RECONCILING THE DIVIDE: THE NEED FOR CONTEXTUAL AND JUST MODELS OF FUNDRAISING IN VOCATIONAL YOUTH MINISTRY

Daniel White Hodge*
Pablo Otaola

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 youth ministry organization in the San Francisco Bay area. "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, and lack of financial capital in Richie's background and context all have a role in this narrative. I (Hodge) knew Richie. Richie and I both started out as directors in this organization; we were among the new "diversity hires" for this national organization and we both came from under resourced communities. Richie worked amazingly with students and young adults, a pied piper of sorts. He took the

*Daniel White Hodge, PhD, serves as Director of The Center for Youth Ministry Studies and Associate Professor of Youth Ministry at North Park University in Chicago.
Pablo Otaola, M.A.T., serves as Metro Developer of Denver Metro Young Life, Co-Director of Young Life Horizons for Cross-cultural Intelligence and Development, and Director of Latino Student Staff Omega Program which works on indigenous leadership development through the lens of culture, race, and business.

director position because it was a great opportunity and he had wanted to affect change in the communities he was ministering in. The job came with fundraising responsibilities; 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 intimated 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 and sometimes 18-hour days just to try to balance the budget. 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 from people he had 1) no relationship and 2) no cultural context with. 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, it is not. Ethnic minority leaders have to work exponentially harder than their White counterparts in Evangelical Outreach Ministries (EOMs).[1] In many EOMs, Black and Brown youth leaders tend to lose anywhere from 40% to 60% of their funding when they assume the role as senior leader.[2] Often, because of their upbringings in disadvantaged communities and their lack of social capital, ethnic minority leaders in EOMs are placed into situations where fundraising is the heart of their ministry with a staff of other local leaders—who are also from disadvantaged communities and in need of work—who depend on the raising

of those funds in order to serve. Yet, given the wealth gaps and disparities in the U.S., many ethnic minority leaders in EOMs simply do not have the access to wealth that their White counterparts do, cannot "fundraise" to the level of White run EOMs and essentially fall short.[3] Arguably, this is what occurred with Richie and his trial with the EOM. Personally, I (Hodge) 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.[4]

The ongoing demographic and cultural changes in the U.S. are demanding a culturally contextual approach not just to the Gospel message, but also in *how* that message is given and *by whom*, yet race and social capital seem to be problematic, at best, and limiting for ethnic minority leaders of 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 EOMs dedicated to youth ministry. Second, this paper will argue from a practitioner's perspective, that fundraising models are neither culturally nor racially fully contextualized for ethnic minority leaders of EOMs. Lastly, we will assert suggestions for culturally relevant and contextually appropriate fundraising in EOMs dedicated to youth ministry and present a conceptual model for pursing a 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 polices 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 what is the reality?

Allow me to ask some specific questions related to

multiculturalism. Do EOMs really want a strong, socially conscious, progressive ethnic minority leader on their staff? Do EOMs affirm the social, cultural, racial, ethnic, and familial history of that ethnic minority leader and allow him or her to live in in light of 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 create 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 establish policies 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? Do EOMs allow for the deconstruction of the metanarrative and insist on input from their ethnic minority staff? We want to make clear that we as authors are not demanding a core theological change of any organization's identity. For example, we are not asking a Roman Catholic parish to allow, say, a Lutheran to lead their organization on theological matters. What we are suggesting is a restructuring of systemic polices, practices, and ideologies which, when set up by hegemonic powers, dismantle and exclude diversity of ethnic minority voices.[5]

These questions are crucial for EOMs because such questions must be addressed to achieve true multiculturalism and to actuate equality and change in these organizations. Research has indicated that when these types of questions are left unanswered or, even worse, ignored, then the EOM stands to create even greater barriers and roadblocks to multiculturalism.[6] Further, in building social capital for ethnic minority populations, an organization stands to gain, not lose, from diversity and the deconstruction of dominant perspectives.[7] That is not to say that "good things" will not happen or that "the Lord's will" cannot happen if these questions are not seriously engaged; however it is to say that these questions represent a shift in power that can 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, theodicies[8] 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 view and are hostile, or at the very least antagonistic, toward anything outside of that mantra. As Soong-Chan Rah has observed, often Pan African, Asian, and Hip Hop theologies are exoticized and castigated as the "other" while White Conservative Evangelical Christian Theology is the standard theology.[9] Hence, theodicies provide easy outs to issues of racism and inequality—as was the case for Richie. Below is a list of some popular theodicies which emerge in many EOMs[10]:

- 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 EOM seeking a multicultural approach in and through the ministry. They are also 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 individual is "I do not see your color. I just see you." That has effectively erased a large portion of that ethnic minority person's experience and narrative and leaves only the part the White person, in most cases, wishes to engage: the non-ethnic part.[11]

Multiple studies of race relations in religious organizations affirm that, when an ethnic minority individual is confronted with one of these or similar theodicies, they have several options at their disposal. [12] They can 1) challenge it, but face loss of

employment and loss of social capital within other EOMs[13]
2) ignore the theodicy, but then are faced with the mounting problem of racism and the potential for anger and bitterness to grow 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 some other types of theological tropes create a blockade for ethnic minority staff in EOMs and can place the ethnic minority leader at odds, at times, with the EOM's mission statement—often grounds for termination. In addition, 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 one's employment.

Second, EOMs lack diversity and engagement with diverse perspectives. Volunteer organizations and EOMs are racially homogenous[14]; 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% of EOMs are led by Whites compared to just 4.8% Black, 8.3% Asian, and 2.2% Latino.[15] We see some of these similar numbers among younth ministry organizations. Numbers such as these present several problems. Previous research has established that Whites tend to be unaware of much of the history of race in the U.S.[16] This presents issues on two fronts, because Whites will more than likely be leading an EOM, and be in a supervisorial role. If they are unaware 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 his or her supervisor—even more so if the issue is with the supervisor. Thus, fundraising becomes problematic because these racial issues negatively impact the social capital available to minority leaders. 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.[17]

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 within the first two months after he assumed the leadership role. 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 75% of funding— he lost over half of his parental support and committee members. While he and I could lament these issues with each other, his supervisors were unable or unwilling to see the racist dimensions of this situation and even suggested that he change his approach and "be more like them." Conforming to the white hegemonic patterns of the EOM is often a struggle for ethnic minority youth workers since 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 leader who works for the EOM will have to give up a lot of his or her ethnic identity and heritage to "fit in" among their White counterparts. This minimizing of their ethnic identity then presents more issues for fundraising.[18]

This is not an isolated example. As I have interviewed other ethnic minority youth workers in EOMs, they have relayed to me other statements made by their White supervisors with the clear intent of either drastically limiting, or in some cases eliminating, any conversation about racism:

- 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 narratives of racism within EOMs, and are told that their experience is invalid or does not exist. EOMs need more ethnic diversity and racial consciousness at the senior leadership level. Such attempts to limit or silence conversations about race in EOMS 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.[19]

Thus, it becomes difficult when *one* ethnic minority leader 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 will be described later, facilitates fundraising models that are not suitable for ethnic minority contexts.

EOMs with leaders who engaged racial issues, including issues of white privilege, and learned about the history 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' narratives and life experiences much better.[20] 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 congregational funding approach can also 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 fundraise their salary, and, if they are the head, like Richie, they are responsible for an entire organization's budget including raising some support for 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 churches with a certain percentage of their budget set aside for "missionary" funds. 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.[21]

As some of the examples cited earlier in the paper attest, this construct around "individual character" can be problematic as Whites tend to make racially charged judgment calls regarding ethnic minorities (e.g. lazy, criminals) and this can affect fundraising efforts.[22] Further, when you do not come from an advantaged background, finding the people who have the capital to invest a significant amount of money (typically $50,000 and up) to fund an 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.

An ethnic minority leader, 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. 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 from other white donors 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.[23] 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.[24] To add more complexity, ethnic minorities have endured historical economic disadvantages and have just recently arrived at a point where home ownership is within reach.[25] 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.[26]

Multiethnic contexts also tend to make it more difficult to ask for money. Researchers have theorized that Black and Brown families come from a context where "asking" for money is seen as less than socially and morally acceptable.[27] 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.[28] 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.[29] Given this proportion, there is need for a just model of fundraising. In light of these findings, it

is a myth that the current levels of multiculturalism and equality within EOMs are sufficient to produce equality in fundraising.

Let us now turn to a practitioner in the field of youth ministry, Pablo, who has experienced many of these issues first hand. This section is important as it will present a youth worker's experience from an ethnic-minority context living out much of what has been discussed to this point. This section is also crucial for understanding the effects of racism, which are widespread and complex, on both a person and an organization. Often, for Whites, it is easily dismissed that race is a factor—especially in EOMs, thus the importance to enter "ground zero" for fundraising in an ethnic minority context. This more detailed case study illustrates and substantiates the claims made already in this paper.

Contextual Models of Fundraising (Otaola)

The past seven years on Young Life staff exposed me to fund-raising philosophies that have some cross-cultural merit. However, the underlying cultural, racial, and gender-based assumptions within the fundraising training left me with tools I had to tweak and contextualize or not use at all. In my search for potential alternatives I have concluded that there are two main concerns when it comes to fundraising. The first concern is the lack of meaningful understanding that the issues existing within many low-socioeconomic status, multi-ethnic communities require long-term contextualized and equitable funding models. The second concern is that there is a lack of contextualized training for all people involved in the funding process.

Often fund-raising comes down to a mix of the following: internal ministry grants, external grants from foundations, personal relationships with friends and family, and different endowment opportunities. While those are all helpful, the baseline for what people need to raise is still the same: 100% of the budget. When the network of the staff person's community and personal relationships has people groups of low socioeconomic status, reaching 100 percent of funding is unlikely and unrealistic. However, 100 percent of funding is required to keep the person on staff and keep ministry going. This missionary-style funding is antiquated and does not take into account race, culture and socioeconomics. What is required are diverse sources of funding which spreads the responsibility of providing finances across a

team of people groups that have different access to wealth.

In Denver Young Life we have created what we hope to be a long term sustainable funding model that spreads out the financial responsibility in an equitable manner. Our funding pie was developed with the idea that if the organization wants ministry in a low-socioeconomic geographic area, then it must own the major part of the funding because the access to wealth in those communities will be small.

We first start with the person that is called to do ministry in the local area. We have created an assessment tool that assesses the staff person's network's net worth to see what we can likely expect the staff person to raise. We also use a similar assessment to see what the community can yield due to their socioeconomic status and what the real estate and retail projections will be over the next 20 years. This gives us a base of the percentage of the total budget that we can build on. After this assessment is completed, we see what the financial gap is to do ministry and the Metro, Regional, and National offices will need to own the gap if Young Life wants ministry in that local area.

The funding pie consists of the following entities (with variable percentages). The first 66% of the funding comes from outside of the ministry area. That 66% is divided into Young Life National Urban Office, the Divisional Office, and the Metro Area Office which will get funds through large personal donors, foundation grants, and social enterprise endeavors. The last 33% of the funding will come from the staff person on the ground, the board of directors for that geographic area, and the community via events and personal giving. The 33% was the first assessment that we thought was realistic for the staff person and their board to raise once we knew the average yearly budget for an urban Young Life area in Denver.

In order to provide longevity in these endeavors the 66% needed to come not only from foundation funds but also by creating economic engines that produce wealth. By creating revenue generators, we can produce income and the financial return on donor investment is multiplied. Our ministry fundraising does not need to be limited to the generosity of people via their disposable income. Disposable income is a privilege that racial minority, poor communities often do not have. Fundraisers and fundraising often focus on the Christians that can give above and beyond their tithe. We focus our economic engines on ways

that give us access to a large percentage of local market cash flow instead of a very small percentage of our communities that have disposable income. Below are six of the revenue generators that fit the above description.

The largest fund generator that Denver Young Life is building is a multi-million-dollar endowment that will require up-front charitable gifts that create immediate cash and end-of-life giving which creates long-term sustainability. This endowment will be invested in stocks and bonds which will yield a certain percentage of dividends each year. Denver Young Life local ministry budgets will be able to count on these funds as long as they have active ministries and staff.

Another way that Denver Young Life will create revenue generators is by creating business ventures that produce profit that can in turn be given to local ministries. We call these business ventures social enterprises. These are businesses which have a dual purpose: to produce a financial return and a social return. We currently have two endeavors. Our large scale endeavor is to raise the necessary funds to purchase a 12-15 unit building. Our projections show that in the Denver Real Estate market a building of that size will continually produce $40k-$60k in profit that the ministry will receive. Once the building is paid off, the profit will increase. Our small scale endeavor is a micro-enterprise t-shirt design and production company. We looked at cash-leakage within our own multi-million-dollar organization and saw that branding was a major opportunity. We spend money on shirts and hoodies and many other apparel throughout the year. We approached our regional office and asked to do a presentation to all of the directors in order to show them that the money will help our ministries to racial minorities thrive financially. Our kids deliver the shirts to these areas around the city and we make a 20%-50% profit on every order. One-hundred percent of the profit goes right back into the ministry. Our realistic and conservative projections for this business is a $30k profit per year.

Some of our events are also seen through the lens of a social enterprises that tap into the assets of our communities. One such event is our Taco Crawl. We know that people from around the city come to Southwest Denver for its amazing authentic tacos. We empower our local teens and community to provide a small food service that leverages local culture. In doing so, people's culture is honored and leveraged for income that can go directly

into the ministry that the community benefits from. You might have heard of a bar crawl. Well, this is similar. We have everyone that comes park at a local high school. We begin by handing out Mexican sodas and explain that the night will be spent walking around the neighborhood from taco joint to taco joint. Each adult pays $100 - $500 to be a part of the experience. These people are most likely not people from the community so I get about 5-8 people from the community to invite and welcome our Taco Crawl participants into the community. We walk from taco joint to taco joint in small groups 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 we might know, or just a friendship that enhances my presence in the community. During the walks we share many laughs and the story of what God is doing in the community. Cross-cultural relationships are formed and *hopefully* maintained. One of our 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 we are ministering so that reconciliation and redemption can happen.

We attempt to leverage every community asset. Churches are huge assets in several ways and can be sources of indirect giving or in-kind giving. Many churches do not have financial resources to give but they have other resources that can help with funding. Our church ministry partners help with funding by not charging us rent, raising awareness and in-kind donations, and giving us access to people that give on a per-project basis. These same churches are places that can host our incoming Young Life Horizons (YLH) groups (www.YoungLifeHorizons.com)

YLH is another social enterprise of Urban Young Life 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 the 45% to 50% profit margins are put right back into the local ministry. What is unique about YLH is that we saw suburban Young Life groups across the country spend $500 to $1500 per person per discipleship

trip and we saw an opportunity to get some of that market share within our own ministry.

The last part of the equitable funding model that we have developed overlaps with personal and traditional fundraising. For the staff person to be motivated to fund their ministry by speaking to people about money they are incentivized. Often, during the first three to four years of Young Life ministry the racial minority staff person does not have a large number of people of financial means in their network. While that network is built, we assess the gap in personal funding and use a match from the endowment that we spoke of above. This added funding does not depend on the financial outcome of the meeting. It depends on if there was a meeting at all. This money is scaled down as the staff person begins to have a bigger and bigger base of personal donors.

The second concern that must be addressed in order to work towards a sustainable funding model is to understand that there is a lack of contextualized training for all people involved in the funding process. Contextual training is needed for the staff person and the local committee to both look at a community to do contextually relevant events like the Taco Crawl, but also for the staff member to have the right tools to fundraise. The way that I was taught to fund raise is not sufficient. It is not contextualized to race, gender, culture, socioeconomics, or multi-ethnic stories. I started with a very small network net worth. I had to figure something out if I was to survive in a missionary-based funding model. Over the last few years I have developed a fund-raising curriculum that is for racial minorities. While the curriculum covers many dynamics specific to racial minorities raising funds, I will briefly speak on one Latino cultural overlay to fundraising.

A Latino wedding is a culturally infused event that will help the missionary explain to Latino locals why fund-raising is key to funding mission. I have seen a Latino 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 $35,000 on their daughter's wedding. Since poor Latino families do not usually have a traditional savings mentality, it follows that something quite culturally important must occur in order to drop the cultural norms of a poverty mentality. We will look at how a Latino wedding functions in order to understand how this cultural event can help Latino missionaries fund-raise locally.

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. However, a monumental insult is the exclusion from being a *padrino*. Latino families include friends and extended family into what White Americans would regard as an immediate family dynamic. This inclusion creates hundreds of "cousins" and "aunts" and "uncles" within Latino culture. Latinos, therefore, hold inclusion as love and exclusion as insulting and hurtful.

A Latino wedding 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. Thus, when I am sitting with Latinos to describe what our ministry does, we often get people that want to get involved.

First, I do not usually sit with individuals on a one-to-one basis. A one-to-one dynamic might seem personal and intimate to White culture and is usually part of most missionaries' training, but with Latinos I prefer to speak to groups due to the strong communal culture. 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.

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. In order to pull it off I will need *padrinos* and *madrinas*. I then invite everyone in the crowd to be a padrino of our ministry by letting them know of our needs. Just like a wedding *padrino,* there is a need to ask for specific tangible items within the ministry. By using a *padrino* model, in a 12-month interval, our giving from a low-socioeconomic community has increased from $400 per year to $9,000 per year which is the difference between two monthly donors and thirty.

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.[30] 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 our broad concepts that present a socio-structural impulse toward change which must occur in order to pave the path for a just model of fundraising to begin:

1. Racial, Cultural, and Inequality Awareness

White staff of EOMs who are in senior leadership must learn, engage with, and embrace the 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 is has not happened to the ethnic minority. Telling the ethnic minority staff person that their experience is not real minimizes them and other narratives like theirs; it places the White person in 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."[31] This must end, and White leaders must begin to learn how to listen to ethnic minority experiences.

2. Movement Toward Justice and Equality and Theologies of 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 crucial elements 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 commitment to justice and equality is needed in many youth EOMs that will lead to addressing racism, dismantling White supremacy and White privilege, promoting intercultural intelligence, and reducing social inequality. A stance toward justice and equality, while still maintaining a certain conservative thought structure (e.g. Jesus' Gospel, The Bible), allows the organization to be an agent of change in a community. Moreover, when the organization is united around an issue, such as racism, support is much stronger from within and demonstrates a united front. Statements that Richie endured would not be tolerated and if models of fundraising were unjust, then a move toward a just

model would be instinctual. An organization that works toward multiculturalism, intercultural competencies and learns to listen to their ethnic-minority members will be stronger, better prepared for the demographic shifts happening in the U.S., and will have the ability to engage in a broader context. Justice and equality theologies will allow youth EOMs to deal with the reality of inequality and injustice 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).[32] 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 and come 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).[33] Further, ethnic minority leaders who come from their communities, know their communities. While White leaders can acquire cultural intelligence and be empathetic toward the plight of ethnic minorities, if they have not come from a particular context, they will never be full cultural insiders with the populations they serve. Further, a power shift would begin to create a more diverse space 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 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 more just form of fundraising in EOMs.

In addition to the above proposals, from the practitioner's perspective Otaola suggests four broad concepts that could help EOMs to create systemic change that will allow local ministers to

move forward in creating just fund-raising systems.

Socio- and Historical Analysis of EOM Ministry Context

We will repeat history unless we understand 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 those systems alienate and oppress minority cultures within these ministries. We continue to repeat these cycles without looking back.

Lament

Once people in power and those without power within EOMs understand the systemic sin within their ministry context, they can move toward lament. EOMs cannot move forward and create anything without first lamenting the history of systemic sin. Without lamenting, EOMs cannot begin to understand the decades of systemic oppression those that have gone before them have experienced. Without lamenting, EOMs risk continuing to see these needed changes as secondary issues, rather than at the core of the heart of God.

Training

Once EOMs have lamented for an extended period 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 EOMs must take those steps. Otherwise, those in power risk creating the same unjust systems due to the lack of CQ.

Systemic Restructuring

The first systemic change that EOMs 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 led their own people; they need to be able to make decisions without running their decisions through people outside of their culture.

These socio-cultural suggestions will not eliminate systemic injustice in fundraising, but they will *begin* to show the type of restructuring of power that is needed to begin creating just systems of funding mission and to prevent stories like Richie's from ever happening in the first place.

---

1. Samuel Perry, "Racial Habitus, Moral Conflict, and White Moral Hegemony within Interracial Evangelical Organizations," *Qualitative Sociology* 35, no. 1 (2012), 89-108 http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11133-011-9215-z; Samuel Perry, "Diversity, Donations, and Disadvantage: The Implications of Personal Fundraising for Racial Diversity in Evangelical Outreach Ministries," *Review of Religious Research* 53, no. 4 (2012), 397-418 http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13644-011-0020-7; Michael D Lindsay and Robert Wuthnow, "Financing Faith: Religion and Strategic Philanthropy," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 49, no. 1 (2010), 87-111.

2. Perry, "Racial Habitus"; Michael O. Emerson, *People of the Dream: Multiracial Congregations in the United States* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010) http://carli.eblib.com/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=664562 ; Brad Christerson and Michael Emerson, "The Costs of Diversity in Religious Organizations: An in-Depth Case Study," *Sociology of Religion* 64, no. 2 (2003), 163-181 http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3712369; Antony W. Alumkal, "American Evangelicalism in the Post-Civil Rights Era: A Racial Formation Theory Analysis," *Sociology of Religion* 65, no. 3 (2004), 195-213 http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3712249.

3. Samuel Perry, "Social Capital, Race, and Personal Fundraising in Evangelical Outreach Ministries," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 52, no. 1 (2013), 159-178.

4. Perry, "Social Capital"; Alumkal, "American Evangelicalism in the Post-Civil Rights Era"

5. Rick McClatchy, "Building a Multi-Cultural Organization in Texas" *Review & Expositor* 109, no. 1 (February 1, 2012), 85-94, http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/003463731210900111.

6. Sally Coleman Selden and Frank Selden, "Rethinking Diversity in Public Organizations for the 21st Century: Moving toward a Multicultural Model," *Administration & Society* 33, no. 3 (July 1, 2001), 303-329, http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/00953990122019785; Judith Y. Weisinger and Paul F. Salipante, "A Grounded Theory for Building Ethnically Bridging Social Capital in Voluntary Organizations," *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 34, no. 1 (March 1, 2005), 29-55, http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0899764004270069.

7. Selden and Selden, "Rethinking Diversity in Public Organizations"; Judith Y. Weisinger, Ramón Borges-Méndez, and Carl Milofsky, "Diversity in the Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector," *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 45, no. 1 suppl (February 1, 2016), 3S-27S, http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0899764015613568. Just because these questions get "answered" does not necessarily constitute change in the EOM which is the most important part of multiculturalism.

8. 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 s is mistaken for fact or Gospel truth when in fact, the event or providence, may just be relative to that context and/ or person.

9. Soong-Chan Rah, *The Next Evangelicalism: Releasing the Church from Western Cultural Captivity* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books, 2009), 77-80.

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

11. Alumkal, "American Evangelicalism in the Post-Civil Rights Era"; Rah, *The Next Evangelicalism*.

12. Perry, "Social Capital"; Perry, "Racial Habitus"; Perry, "Diversity, Donations, and Disadvantage"; Lindsay and Wuthnow, "Financing Faith"; Emerson, *People of the Dream*; Christerson and Emerson, "The Costs of Diversity in Religious Organizations"; Alumkal, "American Evangelicalism in the Post-Civil Rights Era"; Rah, *The Next Evangelicalism*; Anthony B. Pinn, "Black Theology in

Historical Perspective: Articulating the Quest for Subjectivity " in *The Ties That Bind: African American and Hispanic American/ Latino/a Theologies in Dialogue*, ed. Anthony B. Pinn and Benjamin Valentin (New York, NY: Continuum, 2001), 23-35.

13. Perry, "Social Capital," 176.

14. Lindsay and Wuthnow, "Financing Faith," 87.

15. Perry, "Social Capital," 164.

16. Emerson, *People of the Dream*; Alumkal, "American Evangelicalism in the Post-Civil Rights Era"; Wilbert R. Shenk, *Changing Frontiers of Mission* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1999); Tim J. Wise and Twomey Center for Peace Through Justice, *Little White Lies: The Truth About Affirmative Action and "Reverse Discrimination"*, *Blueprint for Social Justice* (New Orleans: Twomey Center for Peace Through Justice, Loyola University, 1995); Tim J. Wise, *Colorblind: The Rise of Post-Racial Politics and the Retreat from Racial Equity*, Open Media Series (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2010); Tim J. Wise, *Between Barack and a Hard Place: Racism and White Denial in the Age of Obama*, Open Media Series (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2009).

17. Marla Frederick McGlathery and Traci Griffin, ""Becoming Conservative, Becoming White?": Black Evangelicals and the Para-Church Movement," in *This Side of Heaven: Race, Ethnicity, and Christian Faith*, ed. Robert J Priest and Alvaro L Nieves (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007), 151.

18. Harry H. Singleton, *White Religion and Black Humanity* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2012); Michael O. Emerson and Christian Smith, *Divided by Faith : Evangelical Religion and the Problem of Race in America* (Oxford: New York, 2000); Perry, "Racial Habitus."

19. Perry, "Diversity, Donations, and Disadvantage," 398.

20. Alvaro L. Nieves, "An Applied Research Strategy for Christian Organizations," in *This Side of Heaven: Race, Ethnicity, and Christian Faith*, ed. Robert J. Priest and Alvaro L. Nieves (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007), 310-11.

21. Perry, "Diversity, Donations, and Disadvantage," 399.

22. Maria Lewis and Amanda E. Krysan, *The Changing Terrain of Race and Ethnicity* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2004); Ashley W. Doane and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, *White Out: The Continuing Significance of Racism* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2003); David L. Brunsma, *Mixed Messages: Multiracial Identities in the "Color-Blind" Era* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2006)

23. Lindsay and Wuthnow, "Financing Faith"; Emerson, *People of the Dream*.

24. Perry, "Diversity, Donations, and Disadvantage," 400-01.

25. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, *White Supremacy and Racism in the Post-Civil Rights Era* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2001); Krysan, *The Changing Terrain of Race and Ethnicity*; Doane and Bonilla-Silva, *White Out* ; Brunsma, *Mixed Messages*; Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003).

26. Perry, "Diversity, Donations, and Disadvantage," 400.

27. McGlathery and Griffin, ""Becoming Conservative, Becoming White?""; Lindsay and Wuthnow, "Financing Faith."

28. Perry, "Diversity, Donations, and Disadvantage," 408.

29. Perry, "Diversity, Donations, and Disadvantage," 407-08.

30. Research and both authors' personal experiences suggest that the difficulties could cause splits, tensions, and chaos as dominant power structures do not easily give up power. Yet, we would argue that this should no less cause us, as Christians particularly, to take up the cross of interculturalism and work through and within that conflict for the betterment of the Kingdom and for the love of our fellow sisters and brothers in Christ.

31. Rah, *The Next Evangelicalism*, 34-42.

32. Perry, "Diversity, Donations, and Disadvantage"; Lindsay and Wuthnow, "Financing Faith."

33. Mark Lau Branson and Juan Francisco Martínez, *Churches, Cultures and Leadership: A Practical Theology of Congregations and Ethnicities* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011).