

Multicultural Church Planting Models

By Ken L. Davis, Director of Church Planting, Baptist Bible Seminary, Clarks Summit, PA

A Paper Submitted to Dr. David J. Hesselgrave, Ph. D.

In Partial Fulfillment for Requirements of the Course

Planting Churches in North America and Overseas

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Chicago, November 2001

Church planting in North America in the twenty-first century will take place amid two massive demographic trends: first, the numerical and cultural dominance of large urban centers, and second, the diversifying and browning of the population. Evangelical Christians must face both of these realities, continuing urbanization and rapid ethnic diversification. Over 85% of Americans live in cities today. With both immigration and intermarriage increasing, our total ethnic population now numbers over 100 million.¹ The nation's streets teem with over 500 ethnic groups speaking more than 630 languages and dialects (Romo 1993, 44). A recent Newsweek analysis states, "We are now living in an Age of Color in which the nuances of brown and yellow and red are as important ... [as] the ancient divisions of black and white" (Meachum 2000, 39). Multiculturalism in America is now an established fact.²

Consequently, in this century the United States will need a variety of multicultural interracial churches. Missiologist Charles Chaney observes, "America will not be won to Christ by establishing more churches like the majority of those we now have" (NAMB 1996, 6). In an increasingly multicultural and urban society at least four types of people do not fit into traditional homogenous churches: interracial couples and families;³ ethnic people who prefer speaking English; urbanites who "appreciate living, working and ministering in the midst of ethnic diversity" and Generation-Xers who often despise racial separatism (Ibid., 6-7). It will take new multicultural churches to reach these groups. In the past homogeneous churches have

been seen as the most productive but in the present social milieu that is changing. Now residents of highly educated, high income, racially mixed communities are often attracted to interethnic heterogeneous churches.⁴ So are many second, third and fourth generation immigrants as well as those living in ethnically changing urban neighborhoods.

Once fully convinced of the biblical imperative⁵ and the many practical reasons⁶ for starting multiethnic churches, it is vital we carefully select church models that hold the most promise for evangelizing and congregationalizing America's largely unchurched ethnic and multiracial multitudes. In this article we will briefly examine four strategic models God is using today.

We must first, however, settle on a working definition of a multicultural church. I would propose that the multicultural church is a biblical community of believers: (1) who intentionally recruit, recognize and embrace a diversity of peoples, (2) is committed to racial reconciliation, and (3) is working out administrative structures that assure the continuation of both unity and diversity.⁷ Underlying this overview of multicultural church planting models are two basic premises. First, in an increasingly pluralistic society, evangelicals will need a comprehensive pluralistic strategy to reach every segment of multiethnic urban America.⁸ Second, new churches will "grow best when they heterogeneously match their community with many various homogenous groups within the church" (Arn, 2-3).⁹ In short, the cultural character of churches in interethnic urban communities should normally follow the interactive pattern of peoples outside the church.¹⁰

Multicongregational Model

In this first approach a planting team would seek to start and organize a number of language and/ or ethnic congregations that would all share one facility. The focus is on starting multiple worship services, each designed to meet the needs of a particular cultural group. All the congregations are expected to work together in a continuing fellowship to build unity. All contribute to the “umbrella” church in finances, ministry and governance. Each congregation is autonomous and has its own pastor and lay leaders. Expenses associated with the use of the building are shared equitably. Often a coordinating council is set up, with leaders from each body represented. Periodically all the components of the umbrella church would gather for combined worship and united outreach. The level of interinvolvement among the congregations would depend upon the local context and the desire of the leadership.¹¹

There are numerous examples of growing churches utilizing this model. Two of the most studied are First Baptist Church of Flushing, New York, which has five language groups—English, Spanish, Filipino, Chinese and Portuguese (Ortiz 1996, 72-78; Pier 1996, 48-56) and First Church of the Nazarene of Los Angeles, which has four interdependent congregations—English, Spanish, Korean, and Filipino (Ortiz, 72-78; Benefiel 1996, 38-47; Appleby 1990, 95-105).¹²

What are the strengths of this model? First, this kind of church presents a strong evangelistic witness in the community. Second, with skyrocketing costs of urban property, this approach is good stewardship. Third, visitors and new members have a choice of language and worship styles; there is no compulsion. Fourth, this model recognizes an important church growth principle: the value of multiple cells and (sub) congregations.¹³ Finally, the multicongregational model recognizes and respects cultural differences, preserving homogeneity

at the fellowship level but intentionally planning for heterogeneous intercongregational times to build interethnic relationships. (Some schedule quarterly Sunday evening combined celebrations—“Sounds of Heaven”—with greetings, prayers, testimonies and special choir numbers in each language represented!) In summary, this exciting model promotes both unity and diversity in the body of Christ.

Multilanguage Satellite Model

Some of the fastest growing churches today sponsor satellite congregations which meet at various times and locations around the city. Sometimes satellites are even planted and led by lay pastors. Often worship services are held in apartments, community halls, mobile home parks or homes. This is one church in many locations.

New Life Community Church in Chicago has six satellite congregations with services in both English and Spanish. This exciting 1700-member multiethnic church has more than 95 home groups meeting throughout the city and suburbs. The pastors and leaders of all the satellites are part of a unified New Life staff and meet weekly for prayer and planning. All the congregations meet together several times a year at a civic auditorium for a grand celebration called “Taste of New Life.” This multisite body has a big vision to reach one percent of Chicago (Jobe 1999, 203-214; Pocock and Henriquez, 2002).

The strengths of this model are similar to the unisite multicongregational church. The satellite approach attracts young visionary leaders.¹⁴ Second, rather than opt for a “one-size-should-fit-all” approach, with multiple services in multiple sites this congregation can better adapt to the shapes (and cultures) of the city. Then too, its decentralized structure liberates it for rapid growth—the home groups meeting weekly are often organized around affinity groups and

thus have great evangelistic appeal. Fourth, people are unleashed to discover/use their gifts as they do ministry in their own neighborhoods and seek to better meet human needs. Finally, this church can readily reproduce itself in new satellite bodies. The daughter congregations can benefit from the support and the image of the mother church.

Cell-Celebration Model

In this model church planters intentionally launch numerous house groups (“cells”¹⁵) whose members also attend a weekly or biweekly celebrative worship service either at a central campus or rented hall.¹⁶ While these larger meetings are important, the focus of the church is fixed on the weekly cell meetings in homes because there authentic community, lay-led ministry, pastoral care, leadership development, prayer, accountability and evangelism all occur more naturally. Thus the life of the church is in the cells not in a building. The church is understood to be a dynamic, organic, spiritual being that can only be lived out in the lives of believers in community. The cells normally contain 5-15 people and are essentially disciple-making communities that network together and are expected/ designed to regularly reproduce.¹⁷ The beauty of this model for multicultural church planting is that the cells can be designed for particular ethnic, language, or generational groups.¹⁸

The cell-celebration church has great appeal to postmodern young adults who are turned off by “impersonal” traditional churches and are longing for more intimate relationships and for shared leadership. Cell churches are uniquely positioned to reach the next generation for Christ because they are not about institutions and property but about living rooms and people. Related to this is a second benefit: this model has strong evangelism and discipling potential. Cell churches are focused on the harvest. Third, the rapid assimilation of new believers into the life of

the church is enhanced by the cell group. Finally, the strong emphasis on training leaders to be able to train other leaders (every cell has both a coach and an apprentice) provides a constant pool of new lay workers for new outreach. Leadership and ministry are viewed as for everyone.

The best-known example of this innovative model is the Yoido Full Gospel Church in Seoul, Korea with 25,000 cell groups and a quarter of a million believers gathering for multiple Sunday services.¹⁹ In the United States two dynamic churches, among others, dispel the myth that cell churches cannot grow in American soil. Bethany World Prayer Center in Baton Rouge has over 700 multiplying cells with 8,000 Sunday worshippers. Victory Christian Center in Tulsa has nearly 12,000 in worship and 1,000 cells. Both of these urban churches have reportedly crossed cultural boundaries in both their cells and celebrations (Comiskey 2001, 29).²⁰

Multiethnic Church Model

A multiethnic church may be defined as a culturally and ethnically diverse body which: (1) meets together as one congregation, (2) utilizes one language, usually English, yet (3) designs its worship services and ministry for a variety of cultural groups. This model would normally be selected for a church plant when all or most of the local cultural groups speak a common language (though this may not be the mother tongue of some) and they are for the most part upwardly mobile socio-economically. Commonly, the targeted ethnic groups all desire their children to learn and socialize in the language of the church.²¹ Interracial couples will also be particularly attracted to this kind of a church.

Research shows that for a truly multiethnic church to succeed there must be both quantitative and qualitative dimensions in place. Not only must there be significant numerical

presence of various ethnic groups but the church must be committed to contextualize its entire ministry and administrative structures to adequately represent and involve each group in the very life of the body (Ortiz, 88-91). Informal blended worship services would be needed, carefully sprinkled with songs, prayers and a wide variety of musical instruments (usually more strings and brass). To keep the heritage of each ethnic group alive, cultural holidays, national costumes, ethnic foods and international dinners would all be encouraged and celebrated whenever possible (Appleby 1986, 96-97). The final goal cannot be the mere maintenance of ethnic diversity but the discipling of all ethnic participants so that they “become responsible members of the local ministry” (Ortiz, 91).

Two multiethnic congregations with an urban impact exemplify this model. The International Bible Church in Los Angeles has blended fifteen ethnic groups.²² Pastor Mark Oh, a Korean American, stresses strong expository preaching and individual discipleship training in order to produce a more unifying “Christ-culture” which transcend ethnic differences (Ortiz, 91-95). Rock of Our Salvation Church in Chicago, led by Pastor Raleigh Washington and Glen Kehrein, is primarily a bicultural (black/white) congregation with smaller numbers of other groups. This church crosses not only ethnic lines but also class lines. In an effort to be preventative, Rock’s leaders seek to head off potential conflict by providing regularly scheduled forums for frank communication – “Chocolate, Vanilla and Fudge Ripple” sessions! (Kachur, 1988, 21-23; Ortiz, 98-105).²³ Other growing multiethnic churches in American cities give evidence that this model, though not for everyone, does attract many.²⁴

Of the four models surveyed, the multiethnic church will take the most work. Ortiz recommends fasting and prayer (105). Racial reconciliation between blacks and whites in itself is sometimes complicated; the task is even more challenging when Hispanics, Asians or others

are included. However, the rich rewards of enhanced community witness and the opportunity to disciple previously unreached peoples, make the multiethnic church well worth it.²⁵

Conclusions

This century will be a golden opportunity era for urban and ethnic harvesting. Evangelical church planters must address the complexities of North American diversity in creative and productive ways. These four models are not meant to be exhaustive but illustrative of how dynamic urban churches are effectively building bridges and reaching out cross-culturally to others with the Gospel. To plant a multicultural church requires hard work, wisdom, cultural sensitivity, a learner's spirit, openness to God's redirection, and above all, much dependence on God's sufficient grace.

In order to select the best church planting model, we must remember that no two urban situations are the same.²⁶ Each community, language and congregation may need its own action plan. Each of these models can be adapted to fit local contexts, without loss of workability.²⁷ When an already established English-speaking congregation is located in a diverse area, a multicultural church can be started in several ways: by natural birth, adoption, implantation, or transition (Appleby 1986, 83-92).²⁸

The multicultural church matches a need in our society. Urban missiologist, Harvie Conn, in the "Forward" to Ortiz' book, *One New People*, clarifies this point:

In a day of fear and distrust the multiethnic church is a sample of recomposition in Christ. *E pluribus unum* is a visionary slogan in politics; in the multiethnic church it is a response of the Holy Spirit to culture wars. It is well worth more than a quick glance by a fractured society seeking unity in too many superficial solutions, and by a church that often doesn't realize the treasure it has been given. (1996, 11)

In cities across this globe, God is already gathering together people of every language and tribe and people and nation to worship Him now and for all eternity. Multicultural churches are microcosms that simultaneously reflect a fulfillment of God's Great Commission (Matt. 28:18-20) and foreshadow the reality of His heaven (see Rev. 5:9-10; 7:9-10; 14:6-7; 15:4; 21:3). They are an example of what God is doing on earth and a foretaste of what will be in eternity (NAMB, 4-5).

Works Cited

- Appleby, Jerry L. 1986. *Missions have come home to America*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press.
- _____. 1990. *The church is in a stew: developing multicongregational churches*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press.
- Arn, Win. n.d. A fresh view of the homogenous unit concept. *The Win Arn Report*, no.1: 2-3.
- Benefiel, Ron. 1996. Transitional communities and multicultural ministry. *Urban Mission* 13:4 (June) 38-47.
- Chaney, Charles L. 1993. Church planting: an apostolic opportunity in urban transitional communities. In *Church planting at the end of the twentieth century*, 237-259. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers.
- Comiskey, Joel. 2001. The 10 largest cell churches in the world. *Cell Group Journal* (Winter): 26-30.
- Conn, Harvie M. and Manuel Ortiz. 2001. *Urban ministry: the kingdom, the city and the people of God*. Downer's Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Foster, Charles R. 1997. *Embracing diversity: leadership in multicultural congregations*. Alban Institute, Inc.
- George, Carl F. 1991. *Prepare your church for the future*. New York: Revell Publishing.
- Jobe, Mark. 1999. Rethinking the church to reach the city: the city-size vision of New Life Community Church. In *A heart for the city*, ed. John Fuder, 203-214. Chicago: Moody Press.

- Kachur, Robert M. 1988. Fudge ripple at the rock. *Christianity Today*, 4 March, 21-23.
- Kasindorf, Martin and Haya El Nasser. 2001. Impact of census' race data debated. *USA Today*, 13 March.
- Logan, Robert E. and Jeannette Buller. 2001. *Cell church planter's guide*. St. Charles, IL: Church Smart Resources.
- Logan, Robert E. and Steven L. Ogne. 1991. *The church planter toolkit*. St. Charles, IL: Church Smart Resources.
- Maluga, Tom. 1999. Multiplying churches to take cities for Christ. In *A heart for the city*, ed. John Fuder, 171-186. Chicago: Moody Press.
- McGavran, Donald A. 1990. *Understanding church growth*, revised. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Co.
- Meachum, Jon. 2000. The new face of race. *Newsweek Magazine*, 18 September, 38-41.
- Neighbour, Jr., Ralph W. 2000. *Where do we go from here? A guidebook to the cell group church*, revised. Houston, TX: Touch Publications.
- North American Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. 1999. *A guide for planting multicultural churches*. Alpharetta, GA: NAMB
- Ortiz, Manuel. 1996. *One new people: models for establishing a multiethnic church*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Peart, Norman Anthony. 2000. *Separate no more: understanding and developing racial reconciliation in your church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Pier, McKenzie. 1996. First Baptist Church: heaven's mirror in Flushing, New York. *Urban Mission* 13:4 (June): 48-56.
- Piper, John. 1993. *Let the nations be glad: the supremacy of God in mission*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Pocock, Michael and Joseph Henriques. 2002. A captivating model of the multicultural church. In *Cultural change in your church: helping your church thrive in a diverse society*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Rhodes, Stephen A. 1998. *Where the nations meet: the church in a multicultural world*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

- Romo, Oscar I. 1993. *American mosaic: church planting in ethnic America*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press.
- Sanchez, David R. 1979. A five year plan of growth for the ministry of the Baptist Convention of New York in the area of evangelism. Ph.D. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary.
- Smallman, William. 2002. The homogenous unit principle. Unpublished class notes, Baptist Bible Seminary.
- Thompson, Barbara. 1988. The gospel in black and white. *Christianity Today*, 4 March, 18-20.
- Yamamori, Tetsunao. 1979. How to reach ethnics. In *The pastor's church growth handbook*. Pasadena: CA: Church Growth Press, 171-183.
- Washington, Raleigh and Glen Kehrein. 1993. *Breaking down walls: a model for reconciliation in an age of racial strife*. Chicago: IL: Moody Press.

NOTES

¹ The 2000 Census revealed that our total ethnic population includes 36.4 million African Americans, 35.3 million Hispanics, 10.2 million Asian Americans, 2.9 million Native Americans, 5.1 million Americans who count themselves as “multiracial,” and another 15.4 million who belong to “other races.” These figures reflect the author’s adjustments. The 1.7 million Americans who claimed to be black and another race are included under the African American category; the Asian and Pacific Islander numbers are combined; Native Americans include Hawaiian and Alaskan. This actually adds up to *105.3 million ethnic Americans or 37.4%* of the 2000 population of 281.3 million!

² This *fact* of demographic multiculturalism must be carefully distinguished from the relativistic *ideology* that goes by the same name and is seeking to transform America’s educational and political institutions. Conservative Christians can accept the first while rejecting the second.

³ The 2000 Census for the first time gave people the opportunity to choose more than one race to describe themselves, and 2.4% of the country’s 281.4 million citizens did so. Multiracial or mixed race Americans currently number at least 6.8 million. As this “blending of America” continues, racial lines may blur until the “melting pot” becomes a harmonious “we-are-the-world” reality. By 2050, 21% of Americans will be claiming mixed ancestry, according to some projections (Kasindorf and El Nasser 2001). The U.S. is mestizing! That is to say, we are a “browning” nation which is shifting rapidly toward being a polyglot of brown, yellow, black, white and mestizo (mixed). For example, California’s population is now predominately “minority” – Hispanics, African Americans, Asians and “mixed” groups now comprise 50% of the state’s population. This will be a reality in Arizona by 2005, in Texas by 2010, and for the entire nation by the year 2050.

⁴ Interethnic multicultural churches will be particularly attractive to that segment within each ethnic group that has low “ethnic consciousness.” For example, those in an ethnic group who are socio-economically upward in mobility tend to associate themselves with Anglos and other ethnics, feeling comfortable among them. Tetsunao Yamamori defines ethnic consciousness as “the intensity of awareness of one’s distinct peoplehood based on race, religion and/or national origin.” (1979, 182). This Christian social researcher has given a valuable index scale that would help church planters identify the relative intensity of ethnic consciousness among any potential targeted

ethnic group (Ibid., 182-184) and thus arrive at the best approach for reaching them. There will always be some within an ethnic group – those with high ethnic consciousness – who will be repelled by a church intentionally seeking to mix groups. Other models (“identificational” or more homogenous church models) will be needed to reach them. Those with high ethnic consciousness are sometimes referred to as “nuclear ethnics.” Oscar Romo, former head of language missions for the southern Baptists, has given a helpful spectrum that enables one to see the *differences within each ethnic group* (1993, 72-74). The point is that different kinds of churches will be often needed to reach everyone within a particular ethnic group!

⁵ To build biblical conviction regarding why we should have multicultural churches, the author recommends study of these core passages: Genesis 12:1-3; Matt. 28:19-20; Acts 6:1-7; 11:19-26; 13:1-3; Eph. 2:14-22; Gal. 3:26-28; Rev. 5:9-10; 7:9-12. John Piper (1993) best summarizes God’s overarching missiological purpose: “God’s great goal in all history is to uphold and display the glory of His name for the enjoyment of His people from all the nations.” For a full discussion of the biblical/theological basis for both racial reconciliation and the need for multiethnic churches see Norman Peart, *Separate No More* and Stephen A. Rhodes, *Where the Nations Meet*. To understand the biblical rationale for reaching unreached ethnic groups (or *ethne* = peoples = “nations”) see John Piper, *Let the Nations Be Glad!*, Baker, 1993, 167-218.

⁶ For solid current discussions of both the demographic and sociological rationale for multicultural churches see Manuel Ortiz, *One New People: Models for Establishing a Multiethnic Church* (1999); George Yancy, *Beyond Black and White: Reflections on Racial Reconciliation* (1996); and Stephen Rhondes, *Where the Nations Meet: The Church in a Multicultural World* (1998). Most of the pragmatic reasons for building multicultural churches can be boiled down to one basic premise: culturally and racially mixed congregations make a stronger statement to a watching world about the power of the Gospel.

⁷ Defining a multicultural church is not an easy task. Scholars and practitioners seem to have widely differing understandings. To compare five definitions gathered by Ortiz as well as his own observations see *One New People*, 86-91, 149-150. For a well-thought out definition used by the Southern Baptists’ Multicultural Church Network see *A Guide For Planting Multicultural Churches* (p. 16). My proposed definition is purposely broad to include both multilanguage and English only churches as well as congregations with multiple services or a single blended worship service. Careful readers should note that with my understanding of an intentionally heterogeneous church we are not calling for: 1) *assimilation* (the blending of one culture into another, usually the majority one), 2) mere *integration* (being just “open” to everyone to come, or 3) *syncretism* (the bringing together of two or three cultures – or religions—to create a new culture/religion. The goal is not homogenizing or Anglo-Americanizing the group until the expression of Christian faith is incredibly tasteless, offending no one, and satisfying to no one. By multicultural churches we are calling for a new paradigm of church which makes “intentional choices to mix, accept, represent, and manifest racial and ethnic differences, but at the same time [magnifies] ... the oneness of believers in Christ...” (Peart, 2000, 140). Very helpful is Dr. Peart’s “reconciliation continuum,” consisting of five types of churches or models (pp. 129-142.)

⁸ For an example of a reasoned and balanced discussion of how to develop a multifaceted yet theologically and culturally sensitive strategy for effective ethnic church planting, see Charles Chaney, “Church Planting: An Apostolic Opportunity in Urban Transitional Communities” in *Church Planting at the End of the Twentieth Century*, 237-259. Most noteworthy is Chaney’s recommendation of David Sanchez’s growth plan for the Baptist Convention of New York which sprang out of Sanchez’s doctoral work at Oxford University. For the more extensive study see David R. Sanchez, “*An Interdisciplinary Approach to Theological Contextualization with Specific Reference to Hispanic Americans*” (Ph. D. dissertation, Oxford Centre of Mission Studies, Oxford), 91-151.

⁹ With Dr. Win Arn, I stand in opposition to the “homogeneous unit principle” (HUP) as *popularly understood and sometimes practiced*. Unfortunately discussions of this controversial church growth concept often generate more heat than light. Though the HUP has been carelessly equated by some to racism, that is a stereotype, not derived from a careful reading of Donald McGavran (see *Understanding Church Growth*, 1980). McGavran never meant for the HUP to be prescriptive but descriptive of cultural realities. In this ongoing debate the author would take a somewhat mediating position: the heterogeneous church is a scriptural concept toward which all of us

must strive; likewise the homogenous church can be a scriptural and effective way of beginning and moving a people group toward the scriptural ideal. Thus the often-heard statements that the homogenous church is not scriptural or that the heterogeneous church cannot be successful (growing) are both untrue. There is increasing evidence that multicultural churches that match their community mix are growing today in many American cities. See, for example, the story of Culmore United Methodist Church in Falls Church, VA as told by the church's pastor, Stephen A. Rhodes in *Where the Nations Meet: The Church in a Multicultural World*.

¹⁰ This second premise means that if several HU's in the surrounding community are essentially friendly and mutually respectful, it is wise to evangelize them through a church which is consciously multiethnic. If there is animosity among the HU's, and especially if they use different languages in their homes, it may be wiser to evangelize them with initially separate churches (or at least separate language services) designed for each group's styles and preferences. Significantly, McGavran referred to non-Christian groups which distrust one another, are not normally friends, and do not interdine or intermarry, as "unassimilated contiguous homogenous units." Ethnically diverse churches are not meant for them but are best for mixed urban communities which are intentionally and comfortably diverse and where groups are mutually respectful/supportive. (For these distinctions I am indebted to Dr. William Smallman, "The Homogenous Unit Principle," unpublished class notes, n.d., 1-3).

¹¹ Ortiz describes three levels of congregational involvement in multicongregational churches he researched: 1) The "*renting model*" (with superficial relationships), 2) the "*celebrative model*" (with some shared ministries but still no intention to share ownership of the building -- this is seen as "paternalistic"), and 3) the "*integrative model*" (where each language congregation not only shares in the ownership of the facility, but is incorporated into the life/structure of the church (1996, 66-72).

¹² Other multicongregational churches with effective ministries could be cited: Uptown Baptist Church in Chicago with seven subcongregations worshiping in English, Spanish, Bulgarian, Russian, Cambodian, Vietnamese and Swahili/English (Maluga 1999, 171-186); Temple Baptist Church, Los Angeles and Nineteenth Ave. Baptist, San Francisco (Wagner 1979, 159-160). The Church of the Nazarene, which in 1984 counted 121 multicongregational churches, predicted that at least 30% of its North American churches would eventually be multicultural/multicongregational (Appleby 1986, 87). A recent study of several Mennonite/Anabaptist denominations entitled "The Diversity Project" lists numerous of multicultural churches in their circles (see www.newlifeministries-nlm.org/online/aec00_diversity3.htm). This site also gives practical suggestions for organizing such churches.

¹³ Ortiz, in his research, found that all the multicongregational churches he evaluated were growing both quantitatively and qualitatively (1999,76).

¹⁴ This is seen in the New Life Community Church leadership team – all are young men below thirty (see Jobe 1999, 203-214).

¹⁵ In some overseas settings the term "cell" is to be avoided because it has communist or even terrorist implications. Some may prefer to use other terms such as "home groups," "discipleship groups" or "sheepfolds." Normally American church growth and church planting advocates prefer to use cell group because of the biological model. The cell is an organic and integral part of the body and made up of the same material. Likewise, the Church is best seen as a "Body" and thus should be expected to naturally reproduce itself.

¹⁶ The cell-celebration church being described here is to be carefully distinguished from "a church with/of small groups" which is still fundamentally organized around Sunday services (and committees or programs.) The cell-celebration church is in many ways a paradigm shift away, because the home cell groups are the focus of church life—winning the lost, caring for the found, and empowering people for ministry. This unique "two-winged" church is also to be distinguished from a "house church" which has no larger gathering and is an independent complete church (of generally 10-30 people) in itself, led by a lay pastor.

¹⁷ Carl George sees the cell-celebration church as a new paradigm which he calls the “meta church” (to be distinguished from the “mega church”) because it calls for such radical change in the thinking of both pastor and people (1991, 50-81). The original and still primary advocate of this non-traditional model is Ralph W. Neighbor, Jr. (*Where Do We Go From Here? A Guidebook for the Cell Group Church*. Houston, TX: Touch Outreach Ministries, 1990.) For practical instructions on how to start a cell church see Logan and Buller’s *Cell Church Planter’s Guide* (2001).

¹⁸ Conn and Ortiz comment, “In the small [cell] group one finds a stronger measure of accountability, greater flexibility and a deeper rooting in the local community and culture that is missing from the regional focus of the mega church” (2001, 247). Thus, if the local context is multicultural the cell groups should reflect this.

¹⁹ For a good descriptive overview of “The Ten Largest Cell Churches in the World” see the article by the same name in *Cell Group Journal*, Houston, TX: Winter 2001, 26-30.

²⁰ Comiskey’s article cited above (FN#19) lists other growing U.S. cell churches. For the story of the New Hope Community Church in Portland, Oregon see Dale E. Galloway, *20/20 Vision: How to Create a Successful Church with Lay Pastors and Cell Groups* (Portland, OR: Scott Pub. Co., 1990). A list of U.S. cell churches by state can also be accessed at www.touchusa.org.

²¹ An English-speaking multiethnic church should be able to reach second and third-generation immigrants whose skills in their native tongue are often limited.

²² International Bible Church has “Anglos, American Indians, Asian Indian, Black, Chinese, Guatemalans, Filipinos, Korean, Mexicans, Salvadorans, Russian, Taiwanese, Thais, and Ukraine.” (Ortiz, 91).

²³ Washington and Kehrein, the black/white pastoral team of the “hybrid” Rock church, offer eight insightful principles for developing a multiethnic church focused on biblical racial reconciliation: commitment to relationships, intentionality, sincerity, sensitivity, interdependence, sacrifice, empowerment and call. These are discussed at length in their recommended book, *Breaking Down Walls: A Model for Reconciliation in an Age of Racial Strife* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1993).

²⁴ Other examples of U.S. multiethnic churches that are growing in urban settings: Atlanta Metropolitan Christian Center (Thompson 1988, 18-20); Culmore United Methodist in Fairfax, VA (Rhodes 1998); Tremont Temple Baptist in Boston (Ortiz, 88), Uptown Baptist Church in Chicago (with over 30 different nationality groups: Anglos, African Americans, ten Caribbean nations, ten African nations, six Hispanic nations, and a dozen Asian nations!); Oakhurst Presbyterian Church in Atlanta (Foster 1997); Covenant Church of Pittsburgh; and the Salvation Army churches in many cities.

²⁵ To hear a convincing testimonial of both the challenges and reward of pastoring a multiethnic church read the exciting story of Culmore United Methodist as told by its pastor by Stephen Rhodes (1998).

²⁶ For helpful criteria in the selection of a church planting model see Steffen, *Passing the Baton*, 1997, 80-86.

²⁷ For example, for newly arrived immigrants and refugees who have a strong desire to learn English and to get a good American job, rather than launching multi-worship services immediately, it might be wiser to first start simultaneous multi-language Sunday School or Bible study classes with worship conducted in English only. Later worship services might be started for a few of the language groups that have been most receptive to the gospel.

²⁸ Like any new church, multicultural churches can be planted through a variety of start-up strategies. Logan and Ogne, in *The Church Planters Toolkit*, list at least nine options, all of them applicable to multicultural church planting: pioneering, branching, colonizing, seeding, adopting, partnering, revitalizing, transplanting, and catalyzing (1991, 4/3).