

JBTS

VOLUME 8 | ISSUE 1

JOURNAL OF
BIBLICAL AND
THEOLOGICAL
STUDIES

Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism in the US and Beyond

Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism: Missional, Intellectual, Theologically Diverse, Complex, and Increasingly Global

by Ryan A. Brandt and Amber Thomas Reynolds

Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism: Missional, Intellectual, Theologically Diverse, Complex, and Increasingly Global

RYAN A. BRANDT AND AMBER THOMAS REYNOLDS

Ryan A. Brandt is Professor of Christian History and Theology at Grand Canyon University; Amber Thomas Reynolds is Adjunct Assistant Professor of History at Wheaton College (IL)

Introduction

Twentieth-century evangelicalism: what a daunting subject to choose! The genesis of this special issue of JBTS was in February 2020. In the three plus years since then, the world changed. And although evangelical identity was already heavily contested prior to 2020, more than ever, whether it is possible to analyze modern “evangelicalism” as an essentially religious rather than a political or cultural movement is in question, especially among American academics and journalists. Important studies of the intersections between evangelicalism and race, politics, and gender have certainly revealed historical blind spots.¹ Yet, for all of the recent debate, it is important to remember that defining “evangelical” and “evangelicalism”—even whether or not to capitalize the term—has been debated for at least a century. The profusion of writing on evangelicalism, furthermore, frustrates any attempt to contribute something new to the discussion.² Thus, the editors have approached the topic with modest aims, recognizing our particular perspectives: one editor, trained in theology at a denominational seminary in the United States, teaches theology students at an evangelical university; the other, trained in cultural history of Christianity at a British university, teaches history courses in an evangelical liberal-arts setting. Although our vantage points may seem to be relatively similar, it became clear during the

1. A few recent examples include Anthea Butler, *White Evangelical Racism: The Politics of Morality in America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2021); Aaron Griffith, *God’s Law and Order: the Politics of Punishment in Evangelical America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2020); John Corrigan, Melani McAlister, and Axel R. Schäfer, eds., *Global Faith, Worldly Power: Evangelical Internationalism and U.S. Empire* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2022); and Kristen Kobes Du Mez, *Jesus and John Wayne: How White Evangelicals Corrupted a Faith and Fractured a Nation* (New York: Liveright, 2020).

2. Start with Mark A. Noll, David W. Bebbington, and George M. Marsden, eds., *Evangelicals: Who They Have Been, Are Now, and Could Be* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2019), and Andrew Atherstone and David Ceri Jones, eds., *The Routledge Research Companion to the History of Evangelicalism* (London and New York: Routledge, 2019).

editorial planning stages that we were coming from two very different academic worlds. Like JBTS in general, we write with the evangelical undergraduate student in mind, who probably has heard much about evangelicals of late but may not, in fact, have a clue who they are.

In that light, this special issue of JBTS will certainly not seek to propose a brand-new definition of evangelicalism, or to throw its total weight behind one existing formulation. As a journal geared toward students, not just scholars, our aim is to, first, clarify some of the major questions involved in defining twentieth-century evangelicalism. Secondly, we explore several religious rather than social or political topics, some of which are well-recognized in the literature and others of which have arguably been overlooked in recent discussions—especially at the popular level—of the twentieth- and early twenty-first century movements. As part of this latter goal, we feature scholar-practitioners from a field that is sometimes under-represented in discussions of evangelical identity: missiology.

This present introductory article seeks to offer some background and cohesion for this special issue's articles. In the first part, we broadly survey definitions of evangelicalism, focusing on six successive historical developments in the twentieth century and how these developments illuminate and complicate such definition. In the second part, we introduce the five articles in this special issue as a way of highlighting some of these key debates today.

Defining Evangelicalism

Defining evangelicalism is notoriously challenging. To situate our own students, the editors would give the following, brief synopsis: The origins of evangelicalism can be traced back to at least the eighteenth century, uniting various kinds of Christians that identified the gospel at the center of their identity and purpose. Because such a description is admittedly inept and vague—indeed, what Christian is not focused upon the good news of Jesus Christ?—we have found it practically helpful to acknowledge precedents in the Protestant Reformation, namely, emphasis on biblical authority and the sufficiency of individual faith in Christ's person and work for salvation. Such teachings about the gospel were later rekindled and interiorized by groups such as the European Pietists (who wanted to recover the heart-changing spirituality of the Reformation for their current-day Lutherans) and English Puritans (who wanted the Church of England to further reform their teachings). These groups influenced early English and American evangelicals like John and Charles Wesley, George Whitefield, and Jonathan Edwards, who each in their own way contributed to the explosion of religious enthusiasm, especially in the United States, and are often regarded as central to the origination of evangelicalism for the current day.

Such a survey is indeed simplistic, but it highlights the difficulty of defining the evangelical identity, especially considering the sizeable scholarly literature on the

subject. Although it is not possible to review every formulation of evangelicalism, most in recent decades have been influenced by David Bebbington's definition or character sketch in his landmark 1989 study, *Evangelicalism and Modern Britain: A History from 1730 to the 1980s*. Primarily historical in nature, the Bebbington "Quadrilateral," as it has been called, reflected evangelicals' theology and practice. Evangelicals, he argued, were distinguished by their emphasis on the necessity of personal conversion for salvation, activism (reflected in evangelism, foreign missions, and social reform), the Bible as theological authority, and Christ's sacrifice on the cross.³ Bebbington's scholarly achievement in a British academic context was undeniable: taking religion seriously as *religion* rather than as cover for economic or political motivations.⁴ The five-volume InterVarsity Press series, *A History of Evangelicalism: People, Movement, and Ideas in the English-Speaking World* (IVP Academic, 2003-2017), used Bebbington's quadrilateral as its working definition to trace the movement from the 1700s to the year 2000. As Mark Noll noted about the rise of evangelicalism in the first volume, "These core evangelical commitments have never by themselves yielded cohesive, institutionally compact or clearly demarcated groups of Christians. But they do serve to identify a large kin-network of churches, voluntary societies, books and periodicals, personal networks and emphases of belief and practice."⁵ Bebbington has continued to defend his thesis against scholarly critics.⁶

Examples of questions about the Quadrilateral which have been raised include the following: Was the Quadrilateral most applicable to British church history (which, of course, was its original intent)? Was it too convinced of the Enlightenment's and Romanticism's influences? Was it too disconnected from its Protestant antecedents? Was the Quadrilateral too broad theologically, allowing post-Vatican II Catholics and Eastern Orthodox Christians, and others who were not "orthodox Protestants" to identify as such? After *EMB*'s publication, W. R. Ward underscored evangelicalism's rootedness in continental European Protestantism and Pietism.⁷ Scholars such as Michael Haykin, Ken Stewart, and Douglas Sweeney also emphasized evangelicalism's

3. Bebbington writes that "there are ... four qualities that have been the special marks of Evangelical religion: conversionism, the belief that lives need to be changed; activism, the expression of the gospel in effort; biblicism, a particular regard for the Bible; and what may be called crucicentrism, a stress on the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. Together they form a quadrilateral of priorities that is the basis of Evangelicalism." David W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989), 2-3.

4. Timothy Larsen, "The Reception Given *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*," in *The Advent of Evangelicalism: Exploring Historical Continuities*, eds. Michael A. G. Haykin and Kenneth J. Stewart (Nashville: B & H Academic, 2008), 33.

5. Mark A. Noll, *The Rise of Evangelicalism: The Age of Edwards, Whitefield, and the Wesleys* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2003), 19.

6. David Bebbington, "Introduction: The Parameters of Evangelical Identity," in *The Evangelical Quadrilateral, Vol. 1: Characterizing the British Gospel Movement* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2021), 1-26.

7. W. R. Ward, *The Protestant Evangelical Awakening* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

continuity with the Reformation.⁸ Sweeney, specifically, has defined evangelicalism basically historically as “a movement that is rooted in classical Christian orthodoxy, shaped by a largely Protestant understanding of the gospel, and distinguished from other such movements by an eighteenth-century twist.”⁹ Others like Alister McGrath have tended to define evangelicalism more theologically in terms of clusters of ideas or doctrines.¹⁰ *The Cambridge Companion to Evangelical Theology* (2008), *The Oxford Handbook of Evangelical Theology* (2010), *Introducing Evangelical Theology* (2019), and various evangelical confessional statements produced by denominations and organizations have all presented overlapping yet unique overviews of normative evangelical beliefs. Still others like John Stackhouse characterize evangelicalism as a religious style of sorts, a third way between the traditionalism of the past and the freedom of liberalism.¹¹ Finally, as noted above, the American context has occasioned calls to define “evangelicals” far more politically and sociologically.

With so much debate that is warranted and reasonable, we hesitate to land on one specific formulation. Nevertheless, historical overviews best help situate our special issue, focused as it is on a particular era—the twentieth century and, to a lesser extent, the early twenty-first. As the last two volumes of the IVP Academic series, along with numerous other secondary works, make clear, twentieth-century developments impacted evangelical identity in ways which—depending upon one’s perspective—complicate or clarify it. We do not intend to settle the debate on every matter.

8. Haykin and Stewart, eds., *Advent of Evangelicalism*.

9. Douglas A. Sweeney, *The American Evangelical Story: A History of the Movement* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005), 23-24. Although suggesting that the term evangelical can apply to other Christian groups as well, he maintains, “Our uniqueness is best defined by our adherence to: (1) beliefs most clearly stated during the Protestant Reformation and (2) practices shaped by the so-called Great Awakening.” Sweeney, *American Evangelical Story*, 24.

10. McGrath argued, “evangelicalism is grounded on a cluster of six controlling convictions, each of which is regarded as being true, of vital importance and grounded in Scripture. . . . These six fundamental convictions can be set out as follows:

1. The supreme authority of Scripture as a source of knowledge of God and a guide to Christian living.
2. The majesty of Jesus Christ, both as incarnate God and Lord and as the Savior of sinful humanity.
3. The lordship of the Holy Spirit.
4. The need for personal conversion.
5. The priority of evangelism for both individual Christians and the church as a whole.
6. The importance of the Christian community for spiritual nourishment, fellowship and growth.”

See Alister McGrath, *Evangelicalism and the Future of Christianity* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1995), 55-56.

11. Stackhouse also uses six adjectives to define evangelicalism: Trinitarian, biblicist, conversionist, missional, populist, and pragmatic. See John G. Stackhouse, *Evangelicalism: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2022), 24-47.

Particular Developments of the Twentieth Century

Although more developments (especially outside of the US) certainly could be cited, when taking into consideration this special issue's articles, the following six are most important: (1) the rise of interdenominational fellowship, (2) revivalism emphasizing the Holy Spirit, (3) the birth of Fundamentalism, (4) the postwar neo-evangelical movement, (5) the fragmentation over various theological, social, and political issues, and (6) the globalization of evangelicals.

1. First, the rise of interdenominational fellowship. To be an “evangelical” by the early 1900s typically—but not always—entailed cooperation and fellowship with other believers outside of one's own denomination for shared gospel priorities. This interdenominationalism certainly had developed earlier, thanks to various mission and Bible societies, revival meetings, and events such as the 1846 establishment of the Evangelical Alliance in London.¹² However, Michael Hamilton has identified Dwight Moody's evangelistic ministry and Bible Institute (which continued well after his 1899 death) as a key force in unifying various conservative Protestants from numerous denominations, not to mention geographic areas in the US, UK, and broader English-speaking world, and ultimately uniting them against Modernism (discussed below).¹³ Darren Dochuk has concurred about the importance of such fellowship.¹⁴ That said, not all who held to evangelical *theology* were as keen on interdenominational fellowship, for example, more church-centered Anglican or Reformed Protestants.¹⁵ In addition, especially in the first few decades of the twentieth century, such interdenominationalism did not come at the expense of identifying primarily as, say, a Baptist or Methodist, or simply as an individual Christian. However, as will be discussed further below, because the twentieth century witnessed the birth of numerous “evangelical,” interdenominational and nondenominational organizations, as well as cultural and political developments uniting evangelicals in opposition, it is fair to include it on this list.

2. Second, revivalism emphasizing the Holy Spirit. Thomas Kidd has recently defined “Evangelicals” as “born-again Protestants who cherish the Bible as the Word

12. See David W. Bebbington, *The Dominance of Evangelicalism: The Age of Spurgeon and Moody* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2005), 21-22, on the Evangelical Alliance's establishment.

13. Michael S. Hamilton, “The Interdenominational Evangelicalism of D. L. Moody and the Problem of Fundamentalism,” in *American Evangelicalism: George Marsden and the State of American Religious History* eds. Darren Dochuk, Thomas S. Kidd, and Kurt W. Peterson (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 2014), 230-80.

14. Darren Dochuk, “Revisiting Bebbington's Classic Rendering at New Points of Departure,” in *Evangelicals*, eds. Noll, Bebbington, Marsden, 151.

15. See Daniel J. Treier, *Introducing Evangelical Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2019), 4n8. Conservative Presbyterian scholar and leader J. Gresham Machen's loyalty to church confessions and order as opposed to interdenominational organizations resembled the prevailing orientation of Old School, Southern Presbyterianism from the mid-1800s. See D. G. Hart, *Defending the Faith: J. Gresham Machen and the Crisis of Conservative Protestantism in North America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994).

of God and who emphasize a personal relationship with Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit.”¹⁶ His inclusion of “through the Holy Spirit” recognized the ecstatic revivalism shaping transatlantic Protestantism since the eighteenth century, the spread of the Holiness Movement in the nineteenth century, and the necessity of Trinitarian theology, thus echoing Timothy Larsen’s inclusion of belief in the Holy Spirit in the 2007 *Cambridge Companion to Evangelical Theology*.¹⁷ Whether or not the Holy Spirit should be included in any definition is made more complicated by the first decade of the twentieth century, when powerful revivals associated with phenomena attributed to the Holy Spirit emerged in the US, the UK, India, Chile, and Korea. From the American revivals, new Pentecostal denominations mandating a second baptism of the Holy Spirit (evidenced typically through tongues-speaking) spread worldwide, while less institutionally organized Pentecostal-charismatic varieties of spirituality also proliferated from multiple points of origin.¹⁸ Should such believers be subsumed under the “evangelical” label or discussed as a parallel movement that merely overlapped with evangelicals? Do the differences between Pentecostal views of sanctification and, in some cases, the Holy Spirit’s theological authority, necessitate distinct taxonomic classification? In addition, many non-Pentecostal evangelicals promulgated a Keswick or “Higher Life” view of the Holy Spirit, which would lead the individual to seek definite, post-conversion “infillings” of the Spirit for holy living, evangelistic power, and sometimes healing, as well as to expect personal, divine guidance in daily life.¹⁹ We would suggest that there is a close kinship between Pentecostalism and evangelicalism, but the reality remains that the lines are not always clear and debates over this issue abound.

3. Third, the birth of Fundamentalism. Although certainly shaped by cultural attitudes (especially in the US), the rise of fundamentalism tended to focus evangelical debates into the nature and content of doctrine: What theological doctrines were absolutely necessary to the “evangelical” faith?²⁰ As higher criticism, Darwinism, and

16. Thomas Kidd, *Who is an Evangelical? The History of a Movement in Crisis* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019), 4. Kidd’s inclusion of “born-again” refers to such believers’ self-identification and outward commitments rather than actual, supernatural regeneration, about which the Christian historian would not speculate.

17. Timothy Larsen, “Defining and Locating Evangelicalism,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Evangelical Theology*, eds. Larsen and Daniel J. Treier (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 1.

18. Two helpful surveys are Mark Shaw, *Global Awakening: How Twentieth-Century Revivals Triggered a Christian Revolution* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2010), and Alan Anderson, *To the Ends of the Earth: Pentecostalism and the Transformation of World Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013). See also Brian Stanley, *Christianity in the Twentieth Century: A World History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2018), ch. 13.

19. Geoffrey Treloar, *The Disruption of Evangelicalism: The Age of Torrey, Mott, McPherson, and Hammond* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2017), 59-61.

20. Treloar, *The Disruption of Evangelicalism*. For studies exploring the cultural and racial factors shaping fundamentalism, particularly in the US, see George Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2022), and Mary Beth Swetnam

liberal theology took root in the major Protestant denominations in the late nineteenth century, many evangelicals grew concerned to stress “fundamental” beliefs, prompting the publication of a 90-essay series entitled *The Fundamentals* from 1910 to 1915. As the essay titles display, the Anglo-American authors emphasized a much more comprehensive version of Protestant orthodoxy and evangelical spirituality than the bullet-pointed statements of “fundamentals” and narrow political battles over evolution animating the movement after 1920, when the term, “fundamentalist,” was first championed by a northern Baptist newspaper editor.²¹ Various statements of fundamentals included different points, too. For example, the 1910 statement of the northern Presbyterian Church required ordinands to affirm an inerrant Bible, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the physical resurrection, and the authenticity of Christ’s miracles, while Minneapolis Baptist William Bell Riley’s nine-point 1919 faith statement of the World’s Christian Fundamentals Association also required assent to the premillennial return of Jesus Christ and (implicitly) required rejection of human evolution.²² Additional groups of self-identifying “fundamentalists” in the UK and China produced their own distinctive statements.²³ Should only those who held to the basic five “fundamentals”—or a close approximation thereof—be considered evangelical in this era? Or, could one claim to be a “liberal evangelical,” a concurrent movement mostly within the Church of England which embraced higher criticism, evolutionism, and theological relativism while maintaining a more orthodox view of Christ’s deity and concern for evangelism and conversion?²⁴ Even today, it would be preposterous to suggest that the “evangelical” label requires no specific doctrinal content, but what specific doctrinal content is necessary to be an evangelical has been widely—and sometimes, hotly—contested. Finally, following development one (above), the Fundamentalist-Modernist Controversy was influenced

Matthews, *Doctrine and Race: African American Evangelicals and Fundamentalism Between the Wars* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2017).

21. <https://digitalcommons.biola.edu/the-fundamentals/>

22. See the contrasting lists at the following links: <https://www.pcahistory.org/documents/deliverance.html>; https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Page%3AThe_Doctrinal_Statement_of_the_World_Conference_on_Christian_Fundamentals_1919.pdf/1. In 1927 the northern Presbyterian church no longer required assent to the five doctrines. Regarding belief in biological evolution directed by God, *The Fundamentals* series contained differing perspectives on it, with contributor James Orr open to it. The Southern Baptist Convention adopted the conservative Baptist Faith and Message in 1925 but it was not enforced. See Anthony L. Chute, Nathan A. Finn, Michael A. G. Haykin, *The Baptist Story: From English Sect to Global Movement* (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2015), 248-49.

23. See essays by Andrew Atherstone, Martin Wellings, David Bebbington, and Tim Grass in *Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism in the United Kingdom During the Twentieth Century*, eds. David W. Bebbington and David Ceri Jones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); and Kevin Xiyi Yao, *The Fundamentalist Movement Among Protestant Missionaries in China* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2003).

24. See Timothy Larsen, “Liberal Evangelicals and the Bible,” in *Every Leaf, Line, and Letter*, ed. Larsen (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2021), 172-95; Treloar, *Disruption of Evangelicalism*, 71-73, 179-80.

by and, in turn, prompted the formation of new interdenominational organizations. These included, for example, the Federal Council of Churches (est. 1908) and related Foreign Mission Conference of North America (est. 1911), which were increasingly marked by the Social Gospel, Modernism, and “ecumenical” ambitions; the fundamentalist Interdenominational Foreign Mission Association (est. 1917), which formed in response to the ecumenical movement and united various independent, Keswick-oriented “faith” missions; and the Inter-Varsity Fellowship (est. 1928), which united theologically conservative university students in Britain before expanding internationally.²⁵

4. Fourth, the postwar neo-evangelical movement. If distinguishing the fundamental components of the evangelical faith from “Modernist” or “ecumenical” Protestantism animated the first few decades of the twentieth century, then whether and how to distinguish “evangelicals” from “fundamentalists” animated the post-World War II era, at least in the US, where the term remained significant. In one sense, the postwar era clarified evangelical identity—because more organizations began actually using the term! The US-based National Association of Evangelicals, established in 1942-43, provided a middle path between the ecumenical Federal Council of Churches (National Council after 1948) and arch-Fundamentalist Carl McIntire’s American Council of Christian Churches (est. 1941). Although promulgating fundamental doctrines, the NAE’s founders (in contrast to McIntire) allowed individuals belonging to mainline-Protestant denominations and interdenominational, special-purpose organizations to join their fellowship.²⁶ Indeed, beyond simply fellowshiping with those outside their denomination, postwar neo-evangelicals had a penchant for the *parachurch*—ministries dedicated not only to missions and students but to media, charity, and many other causes, which tended to be managed and financially supported less like churches (by elders and expected tithes) than like generic non-governmental organizations or even businesses (with executive boards and marketing-informed fund-raising).²⁷

After 1960, a common way of differentiating a “fundamentalist” from a “neo-evangelical” (or simply, “evangelical”) was on the basis of the former’s militant attitude and insistence upon separating from liberal Protestant fellowship.²⁸ Early

25. To clarify two terms, the twentieth-century “ecumenical” movement sought to overcome Protestantism’s historic fractiousness by minimizing doctrinal distinctions and reuniting major denominations under new bureaucratic structures. Independent “faith” missions, e.g., the China Inland Mission (est. 1865) and the Africa Inland Mission (est. 1895), rejected the denominational and ecumenical mission boards’ bureaucratic governance and fund-raising strategies.

26. Joel Carpenter, *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), ch. 8.

27. See Michael S. Hamilton, “More Money, More Ministry: The Financing of American Evangelicalism Since 1945,” in *More Money, More Ministry: Money and Evangelicals in Recent North American History*, eds. Larry Eskridge and Mark A. Noll (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 104-138.

28. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 290. For an alternative view, see Dan D.

“neo-evangelicals” such as Harold Ockenga and Carl Henry also called for a more socially concerned, intellectual approach to the gospel, although the neo-evangelical record on especially the first objective was lackluster.²⁹ (Regarding the latter, as this special issue will demonstrate, many earlier leaders associated with fundamentalism were just as intellectual.) Perhaps “evangelicals,” especially the younger set after the 1960s, were more likely to rethink rigid moral codes prohibiting drinking alcohol, dancing, movie-going, and the like?³⁰ Or, perhaps theological differences actually did matter, with “fundamentalists” being more likely to mandate a stricter view of biblical inerrancy and the end times and to reject the possible continuation of charismatic gifts?³¹ Perhaps the easiest way to distinguish an *American* evangelical from a fundamentalist after World War II remains gauging whether or not one liked Billy Graham, whose ministry was parachurch-driven and inclusive of mainline-Protestant supporters.³²

In the British context, a similar postwar movement of winsome evangelicals arose and had close ties with American evangelicals such as Graham, whose evangelistic crusades prompted denunciations from some non-Americans, too, due to his cooperation with ecumenical Protestants.³³ Meanwhile, the Inter-Varsity network, along with the English Tyndale House Fellowship, fostered evangelical scholarship. Anglican Rector John Stott and the more Reformed J. I. Packer, exemplars of the British wing of new evangelicalism, defended Fundamentalism, when defined as historic evangelical Protestantism, but rejected American-style excesses.³⁴ However, differentiating evangelicals from fundamentalists was not a pressing concern, given the latter term’s minimal usage by conservative Britons; rather, differentiating evangelicals from more theologically liberal Protestants, particularly Anglicans, was

Crawford, “The Idea of Militancy in American Fundamentalism,” in *Fundamentalism: Perspectives on a Contested History*, eds. David Harrington Watt and Simon A. Wood (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2014), 36-54.

29. Molly Worthen, *Apostles of Reason: The Crisis of Authority in American Evangelicalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 26-35, 66.

30. This is, again, most applicable to the American environment. See, for example, sociologist James Davison Hunter’s *Evangelicalism: The Coming Generation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 56-64.

31. <https://www.nae.org/statement-of-faith/>. From its beginning, the NAE welcomed Pentecostals.

32. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 290-91. Daniel Silliman has defended this shorthand for defining the postwar, American movement. Although too critical of the Bebbington Quadrilateral, Silliman’s essay offers important insight into the specific boundaries for evangelical identity formulated by the founders of *Christianity Today*. See Silliman, “An Evangelical is Anyone who Likes Billy Graham: Defining Evangelicalism with Carl Henry and Networks of Trust,” *Church History* 90, no. 3 (Dec 2021): 621-43.

33. Hutchinson and Wolffe, *Short History of Global Evangelicalism*, 185.

34. Brian Stanley, *The Global Diffusion of Evangelicalism: The Age of Billy Graham and John Stott* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2013), 42-43.

still a nagging question.³⁵ One of the most significant differences between postwar British and American evangelicals was that the former were a much smaller minority, numerically and culturally, in their country compared to the latter.

5. Fifth, various theological, social, and political debates starting in the late twentieth century. To be sure, evangelicals' division and "crisis" did not begin with American socio-political conflicts of the past decade, as might be implied by the release of volumes lamenting recent developments such as *Who is an Evangelical?: The History of a Movement in Crisis* (2019) and *Evangelicals: Who They Have Been, Are Now, and Could Be* (2019). Such sentiments, in fact, have been expressed since at least the 1960s, and not just in the US. In Britain, whether evangelicals should separate from theologically liberal Protestants in their own denominations occasioned a public dispute in 1966 between Stott and Martin Lloyd-Jones, with the latter concerned to unite doctrinally like-minded evangelicals.³⁶ To what extent evangelicalism could accommodate the rapidly growing, new charismatic Christianity occasioned similar debate in the 1960s and 1970s. Competing perspectives on biblical inspiration and inerrancy, gender roles, and hermeneutics more broadly began to divide evangelicals throughout the English-speaking world.³⁷

To zoom in on the American context, the editors of *Evangelicals: What they Believe, Who They Are, and Where They Are Changing* (1975, 1977)—compare this title to the just-mentioned 2019 title—sought to unite American evangelicals around the core convictions of "primitive Christianity" at a time of rising national prominence.³⁸ As insiders and outsiders at the time already recognized, the masses of those lumped together as "evangelicals" were rather an inchoate group, divided among social, theological, and political lines.³⁹ Were theologically conservative African-American Protestants "evangelicals," despite being organizationally and often politically distinct?⁴⁰ What about the new movement of self-identifying evangelicals who had joined the Eastern Orthodox church?⁴¹ What about Southern

35. Stanley, *Global Diffusion*, 39.

36. See essays by David Ceri Jones, Alister Chapman, and Stephen Holmes in *Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism in the United Kingdom During the Twentieth Century*, eds. Jones and Bebbington.

37. Stanley, *Global Diffusion*, chapters 7-8; and Worthen, *Apostles of Reason*.

38. David F. Wells and John D. Woodbridge, eds., *The Evangelicals: What They Believe, Who They Are, Where They Are Changing* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1975). Two years later, the editors revised and reissued the volume to incorporate Arminians (including Pentecostals), in Wells and Woodbridge, eds., *The Evangelicals: What They Believe, Who They Are, Where They Are Changing*, Rev. ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1977).

39. According to a Gallup poll in 1976, one-third of Americans claimed to be "born again," prompting *Newsweek's* "Year of the Evangelicals" cover story. Ken Woodward, "Born Again! (The Year of the Evangelicals)," *Newsweek*, October 25, 1976, 68.

40. Compare the still-relevant essays by William Pannell and William Bentley in the 1975/77 Wells and Woodbridge volumes to the more recent take by Jemar Tisby, "Are Black Christians 'evangelicals'?" in *Evangelicals*, eds. Noll, Bebbington, and Marsden, 262-78.

41. Robert Webber and Donald Bloesch, eds., *The Orthodox Evangelicals: Who They Are and*

Baptists, one of whom famously claimed that “evangelical” was a “Yankee” term too associated with “fundamentalism”? (Historians are now more likely to include Southern Baptists in the narrative of evangelicalism proper.)⁴² Increasingly partisan politics divided American evangelicals, too, while laying the groundwork for new camaraderie with formerly spurned groups such as Catholics.⁴³ Denominational labels began to matter less than whether one identified as being “conservative” or “liberal.”⁴⁴ Yet, despite the stereotypes of evangelicals (in the US) as “white Republicans,” the overall movement has been far more ethnically and politically diverse.⁴⁵ This brings us to our final historical development.

6. Sixth, the globalization of evangelicals. That the above developments focus mostly on the US, and to a lesser extent, the UK, obscures perhaps the most significant headline of twentieth-century evangelicalism: its globalization. In 1900, over 80% of all Christians hailed from Europe and North America; by 2020, over 60% hailed from Africa, Asia, and Latin America.⁴⁶ Although Christianity’s twentieth-century shift to the Global South from the North Atlantic world has been analyzed for several decades,⁴⁷ studies of global evangelicalism, specifically, have taken off more recently.⁴⁸ Evangelicalism was brought to the Global South (where the majority of the world’s people live) via Euro-American missionaries, often (but not always) benefitting from imperial connections. But as the twentieth century progressed, evangelicalism took root and flourished in African, Asian, and Latin American cultural soil, often in terms which, if not quite Pentecostal-charismatic, emphasized the supernatural.⁴⁹

What They Are Saying (Nashville: Nelson, 1978).

42. See Kidd, *Who is an Evangelical*, 123-24, on SBC executive Foy Valentine’s infamous quotation in the *Newsweek* story. Southern Baptists and people of color feature prominently in Kidd’s history.

43. Charles Colson and Richard John Neuhaus, *Evangelicals and Catholics Together: Toward a Common Mission* (Dallas, TX: Word Publications, 1995).

44. Robert Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith Since World War II* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988).

45. See, for example, Bebbington, “Evangelicals and Recent Politics in Britain,” in *Evangelicals*, eds. Noll, Bebbington, and Marsden, 292-99. In contrast to British evangelicals’ varied political affiliations, evangelicals in Brazil have tended to support conservative political candidates over the past decade.

46. Gina Zurlo, *Global Christianity: A Guide to the World’s Largest Religion from Afghanistan to Zimbabwe* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Academic, 2022), 3.

47. Pioneers of this field include Andrew Walls, Lamin Sanneh, David Barrett, Dana Robert, Philip Jenkins, and others. For a thematic, global overview, see Stanley, *Christianity in the Twentieth Century*.

48. For a good introduction, see Mark Hutchinson and John Wolffe, *A Short History of Global Evangelicalism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), esp. chapters 6-9; and Stanley, *Global Diffusion*. For a popular-level, almanac-style overview, see Brian C. Stiller, Todd M. Johnson, Karen Stiller, and Mark Hutchinson, eds., *Evangelicals Around the World: A Global Handbook for the Twenty-First Century* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2015). See also David Bebbington, ed., *The Gospel in Latin America: Historical Studies of Evangelicalism in the Global South* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2022).

49. In addition to Shaw, *Global Awakening*, and Anderson, *To the Ends of the Earth*, see also

The relationship between evangelicalism of the Global North and Global South is complex and multi-directional. After World War II, Western evangelists, including Pentecostals, contributed to evangelicalism's globalization, as did parachurch organizations and interdenominational fellowships such as the Scripture Union, International Fellowship of Evangelical Students, the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, the NAE-related World Evangelical Fellowship (later, the World Evangelical Alliance), and the Lausanne movement. Although the brainchild of mainly British and American neo-evangelicals, the 1974 International Congress on World Evangelization in Lausanne, Switzerland featured contributions from numerous Latin American, Asian, and African evangelical leaders such as Peruvian Samuel Escobar and Ugandan Festo Kivengere. This was merely one reflection of the Global South's increasing influence upon American and global evangelicalism, overall, since the 1930s.⁵⁰ A few additional examples include the East African Revival's echoes throughout the English-speaking world, Latin American Pentecostalism's influence on the church-growth and "signs and wonders" movements, African-instituted churches' growth in London, South Korean missionaries' presence in Asia and North America, the Australian-based Hillsong Church's dissemination of contemporary worship music, the conservative Global Anglican Futures Conference (GAFCON)'s ecclesiastical impact, and Chiang Mai, Thailand's emergence as a missions and parachurch hub. A few points should be noted. Many Global South evangelicals have relationships with historic, Western denominations or "big E" organizations such as the World Evangelical Alliance; they may also have theological-moral affinities with conservative Western evangelicals. Nevertheless, as Philip Jenkins has observed, typical "Bible Believers" in the Global South have forged their faith independently and should not be conflated with American-style fundamentalists, as scholars and journalists have sometimes done.⁵¹ As Brian Stanley has argued, although the Bebbington Quadrilateral may hold up well in global perspective, it will

Donald E. Miller, Kimon H. Sargeant, and Richard Flory, eds., *Spirit and Power: The Growth and Global Impact of Pentecostalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), which presents historical and sociological analyses of the global "Renewalist" movement; and Philip Jenkins, *The New Faces of Christianity: Believing the Bible in the Global South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

50. For the relationship between Global South and American evangelicalism, specifically, see Helen Jim Kim, *Race for Revival: How Cold War South Korea Shaped the American Evangelical Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2022); David Swartz, *Facing West: American Evangelicalism in an Age of World Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020); Kathryn T. Long, *God in the Rainforest: A Tale of Martyrdom and Redemption in Amazonian Ecuador* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019); Melanie McAllister, *The Kingdom of God Has No Borders: A Global History of American Evangelicalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018); and Mark Noll, *The New Shape of World Christianity: How American Experience Reflects Global Faith* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2009).

51. Jenkins, *New Faces of Christianity*. Jenkins's argument counters the perspectives of Steve Brouwer, Paul Gifford, and Susan D. Rose, *Exporting the American Gospel: Global Christian Fundamentalism* (New York: Routledge, 1996).

need important modifications acknowledging the Quadrilateral's original reference to a religious context shaped by the European Enlightenment. Activism, however, is most directly applicable to Global South evangelicals, particularly Pentecostals.⁵²

Regardless of the reality, popular perceptions of evangelicalism remain, as demonstrated by the introduction to one of the most recent overviews of it. Expanding upon an illustration used by mission historian Dana Robert, Stackhouse contrasts the “*stereotypical* evangelical” of the 2020s—a “white, middle-aged, and middle-class” man, from the Midwest or Sunbelt, who is a media-savvy Baptist preacher and vocally political conservative—with the *typical* evangelical—a sub-Saharan African or Latin American lay-woman who is active in her local church but does not have a public voice.⁵³ This is powerful imagery that may stop readers in their tracks—then cause them to scratch their heads, as it further complicates the task of defining evangelicalism. For example, we challenge readers to attempt to fill in the following blank with a single person: “A global evangelical is anyone who likes [?].” Determining evangelicalism's representatives, leaders, and theological boundaries will undoubtedly shape the current century.

Overview of Articles

With the backdrop of twentieth-century evangelicalism in mind, the five articles assembled here help illuminate both consensus and more overlooked aspects of evangelicalism. The organizations, trends, and individuals discussed all reflect biblicism, conversionism, crucicentrism, and activism; at various points, they also specifically portray evangelicals as *missional, intellectual, theologically diverse, complex, and increasingly global*.

The articles have been arranged (loosely) in chronological and thematic order, starting with Scott Moreau's essay on missions. Moreau, Wheaton College Professor of Intercultural Studies Emeritus, traces the development and dominance of American evangelical missions over the course of the century. Indeed, at the 1910 Edinburgh (UK) World Missionary Conference, Britain still dominated the Western missionary movement; by century's end, this plaudit went to the United States. In addition, evangelicals had replaced mainline (or theologically liberal) Protestants on foreign fields.⁵⁴ Missions, a prime example of evangelicals' “activism,” can serve as a lens through which to examine broader changes in American Christianity, as well as the US's twentieth-century political and cultural ascendancy.

52. Brian Stanley, “The Evangelical Christian Mind in History and Global Context,” in *Every Leaf, Line, and Letter: Evangelicals and the Bible from the 1730s to the Present*, ed. Timothy Larsen (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2021), 288, 294.

53. Dana Robert, “Shifting Southward: Global Christianity Since 1945,” *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 24, no. 2 (April 2000): 50-58; Stackhouse, *Evangelicalism*, 1-2.

54. Andrew Walls, “The American Dimension of the Missionary Movement,” in *The Missionary Movement in Christian History* (Mary Noll, NY: Orbis, 1996), 221-40.

From his perspective as a missiologist who has trained students for cross-cultural service, Moreau zeroes in on the major shifts in American evangelical missions themselves, looking particularly at organization and theology. His survey raises a few key questions. First, how does the fact that self-consciously “evangelical” missions activity was overwhelmingly shaped by independent mission agencies and other *parachurch* organizations rather than specific denominations affect its character? To be fair, Moreau does not highlight the Southern Baptist Convention’s Foreign Mission Board (the International Mission Board after 1997), despite its numerical strength in missions. Although the technically-Southern Baptist Billy Graham convened the Lausanne Congress, the SBC’s Foreign Mission Board did not often interact with independent, neo-evangelical agencies in organizing key missions gatherings and developing new concepts/strategies; and yet, strong thematic parallels are evident.⁵⁵ Second, how should evangelical mission *theology* relate to evangelical *identity*, overall? In addition to interreligious engagement and the gospel’s contextualization, one of the most important components of such a theology is the relationship between evangelism and social reform, with evangelicals historically prioritizing the former and mainline Protestants prioritizing the Social Gospel from the 1920s to the 1960s. The 1974 Lausanne Covenant portrayed evangelism and social action as mutually inclusive objectives, which reflected Stott’s and non-Western evangelicals’ influence.⁵⁶ Could this statement of beliefs and objectives characterize evangelical identity by the late twentieth century? Mission theology matters quite a bit when considering that, as Moreau observes, relief and development work have increasingly overshadowed evangelism and church planting. Finally, with so many changes to American-evangelical missions, their future is uncertain. Who will dominate global, cross-cultural *evangelism* at the twenty-first century’s end? Although historians are bad futurists, if recent trends continue, Global South-background missionaries will constitute the bulk of the force.⁵⁷

Following Moreau’s article, Covenant College Professor Emeritus of Church History Ken Stewart explores intellectualism’s resurgent place in Anglo-American evangelicalism before World War II, challenging the prevailing emphasis on the postwar movement with a wealth of new bibliographical evidence. The Carl Henry-centered American “neo-evangelicals” were not the first to champion it or to revive it after its perceived nadir in 1920s-30s populist fundamentalism. Here, Stewart continues his contributions to defining evangelical identity by demonstrating its roots

55. For example, compare the IMB’s twentieth-century milestones to the developments Moreau covers, using the following timeline: <https://www.imb.org/175/>.

56. <https://lausanne.org/content/covenant/lausanne-covenant#cov>. For the background and reception of the Covenant, see Stanley, *Global Diffusion of Evangelicalism*, ch. 6.

57. Gina A. Zurlo, Todd M. Johnson, and Peter F. Crossing, “World Christianity and Mission 2021: Questions About the Future,” *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 45, no. 1 (2021): 15–25.

in earlier Protestant (and, specifically, Reformed) movements.⁵⁸ In addition, Stewart's piece underscores the continued connections between evangelicals across the Atlantic between the wars. Indeed, British and European scholars, universities, and publishers were crucial to the American and broader evangelical intellectual renaissance. Stewart's piece raises another question: To what extent should evangelical history be told via reference to theologians, professors, and other intellectual elites? One criticism of Bebbington's *EMB*, after all, was that his evidence tended to downplay popular voices, who represented the numerical majority of evangelicals.⁵⁹ Indeed, intellectualism would never be confused for a *defining* characteristic of evangelical identity, at least in the US, as testified by the 2022 re-release of Mark Noll's *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*, first published in 1994. In recent years, perhaps the temptation has been to overemphasize the need for evangelical intellectualism, unintentionally bifurcating evangelicals on the basis of educational attainment. Nevertheless, to ignore the witness of evangelical scholars—yes, even those dubbed “fundamentalists” in the 1920s-30s—who used the best scholarly tools to defend orthodoxy, would be to fundamentally misrepresent evangelicalism.

Despite the behind-the-scenes work of intellectually rigorous missiologists and theologians, twentieth-century evangelicals undeniably favored innovative, popular-level strategies to spread their faith. Historical theologian and Young Life evangelist Sean McGeever analyzes The Four Spiritual Laws, an evangelistic message originated by Campus Crusade for Christ founder and major postwar-evangelical leader Bill Bright. The Four Spiritual Laws demonstrate the diversity possible within one of Bebbington's four planks: conversionism. As McGeever maintains, twentieth-century views of conversion departed from those of early evangelicals such as Jonathan Edwards, John Wesley, and, to a lesser extent, George Whitefield (whom McGeever has analyzed in previous work).⁶⁰ At the heart of the issue is the relationship between conversion—the outward, recordable experience of acknowledging one's sin and coming to faith—and regeneration—the mysterious, invisible, divinely guided process of heart-change. According to McGeever, the Four Spiritual Laws conflated the moment of conversion with supernatural regeneration, thus departing from Edwards's and Wesley's conceptions. The former salesman-turned-parachurch president Bright's methods of counting card-based “decisions for Christ,” a technique also championed by the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association (BGEA), differed from early evangelical practice, too. Indeed, Bright exemplified modern evangelicals' tendency toward pragmatism, or, of prioritizing what “works” over ideological

58. Ken Stewart, *Reformed and Evangelical Across Four Centuries: The Presbyterian Story in America* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2022); Stewart, *In Search of Ancient Roots: The Christian Past and the Evangelical Identity Crisis* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2017).

59. Larsen, “Reception Given *Evangelicalism*,” 34.

60. Sean McGeever, *Born Again: The Evangelical Theology of Conversion in John Wesley and George Whitefield* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2020).

considerations,⁶¹ especially in his postwar American context, when mass culture and university-student enrollment boomed. Whether one interprets Bright's departure from early evangelicalism as a declension narrative, the subject's importance is underscored by the fact that 1.5 billion Four Spiritual Laws pamphlets have been distributed across the world in 200+ languages since its first official publication in 1965 (with origins a decade earlier), often through mass evangelistic campaigns such as *Explo '74* in South Korea and *Here's Life* 1976 in India.⁶²

The issue's fourth article helps en flesh abstract notions of twentieth-century evangelicalism by focusing on an exemplar of it: Boon Mark Gittisarn, a Thai Christian who laid the foundations for a national evangelical and Pentecostal movement in Thailand before his 1980s death. Boon Mark's religious journey is illuminated in rich detail through the ground-breaking research of author Karl Dahlfred, professor at Chiang Mai Theological Seminary, Thailand, and missionary with OMF International. Throughout his life, Boon Mark exhibited the Bebbington Quadrilateral—biblicism, activism, crucicentrism, and conversionism—as he engaged with numerous waves of evangelical history and changed affiliations when it best suited his beliefs and objectives. Although introduced to Christianity through the Western missionary movement, he was not a passive recipient but rather an active agent of evangelical leadership. Undoubtedly, his story reflects the complexity of modern evangelical identity.

Affiliating first with mainline American Presbyterian missionaries and the ecumenical Church of Christ in Thailand, Boon Mark objected to what he perceived as the missionaries' Modernist theology and disrespect for Thai leadership. After World War II, his theological conservatism and concern for his fellow Thai believers led him to affiliate with major leaders from widely disparate theological viewpoints: the fundamentalist Presbyterian Carl McIntire, followed by the American Pentecostal healing evangelist T. L. Osborn and Scandinavian Pentecostals, followed by an American-based oneness Pentecostal church. But later in life, Boon Mark affiliated with the Seventh Day Adventists. Although his religious flexibility could possibly reflect evangelicals' historic interdenominationalism or pragmatism, it undoubtedly raises questions of theological boundaries for evangelical identity: How did Seventh Day Adventism relate to mainstream evangelicalism? Can non-Trinitarian Pentecostals meaningfully be described as evangelical? What if his choice to affiliate with oneness Pentecostals and practice "Jesus only" baptism demonstrated continuity with his lifelong commitment to an unquestioned evangelical distinctive—crucicentrism? Theology aside, personal moral failings in his later life further complicate his evangelical testimony.

61. On evangelicals' pragmatism, see Barry Hankins, *American Evangelicalism: A Contemporary History of a Mainstream Religious Movement* (Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield, 2008), 164; and Stackhouse, *Evangelicalism*, 38.

62. John G. Turner, *Bill Bright and Campus Crusade for Christ: The Renewal of Evangelicalism in Postwar America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008).

Boon Mark's story demonstrates the need for new, detailed biographies of evangelicals who have developed their faith in non-Western contexts. Twenty years after the *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals* limited its scope mostly to the English-speaking world, and a bumper crop of scholarly biographies have also focused on Anglo-American evangelicals, some progress has been made with the publication of new biographies/autobiographies and online databases such as the Dictionary of African Christian Biography (<https://dacb.org/>) and the Dictionary of Christian Biography in Asia (<https://dcbasia.org/>) highlighting Global South evangelicals.⁶³ For the broader trajectory of twentieth-century church history, Dahlfred's article reflects the importance of "transdenominationalism," "localism," and "transnationality"—in other words, the push-and-pull between formal Christian networks, national leaders, indigenous cultures, and religious trends spanning multiple countries—in the globalization of evangelicalism, which brings us to the final article.⁶⁴

Going from microcosm to macrocosm, this special issue concludes with an exploration of evangelicalism's increasingly global identity—and the implications thereof. Todd Johnson, longtime director of the Center for the Study of Global Christianity and World Christian Database (WCD) at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, recounts the "Southern shift" of evangelicalism—using more of a sociological framework than a narrative, historical approach.⁶⁵ In an era when numerous sociologists, political scientists, demographers, and popular pollsters have been able to shape academic and public perceptions of American evangelicals, it would be a mistake to ignore the WCD's own statistical breakdown of global Christianity, generally, and evangelicals, specifically. Although any attempt to

63. Timothy Larsen, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2003), 1. For a list of figures organized by global region, see Albert W. Hickman, "Evangelicals You Would Want to Know," in *Evangelicals Around the World*, eds. Stiller et al., 227-32. Although some of these individuals (e.g., Festo Kivengere and Pandita Ramabai) have been covered in popular and academic literature, the number of book-length, scholarly biographies of Global South evangelicals remains limited. Two recent, scholarly biographies are Thomas A. Harvey, *Acquainted with Grief: Wang Mingdao's Stand for the Persecuted Church in China* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2002), and B. E. Bharathi Nuthalapati, *Bakht Singh: Theologian and Father of the Indian Independent Christian Church Movement* (Carlisle, UK: Langham Monographs, 2017). For a notable study highlighting the contributions of Ecuadorian C. René Padilla and Peruvian Samuel Escobar, see David C. Kirkpatrick, *A Gospel for the Poor: Global Social Christianity and the Latin American Evangelical Left* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019). South Korean evangelist Billy Kim's memoir was published as Kim, *From Houseboy to World Evangelist: A Life of Billy Kim* (Chicago: Moody Press, 2015). Although not focused on an evangelical, world Christianity scholar Lamin Sanneh's autobiography, *Summoned from the Margins: Homecoming of an African* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012), provides an enormously beneficial perspective on the effects of African, British, and American cultural contexts (including evangelicalism) on his religious journey.

64. Hutchinson and Wolfe, *Short History of Global Evangelicalism*, chapters 7, 9.

65. <https://worldchristiandatabase.org/>

count the world's largest religion will be fraught with difficulties, the figures have provided a benchmark for scholars.⁶⁶ Some unique features of the WCD's typology deserve mention: The World Christian Encyclopedia and Database counts anyone as "Christian" who self-identifies as such, following the United Nations. Then this nominally Christian world is divided into four macro groups comprising Catholics, Independents, Orthodox, and Protestants; two additional groups, Pentecostals and Evangelicals, then cut across the four main groups. In this typology, therefore, evangelicals do not necessarily belong to a Protestant denomination, and they can also be Pentecostal. This makes sense when considering that the twentieth century's revivalism made the boundaries increasingly porous. Readers should understand that Johnson's overview is prescriptive, not merely descriptive, as he challenges readers to countenance evangelicalism's "Western cultural captivity," a term favored by Soong-Chan Rah.⁶⁷ One's views of Western culture and Global South evangelicalism, as well as the general nature of Christian truth, will inform one's response to the argument. Nevertheless, American/Western evangelicals must recognize that the visible church's constituency, following the twentieth-century's remarkable developments, looks ever more like Revelation 7:9. How should its culture, theology, and leadership look?⁶⁸

This special issue now turns to these five articles.

66. See Hutchinson and Wolffe, *Short History of Global Evangelicalism*, ch. 8, "'The Actual Arithmetic.'" For example, not all who say that they are a Christian, or who are counted as a Christian due to nominal membership in a state-recognized church, are actually so. Conversely, in countries where Christianity is persecuted, believers may be formally undercounted (but overestimated by hopeful outsiders). Philip Jenkins explains the possible issues but maintains that the "WCD data represent by far the best available statistics." See Jenkins, "Evangelicals and Globalization," in *Routledge Research Companion to Evangelicalism*, eds. Atherstone and Jones, 267n2.

67. Soong-Chan Rah, *The Next Evangelicalism: Freeing the Church from Western Cultural Captivity* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2009).

68. On theology, see Stephen Pardue, *Why Evangelical Theology Needs the Global Church* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2023).