

Analyzing the Frontier Mission Movement and Unreached People Group Thinking

Part III: Critical Analysis of the Missiology of the Frontier Mission Movement

by Alan Johnson



In the preceding two sections I have endeavored to describe the historical context in which the frontier mission movement and unreached people group thinking emerged, set forth its major concepts and trace some of their development, and provide a brief overview some of the movements and applications which have grown out of this philosophy of missions. This section will interact critically with the concepts presented above.

The Problem of a Minimalist Conception of the Great Commission.

As I have noted above, one of the driving forces of the frontier mission movement is the laudable goal of closure, seeking to bring the Great Commission to completion. While this desire to come up with precise measures of the status of world evangelization is one of the strengths of the movement, the practical result (for those who misunderstand intermediate goals for final goals) is the creation of a minimalist conception of the meaning of the Great Commission. The burning desire to be able to say that we have in some sense finished a task or the task has led to a very limited definition of what the task means so that it becomes possible to finish.

Gary Corwin feels that this truncated conception of the Great Commission has led to a minimizing of both the missiological task and foundational theology.¹ Missiologically, in order to maximize closure speed, the task has been minimized from “making disciples” to “evangelizing.” Robertson McQuilkin points out that when we try to measure where we are in terms of completion of the Great Commission, it simply depends on how we choose to define the issues.² If inclusivistic numbers for “Christians” are used, the sense is that we are nearing completion. On the other hand, if we look at absolute numbers of people who do not know Christ personally on the planet, then we are far from finished. McQuilkin believes that the AD 2000 movement has redefined the task around the establishment of a witnessing church group in each people. “But such an approach should not be used to lull us into thinking the task is completed in any people group where we have a beachhead... the Great Commission speaks of discipling the nations, not implanting a nucleus.”³

Alan has worked in Thailand as an Assemblies of God missionary to Thailand since 1986. He currently serves as the program director for the Institute of Buddhist Studies and is a member of the committee on two-thirds World Mission focusing on the non-western Assemblies of God mission movement and its role in bringing the Gospel to least reached people groups. He and his wife, Lynette, have two daughters. Alan is serving as the Missionary in Residence at Northwest College for the 2001-2002 academic year. They will return to Thailand in the fall of 2002.

Theologically, the doctrine of justification by faith has been in a sense minimized in order to maximize the missionary task force by defining major parts of the world as “Christian” which has the effect of lessening the number of people and groups that need to be reached. Corwin argues that neither Great Commission Christianity nor Biblical Christianity can exist where the principle of justification by faith has not been embraced.⁴ He points out

There is a great gulf between the minimum missiological breakthrough that Winter outlined in 1980 and a pioneer church planting movement of 100 believers.

“that in significant parts of the so-called ‘Christian’ world, the percentage of true believers is so small that a lack of focused missionary endeavor would constitute nothing short of practical heresy.”⁵

There are also strategic problems that arise out of a minimalist conception of the Great Commission. When the focus is placed on initial goals of minimal church planting in order to reach the whole world as quickly as possible, there is the risk of turning over the work of evangelization within a people group to a church that is not yet capable of carrying on that task. There is the very real possibility of the premature death or weakening of young church planting movements where the work would have to be virtually redone at another point in time.

I believe that these missiological, theological and strategic problems that are part of a minimizing of task of the Great Commission represent a change within the frontier mission movement itself, and are in large part driven by a “closure fixation.” This change can be tracked by comparing definitions given at the 1980 Edinburgh World Consultation on Frontier Missions with those connected with the unveiling of the Joshua Project 2000 in 1995. The concepts as outlined by Ralph Winter in his lecture on frontier mission terminology show that the idea of reaching a people group, far from

being minimalist, was a very ambitious project. At Edinburgh Winter defined the task of the penetration of a people for missiological breakthrough as the development of an evangelizing church capable of continuing the evangelization of their group without E-2 or E-3 help.⁶ He notes that, “this kind of breakthrough is a more profoundly difficult task than is the task of evangelistic church planting in a culture once such a breakthrough has taken

place.⁷ Commenting on the stated goal of “A Church for Every People by the Year 2000,” Winter points out that the term church “must mean a viable church,...[which means] at least that minimum yet sufficiently developed indigenous Christian tradition to be capable of evangelizing its own people without E-2 or E-3 help.”⁸ For Winter this lofty goal is just the *minimum* for missiological breakthrough.

It is true that trying to operationalize the goal of a “viable indigenous church” in order to measure it has been a rather elusive task. Although it has been hard to reach consensus on the precise indicators used to quantify viability, Trent Rowland believes that in spite of these difficulties there is value in measuring, since “definitions help us to look at what’s left to do.”⁹ We need to realize that any time we attempt to define the Great Commission in order to measure its completion we are of necessity developing a human construct to do so. The whole idea of “reachedness” and concepts like missiological breakthrough are human attempts at quantifying what the Great Commission would look like if it were completed.

Difficulties with measurement notwithstanding, what Ralph Winter articulated in 1980 appears to me to be rather a different (and intermediate) concept than what brought forth McQuilkin’s criticism of the AD 2000 movement for merely implanting a nucleus.

Viability, as Winter defines it, which is both quantity and quality, is the means which best ensures that the people of a given culture will have an opportunity to hear the gospel message in a way that is understandable.

However, when we come down to 1995 and the unveiling of Joshua Project 2000 there is a tangible change in approach to definitions and terminology. While this was published in *Mission Frontiers Bulletin* it received editorial criticism. The sense of precision is gone, with the goal being variously described as “at minimum, a pioneer church-planting movement among every people (or *ethne*),”¹⁰ “a minimum of 50 believers in reproducing fellowships,”¹¹ or to “ultimately plant a Biblical congregation of believers within practical and cultural distance of every person in every class and kind of people in the nation and beyond.”¹² In a photocopied update on the Joshua Project 2000 peoples list that I received dated June 6, 1996, the initial minimum goal is stated as the establishment of a pioneer church-planting movement, which is then defined as 100 or more believing Christians in one or more churches by December 31, 2000.¹³

There is thus a great gulf between the minimum missiological breakthrough that Winter outlined in 1980 and a pioneer church planting movement of 100 believers.¹⁴ It would seem that this is a case of what Gary Corwin calls, “sound-bite missiology” that majors in catchy slogans, but minimizes the realities of the task for the sake of short-term mobilization goals.¹⁵ The erosion away from the more robust concept of viability to a minimalist definition of reachedness seems to be connected to the issues of the race for closure by the year 2000 and the accompanying need for promoting this goal. In the next section I will examine some of the strategic difficulties that arise from this concept of closure.

Strategic Problems Arising from the Human Construct of Closure

The idea of closure is based on biblical idea found in Matthew 24:14 that after the gospel is preached to all the nations (*ethne*) then the end would come.

However, just as with the concept of reachedness, once we begin to attempt to operationalize closure so that it becomes measurable in our terms, we have moved beyond the biblical idea to a human construct. Advocates of frontier mission are careful to say that they do not understand precisely what closure is and when the Lord will return, rather they are trying to come up with a clear definition that provides some common ground for evaluating progress on the Great Commission. The intent of developing such a construct is good. However, the implication for some observers that comes across is that “reaching” every group in this minimalist way opens the door to the return of the Lord since the gospel will indeed have been preached in this narrow, restricted sense to every ethnic group in the world.

What this means is that an entire strategy of mission is being developed around a limited human construct designed to quantify for our benefit the sense of progress we are making on the Great Commission. This is problematic in my mind for several reasons. First, eschatological systems abound, the extreme complexity of the texts and the wide variation of opinion among scholars would seem to recommend caution for anyone trying to track progress towards the goal of bringing the Lord back. Jesus himself told the disciples that these matters the Father has fixed by his own authority (Acts 1: 6), and that it is our role to be his witnesses to the ends of the earth (Acts 1: 8). What makes us think that we will understand the details of the second coming of the Lord any better than the Jews of the first century understood the prophetic words of the Old Testament about the first coming? It seems wisdom to me to realize that in such matters we see through a glass darkly and that our time is best spent aggressively trying to reach both those who have never heard and those who have not yet

responded.

Second, the push for closure seems to be more of a promotional tool to get people excited about a tangible goal than as a reasoned program for completing the Great Commission. It seems there could be a danger of developing a truncated strategy where a potentially responsive “reached” group is neglected in order to pursue a breakthrough in an unreached one. Also, it opens the door for neglecting discipleship and leadership training issues as new groups are “reached” because we are rushing to the next unreached group to usher in the return of the Lord.

Another problem that occurs when closure is linked to the reaching of all the people groups in the world is that inherent in the very definition employed by the frontier mission movement for the term “people” is the inability to finally quantify the number of groups. Since a people is the largest possible group where the gospel can spread without encountering barriers of understanding or acceptance, this means that by definition until the gospel is really spread to the fringes of every current “people” we cannot know if such barriers have been encountered. When they are, a “people” is born and there is a need for cross-cultural mission work to start a new church planting movement. Ralph Winter points out that “it is inevitable that

this number [of unreached people groups] can only be estimated until all clusters of such groups are actually penetrated and the necessary homogeneity is confirmed.”¹⁶ Therefore, it seems somewhat dangerous to postulate closure and develop strategies based on that construct when the very nature of quantifying the task is an emerging and changing one.

Strategic Problems with the Reached/Unreached Distinction

In my opinion, the paradigm of looking at the world in terms of peoples is a very powerful tool that helps in many ways to clarify the missionary task. It does have limitations however, and when the concept is stretched to its outer limits it can result in some strategic missiological weaknesses. Thinking about peoples in terms of being reached or unreached highlights the critical need for cross-cultural evangelism. However, to begin to draw conclusions much beyond this and base strategic decisions on them is problematic.

One such area is the development of mission strategy based on an extreme literalistic view of the concept of reached. Part of the scriptural basis for pursuing church planting among all people groups is the need for having representatives from every tribe, tongue, people and nation around the throne (Revelation 5:9; 7:9). If this idea were pursued literally, and implemented into strategy, it would mean that once a particular people has enough representatives to gather around the throne (again the problem of defining how many that would be arises), then further work among that people is not necessary. It seems to me that within the ranks of the unreached peoples movement that there is a lack of consistency in the application of this principle. On one hand, it appears that in some circumstances the frontier mission movement falls back to standard evangelical missiology rather than adhering to a strict “people group representation” viewpoint. For instance, although



the North and South Koreans are a single people in the ethnolinguistic sense, North Korea is listed as unreached, even though there is a very adequate representation of Koreans in the Kingdom already. Another case would be where a people was “reached” during the early centuries of Christianity but is now “unreached,” as it is with some groups in North Africa that had strong churches until the coming of Islam. Today they are still counted as unreached, even though technically as an ethnic group they have representatives around the throne. On the other hand, when considering European peoples with a long history of Christianity and large numbers of nominal Christian adherents with only small current evangelical populations, such groups are considered adequately reached.

Two observations need to be made here. First, when the unreached/reached distinction is pushed to its logical limits it becomes less helpful in understanding missiological reality because it designates large blocks of people who are nominally exposed to Christianity as “reached.” Secondly the concept makes a naïve distinction between those who are in other religions and those who live in nominal Christian, post-modern cultures. One group becomes a target for mission because it has no chance to hear, while the other is passed over as a target since they are considered to possess within their culture the chance to hear if they want to take it. This kind of view is naïve for three reasons. First, it does not take seriously enough the reality of spiritual blindness in any system that rejects a personal knowledge of Jesus Christ. It makes an assumption that a lost person in a nominal Christian cultural has a chance to “hear” the message or seek it out. Second, this view does not take into account the kind of prejudices that can make a person look for answers everywhere but Christianity and which arise from being exposed to a nominal Christian setting. In such cases the weakened form of Christianity that people have been exposed to acts almost as a vaccine to keep them from hearing the Good News. Finally, it may not take

into consideration the health of the evangelical church movement in such lands. If the evangelical church is not vibrant in its passion to reach the lost, the opportunity for someone to truly hear the gospel in an understandable way is very small. Thus to make a distinction in evangelistic priority between peoples that have virtually the same small percentage of evangelical Christians in their cultures simply because they are geographically inside or outside the 10/40 Window and historically have little Christian background is to ignore some critical spiritual realities.

Another difficulty posed by an over pressing of the reached/unreached distinction is the extreme emphasis on the 10/40 Window as the most important target of mission efforts. McQuilkin comments that while “a far greater proportion of our task force should be going to the neediest and most neglected areas of the world... the church must not use the 10/40 Window to deflect us from our responsibility to the rest of the world.”¹⁷ Again, while the 10/40 Window is very helpful targeting tool, and highlights the least-reached parts of the world, as a principle for devising strategy it is too limited. The reached/unreached distinction focused on the 10/40 Window emphasis has been made the center of promotion for the great final mission thrust, and has led to a popular understanding that the only place for valid missionary work is there. (This problem will be discussed in more detail in a section below). However, Ralph Winter himself has declared in writing that strategic missionary effort that benefits the unreached can and must take place outside of 10/40 Window countries. He points out that there have been two classic responses to the fact of the imbalance that has existed in the missionary world with most missionaries laboring among already existing church movements. He says:

One response to this unfinished task is that we must drag all or most of our missionaries off the well-established fields and send them to the frontier peoples. Another response is that we ought to channel all our new missionaries to the frontiers and consider all other missionary mere

international church workers. *I have never agreed with either of these ideas, however well-intentioned they may be... [T]hese proposals give the wrong answer I believe, or at least they surely do not give the best answer to the unfinished task.*¹⁸

He believes instead that missionaries need to catch a new vision where they are at, to help the church movements they live and work among to develop and implement a mission vision of their own.¹⁹ Such a view is much more helpful for the further development of a mission paradigm that embraces the entire world and all of the missionary task force, rather than just a part of it.

Another strategic problem that arises from overstressing the reached/unreached concept is the fact that responsive populations can be neglected. McQuilkin warns that we must always be prepared to “flood newly opened windows of opportunity whether or not they are ‘10/40.’”²⁰ Over 25 years ago, in his response to Ralph Winter’s Lausanne paper on cross-cultural evangelism, J. Philip Hogan anticipated this very difficulty that was implied in the notion of a focus on reaching unreached peoples. He appeals for recognition of the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit in mission and notes that “we are witnessing worldwide, an outpouring of the Spirit of God upon persons and places for which there is no human design and in which there is not one shred of human planning.”²¹

The Book of Acts certainly could not be used to reject the idea of planning and working strategically in evangelism. Paul’s missionary journeys show evidence of both of these elements as he plants churches in Asia Minor. Yet what happened in Acts cannot be accounted for solely as the work of human planning, there is the repeated theme of divine intervention and specific leading of the Holy Spirit in order to bring people into the Kingdom. Philip is told by the angel of the Lord what road to walk on, and then by the Spirit to talk to the Ethiopian eunuch (9:26-30), Peter is given a vision and then instructed by the Spirit to go with the men sent by Cornelius (10:9-22), and it is the Spirit who calls apart Barnabas and

This ignorance of complex ethnographic realities can lead to ecclesiastical apartheid

Saul for their first missionary journey (13:1-4). Acts 16 is remarkable for its bringing together specific guidance, strategic decision making and God's sovereign intervention. Luke notes that Paul and his companions were kept by the Holy Spirit from preaching in the province of Asia, and that later, as they tried to enter Bithynia the Spirit would not allow them to (16:6-7). At Troas Paul is led by a vision to enter Macedonia (16:9-10). Upon arrival he then follows his usual strategy of going to major urban centers by traveling to Philippi, and starting with Jews and God-fearers at the local place of prayer (16:11-15). Later while locked in prison they are freed by an earthquake and are able to bring the jailer and his entire household to faith in Christ (16:25-34). We see that surrounded by spiritually lost people, the mission band was directed specifically by the Spirit to certain populations.

This brief overview of the work of the Spirit in evangelism in Acts argues in favor of the need for balance, sensitivity, and humility in our approach to mission strategy. We need to plan and strategize to reach the unreached peoples while at the same time recognizing and praying for the sovereign leading of the Spirit to place us in opportunities for harvest.

Finally, taking the reached/unreached distinctions too far creates a focus on "peoples" to the neglect of "people." Trent Rowland points out that what is at issue when we talk about unreached peoples is access to the Good News of Jesus Christ's victory on the cross.²² Although all people are lost, not all have equal access to the gospel message. The heart cry of the frontier mission movement is that all peoples have a chance to hear, that every group be given a chance to respond to that Good News. Yet in the emphasis to reach peoples there has been a subtle devaluing of the need to reach lost people, wherever they are. I suggested early on in this article that the biblical

understanding about peoples was not the initiating point of the unreached peoples paradigm. Rather it was the experience of missiological reality, of barriers rooted in "peopleness" that led to a closer examination of Scripture and the refined understanding of God's desire to have some from every people around his throne.

Now I want to suggest that as this movement has continued and been shaped by the momentum of the 1990s to reach every people by the year 2000, a selectiveness of understanding to support this "peoples group thinking" paradigm has grown. Within the movement the Bible is understood only through the peoples lens, and other themes such as God's love for the world are understated. While the peoples emphasis lends urgency to the task to penetrate all the ethnic groups, the global emphasis brings urgency to reaching anyone who is lost. God so loves the whole world (John 3:16) and Jesus died for the sins of the whole world (1 John 2:2). Our Lord is not willing that any should perish (2 Peter 3:9) and he is still calling the ends of the earth to turn to him and be saved (Isaiah 45:22-23).

When it comes to peoples and people it is not a case of either/or with the Lord of the harvest, but both/and. We cannot play one emphasis of Scripture against another in order to justify either a "peoples only" approach or a "lost people anywhere" approach. Missiologists and missionaries need to remind themselves that our reached/unreached distinctions are merely human criteria that have been constructed to aid in our thinking about an intermediate milestone to the task that remains, not to obscure the fact or de-emphasize the need to reach lost people wherever they are. Trent Rowland argues that since we cannot share with everyone at once, "we have to decide where to start and how to proceed. By default we will prioritize. Definitions help us make these priority decisions."²³ This is true, and the beauty of the frontier mission movement has

been its call to address the imbalance in our world in order to reach every people. But when efforts to address this imbalance create neglect of other lost people that God loves, it is indicative that the paradigm needs to be adjusted. We do not want to create a new generation of "hidden peoples" should the Lord tarry by missing opportunities and continuing to sow seeds in such cultures.

Finally, Len Bartlott charges the AD 2000 movement with a kind of people group fixation that assumes "neat solid line boundaries around people groups—what could be called a primordial view—rather than fluid and overlapping dotted line identities."²⁴ Bartlott believes that this ignorance of complex ethnographic realities can lead to ecclesiastical apartheid, processes of evangelism that are insensitive to social change, a minimizing of bridge-building similarities between peoples and the impeding of church growth "where ethnic realities and multiple identities may more fruitfully contribute to the formation of multi-ethnic (heterogeneous) or 'urban conglomerate' church movements."²⁵ Ralph Winter's original core concept was that people groups who do not have a church movement present so that E-1 near neighbor evangelism can be done require a cross-cultural missionary to penetrate and plant the gospel. The idea was always to evangelize within a particular group as widely as possible and if and when barriers to acceptance or understanding were encountered, then a new cross-cultural effort must be started. This principle in and of itself is sound. However, it appears that as closure came to be operationalized in a very narrow fashion, a kind of popular and unsophisticated missiology has arisen that in the end may sacrifice quality of ministry and effectiveness among individual peoples in order to make sure that every group is engaged.

The Implication That Frontier Mission is the Only Valid Form of Mission.

I think that is important to make a distinction between the actual concepts that make up frontier mission missiology and the ways in which it

has been promoted, particularly from the late 1980s through the decade of the 90s. Beginning with his 1974 Lausanne address Ralph Winter has been advocating a very specific type of missionary task, the pioneer task of breaking into a previously unreached culture with the gospel. Yet even in that address he recognized at least four levels of valid ministry: the work of nurturing Christians, renewal of nominal Christians, ordinary E-1 near

then what in the world are mission agencies doing in the rest of the world? And aren't they almost criminal in not deploying their resources more effectively?" While the argument may not always be stated so bluntly, the message permeates almost everything published on the subject.

...the problem is that many fine mission organizations today feel they have been all but written out of the "frontier" missions script, and that

for closure of some sort has been a contributor to this phenomenon in that it has created a somewhat short term viewpoint with a limited focus that discourages looking at the broader issues of developing vibrant churches.

Bypassing Mission Agencies and Amateurism in Mission

One of the byproducts of the promotion-driven mobilization which happened in the decade of the 1990s

The lack of expertise that single congregations have in the complexities of mission can mean not only ineffective ministry, but the possibility of costly mistakes in sensitive areas of the world.

neighbor evangelism and the critical task of cross-cultural evangelism.²⁶ His position is that although frontier mission is not more legitimate than other forms of mission, "it may, in a given situation in history, be more neglected."²⁷ In a sense his work since the founding of the U.S. Center for World Mission has been to highlight this neglect and plead that the mission world take seriously the challenge that people groups represent. Focusing on the core concept, that people groups which do not have within them a church movement capable of providing E-1 near neighbor evangelism need a cross-cultural missionary effort from the outside, there would be little debate as to the validity of this point. There is very little controversy here as this is consonant both with missiological reality and biblical reality.

However, what has created a great deal of controversy and sense of uneasiness among mission agencies has been the impression conveyed by careless thinking in the broader frontier mission movement through its publications that frontier mission is the only truly valid form of mission in these days. In a presentation to the 1991 meeting of the International Society for Frontier Missiology Gary Corwin said:

The question is then posed, "If reaching unreached peoples is the essence of mission, and if all but the stragglers among the unreached peoples are to be found within this [10/40] window,

their efforts are viewed as second-class at best."²⁸

Back in 1992 Frank Severn wrote, "I am very uneasy about some applications of the principle of reaching the unreached that call into question the validity or importance of missions to people where there are churches, albeit those churches may make up less than 1 percent of the total population."²⁹ Five years later, he writes:

My concern is that "people group" theology so dominates mission thinking in North American churches that "true and valid" mission only occurs when we focus on the unrelated people groups that have "no significant missiological breakthrough (no Bible, no church, no missionaries). The rest of the world is considered "reached," even though the church may be very small and many towns, villages and even large urban areas have no gospel witness."³⁰

The thoughts of these two mission leaders, who are in basic agreement with the fundamental concepts of unreached people group thinking, are no doubt representative of the concerns of many others. This represents to me a weakness in the presentation of the broader frontier mission movement. The major advocates of the movement themselves are careful to say that other forms of mission are important and valid, yet those brief comments are overwhelmed by the powerful promotion of reaching the unreached as the most critical need of today. I believe that the push

in the push to reach all peoples by the year 2000 has been the phenomenon of local churches becoming directly involved in mission activities. This has created two serious problems that may actually impede progress in the penetration of all people groups and the development of church planting movements among them. One of the manifestations of this interest in mission has been the bypassing of mission agencies to send workers directly to field situations. Len Bartlott points out that originally the idea behind the Adopt-A-People program was that local congregations interested in adoption should consult a mission agency rather than consulting a list and choosing, so that they could be supportive of frontier work already begun or about to begin.³¹ The lack of expertise that single congregations have in the complexities of mission can mean not only ineffective ministry, but the possibility of costly mistakes in sensitive areas of the world.³²

The second manifestation grows out of the first, an increasing amateurism in mission. It is a great irony that Ralph Winter, 20 years after his Lausanne presentation that launched the frontier missions into full swing, feels compelled to issue a warning that real damage to the movement is possible due to a lack of knowledge upon the part of a newly mobilized generation of short term type workers.³³ In another place he says, "I fear that much of this frontier enthusiasm is

ill-prepared and doomed to failure and damage to the cause. . . .”³⁴ It seems that Winter’s continual plea for understanding the complexity of the frontier task of penetrating an unreached culture has gone unheeded by the very movement that he had a major part in founding.

From the beginning Winter has advocated that the business of frontier mission is one of great complexity, far more difficult than near-neighbor evangelism. He points out that, “Missions—in contrast to evangelistic organizations—are in the lock-picking business. They are the only organizations whose unique skill is pioneering—‘getting inside of’—a culture that is bafflingly strange.”³⁵ Winter also proposed back in 1978 in the lead article in the first edition of the MARC Unreached Peoples series that one of the first necessary strategic steps is to reevaluate all previous approaches to the reaching of a group.³⁶ Winter’s writings and comments stand in stark contrast to some of the promotional material coming from places like the AD 2000 and Beyond Movement. In a recent May 1999 letter I received from their missions mobilization network, a new concept called Acts 13 Breakthrough was announced, with a goal of generating 200,000 new missionaries from 100,000 churches. Many of these are expected to go to the 10/40 Window and their support will come from tentmaking. A single sentence near the end of the brochure counsels that good missionary training is important and advises contacting a mission agency.³⁷ The trend towards amateurization and the bypassing of mission agencies goes hand in hand. Again, this seems to be an example of promotional-driven mobilization that is in part connected to a particular view of closure. By ignoring history, and downplaying the complexity of the task, there is a real danger of producing a great deal of action with little overall impact on the least-reached. **IJFM**

Endnotes

¹Gary Corwin, “Just Where Are the Frontiers?” *International Journal of Frontier Missions* (January 1992): 4.

²Robertston McQuilkin, “Six Inflam-

matory Questions,” *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* (April 1994): 130-131.

³*Ibid.*, 132.

⁴Corwin, “Just Where Are the Frontiers?,” 5.

⁵*Ibid.*

⁶Winter, “Frontier Mission Perspectives,” 64.

⁷*Ibid.*, 65.

⁸*Ibid.*

⁹Trent Rowland, “Where Are the Frontiers?,” *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 9: 1 (January 1992): 8

¹⁰Luis Bush, “What is Joshua Project 2000?” *Missions Frontiers Bulletin* (November-December 1995): 7.

¹¹Vararuchi Dalavai, “South Asia Rises to Play Its Role in Joshua Project 2000,” *Mission Frontiers Bulletin* (November-December 1995): 24.

¹²Ross Campbell, “National AD 2000 Initiative,” *Mission Frontiers Bulletin* (November-December 1995): 49-50.

¹³Joshua Project 2000 Unreached Peoples List (AD 2000 and Beyond Movement [6/4/96]), n.p.

¹⁴Winter, writing in 1990, believed that unreached people thinking made realistic the goal of making initial missionary penetration of all the unimax groups by the year 2000. For him the proper focus is not how many people are won but how many have been given a chance to respond. He points out that the Bible does not talk about winning a certain percentage, but rather it speaks of ethnic groups being discipled. “To plant ‘a viable, indigenous, evangelizing church movement’ (a paraphrase of the 1982 definition) only requires some minimum, vital, incarnational response within a group.” [Ralph Winter, “Mission in the 1990s Two Views: I. Ralph D. Winter,” *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* (July 1990): 100.] I think it is important that Winter’s use of the term minimum here be understood in the context that he defined it in during the 1980 Edinburgh consultation. The ideas of minimal and initial breakthrough have been picked up and used by others without the same depth of meaning that Winter gives them.

¹⁵Corwin, “Just Where Are the Frontiers?,” 5.

¹⁶Winter, “Mission in the 1990s,” 100.

¹⁷Robertston McQuilkin, “Six Inflammatory Questions—Part 2,” *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* (July 1994): 263.

¹⁸Ralph Winter, “Are 90% of our Missionaries Serving in the Wrong Places?” *Mission Frontiers Bulletin* (November-December 1991): 34.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, 35.

²⁰McQuilkin, “Six Inflammatory Questions—Part 2,” 263.

²¹J. Phillip Hogan, “Response to Dr. Ralph Winter’s Paper,” in *Let the Earth Hear His Voice*, ed. J. D. Douglas (Minneapolis, MN: World Wide Publications, 1975), 243.

²²Elder, “Where Are the Frontiers?,” 8.

²³*Ibid.*

²⁴Lawrence Radcliffe, “Part 2: A Field Worker Speaks Out About the Rush to Reach All Peoples,” Conference ‘brigadapubs-missionfrontiers,’ file ‘MF98.01-02.40-Field 2,’ 1.

²⁵*Ibid.*, 2.

²⁶Winter, “The Highest Priority: Cross-Cultural Evangelism,” 229-231.

²⁷Ralph Winter, “Defining the Frontiers,” *International Journal of Frontier Missions* (9:1 January 1992): 9.

²⁸Corwin, “Just Where Are the Frontiers?,” 4.

²⁹Frank Severn, “The Critical Context of Today’s World Mission,” *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* (April 1992): 177.

³⁰Frank Severn, “Some Thoughts on the Meaning of ‘All Nations,’” *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* (October 1997): 415.

³¹Radcliffe, “Part 2; A Field Worker Speaks Out,” 8-9.

³²*Ibid.*

³³Ralph Winter, “Editorial Comment,” *Mission Frontiers Bulletin* (November-December 1995): 2.

³⁴Ralph Winter, “Three Types of Ministry,” *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* (October 1997): 420. Len Bartlott points out the irony of a millennial movement with a time-date stamp in its title using an a-historical approach to missions (“Part 2-A Field Worker Speaks Out,” 2).

³⁵Winter, “Are 90% of our Missionaries Serving in the Wrong Places?,” 34.

³⁶Ralph Winter, “Penetrating the New Frontiers,” in *Unreached Peoples* ’79, ed. C. Peter Wagner and Edward Dayton (Elgin, IL: David C. Cook, 1978): 51.

³⁷George Verwer and Chacko Thomas, letter to mission mobilizers, May 1999.