

THE USE OF FOREIGN FINANCED NATIONAL CHRISTIAN WORKERS

■ Between statements that foreign-financed national Christian workers are the only way to go and the sure way to handicap the church is a middle ground wisely expounded by the experience of this missionary and his team.

By "Robert Smith"

OUTLINE

- I. Potential Risks Of FFNCW
- II. Potential Benefits Of FFNCW
- III. Some Sacred Cows Considered
- IV. Models of Missions Support
 1. Limitations of Two Traditional Models
 2. A Third Model of Missions Support
- V. Our Experience In FFNCW
 1. The Optimum Role of Expatriate Missionaries
 2. The Recruitment, Selection, and Training of Personnel
 3. The Management and Motivation of Personnel
 4. Planning for and Achieving Self-sufficiency
 5. Rules Versus Self-regulating Controls
- VI. Summary

Introduction

This is a theme fraught with controversy, exhibiting potentially disastrous as well as exciting possibilities for advancing Christ's kingdom. The risks have persuaded some individuals and missions to categorically forbid the use of national Christian workers (NCWs) with foreign finance (FFNCW). The potential results have encouraged others to charge on full speed, seeing only a goal and neglecting process and all consequences. Still others perceive the poverty of Third- and Fourth-World countries and use outside finance as a way to help a poor struggling church. This article will attempt to discuss some of the pros and cons, risks and potentials, and how we have decided to resolve them in what we believe to be a satisfactory way.

I. Potential Risks, Hazards, and Problems of National Christian Workers with Foreign Finance (FFNCW)

- The risk of confusion and mixed motives on the part of non-Christians and new Christians that one becomes a Christian in order to get a job, patronage, or other sorts of help.
- The accusation of being hired help, spies, recruiters, etc., who serve foreign nations, causes, or religions, and thus are traitors.
- The enfeeblement of the local church which does not learn sacrificial giving to support its own pastors and Christian workers.
- Limiting the growth and progress of Christianity to the availability of outside finance.
- Tendency of the church to remain foreign or, at best, become nationalized rather than being truly indigenous.
- The failure to develop true faith and a complete reliance of God to supply needs and instead to rely on the patronage of the outside world.
- The use of FFNCWs interferes with the primacy of the church and its responsibility and authority to send out and finance missionaries. The church cannot fulfill its responsibility to pray for and care for Christian workers it rarely, if ever, sees. Thus, an arm of the flesh, mere cash, is substituted for the church's spiritual power.

II. The Potential Benefits of FFNCWs

- The Third- and Fourth-World contain many Christians, Spirit-filled believers, who are culturally, socially, linguistically, and economically much more able to adapt to some situations than North Americans. It is a rule of thumb in our part of the world that it can take a

full-term (four years) for a Western missionary to know his head from a hole in the ground, but an NCW can often move from recruitment through some initial training to basic functionality in a few weeks to a few months.

- The failure, dropout rate, departure from the field rate is much lower with NCWs. In the nearest four missions to our work, 25% to 50% of North American missionaries leave the field in their first term for one reason or another. This percentage grows—albeit somewhat slower if later terms are included. For NCWs, this figure is more like 5% to 10%.

- In doing the same task the same way, an expatriate gets much more attention. This is not because he is more spiritual but because he is foreign. In itself, this tends to cloud true response to the gospel. The NCW is seen much more for the value of his message and the quality of his life. A white expatriate cannot be a complete cultural insider in our part of the Muslim world.

- Even though NCWs are less time-conscious, it is a fair observation that motivated NCWs put more time in "on the job" than expatriates. Expats in some cases work hard at full integration and contextualization living simply as Africans but then also find that they cannot survive this 100% of the time. Thus they split their time maybe 50-50 between bush and recovery time in the city. If a year's furlough is added every four years, and a month's vacation per year, their total time in ministry site is under 35%, and much of that is spent in maintenance, not ministry. Other missionaries spend more time in their ministry site at a higher level of living

but spend enormous amounts of time in maintenance (fixing the screens, the toilet, the car/truck, visiting other expats, typing on computers, watching videos, etc.). Rare is the expat who spends 20 hours per week doing the stuff of spiritual ministry of which prayer letters are written. Of those who do, many have a support staff that handle those grubby details for them. Our NCWs average 30-50 hours per week in ministry, and sometimes their relaxation (sitting around talking, drinking tea, etc.) is even the best ministry. They don't engage in solitary or isolationist relaxation like reading books, watching videos, or playing tennis.

- NCWs can be extremely cost-effective. We have 13 full-time NCWs logging ministry hours among thousands (no exaggeration) of Muslims, doing soul-winning and church planting and covering their transport and ministry costs for a cost to the kingdom about the same as a single North American missionary family.

III. Some Sacred Cows Considered

- We wish NCWs to trust God completely, to live by faith and not depend on patronage to the outside world. This is a noble and appropriate goal. Let's make the playing table level. How many expat missionaries remain on the mission field when their support drops seriously? Don't they pray and then go home to raise support? When they have a baby or are sick, don't they, in fact, count on churches or missions to increase their finances to help out? Don't most missions restrain their departure for the field until sufficient funds are raised to pay living costs, vehicle costs, expensive education of children in mission schools, etc.? I believe that in many cases a double standard of faith is being imposed. The expectations of a missionary towards his churches and mission are not necessarily different from that of the FFNCW towards his organization and donors.

- How many expat missionaries that believe (with excellent reasons) that pastors should be bivocational and live by their own sweat and innovation in business are willing to model this? Is it any wonder that our disciples have difficulty doing what we cannot/will not do? Being a "tentmaker" requires

extraordinary motivation, dynamism and entrepreneurialism. There are fewer tentmaker missionaries (whose primary focus is ministry) than supported missionaries sent out by our own entrepreneurial North American cultures. Even in the New Testament, though Paul was a tentmaker, he was probably in a minority, as Peter and others were not. Those who will push bivocationality, dare you say "be ye followers of me?"

- Is church planting itself the *summum bonum* for an expat missionary? I'm not talking about diverting missions into social issues instead of the gospel. Does the responsibility for birthing, growing, and maturing the church rest with the expatriate missionary? Doesn't this, in fact, build in an inherent problem of "turning the work over to the natives?" The church founded by the expat is inherently foreign and, at best, can only be nationalized and the foreign influence lives on in the habits, rules, constitution established under the influence of the expat missionary. I propose that it is NOT the *summum bonum* and that the fundamental responsibility is that of the Holy Spirit in the lives of local believers. The best task of the expatriate missionary is to *facilitate* church establishment and growth.

- How much training must local church leaders have, when should it be given, how should it be given? Whole books have been written on these subjects, and I don't pretend to be able to settle them in a paragraph or an article. One must acknowledge that the New Testament has given little definitive, normative teaching on the subject. Nevertheless, it seems evident that Paul was able to train and establish leaders relatively quickly. We have concluded that Timothy and Titus give greatest weight to life and lifestyle factors of leaders (without ignoring a need for training), and that it is better to have a natural leader with a teachable attitude than more formal training. On-the-job training supplemented by TEE and other training in situ is best, and it should be taught in a "menu form" as they (church or proto-church leaders) desire it. Since we seek not only self-sustaining churches but also a church-planting institution, it is best if training is conducted by NCWs who should be teachable also.

IV. Models of Missions Support

At this point in missions practice, there are two models of missions support commonly practiced and discussed among Protestant missions. Both of these are good models, valid, commendable, and worth pursuing. Like all humanly generated models, they have their strong points as well as limitations. It is not my purpose to condemn either model but to suggest that they have limitations which must be considered before advocating or practicing them and that there is at least one other model, which also has strengths and limitations, which might be an optimum in some circumstances. In this article I focus briefly on the limitations of the two models, not because they are without strengths but because the advocates of each have made their strengths well known. My description of certain problems with each does not mean that they cannot be well done, nor that God cannot, does not or will not bless those using them.

1. Limitations of Two Traditional Missionary Support Models

The model most practiced in Protestant foreign missions today is what I call the external finance model. A missionary, representing a mission society, will raise support in one country, usually his own, so as to be financially free to conduct missionary activities in another country under the surveillance, guidance and/or management of his mission society. The model is good and has successfully planted churches in many parts of the world. I am financed according to this model. It has among other things the following limitations:

- It is expensive and often has limited productivity. It is not necessarily so but usually is. It commonly costs \$25,000 to \$50,000 annually to keep a North American missionary family in the field. As noted above, it is rare that this missionary family puts in 20 hours per week in actual preaching, teaching, evangelizing, discipleship, and relationship time with his host people. When other costs are included—transport, ministry, etc.—and divided by the number of ministry hours (as defined by activities suitable to writing about in prayer letters, fund-raising materials and recruiting materials—our

public persona), the cost per hour can easily be \$50 to \$150 per hour. The cost per convert, per disciple, and church established is also enormous.

- It requires a supporting society that produces an adequate surplus. This limits the number of practitioners of this model to a small subset of the evangelical population of wealthy countries. All Christians everywhere must learn to give sacrificially, but how much giving do you think God expects of a farmer-believer who has suffered a devastating drought in 4 of the last 10 years while his children’s bellies bloat and their hair turns orange? Give that sacrificially yourself!
- It requires a moderately sophisticated banking, communication, and transportation network.

• Management is difficult and oversight is limited. Quality and productivity are primarily a function of the motivated individual. Low quality and productivity are seldom discovered and discipline only occurs for moral turpitude.

As a second model, tentmaking missionaries are certainly to be honored and encouraged. In the last decades there has been a renewed interest in them as a way of penetrating closed countries and as a lower-cost way of putting missionaries in the field. Without disparaging the model in the slightest, it nonetheless has some of the following limitations:

- The lower cost to the church is in many ways simply born by the motivated tentmaker which is not truly a lower kingdom cost but a transfer in which members of the kingdom make the sacrifice.
- Another part of the lower cost is born by the reduced number of hours available to the tentmaker for language and ministry. There are tentmakers who can fully integrate their tentmaking and ministry, but it is doubtful that these are a majority of tentmakers.
- Few people have what it takes in motivation, dynamism, and entrepreneurial skills and individualism to pull it off. North American society particularly emphasizes individualism and entrepreneurship and its evangelical

churches emphasizes foreign missions, and yet a small fraction of its total missions force are tentmakers. Can we reasonably expect that more social and less entrepreneurial cultures with weak, newly planted churches will produce a higher percentage of tentmakers?

None of these remarks are intended to disparage any missionary, mission

involved in literacy work, agricultural development, and the establishment of Christianity all over unevangelized Europe. It’s not a bad model, and its heyday lasted as long as the “Modern Missionary Movement” has. Consider some of the strengths of this model, and perhaps you will conclude, as we have, that this model is appropriate to establishing, not a church, but a church-planting mechanism. We are using it to facilitate Third- and Fourth-World missionaries to gain a missions perspective, to see a doable role for themselves, and to alleviate long-term dependency on Western finance while acting in the present tense to harness NCWs in the Great Commission. Look at the following points:

- It is a team effort. Most non-Western peoples are less individualistic than North Americans. In the first two models as generally practiced today, there is little true interdependence. Mostly, we mean simply a differentiation of tasks. This monastic ideal requires management, differentiation of tasks and working together in dependent, non-individualistic ways, which is more comfortable to NCWs and provides some built-in peer management.

• The members, with different needs and skills, still need to be focused on the right task. Living and working in community (without necessarily being in commune) towards those goals provides accountability. A danger of this monastic model is that it will turn inwards and seek institutional survival and personal success, but this problem is not unique to this model.

- Most orders of monks had a rule of the order to which they made a commitment or even an oath. The rule described their ethos, their distinctives and a commitment to their task and to each other. They too must surely have had personality clashes, but their vow, like present-day marriage vows, helped them work through their difficulties. This is a point that perhaps is worth further study and application to other mission models as well. This year a team of our NCWs developed their own vow and signed it, committing themselves to specific sacrifices for

This year a team of our NCWs developed their own vow and signed it, committing themselves to specific sacrifices for Muslim missions. They and another group are all choosing to wear the same clothes, making a kind of uniform to also express their commitment to each other and their “monastery.”

society, or their methods of finance. May there be more good missionaries, mission societies, and more finance with any model that will get the job done!

2. A Third Model of Missions Support

Another model has existed for missions support in the past which became encumbered with side issues and has fallen into disrepute. It does have a historical track record of successfully “disciplined” nations, in McGavran’s terminology, and was used by a poor, undeveloped nation to send out and support large numbers of missionaries in many countries. The country was Ireland, the model is the monastery (or internal finance model), and an example worth learning from is that of Iona and their evangelization of much of Europe.

The monastic model has clouded its genius with extraneous details of stone walls, celibacy, hair shirts and the like. Judge those details in the context of their times and put them aside so as to see the essentials.

A monastery in its essentials was a:

- Team of talented individuals,
- Focused on the church’s tasks,
- Committed to each other,
- Financially self-sufficient,
- With a strong local management,
- And international connections and accountability system.

Ionan-linked monasteries were

Muslim missions. They and another group are all choosing to wear the same clothes, making a kind of uniform to also express their commitment to each other and their "monastery."

- Financial self-sufficiency was achievable in a team, easier than by an individual. A monastery had lands that it managed, as well as financial and human capital, so that a surplus was produced. Each of the above models of missions finance requires that a surplus be produced. In the external finance model, a wealthy society (of which the church is a part) produces a surplus, and a part of this surplus is used to hire, train and send a missionary. The missionary is a product of that society's wealth (not to mention spirituality, sacrifice, and other values). In the tentmaker model, the individual produces some kind of surplus of which his time and energy are a product, which he contributes to the missionary task. The monastic model also produces a surplus internally by its group effort, which is dedicated to the missionary task. This internal generation of surplus probably was seldom if ever achieved in the very first year of a monastery, but in a reasonable period of transition, with plans and controls, can be produced. This is an appropriate time and way, we believe, for expatriate money to be invested in NCWs. Note that the "monastery" is not the church but a church-planting institution, that foreign investment does not increase dependency, but independence.

- The true interdependence of the team effort, community effort, close personal communion, and good leadership make for effective management. In the first model, the nature of support raising gives each missionary a somewhat independent power and finance base that is not linked so much to his productivity and effectiveness as a missionary, as to his ability to sell himself. It is difficult to manage, oversee and even to hold missionaries accountable, as many a field chairman will acknowledge. Often one does not so much manage them, as simply try to see that he gets his slice of the available ministry pie and that they do not fight or interfere with each other. This independence reflects our free-spirited, independent cultures and the finance model we use. It is our experience that good local management limits the

effective size of "monasteries" to perhaps 10 or 20. This may be a culturally variable limit.

- Monasteries grow and reproduce not only new churches but also new monasteries linked by their establishment, their vows and the interchange and contact of people. Our first "monastery" is busy growing leaders and has budded off one daughter monastery, is preparing for a second, and has a third and fourth in view. We aim that each one will be a church-planting and training "institution" that will last 50, 100 or even more years.

- Our first monastery has an impressive list of accomplishments in its first six years:

- One New Testament translated in the language of one unreached people group, and parts of two others, a song book catechism and other health and agriculture books;
- 3000 plus people become literate in a Bible-based literacy program;
- 75 known converts in six worshipping groups in three languages, among three unreached Muslim people groups. This was done in a place where seven years ago several villages refused food aid offered by aid groups for fear that someone would preach Christianity and they would "rather starve to death than become Christians." This year three chiefs of villages spoke out on the acceptability of converting to Christianity (though without themselves converting—yet). We are expecting large-scale growth in the future.
- Leaders for these groups are being found and trained, and in one village in particular believers are reaching out to other villages.
- As mentioned above, one daughter has budded off, another is in preparation, and two more are in view.
- The first monastery is about 35% self-sufficient, and we expect it to grow by at least 10% annually in its financial self-sufficiency. Foreign finance will not continue indefinitely. Some expat involvement will be ongoing for some time further but not in "line authority," only in "staff" (advisors and facilitating).

V. Our Experience in Foreign Financed National Christian Workers

1. The Optimum Role of Expatriate Missionaries

The world is full of good things that ought to be done by someone. Christians are commanded to be a people of good works, and so it is easy to get buried in many kinds of doing-good trivia. Much time, often inordinate amounts of time, is spent in the maintenance of house, vehicle, garden, etc. Significant time is spent serving other expats, visiting them, "fellowshipping" with them. None of this is bad and can be good and right in balance, but it's not what we came here to do and must be seen in that light.

More serious is the church planter question. Many mission fields have been blessed with years of faithful service by men and women of God. They have toiled, struggled, sacrificing fearfully to preach the gospel, establish a church, to train a pastor for it. They have labored with their own hands to build a modest building in which people could meet and worship God. Believers in home countries have taken up offerings to put on roofs, sent builders teams, bought benches, Bibles and hymnals. Finally, the work is "turned over to the nationals" and soon the door sags, screens are missing, and the pastor won't evangelize if a missionary won't buy fuel for his vehicle. Attendance depends on the missionary to use his vehicle as a church bus not only for Sunday services but women's meetings, prayer meetings and so on. Dependency lingers on and even grows.

McGavran, Hodges, and others have done an excellent job of pointing out the difference between a nationalized church and an indigenous church. They find it significant that from the beginning, a work be indigenous. In our experience this means:

- No foreign finance or labor should build a church building, pay a church worker or otherwise keep converts from learning to sacrifice for their church.
- No expatriate should take a regular, prominent, public role in running the church. This does not mean advice, counsel and teaching cannot and should not be offered by expats, but local leadership must be developed from the

beginning, making their own decisions.

- The church should develop its own constitution and rules, not to have one written for them and either imposed on them or agreed to without full understanding.

- God gives gifts to the church such that the leadership needed is available locally when needed. An outside pastor, even a national, cannot minister to the church like local elders and pastors. These must be chosen in accordance with the instructions of Titus and Timothy. It is better that pastors learn on the job and hunger for further teaching (which is supplied as desired) than if they receive much training (not immediately put into practice), often separating them from their people.

- The birth, growth, and purity of the church is the responsibility of the Holy Spirit working through local Spirit-filled believers. It is not the responsibility of the missionary.

- The role of the missionary is to facilitate these churches. He models, stimulates, encourages, exhorts, rebukes. He teaches when it's wanted, when the need is perceived. The monastery and its personnel are the best way for him to carry out his facilitating role.

- The monastery is not the church and may be made up of national, not necessarily local workers who are receiving foreign finance because there is no local church (we work among unevangelized Muslim tribes) and monastic self-sufficiency is not yet achieved.

The missionary helps the monastery learn to manage and organize itself and trains its appropriately gifted personnel in evangelism, discipleship, literacy and so on. His focus is not the local churches (though he does not ignore them) but to establish a self-sufficient church-planting mechanism, planting self-sufficient churches. The monastery workers follow up on isolated converts, teach literacy and Bible in villages, help new believers organize themselves, train leaders, and move on after about three years. A few remain on in an area as a sort of peripatetic bishopric that follows up on voluntary literacy workers and the worshipping groups,

and to help encourage and continue training local church leaders. NCWs are much more capable than expatriates of conveying the idea of a truly independent church making its own choices since they are less intimidating than an expatriate missionary. Often the suggestion of an expat missionary is

Much depends on the recruitment, selection, and training of monastery personnel. It should not be rushed and like monasteries of old, we need to be free to admit mistakes and that some people are not appropriate or fit for the

heard as a voice of command.

2. The Recruitment, Selection and Training of Personnel

Much depends on the recruitment, selection, and training of monastery personnel. It should not be rushed and like monasteries of old, we need to be free to admit mistakes and that some people are not appropriate or fit for the task. We are generally looking for the following characteristics:

- A Spirit-filled teachable believer. It is more important that he be an eager learner than that he be well taught or be a Bible school graduate. Some of those that have graduated from Bible schools or come from churches formed by extracted believers are more of a problem than a blessing. Often they have paternalistic ideas about the role of mission and/or habits and expectations that create barriers. Those from Christian and animistic backgrounds need training and sensitivity to deal with Muslims, even though they have been raised around them and think they understand. It is not very easy to judge teachability or work attitudes at first, but they will become evident.

- Those with spiritual gifts and desires as pastors, evangelists, and administration. We do not pay them to do spiritual ministry, per se, but to accomplish a specific task such as literacy, teaching agriculture, etc., and teach, train and motivate them to integrate their gift with their task. They are to model the bivocational life we

expect and teach for our convert church leaders.

- Not younger than 20 years old. In our area, age is an important factor in respect and image and he has none before 20. It is also important that he have sufficient years in at least his home culture, to be a man of his culture, not a product of a mission school. Even if his tribe is not identical with those he will be serving, it matters that he is a man of his culture.

- Has calloused hands. We like educated people and give preference to education but those who haven't done manual labor have too high and mighty a view of themselves for us. Many times education, or even the

pastorate, is seen as a way of avoiding hard work rather than a way to help one work better. Pretty much everyone will at least start off with us doing some hard manual labor. We want people ready and willing to do anything. This also affects how they dress, walk, relate to villages and how they will be seen.

- Has either a specific skill that is needed (such as a mechanic, accountant, nurse, etc.) or at least the equivalent of a ninth grade education.

It is just as important, if not perhaps more so, the way that recruits are found. No matter what is said (and we try to explain it all), at least 50% of candidates see themselves simply as Christian employees of a Christian organization. This is because of the widespread practice of missions, denominations, and Christian PVOs (Private Voluntary Organizations) to hire Christian employees. This is not necessarily bad but it takes time to see what people are looking for. Whatever their initial ideas about what they will do, it matters tremendously that they perceive themselves as responsible to a third party within their circle of significant people to do well. This is normally a pastor and/or a church. This third party is an essential part of finding, recruiting, and holding the worker responsible.

Churches in our part of the world have a hard time contributing to their pastor's salary and feel little burden for missions. By involving that church and pastor we try to:

- Help the church gain a vision for

missions;

- Gain prayer support for the candidate;
- Have another input or control mechanism for doing well. There are few ways to modify behavior, especially of a new person, other than firing him, which is like using a shotgun to kill flies. When the recruit perceives himself as representing his pastor, friends and church, he does much better. Generally, the pastor will want regularly to know how he is doing and if he is making any problem.

- Link new churches to old. One pastor of an NCW is making a preaching, evangelistic, and encouragement tour of the worshipping groups set up by "their" man. Other NCWs encouraged by that are trying to get their pastors to visit also.

Training exists on multiple levels for multiple purposes.

- Technical training is offered where needed. Apprenticeship and on-the-job training are preferred.

- Bible studies and Bible correspondence courses are available and encouraged so that personal spiritual growth is ongoing.

- We seek to be sure that discipleship is built into the structure of the monastery and not just operating parallel to the structure. An example of a parallel structure is an expatriate missionary doing TEE with NCWs and emerging church leaders. An integrated structure is exemplified by the manager of the literacy workers (who are NCWs). He brings a word of encouragement and a Bible study on his regular visits and organizes a monthly retreat for prayer, Bible study and mutual encouragement for NCWs and emerging church leaders, and now it is his "bishop responsibility."

- Seminars are held in November and May which focus on missiology, church planting, church growth, and church-related Bible teaching. These are open to NCWs and to anyone else that is interested.

3. *The Management and Motivation of Personnel*

With the goal of a self-sufficient church-planting organization, it is evident that the management must not be in the hands of expatriates. This is difficult, and it took us three years to get expatriates out of direct decision

making and management. They remain in some training and advising and facilitating roles and will probably remain that way for some time to come. It is our perception that it is best to give responsibility as fast as it will be accepted, even though from our point of view some mistakes are made and not everything is at maximum efficiency. On-the-job training is better than any amount of theory. We note the following points about management:

- It's hard to release control on money, but NCWs need to learn to manage it. Build in not only accounting controls but accountability controls. Make rules and policies public.

- Budgets need to be understood and worked out together. The more they are understood, the better will be everyone's attitudes and the less decisions will seem arbitrary, manipulative or deceptive.

- It is best to not simply have one overarching budget but to break it into logical parts and multiply managers responsible for multiple budgets and objectives. This increases the sense of ownership and responsibility, it helps to grow new leaders and give experience, it reduces the size of errors and problems, and slows down rumor generation and misunderstanding. Their sense of "ownership" will help them find new economies and improvements if they are motivated to seek them.

- Job descriptions and performance evaluations are an effort but worth it. Superior and inferior performance should be identified and dealt with. Encouragement and a small additional bonus will get more good response than fat base salaries.

- Wages, salary, allowance or whatever euphemism is used should be at a living level. Salary (what one expects to receive) is not a good motivator, but it can be a demotivator. No one should get less than he needs or more than a budget can afford in the short term of external finance nor more than we see as locally sustainable as the monastery becomes self-sufficient.

- Most people expect their income to rise with time and excellence. Most people are happier with a small salary that rises than a large salary that stays static. Their needs will always expand to consume the available money. What one already has or expects is not

motivating.

- Everyone must be harnessed into the self-sufficiency effort. They must understand that foreign finance will decrease (preferably in annual increments rather than in a sudden cut-off) and eventually be gone. They must adopt a plan for self-sufficiency. It will work best if raises and bonuses are tied to measures of self-sufficiency.

- We do not pay anyone for "spiritual ministry." We do not pay them to do spiritual ministry per se but to accomplish a specific task such as literacy, teaching agriculture, etc. and teach, train, and motivate them to integrate their gift with their task. They are to model the bivocational life we expect and teach for our convert church leaders and that we try to model ourselves.

- The seminars are not only training times but highly motivating as NCWs see victories in conversions and growth of converts. Testimonies as to the viability of a particular technique, plan or idea are tremendous motivators to apply them.

- Managers in the monastery must be leaders, motivators, and encouragers, as well as administrators. The expatriate's involvement is highest at this level.

- The expat missionary himself can be an excellent motivator in being a source of friendly accountability, particularly for the managers and director by asking lots of questions and to all the monastery by visiting in a friendly, non-controlling way all aspects of the work. His priorities will be evident by the questions he asks and the things he does more than by his stated priorities.

- An important rule of thumb is that people will do not so much what you expect as what you inspect. This is true for you and your monastery managers.

- There is a limit, perhaps culturally dependent, as to how big the monastery can grow and how large a radius of action it can serve. For us 10-20 is about the good management limit, and 50 km the maximum radius of action. Beyond those limits, it is probably better to bud off a new monastery than to grow bigger or cover a larger area.

4. *Planning For and Achieving Self-Sufficiency*

I cannot offer many useful, practical details of financial self-sufficiency that would work universally, but I will offer

several generalities and then explain some of our key elements to our self-sufficiency:

- Don't put all your eggs in one basket. It is better and more stable to have 20 small sources of income than one big one. This is particularly so if you produce a primary raw material or commodity such as cotton. Market prices will fluctuate wildly and will catch you sooner or later.

- It is probably unrealistic and uneconomic to try to produce all of your needs yourself. Perhaps half or 3/4 can actually be locally produced but for the remainder, it is more efficient that some of your activities generate cash and that the remainder of your needs be purchased.

- If you are in a rural area and have land available, put some but not all of your self-sufficiency efforts into agricultural production. It is not cost-effective nor acknowledging of human nature to pay people wages or salary for agricultural work. Prices and values will usually be too low and people, even the best of them, don't put out their best that way. It is much better that they work on shares and directly link efforts and results. Allow for individualism. We at one point cut costs and salaries significantly while making NCWs happy and building loyalty by forgoing summer salaries (working in our fields) and loaning donkeys and plows. This put NCWs back in the villages year round when they would normally have only worked in the dry season. It has made for a more year-round gospel impact at reduced cost and reduced their financial needs in the dry season.

- The transformation of primary products is an area that is a good application of applying external capital with skilled NCWs to meet a local economic need and generate that surplus that finances gospel work. If your area produces peanuts, let others grow them. You can shell them and make peanut butter. Similarly instead of growing grain, you could thresh it on shares and/or convert it to flour. Instead of growing cotton you could grind it. With an oil press, many seeds are transformable into either edible or combustible oils.

- Services are another modestly lucrative area depending on what skills you have among your NCWs. Medical

services can certainly cover their own costs and even contribute a profit. A simple shop can reduce the cost of meeting some needs of NCWs and turn a small profit, too. Mechanics, welding and other services can reduce your costs and turn small profits if you can add the services without adding more people. Try to see that all your people use all their skills to redeem the time.

Our “monastery” serves its surrounding communities by training in village appropriate skills (among other things). This is done as a specific part of our penetration strategy to help new converts stand for the Lord and remain integrated in their community. From a self-sufficiency point of view, this gives us many options. We have the following measures of self-sufficiency:

Agricultural Production

Permanent Extensive Crops

- Gum Arabica
- Sisal
- Physic Nut (kerosene substitute)
- Cotton (for fiber and oil)
- Moringa (for edible oil and greens)

Annual Extensive Crops

- Manioc
- Beans
- Gumbo
- Rice

Dry Season Garden Crops

- Beans
- Potatoes
- Cabbage
- Peppers

Animal Husbandry

- Goats
- Sheep
- Chickens
- Guinea Pigs

Agricultural Transformation

- Grain Grinder, earns us cash, millet, and peanuts
- Peanut Sheller, earns us peanuts
- Oil press, produces edible and combustible vegetable oils
- Thresher, earns us millet and rice

Services

- Three income generating clinics
- Mechanics services and moped rebuilding
- Boutique
- Sale of Agricultural Supplies

It is a valuable aspect of our self-sufficiency that it ensures our integration with the surrounding communities. It helps to fight the

anti-Christian prejudice of the Muslims around us and keeps the “monastery” from falling into isolationist “monasticism.”

5. Rules versus Self-Regulating Controls

A reality of any association of humans is the need for rules. It is our experience that the fewest number of rules and decisions is the best. Further, wherever possible, it is better to make rules as self-regulating as possible.

An example of this is transport and vehicle use. It used to consume 20% of our total costs. We tried to add rule upon rule to control it without success. We succeeded when we reduced all the rules to one: Whoever uses it, for whatever reason, will pay from his budget or pocket the full mileage cost (fuel, taxes, insurance, repair, and depreciation). At the same time, we provided alternatives by getting a donkey cart and helping individuals purchase their own bicycles, moped and motorcycles. The result was a dramatic (60%) drop in vehicle costs, decreased social friction, and improved services. We expect the costs to continue to drop.

Another example of this was medical needs. Our NCWs have the perception that if they give their all for the “service,” their medical needs should be met. When we set out to meet their needs without controls, the cost was astronomical. When rules were put onto the system, intense dissatisfaction was produced. We could not make essentially rationing choices and give our NCWs a perception of justice and caring. Again we reduced to one rule: You will pay the first approximately \$10, and the “monastery” will cover the rest. The NCWs were all reasonably satisfied, and our costs dropped about 95%. When economies in a budget are found, they can be used to cover the deductible.

In the same vein, wherever possible, remuneration should not be so much on the basis of per day, per month, starting at this time, ending at that. Wherever possible, we try to link it directly to productivity and quality. Our literacy work, for example, is approaching the ideal of contract education. Our herder works on shares of the flock he cares for.

VI. Summary

In summary, I have tried to show from