EVANGELISM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY: THE MAKING OF A TRANSFORMATIONAL VISION

Al Tizon

Shortly after Ron Sider, one of the pioneers of evangelical holistic mission, returned from Cape Town 2010, he wrote the following reflection: "At Lausanne III … the biblical obligation to combine evangelism and social action was assumed by almost everyone. A deep powerful longing to share the gospel with everyone who is not a believer pervaded the Congress. But so did the call to seek justice for the poor, care for the environment, combat HIV/AIDS, and work for peace."[1]

For some – I think especially of younger evangelicals who may view the fundamentalist-modernist split that plagued much of the twentieth century as ancient history – this reflection may seem somewhat benign, but as Sider concludes, "Lausanne III … reflected the huge change that has occurred among evangelicals all around the world. Holistic ministry – combining evangelism and social action – is now part of our spiritual DNA."[2] The very fact that younger evangelicals view the evangelism vs. social concern issue as a curious debate of a less enlightened time attests to the maturing of an evangelical social vision. The Lausanne Movement has been catalytic in this shift.

Indeed, one of the most important developments to have flowed out of the now forty-year-old missionary movement called Lausanne has been the restoration of social responsibility to the evangelical missionary agenda. And because this social vision has been developed by and among evangelicals, it has always been cultivated in the uncompromising soil of world evangelization.

However, as much as the Lausanne Movement itself should be credited for restoring social concern on the evangelical missionary agenda, it was a lesser known but no less potent movement that at once flowed from, and reacted to, the cautious posture that Lausanne leaders often took through the years with regard to evangelical social involvement. This Movement, which emerged primarily out of the Two Thirds World, mined the richness

---

[1] Ron Sider, 'Evangelizing the World: Reflections on Lausanne III,' in *Prism* (Jan-Feb 2011), 48.
[2] Ibid., 48.

of the word 'transformation', thus eventually becoming known as the Transformational Movement or 'Mission as Transformation'.[3]

This Movement took the evangelical social vision to unprecedented heights since the Great Reversal.[4] In order to understand the evangelical journey toward holistic mission, the Transformational vision – what it is, how it came to be, who the chief proponents were/are, etc. – must be in full view. The purpose of this chapter, then, is to focus on the development of the Transformational social vision, and thereby shed light on the holistic thrust within and beyond the Lausanne Movement as a whole.

Affirmation of Socio-Political Involvement at Lausanne I

For much of the twentieth century, evangelicals suffered from a kind of missionary myopia, viewing mission narrowly in terms of verbal proclamation (evangelism) at the expense of social justice. Although this myopia was a consequence of a debate that sizzled most intensely in North America, the disease went global through North America's strong missionary movement.[5] Scholars across disciplines have offered their respective views to explain this myopia, but they share at least one common explanation. They all agree that it largely developed as a reaction to ultra-liberal definitions of mission in the early part of the twentieth century that emphasized social justice at the expense of evangelization (a myopia of another sort).

Lausanne 74 marks the first serious corporate attempt to correct this short-sightedness among evangelicals. Billy Graham – the inspirational figurehead and catalyst of Lausanne I – listed four hopes in his opening address at the Congress, the third of which pertains directly to the social question.[6] He announced at the outset, "I trust we can state … the

---

[3] I humbly refer you to my book, *Transformation after Lausanne* (Oxford et al.: Regnum, 2008), which is precisely about the Transformational Movement. In fact, this chapter reflects – and sometimes even culls whole sections verbatim – the basic thrust of that book.

[4] In *Transformation after Lausanne,* I define the Great Reversal as, "the move of evangelicals from spearheading social reform in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to retreating almost totally from mainstream society by the late 1920s" (22-23). For a much more detailed sociological perspective, see David Moberg's classic, *The Great Reversal: Evangelism Versus Social Concern* (Philadelphia, PA and New York, NY: J. B. Lippincott, 1972).

[5] Tizon, *Transformation after Lausanne,* 24-26.

[6] Billy Graham, 'Why Lausanne?' in James D. Douglas (ed), *Let the Earth Hear His Voice: International Congress on World Evangelization* (Minneapolis, MN: World Wide Publications, 1975), 34. The other three of Graham's stated hopes were: 1. 'I would like to see the Congress frame a biblical declaration on evangelism'; 2. 'I would like to see the church challenged to complete the task of world evangelization'; the third is discussed above; and 4. 'I hope that a new

relationship between evangelism and social responsibility … [which] disturbs many believers. Perhaps Lausanne can help to clarify it."[7] This opening statement demonstrates that by the time of the Congress, Graham and many others came prepared to settle this issue.

The *Lausanne Covenant*, the official resultant document of the first Congress, includes 'Christian Social Responsibility' as Article 5 (of fifteen key Articles),[8] thereby clearly recognizing and affirming social concern as essential to the task of world evangelization. Article 5, which basically synthesized the papers presented at the Congress by René Padilla, Samuel Escobar and Carl Henry,[9] dealt with the issue most directly.[10] In his analytical treatment of the contents of the Article, Klaus Bockmühl extracts and then comments on the nine 'verbs of action' contained in it, offering a detailed interpretation of the social vision articulated at the Congress.[11]

At least two overall themes emerge from his analysis: 1. To act prophetically in society, denouncing injustices and calling governments to repentance, and 2. To demonstrate and promote the righteousness of the Kingdom of God for and among the oppressed. This summary of the Lausanne social vision points out its two-pronged reactive and pro-active elements. But obviously, these themes only hint at a social ethic; it does not provide one. Article 5 of the *Lausanne Covenant* simply and officially affirmed socio-political involvement, thus validating it among evangelicals as part of the missionary task.

---

koinonia or fellowship among evangelicals of all persuasions will be developed throughout the world'.

[7] Graham, 'Why Lausanne?', 34.

[8] 'The Lausanne Covenant', in John R. W. Stott (ed), *Making Christ Known: Historic Mission Documents from the Lausanne Movement, 1974-1989* (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 1996), 24.

[9] Klaus Bockmühl, *Evangelicals and Social Ethics* (trans. David T. Priestly; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1979), 8-12. These papers to which Bockmühl refers are available in James D. Douglas (ed), *Let the Earth His Voice* (Minneapolis, MN: World Wide Publications, 1976), the official reference volume of Lausanne I. Padilla's address entitled 'Evangelism and the World' (116-146) and Escobar's 'Evangelism and Man's Search for Freedom, Justice, and Fulfillment' (303-326) were both plenary papers, while Henry's address 'Christian Personal and Social Ethics in Relation to Racism, Poverty, War, and Other Problems' (1163-1182) provided a foundation for the sessions of a special committee on ethics.

[10] C. René Padilla and Chris Sugden (eds), *Texts on Evangelical Social Ethics* (Nottingham, UK: Grove Books, 1985), 5-7. The editors discuss Articles 4 and 10 as also influencing the development of social ethics in evangelical mission.

[11] Bockmühl, *Evangelicals and Social Ethics,* 17ff. The nine 'verbs of action' that Bockmühl extracts from the Covenant are: 1. Share God's concern for justice, 2. Share God's concern for reconciliation, 3. Share God's concern for the liberation of men from every kind of oppression, 4. Respect the dignity of every person, 5. Exploit no one, 6. Serve every person, 7. Denounce evil and injustice, 8. Seek to exhibit the righteousness of the kingdom of Christ, 9. Seek to spread the righteousness of the kingdom of Christ.

The strength of this validation gave evangelical theologians and practitioners alike a new sense of freedom to explore what social responsibility might mean for mission. Athol Gil comments that "in expressing penitence 'for having sometimes regarded evangelism and social concern as mutually exclusive' and in emphasizing that 'evangelism and socio-political involvement are both part of our Christian duty', the *Lausanne Covenant* marked a turning point in evangelical thinking …"[12] Vinay Samuel and Chris Sugden concur and add, "Evangelical relief and development agencies around the world received fresh energy because they could now appeal to the evangelical constituency as 'family' without the fear of either being rebuked for preaching the 'social gospel' or being charged with compromising on evangelism."[13] Indeed, for both theological reflection and mission practice, the *Lausanne Covenant* – particularly Article 5 – provided new impetus for evangelicals to engage in social ministries.

The Statement on Radical Discipleship: Seeds of Transformation

The Covenant's clear affirmation of social concern, however, did not go unchallenged at the Congress. Many conservatives saw it as a distraction from the original Lausanne vision of what they called cross-cultural evangelism. Others to the right of the conservatives went even further and accused Lausanne's stated social vision as being the old 'social gospel' in evangelical clothing.[14]

For those left of centre, however, the affirmation of socio-political involvement in the *Lausanne Covenant* did not go far enough. They claimed that even though Article 5 repented of past negligence and affirmed the inseparable relationship of social responsibility to evangelism, it did not define that relationship. Moreover, social concern still felt like an

---

[12] Gill, 'Christian Social Responsibility', 89.

[13] Samuel and Sugden, 'Introduction', *The Church in Response to Human Need,* ix.

[14] See Valdir Steuernagel, 'The Theology of Mission in its Relation to Social Responsibility within the Lausanne Movement' (ThD thesis, Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 1988), 151-156; Roger Hedlund, *Roots of the Great Debate in Mission* (Bangalore, India: Theological Book Trust, 1997), 294-299, and René Padilla 'Evangelism and Social Responsibility: From Wheaton 66 to Wheaton 83' in *Transformation* 2:3 (1985), 29, to know who had problems with the Covenant's social affirmation. The list included Peter Wagner, Ralph Winter, Donald McGavran, Arthur Johnstone, and Peter Beyerhaus. Hedlund mentions these individuals sympathetically from a 'church growth' perspective, which he shares, while Padilla discusses them from a radical evangelical perspective. Steuernagel attempts a more objective discussion, although he falls decidedly on the radical evangelical side.

appendage to the 'real work' of the Gospel.[15] So a group of about 200 people at the Congress formed an *ad hoc* committee to discuss the shortcomings of the Covenant's social affirmation in the light of the implications of radical discipleship. They drafted an official response to Lausanne aptly titled "Theology [and] Implications of Radical Discipleship".[16]

Divided into four main parts, the official response challenged the Congress to declare more overtly the place of social concern in the mission of the church by affirming the comprehensive scope of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God. "The gospel," the paper read, "is Good News of liberation, of restoration, of wholeness, and of salvation that is personal, social, global and cosmic."[17] It ended with a resolution that affirmed both the spiritual and social dimensions of the task of world evangelization:

> We resolve to submit ourselves afresh to the Word of God and to the leading of his Spirit, to pray and work together for the renewal of his community as the expression of his reign, to participate in God's mission to his world in our generation, showing forth Jesus as Lord and Savior, and calling on all men everywhere to repent, to submit to his Lordship, to know his salvation, to identify in him with the oppressed and work for the liberation of all men and women in his name.[18]

In sum, the Statement on Radical Discipleship repudiated the dichotomy between evangelism and social concern, challenged the language of the primacy of evangelism, and broadened the scope of God's salvific work in the world, all the while remaining wholly committed to biblical authority and world evangelization. Writing over ten years after the issuance of the Statement, René Padilla assessed that it "provided the strongest statement on the basis for holistic mission ever formulated by an evangelical conference up to that date".[19]

Sugden reports that although the Statement did not end up as part of the Covenant, convenor John Stott presented it at the end of the Congress along with the final draft of the Covenant, thus giving prominent place to it.[20] Moreover, almost 500 people, approximately a quarter of the number of official delegates, signed it before leaving the Congress. So between the Covenant's affirmation of socio-political involvement and the inclusion of the Statement on Radical Discipleship among the official papers of the

---

[15] Chris Sugden, 'Evangelicals and Wholistic Evangelism', in Vinay Samuel and Albrecht Hauser (eds), *Proclaiming Christ in Christ's Way: Studies in Integral Evangelism* (Oxford, UK: Regnum, 1989), 33.

[16] 'Theology [and] Implications of Radical Discipleship', in James D. Douglas (ed), in *Let the Earth His Voice* (Minneapolis; MN: World Wide Publications, 1975), 1294-1296.

[17] 'Theology and Implications of Radical Discipleship', 1294.

[18] 'Theology and Implications of Radical Discipleship', 1296.

[19] Padilla, 'Evangelism and Social Responsibility', 29.

[20] Sugden, 'Wholistic Evangelism', 34.

Congress, the status of social concern within the evangelical constituency enjoyed a new level of validation that it had not experienced since the days before the fundamentalist-modernist debacle.

Post-Lausanne Tensions

Predictably, evangelicals went about interpreting and developing the Lausanne social vision according to their respective schools of thought. And as proponents of these various schools encountered one another at conferences, as well as on the mission field, an unprecedented level of tension intensified within the post-Lausanne evangelical missionary community.

This tension came to a head at a large Lausanne follow-up gathering in 1980 in Pattaya, Thailand. Time and space will not allow us to go into detail about it;[21] suffice it to say here that the drafters of the Statement on Radical Discipleship at Lausanne I were not happy with the narrow view of evangelism that won the day in Pattaya. Samuel and Sugden lamented that the consultation organizers seemed, "… painfully unaware of all the developments in the Lausanne Movement in seeking to communicate the whole Gospel to the whole world. The years of slow growth in sensitivity to the social dimensions of the Gospel and to the contexts in which it was proclaimed, seemed to be wiped out."[22] Kwame Bediako described the travesty in terms of theology and strategy, and lamented, "The victory of theology over strategy [won at Lausanne 74] was overturned at Pattaya."[23]

If any hope existed for conservatives and radicals within the evangelical missionary community to find some level of consensus on the social question, it hinged upon the 1982 Consultation on the Relationship between Evangelism and Social Responsibility in Grand Rapids (CRESR). Valdir Steuernagel's description of CRESR as 'the most carefully planned, sensitive, feared, and threatening consultation ever held by the LCWE [Lausanne Committee on World Evangelization]' underscores what was at stake at this consultation – namely, unity or another tragic split of the worldwide evangelical family.[24] Co-sponsored by the LCWE and the World Evangelical Fellowship, CRESR gathered fifty evangelicals from around the world to understand better the relationship between evangelism and social responsibility in biblical, historical, and missiological perspectives.

For a full week, the delegates presented papers and responded to each other with openness and respect as well as with honesty and intensity, in what turned out to be, according to CRESR chairpersons Bong Rin Ro and

---

[21] See Tizon, *Transformation after Lausanne,* 43-48.

[22] Samuel and Sugden cited in Steuernagel, 'The Theology of Mission', 196-197.

[23] Kwame Bediako, 'World Evangelisation, Institutional Evangelicalism and the Future of the Christian World Mission', in Vinay Samuel and Albrecht Hauser (eds), *Proclaiming Christ in Christ's Way* (Oxford, UK: Regnum, 1989), 57.

[24] Steuernagel, 'The Theology of Mission', 199.

Gottfried Osei-Mensah, 'a model of how Christians should approach a … divisive issue'.[25] CRESR produced a seven-chapter, 64-page document entitled 'The Grand Rapids Report on Evangelism and Social Responsibility: An Evangelical Commitment'.[26]

The strength of the report relied on the fact that it did not arrive at any one conclusion concerning the relationship; instead it offered a range of possibilities that it considered faithful to biblical and historic Christianity. According to the report, social action can be seen as: 1. A *consequence of* evangelism – one of the principle aims of a changed life is to serve others; 2. A *bridge to* evangelism – with no need of manipulation, good deeds naturally create opportunities to share the Gospel; and 3. A *partner with* evangelism – the church must witness Christ in the world by both word and deed.[27]

Due to this range of valid views, delegates for the most part reached an important level of consensus on the subject. Both Peter Wagner and René Padilla, insofar as they represented the conservative and radical constituencies respectively, expressed satisfaction for what CRESR accomplished – namely, recognizing the vital importance of socio-political involvement in the missionary task.[28] In light of the Grand Rapids Report, evangelicals of all persuasions could no longer ignore the church's social responsibility. Those who chose to retain the language of the primacy of evangelism could not allow that language to reduce or, worse, eliminate the mandate of social responsibility – that which makes credible the church's witness to Christ in a needy world – from the missionary task.

As important a level of consensus as CRESR reached, however, it still operated under a North American-nurtured dualism between body and soul, and social and spiritual, separating these two vital realities from each other and then falsely asking which one has priority over the other.[29] Radicals desired the evangelical community to see the falsity of this unbiblical dualism and then to begin to train its thinking, and therefore its doing, in more non-dualistic, i.e. holistic, terms. For the most part, those who adhered to these holistic notions remained somewhat marginalized from the mainstream of the Lausanne Movement. Indeed, the tension surrounding the implications of the social question to the task of world evangelization enjoyed, at best, only temporary relief as a result of CRESR.

---

[25] Bong Rin Ro and Gottfried Osei-Mensah, 'Preface', in Bruce J. Nicholls (ed), *Word and Deed: Evangelism and Social Responsibility* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986), 7.

[26] 'The Grand Rapids Report', in John R. W. Stott (ed), *Making Christ Known* (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 1996), 167-210.

[27] 'The Grand Rapids Report', *Making Christ Known,* 181-182. Italics mine.

[28] Steuernagel, 'The Theology of Mission', 204-205.

[29] Mark Lau Branson, 'Striving for Obedience, Haunted by Dualism', in *TSF Bulletin* 6.1 (Sept/Oct 1982), 11; Bosch, *Transforming Mission,* 406.

INFEMIT: The Birth of Transformation

In their disappointment for the way the Thailand consultation went, as well as not being wholly satisfied with the results of CRESR, radical evangelicals "resolved to meet … as a Two Thirds World consultation".[30] Making good on their promise, the first consultation – framed and organized for the first time by theologians of evangelical conviction from the Two Thirds World – convened in 1982 at Bangkok. This gathering led to the formation of a loose global network called the International Fellowship of Evangelical Mission Theologians, or INFEMIT.

Although 1987 marks the year when INFEMIT officially formed, 1980 claims its true beginnings when this group of radical evangelicals at Pattaya in 1980 reacted strongly against what they considered a regrettable return to pre-Lausanne mission thinking. They began to come to terms with the fact that the brand of holistic mission theology they espoused would probably never flow into the mainstream of evangelical missionary consciousness as long as 'managerial missiology', as Samuel Escobar described it, dictated the current.[31] Names and institutions associated with this network early on would include Vinay Samuel and Chris Sugden at the Oxford Centre for Mission Studies in the UK, René Padilla, Samuel Escobar and the late Orlando Costas of the Latin American Theological Fraternity based in Argentina, Ronald Sider of Evangelicals for Social Action in the USA, Melba Maggay of the Institute for Studies in Asian Church and Culture in the Philippines, and David Lim of China Ministries International and the Centre for Community Transformation, also in the Philippines, David Gitari and Kwame Bediako of the African Theological Fraternity based in both Kenya and Ghana, and many others.

Through many gatherings, publications, and collaborative actions, INFEMIT made a significant impact on maturing a Transformational – i.e. holistic and contextual – social vision for evangelicals. Despite stops and, starts, its work continues in and through the next generation of evangelical theologian-practitioners. Now renamed as the International Fellowship for Mission as Transformation, INFEMIT articulates its mission in the following way: "Called and equipped by the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, we are a Gospel-centered fellowship of mission theologian-practitioners that serves local churches and other Christian communities so we together embody the Kingdom of God through transformational engagement, both locally and globally."[32]

---

[30] Sugden, 'Wholistic Evangelism', 38. Incidentally, the 'radical evangelical' label is one I used extensively in *Transformation after Lausanne;* it was not one that they attached to themselves.

[31] Samuel Escobar, 'A Movement Divided', in *Transformation* 8.4 (Oct 1991), 11-13, and 'Evangelical Missiology: Peering into the Future at the Turn of the Century', William Taylor (ed), in *Global Missiology for the 21st Century* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2000), 109-112.

[32] INFEMIT, http://infemit.org/ (accessed 12th Dec 2012).

Wheaton 83: Transformation Articulated

If Mission as Transformation was born with the formation of INFEMIT in 1980, then it was given a name at the Wheaton Consultation in 1983. Compared with Lausanne 74, the Wheaton 83 Consultation could not boast huge numbers of participants nor monumental worldwide notoriety. But in terms of the evangelical journey toward holistic mission, Wheaton 83 looms large. Organized into three tracks, Track III of Wheaton 83 with the sub-theme, 'The Church in Response to Human Need', took significant strides toward holistic mission by developing a biblical, theological, and practical understanding of the term, 'transformation'. According to the Wheaton 83 Statement, the official document resulting from Track III, "Transformation is the change from a condition of human existence contrary to God's purposes to one in which people are able to enjoy fullness of life in harmony with God."[33]

This particular understanding of Transformation has undergone its own transformations since its inception.[34] It emerged through reflections on social ethics but later expanded into reflections on a holistic missiology – thus, expansion of the name from Transformation to *Mission* as Transformation.[35] This broadening, however, did not reduce the importance of social concern; on the contrary, it made social concern part and parcel of the Gospel and therefore part and parcel of the church's mission. Proponents of Mission as Transformation refuse to understand evangelization without liberation, a change of heart without a change of structures, vertical reconciliation (between God and people) without horizontal reconciliation (between people and people), and church planting without community building. They point to the biblical paradigm of the reign or kingdom of God as the source and driver for this holistic understanding of mission.[36] Vinay Samuel's 1999 articulation of the term sums it up well; he wrote, "Transformation is to enable God's vision of society to be actualized in all relationships – social, economic and

---

[33] 'Wheaton 83: Statement on Transformation', in Vinay Samuel and Chris Sugden (eds), *The Church in Response to Human Need* (Oxford, UK: Regnum and Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987), 257.

[34] For developments on the definition of Transformation since 1983, see Chris Sugden, 'Transformational Development: Current state of understanding and practice', in *Transformation* 20.2 (April 2003), 70-72.

[35] Vinay Samuel, 'Mission as Transformation', in Vinay Samuel and Chris Sugden (eds), *Mission as Transformation* (Oxford, UK et al.: Regnum, 1999), 228.

[36] Some theologians have made a viable case to use the term 'reign' over 'kingdom' on the grounds that 'kingdom' has male, patriarchal overtones that the broader biblical reality of 'kingdom of God' did not necessarily intend to convey. For more on this, see Mortimer Arias, *Announcing the Reign of God* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1984), xvi. For this study, because the more familiar 'kingdom of God' overwhelms Transformational literature, I have chosen to retain it.

spiritual – so that God's will may be reflected in human society and his love be experienced by all communities, especially the poor."[37]

Many of the same people, who drafted the Statement on Radical Discipleship at Lausanne I and formed INFEMIT, were responsible for Track III of the Wheaton consultation, as well as the drafting of the Wheaton Statement on Transformation. This strongly suggests that the Transformational Movement finds its roots more in the Statement on Radical Discipleship than in the *Lausanne Covenant* itself.[38] To be sure, the drafters understood the Radical Discipleship Statement with reference to the Covenant, and indeed, the Covenant validated the Statement. So the link between the Transformational Movement and the Lausanne Movement remains organically intact. Nevertheless, the convictions, hopes, and spirit of the Statement – viewed by its drafters as both an addendum and a corrective to the Covenant – set a course that was destined not only to go beyond the Covenant in affirming and defining socio-political involvement, but also to go a very different way from the conservative evangelical constituency.

Oxford Centre for Mission Studies: Transformation on the Move

The Transformational Movement matured through a number of channels, including INFEMIT-sponsored consultations, the journal *Transformation*, and book publications by Regnum Books International. But perhaps the most enduring channel through which the Movement has advanced is the Oxford Centre for Mission Studies (OCMS) in Oxford, UK.

The Transformational Movement has always been, at the core, a theological endeavour that involved deep reflection on the service of responsible mission in the world. Pressing missiological issues undoubtedly evoked the questions that shaped Mission as Transformation; but believing that mission finds its vitality and longevity in well-grounded theology, Transformationists have always held up the importance of doing theology – and doing it well, lest "theology take a backseat to strategic initiatives".[39] They knew that solid, research-based, graduate-level, theological education was a key to the success of the Movement. Enter: OCMS. Founded in 1983,

---

[37] Vinay Samuel quoted in Chris Sugden, 'Mission as Transformation – Its Journey Since Lausanne I,' in *Holistic Mission: God's Plan for God's People,* eds. Brian Woolnough and Wonsuk Ma (Oxford et al.: Regnum, 2010), 33.

[38] In light of this, Samuel and Sugden's *Mission as Transformation* should have perhaps included the 'Statement on Radical Discipleship' as an Appendix rather than, or at least in addition to, the Lausanne Covenant. Chris Sugden's *Radical Discipleship* (Hants, UK: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1981), in fact, does just that: Appendix 1 is the 'Statement on Radical Discipleship' and Appendix 2 is the Lausanne Covenant.

[39] Vinay Samuel and Chris Sugden, 'Introduction,' Vinay Samuel and Chris Sugden (eds), *Mission as Transformation* (Oxford et al.: Regnum, 1999), xi.

OCMS has sought to provide a viable avenue for quality graduate theological education for the past 25 years, primarily in the service of the church in the Two Thirds World.[40]

I had the privilege of being invited to speak at the 25th anniversary of OCMS in 2008. In my presentation, I celebrated the accomplishments of this institution in advancing the core commitments of Transformation – i.e. holistic mission and contextualization wrapped in deep, thorough theological scholarship.[41] At the risk of over-simplification, while INFEMIT has represented the cultural agenda of the Movement – a constant reminder that an understanding of the whole Gospel must come from the whole church – OCMS has emphasized the theological scholarship needed to advance the Movement. Between the ongoing work of INFEMIT and OCMS, the Transformational social vision – which thoroughly integrates evangelism and social justice – has continued to thrive and mature.

Cape Town 2010: The Necessity of Mission as Transformation

Time and space compel us to fast-forward to Cape Town 2010, and ask an assessment question: 'What is now the state of the relationship between evangelism and social concern?' I began this chapter with a quote from Ron Sider that evangelicals now essentially assume a holistic orientation to mission. I basically agree, and I credit Sider and the other 'Transformationists' whose courageous tenacity restored the social dimension of the Gospel on the evangelical missionary agenda (alongside evangelism, of course), and thus helped evangelicals move toward greater biblical faithfulness these last forty years.

However, the diversity of, and therefore the tension between, evangelical viewpoints regarding the relationship between evangelism and social concern still exists and perhaps always will. All may affirm the whole Gospel, but some are still cautious about placing social justice on a par with evangelism. In other words, the Gospel may be a whole, but one part is still more important than the other. Unfortunately, I sensed the felt need of some of the plenary speakers at Cape Town 2010 to affirm social ministry with a caveat. *It's important, but we should not be distracted from the real work of evangelism. We should alleviate human suffering, but especially eternal suffering*. And so on. To a Transformationist, this kind of prioritizing and qualifying only perpetuates the dichotomy, and therefore doesn't feel integrally and deeply 'holistic'. So even though evangelicals

---

[40] INFEMIT and OCMS as separate institutions are currently redefining their relationship, but I continue in this paper to keep them together as sustaining symbols of Mission as Transformation.

[41] My presentation is available in article form. Al Tizon, 'Mission as Education: A Past-to-Future Look at INFEMIT/OCMS,' in *Transformation* 28/4 (Oct 2011), 253-264.

have come a long way in negotiating evangelism and social responsibility since the first Congress in 1974, I was disappointed that such statements still had to be made almost forty years later.

At least one other occurrence in Cape Town further points to the tension of which I speak. During my long flight home, I read a *Time* magazine article about Desmond Tutu, the celebrated Anglican Archbishop of South Africa, who did his significant part in effectively toppling the evil giant of apartheid.[42] I was once again inspired by the bishop's example of what it means to follow Jesus in the context of injustice, deepened no doubt by spending a week in his country. After reading the article, my embarrassment that apartheid was not acknowledged, much less repented of, at Lausanne III, only intensified. I was not the only one who was pained by the omission. 'A Statement of Lament' about apartheid was circulated among, and signed by, many participants. It read in part, "This Lausanne Congress … gathered in a land which sixteen years ago stood in the grip of one of the greatest evils of our time – apartheid. We regret that this was not named or confessed at the opening of the Congress."[43] We cannot expect a gathering, even one of this magnitude, to cover everything; but how could we have overlooked such a thing while celebrating Christ's holistic mission in the world?

In light of these things, I believe that the Transformational perspective, which holds together theologically and practically the Gospel of God's reign of peace, justice and salvation, is absolutely crucial, not only for the health of the Lausanne Movement, but for the integrity of our mission in the world.

---

[42] Alex Perry, 'The Laughing Bishop', *Time* (Oct 11, 2010).

[43] 'Statement of Lament for Evangelicals and the Legacy of Apartheid,' http://reconcilers.wordpress.com/2010/10/22/apartheid-legacy-lament/ (accessed 12th Dec 2012).