FIVE SESSIONS · FOR HOSTS

Solving Human Trafficking

Facilitator Guide

You don't need to be an expert. Press play, and facilitate the conversation that follows.

FEATURING TIM TEBOW, LAILA MICKELWAIT, DANI PINTER, WES LYONS, AND MORE

SOLVING
THE WORLD'S
GREATEST
PROBLEMS

SOLVING.ORG

You're here because something about trafficking won't leave you alone.

Maybe it was a documentary. A headline. A number that lodged somewhere and never dissolved. Maybe it's closer than that—someone you know, something you saw, a story you've never fully told. Whatever brought you here, it started with caring. And caring is where every real solution begins.

What comes next is the harder question, and it's the one we're going to work through together: how do we best engage in the fight, and where do we hit so it actually breaks?

Over five sessions we're going to look at this problem as a whole—the economics, the platforms, the laws, and the people already winning against it, and find where our generosity does the most damage to this industry.

The Reality

Roughly

30 million

people are trafficked worldwide each year, according to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security estimate.

The industry generates an estimated

$528 billion

annually, which makes it one of the most profitable criminal enterprises on the planet.

Here's the part that should stop you: the money to fight it has been there for decades. So has the compassion. And yet, the numbers keep growing.

That is not a failure of heart. Some of the bravest people alive are working to solve this problem—rescuing image bearers, walking survivors home, doing work most of us couldn't. They are heroic, and they are necessary.

> ***But as long as trafficking stays profitable, the river keeps producing victims faster than anyone can pull them out.***

So what's actually missing?

Two things, and they belong together. The first is the **how**—builders willing to go upstream and attack the economics, the platforms, and the legal structures that make trafficking profitable before it ever reaches the people it destroys. The second is the **who**—givers who can recognize a working strategy, back it with conviction, and stop giving alone.

Builders going upstream. Givers backing them at scale. Put those two together and this begins to look like a problem that can actually be solved. That's what this course exists to do.

ONE THING BEFORE YOU BEGIN

Before anything else, thank you for saying yes to this.

You're a host, you don't need to be an expert. You don't need to know all the answers, and you'll never be asked to explain trafficking economics or Section 230. What we're asking is simpler: press play, and be willing to facilitate the conversation that follows.

Let the hard questions sit. Wrestle through them with your group rather than for them.

Because you said yes, a group of people is going to gather around a problem most of the world would rather look away from. You're the reason that community exists at all.

Let's wrestle through it together.

01 SESSION

Giving Better

Is my giving effective?

RUNTIME · 23 MIN

THESIS

With 1.8 million nonprofits in the U.S. alone, caring is no longer the bottleneck. Coordination is.

Coordinated capital doesn't just go further, it goes sooner. A fund with committed dollars and standing diligence can move in weeks on something an individual donor could still be researching a year from now. In wartime, that gap makes all of the difference.

FRAME IT BEFORE YOU PRESS PLAY (45 SECONDS)

Tonight isn't about making you feel bad about your giving. It's about a question most of us have never been asked: who are you giving with? Everything else follows from that.

OPENING QUESTION · EVERYONE ANSWERS

Tell us about the first core giving memory. The first one you remember.

This does more work than it looks like. It surfaces formation, family, and church history, and it sets the norm that people talk about money here. Answer it first yourself, and go one level deeper than feels comfortable, whatever you model is the ceiling for the next five weeks.

OBSERVE

1. Henry compares most giving today to stock-picking before mutual funds existed: isolated bets, no shared diligence. Where do you see yourself in that comparison?
2. Justin says he misses the offering plate. What areas for discipleship did we lose when giving became a monthly auto-draft, if anything?

WRESTLE

1. Justin frames this as wartime. Peacetime giving is careful, deliberate, spread evenly. Wartime giving is concentrated, urgent, and costs something. Which one describes your last twelve months—honestly?
2. Who do you make investment decisions with—an advisor, a partner, a committee, a spouse? Now answer the same question about your giving.

   (The asymmetry does the teaching. Let it sit.)
3. What would have to be true for you to give a significant amount to something you didn't personally choose, vetted by people you trust?

   (This is the whole model, and the resistance to it is real.)

APPLY

1. Name one place your giving is scattered right now. Not wrong, scattered. What is it costing?

THIS WEEK

Ask two people in your life what they give to and why. Just listen. Bring back one thing that surprised you.

WATCH FOR

The room will want to defend its current giving. Let them. Don't argue scattered vs. coordinated, the next four sessions continue to pose questions around giving strategy.

Expect money questions tonight. Use the answers on page one, keep them short, and point to Session 3. "That's exactly what week three is. Write the question down and hold me to it."

AT THE END OF EACH EPISODE:

MOMENT OF INTENT

If you're ready to give to the fund and join the community fighting trafficking, you don't have to wait until the end of the course. We built a giving portfolio tool to help you and your family think through your generosity, a framework for putting it behind the world's greatest problems.

Scan to take your first step.

02 SESSION

Giving Upstream

Prevention

RUNTIME · 28 MIN

EAGLE VENTURE, WITH A FILMED TIM TEBOW INTRODUCTION

THESIS

Trafficking is a business: supply chain, pricing model, distribution, financial infrastructure, an estimated $528 billion a year. Markets don't end because people care about them. They end when they stop being profitable.

WHY THE RESULT IS PREVENTION

Rescue restores someone already harmed. Upstream work means the harm never reaches them. That's not a better version of rescue; it's a different product entirely, and almost nobody is funding it.

FRAME IT (45 SECONDS)

Watch for the moment the strategy changes. It's not a change of heart—everyone in this fight has heart. It's a change of position.

OPENING QUESTION

Where in your own work have you seen the difference between fixing a symptom and fixing the root cause?

OBSERVE

1. Trafficking is named not as a tragedy but as a business. What changes for you when you hear it that way?
2. Eagle isn't competing with nonprofits or law enforcement. What are they actually adding?

WRESTLE

1. Rescue work is heroic and necessary. Upstream work is slower, less visible, and much harder to photograph. Which one is easier for you to write a check to, and why?
2. Philanthropic capital goes in first to de-risk a model, then returns to the fund and backs the next builder. Does that feel like generosity to you, or like investing? Does the distinction matter?
3. When you back a founder, what are you actually betting on—the idea, the model, or the person? Which of those did you see in the Eagle team?

   (Watch what happens when the room starts evaluating a ministry the way it evaluates a deal. That instinct is the asset, not the problem.)

APPLY

1. If your giving moved one step upstream this year—from effect toward cause—what would actually change about where the money goes?

THIS WEEK

Look at your top three gifts from last year. For each, write one word: rescue or upstream. No judgment. Just look at the shape of it.

WATCH FOR

Someone may hear “upstream” as a critique of the ministry they've supported for fifteen years. Name it before they do: “This isn't a knock on rescue. The river needs people at both ends. The question is whether anyone we know is at the top of it.”

03 SESSION

Giving to What's Working

Proof

RUNTIME · 23 MIN

LAILA MICKELWAIT

THESIS

You are not being asked to fund a hope. You're being asked to back a track record. Laila took on the 5th most-visited website in the world—bigger than Amazon and Netflix combined—and won. That is a documented, verifiable result, and it's the standard for what this fund backs.

WHY THE RESULT IS PROOF

Two things have to be true before anyone gives seriously. The strategy has to work—Laila is the evidence. And the giver has to be able to see that it worked—which is what the data, the field reports, and the independent diligence are for. Proof is the product of both halves.

READ THIS BEFORE YOU HOST TONIGHT

This is the session your room has been waiting for since week one, and the one where a new facilitator is most likely to get pulled past the edge of what they know. Two rules: everything you need is in the session itself, so let the screen answer rather than you. And when you hit the limit—"I don't know how that's structured, but that's a fair question and I'll get you an answer." Then actually get it.

FRAME IT (45 SECONDS)

Tonight has two halves. The first is a promise about how this fund handles your money. The second is proof that this strategy actually wins. Hold them together—the promise is what lets you trust the proof. And bring the question you've been sitting on since week one. Tonight's the night for it.

OPENING QUESTION

Have you ever given to something and never found out what happened? Tell us about it.

Expect a beat of embarrassment, then a flood. Almost everyone has this story.

OBSERVE

1. Four commitments were named: data, stories from the field, transparency on overhead, and independent diligence. Which one matters most to you? Which one would you actually check?
2. Laila's win is documented and verifiable. Why does it matter, not just for the people on that platform, but for everyone else still in this fight?

WRESTLE

1. Would you fund a fight you didn't believe could be won? Most of us have—repeatedly. What changes when you see a win first?
2. You apply real rigor to your business and investment decisions. Most of us apply almost none to our giving. Why is that?

   (Central question of the session. Give it room.)
3. Partners. Peers. Fellow givers. What does a peer give you that a quarterly newsletter never will? And who—name someone—could ask you a hard question about your generosity and have it land well?

APPLY

1. Name one standard you'd apply to a business or investment decision that you've never applied to a giving decision. What would it look like to start using it?

THIS WEEK

You named a standard tonight that you've never brought to your giving. Before you use it, sit with where it came from, what it cost you to learn, and what it's protected you from since. Then the harder question: why did it never occur to you to bring it here?

WATCH FOR

This is the session where the trust question gets settled or doesn't. If someone in the room is genuinely skeptical, that person is a gift. Slow down and let them ask everything. The room needs to see the question survive daylight—and you do not have to win the argument for that to happen.

One caution the other direction: "back what's working" can tip into "only fund the safe bet." Don't let the room land there—Session 4 is about funding the thing with no track record yet, precisely because someone has to go first.

04 SESSION

Giving Strategically

Innovation

RUNTIME · 18 MIN

DANI PINTER, WITH A FILMED TIM TEBOW INTRODUCTION

THESIS

You can take down one platform, or you can change the law that protected all of them. Roughly 40% of U.S. sex trafficking victims are recruited online, and Section 230 has shielded the platforms from accountability. Dani is building the accountability that didn't exist.

WHY THE RESULT IS INNOVATION

Last week was about backing a proven win. This week is the necessary counterweight—smart capital also funds what nobody has built yet. Legal precedent. New architecture. Innovation is what smart money buys that safe money never will.

FRAME IT (45 SECONDS)

Last week we watched someone win a fight. Tonight we watch someone change the rules of the fight—and that's a different kind of investment entirely.

OPENING QUESTION

What's one change you made a single time that improved a process and made it easier every time since?

Think small and concrete: a standing weekly meeting that killed a hundred email threads. Automating the bill you kept forgetting. A hook by the door so nobody loses keys again. Finally hiring someone to do the thing you kept doing badly.

OBSERVE

1. Before tonight, did you know this legal architecture existed? What did you assume protected people online?
2. What's the difference between winning a case and changing a law? What does each one cost?

WRESTLE

1. Leverage means asking, "where does one dollar move the most?" Some find that language cold when we're talking about human beings. Is it? Or is refusing to think that way its own kind of failure?
2. Every portfolio you've built has both: proven operators scaling something that already works, and innovators still disrupting a status quo. Dani is the second kind. How do you decide what share of your giving goes to each? Which one is harder for you to write the check for?

APPLY

1. Be honest… on your own, would you ever have found Dani? Diligenced her work? Stayed with it for years? Giving through the fund means you never have to choose between the proven buildout and the disruptors, because the portfolio holds both and someone does that work full time. What does handing that decision off free you up to do?

WATCH FOR

You are not expected to know anything about Section 230 beyond the one line in the fact table. If the room goes legal, hand it back to them: “Anyone here work anywhere near this?” Somebody usually does.

Some rooms get political here—Big Tech, regulation, platform liability. Redirect once, kindly: “Set the politics down for a second. The question on the table is just whether platforms that profit from exploitation should be accountable for it.”

05 SESSION

Giving Together

Multiplication

RUNTIME · 21 MIN

BRANDON WEST / PHOS

THESIS

The boy in John 6 didn't give a portion. He gave his lunch, all that he had, and stepped back. Brandon West didn't fund the fight from the outside—he built his company into it.

WHY THE RESULT IS MULTIPLICATION

Every other result in this course is something your gift produces. This one is something God does with it. Five loaves feed a boy. Handed over, they feed five thousand—and the math is unmistakably His, not the boy's. Multiplication is also the practical close: participant becomes host, one room becomes ten.

FRAME IT (45 SECONDS)

Four sessions have been about the problem and the proof. Tonight is about you. Don't leave without answering the question.

OPENING QUESTION

Where in your life do you feel most compartmentalized—business over here, faith over there?

OBSERVE

1. Brandon designed PHOS from the ground up to bring healing, rather than building a company and then giving from it. What's the difference?
2. Humbition—God-sized ambition held together with real humility, holding both fully rather than dialing one down. Who models that for you?

WRESTLE

1. Four descriptions were offered: just getting started, stuck and short on time, numb from watching billions disappear into these problems, and giving well but tired of giving alone. Which one is you? Say it out loud.
2. The boy handed over everything and then stepped back—no recognition, no control. Which is harder for you: the handing over, or the stepping back?
3. Five weeks ago most of you were strangers with separate giving models. What becomes possible in this fight if the people in this room go at it together that isn't possible if we each go alone?

   (Don't answer it for them. This is the question the whole course was built to hand over.)

APPLY

1. Complete the sentence, out loud, to this room: "My next step is _____, by _____." A date. Not "soon."
2. How can we hold each other accountable?

   Answer this one yourself too, and go last. Five weeks ago you told them you were deciding alongside them—this is where that promise comes due.

Read John 6 aloud. Then:

“We started five weeks ago talking about scattered generosity. Here's where we've landed: coordinated generosity. Not because togetherness is nicer—because it's the only thing that has ever moved a problem this size.

Give—the QR code takes two minutes. Put your resources to work alongside a community committed to solving the world’s greatest problems. Set up a Giving Portfolio—sort what you give into proven and unproven, and move your weight toward what's working. And when you're ready, lead a group. That move, from participant to leader, is where the multiplication happens. It's how this problem actually gets solved.

Come join the fight. Find your people. Let's go.”

SCAN TO GIVE

Give the room two quiet minutes to take their first step.

Within 72 hours, text each person one line.

What you saw in them, and one specific next step they named. That text is the difference between a good five weeks and a changed year.

Then look at your own room. You just did the thing you thought you weren't qualified to do—five weeks ago you had never hosted this. Somebody in that circle is now exactly where you were, thinking they couldn't lead it either.

> ***Tell them what you know now: you don't have to be an expert. You have to open a door.***

Under His power. For His glory. Together.