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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Billy Graham Evangelistic Association (BGEA) seeks to be innovative concerning the work of propagating the gospel. The BGEA mission statement reads, “Founded by Billy Graham in 1950, BGEA exists to proclaim the Gospel of Jesus Christ by every effective means and to equip others to do the same.”\(^1\) In order to fulfill this mission of promulgating the gospel “by every effective means,” the BGEA employs diverse methods of evangelism and utilizes various forms of media.

The BGEA’s employment of various evangelism methods revolves around this organization’s efforts to saturate the world with the gospel through mass evangelism. Billy Graham himself, through his crusades and the television and radio broadcasts of his crusades, has preached the gospel to approximately 215,000,000 people in more than 185 countries.\(^2\) His son, Franklin Graham, the current CEO of the BGEA, continues the mass evangelism efforts through his festivals.\(^3\) Moreover, Graham’s grandson, Will Graham, strives to penetrate the masses with the gospel through his celebrations.\(^4\) For over sixty years the BGEA has been involved in mass evangelism on all six continents through crusades, festivals, and celebrations.

---


\(^4\)Ibid.
During any mass evangelism meeting conducted by the BGEA, Billy Graham, for example, has contributed methodologically to evangelism. He has effectively used musical evangelists such as Cliff Barrows and George Beverly Shea. While delivering a sermon Graham has also contributed to the methodological approach in evangelism by effectively using the public invitation.

As Graham has impacted evangelism in terms of methodology, he, through the BGEA, has also used various forms of media to spread the gospel. Graham has disseminated the *Steps to Peace with God* tract. He has made a significant contribution to evangelism through his books, with thirty-three books being published. Also, he started *Decision Magazine*. *Decision Magazine* is the official publication of the BGEA, and it has a circulation of over 425,000. Moreover, through the BGEA, Graham began “My Answer,” a syndicated newspaper column. In utilizing the radio, Graham created the “Hour of Decision” program. Through the BGEA he also started television programs that national Christian networks still broadcast.\(^5\) Graham, through the BGEA, has sought to be innovative through the media, and the BGEA continues that approach by utilizing the internet for evangelism.\(^6\)

**Evangelism and Missions Conferences**

In addition to employing various methods and utilizing the media, the BGEA has equipped through conferences. The BGEA, along with *Christianity Today*, sponsored the World Congress on Evangelism at Berlin, Germany, in 1966 (Berlin ’66). Then, the BGEA sponsored the International Congress on World Evangelization at Lausanne,\(^5\)

---


Switzerland, in 1974 (Lausanne ’74). Following Lausanne ’74, the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization sponsored the Pattaya Conference at Pattaya, Thailand, in 1980 (Pattaya ’80), the International Congress on World Evangelization at Manila, the Philippines, in 1989 (Lausanne II), and the Third International Congress on World Evangelization at Cape Town, South Africa, in 2010 (Cape Town 2010). As the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization proceeded with sponsoring missions conferences, the BGEA convened conferences in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, organized for the purpose of equipping evangelists from across the world. The BGEA invested in equipping these evangelists by prioritizing the calling of the evangelist and the content of the gospel message.

**Berlin ’66**

The evangelism congress, Berlin ’66, contributed to the theology of evangelism. This evangelism congress operated around and promoted the following themes: one race, one gospel, and one task. The leaders at Berlin ’66 understood the evangelistic task of the church to be focused on the entire human race condemned as sinners, the one gospel as the message of salvation exclusively in Christ predicated on His death, burial, and resurrection, and the one task as the fulfillment of the Great Commission.\(^7\)

**Lausanne ’74**

At Lausanne ’74, evangelicals responded to and dealt with the challenges presented by those in the conciliar movement. At this congress they set forth the theological defense for evangelism while at the same time answering the critics’ charge of failing to embrace the biblical mandate for social responsibility. In the Lausanne

Covenant evangelical leaders thoroughly articulated their biblical convictions concerning the specific roles that both evangelism and social responsibility will have in their Great Commission work. They also elaborated on the following issues associated with evangelism: the church and evangelism, cooperation in evangelism, churches in evangelistic partnership, the urgency of the evangelistic task, evangelism and culture, education and leadership, spiritual conflict, freedom and persecution, the power of the Holy Spirit, and the return of Christ.

Moreover, they thoroughly described and explained how they would covenant together to engage in social activity. At the conclusion of the congress evangelicals had articulated the conviction that evangelism has priority and that social responsibility functions as the fruit of the gospel.

**Pattaya ’80**

Six years after Lausanne ’74, evangelicals assembled for a consultation at Pattaya, Thailand. Pattaya ’80 consisted of 850 Christian leaders. This consultation convened to promote the people group strategy of missions.

---


9Ibid., 4. “The Lausanne Covenant” provides the following definition for evangelism: “To evangelize is to spread the good news that Jesus Christ died for our sins and was raised from the dead according to the Scriptures, and that as the reigning Lord he now offers the forgiveness of sins and the liberating gift of the Spirit to all who repent and believe. Our Christian presence in the world is indispensable to evangelism, and so is that kind of dialogue whose purpose is to listen sensitively in order to understand. But evangelism itself is the proclamation of the historical, biblical Christ as Savior and Lord, with a view to persuading people to come to him personally and so be reconciled to God. In issuing the Gospel invitation we have no liberty to conceal the cost of discipleship. Jesus still calls all who would follow him to deny themselves, take up their cross, and identify themselves with his new community. The results of evangelism include obedience to Christ, incorporation into his church and responsible service in the world.”

10Ibid., 5-9.

11Ibid., 4-5.


13Ibid., 142.
Lausanne II

In 1989, evangelicals assembled for the Lausanne II missions congress at Manila, the Philippines. While the leaders at Lausanne ’74 dealt with major missiological issues concerning evangelism, the leaders of Lausanne II designed the plenary sessions to be motivational and inspirational. The goal was to motivate and inspire the formation of new networks and new relationships among different evangelical organizations so that the whole church could take the whole gospel to the whole world. Thus, the congress promoted the objective of completing the task of world evangelization by the year 2000.

Cape Town 2010

In 2010, the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization held the third international missions congress in Cape Town. Evangelicals convened this congress 100 years after the Edinburgh conference. At Cape Town, 4000 Christian leaders from 198 countries came to address significant issues in the task of discipling all the nations. Leaders at Cape Town reaffirmed the truth of salvation exclusively in Jesus Christ, presented a clear statement of evangelizing people of other religions, refocused on evangelism as the integral mission of the church, and articulated the objective of eliminating poverty. Additionally, these leaders advocated humility, integrity, and service in cooperative efforts.

---

14Edward R Dayton, introduction to Proclaim Christ until He Comes: Calling the Whole Church to Take the Whole Gospel to the Whole World, ed. J. D. Douglas (Minneapolis: World Wide, 1990), 13.

15Ibid., 14-15.


18Ibid.

19Ibid.
Thesis

As evangelical leaders through these evangelism and missions conferences have provided direction in the task of fulfilling the Great Commission, the BGEA proceeded with its objective of equipping evangelists worldwide by convening conferences in Amsterdam. As previously noted, the BGEA invested in equipping evangelists by prioritizing the calling of the evangelist and the gospel message. This maneuver by the BGEA is significant, considering that organization’s mission statement is promoting the spread of the gospel by every effective means. Instead of emphasizing the equipping of evangelists worldwide with every effective means, the BGEA prioritized a focus on the calling of the evangelist and the content of the gospel message in equipping evangelists. This maneuver is also significant with reference to evangelism trends.

In evangelism the tendency is to emphasize methods. Particular focuses may be on numerous personal evangelism approaches, evangelistic preaching, the use of the sinner’s prayer, or the use of the public invitation. Moreover, American evangelists have shown this tendency to prioritize methods in their ministries. Consider the following examples that John Mark Terry presents in his book *Evangelism: A Concise History*. In exploring the ministry of George Whitefield, Terry focuses on his open air preaching. In studying the ministry of Charles Grandison Finney, Terry concentrates on the new measures that he implemented while preaching as a revivalist. In investigating the ministry of D.L. Moody, Terry gravitates towards his city-wide campaigns and his use of the musical evangelist.

---


21 Ibid., 145-46.

22 Ibid., 153-54.
Since the tendency in evangelism is to emphasize methods, Graham’s move to prioritize the calling of the evangelist and the message of the gospel in equipping evangelists is significant. The BGEA initially made this investment by convening the International Conference for Itinerant Evangelists at Amsterdam, the Netherlands, in 1983 (Amsterdam ’83) and then convening the Second International Conference for Itinerant Evangelists at Amsterdam, the Netherlands, in 1986 (Amsterdam ’86). Fourteen years later, at the dawn of a new century and new millennium, the BGEA felt compelled to equip evangelists worldwide by convening the Amsterdam 2000 Conference for Preaching Evangelists at Amsterdam, the Netherlands, in 2000.

I will be analyzing these three Amsterdam conferences with the following as my thesis. This dissertation argues that, in equipping evangelists via the Amsterdam conferences, the BGEA prioritized the calling of the evangelist and the gospel message, and this contribution is significant in light of a proclivity to emphasize methods in evangelism. When the BGEA equipped the evangelists, it did not provide training for them that could be evaluated for its effectiveness. The BGEA equipped the participants by communicating knowledge that would have the intent of inspiring evangelists to prioritize operating according to their calling and accurately communicating the gospel message. The analysis will begin with Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86.

**Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86**

Following its efforts to sponsor Berlin ’66 and Lausanne ’74, the BGEA was motivated to convene Amsterdam ’83. While understanding the significance of Berlin ’66 and Lausanne ’74 as evangelism and missions congresses that contributed to the evangelistic task of the church, Graham still desired to contribute to world evangelism by concentrating on those serving as itinerant evangelists. Concerning this desire Graham wrote, “Berlin and Lausanne were unquestionably highlights of our work; and yet, in the back of my mind, those two Congresses were actually something of a diversion from
what I really yearned to do: call together men and women from across the world who were involved, as I was, in itinerant or traveling evangelism.”

Because of Graham’s desire to equip those in itinerant evangelism, the BGEA moved forward with the agenda of equipping evangelists from across the world. In recalling the beginning stages of the efforts, Graham further underscored the significance of this investment by writing, “After much research and prayer, a plan to sponsor what we called the International Conference for Itinerant Evangelists (ICIE) began to form. The gathering would be different from Berlin and Lausanne, where the delegates were primarily leaders in evangelism. This next conference would be for the foot soldiers, not the generals.”

Furthermore, concerning Amsterdam ’83, Graham highlighted the value and significance of equipping evangelists worldwide when he wrote, “Although we did not know where we would find them – no one had ever attempted to draw up a list of those involved in itinerant evangelism – we knew that most would be coming from the developing world.”

Three years later, in 1986, the BGEA repeated these efforts. The rationale undergirding the second international conference for itinerant evangelists was the realization that numerous evangelists, particularly from the developing world, were not able to attend Amsterdam ’83. First, the BGEA realized that 8000 applicants for Amsterdam ’83 could not attend due to lack of space or deficiency in financial resources. Second, the BGEA discovered a significantly larger number of evangelists than the organization had previously known. By the time the organization had finished searching for evangelists, they had collected the names of 50,000 individuals involved in

---

24Ibid.
25Ibid.
26Ibid., 579.
the ministry of itinerant evangelism. The BGEA recognized the need to once again make the investment of equipping evangelists from across the world. Thus, the BGEA convened Amsterdam ’86. During Amsterdam ’86 Graham encountered an evangelist from Africa. In recalling his encounter with the African evangelist, Graham reflected upon the impact that Amsterdam ’86 would have on world evangelism. He commented,

Who could say what impact for Christ a man like this would have in the Africa of the future? I said a silent prayer of gratitude for his dedication, and for the opportunity God had given us to bring together such a unique group from across the world, about 8,000 itinerant evangelists from one hundred and seventy-four countries, for training and encouragement.

Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86 made this contribution by equipping international evangelists from three perspectives. First, they equipped from the perspective of the evangelist as a person. Second, they trained the evangelist in the message that he preaches. Third, they provided the evangelists instruction in the various methods of evangelism. In emphasizing these three perspectives the BGEA demonstrated the priority of the evangelist as a person called by God and the priority of the gospel message. In addition to these priorities, they emphasized the various methods that the evangelists could use.

**Amsterdam 2000**

Fourteen years after Amsterdam ’86, the BGEA desired to impact evangelists worldwide due to the challenges that the church would face moving forward into the 21st century. Thus, the BGEA convened Amsterdam 2000 and contributed to world evangelization by equipping 10,237 evangelists from 209 countries and territories. Amsterdam 2000 equipped international evangelists from a well-defined paradigm. First, they presented the need for evangelism. Second, they concentrated on the gift of the

---

27 Graham, *Just as I Am*, 579.
28 Ibid., 558.
evangelist and the gospel message. Third, they specifically focused on the Bible. Fourth, they delved into the subject of Christ, the Savior. Fifth, they expressed the training in terms of the mission of the gospel. Sixth, they dealt with the Holy Spirit and the evangelist. Seventh, the conference equipped the attendees concerning the evangelist’s personal holiness and spiritual walk with God. Eighth, they provided instruction concerning the evangelist and the church. Ninth, they focused on the evangelist’s role in the world. By equipping evangelists from this paradigm the BGEA once again prioritized the evangelist as a person called by God and prioritized the gospel message. Thus, the BGEA’s investment in equipping evangelists via the Amsterdam conferences is significant due to emphasizing the person of the evangelist called by God and the gospel message rather than capitulating to an emphasis on methods.

**Background**

In 1998, during my first semester at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, I took “H2400: Basic Evangelism” taught by Daniel Forshee. In the context of taking “Basic Evangelism” I sensed God’s call to serve Him as an evangelist. During my second year at Southeastern Seminary, God gave me the opportunity to utilize my calling and gifting as an evangelist by serving as the coordinator of the student-led door-to-door evangelism organization called Doulos. At that time I also developed an interest in the works and influence of Thom Rainer. I sensed that God was calling me to pursue further education at the Billy Graham School of Missions, Evangelism and Church Growth of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. I initially was thinking in terms of earning a Doctorate in Ministry from the Billy Graham School.

After I finished serving as the Doulos Coordinator, I had the opportunity to participate in The Amsterdam 2000 Conference of Preaching Evangelists. Two significant things occurred at this conference. First, God used this conference to motivate me to fulfill my calling within the North American context. Second, I met Chuck
Lawless, then an assistant professor at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and he encouraged me to pursue a Doctorate of Philosophy at the Billy Graham School of Missions, Evangelism and Church Growth rather than a Doctorate of Ministry.

While a student in the Billy Graham School, first in the Master of Arts in Theological Studies (MATS) degree program and then in the Doctor of Philosophy program, I have had opportunities to study the ministry of the evangelist. First, in pursuing the MATS degree, I took “The Ministry of the Itinerant Evangelist” taught by Adam Greenway. In that course I was assigned to write a 25 to 30 page paper on my own itinerant ministry. Going through that exercise showed me the significance of the ministry of the itinerant evangelist. Second, in “86140: Theology of the Christian Mission,” taught by George Martin, I wrote a research paper on the itinerant mission of an evangelist. In that seminar paper I interpreted the itinerant ministry of the evangelist in light of the mission of Christ and the mission of the church.

I have seen the value of the itinerant evangelist through my calling, my experiences, and my research. Since I observed the value of the ministry of the itinerant evangelist, I desired to devise a research project that focused on that particular ministry. Consequently, I determined to analyze the BGEA’s ministry of equipping evangelists via the three Amsterdam conferences.

**Methodology**

I utilized three places for my research. I commenced the research at the James P. Boyce Centennial Library of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. I also utilized the Ernest Miller White Library of the Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary. The last site that I explored was the Billy Graham Center at Wheaton College.

I acquired the three compendiums on the three international conferences for the itinerant evangelist. I acquired *The Work of an Evangelist: International Congress for*
Itinerant Evangelists, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, the compendium of Amsterdam ’83, from the James P. Boyce Centennial Library of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. I acquired The Call of An Evangelist: The Second International Congress for Itinerant Evangelists, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, the compendium of Amsterdam ’86, from the Ernest Miller White Library of the Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary. The BGEA sent me The Mission of an Evangelist: The Amsterdam 2000 Conference of Preaching Evangelists, the compendium of Amsterdam 2000, because I participated in that conference for itinerant evangelists. All three compendiums contain all the plenary messages in print, all the messages delivered in the seminars, and selections in print of the instruction from some of the workshops.

After I acquired the three compendiums of the three international conferences for the itinerant evangelist, I pursued other resources. I obtained books on the life and ministry of Billy Graham. I also accessed magazine articles on the three international conferences for the itinerant evangelist. These resources were all collected from the James P. Boyce Centennial Library of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

In my examination of the materials I started with the three compendiums of the three conferences. The BGEA organized the conferences around the plenary sessions, thus, making those sessions the major focal point of conferences. Utilizing the plenary sessions as the major focal point of the conferences, the BGEA prioritized training all of the participants in the calling of the evangelist and in the gospel message. In order to supplement the major emphases of the plenary sessions, the BGEA designed the seminars to train the attendees in how to prepare and deliver the gospel message and in how to


penetrate a region with the gospel through crusade evangelism. Also, on designated days of the conference the BGEA supplemented the plenary session emphases on the calling of the evangelist and on the content of the gospel by offering numerous workshops on the various methods of evangelism.

Because of the manner in which the BGEA structured the three Amsterdam conferences, I initially read the plenary sessions from the three compendiums. I then organized the material into the following two categories: information on the calling of the evangelist and information on the content of the gospel. I then used the data collected on the calling of the evangelist and on the content of the gospel to advance my argument. Next, I read the instruction from the seminars in all the compendiums. Then, I organized the material into the subject matters dealing with the preparation and delivery of the gospel and the work of penetrating a region with the gospel through crusade evangelism. As a result, in the forthcoming chapters on the three Amsterdam conferences, I will demonstrate how the instruction in the seminars supplemented the emphases promoted in the plenary sessions. In so doing I advanced my thesis that the BGEA prioritized the calling of the evangelist and the content of the gospel in equipping evangelists. I also read from the compendiums the training material on the various methodologies taught in the workshops. In my forthcoming two chapters analyzing the three Amsterdam conferences I will use the material from the workshops to show how the methodologies taught supplemented the priorities placed on the instruction on the calling of the evangelist and the content of the gospel. Thus, I used the material from the workshop to advance my thesis. Finally, I read other books and journal articles that dealt with the BGEA’s efforts at equipping evangelists from throughout the world, examining them to determine how they contribute to understanding the BGEA’s priority of emphasizing the calling of the evangelist and the gospel message.

The Billy Graham Center at Wheaton College contains the documents from the BGEA concerning their planning and execution of the three international conferences for
the itinerant evangelist held in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. The Billy Graham Center has processed every document associated with Amsterdam ’83, and I investigated them. Concerning Amsterdam ’86 the Billy Graham Center has a significant amount of material, but the files are, nonetheless, incomplete. I still examined the substantial amount of resources that the institution has processed. For Amsterdam 2000, the Billy Graham center has collected the documents but has not processed them.

Limitations/Delimitations

The limitations that I dealt with are associated with documents that the Billy Graham Center at Wheaton College has processed and has on file. The delimitations are the ones that I imposed due to the focus of my particular research.

Limitations

The Billy Graham Center at Wheaton College does not have some of the documents for Amsterdam ’86. Therefore, I was unable to utilize a complete collection for my evaluation of Amsterdam ’86. The Billy Graham Center does have the documents for Amsterdam 2000, but the Center has not processed those materials. Therefore, I did not have access to those materials for my analysis of Amsterdam 2000.

Delimitations

This dissertation analyzes only the three international conferences for the itinerant evangelist that the BGEA convened in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. It makes no effort to analyze the impact that Billy Graham’s crusades have had on evangelism in either North America or on the international field. This dissertation does not attempt to evaluate any other attempts of the BGEA to spread the gospel throughout the world. Nor does this dissertation attempt to assess any of the efforts of the BGEA to equip the saints outside the efforts made to equip evangelists from across the world at the three international conferences for the itinerant evangelist. Furthermore, this dissertation does
not include an assessment of the North American Conference for Itinerant Evangelists that the BGEA convened in Louisville, Kentucky, in 1994, because the focus of this research is upon Graham’s impact on world evangelism through his investment in equipping evangelists from across the entire globe.

This dissertation does not attempt to analyze the three international conferences for the itinerant evangelist with a view towards comparing them with the evangelistic contributions of the crusades and other efforts of the BGEA. Thus, no effort is made to compare the three international conferences for the itinerant evangelist with the crusades and other efforts of the BGEA at fulling the Great Commission in order to demonstrate, for instance, that the three international conferences for the itinerant evangelist are that organization’s greatest contribution to world evangelism. Rather, this dissertation is limited to examining the three international conferences for the itinerant evangelist that the BGEA convened in Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

**Conclusion**

To evaluate the three Amsterdam conferences one must investigate Billy Graham’s life. An exploration into his life will demonstrate that, as an evangelist, he contributed to world evangelization. Such an examination of Graham’s life will convey that he contributed not only to world evangelization by preaching the gospel on all six continents, but also to world evangelization by multiplying his ministry. Specifically, the exploration into his life will indicate that Graham multiplied his ministry by convening international conferences, with his most unique conferences being the three international conferences for the itinerant evangelist that the BGEA convened in Amsterdam. Chapter 2 will serve as a biography of Billy Graham, exposing the reader to how he participated in world evangelization through his worldwide crusades and by multiplying his ministry through international conferences. In so doing, chapter 2 will provide the context and the
foundation to defend the thesis and will prepare the reader for the examination of the three Amsterdam conferences in chapters 3 and 4.
CHAPTER 2
A BIOGRAPHY OF BILLY GRAHAM

Introduction

In 1 Thessalonians 2:8 Paul, in referencing his missionary work among the people of Thessalonica, wrote, “Having so fond an affection for you, we were well-pleased to impart to you not only the gospel of God but also our own lives, because you had become very dear to us.”\(^1\) Paul’s articulation of his approach to doing mission work in Thessalonica can be used to characterize Billy Graham’s work as an evangelist. Billy Graham imparted the gospel and his life to the entire world. He did so in at least two major ways that were previously identified in chapter one. First, he preached the gospel in 185 countries on all six continents. Second, he, through the BGEA, convened international congresses and conferences.

The following investigation into Graham’s life will show that he imparted the gospel and his life to the entire world in the two aforementioned ways. The investigation will begin by exploring his social and religious context. It will continue by identifying his salvation experience. Moreover, it will focus on his call into ministry, and it will cover his launch into ministry. This exploration into his life will identify the watershed moment for his ministry, and it will demonstrate how Billy Graham’s ministry expanded into London and Europe. Additionally, it will convey how Graham initially engaged in and made further progress in world evangelization. Finally, this presentation will show how he enlarged his vision for the Great Commission by convening various international congresses and conferences.

\(^1\)Unless otherwise indicated, all Scripture references are to the New American Standard Bible.
Social and Religious Context

Billy Graham was born to William Franklin Graham (Frank) and Morrow Graham on November 7, 1918, in a wood frame farmhouse on Park Road outside of Charlotte, North Carolina. ² He grew up on the family dairy farm during the “Roaring Twenties” and the Great Depression in the 1930s.³ During that time, Frank and Morrow Graham reared Billy in a Presbyterian tradition characterized by a strong Calvinistic theology.⁴

During Graham’s early years, his father, his uncle, and the hired workers did all the jobs on the dairy farm. When Billy and his younger brother Melvin were old enough, they helped out with the farm chores.⁵ Billy started helping his father on the farm during the time of the Depression, and he learned the value of hard work while working on the farm during that crisis.⁶ In experiencing the rigors of life on the farm during the Depression, Graham failed to maintain good grades in school. While in high school Graham would sometimes only sleep three to four hours a night, and Graham attributed his lack of sleep and his responsibilities on the farm as contributing factors to his C average in school.⁷

Within this social context on the farm Frank Graham imparted the values of discipline and hard work to his son Billy. In addition to imparting discipline in this social context on the farm, he and his wife Morrow imparted the strict discipline within the

---
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religious context of the Scottish Presbyterian tradition. Billy’s exposure to this Presbyterian context occurred despite his parents’ diverse religious backgrounds and experiences.

Billy’s father had been raised in the mourner’s bench Methodist tradition. At the age of 18 Frank attended a series of revival meetings organized by three Confederate veterans. The Confederate veterans held the meetings at a Methodist Chapel called the Plank Meetinghouse. During the first night of the revival Frank went to the mourner’s bench during the altar call. While at the mourner’s bench Frank prayed for salvation, deliverance, or some sort of assurance. Frank sensed that something was not right within him. Therefore, he kept returning to the revival services over the next nine nights, seeking God’s favor. Frank was in a miserable emotional, mental, and spiritual state. During those nights Frank could not pinpoint any positive experience that would demonstrate that he had received God’s favor. Finally, on the tenth night of the revival, as Frank Graham was driving his horse and buggy in the bright moonlight, he realized that Christ had died for his sins. As a result, he had a deeply meaningful spiritual experience, one that he understood in terms of placing his faith in Christ.

Frank’s wife, Morrow, had been reared in the Reformed Presbyterian tradition. She could not precisely identify a moment of conversion. She simply could testify to the fact that she had been born again.

When Frank and Morrow married, they dedicated their union to God. The two of them made sure that pious activities characterized the daily routine in the Graham household. Thus, they made sure that the entire family always said grace before meals.

---
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Furthermore, they established the family devotional time. For the family devotional time, the family would assemble at 8:00 p.m. Morrow would read from the Scriptures, and Frank would lead in prayer.  

Concerning church attendance, through the influence of Morrow, they attended the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church. This local church adhered to the Westminster Confession of Faith. Thus, the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church immersed the Graham family in the Calvinistic tradition that took its stand on the literal truth of the Scriptures. To ensure that Billy and his siblings were grounded in the Reformed Presbyterian tradition, Morrow drilled Bible verses into their heads. One of the first verses that she taught Billy was John 3:16. Additionally, Morrow required Billy and his siblings to memorize the Westminster Shorter Catechism by the time they turned 10 years old.

**Salvation Experience**

Within this religious context, Graham learned the tenets of the Reformed Presbyterian tradition without experiencing conversion, and his father lived out what may have been a nominal faith. For Frank, religious activities, ethical behavior, and church attendance were matters of self-discipline rather than joyful commitment. His faith would be significantly transformed when Mordecai Ham held an evangelistic crusade at Charlotte, in 1934. Also, his son, Billy, would be saved at the age of 15 during the same Mordecai Ham crusade.

---


13 Ibid.


Mordecai Ham was controversial. He had a reputation for being anti-Semitic. Ham so intensely preached with anti-Semitic rhetoric that some newspaper editors asked him to leave their cities.\textsuperscript{17} He was also controversial along denominational lines. In general, Southern Baptists supported him. Methodists and Presbyterians did not support his message or style.\textsuperscript{18}

In May of 1934, Christian businessmen, in preparation for the Ham crusade that would occur later that fall, held an all-day prayer meeting in the pasture of the farm that Frank Graham owned. As they prayed for Charlotte, they also prayed that people would be reached for Christ throughout the state of North Carolina. Eventually, they focused their prayers on world evangelism. In fact, at the meeting, Vernon Patterson prayed that God would rise up someone from Charlotte who would preach the gospel to the ends of the earth.\textsuperscript{19}

When the Ham crusade occurred, Morrow wanted to attend the Ham services for her spiritual nurture. Morrow also desired that her husband would attend the services in order to find certainty for his salvation. Frank did attend the services, and he insisted that Ham opened up his eyes to the truth.\textsuperscript{20} He had been dissatisfied simply with moving his membership from church to church, and after his experiences at the Ham crusade, the gospel functioned as a new reality for the rest of his life.\textsuperscript{21} While Billy Graham’s parents were enthusiastic about the impact of the evangelistic meetings that Ham conducted, 15-year-old Billy had informed them that he would not be attending the evangelistic meetings.

\textsuperscript{17}Martin, \textit{A Prophet with Honor}, 63.

\textsuperscript{18}Graham, \textit{Just as I Am}, 22.

\textsuperscript{19}Martin, \textit{A Prophet with Honor}, 62.

\textsuperscript{20}Graham, \textit{Just as I Am}, 25.

\textsuperscript{21}Ibid.
Initially, Billy did not attend any of the meetings. Then, Ham exposed a controversy associated with Central High School in Charlotte. In response, several students planned on protesting one of the meetings while some considered causing physical harm to Ham. One of Graham’s friends enticed him to attend one of the meetings to see the “fighting preacher.” Graham attended, and Ham captivated him with his message. Graham decided to attend the remainder of the meetings, night after night, and week after week. Ham preached on subjects such as the second coming of Christ, infidelity, money, drinking, the Sabbath, and hell.

During the meetings Graham experienced deep conviction over his sins and rebellion, but he did not desire to avoid the meetings. Graham and his friend Grady Wilson decided to sing in the crusade choir to avoid the stare of Ham. As Graham continued to attend the meetings, he realized that he did not know Christ personally as his Lord and Savior. Finally, on one particular night, after Ham had zealously spoken against sin, he quoted from Romans 5:8 and called people forward. While the choir was singing “Almost Persuaded, Now to Believe,” Graham felt compelled to move forward. He struggled with doubts concerning the genuineness of his response to go forward when he saw a woman weeping and contrasted her response with his lack of tears. Then, J. D. Prevatt, one of his friends, embraced him at the platform and clearly explained to him the simple facts of the gospel. He led Graham to respond to Christ in prayer. While in the past Graham had always regarded his baptism and confirmation in the Associate Reformed Presbyterian church as professions of faith, he, at the platform, had embraced

---

22 Graham, *Just as I Am*, 25-26. Graham indicated that the *Charlotte News*, the local newspaper at the time of the Mordecai Ham crusade, had released an article about Ham exposing immoral conditions at Central High School. Graham referenced Ham’s claim of possessing affidavits from students that indicated that the person in the house across the street from Central High School offered what Graham only identified as “pleasures” to the high school girls and boys during their lunch recess. While Graham referred to this controversy as a scandal, he did not offer any other insights into the nature of this incident.
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Christ with intentionality and purpose. Although he had committed to Christ, he did not sense an overall divine purpose for his life.

**Call into Ministry**

Without a clear sense of purpose for his life, Graham started attending Bob Jones College during the fall semester of 1936. Graham had a negative experience at Bob Jones College due to the institute’s goal to regulate every aspect of a student’s life. The college intensely regulated a student’s social life. For example, the school only permitted dating couples to sit in different chairs and to talk for a maximum of 15 minutes while under the supervision of a chaperone. To ensure the student’s purity, the school monitored the mail. Additionally, Bob Jones College vigorously regulated academic life to conform it to the convictions of its president, Bob Jones, Sr. The college permitted the students to embrace only Bob Jones, Sr.’s teachings on doctrines, ethics, and academics. The college discouraged independent thought. Overall, Bob Jones, Sr. operated from the paradigm that he was the authority; consequently, he sought to enforce social and academic discipline on the students. Because Graham never embraced Bob Jones, Sr.’s totalitarian approach, he left Bob Jones College after one semester.

In January, 1937, Graham transferred from Bob Jones College to Florida Bible Institute in Temple Terrace, Florida. While attending Florida Baptist Institute, Graham

---
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responded affirmatively to God’s call to preach the gospel. Graham had entered into a relationship with Emily Cavanaugh and had planned to marry her. When she informed Graham that she would not marry him due to her love for and commitment to Charles Massey, he was devastated. Graham knew that the despondency the he was dealing with went beyond his severed relationship with Emily. He recognized that rather than attempting to please Emily to win her back, he needed to please God with his life. Therefore, following his breakup with Emily, Graham would pace the golf course that surrounded the Florida Bible Institute, struggling in prayer with the Holy Spirit concerning God’s call on his life to serve as a preacher. For weeks, as Graham attempted to resist the Holy Spirit’s working his life, he had to consider the reality that over the eighteen month period at the Florida Bible Institute he had preached numerous times with many people being converted to Christ. Additionally, as he struggled with the fact that God was calling him to preach the gospel, he had to deal with the reality that his professors and classmates affirmed his giftedness to preach. Finally, one evening, while on the golf course surrounding his school, Graham could not resist the inner urge to preach any longer. On one of the greens, he prostrated himself, and while sobbing, surrendered to God’s call to preach. In that moment of consecration to God he concluded that that his purpose and objectives were established.32 Later, while a student at Florida Baptist Institute, he was ordained in 1939 by a Southern Baptist congregation, Peniel Baptist Church, in Palatka, Florida.33 He graduated from Florida Bible Institute in 1940.

In 1940, Graham started attending Wheaton College, where he met Ruth McCue Bell. As the daughter of a missionary surgeon who served in China, she spent the first seventeen years of her life in China. Billy graduated from Wheaton College in 1943,

32Graham, Just as I Am, 51-53.
and he married Ruth Bell. Prior to their marriage, without consulting Ruth, Billy accepted the pastorate of Western Springs Baptist Church. Thus, Billy started the pastorate of a Baptist church as a newly married man.

The Launch into Ministry

Western Springs Baptist Church was located in Western Springs, a semi-rural and high middle-class suburb of Chicago, with straight streets and houses with unfenced lawns. Additionally, Western Springs featured at least ten places of worship. Within this setting Western Springs Baptist Church was a small congregation that worshiped in the basement of a half-finished, mortgage-ridden facility.

When Graham started the pastorate, the church had fewer than a hundred members. Early in his pastorate, the church experienced substantial conversion growth. In addition to preaching twice on Sunday, Graham attended youth meetings in various homes after the evening service, taught Child Evangelism classes with his wife Ruth, and made pastoral visits.

While serving as pastor of Western Springs Baptist Church, Graham capitalized on a couple of opportunities. Since very few Baptists lived in the area, Graham desired to change the name of the church to the Village Church. The church council agreed to change the name, and the change in the name afforded Graham the opportunity to reach a broader audience. Then, in October of 1943, Torrey Johnson, pastor of a growing church, professor of New Testament Greek at Northern Baptist

36Graham, Just as I Am, 81.
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Seminary, and major radio personality, called Graham on the phone. Because his responsibilities had become so numerous, Johnson asked Graham and the Village Church to take over his second radio program, *Songs in the Night*.\(^{40}\) Graham prayed about it, presented the matter to the deacons, and after funding for the program became available, he and the Village Church assumed responsibilities for the radio program.\(^{41}\)

The live 45-minute radio broadcast was held at the Village Church on Sunday nights. Graham organized the broadcast in such a way that he would identify the local topics that were being dealt with that particular day and deliver a biblical message that would provide a scriptural solution for those topics. Additionally, he incorporated singing into the program. For the first broadcast, Graham had secured George Beverly Shea, a well-known bass baritone who had served as staff announcer for the Moody Bible Institute’s WMBI station. The great success of the first broadcast with George Beverly Shea gave the Village Church significant public exposure.\(^{42}\)

As a result of the first broadcast, people consistently filled the building of the Village Church to watch the Sunday night broadcast. Moreover, the broadcast impacted listeners from throughout the Midwest. The *Chicago Tribune* did a report on the program. Eventually, the WMBI station decided to broadcast the morning worship services in March and April of 1944. Furthermore, attendance and conversions to Christ continued to increase.\(^{43}\)

While serving as pastor, Graham also started preaching as an evangelist for Youth for Christ. Youth for Christ was an evangelistic organization founded to minister


\(^{41}\)Graham, *Just as I Am*, 84–85.

\(^{42}\)Ibid., 86.

to the youth and servicemen during World War II. Graham’s increased number of speaking engagements more frequently pulled him away from the pastorate at the Village Church. Eventually, Graham had to choose between serving as pastor and preaching for Youth for Christ. Graham eventually left the pastorate and only dedicated himself to serving as an evangelist for Youth for Christ. After World War II, Graham continued to preach throughout the United States and Europe.

In the fall of 1946, Graham participated in a six month preaching tour for Youth for Christ that started in England. To save money, Graham and his fellow evangelists with Youth for Christ would frequently board in homes rather than hotels. Towards the end of this evangelistic work, in 1947, while preaching in South Wales, Graham had an encounter with Stephen F. Olford that significantly impacted him. His preaching in South Wales had been rather ordinary. The Welsh people simply did not respond well; and consequently, attendance was low. Olford met with Graham for two days in a miner’s home in Pontypridd, where he was lodging. Olford met with Graham concerning encountering the Holy Spirit in his quiet time. Graham had had a quiet time but not in the manner that Olford emphasized. On the first day of their time together, Olford emphasized what it meant for Graham to expose himself to the Scriptures, not merely memorizing them. Olford recognized that Graham memorized the Scriptures well, but he communicated to Graham how to engage with the Scriptures so that they impacted him. Following that time with Olford, Graham continued to preach ordinary messages that did not connect to the Welsh people. The next day Olford met with Graham concerning encountering the Holy Spirit in his quiet times. In this meeting with Olford, Graham learned what being filled with the Holy Spirit entails, and what it means

---
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to preach in the anointing of the Holy Spirit. From that point forward he preached what Olford described as preaching anointed by the Holy Spirit, and the response to the preaching was dramatic. Additionally, the crowds increased significantly. Graham, as a result of his encounter with Olford had a deeper walk with God, and consequently, experienced anointed preaching.\(^4^6\)

In 1948, Billy Graham received the opportunity to serve as the college President of Northwestern Schools in St. Paul, Minnesota. He served in that capacity from 1948 through 1952. Furthermore, his ministry as an evangelist continued to expand.

**Watershed Moment**

The 1949 crusade in Los Angeles proved to be a watershed experience. It was initially slated to occur over a three-week period. The great success of the crusade led to extending the crusade to eight weeks. The impact of the crusade was so great that overflow crowds assembled in a tent in downtown Los Angeles.\(^4^7\) The great success in Los Angeles launched Graham into Boston, Columbia, and New England. In 1950, Graham established the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association.

**Expansion into London and Europe**

Graham’s ministry continued to gain momentum. He eventually had a breakthrough in Great Britain with his London crusade in 1954. Due to great success the crusade in London was extended to last twelve weeks.\(^4^8\) In providing a record of the Greater London Crusade, Charles T. Cook wrote concerning the impact, “With regard to sustained effort, total attendances, and the number of inquirers dealt with, the mission


\(^4^7\) Ibid.

broke all records.”49 Once again, the success could be linked to Graham’s interaction with Olford, the one who led him to the deeper walk with God. In this case, Olford designed the Operation Andrew strategy to bring the lost to the crusade. From the London crusade forward, the BGEA continued to utilize the Operation Andrew approach with significant success.50 Moreover, his evangelistic outreach eventually impacted Europe.

During this time period, as his ministry was expanding throughout Europe, he held another significant crusade in New York City. In 1957, Graham held a crusade in Madison Square Garden of New York City with great success. The success was so great that the BGEA extended the crusade to last sixteen weeks.51 During that 16 week period, over 2,000,000 people heard Graham preach the gospel in person at Madison Square Garden, Yankee Stadium, Central Park, Wall Street, and Brooklyn, and in that same time frame, thousands more heard him broadcast on daily radio and television programs.52 The success that the BGEA experienced with crusades in New York, London, and throughout Europe catapulted the organization to engage in world evangelization.

World Evangelization

From 1956 through 1967, the BGEA’s ministry expanded throughout the world. Graham made a trip to Asia. In 1956, in Asia, he preached in India, the Philippines, Hong Kong, Formosa (Taiwan), Japan, and Korea. Then, in 1959, he ministered in Australia. A year later, in 1960, he preached in Africa and the Middle East.


50 Martin, A Prophet with Honor, 178-79.


**Further Progress in World Evangelization**

As opportunities to engage in world evangelism increased, Billy Graham did evangelistic work in Ireland and South Africa in the 1960s and 1970s. Additionally, Graham was able to make further progress behind the Iron Curtain. In 1977, he served in Hungary. In 1978, he returned to Poland. Then, in the 1980s, he made great advances in the Soviet Union and other Communist countries. In 1982, he entered into Moscow once again. He had the opportunity to preach at the Moscow Baptist Church, and 2500 people filled the facility to hear him. Reverend Mikhail Zhidkov, one of the pastors of Moscow Baptist Church, served as his interpreter. Later, in 1982, Graham went into East Germany and Czechoslovakia. In 1984, Graham had a significant breakthrough in the Soviet Union. At the Baptist Church in Leningrad, the Oleviste Baptist Church in Tallinn, the Cathedral of the Resurrection in Moscow, the Cathedral of the Epiphany in Moscow, and the Orthodox Cathedral in Novosibirsk, he preached the message of Jesus’ death and resurrection and called for a commitment to follow Christ. Furthermore, he preached the gospel message without any restrictions.


---
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Enlarging the Vision for World Evangelization

Graham enlarged his vision for world evangelization by convening various international congresses and conferences. As demonstrated in chapter one, the BGEA convened an evangelism congress in Berlin and a missions congress in Lausanne. Furthermore, as demonstrated in chapter one, the BGEA convened three international conferences for the itinerant evangelist in Amsterdam. By convening these congresses and conferences, the BGEA not only enlarged its vision for world evangelization, it also multiplied its ministry and expanded its disciple-making efforts.

By Convening Berlin ’66

Victor Nelson, colleague at the BGEA and retired Presbyterian pastor, had advised Graham that he should do more to impact world evangelism. Specifically, he exhorted Graham to continue his efforts in mass evangelism and to multiply his efforts by equipping others to engage in world evangelization. Graham recognized the wisdom in Nelson’s counsel; and consequently, he proceeded with the objective of convening a congress on evangelism.55

In order to convene the congress, the BGEA needed to deal with at least two major issues. First, the BGEA needed to form a strong network between evangelicals and evangelists because such a network did not exist. While the World Evangelical Fellowship had been formed in 1951, many leaders from mainline denominations were not a part of this organization. Second, determining a location for the congress proved to be difficult. Initially, Stan Mooneyham and George Wilson considered convening the congress in Rome. Mooneyham and Wilson discovered that Rome had excellent facilities. Additionally, they learned that the BGEA would have excellent translating capabilities at a reasonable cost. The prospects of convening the congress in Rome

55 Graham, Just as I Am, 561.
seemed promising. Although choosing to convene the congress in Rome seemed viable, Tom Allan advised the BGEA to reconsider using Rome. He had at least two major concerns. First, he felt that holding an evangelical congress in Rome might be perceived as anti-Catholic. Second, he considered convening an evangelical congress in Rome at the same time as the Vatican II deliberations to be an unwise maneuver. The BGEA followed Allan’s counsel and eventually settled on Belin, Germany, as the site. 56

After settling on Berlin, the BGEA had to deal with who would sponsor the congress. Graham realized that the BGEA would finance and organize the congress. He simply felt that if another evangelical organization was involved in sponsoring the event, it would eventually attract a larger and more diverse representation of Christian leaders. Graham recognized the possibility that Christianity Today could be the organization that could sponsor an evangelical evangelism congress. The reason was that Christianity Today had earned a respectable reputation worldwide. Both Protestants and Catholics favorably viewed the contributions of the magazine. After Carl Henry, the editor of Christianity Today, prayed about the prospect of sponsoring an evangelical evangelism congress, he agreed to participate. Therefore, Christianity Today and the BGEA cosponsored the evangelism congress and gave it the following title: the World Congress on Evangelism. Bob Evans, founder of the Greater Europe Mission, and Clyde Taylor, secretary of the World Evangelical Fellowship, aided Henry in the development of the program while the BGEA organized the congress and raised the money. 57

As the BGEA proceeded with its plans to convene the congress, the organization continued to deal with issues. The BGEA had to deal with those who ardently opposed the convening of the congress. Others were concerned that the evangelical congress would be anti-Communist and anti-ecumenical. Not only did the
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BGEA deal with various forms of opposition, the organization had to determine who would attend the congress.\textsuperscript{58}

The concern over who would attend the congress revolved around the Charismatic movement. The reason this concern existed was that the Charismatic movement was largely viewed as operating outside the bounds of evangelicalism. The BGEA had to determine whether or not to invite Charismatics in light of the precedent that the organization had set with its crusades. With its crusades, the BGEA had not prevented those involved in the Charismatic movement from participating, but the organization had not also encouraged charismatic participation. Part of the issue with inviting those from the Charismatic movement was the controversial supernatural manifestations characteristic of the movement. The BGEA did not want controversial issues to detract from the focus of the congress. In working through the issues Graham felt that inviting his friend Oral Roberts would be wise. He wanted Roberts as an attendee, but not a participant in the program.\textsuperscript{59} This maneuver would allow a charismatic to attend and not involving him in the program would potentially eliminate the appearance that the BGEA and the congress endorsed the controversial supernatural manifestations.

In addition to working through the issues associated with the Charismatic movement, the BGEA operated around other guiding principles in inviting participants. The BGEA wanted a diverse denominational representation. While at the same time the BGEA wanted to be clear that the organization was choosing individuals for their unique contribution in ministry and not for how he represented his denomination. The BGEA did not want to facilitate the notion that the delegates who attended needed to feel obligated to represent well their denominational convictions or that they had to report
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back to their denomination. Thus, the BGEA sought to have a wide denominational base, and consequently, to choose individuals from those denominations, who, in their own ministries, uniquely contributed to the cause of evangelism.

Another approach to determining who would attend the World Congress on Evangelism was to invite observers. These individuals whom the BGEA would invite would come to simply observe the proceedings. They would not be contributing to the cause of world evangelism. Thus, these attendees were not necessarily evangelicals. In fact, they were not necessarily Christians.

Around 1200 delegates from 104 countries attended. The delegates consisted of evangelists, theologians, scholars concerned with evangelism, denominational leaders, and parachurch leaders. Corrie Ten Boom, one who survived the Nazi holocaust and exuded compassionate forgiveness, attended. Kimo Yaeti and Komi Gikita, two Auca Indian converts, who, prior to coming to Christ, had slain five missionaries in Ecuador in 1956, were in attendance. Their attendance ten years after the slayings displayed the power of the gospel and the necessity of the gospel to penetrate all the tribes and peoples worldwide. Furthermore, as previously noted in chapter one, all the attendees assembled under the theme of one race, one gospel, and one task. The event was held at the Kongresshalle, a highly modern facility located on the banks of the Spree River near the Berlin Wall.
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In the opening address of the congress, Graham emphasized the need for the fires of revival and evangelism to spread through the worldwide church. He declared, “We are not here to organize a new movement – we are here to ask God to rekindle the flame of revival and evangelism throughout the world church.”\(^{67}\) Focusing on the work of the world church he further communicated, “My prayer is that the Holy Spirit will so manifest himself that we will go back to our people with a fresh vision, a fresh zeal, and a fresh love for the souls of men. The need is desperate – the Gospel’s power is undiminished. The Holy Spirit is still available.”\(^{68}\)

Berlin ’66 had at least three significant results. First, the congress facilitated the forming of new relationships and better cooperative efforts among diverse evangelical churches and organizations. Second, the congress led to new efforts in evangelism. For example, the congress motivated Bill Bright to expand the efforts of his Campus Crusade for Christ ministries to include efforts in world evangelism. Third, the congress significantly contributed to articulating a theology of evangelism. The congress benefited the participants in terms of a theology of evangelism by collecting the papers of the congress into two volumes and widely disseminating the works among the participants.\(^{69}\)

**By Convening Lausanne ’74**

The success of Berlin ’66 became the catalyst motivating some to encourage Graham to convene another international congress on evangelism. Some of the people associated with Graham did not desire that the BGEA lose the momentum gained by the Belin congress.\(^{70}\) They urged Graham to capitalize on the momentum by convening
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another congress to further influence the task of world evangelization. Graham was, on his part, hesitant concerning convening another international congress on evangelism.

Graham was hesitant for various reasons. He understood the time and energy involved in the task of convening Berlin ’66. Graham was concerned that the amount of time and effort that some of the staff of the BGEA would have to put into convening another congress on world evangelism would prevent them from concentrating their time and efforts on crusade work. Thus, another congress would divert the BGEA from their efforts of penetrating the world with the gospel. He also understood that convening another congress would be another financial burden. Graham recognized that the BGEA would primarily be responsible for raising the majority of the money that went beyond what their budget normally allocated. Despite Graham’s initial reluctance to embrace the push for a second international congress on evangelism, he would be eventually be persuaded to do so by challenges set forth by the World Council of Churches.

In the fourth World Council of Churches (WCC) conference at Uppsala, Sweden, in 1968, the churches of the conciliar movement who made up that organization began to redefine the concept of the gospel. The WCC began to promote the work of the gospel as changing societal structures. Then, the WCC’s Commission of Mission and Evangelism sponsored a conference at Bangkok in 1973. At that conference the WCC further took radical steps away from the biblical understanding of the gospel. Rather than promoting calling sinners to repentance and belief in Jesus Christ alone for salvation, the WCC presented the work of missions and evangelism as the work of fighting for social and political justice. The rationale justifying the WCC position of redefining evangelism was their conviction that Christ has already provided the entire world with salvation; and consequently, the need to call people to repentance and faith alone in Christ alone did not
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exist. Evangelicals were alarmed by the developments at the WCC conferences and felt the need to assemble in a conference to respond to the challenges made by the conciliar movement.\textsuperscript{73}

Graham likewise recognized the need to respond. Therefore, after initial reluctance, he decisively moved forward with the agenda to convene another congress. For this congress, Graham wanted to underscore the significance of diversity and making sure that the congress truly had an international characteristic to it at every step of the process. Thus, at the outset, in the formation of the committee that would plan the congress, Graham made sure that special attention was given to selecting individuals from diverse backgrounds and cultures. When the committee was formed, it consisted of twenty-eight members from sixteen different nations, about half of them from the developing world.\textsuperscript{74}

Because of the drive to adequately represent the developing world at the international congress, the BGEA desired to hold the congress somewhere in the developing world. As the BGEA searched for a location, they discovered that a facility that could accommodate such a gathering did not exist in the developing world. At the recommendation of Robert Denny, then the secretary of the Baptist World Alliance (BWA), the BGEA focused on finding a facility in Europe.

After careful research, the BGEA eventually selected the Palais de Beaulieu conference center in Lausanne, Switzerland, to hold the international congress of evangelism. The Palais de Beaulieu conference center proved to be a great asset. The auditorium could seat 4000 participants. It provided facilities for simultaneous translation. Moreover, the conference center provided a significant amount of rooms that
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the BGEA could use for the small group meetings and the workshops that it was planning for the international congress.\textsuperscript{75}

The BGEA officially convened the congress on July 16, 1974. The theme of the congress was “Let the Earth Hear His Voice.” Around 4000 delegates assembled from 150 countries.\textsuperscript{76}

The BGEA achieved its goal of diversity at the conference. Graham highlighted the diversity in his opening comments at the congress:

Never before have so many representatives of so many evangelical Christian churches in so many nations and from so many tribal and language groups gathered to worship, pray, and plan together for world evangelization. Assembled here tonight are more responsible leaders, from more growing national churches of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, than have ever met before.\textsuperscript{77}

The achievement of this diversity was significant.

In the opening session, Graham articulated the significance behind and the various objectives for convening the congress. First, he emphasized that the Lausanne Congress stands in the tradition of many movements of evangelism throughout the church’s history. Second, he articulated the conviction that the congress convened as one body, focused on obeying one Lord, and determined to fulfill one task. Third, Graham indicated that the congress assembled to reemphasize the biblical truths essential to evangelism. Fourth, Graham indicated that the Lausanne congress convened to reaffirm that the Christian witness must be both word and deed. Fifth, Graham maintained that the congress convened to demonstrate the necessity of evangelism.\textsuperscript{78} He also exhorted
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the participants to collaborate in the task of evangelism. While peoples and denominations had their differences, the purpose of convening this international congress on world evangelization was to demonstrate that they could unite for the task of evangelism.

With the focus of uniting to do the task of evangelism and developing evangelistic strategies that derived its existence from a strong theology of evangelism, every morning session began with a devotional Bible study. Moreover, many of the plenary sessions focused on the Scriptural teachings on evangelism. Consequently, many of the topics that the plenary speakers focused on involved instruction in the authority of the Scriptures, the nature of God, the work of Christ, the nature of conversion, the exclusivity of salvation in Christ, the lostness of humanity, and the mission of the church.

The BGEA designed the workshops to be more strategic in nature. The workshops had a plethora of focuses concerning evangelistic strategies and methodologies. For example, David J. C. Judson taught a workshop on the evangelization of the deaf, blind, and handicapped. Another example would be the evangelization among college and university students. For other cultural contexts, the training may have emphasized the evangelization of various religious groups such as the Hindus or among Buddhists and Confucianists.
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Graham recognized various ways that Lausanne ’74 impacted world evangelization. Like Berlin ’66, this congress on world evangelization helped facilitate the creation of new evangelical relationships and partnerships. He pointed out that by 1976, 25 new missions or evangelistic organizations were formed in Europe alone as a direct result of the influence of Lausanne ’74. Moreover, Graham also highlighted the fact that new strategies and new movements emerged due to the convening of Lausanne ’74. He indicated that these new strategies and movements enabled Christians to reach more people with the gospel.85

Perhaps, the Lausanne Covenant is one of the most lasting, far-reaching, and significant contributions of Lausanne ’74. The term covenant was chosen to demonstrate the commitment needed to participate in the task of world evangelization. Thus, the Covenant was drafted to compel people to evangelistic action and not merely to exist as a historic document.86 John Stott was appointed the chairman of the drafting body, and thus, was a major contributor to the formation of the document.87 After each session Graham would review the progress that the leaders had made; and occasionally, he would make minor suggestions.88 The final product has been translated into numerous languages.89

One final and significant development that emerged from Lausanne ’74 was the formation of the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization (LCWE). The LCWE was designed to be a permanent committee organized for the purpose of executing the vision and work of Lausanne ’74.90 As the LCWE has made significant
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contributions to world evangelization through the conferences that they sponsored, the BGEA financially supported the committee until they received the needed financial assistance from other sources. Plus, Billy Graham’s involvement with the work that the LCWE continued diminished due to his involvement in his own ministry.91

**By Convening Amsterdam ’83**

As previously indicated, Victor Nelson had exhorted Graham to multiply his ministry by investing in others who could do the evangelistic task. As has also been demonstrated, Nelson’s counsel to Graham was the catalyst that propelled Graham and the BGEA to convene Berlin ’66 and Lausanne ’74. As Graham, through the BGEA, continued to hold crusades worldwide after the conclusion of Lausanne ’74, he desired to apply Nelson’s counsel to multiply his ministry by investing in itinerant evangelists.

After the BGEA had spent a significant time praying and doing research, they proceeded with the objective of sponsoring the International Conference for Itinerant Evangelists.92 The BGEA proceeded in sponsoring the conference for itinerant evangelists with the objective of lifting up the biblical ministry, calling, and standards of the evangelist, along with making the importance of the ministry known to the church.93

With the plan to sponsor Amsterdam ’83 in place, the BGEA pursued the goal of locating 3000 people serving as itinerant evangelists. As noted in chapter one, Graham understood that the task of finding 3000 itinerant evangelists would be complex due to the fact that no one had ever attempted to draw up a list of those involved in that ministry. The BGEA also comprehended that as they sought to achieve this goal that most of the itinerant evangelists that they would identify would come from the
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developing world. This investment in evangelists from the developing world meant that the BGEA would have to subsidize the expenses for the majority of them.

After establishing the goal of equipping itinerant evangelists, particularly those from the developing world, the BGEA had to secure a facility to convene the conference. In typical fashion, the BGEA investigated various possibilities. In the end, the BGEA settled on the RAI Center in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. The RAI Center proved to be an excellent choice for various reasons. First, the RAI Center was rather large and could accommodate a large assembly. Second, the BGEA chose the RAI Center in Amsterdam because the Netherlands had few visa restrictions. In reflecting on the BGEA’s choice of the RAI Center, Graham writes, “The fact that Holland had few visa restrictions contributed to our decision. If we had chosen a country requiring visas of most participants, we would have added enormously to the cost and complexity of the effort.”

When the opening convocation of the opening ceremony finally occurred on July 12, 1983, over 4000 evangelists had assembled. These evangelists came from 133 different countries. In addition to the evangelists who attended, 1200 guests and observers attended. The RAI center provided good facilities for simultaneous translation. For Amsterdam ’83, the BGEA provided the participants with simultaneous translation in 10 languages.

The diversity was immense. The evangelists who attended represented numerous ethnicities. The evangelists who attended came from every continent.
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Ninety percent of those who assembled had never before attended a conference focused on evangelism. Seventy percent of those who attended came from the developing world. They came from rural areas and “sophisticated cities.” Additionally, they came from various islands. The largest number of participants came from India. The second largest number of participants came from Nigeria. The third largest number of participants came from Brazil.

Many of the evangelists in attendance had to endure hardships and difficult circumstances in the developing world. Because many of these evangelists came from deep poverty and had many trying experiences, the BGEA and those closely connected to the BGEA were able to minister to these evangelists through Amsterdam ’83. For instance, numerous evangelists arrived to the conference barefoot and without a change of clothes. Billy Graham’s son, Franklin Graham, through his organization, Samaritan’s Purse, aided these evangelists by providing them with clothes. Additionally, Samaritan’s Purse provided toys for children.

A lack of clothing was not the only issue that these evangelists had to deal with due to their poverty and hardships. They also had spiritual and emotional struggles. Amsterdam ’83 offered twenty-five counselors that these evangelists could confide in to deal with these issues. Some might have personal issues. Others might have family issues. In some instances, the evangelists would articulate spiritual concerns to the counselors. Amsterdam ’83 organized the counseling times to be private sessions.

At the conference the BGEA also supplied the evangelists with various resources that they could use in their ministries. The BGEA provided the delegates with
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books and study aids that they could use to interpret the Bible and to prepare and deliver evangelistic messages. Some of the evangelists needed certain equipment. Some of the gifts that they needed and received included overhead projectors, film projectors, tape recorders, sound systems, megaphones, and bicycles. Indeed, in various ways, the BGEA, through Amsterdam ’83, was able to minister to the evangelists.  

During the conference the participants were able to receive instruction and training. Amsterdam ’83 organized the workshops, for instance, to equip the participants in a myriad of different topics. Most of the diverse topics dealt with the numerous evangelistic methods that could be employed and adapted to various cultural contexts. The evangelists were also trained in these workshops on how to study the Bibles. Other workshops provided evangelists from all six continents training in how to conduct various types of crusades in their respective continents. Overall, the participants had over 200 workshops from which to choose.

While the workshops benefited the participants by exposing them to many and diverse methods that could be contextualized to their cultural setting, the plenary sessions functioned as the centerpiece of the conference. Consequently, the instruction given during the plenary sessions became the focal point of the entire conference. Amsterdam ’83 held twenty-two plenary sessions. These twenty-two sessions broadly dealt with the evangelist and the message he preached, the evangelist as a gifted and called preacher, the evangelist as one who multiplied his ministry through his equipping efforts, and the evangelist as a minister focused on the entire Great Commission. In reporting on the overall teachings of the plenary sessions, Tom Minnery indicated that the emphases in the plenary addresses concentrated on the evangelists living out their callings in robust prayer
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lives and in a devotion to the Scriptures. Thus, during the plenary sessions, the BGEA emphasized and prioritized training in the gospel message and training the evangelist as a person called by God.

Coinciding with this desire to prioritize the gospel message and the calling of the evangelist, the BGEA determined to draft a document that would be directed to the needs of evangelists. The BGEA assembled a committee of theologians and scholars that would draft the document. This committee would ensure that the document would maintain fidelity to the Scriptures. Thus, this commitment in crafting the document paralleled the priorities exhibited by the BGEA in convening the conference. The BGEA, in prioritizing the gospel message and the calling of the evangelist, prioritized remaining true to biblical revelation over the use of methods. Likewise, in crafting the document, the committee emphasized fidelity to biblical revelation.

The end result was fifteen concise, biblical statements concerning the evangelist’s commitment to Christ, to the Great Commission, and to purity and integrity in their lives and ministries. The document was given the title the “Amsterdam Affirmations.” At the conclusion of the conference, during the final plenary session, the delegates would stand up and would, in response to the reading of the “Amsterdam Affirmations,” say in their own language, “This I affirm.” The evangelists enthusiastically embraced the 15 affirmations.

Additionally, in the final affirmation, was a call to all Christians to unite with the evangelists. This call was for the church to unite with the evangelists in prayer, in working for peace, in pursuing revival, in prioritizing evangelism, and in displaying unity

107 Graham, Just as I Am, 578.
108 Ibid.
in fulfilling the Great Commission. Furthermore, this call was for the church to unite with the evangelists until Christ returns.\textsuperscript{110}

To bolster the significance of the “Amsterdam Affirmations” document, Graham wrote an interpretative commentary on the affirmations a year later. His interpretive commentary was a book entitled \textit{A Biblical Standard for Evangelists}.\textsuperscript{111} In his book Graham devotes a chapter to expounding each affirmation.

Graham closed Amsterdam ’83 with the following, “These itinerant evangelists are the most important ambassadors and messengers on earth.”\textsuperscript{112} He, in his closing remarks, further noted, “They are a mighty army of proclaimers, energized by the Holy Spirit, spreading out across the world with a renewed vision to reach their own people for Christ.”\textsuperscript{113} Here in these closing remarks, Graham did not emphasize methods. Rather, he emphasized the person of the evangelist. He emphasized the person as an ambassador and as a messenger. Implied in this focus is that he is a messenger with a specific message. Thus, the focus is upon the evangelist as an ambassador with a particular message. Graham further underscored his emphasis on the evangelist as a person rather than prioritizing methods when he referred to the evangelists in attendance as a “mighty army of proclaimers.” He also concentrated on the work of the Holy Spirit rather than methods. The emphasis in his final remarks is on the Holy Spirit working through the messenger with a renewed vision for reaching people with the gospel message.
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By Convening Amsterdam ’86

As indicated in chapter one, the BGEA discovered that numerous evangelists could not attend Amsterdam ’83 due to a deficiency of funds. Also, as noted in chapter one, through research, the BGEA discovered the names of over 50,000 evangelists that they had not previously known. In recognizing those realities, the BGEA decided to convene another conference for itinerant evangelists for those numerous evangelists who either could not or did not attend Amsterdam ’83. Roger Palms, in referencing the impact Amsterdam ’83 had on various evangelists and in calling for support for Amsterdam ’86, wrote, “Ten thousand of them are eager, and the doors are ready for them to go through. They know what happened to the others in 1983; they want the same for their own lives and ministries in 1986.”

In July of 1986, the BGEA convened Amsterdam ’86 for those evangelists who could not attend the previous conference. Graham, in recalling the opening ceremonies of Amsterdam ’86 and reflecting on his closing comments at Amsterdam ’83 wrote, “I never imagined the full implication of my own words until the second International Conference for Itinerant Evangelists (Amsterdam ’86) convened in July three years later in the same RAI Center outside the city.” For at the opening ceremonies of Amsterdam ’86, Graham observed an assembly of evangelists representing the most “multinational, multiracial, multilingual, multidenominational throng” assembled up until that date. In seeing that immensely diverse assembly of itinerant evangelists singing, praying, studying, and witnessing as one in Christ, Graham more fully recognized the significance undergirding his closing comments at Amsterdam ’83. For assembled at
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Amsterdam ’86 was a far larger and far more diverse gathering of a mighty army of proclaimers who would be energized by the Holy Spirit and who would spread out more extensively across the world with a renewed vision to reach their people for Christ with the gospel message.

Concerning the diversity, nearly three fourths of the 8200 delegates came from the developing world. The largest percent came from Africa, with 2337 representing forty-nine countries in Africa. Furthermore, the diversity could be observed with representatives from Nigeria. Nigeria consists of 137 major tribes. One hundred thirty-six out of the 137 tribes of Nigeria had an evangelist representing them. Approximately 1500 delegates came from Asia and Latin America. From North America, 1361 evangelists attended. Another 1009 came from Europe. The rest of the delegates came from the Middle East, Oceania, and the Caribbean. At Amsterdam ’86, 173 countries were represented.

The majority of these evangelists were young, in their 30s and 40s. Thus, the investment that the BGEA was making in equipping these evangelists was an investment in equipping the following generation. Moreover, Graham indicated that none of the delegates for Amsterdam ’86 had attended Amsterdam ’83, and 80 percent of them had never attended an international conference of any kind.

Concerning structuring the conference to accommodate for the diversity, the BGEA did so in various ways. The BGEA enlisted 100 interpreters to translate the plenary sessions, seminars, workshops, and individual counseling sessions into sixteen languages. Additionally, the BGEA accommodated for the diversity by supplying
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twenty-two international musical groups and soloists. These musicians represented the multicultural emphasis in multifaceted indigenous styles.\textsuperscript{122}

In the plenary sessions Graham and his associates delivered addresses on the themes of the gospel message. As they delivered these messages, they each elaborated on one of the fifteen affirmations from the “Amsterdam Affirmations” document agreed upon at Amsterdam ’83.\textsuperscript{123} In addition to messages associated with the content of the gospel, plenary speakers spoke various messages on the character of the evangelist.\textsuperscript{124} The BGEA also sensitively trained the evangelists in the seminars and workshops in the diverse evangelistic methods that they could appropriately contextualize to their cultural settings. Thus, in the same manner as it did at Amsterdam ’83, the BGEA prioritized the gospel message and the gifting and calling of the evangelist in training the delegates in the plenary sessions and then supplemented that training with a focus on methods in the seminars and workshops.

**By Convening Amsterdam 2000**

Once again, the BGEA convened another international conference for itinerant evangelists. The conference occurred over nine days in the year 2000. The BGEA convened the conference from July 29\textsuperscript{th} through August 6\textsuperscript{th}. Once again, the meetings were held at the RAI Center in Amsterdam. The 10,237 evangelists from 209 countries and territories attended the conference. Thus, Amsterdam 2000 had the largest attendance and was the most ethnically and culturally diverse of the three international conferences for the itinerant evangelist that the BGEA convened in Amsterdam. The rationale undergirding the convening of another conference was the strengthening of
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evangelists and local churches at the dawning of a new century and a new millennium for
the purpose of advancing the kingdom of God and bringing glory to Christ.¹²⁵

To accomplish this objective, the BGEA offered over 200 workshops utilized
to train the evangelists in numerous methods of evangelism. The conference trained the
participants in seminars that dealt with the preparation and delivery of the evangelistic
message. Furthermore, the BGEA invited evangelicals such as J. I. Packer, John Stott,
Ravi Zacharias, Steven Olford, Franklin Graham, Charles Colson, and Ajith Fernando to
deliver the plenary addresses. Again, like the previous two conferences, the BGEA
structured Amsterdam 2000 to center on the plenary addresses that were delivered. The
BGEA organized the plenary addresses according to the following nine themes: the need
for evangelism, the gift of the evangelist and the gospel message, the Bible, Christ the
Savior, the mission of the gospel, the Holy Spirit and the Evangelist, the holiness of the
evangelist and his walk with God, the church and the evangelist, and the evangelist’s
work in the world.

**Conclusion**

At the three Amsterdam Conferences, Billy Graham, through the BGEA,
continued his ministry of imparting the gospel and his life to the world. Graham, in his
crusade ministry, continuously made progress in world evangelization by imparting the
gospel to 185 countries on all six continents, and the BGEA’s ministry of equipping
evangelists via the Amsterdam Conferences proved to be the culminating point of his
efforts at imparting his life to the world. In those three conferences, the BGEA equipped
the evangelists by using plenary sessions, seminars, and workshops.

The training at the three conferences revolved around the plenary messages.
The training in the seminars and the workshops supplemented the instruction in the

plenary sessions. This structure demonstrates the priority that the BGEA placed on the instruction in the plenary sessions. The plenary sessions focused on the calling of the evangelist and on the gospel message. The training in the seminars and workshops focused on the methods that would supplement the instruction on the calling of the evangelist and on the gospel message. Thus, in equipping evangelists, the BGEA prioritized the calling of the evangelist and the gospel message. In the following presentation in chapters three and four of the instruction in the plenary sessions and in the training in methods, this dissertation will set forth evidence indicating that the BGEA did prioritize equipping the attendees in the calling of the evangelist and in the gospel message.
CHAPTER 3
AMSTERDAM ’83 AND ’86

Introduction

The data from Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86 will be presented in this chapter. The rationale for presenting the material from these two conferences together is that the BGEA convened Amsterdam ’86, as previously noted, because thousands of evangelists could not attend Amsterdam ’83. Since the BGEA convened a second international conference for itinerant evangelists for those who did not attend Amsterdam ’83, some of speakers at Amsterdam ’86 delivered the same message that they delivered at Amsterdam ’83. Additionally, Amsterdam ’83 concluded, as previously indicated, with a presentation of the “Amsterdam Affirmations;” and subsequently, the BGEA organized Amsterdam ’86 around the “Amsterdam Affirmations.”

In the “Introduction from Program Chairman and Director” Leighton Ford and John Corts indicated that the BGEA built the program of Amsterdam ’86 on the “Amsterdam Affirmations” of, the experiences of, and the lessons learned from Amsterdam ’83.1 Because the BGEA built Amsterdam ’86 upon the experiences and lessons learned from Amsterdam ’83, this dissertation will examine these two conferences together in this chapter. Nonetheless, Amsterdam ’86 is a unique contribution and will be handled separately in this chapter. The following examination of data begins with the addresses presented in the plenary sessions of Amsterdam ’83.
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Priorities of the Amsterdam ’83 Plenary Sessions

Amsterdam ’83 began with Graham’s opening greetings. Graham, in his opening greetings, articulated three of the major goals undergirding the convening of Amsterdam ’83. These goals reflected the priorities of the conference. Following Graham’s opening remarks, various speakers, including Graham, delivered addresses demonstrating the priorities placed on both the calling of the evangelist and on the gospel message.

Message in Graham’s Opening Greetings

In his opening remarks at Amsterdam ’83, Graham communicated the impacts that he desired the conference to have on the evangelists. The first impact that Graham desired for the evangelists is that they be renewed spiritually in their personal lives. This concern reflected the priority placed on the spiritual walk and anointing of the evangelist over the typical priority of emphasizing the use of innovative methodologies.

The second impact that he desired the conference to have was focused on using innovative methods and tools to improve the evangelistic effectiveness of the evangelists. In highlighting the importance of employing innovative methodologies, Graham claimed:

We also know that God can use methods to make our ministry more effective. Those of us who have been planning this Conference have been concerned that it be practical. That is why there will be addresses and workshops on a wide variety of topics – such as the content of the Gospel, every facet of our personal lives, sermon preparation, finances, working with churches, and setting up city- or village-wide evangelistic efforts, or single-church or street ministry.

As Graham continued in communicating this emphasis, he promoted the subservient role of methods to the message. He asserted, “The message never changes, but methods do.
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We know that we are totally and completely dependent on God the Holy Spirit to bring fruit to our ministry. We can have all the tools and methods that modern technology can provide, but unless God is at work, our efforts are in vain.\textsuperscript{4} Thus, for Graham, the unchanging message and the intervention of God to bring fruit in an evangelistic ministry took precedence over the use of innovative methods.

The third impact that Graham desired was for God to grant the participants a fresh vision of the task.\textsuperscript{5} Graham, by emphasizing this vision, returned to the spiritual concerns of the evangelist and his focus on God. A concern over the spiritual concerns of the evangelist was lined up with the priority placed on the calling of the evangelist.

**Objectives of the Various Plenary Addresses**

After Graham, in the opening greetings, expressed the ways he desired the conference to impact the evangelists, the remainder of the speakers prioritized the calling of the evangelist and the content of the gospel in their plenary messages. The program committee assigned a particular speaker to address a particular purpose associated with either the calling of the evangelist or the gospel message. The program committee designated Billy Graham, Stephen Olford, Luis Palau, Bill Bright, Anne Graham Lotz, Paul Yonggi Cho, Michael Green, E. V. Hill, Alfredo C. Smith, Kalevi Lehtinen, Ajith Fernando, Charlie Riggs, Leighton Ford, and Cliff Barrows to speak on a particular purpose that demonstrated a priority placed on the calling of the evangelist. Furthermore, the program committee appointed Marcus Loane, Akbar Abdul-Haqq, Billy Graham, Gottfried Osei-Mensah, Festo Kivengere, Tom Houston, and Pat Robertson to speak on a
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particular purpose that displayed a priority placed on the gospel message.\(^6\)

Graham, in his opening plenary address, had the goal of showing the evangelist the significance of his task. He had the objective of promoting the priority of the evangelist’s task by stressing the urgency of what the evangelist does in light of the lostness of human beings. In other words, Graham’s purpose in his opening message was to show the need for the evangelist to preach the gospel and to identify the world scene. Olford, in his plenary address, had the objectives of communicating how the evangelist is called and delineating the nature of the evangelist’s gift in ministry. In dealing with the call upon the evangelist to be holy, Luis Palau had the objective of substantiating the fact that evangelists are called to be holy vessels whom God can use. Bill Bright had the assignment of explaining how the evangelist can be filled with the Holy Spirit. Anne Graham Lotz had the purpose of communicating to the evangelists how to have an effective personal prayer life. Paul Yonggi Cho had the assignment of identifying the crucial role that faith played in the life of the evangelist. Michael Green had the purpose of showing the evangelists how to stay fresh spiritually and how to have a quiet time. E.V. Hill had the objective of communicating that the glory God should drive the evangelist to accomplish his task. Alfredo C. Smith had the task of explaining the evangelist’s responsibility to and relationship with the church. Kalevi Lehtinen had the responsibility of articulating the biblical basis for discipleship and multiplication while Ajith Fernando had the agenda of describing how the evangelist can multiply his ministry. Charlie Riggs received the objective of showing that a biblical basis for discipleship will have a priority for the evangelist if they devote significant time for preparation and training in follow-up. Leighton Ford had the task of showing the evangelists that the entire world can be reached according to the Scriptures. Cliff
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Barrows had the task of promoting the priority that the home and family must have for the evangelist.\(^7\)

Marcus Loane, in his plenary address, operated with the agenda of making sure that the evangelists understood the information to be included in the gospel. He also had the objective of conveying the purity, richness, and fullness of the gospel. While Akbar Abdul-Haqq had the agenda of communicating what is necessary for conversion to take place, Billy Graham, in one of his plenary messages, had the objective of making sure the evangelists understood how and when to ask for the decision, without manipulation or coercion. Additionally, Gottfried Osei-Mensah had the purposes of underscoring the role of Jesus’ Lordship in salvation and growth, insisting on presenting Jesus as both Savior and Lord, and showing that the gospel of salvation and the gospel of the kingdom are the same gospel. Festo Kivengere had the goal of making the social dimensions of the whole gospel known. Tom Houston had the assignment of conveying the biblical and practical principles which will help the evangelist understand his audience and know how to communicate to them. Billy Graham, in another one of his messages, pursued the objective of showing principles of communicating biblical truth to the audience. Finally, Pat Robertson had the objective of demonstrating that in view of the world situation, evangelists need to use every means possible to spread the gospel.\(^8\)

**The Priority Placed on the Calling of the Evangelist**

In placing a priority on the calling of the evangelist, the speakers emphasized five aspects associated with the evangelist. First, they showed that various motives drive the evangelist to fulfill his calling. Second, they emphasized the gift of the evangelist.
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Third, they highlighted the anointing of the evangelist. Fourth, they concentrated on the mission of an evangelist. Fifth, they underscored the gospel-worthy conduct that must accompany the evangelist.

**Motives driving the evangelist.** Graham, in his message “The Evangelist and a Torn World: We Are Called by God,” enumerated various motives that will drive the evangelist to preach the gospel. First, Graham identified the motivation of love. Graham utilized 2 Corinthians 5:14 to demonstrate that the love of God compels the evangelist. Second, Graham indicated that the judgment of God also motivates evangelists to fulfill their calling in a torn world, and he substantiated his identification of this motive by quoting from 2 Corinthians 5:11. Third, Graham declared that the command of Christ motivates the evangelist to fulfill his calling by God to serve in a torn world. He referenced the Great Commission given five times by Christ to bolster his position. Graham, throughout his message, emphasized the priority of the person of the evangelist by presenting the evangelist as a man called by God who has at least three motivations compelling him to fulfill his calling in a torn world.

**The priority on the gifting of the evangelist.** Organizers of Amsterdam ’83 showed a priority towards the calling of the evangelist by emphasizing that the evangelist operates with a particular gift. In propagating that conviction, Stephen F. Olford described two major aspects of the giftedness of the evangelist. First, he pointed out that God naturally endowed some believers with the gift of the evangelist. Second, he

---
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conveyed that the gift of the evangelist is a spiritual enduement. In so doing he underlined the conference’s emphasis on the giftedness of the evangelist.

The priority on the anointing of the evangelist. The conference disclosed to the delegates that the giftedness of the evangelist is related to his anointing. The conference underscored that central to understanding the giftedness of the evangelist is to understand that the evangelist properly manifest his giftedness under the anointing of the Holy Spirit. In so doing, Amsterdam ’83 exhibited a priority for the calling of the evangelist by highlighting the reality that the evangelist expresses his giftedness under the anointing of the Holy Spirit.

Luis Palau, in his plenary address, contended that the starting point for experiencing the Holy Spirit’s anointing is to recognize that God is holy. Palau emphasized that evangelists serve and preach a holy God. He maintained that the reality that evangelists serve and preach a holy God means that evangelists are called to be holy. Graham also underlined this calling to holiness by asserting, “Never forget, we are to communicate the Gospel by a holy life.” In addition to the concept that evangelists communicate the gospel with a holy life, Palau promulgated the concept that holiness is the pathway to experiencing revivals and a harvest. Moreover, he indicated that walking in holiness is contingent upon the evangelist spiritually staying fresh by utilizing the means that God has provided. Consequently, Palau demonstrated to the
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evangelists that the holiness derived from continual spiritual renewal positioned them to experience the anointing of the Holy Spirit.

Amsterdam ’83 elucidated for the attendees that the evangelist experiences the anointing of the Holy Spirit by walking in the Spirit. Bill Bright contended that in order to walk in the Spirit the evangelist must first understand and embrace the Holy Spirit as the third person of the Trinity.\(^1\) He further argued that the evangelist must understand why the Holy Spirit came into the world.\(^2\) Furthermore, Bright maintained that understanding the identity of the Holy Spirit and embracing His purpose should prompt the evangelist to pursue being filled with the Holy Spirit.\(^3\) He also revealed that such a pursuit involves addressing the issues regarding what hinders the average Christian from being filled with the Holy Spirit.\(^4\) Bright acknowledged that such a pursuit recognizes that the believer needs to learn how to be filled with Spirit.\(^5\) Bright, throughout his plenary address, aptly demonstrated that the evangelist who pursues being filled with the Spirit walks with the Spirit.

Amsterdam ’83 also conveyed that this empowerment and anointing of the Holy Spirit comes through prayer. The conference emphasized that the prayer life that the Holy Spirit uses to anoint the evangelist is characterized by an intimate time with God. Michael Green, in his plenary address, advocated not neglecting the intimate prayer time with God, an intimacy he characterized as lingering with the Lord and delighting in His presence.\(^6\) Anne Graham Lotz taught that the foundation for such intimacy is

\(^2\)Ibid.
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interacting with God through the Scriptures. She insisted that evangelists must saturate their lives in the Scriptures. She further explained that immersing their lives in the Scriptures means that the evangelist must obey what they read and study.

Additionally, she implored the evangelists to teach the Scriptures. She also pointed out that in such an endeavor, evangelists operate with the confidence that God’s hand is upon them. She maintained that evangelists must depend upon the power of God to succeed, and she espoused the view that God’s power comes through prayer. Thus, Lotz demonstrated that the power or the anointing of the Holy Spirit comes through prayer.

Lotz further explicated her conviction that the evangelist who experiences anointing will through prayer identify with the people. She insisted that this deep identification with the people involves identification with the sin of the people through prayer. Lotz showed that as a result of the anointing that comes through prayer the evangelist experiences success. Paul Yonggi Cho, in his plenary address, demonstrated that the success the anointed evangelist experiences through prayer is connected to faith.

The conference also conveyed that the anointing of the evangelist is related to a strong family life. Cliff Barrows, in his plenary address, indicated that the evangelist,
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operating under the anointing of the Holy Spirit, manages his family well.\textsuperscript{33} He insisted, “The evangelist must be leader in the home.”\textsuperscript{34}

Various plenary speakers emphasized the need for the evangelist to operate under the anointing of the Holy Spirit. They explored how the evangelist embracing holiness and walking in the Spirit experienced God’s anointing. They also advocated the concept that the evangelist will experience this anointing through a prayer life accompanied by faith. Furthermore, they promoted the idea that the evangelist under the anointing of the Holy Spirit manages his family well as the leader in the home. All of these emphases on the anointing of the evangelist conveyed that the conference definitely prioritized the calling of the evangelist. Moreover, the conference prioritized the calling of the evangelist by focusing on his mission.

**The priority on the mission of an evangelist.** Amsterdam ’83 taught that the evangelist’s gifting and anointing is associated with and contributes to his mission. The conference taught that the evangelist is gifted and anointed in a specific way because he has a specific task.\textsuperscript{35} Specifically, Olford, in his plenary message, addressed the task of the evangelist. Olford indicated that the evangelist must focus on purposefully serving the Lord.\textsuperscript{36} He further explained the evangelist must view the service that he renders to the Lord in terms of the work that he does in the church.\textsuperscript{37} Alfredo C. Smith, in his plenary message, articulated that the evangelist must perceive the work that he does as serving the church.\textsuperscript{38} Smith clarified that under the Lordship of Christ, the evangelist is
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subject to the local church.\textsuperscript{39}

Olford also presented the evangelist as a minister who operates with a particular aim.\textsuperscript{40} Kalevi Lehtinen, in his message, articulated that the evangelist’s particular aim in his mission is to make disciples.\textsuperscript{41} Leighton Ford pointed out that in order to fulfill his mission, the evangelist must embrace the fact that King Jesus has inaugurated a great program.\textsuperscript{42} Ford instructed that in participating in the Great Commission, the evangelist is participating in a work to all the nations. Moreover, Ford made known that in this work the evangelist preaches to the ends of the world.\textsuperscript{43}

In continuing to delineate aspects of the evangelist’s task, Olford communicated that the evangelist passionately seeks the lost in bearing witness to Christ to the ends of the earth.\textsuperscript{44} Furthermore, Amsterdam ’83 underscored the fact that the task of world evangelization is not limited to one evangelist. E.V. Hill, in his message, pointed out that the evangelist must recognize the vastness of the harvest and the need to multiply his ministry by preaching for workers.\textsuperscript{45}

Lehtinen explained that this task of bearing witness to Christ and involving more workers has gospel proclamation as its first goal.\textsuperscript{46} Olford indicated that this task compels the evangelist to be a preacher in the world. He declared that the evangelist exercises this gift in evangelistic proclamation. Moreover, he concluded that the
evangelist also exercises this gift in evangelistic conversation, that is, in personal
evergicism.\textsuperscript{47} Olford, in his pursuit to make the evangelist’s task known, indicated that
the second goal of the evangelist is leading sinners to salvation.\textsuperscript{48} Thus, he averred that
the evangelist exercises his gift by employing the evangelistic invitation.\textsuperscript{49} Additionally, Lehtinen showed that the third goal of the evangelist is discipleship.\textsuperscript{50}

In promoting discipleship, Lehtinen conveyed that the evangelist can make
disciples by applying Paul’s instruction in 2 Timothy 2:2.\textsuperscript{51} Amsterdam ’83 advocated
that the evangelist seek to apply Paul’s instruction in 2 Timothy 2:2 in at least two ways.
Ajith Fernando centered his message on conveying that the evangelist’s goal is to
multiply workers.\textsuperscript{52} Charles Riggs showed that in addition to multiplying workers, the
evangelist also seeks to build new believers.\textsuperscript{53}

Fernando maintained that the relationship between Paul and Timothy functions
as a good model to emulate. He insisted that the reason their relationship serves as a
good model is that they spent significant time with each other. He pointed out that
because they spent time with each other, Timothy could observe how Paul conducted
himself in ministry. He noted that Paul taught Timothy the fundamental tenets of the
Christian faith. Fernando also explained that Paul gradually delegated some of the work
of the ministry to Timothy. Fernando also exposed the evangelists to the fact that as Paul
designated ministry assignments for Timothy to do, he prayed for Timothy. Fernando
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summarized Paul’s investment in Timothy by indicating that he imparted his life and ministry to Timothy.\(^5^4\)

While Fernando articulated to the evangelists how they can multiply their ministries, Riggs taught the evangelists how to build up the lives of new believers by following up on them. He appealed to the apostle Paul as an example on how to do follow-up. He cited the following ways that Paul functions as a model of follow-up: sending letters, praying for new believers, sending representatives, and making personal visits.\(^5^5\) Because of the example of Paul, Riggs implored evangelists to make concerted efforts to follow-up on and invest in new believers.

Amsterdam ’83 had provided instruction that the evangelist seeks to preach the gospel, make disciples, build up the disciples in the faith, and multiply workers. Leighton Ford taught that the evangelist engages in these ministries because he is participating in the Great Commission. He pointed out that in doing this work, evangelists must recognize that King Jesus has great power.\(^5^6\) He further explicated that this great power is connected to the reality of the kingdom of God and the purposes of the kingdom.\(^5^7\) Ford also announced that the evangelist must recognize that participation in the Great Commission is dependent upon a great promise.\(^5^8\)

In various ways Amsterdam ’83 communicated the priority of the evangelist’s mission to the delegates in attendance. The conference portrayed to the attendees that the evangelist’s mission has a priority by concentrating the plenary sessions on gospel proclamation, making disciples, building up disciples, multiplying workers, and the
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preacher’s dependence upon Christ in participation in the Great Commission. By
emphasizing various aspects of the evangelist’s mission, Amsterdam ’83 communicated a
priority on the calling of the evangelist.

**The priority on gospel-worthy conduct.** Finally, Amsterdam ’83 prioritized
the calling of the evangelist by emphasizing the gospel-worthy conduct that must
accompany the evangelist.

Graham highlighted the fact that love undergirds the conduct that accompanies
the evangelist’s participation in the gospel. Graham declared, “We communicate the
Gospel by our love of our fellowman.”59 He demonstrated that this love is seen in a
compassionate social concern. Graham also indicated that this love is on display in
Christian unity in the Spirit, and he maintained that such unity communicates the
gospel.60

In another plenary message, Graham indicated that evangelists can exhibit
gospel-worthy conduct by serving as peacemakers in a broken world. He identified at
least four ways that evangelists can be peacemakers in a broken world. First, Graham
indicated that evangelists can pray and call on others throughout the world to pray.
Second, Graham shared that evangelists can be examples of peace in their lives. Third,
Graham taught that evangelists can urge leaders of the world to wake up to the dangers
that people face in the world. Fourth, Graham taught that evangelists can be faithful in
the proclamation of the gospel of Jesus Christ.61

Festo Kivengere, in his plenary address, claimed that evangelists can exhibit
gospel worthy conduct by serving as ministers of reconciliation. He contended that as
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ministers of reconciliation, evangelists seek to accomplish reconciliation with their fellow human beings. He pointed out that evangelists conduct a ministry of reconciliation as Christ’s ambassadors. He pointed out that evangelists further display this gospel-worthy conduct by recognizing the need for reconciliation. Additionally, Kivengere presented evangelists as peacemakers operating from the paradigm that God is the source of the Christian reconciliation and that He restores the peace to the life of human beings. From the various plenary session contributors, the evangelists were taught that gospel worthy conduct must accompany their evangelistic ministries. Thus, they were instructed that prioritizing their calling as evangelists means making sure that they exuded conduct worthy of the gospel. Moreover, they were taught that in addition to gospel worthy conduct, prioritizing their calling as evangelists involves conducting themselves according to certain motives, operating according to their giftedness, operating under the anointing of the Holy Spirit, and engaging in their particular mission.

The Priority Placed on the Gospel Message

In addition to prioritizing an emphasis on the calling of the evangelist, the plenary speakers also prioritized correctly proclaiming the content of the gospel. The BGEA showed the priority that the gospel must have by identifying the urgency in knowing and preaching the gospel. The conference plenary speakers also prioritized the gospel by expounding on the following doctrines: God, reaching lost human beings, the kingdom of God, and the way of salvation. Moreover, the plenary speakers displayed a priority for the gospel message by instructing the evangelists in how to depend upon the gospel.

The urgency of knowing and preaching the gospel. Graham, in one of his

---

plenary messages, stressed the urgency of knowing and preaching the gospel. He pointed out, “In recent years, many have rejected the biblical doctrine that men are individually sinners before God and will be held responsible to Him at the Judgment.” He not only pointed out that many in the church reject the aforementioned truth, he also exposed the reality that preachers are neglecting to call the lost to repentance and to faith in Jesus.

Also, Graham enumerated other trends in the contemporary church that should compel an urgency to know and preach the gospel. He conveyed that Christians are neglecting to teach the New Testament emphasis that a sinner must be born again. Furthermore, he exposed the contemporary church’s proclivity to abandon the concept of evangelism as the verbal communication of the gospel. He declared, “Any message other than the Gospel of Jesus Christ is not evangelism.” Graham also expressed the concern that millions in America and Europe do not know the gospel message because Christians have failed to clearly communicate it.

Graham also underscored the urgency of knowing and preaching the gospel by elucidating some of the solemn realities of the gospel. He elevated the position of salvation exclusively in Christ by quoting form Acts 4:12. He promoted the conviction that evangelists must follow Jesus’ example and clearly speak on hell. He admonished the evangelists to make the gospel clear, indicating, “It is the solemn message that we are alienated from God, and only Christ by His death and resurrection can save us.”

---
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preach any other message, you are not an evangelist.”70

In various ways Graham identified the urgency of knowing and preaching the gospel. By stressing this urgency, Graham showed the priority that Christians must place on clearly making the gospel known. Amsterdam ’83 stressed that in the endeavor of clearly proclaiming the gospel, Christians must clearly propagate the message of God.

The priority of preaching about God. In spreading the gospel, the focus first should be on God. Paul pointed out in Romans 1:1 that the gospel is of God, and he claimed in Romans 1:16 that the gospel is God’s power for the salvation of those who believe. God is the beginning of the gospel, the source of the gospel, and the One who supplies the gospel with its power. The gospel is about God, and Ravi Zacharias, in his plenary address, specifically pointed out, “Christianity is not a religion or perspective as found in Paul; it is God’s self-disclosure as found in Christ.”71

Since Amsterdam ’83 depicted the gospel as revolving around God’s self-disclosure as found in Christ, the evangelists in attendance were taught that they must elevate the deity and the Lordship of Christ in their proclamation. Gottfried Osei-Mensah, in his plenary address, simply declared, “We proclaim Christ as Lord.”72 In light of the conference’s presentation of God’s self-disclosure culminating in Christ, Osei-Mensah additionally connected the proclamation of the Lordship of Christ with the preaching of Jesus as God’s promised Savior-King.73

In promoting the message about God’s self-disclosure of Himself in Jesus Christ, Amsterdam ’83 showed that the message about God must have a priority for the
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evangelist. In so doing, Amsterdam ’83 conveyed to the evangelists that if they are going to prioritize clearly promulgating the gospel, then they must first concentrate upon God’s revelation of Himself. Amsterdam ’83 also clearly demonstrated to the evangelists that a focus on God is simply the starting point, and that prioritizing the gospel means focusing the message on reaching human beings in their lost condition.

**The priority of reaching human beings with the gospel.** Concerning reaching human beings, Graham, in his message, identified some safe assumptions that the evangelist can legitimately have in addressing human beings with the gospel. First, he pointed out that life’s needs cannot be completely met by social improvement or material affluence. Second, he explained that every person who lives without Christ experiences an essential emptiness. Third, Graham indicated that lost people experience some measure of loneliness. Fourth, Graham also pointed out in seeking to reach human beings for Christ that the evangelist can also assume that the lost live with a sense of guilt. Fifth, Graham concluded that all lost people live with a fear of death.74

Zacharias, in his plenary address, also dealt with reaching lost people. In so doing, he maintained that the evangelist is driven with the vision of calling sinners to Christ from among all the nations. He instructed that this endeavor involves confronting adherents of different religions. In reaching people of different religions Zacharias explained that the lost people whom the evangelist is reaching will never lighten the burdens that they are carrying from their own religious tradition until they feel the pressures in their souls to abandon their tradition. He further explained that a person struggles to turn away from their false gods and idols due to the reality that a major commitment to a religion can be conceived and nurtured in ignorance.75
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Both Graham and Zacharias concentrated on reaching lost people. In so doing they informed the evangelists of some universal realities that they need to make a priority in reaching the lost world. They showed that evangelists must take into consideration various universal assumptions that characterize human beings worldwide. They also conveyed that evangelists must take into consideration that calling people from among all the nations necessitates confronting diverse peoples representing diverse religious traditions. Thus, the conference showed that the evangelist who prioritizes the gospel message will venture out to reach the lost who are enslaved to false religions and who share in common experiences due to their common sinful state.

The priority of emphasizing the kingdom. Amsterdam ’83 demonstrated that the evangelist, in pursuing the lost from among all the nations, will make understanding the central themes of the gospel a priority. Osei-Mensah, in his plenary address, communicated to the evangelists the priority of understanding the central, unifying theme of the kingdom of God. In making sure that the evangelists understood this unifying theme, Osei-Mensah underscored the following features of this theme. He indicated that this theme, as previously noted, focuses on Christ’s position as Lord\(^76\) and God’s promised Savior-King.\(^77\) He pointed out that understanding this doctrine requires embracing the truth that Jesus inaugurated the Kingdom. He articulated his conviction that the kingdom relates to Jesus’ work on the cross. Additionally, he pointed out the scriptural standards for the kingdom life-style. He highlighted the new birth as the means for entrance into the kingdom. Furthermore, Osei-Mensah underlined the truth that the new birth produces a new nature within the person. After depicting the new nature that the person receives, he described the new relationship that the believer experiences with
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God through his adoption by God into the kingdom. Osei-Mensah proceeded with his address by expounding on the reality of the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit. Then, he explained that the truth of the new righteousness occurs due to being forgiven and being put right with God, the eternal king. Next, he identified the role the kingdom has for the believer in the present spiritual conflict. Finally, Osei-Mensah examined the concept of the coming glory of the kingdom.  

Osei-Mensah demonstrated that the theme of the kingdom of God is a vast and central theme of the Scriptures. In his portrayal of the kingdom of God he connected that theme to many important truths. Thus, the evangelists were taught that prioritizing the gospel message involves understanding the central theme of the kingdom of God.

**The priority of concentrating on the way of salvation.** The conference emphasized that in addition to understanding the kingdom of God, the evangelist will also prioritize the gospel message by concentrating on the content of the way of salvation. Amsterdam ’83 conveyed to the evangelists that concentrating on the way of salvation means embracing the doctrine of forgiveness on the sole ground of the atonement that Christ accomplished in His death on the cross.  

The conference further instructed that concentrating on the way of salvation means promoting and preaching the doctrine of regeneration. Amsterdam ’83 communicated to the evangelists the priority of focusing their preaching on the absolute necessity of the new birth by the Holy Spirit. The conference also underlined the fact that the evangelist must center his messages on explaining the supernatural transformation that occurs when a person receives a new nature.
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Amsterdam ’83 also communicated that concentrating on the way of salvation means that the evangelist engages in a ministry of calling people to conversion. The conference clarified that such a focus had as its objective persuading human beings to come to Christ. In the plenary sessions, the evangelists further were taught that such a focus involves making an appeal to respond to the gospel. The evangelists were instructed that when they make an appeal for decision, they plead on Christ’s behalf. Since the conference established its position that the evangelist pleads on Christ’s behalf in appealing for a decision to come to Christ, it justified the use of giving an invitation. Furthermore, Graham argued that the legitimacy of making an appeal to sinners to come to Christ means that evangelists must prepare to give the invitation. In order to ensure that the evangelists line themselves up with the Scriptures in calling people to conversion to Christ, Graham insisted that certain guidelines should be in place for the various methods of extending an invitation. Thus, the evangelists were taught in the plenary sessions that in order for them to concentrate on the way of salvation, they must embrace the biblical endeavor to call sinners to the response of repentance and faith, and in so doing, they must conform their practice of inviting sinners to Christ to the Scriptures.

As evangelists heard that the way of salvation includes calling sinners to repentance and faith, they also were instructed that God justifies sinners by faith. In the plenary sessions, the evangelist was taught that a focus on the way of salvation must involve preaching justification by faith alone. The conference taught that in preaching
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the doctrine of justification by faith, the evangelist emphasizes that the sinner experiences a new righteousness as a result of receiving forgiveness and being made right before God. Thus, the evangelists acquired the knowledge that they need to call sinners to faith, understanding that God justifies the wicked by faith alone.

The evangelists also were taught that concentrating on the way of salvation requires dealing with the results of salvation. Graham, in one of his plenary addresses, identified the peace of God that a person experiences as a result of salvation. Graham explicated on this peace, showing that it has at least two effects on the new Christian. First, Graham identified the inner peace that the Holy Spirit produces within the person. Second, Graham pointed to the reality that human beings experience peace with each other as a result of the salvation that God accomplished. E. V. Hill, in his plenary address, pointed out that resting in the certainty of salvation is another result of the salvation experience.

From exploring the substitutionary atonement to considering the results of salvation, the Amsterdam ’83 plenary sessions took the evangelists on a journey investigating the way of salvation. In so doing, these plenary sessions showed that any evangelist making the gospel a priority will delve into, seek to understand, value, and embrace the tenets of the way of salvation. Furthermore, the Amsterdam ’83 plenary sessions showed that embracing the gospel message of the way of salvation entailed depending upon that gospel. Thus, the evangelists learned in the plenary sessions that they show a priority towards the gospel in their dependence upon the gospel. The Amsterdam ’83 plenary sessions showed the evangelists various ways that they can depend upon the gospel.

---
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Prioritizing a dependence on the gospel. The Amsterdam ’83 plenary sessions communicated to the evangelists that depending upon the gospel will compel them to effectively proclaim the gospel with power to all peoples in all societies. Graham, in one of his plenary messages, explored how to effectively communicate the gospel with power in a materialistic, scientific, rebellious, secular, immoral, and humanistic age. In making his presentation, he contended that the key to effectively preaching the gospel in the contemporary world is applying Paul’s instruction in 1 Corinthians 2:2. Thus, Graham pointed out that the key to penetrating the darkness in an increasingly secularistic world is embracing the concept that the cross of Christ has power. He advocated that evangelists must simply depend upon the power of the cross or the power of the gospel in penetrating societies and cultures worldwide.90

At Amsterdam ’83, the evangelists were taught that in order for them to rely on the power of the gospel, they must embrace some principles in communicating the gospel. They were instructed how to communicate the gospel in terms of how their audience will hear, and consequently, receive the message. The evangelists additionally were taught that comprehending how the audience hears the verbal declaration and understanding what the audience sees will impact how they interpret the message. Moreover, the evangelists heard that how they introduce the message will significantly influence how the audience receives the message. Furthermore, the evangelists were taught that the meaning that they assigned the words that they used in the message will significantly define how the audience comprehends the message. The evangelists further were instructed that they need to consider the meaning that the audience assigns to words. Finally, the evangelists were taught that failing to take into consideration all of these factors can result in the gospel not making any sense, the gospel being rejected due to a
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misunderstanding of the message, and the acceptance of a distorted view of the gospel.\textsuperscript{91}

The conference also emphasized to the evangelists that rather than risking the audience developing a distorted view of the gospel, they should show a dependence upon the gospel by utilizing good communication principles. In the plenary sessions, the conference further highlighted that a good communication approach includes using every legitimate, available means to make the gospel known. One example elevated in the plenary session was the use of media.\textsuperscript{92}

During the plenary sessions Amsterdam ’83 articulated to the evangelists that dependence upon the gospel is a dependence upon the power of the gospel. The conference also showed that the evangelist who exhibited a dependence upon the gospel would be the one who employed every legitimate communication approach to clearly make the gospel known. Amsterdam ’83 conveyed that evangelists who go to great lengths to show their dependence upon the gospel are the ministers who give a priority to the gospel message. Throughout the plenary sessions the evangelists not only were taught to show a priority for the gospel by depending upon the power of the gospel, they also were instructed how to prioritize the gospel by concentrating on the message concerning the way of salvation, by emphasizing the kingdom of God, by prioritizing reaching lost humanity, and by focusing on God as the starting point and source of the gospel. Thus, in addition to successfully prioritizing the calling of the evangelist, the plenary sessions successfully placed a priority on the gospel message.

\textbf{Supplemental Design of the Methods at Amsterdam ’83}

While the BGEA successfully prioritized the calling of the evangelist and the
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gospel message in the plenary sessions, the BGEA supplemented these two priorities with training in methods. The BGEA supplemented the two priorities emphasized in the plenary sessions by articulating the goal in equipping in methods. The BGEA achieved its goal in the training in methods by equipping the evangelists in designated workshops and in optional workshops. Finally, BGEA showed that the proper understanding of methods necessitates embracing God’s primary method as the use of people gifted, anointed, and called by Him. In so doing, the BGEA, with its training in methods, underscored the priority of the calling of the evangelist.

The Goal in Equipping in Methods

Graham, in his opening address, referred to the objective of training in methods by stating, “While we are here, we will study various methods of evangelism.” He added, “We, too, need to explore every legitimate method for reaching our world for Christ. New challenges call for new methods and new strategies.” Thus, the goal was for the evangelist to study and explore every legitimate method for reaching the world for Christ in order to meet the new challenges that he faces. While the training in methods designed to meet new challenges was not what drove the convening of the conference, the training did provide a practical benefit for the evangelists and did supplement the instruction that prioritized the calling of the evangelist and the gospel message. The training that supplemented these two priorities of Amsterdam ’83 occurred in the designated workshops that every delegate attended and in the optional workshops that the evangelists deemed most beneficial.

Training in the Designated Workshops

Amsterdam ’83 provided designated workshops on the delivery and
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preparation of an evangelistic message, on extending an invitation, and dealing with
discipleship and multiplication. In providing the evangelists with training in preparing
and delivering an evangelistic message, Amsterdam ’83 offered two designated
workshops for the evangelists to attend. Brian Kingsmore taught the first designated
workshop on preparing and delivering an evangelistic message.95 Sam Kamaleson
trained the evangelists in the second designated workshop dealing with the preparation
and the delivery of an evangelistic message.96

The leaders of the conference provided evangelists with two designated
workshops covering the topic of extending the invitation. Brian Willersdorf instructed
the evangelists in the first workshop.97 Ford Philpot taught the evangelists the second
workshop concerning giving an evangelistic invitation.98

Amsterdam ’83 offered three designated workshops on counselor training and
follow-up. Tom Phillips taught the first workshop on counselor training and follow-up,
and he focused his instruction on conserving the results.99 James W.N. Katarikawe
provided instruction in the second designated workshop, and he also concentrated his
training on conserving the results.100 The third designated workshop was simply the
“Steps to Peace with God” course.101

95Brian Kingsmore, “Message Preparation and Delivery (I),” in Douglas, The Work of an
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100James W. N. Katarikawe, “Counselor Training and Follow-up Seminar (II): Conserving the
101“Counselor Training and Follow-up Seminary (III): ‘Steps to Peace with God’ Seminar,” in
Methods Taught in the Optional Workshops

The evangelists from across the world were equipped in how to conduct crusades. The diversity in the training was immense. Amsterdam ’83 provided training in conducting crusades on various continents. Moreover, the conference provided training in cities and rural areas.

Amsterdam ’83 provided training in crusade preparation for evangelists from North America. The conference offered these evangelists opportunities for training in large cities.102 Additionally, the conference provided them with instruction in crusade preparation for small towns and rural areas.103 This particular training focused on the following: meeting the challenge of laying a good foundation for the crusade, securing the confidence of the people, and establishing credibility.104 The conference also focused on offering training in single-church evangelistic crusades in North America.105

The conference offered training opportunities to evangelists from Latin America. These evangelists could learn how to do crusade preparation for large cities.106 They also could have been equipped in single-church evangelistic crusades.107

The conference leaders also concentrated on providing various crusade preparation for evangelists from Africa. Amsterdam ’83 provided crusade preparation for

large cities\textsuperscript{108} and for small towns and rural areas.\textsuperscript{109} Additionally, the conference leaders offered the evangelists from Africa instruction in single-church evangelistic crusades.\textsuperscript{110}

Amsterdam ’83 also provided crusade training in the Asian context. Evangelists from Asia received instruction in crusade preparation for large cities\textsuperscript{111} and for small towns and rural areas.\textsuperscript{112} Moreover, the conference equipped the evangelists in single-church evangelistic crusades.\textsuperscript{113}

The conference also provided training in conducting crusades in Europe. The leaders offered training to the participants in crusade preparation for large cities.\textsuperscript{114} Amsterdam ’83 provided training to the attendees in crusade preparation for small towns and rural areas in Europe.\textsuperscript{115} Furthermore, the leaders of the conference offered training in single-church evangelistic crusades in Europe.\textsuperscript{116}

The leaders of Amsterdam ’83 also provided the evangelists instruction in various subjects related to conducting crusades. For example, they provided training in
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financial support in places such as North America and Europe, Africa, and Asia. The conference leaders also provided equipping opportunities on conducting crusades with special focuses. They offered training focused on conducting an evangelistic crusade in the inner city. Emphases for inner city training included learning effective evangelistic outreach, learning a comprehensive strategy, learning to do publicity, and learning how to raise funds. Other features of the inner city training included the emphases of operating with a holistic evangelism approach, focusing on the church, utilizing the Jerusalem church that Luke depicted in Acts 2 as a model, and making sure that preaching occurs.

Other specialized focuses related to conducting evangelistic crusades were offered. For instance, a particular focus was on the methods of attracting a larger audience in countries and areas with sophisticated media. On the other hand, a particular focus was on offering training to the participants in the methods of attracting a larger audience in rural and developing areas. The leaders of the conferences offered training in evangelistic preaching in non-Protestant areas.
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instruction in doing evangelism in restrictive areas. Another option for the delegates was learning to preach the gospel of peace in situations of conflict. Another focus was on how to use music in evangelism. Training also concentrated on specialized counseling during evangelistic campaigns. In providing training in mobilizing churches for evangelistic crusades, the conference insisted that these evangelistic crusade efforts must involve the church. Moreover, in recognizing the importance of prayer to the evangelistic effectiveness of a crusade, the conference offered instruction in developing prayer support.

Amsterdam ’83 further recognized that the work of the evangelist involves cross-cultural communication. In providing this training the conference leaders emphasized the priority of the gospel message and then the following secondary issues: the evangelist comprehending his task of proclamation, the evangelist understanding God’s role in cross-cultural communication, and the task of communicating across cultural lines. Amsterdam ’83 also made sure that evangelists understood the various dynamics of doing cross-cultural communication in the context of evangelistic teams.

---


In teaching the evangelists these skills, the conference highlighted the need for evangelists to be clear on their presuppositions in communicating. In further equipping the evangelist in the art of communicating the gospel cross-culturally, the conference leaders emphasized that evangelists must comprehend that words have different meanings, must identify with their audience, and must adapt the method of transmitting the gospel.

In addition to equipping the attendees in conducting crusades, the conference provided a specialized program for women and concentrated on offering training for special interest groups. The women’s meetings were held for the women who accompanied their husbands to the conference, and the meetings had six different emphases. The meetings for the special interest groups were diverse.

Amsterdam ’83 offered women training on how to study the Bible. The conference provided women training in reaching their full potential. In learning how to conduct women’s evangelistic events the women were taught “to relate several effective methods for reaching women for Christ. Also, women were trained in how to be the salt of the earth. The conference provided training in doing creative outreach to women. Finally, the leaders of the conference provided women with instruction in
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what it means for them to minister on the cutting edge.\textsuperscript{141}

Regarding various special interest groups, the leaders of Amsterdam ’83 provided training in evangelizing various resistant peoples. They provided training in doing evangelism among the Buddhists,\textsuperscript{142} Hindus,\textsuperscript{143} Jews,\textsuperscript{144} and Muslims.\textsuperscript{145} The conference also offered instruction regarding the evangelist’s responsibility in a socialist society.\textsuperscript{146}

Concerning various special interest groups, Amsterdam ’83 emphasized reaching the youth of the different continents. The leaders provided training on reaching more teenage youth through crusades in North America,\textsuperscript{147} Latin America,\textsuperscript{148} Africa,\textsuperscript{149} Asia,\textsuperscript{150} and Europe.\textsuperscript{151} Moreover, they provided an opportunity for evangelists to be equipped in reaching more teenage youth through crusades in the Middle East.\textsuperscript{152}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Concerning special interest groups, Amsterdam ’83 focused on reaching students. Josh McDowell, in the workshop on reaching university students, argued that when Christ commanded the church to preach the gospel to every creature, He included the university world. He explained that the universities have unique audiences with most of them having a complete turnover of students every two-and-a-half years. He identified other unique features of the work of reaching university students. He pointed out that evangelists delivering lectures do not get paid. McDowell conveyed that evangelists must have a platform to grant them access to university students. He further also contended that universities were open to the flow of ideas and to the communication of spiritual concepts.153

Dick Purnell, in the workshop on reaching university students, articulated the affinity group approach to reaching a large university campus that could be comprised of 50,000 students. He explained that the affinity group approach to reaching large universities concentrated on reaching a particular people who have united together because of common needs, interests, and identification. He advocated breaking the major universities down into these small affinity groups in order to reach them.154 Thus, he taught that while reaching an entire university may be unmanageable, focusing efforts on a particular affinity group is achievable.

The leaders of Amsterdam ’83 additionally provided training in reaching children.155 They also provided a workshop giving instruction on how to do evangelism among women.156 The conference differentiated this focus on how to present the gospel


to women from the specific women’s program offered to the spouses who traveled to the conference with their husbands.

Amsterdam ’83 also offered instruction in a wide spectrum of categories. The conference offered training in reaching and using athletes in evangelism. The leaders of the conference offered an opportunity to the evangelists to be equipped in how to do prison evangelism. The conference equipped the participants in how to reach business and political leaders. Furthermore, the conference also provided instruction in the role of healing and other gifts in evangelism.

Amsterdam ’83 also provided training in how to use various methods and in how to use various forms of media. The conference offered training in open-air preaching. Additionally, the conference organizers gave the participants an opportunity to learn about evangelistic preaching as a part of a pastoral ministry.

The conference provided methodological training in various forms of evangelistic outreach. The leaders offered training in celebration evangelism. In one particular workshop, Billy Graham’s son, Franklin Graham, and Guy A. Davidson provided the evangelists with the opportunity to be equipped in evangelism that is in the form of relief and development.

---


Amsterdam ’83 also offered methodological training that was focused on the establishment of the church. Thus, the leaders of the conference provided the participants with an opportunity to be trained in the subject of church planting and the itinerant evangelist.165

Amsterdam ’83 also emphasized utilizing various forms of media. One unique form of media involved theological schools. The conference provided training in developing a curriculum for teaching evangelism in theological schools.166

Other forms of media were utilized. One particular aspect was on the use of films. Concerning films, Bill Brown asserted, “We’re living in an age where films happen to be one of the outstanding forms of communication that God is using to touch so many, many lives.”167 David Barr, in his presentation on films, articulated the conviction that God utilizes special films for evangelism.168 Furthermore, Barr stressed the supplementary and subservient role of methods to the conference’s priority of the calling of the evangelist, claiming, “In addition, we do not need the film; we do need men: men who are called of God, just like men who are called to preach; men who are called of God to be film evangelists, not film show-ers; not men who carry a projector, but film evangelists.”169 Pete Margosian stressed using film to reach the current leaders in businesses, in the military, and in government and the future leaders currently in high schools, colleges, and universities.170
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The leaders of the conference also showed how to use various forms of media to bolster, supplement, or enhance a particular evangelistic ministry. They offered training in how to use literature in evangelistic meetings. They provided instruction in using drama to enhance an evangelistic ministry. They offered pragmatic training on how to get on secular television and radio talk shows. They provided training in how to develop an evangelistic television ministry. They also emphasized the methodological approach of doing evangelism through radio. Robert Bowman provided the philosophical convictions concerning using the radio to communicate the gospel. Abe C. Van Der Puy, in his workshop on the radio, focused his training in two ways. First, he identified the characteristics that make the radio an effective evangelizing instrument. Second, he identified the types of radio programs that work well in spreading the gospel.

The leaders of the conference also provided training in how to use apologetics in evangelism. They provided training in how to use apologetics in encounters with those from non-Christian religious backgrounds. They also provided training in how to use apologetics in encounters with those from secular backgrounds.

---


The conference also equipped in terms of practical issues. One practical issue had the focus of how to have a more effective ministry. Specifically, the conference leaders offered the opportunity to evangelists to be equipped in faith planning for a more effective ministry. The conference also practically showed how to build an evangelistic team. The overall impetus driving the training in practical issues was making sure that the evangelists clearly understood and delivered the gospel message.

One major emphasis associated with delivering the gospel message had the focus of training the evangelist to be a personal soul winner. Another emphasis related to effectively delivering the gospel message had the focus of making gospel ministry relevant to human needs.

In addition to methods, Amsterdam ’83 was also concerned with how the evangelist understood his role in and contributed to social responsibility. Sam Kamaleson, in his workshop, systematically articulated the biblical foundations that would direct the evangelist in determining the social responsibility that he has in his calling. In appealing to the Lausanne Covenant, Gordon Moyes, in his workshop, advocated that the evangelist should engage in both evangelism and social action, contending that evangelism must have primacy. Additionally, Richard Sturz, in his
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workshop, articulated a response to the understanding of social responsibility espoused by the proponents of Liberation Theology.186

The leaders of the Amsterdam ’83 conference were also concerned about the evangelist’s family life. In the workshop on the evangelist’s family life in Africa, Natt V. Nkosi taught that the evangelist should have the following priorities: devotion to God, devotion to family, and devotion to his ministerial responsibilities.187 In the workshop on the evangelist’s family life in Asia, Thomas Wang dealt with the following issues: the social pressures that the evangelist experiences, the problems the evangelist must address with his family, the obligations that the evangelist must fulfill to his family, and the steps the evangelist must take to ensure a happy family.188 In the workshop on the evangelist’s family life in Europe, Leo Janz emphasized that the calling of the evangelist does not supersede his devotion to his family.189 In the workshop on the evangelist’s family life in the Middle East, Anis Shorrosh contended that except for the anointing of the Holy Spirit upon the evangelist, nothing is as important as the relationship to his wife.190

As the conference leaders dealt with the practical and family matters of the evangelist, they provided instruction on the personal study life of the evangelist. Olford, in his workshop on the study life of the evangelist, taught the evangelists to establish a time for study. He discussed six areas of concern that the evangelists needed to address in order to establish a time for study. First, he mentioned that the evangelists needed to
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think through their goals. Second, he encouraged them to define and pursue their priorities. Third, Olford exhorted the evangelists to wisely utilize the delays in their daily routine that would interfere with their scheduled time for study. Fourth, he explained that evangelists, in seeking to establish a time for study, must discern God’s timing for them. Fifth, Olford counseled the evangelists to delegate some of their work so that they will be able to set aside a time for study. Sixth, he advised the evangelists to incorporate a time for restoration, relaxation, and recreation into their schedule.¹⁹¹

After sharing with the evangelists what factors to consider in establishing a time for study, Olford implored the evangelists to determine the tools for study. He described three categories of tools for them to consider. He described research tools, resource tools, and recall tools.¹⁹²

Next, in the training, Olford taught the evangelists to determine the text for study. In this part of the training, he advocated that evangelists memorize the Scripture that they will study. He contended that the evangelists must crystalize the subject matter of the text. Olford explained that the evangelists needed to learn to analyze the structure of the biblical text. He further explained that the evangelist needed to ascertain how to organize the substance of the text into a sermon. Additionally, Olford showed the evangelist how to finalize the sermon.¹⁹³

Amsterdam ’83 also provided a workshop on the relationship between revival and evangelism. In this workshop, J. Ewin Orr insisted that the evangelists needed to determine the nature of revival. Furthermore, he instructed the evangelists to distinguish between revival and evangelism. While Orr made the distinction between revival and evangelism, he emphasized that genuine revival positively impacts evangelism. Orr
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concluded that revival calls forth evangelists.\textsuperscript{194}

**Demonstration of the BGEA’s Priorities**

The training of evangelists in methods supplemented the training in the plenary sessions in various ways, and in so doing, demonstrated the priorities that the emphases on the calling of the evangelist and the gospel had. Amsterdam ’83 supplemented the training on the calling of the evangelist and on the gospel message by showing that the training in the designated and optional workshops was subservient to the priorities of the plenary sessions. After the delegates received instruction either on the gospel message or the calling of the evangelist, they would receive in the designated workshops the supplementary instruction that would assist them to live out their calling to accurately preach the gospel. Specifically, the training the evangelists received in preparing and delivering an evangelistic sermon, in extending an invitation, and in counselor training and follow-up was designed to assist them to live out their calling to accurately preach the gospel. Furthermore, after the evangelists received training in a plenary session concerning either the calling of the evangelist or the gospel message, they could choose a workshop covering any of the methodologies mentioned above that they could use as tools to help them in living out their callings to faithfully preach the gospel. Thus, the evangelists in the plenary sessions learned to prioritize their calling and the gospel, and they supplemented these priorities by learning from and utilizing any of the above methods as tools to serve them in their ministries. Moreover, the conference emphasized that the greatest use of methods is to recognize that God’s primary method is men.

Graham underscored the reality that God’s primary method to evangelize the world is His use of human beings. He asserted, “There can be no discussion about methods unless we recognize that God’s method is men and women. There is no doubt

that the heart of the method of God is men and women who have been filled and anointed and called by the Holy Spirit, and are in turn witnessing for Him wherever God sends them.”

Graham further instructed, “We are now living in a generation when nothing will break through the overwhelming power of Satan except the supernatural power of the Holy Spirit.”

Here, Graham demonstrated the secondary role that methods have for the evangelist. While methods are important, must be learned, and must be adapted to different contexts, they are something embraced and utilized by the anointed evangelist engaged in the work of accurately communicating the gospel. Thus, they are only embraced once the foundation of the correct message and the anointed messenger is laid.

In recalling the purpose of Amsterdam ’83, Tom Phillips underscored the fact that the methods should only be embraced once the foundation of the message and the messenger was laid. He maintained that the program was organized around the concepts of the man, the message, and the methods. He explained that the program committee organized the program around the priorities placed on the man living out his calling in holiness and in the anointing of the Holy Spirit and on the powerful message of the gospel. Phillips insisted that the methods must be considered last. He described the evangelist’s use of methods as the outworking of his calling to deliver the gospel message. Phillips argued that the methods become sterile if the evangelist does not first live out a holy and anointed calling while clearly preaching the truth of the gospel.

The “Amsterdam Affirmations” of Amsterdam ’83

In the final plenary session message delivered at Amsterdam ’83, Graham challenged the evangelists in attendance concerning their calling and concerning the
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content of the message they deliver. In so doing, he confronted the evangelists on the two themes that the BGEA prioritized in convening this conference to equip evangelists. He challenged the evangelists concerning their commitment to operate according their calling and their dedication to the gospel message by exhorting them to ascertain if they are acceptable to God. He asked the evangelists a series of questions that they could use to determine if they are acceptable to God. He questioned the evangelists concerning their standing before God in terms of their conversion experience. He questioned the evangelists to assess the legitimacy of their calling to serve God as evangelists. He questioned the evangelists to consider whether their personal lives are holy and acceptable to God. He questioned the evangelists to evaluate the content of their messages. In the plenary sessions, the evangelists were taught that prioritizing the whole gospel is related to their social action, and Graham, in this final message, questioned the evangelists concerning their level of social concern. Also, in the plenary sessions, the evangelists were instructed on the urgency of fulfilling their calling in a torn world by showing a priority to the message by clearly making the gospel known, and Graham questioned them regarding the urgency of their evangelism. Finally, he questioned the evangelists to examine their relationships with fellow Christians.  

All of the questions that Graham posed were designed to prepare the evangelists for the reading and embracing of the “Amsterdam Affirmations.” As previously noted, the “Amsterdam Affirmations” were fifteen statements dealing with the evangelist’s commitment to the gospel, to operating according to his calling, to the church, and to the Great Commission. Thus, the “Amsterdam Affirmations” reflected the two major priorities articulated in the plenary sessions. Amsterdam ’83 culminated in Graham reading the “Amsterdam Affirmations” in the last plenary session. The
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evangelists responded with “We affirm,” demonstrating that they embraced the standards delineated in the fifteen statements.

Priorities of the Amsterdam ’86 Plenary Sessions

As previously indicated, the BGEA built Amsterdam ’86 on the “Amsterdam Affirmations” presented at Amsterdam ’83. In so doing, the BGEA sought to design the messages delivered in the plenary sessions to be an articulation or elaboration of some theme delineated in the “Amsterdam Affirmations.” Thus, in the same manner as Amsterdam ’83, the plenary sessions of Amsterdam ’86 prioritized the calling of the evangelist and the gospel message in equipping evangelists.

The Priority Placed on the Calling of the Evangelist

The BGEA prioritized the calling of the evangelist by emphasizing and training the participants in three major aspects associated with their calling. First, the BGEA emphasized the gifting of the evangelist. Second, the BGEA highlighted the anointing of the evangelist. Third, the BGEA concentrated on the mission of an evangelist in training the delegates.

Priority on the gifting of the evangelist. Just like Amsterdam ’83, Amsterdam ’86 presented the evangelist as having a particular gift and calling.199 Like he did at Amsterdam ’83, Graham, in his opening address, communicated that the evangelist, in expressing his gifting and fulfilling his calling, has various motives.200 He conveyed that the evangelist is motivated by the love of God. He contended that the love
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of God controls or compels the evangelist to preach the gospel. He communicated that the coming judgment of God motivates the evangelist to preach the gospel. He also presented the conviction that the command of Christ, as displayed in the Great Commission, should motivate the evangelist to preach the gospel. Thus, Graham demonstrated a commitment to prioritizing the calling of the evangelist by contending that the evangelist expresses his particular giftedness according to the aforementioned motivations.

**Priority on the anointing of the evangelist.** The Amsterdam ’86 plenary sessions also placed a priority on the calling of the evangelist by exploring the anointing of the evangelist. The plenary sessions investigated the anointing of the evangelist by exploring the role of the Holy Spirit, considering the importance of holiness in the evangelist’s life, examining the faithfulness of the evangelist, delving into the theme of God’s intervention to strengthen the evangelist in times of weakness, considering the prayer life of the evangelist, and identifying the significance of the evangelist’s family life. Thus, evangelists learned that in order for them to live in God’s anointing, they must tend to these aspects of their walk with God.

In exploring the role of the Holy Spirit, Luis Palau focused on the evangelist depending upon the Holy Spirit. He pointed out that when the evangelist depends upon the Holy Spirit, he will have a burning heart and a flaming message. Palau explained that this burning heart will be accompanied with purity. Furthermore, Palau
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emphasized that the evangelist will also have a heart that burns with passion. He further underscored the fact that when the evangelist relies on the Holy Spirit, his heart, characterized by purity and passion, will also burn with purpose. He underlined the fact that the evangelist in reliance upon the Holy Spirit will have a heart that is obedient to his vision. Palau also maintained that an evangelist’s obedience to his vision will propel him to the nations in a global outreach effort. He concluded that the evangelist will conduct a powerful ministry. Palau, in his message, showed that every aspect of the evangelist’s ministry from his pure, passionate, and purposeful heart to his global ministry is contingent on the powerful working of the Holy Spirit in his life.

In the plenary sessions, the evangelists also learned that the Holy Spirit uses a holy vessel prepared for every good work. Steven F. Olford concentrated on the evangelist conducting his ministry as a holy vessel whom the Holy Spirit uses. He maintained that in order for the evangelist to live in holiness, certain realities must be true. He articulated the reality that the evangelist needed to aggressively avoid certain vices associated with the ministry. He also pointed out that the evangelist must actively and diligently embrace and follow the virtues associated with the ministry. In addition to shunning the vices and embracing the virtues of ministry, Olford taught that the evangelist must engage in a battle to fight the variables of the ministry.
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Furthermore, Olford explained that dealing with such realities will help the evangelist conduct his life in holiness. In showing the evangelists how to pursue holiness, Olford demonstrated to them how to prioritize their calling by seeking God’s anointing upon a holy life.

In the plenary sessions, the evangelists were taught that they must not only set themselves apart as holy unto God, they learned to faithfully pursue God in the work He has called them to do. Anne Graham Lotz exhorted the evangelists to show faithfulness.\(^{214}\) She contended, “God calculates your success as an evangelist, not by the number of people who hear your message and respond, but by your faithfulness to give it out.\(^{215}\)

E. V. Hill, in his plenary address, called on the evangelists to live by faith. He depicted a person exercising faith as casting all of his cares on Christ. He further elaborated that placing faith in Christ meant putting complete trust and complete confidence in Him.\(^{216}\) In describing what placing complete trust and confidence in Christ is, Hill declared, “Faith is believing when there is no encouraging evidence. Faith is substance when there is nothing seen. Faith is climbing without a ladder. Faith is going forth when reason and logic advise us to stay put.”\(^{217}\) In articulating the characteristics of what complete faith in Christ entails, Hill showed the evangelists how to experience the anointing of God by pursuing faithfulness. Thus, he underscored the reality that prioritizing the calling of the evangelists means totally depending upon Christ in faith and completely pursuing faithfulness to God.

In the plenary sessions, the evangelists were taught that this faithfulness to God
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that they exhibit when operating in God’s anointing will put them in situations marked by triumph and will place them in circumstances characterized by trial and hardship. In those times of trials and various hardships, the evangelist will experience moments of weakness.

The evangelist will need strength when he experiences times of weakness. Graham pointed out,

For the evangelist, it will be a dangerous life. It will be a lonely life. It will be a burdened life. It may be that you will live in weakness, as many evangelists do. But if you are filled with the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit is producing fruit in your life – such as love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance – and also power.218

Leighton Ford, in his plenary address, examined Elijah’s moment of weakness when he fled Jezebel. In examining the weakness that Elijah experienced, he pointed out that God spoke to Elijah from the gentle breeze, asking Elijah what he was doing in the mouth of the cave. In addressing the evangelists concerning the weakness they experience and applying God’s question to Elijah to them, Leighton Ford asked, “What are you doing here, evangelist? Are you here to stand in God’s presence and to be sent forth renewed to His work? Then do your work for Christ, with Christ and to Christ. Then, in all our weakness – though we are women and men just like Elijah – Christ will make us strong.”219 Thus, the evangelists were taught that whether they needed to be set apart for holiness or to maintain their faithfulness in times of weakness, they needed the Lord’s intervention to strengthen them. They were taught that when they place a priority on their calling and operate in God’s anointing, they must depend upon God to strengthen them in their weakness.

The evangelists also were taught in the plenary sessions that they can


experience God’s anointing by depending upon Him to intervene through prayer. Richard Kriese, in his plenary address, taught that the prayer time of the evangelist is significant. He identified five reasons that the prayer life of the evangelist is significant. First, Kriese indicated that through prayer the evangelist can offer up obedient adoration to God. Second, he insisted that the evangelist in the quietness of prayer is motivated to pursue an authentic spiritual unity. Third, he maintained that the prayer life of the evangelist is significant in that it trains him for a disciplined lifestyle. Fourth, he maintained, that prayer has significance for the evangelist in that it leads him to identification with the crucified Christ. Fifth, Kriese pointed out, that prayer enables the evangelist to preach with a focus on the new heaven and the new earth. 220 The evangelists, thus, were taught about the significance of prayer and how depending upon God through prayer can impact their ministries. The evangelists were taught that in prioritizing their calling, they can experience God’s anointing through dependence upon Him through prayer. 221

In addition to learning that operating in God’s anointing is related to aspects of their personal lives, such as their holiness, their faithfulness, their strength, and their prayer lives, the evangelists were taught that their family lives are significant. The evangelists were taught that they will not authentically experience the anointing of the Holy Spirit if their families are spiritually in a crisis. Therefore, Cliff Barrows taught the evangelists to invest in their families. He explained that the evangelist has a biblical responsibility to his spouse and his children. 221 Thus, Barrows advocated that the evangelist produce guidelines to determine if he is giving enough attention to his family. He exhorted the evangelist to determine how to ensure that the time spent with his family
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is more effective quality time. Moreover, he implored the evangelist to learn how to maintain family worship in the home while absent. Barrows further taught that the evangelist must also determine his responsibilities and opportunities to witness in the neighborhood where he and his family live. Finally, Barrows pleaded with the evangelists in attendance to remember that their family lives are the most important area of their lives. The evangelists were taught from Barrow’s plenary message that they must not only pursue God’s anointing in their personal lives, but that they will experience His continuous anointing in their lives as they invest in their families. Thus, the evangelists were taught that prioritizing their calling requires them to shepherd their families. Moreover, the evangelists were taught that experiencing God’s anointing in their personal lives and in their family lives prepares them for the good work of their mission in the world.

**Priority on the mission of an evangelist.** The evangelists also were taught to give a priority to their calling by pursuing the good work of the mission in this world. Various speakers exposed the delegates to the following features that characterize the pursuit of this mission: pursuing the lost with passion, engaging sinners in personal evangelism, doing evangelism in situations of human need, making disciples, multiplying workers, embracing all the components of the Great Commission, and making a commitment to the local church. Additionally, Graham instructed that confronting the lost with the gospel is done in light of the approaching end times while Billy Kim described what participating in the mission under the influence of revival entails.

In his plenary message, George Sweeting indicated that the evangelist must have a passion for the lost. He conveyed that the evangelist operates out of a singular


passion. He identified this singular passion as a heart passion. Furthermore, he explained that this passion is what should drive the evangelist to pursue the lost.

In the plenary sessions, the evangelists were taught that the passion for the lost is a motivational factor compelling them to confront the lost in personal evangelism. Bill Bright, in his plenary address, maintained that the evangelist must have a personal witness. He explained that the evangelist must personally and regularly bear witness unto Christ as a way of life. He also articulated that the evangelist must determine how to share his faith with individuals encountered during the day. Finally, Bright conveyed that the evangelist must deal with the problem of fear which could hinder him from doing personal evangelism.

Franklin Graham had the objective of describing the mission of doing evangelism in situations of human need. Graham, in his message, maintained that evangelists must deal with strife, poverty, war, and famine while claiming that they must integrate the gospel into their efforts to address these social concerns. He contended that Jesus’ ministry pattern of dealing with the physical needs of human beings can serve as the model for evangelistic ministries today.

Kassoum Keita, in his plenary address, maintained that the evangelist must
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operate his ministry in such a way that he has disciple-making as his goal, not merely the pursuit of conversions. Ajith Fernando, as he did at Amsterdam ’83, dealt with the goal of disciple-making by delivering a message on the ministry of multiplying workers. The focus on making disciples reflected the understanding that the evangelist pursues the entire mission of God to reach people for Christ and to teach converts to observe all that Christ commanded. Gottfried Osei-Mensah, in his plenary message, addressed how the evangelist participates in the Great Commission by examining the contributions from the following texts: Matthew 28:18-20, Mark 16:15-16, Luke 24:46-47, John 20:21, Acts 1:8, and Acts 26:18. He concluded that these texts displayed the following components of the Great Commission respectively: making disciples, calling for a response, the reality of the forgiveness of sins, being sent on a mission, the power for witness, and the deliverance of the sinner from darkness.

Nilson Fanini, in his plenary address, demonstrated that the evangelist does evangelism with a commitment to the church. First, he contended that the church is the body of Christ organized into local assemblies in specific geographic locations throughout the world. Second, he argued that the evangelist is one gifted to build on the foundation of the church laid by the apostles and prophets by winning the lost to Christ and adding to the church. Third, with these first two arguments in view, he insisted that the evangelist must maintain his commitment to the church.

Graham, in one of his plenary messages, explained that the evangelist ministers


in light of the approaching end of the age. He communicated to the evangelists that the end of the age will be characterized by a moral state of the world that corresponds to the moral state of the world in the days of Noah.\textsuperscript{237} In describing the end times, Graham contended that an increase in lawlessness will characterize the moral state of the world.\textsuperscript{238} He further elaborated that this lawlessness will feature an increase in deceivers and scoffers.\textsuperscript{239} He identified an increase in wars as another aspect characterizing this lawlessness.\textsuperscript{240} Additionally, he articulated his position that the end of the age will be characterized by an increase in knowledge and travel.\textsuperscript{241}

Graham believed that recognizing the characteristics of the end times is important because the end of time is related to the preaching of the gospel. He identified that specific relationship as the end following the preaching of the gospel to all the nations. Concerning that relationship, Graham stated,

After this Gospel of the Kingdom has been preached to the world, Scripture says, ‘Then shall the end come.’ We cannot set dates, yet I believe when we have finished the task of evangelizing (not Christianizing) the world, it has something do with when He comes back. This stagers us, it is hard for us to believe that God has committed such a responsibility to us. We are now closer to finishing this mission than any previous generation.\textsuperscript{242}

Graham believed that the understanding of the reality that the end of times follows the preaching of the gospel should supply the evangelist with the confidence that the mission to all the nations will succeed. He also acknowledged that while the truth that the end of time will follow Jesus’ guaranteed declaration that the gospel will be

\textsuperscript{237}Graham, “Approaching the End of the Age,” 63.
\textsuperscript{238}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{239}Ibid., 64.
\textsuperscript{240}Ibid., 63.
\textsuperscript{241}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{242}Ibid., 65.
preached to all the nations should bolster the confidence that the gospel will advance to all the nations, concerns over closed doors call into question such confidence. Graham addressed that concern, saying:

But you say, ‘There are many closed doors around the world.’ While I am concerned about the closed doors, I am more concerned about the ones that are open, that we do not enter. Many times we only enter them superficially and not in depth, so that people are uncertain what it means to both accept and follow Christ. To the church at Philadelphia, Jesus said, ‘I know thy works: behold I have set before thee an open door, and no man shut it: for thou hast a little strength, and hast kept my word, and hast not denied my name’ (Revelation 3:7,8). The Word of God is not bound.243

Graham’s conclusion is that since God has opened up doors for the gospel and that the Scriptures are not bound, then evangelists must confidently step through open doors and preach the gospel.

Graham insisted that evangelists must step through those open doors and not be deterred by potentially closed doors. He pointed out that in addition to closed doors, critics raise the concern that belief in the Second Coming of Christ will also impede the work of the evangelist. Graham stood on the conviction that belief in the Second Coming of Christ serves as a catalyst compelling evangelists to work hard and with great dedication. He asserted, “Critics of those that believe in the Second Coming say they lose incentive to work. It has been my experience that those who believe it are the hardest workers, the most zealous, and the most dedicated.”244

Graham also articulated his conviction that there was a great need for evangelists, fueled by an unwavering belief in the Second Coming of Christ, to be more zealous, more hardworking, and more dedicated. He communicated that the reason for this great need is that sinners stand on the brink of judgement. Underscoring this reality, Graham exhorted the evangelists, “This evil world stands on the threshold of judgment.
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God has given us good news to spread throughout the whole world for these last days. He has given a spiritual power and the tools to take that Gospel to all the world.”

Believing that God has given these evangelists the gospel, spiritual power, and the tools to evangelize, he called on the evangelists to rededicate their lives. He pleaded, “If you have not rededicated your life and ministry to Christ during these days at Amsterdam, I pray that you will do it tonight. ‘Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy [living] and godliness’ (2 Peter 3:11).”

Graham, from the beginning of his message to the end, perpetuated his conviction that the proper understanding of the end times provided the evangelists with the paradigm from which to pursue the mission. He demonstrated his conviction by describing the characteristics of the end times, thus, providing insights into that doctrine. After articulating a proper understanding of the characteristics of the end times, he identified Jesus’ promise that the end times follows the successful preaching of the gospel as the paradigm which should drive evangelists to more zealously and confidently pursue the mission of preaching the gospel to all the nations.

As Graham indicated at the close of his message, in order for the evangelist to more confidently and zealously pursue this mission, he must rededicate himself to God as a holy vessel. The need for evangelists to wholeheartedly surrender their lives to conducting themselves in holiness and godliness drew attention to another aspect associated with the evangelist operating in the anointing of the Holy Spirit and pursuing the mission of God. That aspect is the relationship between the evangelist and revival.

Billy Kim, in his message, addressed the relationship between the evangelist pursuing his mission of preaching the gospel and revival. He taught that the evangelist
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has a particular relationship with the reality that the church needs revival.\textsuperscript{247}

Kim explained that the foundation for this relationship is the role of prayer. Kim believed prayer to be the foundation to revival for various reasons. He understood prayer to be the premise to revival. Not only did he contend that prayer is the premise to revival, he also demonstrated that prayer prepares the evangelist and the church for revival. He also articulated his position that prevailing prayer brings about perpetual power.\textsuperscript{248}

Kim augmented his convictions regarding prayer with the argument that God plans to accomplish revival through the means of preaching. Kim further maintained that while God has ordained preaching to accomplish revival, revival comes to the evangelist and the church down the path of purity.\textsuperscript{249}

Since Kim believed that purity is the path to revival, he exhorted believers to be pure from various things. First, he declared that believers must be pure from idolatry. Second, he announced that believers must be pure from immorality. Third, he claimed that believers must be pure from worldliness. In addition to claiming that purity is the path to revival, Kim indicated that praise is a priority to revival. Finally, Kim asserted that persecution is a prerequisite to revival.\textsuperscript{250}

In the plenary sessions, various speakers highlighted various aspects regarding the evangelist’s mission. All of these aspects, whether the focus was on considering the relationship between revival and the mission of the evangelist or the focus was on another feature, such as passionately pursuing and engaging the lost in personal evangelism, point to the priority of the evangelist’s mission. Thus, the various plenary speakers, in making
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presentations on various features dealing with the evangelist’s mission, showed the evangelists that in prioritizing their calling, they need to prioritize their mission. Finally, after acquiring insights from the training in the plenary sessions, the evangelists could rightly conclude that prioritizing their calling would lead them in pursuing their mission under the anointing of God and according to the gifting He bestowed upon them.

The Priority Placed on the Gospel Message

During the plenary sessions, the conference also showed that in pursuing the mission, the evangelist centers his life on the gospel. In so doing, Amsterdam ’86 showed a priority to the gospel message. Graham, in one of his addresses, indicated that the rationale for prioritizing the content of the gospel is the conviction that the evangelist has a particular message to deliver. In prioritizing the gospel message the conference emphasized at least three major realities. First, Graham pointed out that biblical evangelism is committed to the full and final authority of Scripture alone. Second, he maintained that biblical evangelism concentrates on Christ as the only savior. Third, Amsterdam ’86 showed the priority for the gospel message by advocating the dependence upon the gospel and the Holy Spirit.

The priority of scriptural authority. Samuel O. Libert, in his message, contended that the evangelist operates under a certain authority, the authority of the Scriptures. Thus, he portrayed the evangelist as a minister who gives priority to the authority of Scripture in conducting his ministry. Libert pointed out that the evangelist, in giving priority to the authority of Scripture, would turn to the Scriptures in order to acquire the content of the gospel. He explained that the evangelistic message has a
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biblical foundation.²⁵⁴ He clarified that the evangelist’s message is based upon the inspiration and infallibility of the Bible.²⁵⁵ Libert also indicated that due to the position of the inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures, the evangelist submits to scriptural authority. He further pointed out that the evangelist depends upon the Holy Spirit in submitting to scriptural authority. Libert, additionally argued that in relying upon the Holy Spirit, the evangelist utilizes the authoritative message of the Scriptures to engage in spiritual warfare by penetrating the darkness.²⁵⁶ Libert also maintained that the evangelist in recognizing the authority of the Scriptures and in recognizing the authority of its inspirer, the Holy Spirit, must communicate the message with authority.²⁵⁷

The evangelists were taught that prioritizing the authority of the Scriptures in their ministries should compel them to preach the gospel with authority. They were told that they can preach the gospel with authority because the Scriptures, due to the authority of its inspirer, the Holy Spirit, supply the content of the gospel. The evangelists were instructed that prioritizing the authority of the Scriptures is an act of prioritizing the gospel due to the fact that the Scriptures, as the revealed, inspired, inerrant, infallible, and authoritative written word God supplies 100 percent of the gospel message. Thus, they were taught that the work of preaching the gospel is the work of preaching the Scriptures. Consequently, evangelists in preaching the gospel will give priority to the content of the gospel by authoritatively declaring that salvation is in Christ alone.

**The priority of salvation in Christ alone.** Amsterdam ’86, in prioritizing the gospel message, made sure that the evangelists were trained in the scriptural truth that
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salvation is in Christ alone. The evangelists were taught that in placing a priority on salvation being exclusively in Christ, they must focus on various components. In various plenary sessions they learned to focus on human beings as condemned, lost sinners. The plenary speakers taught them to concentrate on Christ’s work of atonement as God’s solution for lost, condemned sinners. The plenary speakers also exhorted the evangelists to emphasize calling sinners to repentance and faith. The plenary speakers also indicated that in prioritizing the message of salvation in Christ alone, the evangelists should promote the teachings of justification by faith and the instruction on the results of salvation as components of the gospel.

In the plenary sessions, the evangelists were shown that they must underscore the message of the lostness of man.258 Zacharias pointed out that when the evangelist preaches, he must concentrate on man’s rejection of God.259 He clarified that evangelists must also emphasize man’s separation from God.260 As Zacharias dealt with man’s rejection of God and separation from God, he emphasized that evangelists must teach the condemnation of man.261

The evangelists were taught that prioritizing an emphasis on the lost state of human beings who stand condemned before God is a right focus due to the truth that every human has sinned. The evangelists were taught that pointing out the sinfulness of every person is essential to rightly proclaiming the gospel. Michael Baughen, in his plenary address, captured this aspect of gospel preaching when he claimed:

Another essential in the preaching of the Gospel is to communicate the fact that ‘all have sinned and come short of the glory of God’ (Romans 3:23), that no one is excluded from this – presidents, kings and queens, sports stars, business executives,
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shop assistants, road sweepers, bishops or evangelists – no one! We have to make it clear that there is no distinction made by God; that we are all under the judgment of God; that we all deserve separation from a holy God; that without the saving death of Jesus Christ we are without hope.  

The evangelists were instructed that in highlighting the truth that every person has sinned, they also have the responsibility of pointing out the truthfulness of the second half of Romans 3:23 that sin causes every human to fall short of the glory of God. Baughen argued that the objective of pointing out that all people have sinned and have fallen short of God’s glory is to show how seriously God takes sin. He further explained, “People often make light of sin. They do so because they do not see its consequences. We need to show the consequences.”

Baughen also taught that as evangelists prioritize making the consequences of sin known, they need to portray Jesus’ death on the cross as the greatest visual aid to show the consequences of judgment, darkness, separation, and death. He further challenged the evangelists to depict Jesus’ death on the cross as God’s means to deal with sin. He challenged the evangelists concerning this priority, saying,

The Cross was God’s plan to deal with man’s sin. We believe that, but how do we express it in our evangelism? Some modern theologians dismiss the truth of ‘substitutionary atonement,’ of Jesus bearing the penalty of our sins in our place, as ‘barbaric.’ But it would only be barbaric if God had laid the penalty of sins on someone else. It is not barbaric that He laid the penalty of sins on Himself. Instead, it is the most amazing and wonderful love the world has ever seen and will ever see. The scriptural evidence for this wonderful truth is clear and cannot be denied. First Peter 3:18: ‘For Christ also died for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous.’ First Peter 2:24: ‘He himself bore our sins in his body on the tree.'
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In pleading with the evangelists concerning this emphasis, he promoted embracing the biblical doctrine of substitutionary atonement.

In continuing to deal with the priority of preaching the substitutionary atonement, Baughen underscored this biblical doctrine by highlighting the teaching of 2 Corinthians 5:21 that God the Father, made Christ who did not know sin, to become sin so that sinners might become the righteousness of God. He reinforced his position of the substitutionary atonement by referring to Paul’s instruction in Galatians 3:13 that Christ redeemed sinners from the curse of the law, having been made a curse.268

In continuing to speak on the work that Christ accomplished, he pleaded with evangelists to illustrate in their preaching that in Jesus’ crucifixion, the love and justice of God met.269 He explained that God must exercise true justice, making sure that the penalty of death for sin was paid. He further explained that God displayed love in sending Christ to bear that penalty and to pay the price for sin by shedding his blood. He additionally pointed out that Christ made the possibility for accused sinners to be acquitted; and therefore, he concluded for the evangelists that in Jesus’ crucifixion, the justice and the love of God met.270

In drawing out implications concerning the atonement, Baughen insisted that evangelists must prioritize preaching Jesus’ death on the cross.271 He advocated that evangelists must preach Jesus’ death on a cross as he claimed, “The Cross is the center of the Gospel message.”272 Thus, the evangelists were taught that in prioritizing the gospel message, they must make the doctrine of the atonement the central focus.
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In the plenary sessions, the evangelists were taught that as they centered their gospel proclamation on the atonement, they also needed to prioritize calling sinners to a response of faith. The evangelists were taught that in calling sinners to faith, they must call them to repentance. In other words, during the plenary sessions of Amsterdam '86, the evangelists were taught that calling sinners to conversion to Christ entails calling them to both faith and repentance.

Stephen Mung’oma, in his plenary address, pointed out that a relationship must exist between saving faith and repentance. He contended that the initial step in understanding this relationship is the sinner’s recognition that he cannot save himself. Mung’oma claimed, “Saving faith, therefore, is this abandonment of all our human efforts at saving ourselves or guiding our own lives and destiny, and relying completely on the finished work of Jesus Christ.” He elaborated, “Faith in Jesus as ‘the author of eternal salvation’ must be based on the facts about Jesus and conviction that He was indeed who He claimed to be. It is imperative that people know who Jesus is.”

In order to demonstrate that the human response of belief in Christ is contingent upon embracing the person of Christ, Mung’oma expounded on various passages of Scripture. In referencing the apostle Paul, he declared, “Paul calls Him ‘the image of the invisible God,’ the perfect manifestation of God, born of a woman, lived, suffered and died like us, but unlike human beings, He rose from the dead.” Mung’oma explained that although Christ was God, He took on human flesh without ceasing to be God. He pointed out that Christ, in taking on human flesh, lived as a
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servant in obedience to God the Father to the point of death on a cross. He articulated that Christ, in displaying perfect obedience to the Father, accomplished both the propitiation and expiation for the sins of the world in shedding his blood on the cross. Mung’oma clarified that Jesus’ work of accomplishing propitiation and expiation satisfied God’s wrath and served as a substitute for human sins. He concluded that Jesus, therefore, qualified Himself to serve as God’s high priest to intercede on behalf of humanity. Consequently, Mung’oma demonstrated to the evangelists that the human response of faith recognizes that only Christ, on the basis of who he is and the finished work of atonement that He accomplished, can intercede on behalf of human beings to grant them salvation and the forgiveness of sins. Thus, the evangelists were taught that in calling sinners to respond in faith, they must call them to embrace Christ as the only one who can intercede for them to grant them salvation and forgiveness of sins.

Baughen, in his plenary message, addressed the problem that arises for evangelists in calling sinners to only depend upon Christ to grant them salvation and the forgiveness of sins. He asserted, “The human spirit does not want to feel it can do nothing about the forgiveness of sin. It wants to earn forgiveness, or achieve it, or gain credit for it. The truth of free grace and of salvation by faith is against the self-sufficiency a human being wants to feel.” Though that human barrier to total dependence upon Christ to grant salvation and forgiveness of sins exists, the evangelists learned that placing a priority on communicating the gospel to lost and condemned sinners requires them to cross that barrier in making the appeal to saving faith.

Mung’oma also indicated that related to this saving faith is repentance. In showing this relationship, he identified two aspects of repentance as “turning from and
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turning towards.”281 In clarifying the first aspect, he asserted, “First, it is turning from sin.”282 Then he expounded on what this response entails. He indicated that repentance involves ceasing to do overt sins, and a complete abandonment of the self-centered and self-guided life. In other words, Mung’oma described turning from sins as a change of mind, change of direction, and a change of life-style.283 He declared, “Sin is a nature that is alien to God, that is hostile to God and His ways; it is being independent of God. Repentance, then, is turning from your own ways that are by nature at enmity with God. First, there is a feeling of sorrow for sin and for being rebellious against God. Then this sorrow leads to a change of mind and direction.”284

Mung’oma identified the second aspect of repentance as turning towards God through Jesus Christ, and argued that this response is related to saving faith.285 He claimed, “As one turns to God, it is in total dependence on His mercy and grace that he does so.”286 He determined, “Repentance, then, is only possible because of the mercy of God as shown in the finished work of Jesus Christ; and hence it is by faith that one turns towards God.”287

As a consequence of the relationship that Mung’oma emphasized, he insisted that evangelists must stress calling sinners to faith and repentance. He substantiated his position by maintaining that without these components of conversion, regeneration does not occur. He clarified that if evangelists only emphasize believing that they will experience people responding with an “easy believism” whose lives do not display fruits
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or deeds of repentance. He expressed the concern that the evangelist who merely makes the appeal to come and believe will experience people who “come and believe” without exhibiting a sorrow for sin and without abandoning their self-centered living. Mung’oma declared that the end result of this type of appeal is a people whose mouths confess Jesus but whose lives do not at all manifest Him. Conversely, Mung’oma pointed out that an emphasis without faith can result in unhappy individuals mourning over their sins and unworthiness. He explained that these people do not enjoy the fruits of believing in Jesus. In identifying this scenario, Mung’oma expressed the concern that these respondents feel guilty at the beginning but fail to trust in the finished work of Christ and appropriate the fruits of saving faith. He contended that sometimes, when these people experience guilt, they resort to the old life.288 In investigating this relationship between faith and repentance and in examining the dangers of failing to emphasize either one, Mung’oma concluded that evangelists must proclaim both faith and repentance in order to get truly converted individuals.289

Mung’oma additionally explored the relationship between the evangelist’s work of proclaiming both faith and repentance and the Holy Spirit’s role in leading sinners to conversion.290 From the outset in presenting this relationship, Mung’oma cogently articulated the conviction that God always initiates and completes the entire salvation process. He clarified his position by indicating that the Holy Spirit alone accomplishes regeneration. He bolstered his position by referring to Jesus’ claim that He chose the disciples and that they did not choose Him. Moreover, Mung’oma reinforced his stance by referring to Paul’s teaching of salvation by grace through faith, apart from any human works. Thus, concerning the work of the Holy Spirit, Mung’oma concluded
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that the Holy Spirit brings conviction of sin in the heart of the sinner which leads to salvation.\textsuperscript{291}

After communicating the complete work of God in accomplishing salvation, Mung’oma showed how the Holy Spirit, in His work, operated in conjunction with the ministry of the evangelist. He contended that God has chosen to save mankind through the “foolishness” of the preaching of the message of the gospel. He explained how the Holy Spirit uses the evangelist’s call to a response of faith to arouse the listener to the challenges of the gospel. Concerning the response of the listener, Mung’oma announced, “His response is both an act of the will and also a work of the Holy Spirit in his heart. The mind is convinced of the facts about Jesus, the heart is touched to yield to the control of the Holy Spirit, and the will consents and this leads to an action – positive response of faith.”\textsuperscript{292} Mung’oma concluded that evangelists must depend upon God in the following two ways: to grant wisdom concerning calling sinners to Christ and to produce regeneration in the person.\textsuperscript{293} Throughout Mung’oma’s presentation, evangelists learned to show a priority to the gospel message by participating in the work of calling sinners to faith and repentance, while depending upon God to accomplish salvation. Furthermore, in the plenary sessions, the evangelists learned that this reliance on God to save sinners is the dependence upon God alone to justify sinners by faith.

Baughen, in his plenary message, placed a priority on the gospel’s message of justification by faith. He explicated the doctrine for the evangelists. He connected this doctrine for the evangelists to the position of salvation by grace alone, asserting, “But our salvation does not depend on the way we live; it depends on our faith in His death for our sins on the Cross. That is the faith that saves. That is the faith that enables us to say that
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we are justified.”

Baughen indicated that God justifies sinners by faith on the basis of the atonement that Jesus accomplished. He explained that God can justify sinners on the basis of Christ’s work on the cross because in the atonement Christ dealt with sins once for all. Additionally, Baughen underscored the significance of the resurrection. He contended that Christ’s victorious resurrection validated the atonement that Christ accomplished.

Baughen also communicated to the evangelists the results of being justified by faith. He indicated that being justified by faith permanently positions the person as someone who belongs to Christ. He argued that God’s work of justifying a sinner indicates that a person has passed from death to life. As Baughen further elucidated for the evangelists the results of justification, he appealed to Paul’s teaching in Romans 5. In specifically appealing to Romans 5:1-2, Baughen identified peace with God, access into God’s grace, and the hope of sharing the glory of God as results of justification.

Baughen, throughout his plenary message, highlighted the significance of the doctrine of justification by faith. He explained to the evangelists that the doctrine of justification by faith must have a priority in the gospel message. He pointed out to them that because of the reality of this doctrine, they must prioritize calling sinners to faith and repentance. Furthermore, they were taught in these plenary messages that the realities of justification by faith and calling sinners to faith are contingent on the atonement that Christ accomplished. Thus, the evangelists heard that the atonement must have a central place in their preaching. Overall, the evangelists received the training that prioritizing the gospel message involves declaring that salvation is in Christ alone.

295Ibid., 145.
296Ibid., 151-52.
Priority of depending on the gospel and the Holy Spirit. Promoting a dependence upon the gospel and the Holy Spirit was another way that Amsterdam ’86 gave a priority to the gospel message. Particularly, Graham, in one of his messages, conveyed to the evangelists how to depend upon the gospel. He addressed the subject of depending on the gospel by seeking to determine how evangelists can depend upon the gospel in the context of the modern world. He asked, “The basic question we are dealing with today is this: How do we communicate the Gospel in the modern world, with its different cultures, ethnic backgrounds, nationalities, and languages?”

He further posited, “If you had asked Paul, ‘Paul, how do you communicate the Gospel? What is your secret?’ he would have replied, ‘I preach Christ! He is the key which unlocks the door of the human heart, and He must be the center of our message.’”

Graham explained Paul’s rationale in insisting on preaching Christ and making Him the center of the message. He contended that Paul made preaching Christ his emphasis due to the fact that he depended upon the gospel. He conveyed that Paul knew that the gospel had a built-in power. He explained that Paul knew that the gospel had power because of the working of the Holy Spirit to use the message of the cross to bring conviction, repentance, and faith to sinners. Graham maintained that evangelists must depend upon the power that the Holy Spirit supplies to the gospel in communicating to the immensely diverse and complex world rather than capitulating to human skills and human schemes. He underscored the conviction that evangelists cannot rely on organizing large campaigns to reach the masses, must not depend upon eloquent speaking abilities, and must not appeal to human logic to reach the lost societies and cultures of the world. He insisted that evangelists must imitate Paul’s pattern by depending upon the
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power of the gospel.²⁹⁹

Graham also advocated that the evangelist depend upon the Holy Spirit in gospel proclamation. He justified his call for evangelists to depend upon the Holy Spirit by appealing to Paul’s teaching in 1 Corinthians 2:14 that human beings do not receive the things of the Spirit of God because they are spiritually discerned.³⁰⁰ Graham contended that since the things of the Holy Spirit can only be discerned spiritually, evangelists needed to depend upon the Holy Spirit to clearly make the gospel known to the lost. He shared with the evangelists, saying, “When we preach the Gospel of Christ, there is a divine power at work. The Holy Spirit takes the message and communicates it with power to the heart and mind, and breaks down every barrier.”³⁰¹ He concluded that no evangelist can ever experience God’s blessing on his ministry until he completely relies on the Holy Spirit through prayer.³⁰²

Graham, in his plenary address, communicated what he perceived dependence upon the power of the gospel and reliance upon the Holy Spirit to entail. In so doing, he made his case to the evangelists that they need to depend on the power of the gospel and the work of the Holy Spirit rather than capitulating to the modern tendency to rely on eloquent speaking skills or the use of a large-scale evangelistic campaign or crusade. Thus, the evangelists were taught that they will only prioritize the gospel in their ministries to the diverse peoples, societies, and cultures of the world if they depend upon the power of the gospel and the Holy Spirit.

Overall, the evangelists were taught not only to depend upon the power of the gospel but to simply to prioritize the entire gospel. In prioritizing the entire gospel the
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evangelists were told to embrace the message of salvation exclusively in Christ and to operate their ministries under the authority of the Scriptures. The evangelists were instructed that prioritizing the gospel means being excited about the gospel that radically transformed them and being excited about the privilege of sacrificially sharing that message with the world. Baughen, in his message, captured that sentiment saying,

I am very excited about the Christian Gospel. It is the greatest ‘good news’ in the world. It is wonderful to be justified by faith, to know Christ Jesus as Savior and Lord, to know peace with God, access into His flowing grace and the certain hope of glory with Him. Like all of us here, I share the task of evangelism. There is no greater privilege or awesome responsibility for any human being than to preach Jesus Christ, to explain the Gospel, to show what it means to be justified by faith, and to tell of the grace of God and the overwhelming love of God in Christ and the Cross. We are called to go to this needy and lost world with that glorious message and to do so with prayer, communication, love, sacrifice, work, and courage.  

Amsterdam ’86 showed that prioritizing the gospel is being excited about the gospel.

**Supplemental Design of the Methods at Amsterdam ’86**

As Amsterdam ’86, in the plenary sessions, sought to promote the priority of the gospel message by generating excitement for the gospel and sought to prioritize the calling of the evangelist “to go to this needy and lost world with that glorious message,” the conference sought to use the seminars and workshops to supplement those priorities. In showing how the seminars supplemented the priorities emphasized in the plenary sessions, Roger Palms asserted, “Seminars were based on the presentations given in the plenary sessions.” He also explained, “Seminar leaders took the content of the plenary messages and applied it specifically to each language group or culture.” Amsterdam ’86 designed the workshops to supplement the priorities of the plenary sessions by
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providing training and equipping in methods and specialized areas of ministry. The program design for the workshops reads,

Workshops will address the program elements of training and equipping. The emphasis here will be learning-by-doing. The topics were selected to meet the individuals needs and specialties of the evangelist. The workshop leaders, who have expertise in their specialty area, will conduct the workshops around a design of using a readiness set, giving instructional input, demonstrating a correct model of the concept, and practicing what has been taught. There will be over one hundred and sixty workshops. Samples of these specialized areas are youth work, street preaching, the use of films, the use of apologetics, the evangelist as a tentmaker, and leadership skills for the evangelist.306

In providing the training and equipping in the methods and specialized areas discussed below, Amsterdam ’86 provided evangelists with tools that they can use in fulfilling their calling as evangelists anointed by the Holy Spirit to prioritize the spread of the gospel.

Training in the Seminars Based on the Priorities of the Plenary Sessions

Amsterdam ’86 offered the evangelists training in preparing and delivering an evangelistic message.307 The conference offered the evangelists instruction in extending an evangelistic invitation.308 The leaders of the conference trained the evangelists in counseling.309 Additionally, Amsterdam ’86 taught the evangelists how to do follow-up.310 Finally, Amsterdam ’86 equipped the participants in how to prepare an


evangelistic event.  

Tools the Anointed Evangelist Uses in Gospel Proclamation

Amsterdam ’86 provided training for conducting a specialized evangelistic event. For example, the leaders of the conference offered training in the specialized event of a single-church crusade.  

Whether the evangelistic outreach is a general evangelistic event or a specialized evangelistic event, the need exists to get the lost to attend. One of the emphases of the conference was demonstrating the significance of friendship evangelism to achieving that goal. The leaders of the conference provided an opportunity for evangelists to be equipped in the perspective that friendship evangelism was a basis for inviting people to an evangelistic campaign.  

Important to evangelistic work is the paradigm of making disciples and not simply that of calling people to a response. The biblical paradigm of making disciples involves the nurture of new Christians. Thus, the conference offered instruction to the participants on how to nurture new Christians.  

The leaders and organizers of the conference also offered specialized training. One particular specialized focus of world evangelization is reaching unreached people. The leaders and organizers of the conference provided specific training regarding the

---


work of the evangelist among unreached people. With the motivating task of world evangelization and reaching unreached people in mind, the task of world evangelization will include work among cults. The leaders of the conference provided instruction in the work of the evangelist among cults.

The task of reaching the unreached people of the world and discipling all the nations involves cross-cultural work. The leaders of the Amsterdam ’86 conference provided the evangelists with the opportunity to be equipped in working cross-culturally.

The work of crossing cultures may mean going to a place or a people closed to the work of missionaries. Consequently, missionaries enter those areas through some means other than that of a missionary. They enter that region under some platform. The leaders of the conference provided training for the evangelist to serve as a “tentmaker.”

The evangelist seeks to evangelize unreached people and unreached people groups. The task of world evangelization will inevitably lead the evangelist to confront people who embrace cults. Regardless of the focus, the evangelist who participates in world evangelization efforts will engage in cross-cultural efforts. All of this work compels the evangelist to develop strategies. The leaders of the conference provided instruction in evangelistic strategies for the evangelist.

Developing strategies to engage in world evangelization may require building

---


evangelistic teams to develop and execute the strategies. The leaders of the conference offered training to the evangelists on how to build an evangelistic team.\textsuperscript{320}

Evangelists invest in building their evangelistic team as they seek to participate in the mission of discipling all the nations. They also invest in training others as they seek to participate in the mission of making disciples of all the nations. Amsterdam ’86 gave the attendees the opportunity to learn how to teach and train lay evangelists.\textsuperscript{321}

Building an evangelistic team and investing in teaching and training lay evangelists is a significant investment of time. Managing one’s time and one’s responsibilities is necessary. The leaders of the conference provided the evangelists with training in developing management skills.\textsuperscript{322}

Not only does the evangelist need to develop management skills, he also needs to develop communication skills. The leaders and organizers of the Amsterdam ’86 Conference offered training to the evangelists in developing communication skills.\textsuperscript{323}

In addition to receiving various skills, the evangelist also needs to acquire various sources to benefit him in his ministry. The conference exposed the evangelists to the teaching that contemporary society provides the necessary resources that would aid them in their evangelistic preaching.\textsuperscript{324}

The leaders and organizers of the conference also offered specialized training. For example, one of the emphases was on the evangelistic work concentrating on the


\textsuperscript{322}Lloyd Olson, “Management Skills for the Evangelist, in Douglas, \textit{The Calling of an Evangelist}, 375-77.


\textsuperscript{324}John Wesley White, “Resources for Evangelistic Preaching,” in Douglas, \textit{The Calling of an Evangelist}, 397.
inner city. Therefore, they provided instruction for the evangelist to work in the inner cities.\textsuperscript{325}

In addition to the specialized training is the specialized focus and specialized understanding of evangelism. The leaders of the conference trained the participants in holistic evangelism, demonstrating its significance in the socio-economic and cultural context today.\textsuperscript{326}

Another specialized focus involved the national strategies employed to evangelize a particular country. The organizers and leaders of Amsterdam ’86 provided an equipping opportunity on the relationship between national strategies and the evangelist, particularly on the evangelist’s role in the midst of the national strategy.\textsuperscript{327}

Another specialized situation would be a crisis situation. Thus, the leaders of Amsterdam ’86 provided the evangelists attending the conference an opportunity to be equipped in how to work in situations of a natural crisis.\textsuperscript{328}

Another form of specialized training recognizes the reality that a significant percent of people are in prison. Amsterdam ’86 recognized that only focusing on the people living in society would result in the neglect of the lost people in the prisons. Thus, the leaders of Amsterdam ’86 provided training to the participants concerning the evangelist preaching in the prisons.\textsuperscript{329}

Another specialized work is done in the hospitals. The leaders of the


conference gave the evangelists the opportunity to be equipped in how to do hospital evangelism.  

Amsterdam ’86 recognized that all the evangelistic training that they provided should focus on building the church. One important aspect of building the church is church planting. With that understanding in mind, the organizers and leaders of Amsterdam ’86 offered instruction on the subject of the evangelist and church planting. 

Additionally, the conference also invested in equipping the attendees in the various methodological approaches that an itinerant evangelist could employ in his own ministry. For example, the conference offered an opportunity for evangelists to be equipped in street-preaching. 

Another methodological approach that an itinerant evangelist can employ in his personal ministry is the use of the musician. Understanding the significance of the musician in the work of the itinerant evangelist, the leaders of the conference provided training in understanding and embracing the musician as an ambassador on the evangelist’s team.

The conference also provided training in a subject matter closely related to its emphasis that the musician served as an ambassador on the evangelist’s team. This related training was on the role of music. The leaders of the conference offered instruction on the evangelist’s use of music.
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Like the training at Amsterdam ’83, the training at Amsterdam ’86 focused on equipping evangelists in using various forms of media. One particular concentration was on offering instruction in how to use the radio and television.335

Amsterdam ’86 focused on the use of literature as one of its efforts at equipping evangelists in the use of various expressions of media. One feature of the training at Amsterdam ’86 was the use of Scripture distribution. The conference offered training in the evangelist’s use of Scripture distribution.336

Amsterdam ’86 also concentrated on providing training to the evangelists in how to use literature. One particular focus was on providing instruction on how an evangelist can write for publication.337

One example of literature that evangelists can utilize to spread the gospel is the tract. The organizers and leaders of Amsterdam ’86 exposed the evangelists to training in how to create an evangelistic tract.338

As evangelists use various methods that result in disciples being incorporated in the church, they also seek to impact a region and a people as well. A relationship exists between evangelism and relief and development. The leaders of the conference provided instruction in relief and development in evangelism.339

Undergirding all forms of evangelism is prayer. The leaders of the conference understood this reality. They offered training in developing prayer support for the

Both Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86 successfully prioritized the calling of the evangelist and the gospel message. The two conferences did so by instructing the delegates that an emphasis on the calling of the evangelist involves operating according to the gift that God bestowed upon them, fulfilling their ministry in the anointing of the Holy Spirit, and participating in the mission of God. The two conferences also succeeded in their agenda by emphasizing the urgency of knowing and preaching the gospel, by promoting the accurate communication of the doctrines comprising the gospel message, and by contending for the dependence upon the power of the gospel. Additionally, the two conferences effectively showed a priority to the calling of the evangelist and the gospel message by supplementing those emphases with training in methods. In contrast to the tendency to emphasize methods in evangelism, Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86 demonstrated that those involved in evangelism should first and foremost conform their practices to the biblical priorities of leaders operating according to their calling and making the gospel known. The two conferences did not dismiss the importance of methods. Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86 simply showed the proper place that methods must have in light of the priorities on the calling of the evangelist and the gospel message.

Equipping evangelists worldwide at Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86 to prioritize the calling of the evangelist and the content of the gospel was to be the culminating effort of the BGEA’s endeavor to multiply its ministry. As previously noted, fourteen years after Amsterdam ’86, the BGEA recognized that the church faced numerous challenges heading into the 21st century, challenges that the first two
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conferences did not address. Therefore, the BGEA once again sought to equip evangelists worldwide. Chapter four will examine how the BGEA prioritized the gospel message and the calling of the evangelist in equipping evangelists for ministry in the 21st century.
CHAPTER 4
AMSTERDAM 2000

Introduction

Amsterdam 2000 uniquely dealt with the priorities of the gospel message and the calling of the evangelist by structuring the plenary sessions around the following nine themes: the need for evangelism, the gift of the evangelist and the gospel message, the biblical basis for the message, the emphasis on Christ the Savior, the mission of the gospel, the evangelist and the Holy Spirit, the spiritual walk of the evangelist, the evangelist and his relationship to the church, and the evangelist’s service in the world. In the seminars and in the workshops, Amsterdam 2000 supplemented their emphases on the gospel message and the calling of the evangelist by providing training in methods.

Priorities of the Amsterdam 2000 Plenary Sessions

Like the previous two Amsterdam conferences, Amsterdam 2000 prioritized the gospel message and the calling of the evangelist in the plenary sessions. In the first plenary address Billy Kim prepared the evangelists to conduct their ministries according to these two priorities by exposing the great need for evangelism. In the second plenary message Ulrich Parzany prepared the evangelists to operate according to these two priorities by focusing on the gifting of the evangelist and connecting this giftedness to the evangelistic message. In the following plenary messages various speakers initially addressed prioritizing the gospel message and then spoke on the different ways to prioritize the calling of the evangelist.
The Need for Evangelism

In the opening address of Amsterdam 2000, Billy Kim exposed the evangelists to the great need for evangelism. In identifying the great need for evangelism, Kim concentrated on the plight of human beings living in a corrupt world. He identified two major factors that characterize this human predicament, and consequently, reveal a significant need for evangelism. Furthermore, Kim identified these factors, indicating that they serve to motivate evangelists to preach the gospel. Additionally, he showed how the love of God will motivate evangelists to address this great need for evangelism.

Kim exposed the need for evangelism by highlighting the lawlessness that pervades all cultures and societies. He pointed out that the lawlessness that permeates all societies and cultures motivates evangelists to engage in evangelism. Kim conveyed that lawlessness functions to motivate the evangelist by emphatically declaring, “Lawlessness demands evangelism.”

Kim proceeded from the lawlessness of human societies to the depraved nature of human beings. In so doing, he pointed out the truth of the sinfulness of every person. Kim indicated that the lostness of human beings functions to motivate evangelists to engage in evangelism with a sense of urgency.

Finally, Kim articulated that the love of Christ serves to motivate evangelists by constraining them to preach the gospel to lawless and lost people. Thus, the evangelists learned that the love of Christ should compel them to deal with this great need for evangelism. Moreover, Kim exposed the evangelists to the significant need for evangelism that should motivate them to fulfill their callings to preach the gospel, and in the second plenary message they learned to operate according to their giftedness.

---


2Ibid., 16.

3Ibid., 18.
The Priority of the Gift of the Evangelist

In the second plenary message of the conference, Ulrich Parzany dealt with the subject of the gift of the evangelist. In so doing, he placed a priority on the actual gift that the evangelist possesses, and he related it to the priority of the message. Parzany began his exploration into the nature of that gift by starting with the New Testament.⁴

Parzany perused the Book of Acts and cited Stephen, Philip, Paul, and Timothy as examples of whom God calls. He explored Paul’s instruction in 1 and 2 Timothy to Timothy to gain insight into the New Testament emphasis of calling people to a particular ministry. He concluded from his examination of New Testament material that God’s calling upon someone to serve as an evangelist is based on the recognition of church leaders and His work of speaking to the person.⁵

Parzany proceeded by identifying the various features of the gift of the evangelist. He indicated that an evangelist is someone who operates with an urgency of love for the lost. As a result, he determined that the evangelist has a strong desire to proclaim Christ to unbelievers. Parzany believed that in pursuit of this mission of communicating Christ to the lost, the evangelist is the one gifted to listen to what unbelievers are saying and is gifted to understand what the unbelievers are thinking and feeling in relation to the gospel. Parzany pointed out that not only is the evangelist gifted to listen to and understand the lost, he also has the ability to speak a language that his audience will understand. In other words, Parzany maintained that the evangelist is gifted to communicate with unbelievers. Moreover, Parzany insisted that the evangelist is motivated by a concern for and possesses a gift to communicate to people who do not believe in Christ and who also may show no interest for Christ. Also, he conveyed that


⁵Ibid., 24-25.
the evangelist is a minister confirmed by the power of the Holy Spirit to lead people to Christ. Related to Parzany’s previous conviction is his conviction that the evangelist has a God-given ability to call people to make a decision for Christ. Parzany also taught that the evangelist, in his approach of communicating Christ to unbelievers and calling them to make a decision, must be flexible in terms of methods. Moreover, Parzany argued that regardless of methodological approach, the evangelist is a minister who in obedience to the calling of God, is determined to do evangelistic preaching.6

The above exploration of the features that comprise the gift of the evangelist was based on the biblical revelation that the evangelist is a preacher of the gospel. Thus, Parzany enumerated the abilities that he discerned that a person gifted as a preacher of the gospel would exhibit. Parzany’s list of abilities to some degree is based on conjecture due to the fact that the New Testament authors do not specifically identify the abilities of the one gifted as a preacher of the gospel. Paul simply indicated that the evangelist is grace-endowed with his gift. Nonetheless, Parzany did base his enumeration of the abilities on the New Testament revelation that the evangelist is grace-endowed as a preacher of the gospel. Finally, his effort at identifying the various abilities of one gifted as a preacher of the gospel demonstrated the priority placed on the gift of the evangelist.

The fact that the evangelist is grace-endowed as a preacher of the gospel shows that the evangelist’s gift is connected to the message. In pointing out that the gift of the evangelist is related to the message that he preaches, Parzany connected the two priorities of the conference: the calling the evangelist and the gospel message.

Parzany showed that while the ministry of the evangelist is mostly related to the special gift of public evangelistic preaching, evangelistic work does not depend upon a large assembly of people. He utilized various passages of Scripture to substantiate this conviction. He cited Luke’s indication that Philip spoke to the Samaritan crowds and

afterwards to an individual, the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8). He also cited Luke’s communication that Paul spoke to a small group in Philippi (Acts 16) and to a crowd in Lystra (Acts 14) as evidence for his conviction.\(^7\)

Parzany further connected the gift of the evangelist with the message by indicating that the first task of this evangelistic preaching is to communicate the basics of the gospel message to sinners. He continued by identifying his conviction that the second task is to extend a clear invitation to receive Christ. Additionally, he declared that the third task of the evangelist is to explain that conversion is the starting point of a life of discipleship. He further explicated that the evangelist must demonstrate that being born again is the beginning of a process of spiritual development that will be completed when the saint embraces the Lord in His glory.\(^8\)

Parzany, in various ways, emphasized the priority of the gift of the evangelist. In so doing, he connected the two priorities of the plenary sessions: the gospel message and the calling of the evangelist. After Parzany connected the two priorities of the conference with his message, the plenary speakers that followed focused on each priority in separate treatments. The speakers first focused on the priority of the gospel message.

**The Priority on the Gospel Message**

This priority placed on the gospel message was shown in various ways. The priority was shown by identifying the content of the gospel. The priority was shown with the emphasis of explaining how to communicate the gospel in the 21\(^{st}\) century. Furthermore, the conference prioritized the message by emphasizing that the gospel is based on the Bible. The plenary sessions also prioritized the message by focusing on preaching Christ in a broken world, effectively communicating the message, and by

\(^7\)Parzany, “The Gift and Calling of the Evangelists,” 27.

\(^8\)Ibid., 27-28.
emphasizing the exclusivity of Christ position concerning salvation. Finally, Amsterdam 2000 prioritized the gospel by connecting the message to having a heart of compassion and by promoting the mission of the gospel.

**Priority placed on the content of the gospel.** J. I. Packer, in his plenary address, prioritized the gospel by thoroughly, comprehensively, and systematically articulating the content of the gospel. He exhorted the evangelists to embrace the priority of communicating the whole truth of the gospel. He contended that evangelists will exude godliness and honor God by proclaiming the whole story of the gospel.  

In order to show the priority of communicating the whole truth of the gospel, Packer promoted Paul as a model for evangelists. He cited Luke’s portrayal of Paul’s farewell address at Miletus to the elders of Ephesus to substantiate his choosing of Paul as a model. Referencing Paul’s speech, Packer declared, “As he said to the elders of Miletus, ‘I am innocent of the blood of all of you, for I did not shrink from declaring to you the whole counsel of God’ (Acts 20:26-27, RSV).”  

Packer claimed, “In the same way, it is the evangelist’s task to set forth the whole counsel of God.”  

Packer maintained that evangelists should follow Paul’s example by telling the whole counsel of God. He indicated that the term counsel means plan, purpose, and intent. He explained that Paul used the phrase the whole counsel of God to reference God’s whole plan, purpose, and intent of salvation. Packer identified God’s whole plan of salvation as God’s entire mission to bring people out of darkness into the light, to gui
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has in store. He called on evangelists to emulate Paul’s example and to prioritize telling this whole story.\textsuperscript{12}

As Packer prioritized the gospel by emphasizing telling the whole truth of the gospel, he expressed concern over reducing the gospel to the minimum. He believed the tendency to preach as little content as possible rather than as much content as possible exists among evangelists. He argued that in this age of seeking to achieve quick results as soon as possible, the danger of reducing the content of the gospel to the bare minimum is legitimate. Packer, therefore, demonstrated the priority of emphasizing the complete content of the gospel by exhorting the evangelists to proclaim the whole counsel of the gospel as soon as possible and as fully as possible. In exhorting the evangelists to engage in such an endeavor, he acknowledged that the preacher cannot communicate everything in one particular sermon. Nonetheless, he emphasized that the purpose in preaching the gospel should be telling the truth of the gospel as completely as possible and as soon as possible so that people entering into a life of discipleship will know what to expect.\textsuperscript{13}

Packer communicated that the gospel revolves around Christ. Specifically, he taught the evangelists that in the Scriptures the gospel is God’s entire saving plan that is centered on the incarnate, crucified, risen, reigning, and returning savior and Lord.\textsuperscript{14} Packer explained that preaching the gospel involves demonstrating how Jesus relates to every aspect of God’s salvation plan. He pointed out that the gospel centers on Christ by connecting to those who are in covenant relationship with the living Christ through faith. Thus, he explained that evangelism involves explaining the life in Christ, as well as inviting sinners to Him. Finally, he communicated the priority of telling the whole truth by indicating that summarizing the gospel means dealing with at least six main topics.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., 32.
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Packer emphasized telling the whole truth by starting with God. Packer taught that proclaiming the gospel involves telling the truth about the God who revealed Himself as three persons in His plan of salvation. He explained the necessity of showing how the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit love human beings and work together to save sinners and make them holy. He exhorted evangelists to prioritize communicating this view of God, declaring any other view of God as idolatrous.16

While Packer conveyed the fact that the gospel must have a focus on God as the starting point, he also instructed that the gospel reveals the whole message about man. He demonstrated that preaching the gospel must place a priority on telling the whole truth about human beings. He insisted that priorities must be placed on the following realities: humans were created for God as his image bearers, humans were created to reflect his likeness in moral character, humans are as beings controlled and tainted by sin, and humans need to be reconciled to God in their current state of rebellion and depravity. Packer underscored this priority by indicating that any other view of human beings is deception.17

Packer showed a priority to the whole gospel message by concentrating on the theme of the kingdom of God. He maintained that proclaiming the gospel involves telling the entire message of God’s kingdom. He underlined the priority of communicating about the kingdom by highlighting how God has been working to establish His Kingdom in this fallen world. In highlighting the kingdom, Packer pointed out that Jesus is King and that He will serve as judge for those who do not yield to His kingship. Moreover, Packer insisted that trusting, loving, and honoring Jesus as King and
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serving others for His sake is the true display of godliness in the kingdom. He contended that failing to prioritize this understanding of religion is error.\textsuperscript{18}

Packer placed a priority on the content of the gospel by indicating that the way of salvation is solely in Christ. He did so by declaring Jesus Christ to be the sin-bearer on the cross. He did so by teaching that now, from His throne, Jesus reaches out to rescue sinners who are lost in the guilt and shame of sin. He prioritized the exclusivity of salvation in Christ by teaching the necessity of the human responses of faith alone in Him as Savior and repentance, turning to Him alone as master. Packer further prioritized the emphasis of salvation in Christ alone by explaining how God sends the Holy Spirit to change human beings inwardly so that they can respond to the gospel call to salvation. He also highlighted how such a change wrought by God results in regeneration, justification, adoption, and assurance. He placed such a priority on embracing this view of salvation that he maintained that any other view of salvation was deficient.\textsuperscript{19}

Packer prioritized being a part of the church as an aspect of the gospel message. He explained to the evangelists the rationale in including the church as a component of the gospel by stating that the gospel is “the whole story about being born again into a family fellowship which is going to be our family fellowship for the rest of our days and on to eternity.”\textsuperscript{20} He insisted that preaching the gospel includes telling the truth of the life of fellowship. In placing a priority on including the church as a component of the gospel message, Packer taught that Christians belong in the church as God’s people engaging in worship, participating in service, participating in witness and warfare, and enjoying its worldwide brotherhood in Christ. He underscored the
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significance of prioritizing the church as a component of the gospel message by claiming any other view of the Christian calling to be sectarian.\textsuperscript{21}

Packer also showed the priority of emphasizing the whole truth of the gospel message by focusing on the theme of eternal life and the hope of heaven. He emphasized that the gospel is the whole message about the hope of glory. He explained, “Helped by the ministry in the Church of word and sacrament, prayer and pastoral care, spiritual gifts and loving support, Christians live in our constantly hostile world as travelers, heading for a glorious destination.”\textsuperscript{22} He underlined the priority of embracing this theme as a component of the gospel message by insisting that any other view of the Christian life is worldly.\textsuperscript{23}

\textbf{Priority placed on evangelistic preaching in the 21st century.} Amsterdam 2000 placed a priority on the gospel message by focusing on doing evangelistic preaching in the 21st century. Focusing on preaching the gospel in the 21st century means determining how to plant the gospel in an ever-increasing postmodern world. Ravi Zacharias dealt with preaching the gospel within the context of the postmodernism of the 21st century. Zacharias contended that in order for evangelistic preaching to occur in the 21st century, the gospel must cross the huge barrier of postmodernism.\textsuperscript{24} Therefore, the evangelists learned that placing a priority on the gospel requires crossing that huge barrier.

In order to cross the huge barrier of postmodernism evangelists will need to rightly articulate the fundamental difference between postmodernism and the gospel.

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid.
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Zacharias identified the fundamental difference. He pointed out that while postmodernism rejects absolute truth, the existence of a point of reference for meaning, and the reality of certainty, the gospel affirms all three concepts. He indicated that the gospel’s affirmation of these concepts is centered on the person of Christ. Therefore, prioritizing the gospel means that due to the affirmation of these concepts that are centered on Christ, the evangelist will endeavor to cross the huge chasm of postmodernism.

Zacharias contended that human beings have lost a sense of identity in embracing postmodernism. He asserted, “According to post-modernism we do not know who we are as human beings, and we do not know where we are in a gradation of progress. Try and understand that and come to grips with it. No voice from outside, no units to measure; we don’t know where we are and we don’t know who we are.”

In order to cross the great chasm of postmodernism, the evangelist must gain insights into the nature of postmodernism. The task of discovering the nature of postmodernism involves learning what contributed to the prevalence of postmodernism. Zacharias identified five factors that led to the prevalence of postmodernism.

The first factor that Zacharias identified is the rapid spread of atheism with its bold philosophical assertions and the ramifications that follow embracing atheism. He identified the second factor as the growing impact of Eastern spirituality. He claimed that the result of this growing impact of Eastern spirituality is that “We see the amalgam of cultures, part of which has as its central focus a religious worldview, moving into
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cultures where Christianity has been evicted, and culture has become a catch-all for anything that can be absorbed.”

The third factor that Zacharias identified is the dominance of the visual. The fourth factor that Zacharias pointed out is that the youth are gaining dominance over the world by increasing in power and shaping the world. The fifth factor that Zacharias identified is a lost center for cultural molding.

Zacharias then communicated the results of the convergence of these five factors in contributing to the postmodern paradigm. He indicated that societies now celebrate diversity. He pointed out that in celebrating this diversity adherents to postmodernism reject a single point of reference for truth, reject the concept of the existence of a single source from which life gains its coherence, and reject the existence of a single source of authority. He contended that the result of embracing diversity rather than a single source for truth, coherence, and authority is an accepted disconnectedness and an acceptance of a built-in fragmentation. Moreover, Zacharias contrasted this result with the instruction of Psalm 119:105 teaching humanity the necessity of having a light for the path and a lamp for the feet. Since the Scriptures demonstrate that human beings need a light for the path contra the postmodern worldview, evangelists can prioritize the significance of the gospel by responding to and engaging with the postmodern worldview.

Zacharias underscored three ways that evangelists can demonstrate a priority to the gospel in their response to postmodernism. He claimed, “First, we need to have a
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proclamation that is not only heard but is also seen.”

Zacharias implored evangelists to produce good works to accompany the gospel message. He maintained,

> We will have to be men and women who embody the message that we are preaching, whose lives are faithful to the claims we are making, whose love is shown as the love of God, whose kindness and gentleness is present even in the midst of such diversity – so that men and women will see. If our proclamation is to reach a generation, we will have to live lives that make the Gospel visible. Jesus said, ‘Let your light shine before men, that they may see your good deeds and praise your Father in heaven’ (Matthew 5:16, NIV).

Second, Zacharias contended that evangelists can respond by making sure that the lost feel the message. Third, he indicated that evangelists can respond by making sure they value the specific words that they use. He asserted, “We must rescue not only the ends, the goal of the Gospel, the transformation of a life, but the means of the Gospel, the very words that we use.”

**Priority of basing the message on the Bible.** Stott exhorted the evangelists to give priority to the gospel message by basing the message on the Scriptures. Stott declared, “Our topic is a fine statement or affirmation. It is this: ‘The Evangelist’s Message Is Bible-Based.’” He contended that the authentic evangelist can only build a message that is based on the Bible. He claimed that the Bible is indispensable to an authentic evangelism. Additionally, he argued that evangelists only have something legitimate to proclaim if they derive their entire messages from the Bible. He underscored his argument with the claim that the evangelist’s message is not worth listening to if it is not based on the Scriptures. He even maintained that the evangelist
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can only succeed if he derives his messages from the Bible. Thus, the evangelist will demonstrate that he is prioritizing the gospel message in his life by basing all of his evangelistic messages on the Scriptures. In so doing, according to Stott, his messages will be radically different.

Stott highlighted three features of the gospel that derive from the Bible. The three features that Stott identified as deriving from the Scriptures are the content of the gospel, the authority of the gospel, and the power of the gospel. Stott pointed out that the content that comes from the Bible concentrates on salvation through the atoning death and the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Second, he pointed out that the authority the gospel derives from the Scriptures compels attention and assent because it comes across as true. Third, Stott demonstrated that the power the gospel derives from the Scriptures is a transforming and liberating power. Thus, the evangelists learned that prioritizing the gospel should lead them to base its content on the Scriptures, to rely upon the authority that comes from the Scriptures, and to depend on the transforming power of the Scriptures.

When the evangelist prioritizes the gospel by deriving its content from the Scriptures, he embraces the gospel as having God-given content. Stott argued that the gospel has God-given content. In other words, he insisted that God is the source for the gospel. The reality that God is the source of the gospel means that human beings did not create or invent the content. Stott conveyed that the gospel is not the product of human speculation. Stott simply concluded that if the content of the gospel derives from the Scriptures, that it is divine revelation.
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Stott also highlighted the fact that the gospel concentrates on Christ. He claimed, “The Gospel that comes from God focuses on Christ.”\(^{45}\) He contended that the Bible, in essence, is a book of salvation. He clarified his conviction by indicating that the chief purpose of the Scriptures is to provide instruction in the way of salvation that is in Christ alone, by grace alone, and through faith alone.\(^{46}\) Stott declared “Scripture focuses on Christ, in whom salvation is found: Christ crucified, Christ risen, Christ reigning and coming again! And Scripture urges us to put our trust in Christ as the one and only Savior.”\(^{47}\) Stott’s instruction that the Scriptures, and consequently, the gospel which derives its content from them, shows an evangelist intent on prioritizing the gospel message, that basing the gospel on the Scriptures means focusing the message on Christ.

Stott argued that in basing the gospel message on the Bible, evangelists are to affirm that the gospel comes from God and focuses on Christ. Stott pointed out that the Bible also gives the evangelist’s message authority.\(^{48}\) Stott pointed out that the Bible supplies the evangelist’s message with power. He believed that distinguishing between authority and power is important. In the context of evangelism, Stott defined authority as the conviction with which the preacher speaks. Also, in the context of evangelism, Stott defined power as the effect that the Scriptures have on the audience. Stott maintained that true gospel preaching combines authority and power.\(^{49}\) He substantiated his position about authentic gospel preaching by declaring, “As the apostle Paul wrote to the Thessalonians, ‘Our gospel came to you not simply with words, but also with power, … and with deep conviction’ (1 Thessalonians 1:5, NIV).”\(^{50}\)
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This powerful effect of the gospel and the conviction with which the preacher delivers it are not products of human ingenuity. These realities cannot be divorced from the reality of the work of the Holy Spirit. In fact, the Holy Spirit’s role must be considered, and Stott highlighted the Holy Spirit’s role in bringing conviction and power in evangelism. He claimed, “It is the Holy Spirit who gives us both conviction and power in our evangelism. We long that our message, which is often spoken in great human weakness, will be carried home with divine power to the mind, the heart, the conscience and the will of the hearers.”

Stott exhorted evangelists to unite the Scriptures with the working of the Holy Spirit. Stott explained that the evangelists who depend upon the Scriptures and fail to depend upon the Holy Spirit lack power. He also taught that the evangelists who depend upon the Holy Spirit without utilizing the Scriptures, operate without a weapon.

Because the gospel message comes from the Bible and derives its authority from the Scriptures, Stott contended that doing evangelism without the Bible is impossible. Stott demonstrated that without the Bible the evangelist’s message lacks content, authority, and power. Stott stated, “It is the Bible that gives our message its content – Christ crucified, risen and reigning. It is the Bible that gives our message its authority so that we proclaim it with deep conviction. And it is the Bible that gives the message its power, as the Holy Spirit reinforces the Word in the experience of the hearers.” By demonstrating the three features of the gospel being Bible-based, Stott exhibited a priority placed on the Bible.
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**Priority on studying the Bible.** The evangelists in attendance were challenged to place a priority on the gospel by studying the Bible. The evangelists were taught that they must study the Scriptures in order to preach them in a changing world.\(^55\) Understanding the problem of confronting this changing world Anne Graham Lotz asserted, “I pray to God we had more good preachers who would preach the Word – who understand the problem, understand the solution, and preach the Word.”\(^56\)

Lotz taught that in order for the evangelist to preach the Scriptures in this changing world they must have an encounter with Jesus in their Bible study. Lotz emphasized that encountering Jesus in a Bible study involves receiving and interacting with a fresh vision concerning the power of Jesus, the position of authority that Jesus possesses, the person of Jesus, and the presence of Jesus. She also contended that encountering Jesus in a Bible study includes receiving and interacting with a fresh vision regarding the praise that should be ascribed to Jesus, the purity of Jesus, and the holiness of Jesus.\(^57\) Lotz demonstrated that the evangelist who pursues this fresh encounter with Jesus in a Bible study is one who places a priority on the gospel.

Lotz pointed out that such an encounter with Jesus should lead the evangelist to perceive and acknowledge the helplessness of his own condition.\(^58\) She substantiated her point by using Isaiah’s encounter with the holy and glorious God that he recorded in Isaiah 6. In examining Isaiah 6, Lotz pointed out how Isaiah recognized the helplessness of his condition. She explained, “Isaiah knew the sin in his life ruined him as a person. I believe he stood there in the light of the holiness of Jesus and he lost all his self-
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confidence. He lost all of his pride. Isaiah just crumbled in the light of who Jesus is. ‘I am ruined!’ he said.”

Lotz taught that the evangelists who acknowledge their helplessness must embrace the hope of the cross. She asked, “Do you need to be cleansed by the blood of Jesus? It hurts, but it makes a huge difference. We don’t talk the same way after that, we don’t walk the same way, we don’t think the same way, we don’t feel the same way. When we’ve been cleansed by the blood of Jesus, we are cleansed!”

She also believed that the evangelists experiencing the transformation resulting from being cleansed by the blood of Christ will choose to be great in God’s eyes. She also maintained that those who choose to be great in God’s eyes must deal with sin in their lives.

Overall, Lotz presented the importance of studying the Bible in terms of encountering Jesus through the means of study. She demonstrated that encountering Jesus through the means of study will lead the evangelist to root out sin in his life and to seek greatness only in the eyes of God. Any evangelist prioritizing the gospel will pursue a Bible study in which the encounter he has with Jesus will lead him to dealing with his own sins and pursuing what God defines as great.

**Priority of preaching Christ in a broken world.** Embracing the gospel as a Bible-based message means confronting a broken world. Indeed, the biblical message concentrates on preaching Christ in a broken world. Thus, the evangelist placing a
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priority on the gospel will preach Christ in a broken world. The world is broken due to the fallen, sinful human condition. George Carey, in his approach to dealing with the broken world, acknowledged that human beings are definitely fallen. As he acknowledged the fallen condition of human beings, he addressed the issue of brokenness from his perspective that they are always loved.  

In order to address the topic of preaching Christ in a broken world, Carey examined Romans chapter 5 and used it as a basis to diagnose the human condition. He concentrated on how Paul in Romans 5 describes sin in graphic terms. He asserted, “Romans 5 speaks of sin and the depths of sin, the brokenness and despair of sin, and at the same time God’s amazing answer in Jesus Christ, His gift.” Thus, diagnosing the broken world involves understanding sin’s impact on human beings. The evangelist, who prioritizes the gospel, must recognize that the broken world is a result of sin. In recognizing that the world is broken due to sin, the evangelist is able to preach Christ, the one whom Carey referred to as God’s amazing answer for this broken world.

Carey continued to highlight Paul’s depiction in Romans 5 of sin. He declared, Sin is described by Paul in three graphic pictures: sin enslaves, sin kills and sin reigns. In fact, the verb basileuo, meaning to reign, occurs five times in this passage. Three times it is used of the reign of sin, a tyrant, holding mankind subject. And twice it is used of the reign of God’s people, reigning in life through Christ’s victory on the Cross. The Kingdom language that Paul uses depicts a world in which evil is triumphant. It reigns as a tyrant unless Christ’s victory is known and accepted and received.

Carey believed that simply examining the world will lead Christians to the conclusion that sin has a destructive power.  
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Carey claimed that human beings search for saviors other than Christ. He taught that the reign of sin disguises itself. He maintained that in disguising itself the reign of sin places center of attention in other places. He instructed that the end result is that human beings are powerless to overcome their wrongdoing; and consequently they shift the blame from themselves and do not take responsibilities for their sins. He further explained that human beings seek alternative saviors rather than take responsibilities for their sins. Carey argued that a substitute for Christ does not exist; therefore, he pointed out that any human effort to pursue alternative saviors is a pursuit of false gods.\textsuperscript{68} Thus, evangelists who deal with the brokenness of the world will have to pursue preaching Christ to people who turn to alternative saviors.

In Carey’s estimation, Western culture pursues the three alternative saviors of therapy, education, and wealth.\textsuperscript{69} Carey maintained that the false gods of therapy, education, and wealth prevent human beings from recognizing the reality of brokenness. He contended that the Bible refers to the reality of brokenness as the sin which enslaves, the sin which kills, and the sin which reigns. Thus, the evangelist who prioritizes penetrating the broken world with the gospel must deal with the fact that human beings do not recognize the reality of brokenness due to their vain pursuits of alternative saviors or false gods.\textsuperscript{70} Referring to this task of evangelists, Carey declared, “You see, our task is to address this world with a true analysis of its problems, and to enable our fellow human beings to discover a true solution found in Jesus Christ.”\textsuperscript{71}

Since Carey contended that the true solution is found in Jesus Christ, he instructed the evangelists in what kind of savior that the world needs. He contended that
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the world needs a Christ who saves, liberates, and reigns.\textsuperscript{72} Carey then investigated what it would take to preach a Christ who saves to a broken world.

Carey sought to address that issue determining what kind of church would be able to preach Christ to a broken world. He emphasized churches that entered into partnerships based on a common faith would be the ones that could preach Christ as the one who saves to a broken world. He taught that those partnerships need to be new ecumenical partnerships. He still maintained that the authority of Scripture must be upheld.\textsuperscript{73}

Carey also insisted that an effective evangelism will be rooted in the culture of the host audience.\textsuperscript{74} Here at this point Carey goes astray to some degree. Evangelism must only be rooted in the Scriptures. The evangelism that is always rooted in the Scriptures is then contextualized to a particular culture. Through the process of contextualization people of a particular culture can receive the gospel that is always rooted in the Scriptures. The goal is to always plant the Bible-based gospel into a particular culture. The problem with what Carey advocates is that in promoting an evangelism rooted in the culture, he is promoting culture as the source for evangelism. Articulating that culture is the source of evangelism means that culture ultimately defines evangelism. If culture can define evangelism, then what starts out as biblical evangelism can eventually capitulate to the norms of culture.

If biblical evangelism capitulates to cultural norms then the historic Christian faith is eventually abandoned. The abandonment of historic Christianity would result in a Christianity that has left its religion. Carey seems to be making the effort to avoid such a result. He stated, “I don’t plead for a religionless Christianity, but I do plead for a rooted

\textsuperscript{72}Carey, “Preaching Christ in a Broken World,” 87.
\textsuperscript{73}Ibid., 87-88.
\textsuperscript{74}Ibid., 88.
faith, an incarnational faith which is in touch with life, which endeavors to understand the concerns and interests and needs of the people we serve, and which can make the Christian faith accessible.”

Evangelists must affirm Carey’s concern that the Christian faith stay in touch with life and endeavor to empathize with the interests and needs of the people whom they serve. Evangelists will achieve Carey’s concern by rooting evangelism in the Scriptures and contextualizing that biblically-based message to the culture.

To some degree it appears that Carey embraces the concept of rooting evangelism in the Scriptures and contextualizing that biblically-based message to the culture. He merely used the phrase rooting effective evangelism in the culture do describe the above practice. The evidence that Carey uses the concept of rooting effective evangelism in culture as a way to depict the practice of contextualizing the biblically-based gospel is as follows.

Carey insisted that the church should never be controlled by culture in its efforts at becoming rooted in the culture. He asserted,

> While church life must be rooted in culture lest it run the risk of irrelevancy, we must never be taken over by our culture and controlled and shaped by it. The Gospel challenges sinful structures, evil and wrong structures, and the Gospel seeks to shape culture according to the values and norms of the Christian faith. There are times – and perhaps this true of your situation and your culture, but I believe it is going to be increasingly true of my country and the Western world – when the Church will seem to be increasingly an alternative culture to those around us.

The issue concerning Carey is that he made going astray a possibility with his imprecise use of terms. He did not strongly articulate the concept of the gospel being rooted in the Scriptures. Thus, by embracing the language of rooting evangelism in the culture he paved the way for evangelists to abandon the biblical gospel for something more
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palatable even if that is not what he meant by the phrase. When evangelism is rooted in the culture, evangelists could rely on the culture to define their evangelism for them. Consequently, the culture would override the Scriptures concerning the work of evangelism.

Evangelists prioritizing the gospel will be motivated to root their evangelism in the Scriptures and to contextualize their Bible-based gospel to a particular culture. They must avoid rooting the gospel in the culture. In contextualizing the gospel evangelists can still apply some of Carey’s concepts undergirding his use of the phrase “rooted in the culture.” Thus, in contextualizing the gospel, evangelists can relevantly relate to their host culture, seeking to understand the interests and concerns of the people while at the same time making sure that they are not controlled and shaped by the culture. Furthermore, in prioritizing the gospel, evangelists can affirm Carey’s conviction that the gospel sometimes confronts evil structures.

Evangelists prioritizing the gospel message can also affirm Carey’s last two convictions. Carey maintained that effective evangelism is related to all of life. Carey also pointed out that evangelism should function as the natural response of believers to God after a worship encounter with Him. The evangelist placing a priority on the gospel will share the gospel in response to beholding the glory of God in worship. Furthermore, the evangelist prioritizing the gospel will relate the gospel to all aspects of life.

Priority of emphasizing the exclusivity of Christ. Any evangelist prioritizing the gospel will also stand on and proclaim salvation exclusively in Christ. Moreover, any evangelist showing a priority to the gospel message must preach the
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absolute necessity of the sinner placing personal conscientious faith in Christ.

Amsterdam 2000 prepared the evangelists to prioritize the gospel by embracing the exclusivism position on salvation. Specifically, Ajith Fernando delivered the message, “The Evangelist Proclams that Jesus Christ is the Only Way and Calls for a Response of Faith.”

Fernando demonstrated that examining the exclusivity of salvation in Christ is a significant topic because of the rapidly growing influence of pluralism and the increasing hostility to the doctrine. Fernando believed that people in many countries contend that exclusivity of salvation in Christ is an attempt to dominate cultures just like the colonialism approach to missions dominated cultures. Fernando pointed out two realities. He pointed out that the fundamentalists of other religions view evangelism as dangerous. He also pointed out that people within the church are embarrassed by the exclusivity position.

Fernando contended that the exclusivity of Christ is a doctrine that is all through the New Testament. Fernando pointed out that John 14:6 is a prime example of the exclusivity position. He stated,

John 14:6 gives us a comprehensive case for the uniqueness of Christ. He is the way. And as the way, He is unique because only through Him and His work can we find salvation. He is the truth, and as the truth He is unique because He alone is absolute truth. In other religions there are truths; there are all sorts of ways that have truths in them. But Jesus alone is absolute truth. He is the life. And as the life, He is unique because He opens up for us the way to have life to the full, to experience the purpose for which God made us. He is the only way to fulfillment!
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Fernando pointed out that Jesus made claims that only God could make. Fernando insisted that Jesus is who He claims to be. Fernando demonstrated that the Bible focused on Jesus being the absolute truth. He explained his conviction that if the Bible plainly teaches that Jesus is the absolute truth, then people are simply rejecting that message due to a rejection of the gospels as historical documents.\(^\text{84}\)

Fernando set out to substantiate for the evangelists that the four gospels could be embraced as accurate, historical documents. He argued that the writers of the gospels were eager to write about what actually occurred. He pointed out that the gospel writers wrote during a time when people were familiar with what Jesus said. Fernando explained that the gospel writers authored their works a short time after the events took place, and people would have contested an inaccurate portrayal of events and teachings due to the fact that Jesus was a controversial figure. He declared that the early church did not debate about what Jesus taught. Fernando contended that the evidence supports the position that the gospels are reliable historical documents.\(^\text{85}\) He concluded, “So the way they wrote, the commitment they had, was such that we can believe that they wrote what really happened. What they are saying is that Jesus claimed to be absolutely unique, and He backed that claim with His words. It is wise, therefore, for us to accept that this was truly what Jesus said.”\(^\text{86}\) Thus, Fernando made his case that embracing the four gospels as accurate, historical documents necessitates embracing the message of salvation exclusively in Christ.

Fernando also argued that the doctrine of salvation exclusively in Christ should compel evangelists to call sinners to respond to the gospel message.\(^\text{87}\) He referenced
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seven evangelistic messages in Acts as evidence that should compel evangelists to call for a human response. He declared, “There are seven evangelistic messages in the book of Acts, and all of them have something about a response to the message – except one which was in Lystra where Paul couldn’t finish his message because the people came and gave him problems (see Acts 14:15-19).”

Fernando insisted that evangelists must preach for a verdict. He explained that the verdict that the Scriptures exhort the evangelist to call for is faith. He indicated that the call for the response of faith includes a call to repentance. He also believed that the church is becoming soft in insisting that sinners need to respond to the gospel for salvation. He spoke against this tendency among evangelicals, appealing to Paul’s teaching in Romans 10:13-14 and saying, “‘Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved.’ … How can they believe in the one of whom they have not heard? And how can they hear without someone preaching to them?’ (NIV). We must take the Gospel to the world so that people can believe in Jesus.”

His exhortation to take the gospel to the world so that sinners can believe in Jesus showed the evangelists the priority that must be placed on the gospel. Such a priority placed on the gospel emphasizes the necessity of the gospel’s presentation of salvation exclusively in Christ and the necessity of evangelists calling for a response of personal conscientious faith in Christ. Evangelists indeed learned that prioritizing the gospel means embracing and operating from a position of exclusivism.

**Priority of effective communication.** As evangelists prioritize the gospel by centering the gospel message on salvation in Christ alone and by proclaiming the
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absolute necessity for sinners to believe in Christ, they will demonstrate the priority of the gospel by engaging in effective communication. Gerald O. Gallimore conveyed to the evangelists that placing priority on the gospel means engaging in an effective communication that revolves around accurately proclaiming the message and includes the integrity of the messenger.

Such effective communication requires the messenger to always be ready to proclaim the Scriptures. Gallimore called upon the evangelists to preach the Scriptures and to do so in season and out of season. He called the evangelists to such a serious commitment, believing that Christians are living in a time period in which unsound doctrine is being propagated. In referencing 2 Timothy 4:1-5 Gallimore announced,

In these verses, the apostle Paul sets out for us the enormous responsibility and awesome privilege that we have as evangelists. We are called upon to preach the Word, to announce to lost humanity the only saving message, and to be a vital part of preparing the world for the imminent return of the One who will judge the living and the dead. We are to preach the Word in season and out of season. And we are to do that even more urgently because Paul’s prophecy has come to pass in our time. The time of unsound doctrine is here and now.91

Gallimore understood that in order to communicate effectively the evangelist had to begin with the message and not with technique or methodology. He declared, “Communication begins with the message. So I want to call your attention to the biblical message that we must proclaim.”92

He argued that the evangelist’s message is identical to the biblical message that the apostles preached. He contended, “It is the message of the atoning, redemptive, substitutionary, once-and-for-all work of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, upon the Cross
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2000 years ago. You and I have no liberty in the 21st century to change that message, to water it down or to substitute anything that makes it more palatable to modern man.\textsuperscript{93}

Gallimore insisted that the evangelists prioritize knowing the message well. He maintained that the evangelists needed to know the gospel message in its fullness. He claimed that exhibiting competence regarding the knowledge of the content of the gospel is essential for credibility and effectiveness.\textsuperscript{94} In describing how the apostles acquired competence in knowing, teaching, and preaching the gospel, Gallimore declared,

We need to remember that the 11 disciples, the early evangelists, spent three years of intense training under the tutelage of the Master. He had classroom instructions as well as on-the-job missions practicum. They followed Him to the Cross, they experienced the resurrection, and they were filled with the Holy Spirit. You and I cannot expect to make an impact on our generation with any lesser qualifications.\textsuperscript{95}

In prioritizing the focus on the message, Gallimore exhorted the evangelists to spend time with God and to spend time in the Scriptures. He explained his conviction that spending time with Christ and spending time reading, studying, and meditating on the Scriptures will help the evangelists evaluate the societies that they are called to serve. He also explained that the realities that human beings are in sin, lost, living in darkness, and experiencing estrangement from God, are the reasons for justifying the diagnosis of societies.\textsuperscript{96}

In further emphasizing the priority of the message, Gallimore challenged evangelists to preach the lostness of human beings. He taught that such a focus on the lostness of human beings includes demonstrating that human beings face the great eternal peril of hell. Gallimore pointed out that prioritizing the message means preaching more
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than judgment. He demonstrated that prioritizing the message also means recognizing that the gospel is the good news of the life-changing, peril-averting, and destiny-changing salvation that is in Christ alone.97

Gallimore instructed that the good news of the life-changing, peril-averting, destiny-changing hope in Jesus Christ alone is unpalatable to modern man. Gallimore explained,

We want to feel that there are many ways to God. But Jesus says He is the way. He is not one among many. He doesn’t sit on the platform with other prophets of the world. He is the only way, and we must not equivocate on this. We must not waffle on this. You and I must proclaim urgently and lovingly, but uncompromisingly, just as Peter did, ‘There is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved’ (Acts 4:12, NKJV).98

According to Gallimore, getting the message of salvation exclusively in Christ right is the foundation for effective communication. All other priorities build upon and flow from this priority of getting the exclusive gospel right. Thus, following getting the message right Gallimore placed a priority on the messenger. He taught that communication begins with the gospel message and continues with the life of the messenger. The message that continues with the life of the messenger is that of integrity. In other words, he taught that a biblical integrity must accompany the messenger. He insisted that the message must be right and that the messenger must be righteous.99 Gallimore discerned such a close relationship between the message and the messenger that he asserted, “There is no way that we can separate the message from the messenger. If something is deficient in either of these, then we are not going to have effective communication.”100 In making this connection between the message and the messenger,
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Gallimore indicated that the life of the evangelist must line up with the Scriptures and the gospel message. He admonished the evangelists to line up their lives with the Scriptures and the gospel by referencing Paul’s call in Ephesians 4:1 to walk in a manner worthy of the calling.\textsuperscript{101} Thus, Gallimore gave priority to the gospel by presenting it as the standard and contending that the life of the evangelist must line up with it.\textsuperscript{102}

He instructed that foundational to the evangelist’s integrity is conversion to Christ. Therefore, he confronted the evangelists on their conversion experience. He specifically challenged the evangelists on whether or not they have had a personal experience of salvation.\textsuperscript{103}

After establishing that the conversion experience is the beginning of the evangelist’s integrity, Gallimore indicated that evangelists continue in biblical integrity in their commitment to Jesus Christ and the cause for which He died.\textsuperscript{104} This commitment to Jesus Christ and the cause for which he died is a commitment to the message of the gospel and to spreading the gospel. Again, Gallimore showed a priority to the gospel message by demonstrating that an evangelist continues in biblical integrity through his commitment to Christ and the cause for which He died.

Gallimore also demonstrated that biblical integrity requires the evangelist to be constrained by the love of Christ. He explained,\textsuperscript{105}

Integrity requires not only conversion to Jesus Christ and a commitment to His cause but also it requires that we be constrained by His love. Our strongest motivation must be our love for Jesus Christ. The love of Jesus displayed in His coming from heaven to earth in search of unworthy sinners like ourselves, dying upon that cruel Cross, is that love that must constrain us as we go out to witness to the Gospel of Jesus Christ.
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Again, Gallimore showed that he prioritized the gospel in that he indicated that the love of Christ would constrain believers to witness to the gospel.

Gallimore exhorted the evangelists to impart the gospel message to sinners in terms that they will understand. He demonstrated that when the gospel message has a priority for the evangelist he will present the message to the lost in terms that they understand. The fact that Gallimore advocated communicating the gospel in terms that the lost audience will understand means that he believes that evangelists need training in how to be good communicators. At this point in his message, he transitioned from the priorities of the message and the messenger to a focus on methodologies. Even with this transition, he insisted on the Scriptures and the message contained therein functioning as the primary source in training the evangelist. Thus, the message of the Scriptures has the highest priority for Gallimore in training the evangelists in methodologies. He demonstrated that he had this priority by examining Christ’s example in the Gospels, investigating the examples of Christ’s servants found in the book of Acts, and exploring the examples cited in the Epistles.

The priority of emphasizing the gospel and making sure it is received by the audience means that Gallimore focused on being creative and contextual in communicating. This priority also meant that he advocated cooperation in evangelism. Finally, he maintained that effective communication meant that the presentation must be compelling. He explained that a compelling presentation must be driven to preach for verdict, that is, compPELLINGLY calling men and women to salvation in Christ. Thus, with his focus on being compelling, Gallimore prioritized the component of the gospel message that deals with calling sinners to a response of repentance and faith.
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Priority of a heart of compassion. Franklin Graham focused on the evangelist’s heart of compassion. The driving point for Graham’s focus is examining God’s Word. At this juncture, Graham’s focused on Christ and the New Testament’s portrayal of his ministry. For Graham, the evangelist’s heart of compassion is rooted in what he can learn in the New Testament’s revelation regarding the compassion that Jesus displayed in his ministry. He focused on the driving thrust of Jesus’s ministry. He identified the compassion that drove Christ to fulfill his mission of dying on a cross. Thus, he concentrated on the New Testament’s message of Jesus’ compassion for the lost that drove him to the cross. Graham commented, “Jesus had compassion for the sick, for the dying, for the hungry. Jesus did not come to this earth to give us a better life. He came to give eternal life. He came to die on a Cross for our sins. That’s the purpose of Christ’s coming. He had compassion.” Graham clearly connected Jesus’s heart of compassion with his purpose or mission of coming into the world to die on the cross to give eternal life. By making this connection he prioritized the gospel by showing that the focus of a heart of compassion is on the core truths of the gospel.

He asserted that compassion for the lost will compel the evangelist to reach out to people in time of need. He contended that reaching out to people carries with it the responsibility to take the gospel to them. Thus, Graham prioritized the gospel by showing the evangelists that compassionately reaching out to people includes the responsibility of sharing the gospel with them.

Franklin Graham also insisted that the evangelist’s act of compassion will be based on God’s act of compassion in sending Christ to die for sinful man. Graham
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claimed, “The greatest act of compassion is when God sent His Son out of heaven down to this earth for sinful man. When Jesus died on the Cross for you and for me, while we were yet sinners, that was the greatest act of compassion in all of history.” In essence, Graham claimed that the believer’s act of compassion is based on the gospel’s message of God’s act of compassion in sending Christ to die for sinners. By showing that the Christian’s act of compassion is based on the gospel, he showed the priority that he placed on the gospel.

This priority that Graham placed on the gospel prepared him to transition to what preaching an evangelistic message entails. In demonstrating what it takes to do evangelistic preaching he claimed, “We are going to preach an evangelistic message, we have got to be biblical. We must use a text from the Bible.” Franklin Graham also exhorted evangelists to give the invitation clearly and early.

Graham taught that in evangelistic preaching, the evangelist seeks to communicate the fact of sin. He emphasized that evangelists need to give examples of sin. The effort of giving examples of sin reinforces the evangelist’s agenda of communicating the truthfulness of sin. Graham demonstrated that the reason evangelists need to communicate the fact of human sinfulness is so that they can demonstrate what God has done in intervening for lost humanity by giving His Son. He pointed out that God in giving His Son, Jesus Christ, sent Him to die for sins. He conveyed to the evangelists in attendance that God’s intervention to send His Son to die for sinners is due to the fact that God loves the world. Graham also exhorted the evangelists to call sinners to repentance and faith. Graham showed the evangelists how to prioritize the gospel
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by bringing the various elements of the message together and connecting these components of the message with God’s compassion.

**Priority of the mission of the gospel.** Charles Colson explored the power of Christ’s gospel in cultures worldwide.\(^{117}\) He emphasized that real power is found in the gospel.\(^{118}\) Thus, Colson exhibited to the evangelists that they can show a priority for the gospel by depending upon the truth that real power is found in the gospel.

In showing the evangelists that the gospel has real power, Colson articulated the purpose of explaining the themes of the sovereignty of God and the power of the gospel. He explained,

> I want to expand on two themes – the sovereignty of God and the power of the Gospel – in the context of what I see to be the great battle going on in the world today between different understandings of reality, different worldviews, different ways to live our lives. One view says, ‘God is. He is not silent; He has spoken. He reigns, He rules. There is an order in life given to us by our Creator God.’ The other view says, ‘There is no God; He is dead. We can live without Him. We live our own lives.’ That’s the conflict, and all across the world you’re seeing the battle raging between these two fundamental worldviews.\(^{119}\)

Colson explained that the Christian Worldview that God gives is the one that gives hope and meaning.\(^{120}\)

Colson insisted that the message of the Christian gospel answers all the fundamental questions of mankind.\(^{121}\) Thus, Colson demonstrated that a dependence on the power of the gospel means preaching the gospel with the perspective that the gospel answers all the fundamental questions of mankind.
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Colson maintained that Christians must fulfill a cultural commission. Colson asked, “Why is this so important? Well, one reason it’s important is that we are evangelizing today in cultures that aren’t familiar with the biblical message. So we have to go and show them what is wrong with their point of view, what they desperately need and how the Christian message provides an answer.” Thus, Colson showed that dependence on the gospel means showing that other worldviews are wrong and that the gospel message provides the answer.

Colson explored how evangelists can communicate the message in various cultures so that Christian truth influences how people live their lives. He explained, “Well, we have to take every opportunity, in every environment that we’re in, to present the truth. In every area of life you will see that the Christian Gospel provides the answer by which we can live our lives better. Culture is hungry today. If we present the truth, culture will listen to us.” Consequently, Colson showed that dependence upon the gospel means communicating the message so that Christian truth influences how people live.

Colson also demonstrated that dependence on the power of the gospel means advocating making the invisible kingdom visible in the way that the believer lives out the faith. He contended that the people will be changed as the surrounding culture changes. Colson argued that the Christian needs to boldly profess the faith while courageously living in the culture. He explained that courageously living in the culture means taking a stand for Christ while humbly praying that God will use the church and let the world observe the way that Christians live.
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Colson highlighted the unity that believers must have. He underscored this unity by declaring, “Jesus prayed, ‘That all of them may be one, Father, just as you are in me and I am in you. May they also be in us so that the world may believe that you have sent me’ (John 17:21, NIV).” He pointed out that if unity does not exist among Christians then evangelism does not occur. Thus, as Colson maintained, depending upon the gospel means making sure that Christian unity occurs. Moreover, in all the ways that Colson identified in depending upon the power of the gospel, he showed that he placed a priority on the gospel.

**The Priority Placed on the Calling of the Evangelist**

In addition to placing a priority on the gospel, Amsterdam 2000 prioritized the calling of the evangelist in equipping the delegates. In prioritizing an emphasis on the calling of the evangelist, the conference emphasized that the evangelist was a servant-leader in the church who depended upon God in his participation in the Great Commission. Amsterdam 2000’s emphasis of prioritizing the calling of the evangelist in equipping the delegates began with instruction on the Holy Spirit’s role in the life of the evangelist.

**Priority of the evangelist relying on the Holy Spirit.** In promoting the priority placed on the evangelist depending on the Holy Spirit, Finkenbinder argued that the Holy Spirit empowers the man of God to serve as an evangelist. He indicated that an evangelist operating in the power of the Holy Spirit and under His authority presents himself to the world as God’s emissary. Finkenbinder demonstrated that the evangelist
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operates in the power of the Holy Spirit by relying on the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{129}

Finkenbinder contended that the sovereign authority and mandate of the Holy Spirit establishes the evangelist as one who represents Christ to the world. He claimed that the evangelist’s reliance upon the Holy Spirit should impact every aspect of his life and ministry.\textsuperscript{130}

Finkenbinder emphasized that God has a specific calling for the evangelist. He explained that the evangelist’s position in God’s kingdom as one specifically called as an evangelist should supply him with the greatest assurance. He explained that the evangelist must rely on the Holy Spirit in his specific calling or commission.\textsuperscript{131}

He then demonstrated that the evangelist must rely on the Holy Spirit in his private life. He maintained that while the evangelist possesses gifts, he can operate those gifts with or without God’s anointing. He contended that the evangelist must rely on the Holy Spirit rather than his gifts. He explained his conviction that the evangelist who depends upon the Holy Spirit in his private life will experience a lifetime of fruitful and lasting ministry.\textsuperscript{132}

Finkenbinder articulated how the evangelist can depend upon the Holy Spirit in his private life. He conveyed that the evangelist must rely on the Holy Spirit in his devotional life.\textsuperscript{133} He declared, “My dear fellow evangelists, we cannot abandon our relationship with God and expect to maintain our confidence in Him.”\textsuperscript{134} Finkenbinder contended that the evangelist only successfully maintains confidence in God in his
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private life by sustaining a relationship with God. He explained that the evangelist maintains his relationship with God through a devotional life. He indicated that the evangelist will persist in his relationship with God when he recognizes his need of God and recognizes the necessity of living consecrated to God. Moreover, Finkenbinder taught that the evangelist must embrace the reality that a consecrated life comes through the means of daily reading the Scriptures, daily participating in prayer and meditation, and daily depending on the Holy Spirit to grant victorious lives.\textsuperscript{135}

After Finkenbinder conveyed how the evangelist relies on the Holy Spirit in his private life through a devotional commitment to the Lord, he articulated the significance of the evangelist depending on the Holy Spirit in his public life. He stressed that evangelists depend upon the Holy Spirit in their public lives so that they can avoid comparing their public ministries with the public ministries of other evangelists. He underscored the importance of the evangelist relying upon the Holy Spirit in his public work rather than succumbing to the temptation of attempting to promote and produce more than other evangelists.\textsuperscript{136} Finkenbinder elaborated, “We don’t need someone else’s gifts. All we need is to be ourselves. Anointed with God’s Holy Spirit, be the very best that you can be; then seek God every day of your life for the fullness of His divine Spirit. That will give you all the fulfillment that you can possibly contain.”\textsuperscript{137}

Finkenbinder expanded beyond the public life. He demonstrated that the evangelist must rely on the Holy Spirit for public speaking.\textsuperscript{138} According to Finkenbinder, the evangelist must exhibit a dependence upon the Holy Spirit when he preaches an evangelistic message. This point coincided with an earlier point that
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Finkenbinder made concerning the evangelist relying upon the Holy Spirit rather than his gifts. Finkenbinder comprehended that the evangelist easily could rely upon his public speaking skills in preaching. Consequently, he instructed the evangelists to rely upon the Holy Spirit in public speaking instead of their gifts.

Finally, Finkenbinder utilized Acts 1:4-8 to make an interesting point pertaining to the evangelist’s dependence upon the Holy Spirit. He asserted, “The evangelist relies on the Holy Spirit in the spiritual quest. Let us not forget that the message will never be more anointed than the messenger.” His position appears to be that the evangelist must be on an ongoing quest to be empowered by the Holy Spirit in the mission to the ends of the earth. Thus, he believed that Jesus’ emphasis on the continuous empowerment of God’s witnesses by the Holy Spirit demonstrates that the continuous anointing of God’s messenger is equally as important as the anointing of the gospel message. While the anointing of the messenger is crucial, the Scriptures place greater significance on the gospel message. Paul articulated in Romans 1:16 that the gospel is God’s power for salvation for those who believe. While the continuous anointing of the evangelist is important, it cannot contribute to the salvation of sinners. Thus, Finkenbinder’s claim that the message is not more anointed than the messenger is overstated. The anointing of the messenger must have a priority, but to contend that the evangelist is as equally anointed as the gospel message undermines the priority that must be placed on the message.

As Finkenbinder further instructed the evangelists in what he meant by relying on the Holy Spirit in the spiritual quest, he articulated the concept in a better manner. He exhorted evangelists to live out a continuous commitment under the lordship of Jesus Christ. He pleaded with the evangelists not to depend upon past experiences to carry them through their lives and ministries. He further implored them to seek the fullness of
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He declared, “As bearers of the most important message that the world will ever hear, the message of eternal redemption, we have a responsibility unlike anyone else in the world. Let us be faithful to that responsibility. Along with seeking God for an anointed message, let us seek Him for an anointed life.” Although Finkenbinder overstated his case by insisting that the message and the messenger will be equally anointed, his overall point concerning dependence upon the Holy Spirit in a spiritual quest had merit. He was calling the evangelists to rely on the Holy Spirit in a spiritual quest, seeking God for an anointed message and an anointed life. That type of spiritual quest can be affirmed.

From the beginning to the ending of the message, Finkenbinder prioritized the calling of the evangelist by promoting the evangelist’s reliance upon the Holy Spirit. He insisted that the evangelist must prioritize relying on the Holy Spirit in his personal walk with the Lord and in conducting his public ministry. He showed that prioritizing the calling of the evangelist means that the evangelist relies on the Holy Spirit in his pursuit of preaching the anointed gospel as an anointed vessel.

**Priority of the evangelist’s prayer life.** A dependence upon the Holy Spirit will occur, as Finkenbinder pointed out, through a thriving prayer life. Furthermore, the evangelist places a priority on his calling by devoting himself to communing with God. Bill and Vonette Bright also dealt with the priority that the evangelist must place in his prayer life. In so doing, they articulated the foundational concept that prayer is communication. They asserted, “First, we know that all prayer is simply talking to
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God, if we are praying in the Spirit. It is a matter of communication with the great
Creator God of the universe.”

Bill and Vonette Bright explained that prayer is developing an intimate
relationship with God. Developing an intimate relationship with God through prayer,
as Finkenbinder also pointed out, is a key to the evangelist depending upon the Holy
Spirit in his devotional life. Bill and Vonette Bright showed that this development of the
intimate relationship is the starting point of a thriving prayer life.

Bill and Vonette Bright advocated that every believer through this intimate
relationship with God can engage in a ministry of intercession during their prayer time.
They defined interceding through prayer as standing in the gap that is between the person
that needs prayer and the Lord. Therefore, according to Bill and Vonette Bright the
person who stands in the gap on behalf of another person intervenes in prayer for that
person concerning circumstances, needs, or situations. Thus, Bill and Vonette Bright
demonstrated that a believer pursuing a thriving prayer life will intercede for others.

Bill and Vonette Bright also advocated that believers who have a thriving
prayer life should be united in prayer. In other words, those who intercede on behalf of
others should unite in prayer. In using the apostles and the Jerusalem church as an
example Bill Bright asserted, “We want to emphasize particularly that they were united in
prayer; they were praying for boldness, even if that boldness should result in further
persecution. In their prayer they referred to the sovereignty of God. God rules in the
affairs of men and nations. They were excited about it.”
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apostles and the Jerusalem church as a model to emulate, Vonette Bright commented, “What speaks to me in that passage is that they were united in prayer. They were praying specifically, strategically, and they were praying with one heart and mind.”148

In continuing to provide instruction regarding a believer’s dynamic prayer life, Bill and Vonette Bright indicated that Christians can spend time praying the Scriptures back to God in prayer.149 They cited various passages of Scripture as wonderful passages that the believer can pray back to God. They particularly concentrated on the fact that some Scriptures direct praise to God. Thus, when Bill and Vonette Bright advocated the practice of praying the Scriptures, they promoted a practice for a thriving prayer life that included ascribing praise to God.

As Bill and Vonette Bright advocated interceding for others and praying the instruction of Scriptures for their lives and others, they contended that believers have the privilege of interceding for others by praying for the lost. They taught that believers can pray for the lost while trusting that God will save them.150 Bill and Vonette Bright, in explicating their position regarding praying for the lost, taught that the Christian praying in faith for the lost person guarantees that God will save that individual. That position skews the teachings of biblical revelation. What the Scriptures indicate is that the believer can pray in faith, depending upon God as the only one who can save. Approaching God in prayer with the expectation that He can save anyone is a good perspective to have. That confidence in God can drive the believer to pray for the salvation of sinners. While Bill and Vonette Bright did not have the correct perspective concerning interceding for the lost in prayer, their teaching that believers should
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intercede in prayer for the lost is good and should characterize the evangelist prioritizing a thriving prayer life.

Moreover, Bill and Vonette Bright exhorted the evangelists to pray according to the Scriptures. They distinguished this practice from the discipline of praying the Scriptures. Concerning this discipline they instructed the evangelists to examine how the Scriptures apply to a particular subject and to pray for the scriptural application for that particular subject. Thus, Bill and Vonette Bright promoted this practice as a component of a thriving prayer life.151

In addition to teaching various components of a dynamic prayer life, Bill and Vonette Bright offered a five-step plan to help the new believer and the mature Christian feel comfortable in praying together. They articulated the five-step plan as thanking God for everything, thanking God for something that has happened in the last 24 hours, asking for God’s intervention either for someone or something, asking God to meet a particular need, and thanking God for answering the prayers.152 While this five-step plan should not be reduced to a formula that yields certain prayer results, Bill and Vonette Bright did provide helpful guidance that can assist new and mature believers in praying together. Such practical guidance demonstrated the priority placed on believers thriving in their corporate prayer life.

One particular aspect that Bill and Vonette Bright emphasized regarding experiencing a thriving prayer life was the relationship between fasting and prayer. In fact, Bill and Vonette believed that praying and fasting is the most powerful Christian discipline available to all believers. They advocated fasting and praying for national and world revival and for the fulfillment of the Great Commission.153 Although the
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evangelist cannot depend on the discipline of fasting and praying as the means to facilitate world revival and the fulfillment of the Great Commission, the evangelist can fast and pray, desperately depending upon God to accomplish his sovereign work in bringing about the fulfillment of the Great Commission. Thus, evangelists can apply Bill and Vonette’s instruction by making fasting a facet of their thriving prayer life.

While every aspect of the presentation that Bill and Vonette Bright made concerning the believer’s prayer life may not have conformed to the Scriptures, they did offer good insights into what such a life entails. The features that they emphasized communicated the value that they placed on the evangelist having a dynamic prayer life. Thus, they successfully prioritized a thriving prayer life for the evangelist.

Priority of the evangelist and spiritual awakening. The evangelist engaging in a thriving prayer life conveys a dependence upon God to intervene in the affairs of human beings. Such a dependence upon God, as exhibited by the evangelist in his prayer life, includes, as noted by Bill and Vonette Bright, a reliance upon God to fulfill the Great Commission and bring about a spiritual awakening. Dela Adadevoh dealt with the evangelist’s dependence upon God to accomplish a spiritual awakening and placed a priority on the evangelist’s relationship to spiritual awakening.

In dealing with the relationship between the evangelist and spiritual awakening, Adadevoh challenged the evangelists to evaluate themselves to determine if they are ready for God to bring revival. He specifically wanted the evangelists to determine if they are ready to enter into partnership with God in the revival He accomplishes. He set forth such a challenge because he believed that revival precedes a spiritual awakening. He explained his position by claiming, “Spiritual awakening is a special work of the Holy Spirit among a people in creating an unusual awareness and

openness to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Spiritual awakening usually includes, or is preceded by, revival among God’s people.”

With that particular understanding of spiritual awakening undergirding his convictions, Adadevoh challenged the evangelists to consider what they can do to prepare for revival. In seeking to identify for the evangelists what they can do to prepare for revival, he instructed them to consider Nehemiah as an example of one who led during revival. He chose Nehemiah as a model because he believed that Nehemiah provided leadership in what he deemed as one of the greatest revivals recorded in the Old Testament.

In considering aspects of the leadership that Nehemiah provided, Adadevoh pointed out the role that prayer played in bringing about revival. He declared,

> When Nehemiah was first confronted with the disgrace that God’s people were in, he responded by committing himself spontaneously to prayer and fasting. I believe that when God is going to bring revival, one of the first blessings He brings is the spirit of prayer – the willingness on the part of His children to petition Him in prayer, to pour out their hearts before Him, and to expect intervention. Fasting and prayer, I believe, play a very significant role in preparing for revival.

In addition to communicating the role that prayer had in the life of the leader Nehemiah, Adadevoh emphasized that God answers prayers. He explained that God, in answering prayers, works through the prayers of individuals and through the united, corporate prayers of His people. Particularly, he underlined the fact that God does an extraordinary work through the prayers of his united people. In applying his conviction about the unity displayed in the corporate prayers of God’s people, he asserted, “When God’s people come together, putting aside denominational differences, theological differences, institutional differences, and unite in earnest praying, seeking God's
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intervention, His blessings, I believe such united prayer brings an unusual response from God.”

In addition to conveying the role that prayer had in the leadership that Nehemiah provided, Adadevoh examined the role the Scriptures had for Nehemiah in preparing him for revival. Based on his examination of Nehemiah he contended that modern evangelists needed to have a reverential attitude to the Scriptures as the Word of God. He concluded from his examination of Nehemiah as a model that evangelists need to engage in the proper interpretation, explanation, and application of the Scriptures.

Adadevoh explored how the Scriptures bring conviction to God’s people and lead to a time of confession. He observed from the events surrounding the life of Nehemiah that God’s Word accomplishes conviction and compels God’s people to confess sin. He pointed out that the Scriptures drive God’s people to confess their sins as a response to recognizing how far that they have deviated from the righteous ways of a holy God. Thus, Adadevoh demonstrated that in response to the Scriptures, God’s people confess their sins in a deep manner.

Adadevoh taught that the kind of repentance that produces revival is radical. He asserted, “I believe that if we want to see revival in our time, we need to acknowledge that the kind of repentance that begets revival is radical. It is repentance that does not compromise with sinful attitudes or actions. We must ask God for grace so that we are able to turn from all idols to Christ.”
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Adadevoh argued that another ministry of the Scriptures among God’s people as it relates to revival is that it leads to covenanting before God.163 Using the example found in the book of Nehemiah, Adadevoh called for a return to an emphasis on covenanting with God. In using the example from Nehemiah he pointed out “that the people of Israel, when they established their covenant with God, had a written, binding agreement (Nehemiah 9:38).”164 Concerning this example he maintained,

In other words, it was very intentional and a very serious commitment. They established their covenant with God that they were: first, not going to be involved in intermarriages with other ethnic groups (Nehemiah 10:30); second, they were going to honor the Sabbath (see verse 31); and third, that they would honor the Lord with the firstfruits of their labor (see verse 32). They not only confessed those sins, but they entered into a covenant with God not to go back to them.165

Adadevoh used the example of the covenanting that is found in Nehemiah to critique some experiences of revival. He explained that in modern times the church’s experience of revival did not last because the people deviated from their commitment to God by returning to former patterns of rebellion. To confront and change this modern characteristic of revivals, Adadevoh exhorted spiritual leaders to promote faithfulness among God’s people as God pours out his blessing upon them.166 Thus, he used the example of the leadership that Nehemiah employed to encourage the Israelites to remain faithful to their agreements with God through the means of a covenant as a model supporting the implementation of covenants.

The radical repentance displayed in the lives of God’s people and bolstered through the implementation of covenants has a key prominent feature. Adadevoh contended that any revival must have the key feature of centering on Jesus Christ. He
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declared, “Our repentance and pursuit of revival must seek to place Jesus Christ above everything else.”

He taught that a revival centered on Jesus yields the following genuine results: repentance on the part of believers, renewal in the lives of believers, reconciliation among believers, and reformation in society.

Adadevoh also dealt with the issue of whether the church should expect such a revival centered on Christ that could lead to a spiritual awakening. Adadevoh, in addressing that issue, exhorted the evangelists to embrace the reality that God continues to work. He substantiated his position by appealing to John’s recording in John 5:17 of Jesus’ teaching that He and His Father are always working.

In light of the fact that the triune God continues to do a work, Adadevoh instructed the evangelists to pray for more open doors to the gospel. He substantiated his instruction by appealing to how Paul in Colossians 4:3 requested that God open a door to him to preach the gospel. Furthermore, he exhorted them to pray that God will visit the people to whom they are working with a spiritual awakening as they pray for more open doors to the gospel.

Adadevoh also advocated praying that God will open up the spiritual eyes of believers so that they will be able to discern the work that God is doing. Adadevoh believed that open doors to doing evangelism within the context of spiritual awakening are only available for a short period of time. Moreover, Adadevoh implored the evangelists to differentiate between the realities of waiting for open doors to the gospel and waiting for the mission field to become more convenient and safe. He explained,
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So we need to ask ourselves, are we really waiting for God to open doors to the Gospel, or are we waiting for the mission field to become more convenient and safe? There is a great difference between the two. If we are waiting for the mission field to become more convenient and safe, brothers and sisters, remember that the church was built on the blood of the martyrs. There is no reason why it will not continue to be built on the blood of the martyrs. I am not advocating that we initiate suffering and difficulty, but I am suggesting that to finish the unfinished task will require the same radical, sacrificial commitment that it took to bring the Gospel to many of the lands that did not have the Gospel in past centuries.

Adadevoh examined the relationship between revival and spiritual awakening from the paradigm that revival leads to spiritual awakening, and he examined the relationship with the view of identifying the role of the evangelist in revival and spiritual awakening. He identified the evangelist’s role in revival in terms of how he used prayer and the Scriptures. Moreover, he identified these roles in spiritual awakening as embracing the truth that God continues to work and as praying that God will open up the doors for the gospel. In recognizing the roles of the evangelist in revival, and consequently, spiritual awakening, Adadevoh showed a priority for understanding the relationship between the evangelist and spiritual awakening. Furthermore, he also demonstrated that anyone placing a priority on the calling of the evangelist will deal with the relationship between the evangelist and spiritual awakening.

**Priority on the evangelist’s inner life.** At various points in addressing various aspects associated with the calling of the evangelist, the plenary speakers dealt with the inner life of the evangelist. The speakers dealt with this issue in considering the evangelist’s reliance upon the Holy Spirit in his private life, the development of his personal relationship with God through prayer, and the inner transformation that he will experience during times of revival. These references that the plenary speakers made conveyed that prioritizing the calling of the evangelist necessitates addressing the subject of his inner life. Stephen Olford addressed the subject of the inner life of the evangelist.
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He dealt with the inner life of the evangelist with a study of the Scriptures that began with Matthew’s recording in Matthew 5:8 of Jesus’ instruction, “Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.” Concerning this approach of using Matthew 5:8, Olford stated, “I want to open it up to you in a piece of teaching, a piece of exposition, applying it to our hearts with the support of many other Scriptures.”172

In exhorting the evangelists to operate with a pure heart, Olford contended that God is more interested in who the evangelist is than the work that the evangelist does. He maintained that the consistent teaching of the Scriptures conveys that God concerns Himself more with the inner life of the evangelist than the ministry that the evangelist fulfills.173 He stated, “If what we are doesn’t please His holiness, then what we do is virtually worthless.”174 Therefore, Olford pleaded with the evangelists to embrace the injunction of Matthew 5:8 to have a pure heart.

In expounding on the theme of having a pure heart, Olford pointed out that the heart is the control center of the believer’s life. He insisted that Jesus in calling for His people to have a pure heart, was referencing the heart as the control center of the human being. Therefore, Olford taught that Jesus called for the control center for his people to be pure. Olford pointed out to the evangelists that based on Jesus’ teaching their hearts needed to be clean or pure.175 Then, Olford provided an exposition of three verses that addressed how a believer can keep his heart pure. Consequently, he made a point from each verse concerning what a believer needs to do to keep his heart pure.

_________________________
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Olford first used Colossians 3:16. From Colossians 3:16 he exhorted, “We must be dominated by the Word of God.” Olford demonstrated that a believer keeps his heart pure by surrendering to the Word of God so that it will dwell within him.

Second, Olford used Ephesians 5:18. From Ephesians 5:18 he emphasized that believers must be activated by the Spirit of God. Olford conveyed that a believer keeps his heart pure by continuously being filled by the Holy Spirit.

Third, Olford used 1 Corinthians 10:31. From 1 Corinthians 10:31 Olford underscored the fact that believers must be motivated by the glory of God. Olford underlined the reality that believers need to be motivated by the glory of God in order to keep their hearts pure.

Olford also contended that in keeping his heart pure the believer experiences the practical awareness of purity. The practical reality that the believer becomes aware of is the fact that he shall see God. The practical awareness of seeing God compels the evangelist to continue to strive after purity.

Olford also demonstrated the significance of the believer maintaining a pure heart with constancy. He declared, “Tied up in that word pure is the whole concept of constancy, steadfastness in purity. The very meaning of the word suggests that. It is a statement of constancy. I want to say two things about this: We must be daily cleansed, and we must be duly controlled.”

Olford emphasized that the heart must be cleansed. In referencing the truth that the blessed ones are pure in heart, Olford explained that the word translated pure
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denoted a cleansing by an outside agent. He concluded that human beings cannot keep themselves pure; and that they must depend upon Christ to cleanse them.\textsuperscript{181}

Then Olford identified four biblical means that God uses to keep the Christian pure. The first means that he identified was the blood of Christ. He substantiated his identification of the blood of Christ by quoting 1 John 1:7.\textsuperscript{182} He pointed out that the second means that God employs is the effectual working of the Scriptures. In quoting the high priestly prayer of Jesus recorded in John 17:17, Olford declared, “‘Father, Father, sanctify My disciples by Your Word. Your Word is truth. Make them clean. Make them holy. Make them pure by Your Word.’”\textsuperscript{183} He, thus, concluded that in addition to the blood of Christ, God uses the Scriptures to cleanse His people.

The third means that Olford identified is the operation of the Spirit. He cited Paul’s teaching in 1 Corinthians 6:11 that the Corinthians were sanctified by the Holy Spirit as evidence for his position.\textsuperscript{184} Thus, in addition to the blood of Christ and the ministration of the Scriptures, the Holy Spirit does a work to cleanse the believer.

The fourth means that Olford identifies is the inspiration that the blessed hope brings. He pointed out that John’s teaching in 1 John 3:3 conveys how this inspiration driven by the blessed hope brings about this purity.\textsuperscript{185}

In addition to contending that the heart needs to be cleansed, Olford argued that the heart must be controlled. In appealing to Paul’s instruction to Timothy, Olford cited four areas in which the heart needs to be controlled. These four areas that Paul identified for Timothy Olford applied to evangelists.\textsuperscript{186}
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The first area that Olford identified that needs to be controlled in the life of the evangelist is the area of unlawful sex. He cited Paul’s teaching in 2 Timothy 2:22 to prove his point. The second area that Olford identified that needs to be controlled in the life of the evangelist is the area of unbroken pride. He relied on Paul instruction in 1 Timothy 3:6 to make his case.187 The third area that he identified is the area of unholy greed. He pointed out the legitimacy of this truth, claiming, “When Paul says, ‘The love of money is the root of all evil’ (1 Timothy 6:10, KJV), he is not writing to businessmen, he is not writing to the heads of corporations, he is not writing to CEOs; he is writing to a young pastor-evangelist, Timothy.”188

The fourth area that Olford identified is the area of unbalanced truth. He referenced Paul’s instruction in 2 Timothy 2:15 that Timothy should be an unashamed workman rightly dividing the word of truth to substantiate his position.189 The point that Olford made is that the evangelist who rightly divides the word of truth will keep the truth balanced.

Olford, in covering how the evangelist can submit to the injunction to keep his heart pure, addressed the major topic of the evangelist caring for his inner life. In so doing, he portrayed to the evangelists attending Amsterdam 2000 the priority that they must place on making sure their heart is cleansed and controlled. In conveying that high priority to the evangelists, he showed that prioritizing the calling of the evangelist requires dealing with the inner life.

**Priority on the evangelist’s personal life.** The evangelist who prioritizes his inner life will also tend to his personal life. Amsterdam 2000 addressed the issue of the
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evangelist tending to his personal life because of the concern that this minister can neglect this aspect of his calling. As Philemon Choi Yuen-Wan pointed out that evangelists have a tendency to focus more on their public lives than their personal lives, he pointed out that God cares especially for the personal lives of the believer. He taught that while the public life is about achieving, the personal life is about one’s very being, the depth of his spiritual life.190

Since Yuen-Wan insisted that the personal life deals with the depth of the spiritual life, he exhorted evangelists to create time for intimacy with God. He argued that evangelists must create space for intimacy with God. He explained that in establishing space for an intimate time with God evangelists must be aware of unhealed wounds and appropriately deal with them. He communicated the need to define boundaries to protect the soul. He also explained that the evangelist is to guard himself with the understanding that he was never meant to live in isolation.191

While Olford showed that prioritizing the subject of the evangelist’s inner life deals with the process of making sure that the heart is cleansed and controlled, Yuen-Wan conveyed that tending to the theme of the evangelist’s personal life deals more with the personal spiritual walk with the Lord. Yuen-wan demonstrated to the evangelists in attendance that tending to their personal lives must have a priority because it has a priority with God. Thus, Yuen-wan showed the evangelist that they need to place an emphasis on their personal, spiritual walk. In addition to this emphasis, the evangelist must place a priority on his relationship to a local church.

**Priority of the evangelist and the local church.** Paul Negrut explored the relationship between the evangelist and the local church. He investigated this
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relationship, believing that prioritizing such an issue has theological and practical implications for the contemporary church and the evangelist. Negrut conducted his exploration of this relationship from the paradigm that clear, biblical theology generates clear practice.\textsuperscript{192} Negrut investigated the relationship between the evangelist and the church from a threefold perspective. He declared, “We will look first at the nature of the Church, then the nature of evangelism, and finally how it all relates to evangelism.”\textsuperscript{193}

In pursuing the nature of the church, Negrut argued that the being of the church is dynamically related to the being of God. He asserted, “Using New Testament language, one can affirm that the Church is simultaneously a divine-human organism and a historical-eschatological community.”\textsuperscript{194}

In contending that the church in its nature is both a divine and human organism, Negrut explained, “God the Father has designed the Church to exist in a dynamic union between the Head, Jesus Christ, and the body, the believers (both individually and corporately).”\textsuperscript{195} He further explained that in this dynamic union in Christ the believers personally and corporately exist as members of Christ Himself. Negrut demonstrated that this dynamic union means that the church is primarily related to Jesus Christ. Negrut believed that Paul’s teaching in Ephesians 1:22-23 captures this dynamic relationship between Christ and the church, with Christ being the Head and the church being the body. He also maintained that the church, as the body of Christ, serves as Christ’s instrument in the world to accomplish the purposes of God.\textsuperscript{196}
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Negrut also emphasized the reality that the church is a historical-eschatological community. He pointed out,

It must be recognized and emphasized that although the Church as Christ’s unified body lives in this world, it is not of this world. It is an eschatological community with its gaze fixed on the Parousia, the return of Christ. The people of God are simultaneously citizens of their lands and citizens of heaven. In other words, the Church is part of this age and the age to come.  

Negrut taught that the historical and eschatological dimensions of the church provide a theological frame of reference for the relationship between evangelism and the local church. He also explained why he believes that evangelism is the central mode of being for the church. He asserted, “If the Church is simultaneously a divine-human organism and a historical-eschatological community, then evangelism is a central mode of being of the Church. The Church was not created to be an end in itself, but to perpetuate Christ’s ministry to the world.”

Negrut explained that evangelism functions as the way of life of the church, the worshiping community. After Negrut delineated this function of evangelism, he identified the various ways that the Bible depicts evangelism. He identified the biblical depictions of evangelism as proclamation of the gospel, making disciples, bearing witness to Jesus Christ, and fishing for men as examples. All of these descriptions communicate various ways for the church to be involved in the Great Commission.

In fact, Negrut contended that because the Great Commission was given to the church, the evangelist must relate dynamically to the church. He asserted, “The Great Commission is given to the Church. Evangelists must, therefore, relate dynamically to
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the Church. Scripture demands it. Accountability to Christ can be found only in the local church."

Negrut identified the potential reason some evangelists seem to have no clear church affiliation or accountability. He claimed, “Due to the fact that some fail to understand the relation between the local church and the universal Church, some evangelists seem to have no clear church affiliation or accountability. And some churches have no commitment to evangelism.”

Negrut exhorted evangelists to relate properly to a local church body. He therefore, implored evangelists to work with the local church. He exclaimed,

Therefore, the evangelist works with the local church. The evangelist is a special gift of Christ to His Church. The Church will pray for the evangelist and encourage the evangelist. The evangelist must belong to the Church and work with the Church and rejoice in whatever Christ is giving to the Church. May the church go forward and the Kingdom grow until the great day when the Kingdom will come. Let us say, ‘Even so, come Lord Jesus … Amen’ (Revelation 22:20-21, KJV).

Throughout his presentation Negrut showed the priority of the relationship between the church and the evangelist. The priority that he placed on this relationship is significant due to the fact that evangelists typically neglect their relationship and accountability to the church. In showing the necessity of prioritizing this relationship, Negrut rightly started with the nature of the church and then aptly communicated how evangelism is connected to the nature of the church. Moreover, Negrut was able to show that evangelism was the church’s central mode of being, that is, he was able to show that the church, by its nature as the body of Christ, exists to perpetuate Christ’s ministry in the world. In other words, he successfully conveyed that the church was Christ’s appointed instrument to take the gospel to the world; and consequently, he demonstrated that Christ
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gave the Great Commission to the church. In communicating this relationship between the church and evangelism, with the church being the proper instrument for evangelism, Negrut successfully pointed out that the evangelist, in prioritizing his calling, must do evangelism as a part of the church, as a servant to and for the church, and in accountability to the church.

**Priority on the evangelist’s strategy for harvest.** The evangelist, functioning as a servant to and for the church and in accountability to the church, will participate in the church’s mission with a strategy for the harvest. Amsterdam 2000 demonstrated that placing a priority on the calling of the evangelist meant conveying specifically how the evangelist can have a strategy for the harvest. Luis Palau particularly addressed this topic.

Palau began addressing this topic by identifying at least five attitudes that must be present in the evangelist as he launches out with a strategy for the harvest. First, he pointed out that evangelists should have a sacrificial attitude. He appealed to Paul’s teaching in 1 Corinthians 9:12 exhorting God’s servants to sacrifice their rights, rather than hindering the gospel. Palau’s point is that the evangelist who embraces Paul’s teaching to put up with anything will have a sacrificial attitude.205

Second, Palau insisted that the evangelist should be marked by an inner compulsion.206 He referred to Paul’s insight from 1 Corinthians 9:16, conveying that he was compelled to preach. (1 Corinthians 9:16, NIV). Third, Palau pointed out that evangelists should have the attitude that they must discharge their duty by preaching the
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gospel. Again, Palau appealed to Paul’s teaching in 1 Corinthians 9:16 to justify his claim.

Fourth, Palau exhorted evangelists to have an attitude that they will walk in the Spirit. Palau instructed, “Galatians 2:20 says, ‘I have been crucified with Christ and I no longer live, but Christ lives in me. The life I live in the body, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me’ (NIV). We must always, always rely on the power and anointing of the Holy Spirit.”

Fifth, Palau explained that the evangelist must have the attitude of prayerfully persisting in the ministry. He substantiated his explanation using Paul’s instruction in 2 Timothy 3:14 to Timothy to continue in what he has learned and by employing Paul’s exhortation in 2 Timothy 4:2 to Timothy to be ready in season and out of season. He pleaded, “Don’t give up! No matter what trials and suffering come your way, don’t give up! Pray! Pray and persist. Persist until the Second Coming.”

After establishing that the evangelists need to have five attitudes characterizing their lives, Palau instructed evangelists to proceed with a clear divine plan derived from God-defined goals. He communicated that the evangelist uses flexible methods. In calling for evangelists to employ such methods Palau claimed, “God’s principles are rock solid and never change. But methods are to be adapted in every generation.” Finally, Palau exhorted the evangelists to practice biblical evaluation.
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In exhorting the evangelists to operate with a strategy for harvest Palau could have stressed methods. In other words, Palau could have emphasized implementing specific methods or approaches in order to operate with a strategy for the harvest. Palau did not promote innovative methodologies. Rather, he placed a priority on the evangelist fulfilling his calling by highlighting five spiritual attitudes that characterize the evangelist and by exhorting the evangelists to proceed with a divine plan for the harvest derived from goals defined by God.

**Priority of preaching and living the cross.** The evangelist proceeding with a strategy for the harvest will only be able to sustain his ministry by preaching the cross. Thus, the evangelist, in fulfilling his calling, must place a priority on preaching and living the cross. Antoine Rutayisire communicated to the evangelists what this concept means.

Rutayisire explained that preaching the cross means demonstrating what Jesus has done for lost humanity “so that people will understand what it is.”\(^\text{215}\) He insisted that preaching the cross of Jesus Christ should be related to the daily lives of the audience.\(^\text{216}\)

Rutayisire insisted that the cross is the message to lost humanity; therefore he taught that living the cross is displaying that message to sinners. In so doing, he contended that the evangelist relates the cross of Christ to the wounds of modern man.\(^\text{217}\) He also taught that living the cross of Jesus means relating the cross of Jesus to the crisis of human identity.\(^\text{218}\)

Rutayisire, in his presentation, showed that prioritizing the calling of the evangelist means that the evangelist fulfills his calling by preaching and living the cross.
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rather than pursing innovations in methodologies. Thus, the evangelists learned from Rutayisire that fulfilling their calling as evangelists is related to the message they preach and that the message defines how they live. Thus, Rutayisire showed that the evangelist placing a priority on his calling means that he sacrificially preaches and lives the cross. This sacrificial living positions the evangelist as a servant-leader.

**Priority on the evangelist as a servant-leader.** Amsterdam 2000 emphasized that a priority must be placed on the evangelist as a servant leader. Viktor Hamm, in his presentation, dealt with the biblical characteristics of a servant.\(^{219}\) He, in his presentation, also investigated the biblical characteristics of a leader.\(^{220}\)

Hamm acknowledged that the qualities of a servant and a leader are extreme opposites and seem to contradict each other. Hamm explained, “The evangelist is a hybrid of a servant and a leader. Only by divine intervention can these two seemingly opposite characteristics be united in one body, one heart and one mind.”\(^{221}\)

Hamm showed that the evangelist who embraces God’s model of servant-leadership is rejecting the world’s paradigms for the model leader. Hamm contended that in so doing, the evangelist subjects himself to God’s standards and design for leadership. He conveyed that the evangelist, in submitting to God’s design for leadership, is submitting to God to shape and break him. Hamm argued that if God breaks the evangelist, he will emerge morally, mentally, and spiritually stronger. He exhorted, “Do you want to be strong in your character and your ministry? Allow God to break you, melt you, remold you into a new entity? You will come out stronger morally, mentally and
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spiritedly.” Hamm communicated that the work that God does is to remold the evangelist into the new entity of a servant-leader.

Since Hamm advocated the servant-leader model as God’s design, he offered John the Baptist as a portrait of a servant-leader. Thus, by using John the Baptist as a model, Hamm identified the characteristics that the evangelist will have as a servant-leader. First, Hamm claimed that an evangelist is sure of his calling. Second, Hamm indicated that an evangelist is led by character. Third, Hamm pointed out that the evangelist is to serve and lead by preaching. Fourth, he articulated that the evangelist is to serve and lead by serving.

Hamm, throughout his presentation, demonstrated the need for evangelists to embrace the servant-leadership model. Consequently, he conveyed to the evangelists that prioritizing their calling requires them to embrace God and His design for leadership. The evangelists learned that prioritizing the servant-leader model means submitting to God, depending upon Him to mold their character and to establish them as those who are sure of their calling to preach and serve.

Priority on serving in a hostile world. Only servant-leaders will view their mission as preaching Jesus Christ as Lord while viewing themselves as humanity’s servants. In viewing themselves in this way, servant leaders will voluntarily sacrifice themselves in service to a hostile world. Amsterdam 2000 recognized this willingness; therefore, the conference placed an emphasis on the evangelist serving in such a world.

Sami Dagher explained the realities of serving in a hostile world. First, Dagher declared that the evangelist should understand that hostility is to be expected whenever he takes a stand for Jesus. Second, he contended that the upright life of the evangelist
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gives him respect in such a world. Third, Dagher pointed out that God requires his servants to exude faithfulness in the midst of hostility. Fourth, Dagher maintained that evangelists need wisdom from God to know how to deal with this hostility. 224 Concerning this point, he elaborated, “We need wisdom to know when to be silent and when to speak. In Ecclesiastes 3:1, it is written, ‘To everything there is a season, a time for every purpose under heaven’ (NKJV). There is a time to keep silent and a time to speak.” 225

Dagher, with his entire address, conveyed that authentic evangelists are those who take a stand for Jesus and are those who will experience hostility. This priority of serving in a hostile world is significant in light of a tendency to emphasize being relevant when serving in this world. Typically maintaining relevancy in the culture means making sure to connect with the people of the culture rather than offending them. While maintaining relevance should occur, the evangelist cannot give in to the temptation of avoiding suffering in his attempt to be relevant. Thus, Dagher showed the evangelist that prioritizing their calling will require them to persevere through hostility.

**Supplementary Role of Methods**

While Amsterdam 2000 utilized all the plenary sessions for addresses that would show the priorities placed on the gospel message and on the calling of the evangelist, the conference used seminars and workshops to teach methods. The training in methods was designed to supplement the training in the plenary sessions. In the seminars the training was designed to assist the evangelist in prioritizing the communication of the gospel message, in prioritizing the mission of penetrating the masses with the gospel, and in prioritizing the maintaining of a strong family life. In the
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workshops the training in methods would have that particular supplementary function for the evangelists if they learned to prioritize accurately preaching the gospel message in the power and anointing of the Holy Spirit through the methods that they chose. Specifically, Amsterdam 2000 prepared the training in the workshops to have a supplementary role by offering training in the following categories: theology undergirding the use of methods, methods related to the church, building an evangelistic ministry, methods connected to the evangelist’s personal life, methods demonstrating a comprehension of the contemporary world, specific evangelistic methods and strategies, and methods focused on evangelizing children and youth.

**Training in the Seminars**

Amsterdam 2000 assisted the evangelists in prioritizing the communication of the gospel message, in prioritizing the mission of penetrating the masses with the gospel, and in prioritizing maintaining a strong family life by providing training in 8 seminars. Amsterdam 2000 provided the evangelists training in the preparation of an evangelistic message. The conference leaders trained the evangelist in delivering an evangelistic message and extending an invitation. The conference taught the evangelists how to present the gospel to different audiences. The leaders exposed the evangelists to principles for mobilization for evangelistic activities. The conference equipped the evangelists in personal evangelism and counselor training. Amsterdam 2000 gave the
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evangelists principles and methods for follow-up. The leaders gave the evangelists a plan to conduct a national conference for evangelists. Additionally, Amsterdam 2000 offered training on the evangelist’s family.

**Workshops Focused on Theology and Methods**

During the entire conference in the plenary sessions, Amsterdam 2000 prioritized accurately communicating and depending on the content of the gospel, and Rick Marshall supplemented that emphasis by showing the participants how to maintain the biblical message while using modern methods. In offering training in how to mobilize prayer for evangelism, Isaac Ababio emphasized the priority of communicating the gospel by teaching that prayer must undergird the effort. In delineating the components of the gospel message J.I. Packer emphasized starting with God, and Paul Blackham prioritized that emphasis in his workshop on sharing the gospel by explaining the Trinity. Amsterdam 2000 also showed that prioritizing the calling of the evangelist means embracing the servant-leader model, and Robert Coleman highlighted Jesus’ servant-leadership in training disciples. When Lewis Drummond dealt with revival and evangelism, he simply lined himself up with the conference’s priority on the relationship
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between the evangelist and spiritual awakening. In their workshop, Geoff Cragg and Bill Muir dealt with all the paradigm changes that postmodernism brings to the world. In so doing, they supplemented the priorities that Ravi Zacharias underscored in his instruction on evangelistic preaching in the 21st century. With their methodological approach of “three-story evangelism” they gave priority to God’s story of the gospel and connected it to the story of the evangelist and the story of the lost person. Also, Frank Harber offered a workshop on how to use apologetics in evangelism.

Workshops on Evangelism and the Church

In prioritizing the relationship between the evangelist and the church, Negrut showed that the priority placed on the calling of the evangelist means understanding the evangelist as a servant to and for the church while living in accountability to the church as a member. The workshops on evangelism and the church supplemented the priority that Negrut placed on this relationship by offering training with various focuses. The focus could have been on church planting. The conference offered training for church-planting evangelists. Furthermore, the conference gave insights in coaching church planters in evangelism. Moreover, the conference also offered training that considered the issues of evangelism, church planting, and church planting movements. In further
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dealing with the priority on the relationship between the church and evangelism, the conference explored how the churches can cooperate in evangelism efforts.\textsuperscript{244} The conference further showed priority to this relationship by offering training focused on mobilizing the church for area-wide evangelism.\textsuperscript{245} Another emphasis was stimulating the evangelism done by churches of a particular denomination.\textsuperscript{246} Placing the priority on the relationship between the church and evangelism and the evangelist’s role in light of that relationship meant embracing the concept that the church is God’s instrument to spread the gospel. In prioritizing the church as God’s instrument for spreading the gospel, the conference focused on addressing the issue of developing a heart for lost people in an apathetic church.\textsuperscript{247} Additionally, the conference focused on offering principles of a seeker-sensitive church\textsuperscript{248} and promoting church-based servant evangelism.\textsuperscript{249} The conference also supplemented its practical training on the church functioning as God’s instrument to spread the gospel by also providing training for the church to culturally engage the world.\textsuperscript{250} Operating from the paradigm that God gave the Great Commission to the church, the conference provided training in a comprehensive
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approach to evangelism, follow-up, and discipleship in the local church and in the purpose-driven model.

**Workshops on Building an Evangelistic Ministry**

One of the conference’s priorities was to emphasize that the evangelist had a particular calling to exercise his gift in the power and the anointing of the Holy Spirit. The methodological training in the workshops would supplement that training by practically showing that the evangelist could express his calling in the power of the Holy Spirit through the methods that he implemented. Another practical aspect of the training showed the evangelist how to express his calling by building an evangelistic ministry. One particular focus was on the training and development of evangelists. Part of that development was the leadership development for evangelists. The conference also provided direction in how to establish partnerships in evangelism. Additionally, the conference offered insights into how to begin an effective evangelistic preaching ministry. The conference also offered a workshop on conducting effective evangelism campaigns. Moreover, the conference held a panel on raising funds for evangelism in
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a particular region.\textsuperscript{258} Also, the conference offered guidance in developing a ministry’s strategic plan.\textsuperscript{259} In a specialized focus, the conference instructed evangelists in organizing a local prison ministry.\textsuperscript{260}

**Workshops on the Evangelist’s Personal Life**

While evangelists give significant attention to their public ministry, Yuen-wan demonstrated that God concerns Himself more with the evangelist’s personal life. Clearly, as previously demonstrated, the conference placed the priority on the evangelist’s calling by showing the value of tending to his personal life. Since worship is at the core of a strong personal life, the conference offered a workshop on the power of personal worship.\textsuperscript{261} In addition to offering a workshop on engaging with God in worship, the conference provided training in listening to God’s voice.\textsuperscript{262} Engaging God in worship and discerning His will are essential to persevering in the vision that He provided; and consequently, the conference concentrated on showing evangelists how to keep their evangelistic vision.\textsuperscript{263} The conference also taught the foundations for leadership in evangelism.\textsuperscript{264} Personal life issues involved the evangelist’s struggle with


sin; therefore, the conference provided instruction in the temptations encountered by the evangelist.\textsuperscript{265} The struggle with sin also manifests itself in how people relate to each other; thus, the leaders provided instruction in how to resolve conflict in the ministry team.\textsuperscript{266} Moreover, since a significant aspect of the personal life is the family life, the conference offered a workshop maintaining a strong family while the spouse travels.\textsuperscript{267} In attempt to be fair to women and the reality that some women engage in vocational evangelism rather than serving as spouses, the conference did offer a workshop on a woman’s call to vocational evangelism.\textsuperscript{268}

Although this maneuver to provide instruction in a woman’s call to evangelism may reflect a weak understanding of biblical leadership, that potential weakness does not detract from the overall thrust of the workshops dealing with the personal life of the evangelist. In other words, the focus on the woman’s call to evangelism does not undermine the other workshop’s function to supplement the priority placed on the personal life of the evangelist, either the aforementioned ones or the forthcoming ones.

One of the other areas of the personal life of the evangelist that these workshops addressed was practical biblical instruction on managing personal finances.\textsuperscript{269} In addition to dealing with personal finances, evangelists need counsel in other practical
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areas of life. The conference addressed more of those matters by providing practical guidance on managing time and energy.270

Workshops on the Contemporary World

When Ravi Zacharias showed the necessity for the gospel to cross the chasm of postmodernism, he was showing that any evangelist who gives priority to the gospel message will make the effort to comprehend the contemporary world. Understanding the priority the gospel must have, Amsterdam 2000 designed numerous workshops on methods and strategies to get that unchanging message of the gospel to the contemporary world. These workshops were diverse in their scope.

In order to address people in their current life situation with their level of understanding, Amsterdam 2000 showed evangelists how to take the gospel to people where they are.271 Also, comprehending that placing a priority on the gospel means that evangelists must engage people adhering to postmodernism, the conference designed a workshop on postmodernism and evangelism.272 Recognizing that global forces are changing contemporary ministries, Amsterdam 2000 organized a workshop on dealing with globalization.273 The conference also supplemented the priority placed on the gospel by designing a workshop on doing evangelism in a climate of social injustice.274 Additionally, the conference supplemented the priority on the gospel by dealing with


diverse issues such as the subject of the evangelist and spiritual conflict\textsuperscript{275} and reaching business and professional women.\textsuperscript{276}

\textbf{Workshops on Specific Evangelistic Methods and Strategies}

One of the driving principles undergirding the convening of the Amsterdam conferences was the conviction that the gospel message never changes, but methods do. Thus, Amsterdam underscored the priority of the gospel as an unchanging, Bible-based message by continuously seeking how to spread the unchanging gospel with changing methods.

Since methods change, Amsterdam 2000 offered training in diverse and innovative methods so that evangelists could display the priority for the unchanging gospel by employing a myriad of different methodologies. The conference offered evangelists training in considering how to build bridges to share Christ.\textsuperscript{277} The conference provided one particular focus in doing evangelism among refugees.\textsuperscript{278} Furthermore, the conference offered training concerning doing evangelism with interest groups.\textsuperscript{279} Additionally, Amsterdam 2000 offered training in reaching the secular mind through Christian evidences.\textsuperscript{280} Using television in evangelism was an option presented
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to the participants. Moreover, Amsterdam 2000 provided instruction to the participants in using films in evangelism, and the conference offered the evangelists instruction on using mass media to penetrate cultures for evangelism. The evangelists were also taught how to multiply their ministry through the use of tracts. The conference emphasized that the evangelists learn how to reach an audience in terms they understand. Furthermore, the conference leaders provided the participants the option of being trained in reaching the disabled.

The conference also provided training with different focuses. One particular focus emphasized training the evangelists in proclaiming the gospel with passion. Another associated topic dealt with the relationship between evangelism and compassion. A new specialized focus at the time of Amsterdam 2000 was the option of learning about models and resources for internet evangelism. The conference leaders offered instruction in doing evangelism through conflict resolution.
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Additionally, a course was offered on becoming a contagious Christian. Specifically, one focus concentrated on evangelism in the military. Evangelists had the option of participating in instruction in reaching nonbelievers through small groups. One particularly unique instruction dealt with how ‘Stone Age’ people can learn high tech skills for evangelism. The conference further offered training to the delegates in doing evangelism through pastoral counseling. Another unique perspective offered the attendees instruction concerning evangelism through training on the family. Since the world continues to go through a rapid process of urbanization, the need to evangelize the cities is rapidly increasing. Thus, the leaders of the conference gave the evangelists an opportunity to learn a strategy for reaching a city. Moreover, insights were given into using tomorrow’s technology for today’s evangelism. Another workshop focused on the specific ministry of KidsGames and on the concept of major sports events evangelism.


All these vast and diverse methods are simply an introduction to the possibilities of implementing innovative ministries into an evangelistic ministry. The fact that evangelists can utilize numerous methodologies underlines the conviction that methods constantly change. Again, the purpose undergirding these numerous methodological options is for the evangelist to prioritize getting the unchanging gospel message to the lost through relevant methods.

**Workshops on Children and Youth**

Finally, prioritizing the gospel message means crossing the great chasm of postmodernism by reaching the younger generations influenced by that paradigm. One focus was on the youngest segment of society by providing instruction in leading children to Christ. Other workshops provided instruction in how to evangelize contemporary youth and on how to communicate with young people. One option for training focused on reaching counter-culture youth. Additionally, the evangelists had the option of learning how to reach the global youth culture. Along the same lines, Amsterdam 2000 offered training in reaching international students. The focus was on discipling as well with a workshop emphasizing discipling young people into the
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Additionally, the leaders of the conference offered training in mobilizing student leaders for outreach.\(^{307}\)

**Conclusion**

Amsterdam 2000 successfully prioritized the gospel message and the calling of the evangelist. The conference achieved its goal by initially focusing on the gospel and then dealing with various aspects of the calling of the evangelist. One of the strong contributions of the conference was J. I. Packer systematically and comprehensively identifying and expounding on the following components of the gospel: the message concerning the triune God, the instruction regarding human beings, the teaching about the kingdom of God, the proclamation of the way salvation in Christ alone, the relationship between the person’s salvation experience and his incorporation into the church, and the emphasis on the hope of glory. While evangelists learned the various doctrines that comprise the gospel message at Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86, Packer uniquely benefitted the evangelists at Amsterdam 2000 by imparting the six major themes that comprise the content of the gospel in such a coherent, comprehensive, and systematic way. Amsterdam 2000 also uniquely prioritized the gospel by making a cogent defense of the exclusivism position concerning salvation in Christ with Ajith Fernando’s plenary address. Concerning prioritizing the calling of the evangelist made a significant contribution by making a strong theological presentation on the nature of the church and showing how the evangelist fulfills his calling in a hostile world as a servant-leader of the church. Also, Amsterdam 2000 significantly contributed to evangelism by showing evangelists how they can appropriately use methods as tools they prioritize the gospel.


message and fulfilling their ministry according to their calling. Thus, Amsterdam 2000, in a similar manner to Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86, shows those involved in evangelism that priorities must be placed on the gospel message and the calling of God’s servant-leader rather than on methods.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

In 2 Timothy 4:5 Paul exhorted Timothy, writing, “But you, be sober in all things, endure hardship, do the work of an evangelist, fulfill your ministry.” Paul’s indication in 1 Thessalonians 2:8 that he imparted the gospel and his life in doing mission work can be used to determine if the evangelist fulfilled his ministry by doing the work that God appointed for him. Thus, the objective in determining if the evangelist did the work God called him to do is to ascertain if he imparted the gospel and his life to others. Determining if the evangelist imparted his life to others involves examining his equipping ministry.

Paul has underscored the significance of an evangelist’s equipping ministry. In Ephesians 4:11-12 he wrote, “And He gave some as apostles, and some as prophets, and some as evangelists, and some as pastors and teachers, for the equipping of the saints for the work of service, to the building up of the body of Christ.” An evangelist’s equipping ministry is significant, for in it, he contributes to the building up of the body of Christ. In Acts 9:31 Luke conveyed that the building up of the church contributed to its growth. In addition to using the gospel to expand His church, God also works to expand His church through an equipping ministry that builds up the body of Christ. Therefore, the importance of an evangelist’s ministry of equipping the saints cannot be minimalized due to the urgency of taking the gospel to the nations.

Graham’s Emphasis on Methods

Billy Graham has emphasized the importance of methods in his equipping efforts. For example, Graham has emphasized the importance of equipping preachers to
extend an invitation in proclaiming their evangelistic sermons.

In emphasizing the importance of and the purpose behind giving an invitation, Graham contended that the invitation must be understood as more than the means to conclude the evangelistic message. He explained that the invitation is the focal point of the evangelistic message. He asserted, “The whole sermon should be directed toward the invitation. Everything we say in our sermon should, directly or indirectly, point toward the call for decision we will make. An evangelistic sermon makes a person see who he is in the light of God’s Word. It makes a person see what he must do in response.”

Thus, Graham contended that the invitation clearly demonstrates to the hearers that the gospel demands a decision.

While stressing the importance of using the method of the invitation, Graham clearly communicated that evangelists cannot depend on the method to produce results. Rather, he insisted that evangelists must completely depend upon God to accomplish evangelistic results. In describing how he depends on God through prayer in extending an evangelistic invitation, he claimed,

Every time I give an invitation, I am in an attitude of prayer inwardly, because I know I am totally dependent on God. This is the moment that I feel emotionally, physically, and spiritually drained. This is the part of the evangelistic service that often exhausts me physically. A great spiritual battle is going on in the hearts of many people. With me, it becomes a spiritual battle of such proportions that sometimes I feel almost faint. There is an inward groaning and agonizing in prayer that I cannot possibly put into words.

He expanded, “Our sermons should be bathed in prayer, our meetings should be undergirded with prayer. Time after time in my own ministry, I have seen God work in unusual ways, and found out later that God’s people in that area had praying earnestly –
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3Ibid., 173.
sometimes for years. Some may plant the seed, others may water it, ‘but … God … makes things grow’ (1 Corinthians 3:6).”

Graham stressed the importance of methods, such as extending the invitation, while at the same time promoting a dependence upon God to accomplish evangelistic results. Graham’s emphasis on the dependence upon God to accomplish results in his use of the invitation is line with the Amsterdam conferences emphases on the dependence upon the Holy Spirit and the proper place methods have in ministry.

**Proclivity to Emphasize Methods in Evangelism**

The manner in which Graham employed methods is significant due to a proclivity to emphasize methods in evangelism. This tendency manifests itself in at least two different ways. First, the emphasis on methods may focus on giving credit to a particular evangelistic method or approach for producing the conversion of sinners and the establishing of disciples in the church. Leaders in evangelism who emphasize the use of methods to accomplish conversion growth in the church diminish the significance of the gospel message in leading the lost to salvation. Second, leaders involved in evangelism have produced entire works that show the positive contributions of methods. In so doing, they, with their works, have emphasized the methods that they are highlighting. Over time, the end result is that contributors to evangelism produce good contributions on methods while at the same time producing a minimal amount of works focused on the gospel or the calling of leaders. The tendency to emphasize methods in evangelism can be observed in these two major ways as demonstrated by the following examples.

---

Tendency Observed in Evangelistic Invitations

In *The Effective Invitation: A Practical Guide for the Pastor*, R. Alan Streett promoted the extension of the evangelistic invitation as a method that will accomplish evangelistic results. Although Streett in *The Effective Invitation*, advocated the position that the effective invitation produces results, he did not minimalize the significance of the content of the gospel or the truth that salvation is in Christ alone. In fact, he identified the following as aspects of the nature of the gospel: the gospel of God, the gospel of Christ, the glorious gospel of Christ, the gospel of the grace of God, the gospel of peace, and the gospel of salvation. Moreover, in examining these aspects of the nature of the gospel, Streett defended that salvation is in the person of Christ alone, is based on the finished work of atonement accomplished by Christ alone, and is according to God’s grace alone. Streett clearly embraced the truth that God alone accomplishes salvation. The issue regarding Streett is that in addition to defending that God alone accomplishes salvation, he contended that extending the effective invitation brings about evangelistic results. He made his argument for such an effective purpose for the invitation in various ways.

Street advocated the importance of the invitation to accomplish results by elevating the method to the status of the most important component of the evangelistic sermon. He claimed,

> If the conclusion is the most important structural part of the sermon, the invitation is the most important part of the evangelistic sermon. Every evangelistic message succeeds or fails according to the effectiveness of the invitation. The main goal of the gospel is to bring men and women into a saving relationship with Jesus Christ. If the invitation continually fails to produce this desired result, the sermon is...

---
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considered to be less than successful.\textsuperscript{8} In elevating the status of extending the invitation to the most important aspect of the sermon, Streett established his position that the effective delivery of the invitation determines the success of the sermon. In establishing his position he did not promote any of the following as the most important factors determining the success of an evangelistic sermon: the accurate communication of the gospel message, the dependence of the preacher upon the content of the gospel as God’s power for the salvation of sinners, or the dependence of the preacher upon the Holy Spirit to awaken the sinner. He did not challenge the preacher to evaluate if he depended upon God and His gospel to bring men and women into a saving relationship with Christ, but he challenged them to determine whether or not their invitation produced the desired result of bringing people into a saving relationship with Christ. Thus, by elevating the invitation to the status of the most important element of the evangelistic message, Streett promoted the method as the means to produce evangelistic results.

Streett argued for the support of the invitation as a method that produces evangelistic results even while contending that God produces the results. He asserted, “If you are diligent in your preparation and careful to execute your delivery properly, depending totally on God, you will experience many more successes than failures in your attempts to win people to Christ.”\textsuperscript{9} Although he advocated completely depending upon God, he still indicated that diligent preparation and careful execution of the delivery will ensure greater successes in the attempts to win people to Christ. According to Streett the determining factor for the greatest success in evangelistic results was the diligent preparation and the successful delivery of the invitation.

As Streett maintained that achieving the greatest evangelistic results is

\textsuperscript{8}Streett, \textit{The Effective Invitation}, 151-52.

\textsuperscript{9}Ibid., 168.
contingent upon the preparation and careful execution of the invitation, he taught the preacher to carefully choose the method of the public invitation that he plans on using.\textsuperscript{10} In other words his instruction to preachers implied that the best evangelistic results depend upon making the most careful choice in selecting models of extending the invitation. Street offered numerous and various invitational models to preachers so that they could make the wise and appropriate choice. He divided the invitational models into the following two categories: the delayed-response invitation and the immediate-response invitation. He identified the after meeting, special appointments, signing of cards, special classes, and the delayed altar call as examples of the delayed-response invitation. He identified the altar call, raising of hands and standing at the seat, the act of public confession, the progressive invitation, baptism, and the private decision as examples of the immediate-response invitation. Streett, in his presentation of these models, evaluated them, articulating which ones would be the most effective methodologies to employ.

Streett began his presentation by covering the delayed-response approaches. First, he identified the after meeting model. He indicated that the preacher, in using this approach, invites the individuals interested in learning more about the Christian faith to meet with him in another room about ten minutes after the worship service. Second, he described the special appointment. Streett conveyed that the preacher, in utilizing the special appointment, instructs those in the congregation concerned about their relationship with God to set up an appointment for a private meeting with the pastor. Third, Streett described the approach of signing cards. He communicated that some preachers instruct inquirers agonizing over their salvation to provide contact information on a card. He indicated that the preacher will use that information to visit the inquirer concerning his spiritual need. Fourth, Streett commented on the approach of offering

\textsuperscript{10}Streett, \textit{The Effective Invitation}, 163.
special classes. He wrote that in this model the preacher announces at the end of the sermon that inquirers can learn more about the Christian faith in a class that will be offered in the following week. Fifth, Streett wrote about the delayed altar call. He revealed that the preacher who uses this approach informs the audience at the end of his evangelist message that they will be able to respond to an altar call the following week.¹¹

After Streett identified these delayed-response invitations, he assessed them. Streett, in his evaluation, negatively critiqued the approaches. He expressed concern that preachers utilizing the delayed-response invitations disregard the concept that God immediately calls sinners to be saved.¹² Also, he articulated the position that using a delayed-response invitation affords the convicted person an opportunity to quench the Holy Spirit.¹³ Moreover, he communicated his concern that the delayed-response approach gives Satan the opportunity to snatch away the Scriptures that has been placed in the sinner’s heart.¹⁴ He explained, “Satan does everything in his power to keep sinners from being saved. The delayed-response invitation allows him the time necessary to steal the Word of God from human hearts.”¹⁵

While Streett primarily critiqued the delayed-response invitations from a negative perspective, he did acknowledge the plausibility of using these approaches in certain contexts. He commented, “Although certain disadvantages built into the delayed-response invitation cannot be remedied, it would be a mistake never to use this method. There are situations where the delayed-response method is the only feasible alternative. Better to issue this kind of invitation than none at all!”¹⁶

¹²Ibid., 173.
¹³Ibid., 175.
¹⁴Ibid., 175.
¹⁵Ibid., 176.
¹⁶Ibid.
Some of Streett’s concerns seem legitimate. Preachers certainly want to assess methods to determine how well they line up with the Scriptures. Also, preachers should evaluate methodological approaches to determine which ones to use in a given context or to adapt to a given context. Streett rightly promoted evaluating invitation models in order to determine how to adapt them to a particular setting or ascertain which ones to use in specific ministerial situations. He claimed, “Because of the wide variety of invitational styles, each pastor or evangelist must discover for himself the model which best fits his personality, theological interests, and church setting.”\textsuperscript{17} Again, he asserted, “Different models can be adapted to different circumstances.”\textsuperscript{18} The issue concerning Streett is not that he had an overall negative view of the delayed-response models or in the fact that he advocated assessing methods to determine which ones are serviceable in a particular context. Assessments of methodologies are appropriate. The issue is that he went beyond assessing methods to determine which ones are appropriate in a given context to emphasizing and exalting the methods as the determining factor in producing evangelistic results.

Streett’s negative critique of the delayed-response models displays his underlying conviction that the effective use of the right invitation model will produce more evangelistic results. He displayed this underlying conviction by indicating that the defects of the delayed-response models can significantly prevent positive evangelistic results. Thus, he contended that the delayed-response approaches eliminates the necessity to respond immediately to the call to salvation, allows the sinner to quench the Holy Spirit, and permits Satan the opportunity to snatch the Scriptures out of the heart of the unbeliever. Although Streett articulated these defects in the delayed-response models to be responsible for diminishing evangelistic results, he still advocated using these

\textsuperscript{17}Streett, \textit{The Effective Invitation}, 169.
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models in contexts in which the preacher had no other alternative. He justified his support of using the delay-response models in those situations from his conviction that employing some method of extending the invitation is better than doing nothing. Because Streett believes that the methodology of extending the invitation will determine evangelistic results, whether positive or negative, he favored the effective use of the best invitation models. He promoted the immediate-response invitation approaches as the best invitation models.

Streett defined the immediate-response invitation as, “Any invitation that calls upon unbelievers to repent and trust Christ, and gives them an immediate opportunity to do so, is an immediate–response invitation.”19 He identified the altar call as the classic example of an immediate-response invitation. He described the altar call as the approach of the preacher to invite sinners to immediately leave their seats and walk forward to the front of the auditorium with the intent of receiving salvation.20 Streett also identified the method of raising hands and standing at the seat. In depicting this approach he wrote,

Rather than call people forward, some preachers of the gospel prefer to ask sinners to respond publicly in their seats. The usual procedure is for the minster at the close of his sermon to ask everyone to bow his head for prayer. He then invites those who wish to be saved to so indicate by raising their hands or standing at their seats. The preacher prays for their welfare and concludes by asking the seekers to repeat audibly the sinner’s prayer after him.21

Streett mentioned the method of the act of public confession. He indicated that preachers who utilize this method have those who desire salvation silently pray the sinner’s prayer and then come forward to the front of the auditorium to publicly make their decision for Christ known.22 Additionally, Streett identified the progressive

20Ibid.
21Ibid.
22Ibid., 178.
invitation as example of the immediate-response approach. He described that in using the progressive invitation the preacher invites unbelievers to come to Christ in progressive steps. Streett commented that the preacher may initially have those who desire prayer for salvation to raise their hands and then may have those who responded to come forward to the front of the auditorium for prayer.23

Streett referred to baptism as an example of an immediate-response invitation. In citing baptism as an example he contended that the church has effectively used baptism as an act of public commitment throughout its history. He also pointed out, “Over the years, many ministers have also noticed ‘that the services which open with the ordinance of baptism are services most likely to close with visible responses to the evangelistic invitation.’ This interesting observation may speak of the importance of baptism as an instrument in the evangelistic process.”24

Streett also identified the private decision as an example of the immediate-response invitation. He explained that the preacher, in employing the private decision approach, implores those desiring salvation to pray the sinner’s prayer while in their seats and requests those who prayed the sinner’s prayer to make their decisions known before leaving the building.25

In addition to describing and endorsing the various immediate-response approaches to extending the invitation, Streett identified the dangers associated with these approaches. He conveyed that the immediate response models characterized by calling people to publicly make their faith known are susceptible to gimmickry.26 Also, he indicated that practitioners of the immediate-response invitation have a tendency to

23 Strett, The Effective Invitation, 178.
24 Ibid., 179.
25 Ibid., 180.
26 Ibid.
declare all inquirers to be converts. Finally, Streett maintained that a deficiency of follow-through counseling characterizes many immediate-response approaches. He wrote, “If sinners are called upon to pray silently, raise their hands, stand to their feet, or even come forward, and then receive little or no counseling, their commitment may be short-lived.” In identifying these dangers Streett did not seek to deter preachers from using the immediate-response approaches. Rather, in promoting the immediate-response invitations, he sought to admonish preachers to avoid these dangers in their use of these approaches.

Streett, throughout his presentation and description of the various immediate-response invitation approaches, underscored the benefits of using these approaches in securing evangelistic results. Since he operated from the paradigm that the effective use of the invitation will produce results, he advocated using some model of the invitation, whether the delayed-response or immediate response approach, regardless of the situation. Furthermore, he addressed these issues of extending the invitation against the backdrop of Calvinist preachers and others challenging the legitimacy of extending an invitation. In confronting the challenges, Streett asserted, “If Calvinist preachers, as well as others from different theological persuasions, would start calling their hearers to a public profession of faith, I believe the Holy Spirit would draw many more people to Christ under their ministry.” In making this claim, Streett acknowledged that the Holy Spirit draws sinners to Christ. Although he made that acknowledgement, he expressed his belief that the Holy Spirit’s intervention to bless their ministries with more evangelistic fruit was contingent upon their act of extending the public invitation. For

---
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Streett, the determining factor in experiencing increased evangelistic results is extending the invitation.

Streett, in his book, *The Effective Invitation*, rightly highlighted the content of the gospel, correctly exalted God as the only one who saves, and correctly demonstrated that salvation is in Christ alone. Moreover, Streett, in his book, did well in underscoring the importance of the method of inviting sinners to Christ. The issue concerning Streett is that he went beyond stressing the importance of a method. He emphasized extending the invitation to the point of promoting it as a method that is effective in producing evangelistic results. He emphasized that the right use of the constituted means, the public invitation, will produce the desired results of evangelistic fruit. Streett’s emphasis on the public invitation characterizes the tendency in evangelism.

**Tendency Observed in Other North American Evangelism Methods**

The tendency in evangelism to emphasize the right use of a method to produce evangelistic results has been observed in promoting the right personal evangelism strategy. For example, this tendency can be tangibly observed in the promotion of FAITH Evangelism as the strategy to turn around the Southern Baptist Convention. In endorsing FAITH Evangelism, Jimmy Draper wrote,

> The FAITH strategy that places evangelism at the heart of Sunday School ministry is a revolutionary approach that recaptures the birthright of Sunday School, which is evangelism. It was developed by The Sunday School Board (now LifeWay Christian Resources) with the cooperation and endorsement of the North American Mission Board, and I believe it will enable Southern Baptists to baptize one million individuals in one year within only a few years. Incredible, you say. It is absolutely incredible, and God is going to bless every church that will provide this approach to Sunday School ministry.\(^{31}\)

In this endorsement, Draper promoted the FAITH Evangelism strategy as the method that

would enable the evangelistic results of 1,000,000 baptisms. He so strongly emphasized
the strategy that he audaciously claimed that God would bless any church that
implemented this strategy. Thus, Draper placed the emphasis on a method rather than the
gospel message or the calling of God’s servant.

The proclivity to emphasize methods has also been observed in entire works
devoted to conveying the role particular methods have in facilitating evangelistic church
growth. The emphasis might be on showing the importance of expository evangelistic
preaching, praying, and the Sunday School in making a church effective
evangelistically.32 The emphasis might show the significance of new membership classes
in the evangelistic growth, assimilation of, and ongoing discipleship of new members.33
The emphasis has been demonstrated in promoting the pastoral leadership needed to lead
churches to break out of a period of significant decline to a sustained time of evangelistic
growth.34 Perhaps the tendency is seen in advocating embracing a simple process for
making disciples.35 Sometimes the focus may have been on innovations in the church.
Specifically emphases may have concentrated on the following innovations: organic
house churches, recovery churches, multi-site churches, ancient-future churches, city-
reaching churches, community transformation churches, cyber-enhanced churches,
Nickelodeon-style children-focused churches, intentional multicultural churches,
decision-journey churches, and attractional churches.36
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34 Thom S. Rainer, Breakout Churches: Discover How to Make the Leap (Grand Rapids:
Zondervan, 2005).

35 Thom S. Rainer and Eric Geiger, Simple Church: Returning to God’s Process for Making
Disciples (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2006).

36 Elmer Towns, Ed Stetzer, and Warren Bird, 11 Innovations in the Local Church: How
In all of these examples, none of the authors advocated that their particular method or their particular emphasis produced evangelistic results. These authors affirmed an emphasis on the gospel message and the priority placed on God’s leaders operating according their calling. The objective in citing these examples, as previously articulated, is to point out that these authors, over the years, chose to concentrate on methods. Therefore, with work after work, those in evangelism have resources that emphasize methods. These resources are good contributions to evangelism, but they need to be connected to the priorities of the gospel message and the calling of God’s leaders. These evangelism resources show the benefits of these methods and insights without typically showing how these methods and insights promote and supplement the priorities of the gospel message and the calling of God’s leaders. Whereas prioritizing extending the evangelistic invitation and using the FAITH evangelism strategy has emphasized that the use of these methods produces evangelistic results, these other examples simply concentrate on methods without significantly showing the role of methods to supplement the priorities of the gospel message and the calling of God’s leaders. Thus, these examples simply demonstrate the proclivity to emphasize methods in evangelism in North America.

**An Emphasis on Methods on the International Field**

The proclivity to emphasize methods has also occurred on the international mission field. David Sills, in his book *Reaching and Teaching: A Call to Great Commission Obedience*, exposed the promotion of church planting movements as the key method to fulfilling the Great Commission. He wrote,

One of the last decade’s most prolific methodologies is Church Planting Movements (CPM). To be fair to the other strategies and methodologies that missionaries employed in the same period, CPM became one of the most prolific because the largest mission agency mandated its use as the golden-key, single-solution strategy for all of its missionaries worldwide. While the proponents of CPMs argue that it is
not a methodology, when this agency insisted on it as their global modus operandi it became a de facto methodology.\textsuperscript{37}

While emphasizing methods, whether in North America or on the international field, is the tendency in evangelism, the BGEA made a significant contribution to evangelism in equipping evangelists via the Amsterdam Conferences. The BGEA, in its ministry of building up the body of Christ by equipping evangelists, significantly contributed to evangelism by prioritizing the calling of the evangelist and the gospel message. In various ways, the BGEA demonstrated this priority at Amsterdam ’83, Amsterdam ’86, and Amsterdam 2000.

**Priorities Demonstrated at Amsterdam ’83**

Amsterdam ’83 successfully prioritized the calling of the evangelist by emphasizing five aspects associated with the evangelist’s calling. The conference prioritized the gospel by promoting the urgency of knowing and proclaiming the gospel, by expounding doctrines that comprise the gospel message, and by promoting a dependence upon the gospel. Finally, Amsterdam ’83 demonstrated a priority for the calling of the evangelist and the gospel message in the presentation of the “Amsterdam Affirmations.”

Amsterdam ’83 showed the evangelists how to give their calling a priority by providing instruction to them in five areas of their calling. First, Amsterdam ’83 showed the evangelists that various motives drive them to fulfill their calling. Second, the conference emphasized the gift of the evangelist. Third, the conference highlighted the anointing of the evangelist. Fourth, the leaders of the conference concentrated on the mission of an evangelist. Fifth, Amsterdam ’83 highlighted gospel-worthy conduct in their efforts of promoting the calling of the evangelist.

In addition to prioritizing an emphasis on the calling of the evangelist,
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Amsterdam ’83 communicated to the evangelists the necessity of correctly prioritizing the content of the gospel. The BGEA showed the priority that the gospel must have for the evangelists by identifying the urgency in knowing and preaching the gospel. The conference also prioritized the gospel by expounding on the following doctrines: God, human beings, the kingdom of God, and the way of salvation. Moreover, the plenary speakers gave precedence to the gospel message by instructing the evangelists in how to depend upon the gospel.

As previously noted, the “Amsterdam Affirmations” were fifteen statements dealing with the evangelist’s commitment to the gospel, to operating according to his calling, to the church and to the Great Commission. Thus, the “Amsterdam Affirmations” reflected the two major priorities articulated in the plenary sessions. When Graham read the “Amsterdam Affirmations” and provided the evangelists with the opportunity to positively respond to them, he afforded the evangelists the opportunity to positively embrace the two major priorities of the conference.

**Priorities Demonstrated at Amsterdam ’86**

In an approach similar to Amsterdam ’83 the BGEA prioritized the calling of the evangelist by emphasizing and training the participants in three major aspects associated with his calling. First, the BGEA emphasized the gifting of the evangelist. Second, the BGEA highlighted the anointing of the evangelist. Third, the BGEA concentrated on the mission of an evangelist in training the delegates. Also, in an approach similar to Amsterdam ’83 the BGEA prioritized the gospel message at Amsterdam ’86. Amsterdam ’86 successfully prioritized the following three subjects: the authority of Scripture, the message of salvation in Christ alone, and the dependence upon the gospel and the Holy Spirit.

**Priorities Demonstrated at Amsterdam 2000**

Amsterdam 2000 uniquely dealt with the priorities of the gospel message and
the calling of the evangelist by structuring the plenary sessions around the following nine themes: the need for evangelism, the gifting of the evangelist and the evangelistic message, the biblical basis for the message, the emphasis of Christ the Savior, the mission of the gospel, the evangelist and the Holy Spirit, the spiritual walk of the evangelist, the evangelist and his relationship to the church, and the evangelist’s service in the world.

In developing the themes, Amsterdam 2000 prioritized the gospel message and the calling of the message by first exposing the need for evangelism and identifying the motives that drive evangelists to fulfill their calling focused on communicating the gospel message. In expanding on the themes, Amsterdam 2000 emphasized these two priorities by concentrating on the gifting of the evangelist and connecting his giftedness to the gospel message. Finally, Amsterdam 2000 developed the two priorities by initially focusing on the gospel message and then by concentrating on various aspects of the calling of the evangelist.

**Summary of the Contributions**

In focusing on the motives that drive the evangelists, the three conferences promoted different emphases. All three conferences demonstrated how the love of Christ compels the evangelist to fulfill his calling by preaching the gospel. Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86 uniquely contributed to an emphasis on prioritizing the evangelist living out his calling by identifying the judgment of God upon sinners and the command of Christ as motivational factors compelling him to serve in a torn world. Amsterdam 2000 provided a significant contribution concerning the evangelist fulfilling his calling by showing how the lawlessness of societies worldwide and the lostness of human beings demands and urges the evangelist to engage in evangelism.

All three conferences show a priority for the calling of the evangelist by underscoring the fact that the evangelist is uniquely gifted for a particular ministry. Both
Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86 highlighted the evangelist fulfilling his calling by operating under the anointing of God and in engaging in a particular mission. Concerning the evangelist operating in his calling in the anointing that God grants, both Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86 emphasize the evangelist depending upon the Holy Spirit, conducting himself in holiness, engaging in prayer, demonstrating faithfulness, and tending to his family life. Additionally, Amsterdam ’86 emphasized the evangelist receiving strength from God in times of weakness. Regarding the mission, both Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86 promoted the ministries of evangelistic preaching, personal evangelism, and participating in the Great Commission by engaging in the discipleship ministries of multiplying workers, building new believers, and maintaining a commitment to the church. Amsterdam ’86 uniquely conveyed a priority to the evangelist’s calling by advocating a ministry of passionately seeking the lost, promoting the work of the evangelist being done in light of end times theology, and communicating what preaching the gospel in the midst of revival entails. Furthermore, Amsterdam ’83 uniquely contributed to the emphasis of prioritizing the calling of the evangelist by identifying the gospel-worthy conduct that accompanies the evangelist.

In contributing to the emphasis of prioritizing the calling of the evangelist, Amsterdam 2000 likewise highlighted the evangelist’s dependence upon the Holy Spirit, his prayer life, and his inner life of holiness. Like Amsterdam ’86, Amsterdam 2000 conveyed how the evangelist can live out his calling in the midst of revival and spiritual awakening. Amsterdam 2000 uniquely contributed to the emphasis on the calling of the evangelist by developing a solid theology of the church and communicating the evangelist’s role in and relationship to the church. Also, Amsterdam 2000 uniquely contributed to the emphasis on prioritizing the calling of the evangelist by showing that the evangelists serves in the world by developing a strategy for the harvest, conducting his ministry as a servant-leader, and by serving in a hostile world.

All three conferences also significantly contributed to the emphasis of
prioritizing the gospel message. Both Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86 prioritized the gospel by concentrating on the way of salvation being in Christ alone and by promoting a dependence upon the gospel. In promoting Christ as the only way of salvation both conferences emphasized that the evangelists should embrace and preach the following doctrines: the absolute necessity of the substitutionary atonement, the necessity of conversion characterized by repentance and faith, the justification of the sinner by faith alone, and the results of salvation. Additionally, Amsterdam ’83 uniquely emphasized focusing upon God’s self-disclosure of himself, reaching lost humanity among all the nations, the kingdom of God, and the necessity of the new birth.

Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86 also contributed to prioritizing the gospel in various other ways. While Amsterdam ’83 emphasized the urgency of knowing and proclaiming the gospel, Amsterdam ’86 underscored the authority of the Scriptures. Moreover, both conferences emphasized a dependence upon the gospel.

Amsterdam 2000, in its efforts to prioritize the gospel message, made significant contributions. The conference thoroughly and systematically developed in one plenary address the following major themes of the gospel message: the triune God, human beings, the kingdom of God, the way of salvation in Christ alone, the church, and the hope of heaven. Like, Amsterdam ’86, Amsterdam 2000 emphasized the biblical basis of the gospel message. Additionally, Amsterdam 2000 showed a priority to the gospel by explaining how to communicate it to adherents to the postmodern worldview and to a broken world. Furthermore, Amsterdam 2000 uniquely contributed to the emphasis of prioritizing the gospel message by devoting an entire plenary address to defending the position of salvation exclusively in Christ and the absolute necessity of placing personal conscious faith in Him. Finally, Amsterdam 2000 uniquely contributed to prioritizing the gospel message by promoting the power of the gospel in cultures worldwide.
Conclusion

This dissertation has argued that the BGEA, in equipping evangelists via the Amsterdam conferences, prioritized the calling of the evangelist and the gospel message, and that this contribution is significant in light of a proclivity to emphasize methods in evangelism. This dissertation has shown that in various ways and with various contributions, the three Amsterdam conferences prioritized the calling of the evangelist and the gospel message. Showing the various ways that the three conferences prioritized the calling of the evangelist and the gospel message is significant in that it can correct the proclivity in evangelism, both in North America and on the international field, to emphasize methods. Moreover, this dissertation proposes potential significant areas of research associated with the three Amsterdam conferences.

Suggestions for Further Research

A researcher can pursue comparing the equipping efforts of the BGEA with D.L. Moody’s equipping efforts. Moody equipped with conferences. He can investigate to determine if similarities exist. A researcher can investigate the equipping efforts of both Moody and the BGEA to with a particular focus that the modern evangelical church is neglecting. He can also explore the two approaches to conferencing to determine if one of them equipped in a way that the other neglected.

Another option for the researcher is comparing between the contributions of the Lausanne Movement and the Amsterdam Conferences. The BGEA convened Lausanne ’74. Following Lausanne ’74, the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization went in one direction and sponsored Lausanne II and Cape Town 2010 while the BGEA went in another direction and sponsored the three Amsterdam conferences. A researcher can approach such a research project by seeking to address the following questions. Were there contributions that the Lausanne movement made that the Amsterdam conferences overlooked? Were there contributions that the Amsterdam
conferences made that the Lausanne movement has overlooked? Is there a common contribution that both the Amsterdam conferences and the conferences associated with Lausanne made that evangelicals are not considering that would positively influence their approaches to missions and world evangelization?
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ABSTRACT
A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE BILLY GRAHAM EVANGELISTIC ASSOCIATION’S MINISTRY OF EQUIPPING EVANGELISTS VIA THE AMSTERDAM CONFERENCES

Brian David Bohannon, Ph.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2017
Chair: Dr. Adam W. Greenway

Chapter 1 articulates the research problem and identifies the intent to analyze the three international conferences for itinerant evangelists that the BGEA convened in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. The thesis contends that in equipping evangelists via the Amsterdam conferences, the BGEA prioritized the calling of the evangelist and the gospel message, and that this contribution is significant in light of a proclivity to emphasize methods in evangelism.

Chapter 2 is a biography of Billy Graham. This biography shows that Billy Graham contributed to world evangelization and demonstrated that one of his contributions to global evangelism is his work of equipping evangelists worldwide. Consequently, the biography prepares the reader for an examination of the BGEA’s ministry of equipping evangelists via the three Amsterdam conferences.

Chapter 3 covers Amsterdam ’83 and Amsterdam ’86. Concerning Amsterdam ’83 this chapter evaluates the evangelist’s role as a preacher of the gospel, concentrates on his spiritual walk with God, and analyzes his equipping ministry. Regarding Amsterdam ’86 this chapter investigates the evangelist as a person, the evangelist’s message, and the various methods of evangelism.

Chapter 4 covers Amsterdam 2000. This chapter focuses on the following nine themes: the need for Evangelism, the evangelist’s message, the Bible, Christ, the Savior,
the mission of the gospel, the Holy Spirit and the evangelist, the evangelist’s personal holiness and spiritual walk God, the church and the evangelist, and the evangelist and the world.

Chapter 5 concludes that the entire analysis demonstrates that in equipping evangelists via the Amsterdam conferences Billy Graham prioritized the calling of the evangelist and the gospel message, and that this contribution is significant in light of a proclivity to emphasize methods in evangelism. Finally, the chapter offers suggestions for further research.
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