

Copyright © 1978 by Ralph D. Winter
All rights reserved.

PENETRATING THE LAST FRONTIERS

Further information about the U.S. Center for World
Mission and the William Carey International University
may be obtained by writing to 1800 East 18th, Pasadena,
CA 91104.

Price: \$1.25
Write for price in quantity.

Printed in the United States of America

Second edition 1978

William Carey Library
1705 N. Sierra Bonita Ave.
Pasadena, CA 91104



Ralph D. Winter

Copyright © 1978 by Ralph D. Winter
All rights reserved.

Further information about the U.S. Center for World Mission and the William Carey International University may be obtained by writing to 1605 Elizabeth, Pasadena, CA. 91104.

Price: \$1.25
Write for prices in quantity

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Second edition 1979

William Carey Library
1705 N. Sierra Bonita Ave.
Pasadena, CA 91104
(213) 798-0819

These materials became a chapter "Penetrating the New Frontiers" in *Unreached Peoples, '79* (David C. Cook, 1979), and both before and after that circulated as a William Carey Library pamphlet under the present title. This June 1979 edition incorporates some small changes and the new statistics for world population as of mid-1979.

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	5
<i>Introduction</i>	7
Strategies:	
I. Rebuild Pioneer Mission Perspective	10
II. Rediscover the Hidden People	16
III. Reevaluate All Previous Approaches	21
IV. Reconsecrate Ourselves to Wartime, Not Peacetime, Lifestyle	23
Tactics Related to These Strategies:	25
Class I. Rebuilding Pioneer Mission Perspective	27
1. In the Home Church	
2. Among Students	
3. In the Mission Agencies	
4. In the Younger Churches	
Class II. Rediscover the Hidden People	36
Class III. Reevaluate All Previous Approaches	44
Class IV. Reconsecrate Ourselves to Wartime, Not Peacetime, Lifestyle	49
Bibliography	53

PREFACE

By the middle of 1977 the writer was becoming increasingly well-known for his concern for the vast populations effectively beyond the active concern or culturally normal outreach of any existing church or mission. I was told, "You have made your point, now how do we reach all those people?"

I was asked to try to present an answer to that question in December of 1977 before a group of about thirty mission leaders from a wide variety of backgrounds. I offered four strategies. I first briefly reviewed the background of concern — here the Introduction. I then stressed the fact that neither church people, students, mission agencies, nor overseas churches are properly prepared to face the challenge, chapter one. I briefly reviewed the hard data of what is unfinished, chapter two.

In chapter three I played lightly over the complexities surrounding the overseas encounter with non-Christian peoples, feeling that such concerns were beyond the scope of this presentation. Finally in chapter four I assessed the very mood with which we must deal, as it is reflected by the lifestyle we adopt. In the case of each of these four strategies, later chapters in the same order deal with applications, or tactics, corresponding to each strategy.

Thus, this is a pretty serious pamphlet on an exceedingly serious subject: after 2000 years during which Jesus Christ has become the

most widely known and respected personality in all history, and one-third of all people who live on this earth have become self-labelled "Christians," is now the time to give up all hope of completing the Great Commission? Many people, even Christian leaders, apparently think so. How could this be? To know why and to know what to do about it is the difficult task to which we address ourselves.

In view of the massive turmoil of the recent past — the Second World War, the Cold War between East and West, and now the looming third power of the Middle East — it is no wonder that during the past thirty years the chief thinkers within the traditional missionary apparatus of the Western world have by and large considered it sufficient merely to hold on to, or to consolidate, work that had been initiated earlier. A preoccupation with our relations to the so-called "younger churches" also arises as a result of the relative decline of the West. That decline allowed not only the somewhat chaotic emergence of independent nations in the non-Western world but introduced turbulence among the national churches as they have grown toward independence. Western guilt feelings as colonial empires gave way flowed over into the arena of mission empires.

Western mission leaders have bent over backwards in many cases to avoid an ungenerous or ungentlemanly or "paternalistic" stance in regard to the very precious product of their labors, the younger churches. A honeymoon era ensued which has begun only gradually to be ended as the younger churches have recently been seen and have seen themselves in a more realistic light and both their strengths and limitations taken into account.

At this point the reader should be assured that while this paper is written primarily for a U.S. audience, "younger churches" could just as easily be new churches planted cross-culturally by still other younger churches. People "back home" are not necessarily Western Christians but those Christians, wherever they are, whose missionaries elsewhere have established new churches cross-culturally. Naturally, "Third World" mission efforts are for the most part far more recent than those of Western Christians — who are themselves simply savages converted from the forests of Europe a thousand years ago.

Pasadena, California

Ralph D. Winter
June 1979

INTRODUCTION

Let us trace one of the threads that leads us to the present discussion about new frontiers. The January 1971 issue of *International Review of Mission* carried an article I had written on the rise of new missions from the soil of the younger churches (Winter, 1971). Edwin W. Kortz, executive director of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Moravian Church in America, was one who responded to that article and, among other things, highlighted the need for the withdrawal of missionaries where national leadership takes over. My reply to him stressed the necessity of shifting our attention from the needs and concerns of the "national" Christians to the needs of a vast world still larger than can be reached by the capacities of present national Christians. Kortz was shortly later to play an important role in the development of a consultation, *The Gospel and Frontier Peoples*, organized by R. Pierce Beaver in December of the following year (Beaver, 1972). Earlier that same year (1972) Luther Copeland, the outgoing president of the Association of Professors of Mission, had proposed for 1980 a successor to the 1910 Edinburgh Conference.

The 1910 meeting was notable (although to missionaries in Latin America, notorious) for its exclusion from its purview of all missionary activities carried on within either Christian or nominally Christian areas, thus defining *mission* classically as work where there is

no other witness. In 1974 twenty-four professors followed through to formulate a "Call" for such a meeting to be convened in 1980. This Call clearly refers specifically to cross-cultural outreach; and the intended name of the meeting in 1980, World Missionary Conference (deliberately identical to the 1910 meeting) carries forward the concept of missions as they were conceived in 1910, e.g., "not efforts for renewal within the church nor local outreach in the same cultural sphere of existing churches." (This quote is taken from my own analysis of that Call [Winter, 1976].)

Just a few days after the formulation of the Call at the 1974 meeting of professors, the mammoth International Congress on World Evangelization (ICOWE) took place. There the writer was given the privilege of stating at some length in a plenary address the case for cross-cultural evangelism. For that same Congress I was asked also to write the introductory chapter of a book on unreached peoples, published especially for the Congress by World Vision's MARC division. And an earlier paper (Winter, 1974) I had written entitled "Seeing the Task Graphically" provided some of the statistical base for the opening audio-visual at Lausanne, "The Task Before Us," which was developed by Waldron Scott (Scott, 1975). An update and refinement of those statistics was already built into my plenary address at the Congress, "The Highest Priority, Cross-Cultural Evangelism" (Winter, 1975). Finally, further statement and refinement of this analysis was presented in the opening address I was asked to give at the joint IFMA-EFMA executive retreat in 1976, "The Grounds for a New Thrust in Missions" (Winter, 1977), bringing the population data up to July 1977.

Meanwhile, many other forces have begun to focus on the fact that in missions today we have perhaps worked ourselves out of many jobs, but not *the* job. For example, the General Assembly of the UPCUSA (perhaps encouraged by the announced interests of the newly formed United Presbyterian Center for Mission Studies, which is focussed especially on cross-cultural mission) appointed a committee in 1974 called "Strategy Development Committee for Reaching People Who Are Without the Gospel." The problem is that despite this up-swing of interest in new frontiers, the legacy of previous mission education in the churches has gone so far that by now the substance of what most of the people in the pews know is simply that there are "national" churches out there. While this pleases them, it often leads to lowered concern and to less involvement wherever the scope of the still unfinished task is not brought into the picture. As a result, the very

first and foremost strategy for reaching unreached people must be a massive new and urgent effort simply to expand the perspectives of the people back home.

In other words, over these thirty years, virtually all of us have become accustomed to thinking that where there is a mission there is also a national church, and that therefore in that place pioneer methods are no longer appropriate. We think this way mainly because most of us have not been in touch with the continuing experience of penetrating still new frontiers. Only that could make our work identifiably parallel to the classical past. No wonder we still hear it said that the era of the pioneer missionary is past, that we have worked ourselves out of that kind of job!

The first strategy we must develop is, thus, surprisingly, not at all directly related to the task to be performed. It is as though "we have sighted the enemy, and the enemy is us." Alas, the non-Christian world, even including China, is more open and more reachable today than it has been for most of the history of missions. (Any moment China may ask for 50,000 American teachers of English.) If it weren't for the massive contemporary misconstrual of the actual situation, we could probably go right ahead to get on with the task of strategizing for direct involvement with the unreached people. People are sitting back now, and sagging back. Thus the prior strategy is that we must give at least some thought to rebuilding the foundations themselves. Without a renewed foundation, other strategies will never be implemented.

STRATEGY I: REBUILD PIONEER MISSION PERSPECTIVE

To talk about missions in certain of the better informed quarters of the American church today conjures up the following scene. Picture a vast auditorium filled with the delegates to a church convention, wearied and tired after lengthy debates and strenuous dialogues of many kinds. The final item on the agenda is concluded and the meeting is gavelled into adjournment. People are streaming for the doors engrossed in conversation with one another. But now a small lady with a weak voice stands up in the podium and cries out shrilly over the microphone, "Wait, the meeting isn't over. We still have work to do." At first her voice isn't heard over the noise of the people. But finally the hubbub dies down and the startled delegates hear the message, "The job is not done!" Disbelief, weariness and disinterest flood the hearts of the vast majority. "This is no time to talk about an unfinished task. No one told us earlier. We were led to believe that adjournment was now appropriate. Don't lay on us this new task, saying it is the old task, unfinished." A church official gently leads the earnest woman away from the microphone, and the crowd continues to move out the exits. How could a whole auditorium of church leaders be wrong? That auditorium is the church today.

So long as the people back home feel they have completed the pioneering task, they will feel the situation can be normalized. They are not easily reprogrammed. They may say, "Just as the great industrial producers of tanks and guns in wartime shift over to automobiles and sewing machines in peace time, so the classical mechanism of missions now can be retooled for a new program of peace time aid to sister churches across the world." Many thus feel that there is no longer a spiritual crisis constituted by vast millions that are beyond the reach of existing churches. In part, it is this kind of thinking that allows a New York church executive to speak of the "end of the era of missions." The end indeed: the end of pioneer efforts in merely those places where the church is well established. As a result, this line of thinking is, ironically (but understandably), most prominent exactly among those church people whose past efforts across the world have been most successful. The faster the national church grows, the more its needs and wants grow up like high grass to restrict the view of the people back home from the needs of the regions beyond.

But isn't it silly for a mission that has worked in the center of India for a hundred years to pull out and go home just because a tiny, 25-mile-radius sphere has finally had some stable work established? Wait. This is not entirely silly. The work in that place has not for a long time been pioneer "missions" but interchurch aid. The gradual shift to interchurch aid has inevitably selected other than "pioneer missionary" personalities and quite naturally favored the useful technicians of school and hospital, who are sensitive people, good people with spiritual insight and often evangelistic concern, but people not at all prepared to be recast in the tough role of re-engagement elsewhere on a pioneer basis. A friend of mine has long championed the phrase "disengage to re-engage." Magnificent logic, but really not very practical after the long transition has taken place.

In view of this marvellous yet ominous transition, we are no longer doing the nineteenth century type of work despite the fact that there are now more non-Christians quite beyond the range of the normal evangelism of any national church than ever before — that is, there is still a great deal of nineteenth century work to do. The main difference in this century is that strong Christian churches are no longer to be found just in the West. There are now millions of Christians in the non-Western world. The problem is, the very presence of the "younger" churches in the non-Western world is

(without intending to) distracting and deflecting the mission mechanisms from their original purpose. We must acknowledge the fact that the existence of new churches in the non-Western world should occasion new obligations and exciting relationships on the part of the churches back home. But this new dimension must not replace the earlier purpose of continuing mission to new populations. Of course *church* leaders back home, having gotten wind of the existence of churches overseas, tend to identify more easily with national *church* leaders than with any continuing pioneer mission effort. And the people we now send overseas (whether or not we call them *missionaries*) no longer arrive in pitch darkness but are today usually welcomed by the smiles and genuine affection of true Christians. Quite naturally, in a foreign country, today's missionaries are glad to live and work among Christians and find the non-Christian world both less visible and less appealing.

As a result, almost all the older boards and agencies are today almost entirely involved overseas with the kind of work which in this country is normally called *nurture*, or at best *home missions*. For example, an American missionary in Africa, should he not be involved in a school or hospital, is at best merely helping a national church do "local evangelism." Meanwhile, the precious product of our missions, the overseas national churches, remain for various reasons far less aware of the meaning of the Great Commission than do churches in North America. They are more likely to ask help with political oppression, just as we would in their place. Even the missionaries often do not recognize the distinction between 1) the learning of a foreign language in order to help (foreign) local Christians do local outreach (or fight hunger, poverty and oppression), and 2) the learning of a foreign language in order to reach people beyond the local outreach of the overseas national churches.

This is not to conclude that the vast flurry of activity of 37,000 U.S. overseas missionaries shouldn't be. It is rather to emphasize that what we are now doing in "missions" is extremely and uneasily different from what has always been intended by the classical missionary movement. Indeed, the only justification for the present state of affairs would seem to be the total absence of the "regions beyond." But the regions beyond are still massive.

The answer is not to try to turn this situation around. It is not as though what we're doing is wrong. Most of the \$700 million per year of American money going into missions is all to the good. To rebuild

pioneer missions perspective does not require us to tear down interchurch aid perspective. It does not require us to fight against the major emphasis of the Lausanne Committee on redoubling of evangelistic efforts on the part of the national churches. The difference in role between the pastor and the missionary is so great that neither can displace the other. *The problem we face is really very different from what some people see as a tension between social action and evangelism.* Some of the most courageous social action and the most large-minded community development has been the work of early pioneer missionaries. And it is not at all mainly a distinction between mainline denominational boards and "faith missions." Today there is very little difference in the major focus of activity of an agency of mission, whether it is the United Methodist church or the Sudan Interior Mission. In both cases the preponderance of personnel are in church development, education and health. With the exception of Wycliffe Bible Translators and Regions Beyond Missionary Union and a few other highly specialized agencies, virtually all missionary boards with more than twenty-five years of effort behind them are by now focussed primarily on the care and feeding of existing Christian communities. The development of these beachheads to the point of safe disengagement of expatriate personnel is a good goal, but it is not good enough. The classical task remains.

Apparently, people back home have reacted in conscious and sub-conscious dismay as overseas "missions" have increasingly moved away from pioneer evangelism. This dismay has not been entirely alleviated by the use of the phrase "partnership in mission." It is not that *partnership* is objectionable — *partnership in pioneer mission* would be fine. However, the facts are that "partnership in mission" must ordinarily be translated "partnership in many good things that are not classifiable as pioneer mission." This is not an accusation but simply an honest observation. To try to sell people at home on a type of mission other than pioneer mission is not at this point as urgent as to allow and encourage them in their perspective and to do everything possible for "partnership in mission" to become in actuality "partnership in pioneer mission."

To gain a proper impression of how tough it will be to rebuild pioneer mission perspective, take a lesson from my own church. In a desperate effort twenty years ago to safeguard a continuing mission to fulfill this original, classical unfinished task, the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America endeavored to distinguish between interchurch aid (with which "fraternal workers"

would be involved) and the continuing classical mission to non-Christians (with which "missionaries" had always been involved). I can recall vividly a crucial point in one of the plenary discussions of the WCC's new Commission on World Mission and Evangelism in Mexico City in 1963 when missionary statesman John Coventry Smith was pressed to account for the distinction reflected by this novelty in terminology. But then as now, the increasingly loud voices of the younger churches, loyally amplified by the proud or cowed parent bodies, spoke louder than the unstated needs of unrepresented non-Christians. Some may have feared that going into interchurch aid as a new venture separate from classical mission would mean giving up both the name and the vast support base which for a hundred years had focussed primarily on the winning of non-Christians. Many may have felt that the new and worthy "mission" of interchurch aid could not so readily or so quickly develop its own roots as it could demand to eat from the classical mission trough. Thus, reception to United Presbyterian honesty about maintaining this distinction was cool or confused, and not only at Mexico City.

Despite the cool response, my own agency, which had been simply a "foreign mission board" when I was commissioned a missionary in 1956, proceeded resolutely to divide its very name in order to allow for the distinction we are highlighting. It now became the United Presbyterian Church's Commission on Ecumenical Mission and Relations — "relations" referring potentially to interchurch relationships, and "mission" potentially to the traditional "unfinished task" of reaching non-Christians, now, of course, pursued "ecumenically" (e.g., in cooperation with the younger churches and other churches). Unfortunately, the people at the pew level in the church in the U.S. merely got the idea that all overseas workers should now be called "fraternal workers." This for them was the "New Day." And unfortunately, many of the very overseas workers who insisted on still being called missionaries were, in fact, as much interchurch workers as anyone; and before things could be straightened out, the whole issue was bypassed when the agency's name was again changed and the very word *mission* removed and appropriated by the central denominational apparatus to be reapplied as the purpose for all fund-raising of all kinds. In any case, the awesome thing is that, faced with most of the same basic circumstances, most boards, whether liberal or conservative, denominational or interdenominational, ecumenical or

independent, have followed the same pattern. Thus, while the apparatus of mission has in most cases been successfully readjusted to "the emerging task" presented by the fruits of earlier mission work, the classical "unfinished task" is still there, is still mammoth, but it is no longer within even the *aim* of most present agencies, no matter what well-intentioned gestures are made toward "mission" and "evangelism" in the flow of promotional literature. Today such phrases are simply vestigial remains of a nearly extinct earlier vision.

But the classical task cannot and must not be that easily forgotten. The facts are too blunt. They are not, in fact, hidden in a corner, but are available to all who will stop to reconsider.

Before moving to a second strategy which will deal with the facts, let us note that pioneer mission perspective must be rebuilt across the entire spectrum — the people back home, the mission executives, the "missionaries" themselves, and even among overseas church leaders. All these sectors either have lost sight of, or have not yet clearly confronted, the imposing reality of the scope of the unfinished task. Much less have they come to terms with the fact that a high proportion of non-Christians today are beyond the reach of the usual type of evangelistic strategy. The *tactics* whereby this *strategy* can be undertaken will be dealt with after mentioning other essential strategies.

STRATEGY II: REDISCOVER THE HIDDEN PEOPLE

At the risk of repeating some things published earlier, it will be well to try very briefly to restate the broad categories of *unreached* people in order to zero in upon what we shall define as the *hidden* people. Precise figures are not even necessary in order to reconstruct the overall contours. By going from country to country and roughly dividing Christians into two groups and non-Christians into two groups, all the while trying sincerely not to exaggerate the size of the *remaining task* (and therefore we're more likely to exaggerate the number of Christians), we still come up with some imposing world totals for each of four categories, as below. The explanation of the categories is as important as the resulting numbers.

1) 230 million *Active Christians*. These people definitely possess a genuine personal faith and are capable of winning others to that faith. They do need Christian nurture, and many missionaries are involved in this task. The constant danger has always been that their own nurture will soak up all their energies plus that of expatriate missionaries.

2) 1,031 million *Inactive Christians*. These people are culturally within the Christian tradition but hardly qualify as committed Christians. They need "renewal" via an "innermission", or *E-0*

evangelism, if you will, since there is a *zero* cultural barrier to their vital participation in the life of the church. Most evangelism and mission effort (in India one report has it 98 percent) is focussed on this group. Again, the danger is that what efforts may be left over beyond the nurture of the first group will be completely absorbed here.

3) 604 million *Culturally-near Non-Christians*. These are those whose cultural tradition and social sphere have already been penetrated by the Christian faith. Thus, for these people there now already exists, *culturally* near at hand, some Christian congregation or denomination where they can readily fit in linguistically and socially. While they may not actually live *geographically* near such a Christian church, they are *culturally* near, and thus certain existing churches could, at least potentially, reach out to them without crossing any cultural barriers other than *one*, that is, the kind of E-1 evangelism and mono-cultural church planting that sensitively takes into account the *one* "stained glass barrier" between them and the believing communities. Note that missionaries who are "helping national Christians to evangelize" are not often working across this one barrier but rather are working mainly with nominal Christians, as No. 2 above.

4) 2,456 million *Culturally-distant Non-Christians*: These we are calling the *hidden people*. These are individuals and groups of people who, whether geographically near or far from Christian outreach, are sufficiently different linguistically, socially, economically, or culturally so that they are simply not realistic candidates for membership in existing Christian churches. They are "hidden" or isolated by an invisible but significant caste or class barrier. One example is the 97 percent Muslim population of Pakistan which is isolated from the Hindu-background Christian communities in that country. Another example is the group in the Book of Acts called the "devout persons" who as Greeks did not fit well into the Jewish synagogues Paul visited. Some of these hidden people are *somewhat similar* in culture, but are yet too far to fit in readily. E-2 evangelism must take into account a second barrier beyond the stained glass barrier. E-2, unlike E-1 evangelistic tactics, cannot depend on existing congregations, but must create new congregations even if these are closely associated with existing congregations. Note that E-2 necessarily brings into play traditional missionary techniques. Peoples close enough to existing congregations so that normal E-1 evangelism is effective are *defined* to be in the previous (E-1) category. *People who for whatever practical reasons cannot be effectively brought into*

existing congregations are defined to be in the hidden people (or E-2, E-3) category.

E-3 evangelism, more difficult still, is required where cultural differences are nearly total. For simplicity in this paper we are lumping together E-2 (*similar-but-not-same* culture) and E-3 (very different culture) evangelism since, unlike E-0 and E-1 evangelism, a) they both are rarely accomplished apart from the specialized efforts of organizations such as mission societies or Catholic orders, b) they are both beyond the reach of virtually all existing efforts and even beyond the present strategy of most mission agencies, and c) E-2 begins a continuum that ends at E-3. The following diagram and table below are based on the four-fold breakdown we have just made. Note that the hidden people (which are in the fourth column in the table and add up to 2,456 million people) constitute 83 percent of the total non-Christian population of the world, yet columns 7, 8, 9 show the small mission force and the enormous linguistic and cultural diversity posed by the Hidden People in Column 4!

CHRISTIANS		NON-CHRISTIANS		
219	1,031 million (E-0)	604 million (E-1)	2,456 million (E-2 and E-3)	The "Hidden People"

WORLD STATISTICS, MID-1979 IN MISSIONARY PERSPECTIVE
(population given in millions)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	CHRISTIAN		NON-CHRISTIAN		POP.* TOTALS	N.A. FOREIGN MISSIONARIES		DIVERSITY IN COLUMN 4	
	Committed	Nominal E-0	within range E-1	beyond E-2, E-3		working with 1,2,3	4	languages	sub-groups
WESTERN WORLD									
USA, CANADA	69	146	17	12	244	—	—	80	300
EUROPE, LAT. AM. N.Z., AUSTRALIA	60	719	187	151	1,117	15,018	1,000	480	950
SUB-TOTAL	129	865	204	163	1,361				
NON-WESTERN WLD									
CHINESE	2	1	140	737	880	1,217	100	50	2,000
HINDUS	6	11	40	506	563	950	50	200	3,000
MUSLIMS, ASIA**	.11	.05	20	493	513	100	50	300	3,500
MUSLIMS AFRICA	—	—	—	176	176	—	50	280	500
OTHER ASIANS	44	64	157	282	547	7,077	1,600	2,500	4,000
OTHER AFRICANS	49	90	43	99	251	9,338	500	1,500	2,500
SUB-TOTAL	101	166	400	2,293	2,960				
	230	1,031	604	2,456	4,321	33,700	3,350	5,390	16,750
		1,261		3,060			37,050		
		29%		71%					

* Population Reference Bureau, Washington, D.C.

** Note there are additional 26 million Muslims in the Western World

U.S. Center for World Mission
May, 1979

One or two cautions are in order. Some of the peoples in the 80 percent category are very difficult to reach: Chinese in mainland China, women in a harem in a remote Saudi Arabian village, etc. The point, however, is that *this entire category* is not seriously being dealt with today by either Western or non-Western Christians or *their missions!* For one thing, there are hundreds of millions in this column who in fact can more easily be reached right now by known methods than ever before. They alone defy any classification of this column as "out of reach"; but if we really decide to *put our shoulders to the task*, we will, I believe, discover that these 2.5 billions, now receiving only a tiny proportion of existing church or mission efforts, could effectively use at least as much as our entire present outreach, and our present board and agency structures would be the first to applaud this expansion and labor incessantly to implement it.

In a recent book (Winter, 1977) I have a chapter which describes and breaks down this fourth column in some detail. Here there is space only to mention one other caution. Some would question the value of the distinction between the heavy mission involvement with Christians (interchurch aid) and the relatively scant involvement with non-Christians (traditional mission work). Many a "missionary" today, even though he is working with an overseas church, will insist that he is *indirectly* reaching non-Christians by virtue of helping and equipping overseas Christians to do that job. What could be better than to get the overseas Christians, who speak the language as their mother tongue, to do the work the missionaries first came to do? Thus it may be alleged that this entire distinction is false because helping overseas churches is, it is said, the most efficient kind of mission. Indeed, more and more U.S. congregations are so eager to see "native missionaries" do the job that several organizations exist primarily to transmit funds directly to overseas Christians. Nevertheless, as the population bar graph shows, only 20 percent, or 604 million, of the non-Christians could conceivably be reached even if all the existing churches were to get busy and win all the people within their own social sphere.

Thus, as we have noted, the vast bulk of missionaries are not very directly concerned with such outreach at all, and the average church overseas is not any more likely to be making strenuous efforts to establish congregations speaking languages other than their own than is the average church in the U.S. likely to be working diligently *as a congregational initiative* to set up new congregations for Chinese or Korean immigrants. Both in the U.S. and in the non-Western

countries, specialized offices and agencies are necessary for such tasks; and whether the non-Christians are near or far, next door or in another country, there is no structure better designed for outreach than the traditional mission. It is just that our present missions are so deeply involved with the nurture and the E-0 and E-1 outreach of the national Christians they have little time left over to create in the overseas national churches the appropriate mission knowledge and awareness, much less the necessary national mission structures which would alone justify the thought that working with Christians overseas can be counted as a contribution toward reaching the 80 percent column, that is, the 2,456 million culturally distant non-Christians.

Thus, even though the percentage of Christians is higher today than ever before in virtually every country of the world, the unfinished task of the nineteenth century is still very much with us. But the task has been virtually abandoned because the mission agencies of today are extensively converted over to the very different task of interchurch aid. Despite all the flurry of discussion about the role of the present churches in society, no one has invented a better mechanism for penetrating new social units than the traditional mission society, whether it be Western, African or Asian, whether it be denominational or interdenominational. Indeed, the new fact of our time is the emergence in some force already of the so-called "Third World missions." Some suggest that this is the answer.

But the central burden of Strategy II is not to decide who is to reach the hidden people but to describe their existence in operational terms. This will be further elaborated in the section on Class II Tactics.

STRATEGY III: REEVALUATE ALL PREVIOUS APPROACHES

David Liao (1972) in his book *The Unresponsive: Resistant or Neglected?* suggests that while large blocs of people (in his case study, the Hakka Chinese) may for practical purposes be characterized as unresponsive, the fault may be as much ours as theirs. My personal opinion is that to speak precisely we must never use the word *resistant* to apply to a large group of people since the root word *to resist* most precisely describes the reaction of an individual person. But even where a family or a small group seems to unite in resistance to this method or to that, to go on to employ the term for an entire category of people like, say, 700 million Muslims, is where the word *resistant* begins to lack justification. It is more honest to say that what we have tried hasn't worked: *resistant* may throw the blame prematurely on the people we have not yet reached.

Lyle Vander Werff, in a book published in December of 1977, attempts a summary of all Christian approaches to the Muslim world on the part of the Anglican, Presbyterian and Congregational traditions up to 1938. While he does not emphasize reevaluation, his research does do the necessary descriptive groundwork for what has been done before. Recent articles in *Missiology*, notably the special

issue on Islam in July of 1976, are pushing forward the task of reevaluation. See also John Wilder's "Some Reflections on Possibilities for People Movements Among Muslims" (*Missiology*, July, 1977). David Liao's book concentrates on ancestor "worship" in just the Chinese tradition. Bernard Hwang's article "Ancestor Cult Today" in *Missiology*, July 1977, pursues the subject in an even broader context. But these references are just a few illustrations of the kind of foundational reevaluation that is necessary.

In one sense, the recent emphasis upon contextualization provides some helpful insights for reevaluation. But we must understand that mere reevaluation of our message and our theology is not sufficient. We do not merely preach a message which must be made relevant to each new context. The Gospel cannot be disembodied. We not only proclaim a *message*, but carry and extend or modify or create a social *mechanism* which is essential as a carrier vehicle for the gospel. The medium is not equitable to the message but is part of it. In the Muslim world, the structure of the Western church and of the Muslim mosque collide head on. The Fellowship of St. Andrew, on the other hand, has survived without any such conflict ever since Samuel Zwemer first implanted it early in this century.

Class III tactics will be noted further on.

STRATEGY IV: RECONSECRATE OURSELVES TO A WARTIME, NOT PEACETIME, LIFESTYLE

The Queen Mary, lying in repose in the harbor at Long Beach, California, is a fascinating museum of the past. Used both as a luxury liner in peacetime and a troop transport during the Second World War, its present status as a museum the length of three football fields affords a stunning contrast between the lifestyles appropriate in peace and war. On one side of a partition you see the dining room reconstructed to depict the peacetime table setting that was appropriate to the wealthy patrons of high culture for whom a dazzling array of knives and forks and spoons held no mysteries. On the other side of the partition the evidences of wartime austerities are in sharp contrast. One metal tray with indentations replaces fifteen plates and saucers. Bunks, not just double but eight tiers high, explain why the peace-time complement of 3000 gave way to 15,000 people on board in wartime. How repugnant to the peacetime masters this transformation must have been! To do it took a national emergency, of course. The survival of a nation depended upon it. The essence of the Great Commission today is that the survival of many millions of people depends on its fulfillment.

But obedience to the Great Commission has more consistently been

poisoned by affluence than by anything else. The antidote for affluence is reconsecration. Consecration is by definition the "setting apart of things for a holy use." Affluence did not keep Borden of Yale from giving his life in Egypt. Affluence didn't stop Francis of Assisi from moving against the tide of his time.

Curiously enough, while the Protestant tradition has no significant counterpart to the Catholic orders within its U.S. base (unless we think of the more recent campus evangelistic organizations such as Inter-Varsity, Campus Crusade, and Navigators), nevertheless the entire Protestant missionary tradition has always stressed a practical measure of austerity and simplicity as well as a parity of level of consumption within its missionary ranks. Widespread reconsecration leading to a reformed lifestyle with wartime priorities is not likely to be successful (even in an age of increasing awareness of the lifestyle issue itself) unless Protestantism can develop patterns of consecration among the people back home that are comparable to what has characterized the Protestant missionary movement for nearly two hundred years. Several possibilities will be mentioned under Class IV Tactics.

TACTICS RELATED TO THESE STRATEGIES

Our entire discussion thus far has concerned general strategies which are larger than and at least partially beyond the scope of most existing Christian institutions. Most strategizing takes place on the level of the mission society, and therefore whatever task is inherently beyond the scope of any one mission society has fallen by the wayside. It is terrifying when you stop to think of it how many things ought to be done that will not get done if merely the existing structures are expected to work cooperatively for their achievement.

An example is the Missionary Research Library. When it was finally given over to the National Council of Churches' Division of Foreign Missions and thus became the responsibility of all mission agencies under the Division of Foreign Missions, the move was thought to be a beautiful solution. The decline of the Missionary Research Library is one of the great tragedies in modern mission history. All the valiant efforts of Union Theological Seminary may do no more than to put portions of it into a holding pattern. The vigorous further development of a collection of contemporary documents is an unlikely burden for a single theological seminary to carry successfully.

Thus, in mentioning various tactics that can fulfill the four strategies we have outlined, we must resist the inclination to talk only in terms of what existing organizations can do. Edward R. Dayton's

workbook, *Planning Strategies for Evangelism*, outlines nine steps which a specific mission agency may follow in order to evangelize a specific non-Christian people. The Strategy Working Group of the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization is suggesting this nine-step process for the use of existing agencies. They realize, however, that in order for existing agencies to follow these nine steps, certain other things have to be done. They have encouraged conversation about the need for a Consultation on Muslim Evangelism sponsored by the North American Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization. They are proposing that regional and national seminars be held to identify and train key research leaders. They hope that in the normal course of preparations for congresses and crusades there will be special efforts at research leading up to those meetings. Thus we see the interplay of existing forces and incremental additional procedures, plans and activities that can be built upon the present foundations.

It would be a gross and artificial modesty on my part were I to suppress the information that a vast new center of strategic studies and activities is in the process of development in Pasadena, California. Thirty acres of property and 430,000 square feet of buildings comprise the campus and off-campus housing that is the base of this new organization — the U.S. Center for World Mission. This center is one of a planned worldwide network of similar centers. The South India Center for World Mission is one overseas sister organization. The East-West Center for Mission Research and Development in Korea is another. There is also the Hong Kong Center for Frontier Missions. Recently a second center in Korea has been announced. Now we hear of interest from Scotland, Finland and South Africa. We have an acknowledge relationship now with the Singapore Center for Evangelism and Missions. Many of the tactics referred to in this section will be attempted through this network of centers insofar as other agencies are unable to perform them. Not the slightest duplication is intended. Furthermore, the exclusive focus of the center is upon the hidden people as we have defined them above. Thus 95 percent of the work related to present mission agencies is outside of the scope of the concern of these centers. The non-geographical pioneer penetration of the remaining frontiers is the sole emphasis.

Let us go on then to produce what will for lack of space be basically a check list of subordinate tactics which would seem to lead to the fulfillment of the four major strategies we have outlined above.

CLASS I REBUILDING PIONEER MISSION PERSPECTIVE

Class I tactics are those specific plans or programs which can aid in the success of Strategy I: Rebuild Pioneer Mission Perspective. It is clear that this strategy cannot be accomplished overnight. It is equally clear that it is not an altogether uphill task. There is an innate sense among the people in the pew that allots higher priority to pioneer missions than to any other kind. This is not mere old-fashionedness, but may in good part be an awareness of the meaning of the lost coin, the lost sheep, and the lost son in the parables of Luke 15. How else can we account for the fact that the Wycliffe Bible Translators have grown enormously in the last 25 years while in the same period the established denominational and non-denominational missions that have not emphasized the penetration of new frontiers show no similar dynamism whatsoever?

Nothing less than a top-to-bottom revamping of the church and its peripheral institutions is required by this strategy. Sunday School materials have got to be rewritten; the story of the church has got to be reanalyzed as a missionary advance; Christian colleges without any emphasis on missions cannot go on ignoring the category of "new-frontier" missions as being one of the more fundamental

activities of history. The needs of the majority of students who are to be found in the state universities are virtually unmet.

Many different sectors of the Christian movement must be revamped. Let us single out just four and enumerate tactics that would be appropriate in each case.

1. *Rebuilding Pioneer Mission Perspective in the Home Church.* "The local church can change the world" is a brilliant phrase devised by World Vision in a series of attempts to amplify mission understanding at the local level. The phrase acknowledges the central importance of the local church as a source of grass roots initiative. As a womb for the nurture of future missionaries, the local church is potentially unexcelled. What does or does not happen at that level profoundly and gravely affects what can or cannot be done at any other level. When World Vision gave over *The Local Church Can Change the World Seminar* to the Association of Church Missions Committees, the latter employed those materials in its national conference in 1977 and has sent back seminar materials to member churches for their use at the local level. The ACMC is struggling to serve both non-denominational and denominationally-related churches — not an easy task — and has already stimulated mission giving measurably. The increased giving to missions resulting from its own impact on member churches is running over twenty times as much as the funds it uses up. Eventually there will have to be denominational adaptations of the ACMC mechanism that will cooperate closely or perhaps be part of the ACMC itself. The United Presbyterian Center for Mission Studies is an example of such a denominational agency; the Episcopal Church Missionary Community is another. Both the UPCMS and the ECMC are member organizations of the U.S. Center for World Mission. It is expected that in each country where there is a Center for World Mission of this genre, a characteristic feature will be a series of offices reflecting the various strata within the evangelical presence in that country. It is as important in the rebuilding of pioneer mission perspective to work along denominational, confessional and cultural lines as it is to be sensitive to the cultural mosaic of a population first being offered the gospel of Christ. The U.S. Center may eventually have 30 to 40 such offices dedicated to rebuilding pioneer mission perspective in the home church. The ACMC, by contrast, is virtually forced to deal with the entire range of activities nowadays called "mission". The UPCMS, however, was founded explicitly upon the concern for cross-cultural missionary outreach.

The theme of the national conference of the Association of Church Missions Committees in 1978 was the unreached people, and one-third of its emphasis was given to the work of missions in E-0, E-1, E-2/E-3 areas respectively, one-third therefore being on the Hidden People — people who can only be incorporated into Christian fellowship by E-2 and E-3 techniques.

The spectrum of ACMC interests underscores what I believe to be a crucial factor: pioneer missions perspective is not necessarily encompassed by general missions enthusiasm, and any strategy will mainly fail to reach the Hidden People if “missions in general” is the broad mandate. The Mission Renewal Team, Inc., for example (also a U.S. Center member), puts on a day-long seminar that is much heavier than the seminar program mentioned above, and focuses primarily on what we have called the Hidden People. The MRT seminar is called “A Day of Discovery” and is designed for a group of 25 or 30 of the key leaders in a congregation. It takes place in the context of the church instead of in a city or region. It presents ten very carefully hammered-out themes, and trains the group to carry on for the next ten weeks studying one theme each week. By contrast, Sunday School materials produced by Friendship Press dissolve into a sea of “everything” when “missions in general” is the theme, even if geographical areas of the world are segregated. Due to vast budget decreases the word *evangelism* is salt-and-peppered into the materials more so than before, but this is not good enough. On the grounds that everyone is not of pioneer mentality, very little in the world of missions today is exclusively focused on pioneer mission needs, except for a few agencies like Wycliffe Bible Translators, who specialize in jungle missions. The home churches need Sunday School materials, tourist caravans, and even special programs which have specifically pioneer mission emphases.

There ought to be available, for example, seven-minute video cassettes for multiple usage in the various programs of the local church. Something like the monthly “Church Around the World” bulletin insert could focus exclusively on pioneer missions. Why not a pioneer missions *National Geographic*? How about a national lay committee on pioneer missions? Certainly to challenge a million people in America to pray regularly for the Hidden People is a worthy goal. In order effectively to reach a million people, a simple do-it-yourself seminar kit is available which allows any local church or group within a church to put on its own “World Awareness Seminar” leading people to a new awareness of the hidden people. This is

produced by the U.S. Center for World Mission. This seminar leads to and builds upon a solemn process of "registration" of "World Christians" — people who are willing to broaden their concern deliberately to include the hidden people in increased study, prayer, giving and sharing. The registration cards each carry a different number and range from one to a million. Whatever else is done to reach the hidden people it seems unquestionable that at least one million out of the 40 million evangelicals in the U.S.A. must undergo the enlargement of vision and commitment involved in the decision to be "registered" as a World Christian.

2. *Rebuilding Pioneer Mission Perspective Among Students.* The enormous growth of higher education in the U.S. has virtually separated off literally millions of younger citizens from the mainstream of society. Their isolation is mainly an evil, but cannot be remedied easily, and we are indebted to campus organizations like Campus Crusade, Inter-Varsity and Navigators — Young Life, Youth for Christ (Campus Life) on the high school level — for the establishment of surrogate church congregations in the new communities of the university world. Curiously, despite many fine achievements, these campus organizations are hardly more successful than the local church in implanting or maintaining mission vision of any kind, much less pioneer mission perspective. These surrogate student-world denominations, like the regular denominations, have superb internal communication channels. But Campus Crusade leaders are very discouraged about the percentage of their students and staff who are ever recruited for overseas work. Crusade at least incorporates its own mission agency in its Agape Movement. Inter-Varsity at least has its triennial Urbana Missionary Convention. But even the Urbana Convention is in some ways a muted challenge in regard to pioneer missions. The development of the program each time is usually the result of a tug of war between the many contemporary definitions of mission. Not desiring to slight any of the mission agencies, only a small slice of the Urbana program ever focuses exclusively on pioneer mission perspective. Indeed, the massive representation of over one hundred mission boards, each with its own booth for display purposes, is perhaps even more muted than the Urbana program itself when it comes to an emphasis on the remaining frontiers. The reason is, as we have already seen, that the mission agencies themselves for the most part have become engrossed in the needs and wants of the younger churches which are the precious children of their success. This will be mentioned under the next point.

Students themselves have certainly responded. The statistics are well known that in 1970 8% of the 12,000 students gathering at Urbana signed cards indicating their willingness to be led overseas; 28% of 15,000 did so in 1973; and 51% of 17,000 did so in 1976. Part of a pitifully small counter response on the part of the adult missions world has been the Summer Institute of International Studies which since 1974 has carefully disguised basic mission orientation in the form of credit-bearing courses in sociology, philosophy of religion, etc. This is a small, carefully controlled program not trying to expand, but it can readily be duplicated, constituting as it does a superb model of what can and must be done if open-hearted young people are ever in any number going to get the solid knowledge necessary to make an intelligent and spiritually valid decision about their life work. A similar program during the academic year called simply the Institute of International Studies opened in January of 1978 under the auspices of several West Coast colleges and hosted by the United States Center for World Mission. This will be expanded considerably in the fall of 1978.

Some students have taken the initiative to launch highly successful Student Conferences on World Evangelization (SCOWE). Thousands of students between Urbanas have been exposed to high quality pioneer mission orientation in these conferences; but as with all things run by students, leaders graduate and replacement leadership does not always develop. For example, there is not yet any agency whose business it is to plant and cultivate SCOWE type conferences in hundreds of colleges across the country, both secular and Christian. The largest and most successful SCOWE conference to date was at, of all places, the California Institute of Technology.

Beyond the Urbana, SIIS-IIS and SCOWE "events" there needs to be a nurture mechanism which will not leave nor forsake the students who earnestly seek to fulfill their Urbana-type vision to know the Lord's will about possible overseas service. Thus was born the Fellowship of World Christians. As a result, small groups of students in many parts of the U.S. are praying together and studying some of the excellent materials produced by the FWC. Among other arrows in its quiver, the FWC offers a credit-bearing independent-study course called *Understanding World Evangelization* which involves an introductory cassette, a 200-page study guide, a 500-page specially edited reader, and three other books. Westmont College gives undergraduate credit and Conservative Baptist Seminary at Denver offers graduate credit. The FWC is a member organization of the U.S. Center for World Mission.

A major new trend in the last twenty years has been the eager involvement of young people in a short term abroad. Intercristo has been invaluable in helping young people find their way into such experiences. This may actually be the most important single new source of missionaries in the past five years. In some ways, however, exposure overseas to the behind-the-lines work in which missions are now mainly occupied is no more successful in the development of pioneer mission perspective than are the booths of those same mission agencies at Urbana. Thus we are once more impressed that present mission involvement often acts not so much as a channel to the Hidden People as it becomes a barrier to them. The mission agencies, if they do not take care, will continue on (for some potential candidate) to be their own worst enemies. This leads us to our next point.

3. *Rebuilding Pioneer Mission Perspective in the Mission Agencies.* In view of the blunt significance of the Great Commission which allows no stopping point short of reaching the entire world, in view of the endemic sentiments of the people in the pew who are inclined to be more generous in their giving to pioneer work than to anything else, and in view of the actual preference deep down of many missionaries themselves to be involved in pioneer work, it is a foregone conclusion that the mission agencies are relatively alert on the subject of the Hidden People. Indeed, in our introductory remarks we have sketched a number of events which show the keen sensitivities of mission agencies to the mission to frontier peoples. Professor Beaver found only one board out of ninety contacted that disclaimed any interest and concern in the Consultation on Frontier Peoples which he organized in 1972. The matter of mission interest in the frontiers does not even need to be further discussed. The interest is there. The problem lies elsewhere. Mission agencies, in general, labor along with so many millstones around their necks in the form of vested interests, hardened structures, established institutions and responsibilities, rampant inflation, consuming personnel problems and increasingly difficult recruitment and fund raising that to speak of Hidden Peoples and new approaches requiring additional personnel and funds is like changing a tire of a Mack truck rolling downhill. Even missions founded for the sole purpose of reaching unevangelized areas soon find themselves deeply enmeshed or "homesteaded", to use George Peters' phrase.

The following list of openings for personnel needed in Zaire under a certain mission is pulled quite at random from the *IFMA Worldwide*

Opportunities list for 1977-1978, which asks for well over one thousand missionaries for its member organizations.

ZAIRE

3 doctors

1 lab technician

1 physiotherapist

5 nurses

1 maternity supervisor

1 mechanic

1 electrical engineer

2 church workers

6 Bible school teachers

5 theological education by extension workers

5 elementary teachers — MK school

1 jr. high math teacher — MK school

1 cateress — MK school

2 secondary teachers

Note that the 35 people desired by this mission constitute no very impressive evidence that any new cultural groups are being penetrated. This would seem to be a list of tasks mainly behind the lines, jobs that Africans could probably do far less expensively. Nevertheless, we know that in Zaire there are literally hundreds of square miles in the borderland "no-mission-lands" running like ribbons of darkness between the major centers of long standing mission activity. The question is not whether the national leaders or the expatriate workers should be reaching out in these areas. One can imagine the human reluctance of either African or American Christians to learn another language to begin pioneer work again. Yet this is being done in part, and must be done much more. But so long as the frontiers are not even being seriously considered by either group, the Great Commission is effectively being rewritten to say, "Go ye into all the world and meddle in the national churches."

Yet it is clear that most mission boards would welcome any kind of help that would bring them the feasibility studies, the funds and the people necessary to reach further out. Existing mission structures represent efficient and admirable mechanisms, and their extension into pioneer activity is in most cases very close to their founding mandates. Here, surely, is the locus least needing worry. Here is the entity most likely to join any new moves to the frontiers. The U.S. Center for World Mission is already manned primarily by personnel on loan from mission agencies. It does not as a Center intend to send

any missionaries (although many of its specialized member organizations do). Its highest priority activity will be to do whatever will be of service to help existing mission structures penetrate new frontiers.

G. Thompson Brown (1977) in a recent paper has put us all in his debt by beautifully summarizing and elaborating with helpful diagrams the phenomenon Peter Wagner has termed the "church development syndrome." He points out that a church-to-church relationship between a sending church and a receiving church, or even a healthy two-way flow between a "home church" and an "overseas church," is fundamentally inadequate, and he turns our eyes once more to the frontiers. This kind of thinking produced by a top mission executive and taken to heart in mission circles today could rebuild perspective all across the board. Would that it were so easy to conceive of the same thing happening among church leaders overseas.

4. *Rebuilding Pioneer Mission Perspective in the Younger Churches.* Many of the things we have said above about the need to build pioneer mission perspective in the home church can apply just as well to the overseas younger churches. One staggering difference results from the curious fact that missionaries across the decades have in many instances hardly ever mentioned (except on furlough) the idea that all believers everywhere are under the Great Commission. Few national churches today are as poor as those believers that backed William Carey when he went to India. If anyone anywhere suggests that a national church here or there is too poor to send missionaries, he should take a close look at the Friends Missionary Prayer Band of South India, which sends 80 missionaries to North India, has refused all gifts from abroad (it was offered one million dollars in one instance), and subsists with a simple and stern dictum that every believer must either "go or send."

What can Westerners do to rebuild pioneer mission perspective in the overseas church? There continue to be many ways in which Western leaders and non-Western leaders can encourage each other. One or two examples out of many others would be the amazing series of pastors' conferences held all over the world by World Vision. More recently John Haggai has endeavored to encourage Asian leaders in the area of evangelism. The Lausanne legacy continues to spur a great deal of healthy interchange. The World Evangelical Fellowship now has its Missions Commission. And, of course, the World Council of Churches provides a forum of discussion of a sort between the East

and the West. Few of these influences, however, have dared to give proper stress to pioneer missions. We have all felt good about the development of the so-called "Third World Mission Agencies," and at least two new books have recently come out on the subject (Nelson, 1976a and b). But few of us have dared to press the point that most third world agencies are not in cross-cultural missions, and even where they are, they are not often reaching the Hidden People, within whose cultural spheres there is no witness. This is one reason why there must be on the world level a consultation drawing together mission agencies for both East and West, North and South who are actively and specifically concerned about missions beyond where Christ is named. Such a conference has been proposed and discussed ever since 1972, as mentioned above. While other conferences are also scheduled for 1980, none of them focusses exclusively on the frontiers, much less is comprised only of delegations from mission boards and agencies.

There still seems to be a need for a permanent network of Centers for World Mission around the world which will allow and encourage non-Western Christians to enter seriously into worldwide missionary strategy. Just as it is the business of the USCWM to explore and stimulate the various strata of evangelical resources in the U.S., endeavoring to foster pioneer mission perspective, every other point in a world-wide CWM network will have the same function for its home territory so that eventually no country in the world, not even a major region in a country, will lack an office determinedly and exclusively focusing on the task of rebuilding pioneer mission perspective.

CLASS II

REDISCOVER THE HIDDEN PEOPLE

Class II tactics are those specific plans or programs which can aid in the success of Strategy II: Rediscover the Hidden People.

It must be clear by now that the Hidden People of my definition are only part of the unreached or non-Christian people (individuals) in the world. According to the bar chart on page 18, 1,031 million nominal Christians and 604 million non-Christians are unreached, but are *not* part of the Hidden People: there are another 2,456 million others in the Hidden People category. The justification for excluding the first two groups from this strategy — indeed we are not suggesting here any strategies for reaching them at all! — is a very weighty reason. For example, look closely at the following agencies: the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, the National Committees under the Continuing Lausanne program, the Billy Graham Center, and even the Fuller School of World Mission. These agencies are noted for their sincere concern for evangelism of all kinds. All of them are interested in the full spectrum of evangelistic needs in the world. What they intend leaves out no non-Christians of any kind. Nevertheless, their actual outworking in practice is predominantly and admittedly a stress upon what is necessary to reach the E-0 and E-1 categories, that is, the nominal Christians and the “within-range”

non-Christians. After all, the E-0 and E-1 categories consist of 1,031 and 604 millions of people respectively, roughly 1.6 billion together, and it is no wonder that these magnificent organizations do not often work beyond the horizons of such a large mass of authentic spiritual need. The Strategy Working Group of the Lausanne Congress on World Evangelization does, indeed, have a tie-in now with World Vision's MARC, which is doing research on virtually the whole spectrum of unreached peoples. This is to be welcomed. But what we must be concerned about is the possibility that, even so, they will be working mainly in the E-0 and E-1 areas since they are researching and focusing on groups with as high as 20% practicing Christians among them. Once again, how can we avoid the evidence that *wherever an organizational mandate includes activity both where there are sizeable numbers of Christians and where there are no Christians at all, the latter group easily becomes hidden from view and grossly underemphasized?* The fact is that a very small percentage of North American missionaries are working within cultures where there is not yet any national church.

There is a second reason why for strategic purposes some agencies must focus exclusively on the Hidden People (e.g., the E-2 and E-3). Pastors, for example, are usually working with E-0 or E-1 evangelism, but now and then bump into people who are sufficiently strange culturally so as not to fit into their congregations. So long as they have no clear idea what it takes to win such people, they may simply cross them off as "resistant." But let us imagine an inner city Baptist church around which has grown up a Polish ghetto. The church is holding on to a few elderly Anglos whose parents before them probably paid for the building in which they worship. But so long as a sharp distinction is not made in tactics of evangelism between reaching E-1 Anglos who need Christ and the very different task of reaching E-2 Polish, what may happen is that the people in the congregation may get depressed and not even try to win the remaining Anglos. Or, even if they win huge numbers of Anglos and keep their church building full, the Polish will still be hidden from their eyes as much by their very success as by their unanalyzed inability to reach them.

The Apostle Paul in effect entered upon his revolutionary ministry by reason of his awareness of the existence of a Hidden People, namely the Greeks. The Jews in the synagogues he visited may or may not have accepted the gospel he preached, but in any case most of them continued to have "people blindness." They didn't quite realize that the handful of Greeks in the back rows of their synagogues (despite the nice names given to them — the "devout persons" or the

“God fearers”) really constituted a different people and that so long as the Jews ran the synagogue there would never be more Gentiles than a few Greeks in the back rows. Thus, the most revolutionary strategy we see in the New Testament revolves around the distinction we feel important to perpetuate in our endeavors in 1978, namely, the distinction that forces us to look beyond those fortunate people who at least have a church they could go to that fits their cultural tradition, that is, people who are therefore ready targets for the new impulses of evangelism that are being promoted on every hand by agencies ranging from the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association to World Vision’s pastors’ conferences to John Haggai’s evangelism workshops. The very existence of all such good work among people we can see may continue to blind us to the existence of the Hidden People. In order not to be blind, we must determinedly rediscover today the scope and the challenge of *the people among whom there is not yet any culturally relevant organized Christian fellowship. These are our hidden, or our forgotten, people.* In so saying, we are merely stressing what William Carey and Hudson Taylor in their own eras *also* stressed by the ample use of statistics.

Nor was Paul embarrassed by all the good work his mandate excluded. He acknowledged (Gal 2:7) that Peter was called to work among the circumcized (E-0 and E-1) but that he, Paul, was apparently intended by God to ignore such people, being himself sent to the uncircumcized. Imagine the strategic confusion if in every move Paul made he (or any of the other missionary bands, whether of Barnabas or anyone else) were *forced* by some faulty theological consideration to deal with both circumcized and uncircumcized. It seems clear to me that had Paul *not* assumed the complete legitimacy of focussing exclusively upon the uncircumcized, he would have had even greater difficulty than he had trying to please both groups. Thus, the Hidden People today must be isolated in our strategy, and whatever resources of personnel and funds that are focussed upon their redemption need to be separated out and added to what now is going on so as to contrast these additions with the current resources of personnel and funds already focussed upon those who are within the reach of churches. Otherwise I don’t believe we can do either job properly.

To see how such a distinction in strategy can affect the cause of missions we must reflect for a moment upon the immense impetus in modern times resulting from Hudson Taylor’s sensitivity to the Hidden People of his time. It bothered him profoundly that some

people were without any witness at all. As a result of his new departure, the entire modern "faith mission" movement emerged, its most important emphasis as I see it by no means being the element of faith in its fund raising but rather the relentless emphasis upon the "inland" peoples. Thus arose the China Inland Mission, the African Inland Mission, the Sudan Interior Mission, the Unevangelized Fields Mission, the Heart of Africa Mission, the Regions Beyond Missionary Union, the New Tribes Mission, etc., etc. The statistics Hudson Taylor worked with and the "ever accusing map" drove him to his knees and to bold moves that his retiring nature would never have suggested. How we need many new Hudson Taylors today! They must arrive from both East and West to befriend and help to rediscover by maps and statistics the vast groups of Hidden People today, far more vast than those within view, those to whom are directed the great bulk of \$700 million per year of U.S. mission effort.

Of all the functions of the U.S. Center for World Mission, its "strategy institutes" are accorded the highest of all its priorities. Each of them will also function as a department of the William Carey International University, which is the sister corporation to the USCWM. Five of the six institutes now have at least an acting director. They will be autonomous and have a life of their own and can grow as large as seems necessary. The three that focus on the Chinese, Muslims and Hindus respectively need to be fairly large because of the immense sectors of humanity they represent. Each institute will try to keep track of all research being done in its area, sharing in both a giving and a receiving relationship with its counterpart institutes in the sister centers around the world.

Statistics and research, unfortunately, cannot be intelligently pursued unless concrete definitions are employed for the entities being counted. Essential to Strategy II, therefore, is further discussion among the various research agencies presently at work in the area of unreached people. As I discuss the matter with others, I am convinced that the terminology *reached/unreached* is not very helpful. It may be appreciated as a concession to evangelistic jargon, but even so, to *reach* people for Christ normally means to win individuals to a personal loyalty to Christ that constitutes the "evangelical experience." As a result, what is usually meant by to "reach a *person*" is a phenomenon that has no exact parallel to any process that would impinge upon a *group*, especially a group that is not in the same place at the same time. For example, evangelicals do not normally talk about individuals being *partially* reached. They

conceive of regeneration as an event, either taking place or not taking place, just as a woman cannot be *partially* pregnant. Accordingly, the use of the word *reach* when describing a group or a people as *reached* or *unreached* requires a distinct semantic shift which I believe simply confuses the whole issue. To be faithful semantically, one would have to speak of "partially reached groups," and such groups could then never properly be considered unreached so long as there were *any* reached individuals among them. Perhaps they could be called "relatively unreached," or "underreached," or "partially reached," but not "unreached" unless there were precisely *no* "reached" people at all among them. Yet we have already noted that the Strategy Working Group of the Lausanne Committee is suggesting that they will consider "unreached" any group that does not have more than 20% practicing Christians (or "reached people") among them. Furthermore, by this definition the presence or the absence of a culturally relevant congregation is ignored. Moreover, this definition would seem to blur the distinction (and thus the differing priorities in evangelism) between partially reached and totally unreached groups. I have no quarrel with the desire and call of some to work with groups having as many as 20% practicing Christians among them. But since very few peoples in the world have more than 20% practicing Christians, by employing such a definition, the truly and totally unevangelized peoples may very easily remain just as hidden as ever. This is why, however *unreached people* is defined — I would classify E-0, E-1 and E-2, E-3 peoples as *unreached* — I believe we should call "Hidden Peoples" those E-2 and E-3 groups within which there is no culturally relevant church.

This is the reason I have further pause about the very word *reach*. I feel it is much more important to stress the presence or the absence of some aspect of the church in its organized form than to try to grapple with statistics that ultimately rest upon the presence or absence of the gospel in an individual's heart. It is not only easier to verify the existence of the visible church, it is also strategically very important in missionary activity for church planting to exist as a tangible goal. We know that where there is no determined stress upon founding an organized fellowship of worshipping believers, a great deal of evangelism fails to produce long term results, fails to start a beachhead that will grow by itself. Thus, for both spiritual and practical reasons, I would be much more pleased to talk about the presence of a church allowing people to be *incorporated*, or the absence of a church leaving people *unincorporable* instead of *unreached*. I feel it

would be better to try to observe, not whether people are "saved" or not or somehow "reached" or not, but first whether an individual has been incorporated in a believing fellowship or not, and secondly, if a person is not incorporated, does he have the opportunity *within his cultural tradition* to be so incorporated. *Unreached* could be so defined but at present is not, since a person could be "reached for Christ" in the current phrase and yet not be incorporated, and a person could conceivably be incorporated without being truly reached. But the more important, measurable factor has to do with incorporation, in my estimation.

Thus, I would be willing to call a people *reached* whether or not every individual in the group were reached so long as there were, for the majority of the people in the group, the live opportunity to be incorporated into a vital Christian fellowship representing his own group's cultural tradition. Accordingly, I would call a people *unreached* if such opportunity did not exist for all the people. The question for me then is as follows: "Are the members of a given group *incorporable* in a culturally relevant congregation accessible to them?" If *not*, they are unincorporable, and I would prefer to define that group *unreached* if *unincorporable* seems too unwieldy. For our purposes here, I am calling all such peoples "hidden."

So, lest there be any confusion in our research activity about what is intended by the phrase *the Hidden People*, let me reiterate that these are *the people of the world who cannot be drawn by E-1 methods into any existing, organized Christian fellowship* (e.g., church or redemptive sodality). Let me illustrate. When I was in Guatemala, I had to study both the Spanish language and an American Indian tongue. In Spanish I was working at an E-2 distance. In the Indian language, I was at an E-3 distance. But neither group would be part of the Hidden People category we have defined here, since in both groups there were many solid believers and believing fellowships. The Gospel has now successfully penetrated these two cultures, and thus *by E-1 methods any of the non-Christians in either group can be drawn by E-1 activity into existing Christian fellowships*.

Well, are there then any Hidden People in Guatemala? The descendents of the Maya speak 33 different mutually unintelligible dialects. The group with which my wife and I worked numbers today about 400,000, and there are at least five significantly different sub-dialects for this one of 33 dialects. All five of the sub-dialect areas by now have believing fellowships within them. Yet there are still some (but not very many) *areas where a new believer could not be*

incorporated into an existing, believing fellowship. People in such areas are Hidden People. We hope soon that there will be a Center for World Mission in Guatemala that can collaborate with us in determining all the places where Hidden People of that sort are, how to get to them, and whether any additional help is needed from any foreign country in the world. Meanwhile, the U.S. Center for World Mission must undertake to pinpoint the Hidden People in the U.S., some of whom may be Navajo. It may even be that Guatemalan Indian believers might be more successful in reaching Navajos than are U.S. citizens, who cannot easily disentangle themselves from the power structure of our society.

However, the Hidden People in Guatemala are not all tribal people. *Any linguistic, cultural or sociological group defined in terms of its primary affinity (not secondary or trivial affinities), which cannot be won by E-1 methods and drawn into an existing fellowship, are Hidden People,* whether they are Russian Jews in the capital city or wealthy Asian families within whose social milieu there simply is not yet any opportunity both to hear the gospel and to be carried forward in discipleship by an existing Christian fellowship. Note that we are not counting as Hidden People the masses of nominal Catholics who, while they may be unreached and needing E-0 evangelism, are not *hidden* by culture barriers so as to require E-2 and E-3 techniques. We do not unfeelingly exclude them. The great masses of truly hidden people are not spiritually higher in priority, perhaps, but for some people somewhere they must become *highest priority* lest we continue to put the bulk of all our efforts into rewinning nominal Christians in Europe and Latin America while truly hidden, unreached people cry out for even a minimal witness. Why should there be more U.S. missionaries in Austria than in all of North India? Relative to population size, we have sent ten times as many missionaries to Kenya as to Indonesia. Even so, the very few pioneer missionaries in Kenya get relatively little support from either the missions or the national churches. There are intrepid missionary pioneers in Irian Jaya, former West New Guinea, but the bulk of missionaries in Indonesia are assisting settled Christian communities which evangelize their own kind but relatively seldom reach out to cross new frontiers.

It almost goes without saying that the tactics necessary for the rediscovery of the Hidden People must be developed at every point in close coordination with existing churches and missions, especially the latter, and especially missions arising inside the political boundaries within which the Hidden People are to be found. As a last resort,

however, the Hidden People belong to God, not to man, and we must all recognize the need to obey God rather than man in fulfilling the biblical mandate to seek and to find those who sit in darkness. An overemphasis on "partnership in mission" can stagnate many potential efforts.

CLASS III RE-EVALUATE ALL PREVIOUS APPROACHES

Class III takes up those specific plans or programs which can do in the future of history. It is Re-evaluate All Previous Approaches. I have spent ten years reexamining many aspects of the whole history of the expansion of Christianity, and I am aware that a brief synopsis in this paper cannot properly deal with all the necessary support in this strategy. We can at least say that there is much to be gained by disciplined reflection upon past experience. If we learned all we need to from the movements of Jewish and Christian teachers in the early centuries, and the importance of a relatively simple practice whereby a synagogue or church can be founded. It is the significance of the involuntary cross-cultural transmission of the gospel whereby captured peoples carried or caught the challenge of the gospel. Of the astonishing effect of called church leaders or rigorously committed communities devoted to the transmission of the bible, and Christian teachers who flooded Europe with their simple but devout enthusiasm. Of the rustic missionaries of the hidden world who transplanted whole village economies and wilderness supports. Of disciplined orders that impressed empires

CLASS III REEVALUATE ALL PREVIOUS APPROACHES

Class III tactics are those specific plans or programs which can aid in the success of Strategy III: Reevaluate All Previous Approaches.

I have spent ten years reevaluating many aspects of the whole history of the expansion of Christianity, and I am aware that a brief sub-point in this paper cannot properly deal with all the necessary tactics under this strategy. We can at least insist that there is much to be gained by disciplined reflection upon past experience. Have we learned all we need to from the movements of Jewish and Christian merchants in the early centuries, and the importance of a relatively simple process whereby a synagogue or a church can be founded? Or the significance of the involuntary cross-cultural transmission of the gospel whereby captured peoples carried or caught the challenge of the gospel? Or the missionizing effect of exiled church leaders, or rigorously committed communities devoted to the transmission of the Bible, and charismatic mendicants who flooded Europe with their simple but devout enthusiasm? Or the austere missionaries of the Moravian tradition who transplanted whole village economies into wilderness outposts? Or disciplined orders that impressed emperors

with their scientific knowledge? Or breathtaking attempts to build upon and to extend the Vedic literature into the full light of the gospel? Or puzzling proposals for maintaining respect but not worship of ancestors? Or bafflement at the caste stratification of India and the seemingly impregnable hostility of the Muslim tradition? And now, the quest for satellite communication in the major world languages and the perennial impulse to find short circuits without carefully reviewing the record of the past.

Indeed, the characteristic passion of the missionary tends to impatience. "To review all previous approaches" is the last thing the activist wants to do. Even more troublesome, however, may be the appalling ignorance of missionary principles and practices among the masses of the evangelical movement to whom all appeals for funds must make sense. It is an inherent problem that work at a cultural distance will not only be difficult for the missionary to fathom, but doubly difficult for the people back home to digest. William Carey finally gave up on the people back home and organized his own self-support on the field. Hudson Taylor in an 1888 consultation suggested approaches to polygamy with which even his ordinary followers today certainly would have great difficulty. The best brains of the Roman missionary tradition dealing with circumstances in Peking found their superiors in Rome and even their newly arrived competitors in China in startled disagreement. Even the Apostle Paul found the bulk of the Jewish believers unable to comprehend the strategies he employed in dealing with the Hidden People, the Greeks in his day.

The opposite side of the coin is the phenomenon of the uncritical projection to foreign fields of methods and techniques that work in the U.S., assuming they will work in profoundly different situations. This is the bane of many new mission organizations. One of the most tragic weaknesses has been the American (not so much the European) tendency to establish institutions — schools, radio stations, hospitals, seminaries and, in some cases, even churches — that are *seemingly designed to function only if there is perpetual subsidy from abroad*. "Freely we have received, freely we must give" is the misused phrase that has forestalled an earlier transition to what may be called the "developmental approach."

It is no doubt generally assumed that there could be nothing more atrocious in missions than a "how many dollars per soul" approach. Even more unthinkable to the average missionary would be to seek a dollar return per dollar spent. Thus the average missionary simply

spends and is spent for the work — unselfishly and often quite unstrategically. However, the recent stress on the *development* of churches has had a salutary effect in general, one reason being the fact that it injects a measurable goal into the process. Thus, still more recently has arisen the flurry of talk about a *developmental approach* in missions. This thinking is often focussed mainly in the area of economics, but is really very little different in philosophy than many of the ingredients of the church development concern.

The essential vitamins of the developmental approach include among others the recognition of the fact of limited external resources and the resulting concern that the spending of resources must wherever possible somehow have a multiplying effect, developing in the process a self-sustaining phenomenon which will go on generating new resources, eventually functioning without continuing aid but mere intercommunication.

Thus, for example, it is in any case perfectly possible to calculate even for the most traditional missionary effort a dollar per dollar return. If you measure all the dollars poured into missionary salaries and work budgets over a period of time and compare this to the dollars represented by the national leaders' time — both volunteer and paid — and all the money raised in the development and growth of the national church, you would find that after 25 years of church planting activity in a given situation many a mission could say with verifiable justification that every dollar spent has produced \$2 or \$10 or perhaps even \$100. Today the offerings alone of many a younger church exceed current mission subsidy, but surely the cumulative total of all mission funds expended ought not to exceed the cumulative total of all national funds raised. Mission work is really not a bad investment! This reminds us of the developmental significance of the parable of the four soils and the parable of the talents.

But it is also a widely known dictum in the management of human affairs (notably as Parkinson observed it) that *expenses always rise to meet income*. In the absence of any accountability or measurement of results, it is exceedingly unlikely that any private business trying to establish itself in a foreign country would become self-sustaining even in a thousand years if its income steadily arrived from the home office with no questions asked as to the development of income in the overseas branch itself. Yet missionaries commonly work year after year with income from home that is not very strictly related to observable results. In such a case, the fact that even half of all missionaries are as successful as they have been is a magnificent

tribute to the quality of intuition and the integrity of purpose of the traditional missionary movement, and the inherent, unrestrainable power of the seed which is the Word of God.

Nevertheless, previous approaches must be reevaluated with developmental perspective. We understand that laws are already on the books in India which, if implemented, would cut off all foreign funds destined to religious institutions. Some village congregations may appear to be too poor to provide for a pastor without outside funds. This is doubtful unless missionaries have forced city-trained professionals upon them. But congregations need not only to support a pastor but also to send missionaries across new frontiers to reach the Hidden People. This may indeed take economic development within the church and the surrounding community. One missionary is training tribal people to set up and operate as retail merchants in jungle outposts, thus displaying a developmental perspective as well as a tent-making missionary strategy.

The same missionary, Don Richardson, who wrote *Peace Child* and now *Lords of the Earth*, has proposed another kind of approach which capitalizes upon the seeking of *redemptive analogies*, an insight so significant that Kenneth Pike, one of Wycliffe Bible Translators' brilliant senior strategists, declared that he knows of nothing like it in theory or in practice.

Space does not allow us to go further even to list, much less annotate, the major lines of new thinking in the area of reevaluation of approach. Three items must be mentioned which are merely the means of reevaluation.

One is the August 1980 conference of mission agencies where the focus will be exclusively on efforts among totally non-Christian peoples. Patterned after the conference in 1910, and functioning as a follow-through conference to the Lausanne-sponsored more general conference scheduled for January of that year, it would seem that a conference stressing the Hidden People can be a significant milestone in strategic thinking viewed from the particular perspective of the *mission* structures of both the Western and the non-Western worlds. A number of key mission leaders from around the world have already consented to respond to the 1974 Call.

A second means does not yet exist for our day: a major document library which will collect the significant written materials reflecting the ongoing contemporary dynamism of the worldwide cause of missions. The Missionary Research Library performed this function when R. Pierce Beaver was there, but for the last twenty years most of

such documents have slipped, perhaps forever, from the pages of history. It is very difficult to reevaluate without the basic data.

The third mechanism that does not yet exist is an efficient document-interchange service. Back in the days when it took a year and a half for a letter to go from London to Fiji and back again, policies and perspectives could not change very rapidly. Today the largest meetings of mission executives in the U.S.A. are the IFMA and the EFMA executive retreats. These annual cycles of proposal and response are not sufficient either. The William Carey Library which in the past seven years has launched over two hundred book titles is a step forward. Then there are periodicals – *Missiology: An International Review*, the *Evangelical Missions Quarterly*, the new *Gospel in Context*, the expanded *Occasional Bulletin of Missionary Research*, the *Church Growth Bulletin* and *Church Growth: America*. All these represent American efforts at making ideas flow. But just as it is in other fields of endeavor, the majority of the most recent thinking takes years to get around. The U.S. Center for World Mission hopes to do something about all three of these needed mechanisms.

Meanwhile, there seems to be an increasing tempo of consultations of various kinds. The Overseas Ministries Study Center at Ventnor, N.J., has established an admirable pattern in this area. The various Lausanne Committees on their own are grappling forward with many new ideas and sponsoring still other consultations. The general picture today for reevaluation is bright indeed.

CLASS IV

RECONSECRATE OURSELVES TO WARTIME, NOT PEACETIME, LIFESTYLE

Class IV tactics are those special plans or programs which can aid in the success of Strategy IV: Reconsecrate Ourselves to a Wartime, not Peacetime, Lifestyle.

There will only be a way if there is a will. But we will find there is no will

- so long as the Great Commission is thought impossible to fulfill;
- so long as anyone thinks that the problems of the world are hopeless or that, conversely, they can be solved merely by politics or technology;
- so long as our home problems loom larger to us than anyone else's;
- so long as people enamored of Eastern culture do not understand that Chinese and Muslims can and must as easily become evangelical Christians without abandoning their cultural systems as did the Greeks in Paul's day;
- so long as modern believers, like the ancient Hebrews, get to thinking that God's sole concern is the blessing of our nation;
- so long as well paid evangelicals, both pastors and people, consider their money a gift from God to spend however they wish on

themselves rather than a responsibility from God to help others in spiritual and economic need;

- so long as we do not understand that he who would seek to save his life shall lose it.

America today is a save-yourself society if there ever was one. But does it really work? The underdeveloped societies suffer from one set of diseases: tuberculosis, malnutrition, pneumonia, parasites, typhoid, cholera, typhus, etc. Affluent America has virtually invented a whole new set of diseases: obesity, arteriosclerosis, heart disease, strokes, lung cancer, venereal disease, cirrhosis of the liver, drug addiction, alcoholism, divorce, battered children, suicide, murder. Take your choice. Labor saving machines have turned out to be body killing devices. Our affluence has allowed both mobility and isolation of the nuclear family and as a result our divorce courts, our prisons and our mental institutions are flooded. In saving ourselves we have nearly lost ourselves.

How hard have we tried to save others? Consider the fact that the U.S. evangelical slogan "Pray, give or go" allows people merely to pray, if that is their choice! By contrast the Friends Missionary Prayer Band of South India numbers 8000 people in their prayer bands and supports 80 full-time missionaries in North India. If my denomination (with its unbelievably greater wealth per person) were to do that well, we would not be sending 500 missionaries, but 26,000. In spite of their true poverty, those poor people in South India are sending 50 times as many cross-cultural missionaries as we are! This fact reminds me of the title of a book, *The Poor Pay More*. They may very well pay more for the things they buy, but they are apparently willing to pay more for the things they believe. No wonder the lukewarm non-sacrificing believer is a stench in the nostrils of God. Luis Palau (1977) in a new book speaks of "unyielding mediocrity" in America today. When will we recognize the fact that the wrath of God spoken of in the Bible is far less directed at those who sit in darkness than it is against those who refuse to share what they have?

How hard have we tried to save others? The \$700 million per year Americans give to mission agencies is no more than they give for chewing gum. Americans pay as much for pet food every 52 days as they spend annually for foreign missions. A person must overeat by at least \$1.50 worth of food per month to maintain one excess pound of flesh. Yet \$1.50 per month is more than what 90% of all Christians in America give to missions. If the average mission supporter is only five pounds overweight, it means he spends (to his own hurt) at least five

times as much as he gives for missions. If he were to choose simple food (as well as not overeat) he could give ten times as much as he does to mission and not modify his standard of living in any other way!

Where does this line of reasoning lead? It means that the overall lifestyle to which Americans have acquiesced has led us to a place where we are hardening our hearts and our arteries simultaneously. Is our nation not described by Isaiah?

My people are like the dead branches of a tree . . . a foolish nation, a witless, stupid people . . . The only language they can understand is punishment. So God will send against them foreigners who speak strange gibberish! Only then will they listen to Him! They could have rest in their own land if they would obey Him, if they were kind and good (Isa. 27:11, 28:11,12).

Or, hear Ezekiel:

They come as though they are sincere and sit before you listening. But they have no intention of doing what I tell them to; they talk very sweetly about loving the Lord, but with their hearts they are loving their money . . .

My sheep wandered through the mountains and hills and over the face of the earth, and there was no one to search for them or care about them . . . As I live, says the Lord God, . . . you were no real shepherds at all, for you didn't search for them (my flock). You fed yourselves and let them starve. . . . Therefore the Lord God says: I will surely judge between these fat shepherds and their scrawny sheep . . . and I will notice which is plump and which is thin, and why! (Eze. 33:31; 34:6, 34:8, 20, 22b).

We must learn that Jesus meant it when He said, "Unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required." I believe that *God cannot expect less from us as our Christian duty to save other nations than our own nation in wartime conventionally requires of us in order to save our own nation.* This means that we must be willing to adopt a wartime lifestyle if we are to play fair with the clear intent of scripture that the poor of this earth, the people who sit in darkness, shall see a great light. Otherwise, again Isaiah, "I faint when I hear what God is planning" (Isa. 21:3).

The essential tactic to fulfill Strategy IV is to build on the pioneer mission perspective that will be the fruit of Strategy I, and to do so by a

very simple and dramatic method. Those who are awakened from the grogginess and stupor of our times can, of course, go as missionaries. But they can also *stay home and deliberately and decisively adopt a missionary support level as their standard of living and their basis of lifestyle, regardless of their income.* This will free up an unbelievable amount of money — so much in fact that if a million average Presbyterian households were to live within the average Presbyterian minister's salary, it would create at least two billion dollars a year. Yet that happens to be only one-seventh of the amount Americans spend on tobacco. But what a mighty gift to the nations if carefully spent on developmental missions!

In order to help families shift to a wartime lifestyle, two organizations are proposing a six-step plan that will lead gradually (with both education and coaching) to the adoption of the salary provisions of an existing mission agency, the remainder of their income, at their own discretion at every point, being dedicated to what they believe to be the highest mission priority. The United Presbyterian Order for World Evangelization is a denominational sister of the general Order for World Evangelization. The twofold purpose of each of these organizations is 1) to imbue individuals and families with a concern for reaching the Hidden People and 2) to assist them in practical ways to live successfully within the maximum limits of expenditure as defined by an agreed upon existing mission structure.

Even missionary families need help in staying within their income limitations, but ironically, no more so than people with twice their income. These organizations believe that families can be healthier and happier by identifying themselves with the same discipline with which missionary families are coping. For two hundred years it has been the undeviating pattern of all Protestant missionary agencies to establish a single standard for all their overseas personnel, adjusted of course to known costs of living and for various kinds of special circumstances. Some boards extend this system to their home office staff. No agency (until now) has gone the one logical step further — namely, to offer to the donors themselves this unique and long-tested system. In view of the widespread concern of our time for a simple lifestyle, it would seem that this is an idea whose time has come.

We have Weight Watcher Clinics all over the country. We have Total Woman Clinics. Why not mission-focused Family Lifestyle Clinics? How much more significant these clinics will be with ends as noble as the Great Commission!

To reconsecrate ourselves to a wartime lifestyle will involve a mammoth upheaval for a significant minority. It will not go uncontested — any more than did the stern warnings of Isaiah and Ezekiel. But we do not need to defend our campaign. It is not ours.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beaver, R. Pierce, ed.

- 1973 *The Gospel and Frontier Peoples: A Report of A Consultation, December 1972*, So. Pasadena, William Carey Library.

Brown, G. Thompson

- 1977 "Possible Directions for the International Mission of the Church in the Next Decade — A Study Paper," available from the United Presbyterian Center for Mission Studies, 1605 Elizabeth, Pasadena, CA.

Hwang, Bernard

- 1977 "Ancestor Cult Today," *Missiology: An International Review* Vol. V, No. 3, July 1977.

Liao, David

- 1972 *The Unresponsive: Resistant or Neglected?* Chicago, IL: Moody Press.

Nelson, Marlin L.

- 1976 *The How and Why of Third World Missions: An Asian Case Study*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.
- 1976 (ed.) *Readings in Third World Missions: A Collection of Essential Documents*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.

Palau, Luis

- 1977 *Time to Shout*. Portland, OR: Multnomah Press.

Scott, Waldron

- 1975 "The Task Before Us" slides and script available from Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.

Vander Werff, Lyle L.

- 1977 *Christian Mission to Muslims: The Record* Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.

Wilder, John

- 1976 "Some Reflections or Possibilities for People Movements Among Muslims," *Missiology: An International Review* Vol. IV, No. 3, July 1976.

Winter, Ralph D.

- 1971 "The New Missions and the Mission of the Church," *International Review of Mission*, Vol. LX, No. 237, pp. 89-100.
- 1974 "Seeing the Task Graphically," *Evangelical Missions Quarterly*, Vol. 10, No. 1, Jan. 1974.
- 1975 "The Highest Priority: Cross-Cultural Evangelism," *Let the Earth Hear His Voice*, ed. by J.D. Douglas, Minneapolis: World Wide Publications. Available also in booklet form from the William Carey Library with an introduction by Dr. Donald A. McGavran — entitled *The New Macedonia*.
- 1976 "1980 and That Certain Elite," *Missiology: An International Review*, Vol. IV, No. 2, April 1976, pp. 145-159.
- 1977 "The Grounds for a New Thrust in Missions," *Evangelical Missions Tomorrow*, ed. by Wade T. Coggins and Edwin L. Frizen, Jr. So. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library. Also available as a separate booklet.
- 1978 "Ghana: Preparation for Marriage," *International Review of Mission*, July, pp. 338-353.
- 1979a "Protestant Mission Societies: The American Experience," *Missiology*, April.
- 1979b "The Six Essential Components of World Evangelization," *An Evangelical Agenda: 1984 and Beyond*, Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.

About the Author

Dr. Ralph D. Winter graduated from the California Institute of Technology, has an M.A. from Columbia University, a Ph.D. from Cornell University and a B.D. from Princeton Theological Seminary. He served ten years as a missionary in Guatemala, another ten years on the faculty of the School of World Mission at Fuller Theological Seminary. He was one of the plenary speakers at the International Congress on World Evangelization at Lausanne, Switzerland and has given major addresses at the Executives Retreat of the Interdenominational Foreign Mission Association meeting, the Evangelical Foreign Missions Association, and the National Conference of the Association of Church Missions Committees. He has been active in the formation and development of several mission organizations, as well as the Theological Education by Extension movement, the American Society of Missiology (of which he was the first Secretary and later President), the Summer Institute of International Studies, and the William Carey Library publishing house. From time to time he serves as an adjunct professor both at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School and at Fuller Theological Seminary. He was the editor of *Theological Education by Extension*, *The Evangelical Response to Bangkok*, the author of *The Twenty-Five Unbelievable Years, 1945-1969* and numerous chapters and articles in well-known publications. He is the Founder and currently General Director of the U.S. Center for World Mission in Pasadena.

OTHER BOOKLETS BY THE SAME AUTHOR:

The Grounds for a New Thrust in World Mission, 75¢

The New Macedonia: A Revolutionary New Era in Missions Begins, 75¢

1980 and That Certain Elite, 35¢

Say Yes to Mission, 25¢

Seeing the Task Graphically, 50¢

Six Essential Components of World Evangelization: Goals for 1984, 75¢

The Two Structures of God's Redemptive Mission, 35¢

The World Christian Movement, 1950-1975, 75¢

These booklets plus 300 books on world mission strategy are available (mostly at 40% off) through the Church Growth Book Club. Membership in the Book Club is obtained by subscribing to the bimonthly *Church Growth Bulletin* for \$3.00 per year. You may send in your subscription or request further information from the Book Club at 1705 N. Sierra Bonita Avenue, Pasadena, California 91104.

Price \$1.25

William Carey Library

1705 N. SIERRA BONITA AVE. • PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91104



ISBN 0-87808-914-4