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Foreword

During the last number of decades, I have observed the development of world mission sending agencies in many countries. I have watched this process while serving as Executive Director of Fida International (the Finnish Pentecostal Mission organization), as chairman of the World Missions Commission of the Pentecostal World Fellowship (PWF) and of the Pentecostal European Fellowship (PEF) and also its mission branch, the Pentecostal European Mission (PEM), as advisor of the Pentecostal Asia Mission (PAM), and recently as chairman of the African Pentecostal Mission Consultation (APMC). I have been privileged also to see the growth of mission endeavours of the World Assemblies of God Fellowship (WAGF) as a member of the leadership team of its Mission Commission. An even larger picture has opened to me through connections in the Lausanne Movement and the World Evangelical Alliance (WEA). I have personally been involved in mission training in about 60 countries.

The birth of many new mission organizations and mission departments tells me that God is interested in seeing the Great Commission fulfilled and every people group to be reached as soon as possible. At the same time, the need to create fruitful and sustainable structures for world missions is increasing. Therefore I have been eager to provide a tool for such development in cooperation with the Bible and mission education coach and advisor of Fida International, Dr. Ulf Strohbehn, who also serves the wider Pentecostal family in training challenges.

This book does not attempt to give answers to every question concerning mission structures. It is written to give a basic road map for the organizing of a mission agency, but every denomination and mission organization must determine the best structure for its own context. Without a map we may be lost, but with a map, one will find different paths, sometimes longer but more beautiful, sometimes quicker and smoother. Although this book is authored by writers from the West, we have tried to look at the world from a multicultural perspective.

This is a map, a tool, and a vehicle by which to pursue the best practices in world missions. Closely related to this theme, I have also written a book entitled How to Start Missionary Work in New Sending Countries (Fida International, 2003, revised edition 2014). I recommend studying that book as well. In this present book, the focus is concentrated on building the structure of the mission agency.

I trust this book will provide assistance to those who are seriously desiring help in designing a structure for a world missions sending agency.

Helsinki, Finland 16 October, 2017
Arto Hämäläinen
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For the New Testament church, missions was its reason for existence. The birth of the church in Jerusalem was the fulfilment of Jesus’ promise of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Connected to that promise was the pronouncement of the missionary task: “You will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, Samaria and to the ends of the earth.” (Acts 1:8). Its influence was not only felt in Jerusalem but reached even to Ethiopia and to Antioch which then became the base for the spreading of the gospel to the Gentiles through the ministry of Paul and his co-workers (Acts 8 and 11).

We can notice very clearly how the churches Paul and his team established became mission-minded churches, sending missionaries. We can see a glimpse of that in Acts 20:4: “He was accompanied by Sopater son of Pyrrhus from Berea, Aristarchus and Secundus from Thessalonica, Gaius from Derbe, Timothy also, and Tychicus and Trophimus from the province of Asia.” Here, the churches in Berea, Thessalonica, Derbe, Lystra (Timothys’s home church) are mentioned. Paul was instrumental in establishing the churches in Ephesus and in all Asia Minor. His Bible or mission school in Ephesus was very effective, causing the spread of the gospel to the whole province of Asia (Acts 19:10). He himself did not go everywhere, but through his training ministry, he multiplied churches and manpower for the spread of the gospel.

The NT also shows us that the church in Philippi sent Epaphroditus whom Paul calls a co-worker and fellow soldier (Phil. 2:25). He uses the term “your messenger” describing the relationship of Epaphroditus to the church in Philippi. ‘Messenger’ is translated from the Greek word ‘apostolon’ which means a person who has been sent (and also in a special context, ‘apostle’), and is actually the root for the English word ‘missionary’ via the Latin word ‘missio’ which also includes the meaning of sending.

From the time of the Apostle Paul, women have played a very significant role in mission history. Phoebe was one of his co-workers. She worked as a deacon in Cenchreae but served Paul in bringing his letter to the church in Rome (Rom. 16:1-2). He instructs the Romans to receive her “in a way worthy of his people”. We learn also that she had been a benefactor to many people including Paul. He stated that she needed to be cared for in a practical way while in Rome. Paul was not like some enthusiastic people of today who just send missionaries to other countries without thinking of what their needs may be in that foreign country and in its cultural context. Paul focused on sustainable results. That meant a proper sending structure.

Phoebe was not the only female co-worker with Paul. In reading the greetings in Paul’s letters, we find a long list of women who contributed greatly to the expansion of God’s Kingdom. In Roman 13:3 Paul speaks of Priscilla after again mentioning Phoebe. We know that Priscilla worked with her husband Aquila in Corinth, along with Paul, all having the same secular job as tentmakers. As a couple, they later were a great blessing in Ephesus. Couples, families and also singles are needed in cultivating a healthy church.
Later in history, the missional character of the church weakened and even faded away. The churches turned inward, losing the nature of the early church. Missions became a matter for those in the monasteries who were especially interested in it. The Reformation did not make any major change in this respect. Then, because the role of monasteries disappeared in the protestant context, mission vision was fatally weakened. The Anabaptists made some significant attempts but a greater growth in missions came through the protestant mission societies. Even at that time, the protestant churches did not take that role as a fulfilment of the Great Commission. So the churches had no structure for missions. Missionary work became a matter of mission agencies that were started because of the vision of some mission-minded individuals.

Through the influence of William Carey and others, from around 1800, churches started to establish their own mission societies (Baptist mission, Lutheran mission etc.). When the Pentecostal revival touched the world at the beginning of the 20th century, from the very beginning the new movement was missions oriented. From Azusa Street, the revival spread quickly to the other continents. The Holy Spirit is the missionary Spirit.

Pentecostal churches however were influenced by various other traditions, and their world mission structures came to be diverse. One of the main reasons for the formation of the Assemblies of God USA in 1914 was to provide a legal structure for world missions. The practical solution was to form a mission department in the national structure. That model has been followed by the AG churches all over the world. Because some of the World Assemblies of God Fellowship member churches were not established by AG missionaries, their structures are different. Some Pentecostal churches have a singular centralized authority extending globally (Foursquare, Church of God/Tennessee, Church of God in Christ, International Pentecostal Holiness Church), which influences their mission structures as well. In the Nordic countries of Europe, there is a strong emphasis on the role of the local church which has influenced their world mission work. However some national coordinating mission structures have become necessary in the Nordic countries also, and the central question then has been “what is the role of the local church and the national mission department/organization”.

Structures in the Pentecostal context have not been limited to the national level. Unity and cooperation have been important values, and therefore continental and global networks have been built. The approach can be either pragmatic or more theologically founded, emphasizing the unity and cooperation of the churches in the body of Christ. Because of the tremendous growth of Pentecostal-Charismatic churches in the last decades, new challenges have appeared. The global South has become the centre of gravity for evangelical and Pentecostal churches. At the same time, these new, growing churches have awakened to the challenge of the Great Commission. They are the resource of power for the completion of the mission task. But how should they build their mission structures? What can we learn from the teaching of the Bible? What can we learn from mission history? The aim of this book is to reflect on that goal, offering tools for the building of that mission structure.
CHAPTER 1
What is needed to start a mission program?

Three elements are essential for an effective mission program. They are: Holy Spirit empowered people, a mission strategy, and the structure to implement the strategy.

1.1. Spirit empowered people - Arto Hämäläinen

The outpouring of the Holy Spirit in Jerusalem enabled the people to become witnesses for Jesus Christ. The Holy Spirit is a missionary Spirit. The same Holy Spirit also caused the extraordinary expansion of the Moravian missionary movement 300 years ago. The Moravians have been one of the most powerful mission movements in Protestant mission history. Count Zinzendorf welcomed refugees to his farm in Herrnhut (in Germany today). They were believers from different backgrounds, a very diverse crowd. Much disunity appeared among them, but on one Sunday in 1727, the impact of the Holy Spirit melted the ice from their hearts and created harmony and a common vision for reaching people who had not yet heard the gospel. These people went to almost 30 different countries, giving a strong impetus to mission movements in Europe.¹

Those who experienced the Pentecostal experience in Azusa Street at the beginning of the 20th century were filled with a zeal to reach the world. They went to other continents as pioneer missionaries or encouraged the present missionaries to be filled with the Holy Spirit.² That began the shift of the centre of gravity of Christendom to the Southern hemisphere.

The impact of the Spirit is not only needed by those who go. The senders need that empowerment as well. The Holy Spirit spoke to the church in Antioch to send Paul and Barnabas as missionaries (Acts 13:1-4). The Holy Spirit inspired the church at Ephesus through Paul’s teaching ministry to reach the whole province of Asia (Acts 19:8-10). The church of Thessalonica was so active in mission that it became well-known (I Thess. 1:8). The churches in the NT were mission oriented. The Holy Spirit always leads to think of those who have never heard the gospel. If the church is not mission-minded, something is wrong. The Lausanne Covenant expresses this very clearly: “A church that is not a missionary church is contradicting itself and quenching the Spirit.”³

It is advisable for every local and national church to carefully examine whether or not it is appropriately involved in God’s plan to make Jesus known throughout the world. It is easy to see that not every church takes the Great Commission seriously. If every church would provide one missionary, the world would experience a spiritual revolution. In Brazil, there are more than 10,000 local Pentecostal churches. If every church would send one missionary, the number of Brazilian Pentecostal missionaries would be about 10 times greater. In Finland, Pentecostals now have about one missionary per local church. It is

¹ Tucker, 70.
³ Lausanne Covenant, article 14.
the dream however to have one missionary per 100 members. To increase the number of missionaries is a matter of concern for the whole church. The senior or leading pastor, the elders or Board (the leadership) must be committed to the mission vision of the church.

The attitude toward world missions is the indicator of the depth of spirituality in the church because the Holy Spirit is a missionary spirit.

Which principles are followed in a practical sense? Success factors show us the keys to success. We can, for example, ask whether there can be success without prayer.

The Holy Spirit in Missions

Ulf Strohbehn

1. The Holy Spirit is the Inspiring Breath of God, who Instils in the Church a Natural Law, which is the Instinctive Desire to Carry out Evangelism and Missions

“And Jesus came up and spoke to them, saying, ‘All authority has been given to Me in heaven and on earth. Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the age.’”

The Great Commission from Matthew 28:18-20 has a prominent place in the history of missions. These words have given birth to several missionary movements; they have spurred many Christians to give their all on mission fields around the world.

The founding father of the modern missionary movement was William Carey (1761-1834). He too found his inspiration in the Great Commission. His tract called ‘An Enquiry into the Obligations of Christians to use Means for the Conversion of the Heathen’ opposed the theology of his time, which assumed that the Great Commission had expired with the first apostles.⁴ Even Martin Luther had taught nothing else: The Great Commission was exclusively for the first apostles, that they go everywhere and testify. After that, said Luther, no-one else has received such a commission and every pastor has to care only for his own parish.⁵ To personally accept this commission, which the Lord Jesus gave his apostles, whereby a candidate would consider himself an equal to the first apostles, was seen as an infringement according to Luther, which also was the error of the Pope himself.⁶ William Carey, however, brushed all those theological constructs aside. In his day and age, Britain began to expand her rule and, for the first time, something that is known today as ‘globalization’ could be felt. Moreover, English and American churches not only survived the onslaught of the Enlightenment but experienced different revivals which led to the Golden Age of Missions in the 19th century. Carey played a significant role in showing that the church is still responsible to carry out the Great Commission.

---

⁴ Harry R. Boer, Pentecost and Missions, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961, p. 17
The doyen of German missiology, Gustav Warneck, wrote a book called ‘Evangelische Missionslehre’ (Evangelical Doctrine of Missions). He researched and concluded that the main reason for modern missionary work was that Christians took Matthew 28:18ff literally. Even the rather recent beginning of Youth with a Mission goes back to Matthew 28. In his autobiography, founder Loren Cunningham states that he was ‘compelled’ to start YWAM because of the Great Commission.

However, when reading the New Testament, we cannot see that the disciples immediately set to work after they had heard the Great Commission. They heard Jesus’ words much stronger than anybody thereafter, but they did not go. This is because they had received another commandment which told them to wait (Luke 24:49). The first disciples, who later came to be called apostles, became the leaders and powerful witnesses of the emerging church and mission movement only after the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. Everything that had happened before Pentecost was like ready..., steady...but the GO! came only with the Holy Spirit. From that day on, missionary work became the daily habit of the disciples; it became their lifestyle.

The Great Commission is in itself not a commission. It is not called commission in the Bible, and in the text is only one, initial imperative. Matt. 28:18-20 is not a commission, but a natural law. What is a natural law? A natural law is a decree given by God that corresponds with our being and our inherent fabric as human beings. That is why we like to follow natural laws. God decreed natural laws during creation; natural laws are always given at the beginning of someone’s existence.

Two of them can be found in Genesis 1:28, “God blessed them and said to them, ‘Be fruitful and increase in number, fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air and over every living creature that moves on the ground.’” The first natural law is called the law of replenishment, and the second is the law to rule, which also has a lot to do with self-preservation. These two laws are so ingrained in us that we will carry them out without even knowing them and we can certainly say that man has fulfilled them: the earth is over-populated and the entire creation has been subdued under mankind. There were, however, not just these two laws given in the Garden of Eden, but two distinct Spirit-filled moments occurred, too. First, God breathed living breath into man’s body and so man became a living being. The second pneumatological moment came when God later blessed the first human couple. Therefore, we find that a natural law is made up of two components: It comes through God’s spoken Word, and connected to that decree is an action by the Holy Spirit who infills and blesses the recipients. These two events plant a natural law in the receivers which we can simply express with the following formula: commandment + Spirit = natural law.

The same components can be found in the New Testament. God decreed missions in Matthew 28, but only on the day of Pentecost was the church inspired with the Holy Spirit and thus the Great Commission became the natural law of the church. The church in the

---

7 Gustav Warneck, Evangelische Missionslehre, 2. Aufl., Gotha, 1897, vol.1, p. 91.
New Testament does not evangelize out of obedience, but by instinct. She is the church only since Pentecost because her life principle, mission, was given to her on that same day.⁸

Luke writes that there were 120 people in the early morning prayer meeting on the day of Pentecost. They gathered, started praying, and then the Holy Spirit fell. There were tongues of fire, people expressed their emotions to such a degree that the bystanders thought them to be drunk. The Christians prophesied and they spoke in tongues, too. How long did that last? One or two hours? We do not know. But we know who and what called this wonderful, charismatic moment to a halt. It was Peter. He noticed unbelievers there and he had the urge to preach and tell everyone around who this Jesus really was. (I am afraid that many congregations nowadays would have carried on with the prophesying and speaking in tongues, without noticing the unbelievers and with no word about Jesus to the bystanders.) Yet Peter got up and preached a wonderful, clear-cut evangelistic sermon. People were convicted of their sin, they repented, were baptized and so the church started growing in a phenomenal way. It is spiritually healthy to realize that the charismata and the evangelism on the day of Pentecost constitute one inseparable effect of the Holy Spirit’s outpouring. We are the ones who separate these two, worship and evangelism, by venues, times, or people responsible for it, but God sees them as one.

This natural law, the urge to tell others about Christ, and (if it is cross-cultural) to do missions, has been very well expressed by the first apostles. In Acts 4, they are interrogated by the Jewish leaders, and are then bluntly told to shut up. Peter and John’s answer to this is in verse 20, “We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard.” In other words, even if they would want to stop speaking about Christ, they couldn’t. The Holy Spirit is simply bubbling over inside of them and so they speak, witness, and preach.

The Great Commission remains just a stiff law without the Holy Spirit, but with the Spirit, it becomes the pulsating heartbeat of all church activities. The New Testament shows that the church and mission share the same birthday. After that, one cannot separate mission and church in the account of the New Testament. Mission is not an independent enterprise. Mission is simply what the church does. If the church does not do missions any longer, then she ceases to be the church in the full sense; and if mission becomes detached from the church, then it will have lost its anchorage too. Pentecost is the initial spark and full implementation of the Great Commission in and through the church. The disciples did not testify about the risen Christ before Pentecost.⁹

We were taught basic subjects in school like mathematics and English. These subjects were so important that their absence would certainly have brought the entire school system into question. However, we also had extra-curricular subjects. For me, one of them was cooking, and nowadays my daughters have electives like drama, horseback-riding and Annika is even learning how to do karate. Sometimes it seems that missions has now become an extra-curricular activity in our churches. There are some who show an interest

in foreign countries and other cultures, but the church as such does not define herself through missions. Let me say it as clear as I can: Evangelism and missions are constitutional for any church. Without those, we cannot yet speak of a Biblical church in the same way that the New Testament does.

2. The Holy Spirit is God’s Reconciling Peace, who Helps the Church to Overcome all Prejudice and Racism

a. The Holy Spirit Expands the Mission Scope of the Early Church

Starting on the Day of Pentecost, the Church has become a kerygmatic fellowship, meaning that the body of believers lives from and for the proclamation of the risen Lord. As we have seen, this kind of Spirit-filled church needed no outside motivation to evangelize. However, on the Day of Pentecost the scope of the church’s mission was not yet defined. Reading Acts, we can see how the Holy Spirit opens more and many doors for the church to expand her mission. Peter stood at the centre of this initial ministry because he had to fulfill Christ’s prophecy about the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, which he received (Matt. 16:19). Keys are made for doors and doors lock things behind them or open up new rooms. Contrary to many jokes, Peter did not receive keys in order to admit or deny someone from entering heaven. For what kind of doors did Peter then receive those keys? It was he who opened the way of salvation for the Jews first by preaching to them on the Day of Pentecost. It was again Peter who was the first to preach to the Gentiles in the house of the Roman officer, Cornelius. The key was the Gospel itself, but the doors were obstacles of prejudice, racism, segregation and xenophobia. Some of those doors had been closed for centuries, but the Gospel opened them within a few months.

In Acts chapter 3 we meet a man who had been handicapped for years. This made him an object of theological debate in his society, but he never found pity, not to mention healing, from anyone. He was barred from attending the temple because of his handicap. That was a hard lot for a Jewish man, not to be counted as a full member of God’s covenant people. Yet the man had a longing for God. The fact that he begged at the entrance to the temple does not only speak about his shrewdness when begging, but about a longing to see, hear and smell what was going in the sanctuary. Looking at Christ’s ministry to people, we can conclude that to him, nobody was an outsider. The apostles Peter and John continued with the same attitude. With his healing, the paralyzed man from Acts 3 is again integrated into God’s covenant people. Now he is able to walk; in fact, he can jump! And where does he jump to? Certainly, into the temple, because that was where the first church assembled. And the Holy Spirit makes clear, from this day on, handicapped people are not to be excluded any longer from the assembly of God’s children.

Moreover, in Acts 7, Stephen, one of the prime movers in the New Testament, is found guilty of blasphemy by the Jewish leaders and executed by a religious mob. An ambitious Pharisee, Saul of Tarsus, is overseeing the carnage. Why was Stephen killed? Because the Spirit of God, who does not allow discrimination between people, had filled Stephen and caused him to preach this very truth. That was the accusation against him, that he
abolished the election of the Jews, their temple, and their Law, and thus presented a God who would love all people regardless of their ethnic and religious background. Saul became Stephen’s executioner in a twofold sense. First, he oversaw the execution of the verdict against him, but after his conversion, Paul executed the spiritual legacy which Stephen had left. Stephen had boldly proclaimed the love of God shortly before his death, and on top of that, he prayed that God may forgive his murderers. And how the Lord in his grace answered that prayer! Just a while later, he appears to Saul of Tarsus, pushes him down to the ground, and makes him a new creation. This very Saul then lived for the message for which Stephen had died. He carried that proclamation to the streets, market places and palaces across the Roman Empire. Paul talks about the great mystery in Colossians 1:26, which to him is that Jesus has abolished the separation which had been between the Jews and the Gentiles. See also Ephesians 2:14.

Before Paul’s conversion, we can see another racial barricade which was done away with by the Holy Spirit. The Samaritans were reached by a deacon called Philip. His task in the church was actually to serve the soup at the tables, but Acts says that he was full of the Holy Spirit and so he had this urge to tell others about Jesus. He has seemingly forgotten a long string of violent history between his people and the Samaritans. There had been centuries of civil war between the Jews and the Samaritans. It is only the Holy Spirit who can move people into a direction in which suddenly there is a willingness to reconcile. During that time, a pious Jew would go to bed with this prayer, “I thank thee Lord for not making me a woman, neither a pagan nor a Samaritan, Amen.” – in that order! The Samaritans, on the other hand, weren’t saints neither. We have it on good record that one day, a bunch of Samaritans crept up to a Jewish town and threw a pig’s carcass over the wall. The consequence was that the entire population had to come out of the town and wash in the river because they had been ritually defiled.

Now the Holy Spirit confirms God’s plan for the Samaritans by working mighty signs and wonders in their midst. The Christians with Jewish background see God’s acceptance of the Samaritans when the latter are baptized in the Holy Spirit. It is this sign, which brings the breakthrough in reconciliation between people. God made his approval of the Samaritans clear, now the Christians have to follow and accept them, too.

Philip was also involved in bringing the Gospel to someone from a different ethnic background. He met the Ethiopian chancellor and explained Christ to him by interpreting passages from the Old Testament. The Ethiopian, a high ranking political official, was someone who was drawn to the Jewish religion. However, the Jews would never regard him as belonging fully to them because of his different appearance, and mostly because he was a eunuch. His higher pitched voice would have made it impossible to hide the fact. Again, the Spirit of God commands his servant to disregard all these prejudices and bring the Gospel to the African. After the Ethiopian believed, he was also baptized, showing that the body of Christ is open to all ethnic groups. The Spirit’s power and confirmation of God’s plan of salvation for all is again revealed by rapturing Philip from the scene after the Ethiopian’s baptism.

The events at the house of the Roman officer, Cornelius, served to remove the last doubts
concerning God’s reconciliatory purpose for humankind. Perhaps some of those instances wherein the Lord reaches out to minorities in the New Testament are not any more than symbolic. However, when the Spirit of God fell on Cornelius’ household, we truly have a paradigm shift.  

The Spirit takes up where the story was somehow lost, 750 years earlier in a town called Jaffa. Jonah had been commanded to go to Nineveh, it is a mission commission occurring right in the Old Testament. It didn’t really work, mostly because the prophet had to be brought to obedience through the entrails of a sea monster. Transporting missionaries in fish is not very practical and so the Old Testament’s record of mission to the unreached nations stops right there. Jonah is said to go down, three times: He went down from his mountain village in Galilee, then he went down to the harbour in Jaffa, and finally he went below after he had boarded the ship. Centuries later, we find Simon bar Jonah, also named Peter, in the same spot in Jaffa. And he goes up. He receives a vision on a rooftop, which goes right against the grain of his Jewishness. He is commanded to eat all kinds of animals. God only took a fish to bring Jonah to Nineveh, but with Peter, an entire zoo was needed. Yet the real difference here is the Holy Spirit. The Spirit drives people into missions; the Spirit helps us to love those whom we would naturally not regard at all.

The Holy Spirit draws upon a huge arsenal of spiritual means to bring Peter to the gentiles. Angels, visions, gifts of the Spirit, all are now employed to prepare the apostle, and with him the church, for this gigantic step.

The journey continued from Jaffa to Caesarea. Currently it may be difficult to imagine how many obstacles of hate, prejudice and racism Peter stepped over that day when he entered Cornelius’ house.

The man wasn’t just a Gentile, but a Roman, a citizen of the invading country that had cruelly suppressed the Jews. And he wasn’t just a Roman, but a soldier, too. It is likely that Cornelius had led his men into combat against the Jews. Yet Peter knows that he is being led by the Spirit of God. And so he does what by that time had in some way certainly become a routine to him, he talked about Jesus. The apostle probably started with the events around the Sea of Galilee, when he first met Jesus. He continues talking about his master. Right into the story, the Holy Spirit interrupts the apostle. There was only divine order in that meeting! It is almost as if you can hear Jesus shouting from heaven, ‘I cannot wait any longer’, and so he baptizes the entire household of Cornelius in the Holy Spirit. They are filled, they prophesy and speak in tongues, and a mighty chorus of praise rings out from the mouths of pagans!

Peter witnessed God in action. Later he reported these events to the other apostles. Their deliberations are not of a spiritual nature any longer. The apostles talked about the cultural implications of what God himself had spiritually made clear. From that day on, it was resolved that the church was to be a reconciled body of believers from all walks of life, all languages, and all ethnic groups. And the core of the Holy Spirit’s work among people is to

---

bring such a church into existence – until this very day.

b. Some of the Spirit’s Reconciling Acts in Church History

This reconciling work of the Holy Spirit can be found throughout church history. In his famous interpretation on the powers working in church history, Kenneth Scott Latourette reasoned that Christianity advances through revivals. One can see in many of those revivals that barriers of prejudice, sexism, racism and ageism are torn down, at least for a while. Perhaps the Azusa Street revival, which started in 1906, is a prime example of such a move of the Spirit. There the colour bar was washed away in the blood (of Christ), children preached, black laundry ladies prophesied. The son of former slaves, William F. Seymour, laid hands on white Lutheran bishops who had sailed over from Europe and single ladies were sent out as missionaries. For some years one can witness such a wonderful breakdown of discriminatory structures which were prevalent in the society of that day. To mind come other parallel instances in church history:

Patrick, who in the 5th century founded the Celtic Church in Ireland, was a strong opponent of slavery. Somebody once said that until the 17th century, there was not any other who had such a solid stand against slavery as Patrick.11 Where did Patrick’s attitude come from? It is interesting that his ministry and the Celtic Church in general were characterized by signs and wonders much more than the Roman Church in that day. Patrick was one of the last men before the Middle Ages whom we nowadays would call ‘Pentecostal’. For this reason, the Pentecostal churches in Ireland claim his ministry as an important part of their heritage. We can learn from Patrick’s example how charismatic ministry goes hand in hand with the absence of prejudice.

A.B. Simpson was one of the spiritual trailblazers of the modern Pentecostal Movement who ministered especially in missions and faith healing. At the end of the 19th century, his church was known to be the most modern and richest congregation in New York City. Yet there was a spanner in the works. Simpson won hundreds of Italian migrants for Christ, but the church members, including their elders, refused to accept them in their midst. Thereupon Simpson quit his job as their pastor, against the advice of his colleagues and his own wife, and to the amazement of the press. He became independent and advised his most faithful church members not to follow him, but to remain in the church. It took only ten years to see that the Lord had more than rewarded his servant. Simpson built up another strong congregation, moved into an international ministry, and became one of the most famous faith healers in the USA. His mission board supported 24 missionaries around the globe.

c. The Holy Spirit brings Love as the Main Instrument in Missions

It is impossible to be Pentecostal and racist at the same time. While much has been discussed and written about the ‘initial evidence’ of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, the Word of God makes it unmistakably clear what the strongest gift of the Spirit is: Love. Paul

said it like this, “...because the love of God has been poured out within our hearts through the Holy Spirit who was given to us;” (Rom. 5:5). Being filled with love means that we will have more of it than we naturally possess. We ordinarily, in our own nature, only possess a small amount of love. It extends to a limited number of people. We love our children, our partner and close relatives. And even that kind of love is not at its best all the time. Now, with the infilling of the Holy Spirit comes more love - a lot more! We are therefore enabled to love people who would be usually out of our scope to love. Luke 6: 32.35f says, “If you love those who love you, what credit is that to you? For even sinners love those who love them... But love your enemies, and do good...Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful.” Jonah serves again as a contrast to this. Throughout the book, the Lord tried to teach him the most elementary lesson for mission work: To love people and feel compassion for them.

The missionary program is summed up in the last verse of the book of Jonah, verse 4:11, “Should I not have compassion on Nineveh, the great city in which there are more than 120,000 persons who do not know the difference between their right and left hand, as well as many animals?” The prophet did not affirm this question. He felt nothing for people. He felt nothing for animals, who were also bound for destruction by his efficient preaching of judgement. It is as if the Lord planned it this way: ‘Okay, Jonah, you don’t feel for people, neither for animals. So let’s start with a plant.’ And that worked. He felt “compassion for the plant,” (4:10) and the Lord used this as an object lesson to show that his compassion extends all the way to people, even to Jonah’s enemies, the Assyrians.

In the 1990s, I was invited to speak at a Bible school in South Africa. I was only available for one day, so they gathered the students from four classes in the chapel and I got ready to go up and teach. Yet I was startled when I saw the more than one hundred students assemble, and I asked the principal: ‘I know your churches and that you have black congregations, too. So how come you only have white students here?’ He answered, ‘Our church has four Bible schools.’ It turned out that they had a Bible school each for blacks, whites, coloured, and for students of Indian descent. They were Pentecostals, expecting the Holy Spirit to move in their lives and ministries, yet they discriminated in the use of Spirit and couldn’t see the forest for the trees. Fortunately, they abandoned that system a short time later. 1 Corinthians 13:1f says, “If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but do not have love, I have become a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal. 2 If I have the gift of prophecy, and know all mysteries and all knowledge; and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but do not have love, I am nothing.”

The Spirit of God always deals with all of humanity, not just a part of it. He was there at creation as the living breath, the God who gives life to us all. Pentecost is another milestone where we find the Holy Spirit working universally because he opens the door of salvation through Christ to all peoples and nations. The Spirit of God gives life in both instances, at creation and at Pentecost. For this reason, Pentecost can be contrasted with the confusion of tongues at Babylon. The Spirit never splits people apart but reconciles them.
3. The Holy Spirit is the Emboldening Power of God that Equips those that Carry out the Great Commission

a. Spiritual Gifts are Assured to those who Spread the Gospel

Jesus assured his presence to his disciples, not in a just a general, sort of blurred or vague way. The context of Matthew 28:20, “I am with you always…” is especially meant for those who carry out his Great Commission. In other words, you need to carry out verse 19 in order to be able to claim the promise from verse 20. I know that there are people who seem to experience the presence of God when finding a parking space in an overcrowded mall. Yet, interpreting the context of Matthew 28, I think this promise is more for those who talk boldly about Christ in their Muslim community or those who carry Bibles into countries where it is outlawed and punishable with jail sentences.

The danger with charismatic Christianity is for it to turn inward. Some people exercise the gifts of the Spirit as if they entertain themselves on a charismatic playground. It is certainly true that God wants to work miracles in our midst and that we do not see as many healings as we should in our churches. Yet is it to be assumed that a ‘perfect church’ is to be created by the Holy Spirit where no one is ever sick and consequently no funerals will take place?

Is that an ideal that has been thought through? The emphasis of the Holy Spirit’s work in the New Testament is outward. Miracles happened on the streets as Christians engaged in evangelism. Powerful gifts were exercised in the mission expansion of the church.

b. The Value of Signs that Accompany

As to the ranking of spiritual gifts, the Gospel of Mark paints a fine picture, (16:17f). “These signs will accompany those who have believed: in My name they will cast out demons, they will speak with new tongues; 18 they will pick up serpents, and if they drink any deadly poison, it will not hurt them; they will lay hands on the sick, and they will recover.” Just as in Matthew 28, this promise of the Spirit’s supernatural presence is bound to the Great Commission which we find in close proximity in verse 15 of Mark 16. The attention is now on the word “accompany.” This word was used in antiquity when talking about parades. Different kinds took place; for example, victory parades or when a king rode into town. Now, accompanying the king were his courtiers, ministers, generals, sentries, his queen with all her maids and yes, kings had fools, too. There is no doubt that the masses were fascinated with the nobility displayed in front of their eyes. They might have been in awe of soldiers and dazzled by the newest and finest fashion presented in front of them. Yet, the unmistakable centre of all attention was the king. People stood on their tiptoes, climbed on shoulders and into trees to catch a glimpse of the emperor. The same must be said about the gifts of the Spirit. They accompany our king. They are part and parcel of what happens when God moves into town. Spiritual gifts certainly hold a fascination on their own, yet they should never distract from, but point to Christ. The early Pentecostals had novel, and in some cases, abundant experiences with the supernatural workings of the Holy Spirit, yet they were at the same time absolutely Christ-centred. Moreover, they had a catch phrase which expresses this point well: “Do not seek the gift, but seek the giver!”
c. The Fruit of the Spirit

Before we turn to power and miracles, it will be worth noting that the fruit of the Spirit, mentioned in good order in Gal.5:22ff, also play a vital role in evangelism and missionary work. The first fruit mentioned is, of course, love. Some commentators interpret verse 22 to mean that the fruit is actually only love, and that joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control are aspects or ingredients of love. This speaks of the fact that the word “fruit” in verse 22 is in the singular mode. In that case, we do not have different fruits of the Spirit, like a colourful fruit basket in front of us, but only one fruit, say, a grape, which has different arms.

This very neatly falls in line with what I have written above, namely that the Holy Spirit fills our lives with love, and that this kind of love gives us compassion for the lost and spurs the believer onwards to share the Gospel.

The fruit(s) of the Spirit are not to be confined to inner sanctification. One quality of fruit is their attractiveness. Just the look of a juicy mango can have a mouth-watering effect. Likewise, the Holy Spirit works on the characters of Christians, so that others are drawn to us. This is an effect which has actually been very instrumental in evangelism. People noticed something different about Christians. Loving behaviour has made a difference in schools and in factories. Christians were oftentimes able to comfort others in the midst of life-threatening dangers, and this in turn has led people to ask more about Jesus.

d. Natural or Supernatural Gifts?

Value is sometimes given to supernatural gifts, e.g. those mentioned in 1 Corinthians 12:8ff, over and even against the natural gifts of people. By ‘natural’ is meant our inherited qualities, that people are musical, gifted to communicate, or have leadership abilities. Some fancy to “only serve the Lord in the Spirit,” thereby looking down at their natural faculties. Now, where do our natural abilities come from? They are passed on from generation to generation, a long chain which points back to creation. The Holy Spirit, none else, has endowed mankind with natural gifts. This has to be made unmistakably clear: both supernatural and natural gifts have the same source, the Holy Spirit.

I do not know whether one can exercise spiritual gifts in a carnal way (the story of Israel’s physically strongest judge Samson and the events in Corinth seem to suggest this), but I do know that one can operate natural gifts in a spiritual way. We had an elderly lady in our church in Germany who had the gift of baking cakes. This is a wonderful ability, and I wish we had more people like her in our churches. Anyway, we planted a church in former East Germany, and the people came to our meetings because this dear sister accompanied me every time I preached there and she always brought cakes along. Admittedly, the people came for her cakes and not to hear me speak. But to some, this sweet gift opened up the way to hear more of the Gospel and to eventually accept Christ into their lives.

In the realm of missions, all our faculties are needed to be employed for the glory of Christ. We need teachers and pastors, preacher and prophets, but also nurses, builders,
painters, potato farmers and administrators. Some countries cannot be entered by career missionaries, but those persons who can cooperate in the development of business or technical industries, for example, are welcome.

e. Power Evangelism

If you are set to bring the Gospel to unbelieving relatives, if you want to be a witness for Christ in your neighbourhood, if you are ready to start a new church – count on God to support your testimony with supernatural signs. Be bold and pray for miracles to occur. These settings are the prime operating field for the Holy Spirit, leading to breakthroughs in our ministries.

Count on God not only in the positive, but also in the negative, that he will remove obstacles by supernatural intervention. We see such miracles for example in Acts 13:8ff were Elymas the magician was blinded because he opposed the spread of the Gospel. Another example from the Irish church in the 5th century tells how Patrick was once targeted by assassins. Yet their plot came to naught because every terrorist was struck with dumbness. They were literally speechless in front of the man of God.\textsuperscript{12}

There are manifold reasons why believers from other religions become Christians. Among Muslims, assurance of salvation seems to be one of the most attractive aspects of our faith. Yet I know of many cases where Jesus has healed someone in a Muslim family, which then led to inquiry and ultimately, salvation. Pastors in Germany are baptizing former Muslims who have come as refugees to Europe; oftentimes seeking refuge from an all too literal form of Islam. Many of these new Christians are baptized in the Holy Spirit, right at the beginning of their Christian walk. It is a joy to see how they in turn lay hands on the sick – and the Lord is certainly working with and through them. Prophesy is another gift of the Spirit that can lead to a breakthrough in this area, something which religious debate will never accomplish. Encouraging cases come to mind from Iraq and Indonesia, where people encounter a living God who speaks directly into their lives.

I end this chapter with a memory from Malawi, south east Africa, where our family served as missionaries for fifteen years. I visited a local Pentecostal congregation in the north of the country, in a village called Kaulira, for the first time in 1998.\textsuperscript{13} Entering the church on a Sunday morning, I was amazed as there were seven hundred people assembled, perhaps more than the entire population of the village. We had a wonderful service, but at the end I could not help but ask the pastor why he had such a large church. He then led me to two old people who were chatting with others outside the building. Thus, I was introduced to Chekha Kumwenda and Kankhwala Banda.

The church in Kaulira had its beginnings in the late 1940s or early 1950s. No missionary had brought the Gospel to them. Malawian men at that time migrated to South Africa for labour. There they worked in the mines, or were employed as cooks or house boys. Many


migrant workers found Christ on the streets of Johannesburg and in the mining compounds. Most mine workers suffered from tuberculosis, but word had gotten around that the Pentecostal preachers offered healing in the name of Christ. Many people found not only healing, but salvation, too. Upon their return, the migrant labourers became missionaries to their home folks. So, around 1951, there was a small group of Christians in Kaulira, hardly literate, but acquainted with the supernatural power of God.

One day there was an accident in the village and two teenagers were killed. According to custom, the corpses were made to lie in state in a hut so that relatives and friends could pay their last respects. The Christians entered the hut, too, and started singing some of their songs. And then they prayed over the dead bodies. All of a sudden, both teenagers simultaneously came back to life.

The pastor told me that this event is well-known around the area. Chekha Kumwenda and Kankhwala Banda, who stood with us outside the church in 1998, are those two people who were raised from the dead. They were already elderly when I met them. However, whenever there are people in the meetings who have not yet received Christ, these two go up to the pulpit and tell their testimony, with salvific effects! This wonderful, life-giving God, his son Jesus Christ, together with the Holy Spirit wants to encourage us to have faith, and to exercise it in the supernatural – for the sake of his Kingdom and Glory.

1.2. Mission strategy - Arto Hämäläinen

Why is strategy so important? If we want to achieve results in anything we do, we need to set a goal. An athlete needs the desire to win, to set a record. Business people aspire to become market leaders. A composer or artist wants to create top level productions. Originally, the word strategy was related to war. Strategy is simply the answer to the question: how to win the war?

Jesus has given us a goal in the Great Commission; to reach all people, everywhere, with the Gospel. Strategy gives an answer to the question of how that goal is to be reached. Every church and believer who is aware of what Jesus has done to save them from eternal condemnation must ask how they are to participate in the spread of the gospel.

Many churches have never asked themselves what the Holy Spirit is directing them to do to promote the fulfilment of the Great Commission. They have never asked where it is that God wants them to spread the gospel. They have never asked how many missionaries the Lord is asking them to send. They have not sought nor found their Paul and Barnabas. They have never experienced being partners of the Holy Spirit in sending people. Jesus asked us to pray that the Lord would send workers into the harvest. Missions must have a human face. Some churches want to outsource missions by sending money. It is an easier way than praying that the Lord would call someone from the church to go, to invest in their training, and finally to commit to their long-term support.
If the church has a clear mission strategy, a plan for involvement in the fulfilment of the Great Commission, then every member should know these goals, and the means to reach these goals. Some people may think that devising strategy is in opposition to the spontaneous leading of the Holy Spirit. In some cases that may be, but a correct understanding of strategy in the context of mission means a deeper dependence on the Holy Spirit. To understand God’s will and plan concerning the church and individual believers forces us to seek the mind of God and the will of the Holy Spirit.\footnote{Hämäläinen, 2003, 17.}

The basic elements of strategy are foundational (mission, vision, values, principles and success factors), defining the goal, and the process or means to reach the goal. It also requires understanding and supporting the activities which will reach the goal. Mission simply is defined as the main task of the church. Why does the church exist? Vision describes how we want the future to look. Values will direct our decision making. We must analyse what is really important for our consideration. Which Biblical values relate decisively to missionary work? Principles form our policy. How do we do mission work? Goals and sub-goals (objectives) inspire us and keep us on the right track. We follow Paul’s example: “Therefore I do not runaimlessly; I do not fight like a boxer beating the air.” (1 Cor. 9:26). To reach the goal requires activities and processes. If we want to spread the gospel, we need to be witnesses, preach, and teach. We need to love our neighbours. We serve the ‘whole’ person.

Finally, it is important to focus on the supporting activities (support processes). These include leadership, information and marketing activities, human resource management, collecting of funds, and financial management. It is often the case that some or all of these areas are neglected or underdeveloped. Leadership is not clearly designated, information sharing is sparse, missionaries are not served properly, fund raising is not systematic, and financial reporting might be defective. A beginning mission movement is wise to give attention to all these practical issues to insure that all are given proper and adequate consideration. Too many mission endeavours suffer because of poor management. Paul praises the church at Philippi for their quality of management (Phil. 4:15-19). All mission organizations need to strive for quality.

1.3. **Structure to implement the strategy** - Arto Hämäläinen

Any strategy is useless if there is no proper structure in which it can be implemented. It is then like a piece of music on paper but without an instrument to play it. Pentecostals have various kinds of structures for national and local churches. Those structures also influence their mission structures. New senders have crucial questions to ask when they consider mission structures. What is the national mission structure? What is the local church mission structure? How are the national and local structures related? Which decisions are made on the local level, and which are made on the national level? How is the national structure networking with continental and global mission structures?

For what purposes is the structure needed? Four areas should be included. First, it must
motivate people, recruiting them for missions. Secondly, training is needed for both those who are going and for those who are sending them. Thirdly, sending people means providing a structure for accomplishing it. Fourthly, missionary work is not done in a vacuum. Rarely is the missionary or the mission organization alone in a country or an area. What then is the format for partnering with others? How is that aspect noted in the design of the mission structure?

1.4. Antioch as a model church for strategy - Arto Hämäläinen

The local church at Jerusalem was a bit slow in fulfilling the mission task. It was monocultural, reaching only the Jews. Gradually it remembered Jesus’s instructions to go beyond Jerusalem and Judea. Deacon and evangelist Philip, driven by persecution, went to Samaria. He crossed cultural and religious borders and became a cross-cultural missionary. He crossed another border when approaching the Ethiopian eunuch. (Acts 8) Because of persecution, the Jerusalem church became a catalyst for cross-cultural missions at Antioch as well. Those who went to Antioch can be called tentmakers or lay workers. They shared the gospel with the Gentiles there (Acts 11:19-21).

The men who helped in the foundation of the Antioch church had cross-cultural experience. They had lived in Cyprus and Cyrene. The church in Antioch understood that they should not only be receivers of the message. Although they were blessed by the church in Jerusalem, they did not build dependence on that church. They understood the principle of becoming givers. Giving is a divine principle. God gave his best, his begotten Son, Jesus Christ. The Antioch church grasped the concept of giving as well. They had the opportunity to give when the Jerusalem church faced a difficult time because of a famine (Acts 11:27-30). They gave. Receivers became givers. They became a 360 degree church, completing the circle of receiving and sending.

The Antioch church not only gave humanitarian assistance. It began to send missionaries. We clearly see the guidance of the Holy Spirit when they sent Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13:1-4). It must be noted that the Holy Spirit spoke when the church leaders were praying and fasting. We cannot force the Holy Spirit to speak, but we can prepare a forum for him through fasting and prayer.

The local church at Antioch became a sending church. The New Testament churches were missionary sending churches. They were 360 degree churches, not just 90 or 180 degree churches, with just some interest and occasional input into missions. They understood that it was the responsibility of the church to be the agent for fulfilling the Great Commission. They owned a clear understanding of the reason for their existence. They not only served the personal needs of the believers in a centripetal way, but the church became centrifugal in sending people.

We can learn much about Pauls' strategy and that of the church in Antioch (and other churches with which Paul was cooperating). First, we notice that Paul had spiritual goals. In Romans 15 he shares his vision of preparing the Gentiles as an offering to God (Rom 15:15-16). At the time of harvest, the Jews brought crops to the temple and the priests
offered them to God. Paul seems to be thinking of that action when writing this. Pentecost was also a harvest feast. Much symbolism is included in the fact that at the first Pentecostal outpouring, people from many nations became believers and were filled with the Holy Spirit. (Acts 2) Paul’s desire was to bring that kind of offering to God from everywhere.

Secondly, Paul had ethnic goals. He crossed racial and ethnic borders. He was a Jew to the Jews, (1 Cor. 9:20), and he was obligated to Greeks and non-Greeks (Rom. 1:14). He had an attitude of a slave that must win as many as possible (1 Cor. 9:19). He saw that all were redeemed in Jesus. “There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.” (Gal 3:28). Only through the atonement of Jesus can it be realized that all people are equal. All are sinners but all are redeemed by the blood of Jesus. That is the only lasting foundation for the egalitarian approach.

Thirdly, Paul had geographic goals (Rom. 15:19-24). He had reached Illyricum (approximately Albania today) but he had a desire to expand his ministry to Rome and even to Spain, the uttermost corner at that time. Mission must be geographically oriented.

Fourthly, Paul had tactical goals. He wanted to establish local churches everywhere. It was not enough for him to preach the gospel. He wanted to leave the influence of the church in every place he preached. It was to be a centre of training, equipping, and multiplying. Jesus’ command was to make disciples. To achieve this, the existence of the church is a necessity. Disciples cannot grow in a vacuum.

Paul felt it important that the church understood its role in a holistic way. The spiritual needs of people should, of course, be served, but they have other needs as well. In the letter to Titus, he often emphasizes that they be ready to do good works (Titus 2:7, 14, 3:1, 3:8, 14). Loving your neighbour was a part of Jesus’ message. He reminds us to keep a balance between our love of God and the love for our neighbour.

The churches Paul established became interconnected. Unity and cooperation is a reflection of the divine oneness (John 17). The New Testament churches were not fully independent. They were interdependent.

**1.5. Antioch church and Paul’s team as models of structure - Arto Hämäläinen**

We see in the NT that local churches formed the basis for mission activities. In Acts 13 we see that mission vision was cast by the Holy Spirit to the leadership of the church. They understood the instructions He gave. Without having the church leadership involved in the vision of missions, it is almost impossible to move forward. In larger churches, the leadership can delegate practical implementation to a special mission committee or task force. However, in every case, the responsibilities should be clear. The missionary must know how decisions in the home church are made, and what role the local church has in the whole picture.
One might say that a mission organization has no model in the NT but that is not necessarily true. Of course, we cannot find it described in modern terms. The embryo however is detectable. If we follow Paul’s team in its journey, we notice that they did not communicate with Antioch about everything. They reported to the home church, but not every decision was made in consultation with it. Paul and his team usually made decisions along the way. When the Holy Spirit hindered their going to Asia Minor or Bithynia (Acts 16:6-7), or when speaking to Paul in a vision about going to Europe, Paul with his team made the final decision (Acts 16:8-10. Would they obey the Spirit’s leading? Some of them may have had their doubts but they made the decision to follow the Spirit.

We learn that decisions were made partly by the local church (the sending and supporting of Paul and Barnabas) and partly by Paul and his team. The latter was typical for the situations that arose on the field. People in Antioch had no real idea of the situation in the centre of today’s Turkey. Some expertise was needed for decision making, and Paul with his team were able to fulfill that need. Here we then see Paul’s team as the embryo of a mission organization or mission department for a national church. We need the level of the local church and of the national church for decision making in world missions. It is important to define the roles of both. Which matters are to be decided on the local level, and which must be decided on the national level (mission department or organization).

It is also essential to decide how a national church, through its mission department or mission organization, will partner with other missions. If it is connected to continental and/or global mission organizations, it can be a big help. Then the missionaries who are sent out can be connected to other missionaries working in the same area, focusing on the same people group. Our testimony becomes stronger, and we can utilize the best practices tested by others.

Questions for reflection:

- What is the mission vision of my church?
- Does my church have a mission strategy?
- Are there mission structures in my church?
- Is the relationship between the local church and national church clear?
- What can we learn from NT churches in regards to world missions?
CHAPTER 2
For what purposes do we need structure?

Four basic elements are needed for implementing a mission program:

2.1. Mobilizing, recruiting people (Who?)
2.2. Training people (What? How?)
2.3. Sending the missionaries (By whom? To where?)
2.4. Partnering with others (With whom?)

2.1. Mobilizing - Arto Hämäläinen

We must first answer the question as to who is needed. Missions is about people. Jesus’ command was that we ask God to send workers to the harvest (Matt. 9:38). Other people are also needed, not only the ‘goers’. “And how can anyone preach unless they are sent?” (Rom. 10:15). We need those who understand their calling as senders. They must be mobilized to understand and to accomplish their role. It is a mistake to concentrate only on the missionaries. Tools are needed for motivating and recruiting the senders. The international Kairos course is one of the best tools for accomplishing this.

A Finnish missionary couple were touched by the Kairos course and so they began to teach it in their country of Uganda. People were inspired. After one course, four young students came to them saying they could not remain silent while recognizing that in northern Uganda lived 200,000 refugees from Sudan. Among them were people from unreached people groups whom they wanted to serve. As a youth team, they made four trips to the refugee camp, and then they started to plan a trip to Sudan.

As churches learn about world missions through the Kairos course or elsewhere, the churches must provide forums where those who are called by God to go can hear the Holy Spirit speaking to them as in the case of the young people in Uganda. If one has never had a mission event or mission message in his/her church, it is no wonder that nobody investigates the possibility of going. What Paul writes is trust: “faith comes from hearing the message, and the message is heard through the word about Christ.” (Rom. 10:17). You need to preach about world missions if you want to see people get involved. You must inspire them to pray for workers, for missionaries. In Finland, we prayed to add 100 more missionaries in five years’ time. God gave this number in 4 years. The prayer goal was pleasing to God. 15

Mobilization can start with small steps. I visited Czechoslovakia during the communist era. The Pentecostal church was illegal and it was a risk to contact them. We gathered in remote places in mountainous areas. I experienced a baptismal service in the moonlight. Some people found Jesus as their Saviour in those circumstances. I spoke to the believers
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about world missions, in spite of the fact that they could not leave for any mission field as missionaries. They were, however, creative in their mission vision. They wanted to be mobilized in prayer for world missions and asked for the names of our Finnish missionaries to add to their prayer list. We did not know that after some years, they would meet some of these missionaries face by face when the iron curtain came down. They then started to send their own missionaries to at least eight different countries. They have worked among the unreached people groups e.g. in Central Asia and the Middle East.
The first mission society had one significant aspect, which served as a foundation for its structure. At the core of its organization were relationships between key people. And I don’t mean relationships in general, but a special kind: spiritual parenthood. Apostles, leaders and missionaries were mentored into the ministry.

During the New Testament era, mature Christians functioned as spiritual midwives and parents to younger believers. The letters of John do not give us many details about the organization of the churches in the Johannine tradition, but this same principle of spiritual parenthood is found everywhere in John’s first letter.

Paul was the product of the leaders that taught him. Three people can be identified: Gamaliel was Paul’s theological teacher who certainly gave him a thorough grounding in the Scriptures, but this happened before he met Christ. Paul’s conversion was ‘heavenly,’ but his training was very much down to earth. He was spiritually fathered by a man called Ananias, who helped this broken and blinded man onto the path of discipleship. Ananias laid hands on Paul so that he would regain his sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit. Then he baptized him in water. Ananias was also significant because he was the first one to call Paul ‘brother,’ thus opening the door for this former persecutor to be accepted in the churches. These events are described in Acts 9. Comparing this with the first paragraph in Acts 19, a pattern emerges: While Paul was mentored in the first instance, in Acts 19 he is mentoring others. And he is helping people the same way that he was helped: he laid hands on disciples and baptized them in water.

While Ananias helped Paul to become a Christian, a third figure emerges who moved Paul into the ministry. His name is Barnabas. We certainly can learn something from a man who “produced a Paul.”

1. Barnabas believed in people

Barnabas is first mentioned in Acts 4:36. This is already very telling, because the apostles, observing this Joseph, called him by a name which they had coined especially for him, “Son of encouragement,” which is the literal meaning of Barnabas. Barnabas was an encourager. People felt better after meeting him. He could give hope to the downcast. He did not function as a spiritual policeman, always ready to find fault with people. No, he was on the lookout for traits in people through which he could encourage them and spur them onward. As an encourager, Barnabas saw potential in people, which remained obscure to others. He already saw an apostle in Paul while everyone else was still afraid of the man. He introduced Paul to the apostles (Acts 9:27) and made a case for him. Regarding young John Mark, (Acts15:36ff) we see that Barnabas was willing to give people a second chance.
Jerry Cook tells an illustrative story about a couple that went fishing. The wife had been taught how to fish and she was looking forward to landing a big catch. The husband and wife boarded a boat, drove out onto the ocean and threw their baited hooks into the water. All of a sudden, the woman felt a strong tug on her line. She began reeling it in, but at that moment a man from the ship’s crew took the rod out of her hand, and reeled the catch in, which was a small shark, flapping on the floor of the boat. The crew member might have meant well by helping the woman, but she felt very disappointed about such assistance. She wanted to land the big fish herself. She felt betrayed because it was her moment to shine, and she had trained for it, but the final victory had been denied to her.

Now, imagine Barnabas on that boat! He would not have pulled the rod out of the woman’s hand. He would have stood by her, perhaps instructed her a little and in the end, he would have congratulated her for catching such a big fish all on her own. An encourager brings people into the ministry by trusting them. He or she knows when to pull back so that others can “shine.”

**2. Barnabas shared his ministry**

Barnabas was a generous man. He was part and parcel of that generous attitude which characterized the Jerusalem church (Acts 4:32ff). He owned a piece of land, probably around Jerusalem, which his family kept as an inheritance. This he sold for the benefit of the poorer members in the church (v. 34).

There was also another dimension of sharing for Barnabas. He came from the tribe of Levi and was of priestly descent. Originally from the island of Cyprus, Barnabas would have travelled once a year to Jerusalem to perform his duties at the temple. Such ministry lasted for about two weeks each year. The Levites were grouped into teams, and so they cared for the animals, counselled people, brought sacrifices, read the Scriptures publicly or cared for the maintenance of the sanctuary. All this might have been the reason why Barnabas became a believer in the first place. Many priests became followers of Jesus in those days because they saw Christ in the performance of their daily duties, for example, when sacrificing animals (Acts 6:7).

Therefore, even before he became a follower of Jesus, Barnabas had learned to serve in a team. Team ministry implies two basic lessons, and they are both vital for success in the ministry:

a. I am responsible to do my part, otherwise the mission of the entire team is in danger.

b. I cannot do everything on my own. I need others to complement my ministry.

An article describes two elderly women, Margaret Patrick and Ruth Eisenberg, who were residents of the Southeast Senior Center for Independent Living in Englewood, New Jersey, USA. Both were accomplished pianists and spent most of their lives giving lessons to
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17 Frédéric Godet, Kommentar zu dem Evangelium des Lukas, Giessen: Brunnen, 1986, pp. 54f.
aspiring children. In 1982, both women suffered a crippling stroke. Margaret Patrick barely survived. She spent months in hospitals and rehabilitation centres finally regaining movement on her left side. Her right side is still paralyzed. With halting speech, she often says, “I am happy to be alive.” Ruth Eisenberg has a wisecracking wit. She now laughs about that moment when she suffered the stroke and lay on the floor of her apartment, undiscovered for two days. Ruth recovered, but she still does not have the use of her left side, and she is confined to a wheelchair.

The two women met after both were referred to the centre by their doctors. They soon learned of their mutual love for the piano. One day they sat down at the centre’s ancient green piano. Margaret’s long fingers moved back and forth over the left side of the keyboard. Ruth’s shorter, stronger fingers carried the melody on the right side. They sat close together and leaned toward one another. Margaret’s right hand draped limply around Ruth, Ruth’s left hand lay motionless on Margaret’s right knee. Their first attempt was Chopin’s “Minute Waltz in D.” It was truly a revelation to both. Since then they have developed an extensive repertoire. They have performed for countless senior centres, veteran’s homes and hospitals. They have been featured on television shows. They are an inspiration to all who know them and have heard them play. Says Margaret, “I never thought God could use us the way He is doing. We are so happy, and we thank God every day.”

3. Barnabas rejoiced when people under him became greater than he was

Barnabas actively sought Paul and wanted him as his ministry partner (Acts 11:25ff). There was no jealousy, no fear of losing his own position. In Acts, they are first mentioned as “Barnabas and Paul.” But later in Acts, it is written “Paul and Barnabas.” The change is in Acts 13. From these circumstances, we can conclude a principle: Barnabas was able to promote people to such a degree that they became “bigger” than he was. This spiritual attitude can be called ‘the Barnabas principle’.

It is rather common in the Bible that great men of God had a shared ministry. It talks about Moses and Joshua, Elijah and Elisha, Paul and Barnabas, and many others. But what if one of them becomes more prominent than the other? What if the younger one is “better” or just more popular? I believe that a crucial point in our ministry is to let others grow, to increase under us, with us and even ahead of us. That is a good Kingdom attitude. The opposite approach is to keep people small, to perceive them as a threat to one’s own position. The vital question is: Can I allow others to grow into their full potential, even if that means that they become “bigger” than me?

Such a question was once put to Elijah. It naturally perplexed him and he couldn’t give a straightforward answer. “When they had crossed over, Elijah said to Elisha, ‘Ask what I shall do for you before I am taken from you.’ And Elisha said, ‘Please, let a double portion of your spirit be upon me.’ He said, ‘You have asked a hard thing,’” (2 Kings 2:9f)

Elijah answered that Elisha was asking a hard thing, a difficult thing. What might he have meant by that? Three possibilities come to mind:
a. Elijah was so convinced about his greatness that he doubted anybody could match him.
b. He thought little of Elisha and therefore found it hard to believe that he could fit his shoes.
c. Most commentators agree that “a hard thing” is something only God can accomplish.

Yet by saying to his younger colleague that the wish will be granted if he will witness his ascension, Elijah gave evidence that he thought of the last possibility, c. He was not too opinionated about himself, neither did he look down on Elijah. And it happened exactly as Elisha had hoped for (if anointing can be measured in miracles). During his lifetime, Elijah worked 14 miracles, whereas Elisha performed 27 miracles. The last miracle, the 28th, (2 Kings 13:21) happened after Elisha had died. A dead man was thrown into his tomb, his body touching Elisha’s bones, and the man was resurrected by that touch. Thus, Elisha had performed 28 miracles, exactly double the number of Elijah’s.

I would say that the primary function of missionary ministry nowadays is to invest oneself in other people, to build them up and to hand responsibilities over to them. Consequently, a missionary should not be too absorbed by his own ministry, but his chief business should be to promote the ministry of others. This can only happen with an attitude of servitude and humility.

Bayless Conley writes, “The ministries of some of the greatest preachers died with them because they fell short in producing spiritual sons and daughters. Sure, they were excellent when speaking in front of large crowds. They were perhaps able to constantly fill the largest halls in their countries. But they were losers when it came to spiritual parenthood. And for that reason, their work only blossomed during their lifetime.”

Finally, let’s look at Jesus. If there was ever a minister who did not need to see others “greater” than himself, it was Jesus. Yet, and this is truly mind-blowing, Jesus had the humility to extend the prospect of it. He did not talk about his character or personality, but about his works: “Truly, truly, I say to you, he who believes in Me, the works that I do, he will do also; and greater works than these he will do; because I go to the Father;” (John 14:12). Now, I do not think that we should try to compete with Jesus’ miracles. Still the lesson to be learned is that if the Son of God can have the humility to promote others to such a degree, then every one of us should be actively involved in advancing others as well.

2.2. Training - Arto Hämäläinen

Secondly, we need to train both the senders and the goers. Earlier I spoke about training the senders. Today we have different methods of going. Traditionally, some go for long-term service. But we also have those who go for short-term service. It is important to understand that while short-term service is helpful in many ways, it has its limits. You cannot properly reach an unreached people group with short-term service. It can provide some assistance, but we need people who are committed to spending years in building the foundation for the church, in translating Scriptures, and in holistically transforming the society.
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In spite of its limitations, short-term ministry is very important. It offers a taste of the mission field, and a testing of one's calling. It also provides the possibility for service even for those who will never become long-term missionaries. Usually after their experience on the mission field, short-term workers become good motivators for missions in their home church, and also learn the importance of spiritual warfare. In many cases, short-term missionaries do become long-term missionaries.

The concept of “tentmaker” has long been a part of missionary work. It is not a new innovation. Paul partly financed his work as a professional tentmaker (Acts 18:3). The successful Moravian mission movement used this principle 300 years ago. “Tentmaking” today has different nuances. Sometimes it means having a job in a foreign country while at the same time being a witness for Jesus Christ, and together with other believers there, establishing a church or promoting the work of the existing church. Another form of tentmaking (or naming it as a separate category) is Business as Mission. The entrepreneur can start a company in other countries with the idea of becoming a model of a Christian businessman displaying Biblical ethics and ready to serve as witness for Jesus at every opportunity. Some who emphasize the influence of Christian values in the business world like to call it Business as Transformation. They believe that ethical Christian ways of working will transform society. Even just the offering of employment in an environment of unemployment makes a big difference and gives a good testimony for Christ.

Some missionary work requires special skills and training. More than 2000 languages are still without the Bible. Missionaries who concentrate on Bible translation need special training and academic skills. More and more often, sports, art, and music are keys to building genuine contacts with the people in other countries and cultures. Globalization offers a common ground although at the same time, the need for contextualization has not disappeared. Missionary aviation is also a special type of mission work which is centred on professional pilots and aviation technicians.

Media, with all its various modes, especially social media, is an increasingly important way of spreading the gospel and discipling converts. People serving in that area need to be professionals, and often, media organizations have built their own brand, sometimes specializing in certain languages and areas in the world. The danger here is that they may not be cooperating with the churches and other mission organizations in the country where they are heard or seen. There are however plenty of good examples of fruitful cooperation between the media organizations, mission organizations and churches.

A very interesting special missionary force comes from one area of Russia. They are former drug addicts and alcoholics who have become believers, freed from their addictions. They have gone as missionaries to many different countries in Asia, Europe, and to other parts of the world. They know where to find the drug addicts and how to properly approach them. When I visited their leaders with my colleague from Fida International some years ago, we established a cooperative training program which they have continued and also have learned different ways of doing missions.
Training People for Ministry and Missions - Ulf Strohbehn

1. General Principles in Spiritual Formation

a. Throughout the Bible, the overarching principle of spiritual formation is that preparation for the ministry happens through the relationship of father and son.20

Abraham taught Isaac. Isaac taught Jacob. Jacob, in turn, taught his sons. Those nomad chiefs had plenty to teach. Apart from their knowledge about animals, plants, geography, weather, diplomacy and trade, they shared spiritual experiences with their children. Spiritual knowledge was seen as a treasure which was handed down from generation to generation.

Fast forward hundreds of years. Israel’s religion became institutionalized under Moses. Almost everything changed, but the principle of spiritual education remained in power. The Levites formed a clerical class of its own. One could only be trained for the ministry if one’s father was a Levite. Active ministry only started at the age of 30, thus giving sufficient time to learn beforehand. The principle was softened a little during the era of Elijah and Elisha. There were a few schools for prophets, and admission was rather through charisma than genealogy. Yet those schools formed around a senior prophet, a charismatic fatherly figure, so that the principle is upheld to a significant degree.

Being spiritually educated through a father is still the main principle of ministerial formation seen in the New Testament. The Jews had prominent rabbis, such as Gamaliel, who taught Paul. How did Jesus learn? He did not enroll in a famous school of theology, although such schools existed during that time. Neither was our Lord a visitor to public places of learning or libraries which were established, for example in Alexandria. Jesus was taught through the Scriptures and through the unbroken connection to his heavenly father. He gave direct reference to such learning processes, e.g. in John 5:19.

Again, in the first century, much changed along the way, from little secluded Nazareth to a church in an urban metropolis like Corinth. Yet, Peter, John and Paul understood themselves to be the teaching parent to their spiritual sons. Paul named three individuals as sons, and that was a spiritual, not a biological bond. Candidates like Timothy or Titus were educated by spending much time with their spiritual father, travelling and ministering alongside him. They were educated in the Scriptures and were taught how to teach them (2 Tim. 2:2). Paul still cared for his spiritual sons once they had started in ministry on their own; the pastoral letters give ample evidence of this. This entire process was mentoring at its best and it certainly showed tremendous results.

What might have been God’s intention when designing spiritual formation to take place in families? One striking difference between a teacher and a father is that the latter will not only add knowledge, but shape the character of his student, too. Fathers can be very warm-

20 Spiritual parenting includes mothers and daughters, of course.
hearted and supportive, but there also can be a lot of friction between father and son. This always leads to character formation, with or against the father’s plan. The ideal of spiritual parenthood thus stands for holistic training, both mind and character are trained, and that is exactly what is needed in the training of future pastors and missionaries. Any training system which solely concentrates on academic qualifications, without taking attitude, character and holiness into consideration, is bound to fail. Local congregations and mission fields do not just need clever people, they need good ones!

Now, given the fact that this principle is a Biblical stronghold, what are we to do with it nowadays?

Let’s translate the “fatherly” into “pastoral.” One implementation would be to change the qualifications deemed necessary for serving as Bible school teachers. Almost everywhere, lecturers are chosen because of their academic achievements. It would, however, be good to also appoint pastors to schools and colleges. We are not so much in need of teachers who are passionate about doctrine, but those passionate about people. Teachers with a pastoral gifting do not see the contents of their subjects as the most important element in education, but, rather, the hearts and inner growth of their students. They see their foremost ministry not in conveying knowledge, but in the edification of students. Consequently, they take an interest in their students and love to spend time with them.

If it is not possible to go to the extent of having more pastors appointed as lecturers, then schools would at least do better by appointing a counsellor, campus pastor or chaplain for the students. Schools can be very lonely places. Students sometimes have their minds filled with theology, but their hearts remain empty. Such an imbalance has to be checked by actively appointing people to look after the students’ inner wellbeing.

Outside the school, but in conjunction with it, a mentoring system can be set up. Fatherly instructors can accompany an intern or vicar. Churches can be secured to partner with a school and their pastors can be involved in mentoring students. The big question regarding every individual student is always ‘how’ and ‘with whom’ is the person being involved in relationships. Nobody should go through a theological education system without being mentored by someone else.

b. Teaching the Bible and how to Apply it

Perhaps the most important requirement in spiritual formation is to help students to come to a comprehensive understanding of the Bible and to teach them how to apply the Word of God in their future ministry. When it comes to Bible knowledge, it is not so important for students to learn about every fork and knife in the tabernacle, but to acquire the big picture of God’s plan of salvation. A narrative approach works well here.

Hermeneutics is important. I advise every school that I visit not to start with ‘heavy’ theological subjects, such as Christology or Pneumatology before the students have had a basic introduction in hermeneutics. Students, especially in Europe, read the Bible
through too many theological lenses (doctrines). It is best to leave those lenses aside at the beginning. This way, students will later read doctrines through their own understanding of the Bible. They will have become theologically mature when a healthy hermeneutic has become their yardstick in any theological question.

My daughter Marja learned to be a chef. She studied a lot about food ingredients and menus. But it didn’t stop there. She also learned how to cook, at a stove – for people. The same applies to the Bible and Bible schools: Students need to learn how to apply the Scriptures in different settings. Are they able to interpret the Bible in a spiritual and creative way so that they can feed a congregation, one and the same congregation over years? Are they able to lead someone to Christ by showing salvation from the Scriptures? Can they “divide” (2 Timothy 2:15) the Word of God, so that by outlining, it will then become more understandable to their listeners? Can they use and quote the Bible to defend major doctrines? Do they know the themes of singular Bible books so that they can find the right antidote in them for problems they will encounter in church and mission situations? Are they able to edify themselves through prayer and the Word of God, especially when times get tough? To me, these skills are major, and any Bible school that does not teach these things is not worth its name.

c. Contextual Theology Consists of a Healthy Balance of Global and Local Elements

Not any one Bible school in the world teaches an “undiluted doctrine.” Our teaching is always an interpretation of the Bible, which in turn is conditioned by our culture, denominational direction, our own preferences and spiritual passions. The two major influences can be grouped into local and global elements.

Jesus is a good example of a local theologian. His entire teaching and preaching ministry made use of the culture around him. He drew inspiration from family life, working life, plants, animals, customs, sayings, the weather and historical events. He actively built those cultural elements into his teaching and was thus able to illustrate his message vividly. It is also intriguing to see that Jesus made use only of Jewish culture. He could have explained Greek vocabulary to his listeners, impressed them with examples from far away countries and quoted strange books to his audience. Yet he stuck to his own Jewish cultural roots and so his teaching was understandable and applicable to his listeners.

The local theology which Jesus practiced has three dimensions: First, it consisted of local contents. Someone once said that people are always interested to learn more about something they already know. Jesus made good use of this principle. He consistently started with an example that was familiar and oftentimes self-explanatory to the people. “Nor do people put new wine into old wineskins...” (Matt.9:17). “Now suppose one of you fathers is asked by his son for a fish; he will not give him a snake instead of a fish, will he?” (Luke 11:11). Then Jesus built spiritual truths into those everyday examples. Everything that Jesus said made sense to his listeners on a practical level, whereas the spiritual dimension remained hidden to many. Second, his theology also had a local perspective. Giving a personal example of this dimension, I started researching and writing African
church history under a professor at the University of Malawi. In the draft of one of my early books, I depicted how a missionary from Europe prepared himself to go to Africa. I then described his farewell service in his home church and ended with the sentence: “And he went to Africa.” This sentence was not accepted by my professor. He blotted it out with red ink and his correction read, “And he came to Africa.” Now, going or coming doesn’t seem to be much different, but in this case, it was a question of perspective. I was in Africa and so I had to learn to see everything from an African perspective. That is why the man came here, he didn’t go there! In 2015, I was serving as a consultant with a church in Russia to set up their own School of Missions. As we were planning the subjects, I suggested giving a subheading to the subject of Church History, calling it “From Jerusalem to Vladivostok.” The leaders immediately liked this and it was accepted. Moreover, the students can promptly understand that the subject is to draw their attention of major historical developments right to their own church. A local perspective is actually something that many churches in the world are craving for. They want to build and develop their own identity; local theology is the way to do it.

Third and last, local theology also consists of local learning and teaching methods. Sometimes Jesus taught in short, concise sentences which his listeners knew from the book of Proverbs. Jesus knew also how to tell a good story with which he kept his audiences spellbound. I once met a boy who was dyslectic. Letters were to his mind just one big jumble and so he had serious difficulties with reading and writing. He was better with numbers and anything that was visual. For example, pictures were easily understood. Unfortunately, his parents did not enroll this boy in any local school, but had him home-schooled via computers. There the poor fellow sat in front of the screen for many hours a day, trying to read and type. The teaching method did not at all match his faculties. The big question is always whether a culture tends more to the narrative, literal, or visual aspects. After this, the governing question should be, which learning method holds the greatest promise for the contents to become rooted in the students’ minds?

As to global elements, first are the traditional assumptions which have found worldwide acceptance, for example, the doctrine of the trinity. The concept that there are three distinct persons in the Godhead is something on which Roman Catholic, Protestant and Pentecostal Christians agree to a great degree. The same can be said about the human and divine nature of Christ. Most churches teach this, including all evangelical and Pentecostal denominations. Trinitarian and Christological doctrines are not spelled out in detail in the New Testament, yet there is a broad and global consensus about their veracity. Such traditional doctrines constitute one part of global theology.

Another global segment of theology is non-traditional and concerns more the mode of spiritual education. Teachings and even entire curricula have reached worldwide distribution. To mind comes Theological Education by Extension (TEE) or Global University. I can name schools in Nepal, Kenya, the USA and Cambodia that share the same study guides and textbooks. The courses where not written in those countries, but they have been translated into local languages. Moreover, mass media has helped international elements in theology to literally spread around the globe. Sermons can be uploaded and watched;
digital books are readily available to anyone with an internet connection. Furthermore, most missionaries are proponents of international theology. They usually teach something at a location which is not from that location. And their audiences react to this, ranging between oddness and curiosity. Charismatic Christianity is driven by a few movers and shakers, and their teachings are also everywhere present through various communication methods.

Now, local and global theologies need not be antagonists and we do not need to give value to one at the expense of the other. The task is rather to balance the two. The magic formula, which the Taiwanese theologian Shoki Coe developed,\(^\text{21}\) says:

\[\text{local theology} + \text{global theology} = \text{contextual theology}\]

Therefore, nobody needs to start from scratch and invent their entire theology anew. People have worked before us and the church does have a rich heritage to draw from. And so internationally available materials have helped in spiritual formation to somehow get started and to lay structures. What is currently in greater need, in my estimation, is an emphasis on local theology. We have too much international theology and suffer from a lack of local theologians and their work. Many issues in congregations are not taken care of because answers to them cannot be found in the textbooks of global theologies. To all Bible school teachers: It is always better to write one’s own subject, if that is at all possible, then to translate another’s work. The last word, and the best perspective in this matter, should be given to the local churches. Do the teaching contents benefit the local church? Do the graduates of the Bible school benefit the local church? The more local a training program can be, the more acceptance a school will have from local congregations.

**d. Theory and Practice**

Nowadays everyone joins in the rallying cry, ‘Spiritual training must be practical.’ Bible colleges advertise their program to be ‘practically orientated.’ A lot of such phraseology is futile. Training needs to be theoretical, to start with. Any practice, skill, action and operation is based on theoretical knowledge. An action carried out without theoretical support is called an affect, when people act in the heat of the moment. Affects usually cause accidents. Very practical professions such as carpenters, plumbers and even potters base their skills on theoretical knowledge and they teach this to their apprentices as well. How could anyone ever underestimate theoretical preparation for the complex qualifications of a pastor or missionary? Theory is not the problem, but its application certainly is. It’s the interface of theory and practice that decides whether a teaching program is feasible or not. The question always is, “what kind of theory will make it ‘out there’?”

It is true that some firebrands can’t wait to get out of the classroom and into a pulpit. The fire in these students is a good one. Yet as teachers and as their leaders, we should instruct them by giving them a wider perspective. They now have the chance to devote
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most of their time to studying and acquiring a scriptural foundation for their ministry. They will probably never again enjoy such an opportune time as this, although they will miss it sooner than later.

I cannot go into details in this chapter, so I will only mention one more major ingredient which theological education should entail, and it has a lot to do with practice. Given the fact that our graduates will be working with people for the rest of their lives, they should also acquire people skills. This has been neglected at a huge cost in many colleges. Our end product, the successful graduate, should not only be skilled with the Bible, not some kind of book-wormed professor, but should have acquired social competence, too. Traditional curricula have a limited number of social subjects. Counselling is perhaps the most common in this cluster, and indeed, very needed. Some schools have introductions to psychology and sociology. Communication is also a fitting skill in this cluster. Pastoral theology can be about people. Nowadays the subject ‘Leadership’ is widespread, and rightly so. It is true that Bible school training alone cannot impart all that is needed in the area of people skills. Perhaps it’s an area where people will learn more outside than inside the classroom. Yet, emphasis matters, and so any school that creates space for these subjects in its program will do well.

2. Specific Principles Related to Training for Missions

All of the above-mentioned principles apply for the training of missionaries, too. Although they are the most important, we now turn our focus to principles applying specifically to mission work.

a. Attitude and Character

We will only win this world for Christ when people are ready to leave their comfort zones. A missionary is by definition a person who has left one group of people behind in order to reach out to another group of people. To that end, people give up their jobs and oftentimes, the coziness of a large family. They forfeit careers, including the career of becoming a successful pastor at home. They bring their children to strange places and they oftentimes expose themselves to the dangers of sickness, crime and terrorism.

The best mission schools that I know are currently in east Asia. They have a huge emphasis on prayer. And they teach their students to be servants to people and hard workers for Christ. It’s all about attitude. A school cannot create the commitment which every missionary must find by himself or herself before the Lord. Yet a school can create a framework, an atmosphere, where such a commitment is easier to make. The truth is that a missionary actually becomes a child again upon arrival in the field. If there is a church, then they may welcome him as a great man of God, but the fact is that what he hears, smells and feels comes closer to the perception of an infant. He’s got to re-learn most aspects of life. It takes humility to become such a child, yet it is the approach which our Lord chose for himself.
b. The Bible as a Cross-cultural Common Denominator and Tool

I have already talked about the Bible under general principles above. Yet it has to be said, too, that the Bible is the number one ice-breaker in multiple mission settings. Let’s say, for example, that a missionary has to speak in front of a church in his target culture, which happens rather often. He or she will win his listeners over to the message (and to himself) if he is able to share a simple Gospel message in an interesting way that edifies the church. The Bible functions as the common ground and its skillful application can be a bond between missionary and listeners. People will understand and remember that the missionary was able to communicate the word of God to them. That way, he is somehow already “one of us.” Yet, the opposite is also true and has happened many times, namely that a missionary spoke in too complicated a way, too aloof or abstract, so that the moment of bonding between him and his target group was lost. One common mistake that missionaries make in such a situation is that they try to explain themselves, their ministry and the need for it. Yet the prime importance in such a setting is to serve people spiritually, not to explain everything about oneself to them. They will accept a mission approach only after they will have accepted its bearer. I have heard compliments about other missionaries from local people, and one common phrase was, “He came as a brother.” That’s a fine way to put it – and to follow.

c. Teach and Promote Cross-cultural Skills

Candidates are preparing to live and work in a different culture and this requires skills and character. Students have to learn to see themselves in the context of their own culture. The best subject to promote this awareness is a thorough Introduction to Cultural Anthropology. The spiritual foundation and veracity for this comes from Christ’s incarnation and from the initial, cross-cultural spread of the Gospel in Acts, which the Holy Spirit so powerfully implemented.

Students who are monolingual should be exposed to foreign language learning already during their training. No matter what language one has to tackle, there are some general principles of acquisition which should be taught in the school. Students should be taught to learn a language, not just to study it. The difference is that with the former approach, they will actually come to speak it.

Students with a multi-cultural background have stolen a march on those whose background is less complex. Yet, there is a lot of informal, cultural cross-pollination going on at Bible schools, and this diversity should only be encouraged by the teachers. It can be encouraged through cultural festivals, “strange recipe day,” learning songs in a foreign language, a national dress show, and by many other means.

d. Experience and Professionalism

A mission training program must have some experienced missionaries teaching in it. This is not needed for every subject, but all subjects gain tremendously with a voice from
the field. It is further recommended that the students be exposed to a wide variety of missionary ministries, e.g. evangelists, church planters, Bible teachers, Bible translators, agricultural experts and Christian development workers. Expression should also be given to MKs, (missionary kids), the specific role of women in the field, single missionaries, and so on. Special functions can be held that deal with issues like missionary marriage, tropical sickness prevention, homesick children and other issues.

**e. Holistic**

Nowadays, anything but a holistic approach is a hard sell. People in poor countries need answers to their most pressing problems, those in animistic cultures seek relief from fear, and western civilization is striving for meaning in an oftentimes shallow philosophy of life. People want to know how to live. Spirituality is one aspect of life, but not the only one. It’s good to prepare students, at least theoretically, to the fact that ‘out there’ people need more than a sermon. Schools should function in this regard also as a resource tool and a networking agency between missionaries, churches and ministries. Added to this is the circumstance in so many countries where the profession, “missionary”, will never be granted a visa. Professional, secular skills are needed and through these, one may come to minister spiritually, too.

**f. Learn to Make a Case for Your Ministry**

Missionaries don’t have an easy job, for they are simultaneously busy in production and advertisement. Many of us need to learn how to communicate effectively to the home base. It is also good to be open to criticism when it comes to the missionary’s performance in front of a church. Do people understand what you are trying to get across? How can an oftentimes complex ministry situation be broken down into understandable sections? Communication has to be constantly re-learned by the missionary because of three factors: First, the situation in the field changes and the communication must change accordingly. Second, communication methods change rapidly and the missionary needs to keep up with technology and ways of communicating with it. Third, the support base changes over the years. New supporters may be hard to find but winning new supporters through the old channels of communication is almost impossible.

Some people excel in the writing of their newsletters, while others are abysmally bad at it. Some ministries are an easier sell, e.g. serving poor children compared to an outreach to Muslim minorities. Diverse ministries call for tailor-made approaches when gathering support. All this has to be learned and schools will do well to show how to go about this in practical ways.
3. Different Modes of Training for Missions

Mission training happens in different modes worldwide, of which the following modes are the most common:

a. Mission awareness

There are countries which emphasize missions beginning in Sunday school for the children, all the way up to the Bible & Coffee afternoon for the Elderly, where people still speak, pray, and collect money for missions. Mission conferences are held in most countries. They don’t really train anybody for the job, but they raise an awareness and keep people motivated. Short courses or even just sermons are preached in congregations and Bible schools about missions. One of the most successful tools in this regard has been the Kairos course in use over the last decades which I recommend for every church to employ.

b. Mission as a subject

Some Bible schools have missions as a subject, perhaps 20 hours are given to this in a three- or four year-long curriculum. This is fairly little, given the fact that there are usually some students in class who want to make this their lifelong ministry.

c. Missiology as a discipline in the curriculum

Other schools teach missiology and more than one subject is devoted to the theme. There is then Introduction to Mission. This ranges from Mission in the Old Testament, missio Dei, Paul’s ministry, to personal issues like calling. Theology of Missions would build on this. History of Missions and Mission Strategies belong in this discipline, as well as rather common subjects like Evangelism and, more frequently nowadays, Church Planting. A serious missiology will have Cultural Anthropology, as well as specialized approaches, such as Witnessing to Hindus, Muslims, and Ministry in Urban Areas or Tribal Missions. Some books of the Bible make excellent mission textbooks, for example, Jonah and Acts. Related to this also are the studies of Apologetics and Comparative Religions.

d. Mission line

As in c., but a mission line means that students will graduate in this field with a certificate/diploma/degree in missions.

e. Mission school

Here the entire school’s purpose is to concentrate on missions. This is becoming common in countries where the ordinary Bible school serves the homebound candidates, while there are also a large number of mission candidates who go to a training institute devoted solely on this focus.
2.3. Sending - Arto Hämaläinen

First, we must ask by whom are the missionaries being sent. What is the role of the local church in it? What is the role of the national mission department or organization? Who makes the sending decision? Who is screening the candidate? Who has the responsibility for financial support, and who defines the principles of employment?

New senders often experience failure in the sending process. At first, things look fine. The missionary is motivated, the senders are enthusiastic, and the first reports from the field are inspiring. But then the situation sometimes changes dramatically. Communication falters and financial support is not functioning properly. At worst, the missionaries soon return from the field. Unfortunately, this disappointment can paralyze missionary work for years.

What are some pitfalls in the sending process? Dr. Peter W. Brierley has made a study of the reasons. At the top of his list are: lack of home support, lack of call, inadequate commitment, disagreement with the agency, problems with peers. When we look at those symptoms, we can divide them into two categories. They are partly structural, and they are partly caused by poor screening. The structure does not sufficiently protect and support them (human resource management is poor). Because of inadequate screening, people without genuine calling and/or incomplete training are being sent. By rectifying those weaknesses, many disappointments can be avoided, both for the missionaries and for their sending bodies.

Where a missionary should be sent is a crucial question. Can the Holy Spirit speak on this issue as when advising Paul and his team? What kind of principles does the mission department/organization have? How much do they honour Paul’s policy to preach Jesus where he is not yet known? Till now, the centre of gravity of missionary work has not adequately moved toward unreached people groups. Thousands of them are still not properly touched. Of course, this question on focus is not simply black and white. The mobilizing of new senders is an important part of contemporary missionary work. In the WAGF network are 368,000 local churches. Because a huge number of them are in the non-Western world (where thousands of churches have not yet sent any missionaries) we see tremendous potential for new missionaries. That, however, requires cooperation where older senders can help newer senders by sharing their experiences in failures and successes.

In Indonesia, one Pentecostal Bible school has specialized in world missions. The national church of the same denomination is still on its way to building their mission structure but the Bible school has already worked decades in training and sending missionaries to unreached people groups. In ten years’ time, the school has trained and sent 63 pioneer missionaries to work among eleven unreached people groups. One has died a martyr but most are still working among those who have not yet heard of Jesus Christ.

---

22 Taylor, 94
23 WAGF Connection, September 2017
2.4. Partnering - Arto Hämäläinen

When missionaries arrived on their fields, one or two hundred years ago, often there were no other missionaries there. They were pioneers. Today you will hardly find a country in the world without Christians, Evangelicals, and Pentecostals. Of course, in many countries you still find unreached people groups amongst whom nobody is working. However, if Pentecostals, Evangelicals, and other Christians are there, would it not be wise to contact them, finding out what plans there might be to reach a particular group, or whether they are ready to work together for this purpose?

Continental and global networks are very helpful for new senders. Pentecostals networks exist in all continents as well and there also are two global networks (Pentecostal World Fellowship, PWF, and World Assemblies of God Fellowship, WAGF). There is also a loose network connecting all Pentecostal Charismatic Christians (Empowered21).

What is the benefit of these networks? A Pentecostal presence is found in almost all countries of the world. If you then want to send a missionary to country X, through contacting the existing network organizations, you can find the key contacts in that particular country. Through them you can establish a dialogue to map the possibilities of your missionary to work in that context.

Choosing the partner with whom to work is a serious decision. It is not easy to properly know the partner who might be interested in building a relationship. Many pastors and churches in poor countries are primarily thinking they will get some material benefit from that relationship. It is much safer to build contacts through trustworthy channels than just to start with the first interested contact. The existing global and continental networks represent expertise. PWF and WAGF have their doctrinal statements. This gives a common spiritual foundation. Their leaders meet annually which builds a personal network. You know with whom you are working.

Pitfalls encountered by new senders - Arto Hämäläinen

- Lack of screening

The fact that too many missionaries sent by new sending countries soon return home indicates problems in the screening of candidates. The best place for assessing a new candidate is in the home church. The pastor and the leadership of the church should be equipped to understand the basic requirements of missionary work. The candidates need to be tested in their service at home before sending them out.

One of the Finnish pioneer missionaries was asked by the senior pastor of his church to win 200 souls in Finland before going out. He did that, and became a very decisive figure in the development of an African Pentecostal denomination. Today, about one million people attend their Sunday morning services.
- **Lack of training**

Too many new missionaries go without training or are poorly trained. The principal of the mission school in Brazil told me that many pastors and mission candidates tell him that they do not see the importance of mission training. Some feel it is a waste of time because we must be in a hurry to reach people before Jesus returns. Some others say it is expensive and there is a better use of the money. However, according to his experience, 80% of missionaries who go out without training are back home in two years’ time.

- **Lack of strategic thinking**

Sometimes the missionaries and their senders are not familiar with the missions’ map. They go to where missionaries have traditionally gone or where their friends are. Because of this lack in strategic thinking, only a marginal number of missionaries are working among the unreached people. However, almost 7000 such groups are waiting for workers.

One neglected group in missionary work are the children. That is why the concept of the 4/14 Window was born. The fact behind this thinking is that most decisions to follow Jesus are made between the ages of 4 and 14. If we really want to reach the next generation and build continuation for our work, we cannot disregard children.

In some cases, the focus of work can still be in countries where the church has already been established. However, some strategic resources in these churches can still be weak. Experts e.g. in Bible education, media work, children’s ministry, student ministry, Business as Mission, or in world missions training may be needed.

- **Lack of structure**

Plain enthusiasm is not enough. People can be inspired, but long-term results may be insignificant if no proper structure is provided. The sending structure may be there but then the training may be poor, or the partnering structure is missing. Even mobilization can be weak, based only on occasional inspiration without a firm theological conviction and commitment. An African proverb says: If you want to go fast, go alone. If you want to go far, go together. Building structures takes time, but with structure, you can go far.

- **Lack of proper partners**

One Asian country was eager to start missionary work. It found partners in Africa. After some time the Asian leaders noticed that things were not in balance with the partner. They felt they had to discontinue, cut the connection. According to their culture, that meant losing face, and the leaders felt ashamed. The result was that the development of world missions stopped in that denomination for a long period of time. Fortunately, later they launched a new, more balanced approach.
The benefit of Pentecostal and other evangelical networks is that you have trustworthy leaders connected to each other. The network covers almost the entire world. When the statement of faith is similar, and the values and principles are easy to share, then cooperation is based on solid ground.

- Lack of experienced mentors

Another benefit of networks is the contact available with others who are involved in world missions. Through those connections, you can find mentors. In 1991, we started the Pentecostal mission network which today is called the Pentecostal European Mission (PEM). Soon after, we encouraged new senders who planned to start missionary work to join us. They could learn from old senders when meeting together at our annual and other gatherings. They also invited the experienced mission leaders and missionaries from other member organizations to teach and train their people. The new senders could learn from each other when sharing their difficulties and successes. The same has taken place in networks on other continents as well.

- Lack of evaluation

We can learn from our victories and difficulties. However, a process of evaluation is too often forgotten. Every mission organization/department and missionary needs to provide a system for assessment of their activities and results. When Jesus sent the 12 or the 72 to evangelize, he gathered them together after their return. They were excited about the results. Jesus however brought reality to their evaluation. Satan was not happy about the success of their ministry. Jesus helped them to keep the right focus in their work. They should not be afraid of Satan but avoid his trap of becoming proud. They needed to concentrate on the grace which guarantees that their names are written in the heavenly book (Luke 10:20).

Pitfalls of old senders - Arto Hämäläinen

- Interested only in their own programs

Every mission sending unit needs supporting churches or people behind it. That is why their interest is in keeping their supporters satisfied. Paul with his team was aware of this. He reported inspiring news and shared the challenges they were facing. There is the danger, however, when one’s own success becomes so important that the main goal is forgotten. Missions and missionaries are there to serve and build strong partnerships with the national church and other missions. They are driven in the same way as Paul: Christ should be preached everywhere where he is not yet known.

In extreme cases, the projects of the sending unit become so important that they are
not at all synchronized with the goals of the receivers. There, open dialogue is an urgent need. Missions should not be money-driven or self-focused. Missions should be Spirit and partnership driven. The Spirit always leads towards unity because it is the nature of the Triune God.

If dialogue is lacking, missions will do things that are not priorities for the receivers. They might be good ideas but not effective in meeting the more important needs. Building some houses may inspire people at home, but the national church might be lacking support for Bible education.

In the context of building a mission structure for a national church, exporting the model of the sender is not recommended. Dialoguing together on the structure of mission organization is much more fruitful. Many elements may function in a foreign setting, but some cultural aspects are easily missed and not properly analysed. Thus, the best result is not reached.

- **Partnering from an unequal base**

Genuine partnering takes place between people who are really on the same level. Feelings of cultural superiority (many times hidden), can spoil good possibilities. This is very challenging if one counterpart has more resources than the other. Money starts to lead. How is this to be avoided? You really need to see your partner as an equal. That can only take place from a spiritual perspective. You need to see yourself as sinner redeemed by the blood of Jesus. Of course, it is the same for your partner. It is there that you are on the same level. You can try whatever else, but you will soon find that you feel differently on some matters, and his/her views are not fitting with your pattern of life.

We can and must learn to understand the other culture. It is usually a long process. The starting point might be an ethnocentric attitude where we judge the other culture to be bad and our own culture to be superior. If the willingness to understand the other is there, the journey toward healthy inter-ethnic relations can begin. This then can lead to integration with the other culture. The summit is reached when the differences in cultures are involved as leveraging factors.24

In the best scenario, the Western structured way of working can become enriched by the Asian sensitivity to relationships, or by the warmth of the African family atmosphere. In which way can these things influence the building of a mission structure?

- **Lacking holistic understanding of the national work**

Westerners often enter other cultures bringing their cultural patterns with them, not really understanding the context to which they have come. Sometimes they see proclamation as the only solution to meeting the population’s needs although the people are burdened by sickness and social problems which hinder their concentrating on the message. Non-

24 Hämäläinen 2005, 150
western people often have a better holistic understanding about life in spite of the fact that their resources to help are limited. It is better for new missionaries to listen and learn, and together with the local people find the way forward. It is not usually a case of one method against another, but the goal is to find a balanced way of combining views of living in this world while having eternity in view.

- Money-driven replacing Spirit-driven projects

Missions work needs money but money should not direct missions. One day, a particular missionary from a rich Western country arrived in a poor country claiming to have millions of dollars, asking the local church leaders who would be interested in starting a social project with that money. Undoubtedly there was no lack of interest. The end result however was money-driven projects instead of holistic help provided for the people. Money was the dictator, not the Holy Spirit.

Teklu was a young student when a British missionary led him to Jesus. This missionary did not have much money or great projects but he saw the young man in his spiritual need. The missionary returned home disappointed because he thought he had not accomplished great things. Decades later, Teklu met him in the UK and told how his life has been led by the Holy Spirit. He has served as General Secretary of a large Pentecostal church in his country, helping the growth of the church, and later, as director of a mission concentrating on unreached people groups. Thousands had found the Lord as Saviour. After hearing this, the old missionary broke into tears. His going had not been in vain.

- Lacking a 360 degree understanding of missions

In NT times, the receivers became givers and senders. In our time, too many churches stop moving forward when they have reached stability. To have 50-100 members makes them satisfied. They begin to look inward and lose evangelistic or missional zeal. The same takes place unfortunately in their mission target. When local churches have been established, missionaries or pastors feel they have reached the goal. But that is not true. The goal is not reached before the receiving church has become a sending church. The church needs to come full circle, praying that God will send workers into his harvest, and then sending those people whom the Lord is calling into service.

- Individualistic attitude

Western culture is becoming more and more individualistic. It’s me, my ego, my interest, my privilege, my benefit. That same virus is poisoning believers as well. It is not that we shouldn’t ever think of ourselves. Jesus taught us to the love our neighbour as ourselves. When ‘the other’ is missed, we lose balance and fall. The danger of individualism is not only a threat for believers, but also a risk for local churches. They can become individualistic, taking interest only in their own matters. The NT churches were not independent; they were interdependent. Ego-centred individuals and ego-centred churches are unable to see the needs around them. Jesus said: “open your eyes and look at the fields”. (John 4:35) Jesus saw people harassed and helpless, and had compassion on them (Matth. 9:36).
Pitfalls of receiving partners - Arto Hämäläinen

- Lack of cultural sensitivity

The central subject in missionary training is how to meet a foreign culture. The receiving/target culture is not necessarily any better in meeting the new missionaries, especially if they have had no previous experience in it. Their normal reaction is to reflect on the situation from the point of view of their own culture. A bicultural journey is needed.\(^2^5\) This includes some stress for both sides, but that kind of bridge is needed for proper understanding and fruitful cooperation. A wise receiver dares to take this journey in trying to understand the missionary coming from another culture. At the same time, there is no other alternative for the person coming to serve the church or group of believers in a new culture.

- Cultural ethnocentrism

Rosinski states that we deal with cultural differences in one of two ways. Our approach to other cultures can either be ethnocentric or ethno relative.\(^2^6\) In the former, we tend to ignore differences or evaluate them negatively. At least we minimize their importance. That kind of attitude leads to separation, isolation, denigrating others, feelings of superiority, or to trivializing the differences. It is very sad if the relationship between missionaries and their receivers is characterized by ethnocentrism.

A positive development in cultural relations includes recognizing and accepting differences, and adapting to them, even integrating and leveraging the divergences. All these positive attitudes are what Rosinki calls ethno relative approaches.\(^2^7\) At the highest level, differences generate concepts for something new. They lift the situation up to the next level. This leveraging means, for example, that the Asian relational culture connecting to the Western way of logical planning, creates a benefit for each.

- Too little attention given to guide the missionaries coming from another culture

Sometimes the arrival of a new missionary does not generate much attention among the receivers. The reason may be poor communication from the side of the senders. However it can also be a consequence of a weak receiving structure. Perhaps nobody has been appointed from the receiver side to be a contact person and mentor for the new missionary. It can also be caused by a poor relationship between the sending mission and the national church. In the best case, the national church has a designated person as a mentor for the newcomer. It includes communication by which the sending mission has prepared the receiving church for the arrival, and has arranged for the mentoring and a job description for the missionary.

\(^{2^5}\) Hiebert, 235-236
\(^{2^6}\) Hämäläinen, 150
\(^{2^7}\) Ibid
Lack of a national strategy

It is much easier for a new missionary to find his/her place if the national church has a strategy. Unfortunately, that is not always the case. Everything might be communicated only on an oral basis with several leaders emphasizing different things. Strategy does not require a written document, but it certainly is much easier to communicate strategy if it is in a written form. It is very helpful for all coming from the outside because then they can know what the serious concerns of the national work are, and what the goals are. It also helps the sending mission to understand what kind of missionaries are needed, and whether those interested in going have the right capacities to fill the need.

Inadequate knowledge or expectations of gifts and skills of the missionary

If the country has a long history of missionaries, the models from the past will easily dominate their image of a missionary. The pioneer missionaries are honoured, which easily leads to expectations of the same skills, gifts, and characteristics of the younger generation of missionaries. This is in spite of the fact that the context of today is totally different. For this reason, a sincere analysis of the current situation is needed, and then expectations will be more realistic and fitting for the actual needs.

Questions for reflection:

- Are members in my church feeling that they are a part of the mission force?
- How are the members in my church trained for missions as senders and goers?
- What kind of sending structure is available for the churches and missionaries in my context?
- With whom is the mission organization in my context partnering in the receiving country?
- What are the pitfalls in our mission context?
In the initial stages of designing a mission structure, thought must be given to the different levels. What is the structure on the local church level? What is it on the regional level? How should we design the national or regional structure referencing the other levels? What kind of power is to be given to different levels? What kinds of decisions are to be made and at what level are they to be made?

A major decision is whether there is to be a mission department of the national church or is it to be a separate mission organization. We can look at this question from the theological or pragmatic point of view. If we understand missions as the reason for the existence of the church, it is natural to place the mission structure at the core of the church. In that way the mission department is easily legitimized. This arrangement keeps world missions in the heart of the church and it is not outsourced to any other entity.

The pragmatic approach to this matter, however, unveils a different reality. Some church leaders do not have the understanding of the missional character of the church and are hesitant or even antagonistic toward the idea of a mission department. It has been said that the largest unreached people group are the pastors. They are in a key position for world missions, but if they are not promoting a missionary vision, it is very difficult to move on. Sometimes it is not possible to reach the goal in the most ideal way.

In one European country which was part of the communist world after the WWII, some interest in world missions arose at the turn of the century. Several times I was asked to teach these interested people. The group of interested pastors was not very large but they wanted to arrange training again and again. Others from the USA and Sweden also came to teach. Some pastors were eager to start a mission department in the national church but the national leaders were not interested. The missions-minded pastors did not give up. Finally, after many years and attempts, they came to the conclusion that they had to take another route and establish a separate mission organization. However, they did not make that decision in a spirit of opposition but by negotiating with the national leaders. Finally they agreed to start the mission organization which has become a real blessing for the churches and for global missions. They have trained and already sent out over 60 missionaries in just one decade.

Unity is a divine principle. The Triune God is an example of cooperation. Whatever type of mission structure is developed, the divine principle of unity should be honoured. All models should seek the promotion of unity among the national and local church.

We turn now to the study of some basic principles in the building of structure.

**3.1. Mission structure should be culturally relevant**

When the Protestants started establishing mission organizations, they followed the idea of a voluntary association. In the beginning, churches were not officially involved into
the process. Sodalities (voluntary associations) instead of modalities (the churches) took the active role. Later the churches awakened to mission vision, and began forming their mission departments or mission organizations. The mission societies and organizations reflected the culture of the Western countries. It would be a mistake to bring those structures without contextualization into a non-Western church.

The structure of the national church affects mission structure. Three main categories of church government, congregational, Presbyterian and episcopal are found throughout the world. The Pentecostal movement which started more than 100 years ago received influences from all three types because many believers who experienced Spirit baptism were a part of those churches. As a result of that development, we have these three types of Pentecostal churches along with some mixtures. For instance, the Nordic Pentecostals have a congregational-Presbyterian model. When the Pentecostals with different models established churches on the mission field, they often replicated the model of their sending country. There are exceptions, as some African, Asian, and Latin American leaders have been able to adapt features from their own cultures into their church structures.

The Western world has developed a more individualistic culture. That has brought challenges to cooperation with other cultures in some activities. World mission efforts need collaboration which is what we see in the NT. Many non-Western cultures are collective by nature. Their cultures provide good starting points for missions which requires working together.

Cultures differ in their understanding of power distance. In many Western democratic countries, the power distance is small. You can approach your boss without it causing problems if you have something on your mind. In high power distance countries, you cannot approach higher leaders without a mediator. The distance is too great for an ordinary person to breach. That factor effects mission structure as well. Of course every cultural aspect must also be evaluated from a Biblical perspective. Differences were also present at the time of the primitive church. That is why Paul, a Jew, wrote to the Corinthians who lived in the Greek culture, saying that they only understood him in part. He was hoping that their cultural understanding would increase so he could be fully understood (2 Cor. 1:14).

Cultural clashes are always a danger in missionary work. That is why missionaries must be well-trained in cross-cultural understanding. Behaving in a mono-cultural way in a cross-cultural context is always seed for misunderstanding and conflict. Understanding a foreign culture is a long journey full of surprises. Learning begins with sensitive listening. It benefits both counterparts, if as a result, the strong and weak points in your own and in the other culture can be identified. The most difficult to analyse is your own culture. You cannot do that without a looking-glass. What is that looking-glass? The other culture. Only by learning the other culture can you properly understand the strengths and weaknesses of your own culture.

---

28 Winter, eds. Winter&Hawthorne, 220-230
When a missionary forms a national church, there needs to be an understanding of their culture in order to structure a culturally appropriate mission department/organization there. This understanding will avoid replicating unsuitable elements of the missionary’s home culture. A good analysis helps prevent foreign features from infiltrating the mission structure.

Chadwick Mohan, one of the pastors of New Life Assemblies of God Church in Chennai, India, has researched the effect of Western influence on South Asian Church Leadership. He has identified both positive and negative influences. Negative factors were identified such as secularism, capitalism, and consumerism. Mohan underlines a selective approach towards Western influence. The church leadership in Asia “must ‘wisely discern’, take the good and leave not so good”. Mohan is concerned particularly about the weakening of spiritual and moral values in the Western world. Westerners have much to learn e.g. from the South Asia church context.

3.2 The structure should foster world missions

The mission structure must protect and foster missionary vision. In what way is the structure promoting world missions on a national and local church level? Is the structure promoting international connections for the national church? Are all four strategic areas of missions well covered (motivating, training, sending and partnering)?

Protection from power misuse and corruption is important for sustaining results. The fostering aspect will not function if such protection is not in place. There needs to be safeguards against a dictatorship style of leadership. This is a particularly great danger in a strong power distance culture. Every leader must be responsible to someone. This should be built into the structure. Paul has given us a good example by reporting on his ministry among the Gentiles to the apostles In Jerusalem (Gal. 2:1-10). It is good to note also that the Holy Spirit was behind that ministry initiative. Paul went to the Gentiles because of a revelation (Gal. 2:2). Paul’s report was not prompted by any human bureaucracy, but by a divine principle, showing responsibility to God-appointed leaders. Structured leadership protects from the misuse of power.

The structure has to protect each missionary. That is why a leadership structure must be clearly built, both in the sending unit as well as in the receiving unit. Missionaries are in a challenging position as they serve both the sending structure and the receiving structure. To really provide a proper covering, the structures must be in legal harmony with national laws. In its best form, it will hinder misbehaviour and also pave the way for problem solving.

Too rigid a structure will hinder flexibility which is needed in complicated life situations. In turn, too loose a structure will not provide protection against failure. Typical weak points
of structures are a lack of delegation, poor empowerment, and unclear roles. Too many leaders tend to concentrate all power in their own hands. Capable men and women are around them but they do not release any power and function to them. Jethro saw this problem in Moses’ leadership (Ex. 18:17-23). The work was too heavy for Moses so Jethro recommended selecting capable men to share the burden. Paul advised Timothy to entrust responsibility to reliable men, qualified to teach others (2 Tim. 2:2).

Empowerment is a major responsibility of spiritual leaders. Paul describes how God has given apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers “to prepare God’s people for works of service” (Eph. 4:11-12). Church leaders were to be coaches and trainers for the believers in the use of ministry gifts for practical service.

In hierarchical cultures, everyone must know and keep their particular position in the whole spectrum, not aiming higher, and not lower. In egalitarian cultures, people are freer to strive for position. Many may dream of starting low and then climbing to a higher role. Their culture offers space for that but other cultures are more rigid. One needs to understand the place for which you have been born. The roles are predictable, for instance, so that if your father is pastor, then your role also will be that of pastor. Sometimes this may be God’s plan, but the danger also is that it is only a cultural expectation. The leadership of the Holy Spirit is decisive and very important. Discernment is needed to know what is the true will of God or what is only a cultural expectation.

Understanding of the role is important for the mission and missionary. For what purpose has he/she come? Is the understanding of the role the same in the sending mission organization as well as in the receiving national church? If not, problems await. Both receiver and missionary will experience disappointment. Needs are not met, dreams are not fulfilled.

Readiness for evaluation helps to overcome disappointments. If assessment is done properly, then the work can be developed. The learning process continually helps to improve quality. Evaluation leads to changes, small and great. Many people only want stability, not change. Our creator God has not stopped activity. Jesus said that his father works all the time. Paul encourages us to be transformed by the renewal of our mind (Rom. 12:2). God is for change, transformation and renewal. If our organization forgets this, we are then on our way to stagnation, declining, and dying.

**Questions for reflection:**

- What cultural aspects are involved in building a mission structure?
- In what ways are the church and missionaries protected by the mission structure?
- In what way is the mission structure in my context fostering missionary work?
CHAPTER 4
Different types of mission structure - Arto Hämäläinen

There are three main types of mission structure: The networking model, the cooperation model and the hierarchical model.

4.1. Networking model

In this model, churches or mission organizations/departments are loosely connected in world mission effort. There are no binding documents or agreements, or if present, they are few and loose. Churches, however, want to be connected with others, and like to benefit from the experience of others. In some instances, they are only connected on an official level in order to easier receive recognition from the authorities, but in their work, they are rather independent. In some cases the networking is stronger and more organized. Networking offers a forum for creative new things. Because the churches keep their independence, no common strategy is formed, or it may be very loose providing only basic guidelines. Every unit maintains independence as much as possible. There is a strong tendency towards democracy. If decisions are made, it is with the support of every unit.

The strength of this model is the possibility for growth in every unit. At the same time, it can benefit from the best practices of others. Even a loose fellowship enables some joint activities.

The weakness of this model is disintegration. It can never enable effective, larger scale joint activities that need a solid structure and strategy for implementation. Usually this is
the case for ministering to unreached people groups, running Bible and mission training institutions, Bible translation projects, large evangelistic campaigns, mass media efforts, large social projects or providing humanitarian assistance in catastrophic situations. These efforts are usually too much for one or just a few churches, and it is difficult for them to develop sufficient expertise to meet the massive needs. This model is used by Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Icelandic and Brazilian Pentecostals but with certain variations.

4.2. Cooperation model

In this model, the local church and the mission organization or mission department of the national church form a cooperating unit. It is important to define the roles of both counterparts. What is decided and/or done by the local church, and what is done by the mission department/organization?

Usually there is some kind of constitution defining the roles of both counterparts and outlining the decision making process. A common strategy helps everyone to understand why, for what, and how the work is done. A manual of operations helps in the management. Time is saved because the mode of operation need not be defined for each case or situation individually. The commonly agreed upon and clearly stated principles help in coming to conclusions and finding solutions.

The benefit of this model is that the local church and the mission department/organization can find its natural strengths and concentrate on those. The local church as a basic unit can motivate and give fundamental training for missions. It can also take financial responsibility, and provide spiritual support. Whatever its role would be in the details, it is strongly involved in implementing the Great Commission.

The weakness of this model can be seen when either the local church or mission organization loses the vision. That always affects the whole system. If the church is not active, it does not assist in the efforts of the organization. The organization will then lack personnel and financial resources. If the organization becomes weak, the churches will struggle in sending people and finding partners in the target country. Another weakness is that in case the roles are not clearly defined, decision making becomes slow and ineffective. Nobody is making the decision, and the local sending church, or the missionary, or the partnering national church become frustrated. This is why roles and responsibilities need careful consideration.

This model is much used by Pentecostal churches although the roles in various countries differ. The Assemblies of God USA follows this model, as do many European Pentecostals.

4.3. Hierarchical model

Many cultures are characterized by pyramid thinking. People are used to top down leadership. The top leader has a great responsibility. It does not mean that he is leading
alone as a dictator. He perhaps has a leadership team helping and advising. The leader is usually responsible to the executive committee or an entity of that nature. In missionary work, this model means that there is a mission director. Some Pentecostals have built a global hierarchical structure, some others, a national one. In every case the system is directed from the top.

In this structure, the local church’s missionary efforts are under the leadership of the national mission department/organization. On the field, the missionaries are responsible to the regional or country leaders. Many times the national structure includes the local, regional and national levels. That aspect is included in the whole structure so that leaders along with their committee, are responsible at all these levels.

The benefit of the hierarchical model is that usually the responsibilities and decision making power is clear, and fits well with the thinking of their counterparts if their culture is also hierarchical. This model can also offer opportunities for mission activities on all levels as it covers all. The constitution and manual of operations can give clarity to daily work.

The weakness might be the misuse of power. The leader can be effective if he is promoting valuable activity but he can become dangerous if he loses the vision but loves the power. Another weakness can be the danger of quenching creative initiatives from the grass roots level. The Holy Spirit can speak to any “Ananias” to go. Is there space for that in this model? This model is reflected in many Asian, African and Latin American cultures. The national church structures are characterized by hierarchical thinking, and therefore it is natural to find the mission structure following the same principle.

At its best, this model is effective, and also widely culturally relevant. More democratic oriented cultures might consider it strange. It is powerful if it encourages input from all different levels in the hierarchical structure or involves all levels in the implementation of mission-related decisions.

4.4. Openness to change

As we have seen, all models have their pluses and minuses. Evaluation is important to eliminate any negative developments. The assessment should be done by following spiritual principles. Questions should be focused on the main goals. Is the structure helping us to reach the unreached? Is the structure satisfying the motivation of the local churches for world missions? Is the structure supporting the work of the missionaries? Is the structure offering a good basis for partnership with the receiving church or the cooperating partner organizations?

The Finnish Pentecostal missionary work has gone through major changes. At first it practiced the old mission agency model. Then it moved on to the networking model, giving the responsibility of missionary work to the local churches. Finally, it arrived at the cooperation model which has developed and becoming more effective.
4.5. Learning from each other

New senders often can get much help from each other. They can, of course, learn many things from old senders but their practical questions differ from the questions of the old senders. It is natural for them to identify with the experiences of those who are struggling with the same challenges. The forums where they meet their colleagues who are also new senders are helpful to them. The consultations of PEM, PAM, APMC, the Latin American Pentecostal network, and others provide a chance for such encounters. In the current world situation where the gravity of Christianity is in the south, we speak in terms of South-South relations. Of course, the same is needed also in the North between the new senders. The national leader of Bulgaria expressed how he feels that Romania’s experience as a new sender is helpful for them as they take their first steps as a new sending country.

Questions for reflection:
- Which model of the three best fits my cultural context?
- What can we learn from others in developing a structure?
- What kind of weaknesses or threats are likely in our mission structure?
5.1. Mission director

A very crucial matter affecting the future of a mission organization/department is the election of the mission director. The title can be executive director, mission director, director of missions, general secretary or something else pointing out the leadership role.

Vision is the decisive factor for growth, and the mission director is key to articulating that vision although he need not carry the load alone. He can delegate, empower others, and develop work assignments to facilitate leadership. He usually has an office staff, whether larger or smaller. To be a visionary leader means to be prayer-oriented. He must be prepared to make important decisions. Jesus gave a model for leadership by praying before his big decisions (choosing of the disciples, the prayer battle in Gethsemane).

A common way of describing the two main aspects of directing are the terms ‘leadership’ and management. The leadership role answers the question “what” and the management role, the question “how”. Both are needed. As the top leader, the mission director should be capable of answering the ‘what’ question which entails vision sharing and keeping. Others can respond to the “how” question.

What are the qualifications for the role of mission director? First, he should have a calling from God. He is not just a bureaucrat. He needs to carry a mission vision. He should be recommended by God, just as Paul and Barnabas were in Antioch.

Secondly, he needs to have some experience in world missions. Usually such a person has served as a missionary. However, he may have gained experience in another way. Attitude is very important. If there is interest in world missions, and sensitivity to hearing the life stories of missionaries, this may compensate for the lack of experience. Nobody is fully qualified. Some strengths are evident, while some others need to be developed. Thirdly, the director needs to understand local church work. The local churches are the basis of missionary work. The role of local churches in world missions is crucial, and the mission director needs to understand the dynamics of the local church.

Fourthly, he should be cross-culturally oriented. Sensitivity towards other cultures is a key matter in his work. This is a life-long journey which needs commitment.

Fifthly, he should be people-oriented. Mission is about people, not money (which is of course needed and should be managed well) nor projects, although they are included in the whole picture. The successful mission leader is interested in people and their well-being. Jesus gave us an example. He was not only interested in the disciples doing effective ministry but he took care of their eating and rest. Sometimes it meant moving them to a remote place which provided the opportunity for rest.

---
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Sixthly, the mission director should be a team player. Paul always worked with a team. He was not a loner but was surrounded by his co-workers. He was a leader that shared his vision with his team and created a “we” atmosphere (Acts 16:10). Unfortunately, we see leaders who only dictate what is to be done, not accepting any questions or input from co-workers. Paul had tens of co-workers, both Jews and

Finally, the mission director needs to lead by the word of God. His decisions should be theologically grounded.

In electing leaders, it is good to analyse the abilities of the candidates. Especially decisive is the style by which his leadership is characterized. Janet Hagberg has interestingly categorized the leadership styles. According to her, we can find six different variations. 33

1. **Powerless – leading by force**

This type leads by force and inspires fear. They are insecure and lack authentic power; therefore they use force to get people to follow them. We can find many examples from history how dictators have created fear through their oppressive systems. Unfortunately, some spiritual leaders have perpetuated this.

2. **Power by association – leading by seduction and inspiring dependency**

These leaders are dependent on supervisors, and do not take risks by making their own decisions. Therefore they do not develop their own competencies. This makes for leadership characterized by dependency and seduction.

Perhaps Paul saw in Timothy the danger of him becoming too dependent on him when he reminded Timothy that God has not given us the spirit of timidity, but a spirit of power, of love and of self-discipline (2 Tim 1:7).

3. **Leading by symbols – controlling**

Power for these leaders is a controlling affair. They are often ambitious, competitive, charismatic, and egocentric. Controlling power keeps them from moving forward to the next stage. However, they can inspire a winning attitude by their personal powers of persuasion.

These kinds of leaders do great things. Especially in a culture where the leadership structure is pyramidal, the danger of becoming too controlling is great. This hinders the empowerment of younger leaders.
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4. Power by reflection – modelling integrity and inspiring hope

Leaders of this nature use influence as a way to express their power. They are known for being strong, reflective, competent, and skilled at mentoring. They model integrity and inspire hope.

This style is fitting for pastoral leadership. Paul in writing about the Thessalonian believers, expresses how they became a model for others (1 Thess. 1:7). The reason was that they imitated Paul and the Lord (1 Thess. 1:6). At its best, our ministry can inspire others to follow our model.

5. Power by purpose – empowerment inspiring love and service

These types of leaders are known for their vision, and are sometimes called “the irregulars”. They are not ego oriented, and they are ready to give away power and let others lead. They are self-accepting, calm, humble, confident of life’s purpose, and spiritual. Their hallmark is empowerment which inspires love and service.

We can see how Paul inspired the Macedonians to give generously although they were poor. The secret was that he had proclaimed the grace of God in Jesus so clearly and with enthusiasm that the Macedonians were ready to give even their bodies to serve God (2 Cor. 8:1-5). The decisive factor was the experience and understanding of the grace of God. Paul’s leadership inspired empowerment and service.

6. Power by gestalt – wisdom inspiring inner peace

This leadership style is expressed as wisdom. They are comfortable with paradox, unafraid of death, quiet in service, and ethical. Their power is almost invisible, and they seek to inspire inner peace in those around them.

The best example of this kind of leadership is Jesus. His presence solved many problems. Even children were intuiting the peace around him, and wanted to come close to him. The question is whether leadership is natural or whether it can be learned. At a certain level, it is surely connected to the gifts God has given to the individual person. As believers we need to also remember that the Holy Spirit empowers us. People who seem to be very shy can become leaders through supernatural anointing by the Holy Spirit. Also those who have natural talents need the empowerment of the Holy Spirit to avoid the temptation of trusting in their intrinsic abilities.

5.2. Mission board and committees

Usually there is a mission board that makes the biggest decisions. Who should be on that board? What kind of qualifications should be present? Of course, experience or expertise in some form is needed. If the mission organization is young, it is not easy to find people with great and long-term experience. At that point, vision and attitude are decisive. Later
it becomes easier to find persons who have missionary experience on the field. The board should not only be made up of missionaries because the input of the churches is needed as well. In the beginning, the members likely are pastors or key people involved in the sending aspect. Also lay people like elders in the churches with experience in leadership and management can be valuable, if they are also real spiritual leaders.

If the national structure includes regional level(s), then the mission structure must reflect that. Otherwise the implementation of the mission program might become weak in some area. However, the roles of the national, regional and local levels should be made clear to avoid unnecessary duplication and delay in decision making.

There can be different committees which will help the process but one must be careful in establishing new committees. Too heavy a structure can paralyze the work. Every committee or task force should meet a clear and definite need. The organization should also evaluate how long different committees or working groups are needed. It is better to establish them for a certain purpose, with a clear goal.

### 5.3 Director of mission training

Training of the missionaries is one of the key activities of a mission organization. Here, close cooperation with the training institution of the national church is useful. Collaboration with the Bible institution helps to develop a program were both theological and missiological needs are met. If cooperation in that way is not possible, the mission organization needs to develop its own training program. Whatever the arrangement, a key person is needed for directing missionary training.

At the same time, it is important to remember that training is also needed for short term and special ministries. It is important not to forget the need for equipping the senders as well. So, the director of mission training needs to cover the whole spectrum of mission education.

### 5.4 Field structure

Who is making the decisions in the country of the missionary’s calling? The sending mission organization? The receiving national church? The missionary? Many tensions and problems have arisen when the structure has not been clear in this matter. In history, mission organizations played a central role. Missionaries had to ask the home country what to do. The three-self principle helped much in moving decision making to the field. London, New York and Berlin should not dictate what is to be done. The national/local church must decide. Churches need to become self-governing.

The role of the missionary becomes a challenge in this process. Should he/she only obey

---

34 Rufus Anderson and Henry Venn in the 19th century developed the three-self principle, and later a fourth principle, self-theologizing was added. The same principle was central also in the writings of Roland Allen. In Pentecostal missiology, Melvin Hodges, an AG missionary in Latin America developed this as a central principle of AG missions which has been practiced as well by many other Pentecostals.
what the national church is prescribing? What about the role of the missionary if the mission agency suggests or implements something? Where is the voice of the sending church?

Those questions are usually solved by creating a field structure for the mission organization. Different variations are possible but someone must represent the mission organization so that its voice can be heard by the receiving national church. The sending church is represented by the mission organization. If each local church tries to have its own dialogue with the national church, the situation can become chaotic. If the mission agency represents the local church, the national church has a clear counterpart.

The mission organization, however, needs a face in the foreign country. Such a face is a person called e.g. regional director if he/she is responsible for a larger area or e.g. field coordinator if the responsibility is for one country alone. This does not mean that the regional director or field coordinator would decide on behalf of the national church. Ownership should belong to the national body but he/she can officially represent the sending mission organization, give face and voice to it. In some cases, there is also a committee consisting of some missionaries which help the regional or field director/representative.

The field structure will be unstable if the national church is not developing a counterpart to the mission organization. With whom should one discuss mission issues? Is the national contact person always the same person or does is that a different person according to the matter at hand (e.g. church planting, Bible institution, humanitarian assistance, development work, special ministries etc.)? So structure is a common concern of the sender and the receiver. In building that structure, the problem-solving process needs to be designed. If both counterparts know what process is in place before a crisis occurs, it saves much time and energy, and most importantly, finding a solution comes easier.

Questions for reflection:
- What qualities would best suit a mission director in our context?
- What is the role of the possible mission committee in our leadership structure?
- At which levels are committee(s) needed?
- Who has the responsibility for mission training in our context?
- How the is the field structure to be built?
CHAPTER 6
Decision making - Arto Hämäläinen

Sometimes decision making is difficult. This can stem from cultural factors. In some cultures, communication is indirect, and the decisions dealing with problems connected to persons might be very sensitive. The need is to find a way to communicate properly, avoiding loss of face. Direct culture people might have to slow down and give time for this process. Respect the culture by involving the right persons to help the situation. Finding a mediator is often a good solution.

Another cultural factor in decision making deals with uncertainty avoidance. In some cultures it is weak, and in some others it is strong. This observation from sociologist Hofstede means that when uncertainty avoidance is weak, you are ready to take risks. If it is strong, you avoid risks. In missionary work, you cannot avoid risks. God took a huge risk by choosing twelve ordinary men to spread his message to all the world. The church in Antioch took a great risk by sending Paul and Barnabas to unknown cities and countries to make the name of Jesus known. So we cannot avoid risks if we want to win the world. However, our culture influences our decision making so that some are hesitant to move forward whereas others are happy in taking bold steps. The leadership of the Holy Spirit is needed to balance our actions. For some leaders, it means more time for consideration, but for others, it means more boldness is needed to move in faith.

There are however more structural factors in decision making. It is good to determine on which level the particular decision is best made. In hierarchical cultures, almost all decisions are made at the top level. That places an enormous burden on the leader as we can see in Moses’ situation before Jethro advised him on delegation. The most demanding cases were however left to Moses. It is not wise to overlook the experience and knowledge of elders. Many cultures appreciate this. However Western culture often turns the focus to young people with their creative ideas, sometimes at the cost of neglecting history and experience. Would Malachi’s prophecy characterize our leadership? He says: “He will turn the hearts of the fathers to their children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers…” (Mal. 4:6). There is blessing when the older and younger generation are together. The challenge often is that younger people are not invited to participate in the decision making bodies.

I am thankful that at 26 years of age, I was invited to serve as a church elder candidate. I learned so much from the more aged brothers, their approach to difficult matters, their attitude in talking about problems in a church member’s life, their sensitivity in dealing with failures of some, their trustworthiness in counselling, their wisdom in complicated problems, and their prophetic vision in planning future activity. It was a forum for empowerment and equipping. I hope somehow that every church and mission structure would involve the younger generation in decision making, first as students, and then as authorized participants.
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6.1 Responsibilities and roles

If the responsibilities and roles have been clearly agreed upon, it will save many problems. Too often people assume what others need to do, but no one has informed them of it. If we read Paul’s letters, we find very clear orders to Timothy, Titus, and many others. Paul is a good example for leadership. In honouring their own ability, he does not go into too much detail which might quench their own initiatives. He says to Titus: “Do everything you can to help Zenas the lawyer and Apollos on their way and see that they have everything they need.” (Tit. 3:13). He does not list different items or ways of helping. He just instructs, “do everything you can”. It was up to Titus to find out what he could do.

On the other hand, Paul gave clear role description for church structure which he practiced everywhere. The churches had elders, deacons, and helpers. He defines the requirements for elders and deacons. We can enact the same principles in mission structures. The responsibilities and roles can be written on paper. Written agreements provide the possibility to check on what has been agreed. In Finland, we sign a three-party agreement when a new missionary goes to the field. It is signed by the mission organization, local sending church, and the missionary. If the agreement is only oral, memories easily result in different interpretations which negatively affect the working atmosphere.

6.2 Delegation

Moses had a huge task in leading the people of Israel out of Egypt and into the promised land. Around one million people walking through the desert, was an extraordinary leadership challenge. Moses got tired. His father-in-law was a wise person. He instructed Moses to delegate power. Only the most difficult cases were brought to him after that. Not only was Moses happy, but all were satisfied (Ex. 18).

Many church and mission leaders concentrate too much power in themselves. Many capable people around them are sometimes frustrated by the lack of opportunity to learn by taking on new responsibilities. Paul was eager to delegate. We see that when he sent Timothy, Titus, Tychicus or others out for a particular purpose. He delegated duties to them. They were authorized by him. The key point is that they did not go on their own but as representatives of Paul. For new workers and the younger generation, it is very important that they be recommended by experienced, respected leaders.

I personally would never have been elected to several international responsibilities if many respected brothers in Finland and other countries had not paved the way. God has used them to open doors. I had not been aiming at the positions to which I have been elected. They have been prepared by the Lord who has used people to make things happen. As we have stated previously, God needs people like Barnabas.
6.3 Empowerment

Empowering is different than delegating. Of course we need the empowerment of the Holy Spirit, but we can also become an empowering force by him to others. Paul writes to the Ephesians that God has given apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers to prepare God’s people for works of service (Eph. 4:11-12). The believers should be empowered for service. We as human beings cannot do that but God can use us as instruments for it. His gifts enable us to serve people in a way that equips them for service.

The secular world also talks about empowerment. Research, however, has shown that people cannot directly empower another person. The only thing that can be provided is an environment of freedom and trust. This is also true for mission leadership. It was surely a fact in Paul’s ministry. He emphasized that Christ has set us free (Gal. 5:1). He trusted in his co-workers of which many are mentioned in his letters. He delegated duties to them, while at the same time empowered them for various kinds of service. Every spiritual leader should be sensitive to possibilities for delegation and empowerment. In that way Paul educated a new generation for missionary work and the expansion of Christianity.

An excellent practical example of empowerment was found in my first employment which was in music education. This was before I began church work and theological studies. In Finland is one of the best educators for conductors of symphony orchestras, Professor Jorma Panula. His students are famous, now conducting the best orchestras in the world. What is his secret? He does not just make them copies of himself. They are all different in their styles and personalities. In his training, he has created an environment where their skills have had space to sprout and blossom. They have become creative in their own personalities, not clones of Panula. The same is needed in the church; an atmosphere where the Holy Spirit can ignite the gifts God has placed in us. We should be striving to create that.

Questions for reflection:
- What are the biggest challenges for decision making in our context?
- Are the roles and responsibilities clear in our mission structure?
- Is delegation practiced? If not, why not?
- Are people empowered in our mission structure? What are the positive factors promoting it?

---
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The mission organization/mission department needs to provide a system for the resourcing of missionary salaries. In mission history, three main types of financial support can be identified. First, there has been the faith mission principle. No fixed salaries have been promised. Support is entirely dependent on the donations that have come in. These come from churches or from individuals. Church-based missions have preferred that the money be given from the local churches.

In the second model, the mission agency collects the funds and takes the responsibility to pay the salaries. The local churches or individuals only send money to the agency/mission department where the level of the salaries have been determined. The churches have no other practical role other than to send in the money and, of course, to give prayer support.

In the third model, local churches have the responsibility of supporting the missionary. Some may work independently, while others work in cooperation with the mission department/mission organization. In the latter case, the mission organization provides the recommendation of the salary level and other financial responsibilities.

Whatever the financial support system may be, it is not only the monthly salary which is to be considered. The senders also need to provide for travel and work costs.

It is important to remember that the mission department/organization itself needs financing. A portion of the mission offerings from the local church can be designated for this expense (e.g. 5-10%). In some countries, churches provide a certain sum per member for that purpose. In some instances, business profit can be used for this purpose. There can be creative ways to find solutions. It is often the case that people are reluctant to give money for administration but any activity will not be properly managed without administration.

One person gave a donation for a certain mission field by demanding that not one cent should be used for administration. The mission director to whom the person offered the money replied that then it would be better that he went himself to deliver the money to that mission field. Many people do not realize that every step has a cost when money or other donations are sent to the mission field. Personnel is needed to receive the money, to record it, to send it to the bank, and a person is needed in the receiving country as well to confirm that the money has arrived and to do the bookkeeping involved. Others are needed to make the designated purchase with the money or to forward the funds to a person in need. Every step has its cost.

The question of financing also arises regarding missionary training. How much are the candidates themselves to pay for it? Is the sending church or mission department/organization supporting the training course financially? Are there other sources to assist in the expenses involved in the course?
A big question is in regards to the education of the missionary kids. Who is responsible for that? The parents? The sending church? The mission organization? In practice, it is often an enormous burden for the parents, and in some cases, the door to missionary service is closed because of this challenge. In Finland, some decades ago, it was concluded that the mission organization would take the responsibility for the education of the missionary kid. We realized that this education issue had easily become an obstacle to a family proceeding to the mission field if it was not being provided for by the organization. In some countries, the schools are very expensive. Sometimes cheaper alternatives offer such a low level of education that the future of the children is seriously endangered.

The solution in Finland was that the burden of MK education be divided between the local churches. They pay a school fee per member, and in that way, together carry the burden of the missionary families. The mission organization coordinates this, and carries the overall responsibility.

What about financing the needs and projects of the partnering national church? This issue brings us to face the question raised by the three- or four-self indigenous church concept. Being self-supporting is one of the principles of the system. The initiators of this thinking, Henry Venn and Rufus Anderson, emphasized that financial resources should come from their own country, not from the USA or UK. Respecting this principle has brought good fruit. Of course, sometimes there are catastrophic situations where humanitarian assistance is the right way to respond, but as a permanent principle, outside support leads to dependency which has very often quenched local initiative.

A question that commonly arises is the support of native workers. It seems good to help people who know the language and culture, and who can work for a much lower salary than the missionaries. Too often people are blind to the results of this kind of support. Dependency is quickly created, and it is very difficult to discontinue this support. It can be shown that the churches which are growing are also self-supporting. There might be reasons in a few cases to provide support for a limited time, but with a system in place of the continual decrease of support and the increase of local support.

Questions for reflection:
- What is the plan and system of organization for missionary salaries?
- What is being done for the education of the missionary children? Who is responsible and in what way?
- How are the costs of the mission HQ being covered?
- What is the basis of motivation for giving in missions?
- What is the role of faith in giving?
Conclusion - Arto Hämäläinen

Determining the leading of the Holy Spirit is the first step in starting a mission program. He can empower people both to send and to go. Without people, the structure is an empty shell, like the ruins of old cities without inhabitants. As at the first Pentecost, the church can receive power to become witnesses to all nations and people groups.

Just as in the NT, mission activities need goals; where to go and what results are desired. That is the strategy which simply determines success in fulfilling the command of Jesus Christ to go into all the world, preaching the good news about Him. The strategy is however an empty promise without a structure that offers a channel for implementation. The mission structure needs to provide the basis for the four basic elements of mission, namely mobilizing, training, sending and partnering.

Structures can be different, and it is important to identify the cultural aspects that are involved in your particular context. Some cultures strongly emphasize egalitarian values and prefer a networking type of structure. Others are hierarchical, and the thinking is pyramidal, top down. A third structure is the cooperation model where the partners are equal but the roles are clearly divided between them.

For effective implementation, specific entities are necessary; the mission director, mission committee members, people involved in mission training...all are key players. The same is true in the field structure.

Not only is the structure itself important, but also the decision-making process affects the brand of the mission. Through defining clear roles and responsibilities, the staff and the clients are given excellent service and are satisfied. The ability to properly delegate and empower others impacts the image of the mission.

Careful consideration is needed in building the financial structure. This includes the support system of the missionaries, financing the education of the missionary children, and the support of the mission HQ. The financial support of the partner needs careful consideration in order to avoid dependency, and the danger of quenching the initiative of the indigenous church.

The best structure will echo the glory of God, not human politics or power games. The church is the bride of Jesus Christ and its actions are to reflect his heartbeat which is expressed in John 3:16: “that whosoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life.”

Group work:
Design a national mission structure for your country which will reflect all the important elements.


Lausanne Covenant 1974. [https://www.lausanne.org/content/covenant/lausanne-covenant](https://www.lausanne.org/content/covenant/lausanne-covenant)
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1. 5 Models for doing missions

1.1. Local Church as sender model.

The local church sends the missionary without the involvement of a missions agency.

*Advantages of this system:*
A missionary is very accountable to his local church, and doesn’t have the pressure of raising finances.
In some countries this may be the only model or system available.

*Disadvantages:*
In many developing nations with weaker economies, it is very difficult for churches that aren’t large to send missionaries alone as a local church. As well, those who are called from medium and smaller churches in those contexts may not be able to go.

From an international perspective, if several churches have several missionaries in the same receiving country, instead of “one voice,” they are “many voices” to that country, and that can cause confusion and misunderstanding in some national church contexts.

The expectation for practitioners of this model is that they deliberately network with the body of Christ in their country of service. Networking in the home country with other local church senders will also help in the sharing of resources and information that can mutually benefit all local church senders.

1.2 National Department with a pool system.

This is where churches give to a central fund, and that fund decides how the funds are to be administered. This model is used for example by the U.S. Southern Baptists. From our experience, it is very difficult to use this model in “start up” situations in most developing countries.

*Advantages of this system:* The missionary has less pressure in raising funds.
Disadvantages of this system: churches give to an office and not to a person and are potentially less motivated to do so. Finally, there is generally greater suspicion in some cultures used to secular “corruption” where people don’t trust one person administering large amounts of money.

1.3. National Department: with churches giving specifically towards the missionary:

A national structure with a functioning committee or commission makes decisions in approval of missionary candidates, and the structure of supporting and sending them. There is a central fund and funds are channeled through the missions agency, but unlike the pool system, offerings are designated to individual missionaries and normally a small percentage (5 to 10%) is taken out for the administrative budget of the agency.

Advantages: Potentially every church can participate and every “call” can be considered to go. Churches are more motivated to support the missionary because giving is targeted to a person, and personalized. But there is still accountability and structure.

Disadvantages: The responsibility to raise the budget is largely on the missionary, and though their local church might be in a condition to provide a large percentage of it, when it is not the missionary has to raise their budget when they come home on “furlough or deputation.”

1.4. National Department combining working with local church.

This is a good middle of the road model for countries with strong local sending churches, but that also need or want some type of national structure. The agency approves, coordinates, is a contact and “voice” for the receiving countries, but the local church has participation and voice in important decisions. Some Latin and European countries have done this. They have a national department yet allow the local church to participate in information and important decisions, if they want to. Yet the local church doesn’t control the missionary; to the receiving church, the missionary is sent by the department and country, not just a local church. A good middle of the road for countries with strong local churches or whom are suspect of the virtues of a missions agency.

1.5. A Model of a “Network” of sending structures or churches, rather than a “centralized sending model.”

This is a potential model for a place like Brazil. (It has not been implemented yet; but it is a good idea) Where the missions sending structure serves as “network” and coordinator between sending churches (large ones) or Districts (very autonomous). This is a potential model if districts are very organized and autonomous and the church is used to doing things on a district level and not on a national one.
1.6. The most important point: God’s model.

I would add there needs to be a 6th model: (God’s Model)

- Everyone is involved
- Everyone can go
- Everyone prays
- Everyone gives

In most countries, especially developing nations, many churches, especially if they are not large, can not fulfill the great commission without a national sending agency of some type. If this can be accomplished with a local church model, excellent! In very few countries can God’s model be fulfilled with only a local church sending model!

**Conclusion to point one:**

These models are not all exhaustive, but a general guide and most sending will reflect one of them.

Remember, the biggest advantage in having some sort of national sending structure, is:

*Without a missions department:*

1. It is more difficult for workers from medium and small churches to go.
2. It is more difficult for smaller and medium sized churches to participate in sending.

(A large majority of the churches in the World Assemblies of God Fellowship are smaller or medium sized and from countries where the economy is not as strong and makes it difficult to send if you are not a large church).

*With a missions department:*

1. Every church whether small, medium or even large can participate.
2. Every call can go, without a question of if their church is large.

Three other advantages of some type of “sending” structure:

There is a “big picture” perspective and we see the potential we have on a national level. The denominational structure already exists. The advantage and potential of a relational structure, that comes from a “denominational network.” With have a network to use events that reach many pastors like general council. A inter-denominational structure doesn’t have a network to promote through.

The advantage of results: results produce more results; they encourage other to get involved.

A structure has the potential to channel the call of God into a “river of blessing,” and avoids
mistakes from doing it alone.

2. What are the characteristics of a Mature Missions Sending Structure/Department?

Before we consider this, let’s remember a couple important principles:
   a. Everything that is worth something takes “time.” Maturity doesn’t come instantly. You have to make mistakes, confront battles, win them, and have experience, which is impossible to get from reading a book or just theory.
   b. You need the right leader! Many times a country is “ripe” for fruit, but the right leader has not been formed or is not willing or has not been selected to take on the challenge. As well a real challenge for MOST of our “sending south” nations is that they don’t have a missions leader who has experience is being a missionary, therefore they have a “ceiling” as to how far they can take the agency. But after 10-20 years, there will be candidates who have been missionaries and who can come back and help even possibly eventually take over the leadership. As well most of our new senders are in the “pioneer” stage and have few missionaries or limited experience and it is a challenge to continue on to the next level of maturity.

TEN CHARACTERISTICS OF A MATURE MISSIONS SENDING STRUCTURE OR “DEPARTMENT”

1. They have sent missionaries outside their country for the long term, and to nations which speak different languages than theirs. They have overcome the barriers of time (short term – long term), distance (not just going “close by), language (different language than the sending nation) and religion (different religion than the sending nation). Each barrier requires a greater effort than the previous.

2. Their income is in constant growth, and possibly they have even surpassed the “income” or “tithes” of the general headquarters, however it is supported. How do you recognize a mature missions VISION in a country? When this doesn’t bother them or cause jealousy, but they rejoice that more income is given to missions than to “general administration” of the work.

3. They provide pastoral care to the missionaries in the field. They are understood and ministered to. (The local church also does this and the agency/department doesn’t take the place of the local church.)

4. They have administrative personnel that are full time, and one or more of the executive team is dedicated full time to missions. There are great difficulties if one is “married” to both their church and a full time job of leading a missions department.

5. They have a good image and reputation when it comes to the administration of the money and resources. They are not questioned about the use of money, because they have been transparent. There may be some that complain about the amount of money given (which reflects that there is still not a mature “vision” in the country) but no one complains
about the correct administration of those resources. (which reflect a “mature missions agency/department)

6. They have savings and money in the bank to respond to possible emergencies, and do not live “one day at a time.”

7. The responsibilities of decisions don’t fall on only one person, and there is a commission, as well as a “team” that constantly evaluate, decide, and execute decisions.

8. There is one or more persons in the team or commission that speak English, so that communication with the exterior is not limited.

9. There are training programs to prepare and orient future missionary candidates.

10. There are programs to motivate and mobilize the churches, in all areas, from teaching children, teaching young people, for intercession, and for promotion and missions information geared to the local churches.

**STEPS TOWARDS MATURITY**

1. PIONEER STAGE
The beginnings can be slow, but we must be faithful with little to be given “much.”

2. BATTLES
I do not know of a national program that is effective that did not fight many battles on many fronts as Satan tried to stop the advance of the program. I know of nothing that scares the enemy more than that 95% of our believers in the “sending South” become mobilized with missions vision for the world.

3. GROWTH
Fruit and permanence is observed through progress and advances.

4. CONSOLIDATION
A solid structure is organized and not just for the present growth, but in anticipation of the future.

5. RESPECT
They have a good testimony before the national work. Many still do not understand the vision, but everyone “respects” the achievements and advances of the missions department, as well as their testimony.

**Conclusion to point 2:**
A mature missions department does not mean that the country has a MATURE MISSIONS VISION. But a mature missions department will be advancing towards that goal:

THAT THE COUNTRY WILL EVENTUALLY HAVE A MATURE MISSIONS VISION!!
Appendix 2

Guidelines for missionary relationship/AG Latin America (used by permission)

“Together in Missions” of the Assemblies of God of Latin America presents:

GUIDELINES FOR MISSIONARY RELATIONSHIPS:
The Interrelationship between Sending Church, Missionaries and Receiving Church

Justification:

It is interesting to note that two-thirds of the Pentecostal population come from the continents of: Africa, Asia and Latin America; and the eighty-eight percent of Assemblies of God believers reside in these areas of the world.

In light of the missionary awakening in the church of Latin America and the Carribean and its participation in the sending of missionaries to established works, new relationships have emerged between the sending church, the receiving church and the missionaries that are sent. In view of this reality, we present this document for study and analysis.

The purpose of this document is to improve the interrelationship between the sending church, the receiving church and the missionaries, and thereby, fulfill the great commission by taking advantage of the available resources.

General Principles:

Our challenge is to examine the new realities of a world pentecostalism to find ways to integrate all the needed resources brought by each entity to advance toward mutual cooperation between the missionary fellowships and the national work. The concept involves a reciprocal partnership which produces “partners” in the missionary fellowships and the national work.

We recommend a teamwork which demonstrates an interrelationship of missionary resources and strategies. We must base this interrelationship on a theology, missiology, and practice which is advantageous to all.
1. **THE SENDING CHURCH’S RELATIONSHIPS**


1.1. **THE SENDING CHURCH’S RELATIONSHIP TO THE RECEIVING CHURCH.**

1.1.1. Create and maintain communication channels.

1.1.2. Present available resources and possible projects, keeping in mind that all investments on the mission field should be made in the name of the receiving work.

1.1.3. Request information concerning needs.

1.1.4. Clarify procedures (introductory letters, approval processes, tithing and others).

1.2. **THE SENDING CHURCH’S RELATIONSHIP TO THE MISSIONARY.**

1.2.1. Establish the procedures responsible for missionary selection including a minimum of basic requirements in the areas of abilities, formation and ministerial experience.

1.2.2. Train and equip missionaries for their field of service.

1.2.3. Send only those missionaries that have been approved as being capable of going to the mission field.

1.2.4. Do a cost of living study of the country where missions work is being done and make the necessary adjustments each year to be responsible for the missionary’s economic stability.

1.2.5. Keep the missionary informed as to the current reality of the national sending church (minutes, magazines, changes and others).

1.2.6. Encourage the missionary families, noting special dates, birthdays, the children and others.

1.2.7. Develop integral pastoral care of the families on the mission field.

1.2.8. Establish the appropriate context and time for the missionary’s return for promotion.

1.2.9. Create a fund for the missionary in order to provide support for some months after returning from the field.
1.3. **THE SENDING CHURCH’S RELATIONSHIP TO THE LOCAL CHURCH.**

1.3.1. Teach the church its missionary responsibility.

1.3.2. Develop an intercessory prayer movement and a missionary discipleship.

1.3.3. Teach the church to develop an effective continual missions promotion.

1.3.4. Provide materials to local churches and keep them informed of missionary work.

1.4. **THE SENDING CHURCH’S RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER MISSIONS AGENCIES.**

1.4.1. Have a free interchange of missionary reports, achievements and projects.

1.4.2. Cooperate in areas of missionary logistics.

2. **THE RECEIVING CHURCH’S RELATIONSHIPS**

2.1. **THE RECEIVING CHURCH’S RELATIONSHIP TO THE SENDING CHURCH**

2.1.1. Provide information related to missions needs.

2.1.2. Request in writing, missionary assistance and when informed of a possible candidate, extend an official letter of invitation.

2.1.3. Come to a mutual agreement between the missionary, the sending church and the receiving church regarding the needs and areas of missionary service.

2.1.4. Send an annual report of developments in missionary work.

2.1.5. Communicate unique cultural values and church polities.

2.1.6. Inform the sending church, through the leadership of the missions department (or agency), of any accusation directed at the missionary which may require ministerial discipline, keeping in mind that the sending church can terminate the missionary’s service at any time, but it is the sending church who applies disciplinary measures according to the information presented and trial outcome.
2.2. THE RECEIVING CHURCH’S RELATIONSHIP TO THE MISSIONARY

2.2.1. Recognize both North American and Latin American missionaries under the same conditions, regardless of the missionary’s origin there should be no economic expectations, rather missionaries should be received as God’s ministers not as “sources of material goods.”

2.2.2. Communicate to the missionary and his family unique cultural values and church polities.

2.2.3. Receive the missionary and formally present him/her to the appropriate authorities.

2.2.4. Allow the missionary freedom to work in the agreed upon areas of service.

2.2.5. Provide the missionary with the needed documentation for immigration and residency.

2.2.6. Inform the missionary of any accusation which may require ministerial discipline.

3. THE MISSIONARY’S RELATIONSHIPS

3.1. THE MISSIONARY’S RELATIONSHIP TO THE SENDING CHURCH.
   (Agency and Local Churches)

3.1.1. Maintain contact with the national missions committee and the pastors and members of supporting local churches.

3.1.2. Periodically provide information related to the work: problems, triumphs and projects.

3.1.3. Pray for supporting churches, pastors and leaders.

3.1.4. Send visual materials of the missionary’s activities.

3.1.5. Be gracious hosts to missions related visitors.

3.1.6. Dedicate time to supporting churches during promotional period.

3.1.7. Keep in mind that without the support of the church, missionary work is paralyzed.

3.1.8. Request permission from the Missions Department to leave the country where assigned as a missionary whether it is for study, to attend seminars or to return to one’s own country.
3.2. THE MISSIONARY’S RELATIONSHIP TO THE RECEIVING CHURCH.

3.2.1. Present yourself to church authorities and maintain a good relationship with them, informing them of trips outside the country.

3.2.2. Be aware of the unique cultural values and church polities of the receiving church.

3.2.3. Establish goals and work projects, always in harmony with the national receiving church being aware of and respecting its norms and by-laws.

3.2.4. Maintain neutrality in regards to the politics of the country in which one ministers.

3.2.5. Go with an attitude of service.

3.2.6. Be a blessing to the national church.

3.2.7. Make an effort to win respect through the exercise of your ministry.

3.2.8. Maintain harmonious relationships with executives, leaders and ministers of the national work.

3.2.9. Foment missionary vision in the receiving church.

3.3. THE MISSIONARY’S RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER MISSIONARIES.

3.3.1. Recognized that even though there is not a legislative relationship with missionary agencies from other countries, there is a need to cooperate with missionaries from other agencies.

3.3.2. Organize, where possible and with authorization of the national church, a meeting with all officially recognized missionaries that work in the receiving country in order to encourage, respect, learn from one another, be mutually edified and work in harmony.

Conclusion:

In all these relationships one must respect the lines of authority and service, respecting each person and their abilities, gifts and call in order to have a united church, all under the authority and unity of the body of Christ and the divine love that unites the church.
Historical Development of the Present Document.

The beginnings of this document were developed for CELAD under the title of “A Proposal for a Guide to Missionary Work in the Area” in June of 1993 in San Jose, Costa Rica by: Rev. Rodolfo Sáenz Salas (National Superintendent of Costa Rica and President of CELAD), Rev. Enrique Vargas (National Assistant Superintendent and Missions President of Costa Rica) and Rev. Douglas Petersen (Area Director for Central America, DFM, U.S.A.). The document was presented at the CELAD superintendents meeting March 7-10, 1994. The superintendents made observations and referred the document to the Missions Committee for CELAD.

The Missions Committee for CELAD met in Caguas, Puerto Rico on September 13-14, 1994. In that meeting the superintendent’s observations were incorporated and substantial modifications were made to the document under the title of “A Proposal for a Guide to Missionary Work in Latin America.” The following participated in the document’s revision: Rev. Félix Hernández (President of the CELAD Missions Committee), Rev. Enrique Vargas (Missions President of Costa Rica and CELAD Missions Committee member), Rev. Josué David Flores (Missions President of Guatemala), Rev. DeLonn Rance (Missions President of El Salvador and CELAD Missions Committee member), Rev. Brad Walz (Vice-President of Missions of Argentina and Missions Representative of CADSA), Rev. Saturnino González (Superintendent Puerto Rico District, U.S.A. and CELAD Missions Committee member) and Rev. Carmen H. Pérez (Missions President of Puerto Rico).

As the modified document had not been presented to the superintendents nor missions leaders of CELAD, the “Together in Missions” committee took the document off the table in their meeting on July 1-2, 2002 in Miami, FL re-titling the document, “Guidelines for Missionary Relationships: The Interrelationship between the Sending Church, Missionaries and the Receiving Church” and added points 2.1.6. and 2.2.6. This latest revision will be presented to the Third Encounter of Missions Leaders of Latin America to be held in San Jose, Costa Rica, June 11-14, 2003. The “Together in Missions” Committee consists of: Rev. Brad Walz (Argentina) - president, Rev. Enrique Vargas (Costa Rica) -member, Rev. Efraín Arosemena (Panama) - member, Rev. Samuel Rodríguez (Venezuela) - member, Rev. DeLonn Rance (El Salvador) - secretary. Rev. Rodolfo Sáenz, (Costa Rica) - counselor, was unable to attend. English version translated by DeLonn Rance.

Used by permission.
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