

Reconciling The Divide: The need for Contextual and Just Models of Fundraising that Empower all People Groups in Vocational Youth Ministry

DANIEL WHITE HODGE
dwhodge@northpark.edu

Director of the Center for Youth Ministry Studies & Assistant Professor of Youth Ministry at North Park University. Daniel White Hodge has been engaged with urban youth work and ministry for 20 years and is the author of *The Soul OF Hip Hop: Rimbs, Timbs, & A Cultural Theology* (IVP 2010), *Heaven Has A Ghetto: The Missiological Gospel & Theology of Tupac Amaru Shakur* (VDM Academic 2009), and of the forthcoming publication *The Hostile Gospel: Seeking God in Post Soul Urban American Hip Hop* (Brill Academic 2014).

PABLO OTAOLA
Pablo@pablootaola.com

Director of Southwest Denver Young Life, Co-Director of Young Life Horizons for Cross-cultural Intelligence and development, and Director of Latino Student Staff Omega which works on indigenous leadership development through the lens of culture, race, and business. Pablo Emmanuel Otaola has been engaged with urban youth work and ministry for over 12 years and is currently working on a book called *The Immigrant Jesus*. He is currently at Northpark University earning a dual degree: MBA in Non-Profit Management and Masters in Christian Formation.

ABSTRACT

Fundraising, social capital, and networking are a critical and crucial part of youth ministry. For many youth ministers and workers, their very means of living depends on their ability to raise funds and make their budget each month. In a recent landmark study, sociologist Samuel Perry (2013) found that ethnic minority fundraisers were suffering as a result of their lack of social networks and connections to wealth. Further, Perry found that White Evangelical outreach ministries (EOMs) were more likely to be funded and supported in urban areas and in para-church settings. The ongoing demographic and cultural change in the U.S. is demanding a culturally contextual approach to not just the Gospel message, but also how that message is given and by whom, yet, with findings such as these, race & social capital seem to be problematic and limiting for ethnic minorities who run and operate EOMs. This paper is presented in two parts, first, this paper will argue that EOMs and youth ministry contexts are lacking in cultural, ethnic, and social capital diversity in both their leadership and fundraising methods by examining Perry's study and data gathered in the field on EOM dedicated to youth ministry. Second, this paper will argue from a practitioner perspective, that fundraising models are neither culturally nor racially fully contextualized for ethnic minorities leading EOMs. Lastly, we will assert a new model for culturally relevant and contextual fundraising in EOMs dedicated to youth ministry and present a conceptual model for pursuing a relevant, racially sensitive, and culturally relevant approach to fundraising in youth ministry contexts.

KEYWORDS: Fundraising, funding, social capital, youth ministry, diversity, racism, funding religion

INTRODUCTION

“You’ll do great! God has placed you here for a reason,” they told the young Black youth director who recently assumed the leadership of a large metro area in the San Francisco Bay. “This place has needed someone like you for a long time. You have our full support” his supervisors exclaimed as they led him into a \$1.1 million budget that he was to manage and develop. “I’m not so sure I can do this, a million dollars is a lot of money” said Richie, “I’d like to see if I could get some help; maybe write a grant or two?” “No,” they told him, “you’ll be fine. Just trust God, and everything will work out. Remember, we will help you along the way.” Less than two years later, Richie was terminated from his position citing that “he did not fulfil the area development as directed in his duties.” So, what happened to Richie? Was he incompetent? Was he a “slacker?” Did he simply do a bad job? Or, were there other factors at work? Factors such as race, social capital, lack of capital in Richie’s background and context all have a facet in this narrative. I knew Richie. Richie and I started out as directors in this organization; we were among the “diversity hires” for this national organization and we both came from under resourced communities. Richie worked amazing with students and young adults; a pied piper of sorts. He took the director position because it was a great opportunity and he had wanted to affect change in the communities he was ministering in. But, the job came with fundraising capabilities; yet, that did not stop Richie. Richie was in sales prior to coming on staff; he understood the basics of selling yourself, the organization, and the social tropes surrounding monetary constructs. Richie was not intimidated with raising money, other than one thing: the area he was taking over had a donor base of predominately-White affluent families. Moreover, he was the first Black director this area had had and his own donor base, while strong in faith and spiritual maturity, was weak in affluence and financial mobility.

Richie worked hard. 14 sometimes 18-hour days at times just to try and keep the budget even. When it dipped into the red by \$5,000, Richie was put on probation. Richie worked even harder; golf marathons, banquets, car washes, even having students stand out on the corner of stores asking for money. The majority of his “ministry” was now consumed with fundraising. The “help” and “support” Richie was promised was an antiquated model of fundraising given to him by his White male supervisor, which had him, in essence, asking for money to people he had 1) no relationship with and 2) no context. Conjoin that with Richie’s racial background, and the situation was bleak. Richie’s work did not pay off and in the end he was told that he “failed at ministry.” When Richie mentioned that several of his major donors had left because “no nigger will ever get my money,” he was told that while that was unfortunate, he still needed to find the money that had just left. Richie even stated that this might be a racial issue, but his supervisors cited that “racism does not exist in God’s Kingdom” and that he needed to keep doing the work.

While you may think this is an isolated event and story, it is not. Ethnic minorities have to work fifteen, and in some cases, twenty times harder than their White counterparts in Evangelical Outreach Ministries (EOM) (Lindsay & Wuthnow, 2010; Perry, 2012a, 2012b). In many EOM, Black and Brown youth leaders tend to lose anywhere from 40% and in some cases, 60% of their funding when they assume the role as senior leader (Alumkal, 2004; Christerson & Emerson, 2003; M. O. Emerson, 2010; Perry, 2012b). Often times, because of the upbringing in disadvantaged communities and lack of social capital, ethnic minority leaders in EOM are placed into situations where fundraising is the heart of their ministry with a staff of other local leaders – that too are from disadvantaged communities and in need of work – who depend on the raising of those funds in order to service. Yet, given the wealth gaps and disparities in the U.S., many ethnic minorities in EOM simply do not have the access to wealth that their White counterparts do and cannot “fundraise” to the level of White run EOMs and essentially fall short (Perry, 2013). Arguably, this is what occurred with Richie and his trial with the EOM. Personally, I have had donors divulge to me that as long as I “kept those ghetto boys” from dating their daughter, that I would have funding for the rest of my ministry. Further, given the White hegemony within the U.S., it

stands to reason that White racism has a role in fundraising and social capital for ethnic minority youth ministers (Alumkal, 2004; Perry, 2013).

Thus, the need for this article and the very real argument that race has a role in fundraising inside EOMs.

The ongoing demographic and cultural change in the U.S. is demanding a culturally contextual approach to not just the Gospel message, but also *how* that message is given and *by whom*, yet, with findings such as these, race and social capital seem to be problematic, at best, and limiting for ethnic minorities who run and operate EOMs. Hence, this paper will argue that EOMs and youth ministry contexts are lacking in cultural, ethnic, and social capital diversity in both their leadership and fundraising methods by examining Perry's study and data gathered in the field on EOM dedicated to youth ministry. Second, this paper will argue from a practitioners perspective, that fundraising models are neither culturally nor racially fully contextualized for ethnic minorities leading EOMs. Lastly, we will assert a new model for culturally relevant and contextual fundraising in EOMs dedicated to youth ministry and present a conceptual model for pursuing a relevant, racially sensitive, and culturally relevant approach to fundraising in youth ministry contexts.

THE MYTH OF MULTICULTURALISM IN YOUTH MINISTRY (HODGE)

Almost any EOM has some type of multi-cultural or multi-ethnic statement in their documents. Almost every major EOM in the U.S. (e.g. Young Life, World Vision, Youth For Christ) has a statement that appears inclusive to ethnic minorities and women. There are non-discriminatory policies that are rooted in most EOMs too. Buried deep in the hiring forms are statements that affirm diversity and some aspects of multiculturalism. On the surface, most EOMs appear to desire "diversity" and to hire ethnic minorities. But is that accurately a reality? Allow me to ask some specific questions related to multiculturalism. Do EOMs really want a strong, socially conscious, progressive ethnic minority on their staff? Do EOMs affirm the social, cultural, racial, ethnic, and familial history of that ethnic minority and allow him or her to live in that ethnic history? Do EOMs understand the history of racism, inequality, and oppression in this country, and, moreover, actively do something about those issues through their ministries? Do EOMs empower their ethnic minority staff by giving authority, power, and privilege within their organizations? In other words, do EOMs allow ethnic minority staff to effectuate change that is contextually and Biblically appropriate? Do EOMs support their ethnic minority staff by giving them the freedom to speak openly regarding racism, oppression, and inequality within the organization itself? Do EOMs allow for contextual approaches to the Gospel and put in place policy that sustain and develop these approaches? Do EOMs create space for ethnic minority staff to feel safe and discuss their problems? Do EOMs create job descriptions that invite a multicultural and multiethnic approach to Christian theology? To put this another way, do EOMs allow for liberation, Hip Hop, East Asian, Central American, Pan African theologies to be expressed through and within the ministry in order to construct a more robust and accurate picture of The Gospel message? Do EOMs sanction ethnic minority women (or men) to pursue womanist, feminist, and womanist liberation perspectives for outreach purposes? Do EOMs allow for the deconstruction of the metanarrative and insist on input from their ethnic minority staff?

These questions are the reality for EOMs to cogitate on and wrestle through. Further, these are questions that are at the core for true multiculturalism to happen and to actuate equality and change in and within EOMs. If these questions are left unanswered or, even worse, ignored, then the EOM is simply mythologizing multiculturalism and only desires to have ethnic minorities as tokenized representatives for hegemonic display within the EOM¹. That is not to say that "good things" will not happen or that "the Lords" will cannot happen if these questions are not seriously engaged, however it is to say that these questions represent the shift in power and begin to create equality and multiculturalism. Let us now turn

to three modalities that suffocate multiculturalism and stifle fundraising efforts for ethnic minority staff in EOMs.

First, theodicies² promote colorblind racism in EOMs. Theodicies are typically utilized in favor of avoiding the heart of multiculturalism and equality in EOMs. “God’s will” or “God is no respecter of persons” are typical approaches that EOMs utilize to minimize multiculturalism. Theodicies are dangerous tropes within any organization, but especially EOMs; even more so when they are constructed from the power hierarchy in a manner to salvationize a theological pathway that characteristically fits into the hegemonic metanarrative of the EOM. These processes tend to avoid any engagement with multiculturalism and multiethnic values. Often, these types of theodicies fit a White conservative Evangelical prose and are hostile, or at the very least antagonistic, toward anything outside of the realms of that mantra. As Soong-Chan Rah has observed, oftentimes Pan African, Asian, and Hip Hop theologies are exoticized and castigated as the “other” while White Conservative Evangelical Christian Theology is the standard theology (2009, pp. 77-80). Hence, theodicies provide easy outs to issues of racism and inequality – as was the case for Richie. Below is a list of accumulate more popular theodicies, which emerge in many EOMs³:

- God is colorblind.
- It does not matter the color of God because God created us equal.
- Jesus’ Gospel is the primary focus of this ministry; nothing else.
- Focus on Christ. Not your race or ethnicity
- God will have to clean up the mess of racism. It is not our job.

These types of theodicies have a detrimental effect on any staff of and EOM seeking out a multicultural approach in and for the ministry. However, they are injurious to ethnic minority staff in EOMs because they create a disassociation with their own heritage. One of the worse statements a White person can tell an ethnic minority is “I do not see your color. I just see you.” That has effectively erased a large portion of that ethnic minorities experience and narrative as a person and leaves only the part the White person, in most cases, wishes to deal with and engage: the non-ethnic part (Alumkal, 2004; Rah, 2009).

Derived from the research (Alumkal, 2004; Christerson & Emerson, 2003; M. O. Emerson, 2010; Lindsay & Wuthnow, 2010; Perry, 2012a, 2012b, 2013; Pinn, 2001; Rah, 2009), when an ethnic minority is confronted with any of these, or more, theodicies, they have several options at their disposal. They can 1) challenge it, but face loss of employment and loss of social capital within other EOMs (Perry, 2013, p. 176). 2) Ignore the theodicy, but then are faced with the mounting problem of racism and the potential for anger and bitterness to cultivate in a manner that can lead to a multitude of problems. 3) Accept the theodicy at face value, but the issue itself is never resolved. Theodicies and theological tropes create a blockade for ethnic minority staff in EOMs and can place the ethnic minority at odds, at times, with the EOMs mission statement – often grounds for termination. To add, most EOMs are non-profit, privately, funded, and do not fall within a standardized human resource regulation; simply put, EOMs hire and fire at will with little to no recourse for the person being fired. Often, theological differences can be cited to terminate ones employment.

Second, EOMs lack diversity & engagement with diverse perspectives. Volunteer organizations and EOMs are racially homogenous (Lindsay & Wuthnow, 2010, p. 87); to place this in another manner, most EOMs are led by White Evangelicals. In his study of social capital and fundraising within EOMs, Samuel Perry found that Whites dominated the ministry landscape; 84.8% compared to just 4.8% Black, 8.3% Asian, and 2.2% Latino (2013, p. 164). We see some of these similar numbers among young ministry organizations. Numbers such as these present several problematic variables. It has been widely researched and argued that Whites tend to be unconscious and unaware of much of the history of race in the U.S. (Alumkal, 2004; M. O. Emerson, 2010; Shenk, 1999; Wise, 2009, 2010; Wise & Twomey Center for Peace Through Justice., 1995). This presents issues on two fronts, because Whites will more than likely be leading an EOM, and be in a supervisory role. If they are unaware or unconscious of the racial history in

the U.S., it will be likely that they will dismiss or minimize racial identity, racism within the EOM, or on national issues such as Trayvon Martin, appear unsympathetic toward the death of a young man. On the second front, it is difficult for a subordinate to discuss issues of racism and racial inequality with their supervisor—even more so if the issue is with their supervisor. Thus, fundraising becomes problematic when issues of social capital are factoring into the context. As Marla Fredrick McGlathery and Traci Griffin remind us:

Further complicating this problem is that upon becoming a part of contemporary interracial evangelical mission organizations, many workers do not know the history of African American evangelical missions or the struggle of the black church in America. Without this knowledge, the appeal of white-conversion Christianity can appear unproblematic. Those who want to share the gospel with the world and be held accountable for living lives of more integrity would ‘naturally’ become part of such an organization. ...[this] immediately places them in a position that requires them to work against the stigma within African American communities regarding the racist history of white missionary organizations in places like the United States, Africa, and South America (2007, p. 151).

Lack of diversity also presents problems for ethnic minorities among donor bases. When I was a young area director with Young Life on the Central Coast of California, my metro director (supervisor) who was Black lost 75% of his funding when he assumed the leadership role within the first two months. Further, parents did not want to send their children to our weekly club meetings in fear of the new “urban youth ministry” component, and within the next three months—after losing the 75% of funding—lost over half of his parental support and committee members. While he and I could lament to these issues, his supervisors above him were opaque toward the situation and even suggested that he change his approach and to “be more like them.” Conforming to the hegemony is often a struggle for ethnic minority youth workers in EOMs as just the mere fact of being an ethnic minority in an EOM can place them in an adversarial stance. But more than likely, the ethnic minority who works for the EOM will have to give up a lot, and in some cases all, of their ethnic identity and heritage to “fit in” among their White counterparts; presenting more issues for fundraising (M. O. S. C. Emerson, 2000; Perry, 2012b; Singleton, 2012).

This is not an isolated occurrence either. As I have interviewed other ethnic minority youth workers in EOMs, they have relayed to me other lack of diversity tropes told to them by their White supervisors, such as:

- I’d like to talk about racism, but can we do away with the anger
- Social problems are not our concern; preaching the Gospel is
- The reason there are still problems regarding racism is because we keep talking about it
- I don’t think racism is at play here in this situation

Often, ethnic minority staff are cross-examined when they relay narrative of racism within EOMs, and told that their experience is invalid or does not exist. The lack of diversity and having a conscious ethnic minority leader in senior leadership is needed. These issues here, too, hinder fundraising. It is as Samuel Bell, once again, correctly asserts:

Recent research on race relations within evangelical institutions suggests that white evangelicals, like white Americans in general, tend to embody a complex of covert racial ideologies, attitudes, and practices collectively labeled “white racial identity” or “whiteness” that serve to legitimize and reproduce white structural and cultural dominance within evangelical institutions (2012a, p. 398).

Thus, it becomes difficult when *one* ethnic minority is hired; they are faced with a myriad of issues in regards to race and ethnicity. This ‘Whiteness’ which Bell refers to, complicates the fundraising process, and, as I will argue briefly, facilitates fundraising models that are not suitable for ethnic minority contexts.

Having engagement and being learned of the historical occurrences of racism, inequality, and oppression toward ethnic minorities in the U.S. could alleviate some of these problems. When one is aware and conscious of their own ethnic heritage and knowledgeable of the continuing significance of race in the U.S., they are able to listen to others’ narrative and life experience much better (Nieves, 2007, pp. 310-311). Further, a diverse staff means diverse views and approaches to evangelism and The Gospel within respective contexts. However, what typically happens is that ethnic minorities suffer in silos within youth ministry EOMs, and if there is a group of ethnic minorities who can organize, do so in small numbers or once a year at national events such as CCDA (Christian Community Development Association) or UYWI (Urban Youth Workers Institute).

Third, current fundraising models in EOMs are not suitable for a multicultural context. Within most church contexts in the U.S., typically, employees draw their salary from their respective congregations and/ or denominations – this too can be contentious for ethnic minorities if they are planting a church or assuming the role of lead pastor in a small or under supported church. By contrast, those working in EOMs are responsible to personally fundraise their salary, and, if they are the head, like Richie, they are responsible for an entire organization including other staff. The widely used model of fundraising in EOMs is donations obtained from individuals (e.g. friends, family, and neighbors), business events, large galas, dinners, and/ or churches with a certain percentage of their budget set aside for “missionary” funds. Once again, Samuel Perry gives us an accurate picture of the peril within this model:

Individual character qualities (e.g., work ethic, budgeting habits) being equal, success or failure within the EOM funding structure is contingent on the ability of a potential worker to obtain access to enough individuals and/or groups who are sufficiently familiar with the organization, are in ideological agreement with both the goals of the ministry and their funding strategy (or at least are not too opposed to either), are motivated to contribute, and have the financial capacity to make donations (2012a, p. 399).

As noted, this construct around “individual character” can be problematic as White’s tend to make racially charged judgment calls regarding ethnic minorities (e.g. lazy, criminals) and this can affect fundraising efforts (Brunsma, 2006; Doane & Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Krysan, 2004). Further, finding the persons, when you do not come from an advantaged background, who have the monetary capital to invest a significant amount of money (typically \$50k and up) to fund a EOM can be difficult.

Ramon, another youth director who worked for Inter Varsity and Young Life, relayed to me:

It was very hard as a Latino male trying to raise a half a million dollars. I was always stressed. Plus, I had no help! None! I didn’t know the CEO of Bank Of America like my colleague did, who was White, and did ministry across town. I didn’t even know how to approach White donors regarding issues that we in the Latino community were dealing with at the time: police brutality, racism, and immigration issues. How do you approach a very conservative, rich, White donor about that when they ask you about what your ministry is up to? I just can’t see it. There has to be another way.

In yet another ethnic minority, Jack, who works for Inter Varsity, said:

I only have to raise my salary. So, that's no too bad, but, that's close to \$70k when you add in insurance, 401k, and any benefits. The manse allowance helps, but, that's *after* you've raised the money. I've got a family of 4 to support and live in the middle of the country where the median income is \$35k for a family of 4. Most of the money is in the cities, which, is about an hour and a half away. When am I supposed to do the actual work of ministry I was hired to do? I have 10 donors right now, but they are middle class and can only give like \$50 a month...that's a drop in the bucket!

These models of fundraising are antiquated – the ideological structure of attaining donors and lobbying for large funds to support the EOM. They follow a 1950s' model when EOMs were entirely White and male, and lend themselves to a privileged context in which wealth is easily accessible and with similar values, morals, and ideology as the EOM. Today, there are EOMs which are engaging issues such as racism and reconciliation – topics not typically “popular” with White conservative supporters (M. O. Emerson, 2010; Lindsay & Wuthnow, 2010). Thus, similar to Ramon's experience, funding becomes difficult.

Perry reminds us that White Americans tend to enjoy economic advantages over ethnic minorities in virtually every category measurable (2012a, pp. 400-401). To add more complexity, ethnic minorities have endured historical economic disadvantages and have just recently arrived at a point where homeownership are attainable and within reach (Bonilla-Silva, 2001, 2003; Brunnsma, 2006; Doane & Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Krysan, 2004). Perry further states,

At the societal level, African Americans and Latinos tend to come from families who earn less on average than whites. Moreover, social homophily researchers argue that persons tend to be embedded within networks of individuals who are the same race and SES. This suggests that the social networks of Latino and African American fundraisers will tend to be constituted primarily by other minorities who also earn less on average than whites. Additionally, African American and Latino Protestants tend to belong to minority churches with fewer economic resources than white churches (2012a, p. 400).

Multiethnic contexts also tend to have difficulties asking for money. Researchers have theorized that Black and Brown families come from a context where “asking” for money is seen as less than societally and morally (Lindsay & Wuthnow, 2010; McGlathery & Griffin, 2007). This adds yet another strain to the fundraising situation when friends and family members may perceive the ethnic minority fundraiser asking for money as a “beggar,” or “lazy” thus producing shame for the person. As one Black EOM employee relayed,

My family and friends didn't understand what I was doing [working for an EOM]. They wondered why I was asking for money when I had a college degree. My aunties were like 'why'd you go to college for anyways? And now you asking me for money?' It was tough...still is.. Then, when I go to the White folks, I'm looked at like, haven't you been asking your personal friends? Why are you still so behind in making your budget? A no win situation.

As Perry contends, current EOM fundraising models present a twofold structural problem: 1) the number of viable support contacts accessible to ethnic minorities is low, and 2), the amount of disposable income that these contacts, if any, possess relative to contacts accessible to White fundraisers is also low (2012a, p. 408). Perry found that accessible contacts that had wealth and access to large amounts of disposable income were 6 times more reachable to Whites than ethnic minorities (2012a, pp. 407-408). Given this proportion, the need for a just model of fundraising is in need. A mythology exists of equality and multiculturalism within EOMs given these findings.

Let us now turn to a practitioner in the field of youth ministry who has experienced many of these issues first hand. Next, we will enter ground zero for fundraising in an ethnic minority context.

CONTEXTUAL MODELS OF FUNDRAISING (OTAOLA)

A contextual model for fund-raising is of utmost importance to me. Eric's articles have touched on something that can, and in many cases has, impeded indigenous leadership staff development within minority communities. The past five years on Young Life staff exposed me to fund-raising models that have some cross-cultural merit. However, the underlying cultural assumptions left me with tools I had to tweak and contextualize, or not use at all. Recently, Young Life was selected as one of the top 10 non-profits in the country for the way they steward wealth. I agree with this assessment. But no ministry is without systemic flaws. The Young Life funding model definitely has some of these systemic flaws that Eric proposes in his series.

In my search for potential alternatives, or at least temporary Band-aids, I have concluded the issue is two-pronged. First is the lack of meaningful understanding that the issues existing within many low socioeconomic communities require long-term funding solutions. This long-term need is frequently not reflected in the apparent urgency in the funding models. The second component surfaces in a lack of honoring local communities. Jesus is involved with the local communities long before any national or international staff arrive. When "we" show up, and before *we* attempt to fix the funding issue, we must honor and empower the local community to resolve their own challenges.

My immigrant identity has fostered in me a drive to find a way around these funding model hurdles. In Argentina I tasted the privilege of financial legacy. We left all financial resources behind and thus began with no financial legacy passed onto us when we immigrated into the United States and had to start from scratch. The immigrant mindset often includes a fervent attempt to find financial security, or at least to "get by". The US system is not designed for the immigrant, so many adopt an entrepreneurial mentality: since there's no systemic way to be upwardly mobile financially, one must create their own means of making headway. Even then, inherent systems can prevent success no matter how hard a person tries.

The way that I was taught to fund raise is not enough. I have been forced to think outside the box. I have been forced to generate alternative funding sources. My network's net worth was very small, so I had to figure something else out. No person forced me, but if I wanted to continue walking out my call, so something had to change. My paradigm shifted when I broadened my focus beyond fund-raising to include raising capital or think about business cash flow. When it comes to indigenous leadership development, there are not enough wealthy people within my reach to support all the indigenous minority leaders I desire to develop and there are not enough wealthy people in Young Life's reach to empower and financially support all minorities that could come on staff. That means personal funding can be only part of the pie if I am serious about developing communities, and not just looking out for myself.

Often times fund-raising comes down to internal ministry grants, external grants from foundations, personal relationships with friends and family, and different endowment opportunities. I don't believe that's enough to have self-sustaining long-term financial health. I don't believe that our work is limited to the generosity of people. Why would I limit the revenue potential that could fund my ministry? Here's how I see it: If I can have access to all people and to their entire monthly revenue, then I will focus on that. People often focus on the Christians that can give above and beyond their tithe which is often a small percentage. Disposable income is a privilege that minority communities often do not have. Why would I not look at 100% of my market cash flow and figure out a way to get a larger piece of the pie? What follows are some components of community development that motivate my creative thinking and help me to implement unique and innovative funding models.

When I contemplate infusing funds into ministry, I consider eight cornerstones: Relocation, Reconciliation, Redistribution, Leadership Development, Listening to the community, Church-based (or partnership-based), Wholistic, and Empowerment. Those eight components were developed by the Christian Community Development Association (www.cdda.org). Those components are for Christian community development, but when thinking about fund-raising, I live by those components so that a community and their culture, their values, their needs, their assets, and their worth are held high, honored and leveraged. I would never want to dishonor the local community to achieve the goals of any organization.

In raising funds, I concentrate quite a bit of my time into thinking about economic engines that generate revenue with a long-term goal of having those engines be self-sustaining; or at least not being sustained by me. In thinking about that, I try to see where there is revenue leakage in the community. It takes time, but one can often see that things can be done more efficiently; that one might be able to provide a service that saves someone money and in the process I can take a share in the profits which would be fully reinvested into the ministry. One such example is food. People will pay money for food all the time. So if I can empower my local teens or community to provide a small food service that leverages local culture, then the local people's culture is honored and leveraged for income that can go directly into the community. One such micro-business is what I call a Taco Crawl. You might have heard of a bar crawl. Well, this is similar. I have a large RV come into the city and I fill it with Mexican drinks and about 30 adults. Each adult pays \$100 - \$500 to get into the RV. These people are most likely not people from the community so I get about 5-8 people from the community to make the room a bit more culturally and racially diverse. We drive from taco joint to taco joint tasting only 1 taco per restaurant. At the end of the night we all rank the taco joints and the winning restaurant gets a plaque from our ministry saying that they won "Best taco in Southwest Denver 20XX." In turn, I build relationships with the local restaurant owners that will hopefully turn into a community funding partner, a job for a local teen or adult that I might know, or just a friendship that enhances my presence in the community. During the drive from taco joint to taco joint, we share a lot of laughs and the story of what God is doing in the community. Cross-cultural relationships are formed and hopefully maintained. One of my goals is not to always have to go to the suburbs or wealthy city areas to raise money but to bring those people into the communities where I am ministering so that reconciliation and redemption can happen.

I attempt to leverage every community asset that I can get my hands on. Churches are huge assets in several ways. Many churches do not have financial resources but they have building resources. One of those building resources can be that I do not have to pay space. Many churches were donated or bought very cheaply from areas that have gentrified so local minority church buildings are usually a hidden gem. In other words, the church budgets usually cannot support a missionary due to their lack of funds, but they can let me use their building for free. We also have several church partnerships that allow me access to people. Access to people is a huge resource! These local community people might not have the funds to be monthly financial supporters, but they can definitely help cook food for another micro-business or they can be non-staff help etc. When we share resources, we can definitely lower the cost that it might take to have a person of color on staff.

Another way that these churches help fund-raise is by raising awareness. They have been in the community long before any of our large ministries were even thinking about going into those neighborhoods and therefore have a lot of social capital. People know they are not leaving and therefore they are trusted entities. This social capital will definitely generate financial revenue if they advocate for you and your minority staff in the community. One of the things that we are doing is to have our Latino Student Staff, who are members of these local churches, update the community from the pulpit on how ministry is going once a month for 10 minutes. When locals see their own talking about ministry in their own neighborhood, they are incredibly more likely to get involved financially. And if they cannot get involved financially by giving out of their disposable income, they will likely buy taquitos or enchiladas right after church from us instead of a local restaurant. They enjoy that. Who doesn't?! They enjoy the

community time with their church as well as knowing that their \$10 went to God and a local ministry that is mentoring their own youth. There are of course many more cultural advantages to this type of fund-raising, but it takes a while to understand the local community and culture and then know how to leverage the assets.

Yet another way that our minority staff is aided in fund-raising is with our Latino Student Staff Omega program. We take Latino staff from around the country and we teach them how to fund-raise by teaching them how to be cross-culturally intelligent. We also dive into how their race and culture gives them a unique cultural advantage. We teach them how to interact with wealthy donors and much more in this two-year process. Lastly, one of the most important things that we do in this program is that we give the staff access to personal relationships with people of wealth. For every indigenous Latino leader, we pair them up with 5 to 10 local wealthy donors. Without this access to wealth, there is no access to power. We are early on in this leadership development program but the two Latino Student Staff that are graduating from this program went from raising under \$100 combined in personal monthly support from their personal network to fund-raising a combined \$22,000 per year. Each of them is raising this through a combination of their local communities and the people of wealth that they were introduced to.

Something that Young Life regions around the country are also doing is creating legacy funds for urban staff. In general, they are endowments of 3 to 5 million dollars that are used to subsidize the fund-raising efforts and empower the minority staff by giving them time to learn how to fund-raise in their local context and still continue to give a certain percentage of their fund raising responsibility. Chicago and Denver have these models and are each finding that these funds are needed for long term sustainability. In order to have long-term sustainability, the original investment is not touched, but instead, only the yearly profit yielded is used as cash flow for ministries. There are definitely pros and cons with these funds and it is still in the beginning stages (under 15 years). I think that one of the major issues with this model, however, is that if a city does not have this available, then the minority staff is usually not able to work in this city unless some other combination of the above is somehow implemented. Something to keep in mind is that there is a fine line between empowerment and enabling people. I would never want to stop the potential professional growth of a minority staff that needs these funds by giving them a staff position where they do not have to learn how to raise funds in these methods as well as traditional ones.

When we continue to think about how to leverage and partner with local culture to provide a service that people of means (middle class and up) can pay for, we have come up with an urban plunge summer trip (www.YoungLifeHorizons.com). Young Life Horizons is a social enterprise of Urban Young Life Chicago and Denver. It is a discipleship trip and immersion into the inner city and Young Life's response to the need for cultural intelligence and a better theological understanding of Jesus through the theologies of celebration and suffering. We use this tool to teach about cross-cultural humility and cross-cultural intelligence and all the profits are put right back into the local ministry. We ONLY hire people from the community in order to give them jobs and we ONLY have community volunteers to help create cross-cultural relationships that will last beyond the trip. We honor the locals by having them lead these mostly White suburban groups into their own communities and to teach them about their communities and culture. We have found that there are plenty of these types of ministry models. However, what I think is unique to ours is that we saw a financial opportunity within our Young Life cash market and thus why we treat this as a social enterprise. We saw that our suburban groups were oftentimes spending over \$1000 per person to go on these crazy fun trips into the mountains, rapids, etc. So, we took the opportunity to invite these groups to come into a cross-cultural experience that most do not get to experience: God in the city. These teens and young college students will be the leaders of our ministries by serving as staff, volunteers and in board positions. We want them to have a seed planted about cross-cultural ministry. We want them to see the face of God in a completely different way. So once again like the Taco Crawl, we leverage local culture in order to receive funds that our communities could otherwise not provide in the conventional manner of fund-raising.

Lastly, I would like to talk about a Latino wedding and how this culturally infused event can help a person outside of the local culture explain to locals why fund-raising is key to funding mission. Most Latino communities around the USA have several repeating financial dynamics of which low-socioeconomic families seems to be primary. This financial dynamic causes many sub-categories or trickle-down effects. The lack of funds does not usually allow people to learn how to steward abundance, invest long-term, and many times the uncertainty of a financial future creates a financial hoarding mentality. When we add the immigrant mindset or the undocumented immigrant mindset those dynamics, especially the hoarding dynamic, are unbelievably augmented. I have seen a family rarely tithe at church over the span of nine years and constantly have a hard time paying rent, buying food, etc. However this same family spent over \$15,000 on their daughter's *quinceañera*. Saving money seems to be common sense for a majority culture or a people group that is middle class and up. Hence, it follows that something extremely culturally important must occur in order to drop the cultural norm of hoarding, stewardship, etc. We will look at what a *quinceañera* and a Latino wedding are in order to further understand and thus continue on to see how this cultural event can help Latino missionaries fund-raise locally.

For those that might not know, a *quinceañera* is the Latino 'coming of age' 15th birthday; it is a mix between a wedding and a debutante party. Massive amounts of money are spent to welcome the young woman into womanhood, introduce her to society, and to celebrate this occasion. Many within the community are invited and all of the friends and extended family are expected to be there. A *quinceañera* is only second in spending and importance to a Latino wedding.

A Latino wedding as we know it today has an interesting background. Like the Argentine Tango, many Latino wedding customs in Central and South American weddings began with the poor. Due to the lack of finances, the community pulled together to help the bride and groom have a great wedding. This dynamic became central to many Latino weddings and thus the "wedding *padrino*" was born. A *padrino*, or the female equivalent *madrina*, are the male and female god-parents to a child. However, within the wedding context, a *padrino* is the person that takes ownership of purchasing and providing a needed wedding item. There are *padrinos* of just about everything; the cake, the bride's shoes, the bride's tiara, the chair rental, the DJ fee, etc. Just about anything that needs to be paid for usually has a *padrino*. These *padrinos* not only get asked to be part of this monumental event, but those that are part of the family and close friends hold the baby girl or boy in their arms after being days old and begin to dream of being a *padrino* in their future wedding. Being a *padrino* is a monumental honor and not being asked to be part of that day in this way is most often taken as an insult; an insult of exclusion. Latino families include friends and extended family into what US White Americans would regard as an immediate family dynamic. This inclusion creates hundreds of "cousins" and "aunts" and "uncles" within Latino culture. Latino's, therefore, hold inclusion is held in high regards and look at exclusion as highly insulting.

A Latino wedding can be seen as the epitome of a community event; an event that celebrates the covenant between two entities. This covenant is known to be timeless because it was something that God desires and blesses. To be a *padrino* is thus an invitation into a timeless covenant in which the person is to actively participate and hold the married entities accountable. There is no lack of action in the unwritten job description of a *padrino*.

When we join both the wedding dynamics and local fundraising in a low-socioeconomic community, we find what I have come to understand as an ideal method to describe fund-raising to a community that does not have the cultural middle class and up, White, Western understanding of the giving models that most EOM's follow. When I am sitting with local community members and begin to describe what our ministry does, most often than not, the community members love the vision and our programs and want to somehow be involved. However, the financial ask is usually phrased in a way that is not culturally relevant. This is where the Latino wedding paradigm comes into play.

First, I do not usually sit with individuals on a one-to-one basis. A one-to-one dynamic might seem personal and intimate and is usually part of most missionaries' training, but when in the Latino

community, I prefer to seek out groups of people due to the strong communal ties that long-term committed people have to each other within these groups. Ideally, I would stand in front of a church service or in sub-groups within a church, but other groups not affiliated with a church would also work. As I do this, a cultural dynamic that I must keep in mind in asking individuals for money can play into a cultural shame over the lack of finances; especially the feeling of lack of power that individuals and nuclear families most often feel.

Also, I would hardly ever stand in front of these groups until I have earned the trust of the group leaders. In Latino communities, most church or community group leadership models are authoritative from top to bottom and the leader's opinions and decision carry most of the weight in a decision-making-process. Due to this, it most often takes quite a bit longer than in a majority culture context to earn the right and trust to ask for money from the individual's church or organization. This amount of time often causes tension when an EOM's fund-raising model and strategy requires a shorter amount of time to be self-sustaining.

When I finally feel that I have earned the right to ask the leadership of an organization or group to speak to their people and they then agree, I stand before them and begin to remind them of their culture. I remind them of how amazing it is to be a *padrino* at a wedding and how honored we feel to see our *chiquitita* or *señorito* grow up and get married. I remind them of how honored we are to be invited into that part of the lives of the younger generation. And I begin to remind them of how they felt when they were the family that provided the funds for this majestic event to happen.

After I finish reminding them of how amazing it is to be a *padrino* of a Latino wedding, I tell them that we are having another wedding; a wedding that they are invited into. However, this marriage will not eventually birth physical children rather a spiritual, physical, emotional, and economic revival in our community. I explain that I received a call from the Lord to be married to the community we live in and that it is a covenant ordained by the Lord that will be long-standing and fruitful. Yet that marriage celebration and marriage life is in jeopardy of not ever happening due to the lack of *padrinos*. I then invite everyone in the crowd to be a *padrino* of our ministry by letting them know of our needs. Some of our needs are volunteers, other needs are financial monthly giving, and yet another need is indirect-fundraising by providing food for the kids, rides for the kids before and after program nights and events, etc. Just like a wedding *padrino*, there is a need to ask for specific tangible items within the ministry. By using a *padrino* model, in the last 12 months, our giving from a low-socioeconomic community has increased from \$400 per year to \$9000 per year which is the difference between 2 monthly donors and 30.

CONCLUSION: TOWARD A JUST MODEL OF FUNDRAISING IN YOUTH MINISTRY

Moving towards a just model of fundraising in youth ministry will not be an easy task. Yet, that should never stop a Christian whose call it is to fulfill elements of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in a contextual manner. Hence, let us move forward with some practical concepts to alleviate the disadvantage ethnic minority staff face in EOMs.

What follows are my, Hodge, broad concepts that present a socio-structural impulsion toward change which must occur, as I would argue, in order to pave the path for a just model of fundraising to begin:

1. Racial, Cultural, & Inequality Awareness: White staff of EOMs who are in senior leadership must learn, engage with, and embrace the very real reality of racism and inequality in the U.S. The largest argument from Whites is that racism does not exist, or, at a minimum, is being overused and exaggerated by ethnic minority leaders. The cross examination from Whites must end and the very real difficult work of education must take place among White leaders of EOMs. Without this crucial piece in place, what

follows will not only fall on deaf ears, but also hardened hearts. Whites must embrace the narrative of ethnic minorities and just because an event has not occurred in the life of a White person, does not mean it has not occurred to the ethnic minority. Telling the ethnic minority staff person that their experience is not real minimizes them and other narratives like that; it places you, the White person, in a place of what Soong-Chan Rah describes as assumptions of normality – in other words, if it didn't happen to me, and I am the dominant group, it surely could not have happened to you (2009, pp. 34-42). This must end, and White leaders must begin to learn how to listen to ethnic minority experiences.

2. Movement Toward Progressive Theologies of & on Social Change: in a conservative stance, by definition, one desires to conserve ideological constructs, product, capital, and normativity. In many instances, this is understandable. But, it leaves out a crucial element of the human experience: change and injustice. These two areas are part of the human experience and part of our calling as Christians to engage with. Jesus did not sit by and allow “things to happen” without engaging them. While Jesus did not take up every single issue of His day, this did not signify that it leaves us, in the current context, to merely “preach the gospel” and avoid social ills and issues. A progressive stance is needed in many youth EOMs toward areas of racism, police terrorism, micro-aggression, White supremacy, White privilege, and social inequality. A progressive stance, while still maintaining certain conservative thought structure (e.g. Jesus’ Gospel, The Bible), allows the organization to be part of that agent of change in a community. Moreover, when the organization is united around an issue, like, say, racism, support is much stronger from within and demonstrates a united front. Statements that my friend Richie endured would not be tolerated and if models of fundraising were unjust, then a move toward a just model would be instinctual. Progressive theologies would allow youth EOMs to review actions needed to take when young men like Trayvon Martin and Michael Brown are brutally murdered. Progressive theologies will allow youth EOMs to deal with the very reality of White supremacy in the organization and to root it out because that *is* what Jesus would do and *not* because it is a liberal form of engagement.
3. Leadership Power Shift in EOMs: One of the ongoing struggles in the U.S. is that EOMs are, largely, White (and male) (Lindsay & Wuthnow, 2010; Perry, 2012a). This is particularly problematic in spaces where urban, multi ethnic, and diverse populations are present because, as researchers have found, young people need to see leaders who look like them from their context. Further, true change will require policy and procedural conversion from the top down. Research has found that when the leader is on board with a particular issue, the followers tend to follow (given the leadership is concrete) (Mark Lau Branson & Martínez, 2011). Further, ethnic minority leaders who come from their communities, know their communities. While White leaders can assimilate and be empathetic toward the plight of ethnic minorities, if they have not come from a particular context, there will always be a loss in experience and context for them with the population they serve. Further, a power shift would begin to create a more diverse space and place for various fundraising models because when you have experienced something as nefarious as social exclusion, sexism, profiling, or racism, you typically do not want others to experience the same thing; having a firsthand knowledge of and for the experience of ethnic minority youth is important and needed in EOM leadership.

While these three socio-structural suggestions will not bring about a conclusive end to unjust fundraising practices, they will certainly help to promote a just and equality form of fundraising in EOMs.

What follows are my, Otaola, broad concepts that present the opportunity for EOM's to engage with and create systemic change that will allow local ministers to move forward in creating just fundraising systems.

1. **Socio and Historical analysis of EOM ministry context:** We will repeat history unless we understand where the mistakes that others have committed before us. We need to understand the systems of power and race that have constructed our country's system and thus inform our church and ministry culture. We need to understand that majority culture has shaped and formed systems without minority culture in mind and thus alienate and oppress minority cultures within these ministry systems. We continue to repeat these cycles without looking back.
2. **Lament:** Once people in power and those without power within EOM's understand the systemic sin within their ministry context, they can move towards Lament. EOM's cannot move forward and create anything without first lamenting history of systemic sin. Without lamenting, EOM's cannot experientially understand the decades of systemic oppression those that have gone before them have experienced. Without lamenting, EOM's risk continuing to see these needed changes as issues, rather than at the core of the heart of God.
3. **Training:** Once EOM's have lamented for an extended amount of time, they need to retrain every level of leadership to be more culturally intelligent (CQ). When seeking CQ training, experts in the field must be sought out. This training cannot come from anyone other than experts. Those experts will also suggest action steps which must be taken and EOM's must take those steps. Otherwise, those in power risk creating the same unjust systems due to the lack of CQ.
4. **Systemic Restructuring:** The first systemic change that EOM's need to put into place is to empower people from minority cultures to have authority-wielding top-tier staff positions. Without these voices having power in the restructuring process, we risk creating unjust systems out of an unjust power dynamic. Once these authority-wielding top-tier staff positions are created and a new system is created in a team environment, these staff positions must also have the same liberties that the seven leaders in Acts 6 had when they lead their own people; they need to be able to make decisions without running their decisions to people outside of their culture.

These socio-cultural suggestions will not bring conclusive change to systemic injustice in fundraising, but it will begin to show the type of restructuring of power that is needed to begin creating just systems of funding mission and to begin circumventing stories like Richie of ever happening in the first place.

END NOTES

¹ I would also make the argument that just because these questions get “answered” that it does not necessarily constitute change in the EOM which is the most important part of multiculturalism.

² We use this term here to define the vindication of divine goodness and providence in view of the existence of evil or demonic forces expressed through allegorical form that often times is mistaken for fact or Gospel truth when in fact, the event or providence, may just be relative to that context and/ or person.

³ Taken from a qualitative survey of EOMs in conjunction with the author’s personal experience.

References

- Alumkal, A. W. (2004). American Evangelicalism in the Post-Civil Rights Era: A Racial Formation Theory Analysis. *Sociology of Religion*, 65(3), 195-213. doi: 10.2307/3712249
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2001). *White supremacy and racism in the post-civil rights era*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). *Racism without racists : color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Brunsmas, D. L. (2006). *Mixed messages : multiracial identities in the "color-blind" era*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Christerson, B., & Emerson, M. (2003). The Costs of Diversity in Religious Organizations: An In-Depth Case Study. *Sociology of Religion*, 64(2), 163-181. doi: 10.2307/3712369
- Doane, A. W., & Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). *White out : the continuing significance of racism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Emerson, M. O. (2010). *People of the Dream : Multiracial Congregations in the United States* Retrieved from <http://carli.eblib.com/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=664562>
- Emerson, M. O. S. C. (2000). *Divided by faith : evangelical religion and the problem of race in America*. Oxford: New York.
- Krysan, M. L. A. E. (2004). *The changing terrain of race and ethnicity*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lindsay, M. D., & Wuthnow, R. (2010). Financing Faith: Religion and Strategic Philanthropy. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 49(1), 87-111.
- Mark Lau Branson, & Martínez, J. F. (2011). *Churches, cultures & leadership : a practical theology of congregations and ethnicities*. Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic.
- McGlathery, M. F., & Griffin, T. (2007). "Becoming Conservative, Becoming White?": Black Evangelicals and the Para-Church Movement. In R. J. Priest & A. L. Nieves (Eds.), *This Side of Heaven: Race, Ethnicity, and Christian Faith* (pp. 127-144). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Nieves, A. L. (2007). An Applied Research Strategy for Christian Organizations. In R. J. Priest & A. L. Nieves (Eds.), *This Side of Heaven: Race, Ethnicity, and Christian Faith* (pp. 309-334). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Perry, S. (2012a). Diversity, Donations, and Disadvantage: The Implications of Personal Fundraising for Racial Diversity in Evangelical Outreach Ministries. *Review of Religious Research*, 53(4), 397-418. doi: 10.1007/s13644-011-0020-7
- Perry, S. (2012b). Racial Habitus, Moral Conflict, and White Moral Hegemony Within Interracial Evangelical Organizations. *Qualitative Sociology*, 35(1), 89-108. doi: 10.1007/s11133-011-9215-z
- Perry, S. (2013). Social Capital, Race, and Personal Fundraising in Evangelical Outreach Ministries. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 52(1), 159-178.
- Pinn, A. B. (2001). Black Theology in Historical Perspective: Articulating the Quest for Subjectivity In A. B. Pinn & B. Valentin (Eds.), *The Ties That Bind: African American and Hispanic American/ Latino/a Theologies in Dialogue* (pp. 23-35). New York, NY: Continuum.
- Rah, S.-C. (2009). *The next evangelicalism : releasing the church from Western cultural captivity*. Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Books.
- Shenk, W. R. (1999). *Changing Frontiers of Mission*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Singleton, H. H. (2012). *White religion and black humanity*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.
- Wise, T. J. (2009). *Between Barack and a hard place : racism and white denial in the age of Obama*. San Francisco: City Lights Books.
- Wise, T. J. (2010). *Colorblind : the rise of post-racial politics and the retreat from racial equity*. San Francisco: City Lights Books.
- Wise, T. J., & Twomey Center for Peace Through Justice. (1995). *Little white lies : the truth about affirmative action and "reverse discrimination"*. New Orleans: Twomey Center for Peace Through Justice, Loyola University.

The next group has both referential and emotive meaning. Besides words there exist different kinds of set phrases (phraseological units). They also possess the property of expressiveness. To set phrases belong proverbs and sayings. These two groups of set phrases have very large expressive power and their usage makes speech emphatic mainly from emotional point of view. Logical emphasis Syntactical level is in charge for logical emphasis. In order to able to distinguish between expressive means and stylistic devices it is necessary to have in mind that expressive means are concrete facts of lan Young people today face considerable challenges in creating a bright future for themselves.Â In high-income economies, young peopleâ€™s prospects have plummeted, and there are significant concerns for their positon in the labour market and the future of their financial security. The situation is worse for young people in low-income countries, where many workers are involved in informal employment â€“ something the ILO describes as sporadic, poorly paid and falling outside the protection of law. Many of the global challenges to development are especially salient for children and youth. September marks the one-year anniversary of the United Nations Sustainable Development Summit, where worl