarm in the ranks of conservative evangelicalism. Since evangelicals hold that authority comes from God and His revelation of Himself to mankind, Kepler’s statement “such a theology must measure authority and accept it on new terms” appears to question the way evangelicals have accepted authority in the past. And her declaration that ‘such a theology must be able to feel as well as reason” sounds a bit existential to

---

81 Patricia Budd Kepler, “We need a New Theology,” Church and Society, (Sept/Oct. 1972): 9. Kepler claims that the current systems (created by men) have been primary in causing war, tolerated hunger, oppression, and disease. She even attributes environmental pollution to them. She calls for a New Theology. 9-12.
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the evangelical. Here again appears to be a convergence as Kepler blends a traditional theology with a new theology.

Another area of convergence is the acceptance of non-Christians into the WCC Assemblies and other Christian gatherings. Allowing non-believers to participate in Christian dialogue, share the speaking platform, and have influence over church leaders is unthinkable to most conservative evangelicals. The WCC infuriated conservatives when for the sake of human relationships they issued a statement seriously considering inviting “men of other faiths and ideologies for partial or full participation in conferences sponsored by the World Council.”

In August 1969 the Executive and Central Committees of the WCC met at Canterbury. They determined that the topic of “men of other faiths” was an urgent issue that needed to be addressed. It was their desire that Christians living among peoples of other religions would “co-operate rather than compete in matters of religion.”

S. J. Samartha holds the position that,

The involvement of Christians in development and nation-building calls for a new relationship between men of different faiths on the local, regional, and world level. What this would mean to the understanding of the nature of the Church and the practice of mission must be considered afresh.

In 1970 Samartha made it clear that he advocated the WCC act swiftly with men of other faiths. He thought that

---
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the present moment [1970] was the appropriate time for Christians to act and work with such men, and they should “be open and sensitive to possibilities of cooperation and study and action.” Samartha challenged the WCC to keep in mind that there might possibly be theological implications when partnering with men of other faiths and ideologies. Samantha never commanded a majority following among evangelicals or ecumenicals. In fact, the strong stand against Samantha by the Orthodox at Bangkok 1973 may have been responsible for the change of direction at Nairobi in 1975.

Donald McGavran condemned Samantha’s type of thinking. He addressed the issue head on by claiming that God did not reveal Himself through other faiths. McGavran asserts that some claim that

we must approach the man of another faith than our own in a spirit of expectancy to find how God has been speaking to him and what new understanding of grace and love of God we ourselves may discover in this encounter.89

McGavran’s response is to reply with Scripture. He refers to the Apostle Paul speaking at Mars Hill. While it is true that Paul affirmed man’s religious longing, he did not “explore Socrates, Plato, and others to find what God had told them.”90 Paul simply presented the Gospel of the one true living God. When confronted with reasoning that

87 Ibid., 198.
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seems to indicate that God reveals Himself to non-
Christians through means other than the Bible, conservatives will always dissent.\footnote{Ibid., 105.}

**Summary**

The theological convergence infused at Edinburgh 1910 survived and at times thrived through avenues like the “Life and Work” movement and the “Faith and Order” movement. Ecumenism’s survival was strategically insured by appointing a Continuation Committee to carry out Edinburgh’s vision and by placing Mott and Oldham as its first Chairman and Secretary. It led to three distinct movements each of which promoted ecumenism. The constituency of the three movements eventually found themselves absorbed into the World Council of Churches or some affiliates of these movements later joined the WCC. The primary vehicle since its inception in 1948 until Lausanne 1974 has been the WCC. Focusing on the twenty years prior to Lausanne, it has become evident that one of ecumenism’s most impactful strategic shifts in theology on evangelicalism is the focus of a salvation for mankind’s eternal soul to a more social activism/deliverance salvation.

Through venues like “Uppsala 1968” the WCC continued to spread its vision of unity and social, economic, and political justice as part of the whole Gospel. While most ecumenicals and many evangelicals embraced the WCC’s vision, there were the dissenters. One such dissenter was Harold Lindsell who claimed,

At the Fourth Assembly there was the Establishment and there were the delegates. The latter were diverse and
disorganized. They ranged from evangelical to liberal in theological persuasion, from supporters of evangelism to far-left-social-auctioneers, from deeply committed priests whose language was the language of Scripture, to social engineers who spoke the secular lingo of the profane world.\textsuperscript{92}

In Lindsell’s mind Uppsala had been intentionally organized to promote the “Establishment’s” (WCC) agenda as they clearly were aware of “power structures and how they can be used to implement ideology.”\textsuperscript{93} The fact that the “Establishment determined the agenda for the churches”\textsuperscript{94} coupled with General Secretary Blake’s appeal, led Lindsell to conclude that there was an underlying liberalism within the WCC movement.\textsuperscript{95} Lindell’s apprehensiveness of the WCC would change slightly after the Nairobi Congress of 1975.

Nairobi was a substantial improvement over Uppsala. The radical cast of the 1968 assembly had yielded to a more centrist approach, a better balance, and a rediscovery of evangelism as an important part of mission of the Church. Undoubtedly the International Congress on World Evangelization in 1974 with its Lausanne Covenant had something to do with the mood that prevailed.\textsuperscript{96}

\textsuperscript{92} Lindsell, “Uppsala 1968” Christianity Today, 3.
\textsuperscript{93} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{95} Ibid. General Secretary Blake appealed to the delegates to listen to “us who are official or established leaders.” He urged them to “approve the revolutionary and risky proposals that would be presented to them.” Lindsell states “one is reminded of the liberal-fundamentalist controversy of fifty years ago. The terminology has changed, the personnel have changed, the setting is different. But the issue remains the same.” 4. For Lindsell there is only one question. “What is the mission of the church?” He sees the two views in competition with each other. To him one view of the mission is more secular (WCC) and the other (proclamation of the Gospel) is more spiritual. Ibid., 7.
\textsuperscript{96} Harold Lindsell, “Nairobi:Crisis in Credibility,” Christianity Today, January 2, 1976, XX, no.7, 10.
After the moving speech delivered by Charles Birch which focused on population explosion, the scarcity of food, environmental deterioration, and war, evangelicals began to realize that they had something to learn from the WCC. Lindsell admits, “The Nairobi assembly approved a number of concrete proposals calling for justice and observance of human rights.”

Some attribute the coming together at Nairobi to John Stott because he urged the WCC to recognize the lostness of humanity. He pleaded they they have full confidence in the Gospel of Christ and the uniqueness of Christ. Stott urged the conference to affirm the necessity of a personal relationship to Christ and the urgency of evangelism. The WCC acknowledged that “staying together” was secondary to the church as evangelization was the primary “indispensable task of the Church of Christ.”

At Nairobi, the WCC won the confidence of many evangelicals. However, some were still concerned over the inclusion that the “Gospel always includes the responsibility to participate in the struggle for justice and human dignity, the obligation to denounce all that hinders human wholeness.”

In spite of adversity, ecumenicals just prior to Lausanne, still sought Christian unity. One of the major stumbling blocks with the evangelicals was the issue of authority and truth. Evangelicals strongly believed that any other authority other than Scripture would lead to
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unscriptural theologies, practices, and methodologies, a sampling of which have been presented in this chapter, such as in 2002 when Mary Tanner celebrated the Lausanne 1927 conference and attests to the achievements of ecumenism from that time.

Ecumenism has continued to influence evangelicalism and press for a convergence in theology as is evident in the Geneva and Uppsala documents. However, evangelicalism has also influenced ecumenicalism as ecumenism as also diverse and differ strongly on some issues. By Bangkok 1973 many evangelicals had forsaken their conservative theologies and allowed them to converge with the “new” ones.

What began in Edinburgh nearly a century ago has now become a full blown ecumenical movement with ecumenicals and many evangelicals either holding to new theologies or at least partnering with one another, yet seldom if ever questioning the other’s theology. The WCC has been a key factor in bringing this to fruition. They have successfully brought together Roman Catholics, Orthodox, Presbyterians, Cooperative Baptists, Salvation Army, Evangelical Free, Wesleyan, Nazarenes, Mennonites, International Evangelical Church, Lutherans, Christian Reformed, Church of God (Cleveland and Anderson), and a multitude of others. When this many denominations partner together, convergence occurs.
Introduction

Previous chapters have laid the foundational understanding of major theological differences between ecumenism and evangelicalism, examined ecumenism within Edinburgh 1910, and briefly traced ecumenical influence from Edinburgh through 1973. Evidence supports the fact that there has been theological convergence as ecumenism has pressed for unity during the first two-thirds of the twentieth century.

To better ascertain theological convergence due to ecumenism from Lausanne 1974 and the movement that followed, this chapter will first examine the background and inception of Lausanne, Lausanne’s purpose and focus, the 1974 and 1989 conferences and documents. Second, it will evaluate ecumenism within the Lausanne Movement 1974 to present. Third, will determine ecumenism’s relationship to Lausanne and theological convergence 1974 to present.

It must be noted that due to the sheer volume of topics at and writings from Lausanne 1974 and 1989, only a mere strategic sampling of papers concerning pertinent topics can be discussed in this chapter. Additionally,
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1 This will be achieved through the summation of several crucial Lausanne documents, including the Lausanne Covenant of 1974, Lausanne Manifesto of 1989, and multiple papers presented during the 1974 and 1989 Lausanne conferences, assessments of those conferences, and evaluations concerning the conferences.
plans for Lausanne 2010 will be assessed in order to determine possibilities of future convergence.\footnote{Due to the limited number of relevant written resources dealing with this chapter’s specific topic, the author has chosen to expand the research to include transcripts of oral interviews and Internet sources for collaboration of the evidence. The author recognizes that Internet sources are not as credible as hard copy published works, as Internet sources can be changed or removed and can be difficult to verify. Therefore, the Internet sources will be sited only when necessary.}

5.1 Lausanne: Its Background, Inception, Purpose, and Focus

Due to growing nationalism, social oppression, nuclear armaments, energy crises, global disasters, wars and conflicts, and social and political upheavals the world faced disillusionment and uncertainty in the years leading up to 1974. The world needed Lausanne 1974. Lausanne propelled evangelicals to a position of international prominence. “No one can seriously deny the remarkable evangelistic impact of Lausanne 1974 upon the world.”\footnote{Arthur P. Johnson, \textit{The Battle for World Evangelism} (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1978), 335.} This global gathering in Lausanne, Switzerland may well prove to be the most significant conference of the twentieth century.

John R. Stott stated that, “Time magazine referred to the Congress as a formidable forum, possibly the widest-ranging meeting of Christians ever held.”\footnote{John R. Stott, “The Lausanne Covenant-An Exposition and Commentary,” \textit{Lausanne Occasional Papers} \#3 (Wheaton: Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization, 1975), 3.} Lausanne 1974 was truly a global event as the theme “Let the Earth Hear His Voice” was displayed in six official languages. In order to best understand Lausanne 1974 and the movement that followed some thirty plus years after the first congress of
1974, it is necessary to examine briefly the background and inception, purpose, and focus of Lausanne.

5.1.1 Lausanne’s Background and Inception

For many evangelicals the International Congress on World Evangelization held in Lausanne, Switzerland, 1974. Lausanne 1974 was never intended to be a single stand-alone event. From Lausanne’s inception its architects planned to continue the momentum, which had begun in Berlin 1966, and would continue through Lausanne 1974, and remain influential well into the future. This process was planned strategically and carefully executed. As a follow-up to the 1966 World Congress on Evangelism in Berlin, Billy Graham convened a meeting in November 1971 at which he inquired as to the possibility of holding another international congress on world evangelization. Graham desired to gather the leaders of evangelical Protestant Christians together for strategic planning and inspiration to move toward completing the Great Commission. One hundred sixty-four evangelical leaders gathered at Graham’s invitation and served as the formal governing authority of the Congress. The Lausanne Congress office opened in April 1973 with funding support from donations and the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association (Addendum A).

The administrative structure of the Congress was made up of a Board of Conveners, a Planning Committee, and an Administrative Committee, which was comprised of a number of subcommittees. The thirty-one member Planning Committee, headed by Sydney Bishop A. Jack Dain, was charged with formulating the Congress guidelines. The precision in planning and implementation of the Committee’s vision finally came to fruition.
The Lausanne Committee states,

Contributing to the long-term impact of the Congress were the consultations held in 1973 on how best to continue the Congress's goals after the meeting. From these meetings came the first plans for the Lausanne Continuation Committee (LCC), which was established as the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization (LCWE) in 1976....The function of the LCWE was to serve as an international catalyst, clearinghouse, information center, and motivational source for evangelization throughout the world. Although not intended to be simply a reaction to the World Council of Churches (WCC), it did serve as an evangelical counterpart to the ecumenical WCC by establishing and fostering an international network of evangelical leaders, as well as periodically sponsoring conferences and consultations. During its history, a periodic topic of discussion was its relationship with the World Evangelical Fellowship (WEF), and whether or not to merge with the WEF, whose goals and function were similar.\footnote{LausanneCommittee} \cite{14700}

After months of strategic planning the Congress dates were set for July 16-25, 1974. In addition to the sessions held for the Congress delegates, Graham scheduled an evangelistic meeting to be held for the general public in Lausanne, Switzerland. This meeting was held in the city's stadium. The Congress was considered to be a great success (as will be discussed later in this work). The Congress office was officially closed in October 1974.

\subsection*{5.1.2 Lausanne’s Purpose}

The concept for Lausanne was first articulated by Billy Graham when he envisioned a global consultation on world evangelization as a follow up to Berlin 1966. Graham was committed to bringing evangelicals together to assess

\footnote{LausanneCommittee}
\cite{14700} (accessed 12/18/2008).
the task of evangelizing those who had never heard the Gospel. After Berlin 1966, the Billy Graham Evangelical Association (BGEA) sponsored regional conferences in Singapore (1968), Minneapolis (1969), Bogota (1969), and Amsterdam (1971). These conferences were designed to sustain the momentum attained in Berlin. In 1971 Graham desired to press beyond Berlin and host a global consultation much like Edinburgh 1910 where delegates were hand selected to address particular topics regarding completing the task of world evangelization. Graham’s purpose for the congress was to unite evangelicals to assess the unfinished task of globalizing the message of the Bible and producing a unity that would result in the completion of the task.6

Graham, in his opening address “Why Lausanne” to the Lausanne Congress of 1974, clearly and concisely stated the ultimate purpose for the event. “Why Lausanne? That the earth may hear his voice.”7

After, the Lausanne 1974 event the Lausanne Committee was established to perpetuate the vision and purpose of the event.

The Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization seeks to serve leaders worldwide by providing a place for theological discussion and development of practical strategies to address the seminal issues facing the church and world today with respect to global missions. Lausanne also seeks to encourage and

6 The Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization provides several useful documents (which can be downloaded in PDF) concerning the vision and purpose of Lausanne at www.lausanne.org. Documents like “The Lausanne Movement” and “About Lausanne” may be accessed at this site.

stimulate the involvement of churches, denominations, ministries, networks and individuals in the cause of world evangelization by producing documents and holding leadership gatherings that equip and call Christians together for the task of evangelism.8

Some envisioned Lausanne as the answer to the prayers of Edinburgh. The heart cry of Edinburgh was “Let the World hear [His voice] at least once.” The theme of Lausanne 1974 was “Let the Earth Hear His Voice.” In November 1974, immediately following the Lausanne Congress in July, Arthur P. Johnson questioned whether or not Lausanne would live up to its expectations. He stated, “Now sixty-four years later it remains to be seen how much the International Congress on World Evangelization held this past summer in Lausanne, Switzerland, contributed to the fulfillment of that unanswered prayer.”9

5.1.3 Lausanne’s Focus

Lausanne 1974 set the stage for evangelicals and ecumenicals from linguistic, cultural, racial, and denominational backgrounds to discuss what it might take to bring about global evangelization. As a result of the interaction there arose a new evangelical consensus. Johnson wrote, “Lausanne stimulated and implemented the ongoing process of evangelism by a regionalization that delegated the preparation of evangelistic strategy on the continent-wide or national level.”10


10 Johnson. The Battle for World Evangelism 337.
Prior to Lausanne Christian responsibility was focused on the individual. Lausanne, through the “Lausanne Covenant, shifted the emphasis on Christian responsibility from the individual to the Church body and personal responsibility became blurred in group responsibility.”\textsuperscript{11}

5.2 Lausanne: The World Congresses of 1974, 1989, and 2010

Lausanne has hosted some sixty plus conferences, consultations, and global gatherings since 1974. Their global impact has been significant. However, they are best known for the three global gatherings of 1974 (Lausanne, Switzerland), 1989 (Manilla, Phillipines), and the future 2010 (Cape Town, South Africa). Due to the specific scope of this work only these three global events will be examined in this chapter.

5.2.1 Lausanne 1974

After significant planning and preparation the first Lausanne Consultation on World Evangelization opened session on July 16, 1974. For ten days 2,300 delegates along with an additional four hundred participants, and another one-thousand plus observers, media, and guests converged on Lausanne, Switzerland, to strategize for global evangelization.\textsuperscript{12} The Congress achieved unprecedented

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 359.

\textsuperscript{12} This work recognizes that there are at least two discrepancies concerning the Lausanne Congress of 1974. The first discrepancy is found in assessing the number of delegates or participates who attended the congress. David Barrett attributes the number of delegates to 2,700 claiming a total of 4,000 participates.\textsuperscript{12} However, The Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization has determined that there were 2,300 delegates and the total attendance was 2,700. This chapter will use the Lausanne Committee’s figures as the committee is Lausanne’s official representative. The second discrepancy is found in the dating of the Lausanne event. Some archives have the event taking place July 15-25, 1974, while others use the dates of July 16-25, 1974. This dissertation will use the Lausanne Committee’s dates of July 16-25, 1974.
diversity of denominational affiliations, occupations, nationalities, and ethnicities for over one hundred fifty countries. The event was led by honorary chairman Billy Graham. The leaders participated in plenary sessions, Bible studies and discussions focused on missions, theology, strategy and methods of evangelism. The delegates of Lausanne 1974 produced The Lausanne Covenant, a declaration that is ‘intended to define the necessity, responsibilities, and goals of spreading the Gospel.’ Since 1974, the Lausanne Covenant has challenged Christians to work together to make Jesus Christ known throughout the world. Also, hundreds of organizations use The Lausanne Covenant as their ministry Statement of Faith.13

One of the major achievements of the Congress was the signing of the Lausanne Covenant. The covenant was drafted largely by John Stott who chaired the committee.

5.2.1.1 The Lausanne Covenant

To assess properly the significance and impact of Lausanne 1974, one must examine the Lausanne Covenant, which was signed by 2,200 of the 2,300 delegates at the conclusion of Lausanne 1974 (addendum B). The covenant was not signed by everyone and thus raises the question as to why some abstained. That issue has also been investigated and dealt with in this chapter.

The Lausanne Covenant is a document consisting of an introduction, fifteen major points of agreement, and a conclusion. The Covenant is broken down into six major areas of Christian thought and responsibility: the

authority of Scripture; the nature of evangelism; Christian social responsibility; the urgency of world missions; the problems of culture; and spiritual warfare.

Technically, the Lausanne Covenant is a covenant; however, there are some including the Lausanne Committee who view it as a statement of faith as will become evident later in this chapter. There does not appear to be much opposition to the document as a covenant. However, when the Lausanne Covenant is used as a statement of faith opposition quickly arises from the more conservative realm of the evangelical movement. One example of the Covenant being used as a statement of faith is seen within the Lausanne Committee’s own statement; “The Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization uses as its statement of faith the historic Lausanne Covenant which was produced out the 1974 International Congress on World Evangelization held in Lausanne, Switzerland.”

One might expect the Lausanne Committee to use the document in such a manner; however, other evangelical mission agencies have also adopted the same practice. This is clearly seen in statement of Life Transitions Academy;

Life Transitions Academy, Inc subscribes to The Lausanne Covenant which was developed by participants from 150 countries at the 1974 International Congress for World Evangelization in Lausanne, Switzerland, a congress called by Rev. Billy Graham. The Lausanne Covenant is being used as a statement of faith by hundreds of ministries throughout the world.


Using the Covenant as a statement of faith caused Francis A. Schaeffer and others to become skeptical of the Covenant because he felt that it guides its followers down the road to a new Neo-Orthodoxy. The controversy has raised the question as to whether or not the covenant was intended to be used as a statement of faith or not.

John Stott clarifies as to what the Lausanne Covenant Drafting Committee meant when they selected the term covenant rather than manifesto or declaration. He states, “The term covenant is not used in its technical, biblical sense, but in the ordinary sense of a binding contract.” Stott asserts, “We wanted to do more than find an agreed formula of words.” Their intention was “not just to declare something, but to do something, namely to commit [themselves] to the task of world evangelization.”

The covenant has been closely scrutinized since its unveiling in 1974. Proponents and opponents have vigorously debated the merits of the covenant over the past thirty plus years. One such debate focused on the selection of wording used in the covenant as well as the omission of others, and the perceived biblical authority or lack of it.

5.2.1.2 The Lausanne Covenant Controversy

Of the six major arenas of Christian thought and responsibility dealt with in the Covenant, the authority of Scripture, the nature of evangelism, and the Christian social responsibility seem to be at the heart of the controversy between the more conservative evangelicals and

16 Stott, Lausanne Occasional Papers #3, 1.

17 Ibid.

18 Ibid.
more moderate evangelicals.¹⁹ Due to the specific scope of this paper, and the fact that all three areas of controversy are so closely intertwined, this paper will deal with them as a single unit.²⁰

The controversy begins with the authority of Scripture. One of the main concerns of conservative evangelicals is that the authority of Scripture should maintain its rightful place. Any time that the Word of God is displaced or replaced for the sake of unity, evangelism, missions, social ministry, or any other reason, traditional conservative evangelicals become concerned. Some evangelical scholars (presented later in this chapter) believe that the Lausanne Covenant has accepted a lower view than Scripture deserves. While some evangelicals see no danger in the wording of the Covenant, others insist that the poor choice of words have compromised the very document that binds evangelicals together. To one it is a document that binds, to others it is a document that divides.

One clear example of the controversy is seen in the comments of two leading missiologists of the twenty-first century. The lengthy quotes below display the differing

---

¹⁹ Conservative evangelicals hold more to the traditional evangelical view of the early and mid 1900s and tend to focus on the spiritual dimensions of man’s need, whereas, moderate evangelicals tend to be more open to mankind’s physical and social needs.

²⁰ Section 5.2.1.2 entitled “The Lausanne Covenant Controversy” comes directly from the author’s first dissertation Harold E. Pruitt, Some Mission Societies Since Lausanne 1974. (diss., UNISA), 38-45. This section was first written in 3.5.2 pages 38-45 of that dissertation. The dissertation was completed in September 2007 and is on file at UNISA in Pretoria, South Africa. The author has chosen to include this earlier research in the present work as the controversy over the covenant is extremely relevant in understanding the impact and influence of Lausanne on the current evangelical world.
views of the Covenant’s use of Scripture. (Although the quotes are lengthy, the length is needed to represent accurately the view of these men). Global Mapping International’s staff missiologist Stan Nussbaum who studied under missiologist David Bosch shakes the conservative position, when in an interview he states:

The Lausanne Covenant does something that evangelicals typically do not do, which is, it puts mission first and the Bible second. Evangelicals are used to saying, Bible first, before belief in God, before whatever – you always start with the Bible and then you build from there. And the Lausanne Covenant the first article is on mission, the second is on the authority of Scripture. And that shift is hugely important in theological terms.\(^{21}\)

Nussbaum believes that one of the unifying factors of the Covenant is the fact that words like hell, atone, and eternal life were omitted from the document. Heaven is only mentioned once and refers to the New Heaven and New Earth. And judgment is only mentioned twice with references to social justice and the return of Christ. Nussbaum further states that the Lausanne Covenant’s long-term impact on the global church stems from the fact that “the Lausanne Covenant was not boxed in the way previous evangelical theology had been.”\(^{22}\)

Nussbaum views the fact that the Lausanne Covenant places the importance on missions above the importance of Scripture as a positive, whereas David Hesselgrave clearly views it as a negative. When asked to comment concerning Nussbaum’s comments, Hesselgrave thinks for a moment and

\(^{21}\) Addendum C (Nussbaum/O’Rear).

\(^{22}\) Ibid.
then responds. He remembers how just prior to Lausanne 1974 the emphasis for many missions organizations was on social action. He also recalls the importance of liberation emphases that grew out of the 60s and 70s, which had grown into a full blown liberation theology. Hesslegrave states:

All of this is bearing in upon Lausanne. And John Stott with his international connection is very much concerned with that, which you can see from his writings that came out of that time. And the Lausanne Covenant is very much a result of the thinking of John Stott and others like him. So what you come up with there is a statement which for all of its many conclusions has a... I wouldn’t say necessarily the primary concern, but a primary concern to write a missiology or social concern, maybe a socio-political concern into a statement that will then be espoused by a broad spectrum of evangelicals.²³

While some like Nussbaum attribute the success and spirit of Lausanne to the Covenant, Hesselgrave asserts that in actuality the Covenant fell short in providing the global church with what was actually needed in 1974. He states,

If I’d take that just one step further, you see it wasn’t only a little over a decade after that, that Donald McGavern approached me and said we’ve got to have a new missiological society that has to be called the Christian Missiological Society or the Christian whatever and so on, and what he is saying.... The reason for him saying that way, you know a Christian mission organization, he said we’ve got to have some way of bringing together those who are committed to what he called Great Commission mission. So we don’t have to argue whether Christ was divine or whether He was just THE Way. But where we have a consensus on these basic issues and then we can start speaking from

---

²³ Addendum D (Hesselgrave).
that base. That’s what evangelicals have desperately needed and they didn’t get that at Lausanne.  

Hesselgrave is not the only conservative evangelical who is concerned with how the authority of the Bible is perceived through the lens of the Lausanne Covenant. Francis A. Schaeffer agreed that Lausanne 1974 was a watershed for the evangelical world. Schaeffer believed that evangelicals are facing what he called a "great evangelical disaster." He stated that this disaster is "the failure of the evangelical world to stand for truth as truth." Schaeffer believed that the evangelical world has failed to stand for biblical truth because it has accommodated the spirit of this current secular age. His concern with the Lausanne Covenant is that it provides a loophole for a new neo-orthodoxy within the conservative evangelical movement. That loophole allows those within evangelicalism who are quite happy to use the words infallibility, inerrancy, and without error, but upon careful analysis they really mean something quite different from what those words have meant to the church historically. This problem can be seen in what has happened to the statement on Scripture in the Lausanne Covenant of 1974.

The loophole to which Schaeffer refers is found in section two of the Covenant, which is entitled "The Authority and Power of the Bible." It states,

---

24 Ibid.
26 Ibid., 56.
We affirm the divine inspiration, truthfulness and authority of both Old and New Testament Scriptures in their entirety as the only written word of God, without error in all that it affirms, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice...\(^{27}\)

Schaeffer believed that the “widely accepted existential methodology in certain parts of the evangelical community”\(^{28}\) undermined the traditional meanings of infallibility, inerrancy, and without error. He also has serious concerns as the Covenant attests to the authority of the Bible only in all that it affirms. Schaffer believed that the Covenant is too narrow in its interpretation of the Bible’s authority. Since the Covenant only affirms what the Bible has to say when it speaks of values, the meaning system, and religious things, it should also affirm that the Bible is authoritative when it speaks of other things such as history and the cosmos.

Whereas many evangelicals consider Lausanne 1974 to be a positive watershed moment, Schaeffer considered the watershed to be negative. In his book The Great Evangelical Disaster Schaeffer paints an elaborate picture of two snowflakes that sit together on a snow capped mountain in Switzerland. When the snow melts the watershed leads the melted snow into two different rivers and ends up a thousand miles apart. To him the watershed is a dividing line. Schaeffer believes that the Lausanne Covenant is a

\(^{27}\) See Addendum B.

\(^{28}\) Schaeffer, The Great Evangelical Disaster, 57.
watershed that divides evangelicals into conservatives and neo-orthodox. Schaeffer states,

Here then is the watershed of the evangelical world. We must say most lovingly but clearly: evangelicalism is not consistently evangelical unless there is a line drawn between those who take a full view of scripture and those who do not.\(^{29}\)

Of course, when Schaeffer uses the phrase “full view of Scripture,” he is referring to those who hold to the traditional conservative understanding of infallibility, inerrancy, and without error. Schaeffer is convinced that true evangelicals will hold to the traditional meanings of infallibility, inerrancy, and without error, and will not compromise God’s Word in any way. He stresses,

That on the basis of what the word evangelical originally meant in regard to Scripture, we must be willing in love to draw a line in regard to those who take a lower view of Scripture. On the basis of the original term evangelical, they are false evangelicals. Not to do so is accommodation to the world’s spirit about us at a critical point which will eventually carry everything else down with it.\(^{30}\)

Schaeffer’s argument is not without warrant. Certainly there have been compromises and abuses to Scripture by evangelicals and ecumenicals alike as they work together. One of these abuses according to Schaeffer is seen in the socialist mentality of the Evangelicals for Social Action (ESA). Schaeffer maintains, “[The] ESA is saying that ‘unjust social structure’s and in particular ‘the maldistribution of wealth’ are the real causes of evil in

\(^{29}\) Ibid., 64.

\(^{30}\) Ibid., 103.
the world.” He points out how absurd this is since abortion, crime, and humanism are found in nearly every level of society irrespective of the level of wealth. Schaeffer asserts that to allow this type of socialistic thinking in the evangelical world is paramount to Marxism. He states that in this mentality “the gospel has been reduced to a program for transforming social structures,” which is a gross misuse of the truth of the gospel.

If Schaeffer is correct theologically, the “ESA seems to be saying that changing economic structures is the means of salvation for modern man since only this deals with the basic causes of the disease.” In reality, however, the real problem lies deep within man’s sinful wicked heart, which has been the case since the fall of Adam. Schaeffer feels so strongly that evangelicals within the social gospel movement have compromised the gospel that he accuses them of “talking about another gospel.”

David Hesselgrave and Francis Schaeffer are not the only evangelicals who are concerned over the watershed Lausanne Covenant. Several Southern Baptists including missiologist Keith E. Eitel, Dean of the School of Theology and Mission at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, has personally expressed his concerns surrounding the Lausanne Covenant. In a recent exchange of email concerning Nussbaum’s statement Eitel states,

---

31 Ibid., 112.
32 Ibid., 113.
33 Ibid.
34 Ibid., 114.
I would agree with Nussbaum's observations but would interpret it as an indication of how we have drifted away from a biblical focus or grounding for our missiology. Now we have Winter [Ralph Winter] advocating counting Muslims as Christians because they carry their Bibles to the mosque with them. So his attitudes "writ large" are the issues we're facing in evangelicalism as a whole.  

Nussbaum sees the Lausanne Covenant placing missions before Scripture as a miracle, but Eitel views it as a slippery slope. Eitel’s concern is valid as it appears that even Ralph Winter now advocates calling Muslims brothers. There is one question that remains to be answered in this controversy. Are all of the concerns expressed above a direct result of Lausanne 1974, an indirect result, or is there any connection at all? Due to the limited scope of this dissertation the question will remain unanswered for now.

In conclusion to the controversy, traditionally conservative evangelicals have a problem with what they perceive to be a low view of Scripture in the Lausanne Covenant. Added to that is the problem of attempting to understand the nature of evangelism verses evangelization, and just how does the social responsibility relate to evangelism. These are issues that stand unresolved today some thirty plus years after Lausanne 1974.

Donald McGavran articulates evangelism as “proclaiming Jesus Christ as God and Savior and persuading men to become his disciples and responsible members of his church.”

---

35 See Addendum E (Eitel).

36 Donald A. McGavran, “The Dimensions of World Evangelization,” in Let The Earth Hear His Voice: International Congress on World
of the Lausanne delegates would agree that McGavran’s definition is a solid basis from which to operate, but that it is deficient for use in terms of evangelization. With disagreements as presented above there is little doubt that not everyone considered Lausanne 1974 as a positive watershed moment for the evangelical world.\textsuperscript{37}

5.2.2 Lausanne II Manila 1989

Lausanne II July 1989 in Manila was significant in that it was spawn from a movement which takes seriously the task of completing the task of world evangelization, cooperation in that cause, and the networking between evangelical leaders. The theme of Lausanne II was “Proclaim Christ until He Comes: Calling the Whole Church to Take the Whole Gospel to the Whole World.” It was equally significant as it sought to focus the “whole church of Jesus Christ in a fresh way on the task of taking the whole gospel to the whole world.”

There were 4,300 participants representing 173 countries. There was a larger contingency of women, lay


\textsuperscript{37} The lack of unity between certain evangelicals and ecumenicals is not a new phenomenon. For some, the skepticism has existed since Edinburgh 1910. Delegates at the Wheaton Congress in 1966 and again at the Berlin Congress 1966 attempted to bridge the gap between two sides, but both fell short. Wheaton articulated a pragmatic view of unity, and Berlin established a unity based on “like-mindedness.” It needs to be noted that Lausanne 1974 was the first World Mission Congress to recognize the “whole church” as an organized institution at the center of efforts for world evangelization. The Lausanne Covenant succeeded where other congresses and documents had previously failed. Lausanne united with nearly 2200 signatures affirming such unity. For an in-depth look into evangelical/ecumenical unity issue see Willem A. Saayman’s, Unity and Mission: A study of the concept of unity in ecumenical discussions since 1961 and its influence on the world mission of the church (Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1984).
persons and younger leaders than at previous Lausanne conferences. The topics ranged “from the A.D. 2000 movement, to the work of the Holy Spirit, to liberating lay people, to the heart-cry of the poor of our world—and all related to Christ's global cause.” Edward R. Dayton states,

Lausanne II in Manila was the second International Congress on World Evangelization. The Congress drew its name from the first International Congress which was held fifteen years ago in Lausanne, Switzerland. The years between these two Congresses were a dynamic time in the spread of the gospel around the world. In 1974 we were alarmed to hear that there were over two billion people who had never heard the gospel. In 1989 we were still challenged by two billion people who had yet to hear, but we were also encouraged by the large number of people groups within which there was now an evangelizing church.38

5.2.2.1 The Manila Manifesto

An accurate summary of the Manila Manifesto was published by the Lausanne Committee.

The Manila Manifesto is an elaboration of The Lausanne Covenant fifteen years later. The participants in Lausanne II, the Second International Congress on World Evangelization, in Manila in the Philippines in July 1989 deliberated on the prospects for the fulfillment of the Great Commission of our Lord Jesus Christ. The subject was looked at from every conceivable angle with an attempt to be true to the Holy Scriptures in the analysis. The results were summarized in The Manila Manifesto. Its second draft was submitted to all the participants. They made many comments and suggestions, which were carefully considered in the preparation of the final document. The following motion was then put to the whole Congress in plenary session: "We accept the Manila Manifesto as an expression, in general terms, of our concerns and commitments, and we commend it to

ourselves, to churches and to Christian organizations for further study and response." This motion passed by an overwhelming majority.\(^{39}\)

5.2.3 Lausanne III Cape Town 2010

At Cape Town 2010: The Third Lausanne Congress on World Evangelization, the theme will be “Global Conversations on the Issues.” It is the Lausanne Committee’s hope that Lausanne III will inspire its anticipated 4,000 plus leaders from 200 countries to tackle “Global Issues” through genuine “Global Conversations” and develop “Global Solutions.”\(^{40}\) Since 1974 Lausanne has hosted many smaller regional consultations and gatherings as well as participated globally with many organizations promoting world evangelization. However, thus far Lausanne has hosted only two Global Consultations on World Evangelization. Why host a third one now? Will it be more than a celebration of the Edinburgh centennial? The Lausanne Committee shares its reasoning and states that,

Today on nearly every continent, the Body of Christ is faced with major challenges to not only its physical survival, but also attacks on the very tenets of the Christian faith. How should the church respond to these challenges and what issues require the attention of the global church?

‘The church is facing important global issues that require global conversations to find global solutions,’ says Rev. S. Douglas Birdsall, Executive Chair of the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization (Lausanne Movement).

---


At the urging of evangelical leaders worldwide, the Lausanne Movement, with the participation of the World Evangelical Alliance, will host Cape Town 2010: The Third Lausanne Congress on World Evangelization in Cape Town, South Africa, 16-25 October 2010. Cape Town 2010 will provide a global forum — before, during and after the Congress — in which leaders from around the world will explore issues facing the church and God’s world. Then together leaders will prayerfully seek God’s guidance in responding so that God’s name may be honored and many more men, women and young people will be able to hear and respond to the message of Christ presented in a relevant and culturally appropriate manner.

It is anticipated that over 4,000 leaders from 200 countries will attend Cape Town 2010. The Participant Selection Team, made up of leaders worldwide, has established specific criteria to ensure that the Congress will include men and women from a broad spectrum of nationalities, ethnicities, ages, occupations and denominational affiliations.41

This statement by the Committee shows that the Third Congress on Global Evangelization will be in the same vein as previous Congresses. The selection committee has issued invitations to delegates based on Lausanne’s criteria to insure a successful congress. The selection is (as were previous congresses) from a broad cross section of the evangelical/ecumenical world. As in previous congresses Lausanne is attempting to be relevant by tackling the current problems that face world evangelization. Theological convergence is likely since there is active participation from the World Evangelical Alliance (WEA). The WEA’s close connection with the World Council of Churches (WCC) and their ecumenical mooring have the

potential to make this the most ecumenical Lausanne Global Congress to date.

Will Lausanne III live up to its expectations? In a letter to Lausanne, Billy Graham admits that he is encouraged over the plans for Lausanne III in Cape Town in 2010. He states, “I thank God that He has given our new generation of Lausanne leaders a fresh vision for world evangelization just as He laid a burden upon many of us more than thirty years ago.”42 Graham still holds out hope for Christian unity in missions, stating,

Approaching ninety years of age, I will likely be in Heaven by the time Lausanne III is convened in Cape Town. But I trust that God will use the congress to unite the church in its commitment to the gospel and in its engagement with the world – for the hope of the world and for the glory of God. I am praying that God will bless all those who are involved in leading and planning this congress in Cape Town. We pass the baton to a new generation.43

On a final note concerning Lausanne III: Cape Town 2010 (ct2010), one has to wonder how much influence the WCC and the WEA have had throughout the years on Lausanne? At the Buenos Aries Lausanne Leadership meeting held in June 2008, Lausanne’s Executive Chairman makes his views known concerning a World Church Council; “The Revd Doug Birdsall, Lausanne Executive Chair, says the time is right for a world Church Council such as CT2010 [Cape Town 2010], given
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the current crises both internally and externally in the church."\textsuperscript{44}

The Lausanne Leadership group also affirmed that at Lausanne III much of the emphasis needed to focus on “discipling young Christians and helping them form a Christian world view toward political, environmental and economic issues as well their family life.”\textsuperscript{45} Additionally, the 4,000 expected participants, “two-thirds will come from the non-western world, 60% will be under 50 years old, and 35% will be women.”\textsuperscript{46}

5.3 Ecumenism and Convergence within the Lausanne Movement 1974 to Present

Since its inception in 1974 Lausanne has continually attempted to provide venues for Christian theologians, missiologists, and churchmen to assess the unfinished task of global evangelization, assist them in forming new effective strategies for completion of the task, and worked with them in mobilizing the body of Christ to meet the task. These venues have allowed evangelicals and ecumenicals repeated interaction that have been beneficial for each. Yet, there still remains some skepticism between the two. There are at least two primary issues that separate conservative evangelicals from other evangelicals and ecumenicals. First, there is the concern over “social ministry” and its affect on evangelism or (the proclamation of the Gospel as it pertains to mankind’s
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eternal destiny). Second, are concerns over unity between Christians that hold to differing theologies.

There are several areas of conflict that divide evangelicals (even within their own camp) and ecumenicals such as women’s roles in ministry, authority of Scripture, perceived drift from evangelism, emphasis on social ministry, and even eschatology. Due to the limited focus of this work only one area of concern will be examined in this section. Conservative evangelicals have long been concerned over what they perceive to be a shift away from the proclamation of the Gospel aimed at man’s final destiny to a more “social gospel,” which tends to focus on the here and now. Lausanne 1974 and the movement that followed has proved to be more balanced in their presentation of ideas than some previous conferences. This balance can be seen in the Lausanne Covenant and in the presentation of papers.

5.3.1 The Lausanne Covenant on Social Responsibility

Section five of the covenant is titled: Christian Social Responsibility, and states,

We affirm that God is both the Creator and the Judge of all men. We therefore should share his concern for justice and reconciliation throughout human society and for the liberation of men from every kind of oppression. Because mankind is made in the image of God, every person, regardless of race, religion, color, culture, class, sex or age, has an intrinsic dignity because of which he should be respected and served, not exploited. Here too we express penitence both for our neglect and for having sometimes regarded evangelism and social concern as mutually exclusive. Although reconciliation with man is not reconciliation with God, nor is social action evangelism, nor is political liberation salvation, nevertheless we affirm that evangelism and socio-political involvement are both part of our Christian duty. For both are necessary expressions of our doctrines of God and man, our love for our neighbor and our obedience to Jesus
Christ. The message of salvation implies also a message of judgment upon every form of alienation, oppression and discrimination, and we should not be afraid to denounce evil and injustice wherever they exist. When people receive Christ they are born again into his kingdom and must seek not only to exhibit but also to spread its righteousness in the midst of an unrighteous world. The salvation we claim should be transforming us in the totality of our personal and social responsibilities. Faith without works is dead.47

In his exposition of the Lausanne Covenant John Stott explains that in the past Christians have neglected their social responsibility, yet they have at times polarized evangelism from social concerns as though the two were mutually exclusive. He calls on the signers of the document to repudiate any attempt to divide the two. Stott urges Christians to affirm “that evangelism and socio-political involvement are both part of our Christian duty.”48 Section five: Christian Social Responsibility is based on four biblical doctrines (God, Man, Salvation, and the Kingdom). It is the doctrine of salvation that seem to be at the heart of the controversy. Conservative evangelical Christians are concerned that the social aspects of Christian ministry have become primary thus placing concern for man’s soul as a secondary or tertiary issue. Some of their concerns are well founded due to past WCC conferences like Bangkok 1973. Stott clearly distinguishes Lausanne from Bangkok in their understanding of salvation. Stott recalls,

47 Addendum B.
48 Stott, Lausanne Occasional Papers #3, 12.
There was a good expectation that the Assembly of the World Council of Churches' Commission on World Mission and Evangelism at Bangkok in January 1973 entitled Salvation Today would produce a fresh definition, faithful to Scripture and relevant to today. But Bangkok disappointed us. Although it included some references to personal salvation, its emphasis was to equate salvation with political and economic liberation. The Lausanne Covenant rejects this, for it is not biblical. Reconciliation with man is not reconciliation with God, nor is social action evangelism, nor is political liberation salvation. Nevertheless, it is our duty to be involved in socio-political action; that is, both in social action (caring for society's casualties) and in political action (concerned for the structures of society itself). For both active evangelistic and social involvement are necessary expressions not only of our doctrines of God and man (as we have seen) but also of our love for our neighbor and our obedience to Jesus Christ. Further, although salvation is not to be equated with political liberation, yet the message of salvation implies also a message of judgment upon every form of alienation, oppression and discrimination. Salvation is deliverance from evil, and implicit in God's desire to save people from evil is his judgment on the evil from which he saves them. Moreover, this evil is both individual and social. Since God hates evil and injustice, we should not be afraid to denounce evil and injustice wherever they exist.49

49 Ibid., 13.
Stott’s public rejection of Bangkok 1973’s desire to equate salvation with political and economic liberation as unbiblical, and then to further state that the Lausanne Covenant rejects this concept of salvation provided the much needed assurance for many conservatives. The Lausanne Covenant bridged the chasm between the traditional evangelical view of salvation and the Bangkok interpretation. Stott’s assertion that “reconciliation with man is not reconciliation with God, nor is social action evangelism, nor is political liberation salvation” settled much of the opposition from within the evangelical constituency.

5.3.2 The Manila Manifesto on Social Responsibility

Section Four of the Manila Manifestos entitled: The Gospel and Social Responsibility states,

The authentic gospel must become visible in the transformed lives of men and women. As we proclaim the love of God we must be involved in loving service, as we preach the Kingdom of God we must be committed to its demands of justice and peace.

Evangelism is primary because our chief concern is with the gospel, that all people may have the opportunity to accept Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour. Yet Jesus not only proclaimed the Kingdom of God, he also demonstrated its arrival by works of mercy and power. We are called today to a similar integration of words and deeds. In a spirit of humility we are to preach and teach, minister to the sick, feed the hungry, care for prisoners, help the disadvantaged and handicapped, and deliver the oppressed. While we acknowledge the diversity of spiritual gifts, callings and contexts, we also affirm that good news and good works are inseparable.

The proclamation of God's kingdom necessarily demands the prophetic denunciation of all that is incompatible with it. Among the evils we deplore are destructive violence, including institutionalized violence, political corruption, all forms of exploitation of people and of the earth, the
undermining of the family, abortion on demand, the drug traffic, and the abuse of human rights. In our concern for the poor, we are distressed by the burden of debt in the two-thirds world. We are also outraged by the inhuman conditions in which millions live, who bear God’s image as we do.

Our continuing commitment to social action is not a confusion of the kingdom of God with a Christianized society. It is, rather, a recognition that the biblical gospel has inescapable social implications. True mission should always be incarnational. It necessitates entering humbly into other people's worlds, identifying with their social reality, their sorrow and suffering, and their struggles for justice against oppressive powers. This cannot be done without personal sacrifices.

We repent that the narrowness of our concerns and vision has often kept us from proclaiming the lordship of Jesus Christ over all of life, private and public, local and global. We determine to obey his command to "seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness". (1 Th. 1:6-10; 1 Jn. 3:17; Ro. 14:17; Ro. 10:14; Mt. 12:28; 1 Jn. 3:18; Mt. 25:34-46; Ac. 6:1-4; Ro. 12:4-8; Mt. 5:16, Jer. 22:1-5; 11-17; 23:5-6; Am. 1:1-2,8; Is. 59; Lev. 25; Job 24:1-12; Eph. 2:8-10; Jn. 17:18; 20:21; Php. 2:5-8; Ac. 10:36; Mt. 6:33)

A close examination of the Lausanne Covenant and the Manila Manifesto clearly points to a genuine concern on the part of the Lausanne conveners and Lausanne Continuation Committee towards Christian responsibility on behalf of the poor, oppressed, and the unjustly treated. Some evangelicals believe there exists an over-emphasis on the subject. Perhaps an examination of some of the Lausanne papers will shed light as to whether or not Lausanne is out of balance in this area of ministry.

5.3.3 Lausanne Papers on Social Responsibility

As with each topic Lausanne chooses to tackle at their conferences, congresses, and consultations there are a multiplicity of papers and counter papers. Due to the
massive number of documents written since 1974 that deal with social responsibility it would be impossible to include them all. Therefore, a representative cross section will be examined to demonstrate the balance of Lausanne towards social responsibility.

Only four of these will be examined in this section. Among them was one entitled “Personal and Eternal Salvation and Human Redemption” by C. Emilio Antonio Nunez. Nunez begins his paper by asking a series of provoking questions like “Is Christianity only vertical turned towards heaven, or is it horizontal, at the service of the total man within the context of human society?”

Nunez raises such questions so that the reader will reflect on the very nature of mission. He quickly acknowledges that “no one can ignore the distressed, desperate, and heart-renting drama which the great majority of mankind is living.”

Nunez firmly believes that, in general, liberation theologians use a faulty hermeneutic in determining their view of the mission of the Church. His stance is that the origin or foundation of the “theology of liberation is not the Bible but the economical-political
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analysis of the infrahuman situation in which millions of persons are living throughout the world.\textsuperscript{52}

According to the liberation theologians, the mission of the church is to compromise with the political-social liberation. To this end it must denounce every dehumanizing situation, question the status quo, and render the masses conscious and political... To sum it up, the liberationist theology does not have its point of origin in the Bible, but in the economical-social situation of the under-developed nations.\textsuperscript{53}

Nunez is well balanced in his understanding of biblical social responsibility as is clear in his conclusion. After affirming that “deliverance in Christ is fundamentally related to the sin which is enchanting man in his deepest being,”\textsuperscript{54} he also asserts,

Although the Gospel emphasizes the deliverance of the individual, there are evangelical principles that have been influenced and can influence here and now for the good of humanity. Even if the Church fulfills its mission faithfully to proclaim the entire counsel of God, it cannot avoid either the auto-judgment or the trial of society because of the state of oppression in which millions and millions of human beings are living in different parts of the world.\textsuperscript{55}

J. Raymond Knighton in his “Social Responsibilities of Evangelization Report” establishes that his committee holds to the view that social responsibility is not evangelism but that it is a part of evangelization. Most conservative evangelicals have no problem affirming that “when we enjoy

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., 1062.
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the privilege of proclaiming Jesus Christ as Lord, we have the consequent responsibility to express this servant relationship to others."  

Additionally, many would agree that social action should never be used as some form of bribe to make the Gospel more attractive, but that it should be done out of love for Christ and compassion on those who are in need.

However, it is Knighton’s concluding comment that raises concerns for some evangelicals. After making it clear that the committee affirms that social action is commended by God and that Christians are to participate out of obedience, he states that Christians “should not evangelize through social service, but rather see social action as part of evangelization.”

The question arises, what does Knighton mean by this statement? Does he mean that one should never proclaim the Gospel of eternal salvation during times of social ministry or does he simply mean that social action should not be performed only as a means for spreading the Good News? A closer examination of Knighton’s report reveals that he is attempting to show that social action is a biblical concept flowing from the very heart of God, and that it is a Christian’s moral and spiritual responsibility to participate in social endeavors. Furthermore, social action should not be used as a means to coerce individuals into listening to the Gospel. Yet, he does affirm that

---
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Christians have the privilege of proclaiming the Gospel of Christ as Lord.

Samuel Escobar presented a well balanced paper at Lausanne 1974 and declared that “Jesus takes seriously the problems of poverty, power, relationships, which are essentially the problems that cause social and political maladjustment and injustice.”58 After making his statement, Escobar does a magnificent job developing his position. He makes it clear that he views social responsibility not only as a responsibility of Western Christians upon those in need, but also those in need have responsibility.

Escobar states “Jesus creates a new people, a new community where these problems are dealt with under the Lordship of Christ.”59 For Escobar, when a person becomes a Christian he has a responsibility for changing his own community by the way his own life changes.

This is a biblical model of evangelism, the radically different community that calls men to faith in the crucified and resurrected Christ that has transformed their lives, and the new life in the Spirit that enables them to follow the example of Christ. Such a community has a revolutionary effect in changing society.”60

Using the examples of Christ and his Apostles, Escobar illustrates that “there is no separation or gap between

---
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preaching and teaching.”61 It is the Christian’s responsibility not only to proclaim the Good News, but also he must teach or disciple the new believer. It is then the new convert’s responsibility to get involved, penetrate society, and be a part of changing his own environment.

Escobar brings up another good point in that for far too long those proclaiming the Gospel have been associated with the oppressor rather than the oppressed. How are Christians to be taken seriously when they bring Good News of deliverance when they are viewed as part of the oppression? He states, “If this is not taken seriously by the evangelists, in both their style and their message, the credibility of the Gospel is at stake.”62 Escobar uses the example of Billy Graham to illustrate his point. From the beginning of his ministry Graham refused to preach to segregated audiences. During racially tumultuous times in America Graham took his stand and proclaimed the Gospel to everyone who would listen regardless of race or economic condition. Graham was viewed by the poor and oppressed as identifying with them. He was not viewed as part of the problem. Perhaps, that is a contributing factor in his global influence.

While Nunez, Knighton, and Escobar each appear more balanced to the conservative evangelical, George Hoffman does seem to be a bit overly focused on social responsibility and less concerned with the proclamation of eternal salvation. Hoffman immediately points out,

61 Ibid., 324.
62 Ibid., 323.
As Christians for whom the Bible is authoritative, we have just as much (if not more) right to be concerned for man’s total development as anyone. Unfortunately, in the debate on development, the evangelical voice has seldom been heard, largely through our own default, and once again we have retreated from, if not wholly evacuated, yet another area where we have let other Christian and non-Christian voices and programs dominate the scene, preoccupied with man’s ‘horizontal’ development at the expense of being concerned for man’s total welfare – yet another casualty perpetuated by the false dichotomy between the so-called ‘social’ and ‘spiritual’ gospels.”

It is this type of phraseology that concerns conservative evangelicals. Hoffman is correct in that there have been many evangelicals who have ignored their social responsibility, but there have also been those who have failed to share the eternal salvation aspects of the Gospel. In his paper delivered at Lausanne 1974 Hoffman fails to affirm that proclamation of eternal salvation is a necessary part of evangelization, but asserts,

If, then, we are going to take seriously the words of our Lord Jesus Christ and bring deliverance to the captives, it will embrace deliverance from the constant threat of exploitation; deliverance from the indignity of a lifetime of servitude and unemployment; deliverance from the menace of death by starvation and malnutrition; deliverance from the threat of disease and chronic ill-health through insanitary living conditions and the degrading squalor of some of our urban gettos. These must all be seen as part and parcel of bringing deliverance to the captives of poverty, injustice, exploitation, and neglect. To talk and speak of just a ‘spiritual deliverance’ is to

---

truncate and devalue the glorious Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.⁶⁴

This type of continuous rhetoric throughout the paper without mention of man’s eternal destiny in a positive light leads some evangelicals to label Hoffman as a socio-political ecumenical even though Hoffman refers to himself as an evangelical. With Hoffman’s interpretation of Scripture in mind, if he is an evangelical then certainly his paper does not reflect the traditional evangelical view, thus, providing evidence of theological convergence within evangelicalism.

In fairness to Hoffman, a thorough reading of his work reveals that his major concern is that Christians (who have been overly focused on eternal deliverance) begin to examine their own lives and become involved in man’s earthly deliverance. Among his concluding remarks Hoffman reminds the Lausanne delegates that “if as Christians we believe that we are called to ‘bear one another’s burdens,’ we must know what it means to share one another’s burdens.”⁶⁵

Lausanne has continued to press for social responsibility from its inception. There have been papers presented at the global congresses as well as smaller gatherings which hosted mini-conferences which focused on social responsibility. One example was the Consultation on the Church in Response to Human Need held in Wheaton,
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Illinois, in 1983. Since the smaller gatherings were not global congresses only the papers from the two world congresses will be examined. The following three papers were delivered at Lausanne II in Manila in 1989.

Tokunboh Adeyemo presents a well balanced thesis. He begins his argument by referencing the Old and New Testaments to define the nature of the Gospel of salvation. He points out that the Gospel as it relates to salvation denotes “deliverance, preservation and salvation to those who accept his [God’s] conditions of repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus, in whom alone it is to be obtained.” He then proceeds to display the demands of the Gospel and illustrates how redeemed humanity is to live separated from wickedness, corruption, injustice, and violence. At conversion believers are ushered away from such and are transformed by God to live different lives.

Adeyemo continues by showing that the ministry of Christ was demonstrated by His compassion and that a Christ-like ministry demands involvement in the lives of those for whom Christ died. In many cases that involves getting involved in the lives of the poor and/or oppressed. Ministry takes place in the marketplace, ghettos, poor

66 The Consultation on the Church in Response to Human Need met in Wheaton, Illinois, in June 1983 as the third track of a larger conference sponsored by the World Evangelical Fellowship under the title "I Will Build My Church." The statement "Transformation: The Church in Response to Human Need," which was produced as an outgrowth of the consultation, does not attempt to be a comprehensive statement of the whole counsel of God on the issues of development, but it reflects the thoughts of the participants at the consultation as they were expressed and modified in the papers and discussion that followed. More information may be attained at Lausanne.org.

urban center, prisons,... and demands involvement. Adeyemo concludes by asserting that,

The Gospel is not only a creed to believe, but a life to live! With the untold billions still unevangelized; with escalation of violence and unrest all over the world; with the economic hope of the world waning as nations from the Third World sink deeper and deeper into debt; what better gift can come from Manila than to call on the church of Jesus Christ ‘to take the whole gospel to the whole world!’  

Additionally, Vinay Samuel makes several good points in his paper “Social Concern and Evangelization”. Samuel begins by establishing the fact that the Kingdom of God is in the future, but is also in the present. He asserts that there are six guiding principles for evangelicals who desire to minister to the oppressed. In the midst of his urging evangelicals to become involved in ministry to the oppressed, Samuel reminds them that Christ used a strategy of love not conquest. He further asserts, “Any authentic strategy to share the whole Gospel must reflect love rather than conquest.” Samuel challenges the delegates to begin

---
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Six guiding principles: First, our message must come out of a heart committed to the one thing most oppressed people desire: Justice. Second, We must never allow strategy triumph over our theology. Third, We must never change our message during a crisis because when a crisis is over, we will have no message. Fourth, Our evangelism and mission need to be incarnational if they are to be authentic. Fifth, We need to do a social analysis. This is essential if we are contextual (transforming and empowering) and it enables us to take a clear biblical stand when challenges arise. Sixth, It must be clear that we serve only one Master—the Lord. We have a primary allegiance to only one King. Ibid., 296-97.
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the process of ministry to the poor and oppressed in order that the Gospel might release them to change their own situation which will in fact empower those to whom Samuel is speaking.\footnote{Ibid.}

One additional paper from the Manila gathering that seemed to be well balanced was “Good News for the Poor” part I by Edna Lee de Guitierrez. In the section “Something to Pray for and to Think About” de Guitierrez brings to light that “in ministering to the economically poor, we must not make them dependent on our giving but rather help them to be self-sufficient.”\footnote{Edna Lee de Guitierrez, “Good News for the Poor,” in \emph{Proclaim Christ Until He Comes}, ed. J. D. Douglas and the Lausanne Committee, (Charlotte: Grason Publishing, 1990), 151.} She then quickly reminds Christians that “there is a blessing in the partnership in the ministry but let us not forget that we have our own resources. Freely we have received, let us freely give what we have.”\footnote{Ibid., 152.}

Lausanne draws the attention of evangelicals and ecumenicals alike. It is true that papers have been presented at Lausanne conferences, consultations, and gatherings that are one-sided and unbalanced in that they either eliminate the need for a Gospel as it pertains to man’s eternal destiny or they totally ignore Christian social responsibility. It is this author’s belief that the papers presented above are representative of the spirit and purpose of Lausanne. Thus, demonstrating that Lausanne (while like Edinburgh in several ways) is different in that it allowed the Bible to be used to support doctrinal
positions and those positions were allowed to be discussed among the delegates. Lausanne has been a unifier for many evangelicals and ecumenicals who attend the gatherings. There continue to be those skeptical of Lausanne and the relationships that stem as a result of the conferences, but mainstream evangelicalism and ecumenism both have shifted and embraced the others views in order to accomplish world evangelization.

5.4 Comparison of Edinburgh’s and Lausanne’s Relationship to Theological Convergence.

As stated in the previous section, Lausanne has been more balanced in their approach to mission and ministry than some previous movements. However, it must be noted that Lausanne does seem to focus more on social aspects of ministry than they do on the proclamation of Christ as eternal savior of man’s soul. Perhaps, it is due to the fact that Lausanne is open to evangelicals and ecumenicals alike. Lausanne could be compared to a clearinghouse of ideas where the dominate culture is evangelical/ecumenical. It is more than conservative evangelical, yet less than ecumenical. At times this provides an atmosphere where conservative evangelicals feel surrounded by ecumenicals and likewise with ecumenicals. However, the reality is that Lausanne unlike some previous movements is a better balance of evangelical and ecumenical thought. This becomes more evident through a comparison of convergence from Edinburgh 1910 and the movement that followed to the convergence of Lausanne 1974 and the movement that followed.

5.4.1 Edinburgh’s Relationship to Convergence

As presented in chapter three of this thesis, Edinburgh 1910 intentionally avoided theological discussion in order to promote unity. Therefore, as a result,
Edinburgh’s relationship to theological convergence, although perhaps unforeseen by its founders, was intentional on several levels. Throughout the years many evangelicals and ecumenicals have hailed Edinburgh as the great missions conference of the twentieth century, thereby giving the impression that the results of the conference were successful and to be mimicked and/or integrated into future conferences. Edinburgh’s intentionality\(^74\) can be seen in several ways.

First, evidence of intentionality was their decision to avoid doctrine at any cost. David Hesselgrave reminds missiologists today that Edinburgh’s decision to avoid doctrinal issues was a grievous error.\(^75\) Hesselgrave asserts that Mott and those planning the event made a serious error in judgment by avoiding theological discussions. Hesselgrave states that “they should have insisted on including doctrinal discussion both when planning and when guiding conference proceedings.”\(^76\)

Second, the convergence was intentional as witnessed by the selection of delegates. They were carefully hand selected. Kyo Seong Ahn states, “To put it bluntly, most of

---

\(^{74}\) Intentionality: The state of having or being formed by an intention or the property of being about or directed toward a subject, as inherent in conscious states, beliefs, or creations of the mind. The author chooses to use the word “intentionality” due to the fact that the Edinburgh conveners could have and very well may have foreseen that theological convergence was a possibility and even more so a probability as a result of their decisions. Thus, leading to intentionality of convergence.
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the participants of the Edinburgh Conference could be labeled as ecumenical evangelicals."  

Third, evidence was the Edinburgh convener’s commitment to ecumenism. Edinburgh’s founders appeared to be more committed to ecumenism than they were to scriptural principles. Andrew Walls claims that the conference organizers exercised “great diplomacy” in avoiding “flashpoints” where differing traditions might possibly conflict. That diplomacy required a strong commitment to ecumenism. Ecumenism was a primary focus of Edinburgh from the preplanning of the preparatory committee throughout the conference and continued in some of the conferences that followed Edinburgh 1910. Kenneth Scott Latourette states that Edinburgh 1910 “became a landmark in the history of the Ecumenical Movement.” Chapter three establishes the fact that theological convergence existed in Edinburgh 1910 from its inception and that ecumenism proceeded from Edinburgh until Lausanne. There were many contributing factors to that convergence. Yet, the dominating factor was the quest for unity. The desire for unity was the motivating force behind most other factors. However, there was another contributing factor that needs to be mentioned and that is motive.

---


Intentionality was the order of the day at Edinburgh. The ecumenical motives themselves may have also contributed to theological convergence. J. Marcellus Kik list six primary motives for ecumenicals. Although these motives may be pure, they may have influenced the Edinburgh conveners to strive for unity at the expense of theology, thus attributing to intentional theological convergence.

In their decision to ignore theology the conveners of Edinburgh with hand selected delegates permitted people with differing authority structures to influence the evangelical world. Some believe that the authority of experience equals the same level of authority as Scripture, yet others affirm the position of agnosticism. Although religious experience cannot be dismissed, according to evangelicals it should be measured by the Scriptures. Conservative evangelicals protest elevating anything to the same level as Scripture. Since it is their firm conviction that all experience be subject to God’s Word for authentication, value, and truth, Scripture is the point of origin for everything, including experience. When religious experience is elevated to the position of religious authority, the ultimate judge of religious truth is not God but humanity.

---

80 J. Marcellus Kik, *Ecumenism and the Evangelical* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 1958), 4-8. Kik’s six primary motives “the world situation presents a powerful incentive to act with Christian unity; the conquest of the heathen world forms a powerful drive for the Christian church to become united; prevalent secularism; the growing power and influence of the Roman Catholic Church creates a motive for a united Protestant church; a common complaint expresses concern that divided Protestantism cannot speak with one voice and act with united purpose;” and the most powerful motive for the establishment of a world-wide church is the conviction that “God desires his worshippers to be within the framework of one ecclesiastical structure.”
Since theology was considered to be divisive and not to be permitted at Edinburgh theological convergence was a foreseeable outcome. Edinburgh was a safe haven for the convergence of competing ideas as to proper authority for faith and practice. Arthur P. Johnson has concerns over the attitude toward the authority of Scripture at Edinburgh. He asserts that even though the World Mission Conference was "an epoch-making conference.... Its inclusive nature sowed seeds of a progressive theology so evident later on in Life and Work, Faith and Order, and especially in the International Missionary Council."81

The convergence of theology manifested itself in several ways. For example, in Christology and Ecclesiology (to name two) there was a convergence in the very understanding of the authority of Scripture. Some conservative evangelicals believe that this convergence resulted in the founding of the World Council of Churches, which may have attributed to its inclusive theological basis.82

Edinburgh’s convergence while intentional was not done with malice or intentional detriment to the Gospel of Christ. It was intentional in that Christian unity was deemed to be the most valuable and sought after commodity at that time. Keith Eitel and David Hesselgrave are correct in their belief that Edinburgh made a significant impact on several of the mission conferences that followed. It is equally true that Lausanne 1974 has left its imprint on Christian missions as well; however, their relationship to
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theological convergence does not appear to have been through intentionality.

5.4.2 Lausanne’s Relationship to Convergence

Perhaps the reason that Lausanne’s contribution to theological convergence does not appear to be intentional is that from the beginning Lausanne focused on spiritual unity, whereas Edinburgh sought after physical unity. Another factor may have been Lausanne’s willingness to address doctrinal concerns. With the plethora of presentations from such diverse positions, at least conservative evangelical theologians and missiologists felt as though they had a voice, unlike Edinburgh.

Initially, the convergence that resulted from Lausanne was due to the exchange of free thought expressed in the presentations, papers, seminars, and conferences. Evangelicals from every spectrum were free to openly share their interpretation of Scripture and express their understanding of possible applications. When asked, “How did Lausanne 1974 impact the global church?” Jason Mandrake replied, “Communicating how large and diverse we were and even more so, how much more was left to do. New models of thinking impacted the church globally regarding mission and evangelism.”

It was their commitment to world evangelization that led Lausanne to draft the Lausanne Covenant, which in turn also has attributed to convergence. Leonard Tuggy believes that the Lausanne Covenant was a brilliant work and makes it clear that,

Nearly 4000 leaders from about 150 countries prayed, studied and discussed together concerning the evangelistic task facing the church worldwide. The

---
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resulting "Lausanne Covenant" was a masterful document that has had a continuing influence on the evangelistic strategies and efforts of churches and missions worldwide. 84

Stan Nussbaum believes that the Lausanne Covenant is responsible for shaping the direction of evangelicalism from 1974 onward. It is his belief that the freedom at Lausanne to exercise theological differences and to set those differences aside for missions allowed the Lausanne Covenant to become the standard unifying document for cooperation in evangelical missions. Due to the fact that it is not bound by “typical evangelical jargon,” nor restricted to a “typical evangelical framework,” the covenant allowed theological convergence to emerge from 1974 until today. Nussbaum asserts,

Now the amazing thing about the document, and I just checked this on the computer the other day getting ready for this discussion, the word hell is not in the Lausanne Covenant. The word death is not in the Lausanne Covenant. There is no form of the word atone in the Lausanne Covenant. The phrase eternal life does not occur. Heaven only occurs once, and it’s about the new heaven and new earth. And judgment only occurs twice. And one of those is about judgment on society in the social responsibility, for a judgment on society for its evils. And the other one is in the return of Christ, where He will exercise judgment something of that nature. Now this is amazing that you can get a bunch of evangelicals together, and you can get them all talking about the gospel, and all defining out - OK it’s not a huge document, but it’s substantial - and saying lots of things about lots of things, and not have the typical evangelical jargon and the typical evangelical framework really tying it together. And I think what that means in terms of its long-term influence is that the Lausanne Covenant was

84 Addendum G (Tuggy)
not boxed in the way that a lot of previous evangelical theology had been. And lacking the artificial limits that some of these words and some of these concepts had put around what the gospel is, or how you summarize the gospel or how you explain it. It’s allowed it to grow in a contextualization direction. It’s allowed it to grow in the social responsibility area. The whole transformation agenda that’s getting emphasized so much now, 30 years later, there was room for it in the Lausanne Covenant and there was a platform for it and a natural way for it to develop. Which I don’t think was there if you look at evangelical writings in the 60’s or in the 50’s. It was a new document and a remarkable consensus. 85

As is evident in the earlier portions of this chapter, there are evangelicals who have serious problems with the covenant. From their concerns, the question naturally arises, was the covenant intended to be a compromise of evangelical theology? Did John Stott know that the covenant would lead to theological convergence? Keith Eitel recalls, “Of course. John R. W. Stott was the mastermind behind development of the covenant. It largely reflects his theological convictions yet he wove together the themes and convictions of those from the global evangelical church.” 86

David Hesselgrave attributes the convergence to pressure from liberation theologians and missiologists from Latin America and the socio-politically charged climate of the times. 87 While Hesselgrave does not state that the

---

85 Addendum C (Nussbaum)

86 Addendum H (Eitel)

87 The liberation theologians from the Latin America together with their brothers and sisters from Africa and Asia were highly influential upon Lausanne. While some evaluate their influence more negatively, there are those who see the value in their contributions and see their influence more positively. It is noteworthy that the Evangelical/Ecumenical polarization was not merely a result of
covenant was an intentional compromise, Hesselgrave does attribute the lack of conservative evangelical thinking to pressure placed on John Stott and the Lausanne Covenant Committee to be socio-politically correct.88 Hesselgrave states,

But there was a lot of pressure there upon non-Latin evangelicals to make some significant statements and moves in the direction of more of a socially oriented Gospel and ministry. All of this is bearing in upon Lausanne. And John Stott with his international connection is very much concerned with that, which you can see from his writings that came out of that time. And the Lausanne Covenant is very much a result of the thinking of John Stott and others like him. So what

differing theological interpretations about Scripture. There were also polarizations between America and Europe. Polarization existed between theological schools and universities. There were the “liberal Easterners” over against the “conservative Southerners” and there was also polarization between denominations. For the most part, this polarization was completely foreign to the church in the Third World. Third World ecumenicals and evangelicals were not polarized and that permitted them to cooperate far easier than the church in the West. Lausanne was the first evangelical meeting in history with such a dominant representation of Third World Christians. These Third World Christians definitely influenced the spirit of Lausanne. While some conservative evangelicals view that influence as negative toward the evangelical position, there are those who see the influence as beneficial to Christianity globally. In general, Third World Christians are typically committed to “evangelization”, but are not as steadfast on “inerrancy” and “accuracy.” This may be due in part as the Third World is mainly verbal culture. It must be noted however, that in spite of all the differences, Third World Christians made significant contributions that challenged evangelicalism with a deep desire for engaging the lost world in all its spiritual, social and economic dimensions.

88 Addendum D (Hesselgrave). “Well, let’s put that in context. Let’s remember again, the emphasis on social action, really social-political action that was so dominant in World Council circles. And let’s remember the importance of liberation emphases in the 60’s and then growing in the 70’s into a full blown liberation theology and had its various additions in the various parts of the world, various churches. And the particularly, probably the emphasis on our Latin friends, evangelicals, but coming out of the Latin context, the Latin American context, their push for evangelicals to do and say something about social inequality and political oppression and so on for various reasons.”
Hesselgrave believes that the covenant is deficient and failed to provide conservative evangelicals with the thing they needed most. Theological convergence may not have been intentional in the developing stages of the covenant, but it has certainly been a contributing factor in the years that followed Lausanne 1974.

And I think of it now, looking back, as kind of a purpose driven statement, you see, which the [14:00] originators are hoping to drawn in a great consensus of evangelicals what they really needed was a statement of faith. What they got was a kind of a statement of evangelical purpose. And you have to remember that there were a hundred that didn’t sign and there probably was a lot of pressure for them to sign, but they didn’t. But I know also there were a lot of people who signed, but signed with some reservations. And there’s no way of identifying them, and there’s know way of identifying just what their reservations were. If I’d take that just one step further, you see it wasn’t only a little over a decade after that, that Donald McGavern approached me and said we’ve got to have a new missiological society that has to be called the Christian Missiological Society or the Christian what ever and so on, and what he is saying.... The reason for him saying that way, you know a Christian mission organization,

\[89\] Ibid.
he said we’ve got to have some way of bringing together those who are committed to what he called Great Commission mission. So we don’t have to argue whether Christ was divine or whether He was just THE Way. But where we have a consensus on these basic issues and then we can start speaking from that base. [16:00] That’s what evangelicals has desperately needed and they didn’t get that at Lausanne.90

There are conservative evangelicals who agree with Hesselgrave that the Lausanne Covenant has contributed to theological convergence within even the conservative ranks of evangelicalism. Keith Eitel is one who agrees. Yet, he also believes that had it not been for John Stott the covenant would have been even less biblical. Eitel states, “I think that John R. W. Stott was essential in that he guided the panel of theologians that wrote the Lausanne Covenant and held it truer to the Scripture than it likely would have otherwise drifted.”91

As stated earlier, perhaps the reason that Lausanne’s contribution to theological convergence does not appear to be intentional is that from the beginning Lausanne focused on spiritual unity or it may have been Lausanne’s willingness to address doctrinal concerns. Whether or not either of these were factors in the perception that Lausanne was not intentionally contributing to convergence, there does not appear to be intentionality on the part of

90 Ibid.

91 Addendum H (Eitel)
Lausanne’s founders to produce convergence through Lausanne.

Nevertheless, this chapter has provided evidence that there has been theological convergence as a result of Lausanne. Many evangelicals and most ecumenicals would agree that the convergence has been positive and that evangelicalism is the beneficiary of its results. Yet, some conservative evangelicals still hold to the position that the convergence has been negative and that evangelicalism is less biblically driven today than prior to Lausanne 1974.

It must also be noted that Ecumenicals benefitted from Lausanne because Ecumenicalism was in danger of drifting from its roots and its losing direction. If Lausanne had not provided a venue for ecumenical expression, ecumenism may have continued in to work in isolation, which could have allowed it to disappear. In fact, Willem A. Saayamn believes that Lausanne was partially responsible for bringing renewal to ecumenism at Nairobi where John Stott was the keynote speaker. Saayman never claims that Lausanne corrected theological falsehoods of Ecumenicalism, but he firmly believes that it served as a important change in direction which brought many Third World Christians back from their extreme social activism and allowed them to return to service of the whole Gospel. Saayman believes that Lausanne was a blessing for the whole body of Christ, not just evangelicals.92

Regardless of one’s position on this issue, research has provided evidence that Edinburgh was an ecumenical attempt to unite ecumenicals with evangelicals into a physical unity to present a united Christian testimony to the world. Yet, Lausanne was an evangelical attempt to unite evangelicals with other evangelicals (and like-minded ecumenicals) into a spiritual unity for the purpose of global evangelization.

The global Lausanne events of 1974 and 1989, the Lausanne Covenant and Manifesto, and the Lausanne philosophy that has grown into a global movement, has truly changed the face of global Christianity. Its impact can be witnessed in evangelical mission agencies and church planters worldwide. While Lausanne has contributed to convergence (good or bad) Lausanne has also contributed to the spreading of the Gospel of Christ globally. They have made great strides in assisting “the whole Church in taking the whole Gospel to the whole world.”

One of the major differences between Edinburgh and Lausanne is that Edinburgh began as an ecumenical movement inviting evangelicals to participate in the ecumenical agenda of that day. The movement that followed has continued to be ecumenical driven. Lausanne, on the other hand, began evangelical with an evangelical agenda. They invited ecumenicals to join in and allowed them the freedom to express their views (unlike Edinburgh) and truly participate in the debates and direction of the movement. The movement that swelled from Lausanne 1974 has become increasingly more ecumenical over the years. However, Lausanne is still considered by most to be truly evangelical. This is due in part to theological convergence
where mainstream evangelicalism has shifted from the once traditional conservative viewpoint that the Gospel of Christ should primarily focus on mankind’s eternal destiny.
Chapter 6

Convergence beyond the Lausanne Movement

Chapter 6 examines theological convergence that has made an impact beyond the “official” Lausanne Movement. With that as a preface, this writer must admit that due to the fact that Lausanne is involved in so many alliances and networks, it is impossible to attribute theological convergence outside the Lausanne Movement without acknowledging Lausanne’s influence. One prime example of this can be seen in the World Evangelical Alliance (WEA). Even though the WEA (formerly WEF—World Evangelical Fellowship) existed prior to Lausanne 1974, Lausanne and the WEA have both been mutually influential to one another. As recent as the WEA GA2008 which met in Pattaya, Thailand in October 2008, Doug Birdsell (chairman of the Lausanne Committee) was a scheduled speaker casting vision for Lausanne 2010 during a formal WEA luncheon. The WEA committed to partner with Lausanne in the 2010 Movement. Similar scenarios may be attributed to other networks as well, such as the Evangelical Missiological Society when Birdsell spoke to their constituency in September 2008.

6.1 Theological Convergence and its Impact on the Broader Evangelical and Ecumenical World Focusing on Theological Assumptions.

One area of theological convergence is in the evangelical’s perspective of a “woman’s role in ministry.” Historically, prior to Lausanne 1974 evangelicals viewed a woman’s role in ministry much different than today. This can be witnessed in the current evangelical’s
interpretation that a woman may hold any ministry role equally as a man. The current movement for equality in ministry can be viewed in the understanding of N. T. Wright who believes that traditional evangelicalism has misinterpreted Scripture as it pertains to women and their role in ministry.

Wright relates the former misunderstanding to the fact that evangelicals “have seriously misread the New Testament passages”¹ and that “these misreading are undoubtedly due to a combination of assumptions, traditions, and all kinds of post-biblical and sub-biblical attitudes that have crept into Christianity.”² These statements strike at the very heart of traditional evangelicalism.

Wright builds his case by reviewing Scripture on women’s role and service in the church (Gal 3:28; 1 Cor 14). He then asserts that 1 Tim. 2:12 has long been misinterpreted and instead of the traditional, “I do not allow a women to teach or hold authority over a man,” could read, “I do not mean to imply that I am now setting up women as the new authority over men in the same way that previously men held authority over women.”³ Wright then proceeds to open the door for women in every aspect of evangelical ministry.

While it is true that N. T. Wright is only one evangelical and that his interpretation is his interpretation, when placed in the context of how his view is being propagated, it reveals a new non-traditional view

² Ibid.
³ Ibid., 9.
of women in ministry within evangelicalism. Wright’s understanding and many other like-minded views were freely distributed at the WEA GA2008 before some five hundred plus delegates.  

Another area of convergence is in the evangelical’s mission as it pertains to “eternal salvation.” Prior to theological convergence from Edinburgh 1910, the movement that flowed from it, and the Lausanne movement, evangelical missionaries understood “salvation” as the salvation of mankind’s soul that affected his eternal destiny. However, throughout the years the mission has broadened and become much more difficult for many evangelicals to accept. On prime example is David J. Hesselgrave. He writes,

Today’s missionary and tomorrows prospective missionary have heard the mission described in about every conceivable way from simply ‘being there as a Christian’ to literacy work, Bible translation and distribution, feeding the hungry missions, preaching the Gospel, planting churches, making men truly ‘human’ and participating in revolution.  

Hesselgrave believes that the onslaught of competition from competing concepts of “mission” has all but eliminated the proclamation of the Gospel for the purpose of changing mankind’s eternal destiny. It is his belief that today’s missionary has been “warned against preaching as though men were simple souls with ears, converting men to satisfy his

---

4 Multiple volumes of Priscilla Papers were made readily available to the delegates at WEA GA2008. In addition to Wright’s work Priscilla Papers are filled with works such as “Christian Women and Leadership” by Roberta Hestenes, “The New Evangelical Subordinationism: Reading Inequality into the Trinity” by Phillip Cary, and “Post-1970s Evangelical Responses to the Emancipation of Women by Kevin Giles.”

own ego and transplanting western-type churches.” These warnings have contributed to a de-emphasizing of spiritual salvation and become focused on the betterment of humanity here and now.

It appears the warnings have resulted in missionaries who have moved from proclaiming a Gospel of spiritual salvation to mostly preaching a social gospel. They have been persuaded because “conversion has become proselytization, reconciliation has become increasingly horizontal, and salvation has become defined in social terms alone.” Hesselgrave believes that this change in evangelical approach to missions has resulted in a missionary identity crisis. He attributes much of this crisis to the changes in evangelical theology. He states, “Divergent theologies of mission have, indeed, contributed to the identity crisis.” Being so disturbed by this trend in missions, Hesselgrave takes the problem of theological convergence further and boldly proclaims, “It [theological problems] takes aim at the heart of every human being.” That is why he strongly advocates cooperation between theologians, Bible scholars, and apologists with practitioners at Edinburgh 2010. It is essential that they allow theology into the debates as the Edinburgh centennial approaches.

---

6 Ibid.
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
There are those who would agree with Hesselgrave that theology is the problem. However, they see theological convergence in a positive light. Stanley Samartha is one such individual. On the surface, Samartha’s mission statement, “The mission of the church stems from within the activity of God for the salvation of all mankind”\(^\text{11}\) seems to be compatible with Hesselgrave. Yet, his understanding of salvation is radically different from that of Hesselgrave. He believes,

The debate in mission as to where the emphasis should be – on the sacred or the secular, the spiritual or the material, the vertical or the horizontal – is really not helpful because it separates what God has joined together. The content of mission, the message of salvation in Jesus Christ concerns the whole man.\(^\text{12}\)

Many conservative evangelicals would agree with Samartha’s statement concerning the debate in missions. They would affirm that the message of salvation concerns the “whole man.” But many conservative evangelicals like Hesselgrave part with Samartha over the issue of where genuine truth concerning salvation is to be found. Most conservative evangelicals hold that the Bible is where God speaks to mankind and that it is the Bible that reveals truth concerning salvation. Samartha’S views are a bit different as can be seen in his question,

In what ways do we understand the truth claims and messages of salvation on which the spiritual life of millions of our neighbors have been sustained over the centuries? Can we continue along lines we are used to in the colonial era, treating other religions as false, ordinary, discontinuous, distorted, partial,


\(^\text{12}\) Ibid.
incomplete, preparatory, ext., in their various polite and impolite combinations?\textsuperscript{13}

Samartha’s final analysis is that there is salvific truth in other religions and that Christian missionaries “must venture” into relationships with people of different faiths and partner with them “even though we do not know where we are being led.”\textsuperscript{14} He makes the point that in order to be innovative and creative missionaries must be willing to take risks. It is this type of theological convergence that causes deep concerns for many evangelicals. Unfortunately, Samartha is not alone in his understanding of missions. When non-biblical philosophies, theologies, and/or sociologies are allowed to be integrated or woven into a biblical theology, a convergence takes place, making the once biblical theology less than biblical and thus has the potential to lead to false assumptions concerning basic evangelical theology.\textsuperscript{15}

6.2 Theological convergence and its impact on the broader evangelical and ecumenical world focusing on missiological methods that emerged from the Lausanne Movement.

The influence of Lausanne has been felt globally through many avenues. Due to the limited scope of this work

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., 153.

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 153.

\textsuperscript{15} It must be noted that Samartha was considered to be something of a gadfly to many, even within the WCC. He never had many adherents to his extreme positions. However, since Samartha did deliver a paper at Lausanne, the author chose to use him as an example of some of the ecumenism at Lausanne. The author recognizes that this type of ecumenism had a small following and was NOT the primary ecumenical stance, yet it did exist, and needed to be acknowledged. A more balanced WCC ecumenical view can be seen in the 1982 official WCC document, “Mission and evangelism – an ecumenical affirmation”. This document was representative of the WCC view at Lausanne and Lausanne’s influence can be witnessed in the document as well. The document can be accessed at \url{http://www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents.html}.\url{http://www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents.html}
only three will be explored. This section will examine Lausanne’s influence on the International Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, DAWN Ministries, Youth With A Mission, and the Alliance for Saturation Church Planting.

6.2.1 The International Mission Board

The International Mission Board (formerly the Foreign Mission Board) of the Southern Baptist Convention is the United States’ largest Protestant mission sending agency. This work would not be complete without examining its relationship to Lausanne 1974 and its impact on the global church.

The International Mission Board (IMB) is an entity of the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC). The SBC is the largest evangelical denomination in the United States. They report more than 42,000 churches and claim a membership of nearly 21 million members.16 The Southern Baptist Convention was formed in Augusta, Georgia, in 1845. One of the main reasons for this new formation was to “create two mission boards—the Foreign Mission Board and the Domestic Mission Board (now the North American Mission Board).”17 The IMB’s “main objective is presenting the gospel of Jesus Christ in order to lead individuals to saving faith in Him and result in church-planting movements among all the peoples of the world.”18

---


18 Ibid.
6.2.1.1 The IMB and Its Relationship with Lausanne

R. Keith Parks, then secretary for Southeast Asia and former missionary to Indonesia, delivered a paper at Lausanne 1974 entitled “The Great Commission.” In 1980 Parks became the president of the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, and the influence of Lausanne can be seen in Parks’ philosophy of ministry. During Parks’ twelve years at the helm of the then Foreign Mission Board, he understood the need for and value of unity within the Christian world.

Also, Parks was in step with the flow of the social-political emphasis that dominated Lausanne 1974. In an oral interview on April 4, 2000, Parks speaks concerning Southern Baptists. Parks clearly reveals his position when he asserts,

I think we distort Scripture if we assume that evangelism is all that you do and that social ministry is not a necessary add on, because Jesus never, as best I can understand, never separated, and never said just evangelize, but it was ... It was always a holistic Gospel, and when you say that people, some people get nervous that you’re leaving out evangelism. But, I would often say to people, missionaries who were in institutional work, for example, or who were in ministry of one form or another that to go and meet the social or physical or emotional needs of people and to fail to meet their spiritual needs would be a total perversion of the Gospel. Where at the same time to go and just say ‘Jesus loves you and you ought to trust Him’ when somebody’s starving to death, this is also a perversion of the gospel.19

Parks affirmed the presentation of the Gospel as a vital part of missions; yet like many at Lausanne, he believed that missions must include active ministry to

---

19 Addendum G (Parks).
those oppressed by poverty and politics. Parks also believed that unity was more important than doctrine and that missions was the great unifier within the SBC;

"Early on I would argue with Adrian Rogers about that and he’d say no, ‘the thing that has held us together is not missions, but doctrine’... I believe you can study history and find that those conventions that have been organized around doctrine tend to divide and re-divide because somebody has to decide what the true doctrine really is and you reach a point of definition where others say no that’s not what I really believe. When a convention is focused on missions, this is a cause that hopefully all of us believe in and is so much bigger than any of us that it can pull us together."\(^{20}\)

Parks was not the only one with this view of missions. This same philosophy of ministry is evident in the IMB to this day. Jerry Rankin, the man who followed Parks in the presidency of the IMB, holds to the same beliefs as Parks. This may be due in part to the fact that they worked together in Southeast Asia for many years. Under Rankin’s leadership (at that time part of the IMB’s Pacific Rim regional leadership team) the IMB became active participants in Pattaya, Thailand, at the Lausanne meetings in 1980 and again at Lausanne II in Manila in 1989.

As Rankin settled into his presidency in 1993, he and his Vice President of Overseas Operations, Avery Willis, both became more involved within the Lausanne movement. Rick Wood affirms that “Avery Willis served as the co-chairman of the Mission Executive Consultation at GCOWE 97 in Pretoria, South Africa.”\(^{21}\) One of the common themes of

\(^{20}\) Ibid.

GCOWE 97 was “Unity in Diversity,”22 which Rankin and Willis affirmed.

Rankin also attended the GCOWE Mission Executive Consultation. In reality, “Jerry Rankin of the Southern Baptists was only one of a handful of denominational mission sending agencies represented at the meeting.”23 Lausanne has made a significant impact on the IMB as had the IMB on Lausanne.

The IMB continues to cooperate with Lausanne in the areas of research and church planting methodologies. IMB missionaries were present at the Lausanne research meeting in Chiang Mai, Thailand, in September 2001. Their presence was also seen at the 2004 Forum for World Evangelization which was held in Pattaya, Thailand, on September 29–October 5, 2004. The conference consisted of more than 1,500 Christian leaders from around the world who focused on the unfinished task of global evangelism. IMB personnel were also part of the Lausanne Researchers Conference held in Geelong, Australia in 2008 where the opening speaker prayed to the ancient ancestral spirits of the region to bless the meetings. IMB personnel are also serving on planning committees for the Lausanne 2010.

Additionally, the IMB has an ongoing relationship with ministries like Dawn Ministries (which also has been influenced by Lausanne) and is influenced by them. IMB missionaries attend DAWN Conferences and work hand in hand with DAWN associates globally. One example of this is found in the speaking schedule of David Garrison, IMB Regional Leader for South Asia. Garrison speaks on church planting

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid., 14.
at conferences where DAWN associates are present, and has written a book entitled *Church Planting Movements: How God is Redeeming the World*. This book has become popular among the DAWN associates, and Garrison’s methodologies are often the topic of conversation at DAWN Congresses. Garrison speaks globally, and his schedule can be accessed via his website.24

Finally, as mentioned in chapter four, Jerry Rankin has changed the IMB’s vision and mission statements. The changing of these statements allows Rankin to lead the IMB into more global partnerships with Great Commission Christians.25 This places Southern Baptist missionaries in partnerships with denominations and mission agencies who hold to differing theological views than traditional Southern Baptists. Therefore, it is conceivable that Southern Baptists could partner with Methodists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and even Mormons (David Barrett includes Mormons in his GCC count). In fact, in March 1999 when the author of this work met with IMB personnel in Jakarta, Indonesia, it was revealed by an IMB administrator


25 Office of Overseas Operations, “Something New Under the Sun: Strategic Directions at the International Mission Board,” IMB. Richmond. (January 1999: pp-40m-2/02-p2962-e), 52; Jerry Rankin. “The International Mission Board, SBC, Vision for Global Advance” IMB. Richmond. (January 2009: imb-1m-1/09-p5802), 18; The 1999 mission statement focused on “the Mission of the International Board, SBC, is to lead Southern Baptists in international missions efforts to evangelize the lost, disciple believers, develop churches and minister to people in need.” 52, Whereas the 2009 mission statement “is to make disciples of all peoples in fulfillment of the Great Commission.” 18. Additionally, the vision statement has changed from “we will lead Southern Baptists to be on mission with God to bring all peoples of the earth to saving faith in Jesus Christ.” (1999 statement).52 and has been replaced with the 2009 vision of “a multitude from every language, people, tribe, and nation knowing and worshipping our Lord Jesus Christ.” 18.
that the IMB had indeed partnered with Mormons in Indonesia for research purposes. Here too is an example of convergence.

6.2.2 Dawn Ministries

Another organization that has been greatly impacted by Lausanne is Dawn Ministries.\textsuperscript{26} The DAWN concept did not originate with Jim Montgomery (founder of Dawn Ministries) or any one particular individual. The acronym (DAWN) which stands for “Discipling A Whole Nation” was first suggested by Donald McGavran who “applied it to the strategy and project that was being developed in the Philippines in the early 1970s.”\textsuperscript{27}

The vision for DAWN existed long before its official founding in 1985. In 1960, Jim and Lyn Montgomery were sent to the Philippines where Jim worked as editor of Crusader Magazine. Dawn Ministries acknowledges that,

It was there, among the responsive Filipino people, that Jim received insight from the Lord about the discipling of a nation. He concluded that a whole nation could be reached when every community of that nation had a church, or congregation of believers, incarnating or living out the life of Christ in all of His compassion, truth, power, beauty and grace. In 1962, he became the Philippine Crusades Field Director. Later, he challenged Filipino denominational leaders to join forces to plant a church in every village and neighborhood of the Philippines. They estimated a need for at least

\textsuperscript{26} The term Dawn Ministries is used when referring to the Dawn Ministries organization, which is based in the United States. The term DAWN is used when referring to the global DAWN movement.

\textsuperscript{27} Jim Montgomery, DAWN 2000: 7 Million Churches to Go (Pasadena: William Carey Library, 1989), 7. Dawn is used when referring to the mission organization founded by Jim Montgomery (officially DAWN). However, DAWN (Discipling A Whole Nation) the acronym is used to refer to DAWN as a movement which includes many affiliates and associates who are not employed by Dawn Ministries, but may receive compensation by means of travel or conference reimbursement.
50,000 new churches to be established by the year 2000, a goal that the church steadily worked toward and exceeded, setting new goals to reach communities that were still without churches. At the age of 55, Jim stepped out in faith to found Dawn Ministries, setting up his first office in the garage. Jim and his team took the DAWN (Discipling A Whole Nation) strategy from country to country, and thousands of church leaders throughout the world caught the vision.28

In 1985 DAWN was officially founded as a global movement, and the word "DAWN" became an acronym for "Discipling A Whole Nation." DAWN is a strategy of ministry that has been developed from the terms of the Lord's command to "make disciples of all nations."

Dawn Ministries has grown from those early days in Jim’s garage. A major factor in their growth is Dawn’s values and deep commitment to finishing the task, which they have successfully passed on throughout the Dawn Ministries movement.

It is the belief of the Dawn team that Christ wants nations to be discipled. Dawn seeks to mobilize the whole Body of Christ from within every nation in an optimum strategy for the discipling of all the "nations" or peoples of those countries. Dawn aims at mobilizing the whole Body of Christ in every nation in a determined effort to complete the Great Commission. They achieve this “by working towards the goal of providing an evangelical congregation for every village and neighborhoods of every class, kind and condition of man in the whole country.”29


The DAWN strategy works toward a witnessing congregation in every small community of man. That way it will be possible to communicate the gospel in the most direct and productive way to every person in that context. Dawn Ministries has come a long way from those early days in the Philippines. Today Dawn Ministries works with the Body of Christ in 155 nations. Their goal is to see a church within easy access of every person on the globe, and they are attempting to work with all ethnic, socio-economic, and demographic groups within these 155 countries.

What caused this new model for missions and church planting to explode from the Philippines to become globally accepted? The Lausanne Conference of 1974 created a mounting concern for the thousands of still unreached peoples of the world which was coupled with a growing excitement for targeting the year 2000 as a date for completing the task of evangelizing them.\textsuperscript{30} Added to this is the rising interest of missionaries in third world countries and churches. Dawn Ministries would take these realities into consideration in the developing of this new strategy which later would become DAWN International or DAWN. Montgomery states,

Here is the way the Lord had been leading us to face these realities: We would develop a small team of experienced missionaries capable of motivating and training the top level of leaders in a country to organize a nationwide project that would lead most directly to the discipling of that country and all the

\textsuperscript{30} While Ralph Winter at Lausanne 1974 is credited with launching the “unreached peoples movement,” he was not the first to conceive of the idea. For example, Donald McGavran used the term “unreached peoples” at Uppsala and has the same concept but uses the term “people movements” in “The Bridges of God.”
peoples within it. Such a strategy would be called DAWN-Discipling A Whole Nation.\textsuperscript{31}

The Dawn missionaries would not reside in any particular nation, but they would communicate the vision of the DAWN strategy through various publications and seminars as they traveled country to country. Their primary task was to locate and equip what would become known as a "John Knoxer" of a nation. That person would have the same burden as John Knox, whose famous heart cry was, "Give me Scotland or I die." The new DAWN “John Knoxer” would have the passion for and the ability to mobilize the Church of a nation for a DAWN-type project. For example,

Dawn Ministries would work towards the goal of being in contact with such a leader in every nation of the world by 1995 so that there could be a DAWN project in operation for every country by AD 2000. (In some cases, it would be impossible for such a person actually to live within his country. Creative ways would need to be found to develop a DAWN project in such situations.) DAWN missionaries, then, would serve in two basic capacities: 1) They would communicate the vision of DAWN. 2) They would serve as consultants and helpers to the John Knoxers who desired to develop DAWN projects.\textsuperscript{32}

Dawn Ministries would use this approach to make it possible for individuals to help mobilize the whole body of Christ in whole countries at a very low total cost. The task was completing the Great Commission to the whole world. Ultimately, Dawn Ministries would spread the vision of the DAWN strategy and would attempt to fan the flames of a movement to evangelize the world.

\textsuperscript{31} Montgomery, \textit{DAWN 2000}, 6.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
Perhaps timing played an important factor in Dawn Ministries becoming a global missions movement. DAWN’s passion to disciple the nations coupled with the Lausanne emphasis for engaging the unreached peoples of the earth met in what appears to be a “kairos” moment in history, a time where God intervenes in time and space and does something special that only He can do. Lausanne’s influence upon the DAWN Movement has infiltrated other mission organizations through partnerships with agencies like the International Mission Board (IMB), The Alliance for Saturation Church Planting, Youth With A Mission (YWAM), A.D. 2000 and Beyond, North India Harvest Network, Global Mapping International (GMI), Operation Agape, and many others. The vast reaching impact of Dawn Ministries has contributed to convergence (as mentioned in section 6.2.1 IMB). As theologians, missiologists, church planters, and pastors connect globally through Dawn Ministries, the exchange of philosophy, theology, methodology, and Missiology converge. As one who has experienced this first hand over the past twelve years, this author has witnessed just how powerful an impact the DAWN Movement has made on global Christianity. It has promoted unity and cooperation while attempting to hold to biblical foundational truths. Lausanne 1974 and the movement that followed so influenced Jim Montgomery’s life that it has now spread globally through his organization. But where did Montgomery get his passion and vision? Montgomery’s passion and vision came from three sources.
Montgomery caught a vision in the 1970s, continued to cast its influence throughout the 1980s and 1990s, and still motivates church planters globally. It all began with Montgomery’s relationship to O.C. International (O.C.I.). In fact the offices of O.C.I. and D.A.W.N. were next door to each other on North Union Blvd in Colorado Springs until Montgomery’s retirement. Upon his departure from the presidency of D.A.W.N. Ministries in July 2005, Montgomery returned to O.C.I. and served as Managing Editor for their Global Church Growth Bulletin until his death in October 2006.

Montgomery’s service and close affiliation with O.C.I. helped to steer the agency that today is focused on reaching the unreached peoples of the world. But what was it that inspired Montgomery to the ‘unreached?’ Lausanne 1974 played a powerful role. The impact of Lausanne 1974, Ralph Winter, and Donald McGavran can vividly be witnessed in Montgomery’s 1999 statement to this author.

A conversation between Jim Montgomery and this author began in 1998 in Tagaytay, Philippines, at the sixth National DAWN Congress and culminated a year later in Colorado Springs. In February 1998 one morning at breakfast Montgomery was explaining how he became so convinced that Dawn Ministries could impact the world for Christ by

---

While O.C. International’s vision and passion stemmed from Dick Hillis, its ministry direction since 1958 has been heavily influenced by Jim Montgomery. Montgomery began his missionary service with O.C. in 1958 serving in Taiwan. After moving to the Philippines, he served as Field Director there from 1968 through 1974. Montgomery took a two-year leave of absence during 1975 and 1976 to study at Fuller Theological Seminary where he became enthralled with the passion and teaching of Donald McGavran. In 1977 Montgomery returned to O.C. and worked as Director of Overseas Fields until 1979 when the department was renamed Research and Strategy where Montgomery continued as the director.
discipling whole nations. Montgomery spoke with such passion and conviction that in the spring of 1999 in Montgomery’s Colorado Springs office the conversation resumed.

When asked, “Jim, your passion and zeal for the nations is incredible. Is there any one factor that has been the driving force behind that passion?” Montgomery replied, “There are three that are so intertwined that I don’t think I can separate them. You see, Donald McGavran showed me the needs of the ‘unreached Peoples’. Ralph Winter brought those realities to the forefront at Lausanne (1974), and Lausanne promoted the concept and unified the constituencies in the pursuit of reaching the ‘unreached’. There is no way to separate McGavran, Winter, and Lausanne from the ‘unreached’.”

By this statement Montgomery himself establishes Lausanne 1974 as being a major contributing force in his life. He used that driving force to help guide the course of O.C. International, D.A.W.N. Ministries, and evangelicalism at large (through his writings) to reach the “unreached.”

As recently as 2002 Montgomery recalls the impact of Lausanne on his ministry and the ministry of his close colleagues;

One major milestone achieved at Lausanne was the brilliant presentation of Ralph Winter that opened our eyes to the vast number of still unreached people groups (UPG's) of the world. People group thinking since then has become the heart of much planning and action toward the completion of the Great Commission in our time.

The U.S, Center for World Mission, the Adopt a People Movement, the AD2000 and Beyond Movement, the Joshua

---

34 Quote taken from one of several conversations between Jim Montgomery and the author of this thesis.
Project, the massive promotion and prayer for the 10-40 window and a host of other initiatives focusing on unreached peoples have all been major thrusts flowing out of Lausanne ’74.35

Jim Montgomery died in October 2006, but the vision and passion to disciple the nations continues to spread. By Montgomery’s own statements it is clear that Ralph Winter and Lausanne made major contributions to Montgomery’s thinking and ultimately to the direction of his ministry. Not only did Montgomery take to heart Winter’s appeal for the “Unreached Peoples”, but he also took Lausanne’s vision for unity. DAWN is multi-national and multi-denominational. The national leadership teams are comprised of nationals (not just westerners) and DAWN has an impressive mixture of Anglicans, Baptists, Episcopalians, Evangelical Free, Methodists, Pentecostals, Presbyterians, etc. Additionally, DAWN will be involved in Lausanne 2010 as it has been in past conferences. Lausanne made a deep impression on DAWN.

6.2.3 Youth With A Mission

Lausanne has also left an imprint on YWAM (Youth With A Mission), and there is evidence that theological convergence exists within the organization. One reason for convergence may be that YWAM “encompasses thousands of people and hundreds of ministries in almost every country of the world.”36 Their passion and ministry focuses on knowing God personally and personally making Him known to others. While Lausanne’s impact on YWAM may not be directly


attributed to the events of 1976 and 1989, or the Lausanne Covenant per se, YWAM does have very close ties to Lausanne through Ralph Winter and Todd Johnson, and their impact is certainly there.

Additionally, YWAM’s personnel structure provides an opportunity for convergence. YWAM is a global mixture of people currently working in 149 countries. YWAM personnel come from numerous Christian denominations and speak hundreds of different languages. Nearly 50 percent of the YWAM staff come from "non-western" countries, including Brazil, Korea, Indonesia, India and Nepal. Additionally, YWAM also ministers through short-term outreach projects. Teams made up of individuals, youth groups, families and churches get to participate in sharing the Good News of Christ around the world. YWAM sends out over 25,000 short-term missionaries each year. These missionaries come from such diverse backgrounds and hold such varying theological views that convergence is inevitable. YWAM’S ministry is different from that of the IMB or DAWN, yet they are highly effective.

YWAM’s approach focuses on three strands of ministry that weave throughout all that YWAM does: Evangelism, Mercy Ministry, Training and Discipleship. YWAM uses some creative evangelism tools in presenting the gospel which include drama, music, performing arts and sports camps. Although all ministry is important to YWAM,

Mercy Ministry is the "hands and feet" of making God known. YWAM helps meet some of the practical and physical needs of about 400,000 people annually. Caring for street children in South America; aiding in the recovery of drug addicts in North America and Western Europe; feeding and housing refugees and women in need in Africa and Asia, and operating ships that declare the good news practically and verbally, are
just some of the ways in which helping hands are extended.\textsuperscript{37}

YWAM employs Training and Discipleship to equip Christians better to serve others. Their training includes agriculture, health care, drug rehabilitation, and biblical counseling.

YWAM also has a university that resides in 250 different locations globally. Through YWAM’s University of the Nations missionaries can study in specialized areas such as science and technology, linguistics, the humanities, and Christian ministry. Each year an average of some 10,000 students attend University of the Nations at one of these locations.

The vision for YWAM began in June of 1956 when Loren Cunningham, a twenty-year-old student at the Assemblies of God College in Springfield, Missouri, had a dream. In Cunningham’s dream he saw “waves of young evangelists washing up on the shores of every continent.”\textsuperscript{38}

In December 1960 Loren decided on the name Youth With a Mission. YWAM’s first missions effort was to send two men in their early twenties to Liberia to build a road through the jungle to a leper colony. After that first trip YWAM experienced growth throughout the 1960s.

In 1973, YWAM’s founder, Loren, had visions for the Mercy Ships. In 1979 Loren's vision about the Mercy Ships was confirmed. YWAM cautiously began negotiations to buy


\textsuperscript{38} Loren Cunningham, “Q & A With Loren,” Transformations: YWAM University of the Nations, Kailua-Kona Hawaii 3, 2006, 2.
the Victoria. By 1979 the ship was paid for and towed to Greece to be renovated. The Victoria was renamed "Anastasis" (the Greek word for Resurrection). In 1982 the refurbished Anastasis sailed from Greece, and the ministry of Mercy Ships had begun.

YWAM continued to grow. By 1980, YWAM had a full-time staff of 1,800. In the 1980s as YWAM's mercy ministry continued to grow. YWAM was part of several international strategy conferences, some of which focused on church planting. YWAM personnel were in Manila for Lausanne 1989 and the signing of the Manila Covenant. YWAM began to set international goals including “Project 223, which aimed to start ministry in every country; and Target 2000, which focused attention on the needs of unreached peoples.”

In 1991, YWAM's international leadership team met in Egypt. This was the first time for this international group to meet in the Middle East. YWAM's leaders sensed the mission should focus on the needs of the Muslim world.

In 2003 YWAM released Mercy Ships to become a separate ministry. YWAM has continued its growth throughout the beginning of the twenty-first century. As of the end of 2006 they were operating in more than one thousand locations in over 149 countries ministering with a staff of nearly 16,000 individuals.

YWAM has continued to grow and influence the world for Christ. Their influence through the University of the Nations and their global missionaries would be too comprehensive for this work to explore.


---

39
As mentioned earlier, while there is no evidence of YWAM changing its direction as a direct result of Lausanne 1974, it is clear that Ralph Winter (one of the Lausanne 1974 key architects), the U.S. Center for World Mission, and Todd Johnson made a significant impact on YWAM’s direction. Winter’s passion to reach the unreached penetrated YWAM’s leadership in 1979. Winter’s U.S. Center holds to the EFMA’s and IFMA’s Statements of Faith, and openly embraces the Lausanne Covenant. The Center focuses on the unreached masses. Add to that the influence of Todd Johnson (Ralph Winter’s son-in-law), and the impact is visible. Johnson is the Director of the Center for the Study of Global Christianity at Gordon Conwell Theological Seminary, but also serves as an advisor to YWAM. Todd M. Johnson “has been with Youth With A Mission (YWAM) since 1978. His main role has been to support YWAM’s long-term work among unreached peoples with research and training.”

Prior to Winter’s and Johnson’s influence YWAM focused on young people experiencing positive, short-term exposure to missions and evangelism. However, that changed in the late 1970s. Winter’s and Johnson’s influence led to the basic purpose of YWAM shifting to give young people experience in dynamic cross-cultural missions and evangelism. The subtle shift in wording is pregnant. Whereas before the Winter/Johnson influence, the focus was a short-term exposure for the student, the new focus was on a dynamic cross-cultural experience that would forever change the life of the student and the culture impacted by the student. YWAM’s website states,

The history of the frontier missions movement within YWAM began in 1979 when Kalafi Moala, a Tongan member of YWAM's international council, sat under the teaching of Dr. Ralph Winter, founder and director of the U.S. Center for World Mission. Moala felt that although he had heard about "hidden peoples" before, Dr. Winter "grasped the lens of my camera and brought the fuzzy concepts into sharp focus". From that moment on, Moala began to tirelessly encourage YWAM in the direction of frontier missions and significant events began occurring in rapid succession. Leaders in Amsterdam, Lausanne, Bangkok, and other locations began catching the vision for the frontiers.41

YWAM's new direction was not merely a subtle shift in mission mentality, it was a re-direction. Luis Bush publicly noted the paradigm shift in YWAM in the fall of 1999. Bush points out that

the focus of mission within Christendom has changed also. As Naisbitt and Aburdene write, "The year 2000 is operating like a powerful magnet on humanity, already reaching down into the 1990s and intensifying the decade. It is amplifying emotions, accelerating change, and heightening awareness, compelling us to re-examine ourselves, our values and our institutions... Youth With A Mission (YWAM), one of the largest evangelical mission organizations in the world today, exemplifies this new reality. In the last few years approaching the year 2000, YWAM has totally restructured to focus on reaching the unreached people groups in the 10/40 Window. Beyond 2000 this trend undoubtedly will accelerate among other organizations.42

YWAM has continued pushing the envelope in reaching the entire globe for Christ. One of their latest ventures is the 4K Project. The 4K Project seeks to engage every


segment of society within every people group by dividing the world’s population down into manageable groups of four thousand and then enlisting young YWAM recruits to adopt one of these blocks of four thousand. Each recruit is then trained by YWAM and sent to minister among their people group segment.

One of YWAM’s more significant contributions to the global church is their strategy for assisting “church planters.” YWAM trains seasoned missionaries to “coach” church planters. These “coaches” who have been trained in the latest church planting methodologies and practices (such as organic church and simple church) hold what is called by some a “non-conference” to equip church planters to become more effective in their ministry context. YWAM’s connection with Ralph Winter and Todd Johnson has certainly made its impact as has its connection with DAWN and the WEA.

Additionally, YWAM has close connections to Lausanne and other evangelical networks through Jeff Fountain. Fountain is a New Zealander who has worked with YWAM in his adopted land of The Netherlands since 1975. He has served as director of YWAM Europe since 1990 and writes a comprehensive weekly article that portrays the current spiritual climate of Europe. Many of the DAWN affiliates receive this newsletter and use it as a barometer for ministry decisions. Fountain participates in World Evangelical Alliance of Europe, Hope for Europe, DAWN Europa Conferences, and has contact with Lausanne representatives throughout Europe.

Theological convergence has occurred in YWAM much like it has in Dawn Ministries. Their multi-denominational, multi-national structure itself permits theological
convergence. Add to that the fact that each organization works closely with many other evangelical organizations and mission agencies with differing theologies, and convergence just happens as the personnel from the organizations partner and work together globally for world evangelization. This convergence is evident in the styles of YWAM worship with some exercising spiritual gifts such as speaking in tongues while others do not. Evangelical organizations that cooperate with one another seem to be more inclusive and open to different understandings in biblical interpretation than those who value their theological stance more than cooperation.43

6.2.4 The Alliance for Saturation Church Planting

The Alliance for Saturation Church Planting was also affected by Lausanne. Although it is no longer operational, it serves as a typical example to the type of impact Lausanne has had on mission agencies.

The Alliance for Saturation Church Planting dissolved as a formal partnership in June 2006 after thirteen years of ministry. Prior to June 2006, the Alliance attempted to facilitate church planting efforts in the twenty-seven countries of post-communist Eurasia. Like many mission agencies, the Alliance adopted the Lausanne Covenant as an official statement of faith for their ministry. The Alliance personnel all knew that,

43 YWAM does have a Statement of Faith and Foundational Values document that can be downloaded from the ywam.org website. However, both documents could be affirmed by most of not all evangelicals and many ecumenicals alike. YWAM also affirms the Lausanne Covenant and Manila Manifesto and provides these on their sight as well. YWAM has successfully integrated education, passion, evangelism, and social ministry into its multi-national, multi-denominational structure without causing a theological rift. They have seemingly avoided theological controversy that has plagued the International Mission Board much of the twenty-first century.
The Lausanne Covenant serves as the ASCP statement of faith. Among other important evangelical doctrines, it affirms the authority and power of the Bible, the uniqueness and supremacy of Jesus Christ and the urgency of sharing the message of the gospel to the entire world.\textsuperscript{44}

The Alliance worked from the understanding that God intended the local church to be the primary instrument for evangelism, discipleship and the fulfillment of the Great Commission. They worked through partnerships with the evangelical Body of Christ which included existing churches, emerging churches and other para-church organizations. The Alliance partnered with a broad spectrum of evangelicals including Baptist churches, Evangelical Free churches, Grace Churches, Presbyterian Churches, and several Interdenominational churches as well as Dawn Ministries, Global Mission Fellowship, BEE International, O. C. International, Greater Europe Mission and numerous others. The Alliance partnered with seventy plus churches and/or mission agencies in saturation church planting efforts.

The Alliance expected their partners to embrace the saturation church planting vision. They asked them to pursue a strategy that enabled nationals to plant churches that would multiply themselves. They adopted the following seven basic practices in the belief that it would best assist saturation church planting movements in post-communist Eurasia.

1. Facilitate - Alliance partners work with existing and/or emerging indigenous churches in a way that helps them foster and participate in saturation church planting movements.

2. Multiply - Alliance partners work toward methods and models (for example, cell groups or lay ministry empowerment) that will lead to natural reproduction.
3. Work SCP elements - Alliance partners work so that certain elements will feed an SCP movement.
4. Partner - Alliance partners work together whenever possible capitalizing on the strengths of different organizations and the gifting of their people.
5. Resource - Alliance partners actively contribute what is dear to them - people, money, materials, time, credibility and networks for SCP facilitation efforts.
6. Clarify - Alliance partners have clear identity and vision. They know why they exist and know how they can contribute to SCP facilitation.
7. Advocate - Alliance partners identify at least one partnership advocate from within their own ranks that will ‘champion’ the cause and vision of the Alliance within each organization.45

After evaluating their ministry purpose and assessing their effectiveness in light of all the evangelical work taking place in Europe, the Alliance decided that other ministries could continue to make significant impact without their assistance. Therefore, in September 2005 the Alliance officially dissolved as an mission organization. Even though the Alliance dissolved in 2006, many of the Alliance personnel are still serving in Eurasia with other organizations. David Toth began working in Budapest with Dawn Ministries. Lee Behar is working with the Maclellan Foundation. These former Alliance workers are still contributing to saturation church planting by motivating and training national pastors and church planters.

Additionally, the Alliance workers trained, encouraged, and equipped thousands of church planters across Eurasia. Some of their church planters planted

45 Ibid.
churches that produced missionaries that took the Gospel beyond Eurasia into India and Africa.

Perhaps the Alliance’s greatest contributions to the global church are the resources they left behind. Foremost in this regard is the Omega Course, which is a five-volume set of manuals on saturation church planter training. Secondly, the Prayer Book is a 160 page book called "Prayer that Strengthens and Expands the Church." Third is the Essential Vision, which is a sixty-seven-page book that outlines saturation church planting principles. Finally, their Mentoring Manual which is a 125 page practical tool that helps leaders understand the role of mentoring. These tools remain for the church and can be freely downloaded from the Alliance website at http://www.alliancescp.org/resources/index.html.

The Alliance was influenced by and influenced organizations like Dawn Ministries and the IMB. Alliance missionaries networked closely with DAWN associates through conferences and leadership training seminars. Men like Jay Weaver and Don Crane would impact Dawn personnel, as well as a multitude of others, through events like Hope For Europe’s “Hope 21 Conference.” In the planning stages it was decided that Hope 21 would be,

a ‘cluster’ congress, with some 25 separate consultations taking place simultaneously in a dozen hotels spread across the city. Each of these two-day consultations represented a Hope For Europe network, and explored the meaning of the hope of the gospel in a particular field.⁴⁶

Hope 21’s aim was to provide an honest evaluation of Europe’s spiritual situation at the beginning of the 21st

century. It provided an opportunity for DAWN strategists and Alliance church planters to teach seminars together and glean from each other. Jay Weaver (Director of Field Ministries for the Alliance) and (Director for DAWN Europe) were examples of key leaders at Hope 21. Additionally, Hope 21 induced an atmosphere of camaraderie where church planters, missiologists, and statisticians were united in their efforts to penetrate Europe with the Gospel. Hope 21 was the launching pad for the “Hope for Europe” movement. But what does all this have to do with Lausanne?

Gordon Showell-Rogers serves as the Lausanne International Deputy Director for Europe. He has also served as the European Evangelical Alliance's (EEA) General Secretary since April 1999, and was the director of HOPE 21. His influence can be traced throughout the European evangelical network as is typical of many of Lausanne’s personnel. He has been Lausanne’s point of influence to Europe in the past and continues to promote Lausanne and the movement today. Showell-Rogers states,

The European Evangelical Alliance is very positive about the partnership between the 'Lausanne' movement and the World Evangelical Alliance towards the 2010 Evangelism Conference. As one expression of that partnership it seemed sensible and logical to accept the invitation to become the 'Lausanne' contact person for Europe: so that we can create as much synergy as possible, within existing networks around Europe.\(^{47}\)

The Alliance, like DAWN, YWAM, the IMB, and so many other evangelical organizations participated in joint

conferences and congresses. The influence of Lausanne entered into each organization, then its vision and passion spread like a virus at the conferences through the interaction of these agencies. Lausanne has integrated itself so effectively within so many evangelical networks that it truly is a global movement.

6.3 Closing Thoughts on Theological Convergence.

There is little doubt that theological convergence took place at Edinburgh and has continued throughout the Lausanne movement. This work has addressed this in limited fashion. The convergence began in the hearts and minds of John R. Mott and J. H. Oldham.

Lesslie Newbigin calls Mott an “extraordinary man” and credits him with bringing the Orthodox into the ecumenical movement at Edinburgh. He further states, “The records of the Edinburgh Conference show that even at that early date, staunchly evangelical missionary leaders were moved to express their longing for a unity which should embrace Roman Catholic and Orthodox.”

Add Oldham’s passion and vision for a united Christianity to Mott’s, and ecumenism had a quick start from Edinburgh. Oldham made it clear that he envisioned a united Christian witness to the world. J. W. C. Dougall states, “The Gospel belongs to the Church and only the universal Church can declare truly and fully what it is.”

---


Mott and Oldham inspired men like Newbigin to a point to where they were willing to confess that “a Christian world mission without the witness of the Orthodox churches is a maimed and lop-sided thing, deprived of some of the riches of the Gospel”.⁵⁰

It was this sort of rhetoric that troubled evangelicals. Since the theology of Protestants, Catholics, Anglicans, Orthodox, Anglican, and Reformed can be so varied, some evangelicals were concerned that seeking unity at the expense of doctrine was too costly. Throughout the years evangelicals have questioned the validity for the need of such a unity. Discussions have been numerous on this topic.

There was also evidence that mission could be very effective without unity, of which the evangelical and Roman Catholic missions were good examples. So the argument that unity was necessary for a credible and successful mission was not quite tenable.⁵¹

### 6.3.1 Edinburgh 2010 and Lausanne III

In 2010 there will be a major celebration commemorating Edinburgh 1910 that will be held in Edinburgh, and Lausanne will host Lausanne III in Cape Town. What will these celebrations and conferences accomplish? Will they contribute to more convergence and if so, which way will the convergence lead? Will there be a renewed emphasis on social justice, unity, biblical authority or will some new missiological paradigm be introduced to advance global evangelization? Only time will tell.

---

⁵⁰ Newbigin, “From the Editor,” 277.

As Edinburgh 2010 approaches the 1910 Conference takes on a renewed prominence and is fondly recalled by many. However, there are those like Hesselgrave and others who fear that 2010 may be a repeat of 1910. There is a clarion cry from some evangelicals for Edinburgh 2010 to not repeat the trends of the past. One of the major concerns was the extent to which Christianity would go for unity and fellowship. Arthur P. Johnson believes that at the Edinburgh Conference two notable new points appeared: first, an understanding and sympathy for the nobler elements in the non-Christian religions, and second, a compromising of the universal and emphatic witness to the absoluteness of the Christian faith by a new attitude of charity and tolerance.\(^5\)

If Johnson is correct, it may be due to the fact that in 1910 Mott and the committee was “committed to the omission of all controversial theological questions in which the participating churches or societies differing among themselves.”\(^5\)

While the Lausanne conveners likened Lausanne 1974 to Edinburgh 1910, there were some major differences. First, Lausanne 1974 was theological and “was founded upon the infallible Bible.”\(^5\) Second, Lausanne rejected non-evangelical inclusion and issued forth pleas that the Gospel of Christ be proclaimed among those who had never heard. Yet, Edinburgh gave the impression that there were some Christian countries not in need of missionaries.\(^5\)


\(^5\) Ibid., 11.

\(^5\) Ibid.

\(^5\) Ibid., 12.
Third, “Lausanne 1974 took seriously the growing evangelical voices and bodies around the world, recognized their place under the authority of Christ, and fully accepted them as equals.”

Fourth, Lausanne was truly global in focus and ethnicity whereas Edinburgh had a worldwide vision, but the gathering was primarily a conclave of western missionaries.

One of the most significant differences between the two was in their understanding of unity. For Edinburgh, organizational unity was primary, whereas Lausanne sought spiritual unity. Edinburgh desired physical unity between all Christians in an effort to promote world evangelization. Lausanne built in the spiritual unity already present, and brought together denominations, countries, and ethnicities.

Lausanne benefitted from Edinburgh’s strengths and weaknesses, and has justified itself by implementing the lessons it has learned. Arthur Johnson points out that “Lausanne revealed the growing strength of evangelical Christianity, gave it a new visage, showed its worldwide presence, and presented evangelical churches and the world with a biblical theology of evangelism.”

The delegates of Edinburgh 1910 had a vision to see a “World Church” with deep roots into every nation and culture. To some degree that vision has been fulfilled. However, as the celebration begins in 2010 there needs to be a recognition that some aspects of the vision have yet to be fulfilled. The success of Gospel does not rest on

---

56 Ibid., 11.
57 Ibid., 12.
58 Ibid., 14.
“Western missionaries” as was once believed. The world was not evangelized in one generation and most likely will not in the current generation either. Western missionaries need to accept that Edinburgh 1910 stood at the high point of the Western missionary movement. It is unlikely that the “Western Missionary Movement will occupy center stage” again.\(^5^9\)

Kenneth R. Ross asserts, “While the ultimate vision of Edinburgh 1910 may have been realized, it must be acknowledged that it occurred in spite of the limitations of the conference.”\(^6^0\) Unlike the 1910 conference there must be sufficient distance from the imperialistic mindset that dominated twentieth century western missions. 2010 requires that there be an atmosphere of Christian unity based on spiritual unity which does not reflect a lack of confidence in the Christian message. There does need to be a healthy respect for people of other faiths (Muslims, Buddhist, Hindis, etc.), but without the inclusive nature of the Commission Four Report of 1910. The Christian message must be celebrated and proclaimed in a manner respective of other religions, not antagonistic, militaristic, or triumphalistic, but confidently, boldly, and compassionately.\(^6^1\)

As 2010 celebrations and conferences draw near Edinburgh and Lausanne have the potential to stimulate a fresh movement. It will be interesting to see if each hold to their original purpose, moorings and values. Will

---


60 Ibid.

61 Ibid., 177-78.
Edinburgh continue to seek physical unity? Will Lausanne remain true to the 1974 opening address by Billy Graham and base the conference on an “inerrant Bible?” Again, only time will tell. Each conference has incredible value and possibilities for the future of the Kingdom of God.

6.3.2 Final Note

Theological convergence is not a one way street. Convergence has taken place among evangelicals and ecumenicals alike. While conservative evangelicals believe that the convergence has primarily taken place from within the evangelical world, there has been convergence within ecumenism as well. Evangelicals have been successful in their efforts to gain entrance to the WCC and yield some influence. However, it has not made as deep an impact as hoped. Arthur P. Johnson believes that “evangelicalism by its very nature is ecumenical. It loves and seeks fellowship with ‘born again’ believers where they are found.”62 Perhaps, the failure of evangelicalism to deeply impact ecumenism stems from the conservative view of what actually constitutes a “born again believer.”

Tom Houston presents a course of action for displaying Christian unity and cooperation while engaging in missions. He encourages Christians to follow the “Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization goals for the future.”63 Tom Houston writes a compelling assessment of “LCWE’s Goals for the Future.” He points out that Christian’s should participate with one another in missions with the same understanding of David Bosch. He argues that there are six

---


saving acts that should be evident to all Christians.\textsuperscript{64} Houston points out that each denomination interprets each act a little differently, and each denomination tends to focus on one or two of the acts more than others; yet all hold to them as biblical truths. Therefore, there should be a unified effort by the broader evangelical world to cooperate together in world evangelization. Houston reminds his readers that,

God gives us each a torch to carry, but it is one procession. We do not need to apologize for our torch. We need to carry it high, but let us not image it is the whole truth. Let us affirm the whole procession and the others in it. Let us maintain our commitment to show the world the people of God as one—both women and men, poor and rich, young and old, lay and clergy, weak and strong, white and black, yellow and brown, non-reading and reading. Let us make it our determined goal to stay together under the banner of the Word of God as reflected in the Lausanne Covenant and show the world the fullness of saving acts of God in Christ.\textsuperscript{65}

In 1991 David Bosch alerted the evangelical world to the reality that convergence had taken place and that “an important segment of evangelicalism appears to be poised to reverse the ‘Great Reversal’ and embody anew a full-orbed gospel of the irrupting reign of God not only in individual lives but also in society.”\textsuperscript{66} Bosch also, reminds his readers that within ecumenism there had emerged a convergence from the Nairobi assembly which seemed to be reversing the trends of the 1970s. He points out that

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid. The six saving acts are; The Incarnation; The Atonement; The Resurrection; The Ascension; Pentecost; The Advent. (accessed 2/16/2009).

\textsuperscript{65} Ibid.

Protestants, Catholics, and Orthodox have been working to overcome the dichotomies (social gospel vs. spiritual gospel) which had separated them for so long.\(^{67}\)

Bosch left behind something great for the evangelical/ecumenical world to seriously consider when he quoted portions of sections 6 and 43 of the WCCs “Mission and Evangelism” document which address unresolved tensions. His conclusion was that Christians are to recognize,

That we do not have all the answers and are prepared to live within the framework of penultimate knowledge, that we regard our involvement in dialogue and mission as an adventure, are prepared to take risks, and are anticipating surprises as the Spirit guides us into fuller understanding. This is not opting for agnosticism, but for humility. It is, however, a bold humility—or a humble boldness. We know only in part, but we do know. And we believe that the faith we profess is both true and just, and should be proclaimed. We do this, however, not as judges or lawyers, but as witnesses; not as soldiers, but as envoys of peace; not as high-pressure sales-persons, but as ambassadors of the Servant Lord.\(^{68}\)

Finally, to sum up this thesis from chapter one through chapter six, the closing words in chapter five seem applicable and affirm,

One of the major differences between Edinburgh and Lausanne is that Edinburgh began as an ecumenical movement inviting evangelicals to participate in the ecumenical agenda of that day. The movement that followed has continued to be ecumenical driven. Lausanne, on the other hand, began evangelical with an evangelical agenda. They invited ecumenicals to join in and allowed them the freedom to express their views (unlike Edinburgh) and truly participate in the debates and direction of the movement. The movement that swelled from Lausanne 1974 has become increasingly more ecumenical over the years. However, Lausanne is still considered by most to be truly

\(^{67}\) Ibid., 408.
\(^{68}\) Ibid., 489.
evangelical. This is due in part to theological convergence where mainstream evangelicalism has shifted from the once traditional conservative viewpoint that the Gospel of Christ should primarily focus on mankind’s eternal destiny.\textsuperscript{69}

\textsuperscript{69} Concluding remarks from Chapter 5 150.
ADDENDUM A

(from the Billy Graham Archives at Wheaton)

1974 International Congress on World Evangelization (ICOWE), Lausanne, Switzerland (also called Lausanne Congress)
Honorary Chairman: Billy Graham
Director: Donald Hoke
Associate Director: Paul Little
Executive Chairman: A. J. Dain
Chairman of Planning Committee: A. J. Dain
Chairman of Program Committee: Leighton Ford

1980 Consultation on World Evangelization (COWE), Pattaya, Thailand.
Honorary Chairman: Billy Graham
Chairman: Leighton Ford
Director: David Howard
Assistant to the Director: Rosemarie Struckmeyer
Program Director: Saphir Athyal
Assistant to Program Director: Carol Ann Webster Paul
Director of Communications: Stan Izon
Assistant to Director of Communications, Newsletter Editor: Lucinda Seacrest
Director of Operations: John Howell
Assistant to Director of Operations: Jane Rainey
Travel Coordinator: Robert Gray
Bookkeeper: Cindy Wilson
Pattaya Office Manager: Narong Sarasmut

1989 International Congress on World Evangelization, Second, Manila, Philippines (also called Lausanne II)
Chairman: Leighton Ford
Deputy Chairman: Donald Hoke
Program Advisory Committee Chairman: Bill Hogue
Program Chairman: Saphir Athyal
Program Director: Ed Dayton
Intl. Participant Selection Committee Chairman: A. J. Dain
Intl. Participant Selection Committee Director: Brad Smith
Intl. Participant Selection Committee Associate Director: Carol Kocherhans
Convened with the theme "Proclaim Christ until He Comes: Calling the Whole Church to Take the Whole Gospel to the
Whole World," with 4300 in attendance representing 173 countries.

2004 Forum on World Evangelization, Pattaya, Thailand
Chairman: Roger Parrott
Convened with 1500 Christian leaders from around the world participating.
ADDENDUM B

The Lausanne Covenant:

INTRODUCTION
We, members of the Church of Jesus Christ, from more than 150 nations, participants in the International Congress on World Evangelization at Lausanne, praise God for his great salvation and rejoice in the fellowship he has given us with himself and with each other. We are deeply stirred by what God is doing in our day, moved to penitence by our failures and challenged by the unfinished task of evangelization. We believe the Gospel is God's good news for the whole world, and we are determined by his grace to obey Christ's commission to proclaim it to all mankind and to make disciples of every nation. We desire, therefore, to affirm our faith and our resolve, and to make public our covenant.

1. THE PURPOSE OF GOD
We affirm our belief in the one-eternal God, Creator and Lord of the world, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, who governs all things according to the purpose of his will. He has been calling out from the world a people for himself, and sending his people back into the world to be his servants and his witnesses, for the extension of his kingdom, the building up of Christ's body, and the glory of his name. We confess with shame that we have often denied our calling and failed in our mission, by becoming conformed to the world or by withdrawing from it. Yet we rejoice that even when borne by earthen vessels the gospel is still a precious treasure. To the task of making that treasure known in the power of the Holy Spirit we desire to dedicate ourselves anew.

(Isa. 40:28; Matt. 28:19; Eph. 1:11; Acts 15:14; John 17:6, 18; Eph 4:12; 1 Cor. 5:10; Rom. 12:2; II Cor. 4:7)

2. THE AUTHORITY AND POWER OF THE BIBLE
We affirm the divine inspiration, truthfulness and authority of both Old and New Testament Scriptures in their entirety as the only written word of God, without error in all that it affirms, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice. We also affirm the power of God's word to accomplish his purpose of salvation. The message of the Bible is addressed to all men and women. For God's revelation in Christ and in Scripture is unchangeable.
Through it the Holy Spirit still speaks today. He illumines the minds of God's people in every culture to perceive its truth freshly through their own eyes and thus discloses to the whole Church ever more of the many-colored wisdom of God.

(II Tim. 3:16; II Pet. 1:21; John 10:35; Isa. 55:11; 1 Cor. 1:21; Rom. 1:16, Matt. 5:17,18; Jude 3; Eph. 1:17,18; 3:10,18)

3. THE UNIQUENESS AND UNIVERSALITY OF CHRIST
We affirm that there is only one Saviour and only one gospel, although there is a wide diversity of evangelistic approaches. We recognise that everyone has some knowledge of God through his general revelation in nature. But we deny that this can save, for people suppress the truth by their unrighteousness. We also reject as derogatory to Christ and the gospel every kind of syncretism and dialogue which implies that Christ speaks equally through all religions and ideologies. Jesus Christ, being himself the only God-man, who gave himself as the only ransom for sinners, is the only mediator between God and people. There is no other name by which we must be saved. All men and women are perishing because of sin, but God loves everyone, not wishing that any should perish but that all should repent. Yet those who reject Christ repudiate the joy of salvation and condemn themselves to eternal separation from God. To proclaim Jesus as "the Saviour of the world" is not to affirm that all people are either automatically or ultimately saved, still less to affirm that all religions offer salvation in Christ. Rather it is to proclaim God's love for a world of sinners and to invite everyone to respond to him as Saviour and Lord in the wholehearted personal commitment of repentance and faith. Jesus Christ has been exalted above every other name; we long for the day when every knee shall bow to him and every tongue shall confess him Lord.

(Gal. 1:6-9; Rom. 1:18-32; I Tim. 2:5,6; Acts 4:12; John 3:16-19; II Pet. 3:9; II Thess. 1:7-9; John 4:42; Matt. 11:28; Eph. 1:20,21; Phil. 2:9-11)

4. THE NATURE OF EVANGELISM
To evangelize is to spread the good news that Jesus Christ died for our sins and was raised from the dead according to the Scriptures, and that as the reigning Lord he now offers the forgiveness of sins and the liberating gifts of the
Spirit to all who repent and believe. Our Christian presence in the world is indispensable to evangelism, and so is that kind of dialogue whose purpose is to listen sensitively in order to understand. But evangelism itself is the proclamation of the historical, biblical Christ as Saviour and Lord, with a view to persuading people to come to him personally and so be reconciled to God. In issuing the gospel invitation we have no liberty to conceal the cost of discipleship. Jesus still calls all who would follow him to deny themselves, take up their cross, and identify themselves with his new community. The results of evangelism include obedience to Christ, incorporation into his Church and responsible service in the world.

(I Cor. 15:3,4; Acts 2: 32-39; John 20:21; I Cor. 1:23; II Cor. 4:5; 5:11,20; Luke 14:25-33; Mark 8:34; Acts 2:40,47; Mark 10:43-45)

5. CHRISTIAN SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
We affirm that God is both the Creator and the Judge of all men. We therefore should share his concern for justice and reconciliation throughout human society and for the liberation of men and women from every kind of oppression. Because men and women are made in the image of God, every person, regardless of race, religion, colour, culture, class, sex or age, has an intrinsic dignity because of which he or she should be respected and served, not exploited. Here too we express penitence both for our neglect and for having sometimes regarded evangelism and social concern as mutually exclusive. Although reconciliation with other people is not reconciliation with God, nor is social action evangelism, nor is political liberation salvation, nevertheless we affirm that evangelism and socio-political involvement are both part of our Christian duty. For both are necessary expressions of our doctrines of God and man, our love for our neighbour and our obedience to Jesus Christ. The message of salvation implies also a message of judgment upon every form of alienation, oppression and discrimination, and we should not be afraid to denounce evil and injustice wherever they exist. When people receive Christ they are born again into his kingdom and must seek not only to exhibit but also to spread its righteousness in the midst of an unrighteous world. The salvation we claim should be transforming us in the totality of our personal and social responsibilities. Faith without works is dead.
6. THE CHURCH AND EVANGELISM
We affirm that Christ sends his redeemed people into the world as the Father sent him, and that this calls for a similar deep and costly penetration of the world. We need to break out of our ecclesiastical ghettos and permeate non-Christian society. In the Church's mission of sacrificial service evangelism is primary. World evangelization requires the whole Church to take the whole gospel to the whole world. The Church is at the very centre of God's cosmic purpose and is his appointed means of spreading the gospel. But a church which preaches the cross must itself be marked by the cross. It becomes a stumbling block to evangelism when it betrays the gospel or lacks a living faith in God, a genuine love for people, or scrupulous honesty in all things including promotion and finance. The church is the community of God's people rather than an institution, and must not be identified with any particular culture, social or political system, or human ideology.

(John 17:18; 20:21; Matt. 28:19,20; Acts 1:8; 20:27; Eph. 1:9,10; 3:9-11; Gal. 6:14,17; II Cor. 6:3,4; II Tim. 2:19-21; Phil. 1:27)

7. COOPERATION IN EVANGELISM
We affirm that the Church's visible unity in truth is God's purpose. Evangelism also summons us to unity, because our oneness strengthens our witness, just as our disunity undermines our gospel of reconciliation. We recognize, however, that organisational unity may take many forms and does not necessarily forward evangelism. Yet we who share the same biblical faith should be closely united in fellowship, work and witness. We confess that our testimony has sometimes been marred by a sinful individualism and needless duplication. We pledge ourselves to seek a deeper unity in truth, worship, holiness and mission. We urge the development of regional and functional cooperation for the furtherance of the Church's mission, for strategic planning, for mutual encouragement, and for the sharing of resources and experience.

(John 17:21,23; Eph. 4:3,4; John 13:35; Phil. 1:27; John 17:11-23)
8. CHURCHES IN EVANGELISTIC PARTNERSHIP
We rejoice that a new missionary era has dawned. The
dominant role of western missions is fast disappearing. God
is raising up from the younger churches a great new
resource for world evangelization, and is thus
demonstrating that the responsibility to evangelise belongs
to the whole body of Christ. All churches should therefore
be asking God and themselves what they should be doing both
to reach their own area and to send missionaries to other
parts of the world. A reevaluation of our missionary
responsibility and role should be continuous. Thus a
growing partnership of churches will develop and the
universal character of Christ's Church will be more clearly
exhibited. We also thank God for agencies which labor in
Bible translation, theological education, the mass media,
Christian literature, evangelism, missions, church renewal
and other specialist fields. They too should engage in
constant self-examination to evaluate their effectiveness
as part of the Church's mission.

(Rom. 1:8; Phil. 1:5; 4:15; Acts 13:1-3, I Thess. 1:6-8)

9. THE URGENCY OF THE EVANGELISTIC TASK
More than 2,700 million people, which is more than two-
thirds of all humanity, have yet to be evangelised. We are
ashamed that so many have been neglected; it is a standing
rebutle to us and to the whole Church. There is now,
however, in many parts of the world an unprecedented
receptivity to the Lord Jesus Christ. We are convinced that
this is the time for churches and para-church agencies to
pray earnestly for the salvation of the unreached and to
launch new efforts to achieve world evangelization. A
reduction of foreign missionaries and money in an
evangelised country may sometimes be necessary to
facilitate the national church's growth in self-reliance
and to release resources for unevangelised areas.
Missionaries should flow ever more freely from and to all
six continents in a spirit of humble service. The goal
should be, by all available means and at the earliest
possible time, that every person will have the opportunity
to hear, understand, and to receive the good news. We
cannot hope to attain this goal without sacrifice. All of
us are shocked by the poverty of millions and disturbed by
the injustices which cause it. Those of us who live in
affluent circumstances accept our duty to develop a simple
life-style in order to contribute more generously to both relief and evangelism.

(John 9:4; Matt. 9:35-38; Rom. 9:1-3; I Cor. 9:19-23; Mark 16:15; Isa. 58:6,7; Jas. 1:27; 2:1-9; Matt. 25:31-46; Acts 2:44,45; 4:34,35)

10. EVANGELISM AND CULTURE
The development of strategies for world evangelization calls for imaginative pioneering methods. Under God, the result will be the rise of churches deeply rooted in Christ and closely related to their culture. Culture must always be tested and judged by Scripture. Because men and women are God's creatures, some of their culture is rich in beauty and goodness. Because they are fallen, all of it is tainted with sin and some of it is demonic. The gospel does not presuppose the superiority of any culture to another, but evaluates all cultures according to its own criteria of truth and righteousness, and insists on moral absolutes in every culture. Missions have all too frequently exported with the gospel an alien culture and churches have sometimes been in bondage to culture rather than to Scripture. Christ's evangelists must humbly seek to empty themselves of all but their personal authenticity in order to become the servants of others, and churches must seek to transform and enrich culture, all for the glory of God.

(Mark 7:8,9,13; Gen. 4:21,22; I Cor. 9:19-23; Phil. 2:5-7; II Cor. 4:5)

11. EDUCATION AND LEADERSHIP
We confess that we have sometimes pursued church growth at the expense of church depth, and divorced evangelism from Christian nurture. We also acknowledge that some of our missions have been too slow to equip and encourage national leaders to assume their rightful responsibilities. Yet we are committed to indigenous principles, and long that every church will have national leaders who manifest a Christian style of leadership in terms not of domination but of service. We recognise that there is a great need to improve theological education, especially for church leaders. In every nation and culture there should be an effective training programme for pastors and laity in doctrine, discipleship, evangelism, nurture and service. Such training programmes should not rely on any stereotyped methodology but should be developed by creative local initiatives according to biblical standards.
12. SPIRITUAL CONFLICT
We believe that we are engaged in constant spiritual warfare with the principalities and powers of evil, who are seeking to overthrow the Church and frustrate its task of world evangelization. We know our need to equip ourselves with God's armour and to fight this battle with the spiritual weapons of truth and prayer. For we detect the activity of our enemy, not only in false ideologies outside the Church, but also inside it in false gospels which twist Scripture and put people in the place of God. We need both watchfulness and discernment to safeguard the biblical gospel. We acknowledge that we ourselves are not immune to worldliness of thoughts and action, that is, to a surrender to secularism. For example, although careful studies of church growth, both numerical and spiritual, are right and valuable, we have sometimes neglected them. At other times, desirous to ensure a response to the gospel, we have compromised our message, manipulated our hearers through pressure techniques, and become unduly preoccupied with statistics or even dishonest in our use of them. All this is worldly. The Church must be in the world; the world must not be in the Church.

13. FREEDOM AND PERSECUTION
It is the God-appointed duty of every government to secure conditions of peace, justice and liberty in which the Church may obey God, serve the Lord Jesus Christ, and preach the gospel without interference. We therefore pray for the leaders of nations and call upon them to guarantee freedom of thought and conscience, and freedom to practise and propagate religion in accordance with the will of God and as set forth in The Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We also express our deep concern for all who have been unjustly imprisoned, and especially for those who are suffering for their testimony to the Lord Jesus. We promise to pray and work for their freedom. At the same time we refuse to be intimidated by their fate. God helping us, we too will seek to stand against injustice and to remain
faithful to the gospel, whatever the cost. We do not forget
the warnings of Jesus that persecution is inevitable.

(I Tim. 1:1-4, Acts 4:19; 5:29; Col. 3:24; Heb. 13:1-3;
Luke 4:18; Gal. 5:11; 6:12; Matt. 5:10-12; John 15:18-21)

14. THE POWER OF THE HOLY SPIRIT
We believe in the power of the Holy Spirit. The Father sent
his Spirit to bear witness to his Son; without his witness
ours is futile. Conviction of sin, faith in Christ, new
birth and Christian growth are all his work. Further, the
Holy Spirit is a missionary spirit; thus evangelism should
arise spontaneously from a Spirit-filled church. A church
that is not a missionary church is contradicting itself and
quenching the Spirit. Worldwide evangelization will become
a realistic possibility only when the Spirit renews the
Church in truth and wisdom, faith, holiness, love and
power. We therefore call upon all Christians to pray for
such a visitation of the sovereign Spirit of God that all
his fruit may appear in all his people and that all his
gifts may enrich the body of Christ. Only then will the
whole church become a fit instrument in his hands, that the
whole earth may hear his voice.

(I Cor. 2:4; John 15:26;27; 16:8-11; I Cor. 12:3; John 3:6-
8; II Cor. 3:18; John 7:37-39; I Thess. 5:19; Acts 1:8;
Psa. 85:4-7; 67:1-3; Gal. 5:22,23; I Cor. 12:4-31; Rom.
12:3-8)

15. THE RETURN OF CHRIST
We believe that Jesus Christ will return personally and
visibly, in power and glory, to consummate his salvation
and his judgment. This promise of his coming is a further
spur to our evangelism, for we remember his words that the
gospel must first be preached to all nations. We believe
that the interim period between Christ's ascension and
return is to be filled with the mission of the people of
God, who have no liberty to stop before the end. We also
remember his warning that false Christs and false prophets
will arise as precursors of the final Antichrist. We
therefore reject as a proud, self-confident dream the
notion that people can ever build a utopia on earth. Our
Christian confidence is that God will perfect his kingdom,
and we look forward with eager anticipation to that day,
and to the new heaven and earth in which righteousness will
dwell and God will reign forever. Meanwhile, we rededicate
ourselves to the service of Christ and of people in joyful submission to his authority over the whole of our lives.


CONCLUSION
Therefore, in the light of this our faith and our resolve, we enter into a solemn covenant with God and with each other, to pray, to plan and to work together for the evangelization of the whole world. We call upon others to join us. May God help us by his grace and for his glory to be faithful to this our covenant! Amen, Alleluia!
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This is Ed Pruitt. I’m in Colorado Springs, September the 6th, 2006. I’m with Mr. Michael O’Rear, who is the president of Global Mapping International, and Dr. Stan Nussbaum, who is the staff missiologist. And we are going to be talking to both gentlemen at the same time today. Talking a little bit about their ministry background, and then a little bit about Lausanne. And I’ll start with Mike – Mike, if you would, tell me a little bit about your ministry journey from the time you entered ministry up until now, a little bit about how you became the president of GMI, and maybe a little bit about the main things that GMI is doing right now. (0:00:34)

Thank you Ed. Ministry for me really began on a cattle and sheep ranch in Montana, after Bible college. And ah I’m sitting there in the evenings in the shepherders cabin, and I’m reading book by people like Jim Angle, and you know Dr. Hesselgrave, and Craft, and people like this and getting turned on to missions ideas. Went to Wheaton College graduate school, in ‘79, entered the M.A. program in communications under Jim Angel. And that turned my world upside down, and just really caught the vision of, not only cross-cultural communication, but the role and value of research within cross-cultural communication. While I was there I kept hearing about this strange and wonderful man out in Pasadena, California, named Dr. Ralph Winter, and what was happening there at the beginning of the U.S. Center for World Mission. About a year after I graduated from Wheaton I got married, and Laura and I decided that we would go down and volunteer for a summer at the U.S. Center for World Mission. And that was the summer that Bob Waymire moved there to begin Global Mapping. And so right away Bob and I got acquainted and our hearts really drawn together by the Lord in terms of a vision for helping the church to see and use research and strategic information from every people and every country, every corner of the globe. And so Laura and I joined Global Mapping that summer, summer of 83, and I have been with Global Mapping ever since. Did just about everything that you could imagine in terms of different roles at GMI over the last 23 years. But in 1991, we moved to Colorado Springs, the ministry moved
from Pasadena to Colorado Springs, and I was asked by the board to become president at that time. So, have just seen tremendous blessing from God, in terms of being able to serve church and mission leaders around the world with information and information tools. (0:02:45)

**Pruitt**

And Stan, what about your journey from the time you entered ministry until where God has led you here at GMI? (0:02:52)

**Nussbaum**

Well, I grew up as a pastor’s kid. Went through college and seminary figuring I would probably be a college teacher. Went and took a Christian Ed position soon after that. And then got asked to teach in southern Africa, and end up spending seven years as a Bible teacher at the village level. Did my doctorate while I was there because one of the big challenges was to sort of get into the heads of the Africans. I was working with indigenous churches, not ones that missionaries founded. And so the first thing is to figure out what they already know, and then how do you move them from where ever they are to in a more biblical direction. After that, taught mission for a couple of years in the states and then went to England, and worked there for seven years at a mission training center, mission training and research center at the Celio(?) Colleges. And in 93 left there, we came back to the States, moved back as a family, and joined GMI because of the research interest. I had developed a research, or was developing a research methods course and I was looking for some place in the States that I though would make a good, a natural home or a good base from which to further develop that and launch that. And it’s still, it’s just in a way it’s just getting launched now 13 years later. But it has been in the works that whole time. (0:04:34)

**Pruitt**

Alright, I appreciate that. I want to ask you both just a couple questions about Lausanne 1974. You know several evangelical leaders like Louis Bush, Jim Montgomery, and well even you Stan Nussbaum. I’ve read some things that you’ve written about where refer to Lausanne 1974 as a watershed moment in evangelical missions history. What was it about, I’ll start off with you Mike, what was it about Lausanne 74 that made
O’Rear

It seems to me two things stand out, and they’re both directly related to what I’ve seen within the ministry of Global Mapping and how we’ve been able to minister over the years. The first was this call to focus on unreached peoples. Defining mission much more clearly in terms of cross-cultural communication, Dr. Ralph Winter’s presentation of this E-1, E-2, E-3 model of cross-cultural evangelism. And even the missiological call that grew out of that that said the church needs to put a priority on establishing a beachhead in unreached peoples. So that to me seemed to be a pivot point for the church coming out of Lausanne 74, was this new focus on the priority of reaching unreached peoples. Secondly, the miracle of the Lausanne Covenant and getting people to agree together there at the congress with that wording. The way that God used the wording of the Lausanne Covenant to call so many people from so many different denominations and kinds of ministry and persuasions to say how do we genuinely collaborate together for the sake of the gospel in ways that don’t take away from our distinctives, but allow us to be the body of Christ? I think post Lausanne ‘74 you saw the emergence of much greater desire and reality in terms of cooperation among evangelicals than you did prior to that. (0:07:08)

Pruitt

And Stan, what would you add to that, or how do you view the impact of Lausanne or the watershed moment? (0:07:16)

Nussbaum

Well, I’ve got three points. The first one has to do with the historical moment. If we look at the 60’s there was a lot of debate and confusion about what mission was or wasn’t. And the year before Lausanne was the WCC Bangkok ‘73 ‘Salvation Today’ thing, where as far as theological content that was probably the low point for the ecumenical world. Where it was a vacuum, I mean it was all humanization – mission is all about making a better world, period. So the next year the evangelicals come back and they’re saying in Lausanne we’re lost, we’re not crazy, we’re not narrow, we’re not all of those things that ecumenicals think we might be. But we do believe this and this and this and this. So seen in that context it was a
defining moment for evangelicals. Second thing I’d say, I think in terms of people, that the emergence of John Stott, Ralph Winter, and I’m not sure if Chuck Craft was there was he? Anyway it’s stuff that I associate with Craft anyway. At least Stott and Winter, who were well known before, but got bumped up a notch and then dominated the scene for a whole generation. In different ways in theology of mission, and the unreached peoples emphasis, and then Craft as the leading figure on the contextualization. I’m pretty sure he was at the Willowbank, I’m almost positive he was in the Willowbank thing in ’78, which was a follow on from Lausanne. But anyway, I’d say the emergence of those three figures were terrifically influential in the evangelical world. Third point is on the theological side. The Lausanne Covenant does something that evangelicals typically do not do, which is, it puts mission first and the Bible second. Evangelicals are used to saying, Bible first, before belief in God, before whatever – you always start with the Bible and then you build from there. And the Lausanne Covenant the first article is on mission, the second is on the authority of Scripture. And that shift is hugely important in theological terms. And compatible with that or reinforcing that interpretation is the fact that they never really set out in the Lausanne Covenant to define the gospel. It was kind of assumed that you knew what it was. And yet all through there they’re really defining the gospel point by point, that the gospel is this whole thing that we are doing. Now the amazing thing about the document, and I just checked this on the computer the other day getting ready for this discussion, the word hell is not in the Lausanne Covenant. The word death is not in the Lausanne Covenant. There is no form of the word atone in the Lausanne Covenant. The phrase eternal life does not occur. Heaven only occurs once, and it’s about the new heaven and new earth. And judgment only occurs twice. And one of those is about judgment on society in the social responsibility, for a judgment on society for its evils. And the other one is in the return of Christ, where He will exercise judgment something of that nature. Now this is amazing that you can get a bunch of evangelicals together, and you can get them all talking about the gospel, and all defining out – OK it’s not a huge document, but it’s substantial – and saying lots of things about lots of
things, and not have the typical evangelical jargon and the typical evangelical framework really tying it together. And I think what that means in terms of its long-term influence is that the Lausanne Covenant was not boxed in the way that a lot of previous evangelical theology had been. And lacking the artificial limits that some of these words and some of these concepts had put around what the gospel is, or how you summarize the gospel or how you explain it. It’s allowed it to grow in a contextualization direction. It’s allowed it to grow in the social responsibility area. The whole transformation agenda that’s getting emphasized so much now, 30 years later, there was room for it in the Lausanne Covenant and there was a platform for it and a natural way for it to develop. Which I don’t think was there if you look at evangelical writings in the 60’s or in the 50’s. It was a new document and a remarkable consensus.

Pruitt: Alright, Mike, back to you. It seems that after talking to some of the mission leaders, that after Lausanne ’74 some of the mission agencies and Para-church organizations that were already organized, after Lausanne ’74 they either redirected or shifted the focus of their ministry. And of course, out of Lausanne 74 or shortly there after, other missions agencies were birthed. And from Lausanne 74 till where we sit here in 2006, can you see any impact that Lausanne has had on the global church through Para-church organizations? Whether it’s the spirit of Lausanne or what ever, do you see Lausanne ’74, can you see it in the life of the Para-church organizations that you’ve dealt with over the years?

O’Rear: Certainly, both the Para-church organizations and networks and movements...one of the central themes coming out of Lausanne ’74 was this focus on unreached people groups. Identifying them, planning to reach them, reaching them, establishing churches in them. I think that laid the foundation, more that anything else, for groups like “Global Mapping” who is all about providing research information for church and mission work; for groups like DAWN Ministries and that kind of saturation church planting approach for AD2000 Beyond Movement. As well as the growth of what I call research oriented ministries. Again, groups like
“Global Mapping” and DAWN and there are numerous others that say, to be faithful to Christ’s call and mission, we need to understand what the harvest field and the harvest force looks like; that those are central components to the mission. And so I think that it gave rise to the formation of new ministries and gave them legitimacy or a platform or openness to serve as part of the body of Christ.

Pruitt: Alright, Stan, would you like to add anything to that?

Nussbaum: I think the impact...I guess I’d look at also the second level impact. If the first level is the Lausanne impacting the agencies, the second level is the agencies impacting the world. And maybe I should even talk about a third level, because I think what’s happened is that you’ve gotta fire that’s spreading. The agencies are getting involved in evangelism in places where it wasn’t before. But then the church there takes off and it moves outside what the agency had in mind for what was going to develop there. It takes on a life of its own. And it starts multiplying and you get new mission vision, new mission activity happening so that now, you know you look at missionary sending countries, you look at what Indians are doing within India and beyond. You look at what Koreans are doing, Brazilians, or Nigerians, and Philippinos. The kind of vision that’s happening there, a lot of the seeds for that were planted by the groups that Mike is talking about. And a lot of those groups were actually...you could trace them back or you could trace an influence from Lausanne to them, so in a way we’re looking at some of the grandchildren now, or even some of the great grandchildren of Lausanne ’74.

Pruitt: Ok, one final question for you. As both of you know the topic of my dissertation is the impact of Lausanne 1974 on the global church through Para-church organizations as experienced or as viewed through DAWN Ministries as a movement. With that as a topic of my dissertation before we close out this interview, is there anything else you will have to say, may be some question I haven’t asked you? Some thoughts that you have about DAWN Ministries and how Lausanne’s impacted them or anything else about Lausanne that might be relevant to this type of a dissertation? Mike, we’ll go to you first.
O’Rear: I think the movement of DAWN has been instrumental in redefining or clarifying the definition of mission as related to churches, in the presence of churches in church planting. It’s had a variety of impacts in different countries, depending on various factors and the contextualized situation in each country. But this concept of saturation church planting, God has used DAWN to popularize that, to unify the body to energize the body and to focus the body on planting lots more churches where they never were. I don’t believe that would have happened without the impact of Lausanne ’74 that said it’s ok to cooperate together. It’s a mandate to cooperate together. Its part of the Gospel that we as different denominational leaders, national church leaders in our country, get to gather and fellowship and pray and ask God together for a vision of what hasn’t been done yet. And how are we going to divide up the task. So I see that as a huge impact through particularly the whole DAWN movement which I see growing out of Lausanne.

Pruitt: Ok, and Stan, what about you? (0:19:05)

Nussbaum: I’d see the Lausanne ’74 as the time when...that created the awareness of a particular need. The awareness of the need for mission resources to be used much more in many parts of the world that were getting missed. Ok, now we are aware of it, but how are we going to do something about what we are aware of. And then DAWN comes along with a strategy, but the DAWN strategy connects because of the awareness has been raised at a very broad level by the Lausanne gathering and by Ralph Winter and getting the US center going coming directly out of that.... So I think it was kind of Lausanne creating a certain situation and then DAWN coming in and saying, “Oh yeh, we’ve got an answer for that; and here it is,” And then they began to work with it and experiment and role it out in different countries. (0:20:15)

Pruitt: Well, I do have one final question for you. I know that you did your dissertation, your Doctorate, under Dr. David Bausch at the University of South Africa who, if he was not the premiere missiologist of the twentieth century, certainly the last have of the twentieth century. Brilliant man, not sure how you
ever did a doctorate under him. His paradigm books I’ve read twice and I’m not sure I understand totally yet. But because you did know Dr. Bausch so well, you’ve studied him, you’ve written a book on how to understand his works which is outstanding.... But since you have known him so well, (21:00) and you have a good working knowledge of his understanding of Lausanne and what his conceptionalization of the future would have been...I want to ask you kind of an unfair question, but just deal with it the best you can I guess. If David Bausch were alive today, and he was sitting here in the room with us and he was answering these questions and he would look back to ’74, I’m sure he would probably be amazed at where we are today, working as evangelicals you know, Southern Baptists working with Pentecostals, working with these different organizations, with Mennonites, and different Methodists, Presbyterians and everybody working together to get the Gospel out. What do you think that David Bausch’s thoughts might be on the spirit of Lausanne? I mean obviously I’m sure he would have thought it was a great success from a philosophical standpoint or the spirit that Lausanne has cast. But what do you think David Bausch’s input would be today about the impact of Lausanne on the church if he were here today? (0:22:04)

Nussbaum: One thing he does say in transforming missions, he looks back on Lausanne on the point of evangelism and the relationship between evangelism and social responsibility which is a key dividing line between evangelicals and ecumenicals which is a key over arching issue for Bausch all the way through his life and his thinking. And the Lausanne Covenant still has...it traces the history where it says well here evangelism is primary and then later in the Lausanne movement, the things become more integrated. So it’s a progression. Lausanne has social responsibility which it barely was in the sixties for evangelicals. So it gets in on the agenda and then it grows on from there. And Bausch, if he were here, would give you much finer historical analysis than that little thumbnail sketch. I think that Bausch would ask some very insightful questions that would push evangelicals in Lausanne further on. And one of them would probably be how does the whole thing relate to dialog with other religions? Dialog was not that big of a term or concept in
missiology in 1974. The evangelical world would have sounded like a mission wash out, which is what they were reacting to in the Bangkok meeting already. So they would have been skittish of it. And particularly with Stott...because Stott is famous for the proclamation side of evangelism; get the message right, put it out there and let people respond to it. But I think Bausch would say ok, he understands that and sees that in perspective and so on, but where are you guys now? And how does that proclamation emphasis relate to a dialog with other religions; because Bausch, no doubt about it, was still for proclamation. He’s got plenty of criticism of the people who go too far down the dialog road. But I think that’s one point where he would say, Lausanne and even more so the movements like DAWN that came out of Lausanne haven’t really grappled with the dialog verses proclamation thing. They just assume the one track and gone for it for the most part. Again he’d ask the question better than that, but I think you get the general idea of one of the things I think he would raise.

Pruitt:    Well gentlemen, thank you for your time, I appreciate it. This ends our interview with Michael O’Rear who is the president of Global Mapping International and with Dr. Stan Nussbaum who is the Staff Missiologist here.
"All authority has been given to Me in heaven and on earth. Go, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the age."

Matthew 28:18-20
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Dr. David Hesselgrave

PRUITT: This is Ed Pruitt. I’m interviewing Dr. David Hesselgrave, September 6, 2006. We’re in Palmer Lake, just outside of Colorado Springs. Dr. Hesselgrave I’d like to talk to you just a few moments about Lausanne 1974. As you are aware, Luis Bush, Stan Nussbaum, Jim Montgomery and others refer to Lausanne ’74 as a “watershed” moment in Modern Mission’s history and just wanted to know if you agree with that, and if so, what was it about Lausanne ’74 that made it a watershed event or watershed moment in Modern Missions History.

HESSELGRAVE: Well, Ed I remind you that I wasn’t at Lausanne and I haven’t really been a part of the movement so I speak as kind of an outside observer. Not having been, still not really well acquainted with either that conference or the subsequent developments. But, I’ll just kind of respond, in accordance with the thinking that has gone through my mind since that time. It seems to me there might be something of a parallel between what happened in Uppsala in 1968 and then what was initiated in Lausanne ’74. Then …you’ll remember in Uppsala ’68…Donald McGavern, that was the time when Donald McGavern brought his question to bear, What about the 2 billion? Trying to bring an emphasis for the unreached to be reached. The response at Uppsala was extremely disappointing for Donald McGavern. In fact that was kind of a watershed for him. From my discussions with him I gather that that was a time when he more or less gave up on restoring to the WCC a concern for the lost and for the unreached and for the preaching of the Gospel. If I remember correctly, the theme was “Behold I make all things new.” And, it ultimately ended up in kinda the slogan “Let the World set the Agenda.” So God’s gonna make all things new and you can choose the agenda which comes first, second, third, and fourth. That’s just kind of a Peter Rabbit way kind of saying what I think happened. It seems to me that one might say that was kind of a water shed, it certainly was a watershed for Donald McGavern and for those who, many who had hopes for…that concern for world evangelism would be revived in the World Council. Now what happened six years later in Lausanne. It seems to me it might be conceived as a watershed for contemporary evangelical movement in the sense that, from my perspective there were two main emphases there, one was the social agenda of the church which had been high on the agenda of the World Council and that was kind of personified in the preparations that John Stott had made for the converse in his thinking and writing and then the other, of course, was Dr. Winter with his emphasis upon the people groups and the necessity for evangelizing them. Now if you follow subsequent history, it seems to me that what happened at Lausanne, in a sense picked up the history of the WCC and picked up that concern, both of those concerns, but if you follow the history it seems that the social emphasis has eclipsed over time the emphasis of world evangelization, as strong as that emphasis for a time, not so much I think because of Lausanne itself,
but probably because of the fact we were facing the end of another century and the beginning of a new century. And probably that timing was as important in that...at any rate...that concern, as strong as it was for a while, certainly diminished once we got past the year 2000, 2001. The socio-political emphasis has gathered momentum and has not decreased and maybe is increasing. If that is the case you have to ask the question, ya know, was Lausanne the beginning of a emphases and direction that had been set in the World Council and are we going to re-trace that history? That’s just a part of my thinking.

PRUITT: Well, along those same thoughts, one of the things that comes to mind now, I hadn’t intended on asking you…we had talked about it a little bit at dinner, but earlier today, Dr. Stan Nussbaum in his interview, he was talking about the covenant, and how the covenant he noticed there were about twelve words that were not in the covenant. Hell was not in the covenant, propitiation, atonement, sacrifice, heaven is only mentioned one time. So he goes through the different words that are not mentioned in the covenant, and it seems there were 22 hundred delegates that signed it, but 23 hundred that attended. So it appears that there’s about a hundred delegates more or less that did not sign the covenant. Most people, I guess in fact, every one I’ve interviewed, they’ve chose to talk about the positive aspects of Lausanne. A lot of them say it is the spirit of Lausanne or the philosophy of Lausanne, but I’m sure there has to be some negative impacts, at least for some evangelicals, do you think that some of the words that many evangelicals would hold dear, like the sacrifice and obviously atonement, do you think there is some negative impacts of Lausanne stemming from the covenant? In other words have we given the cow away to get the milk? …I guess is really what I’m asking.

HESSELGRAVE: Well, let’s put that in context. Let’s remember again, the emphasis on social action, really social-political action that was so dominant in World Council circles. And let’s remember the importance of liberation emphases in the 60’s and then growing in the 70’s into a full blown liberation theology and had its various additions in the various parts of the world, various churches. And the particularly, probably the emphasis on our Latin friends, evangelicals, but coming out of the Latin context, the Latin American context, their push for evangelicals to do and say something about social inequality and political oppression and so on for various reasons. But there was a lot of pressure there upon non-Latin evangelicals to make some significant statements and moves in the direction of more of a socially oriented Gospel and ministry. All of this is bearing in upon Lausanne. And John Stott with his international connection is very much concerned with that, which you can see from his writings that came out of that time. And the Lausanne Covenant is very much a result of the thinking of John Stott and others like him. So what you come up with there is a statement which for all of its many conclusions has a… I wouldn’t say necessarily the primary concern, but A primary concern to write a missiology or social concern, maybe a socio-
political concern into a statement that will then be espoused by a broad spectrum of evangelicals. Now we can talk about the nature of that and that’s what Stan was evidently referring to. That’s not a statement of faith. Well if it’s a statement of faith, it’s kind of like a statement of faith that you get in purpose driven churches these days. Where you sit down and you have the scripture over here, hopefully, and you decide – what are our purposes in this church or in this mission or whatever? And you set those out and they’re not necessarily bad they’re not necessarily unbiblical, but they’re deficient. Why are they deficient? They are deficient because they are not a statement of faith. And yet many times they function as that. I could take you to churches that repeat their purpose statement over and over and publish it over and over and don’t even repeat the Apostle’s Creed on Sunday or the creedal statement of their own denomination or their own church. I think there’s a parallel there between that sort of a situation that we now can understand very well because this is so current and then we’re back to Lausanne. And I think of it now, looking back, as kind of a purpose driven statement, you see, which the originators are hoping to drawn in a great consensus of evangelicals what they really needed was a statement of faith. What they got was a kind of a statement of evangelical purpose. And you have to remember that there were a hundred that didn’t sign and there probably was a lot of pressure for them to sign, but they didn’t. But I know also there were a lot of people who signed, but signed with some reservations. And there’s no way of identifying them, and there’s no way of identifying just what their reservations were. If I’d take that just one step further, you see it wasn’t only a little over a decade after that, that Donald McGavern approached me and said we’ve got to have a new missiological society that has to be called the Christian Missiological Society or the Christian whatever and so on, and what he is saying…. The reason for him saying that way, you know a Christian mission organization, he said we’ve got to have some way of bringing together those who are committed to what he called Great Commission mission. So we don’t have to argue whether Christ was divine or whether He was just THE Way. But where we have a consensus on these basic issues and then we can start speaking from that base. That’s what evangelicals has desperately needed and they didn’t get that at Lausanne.

PRUITT: …But I guess the final question would be, as we have talked about mainstream conservative evangelicalism seems to have give up something to gain a larger pool of evangelicals together: what do you think the global impact has been on the church, on the global church, from Lausanne ’74?

HESSELMORE: Well Lausanne has had some difficulty maintaining its identity and clarifying its purposes, hasn’t it? Isn’t that the case? I think that grows out of the fact that some of the basic issues that occasioned Lausanne were not answered at Lausanne. In other words the Lausanne Covenant really did not answer to the fundamental problem of how actually are we going to work, what actually are we going to do, and how actually is this going to
be implemented, then discussing the nature of mission itself in Grand Rapids and in Manila and so on since that time. So it really hasn’t answered some of the fundamental questions that were raised that presumably we would have liked to have answered with the Lausanne Covenant. And in that vein, part of the part of the results of coming together on many things, but not necessarily the most important things, which should bring us together, have worked themselves out in various enclaves and in various movements. The most obvious probably would be the movement for world evangelization by the year AD 2000 and beyond. I remember speaking in a conference right here in Colorado on that at that one time when my assigned topic was “Barriers to the achievement of world evangelization by the year 2000.” Well just prior to that there had been a booklet that had been published that called upon the cooperation of everybody who was to participate in this thrust for world evangelization. And the basis for it was that anybody who had a vision for the evangelization for the world should be included in this. Well it was brought out and I tried to bring it out if that’s the basis of cooperation, our Mormon friends have probably a great vision of world evangelization as anyone else. And then I brought out, very unpopularly, that that involved us immediately with our Roman Catholic friends, and involvement with them raised some serious questions as to the nature of the Gospel. And so on. That paper that I read was not really enthusiastically received. But I just looked at it the other day, it has never been published, I don’t think. But looking back at it, I think it fit the circumstances and raised significant questions. And the fact that it wasn’t well received indicated that …it raised questions that they didn’t want to try to answer. So, I think that the negatives probably outweigh the positives because I don’t think the Lausanne Continuation Committee in Lausanne today can engender anything like the same kind of enthusiasm that Lausanne ’74 evidenced. And I think it certainly didn’t enhance involvement for world evangelization by the year 2000 movement. If anything it abetted some of the weaknesses of that and probably even contributed to its relative demise, as time moves on. The other side of that is, there has to be some positives. And I think that the positive it, whether we agree or don’t agree or what ever, it has kept evangelicals talking, and it has kept evangelicals thinking in terms of places where we might agree and work together in evangelical ecumenicity, and so on. But right there is the problem isn’t it? It has to be an evangelical ecumenicity or it’s not really Christian. So I think that perspective people like Donald McGavern put his finger on that very early even though he didn’t draw attention to Lausanne. I’m sure that was in his thinking. There’s another aspect to that and that is there’s a plus and minus to this tremendous emphasis on socio-political action and so on. And other positives would take us back to some of the great revivals and the Awakening, Second Awakening, and so on. There is that responsibility, but when that becomes, in John Stott’s words, more or less equal partner with evangelism, church planting and so on, then we’re in troublesome and even quarrelsome territory. So, there’s good, bad, and indifferent. But to some extent we keep on talking with one
another and it’s only when we talk that we can really even mention the varieties of faith, which ultimately will bring us together or break us apart.

PRUITT: Well Dr. Hesselgrave, thank you so much for this interview and this concludes our interview with Dr. David Hesselgrave.
I would agree with Nussbaum's observations but would interpret it as an indication of how we have drifted away from a biblical focus or grounding for our missiology.

Now we have Winters advocating counting Moslems as Christians because they carry their bibles to the mosque with them. So his attitudes "writ large" are the issues we're facing in evangelicalism as a whole.

KE

On 10/31/06 1:04 PM, "Harold Pruitt" <EdPruitt@pobox.com> wrote:

> >
> >
> > Dr. Saayman and Dr. Eitel,
> >
> > I am hard at work on chapter 2 of my dissertation and making significant progress. I do need for each of you to respond to a couple of questions for me. I have posted a brief portion of chapter 2 where Dr. Nussbaum states that the Lausanne Covenant puts missions above Scripture and he views this as a positive, but Dr. Hesselgrave sees this as a negative. I would like for each of you to please read their quotes and then answer the following questions. With your permission I will incorporate your answers into the chapter for better clarity.
> >
> >
> > 1. Do you believe that the Lausanne Covenant puts missions above Scripture?
> >
> > 2. What impact has that had on the evangelical world at large?
One of the main concerns of conservative evangelicals is the authority of Scripture. One clear example of the controversy is seen in the comments of two leading missiologists of the twenty-first century. The lengthy quotes below display differing views of the covenant’s use of Scripture. (Although the quotes are lengthy, the length is needed to accurately represent the view of these men). Global Mapping International’s missiologist Dr. Stan Nussbaum who studied under the great missiologist Dr. David Bosch shakes the conservative position when he states:

“Third point is on the theological side. The Lausanne Covenant does something that evangelicals typically do not do, which is, it puts mission first and the Bible second. Evangelicals are used to saying, Bible first, before belief in God, before whatever – you always start with the Bible and then you build from there. And the Lausanne Covenant the first article is on mission, the second is on the authority of Scripture. And that shift is hugely important in theological terms. And compatible with that or reinforcing that interpretation is the fact that they never really set out in the Lausanne Covenant to define the gospel. It was kind of assumed that you knew what it was. And yet all through there they’re really defining the gospel point by point by point, that the gospel is this whole thing that we are doing. Now the amazing thing about the document, and I just checked this on the computer the other day getting ready for this discussion, the word
> hell is not in the Lausanne Covenant. The word death is not in the Lausanne
> Covenant. There is no form of the word atone in the Lausanne Covenant. The
> phrase eternal life does not occur. Heaven only occurs once, and it’s about
> the new heaven and new earth. And judgment only occurs twice. And one of
> those is about judgment on society in the social responsibility, for a
> judgment on society for its evils. And the other one is in the return of
> Christ, where He will exercise judgment something of that nature. Now this
> is amazing that you can get a bunch of evangelicals together, and you can
> get them all talking about the gospel, and all defining out – OK it’s not a
> huge document, but it’s substantial – and saying lots of things about lots
> of things, and not have the typical evangelical jargon and the typical
> evangelical framework really tying it together. And I think what that means
> in terms of its long-term influence is that the Lausanne Covenant was not
> boxed in the way that a lot of previous evangelical theology had been. And
> lacking the artificial limits that some of these words and some of these
> concepts had put around what the gospel is, or how you summarize the gospel
> or how you explain it. It’s allowed it to grow in a contextualization
> direction. It’s allowed it to grow in the social responsibility area. The
> whole transformation agenda that’s getting emphasized so much now, 30 years
> later, there was room for it in the Lausanne Covenant and there was a
> platform for it and a natural way for it to develop.”[1] <#_ftn1>
> 
> Nussbaum views the fact that the Lausanne Covenant places the
> importance on missions above the importance of Scripture as a positive where
Dr. David Hesselgrave clearly views it as a negative. When asked to comment concerning Nussbaum’s comments Hesselgrave states:

“Well, let’s put that in context. Let’s remember again, the emphasis on social action, really social-political action that was so dominant in World Council circles. And let’s remember the importance of liberation emphases in the 60’s and then growing in the 70’s into a full blown liberation theology and had its various additions in the various parts of the world, various churches. And the particularly, probably the emphasis on our Latin friends, evangelicals, but coming out of the Latin context, the Latin American context, their push for evangelicals to do and say something about social inequality and political oppression and so on for various reasons. But there was a lot of pressure there upon non-Latin evangelicals to make some significant statements and moves in the direction of more of a socially oriented Gospel and ministry. All of this is bearing in upon Lausanne. And John Stott with his international connection is very much concerned with that, which you can see from his writings that came out of that time. And the Lausanne Covenant is very much a result of the thinking of John Stott and others like him. So what you come up with there is a statement which for all of its many conclusions has a… I wouldn’t say necessarily the primary concern, but a primary concern to write a missiology or social concern, maybe a socio-political concern into a statement that will then be espoused by a broad spectrum of evangelicals. Now we can talk about the nature of that and that’s what Stan was evidently referring to. That’s not a statement
of faith. Well if it’s a statement of faith, it’s kind of like a statement of faith that you get in purpose driven churches these days. Where you sit down and you have the scripture over here, hopefully, and you decide what are our purposes in this church or in this mission or whatever? And you set those out and they’re not necessarily bad they’re not necessarily unbiblical, but they’re deficient. Why are they deficient? They are deficient because they are not a statement of faith. And yet many times they function as that. I could take you to churches that repeat their purpose statement over and over and publish it over and over and don’t even repeat the Apostle’s Creed on Sunday or the creedal statement of their own denomination or their own church. I think there’s a parallel there between that sort of a situation that we now can understand very well because this is so current and then we’re back to Lausanne. And I think of it now, looking back, as kind of a purpose driven statement, you see, which the originators are hoping to drawn in a great consensus of evangelicals what they really needed was a statement of faith. What they got was a kind of a statement of evangelical purpose. And you have to remember that there were a hundred that didn’t sign and there probably was a lot of pressure for them to sign, but they didn’t. But I know also there were a lot of people who signed, but signed with some reservations. And there’s no way of identifying them, and there’s know way of identifying just what their reservations were. If I’d take that just one step further, you see it wasn’t only a little over a decade after that, that Donald McGavern approached me and said we’ve got
to have a new missiological society that has to be called the Christian
Missiological Society or the Christian what ever and so on, and what he is
saying... The reason for him saying that way, you know a Christian mission
organization, he said we’ve got to have some way of bringing together those
who are committed to what he called Great Commission mission. So we don’t
have to argue whether Christ was divine or whether He was just THE Way. But
where we have a consensus on these basic issues and then we can start
speaking from that base. That’s what evangelicals has desperately needed and
they didn’t get that at Lausanne.”[2] 

[1] See Addendum D

[2] See Addendum E

Thank you for your assistance,

Blessings,

Ed Pruitt
The Manila Manifesto

THE TWENTY-ONE AFFIRMATIONS
of the Manila Manifesto

1. We affirm our continuing commitment to the Lausanne Covenant as the basis of our cooperation in the Lausanne movement.
2. We affirm that in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments God has given us an authoritative disclosure of his character and will, his redemptive acts and their meaning, and his mandate for mission.
3. We affirm that the biblical gospel is God's enduring message to our world, and we determine to defend, proclaim and embody it.
4. We affirm that human beings, though created in the image of God, are sinful and guilty, and lost without Christ, and that this truth is a necessary preliminary to the gospel.
5. We affirm that the Jesus of history and the Christ of glory are the same person, and that this Jesus Christ is absolutely unique, for he alone is God incarnate, our sin-bearer, the conqueror of death and the coming judge.
6. We affirm that on the cross Jesus Christ took our place, bore our sins and died our death; and that for this reason alone God freely forgives those who are brought to repentance and faith.
7. We affirm that other religions and ideologies are not alternative paths to God, and that human spirituality, if unredeemed by Christ, leads not to God but to judgment, for Christ is the only way.
8. We affirm that we must demonstrate God's love visibly by caring for those who are deprived of justice, dignity, food and shelter.
9. We affirm that the proclamation of God's kingdom of justice and peace demands the denunciation of all injustice and oppression, both personal and structural; we will not shrink from this prophetic witness.
10. We affirm that the Holy Spirit's witness to Christ is indispensable to evangelism, and that without this supernatural work neither new birth nor new life is possible.
11. We affirm that spiritual warfare demands spiritual weapons, and that we must both preach the word in the power of the Spirit, and pray constantly that we may enter into Christ's victory over the principalities and powers of evil.
12. We affirm that God has committed to the whole church and every member of it the task of making Christ known
throughout the world; we long to see all lay and ordained persons mobilized and trained for this task.

13. We affirm that we who claim to be members of the Body of Christ must transcend within our fellowship the barriers of race, gender and class.

14. We affirm that the gifts of the Spirit are distributed to all God's people, women and men, and that their partnership in evangelization must be welcomed for the common good.

15. We affirm that we who proclaim the gospel must exemplify it in a life of holiness and love; otherwise our testimony loses its credibility.

16. We affirm that every Christian congregation must turn itself outward to its local community in evangelistic witness and compassionate service.

17. We affirm the urgent need for churches, mission agencies and other Christian organizations to cooperate in evangelism and social action, repudiating competition and avoiding duplication.

18. We affirm our duty to study the society in which we live, in order to understand its structures, values and needs, and so develop an appropriate strategy of mission.

19. We affirm that world evangelization is urgent and that the reaching of unreached peoples is possible. So we resolve during the last decade of the twentieth century to give ourselves to these tasks with fresh determination.

20. We affirm our solidarity with those who suffer for the gospel, and will seek to prepare ourselves for the same possibility. We will also work for religious and political freedom everywhere.

21. We affirm that God is calling the whole church to take the whole gospel to the whole world. So we determine to proclaim it faithfully, urgently and sacrificially until he comes.

A. THE WHOLE GOSPEL

B. The gospel is the good news of God's salvation from the power of evil, the establishment of his eternal kingdom and his final victory over everything which defies his purpose. In his love God purposed to do this before the world began and effected his liberating plan over sin, death and judgment through the death of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is Christ who makes us free, and unites us in his redeemed fellowship. (Col 2:15; 1. Co 15:24-28; Eph. 1:4; Col. 1:19; Tit. 2:14)

1. OUR HUMAN PREDICAMENT
We are committed to preaching the whole gospel, that is, the biblical gospel in its fullness. In order to do so, we have to understand why beings need it.

Men and women have an intrinsic dignity and worth, because they were created in God's likeness to know, love and serve him. But now through sin every part of their humanness have been distorted. Human beings have become selfcentered, self-serving rebels, who do not love God or their neighbour as they should. In consequence, they are alienated both from their Creator and from the rest of his creation, which is the basic cause of the pain, disorientation and loneliness which so many people suffer today. Sin also frequently erupts in anti-social behavior, in violent exploitation of others, and in a depletion of the earth's resources of which God has made men and women his stewards. Humanity is guilty, without excuse, and on the broad road which leads to destruction.

Although God's image in human beings has been corrupted, they are still capable of loving relationships, noble deeds and beautiful art. Yet even the finest human achievement is fatally flawed and cannot possibly fit anybody to enter God's presence. Men and women are also spiritual beings, but spiritual practice and self-help techniques can at the most alleviate felt needs; they cannot address the solemn realities of sin, guilt and judgment. Neither human religion, nor human righteousness, nor sociopolitical programs can save people. Self-salvation of every kind is impossible. Left to themselves, human beings are lost forever.

So we repudiate false gospels which deny human sin, divine judgment, the deity and incarnation of Jesus Christ, and the necessity of the cross and resurrection. We also reject half-gospels, which minimize sin and confuse God's grace with human self-effort. We confess that we ourselves have sometimes trivialized the gospel. But we determine in our evangelism to remember God's radical diagnosis and his equally radical remedy. (Ac. 2:27; Ge. 1:26,27; Ro. 3:9-18; 2 Ti. 3:2-4; Ge. 3:17-24; Ro. 1:29-31; Ge. 1:26, 28; 2:15; Ro. 1:20; 2:1; 3:19; Mt. 7:13; Mt. 5:46; 7:11; 1 Ti. 6:16; Ac. 17:22-31; Ro. 3:20; Eph. 2:1-3; Gal. 1:6-9; 2 Co. 11:2-4; 1 Jn. 2:22, 23; 4:1-3; 1 Co 15:3,4; Jer. 6:14; 8:11)
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2. GOOD NEWS FOR TODAY
We rejoice that the living God did not abandon us to our lostness and despair. In his love he came after us in Jesus Christ to rescue and remake us. So the good news focuses on the historic person of Jesus, who came proclaiming the kingdom of God and living a life of humble service, who died for us, becoming sin and a curse in our place, and whom God vindicated by raising him from the dead. To those who repent and believe in Christ, God grants a share in the new creation. He gives us new life, which includes the forgiveness of our sins and the indwelling, transforming power of his Spirit. He welcomes us into his new community, which consists of people of all races, nations and cultures. And he promises that one day we will enter his new world, in which evil will be abolished, nature will be redeemed, and God will reign forever.

This good news must be boldly proclaimed, wherever possible, in church and in public halls, on radio and television, and in the open air, because it is God's power for salvation and we are under obligation to make it known. In our preaching we must faithfully declare the truth which God has revealed in the Bible and struggle to relate it to our own context.

We also affirm that apologetics, namely "the defence and confirmation of the gospel", is integral to the biblical understanding of mission and essential for effective witness in the modern world. Paul "reasoned" with people out of the Scriptures, with a view to "persuading" them of the truth of the gospel. So must we. In fact, all Christians should be ready to give a reason for the hope that is in them.

We have again been confronted with Luke's emphasis that the gospel is good news for the poor and have asked ourselves what this means to the majority of the world's population who are destitute, suffering or oppressed. We have been reminded that the law, the prophets and the wisdom books, all the teaching and ministry of Jesus, all stress God's concern for the materially poor and our consequent duty to defend and care for them. Scripture also refers to the spiritually poor who look to God alone for mercy. The gospel comes as good news to both. The spiritually poor, who, whatever their economic circumstances, humble themselves before God, receive by faith the free gift of salvation. There is no other way for anybody to enter the Kingdom of God. The materially poor and powerless find in addition a new dignity as God's children, and the love of brothers and sisters who struggle with them for their liberation from everything which demeans or oppresses them.
We repent of any neglect of God's truth in Scripture and determine both to proclaim and to defend it. We also repent where we have been indifferent to the plight of the poor, and where we have shown preference for the rich, and we determine to follow Jesus in preaching good news to all people by both word and deed. (Eph. 22:4, Lk. 15; 19;10; Ac. 8:35; Mk. 1:14, 15; 2 Co. 5:21; Gal. 3:13; Ac. 2:23,24; 2 Co. 5:17; Ac. 2:38,39; Eph. 2:11-19; Rev. 21:1-5; 22:1-5; Eph. 6:19,20; 2 Ti. 4:2; Ro. 1:14-16; Jer. 23:28; Php. 1:7; Ac. 18:4; 19:8-9; 2 Co. 5:11; 1 Pe. 3:15; Lk. 4:18; 6:20; 7:22; Dt. 15:7-11; Am. 2:6,7; Zec. 7:8-10; Pr. 21:13; Zep. 3:12; Mt. 5:3; Mk. 10:15; 1 Jn. 3:1; Ac. 2:44,45; 4:32-35)

3. THE UNIQUENESS OF JESUS CHRIST

We are called to proclaim Christ in an increasingly pluralistic world. There is a resurgence of old faiths and a rise of new ones. In the first century too there were "many gods and many lords". Yet the apostles boldly affirmed the uniqueness, indispensability and centrality of Christ. We must do the same. Because men and women are made in God's image and see in the creation traces of its Creator, the religions which have arisen do sometimes contain elements of truth and beauty. They are not, however, alternative gospels. Because human beings are sinful, and because "the whole world is under the control of the evil one", even religious people are in need of Christ's redemption. We, therefore, have no warrant for saying that salvation can be found outside Christ or apart from an explicit acceptance of his work through faith. It is sometimes held that in virtue of God's covenant with Abraham, Jewish people do not need to acknowledge Jesus as their Messiah. We affirm that they need him as much as anyone else, that it would be a form of anti-Semitism, as well as being disloyal to Christ, to depart from the New Testament pattern of taking the gospel to "the Jew first...". We therefore reject the thesis that Jews have their own covenant which renders faith in Jesus unnecessary.

What unites us is our common convictions about Jesus Christ. We confess him as the eternal Son of God who became fully human while remaining fully divine, who was our substitute on the cross, bearing our sins and dying our death, exchanging his righteousness for our unrighteousness, who rose victorious in a transformed body, and who will return in glory to judge the world. He alone is the incarnate Son, the Saviour, the Lord and the Judge, and he alone, with the
Father and the Spirit, is worthy of worship, faith and obedience of all people. There is only one gospel because there is only one Christ, who because of his death and resurrection is himself the only way of salvation. We therefore reject both the relativism which regards all religions and spiritualities as equally valid approaches to God, and the syncretism which tries to mix faith in Christ with other faiths. Moreover, since God has exalted Jesus to the highest place, in order that everybody should acknowledge him, this also is our desire. Compelled by Christ's love, we must obey Christ's Great Commission and love his lost sheep, but we are especially motivated by "jealousy" for his holy name, and we long to see him receive the honour and glory which are due to him.

In the past we have sometimes been guilty of adopting towards adherents of other faiths attitudes of ignorance, arrogance, disrespect and even hostility. We repent of this. We nevertheless are determined to bear a positive and uncompromising witness to the uniqueness of our Lord, in his life, death and resurrection, in all aspects of our evangelistic work including inter-faith dialogue. (1 Co. 8:5; Ps. 19:1-6; Ro. 1:19,20; Ac. 17:28; 1 Jn. 5:19; Ac. 10:1,2; 11:14,18; 15:8-9; Jn. 14:6; Ge. 12:1-3; 17:1,2; Ro. 3:9; 10:12; Ac. 13:46; Ro. 1:16; 2:9,10; Ac. 13:38, 39; Jn. 1:1,14,18; Ro. 1:3,4; 1 Pe. 2:24; 1 Co. 15:3; 2 Co. 5:21; 1 Co. 15:1-11; Mt. 25:31,32; Ac. 17:30, 31; Rev. 5:11-14; Ac. 4:12; Php. 2:9-11; 2 Co. 5:14; Mt. 28:19,20; Jn. 10:11,16; 2 Co. 11:2,3, 1 Ti. 2:5-7)

4. THE GOSPEL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The authentic gospel must become visible in the transformed lives of men and women. As we proclaim the love of God we must be involved in loving service, as we preach the Kingdom of God we must be committed to its demands of justice and peace.

Evangelism is primary because our chief concern is with the gospel, that all people may have the opportunity to accept Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour. Yet Jesus not only proclaimed the Kingdom of God, he also demonstrated its arrival by works of mercy and power. We are called today to a similar integration of words and deeds. In a spirit of humility we are to preach and teach, minister to the sick, feed the hungry, care for prisoners, help the disadvantaged and handicapped, and deliver the oppressed. While we acknowledge the diversity of spiritual gifts, callings and contexts, we also affirm that good news and good works are inseparable.
The proclamation of God's kingdom necessarily demands the prophetic denunciation of all that is incompatible with it. Among the evils we deplore are destructive violence, including institutionalized violence, political corruption, all forms of exploitation of people and of the earth, the undermining of the family, abortion on demand, the drug traffic, and the abuse of human rights. In our concern for the poor, we are distressed by the burden of debt in the two-thirds world. We are also outraged by the inhuman conditions in which millions live, who bear God's image as we do.

Our continuing commitment to social action is not a confusion of the kingdom of God with a Christianized society. It is, rather, a recognition that the biblical gospel has inescapable social implications. True mission should always be incarnational. It necessitates entering humbly into other people's worlds, identifying with their social reality, their sorrow and suffering, and their struggles for justice against oppressive powers. This cannot be done without personal sacrifices.

We repent that the narrowness of our concerns and vision has often kept us from proclaiming the lordship of Jesus Christ over all of life, private and public, local and global. We determine to obey his command to "seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness". (1 Th. 1:6-10; 1 Jn. 3:17; Ro. 14:17; Ro. 10:14; Mt. 12:28; 1 Jn. 3:18; Mt. 25:34-46; Ac. 6:1-4; Ro. 12:4-8; Mt. 5:16, Jer. 22:1-5; 11-17; 23:5-6; Am. 1:1-2,8; Is. 59; Lev. 25; Job 24:1-12; Eph. 2:8-10; Jn. 17:18; 20:21; Php. 2:5-8; Ac. 10:36; Mt. 6:33)

B. THE WHOLE CHURCH

The whole gospel has to be proclaimed by the whole church. All the people of God are called to share in the evangelistic task. Yet without the Holy Spirit of God all their endeavors will be fruitless.

5. GOD THE EVANGELIST
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The Scriptures declare that God himself is the chief evangelist. For the Spirit of God is the Spirit of truth, love, holiness and power, and evangelism is impossible without him. It is he who anoints the messenger, confirms the word, prepares the hearer, convicts the sinful, enlightens the blind, gives life to the dead, enables us to repent and believe, unites us to
the Body of Christ, assures us that we are God's children, leads us into Christlike character and service, and sends us out in our turn to be Christ's witnesses. In all this the Holy Spirit's main preoccupation is to glorify Jesus Christ by showing him to us and forming him in us.

All evangelism involves spiritual warfare with the principalities and powers of evil, in which only spiritual weapons can prevail, especially the Word and the Spirit, with prayer. We therefore call on all Christian people to be diligent in their prayers both for the renewal of the church and for the evangelization of the world.

Every true conversion involves a power encounter, in which the superior authority of Jesus Christ is demonstrated. There is no greater miracle than this, in which the believer is set free from the bondage of Satan and sin, fear and futility, darkness and death.

Although the miracles of Jesus were special, being signs of his Messiahship and anticipations of his perfect kingdom when all nature will be subject to him, we have no liberty to place limits on the power of the living Creator today. We reject both the skepticism which denies miracles and the presumption which demands them, both the timidity which shrinks from the fullness of the Spirit and the triumphalism which shrinks from the weakness in which Christ's power is made perfect.

We repent of all self-confident attempts either to evangelize in our own strength or to dictate to the Holy Spirit. We determine in the future not to "grieve" or "quench" the Spirit, but rather to seek to spread the good news "with power, with the Holy Spirit and with deep conviction". (2 Co. 5:20; Jn. 15:26,27; Lk. 4:18; 1 Co. 2:4; Jn. 16:8-11; 1 Co. 12:3; Eph. 2:5; 1 Co. 12:13; Ro. 8:16; Gal. 5:22,23; Ac. 1:8; Jn. 16:14; Gal. 4:19; Eph. 6:10-12; 2 Co. 10:3-5; Eph. 6:17; Eph. 6:18-20; 2 Th. 3:1; Ac. 26:17,18; 1 Th. 1:9-10; Col. 1:13,14; Jn. 2:11; 20:30,31; Jn. 11:25; 1 Co. 15:20-28; Jer. 32:17; 2 Ti. 1:7; 2 Co. 12:9,10; Jer. 17:5; Eph. 4:30; 1 Th. 5:19; 1 Th. 1:5)

6. THE HUMAN WITNESS

God the evangelist gives his people the privilege of being his "fellow workers". For, although we cannot witness without him, he normally chooses to witness through us. He calls only some to be evangelists, missionaries or pastors, but he calls his whole church and every member of it to be his witnesses.
The privileged task of pastors and teachers is to lead God's people (laos) into maturity and to equip them for ministry. Pastors are not to monopolize ministries, but rather to multiply them, by encouraging others to use their gifts and by training disciples to make disciples. The domination of the laity by the clergy has been a great evil in the history of the church. It robs both laity and clergy of their God-intended roles, causes clergy breakdowns, weakens the church and hinders the spread of the gospel. More than that, it is fundamentally unbiblical. We therefore, who have for centuries insisted on "the priesthood of all believers" now also insist on the ministry of all believers.

We gratefully recognize that children and young people enrich the church's worship and outreach by their enthusiasm and faith. We need to train them in discipleship and evangelism, so that they may reach their own generation for Christ.

God created men and women as equal bearers of his image, accepts them equally in Christ and poured out his Spirit on all flesh, sons and daughters alike. In addition, because the Holy Spirit distributes his gifts to women as well as to men, they must be given opportunities to exercise their gifts. We celebrate their distinguished record in the history of missions and are convinced that God calls women to similar roles today. Even though we are not fully agreed what forms their leadership should take, we do agree about the partnership in world evangelization which God intends men and women to enjoy. Suitable training must therefore be made available to both.

Lay witness takes place, by women and men, not only through the local church (see Section 8), but through friendships, in the home and at work. Even those who are homeless or unemployed share in the calling to be witnesses.
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Our first responsibility is to witness to those who are already our friends, relatives, neighbors, and colleagues. Home evangelism is also natural, both for married and single people. Not only should a Christian home commend God's standards of marriage, sex and family, and provide a haven of love and peace to people who are hurting, but neighbors who would not enter a church usually feel comfortable in a home, even when the gospel is discussed.

Another context for lay witness is the workplace, for it is here most Christians spend half their waking hours, and work is a divine calling. Christians can commend Christ by word of mouth, by their consistent industry, honesty and
thoughtfulness, by their concern for justice in the workplace, and especially if others can see from the quality of their daily work that it is done to the glory of God.

We repent of our share in discouraging the ministry of laity, especially of women and young people. We determine in the future to encourage all Christ's followers to take their place, rightfully and naturally, as his witnesses. For true evangelism comes from the overflow of a heart in love with Christ. That is why it belongs to all his people without exception. (2 Co. 6:1; Ac. 8:26-39; 14:27; Eph. 4:11; Ac. 13:1-3; Ac. 1:8; 8:1,4; Co. 1:28; Eph. 4:11-12; Mt. 28:19; 2 Ti. 2:2; 1 Th. 5:12-15; 1 Co. 12:4-7; Eph. 4:7; Mt. 21:15,16; 1 Ti. 4:12; Ge. 1:26-27; Gal. 3:28; Ac. 2:17-18; 1 Pe. 4:10; Ro. 16:1-6,12; Php. 4:2,3; Mk. 5, 18-20; Lk. 5:27-32; Ac. 28:30,31; Ac. 10:24,33; 18:7, 8; 24-26;1 Co. 7:17-24; Tit. 2:9,10; Col. 4:1; Col. 3:17,23,24; Ac. 4:20)

7. THE INTEGRITY OF THE WITNESSES

Nothing commends the gospel more eloquently than a transformed life, and nothing brings it into disrepute so much as personal inconsistency. We are charged to behave in a manner that is worthy of the gospel of Christ, and even to "adorn" it, enhancing its beauty by holy lives. For the watching world rightly seeks evidence to substantiate the claims which Christ's disciples make for him. A strong evidence is our integrity.

Our proclamation that Christ died to bring us to God appeals to people who are spiritually thirsty, but they will not believe us if we give no evidence of knowing the living God ourselves, or if our public worship lacks reality and relevance.

Our message that Christ reconciles alienated people to each other rings true only if we are seen to love and forgive one another, to serve others in humility, and to reach out beyond our own community in compassionate, costly ministry to the needy.

Our challenge to others to deny themselves, take up their cross and follow Christ will be plausible only if we ourselves have evidently died to selfish ambition, dishonesty and covetousness, and are living a life of simplicity, contentment and generosity.

We deplore the failures in Christian consistency which we see in both Christians and churches: material greed, professional pride and rivalry, competition in Christian service, jealousy of younger leaders, missionary paternalism, the
lack of mutual accountability, the loss of Christian standards of sexuality, and racial, social and sexual discrimination. All this is worldliness, allowing the prevailing culture to subvert the church instead of the church challenging and changing the culture. We are deeply ashamed of the times when, both as individuals and in our Christian communities, we have affirmed Christ in word and denied him in deed. Our inconsistency deprives our witness of credibility. We acknowledge our continuing struggles and failures. But we also determine by God's grace to develop integrity in ourselves and in the church. (2 Co. 6:3,4; Php. 1:27; Tit. 2:10; Col. 4:5,6; Pr. 11:3; 1 Pe. 3:18; 1 Jn. 1:5,6; 1 Co. 14:25,26; Eph. 2:14-18; Eph. 4:31-5:2; Gal. 5:13; Lk. 10:29-37; Mk. 8:34; Mt. 6:19-21; 31-33; 1 Ti. 6:6-10,17,18; Ac. 5:1-11; Php. 1:15-17; 1 Co. 5:1-13; Jas. 2:1-4; 1 Jn. 2:15-17, Mt. 5:13; Mt. 7:21-23; 1 Jn. 2:4; Eph. 4:1)

8. THE LOCAL CHURCH

Every Christian congregation is a local expression of the Body of Christ and has the same responsibilities. It is both "a holy priesthood" to offer God the spiritual sacrifices of worship and "a holy nation" to spread abroad his excellences in witness. The church is thus both a worshipping and a witnessing community gathered and scattered, called and sent. Worship and witness are inseparable.

We believe that the local church bears a primary responsibility for the spread of the gospel. Scripture suggests this in the progression that "our gospel came to you" and then "rang out from you". In this way, the gospel creates the church which Lausanne Movement http://www.lausanne.org Generated: 16 February, 2009, 18:55 spreads the gospel which creates more churches in a continuous chain-reaction. Moreover, what Scripture teaches, strategy confirms. Each local church must evangelize the district in which it is situated, and has the resources to do so.

We recommend every congregation to carry out regular studies not only of its own membership and program but of its local community in all its particularity, in order to develop appropriate strategies for mission. Its members might decide to organize a visitation of their whole area, to penetrate for Christ a particular place where people assemble, to arrange a series of evangelistic meetings, lectures or concerts, to work with the poor to transform a local slum, or plant a new
church in a neighboring district or village. At the same time, they must not forget the church's global task. A church which sends out missionaries must not neglect its own locality, and a church which evangelizes its neighborhood must not ignore the rest of the world.

In all this each congregation and denomination should, where possible, work with others, seeking to turn any spirit of competition into one of cooperation. Churches should also work with para-church organizations, especially in evangelism, discipling and community service, for such agencies are part of the Body of Christ, and have valuable, specialist expertise from which the church can greatly benefit. The church is intended by God to be a sign of his kingdom, that is, an indication of what human community looks like when it comes under his rule of righteousness and peace. As with individuals, so with churches, the gospel has to be embodied if it is to be communicated effectively. It is through our love for one another that the invisible God reveals himself today, especially when our fellowship is expressed in small groups, and when it transcends the barriers of race, rank, sex and age which divide other communities.

We deeply regret that many of our congregations are inward-looking, organized for maintenance rather than mission, or preoccupied with church-based activities at the expense of witness. We determine to turn our churches inside out, so that they may engage in continuous outreach, until the Lord adds to them daily those who are being saved. (1 Co. 12:27; 1 Pe. 2:5,9; Jn. 17:6,9,11,18; Php. 2:14-16; 1 Th. 1:5,8; Ac. 19:9,10; Col. 1:3-8; Ac. 13:1-3; 14:26-28; Php. 1:27; Lk. 12:32; Ro. 14:17; 1 Th. 1:8-10; 1 Jn. 4:12; Jn. 13:34,35; 17:21,23Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:11; Ac. 2:47)

9. COOPERATING IN EVANGELISM

Evangelism and unity are closely related in the New Testament. Jesus prayed that his people's oneness might reflect his own oneness with the Father, in order that the world might believe in him, and Paul exhorted the Philippians to "contend as one person for the faith of the gospel". In contrast to this biblical vision, we are ashamed of the suspicions and rivalries, the dogmatism over non-essentials, the power-struggles and empire-building which spoil our evangelistic witness. We affirm that co-operation in evangelism is indispensable, first because it is the will of God, but also because
the gospel of reconciliation is discredited by our disunity, and because, if the task of world evangelization is ever to be accomplished, we must engage in it together.

"Cooperation" means finding unity in diversity. It involves people of different temperaments, gifts, calling and cultures, national churches and mission agencies, all ages and both sexes working together.

We are determined to put behind us once and for all, as a hangover from the colonial past, the simplistic distinction between First World sending and Two-Third World receiving countries. For the great new fact of our era is the internationalization of missions. Not only are a large majority of all evangelical Christians now non-western, but the number of Two-Thirds World missionaries will soon exceed those from the West. We believe that mission teams, which are diverse in composition but united in heart and mind, constitute a dramatic witness to the grace of God.

Our reference to "the whole church" is not a presumptuous claim that the universal church and the evangelical community are synonymous. For we recognize that there are many churches which are not part of the evangelical movement. Evangelical attitudes to the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches differ widely. Some evangelicals are praying, talking, studying Scripture and working with these churches. Others are strongly opposed to any form of dialogue or cooperation with them. All are aware that serious theological differences between us remain. Where appropriate, and so long as biblical truth is not compromised, cooperation may be possible in such areas as Bible translation, the study of contemporary theological and ethical issues, social work and political action. We wish to make it clear, however, that common evangelism demands a common commitment to the biblical gospel.
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Some of us are members of churches which belong to the World Council of Churches and believe that a positive yet critical participation in its work is our Christian duty. Others among us have no link with the World Council. All of us urge the World Council of Churches to adopt a consistent biblical understanding of evangelism.

We confess our own share of responsibility for the brokenness of the Body of Christ, which is a major stumbling-block to world evangelization. We determine to go on seeking that unity in truth for which Christ prayed. We are persuaded that the right way forward towards closer cooperation is frank and patient dialogue on the basis of the Bible, with all who
share our concerns. To this we gladly commit ourselves. (Jn. 17:20,21; Php. 1:27; Php. 1:15,17; 2:3,4; Ro. 14:1-15:2; Php. 1:3-5; Eph. 2:14-16; 4:1-6; Eph. 4:6,7; Ac. 20:4; Jn. 17:11, 20-23)

C. THE WHOLE WORLD

The whole gospel has been entrusted to the whole church, in order that it may be made known to the whole world. It is necessary, therefore, for us to understand the world into which we are sent. (Mk. 16:15)

10. THE MODERN WORLD

Evangelism takes place in a context, not in a vacuum. The balance between gospel and context must be carefully maintained. We must understand the context in order to address it, but the context must not be allowed to distort the gospel.

In this connection we have become concerned about the impact of "modernity", which is an emerging world culture produced by industrialization with its technology and urbanization with its economic order. These factors combine to create an environment, which significantly shapes the way in which we see our world. In addition, secularism has devastated faith by making God and the supernatural meaningless; urbanization has dehumanized life for many; and the mass media have contributed to the devaluation of truth and authority, by replacing word with image. In combination, these consequences of modernity pervert the message which many preach and undermine their motivation for mission.

In AD 1900 only 9% of the world's population lived in cities; in AD 2000 it is thought that more than 50% will do so. This worldwide move into the cities has been called "the greatest migration in human history"; it constitutes a major challenge to Christian mission. On the one hand, city populations are extremely cosmopolitan, so that the nations come to our doorstep in the city. Can we develop global churches in which the gospel abolishes the barriers of ethnicity? On the other hand, many city dwellers are migrant poor who are also receptive to the gospel. Can the people of God be persuaded to relocate into such urban poor communities, in order to serve the people and share in the transformation of the city?

Modernization brings blessings as well as dangers. By creating links of communication and commerce around the globe, it makes unprecedented openings for the gospel, crossing old frontiers and penetrating closed societies, whether
traditional or totalitarian. The Christian media have a powerful influence both in sowing the seed of the gospel and in preparing the soil. The major missionary broadcasters are committed to a gospel witness by radio in every major language by the year AD 2000.

We confess that we have not struggled as we should to understand modernization. We have used its methods and techniques uncritically and so exposed ourselves to worldliness. But we determine in the future to take these challenges and opportunities seriously, to resist the secular pressures of modernity, to relate the lordship of Christ to the whole of modern culture, and thus to engage in mission in the modern world without worldliness in modern mission. (Ac. 13:14-41; 14:14-17; 17:22-31; Ro. 12:1,2)

11. THE CHALLENGE OF AD 2000 AND BEYOND

The world population today is approaching 6 billion. One third of them nominally confess Christ. Of the remaining four billion half have heard of him and the other half have not. In the light of these figures, we evaluate our evangelistic task by considering four categories of people.

First, there is the potential missionary work force, the committed. In this century this category of Christian believers has grown from about 40 million in 1900 to about 500 million today, and at this moment is growing over twice as fast as any other major religious group.

Secondly, there are the uncommitted. They make a Christian profession (they have been baptized, attend church occasionally and even call themselves Christians), but the notion of a personal commitment to Christ is foreign to them. They are found in all churches throughout the world. They urgently need to be re-evangelized. Thirdly, there are the unevangelized. These are people who have a minimal knowledge of the gospel, but have had no valid opportunity to respond to it. They are probably within reach of Christian people if only these will go to the next street, road, village or town to find them.

Fourthly, there are the unreached. These are the two billion who may never have heard of Jesus as Savior, and are not within reach of Christians of their own people. There are, in fact, some 2,000 peoples or nationalities in which there is not
yet a vital, indigenous church movement. We find it helpful to think of them as belonging to smaller "people groups" which perceive themselves as having an affinity with each other (e.g. a common culture, language, home or occupation). The most effective messengers to reach them will be those believers who already belong to their culture and know their language. Otherwise, cross-cultural messengers of the gospel will need to go, leaving behind their own culture and sacrificially identifying with the people they long to reach for Christ.

There are now about 12,000 such unreached people groups within the 2,000 larger peoples, so that the task is not impossible. Yet at present only 7% of all missionaries are engaged in this kind of outreach, while the remaining 93% are working in the already evangelized half of the world. If this imbalance is to be redressed, a strategic redeployment of personnel will be necessary.

A distressing factor that affects each of the above categories is that of inaccessibility. Many countries do not grant visas to self-styled missionaries, who have no other qualification or contribution to offer. Such areas are not absolutely inaccessible, however. For our prayers can pass through every curtain, door and barrier. And Christian radio and television, audio and video cassettes, films and literature can also reach the otherwise unreachable. So can so-called "tent-makers" who like Paul earn their own living. They travel in the course of their profession (e.g. business people, university lecturers, technical specialists and language teachers), and use every opportunity to speak of Jesus Christ. They do not enter a country under false pretenses, for their work genuinely takes them there; it is simply that witness is an essential component of their Christian lifestyle, wherever they may happen to be.

We are deeply ashamed that nearly two millennia have passed since the death and resurrection of Jesus, and still two-thirds of the world's population have not yet acknowledged him. On the other hand, we are amazed at the mounting evidence of God's power even in the most unlikely places of the globe.

Now the year 2000 has become for many a challenging milestone. Can we commit ourselves to evangelize the world during the last decade of this millennium? There is nothing magical about the date, yet should we not do our best to reach this goal? Christ commands us to take the gospel to all peoples. The task is urgent. We are determined to obey him with joy and hope. (Ac. 18:1-4; 20:34; Lk. 24:45-47)
12. DIFFICULT SITUATIONS

Jesus plainly told his followers to expect opposition. "If they persecuted me", he said, "they will persecute you also". He even told them to rejoice over persecution, and reminded them that the condition of fruitfulness was death. These predictions, that Christian suffering is inevitable and productive, have come true in every age, including our own. There have been many thousands of martyrs. Today the situation is much the same. We earnestly hope that glasnost and perestroika will lead to complete religious freedom in the Soviet Union and other Eastern bloc nations, and that Islamic and Hindu countries will become more open to the gospel. We deplore the recent brutal suppression of China's democratic movement, and we pray that it will not bring further suffering to the Christians. On the whole, however, it seems that ancient religions are becoming less tolerant, expatriates less welcome, and the world less friendly to the gospel.

In this situation we wish to make three statements to governments which are reconsidering their attitude to Christian believers.
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First, Christians are loyal citizens, who seek the welfare of their nation. They pray for its leaders, and pay their taxes. Of course, those who have confessed Jesus as Lord cannot also call other authorities Lord, and if commanded to do so, or to do anything which God forbids, must disobey. But they are conscientious citizens. They also contribute to their country's well-being by the stability of their marriages and their homes, their honesty in business, their hard work and their voluntary activity in the service of the handicapped and needy. Just governments have nothing to fear from Christians.

Secondly, Christians renounce unworthy methods of evangelism. Though the nature of our faith requires us to share the gospel with others, our practice is to make an open and honest statement of it, which leaves the hearers entirely free to make up their own minds about it. We wish to be sensitive to those of other faiths, and we reject any approach that seeks to force conversion on them.

Thirdly, Christians earnestly desire freedom of religion for all people, not just freedom for Christianity. In predominantly Christian countries, Christians are at the forefront of those who demand freedom for religious minorities. In predominantly
non-Christian countries, therefore, Christians are asking for themselves no more than they demand for others in similar circumstances. The freedom to "profess, practice and propagate" religion, as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, could and should surely be a reciprocally granted right.

We greatly regret any unworthy witness of which followers of Jesus may have been guilty. We determine to give no unnecessary offence in anything, lest the name of Christ be dishonored. However, the offence of the cross we cannot avoid. For the sake of Christ crucified we pray that we may be ready, by his grace, to suffer and even to die. Martyrdom is a form of witness which Christ has promised especially to honor. (Jn. 15:20; Mt. 5:12; Jn. 12:24; Jer. 29:7; 1 Ti. 2:1,2; Ro. 13:6,7; Ac. 4:19; 5:29; 2 Co. 4:1,2; 2 Co. 6:3; 1 Co. 1:18,23; 2:2; Php. 1:29; Rev. 2:13; 6:9-11; 20:4)

CONCLUSION: PROCLAIM CHRIST UNTIL HE COMES

"Proclaim Christ until he comes". That has been the theme of Lausanne II. Of course we believe that Christ has come; he came when Augustus was Emperor of Rome. But one day, as we know from his promises, he will come again in unimaginable splendor to perfect his kingdom. We are commanded to watch and be ready. Meanwhile, the gap between his two comings is to be filled with the Christian missionary enterprise. We have been told to go to the ends of the earth with the gospel, and we have been promised that the end of the age will come only when we have done so. The two ends (of earth space and time) will coincide. Until then he has pledged to be with us.

So the Christian mission is an urgent task. We do not know how long we have. We certainly have no time to waste. And in order to get on urgently with our responsibility, other qualities will be necessary, especially unity (we must evangelize together) and sacrifice (we must count and accept the cost). Our covenant at Lausanne was "to pray, to plan and to work together for the evangelization of the whole world". Our manifesto at Manila is that the whole church is called to take the whole gospel to the whole world, proclaiming Christ until he comes, with all necessary urgency, unity and sacrifice. (Lk. 2:1-7; Mk. 13:26,27; Mk. 13:32-37; Ac. 1:8; Mt. 24:14; Mt. 28:20)
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ADDENDUM G

Addendum G provides access to the transcripts of oral interviews that have been used in the preceding dissertation.

http://www.sebts.edu/CGCS/Projects/Oral_History.cfm (Eitel)

http://www.sebts.edu/CGCS/Projects/Oral_History.cfm (Hesselgrave)

http://www.sebts.edu/CGCS/Projects/Oral_History.cfm (Steele)

http://www.sebts.edu/CGCS/Projects/Oral_History.cfm (Parks)

http://www.sebts.edu/CGCS/Projects/Oral_History.cfm (Tuggy)

http://www.sebts.edu/CGCS/Projects/Oral_History.cfm (Johnson)

http://www.sebts.edu/CGCS/Projects/Oral_History.cfm (Fernandez)

http://www.sebts.edu/CGCS/Projects/Oral_History.cfm (Steffen)

http://www.sebts.edu/CGCS/Projects/Oral_History.cfm (Nussbaum/O’Rear)
Several evangelical leaders like Dr. Jim Montgomery and Dr. Stan Nussbaum as well as several evangelical mission agencies, including Youth With A Mission and the International Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, refer to Lausanne 1974 as a turning point or watershed event in modern missions history.

1. Do you agree that Lausanne 1974 was a turning point or watershed event?
Generally I would agree with this statement, realizing that one needs to explain the details as to what the watershed or turning point actually is defined to be. In other words, were there decisions made, actions taken, or people motivated to do something different in missions that the way/s they were done before? Then one can demonstrate that it was a turning FROM one set of things TO a new set of thing.

2. If so, Why? What was it about Lausanne 1974 that made it so important?
Likely the two most significant themes were the establishment of the Lausanne Covenant, which may well be the first global definition of evangelical theology and practice attempted. I can’t think of any that preceded that that were substantive. Of course John R. W. Stott was the mastermind behind development of the covenant. It largely reflects his theological convictions yet he wove together the themes and convictions of those from the global evangelical church. Secondly, and perhaps most significantly for the changes in the way missions are done, is the development of the concept of Unreached Peoples. I say development instead of introduction of this concept because actually Donald McGavran introduced the concept in another form, calling them hidden peoples at the World Council of Churches gathering in Uppsala in the 1960’s. But Ralph Winter developed the concept to the level of a missiological strategic need and did so leaving the hearers with a sense of urgency. The impact of that urgent call is still being felt into this century.
3. How did Lausanne 1974 impact the global church?
Ralph Winter described in “The Twenty-Five Unbelievable Years, 1945-1969”, Pasadena: William Carey Library, 1970, the first phase of the post-WWII era and its accomplishments. A corollary book is by Winston Crawley, World Christianity: 1970-2000”, Pasadena: William Carey Library, 2001. It brings things up to date at the turn of the past century. Both books line out the atmosphere in which change was occurring when the ’74 Lausanne conference took place. It started in motion the change in perception of how we needed to focus on the unreached zones, peoples of the earth to bring closure to the Great Commission task. So there has been radical re-thinking restructuring of missions, organizations, and even local church engagement in the aftermath.

4. How did it impact mission agencies and organizations?
See number 3 above.

5. How has Lausanne 1974 impacted your ministry?
I suppose I’m part of the flow of this change. My missiology training took place (experientially on the field) in the late 70’s when folk were a buzz with the excitement generated by Lausanne, then my formal training took place mostly in the 80’s at Trinity when some of the dangers, especially of theological contextualization issues, began to surface, so I’ve become convinced we need to engage the ends of the earth, but do so with biblical caution tied to an inerrant text.

6. Some evangelical leaders say that Lausanne 1974 changed the direction of or gave new direction to many mission agencies and organizations. Do you agree? Generally, but let’s not overstate it, Lausanne was a motivating impetus for change but it alone didn’t foster the change. Folk had to hear the message of Lausanne & implement the change.

7. If so, was there one primary speaker, act, or event that contributed to this redirection?
Most associate Ralph Winter with the major contribution for this change. But I think that John R. W. Stott was essential in that he guided the panel of theologians that wrote the Lausanne Covenant and held it truer to the Scripture than it likely would have otherwise drifted.
8. What impact have mission agencies and organizations had on the global church?

They’ve engaged their respective horizons & others have been birthed to address the challenge of these new zones e.g. Pioneers, Frontiers, etc.

9. Based on your understanding of and/or your relationship to DAWN Ministries, how do you think Lausanne 1974 impacted DAWN?

Not sure specifically.

10. What impact has DAWN Ministries had on the global church? Please explain your answer.

The key contribution DAWN has made is to stimulate thinking about what’s left to be done in any given country to impact all of the unevangelized areas of each country.

Thank you for your time in answering these questions. Your answers will be incorporated into my dissertation for the University of South Africa.