

Below is a list of questions composed by Pastors in North Carolina concerning International Missions policy changes. Bro. Forlines will be responding to these questions and we will post those answers when they are received.

QUESTIONS THAT NEED ANSWERS

New Direction

Do we really intend as a Mission to literally win the lost at any cost? Are we willing to say that the end justifies the means? Are we willing to sacrifice our interpretation of Scriptural passages that separate us in doctrine and practices from the trendy evangelical movements? Are we no longer stewards of a historical conservative denomination obedient to the Great Commission?

Does the mission's new purpose statement("FWBIM exist to facilitate church planting movements among unreached people groups") not limit the methodology (facilitating Church Planting Movements), shifting the focus and priority, and narrowing the scope of the Great Commission as given by Christ(only "unreached people groups"), thus: stifling the leadership of the Holy Spirit?

How is FWBIM to be administrated? As a corporation or as a denominational department that reflects an ecclesiastical and pastoral model? Does the Board truly believe that a highly structured and vertical organization is conducive for effective missionary work and that it builds the morale of the missionary? Was it the intent of the Board to silence the voice of the missionaries in this newly approved Mission structure? Was it the intent of the Board in adopting a new structure for the General Director to be distant from the missionary?

Do you see IM existing to serve local churches or do local churches exist to serve IM? Is IM subject to or superior to the local church?

-Why then did IM create a new purpose statement, core values, and policies without consulting the denomination it serves and is subject to?

Funding system

Is the Board willing to place at the feet of designated giving the blame for all the past financial woes of FWBIM? Could not the FWBIM operate under a hybrid system accepting both plans of support – generalized and designated giving - to fully fund missionaries budgets and mission operations?

Apart from those few churches which are able to partner with certain missionaries as a SMP, is there any way for the average church to designate their mission giving to the missionary or ministry they identify with and feel led to support?

What options does a church or an individual have if they feel strongly about supporting a specific missionary, but were not able or chosen to be a Strategic Ministry Partner of that missionary?

What is the board imposed limit (percentage) of what the office can take out of missionaries support (GEF) to maintain itself?

-Who decides where the money given to the GEF goes?

Would you financially support someone who does not agree theologically with FWB doctrine (perhaps a charismatic) if they were the only option to reach a targeted people group?

Less personal control of one's own ministry

What kind of Mission does the board desire to oversee? A Mission that mirrors the broad evangelical tent where methods used incorporate styles of worship such as rock music with their bands using electric guitar and drums, dancing and clapping during the songs or a Mission that leads the denomination in a missions effort in foreign fields that reflects our historical conservative denomination

Has the mission adopted a power sharing concept of leadership from the corporate world resulting in the general director abdicating his governing of field side operations to the Director of Field Operations and the Field Ops team?

Does the Board understand the mission call as a call to a specific place, people or ministry or is the mission call a call to serve FWBIM? Or in other words,

Are the missionaries agents of their local churches, assisted by the mission to serve overseas, or are they only the employees of FWBIM?

In addition to the board, general director, office personal, and the handbook, how many authorities does the average missionary have over him?

-Deputy Director of Field Operations (DDFO), Regional Director (RD), Field Manager (FM)

Why did the name of the field council chairman recently change to the Field Manager?

Connectional Leanings

Does the Board understand FWBIM to be a servant of the churches in a true sense of the word where the church is recognized as the true senders and the Mission as the facilitator for both the church and the missionary?

The new core values of IM states interdependence as a core value. Is this not a connectional government concept?

Does middle management (the field ops team) have the authority to make demands of missionaries in the area of ecclesiastical associations?

Are missionaries expected to yield to these current trends in order to be part of the FWBIM team and follow unity above anything else or can they have the liberty to follow their personal Biblical convictions and still be part of the team? Is it proper for the FWBIM Leadership Team to override the convictions of the missionaries and national pastors in order to accomplish their agenda?

Can the field ops team deny building funds to a missionary?

Will missionaries, who are now treated as employees, be told where to go on furlough?

Do you believe the corporate leading of the Holy Spirit through the field ops team to be superior to the Lord's leadership in the life of missionary?

Do you believe the corporate leading of the Holy Spirit through the FWBIM board and general director to be superior to the leadership of the Lord in the life of a local church pastor?