

Partnership in Mission: An Analysis of Hindrances and Practical Suggestions for Implementation

Mike McAteer *

With the rise of missions emphasis in the churches of the Two-Thirds World, matters of partnership and cooperation must be addressed. Yet discussions on partnership generate mixed feelings. Past experiences have left some with painful memories and a preference to work alone rather than as a group. Others believe in the wisdom of the African proverb that says that he who wishes to go quickly goes alone, but he who wants to go far goes together. Partnership means different things to different people. The business world operates with a primarily horizontal interpretation of partnership. Secular companies seek to build synergy so that the various member organizations prosper as well as enjoy protection from competitors. Some partnerships exhibit unhealthy relationships due to one or more members entering the agreement with a predetermined agenda. As a result, conflicts often arise over matters of power and control.¹ Daniel Rickett defines partnership as “a complementary relationship drawn by a common purpose and sustained by a willingness to learn and grow together in obedience to God.”²

Charles Van Engen enlarges upon Rickett’s definition by saying partnership is “the association of two or more autonomous bodies who have formed a trusting relationship and fulfill agreed upon expectations. They do this by sharing complementary gifts and abilities in order to achieve a common goal. A complementary partnership, then, is a relationship of shared commitment and interdependency.”³ Yet achieving the optimum in a partnership relationship requires hard work on the part of the participants. Bill Peterson says that working in partnership is a lot of headaches and that it is harder to work as a group than alone.⁴ So if partnership is so difficult and requires so much hard work and if partnerships are prone to misunderstandings and power struggles, why should we work together? If we truly believe the Bible when it says that one is able to put a thousand to flight and two will overcome ten thousand, then we will be

* Mike McAteer and his wife Jane Ann have served in Asia for the last 28 years. Mike has a M.A. in Intercultural Studies from Asia Pacific Theological Seminary, Baguio, Philippines and is currently enrolled in the D.Miss. program at the Assemblies of God Theological Seminary, Springfield, Mo.

motivated to develop partnerships. Not only is there a synergistic effect in our work, but protection comes from the group. “Though one may be overpowered, two can defend themselves. A cord of three strands is not quickly broken” (Ecclesiastes 4:12). Two people working together accomplish more than just the sum of two people’s work. Partnerships have the capacity to produce exponential results. That coupled with the added benefits of personal spiritual protection/accountability and character development provides a powerful argument in favor of cooperative endeavors.

Satan clearly understands the potential of effective partnering which explains why he does everything possible to hinder the development of cooperative teamwork as well as disrupt team unity when partnerships are established. Impacting our generation in unprecedented power requires that serious consideration be given to the subject of teamwork. The type of partnership needed extends from the individual and local to the national and international levels. This paper will examine the concept of partnership in relationship to indigenous church principles. Can we build a theological framework for cooperation? What hinders the development of partnerships and how can these hindrances be overcome? Finally, a practical model for implementation will be considered.

Partnership and the Indigenous Church Principle

Roland Allen and Melvin Hodges strongly influenced the development of the Assemblies of God indigenous church missions philosophy. Later Morris Williams, with his book *Partnership in Mission*, contributed to the A/G stance on partnership.⁵ The core of the indigenous church principle revolves around three “selfs”: self-supporting, self-governing, and self-propagating. By this definition, an indigenous church exists if it is able to (1) financially support itself and its operations, (2) govern itself with local leadership, and (3) engage in outreach to those in its community and beyond.⁶ A rigid interpretation of this definition leads some to ask concerning the compatibility of partnership with the indigenous church principle. If our goal is self-supporting, self-governing, and self-propagating churches, where does partnership fit? Before attempting to answer this question, the following facts should be considered.

First, the modern missions movement was born and grew in the context of Western colonialism.⁷ Second, Hodges and Williams wrote from Latin American and African

backgrounds. Roland Allen served briefly in North China towards the close of the nineteenth century. Are their concepts concerning the indigenous church principle appropriate for all areas of the world and all time periods? Are the “three selves” the only “selves”? Is this model appropriate for all Asian cultures? And again, does partnership fit into a working model of an indigenous church? The indigenous church principle grew out of a reaction towards the paternalism that grew out of Western colonialism. Rufus Anderson and Henry Venn pioneered that reaction and argued for missionaries to view themselves primarily as evangelists. Education and training of a local clergy to quickly take leadership roles in the churches became a part of their program. Roland Allen’s book *Missionary Methods: St. Paul’s or Ours?*⁸ carried on these emphases stressing the role of the Holy Spirit in guiding the local church in developing its own forms of leadership. Roland Allen profoundly impacted the development of the missions philosophy of the Assemblies of God.⁹

Morris Williams’ writings on partnership assumes the indigenous church principle as described by Melvin Hodges. His ideas of “partnership” entail the partnering of a sending church organization with a national indigenous church. Williams describes four different types of relationship that can exist between sending and national churches: (1) paternalism (which Williams says is necessary in the beginning), (2) fusion—where the national church takes over everything independent of the sending organization (some might argue that this is where a strict interpretation of indigenous church principles would take us), (3) parallelism—where both sending church and national church continue to minister in the country but are totally independent of each other, and (4) partnership— where the sending church and national church work together.¹⁰

The natural result of planting an indigenous church should result in the development of relationships that make partnership desirable. As the national church grows to the point of being able to be not only self-propagating but also self-sending (becoming sending organizations themselves), the two sending organizations should naturally develop a working partnership. The challenge is to find the proper balance between indigeneity and paternalism/partnership and sponsorship. Van Rheenen claims that both the partnership and indigenous model have many pitfalls. Subsidy systems, introduced as partnership, become sponsorship. If outsiders control the decision-making and the setting of agendas then partnership has reverted back to paternalism.¹¹

Van Rheenen argues that some cases do not neatly fit a pure indigenous model. Urban church plants seldom survive without initial financial help. Partnership helps in those contexts in which foreign money, if appropriately used, can empower without created dependency.¹² Christopher Little, in contrast, quotes Dean Gilliland that if Paul “were among us today there is no question he would expect new churches to provide the financial basis for their own lives.” He further quotes Ramseyer that the “subsidization of the church has been a mistake from the beginning. The damage which subsidies have done has far outweighed any good which they have accomplished. In this situation, not a moratorium on mission, but a moratorium on chronic subsidies is not only justified but essential for the responsible maturity on both sides of the relationship.”¹³

The question is where does partnership become sponsorship and another journey down the pathway of paternalism? Is it possible to reap the benefits of partnership in an indigenous model context without crossing over to paternalism or the existence of both national and sending organizations going their separate ways with separate agendas?

Van Rheenen advocates a combination that mixes both the indigenous church model and the partnership approaches into an indigenous/partnership model. This model emphasizes two stages. The first follows a more traditional indigenous model where missionaries from the sending church involve themselves primarily in evangelism and training. From the beginning stress is laid on building a self-supporting church. Because the missionaries’ work does not stop with evangelism but goes on to encompass discipleship and the training of future leaders, the way is being paved for the second stage represented by a mature national church. In this stage, foreign entities work through missionaries to partner with national leaders. Throughout this stage, the local national church is encouraged to develop indigenous structures providing their own evangelism, discipleship, training, and ultimately, mission organizations.¹⁴ Van Rheenen’s division of three models (traditional indigenous, partnership, and indigenous/partnership) seems to work well in our complex world. Traditional indigenous and indigenous/partnership methods relate well to more rural societies. His model also calls for partnership models to lead the way in ministry in more multicultural urban settings.¹⁵

A Biblical Mandate for Partnership

Looking at how God has chosen to operate throughout the scriptural record provides a foundation for a biblical basis for partnerships. The very creation of man hints at God's partnering method. "Let us make man. . . ." The placing of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden involved a cooperative agreement. It can be argued that God the landowner entered into a partnership agreement with Adam whereby Adam was allowed to enjoy the benefits of Eden in exchange for his obedience to God's commandments. A similar arrangement was made with Noah. God's plan involved one hundred years of shipbuilding, animal preservation, and preaching. Noah did his part, and God did his. God called Abram and made a covenant (partnership agreement) with him in Genesis 12:1-3. That agreement was renewed with subsequent generations. God called Moses to partner with him in the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage. Perhaps the greatest scriptural mandate for partnership comes from God's own model.¹⁶

The Bible emphasizes cooperation not competition. Paul frequently uses the word *sunergos* (fellow-worker). Being an apostle, it would have been easy for Paul to have claimed special position or authority. But the biblical reader constantly sees Paul in a position of teamwork with groups of people, and it appears that he was able to work harmoniously with them. Timothy, Titus, Priscilla and Aquila, Urbanus, Philemon, Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, Luke, Euodias, Syntche and many others are referred to as his "fellow-workers."¹⁷

Reading through the book of Acts as well as the epistles, we are left with the impression that the missionaries considered themselves to be working with the churches. Paul and his team returned to give a report of their missionary journey to those who had sent them out from Antioch. He travels to Jerusalem to seek to maintain good relationships with the church there. He writes to those at Philippi who have partnered with him in ministry. In addition to this horizontal aspect of partnership (churches working with missionaries and missionaries working with churches) there is an additional vertical dimension—the realization that all of them are working together with God and God with them.¹⁸

However, this cooperation does not blindly accept everyone and everything. Doctrinal and moral boundaries exist, and where there is serious doctrinal error or moral misconduct, partnership becomes an impossibility. Light and darkness, Christ and Belial, God and idols have

nothing in common. At the same time, doctrinal limits should not extend to non-essentials. These can be defined as “doctrines and practices regarding which equally biblical Christians, equally concerned to be submissive to Scripture alone, reach different conclusions.”¹⁹ A cooperative spirit marked Paul and his team. In reading Acts 13, we face the fact that the first missionary journey was not exclusively his idea. Perhaps it was not even revealed to him directly. All that is said is that the Holy Spirit spoke to a group of five church leaders among whom Paul and Barnabas were two. Paul constantly reemphasizes his apostolic calling is from God and yet, he is anxious that his ministry be recognized by the leaders in Jerusalem.²⁰ When controversy arose, there were no dictatorial decisions that were made to resolve the issues. Instead, the entire group made sincere efforts to determine how the Holy Spirit was leading them.

Charles Van Engen focuses on Ephesians 4:1-5:2 in developing a theology of mission partnerships. He draws the following implications from the Ephesians passage. First, we need to partner together because we all belong to Jesus Christ. Second, our partnership must have a purpose and that purpose relates to His mission. Third, we are a global *koinonia*. And finally, partnerships are primary. The fruit of the Holy Spirit becomes real in the day-to-day interaction of interpersonal relationships.²¹ Van Engen goes on to say that “the greatest harm to the gospel is when we say we obey the same Lord and believe the same gospel, but we compete, contradict, and conflict with one another in our witness to those who are not yet disciples of Jesus Christ.”²²

Frequently Asian non-Christians express confusion over the many denominational differences that they observe in Christianity. This not only relates to differences between Baptists, Presbyterians, and Assemblies of God but also goes on to include Mormons and the difference between Protestants and Catholics. The older Protestant community attempted to solve this problem and to cooperate in missions through comity agreements. This involved the dividing up of “missionary” territory with various churches/denominations agreeing to work only in designated areas. The best of intentions lay behind these agreements—showing respect for each other’s work, avoiding duplication of ministry, reducing the appearance of competition, and so on. However, in the long run, these comity agreements came up short. Rather than resulting in a spirit of cooperation, groups simply chose to ignore each other. There was no united effort to reach a designated country for Christ.²³

One further note needs to be added to the discussion of the biblical mandate for partnership. In 1 Corinthians 12 Paul uses the metaphor of the human body to describe our unity

in Christ. He also refers to the gifts of the Holy Spirit which are given to the church. Paul's concept of the gifts of the Holy Spirit is one of "mutuality and complementarity." In looking at this from a global perspective, it means that all of us are participants in God's mission. Van Engen points out that partnership is not the point. Participation in Jesus' mission is the issue. And the gifts of the Holy Spirit must be exercised in an atmosphere saturated with the fruit of the Spirit.²⁴

Hindrances to Partnership

The Lausanne Occasional Paper on cooperation in world evangelization lists several hindrances to partnership among which are: (1) control issues which frequently are reflected in territorial jurisdiction, fear of loss of power, and fear of being swallowed up; (2) relationship issues which range from attitudes of superiority, racial prejudice, competitive spirit, and fear of personnel being stolen; (3) communication issues which frequently are reflected by lack of understanding of goals as well as feeling threatened by others; and (4) financial issues.²⁵ Power and control issues must be confronted. Who is going to direct the partnership team? Who controls the agenda? In Western cultures, the partner who invests the most money usually expects to control the bottom line and set the agenda. When the pattern of the secular world creeps into partnership efforts between Western churches/agencies and ministries/groups in the Two-Thirds World, a danger follows of retreating back to the paternalistic spirit of the colonial era. Ray Wiseman says, "There is no biblical basis for the secular concept that money determines leadership."²⁶

All participating partners must earnestly search their hearts and motivations. It is too easy for pride in our own work and a desire to promote our own agenda to interfere with a "servant's heart" approach to ministry. We must constantly remind ourselves that it is God's work that we are doing. If the primary focus becomes the building of personal kingdoms rather than His, then protectionist attitudes for "our" territory will develop. Issues of control/power and conflicting authorities naturally develop during the term of any partnership. Each partner has turf to protect and a responsibility to personal donors and constituents for how money donated to the ministry is used. Each individual missions organization has its own set of working procedures. In such an atmosphere, the natural result is protection of personal interests. All of us enter any partnership viewing the work through the colored glasses of our own agendas.²⁷

Van Engen describes several “syndromes” that result when power or control issues become dominant in a partnership relationship. Money frequently is used as a means of control. We give money only when we are certain we can control its use. Sometimes we withhold money with the rationalization that it will benefit “them.” Money can be given to create dependencies. Power/control issues affect decision-making. One partner decides what the other partner needs. A variation of this occurs when the more financially able partner designs their own programs and expects others to work implementing the plans. Very little consultation goes into the decisions. “We have the plan; we have the money; therefore it will be done.” Being in a position of control feeds the ego and hinders the building of close relationships. Attempting to produce spiritual clones, doing things the way they were done “back home,” and listening to others in a condescending way are all symptoms of power/control issues.²⁸

If partnerships are going to operate at maximum effectiveness, then these issues must be addressed. Many such issues relate to spiritual pride. Distractions come when we allow ourselves to want to receive recognition for the development of large and effective ministries or when we worry about the loss of “our sheep” to “their ministry.” Who is going to get the credit for what the team accomplishes? Will people feel that the personnel from the other agency are more gifted in ministry than we are? These are often perceived as threats even though they should not be our ultimate consideration in our work for God.²⁹ Andrew Kaiser writes of the need for “due diligence” and the need for a high level of understanding between cross-cultural partnering groups. He expresses his doubts whether short-term or non-field based personnel will be able to investigate and understand such issues as church programs, history, personal concerns, theological concerns, leadership potential, and so on. Kaiser states, “For our church partnerships to be valuable and productive, we need long-term servants to function as mediators between the two partners.”³⁰

Career personnel play a vital role in the development of strong cross-cultural relationships. James H. Taylor III states that there are five essential ingredients to all effective partnerships: “unity of purpose, mutual trust, division of responsibility, collective decision-making, and good communications.” All five of these rise and fall upon relationships.³¹ Attitudes of superiority, racial prejudices, and competitive spirits hinder the development of good relationships. Overcoming these hindrances requires examination and possible changes in our

own personal attitudes. Key to accomplishing this is to realize the importance of unity in the body of Christ and to spend time together in corporate prayer.

Closely related to relationship issues are problems in communication. Language and cultural issues cloud effective communication. However, hiding behind language differences should never excuse making the sincere effort to communicate. Some basic questions serve as the basis for a start in partnership communication. What are your basic goals and how will they help our church? How can we avoid the duplication of ministries? How can we meet and talk and theologize and pray together on a local, regional, national, and world level? How can we better understand not only what you are thinking and feeling but why?³² Ajith Fernando, in responding to interview questions concerning the building of partnerships with nationals, made the following suggestions:

As far as I can see, the basic way to do this is to develop good fellowship with the leaders of the two groups developing into a partnership—to really become brothers and sisters in Christ. That takes time. It's not something that is forged by signing a contract or by a quick visit. . . . For that, they have to come to our country. It's a little complex, in that most often these people stay in hotels, which remove them from the people. I think it's much nicer if they can stay in our homes and become part of our people. . . . The whole thing that partnership requires is spiritual heart fellowship, where you get into a country and get the feel of the people, and that takes a lot of time. I think those who want to establish relationships will have to be willing to invest time so that the relationship is not just a business relationship.³³

There is no quick and easy way to do this. Spending time with each other improves communication and builds strong relationships.

Finally, there are financial issues. This hits at one of the fundamentals of the indigenous church principle—self-support. History shows that foreign funding of pastors, churches, and ministries do not usually contribute to the development of an indigenous church. Foreign funding creates unhealthy dependencies.³⁴ The following guidelines are helpful in developing a healthy framework for financial aspects of partnership. It is best to not give money directly to individuals. The support of one hundred percent of a ministry's need is not usually wise. Unless a long term relationship has been built with an individual it is often difficult to know what real intentions and motivations exist. Giving that is based on need alone becomes an endless cycle with no end in sight.³⁵ Relationship should never be based on the one way flow of finances.

Constant effort must be made to emphasize that money is not the most important resource in the partnership. There should be no interference or efforts to control decision-making or administration in the partner's organization or group. Don't hinder the development of faith or sacrificial giving by doing what might be best left to the other partner. There is more to resource sharing than finances. All efforts to control and manipulate through money must be resisted. And we must give ample opportunity for God to develop faith in those working with us.³⁶

Practical Suggestions for Implementation

General practical suggestions for building partnerships start with simply observing and practicing good communication habits. Daniel Ricketts gives the following excellent suggestions for building good team communication. First of all, each participating member should be clear about both their expectations of what will take place in the relationship as well as what each is capable of bringing to the team. Meeting often and talking about these items again and again helps avoid misunderstandings. This is especially critical in cross-cultural partnerships. Communicate to the point of over-communicating. Keep partners informed of developments or changes in direction. Be quick to ask for your partner's opinions. In cross-cultural relationships, remember that your partner brings an insider's opinion to the work in their area/country. Regard your partner as a trusted advisor. If the relationship is not strong, they will be hesitant to share from the heart and the benefits of honest insight will be missed. At the same time, if you view them as a trusted advisor, you probably have entered into the type of relationship where you can share freely your opinions and discuss openly where differences might exist.³⁷

Do not build unrealistic expectations in your partner. Some would argue that you should only get involved in projects that you are absolutely certain you can handle. However, such an approach does not encourage the exercise of faith or take into consideration that we also are partnering with an omnipotent God. Yet, we should be cautious in what we promise and the expectations that our partner has of what we can do in our relationship. Be aware of where your gifts and strengths lie and make those the focal point of what you commit as a team member. Build secondary relationships with a large number of people and be aware of their gifts and strengths as well. Sometimes recommending someone else who may be better suited to help or

seeking to enlarge the team by enlisting those people to work with us strengthens the partnership.³⁸

Goals for the partnership should reflect not only things to be accomplished or “doing” goals; they should also include relationship building goals or “becoming” goals. These types of goals build a foundation for future cooperation and a reputation that the partnership is not inward based or self-serving. A reputation for being interested in the personal development of all team members goes far in the development of a strong partnership.³⁹ Work, work, and work some more at being culturally sensitive and understanding the culture of all members of the group. A minimum understanding of the worldviews of all team members as well as a basic understanding of communication methods, conflict resolution styles, and value systems of the team members helps in building a successful partnership. Be a constant student of culture. Understand your culture as well as that of others. Become a student of the history of the participant members’ countries/ethnic groups. Observe. Ask questions. Avoid making quick judgments. Being perceived as having an inquisitive heart and a genuine interest in others opens the door to communication. Developing great team relationships requires the investment of large amounts of time. Christian ministry does not happen without meaningful relationships. Share your stories with each other. Talk about your differences. Dream together and pray together. As you do this, differences in understanding will surface, but they will surface in such a way that they are not hidden, but can be dealt with in an atmosphere of trust.⁴⁰

Do not be sidetracked by temptations to take shortcuts. Insist on accountability, and set the example by being accountable to others. When evaluating whether or not to partner with a particular person or group, study their past track record. How do they relate to other Christian ministries in their area/country? If they struggle in these relationships, then there is a strong possibility that you will also have similar challenges. Is there doctrinal agreement on key issues? What financial expectations exist on both sides? Is there a common commitment to sacrifice? Are you able to pray together?⁴¹

Finally, it is important to have an exit plan. Relationships are built for the purpose of discipling and mentoring. Do not lose sight of the bigger picture. Most partnerships are not started by individuals who are equal in every sense of the word. But growth should take place, and the time should come when multiplication and division can take place. Great partnerships plan for this.⁴²

How does all of this relate to Western missionaries partnering with the Two-Thirds World missions movement? The number of non-Western missionaries have steadily increased over the last forty years. The growth rate for missionaries from the Two-Thirds World for the decades of the 1970s and 1980s was five times greater than the growth rate for Western missions. However, statistical evidence for that same time period (up to 1988) indicated that the missions growth rate among Pentecostal/charismatic churches in the two-thirds world was lagging behind that of other evangelical groups. Dempster, Klaus, and Petersen projected that only about 40 percent of the missionaries and agencies from the two-thirds world were Pentecostal/charismatic whereas the percentage of Protestant church membership was much higher.⁴³

Larry Pate claims that the reason for this can be found in a faulty ecclesiology that has left the national church with “people-blindness” and a lack of missionary vision. “People-blindness” results in the national church failing to recognize the cultural barriers existent within their particular country. Assumptions were made that providing local Christians with evangelism training would result in their entire country being reached. What actually happened was the spread of the gospel within a particular people group while many surrounding groups remained untouched within that same country. Related to that was the failure of national churches being challenged to become missionary churches themselves.⁴⁴

Pate continues by observing that Bible school curricula in the two-thirds world was modeled on the Bible college curricula in the West with one notable exception. There was a shortage of missions and cross-cultural training courses.⁴⁵ This observation should lead us to a potential new role for Western missionaries in the two-thirds world that is compatible in partnership with the indigenous church model. Non-Western missionaries can perform many traditional missionary roles as well or better than their Western counterparts and with a smaller price tag. Also, as more non-Western leaders receive more advanced biblical and theological training it is only natural that they should be given more responsibilities in staffing their own Bible schools. But one of the key areas of need which can be met by Western missionaries involves the training of non-Western missionaries in missions and other cross-cultural ministry training programs. In addition, Western missionaries can lead in the development of networks and other strategic relationships that allow Western churches to participate effectively in partnership with non-Western mission agencies.⁴⁶

This needs to take place from the higher levels all the way down to the grassroots local church. "To fulfill the biblical mandate, local churches must be educated regarding basic biblical teaching on missions. Unless the grassroots level local churches understand, become mission minded, and committed to fulfilling the Great Commission, annual international conferences on the leadership level with a handful of individuals alone will not accomplish the task."⁴⁷

In summary, this provides an excellent way to network and partner with the local and national church in most Asian countries. Missions and cross-cultural training courses must be well represented in all Bible school curricula. In addition, these emphases should flow down to the individual local churches. The promotion of "people-awareness" and the providing of opportunities for participation in cross-cultural outreach will facilitate these types of partnerships. Furthermore, the promotion of an aggressive prayer ministry that targets unreached peoples will further challenge those in the local church to see the world with "missionary" eyes.

In responding to the question "Why Partnership?" Phill Butler listed the following reasons. (1) Church planting partnership is biblical. (2) Partnerships model the power of community witness. (3) Partnerships are the most effective way to develop a church. (4) Partnerships are needed because of volatile world conditions. (5) Partnerships maximize overstretched resources.⁴⁸ We must never forget that although the horizontal aspect of partnership is important, the most critical aspect is vertical which brings us into the proper relationship with the most important partner of all—God Himself, the Lord of the Harvest.

¹ Chin Do Kham, "Partnership Issues and Challenges in Asian Mission," in *Asian Church and God's Mission*, Wonsuk and Julie Ma, eds., (Manila, Philippines: OMF Literature, Inc., 2003), 47-48.

² Daniel Rickett, *Building Strategic Relationships* (Enumclaw, Washington: WinePress Publishing, 2003), 13.

³ Charles Van Engen, "Toward a Theology of Mission Partnerships," *Missiology: An International Review* 29 #1 (January 2001): 15.

⁴ Bill Peterson, "Advice on Joining a Partnership," *China Source* (Fall 2003): 7.

⁵. Paul Lewis, "Hodges, Williams and Contemporary China", Presented at the first International Pentecostal Missiology Symposium at APTS, Baguio, Philippines in April 2002, 1-3.

⁶ Melvin Hodges, *The Indigenous Church* (Springfield, Mo: Gospel Publishing House, 1976), 22, 42, and 74.

⁷ David Bosch, *Transforming Mission* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1991), 303.

⁸ Roland Allen, *Missionary Methods: St. Paul's or ours?* American Ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1962.

⁹ Gary McGee, *This Gospel Shall Be Preached: A History and Theology of Assemblies of God Foreign Missions to 1959* (Springfield, Mo: Gospel Publishing House, 1986), 30-33.

¹⁰ Lewis, 4.

¹¹ Gailyn Van Rheenen, “Using Money in Missions: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly,” *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 38 #1 (January, 2002): 44.

¹² Ibid., 43.

¹³ Christopher Little, “Partnerships in Pauline Perspective: The Economics of Partnership,” *International Journal of Frontier Missiology* 27 #2 (Summer 2010): 66.

¹⁴ Van Rheenen, 44.

¹⁵ Ibid., page 45.

¹⁶ Frampton Fox, “Partnership—More than a Buzzword,” *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 37 #3 (July 2001): 299-300.

¹⁷ “Cooperating in World Evangelization: A Handbook on Church/Para-Church Relationships,” Lausanne Occasional Paper (http://lausanne.org/printable_template.jsp?show-print=no&backPageID=14599&sm), Accessed 1/25/2006), 4.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid., 5.

²⁰ Ibid., 5-6.

²¹ Van Engen, 16-23.

²² Ibid, 18-19.

²³ Ibid., 21-22.

²⁴ Ibid., 18-27.

²⁵ Lausanne Occasional Paper, 1.

²⁶ Ray Wiseman, "The Fundamental Question in Mission-National Partnerships," *Didaskalia* 9 #1 (Fall 1997): 53-54.

²⁷ Van Engen, 11-12.

²⁸ Ibid., 25-26.

²⁹ Lausanne Occasional Paper, 18.

³⁰ Andrew Kaiser, "Cross-Cultural Partnerships in China Ministries: The Role of Due Diligence Research," *China Source* (Fall 2003): 3.

³¹ James H. Taylor III, "The Power of Partnership in Christian Professional Service," *China Source* (Fall 2003): 4.

³² Lausanne Occasional Paper, 8-11.

³³ Ajith Fernando, "Sri Lankan Leader Eyes Partnership," Interview with EMQ, *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 37 #3 (July 2001): 312-313.

³⁴ Rickett, 28.

³⁵ Ibid., 27-30.

³⁶ Ibid., 30-32.

³⁷ Daniel Rickett, "7 Mistakes Partners Make and How to Avoid Them," *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 37 #3 (July 2001): 309.

³⁸ Ibid., 310.

³⁹ Ibid., 311.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 312-314.

⁴¹ Ibid., 315.

⁴² Ibid., 317.

⁴³ Larry Pate, "Pentecostal Missions from the Two-Thirds World," in *Called and Empowered: Global Mission in Pentecostal Perspective*, Murray Dempster, Byron Klaus, and Douglas Petersen, eds. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1991), 245-250.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 250-251.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 251-252.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 254-255.

⁴⁷ Chin Do Kham, 45.

⁴⁸ Phill Butler, “Interdev-The Power of Partnership: Why Partnership?”
<http://www.ad2000.org/adoption/Coop/Partner/pidwhyp.htm>, accessed 1/25/2006.