



Journal of Religion & Society

The Kripke Center

Volume 12 (2010)

Searching for a New Story

The Possibility of a New Evangelical Movement in the U.S.

Paul N. Markham, Western Kentucky University

Abstract

This article explores the possibility of a new Evangelical movement in the United States. Dubbed the “New Evangelicals” by members of the press, this growing number of American Christians are finding themselves somewhere between the liberal and conservative politics of the past. The author investigates the growth of this movement by arguing that at the heart of this phenomenon is a struggle to shape a “framing story” that describes transitions in their theological and political perspectives. The author will draw on a review of current literature as well as original qualitative research designed to explore the theological and ideological characteristics of this growing movement.

Introduction

Historically, Christian awakenings have been associated with progressive politics, not conservative politics. Indeed, it’s hard to think of periods of egalitarian or progressive social change in the United States that has not been preceded by a period of Evangelical fervor (Putnam).

[1] Something is stirring among evangelicals in the United States. Despite the relatively recent connection between evangelicals and the Religious Right, this segment of the Christian population has long been engaged in progressive efforts toward social transformation. Comments like the one above from Putnam remind us that a significant renewal among the evangelical population might well lead to another wave of social change in America. While younger evangelicals still claim a “pro-life” stance, they are taking up a broader social agenda than the previous generation.

[2] This article will address the possibility of a new evangelical movement in the United States and explore its potential to generate significant social change at the local, national, and global levels. In many ways, these “new evangelicals” share notable similarities with early evangelicals dating back to the eighteenth century – the most notable similarity being their fervor for personal and social transformation. Our present-day technological culture replete with such a high rate of information exchange is helping to form a generation of evangelical Christians who are shaped by multiple forms of knowledge and practice. I will argue that we are seeing a significant movement away from the Religious Right as these Christians find innovative avenues of social reform and entrepreneurship.

[3] The case presented in this article is based on a review of relevant literature related to evangelicals in the U.S. and a discussion of an original qualitative research project that is designed to investigate the theological and ideological characteristics of this emerging population and to explore their mode of activism and means for collective action. This latter point is of particular interest as a growing number of scholars and practitioners are seeking to understand these new evangelicals. As this segment grows numerically, there is an outstanding need for an organizational center to emerge. As we will see, many new evangelicals are characterized by a post-partisan mentality and therefore shun formal organizational affiliation; thus, a much more creative approach to organizing is required than we have seen in mobilizing tactics of the far left or right that create a distinctive in-group/out-group dynamic through polarizing one group against another.

Looking Back to Move Ahead

[4] Understanding the scope of American Evangelicalism is a significant task. Current accounts regularly associate evangelicals with the Religious Right and the Republican Party. While there is sufficient reason to make this claim, one does so at the expense of overlooking a rich tradition of Christians committed to progressive social change. In terms of defining evangelicalism, David Bebbington’s four distinctive features of evangelical faith have been widely accepted among academics. They are: (1) a strict focus on religious conversion with following Jesus as the focal point of the experience, (2) adherence to the Bible as the ultimate source of religious authority, (3) a distinct evangelistic activism focused on sharing one’s individual faith commitment, and (4) a focus on the life of Jesus that centers on the cross and his physical resurrection. A key aim of this article is to show that these new evangelicals are not adequately described by Bebbington’s typology. Their broadening sense of social responsibility is pushing them to rethink many of the fundamental theological presuppositions characteristic of their evangelical traditions.

[5] While Bebbington’s description provides a useful typology for the academic study of evangelicals, there are a great many nuances among these Christians that are not captured in these four features. Evangelicalism has never represented a single cohesive organizational structure easily demarcated among the American religious landscape. A comprehensive account of the evangelical movement must take seriously the ways in which these four distinctive features have been emphasized over time and the end to which these Christians have acted within the wider society – ends which have often placed evangelicals on the leading edge of social transformation. Mark Noll asserts that evangelicalism has always been made up of “shifting movements, temporary alliances, and the lengthened shadows of

individuals” and that all discussions of evangelicalism are always both “descriptions of the way things really are as well as efforts within our own minds to provide some order for a multifaceted, complex set of impulses and organizations” (8).

[6] In this way, evangelicalism has itself been more like a movement than a denomination in so far as it is constituted by more than a set of beliefs, but by a *style* and form of expression that has touched literally every Christian segment in America. For the purposes of this article, it is important to understand the relationship between evangelicalism and its evolutionary kin – *fundamentalism*. As George Marsden recounts the history of these two strands of American Christianity, he notes that the vast cultural changes occurring between the 1870s and the 1920s created a major crisis within the evangelical population that essentially resulted in the formation of two groups with notably opposing ideologies. On the one hand were those characterized by a more liberal theology and progressive social agenda, yet held to the basic tenets of the evangelical faith such as the authority of the Bible and the necessity of salvation through the atoning sacrifice of Jesus. On the other hand were those who were much more conservative in their theology and held strictly to the traditional evangelical doctrines, which in many ways put them at odds with the modern age. By the 1920s a militant wing of the conservative group emerged and took the name “fundamentalist.”

[7] While there are many historical complexities associated with fundamentalism in America, it is of particular importance to understand the relationship between it and evangelicalism. I argue that such an understanding is critical, because much of the resistance to progressive social and political change has been due to the improper equating of fundamentalists with evangelicals at large. This unfortunate association has resulted in the oversight of a vital thread of evangelicalism that has led the way to progressive reform in the U.S. and beyond. Such realization is key as we seek to project what a *new* evangelical movement will look like and to what goals it will strive.

[8] In order to understand where the new evangelicals are going, it is important to recognize that much of their fervor is in fact not new, but might well be the extension of a movement beginning in the early twentieth-century. One of the most interesting points of this development, which will not be discussed at length here, is the way in which the rise of the Religious Right served as a contemporary diversion in the development of a new evangelicalism. Randall Balmer has written extensively on this topic and has sought to correct this deviation by recounting evangelical historical alignment with progressive political causes including the abolition of slavery, universal suffrage, and public education. Balmer’s criticism is leveled against contemporary conservative activists who embraced a political and social agenda virtually indistinguishable from the Republican Party platform. The consequence of this alignment has been the entrenchment of evangelicalism within a narrow partisan politics.

[9] Much of the character of new evangelicalism is determined by a reaction to the politics of the Religious Right and this reaction is resulting in an identity crisis of their evangelical faith. Many of these Christians are abandoning the term “evangelical” altogether and seeking new ways of expressing their religious commitments to personal and social transformation. Many scholars are attempting to reconnect these Christians to the deeper religious heritage of

evangelicalism and demonstrate how they might consider themselves committed evangelicals without adhering to the narrow conservative politics of the Christian Right (e.g., Olson). As young evangelicals struggle to define themselves in a religious sense, many seem to lack a historical understanding of early evangelical reaction to the growth of Christian fundamentalism in the U.S. This understanding is critical because, in many ways, the early reaction to the fundamentalists is like the present-day reaction to the conservatism of the Religious Right.

[10] The re-emergence of fundamentalism in the 1940s bore the same theological and social characteristics of its anti-modernist predecessor. Evangelical reaction culminated in three distinct events that served as the seeds for a “new evangelicalism” in postwar America: (1) the creation of the National Association of Evangelicals in 1942, (2) Carl F. H. Henry’s 1947 publication of *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*, and (3) the founding of *Christianity Today* in 1956 (Carpenter). These three events marked the initiation of a long-running effort to return to a more balanced view of the Christian gospel that stressed both biblical authority and social justice.

[11] Despite its temporary retreat, by the 1940s fundamentalism had become a “comprehensive religious movement with a whole panoply of aims and aspirations” (Carpenter: 8). In an effort to unify evangelicals as distinct from the fundamentalists, J. Elwin Wright convened the “National Conference of United Action among Evangelicals” on April 7, 1942 in St. Louis, Missouri. Wright and the Congregationalist pastor, Harold J. Ockenga, delivered sermons lamenting the collective testimony of evangelicalism in America. They observed that evangelicals had lost their sense of unity and been reduced to disparate and individual congregations scattered across the country. Their speeches culminated in a challenge for evangelicals to put aside their denominational differences and form a more consolidated witness for Christ. Soon after, the National Association of Evangelicals was formed at their Constitutional Convention in Chicago, Illinois. The official formation of the NAE signaled the conception, if not birth, of new evangelicalism in the U.S. (McCune). As Wright sought to steer a course between modernism on one hand and militant fundamentalism on the other, the distinction between “fundamentalist” and “evangelical” began to take shape.

[12] The prominence of Carl F. H. Henry cannot be understated in the historical development of a new evangelicalism. Henry was born in 1913 and raised in New York by a Protestant father and Catholic mother. Following his evangelical conversion experience at age 20, he enrolled at Wheaton College where he began his theological education culminating in a Ph.D. from Boston University. Henry followed the work of the NAE and eventually served on its administrative board. In 1947, he published *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*, which has arguably become one of the most important documents in the evolution of contemporary evangelicalism. Henry’s goal was to “perform surgery” on the fundamentalism of his time and return the cultural consciousness maligned by the fundamentalist fear of modernism.

[13] In the *Uneasy Conscience*, Henry bemoans fundamentalism’s lack of humanitarian concern. He comments that “The average fundamentalist’s indifference to social implications of his religious message has been so marked, however, that the non-evangelicals have sometimes

classified him with the pessimist in his attitude toward world conditions” (19-20). Furthermore, he notes what he calls the “Embarrassing Evangelical Divorce” from social concerns evident in the Old and New Testaments. Henry painstakingly leads the reader through the biblical texts as well as Christian history to demonstrate the social implications of evangelical faith. In a strong rebuke, he proclaims that “Today, Protestant Fundamentalism although heir-apparent to the supernaturalist gospel of the Biblical and Reformation minds, is a stranger, in its predominant spirit, to the vigorous social interest of its ideological forebears. . . It has ceased to challenge Caesar and Rome, as though in futile resignation and submission to the triumphant Renaissance modernism” (45).

[14] Vital to Henry’s agenda was his emphasis on Jesus’s message of the Kingdom of God. This point was perhaps the most prominent theological problem among the fundamentalists. The cultural and political isolation characteristic of fundamentalism had its ideological roots in the notion of the Kingdom of God as a distant goal rather than a present reality. This otherworldliness was detrimental to efforts to effect positive social change in the present society. While Henry did not reject premillennialism on the whole, he did claim to have no interest in a “postponement theory of the kingdom” (52). His arguments sought to balance the future-oriented position of the dispensationalists and the present-focused position of the postmillennialists. Henry’s ultimate goal in this regard was to maintain a robust evangelical theology, yet not deprive the budding new evangelical movement of its motivation to engage a host of social problems.

[15] Henry’s influence extended beyond the *Uneasy Conscience* as he was recruited by Billy Graham to become Associate Editor of *Christianity Today*. Graham launched the publication in an effort to offer a balanced perspective between the theological and political extremes of his day. The magazine was intended to address concerns relevant to leaders of evangelical churches throughout the country; thus, the first issue was sent free of charge to religious leaders across the nation. In the opening editorial article, the editors asserted that *Christianity Today* had its origin in a “deep-felt desire to express historical Christianity of the present generation” and their primary goal was to “apply the biblical revelation to the contemporary social crisis, by presenting the implications of the total Gospel message in every area of life” (20).

[16] As the Associate Editor, Henry had a hand in addressing a variety of social topics including race relations, foreign policy, politics, and church and state affairs. The magazine became a pulpit where his social concern could be shared with thousands of evangelicals across the nation. In his detailed investigation of the historical development of evangelical political activism, David Weeks notes that Henry “made *Christianity Today* the most formative influence on social ethics in the evangelical world” (96).

[17] The salient point of the above account is that, although there are a number of contemporary nuances, a socially progressive form of evangelicalism has roots extending back for more than six decades in American religious history. Evangelicals have a significant tradition of distancing themselves from fundamentalists in terms of both theological expression and social engagement. A helpful example is found in a 1956 article in *Christian Life*, which featured interviews with prominent faculty members from Wheaton College, Asbury College, Denver Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary, and Baylor University.

The article entitled “Is Evangelical Theology Changing,” listed the following eight significant developments in Evangelical theology (16-19):

1. A friendly attitude toward science.
2. A willingness to re-examine beliefs concerning the work of the Holy Spirit.
3. A more tolerant attitude toward varying views on eschatology.
4. A shift away from so-called extreme dispensationalism.
5. An increased emphasis on scholarship.
6. A more definite recognition of social responsibility.
7. A re-opening of the subject of biblical inspiration.
8. A growing willingness of evangelical theologians to converse with liberal theologians.

[18] This expanding theological and social agenda continued in various forms until the late 1960s when a mode of contemporary progressive evangelicalism began to take shape. This segment of the evangelical movement has been dubbed *progressive* due to their strong emphasis on social justice issues and penchant for political activism. These evangelicals reject the assumptions of classic political liberalism that relegate religious convictions strictly to the private life of individuals – thus sterilizing public life and debate from moral or religious beliefs. This more recent form of evangelicalism bears a strong likeness to Henry’s, but differs in the prioritization of the social in relation to the religious. While the early editors of *Christianity Today* often asserted that social justice was to be realized through personal religious transformation, these later evangelicals emphasized the systemic nature of social ills and the deep social dimension of faithful Christian life.

[19] As the number of academic publications justifying Christian social and political engagement grew, a number of prominent meetings and conferences sprang up exploring practical reactions to social problems. In the midst of this expansion, two important evangelical journals appeared. The first was *Freedom Now*, which began publication in 1965 by Fred and John Alexander. Although their initial purpose was to address blatant racism within evangelical churches, the journal eventually broadened its focus to address all forms of human injustice and suffering and changed the name of the journal to *The Other Side*. Jim Wallis began the second prominent publication in 1971 and called it *The Post-American*. Wallis and a number of other students from Trinity Evangelical Seminary formed the journal in response to what they saw as the American church’s embrace of military imperialism in Vietnam and the propagation of domestic racism and economic injustice. Four years later, the group relocated to Washington D.C. and renamed the journal *Sojourners*. By the mid 1970s, *Sojourners* and *The Other Side* served a key synergistic role for like-minded evangelicals dedicated to theological conservatism and progressive social justice.

[20] Another key figure among evangelical activists is Ron Sider who rose to prominence following the 1973 “Chicago Declaration of Evangelical Social Concern.” This declaration resulted from a workshop convened over Thanksgiving weekend at the YMCA hotel in Chicago. A number of evangelical leaders came together to draft a statement defending progressive social and political reform and to re-balance evangelical commitments to both personal and social transformation. The spirit of the declaration is captured in the following excerpt:

We acknowledge that God requires love. But we have not demonstrated the love of God to those suffering social abuses. We acknowledge that God requires justice. But we have not proclaimed or demonstrated his justice to an unjust American society...We affirm that God abounds in mercy and that he forgives all who repent and turn from their sins. So we call our fellow evangelical Christians to demonstrate repentance in a Christian discipleship that confronts the social and political injustice of our nation (Sider).

[21] Following the 1973 meeting in Chicago, Sider led the formation of Evangelicals for Social Action which eventually joined with *The Other Side* and *Sojourners* to form the most visible and politically influential segment of the new progressive evangelicalism. While the rise of the Religious Right certainly represents a break from the progressive form of evangelicalism mentioned above, evangelical fervor for personal and social transformation has never faded from existence. It is re-emerging in the twenty-first century in new and interesting ways. This re-emergence is marked by a struggle to find a new story and renewed agenda that extends beyond the religious conservatism of the Religious Right and seeks to embrace a more holistic gospel.

Searching for a New Story

[22] Sociologist Herbert Blumer has been an influential figure in the study of collective action and social movements. According to Blumer, social movements can be viewed as collective efforts to establish a new order of life. They have their inception in “the condition of unrest, and derive their motive power on one hand from dissatisfaction with the current form of life, and on the other hand, from wishes and hopes for a new scheme or system of living” (199). Working from this early framework, Mario Diani describes the common characteristics of social movements being that (1) they arise to address social problems, (2) members of the movement are bound by a “shared set of beliefs and a sense of belongingness,” and (3) they consist of “networks of informal interaction” (7).

[23] An important aim of this article is to demonstrate how the emergence of new evangelicals constitutes a potentially formidable social movement in the United States. Given Diani’s characteristics above, it is critical that we explore the ways in which this group understands their self-identity and how they might position themselves for collective action. I will initiate this charge by briefly exploring an important theoretical framework based on personal and public narrative, followed by key examples from current literature. The remainder of this article will summarize original qualitative research aimed at investigating the theological and ideological characteristics of these new evangelicals.

[24] A vital, and often overlooked, aspect of human social life is the power of narrative and its role in the formation of social systems. There is substantial literature on this subject, but for the purposes of the present article, I will assume personal and public narratives to be the means through which humans establish their sense of individual and collective identity. In his investigation of Christian social movements, David Gutterman stresses that “Narratives provide the scaffolding that offers the degree of stability we create in our world . . . [they] do not just describe or reflect, but rather define and give meaning to, human existence” (2005: 28). Likewise, Alasdair MacIntyre suggests, “Man is in his actions and practice, as well as in his fictions, essentially a story-telling animal. . . But the key question for men is not about

their own authorship; I can only answer the question ‘What am I to do?’ if I can answer the prior question ‘Of what story or stories do I find myself a part?’” (216). The present article captures a degree of irony in the emergence of new evangelicals because respondents in the study seem significantly disconnected from the progressive tradition of evangelicalism. In this way, the search for a “new story” is sociologically and theologically based not within the long tradition of evangelicalism, but in a reaction against contemporary forms of Christian fundamentalism.

[25] It is through the telling and retelling of stories that we create boundaries protecting us from an otherwise endless flux of social circumstances. Our sense of time and context is dependent upon the stories we tell ourselves; thus, narratives are the means by which we make connections between past, present, and future (Ricoeur). A key reason for my brief review of the historical development of “new evangelicalism” is to demonstrate that a sense of *tradition* is critical to the development of narrative. Hannah Arendt writes, “Without tradition – which selects and names, which hands down and preserves, which indicates where the treasures are and what their worth is – there seems to be no continuity in time and hence, humanly speaking, neither past nor future, only sempiternal change of the world and the biological cycle of living creatures in it” (5). It is plausible to assume many of the problems noted in the organization of new evangelicals is due to this disconnection from tradition and some of the essential practices that make social cohesion possible.

[26] Despite a disconnection from tradition, contemporary new evangelicals have a distinct sense of present “crisis” and they are seeking ways to describe the world around them as well as the possibilities of how they will act to change it. “The aim of social movements is not simply the redress of grievances, but the transformation of the world. The need for such transformation and the path toward change are defined in the narratives told by social movements” (Gutterman 2005: 45). The power of social change through collective action lies in the potential for a shared narrative that defines the common goal to which the group strives. In this case, an interesting dialectic emerges between “crisis” and “renewal,” where the collective narrative shared between members of the movement shapes the resulting action (e.g. Gutterman 2006, where he notes how stories of “sinfulness” shape U.S. political agendas). So the subsequent challenge for these new evangelicals is to articulate a collective narrative that will give shape to a substantive movement.

[27] In order to predict the actions of the movement, one must survey a wide variety of media spanning from internet blogs to academic publications. One need not look too far to discover the “crisis” at hand. Concerned Christians, including both clergy and those outside formal church service, are expressing increasing distress over the co-opting of evangelicalism to a strict form of conservative ideology (e.g. Burke). There have been a number of efforts to address the disparity between recent conservative forms of evangelical expression and the emerging evangelical ethos marked by a substantively broader agenda. Tony Campolo has adopted the term “Red Letter Christian” to challenge the popular image of evangelicals in America. Campolo declares, “I want it to be known that there are millions of us who espouse an evangelical theology, but who reject being classified as part of the Religious Right – we don’t want to make Jesus into a Republican” (17). Likewise, Joel Hunter has written a popular book entitled *A New Kind of Conservative* where he seeks to offer a new image of the conservative Christian – one that embraces a conservative view on traditional moral issues,

but takes seriously Christian responsibility for pressing social problems such as poverty and environmental sustainability.

[28] One of the most interesting and academically engaging of these new perspectives comes from David Gushee in his presentation of the “Evangelical Center.” Gushee focuses on what he believes is a substantial population of evangelical Christians in the U.S. who are fundamentally conservative in their theological outlook, but are coming to embrace a social conscience that might traditionally be labeled as liberal in character. Research findings indicate that as much as 40% of present-day evangelicals fall into this centrist category (Public Religion Research 2008a). Gushee numbers himself among the evangelical centrists and encourages a dialogue and exploration of evangelicalism that is neither “unipolar” (Christian right) or “bipolar” (right vs. left), but “multipolar” and recognizes the rich diversity of the movement.

[29] A sobering example of the popular appeal of this sentiment is *Esquire* magazine’s naming of evangelical activist Shane Claiborn to its list of “2009’s Top 23 Radicals and Rebels Who Are Changing the World.” Claiborne is originally from East Tennessee, but settled in inner-city Philadelphia to work among the poor and homeless. He begins his comments to *Esquire* by stating:

To all my nonbelieving, sort-of-believing, and used-to-be-believing friends: I feel like I should begin with a confession. I am sorry that so often the biggest obstacle to God has been Christians. Christians who have had so much to say with our mouths and so little to show with our lives. I am sorry that so often we have forgotten the Christ of our Christianity. Forgive us. Forgive us for the embarrassing things we have done in the name of God.

[30] The thrust of Claiborne’s appeal can be summed up by his statement, “the Christian Gospel has as much to do with *this life* as the next, and that the message of that Gospel is not just about going up when we die but about bringing God’s Kingdom down” (emphasis added). Social scientists have long acknowledged the positive correlation between a present religious eschatology – with the focus being on the Kingdom of God – and increased levels of political activism (Mac Iver). However, it is only recently that we have begun to gain a qualitative understanding of the theological commitments that motivate evangelical activists like Claiborne. This feature of the new evangelicals resonate strongly with the work of Henry and his emphasis on the Kingdom of God and the rejection of “otherworldliness” to the degree that it detracts from present social activism.

[31] Robert Jones has conducted a significant study of what he refers to as “progressive” Christian leaders in America. He found a prominent view of Jesus that emphasized his compassionate and countercultural nature. Furthermore, he comments:

It is worth noting what these leaders did not emphasize: atonement theology, with its singular emphasis on the death and crucifixion of Jesus as vicarious payment for the sins of humanity. Atonement theology, which has dominated evangelical circles, radically narrows the relevant part of the story of Jesus to his death. . . In sharp contrast, when progressive leaders talked about Jesus, they emphasized his life, example, and teachings; they might say,

“Jesus was killed because of the radical way he lived.” And when they spoke of his death, they most often connected it to his radical politics that upset the status quo by calling on his followers to stand with the poor and the oppressed and taking the privileged to task for their apathy and complicity in the injustices of society (81).

[32] This perspective on the person of Jesus renders a distinctive type of politics exercised by these new evangelicals that cannot be understood purely in terms of the left-right binary structure. They increasingly question the legitimacy of war and have a broadening scope of social concerns extending beyond issues such as abortion or same-sex marriage. While generally remaining “pro-life,” they are expanding its meaning to something more representative of “pro-whole-life” by taking up issues such as poverty reduction, sex trafficking, AIDS, and environmental sustainability. Robin Rogers and Peter Heltzel claim that we are witnessing the birth of a new evangelical politics properly referred to as “prophetic politics.” They define prophetic politics as “a biblically-based and theologically conservative form of politics marked by a broad focus on internationalism, environmentalism, and decreased identification with partisan politics” (412). The distinctiveness of the new evangelicals is not in their political activism, but in the range of issues in which they engage.

[33] Empirical evidence suggests that evangelicals donate more money to charity, volunteer more frequently, and participate in international service opportunities more than non-evangelicals and non-Christians (Greenberg-Quinlin Roslin Research 2004). However, younger evangelicals are demonstrating a growing interest in social justice issues that extend beyond mere volunteerism and seek to address systemic equity issues. Popular examples of this level of participation include: mega-church pastor Rick Warren’s *PEACEworks* plan, having the goal of mobilizing one billion Christians around the world to addresses what he calls the “five global giants” – spiritual emptiness, corrupt leadership, extreme poverty, pandemic disease, and rampant illiteracy; music artist Bono’s ONE Campaign that has recruited over two million people – including many evangelicals – committed to eliminating extreme global poverty; and the NAE’s *For the Health of the Nation* document, initiated by Kevin Manioa and Richard Cizik, which offers a political framework for engaging their over 30 million individual constituents in issues related to poverty, human rights, and “creation care.”

[34] Present day evangelicals, particularly the younger generation, are taking up a broader agenda than their predecessors. In an interview with the *Washington Times*, John Green noted, “We’re not seeing the younger drifting away from social issues; they’re adding new issues. Some evangelicals are being criticized for not preaching the whole Gospel, only focusing on traditional moral issues. [The younger generation] is interested in applying their faith to a broader range of issues – poverty, human rights, etcetera” (Taylor). Similar sentiments are echoed in the popular media through outlets such as *Relevant Magazine*, dedicated to exploring the interface between faith and pop culture. The magazine was founded by Cameron Strang and currently has more than 75,000 readers, which are largely evangelical Christians. In his November 2008 editorial, Strang argues:

Just as they do for abortion, Christians should be on the forefront of standing against things that take millions of innocent lives around the world every day – systemic poverty, preventable disease, unnecessary wars, slavery, genocide. The list goes on . . . Christians shouldn't just be known for being “pro-life,” a term which will never be disassociated from the 1990's abortion clinic bombers. Instead, we need to embrace a more holistic definition of Christ's love and example. We need to be “whole-life”. . . Being whole-life means living out Jesus' example in our world today – fighting injustice, promoting life, being good stewards of our natural and financial resources, and showing God's love in a tangible way. To dismiss these as liberal issues is to miss the very heart of God. It's only our Western, partisan mentality that has blinded us from this practical application of scriptural living.

[35] These sentiments are also reflected in recent empirical research conducted to explore cultural shifts among American evangelicals. Although younger evangelicals still consider themselves “pro-life,” their concerns are expanding to encompass a much broader activist agenda that focuses more on the “common good” than a narrow politics of moral conservatism (Public Religion Research 2008b; Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research 2008a, 2008b). Although such quantitative research helps us understand the general nature of the changes among young evangelicals, there is a present void of information regarding the potential of these new evangelicals to form a cohesive social movement. The above accounts give us a sense of the “crisis” that these evangelicals confront as they express an increasing degree of divergence from the Christian Right. Christian authors have provided a number of anecdotal accounts of shared belief, but we still lack substantial research exploring the theological and ideological beliefs of the new evangelicals. Finally, and perhaps the most practically significant issue yet to be addressed, is how these Christians might develop a common sense of “belongingness” and level of informal interaction sufficient to constitute collective action. The following section will summarize the results from original research intended to explore these questions.

Shaping a Movement

[36] Despite the common themes emerging from contemporary new evangelicals, the group's general tendency toward decentralization makes it difficult to identify a common organizational center or an apparent framework for collective action. In order to explore this and other ideological issues, the author conducted a qualitative research project based on interviews with both “experts” and practitioners across the United States. Findings support much of what has been presented above and reveal insights regarding the group's mode of social action.

Preliminary Considerations

[37] In addition to the literature mentioned above, the author conducted twenty informal “elite” interviews in order to establish the parameters of the study. These participants included noted scholars, journalists, researchers, and religious leaders recognized for their work related to religious movements among evangelicals in particular. Four salient points emerged from these conversations:

1. Terminology is critical as scholars seek to label the potential movement. Various terms qualifying “evangelical” are used (e.g. “center,” “progressive,” “liberal,” etc.); however, it is not at all clear that these expressions properly describe the complexity of what is occurring in evangelical circles as these terms have historical political ramifications.
2. The lines between “evangelical” and “non-evangelical” are becoming increasingly vague. A number of the elite respondents suggested that much of what the media attributes to current trends in evangelicalism might well be the product of a growing coalition between traditional evangelicals and activists from the margins of other Christian traditions including Catholics, Pentecostals, and Mainliners.
3. The single most unifying characteristic among the young religious progressives is concern over social justice issues.
4. The most critical issue among those interested in a new evangelical movement concerns the group’s ability to organize for collective action in the absence of a single organizational center or leader.

Data Collection

[38] Based on the target population’s interest in social justice issues, the research sample was chosen from potential participants in the *Mobilization to End Poverty* event held in Washington D.C. on April 26-29, 2009. The event was billed as a historic gathering of thousands of Christians coming together in a powerful movement committed to the biblical imperative of reducing domestic and global poverty. Event speakers focused on both theological teaching and practical strategies for political activism aimed at achieving the Millennium Development Goals to cut domestic poverty in half within 10 years. The *Mobilization* was sponsored by a number of faith-based groups including Sojourners, World Vision, the ONE Campaign, Oxfam, and the National Ministries of the American Baptist Church.

[39] In January of 2009, organizers launched a Facebook group in order to spread awareness of the *Mobilization* and provide a forum for discussion related to the goals of the event. Within a few days the group had over 400 members interested in the event and/or the goals that it strove to accomplish. Research participants were determined by a random sample from the 432 members of the Facebook group. A random sample was taken and email invitations were sent to 64 group members of which 43 agreed to participate in the study – 39 interviews were conducted via telephone and four face-to-face. The interviews were semi-structured and designed to explore the respondent’s personal narrative regarding their interest in the *Mobilization* event. Questions were structured to probe for (1) religious and political characteristics, (2) mode of activism, and (3) means of organization for collective action.

Research Findings

[40] Interviews were digitally recorded, transcribed, and coded for common themes and insights relevant to the aims of the research. A number of prominent themes emerged from the respondents including ways in which they label themselves in both a political and

religious context. In order to allow for a qualitatively rich account, answer choices were not provided to the respondents; rather, they were allowed to self-identify. Interestingly, when asked about their political self-identity, a striking number of respondents refused to accept any political label whatsoever (see Table 1).

Table 1. Political Self-Identification

Label	#	Rank
No Affiliation	17	1
Progressive	9	2
Democrat	6	3
Center	4	4
Liberal	4	4
Independent	3	5

[41] A significant number of the respondents were clearly politically educated and active, yet expressed a sincere struggle in identifying with any single political party. Two examples:

That's more complicated just because with two choices, none of the labels actually fit, you know? Christian actually fits me and I'll say to someone I believe that Jesus is my Savior, that's how I define Christian so that's how I identify. I would tell someone that I voted for the Democratic party in the last election and that I align myself with them more often than I align myself with the Republican party, but really neither one of those labels is actually accurate, which is why I wouldn't use them.

Politically I registered as no party defined, which is even worse than Independent - even less associational than Independent. It's sort of like a real big stick-it-to-the-man. I would say that my social agenda is pretty liberal in that I desire equality and justice for all peoples, but I would also say that I'm pretty fiscally conservative.

[42] In an effort to navigate between the politics of the left and right, nine of the respondents labeled themselves politically progressive. For example:

I try to avoid labels just because there's no good that can come out of labeling myself in any particular way because of the culture wars. Like if I called myself a political liberal, I hate that label. I hate the term liberal, I don't want to identify as liberal because to me that's become associated with this whole sort of general secularism and looking down at Middle America and the South and just drinking a latte. I would say I'm progressive.

[43] Likewise, the respondents were remarkably leery of religious labels. In many cases, even those who attended denominational churches did not identify with the religious body to which they formally belonged (see Table 2). They might attend a congregation with family or

friends, but felt somewhat isolated in terms of theological conviction or commitment to social justice. For example:

To be quite honest with you, I would love to accept no labels whatsoever. I mean none. I actually don't even like the title Christian. To say that for me simply means Evangelical, where I'm at and where I've been, and I really like the idea that personally and the community I've been a part of, we're just fashioning lives in the way of Jesus. I don't know what that label is but again, you don't really have to label yourself, people will label it for you. But I mean really, I really don't want any labels whatsoever.

Table 2. Religious Self-Identification

Label	#	Rank
No Affiliation	16	1
Follower of Christ	13	2
Evangelical	5	3
Presbyterian	2	4
Progressive Christian	2	4
Catholic	1	5
Episcopal	1	5
Methodist	1	5
Protestant	1	5
Small "b" baptist*	1	5

*Note: The phrase "Small 'b' baptist" is meant to distinguish the respondent's affiliation with the Anabaptist tradition from formal Baptist denominational membership.

[44] The second most recurring theme in terms of religious labeling was "Follower of Christ." This term seemed to capture the personal commitments of the respondents, yet distance them from any formal obligation to traditional denominations. According to one respondent:

I really identify more with the term Christ-follower, because the label "Christian" has gotten so skewed and perverted and people don't understand what that means anymore, especially in this part of the country. So I usually identify myself as a Christ-follower. Beyond that, the details all come out in conversation.

[45] Although the interviewer did not explicitly seek to gain information regarding the respondent's satisfaction with his/her religious affiliation, a significant tone of religious frustration marked their accounts. In fact, over three-quarters of the respondents expressed some type of frustration with their personal "church" experiences. The following three accounts are typical:

Even though my background is ministry, I see myself working at a non-profit because right now the way our nation is, churches aren't working together. There could be 20 churches in a three-mile radius and they're all doing independent things and not really trying to change the community together.

For Evangelicals, it feels like trying to mesh water and oil. They don't get the fact that they're supposed to go together [personal faith and social responsibility]. So yeah, it's frustrating for me because with my work education and theological education, I would love to apply my skills in a church setting, but finding the right situation is going to be tough.

The church really has let the poor down in a great many ways, and so in order to deal with economic justice, we're probably going to have to go outside of the church to actually reach the poor that are first-hand affected.

It is worth noting that, although the respondents expressed these frustrations, they did not seem in any way paralyzed by their criticism. They had either found novel ways of expressing their faith and activism or were actively seeking ways to do so.

[46] The research revealed a number of key theological characteristics related to the individual's sense of: (1) christology – notions of the person and teachings of Jesus, (2) soteriology – ideas about religious “salvation” and the priority of evangelism, (3) eschatology – feelings about the “end times” and the implications such views have on present life, and (4) ecclesiology – understanding of the church and its role in society. In terms of christology, references to Jesus characterized him more as a practical exemplar than as a spiritual savior.

We have to figure out how to preserve the very best of what we have and offer Jesus to the world in a way that people can understand. That doesn't mean dumbing it down or watering it down, I think it means going back to who Jesus really was in the first place, which was someone who really didn't find his identity in his prestige or his status within the social or the religious structure, but who found his identity by loving those people in the world who the world hadn't loved.

The vast majority of references to Jesus were rooted in stories of his compassion and service to others. He was seen as the “way” to God because of his extraordinary life as opposed to his sacrificial death. Respondents repeatedly cited accounts of Jesus found in the Gospels as a model for their own ministries and service. Their movement away from “crucicentrism” represents a significant departure from Bebbington's distinct features of evangelicalism. One can resolve this tension by either claiming that the sample does not represent evangelicals, or that they do in fact represent a “new” form of evangelicalism that are not adequately described by Bebbington's typology. At any rate, this represents a complexity in the research that can be addressed in a subsequent work.

[47] In terms of their views on religious conversion, although there was some discussion of their own “salvation” experiences, there was *not* a sense of mandate for crisis conversion events. This represents a significant departure from the traditional evangelical notion of conversion and the place of evangelism in the Christian mission. Note the following two responses:

The rich young ruler says, “I can’t do that,” and Jesus says, “All right then.” He doesn’t chase after him or rework the message to try and convince him that he’s going to go to hell if he doesn’t do it. Jesus lays out what he believes and what needs to happen for somebody to achieve eternal peace, and if somebody’s not jiving with the turkey, then that’s it, that’s okay. I think that’s something that was overwhelmingly true about who Jesus was as a person, that he met people where they were and didn’t really pressure them into any sort of decision.

To be honest with you, I’m not sure I’m even concerned with – I know I’m not – I’m not concerned with someone giving their heart and life to Jesus anymore. I really am just concerned with just loving God and loving our neighbors as ourselves, and as much as we love God, I’m not interested in that agenda anymore. I mean I really am just interested in serving people.

[48] It is important to note that the respondents did not indicate a lesser degree of fervor to impact people’s lives, it just appears that the central message has been altered in this sample population. Whereas the traditionally stereotypical evangelical mission might be to “save souls,” their motivation and message is much more dictated by present physical circumstances. In this way, the respondents reflected a *present-focused* eschatology with the goal of creating a just society. There were no references to an after-life or any other form of dispensationalist theology:

Our goal is building the kingdom. Jesus prayed for the kingdom to come on earth as it is in heaven. That’s about making this world consistent with the way God calls us to live. So part of my goal with folks in my congregation is to get them out of the church and into the world in some sort of setting where they can experience what the world is like for other people and maybe be a part of some way of making the world better.

Rob Bell gave this amazing message on salvation and talked about salvation starting now and this is a revolutionary way you live now and you’re bringing heaven down, and it’s not about going there later. So that just transformed everything with both me and my husband. It made our faith bigger and more exciting, and then it added this kind of sacred calling onto taking care of the earth and taking care of the people around us that needed care and a voice.

[49] The final theological characteristic explored was the respondent’s feelings about the church and its proper place in society. Among the theological categories, this rose to the surface as the primary emphasis. Although “church” was spoken of in both the institutional and prophetic sense, respondents tended toward identification with – or desire to affiliate with – a counter-cultural community marked by a commitment to social justice issues. Furthermore, there was a strong attraction to *community* as the key identifying characteristic of a faithful congregation.

I believe the church is a community of followers of Jesus who are on a mission, who care about the things that Jesus cared about. We strive to work for the oppressed and marginalized and those who don’t have a life, those

who are stuck in this cyclical poverty and they can't break free for numerous reasons.

Often times, respondents indicated a sense of conflict between their political aspirations and their desire to participate in the countercultural life of the church community. The following response is typical:

I'm torn because I personally like Obama; however, I am a steward of the church and I'm not sure that my calling is to be, and help people be enlightened, active participants in a liberal Democratic process. It's a problem to me when you can walk in to a Senator's office and say, "No complaints here, keep up the good work." That bothers me because it appears that the striving to perfection is over. We got their vote. I'm not happy with that. We're still fighting wars. We spend more on military than anything else. We send guns to countries before we do food. We rape the earth a little less than we used to and say we're making "progress." Maybe people are called to lobby and let politicians know they are being watched by people of faith, but I can't do it. I can't lead children in saying the Lord's Prayer every Sunday and then lobby the rest of the week. God's kingdom on earth is one we need to realize and awaken to and discover and it might not have a damn thing to do with Washington.

[50] Two additional points of interest emerged from the interviews. The first was the surprising proclivity of the respondents to comprehend the interrelated nature of social issues. They were committed to such individual causes as fighting homelessness, war, torture, global slave trade, genocide, and abortion, but they articulated an understanding of how concerns such as poverty and environmental sustainability affected all issues in profound ways. In this way, they were "pro-life" in the fullest sense as they focused on means of improving quality of life from birth to death.

[51] Second, as the interviewer probed for the respondent's key theological or ideological influences, a common list of individuals emerged. The top five most referenced authors and practitioners were: Jim Wallis, Brian McLaren, Shane Claiborne, N. T. Wright, and Rob Bell. It is interesting to note that, regardless of the respondent's predisposition to reject evangelicalism as a label, they are being influenced by key evangelicals working to articulate the public nature of their faith tradition.

[52] A significant portion of each interview was spent exploring the respondent's mode of activism and perceived means of organizing for collective action. A striking finding involves the way in which the respondents perceive the nature of their faith-based work and the approach they use to realize it. Seventy-two percent of the group focuses their activism at the *local* level as opposed to national/global advocacy. Furthermore, a majority of the respondents (58%) approach their activism through a *development* framework as opposed to *service*. Essentially this means they focus on such qualities as relationship and community building, reciprocity, and sustainability as opposed to occasional charity-style events.

The number one way to get out of poverty is actually through entrepreneurial activities. We should always give in a way which preserves the godliness of

the people we are also giving to. And I'd love to see a Christian perspective on social entrepreneurial, but I haven't found it.

When I worked in southeast DC with this ministry I had a chance to be engaged in some structural issues. And so that's when my eyes first opened to, oh my gosh, we can love these young kids but if we don't change the educational system down there, there's still a very low chance they're going to graduate from school and be able to then get jobs that pay.

[53] Perhaps the most interesting and pressing question in this research concerns the new evangelicals' ability to organize themselves for collective action. There are three key insights gleaned from the interviews that are important to emphasize: (1) the group generally embraces diversity and sees working across differences as a key virtue to being a faithful Christian and addressing society's problems; (2) there is a common skepticism of protest and other mobilizing tactics because they are seen as divisive and typically unproductive; and (3) the respondents are exploring innovative modes of development and service aimed at strengthening communities and improving quality of life. These insights are expressed in the following responses:

I would like to see more creativity from people who are committed to social justice and just more creativity in the forms of grassroots action. I'd like to see more comprehensive interfaith efforts, more people working together. For example, it's very common to still see a lot of the tactics that were made popular in the Sixties, but I think that I'd like to see something else - just more creativity in grassroots kind of mobilizing.

I've been to a handful of peace marches, but I don't actually like the peace march because it seemed not constructive, like there's a lot of angry flag waving and a lot of George Bush picture burning. I don't have to be reminded that I don't like the war. Instead, we have a community meal every Thursday. So probably anywhere from 10 to 30 people come over for dinner, and it's a potluck and a lot of people have met each other that way. I do think that networking is an invaluable tool to make projects happen.

So like the way this started was in my local neighborhood, we started just reaching out to people and helping them. One of the things we found in our neighborhood was we had a ton of single moms who'd gone through a divorce and one of the things they always had less of was just good, quality food. So we developed a relationship with local businesses to pick up about \$1000 worth of perishable and non-perishable goods from grocery stores in the area, and we put it in our garage and we share food with our neighbors, people that need help. So what I can do is begin to put all of those different services and ideas together, because it's not just what I can do, but it's more about creating a network where people who have ideas like that can share those ideas and share those resources. So now I have friends in California who go pick up food at Trader Joe's and out of their house they distribute food to their neighbors. And I have friends in Dayton who do the same thing. And so we're able to kind of all work together at the grassroots.

[54] The findings summarized above reveal characteristics of a new evangelical population that both supports accounts from current literature and, in some important ways, extends beyond those reports to show a growing mass of young, passionate Christians committed to finding innovative ways of addressing complex problems. A key challenge going forward will be to consider the implications for these findings as they relate to the ability of these Christians to form a cohesive social movement. It is clear they are sharing an increasingly common set of beliefs based on a shared commitment to social justice; however, it is less clear they have a unified sense of belongingness or an established network for informal interaction. In this case, “belongingness” most directly relates to these young evangelicals’ ability to form a shared narrative that will animate their collective action. Based on what has been presented here, the clear challenge rests in the *search* for this framing story. Given the commonality of “crisis” – as reaction to contemporary forms of Christian fundamentalism – there is great impetus for organization, but their general tendency toward decentralization will necessitate innovative means of collaboration and coalition building.

[55] It is noteworthy the number of respondents who had a sense they were a part of a potentially enormous movement, yet felt quite alone in their day-to-day interactions and work. In this way, the potential New Evangelical Movement is not yet like the Moral Majority or the Christian Coalition in so far as they have a single base of ideological operation. In fact, it is unclear that these evangelicals even desire such an institutional base. Their reluctance to adopt political or religious labels makes formal membership in any group challenging. Those interested in organizing these new evangelicals are faced with a unique challenge of navigating critical terminology and understanding the ways in which this generation uses social media and other forms of informal networking.

Conclusion

[56] This article began with a statement from Robert Putnam indicating the historical significance of evangelicals in progressive social change. The aim of this work has been to explore the possibility of a growing New Evangelical movement in the United States. One of the most pressing concerns in this regard is investigating the character of social movements in order to articulate the nature of this emerging form of evangelicalism, particularly expressed by the younger generation. This investigation necessarily involves an understanding of the long history of evangelicalism’s theological and social engagement.

[57] The “crisis” among new evangelicals appears evident as they increasingly disassociate from the Religious Right and take up a progressive theological agenda oriented toward social justice – with an emphasis on a broad range of social issues. What is less clear is how they develop a shared narrative and means of sustained informal interaction. Despite the lack of an apparent organizational center, there are significant commonalities among the new evangelicals. The most significant of these shared aims is their growing agenda, which places an emphasis on social justice issues and the degree to which their theological expression is intimately bound to the exercise of social responsibility.

[58] This key goal is being increasingly expressed through innovative social activism and entrepreneurship. Although increased technology is not replacing the need for face-to-face relationships, it is expanding the means by which this new generation of evangelicals is connecting with one another’s shared self-interest. This is evident through the qualitative

research presented in this article, as the respondents were determined through a random sample of an online Facebook group. The participants of this group were able to informally interact in ways previously not possible. As we move into a new decade, one cannot help but wonder how the energy and creativity of these young evangelicals will impact a world saturated with such complex problems. No doubt, the race is on among politicians, researchers, and clergy alike to answer this very question.

Bibliography

Arendt, H.

1977 *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought*. New York: Penguin.

Balmer, R.

2006 *Thy Kingdom Come: How the Religious Right Distorts the Faith and Threatens America*. New York: Basic Books.

Bebbington, D.

1989 *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Blumer, H.

1939 "Collective Behavior." Pp. 219-80 in *An Outline of the Principles of Sociology*. Edited by R. Park. New York: Barnes and Noble.

Burke, S.

2007 *Out of the Ooze: Unlikely Love Letters to the Church from Beyond the Pew*. Colorado Springs: Navpress.

Campolo, T.

2008 *Red Letter Christians: A Citizen's Guide to Faith & Politics*. Ventura: Regal.

Carpenter, J. A.

1997 *Revive us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Christian Life

1956 "Is Evangelical Theology Changing?" *Christian Life* (March): 16-19.

Christianity Today

1956 "Why Christianity Today?" *Christianity Today* (October 15): 20-23.

Claiborne, S.

2009 "What If Jesus Meant All That Stuff?" *Esquire* (November 20). Available online at <http://www.esquire.com/features/best-and-brightest-2009/shane-claiborne-1209>.

- Diani, M.
1992 "The Concept of Social Movement." *The Sociological Review* 40: 1-25.
- Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research
2004 *Evangelicals in America*. Washington D.C.
2008a *Religion and America's Role in the World*. Washington D.C.
2008b *Young Evangelical Christians and the 2008 Election: Survey Results*. Washington D.C.
- Gushee, D. P.
2008 *The Future of Faith in American Politics: The Public Witness of the Evangelical Center*. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Gutterman, D. S.
2005 *Prophetic Politics: Christian Social Movements and American Democracy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
2006 "Stories of Sinfulness: Narrative Identity in America." Pp. 73-79 in *Religion, Politics, and American Identity: New Directions, New Controversies*. Edited by D. S. Gutterman and A. R. Murphy. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Henry, C. F. H.
1947 *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Hunter, J. C.
2008 *A New Kind of Conservative*. Ventura: Regal.
- Jones, R. P.
2008 *Progressive & Religious: How Christian, Jewish, Muslim, and Buddhist Leaders Are Moving Beyond the Culture Wars and Transforming American Public Life*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mac Iver, M. A.
1990 "Mirror Images? Conceptions of God and Political Duty on the Left and Right of the Evangelical Spectrum." *Sociological Analysis* 51: 287-95.
- MacIntyre, A.
1981 *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Marsden, G. M.
1998 *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

McCune, R. D.

- 1999 "The Formation of the New Evangelicalism (Part Two): Historical Beginnings." *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 4: 109-50.

Noll, M. A.

- 1994 *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Olson, R. E.

- 2008 *How to be Evangelical Without Being Conservative*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Public Religion Research

- 2008a *Quick Facts About the Emerging Evangelical Center*. Washington D.C.

- 2008b *Religion in the 2008 Election: Post-Election Survey*. Washington D.C.

Putnam, Robert

- 2007 "From Passion to Politics: What Moves People to Take Action?" Princeton Colloquium on Public and International Affairs (April 20).

Ricoeur, P.

- 1990 *Time and Narrative: Volume 1*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rogers, R., and P. G. Heltzel

- 2008 "The New Evangelical Politics." *Society* 45: 412-14.

Sider, R. J.

- 1974 *The Chicago Declaration*. Carol Stream: Creation House.

Strang, C.

- 2008 "What it Means to Be Whole-Life." *Relevant Magazine* (November/December): 8.

Taylor, S.

- 2008 "Religious but not right; Moderate stance more popular with evangelicals." *The Washington Times* (April 11): A02.

Weeks, D. L.

- 1998 "Carl F.H. Henry's Moral Arguments for Evangelical Political Activism." *Journal of Church and State* 40: 83-93.