

Money; Technology; the Unreached

Our Father, You are a great and marvelous God. You are mighty, the creator and ruler of all things. You have showed Your grace, faithfulness, and mercy to Your people despite the fact that we have so consistently in the direct wake of Your miraculous works of grace—whether that has been delivering us from Egypt, taking us to the Red Sea, or even sending the Lord Jesus and giving us Your very presence by Your Holy Spirit—have turned our backs on You and calculated that our ways were better than Your ways. Throughout, You have remained faithful, and Your grace and love are constant. We bless You and thank You for Your mercy and faithfulness. Thank You, O God, for working so mightily and wonderfully so as to bring all sorts of people together in Your Son. As we as Your people walk before You, we pray for Your continued guidance and help. O Lord, we face difficult times and challenges in various places in the world where we are, whether that is in areas of particular religious plurality, political instability, war, nervousness, or being frightened of attacks. We face the often daunting challenge of sin in our own hearts and fears and uncertainties before us. Yet we look back, recognize, and acknowledge how you have worked. We are glad for Your presence in our hearts today and trust that You will draw close to Your people in situations today that face genuine life or death circumstances, illness, poverty, or lack of food. For those of us who live in relative abundance, we face different sorts of temptations and challenges. We trust, O God, that You will be with us and lead us. As we here seek to be better equipped and trained to serve You, we pray for Your help and guidance. As we meet together in this class, O God, we look to You to help and lead. We ask it in Jesus' name. Amen.

Let me go over another of the recommended books about missions. This one is probably not as well known as some of the others; it is called *Readings in Dynamic Indigeneity*, and it is edited by Charles Kraft and Tom Wisley. Tom Wisley is with the Christian Missionary Alliance and is a former colleague of mine at Tokyo Christian University in Japan. Charles Kraft is a name that is widely known when you talk about missiological thinking and matters such as contextualization. Dynamic equivalence is one phrase that he has kneaded, tweaked, explored, and written heavily about. Dynamically equivalent churches, theology, and structures all come into play via Kraft. This book was put out back in the 1980s and has a number of writers. It is not as well-known, but I commend it to you because of its stimulating thinking. They have genuinely incorporated a number of writers from around the world, including Latin America, Asia, and Africa. I greatly appreciate that. Charles Kraft is one of the writers, and he is very influential. You need to be familiar with him, especially when you start talking about contextualization. He goes more toward the side of the context determining what happens, sometimes in ways that make a lot of people nervous. He has many helpful things to say about contextualization and what that means for all of us in the Christian church. If you plan to move in that area of research and writing, Kraft is a name you need to know.

Let us pick back up with topic 23, which we started in the last lesson. We overviewed Mission to the World (MTW) and the International Mission Board (IMB) of the Southern Baptists. We also began the whole topic of strategies and technology. We ended with Shenk and Bonk.

To speak of MTW and others with respect to strategies and technology, as we already mentioned, MTW and many North American and evangelical mission agencies are focused on beginning church planting movements. They do not want to just plant individual churches but begin a whole church planting movement. One of the conscious adjustments that mission organizations like MTW have made is to have missionaries become more intentional about being trainers and equippers supporting indigenous workers as opposed to being frontline church planters. There is a heated discussion about the rightness of that approach. That is much of what MTW seeks to do with its own missionaries. I have been in on some of

those inner discussions, and some people say, "If we are not on the frontlines as well, we will lose our cutting edge. How are we going to be able to train and equip people if that happens?" That is one sort of an adjustment that MTW has made. MTW has what was originally called a global church-planting network, which is now called the Global Training and Development Team. About a half a dozen people are stationed in various parts of the world and are resources and networkers who help all sorts of people be better equipped for church planting. They draw on the resources of Redeemer Presbyterian Church in New York and others for training and equipping missionaries and national church planters. I hesitate to use the phrase "national," because if we are not careful, it can perpetuate the Christendom distinction that we make. It differentiates those who are the goers and the people who do missions from the nationals, who are the ones who work at home. We forget that we all are national and all are international. Be that as it may, that is part of the strategy of MTW. MTW and other mission agencies have opened up more recently to be more intentional about medical missions and ministry to street children. MTW is not so much into radio ministry, although that continues with Transworld Radio and other mission organizations. There are all sorts of particularized mission strategies that groups have. For example, some work with seamen around the world, military personnel, and others. Be aware of that.

One matter we mentioned earlier is about the issue of local churches versus mission agencies carrying out cross-cultural international missions. In the past decade or so in North America in particular, many local congregations have said that it is their calling to send missionaries. It is not just the case that they need to sit there and send resources to the mission agencies to let them do all the work. There is a jockeying for position and attempts to constructively cooperate in this transition. I think MTW has made a very constructive, genuine effort that has been very helpful in working with local congregations in North America to be about cross-cultural missions efforts. MTW does things like grouping up churches in the United States that would have a similar interest. For example, they might put together half a dozen churches in America to coordinate with half a dozen churches in Mexico to work together. MTW has helped coordinate a number of different churches in America who, beginning 10 years ago, had significant involvements in Eastern Europe. Within that whole commission effort (where different mission agencies worked together after the fall of the wall in 1989), different agencies reached some comity agreements of taking responsibility for different areas. The reason that many churches that you know have involvements in the Ukraine, for example, is because MTW received particular responsibility for the Ukraine. MTW has coordinated different churches in the United States to do different things in the Ukraine, and they know what each other does. Paul Alexander recently retired as a pastor of Westminster Church in Huntsville, Alabama, where he had been the pastor for about 42 years. He is spending two years as the coordinator of MTW's efforts in the Ukraine. That is part of that important issue. Money is involved, because local churches have to choose whether to send their own people or to send money to mission agencies. You have to make difficult choices when you are on missions committees in local congregations. As a missions agency, you have to cooperate with churches along that line.

Let us talk further about money a bit. Jonathan Bonk talks about grappling with affluence. He seeks to give some concrete suggestions on how to proceed amid the current situation of affluence that North American churches and missionaries find themselves in relative to many other parts of the world. He suggests that you start with yourself and have networks of people who want to live more simply to resist some of the risks of affluence. You start with certain mission agencies, congregations, and denominations forming particular partnerships with various people. Bonk seeks to try to make it practical. It is a practical issue, and it is not an easy one.

Just yesterday, for example, we got a prayer letter from North American missionaries whom we know. They are doing effective work in a particular country that has far less developed living standards than

many of us have in the United States. They have just moved to this area, and their letter had a picture of their new house, which is a beautiful looking house. I have been to this place, and I know how most people live. It is not like the house that is in the picture. Having lived as a cross-cultural missionary in Japan, where there is a similar sort of affluence that you have here but not the same as housing space for most people, I know that struggle. It is not an easy struggle.

Jonathan Bonk has issued some particular criticisms regarding the struggle with affluence. I know Jonathan, and he knows those struggles, too. He is a very sensitive and warm person, and he is not the kind of guy who will just criticize. He is genuinely seeking to wrestle over this and provide some suggestions in approaching the issue. He leans toward one end of the spectrum about what to do about affluence. Generally speaking, those of us in the Reformed tradition have an appreciation of the goodness of creation and enjoying God's good gifts to us as His people. We want to take Paul seriously in 1 Timothy 4 where he says all good gifts (like marriage and food) are good. As a result, we tend to lean toward appreciating and being able to live in the midst of affluence. We might be on a different point of the scale than the tenor of some of the readings we have looked at. It is not an easy issue, and it often comes down to what it means for me. How am I going to live with different people? How do we trust each other? I know as I have been with different people where our living standards are different that the matter of personal trust, coming to a place where you share, and feeling like you belong to each other and can accept each other are very fundamental. Issues of lifestyle, living standards, and use of technology are not simple matters. I think the theological moorings, as Bonk calls them, about the incarnation and how Jesus lived, are powerful motifs for us to consider. The great effectiveness cross-culturally of missionaries, whether they are medieval monks or present-day immigrants from third-world countries, seeing people come to Christ and having a ministry for the Gospel out of poverty is something to be reckoned with.

Some have said that often times missionaries will seek to live at the same level of middle to upper-class people so it is better to reach them and target them with the Gospel. What about intentionally living at a lower socioeconomic level? Will that risk being looked down on by other people, and how might that be effective? It is an interesting question and one that is tough to answer. I would have to look at my own heart in the situation in offering possible criticism. It could be that the only reason that you say you want to reach a certain level of people where you live is because you want to live at that level. I would want to look at my own heart and see the validity of that strategically, relationally, and personally. There is certainly something to be said for people in middle-class situations seeing an intentional move toward living below that. Out of admiration and conviction, they have seen the power of the Gospel. I have had people who live at comfortable standards remark to me that what often moves them about the Christian faith and religion in general is the willingness to sacrifice. That could be a maneuver to reach others.

To change the topic a bit, in relating to people in less developed areas, often times they say that they do not expect and do not want North American missionaries to attempt to live at their level. They know we do not live that way. They know who we are, and that is fine. They want to honor us by allowing us to live at the best that is available in their country. There are those sorts of dynamics that go on as well. Some people on the receiving side could feel insulted or awkward about an attempt from a missionary to live like they do. It is an interesting dynamic.

In the United States, the church might make specific decisions regarding how it should live for the sake of the Gospel and thinking of Gospel outreach socio-economically. I find myself often times amazed at God's seeming willingness to have His people in all sorts of situations. This includes situations where I wish He would not allow people to be. For example, by a certain line of thought, it is easy to think that all the wealth and affluence that so many Christian people have is just not right. We should just give it

all away. Yet the Lord seems to have so many of His people in well-to-do situations. Many of these people are the godliest people who use their resources for the sake of the kingdom. God seems not only willing but pleased and intent on having His people in those circumstances. When you look at the Scriptures, while I am of the mind that there is a preference for those who are in oppressed and disadvantaged situations, at the same time there is a continual, blessed, and useful presence of the Lord's people in all sorts of situations. In the New Testament, there are people who have means who help to support Paul and the ministries. Just think of all the incredible resources that so many of the Lord's people use for good. If God is willing to have His people in various situations, despite the fact that I might think it is wrong, I need to take a step back. That is a whole other dynamic to the situation.

For instance, churches in a fresh position of evaluating and looking at a building program should ask the missiological-type questions of who they want to reach and how that might best be done. They should not simply go along with the ride because it is comfortable. They need to think in missiological terms. It will not be that case that our thinking is pure. You have probably seen situations like I have where building programs really pull churches apart. I have seen building programs where some say they should give all their money toward missions and not build a new building. That is a powerful argument. Yet as the Lord leads His people together, that is powerful too. To be able to fight together as the Lord's people and as bound together by His Holy Spirit under His Word seems to be appropriate.

In terms of missionary financial support, let me mention that there are different ways that missionaries and mission organizations are financed. One of them is through what the Southern Baptists have called the cooperative program. I have also termed this the central pot. In this, related churches, congregations, and groups contribute toward a central fund. Missionaries and projects are funded out of that. Another way of doing it is that funds are raised by the missionaries. Most evangelical organizations fall into this category, including MTW. Some churches have a combination of these, for example, the Christian Reformed Church (CRC). CRCs will have first-term missionaries not have to raise their support. They are an unknown quantity, and it is difficult to raise the funds. Their funds are raised out of a central pot that churches give toward. Once they become more established and churches know who they are, they raise their own support so that other first-time missionaries do not have to go through that. That is a creative combination. In a way, MTW has a combination too, because congregations will give toward administrative costs. There are askings that all of our General Assembly committees have, to where if everyone were to give a certain amount per head, it would cover the need.

Then you have faith missions, which began anew in the modern missions movement in the mid-nineteenth century. This is when you do not broadcast your financial needs, but you trust God and go. God will supply your needs. There is the tent-making approach, where you go and work where you are to earn your income. That is how you supply your needs. Personally I find myself quite pragmatic about all of these. I do not have any particular biblical conviction about the exclusive use of any of these. They all strike me as legitimate. I have been a part of those arguments that are very heated about one way being the only way to raise money. I grew up in one church tradition and shifted to another, and the missionary funding systems were different. When I went to start raising my support, I had a lot of people who knew me ask what I was doing. That might be part of what some of you encounter as well. I find myself more pragmatic about this.

One of the other much-debated issues in our day with respect to mission support is whether you should send money to indigenous workers and missionaries or just send missionaries. The basic argument is that sending missionaries from North America is very expensive because of the living standards and all the support that is required. You send someone who usually does not know that particular language or culture. It will take a long time for them to get adjusted. Even as they get adjusted, it is not certain how

effective they will be. For the amount of money that you can send a typical North American family, you can support oodles of other indigenous workers who will be much more effective. That is the argument toward supporting indigenous workers.

The argument that says we need to send missionaries has a couple of points to it. One is that if you send money to other people, you will create unhealthy dependence on funds. Second, people say that if you do not send your own sons or daughters into various places, you will not be able to maintain your own cross-cultural mission involvement and intensity. Third, as a matter of fact, there are significant contributions that North American missionaries make, have made, and will continue to make. To represent those sides, an article was written in the August 1999 issue of *Frontiers* about avoiding dependence. Robertson McQuilken, who is a well-known evangelical mission leader, wrote it. He was a missionary in Japan and then president of Columbia International University in South Carolina. He says that money corrupts when you send it. You do not read in the New Testament where money was sent to support churches and workers. You saw money given for relief efforts, but churches were self-supporting. It will take away from their own growth and discipleship to send money. It runs the danger of creating dependency. That is McQuilken's article. Ralph Winter notes that it does not have to be an either/or type of question, and I agree with that.

Another piece was written by an organization called Mission Link, which partners with national missionaries around the world. They say that native missionaries get the job done, and 80 percent of unreached people live in countries effectively closed to the Gospel by traditional missionaries. Their arguments say that there are two significant ways to fulfill the Great Commission. One, you could send Westerners to the world, and we should go. There will always be a need to do this. The second is by supporting nationals to reach their world. God has raised up thousands of national missionaries throughout the world uniquely suited to reach their country for Christ. Mission Link Internationals and others support national church planters and missionary workers. They have seven reasons for doing so. First, they are culturally conditioned, and second, they do not need to spend years studying the language. Third, they are physically and psychologically adjusted, and fourth, they have rights and privileges. Fifth, it is easier to organize. Sixth, they do not need to go home on furlough. Seventh, they are economically conditioned to live on much less.

That is the type of argument that takes place a lot. When you work on missions committees in your local church, these are the sorts of questions that come up. Churches tend to go in one direction or another. Where you are as a local congregation makes a difference too. If you live in south Florida, your situation is different than if you are at a church in Iowa. The type of people who want support, need support, and ask for support will probably be different. I know of congregations who have established as their policy not to support any more Western missionaries. They want to support only indigenous national workers. I do not think it is an either/or type of question, personally.

There is concern over using the argument that more missionaries need to go to unreached peoples than presently do. People cite the statistic that an incredibly high percentage of missionaries go to reached peoples. Is using that argument legitimate in light of the recognized need that formerly reached peoples need missionary work as well? It is an interesting question, and I submit once again that understanding where we are historically can help to parse out the issues involved in that type of question. In other words, we have been in a modern missions movement that has been Western based. We are at the tail end of that. Some people are beyond that, and for them it is something of the past. For others it is still very much the mode of operation. The whole understanding of missions is related to it. Is missions just reaching unreached peoples, or is it more comprehensive than that?

I have suggested in this course that we need to think of God's world mission as something that is more comprehensive. In doing so, I do not want to take off the edge of the worldwide church's calling, mandate, and need to continue to focus on unreached peoples receiving the Gospel. I think it is fair to say that the ethos of this MTW manual, which is a few years old, is representative of working within a modern missions movement mindset: "From the West to the rest." It is not only that because there is recognition there are missionaries in other parts of the world. But the mission is reaching other peoples out there with the Gospel. There would be agreement by whoever put this together that it is God's mission and a comprehensive thing, but the focus is very much on reaching unreached peoples. That is what missions is. Using the argument of the statistics is one statistic that needs to be taken into account. If nothing else, we must not let ourselves off the hook.

One concern that I have in emphasizing the comprehensive, worldwide nature of the mission of the Gospel is that people who need to consider the possibility of ministering elsewhere cross-culturally can be let off the hook. That is why I do not want to be misunderstood to say that wherever you are is okay. In one sense that is true, but in another sense, not only are there people who have yet to hear, but the glory of ministering cross-culturally and the good that you can do ought to continue to push and challenge all of us. I approach this comment in different ways by pointing to where we are in history so we can split out what informs different assumptions in the discussion of what missions is.

The MTW manual gives statistics from Advancing Church Mission Congregations (ACMC). They put out a lot of information to produce missions-minded churches. I suggest that the posture is squarely within the modern missions movement in terms of what missions is all about. That is not necessarily a criticism, but it is an observation of how the historical transition takes place. Page 5 of the manual talks about missions the way it used to be and missions the way it was in the 1990s. "Missionaries start with terms of two years or less, called to strategic vision, do partnership, development, and fundraising." MTW has changed since then, and there is much more of an emphasis on missionaries being supportive of indigenous missionaries. It is accurate for North American churches that so many local congregations want to be involved in particular projects. They want to build a medical center, give money, and send medical teams. They focus on one thing, whether it is a home for children or a particular Bible translation project. One church could really give itself to something for five years and see something happen. That is very much on the agenda of many local congregations, especially in North America and Korea. Even the way missions was in the 1990s has changed, including for MTW. Page 14 talks about why a mission conference is important. They "want to move mission and evangelism from one of several priorities via a paradigm shift to having the Great Commission at the center of things." I suggest that that is within a modern missions movement framework. To me, it is not integrated enough to see the full nature of God's covenantal commitment to redeeming His world and all that that calls forth from us as His people. His mission is more seamless. You can split out what worship, evangelism, and nurture are, but to set the Great Commission as the main thing does not seem to allow for the more seamless and comprehensive nature of God's mission to grab a hold of us.

Faith-promise giving is something that you will encounter in your particular church or system. I feel similarly about this to the way I was with the missionary support. Personally, there is biblical support for this, and it works well for many congregations. Different congregations employ faith-promise giving or do not employ it in their own particular ways. Some congregations raise all of their missions support through faith promise. Some congregations do not use faith promise at all. Some congregations have a combination of faith-promise and budget-designated giving. There are all sorts of creative ways that churches do it, and I think they are all fine. I do not have any objection to faith-promise giving. I think it is a great way that God has used to stir up people to give toward helpful projects. It is certainly a way that MTW recommends for churches to use. There are testimonies that I run across all the time of

churches who say that they did not get any giving toward any project outside of themselves until they started a faith-promise program. Now they see all sorts of money, energy, and interest directed outside of themselves. That is a good response. I do not necessarily want to say it is the only way to raise money for missions, but it is a helpful suggestion that can be employed properly.

It has been commented that on either side of the argument of whether to send missionaries or money it seems to be a pragmatic argument. Therefore we need to look at the compelling and foundational reason for going. I think that either side assumes that the whole compelling reason that we are concerned about this in the first place is that people need to hear the Gospel. It is a matter of determining the most effective way to accomplish that and meet that need. The items of concern in the argument are effectiveness and doing it in an economical way and being good stewards in accomplishing the goal of seeing people reached with the Gospel. The compelling reason is for people to hear the Gospel, but it is a matter of being strategic. Even in the midst of the pragmatic arguments, we want to recognize that there is the underlying compulsion that people hear the Gospel.

There is desire for effectiveness and being businesslike on the mission field, yet the reality is that many missionaries serve faithfully but do not see results. This leads to discussion about getting the best results for the money. Different people evaluate that by saying that it is just the business mentality taking over what should be governed by faithfulness to God's leading. Therefore they think we need to back off from this talk of effectiveness and instead stress faithfulness whatever the results are. There are some people who counter that by saying that there are records in the Scriptures of numbers and results recorded. That gives glory to God, and it is a tangible goal for people to reach for. They say it lets them off the hook by just talking about faithfulness only, as important as that obviously is. Certainly you can see the pragmatic, business-type approach and strategizing to be effective that is a part of the mentality of some missionaries.

How you want to evaluate that might be the next appropriate question. I would stand for the need to be faithful for the recognition that God works in ways that we do not predict and often times do not see or acknowledge. I am for the need, especially where big money is involved, to be able to give credible proposals for why you need the money and how it is being used. Necessarily proper business organizational matters come into play at that point. One reason for sending people would be to continue to spread the Reformed faith and Calvinism. Those of us who understand that theology have an ongoing need to share that theological tradition. It has been noted that the matter of wanting to be effective and see results could lead to unfavorable or negative possibilities. For instance, it could value missions-related ministries that involve conversions and church planting more than ministries that are not as measurable and take time.

Let us go to the next topic of the unreached peoples. We need to remember what mission is all about. The focus on unreached peoples has been at the forefront of much evangelical thinking for the past decade or two. It says very clearly that world evangelization of all peoples in the world and having the opportunity to hear about Jesus Christ and His death and resurrection is the primary goal of the Christian church—period. That has got to be at the forefront. All that we are about and all of our lives are to be focused there. You always live in a war as Christian people, because it is a struggle to see the Gospel go to all sorts of people. Unreached peoples are the last frontier for Christian ministry. These are the thoughts of evangelical thinking today.

Let us look at the development of the concept of unreached peoples. We have looked before at the three eras of the modern missions movement, which I want to call phase II of the modern missions movement. Originally, 200 years ago, starting with William Carey, there was a focus on the coastlands. Then with

Hudson Taylor and others there was a focus on the inlands, which led to the formation of Sudan Interior Mission and Africa Inland Mission. Here, in thinking about unreached people, the focus was more on geographic areas that needed to be reached outside the West. When Cam Townsend and Donald McGavrin both had their experiences, there started to be a coming together of the understanding of the “third and final era” of the modern missions movement. It looks at the unreached peoples who are not geographically based. There are all sorts of Christians around the world involved in this. It looks at particular people groups, and there are missions agencies that specialize in seeking to reach unreached peoples. That is where we are now.

Let me share some comments from Ralph Winter about unreached peoples. “Unreached peoples [is] a term now synonymous with two others—hidden peoples and frontier peoples [...]. An unreached people group should be defined as a people group within which there is no indigenous community of believing Christians able to evangelize this people group without outside [cross-cultural] assistance.” Sometimes an unreached people group is defined as such if less than 1 percent of the population is Christian. The definition used here is that if there is a church there able to carry out evangelization to the rest of the people on its own, then it is reached. It is not that everyone has become a Christian or that everyone has heard the Gospel yet. Dr. Winter goes on to say, “I think we are living in the third and final era of mission history.” “The most famous of all missionary slogans—‘the evangelization of the world in this generation’—was surely a closure theology. What I do not see in their [Student Volunteer Movement] literature specifically is the wedding of the people concept as a missionary target with a restatement of their closure goals as basically a reaching of unreached peoples. I have been slow to do so myself.” This is where the understanding of a final frontier comes in. He goes on, “They did, however, faithfully parcel out the necessary remaining task as they saw it. Comity agreements were intended to encourage some attention to every part of the world. They [...] boldly conceived of a ‘Distributed Responsibility.’” There was a list of different parts of the world that has been carved out to different churches. They were responsible for that part of the world being reached or ministering to that part of the world somehow. The whole world was mapped out in a way that in some ways is reminiscent of what happened between Spain and Portugal 500 years ago. Now he notes, “We are gratified that the ultimate unity of mind and heart in all these discussions is the attempt to hasten the completion of the task. In that we must not grow weary. In due time, we shall reap if we faint not. Providentially, the ‘we’ here includes a vast, unprecedented world family of believers whose final citizenship is in heaven.” In Matthew 24:14 it says, “The Gospel shall be preached to all the nations, and then the end shall come.” It is what Jesus said. Dr. Winter says there is a final frontier, and we are in a final stage of mission history now.

In one newsletter I get, called *Brigada Today*, there is an article about the final frontier being assigned. It points out that different groups now have at least taken responsibility for all the groups in the world. Not everyone has been reached, but now unreached people groups have been accounted for and have been recognized as different groups’ responsibility. The Joshua Project 2000 and AD 2000 movements all sought to push the church to reach all peoples by the year 2000. Now that the year 2000 has come, there is recognition that it was a worthy goal, though it did not quite come about. Now we can see the end, and it is here. We are in the final frontier of mission history. They say that reaching unreached peoples is what it is all about.

The whole discussion of whether it is better to send money or missionaries is something that is ongoing. I do not want to give an answer here, but I want to point out discussion. I think people would say that sending missionaries has been a helpful and necessary part of the whole process. Now some people want to disagree with them. They say that sending money instead of missionaries is the most effective way. Others say it is a both-and situation, where both money and missionaries need to be sent. As one who has been in a situation of receiving missionaries, to have at least one missionary there to help express

how the project should go or how the money is to be used is important. It gives a picture of what they want to do with the money.

It has been noted that reaching unreached people groups is attainable and measurable, yet it is hard to know when you reach them. Unreached peoples and what it means to be unreached might be a little more fluid and less definable than what is presented by Dr. Winter. For example, ministering the Gospel across generations is important, and each generation needs to be reached. I point us to the comprehensive understanding of what God's world mission is. I think the edge and the impetuous that the focus on unreached people groups gives is very important. But when some of us think that we are no longer the objects of God's mission, it is dangerous. God is always concerned about redeeming, refining, and maturing His people as a part of His comprehensive notion of redeeming the world.

We will continue next time.