

THE LAUSANNE MOVEMENT AND THE WORLD EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE

Rose Dowsett

The First Bridges across Evangelical Divides

In 1846, 900 delegates, from 52 'bodies of Christians' and drawn from eleven countries, met in London, England. For thirteen days they prayed and discussed, grappling with complex issues, but with the overwhelming desire to find a way to express the unity in Christ that they believed to be more fundamental than their differences.¹

Their meeting was the culmination of several years of correspondence and meetings, of small initiatives but far larger dreams. The great evangelical revivals and awakenings of the eighteenth century, on either side of the Atlantic, had produced under God's good hand huge energy for the Gospel. Yet, paradoxically, with the new century two completely opposite phenomena became apparent. On the one hand, Protestant Christianity was fracturing at an alarming rate, with more and more denominations and groups being formed, often acrimoniously. On the other hand, there was a growing swell of desire to find ways to work together in unity. Surely brothers and sisters in Christ ought to be able to bridge denominational distinctives, preferences and convictions, and to live out the profound reality of being one Body in the Lord?

Many of those distinctives and convictions were by no means trivial, and many Christians bore scars from painful separation from a former church. To be in reconciled fellowship across divisions was often costly. In particular, there were literal and historical war wounds dividing 'churchmen' (those of state churches, usually Episcopal in structure, though some state churches were Presbyterian or Reformed) and 'Dissenters' (in turn to be known as Free Church, those who followed the Anabaptist tradition, and who were independent of state ties). Such wounds of body, mind and heart went deep, and were not easily healed.

¹ The story of the founding of the World Evangelical Alliance may be found in numerous volumes, among them Ian Randall and David Hillborn, *One Body in Christ: The History and Significance of the Evangelical Alliance* (Paternoster, 2001); W. Harold Fuller, *People of the Mandate: the story of the World Evangelical*

Yet, by the end of their time together, those 900 delegates had agreed on a doctrinal statement of shared evangelical faith, drawn up a series of practical resolutions about how to conduct relationships across denominations,² established commonality and mutual love and respect, inaugurated three national Evangelical Alliances with eight more following within a few short years, and determined to foster ongoing friendship and meeting together.

Challenges and Advances

Sadly, the hoped-for world structure foundered not over doctrinal differences but over disagreement over the issue of slavery. The North American contingent were themselves opposed to owning slaves, but were not willing to turn their backs on believers in the southern States who ran their plantations with slave labour, at a time of delicate negotiations. In 1884, once again it was the Americans who blocked the establishing of an international committee, this time on the grounds that small Alliances should not have power to influence their own American decisions. History would repeat itself once more, in 1951, at the birth of the World Evangelical Fellowship, when the American delegation once again were not able to become fully identified, this time over the failure to include the term 'infallible' in relation to Scripture. This history probably lies behind the rather chequered profile of the Evangelical Alliance in the USA and, sadly, a certain level of suspicion relating to the WEA.

Nonetheless, following 1846 a fully functioning network of national alliances kept in close touch with one another, and met every few years for extensive international consultations. (Here, America played a fuller part, at least till the 1890s, for instance attending conferences in Europe, and in 1873 hosting the sixth general conference, held in New York.) In this, the networking and conferences established the practice we take for granted today that Christians of different cultures and denominations can work together in close harmony in common cause. It is impossible to express too strongly what a remarkable achievement this was, overcoming historic and theological divisions.

It is also important to note that many of the international consultations were deeply exercised by the need to engage in world mission as well as local mission, and the national alliances were fully involved. This was fostered by the international conferences meeting in different countries each year or two, but also by contributing strongly to the international mission conferences in 1878, 1888 and 1900 as expressions of evangelical co-operation. Further, the European countries where the national EAs were at their strongest were also countries with Empire and colonial links to

² The full text of the Basis of Faith and of the Practical Resolutions may be found in Randall and Hilborn, 358-365.

much of the unevangelised world. Whatever the ambiguities of imperialism, Christians in those European countries often had a strong interest in what was happening around the world, and contributed hugely to world mission.

It is arguable that without the proven track record of national evangelical alliances, and their international co-operation through the informal links of the World Evangelical Alliance, long before the formal establishment of the World Evangelical Fellowship (WEF) in 1951, the Lausanne Movement could not have been born. Nor for that matter would many of the great interdenominational mission agencies of the mid-nineteenth century onwards have been possible.³ Lausanne built on a century of evangelical interdenominationalism and international relationships pioneered and modeled by WEA.

The Establishing of WEF with International Structures

The years following the Second World War saw many global bodies formed, both because of increasing globalization and also because the appalling experiences of the two world wars had convinced many people that only commitment to global structures could prevent further massive wars. So in 1945 the United Nations was established, in 1947 the International Fellowship of Evangelical Students,⁴ in 1948 the World Council of Churches, and in 1951 the World Evangelical Fellowship (the latter following renewed consultation from 1946 onwards). While the UN was concerned primarily with political affairs, the three Christian bodies were all in different ways seeking to bring together Christian people from different parts of the world, in shared understanding and shared enterprise.

This was not entirely without precedent, not only because of the history of the national evangelical alliances, but also because of the great Missionary Conference held in Edinburgh in 1910.⁵ Many of the delegates there were active in their respective national evangelical alliances as well as in their own denominations, or mirrored EA principles in working together with those of other denominations or agencies in their mission fields. For

³ In particular, the Faith Missions which began in the nineteenth century, such as the China Inland Mission, drew together evangelicals from across various denominations, in shared mission enterprise. This was distinct from the denominational mission agencies, and allowed for more flexible ecclesiology when pioneering. This model of mission agency has been a strong contributor to the Lausanne Movement.

⁴ The IFES has produced many leaders both for EAs and for Lausanne. The story of IFES is found in Douglas Johnson *A Brief History of the International Fellowship of Evangelical Students* (IFES, 1964) and Lindsay Brown *Shining Like Stars* (IVP, 2006).

⁵ For a full study of the Edinburgh 1910 conference, see Brian Stanley *The World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910* (Eerdmans, 2009).

instance, in the great mission field of China, the leaders of many agencies, denominational and interdenominational, had for years met annually to agree patterns of working and to deal with problems. Edinburgh 1910 was concerned to see mature churches all over the world, and the Gospel taken to every corner of the globe. Further, the Edinburgh delegates believed that the world could only be evangelized if Christians worked together in harmony and united purpose. Again, it is hard to see how this way of looking at things could have been taken for granted had it not been for the pattern demonstrated through the WEA.

Two world wars smashed much of the optimism (and arguably, wrong triumphalism) of Edinburgh 1910, and post-war initiatives were both more cautious and more realistic. Nonetheless, evangelicals worked hard at reconciliation with those from countries with whom so recently their own nations had been at war, and there were fresh commitments to world mission from both Europe and North America. At the same time and understandably, European national EAs were often fully occupied in contributing to the reconstruction of their own countries so devastated by war. Some of the formerly active alliances, both in Europe and in Asia, disappeared (or at least went underground) under the iron fist of Communism.

In 1951, more than 90 delegates from 21 countries and national EAs gathered in Holland, and informal fellowship moved on into a global administrative body, the World Evangelical Fellowship (later named the World Evangelical Alliance). They adopted a Statement of Faith closely based on that of 1846, and defined WEF's purpose as threefold: (a) the furtherance of the Gospel (Phil 1:12); (b) the defence and confirmation of the Gospel (Phil 1:7); and (c) fellowship in the Gospel (Phil 1:5). Since 1861, the national EAs together had held an annual week of prayer, not only linking themselves but also focusing on the whole world and its needs, so that world mission was always a strong element of the alliances' commitment.

Among the delegates were Jack Dain, later Bishop, and the young Anglican minister John Stott, both of whom were deeply involved in their national EA, and who later – especially John Stott – would also be key to the Lausanne Movement. Stott said later that the meeting in Holland was his first experience of worldwide evangelicalism, to which he would go on to contribute so much in his lifetime. It was also through WEF and the British EA that his friendship with Billy Graham would blossom, when Graham was invited through EA (on whose Council Stott served) to conduct a mission in London in 1954.

From the beginning, it was understood that WEF's structures would be 'light touch', serving to support and develop national EAs and then regional groupings of EAs, not seeking to set the agenda for them or to be strongly directive. With a small budget, and very small staff team, WEF/WEA has not always had high visibility, preferring that that role

should be taken primarily by national EAs, each working in their different religious, ecclesiastical, cultural and historical contexts. This has not always been understood or appreciated by those more accustomed to equating effectiveness with high budgets, uniformity, and dominant leadership. Nonetheless, with some 130 national and regional alliances today, representing some 600 million Christians worldwide, there are frequently times when the international leadership of WEA has been able to speak to global issues, or to governments where Christians are oppressed, for instance, in a way not so effective when done by an individual EA or a single denomination. There have also been times when lack of funds, or a clear sense of distinct purpose, has left WEA with a weaker voice than it should have.

The Birth of Lausanne

The initiative for the international consultation in Lausanne in 1974 came from the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, but the planning committee included several who were leaders in, or active in, their national EA. The Executive Chairman was Bishop Jack Dain from Australia, who in 1951 had been a founding member of WEF and who was still closely involved. The specific purpose of the gathering, to which 2,400 delegates from 150 countries came as well as about 1,300 observers, guests and journalists, was to consider world evangelization: what remained to be done and how to do it. This echoed Edinburgh 1910, but in a different world context after sixty turbulent years. The church had been birthed in many places where there had been no known Gospel witness in 1910, and the church was indeed more truly global than ever before. God had done marvellous things! But there were still too many places where Christ remained unknown.

What in retrospect came to be known as Lausanne I undoubtedly brought fresh impetus to world mission. That story has been frequently told elsewhere, and deservedly so. It was probably the first time that some leaders from the global south had had the opportunity of speaking so clearly and with authority into a community still dominated by northerners and westerners.⁶ It demonstrated that the 'young churches' of the global south had come of age, and indeed were often more vigorous than many of the older churches of the north and west. It introduced some very different ways of thinking about the unevangelised world, focusing on people groups rather than nations or sharply demarcated geographic areas.⁷ It produced the *Lausanne Covenant*, a document which takes its place among the great

⁶ Especially influential were the contributions of Samuel Escobar and René Padilla, both Latin Americans with an IFES background. There were other delegates, too, who were leaders in IFES movements, many of them invited to Lausanne by John Stott who by now had a significant worldwide ministry among IFES movements.

⁷ Significantly through the input of North American Reuben Winter

statements of the church down through the centuries. It remains to this day a formative event for much of the world church, and impacted generations of mission leaders.

There is however another side to the story that is not so well acknowledged, perhaps symbolized by the fact that 400 of the 2,400 official delegates chose not to sign or affirm the Covenant. There was a deep-seated disagreement over the nature of mission, and the adequacy or otherwise of evangelism more narrowly defined. Some of the tensions WEF had already struggled with over the generations were inevitably present in this new context too. There were different assumptions about the role of the churches, and of relating to already established ministries in any given context. And there was disagreement about creating a new global structure following on from the consultation.⁸

In 1974, Billy Graham was at the height of his ministry. His passion was evangelism, and God gifted him for that. Only the Lord knows how many men, women and children came to faith through Graham's preaching. That is beyond dispute. But Graham was heavily dependent on being invited to a place, and having national churches fully involved in every part of a campaign. He did not pioneer into a vacuum. Almost always it was the national EA that acted as catalyst, both for the invitation and then for all the practicalities of making the campaign work. Graham's role was one part of a much bigger picture and process, not just practically but also in terms of a much more complex praxis of evangelism. Further, in the greatest majority of cases, Graham was preaching in a context where there was a significant Christian history, so that a simple revivalist style of evangelism was effective and appropriate, and the local churches – usually co-ordinated by the EA – could follow through on discipling those who professed faith or who indicated some level of interest. Graham's understanding of what evangelism is, and how to set about it, did not seem to grasp fully that in fact there were many crucial ingredients beyond a simple conversionist message. There were many at Lausanne I who saw evangelism in similar terms: proclamation (and at that, proclamation that was simply a transposition of the message and style that was used in the west), looking for a decision for Christ, and anything else being a distraction from the essential business, or, even worse, a sell-out to liberalism with its socio-political concerns.

The problem was that equally many understood evangelism rather differently. In his opening address, John Stott, himself a greatly gifted evangelist, insisted that making disciples cannot be separated from loving one's neighbor: the two are intertwined, and the Great Commission and Great Commandment belong together. The appeal of the Gospel by proclamation must be complemented by the appeal of the Gospel through

loving service, and concern for the whole person in his whole context. Words alone lacked credibility, and true conversion to God must involve transformation of life in all dimensions. The Gospel is more comprehensive and more radical than urging a person to seek personal salvation.

Simplistic evangelism does not produce deep-level conversion or radical disciples, nor does it lead to a demonstration of the Kingdom – reign – of God. Many of the Lausanne delegates knew that superficial evangelism had left them with shallow churches and shallow Christians, more in tune with their culture than with God. In fact, that was a problem for the west quite as much as for the rest of the world, but was often masked by the impact of centuries of Christendom.

For many of the Latin Americans, evangelism divorced from seeking justice and changed lives for the poor and hungry, for instance, was a parody of what the good news in Christ is all about. Further, while highly individualistic western cultures saw evangelism as focusing on individuals, with rather less attention to the communal life of the Christian community, the church (or indeed of family and community dynamics), those with a stronger ecclesiology or from the more communal cultures of the global south could not separate authentic evangelism from the corporate life of believers. Equally, evangelism needed to be addressed to groups – families, communities according to structures in context – not just to individuals. Lastly, those from the context of another world faith, or from the increasingly post-Christian parts of the west, knew that evangelism must much more patiently lay deeper foundations before making an appeal. This longer task depended on the church, where it was established, and long-term commitment from expatriate missionaries where it was not.

The *Lausanne Covenant* sought to capture these major concerns, and expressed the essential partnership between evangelism by proclamation and social action, amongst other statements. In theory, the Lausanne Movement ever since has been committed to holistic or integral mission, as it came to be called. The *Lausanne Covenant*, the *Manila Manifesto*, and the *Cape Town Commitment*, all 'official position documents' of the Lausanne Movement, all state clearly the commitment to a holistic understanding of evangelism and mission. Nonetheless, in practice there remain many within its ranks who still hold fast to a narrower agenda for evangelism, and for whom the primary concern is ensuring that everyone 'hears the Gospel once' in the shortest possible time, and with limited focus on the more complex task of seeing strong, mature churches established, an abiding concern of WEA.

Two Global Evangelical Organizations or One?

The other major area of disagreement before and after Lausanne was over whether or not to establish another global organization in addition to the WEF. Many people, including John Stott and Jack Dain, pleaded that there

⁸ See chapter 7, 'World Evangelization: The Lausanne Vision', in Timothy Dudley-Smith, *John Stott: A Global Ministry* (IVP, 2001)

should not be another evangelical global structure, and WEF made a formal plea to the same effect. The WEF leadership, and leaders of national EAs, were willing to take forward the agenda from Lausanne, and indeed many of the delegates were already active in their EAs. However, there was pressure from some to establish a new entity, perhaps because of some of the differing views suggested above, and perhaps because some came from cultures where multiple competing organizations was simply an expression of entrepreneurship and perfectly acceptable. Billy Graham was in favour of a new organization, with the sole focus of evangelism. In the event, a Continuation Committee was established, a form of compromise; but in the way of such groups, it was not long before the committee set up to facilitate certain gatherings gained a complete life of its own, and became the separate organization with which we are familiar today.

There have been several occasions since when a merger between Lausanne and WEA has been sought, and to the end of his long life Stott continued to pray for a closer relationship, if not merger, between the two organizations. As for many, separateness seemed to him to be a denial of unity as it should be expressed between evangelicals. So, for instance, with Stott's encouragement, WEF in 1980 made a formal appeal to Lausanne for a merger. The irony has been that many of those who have served Lausanne over the years have also been EA people, and that Lausanne continues to be heavily dependent on leaders and networks fostered through EAs, and frequently overlaps with WEA ministries, including the WEA Commissions. In 2011 there was a request that one of Lausanne's working groups should integrate with a parallel Commission of WEA, but the request was turned down by Lausanne leaders.

The practical relationship between Lausanne and WEA has differed at different periods and in different places. For instance, in several northern European countries, there is simply one body, the national manifestation of the Mission Commission of the WEA, and no differentiation as to whether a person is involved in a theoretically Lausanne project or a WEA one, while in some countries it seems that the profile of the two organizations is much more distinct. Most Associates of the WEA Mission Commission and a high proportion of those who have attended recent conferences of the Mission Commission, were also present at the Cape Town Congress, and many were involved in some of the preparatory consultations and activities. The Theology Working Group of Lausanne has had a long history of quietly incorporating serving members of both the WEA Mission Commission and the WEA Theological Commission. This practice was established by John Stott, who initially chaired the Lausanne group. It was wisely and graciously continued under the chairmanship of Chris Wright. This combined group met several times preparing a theological framework leading up to the Congress in Cape Town, and issuing a document expounding the *Lausanne Covenant's* phrase: 'The Whole Church Taking the Whole Gospel to the Whole World'. In addition, the team of eight

tasked with drawing up the *Cape Town Commitment*, again under the leadership of Chris Wright, were almost all men and women active in both Lausanne and WEA, including their national EA movements, and WEA's Mission and Theological Commissions.

It was widely stated that the Cape Town Congress would be a partnership between Lausanne and WEA. In some ways it was, in some ways it wasn't. There was undoubtedly a warm friendship between many leaders of both organizations, including the respective chief Executives. As described above, there was wide overlap between people operating happily under both Lausanne and WEA umbrellas. All the same, 'WEA' appeared on publicity only after repeated requests and some protests, and then usually in small letters somewhere on the document. There was no agreed protocol drawn up between the organizations, and little consultation over key decisions and little invitation to WEA structures to be involved. The WEA Mission Commission was invited to present a plenary, and then after considerable work found almost by accident that the invitation had been extended to someone else instead. Perhaps different parts of the necessarily complex Lausanne planning structure were not entirely co-ordinated, but it led to some unhappy results. At the Congress, the name 'Lausanne' was referred to frequently from every platform, but WEA was rarely mentioned. Few delegates understood that this was intended to be a partnership. It was even only after considerable negotiation that WEA was allowed to have a stall in the concourse.

Perhaps it would be more godly to say that neither organization should be in the business of raising profile in any kind of competitive way. Nobody should be empire-building; the Kingdom of God is far more crucial than any organization. Yet it seemed to many delegates that a great opportunity had been missed to model a far more robust kind of partnership, and in particular an equal partnership that did not depend on equal finances (a huge issue in developing healthy partnerships in the mission world, especially between global north and south). Others concluded that since Lausanne leaders had raised most of the enormous cost of the project, and employed a large team to deliver it all (with huge efficiency and brilliance, it should be said), they should be entitled to quietly sideline WEA whose resources are of a very different order. Some concluded that some major donors have reservations about WEA. Others thought there were doctrinal politics at work. Perhaps there were as many conclusions, true and false, as there were delegates, but it was sad that an opportunity that probably will not come again, and certainly not for a generation, did not fulfil its potential to live out the deepest kind of evangelical unity. Will the Lord hold us all responsible?

Where Do We Go Next?

What of the future? Lausanne has an ambitious range of plans for the next decade at least. The Continuation Committee of 1974 has morphed into a complex organizational structure with worldwide involvement, though still (many would say) observably western in culture. Many of its working groups and networks will provide valuable resources and consultations. The commitment and integrity of its senior leadership is beyond question.

There remain some questions. Is it really right to have such duplication in many areas that we continue to find ourselves with? Many of the current Lausanne working groups and networks, and the consultations they plan, duplicate the WEA Commissions and working groups that have been steadily at work for decades. Is there not an element of 'I belong to Apollos, I belong to Paul' about all this, which the apostle so roundly condemned? What does this say to the watching world? That evangelicals are incapable of working together? Duplication is also financially draining. Many Christian agencies, including some national EAs, found that the Cape Town Congress, together with the complicated processes leading up to it, diverted scarce resources from other ministries, sometimes with devastating effect.

It is undoubtedly sometimes easier to bypass the churches and 'do our own thing' in mission. That doesn't make it right. How will the good work that Lausanne does through its groups and networks be accountable to, and serve, the churches? WEA's structures seek to stimulate local churches and denominations to engage in every dimension of mission, discipleship and holistic Christian witness locally, nationally and globally. Strengthening Gospel churches to fulfil their God-given calling, including evangelism, in other words full-orbed disciple-making and forming, seems a fundamental New Testament pattern.

This is all the more urgent now that in the goodness of God there are indeed Gospel churches all over the world, and ongoing expatriate missionary work needs increasingly to work alongside and under national leadership rather than engaging in independent initiatives. Even where the churches are not evangelical, and especially where they have maintained a Christian witness for centuries, even under persecution, we need to work hard at building relationships, in humility. 'The whole church' of Lausanne's slogan comprises more than evangelicals, as Lausanne's own documents testify. It takes patience to mobilise local congregations, but it is crucial in God's economy, not least to conserve those who make professions of faith and to develop them as lifelong disciples. This does not by any means rule out the role of agencies and individuals, but it does set that role in a biblical context.

The WEA, through its Mission Commission, has for a long time supported the new mission movements of the global south and of Eastern Europe. Sometimes Mission Commission staff and Associates have served as midwives, facilitating the birth of such movements and assisting them in

getting established. This is a huge contribution to ongoing world evangelization, representing new energy and vision, but also enabling easier entry into pioneer situations where westerners may no longer be welcome. In many instances, the new mission movements are more fully integrated into the churches than was the pattern often set by agencies in the past. Also, WEA's pattern of light-touch structure, and the considerable measure of freedom of each national alliance (apart from subscribing to a shared Basis of Faith), means that it is simple for local alliances and mission movements to emerge which are financially and culturally contextualized and viable. This respects diversity and indigeneity, both essential for long-term health, and for sustained and sustainable involvement in cross-cultural mission.

In his brief speech of greetings at the start of the Cape Town Congress, Geoff Tunnicliffe referred to some of the unprecedented challenges facing today's world – and the church within it – and then went on to say: "Our commitment to seeking to fulfil God's purposes demands greater levels of partnership between all of us than ever before: between North and South, as well as between South and North and North and North. Our God, and the needs of our world, demand a deeper humility and deeper commitment to being God's agents of reconciliation and justice together, in a broken and oftentimes harsh world."

Since the Lausanne III (Cape Town) Congress, WEA senior staff and Lausanne senior staff have made a mutual commitment to some simple guidelines designed to strengthen global Gospel and Kingdom efforts, and to help avoid misunderstandings or duplication.⁹ The WEA remains very committed to doing all in its power to foster evangelical unity. It is to be hoped that those guidelines will be adopted throughout both organizations, and indeed that partnership will be strengthened and duplication avoided.

Our Shared Goal

The WEA's founding purpose, implicit from 1846 and explicitly stated and adopted in 1951, is the furtherance of the Gospel, the defence and confirmation of the Gospel, and fellowship in the Gospel, in the context of the whole world and the worldwide church. Lausanne's purpose is expressed as 'the Whole Gospel, from the Whole Church, to the Whole World'. It is hard to see how these differ from one another in any meaningful way. Both organizations draw together those with shared doctrinal convictions in all primary matters, and with freedom for diversity in secondary matters. Both revolve around love for the Lord Jesus Christ, and commitment to be the human agents that carry out his mission in every generation and in every corner of God's world. Both are committed to making disciples of all peoples, and to do that in fellowship across

⁹ The full text of the agreement is included in the Appendix below.

denominations and ethnic distinctives. Both are committed to Scripture as a governing authority, both preach the Cross and Resurrection of Christ, both foster active discipleship.

With so much in common, it is to be hoped that WEA and Lausanne will find many ways in which to live out our shared calling, for our good but most of all for God's glory.

Appendix

Personal and corporate relationships between leaders of Lausanne and World Evangelical Alliance:

Recognising that close relationships of mutual trust are an essential foundation for strong relationships between the two movements, the leaders of Lausanne Movement for World Evangelization and the WEA nevertheless recognize that a framework is also needed for the relationship between the two movements.

They have therefore agreed a process designed to maximize partnership opportunities and minimize conflicts or misunderstandings. They agreed to:

1. Meet regularly to strengthen their relationship with one another.
2. Share news with one another about their respective activities.
3. Review events and structures to discern areas of common concern.
4. Connect people in the two movements already active in areas of common concern.
5. Clarify the language used about each other's movements and describe each other with the terminology preferred by their respective movements.
6. Discuss ways to communicate with one another about people asked to carry senior responsibilities in the movements.

Review and adjust these simple guidelines as necessary.

The centenary of the World Missionary Conference of 1910, held in Edinburgh, was a suggestive moment for many people seeking direction for Christian mission in the 21st century. Several different constituencies within world Christianity held significant events around 2010. From 2005, an international group worked collaboratively to develop an intercontinental and multi-denominational project, known as Edinburgh 2010, and based at New College, University of Edinburgh. This initiative brought together representatives of twenty different global Christian bodies, representing all major Christian denominations and confessions, and many different strands of mission and church life, to mark the centenary.

Essential to the work of the Edinburgh 1910 Conference, and of abiding value, were the findings of the eight think-tanks or 'commissions'. These inspired the idea of a new round of collaborative reflection on Christian mission – but now focused on nine themes identified as being key to mission in the 21st century. The study process was polycentric, open-ended, and as inclusive as possible of the different genders, regions of the world, and theological and confessional perspectives in today's church. It was overseen by the Study Process Monitoring Group: Miss Maria Aranzazu Aguado (Spain, The Vatican), Dr Daryl Balia (South Africa, Edinburgh 2010), Mrs Rosemary Dowsett (UK, World Evangelical Alliance), Dr Knud Jørgensen (Norway, Areopagos), Rev John Kafwanka (Zambia, Anglican Communion), Rev Dr Jooseop Keum (Korea, World Council of Churches), Dr Wonsuk Ma (Korea, Oxford Centre for Mission Studies), Rev Dr Kenneth R. Ross (UK, Church of Scotland), Dr Petros Vassiliadis (Greece, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki), and co-ordinated by Dr Kirsteen Kim (UK, Edinburgh 2010).

These publications reflect the ethos of Edinburgh 2010 and will make a significant contribution to ongoing studies in mission. It should be clear that material published in this series will inevitably reflect a diverse range of views and positions. These will not necessarily represent those of the series' editors or of the Edinburgh 2010 General Council, but in publishing them the leadership of Edinburgh 2010 hopes to encourage conversation between Christians and collaboration in mission. All the series' volumes are commended for study and reflection in both church and academy.

Series Editors

Knud Jørgensen	Areopagos, Norway, MF Norwegian School of Theology & the Lutheran School of Theology, Hong Kong. Former Chair of Edinburgh 2010 Study Process Monitoring Group
Kirsteen Kim	Leeds Trinity University and former Edinburgh 2010 Research Co-ordinator, UK
Wonsuk Ma Tony Gray	Oxford Centre for Mission Studies, Oxford, UK Words by Design, Bicester, UK

The Lausanne Movement: A Range of Perspectives

Edited by
Lars Dahle
Margunn Serigstad Dahle,
and Knud Jørgensen

Copyright © Lars Dahle,
Margunn Serigstad Dahle and Knud Jørgensen 2014

First published 2014 by Regnum Books International

Regnum is an imprint of the Oxford Centre for Mission Studies
St Philip and St James Church
Woodstock Road
Oxford OX2 6HR, UK
www.ocms.ac.uk/regnum

09 08 07 06 05 04 03 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

The right of Lars Dahle, Margunn Serigstad Dahle and Knud Jørgensen to be identified as the Editors of this Work has been asserted in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electric, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying. In the UK such licences are issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1P 9HE.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-908355-52-2

Typeset by Words by Design
Printed and bound in Great Britain
for Regnum Books International
by TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

The publication of this title is made possible through the generous financial assistance of Normisjon (Norway), Norwegian Lutheran Mission, Norwegian Council on Mission and Evangelism and the Lausanne Committee on World Evangelization.

CONTENTS

Foreword	ix
Michael Oh	xi
Abbreviations	1
Introductory Chapter: Evangelical Perspectives on Mission – from Lausanne to Cape Town	
SECTION 1: INTRODUCING THE LAUSANNE MOVEMENT	
The Lausanne Story: A Personal Prelude Knud Jørgensen	13
The Lausanne Story: A Personal Prelude Robyn Claydon	21
The Role of the Lausanne Movement in Modern Christian Mission Tormod Engelsviken	26
Lausanne and Global Evangelicalism – Theological Distinctives and Missiological Impact Timothy Tennent	45
John Stott and the Lausanne Movement: A Formative Influence Julia Cameron	61
Continuing the Vision from Lausanne 1974: A Personal Perspective Ramez Atallah	74
To Tell the Whole World: Three Global Lausanne Congresses Seen from the Press Center Kåre Melhus	86
Communicating Lausanne – Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow Julia Cameron and Lars Dahle	99
Resourcing the Global Church: A Guide to Key Lausanne Resources 1974-2013 Margunn Serigstad Dahle and Lars Dahle	113
SECTION 2: INTRODUCING MAJOR LAUSANNE CONCERNS	
The Holy Spirit and the Gospel David Wells	131