America's New Internationalists? The Rise of Contemporary Evangelical Transnational Activism and U.S. Foreign Policy

Chan Woong Shin
chan.shin@indwes.edu
Division of Social Sciences
Indiana Wesleyan University

국문초록

탈냉전 이후 미국 복음주의자들은 종교 박해, 에이즈, 인신매매, 나아가 환경 및 이민에 이르기까지 여러 국제문제에 대해 목소리를 내기 시작하였고, 그 결과 "새로운 국제주의자들 (new internationalists)"이라는 호칭을 얻게 되었다. 주로 낙태나 동성애와 같은 국내문제에 초점을 맞추었던 과거에 비춰볼때 이는 새로운 현상인데, 본 논문은 미국 복음주의 내부에서 어떻게 이런 변화가 일어났는지, 그리고 과연 복음주의자들은 이런 문제들을 어떤 관점으로 접근하고 있는지를 미국 복음주의 선교 담론과 세 가지 국제 문제---종교 박해, 에이즈, 인신매매---의 사례 분석을 통해 살펴본다. 보다 구체적으로 세 가지 다른 선교 이해가 드러나는데, 첫째는 선교를 전도와 동일시하고 사회 변화나 발전은 그 부산물로 보는 입장, 둘째는 선교를 봉사(service)까지도 포함하나 전도의 수단으로 전도만큼은 중요하지 않은 것으로 보는 입장, 셋째는 선교를 개인의 변화와 사회의 변화 양자를 포괄하는 것으로보고 둘 사이에 우선순위를 가리지 않는 입장이다. 첫번째 입장은 사회 문제에 있어 개인주의적인(individualistic) 접근법과 친화성을 갖는데, 위에서 언급한 세 가지 이슈의 사례를 볼 때 이러한 접근법이 아직도 복음주의자들 사이에서는 우세하나, 몇몇 개인과 단체들은 보다 총체적이고 (holistic) 구조적인 (structural) 접근법을 채택하기 시작하였음을 알 수 있다. 이러한 변화가 과연 지속될 것인지, 이러한 변화가 복음주의 내외부에 미치는 영향이 무엇인지는 더 지켜봐야 할 것이다.

I. Introduction

Previously known for their domestic social and political activism, American evangelicals have for the past decades expanded their agenda into international humanitarian and human rights issues, giving rise to a series of foreign policy advocacy and legislation. Starting with the passage of the International Religious Freedom Act (IRFA) in 1998, evangelicals have been a major force behind the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act (2000), the Sudan Peace Act (2002), the United States Leadership against Global HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Act (2003), and the North Korean Human Rights Act (2004). Slowly but surely, journalists and scholars have noticed this "transnational" turn in evangelical activism and attempted to understand where it comes from, how it works, and what it means not only for evangelicals themselves, but also for broader society and politics, both home and abroad.

Nicholas Kristof, a *New York Times* columnist normally critical of evangelicals on many issues, has written a series of articles praising their good works abroad, declaring evangelicals the "new internationalists."[1] Former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright agrees. In the religious conservatives' changed attitudes toward international humanitarian issues, she sees a hope of bipartisan cooperation, particularly on three issues: religious liberty, global poverty, and genocide (Albright 2006, 91-105). In his book-length study of the role of evangelicals in legislating IRFA and other global human rights-related bills, Hertzke (2004, 5) proclaims that "the new faith-based movement is filling a void in human rights advocacy, raising issues previously slighted—or insufficiently pressed—by secular groups, the prestige press, and the foreign-policy establishment." Finally, U.S. diplomatic historian Walter Russell Mead (2006) argues in his *Foreign Affairs* article that the balance of power between the conservative and liberal Protestantism in the U.S. has shifted toward the former in the past generation and that it will remain the case for the foreseeable future. He suggests that foreign policy makers learn to live and work with the growing evangelical influence since it can make positive contributions to U.S. foreign policy.

---

[1] Nicholas D. Kristof, "Following God Abroad," *New York Times*, http://www.nytimes.com/2002/05/21/opinion/following-god-abroad.html; "When the Right Is Right," *New York Times*, http://www.nytimes.com/2004/12/22/opinion/22kristof.html; "Evangelicals a Liberal Can Love," *New York Times* http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/03/opinion/03kristof.html?_r=0; "Learning from the Sin of Sodom," *New York Times* http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/28/opinion/28kristof.html?_r=0; "Evangelicals without Blowhards," *New York Times* http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/31/opinion/sunday/kristof-evangelicals-without-blowhards.html (all last accessed November 4, 2013).

The main purpose of this paper is to examine the rise and nature of contemporary evangelical foreign policy activism through a brief historical study of evangelical foreign missions and short case studies of recent evangelical campaigns on three international issues: religious persecution, HIV/AIDS, and human trafficking. Why foreign missions? Because the missionary movement is what provided the earliest occasions for U.S. evangelicals to connect with the world outside their borders and still remains the dominant mode of evangelical global engagement. In fact, evangelicals might as well be called the "oldest" internationalists since their transnational activism can be traced at least back to the early nineteenth century when the first American missionaries set their feet on a foreign land. In most cases, the missionaries' attempt to converting people to Christianity was accompanied by a variety of social and political work, which included not only providing material relief and building schools and hospitals, but also advocating for the victims of injustice and oppression through promoting political and social change. Some of the better known examples are the anti-slave trade movement on both sides of the Atlantic and the campaign against footbinding in China (Appiah 2010; Keck and Sikkink 1998), but what Tyrrell (2010) calls "America's moral empire"—the transnational moral reform movement led by American evangelical missionaries and activists in the late 19th and early 20th centuries—was much more extensive. Prostitution, opium, and alcohol were also the "vices" against which these moral reformers fought hard, not just domestically, but globally.

That harmony between spiritual and social mission did not live past the early twentieth century, however. According to Patterson (1990, 74-77), a consensus which had existed within American Protestant Missionary enterprise consisted of the following convictions: 1) the urgent priority of evangelism and church planting; 2) the allegiance to the uniquely divine nature of Jesus Christ; 3) no dichotomy between evangelism and social involvement; and 4) pragmatic ecumenism (Patterson 1990, 74-77). Shortly after World War I, however, these convictions began to be challenged on many fronts. Domestically, the earlier fundamentalist-modernist divide regarding the authority of the bible, the uniqueness of Christ, and the proper role of sociopolitical activism finally entered the missionary enterprise. Globally, World War I discredited the notion that Christianity and western culture were superior to other religions and cultures, and the charge of imperialism both from inside and outside the U.S. forced American Protestant missionaries rethink their long-held assumptions and beliefs. Modernists or theological liberals, who gradually took over major denominational mission boards, responded

by rejecting the traditional belief in the Bible and Jesus Christ and, in turn, the primacy of evangelism as the mission of the church. Instead, they sought to redefine mission in terms of coexistence with other religions, partnership with national churches, and engaging in social and political reform.

Fundamentalists—as evangelicals were called at the time—reacted by establishing non-denominational "faith missions," such as Africa Inland Mission, Central American Mission, China Inland Mission, and Sudan Interior Mission, and their own interdenominational agencies like the Interdenominational Foreign Mission Association (IFMA) in 1917. Later in 1945, with the rapid growth of evangelical missions after World War II, the Evangelical Foreign Missions Association (EFMA) was formed under the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) to connect and serve both existing and new agencies. As opposed to what they called the "Social Gospel" of liberal Protestants, evangelicals defined the ultimate goal of Christian mission as individual salvation through evangelism and church building, not the betterment of society and culture. This does not mean, however, that they were indifferent to social and political problems home and abroad. By this time, evangelicals (or "neo-evangelicals" as major evangelical leaders called themselves) were distancing themselves from their more fundamentalist brethren by criticizing the latter's failure to engage the world. Still, at least regarding foreign missions, the dominant evangelical approach at the time could be described as follows:

> "Evangelicals are…convinced that the preaching of the Gospel is the essential task of missions and must always remain so. They do not object to programs for the solution of agricultural, social, political and industrial problems, but they believe that each country, race and generation must solve its own problems in the light of God's Word through the native churches. Their chief aim is the personal conversion of men to a new life in Christ, to complete surrender to God's will as revealed in His Word and to new relations of love to their fellowman" (Murch 1956, 97-98).

Thus, those who are interested in understanding U.S. evangelicals' recent foray into transnational humanitarian activism might as well first ask why and how evangelicals have come to (re)discover social action as a legitimate part of their foreign missions. In the next section of the paper, I show briefly how the evangelical notion of mission has become more socially-oriented, laying a theological foundation for the three advocacy campaigns that I analyze in the latter part of the paper. Yet, it will also be shown that the transition to the idea and practice of *mission as transformation* or *holistic mission* has never been complete and it still competes with at least two other, more traditional frames of mission: namely, *mission as evangelism* and

4

mission as service. The influence of the *mission as evangelism* frame is still visible in the largely individualistic approaches that a majority of evangelical leaders have taken to understand the three transnational problems (religious persecution, HIV/AIDs, and human trafficking) and propose solutions to them, even though a new generation of evangelical activists and organizations is trying to challenge and change it.

II. The Rise of Holistic Mission in Evangelical Missionary Circles

Quickly after the World Missionary Conference held in Edinburgh, Scotland, in 1910, which is considered one of the landmarks in the history of Christian missions, the consensus that had undergirded the American Protestant missionary enterprise started to break down and the very nature of mission became a subject of serious debate between the ecumenical and evangelical movement. In opposition to their ecumenical counterpart's broadened and more this-worldly notion of mission, evangelical theologians both in America and Europe, especially in the 1960s, sought to defend what they thought the orthodox and biblical definition of mission, which was firmly based on Jesus's Great Commission: evangelism, church planting, and discipleship.[2] Evangelical institutions, such as the Interdenominational Foreign Mission Association (IFMA), Evangelical Foreign Missions Association (EFMA), and the School of World Mission at Fuller Theological Seminary, were the major force in that effort and the World Congress on Evangelism, organized by Billy Graham in 1966, demonstrated the viability of evangelical missions both in America and the world.

One significant point of debate between ecumenicals and evangelicals had been the place of social involvement within the overall mission of the church. Never indifferent to social problems around them, evangelicals still believed that the church's mission was evangelism and that social action was its *consequence*, or a *duty* of Christians. This view is aptly expressed in Graham's (1967) often quoted words: "If the Church went back to its main task of proclaiming the Gospel and getting people converted to Christ, it would have a far greater impact on the social, moral, and psychological needs of men than it could achieve through any other thing it could possibly do" (28). Evangelicalism's global diffusion and its growing awareness of

---

[2] "Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you" (Matthew 28:18-20).

enormous social, political, and economic problems in the non-Western world since 1966, however, have continuously forced evangelicals to put more practical and theological emphasis on the issue of social action. British theologian John Stott's influence as the main architect of the 1974 Lausanne Covenant is noteworthy in this regard. Through his bible studies at Lausanne and their publication as a book a year later, Stott provided a biblical basis for reframing the mission of the church as *service* modeled after that of Jesus, which, in his view, included both evangelism and social action as authentic expressions of his love and compassion.[3] By reinterpreting the Great Commission and suggesting the Great Commandment as an equally valid source of Christian mission, Stott established social action as legitimate part of mission—even apart from evangelism—and as its *partner*—not its consequence or means—although he, along with the Lausanne Covenant, maintained the primacy of evangelism if one must choose. He also argued for something which can be called the "functional separability" of evangelism and social action: "This does *not* mean that words and works, evangelism and social action, are such inseparable partners that all of us must engage in both all the time. Situations vary, and so do Christian callings. As for situations, there will be times when a person's eternal destiny is the most urgent consideration…But there will certainly be other times when a person's material need is so pressing that he would not be able to hear the gospel if we shared it with him…Then too there is a diversity of Christian callings, and every Christian should be faithful to his own calling…" (44-45, Italics mine).

Stott's view provoked criticism from more conservative Evangelical theologians, especially those in the United States, for redefining the traditional concept of mission. At the same time, it was hailed by many of their non-Western counterparts as a faithful and pathbreaking attempt to overcome Western theology's unbiblical dichotomization of the spiritual and the physical—or the vertical and the horizontal—and prioritization of the former. Within the context of the Lausanne Movement, this continued dispute led to the Consultation on the Relationship between Evangelism and Social Responsibility (CRESR) held in Grand Rapids, Michigan, in 1982, where three different relationships between evangelism and social activity were eventually validated: the latter as the former's *consequence*, *bridge*, and *partner*, respectively. As to the partnership between the two, it was further explained: "evangelism, even when it does not have a primarily social intention, nevertheless has a social dimension, while

---

[3] Stott (1975).

social responsibility, even when it does not have a primarily evangelistic intention, nevertheless has an evangelistic dimension. Thus, evangelism and social responsibility, while distinct from one another, are *integrally* related in our proclamation of and obedience to the gospel. The partnership is, in reality, a *marriage*" (Italics mine). The priority of evangelism was reaffirmed, but the choice of one over the other was understood as "largely conceptual" since "[i]n practice, as in the public ministry of Jesus, the two are *inseparable*, at least in open societies" (Italics mine).

As such, the CRESR report laid the foundation for the development of *holistic mission*, a "frame of mission that refuses the dichotomy between material and spiritual, between evangelism and social action, between loving God and loving neighbor" (Myers 1999, 286-287). And it was at the 1983 Wheaton Consultation entitled "The Church in Response to Human Need" where one of the landmark statements of holistic mission was produced. While acknowledging the necessity of evangelism, its final document introduced the word *transformation* as what Christian mission should pursue: "the change from a condition of human existence contrary to God's purpose to one in which people are able to enjoy fullness of life in harmony with God." Utilizing the theme of the kingdom of God, it further argued that the goal of transformation includes "striving to bring peace among individuals, races, and nations by overcoming prejudices, fears, and preconceived ideas about others," "sharing basic resources like food, water, the means of healing and knowledge," "working for a greater participation of people in their decisions which affect their lives," and "growing up into Christ in all things as a body of people dependent upon the work of the Holy Spirit and upon each other." Another prominent aspect of the Wheaton statement was a stronger emphasis on the biblical call to *justice*, which in turn calls for a more serious engagement in sociopolitical activities, as opposed to traditional philanthropic efforts, aimed at removing the causes of human need through transforming the structures of society.

According to Rene Padilla, a Latin American theologian who has played a significant role in promoting holistic mission theology in and outside Lausanne since its beginning, the Wheaton 1983 "completed the process of shaping an evangelical social conscience, a process in which people from the Two-Thirds World played a decisive role" (1985, 31). He also later argued that "[a]fter the Wheaton '83 Statement, no significant advance was made in evangelicals circles with regard to the definition of holistic mission…Rather…the moment for the *practice* of holistic

mission had arrived" (2004, Italics original). While it is hard to ascertain his claim systematically, there is indeed some anecdotal evidence that the idea of holistic mission, or mission as transformation, has become more prevalent among evangelical mission theologians and practitioners. Departing further from his position in 1975, John Stott (1995) wrote: "looking back over some twenty-five years of debate over the relation between evangelism and social activity, it is really extraordinary that the controversy ever arose. If in the public ministry of Jesus the audible proclamation of the kingdom was accompanied by a visible demonstration of its arrival, words and works cannot be separated in our ministry either. The rising generation of evangelical leaders in the Third World hardly sees the problem that preoccupied our generation…What is needed now is the development of more innovative models of integrated mission, in which the Gospel, far from being silenced or marginalized by social involvement, is illuminated and enforced by it" (54). Many American evangelical leaders are also increasingly engaged in various forms of transnational ministries which go beyond traditional evangelism and relief and development works: Rick Warren's PEACE plan in Rwanda, Gary Haugen's International Justice Mission, and World Vision's "transformational development," to name a few.

The brief review of the history of evangelical missionary thinking above reveals that at least three distinctive, if not mutually exclusive, frames of mission have been developed and articulated. Their respective features can be summarized in the following table.

Table 1. Three Evangelical Frames of Mission

Frame of mission	mission as evangelism	mission as service	mission as transformation/holistic mission
Primary biblical mandate/themes	Great Commission	love/mercy/compassion, Great Commandment, Good Samaritan	Kingdom of God, justice, peace and reconciliation
Primary specific activities	Evangelism, discipleship, church planting	Relief, development, medical work	Advocacy, law enforcement, social and political reform
Evangelism vs. social action	Evangelism is primary. Social action is a consequence of or bridge to evangelism.	Evangelism and social action are separable partners. Evangelism is primary (if one must be chosen).	Evangelism and social action are inseparable partners. Neither is primary.

For our purpose, the three frames are important in that they tend to lead to different views of social action and social change. To be accurate, champions of *mission as evangelism* are not indifferent to social problems even though they define the mission of the church almost exclusively in terms of individual soul saving. Their primary solution to them, however, is to change individuals who will in turn correct the social problems by behaving morally. According to Hollinger (1983), individualism is the dominant social philosophy of American evangelicalism, which can be defined by the four following characteristics: 1) the primacy of personal morality over social morality, 2) social change as a by-product of individual change through conversion, 3) strong individualistic economics (laissez faire capitalism), and 4) individualistic political ethic emphasizing personal freedom, a limited government, and the protection of personal rights. According to Shah (2009, 136-137), this view can best be summarized as "soulcraft as statecraft" as opposed to the long tradition of Western Christianity to view "statecraft as soulcraft." As Smith (2000, Chapter 3) shows in his wide-ranging study of American evangelicalism, this view of social problems ultimately rooted in spiritual problems often counterbalances the call for evangelicals to more actively participate in politics. When a large-scale political movement does arise among evangelicals, however, it is typically about those personal moral issues writ large, such as alcohol, sex, and drug, and evangelicals tend to attempt to address the problem by regulating individual behavior instead of reforming social structures. Morone (2003, 13-19) calls this approach the Puritan tradition although he points out that the Puritans in fact held both individuals and community accountable for social sins. The other approach, which Morone calls the Social Gospel, blames social pressures, not individuals for social problems.

The second frame, *mission as service*, sees social action as part of the church's mission, but limits it to a so-called "act of compassion." Supporters of this view are eager to help individuals who suffer from various social ills, but do so without concerning themselves with deeper and more complex structural issues. Not only do they not find a compelling biblical justification for social change through political advocacy and structural reform, they also find it distracting and even potentially dangerous for achieving their ultimate mission of evangelism. Samaritan's Purse, an evangelical relief and development agency currently headed by Franklin

Graham, embodies this approach in their mission statement and activities.[4] In his recent history of global humanitarianism, Barnett (2011, 37-41) distinguishes two different types of humanitarianism: *emergency* and *alchemical*. The first focuses on relieving people of immediate pain and suffering while remaining neutral and independent and maintaining a hands-off approach to politics. In contrast, alchemical humanitarianism seeks to address the root causes of suffering and in so doing, does not hesitate to take sides between competing political claims.

While Samaritan's Purse represents emergency humanitarianism, World Vision and other evangelical relief and development agencies which define their mission as one of *transformation* are closer to practitioners of alchemical humanitarianism although they still take caution not to be seen as being overly political.[5] In addition, they tend to understand poverty and other social problems from a broader, more structural perspective. Yet, they are also different from their secular counterparts in that they maintain, at least in rhetoric, personal transformation as part of their overall strategy of social transformation.

I believe that the three different approaches to mission above provide a better conceptual and analytical lens though which we can understand how American evangelicals have attempted to address various social and political problems abroad. They help us paint a more nuanced and complex picture of the recent evangelical foreign policy activism than the popular notion that it is a mere tool of American imperialism or a global projection of U.S. evangelicals' conservative moral values.

III. Case One: Religious Persecution

The plight of fellow Christians abroad had always been a major concern for American evangelicals even before they successfully mobilized to push for the passage of the International

---

[4] *"*The story of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:30-37) gives a clear picture of God's desire for us to help those in desperate need wherever we find them. After describing how the Samaritan rescued a hurting man whom others had passed by, Jesus told His hearers, "Go and do likewise." For over 40 years, Samaritan's Purse has done our utmost to follow Christ's command by going to the aid of the world's poor, sick, and suffering. We are an effective means of reaching hurting people in countries around the world with food, medicine, and other assistance in the Name of Jesus Christ. This, in turn, earns us a hearing for the Gospel, the Good News of eternal life through Jesus Christ" (http://www.samaritanspurse.org/our-ministry/about-us/).

[5] "World Vision is a Christian humanitarian organization dedicated to working with children, families, and their communities worldwide to reach their full potential by tackling the causes of poverty and injustice.
"We believe in a full solution to poverty and injustice. We provide emergency assistance to children and families affected by disasters and conflict, partner with communities for long-term solutions to alleviate poverty, and advocate for justice on behalf of the poor" (http://www.worldvision.org/about-us/who-we-are).

Religious Freedom Act (IRFA) in 1998. It has been noted by previous studies that evangelicals' staunch anticommunism during the Cold War was mainly due to its anti-religious, anti-Christian nature (Preston 2012; Schäfer 2012; Settje 2011). Yet, even during the Cold War, U.S. evangelicals' attitudes toward communism and its persecution of Christians were not straightforward. Despite his strong anti-communist rhetoric, for example, Billy Graham worked with Communist governments for the sake of evangelism and in favor of quiet diplomacy, which was heavily criticized by religious freedom and human rights advocates at home. Yet, the latter's approach, which largely consisted of publicly denouncing perpetrators and advocating sanctions on them, can also be seen as an offshoot of the view of *mission as evangelism* in that it exhibits strong individualism, moralism, and anti-government tendencies that proponents of holistic mission tend to criticize for being particularly Western or American. More recently, however, some evangelical leaders have embraced a more diplomatic and structural approach to the issue. Unlike religious freedom advocates who view the issue mainly from a human rights perspective and tend to disregard complex structural factors that lead to persecution of individuals, they have argued that religious freedom should be understood more broadly as a national and international security issue and it must be placed at the center of all aspects of American diplomacy so that it can create durable conditions under which religious freedom can flourish without negating religious majorities' right to bring their faiths to public affairs, especially in Muslim countries.

The campaign against religious persecution first became visible in 1996 when one hundred evangelical leaders, including Charles Colson (Prison Fellowship), Richard Cizik (National Association of Evangelicals), and Richard Land (Southern Baptist Convention) among others, were gathered by the NAE to release a "Statement of Conscience Concerning Worldwide Religious Persecution." The meeting was orchestrated by the two leading advocates, Michael Horowitz (a Jew) and Nina Shea (a Catholic), who had been previously involved in the issue (Hertzke 2004, 185-186; Shea 2008, 25-26). Condemning the persecution of evangelical and Catholic Christians by many unnamed Islamic countries and ex-Communist regimes in China, Cuba, Laos, North Korea, and Vietnam, the Statement called for the following four actions to be taken by the U.S. government: 1) public acknowledge of the widespread persecution of Christians worldwide and the adoption of policies condemning it; 2) issuance of "more carefully researched, more fully documented and less politically edited reports" regarding religious persecution abroad; 3) better treatment of the petitions of anti-Christian persecution victims by

the Immigration and Naturalization Service; and 4) termination of non-humanitarian aid to governments that fail to take appropriate action to stop persecution (National Association of Evangelicals 1996).

The eventual outcome of the campaign was the International Religious Freedom Act (IRFA) passed by the U.S. Congress and signed by President Bill Clinton in October 1998. With a view to establishing the promotion of religious freedom around the world as a main objective of U.S. foreign policy, IRFA created two governmental agencies: the Office of International Religious Freedom within the State Department, and the non-partisan U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom. Each agency was mandated to publish its own annual report on the status of religious freedom in almost every single country in the world. Based on the findings presented in the State Department report, IRFA requires the President to take action against most severe violators of religious freedom, so-called "countries of particular concern" (CPCs).

Even after the passage of IRFA, advocates have been continuously working to ensure its proper implementation through their own advocacy organizations and as members of the two newly-minted governmental agencies. NAE issued two more statements on persecution, one in 2002 specifically singling out Sudan and North Korea and the other in 2007 concerning the plight of the Dalits in India (National Association of Evangelicals 2002; 2007). *CT* continues to regularly publish reports and analyses regarding religious persecution, perhaps more than any other global issues. The Institute for Global Engagement (IGE), a new organization solely dedicated to promoting international religious freedom, was established in 2000 by Robert Seiple, an evangelical Christian who had served as the first U.S. Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom.

As pointed out above, however, the evangelical advocacy for religious freedom has not been without contentions. One of them is between a majority of activists who advocates for a more individualistic human rights approach and those who champion a more diplomatic and structural approach. The former includes individuals like Colson, Horowitz, and Shea, who played a major role in legislating IRFA and have continued working through their respective advocacy organizations and the Commission on International Religious Freedom. The latter is represented by Robert Seiple, the founder of IGE, and his son Chris Seiple who was his father's successor at the organization, and Thomas Farr, a former diplomat who previously worked with Robert Seiple in the Office of International Religious Freedom and currently directs the

Religious Freedom Project at Georgetown University. It is important to note that Robert Seiple's experience in the State Department led him to found an organization that would focus on building relationships both at the governmental and grassroots level in order to promote durable, long-term structural changes in a target country. According to Chris Seiple (2012, 97), the driving question that started the organization was this: "Instead of getting people out of jail who had been imprisoned for their religious beliefs, could the culture and structures of persecution gradually be transformed toward an environment of sustainable religious freedom, so that people didn't go to jail in the first place?"

For that purpose, instead of the human rights argument that tends to emphasize protecting individual liberty, IGE has more broadly framed the discussion in the language of national and global security. Its main premise is that "responsible religious liberty is a necessary condition for sustainable security" (Seiple and Hoover 2012, 317). According to Robert Seiple (2008, 55), "when the populace feels that the government has their best interest at heart, that populace is more loyal to the government. Loyalty brings stability. Stability allows for security" (Seiple 2008, 55). This creates a positive cycle of religious freedom, social stability and well-being, and security, as opposed to a negative cycle of religious persecution, religious extremism, and insecurity (Seiple and Hoover 2012, 318-325).

Yet, this argument that more religion produces more social goods is likely to sound more persuasive to those who regard religion as something positive and even intrinsic to any human experience, which is not often shared by Western secular elites. Farr claims that this secular blind—what he calls "religion deficit"— is much more pervasive among the members of the U.S. foreign policy establishment and, together with the misplaced priority of saving a few persecuted individuals, that is the main problem why the U.S. effort to promote religious freedom has remained an unsuccessful one (Farr 2008b, chapters 1 and 2). In his 2008 *Foreign Affairs* article, he argues that the ultimate goal of U.S. religious freedom advocacy should be to promote "the durable and mutual accommodation of religion and the state within the boundaries of liberal democracy" (Farr 2008a,124), especially in the Muslim world. His view is heavily indebted to the notion of "twin toleration" proposed by political scientist Alfred Stepan as an alternative to secularism or the strict separation of church and state. Instead, in a country where religious communities are powerful, they should be encouraged to bring their faiths both to

private and public activities, on the condition that they will respect the rights of other citizens and the rule of law (Farr 2012, 336-337).

Then the question becomes *how*. According to Chris Seiple (2012, 98-99), there are two types of strategies to promote religious freedom. The first is to *advocate* it "from the outside in" and the second is to *build* it "from the inside out" and IGE is specialized in the latter. More specifically, Seiple (2012, 100-101) defines IGE's strategy as the "4-S strategy of sustainability": 1) create a politically acceptable and safe *space* for discussion of religion and politics; 2) *cultivate* a local scholarship that can make a case for religious freedom; 3) produce a *standard* for training and education of local leaders; 4) build a *structure* within which a further, broader reform effort can take place. This bottom-up approach requires collaborating closely with communist leaders in countries like Vietnam and Laos where IGE has been working for more than ten years. And this could sometimes put the organization in a difficult situation where human rights violations occur and are highlighted by outside media and advocacy organizations. While acknowledging the need to speak truth, IGE in those cases stresses "constructive advocacy" based on the following principles: 1) "build credibility through dispassionate reporting"; 2) "accompany public statements with private conversations"; 3) "create the kind of dialogue you expect from the other party"; 4) "promote insider-owned reform, not outsider-imposed reform"; and 5) "avoid jeopardizing long-term objectives while reacting to situations in the short-term" (Daugherty 2007).

It remains to be seen how U.S. evangelicals would respond to this call for a more structural and "political" approach to religious freedom promotion, both at the government and civil society level—especially in Muslim countries—since it will definitely require "complex negotiations among a number of interest groups, and a careful weighing of economic, cultural, political, technological, and diplomatic concerns," which are not particularly known as evangelicals' "strong suit" (Galli 2006, 55). For example, a 2005 *CT* article expressed concerns about the potentially harmful effect that democratization in the Middle East might have on the region's Christian minorities since it could mean the rule by the Muslim majority. And things could get worse if it is induced by U.S. intervention, which often conjures up the image of "crusade" (Hoffman 2005).

Another difficult issue is evangelism, which still seems to be at the heart of evangelical mission. In a *CT* editorial (2012) in which IGE's work in Pakistan is introduced as a positive

example of Christian effort to tackle terrorism, the editor concludes that "As Christians, we are called to tread carefully but not lightly in Pakistan. Our quiet efforts—which always include winsome *evangelism*—won't overthrow the Taliban immediately and uproot terrorism tomorrow. But they can subvert injustice and terror over time" (Italics mine). Yet the IGE founder Robert Seiple (2009, 30) himself cautions against some culturally insensitive forms of evangelism, which he believes have led to increased persecution in some countries. His criticism is not limited to the *methodology* of certain missionaries, however, but to the *message* that they promote as well. And he advocates the gospel message interpreted through the lens of kingdom theology, as opposed to what he believes an individualized and over-spiritualized gospel. He recounts his experience as president of World Vision, an evangelical relief and development organization with a *mission as transformation* mission orientation, when somebody would always ask him whether the organization evangelizes in addition to working on a variety of social programs, which he thinks is based on a false dichotomy (Seiple 2009, 31).

IV. Case Two: HIV/AIDS

Evangelicals' campaign against global HIV/AIDS also exhibits a similar dynamic among different approaches to evangelical mission. It has been commonly argued that American evangelicals were indifferent, if not hostile, to helping the people with AIDS due to their belief that AIDS is God's punishment for homosexuality and sexual promiscuity. An analysis of early evangelical documents regarding HIV/AIDS, however, shows that while affirming the sinful nature of homosexuality and promiscuity, the main message initially proclaimed by evangelical leaders was one of engagement and care, reflecting the influence of the *mission as service* frame, which suggested that compassionate care is a mark of Christianity and the AIDS crisis presents a significant opportunity for evangelism. Yet, as discussion moved to the issue of prevention of the disease, evangelicals' traditional emphasis on abstinence and fidelity, which exemplifies their individualistic social and political ethics, began to take the center stage, producing disputes between religious conservatives and liberal activists and turning AIDS into a domestic culture wars issue.

Evangelical advocates who later took up global HIV/AIDS have sought to bypass this political impasse altogether or win the debate by framing the causes and consequences of the AIDS pandemic in Africa in more structural terms and blaming American Christians for their

inaction, while maintaining their focus on abstinence and fidelity as legitimate and effective solutions. The first international Christian conference on HIV/AIDS organized by Franklin Graham and his organization Samaritan's Purse was held in 2002, which has been argued to have changed the attitudes of many conservative politicians, including North Carolina Senator Jesse Helms, toward the AIDS pandemic (Burkhalter 2004; Busby 2010). In 2003, World Vision U.S. started its "Hope Tour" to raise national awareness of global AIDS (Shapiro 2006). In June 2003, more than 100 evangelical leaders signed a "Statement of Conscience on the Global AIDS Crisis" at a conference convened by several evangelical organizations, including World Vision, World Relief, MAP International, and NAE. In November of the same year, the Global Missions Health Conference, which began in Louisville, Kentucky, in 1996, sponsored a consultation on the church and the HIV/AIDS crisis, which gathered more than 3000 participants. The papers presented in the consultation were later published as a book titled *The Hope Factor: Engaging the Church in the HIV/AIDS Crisis*, whose contributors included almost all the prominent voices in the evangelical anti-global AIDS advocacy. And after PEPFAR was established, the Association of Evangelical Relief and Development Organizations (AERDO) formed the AERDO HIV/AIDS Alliance, whose 14 members secured over $39 million for their overseas AIDS work between 2004 and 2009.[6]

Besides foreign missionary and development organizations and their leaders, a few well-known evangelical pastors and leaders of primarily domestic ministries also actively promoted the cause of fighting the pandemic. Rick Warren, arguably the heir apparent of Billy Graham as the most influential evangelical preacher, started an HIV/AIDS ministry with his wife Kay in their Saddleback Church in California in 2003. In 2006, the church hosted the second annual Global Summit on AIDS and the Church, where a bipartisan couple of then-Senators Barack Obama and Sam Brownback, along with the U.S. global AIDS coordinator Mark Dybul and Franklin Graham, spoke.[7] Bill and Lynn Hybels of Willow Creek Community Church near Chicago, another evangelical megachurch, have also been active in an overseas AIDS work.

---

[6] AERDO is now called Accord Network. Accord's website does not reveal the identities of those 14 member organizations. http://www.accordnetwork.org/collaboration/ (accessed March 19, 2014). Through multiple web search efforts, I identified twelve of them and they are Food for the Hungry, World Concern, Nazarene Compassionate Ministries, World Hope International, Christian Reformed World Relief Committee, CURE International, Operation Blessing, Salvation Army, World Relief, Medical Ambassadors International, Medical Assistance Program, Trans World Radio.

[7] Kelly Cottrell, "Rick Warren Welcomes Obama, Brownback to Saddleback's AIDS Summit," *Baptist Press*, http://www.bpnews.net/bpnews.asp?id=24509 (accessed March 19, 2014).

Charles Colson, founder of Prison Fellowship and evangelical statesman who were deeply involved in the religious persecution issue as we saw in the previous chapter, voiced his support for the fight against global AIDS as well, calling it a "moral imperative" (Colson 2003).

Although the efforts of these evangelicals alone did not directly lead to the creation of the U.S. President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) in 2003, they were certainly among the most vocal supporters of the initiative, which, according to its website, "the largest by any nation to combat a single disease internationally."[8] In fact, the overall approach it took and some specific policies it included were clearly seen in line with the way evangelical advocates defined the global AIDS problem and proposed solutions to it.

Notwithstanding occasional minor divisions and conflicts among themselves, evangelicals used a distinctive set of rhetorical strategies to address the pandemic. First, they emphasized the enormity of the AIDS crisis in Africa, which affects societies in general—not just a few "high risk groups" such as homosexuals and drug users—as a main difference between AIDS in the U.S. and AIDS in Africa, eliciting a more compelling response from American evangelicals to the latter. It is noteworthy that even when it is acknowledged that AIDS is a primarily sexually transmitted disease, more structural factors are blamed, not individual behavior. So Deborah Dortzbach, a long time medical missionary and World Relief's international director for HIV/AIDS program, identifies in her interview with *CT* the following factors that have contributed to the overwhelming extent of AIDS in Africa: first, sexual revolution of the West spread globally and penetrated Africa; second, urbanization and war that caused displacement and breakdown of family that led to sexual behavior; and finally, the lack of good healthcare (Morgan 2000). This way, the question of individual responsibility is muted by highlighting structural conditions that lead individuals (almost inevitably) to practice unsafe sexual behaviors. Together with the claim that AIDS is not a homosexual disease in Africa, this rhetorical strategy effectively produces and promotes a notion of "innocent victims." The prime example here is World Vision's decision to frame its AIDS work in terms of biblical call to care for orphans and widows. Steve Reynolds, marketing coordinator for World Vision's AIDS program, explained in a 2006 interview how the organization came up with an idea to mobilize its evangelical base:

---

[8] http://www.pepfar.gov/about/index.htm (accessed March 12, 2014).

"We decided to make it relevant by focusing on the widow and the orphan…We chose to do that because there's a Bible verse, James 1:27, which lays it out very, very clearly for anybody who believes in God, or anybody who's a Christian, and that verse says basically: 'Pure and faultless religion is this, that you care for the widow and the orphan in distress.' And that was kind of like a revelation to us. That was like, 'Aha, OK, this is the message.' This is the platform [with] which we can go now to our faith-based audience and say: 'We have to do something.'" (Shapiro 2006).

Yet, as to the solutions to the pandemic, evangelical activists maintained their focus on abstinence and fidelity even as they grudgingly acknowledged the utility of condom use as part of the so-called ABC approach ("Abstinence, Be faithful, and use Condom"). This exemplifies a largely individualistic view of social change, rooted in the idea of individual moral ethics and personal responsibility, which has been argued as a hallmark of evangelical social and political ethics. What is unique in this case, however, is the promotion of Uganda as the progenitor and success story of the ABC approach, thus making it a local solution, not an imposition of American moral and religious norms.

Another emphasis the evangelical activists made was on the role of the church in fighting against AIDS in Africa. Probably the most vocal proponents in this regard have been Rick and Kay Warren of the Saddleback Church. To the question of why the AIDS pandemic worsens despite the amount of money spent to tackle it, Kay warren answers that "We're not including the church. We won't ever be able to stop AIDS without the involvement of local churches. The government can try its hardest…And philanthropists are spending millions and millions of dollars…But without the faith community, I just don't think it will get accomplished" (Morgan 2007). Saddleback's own HIV/AIDS Initiative website offers seven advantages of the church in addressing the AIDS crisis: 1) the church has the largest participation; 2) the church also brings the widest distribution; 3) the church has the simplest administration; 4) the church has the fasted proliferation; 5) the church has the longest continuation; 6) the church has the strongest authorization; and 7) the church has the highest motivation.[9] The church AIDS team earlier came up with an acronym which describes six things churches can do to fight AIDS: CHURCH. The letters respectively stand for 1) Care and comfort; 2) Handle testing and counseling; 3) Unleash a volunteer force of compassion; 4) Remove the stigma; 5) Champion healthy behavior; and 6) Help with nutrition and medication (Morgan 2007).

---

[9] http://www.hivaidsinitiative.com/initiative/whatwedo/ (accessed March 24, 2014).

18

In sum, I argue that the overall response to global AIDS by American evangelical leaders has been somewhat "holistic" in the sense that it has advocated a package of diverse solutions including care, treatment, and prevention—as reflected in the three-part way the PEPFAR funding has been divided. Yet, the predominant focus that has been given on prevention based on abstinence and fidelity exhibits an individualistic view of social change that scholars have pointed out as prevalent, if not inherent, to American evangelicalism. This clearly indicates a gap, at least in rhetoric, between the American evangelical anti-AIDS campaign and the broader effort to fight AIDS within global evangelicalism. For example, the paper produced by the "Holistic Mission" issue group at the 2004 Forum for World Evangelization hosted by Lausanne Movement contains a section on "Holistic Mission and AIDS." Its author Bryant Myers, former World Vision employee and ardent proponent of holistic mission, defines HIV/AIDS as a 1) biological, 2) behavioral, 3) child and youth, 4) gender, 5) poverty, 6) culture (stigma), 7) socio-economic (tearing the fabric of society), 8) justice (drugs, debt, trade, corruption, poor governance, female inheritance), 9) deception (condemnation and judgment; biology and condoms alone), 10) compassion, and 11) world evangelization issue (Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization 2004). The Cape Town Commitment, adopted at the Third Lausanne Congress on World Evangelization in 2010, also mentioned AIDS as one of the most significant social issues that evangelicals worldwide need to address. The journal *Transformation*, which has presented the views of holistic mission advocates within global evangelicalism, has also published articles on HIV/AIDS, and simply browsing their titles suggests that the way AIDS is understood by the authors of many of the articles is to put it in a wider, more structural, and more complex social and political context. The titles include: "Reducing Poverty though Combating HIV/AIDS" (Okaalet 2000); "Family Dynamics when a Member of the Family has HIV/AIDS" (Allen, Cox, and Matlock 2002); "Christian Microenterprise Development and HIV/AIDS" (Getu 2003); "The Church's Mission: Gender and HIV/AIDS among the Luos of East Africa" (Oloo 2004); "Mission and Pastoral Care in the Context of HIV/AIDS: The Rwandan Experience" (Karamera 2004); and "Transformation with the HIV/AIDS Context" (Kareithi, Rogers, and Mash 2005). Even the articles that argue for the necessity of abstinence and fidelity programs tend to discuss individual behavior change in connection with other structural factors. For example, the first article on HIV/AIDS that appeared in *Transformation* was written by a

Uganda minister, a person living with HIV himself. Rejecting the notion that AIDS is basically a matter of individual sexual behavior, he argues:

> "…people have sexual contact and produce babies all over the world. Why then is it that part of the world has very little HIV/AIDS while another has so high a proportion of the total infection? If it were right to focus on the act of sexual intercourse this would not be the case. Rather it is because of what I believe to be the fundamental factors: poverty, behavior patterns, the spiritual outlook on life, and one more: character of the individual…Sadly I have found out in Uganda that it is the 'good obedient girls who are dying of HIV/AIDS. The aggressive assertive ones are relatively safe" (Byamugisha 1996, 28).

Another article offers the following anecdotes to argue the same point:

> "…a mother of four in Uganda who can make the equivalent of $3 for having unprotected sex with a client—or $1 if she demands he wears a condom—can hear the message of safe sex all day, but it will not drown out the hungry cries of her children. Narisa, a ten year old in South Africa who is forced to have sex with a virgin will cure him, is an inappropriate target for the 'wait until you are married' talk. And the debt relief, which are the result of efforts by faith based, governmental and other agencies, proved to be one of the most effective strategies in Uganda AIDS success story" (Okaalet 2002, 277).

These examples clearly represent a more structural and holistic understanding of the AIDS problem in Africa, which has not been pronounced among American evangelicals, although organizations such as World Vision has certainly placed the issues within a broader context of transformational development. It remains to be seen whether it will be embraced by U.S. evangelicals more widely.

V. Case Three: Human Trafficking

The evangelical campaign against human trafficking utilized the same movement structure which had been previously built for the campaign against religious persecution. Albeit with somewhat different individual and organizational profiles, the campaign was again catalyzed by the Jewish activist Michael Horowitz, who spearheaded the legislation of IRFA with the support of the unlikely coalition of evangelicals and feminists. The NAE released a policy resolution on trafficking in 1999 (NAE 1999). The resolution is specifically titled "Trafficking in Women and Children," which shows on what particular aspect of the broader human trafficking issue evangelicals were focused: sex trafficking. The resolution begins with the statement that "Each year force and fraud bring as many as a million innocent victims into the international sex

industry. There is a growing movement to oppose this horrendous degradation of women and children. The National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) joins with others to condemn and organize to end this travesty." A trafficking bill was introduced by Congressman Chris Smith in the same year; it was drafted by his aide Joseph Rees, who had also written the initial draft of the initial IRFA bill (Hertzke 2004, 322). The subsequent Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000 mandated the establishment of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons within the State Department, which has allocated funds to anti-trafficking organizations and published an annual report about the status of trafficking in almost all the countries in the world. The Trafficking in Persons Report evaluates their compliance with the "minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking" listed in TVPA and designates them as Tier I, Tier II or Tier III countries. Tier III governments, which neither fully comply with the minimum standards nor make serious efforts to comply, are subject to the withdrawal of non-humanitarian assistance and other sanctions.

The evangelical movement against human trafficking has often been criticized for its almost exclusive focus on sex trafficking when labor trafficking is numerically a bigger problem. Detractors suspect that evangelicals have a hidden agenda of attacking pornography and prostitution and promoting their own conservative and religious sexual ethics (Weitzer 2007). Even those who do not necessarily question evangelicals' motives tend to find their *criminal justice* approach to the issue, which they argue neglects its broader social, political, and economic conditions (Baker 2015, 197-198; Choi-Fitzpatrick 2014). To be accurate, the above-mentioned NAE resolution on trafficking "recognizes those origins of this problem that lie in poverty as well as vice, and applauds the excellent work of World Relief, in children's evangelism and micro-enterprise development among families at risk in Cambodia." When it comes to government response, however, the resolution "supports appropriate federal legislation that would seek to end sex trafficking by *punishing* those responsible. Penalties should be considered that punish violators in a just manner and to serve as a deterrent. Such legislation may also include incentives to countries to take appropriate actions (e.g. criminalizing and punishing offenders)" (Italics mine).

International Justice Mission (IJM) is perhaps the best-known evangelical advocate in human trafficking and often mentioned as a prime example of the law enforcement approach. It is primarily made up of lawyers, investigators, and aftercare professionals and its "rescue"

21

operations has been profiled by the secular and Christian media. In response to the biblical call to "seek justice, rescue the oppressed, defend the orphan, plead for the widow (Isaiah 1:17)," Gary Haugen founded IJM in 1997. His experience as the director of the U.N. investigation into the Rwandan genocide turned out to be a turning point for his life and mission, although it probably was a culmination of his previous dealings with prevalent injustices in the world outside the U.S. After graduating from Harvard University, he worked with South African church leaders on the National Initiative for Reconciliation for a year. After studying law at the University of Chicago, he investigated the atrocities committed by the Filipino soldiers and police as part of his work for the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights. When he was detailed to the U.N. to work on the Rwanda case in 1994, he was working as a trial attorney in the civil rights division of the U.S. Department of Justice (Haugen 2009, 28).

After he came back from Rwanda, Haugen and his Christian colleagues launched an extensive study based on the survey of a large number of Christian missionary and humanitarian organizations, which confirmed a massive need for an expert agency which will tackle injustices and abuse to which the poor and vulnerable in many non-Western countries are regularly subject. The list of injustices and abuse the survey identified included: abusive child labor; abusive police or military; child pornography; child prostitution; corrupt seizure or extortion of land; detention or disappearance without charge or trial; extortion or withholding of wages; forced prostitution; forced migration; genocide; murder of street children; organized political intimidation; organized racial violence; public justice corruption; state, rebel or paramilitary terrorism; state-supported discrimination or abuse of ethnic minorities; state-sponsored religious persecution; and state-sponsored torture (Haugen 2009, 55).

IJM's distinctive approach—so-called "case advocacy" or "collaborative individual casework"—is based on the realization that the vast majority of victims of injustices such as listed above suffer, not because the laws or norms to protect them are not in place, but because they are not properly executed. Thus, while IJM does engage in the campaign-style public policy advocacy at times—Haugen played an important role in legislating TVPA—its main strategy is individual casework, which he believes both biblical and strategic:

> "God does not call us to love a country, humanity, principles, projects or ideology. Instead, he calls us to something as eminently doable as it is difficult. To love actual, individual people—people made in his image. It is easy to become paralyzed by the

massive scale of injustice when we look at the problems in the developing world. And so rather than get caught in what Martin Luther King Jr. aptly called "the paralysis of analysis," we begin to combat injustice through casework the way the Bible tells us to embrace the world—one person at a time. We come face to face with the real and painful struggles of our brothers and sisters around the world" (Haugen 2009, 191).

Yet, it would be inaccurate to describe IJM's approach and work as purely individualistic. IJM's individual casework consists of four elements: 1) victim rescue, 2) perpetrator accountability, 3) victim aftercare, and 4) structural transformation. It is also called collaborative casework since it involves a team of investigators, lawyers, and social workers. As can be seen from the fact that structural transformation is part of individual casework, IGE views public policy advocacy and individual case advocacy as complementary, not mutually exclusive. To Haugen (2009, 194), conducting casework is like "running water through a hose," which is the best way to locate points of damage in the hose. Likewise, casework enables IJM to make specific recommendations to policy makers regarding the problems to be fixed in the system. In addition, when it finds local authorities unwilling or unable to cooperate in their casework, IJM sometimes call on the U.S. government to provide leverage (Guthrie 2009, 36-37). Haugen (2009, 198-209) recognizes international law and diplomacy, economic sanctions, and military force as "additional" intervention strategies, yet he also emphasizes that they are not appropriate at all times and must be used after a careful consideration. IJM's primary effort to bring structural transformation consists of working *in partnership with* state and local authorities as well as citizens. For instance, it has provided trainings for the local police in several countries. What distinguishes IJM's program, Haugen (2009, 184) maintains, is "the way we maintain a long-term presence in the community *with* the police to provide tangible assistance and encouragement in putting the training to work in the streets" (Italics original). IJM also educates civil society leaders and citizens so that they know their rights. Currently, it has 17 field offices in Africa, Latin America, and South and Southeast Asia.[10]

VI. Conclusion

In this paper, I briefly examined how American evangelicals have become a major voice in global humanitarian and human rights issues, shaping U.S. government responses to them. I

---

[10] https://www.ijm.org/where-we-work.

looked at how international evangelical discourse on mission has changed over the years, producing three distinctive, yet not mutually exclusive understandings of foreign missions: *mission as evangelism*, *mission as service*, and *mission as transformation*. They present different views of social problems, their causes and consequences, and proper solutions to them. My examination of the recent evangelical campaigns against religious persecution, HIV/AIDS, and human trafficking abroad shows that all three frames of mission are present, although the mission as evangelism frame and the individualistic approach to social change are still dominant among evangelical activists. A new generation of evangelicals and their organizations, including Institute for Global Engagement, World Vision, and International Justice Mission, represents the rise of holistic mission ideas and practice within American evangelicalism. I find this development positive as long as it does not lead to an exclusive focus on structures and institutions at the expense of individuals. Obviously, one cannot accomplish everything and we should let different churches, organizations, and individuals develop and utilize their particular orientations, knowledge, and skills expertise as far as they can work together to address a given problem in a holistic way. It remains to be seen whether this trend will continue and mature in American evangelicalism and whether its Korean counterpart will be able to make a similar transition in the near future.

Works Cited

Albright, Madeleine. 2006. *The Mighty & the Almighty: Reflections on America, God, and World Affairs*. New York: HarperCollins.

Allen, Laura, Gay Cox, and Robert Matlock. 2002. "Family Dynamics When a Member of the Family Has HIV/AIDS." *Transformation* 19 (1): 82-88.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 2010. *The Honor Code: How Moral Revolutions Happen*. New York: Norton.

Baker, Carrie N. 2015. "An Examination of Some Central Debates on Sex Trafficking in Research and Public Policy in the United States." *Journal of Human Trafficking* 1: 191-208.

Barnett, Michael. 2011. *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Burkhalter, Holly. 2004. "The Politics of AIDS: Engaging Conservative Activists." *Foreign Affairs* 83 (January/February): 8-14.

Busby, Joshua W. 2010. *Moral Movements and Foreign Policy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Byamugisha, Gideon B. 1996. "Living with HIV/AIDS: A Personal Testimony." *Transformation* (June): 28-30.

Choi-Fitzpatrick, Austin. 2014. "To Seek and Save the Lost: Human Trafficking and Salvation Schemas among American Evangelicals." *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology* 1 (2): 119-140.

Colson, Charles. 2003. "Beyond Condoms." *Christianity Today* (June 1).

Daugherty, Jared. 2007. "Constructive Advocacy: Creating a Context for Action." http://www.globalengage.org/issues/articles/freedom/622-constructive-advocacy-creating-a-context-for-action.html (Accessed March, 20, 2012).

Farr, Thomas F. 2008a. "Diplomacy in an Age of Faith: Religious Freedom and National Security." *Foreign Affairs* 87 (March/April): 110-124.

Farr, Thomas F. 2008b. *World of Faith and Freedom: Why International Religious Liberty Is Vital to American National Security*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Farr, Thomas F. 2012. "Religious Freedom and International Diplomacy." In *The Future of Religious Freedom: Global Challenges*, ed. Allen D. Hertzke. New York: Oxford University Press: 331-352.

Galli, Mark. 2006. "Evangelical DNA and International Affairs." *The Review of Faith and International Affairs* (Winter): 53-55.

Getu, Makonen. 2003. "Christian Microenterprise Development and HIV/AIDS." *Transformation* 20 (1): 55-60.

Graham, Billy. 1967. "Why the Berlin Congress?" In *One Race, One Gospel, One Task: Volume I*, eds. Carl F. H. Henry and W. Stanley Mooneyham. Minneapolis: World Wide Publications, 22-34.

Guthrie, Stan. 2009. "Pivoting toward the Faraway Neighbor." *Christianity Today* (January): 34-37.

Haugen, Gary A. 2009. *Good News about Injustice: A Witness of Courage in a Hurting World* (Tenth Anniversary Edition). Downers Grove: IVP.

Hertzke, Allen D. 2004. *Freeing God's Children: The Unlikely Alliance for Global Human Rights*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Hoffman, Derek. 2005. "The Risks of Regime Change." *Christianity Today* (March 18). http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2005/april/13.84.html (accessed February 5, 2014).

Hollinger, Dennis P. 1983. *Individualism and Social Ethics: An Evangelical Syncretism*. Lanham: University Press of America.

Karamera, Francis. 2004. "Mission and Pastoral Care in the Context of HIV/AIDS: The Rwandan Experience." *Transformation* 21 (1): 78-80.

Kareithi, Samuel. Jessie Rogers, and Rachel Mash. 2005. "Transformation within the HIV/AIDS Context: Lessons from the Fikelela Initiative in the Diocese of Cape Town." *Transformation* 22 (2): 106-114.

Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Network in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization. 2004. "Holistic Mission: Occasional Paper No. 33." http://www.lausanne.org/docs/2004forum/LOP33_IG4.pdf (accessed March 25, 2014).

Mead, Walter Russell. 2006. "God's Country?" *Foreign Affairs* 85 (September/October): 24-43.

Morgan, Timothy C. 2000. "'Sexual Revolution,' AIDS, and the African Church." *Christianity Today* (February 7).

Morgan, Timothy C. 2007. "Q&A: Kay Warren." *Christianity Today* (November 2).

Morone, James A. 2003. *Hellfire Nation: The Politics of Sin in American History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Murch, James Deforest. 1956. *Cooperation without Compromise: A History of the National Association of Evangelicals*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Myers, Bryant. 1999. *Walking with the Poor: Principles and Practices of Transformational Development*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

National Association of Evangelicals. 1996. "Statement of Conscience Concerning Worldwide Religious Persecution." http://www.nae.net/government-relations/policy-resolutions/413-worldwide-religious-persecution-1996 (Accessed March 20, 2012).

National Association of Evangelicals. 1999. "Trafficking in Women and Children." http://www.nae.net/government-relations/policy-resolutions/337-trafficking-in-women-and-children-1999- (Accessed March 20, 2012).

National Association of Evangelicals. 2002. "Second Statement of Conscience Concerning Worldwide Religious Persecution with Special Examination of Sudan and North Korea." http://www.nae.net/government-relations/policy-resolutions/430-worldwide-religious-persecution-2002 (Accessed March 20, 2012).

National Association of Evangelicals. 2007. "Statement of Conscience of the National Association of Evangelicals (USA) Concerning the Dalits." http://www.nae.net/government-

relations/policy-resolutions/451-statement-of-conscience-of-the-national-association-of-evangelicals-usa-concerning-the-dalits (Accessed March 20, 2012).

Okaalet, Peter. 2000. "Reducing Poverty through Combating HIV/AIDS." *Transformation* 17 (4): 142-145.

Oloo, Pamelah. 2004. "The Church's Mission: Gender and HIV/AIDS among the Luos of East Africa." *Transformation* 21 (1): 70-77.

Padilla, C. Rene. 1985. "Evangelism and Social Responsibility: From Wheaton '66 to Wheaton '83." *Transformation* 2 (3): 27-33.

Padilla, C. Rene. 2004. "Holistic Mission." *Holistic Mission: Lausanne Occasional Paper No. 33.* http://www.lausanne.org/en/documents/lops/846-lop-33.html (accessed December 24, 2013).

Patterson, James Alan. 1990. "The Loss of a Protestant Missionary Consensus: Foreign Missions and the Fundamentalist-Modernist Conflict." In *Earthen Vessels: American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880-1980*, eds. Joel A. Carpenter and Wilbert R. Shenk. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 73-91.

Preston, Andrew. 2012. "The Spirit of Democracy: Religious Liberty and American Anti-Communism during the Cold War." In *Uncertain Empire: American History and the Idea of the Cold War*, eds. Joel Isaac and Duncan Bell. New York: Oxford University Press, 141-163.

Schäfer, Axel R. 2012. *Piety and Public Funding: Evangelicals and the State in Modern America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Seiple, Chris, and Dennis R. Hoover. 2012. "Religious Freedom and Global Security." In *The Future of Religious Freedom: Global Challenges*, ed. Allen D. Hertzke. New York: Oxford University Press: 315-330.

Seiple, Chris. 2012. "Building Religious Freedom: A Theory of Change." *The Review of Faith & International Affairs 10* (3): 97-102.

Seiple, Robert A. 2008. "Methodology, Metrics, and Moral Imperatives in Religious Freedom Diplomacy." *The Review of Faith & International Affairs* (Summer): 53-56.

Seiple, Robert A. 2009. "From Bible Bombardment to Incarnational Evangelism: A Reflection on Christian Witness and Persecution." *The Review of Faith & International Affairs* 7 (1): 29-37.

Settje, David E. 2011. *Faith and War: How Christians Debated the Cold and Vietnam Wars*. New York: New York University Press.

Shah, Timothy Samuel. 2009. "For the Sake of Conscience: Some Evangelical Views of the State." In *Church, State, and Citizen: Christian Approaches to Political Engagement*, ed. Sandra F. Joireman. New York: Oxford University Press: 115-143.

Shapiro, Nina. 2006. "The AIDS Evangelists," *Seattle Weekly* (November 15) http://www.seattleweekly.com/2006-11-15/news/the-aids-evangelists/ (accessed April 22, 2009).

Shea, Nina. 2008. "The Origins and Legacy of the Movement to Fight Religious Persecution." *The Review of Faith & International Affairs* (Summer): 25-31.

Smith, Christian. 2000. *Christian America? What Evangelicals Really Want*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Stott, John, 1995. *Christian Mission in the Modern World*. Downers Grove: IVP Books.

Tyrrell, Ian R. 2010. *Reforming the World: The Creation of America's Moral Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Weitzer, Ronald. 2007. "The Social Construction of Sex Trafficking: Ideology and Institutionalization of a Moral Crusade." *Politics & Society* 35 (3): 447-475.