A CASE FOR MONO-ETHNIC CHURCHES[1]

Ian Hussey

Director of Postgraduate Studies, Malyon Theological College, an affiliated institution of the Australian College of Theology

INTRODUCTION

In an increasingly globalised world, many Western churches have either become ethnically diverse or find themselves geographically located in ethnically diverse communities. Further, many Christians in Australia find themselves in ethnically diverse frontlines.[2] Because of this growth in ethnic diversity, many churches are more ethnically diverse than they were a generation ago. Coinciding with this "natural" change has been a growing push for churches to be deliberately ethnically diverse, or what some would call "multicultural."

Definitions vary significantly in this area. For the purpose of this paper, "multi-ethnic" refers to churches where no more than 80% of the congregation comes from the same ethnic group.[3] The term "multicultural" is reserved for churches that have *embraced* the ethnic and cultural diversity of their congregations and manifest that diversity in their operations. Hence it is possible for a church to be ethnically diverse but not multicultural if it continues to operate in a mono-cultural manner.

In contrast to the multi-ethnic or multicultural church is the mono-ethnic church. Using DeYoung's definition this means that the congregation is made up of over 80% of people who belong to the same ethnic group and that the church operates from a mono-cultural paradigm. Most churches in Australia are mono-cultural Anglo churches. Any ethnic diversity in these churches is often explained by the presence of skilled migrants. These migrants deliberately choose to come to Australia and often want their children to grow up in an English-speaking church. Although some skilled migrants to Australia prefer churches aligned to their ethnic backgrounds, many are quite happy to embrace the mono-cultural Anglo approach.

However, at various times in its history, Australia has welcomed refugees to its shores as well. These migrants generally do not wish to leave their homeland but are forced to do so by some geopolitical or socioeconomic scenario. Although they are generally very thankful to be in Australia, their commitment to embracing the Australian culture is often tempered by the grief of having to leave their homeland. Frequently these refugees have little or no English and struggle to feel at home in English-speaking churches. Understandably, these people wish to maintain their language and culture and they often do this by joining with, or forming, non-Anglo mono-ethnic churches, even if they attend an Anglo church as well. These

---

[1] My thanks to Rev. Emil Rahimov and Rev. Dr Greg Peckman who have been my conversation partners on the question of mono ethnic churches and so have contributed many ideas to this paper.

[2] "Your frontline is the place where you spend much of your time, where you meet people who don't know Jesus." London Institute of Contemporary Christianity, *Life on the Frontline Leader's Guide* (London: London Institute of Contemporary Christianity), 8. Frontlines are places like workplaces, social groups, schools and unsaved family members.

[3] Curtiss Paul DeYoung, *United by Faith: The Multiracial Congregation as an Answer to the Problem of Race* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 2.

churches not only provide worship services in their mother tongue but are a crucial social context which is accepting and supportive in what is sometimes a disorienting and, sadly, sometimes hostile environment. It is these churches that are the focus of this paper.

In the last 20 years there has been much interest in multicultural churches and their development.[4] Much of this scholarship has emerged from the American context, which continues to be influenced by the legacy of slavery[5], segregation and large-scale Latino migration—factors that are not relevant to the Australian context. According to Hardison, the vast majority of this scholarship has supported the case for multicultural churches and what he calls the development of the "multi-ethnic mandate" which says that *all* churches should strive to become as ethnically diverse as their surroundings.[6] In the multi-ethnic Australian context, this mandate has serious implications for both Anglo and non-Anglo mono-ethnic churches. It means that mono-ethnic churches are operating outside of the will of God for church life. This article seeks to bring a more nuanced and contextual perspective to mono-ethnic churches through a multidisciplinary methodology utilising theology, history and social science.

In raising this topic, I realise that I might be accused of being against multiculturalism. However, that is not the case. When I was the senior pastor of a church, I pushed hard for cultural diversity in the congregation. My wife and I have taught conversational English to migrants on and off for over 20 years. When we moved home and were looking for a new church, we deliberately chose an ethnically diverse congregation. In fact, the church we chose had over 60% of the congregation from non-majority ethnicities. It was one of the most ethnically diverse churches in Australia, and we loved it! Far from disliking multi-ethnic congregations, I have greatly enjoyed them and would recommend them to others as well. However, as will be discussed below, the issue of mono-ethnic churches is a contextual and complex one.

DEBUNKING THE MULTICULTURAL MANDATE

Hardison does a fine job in summarising the arguments for multicultural churches:

> The OT instructs Israel to welcome foreigners (Exod 22:21), and hospitality toward outsiders is a theme in the NT (Luke 10:25-37; 3 John 5-8). When Christ came as the Messiah for the Jews, he ministered across ethnic lines. His house will be a place of prayer "for all nations" (Mark 11:17), and his Gospel is now for all nations (Matt 28:20). Jesus also prayed that the church would be unified, which is a powerful witness to the watching world that Jesus was sent from the Father (John 17:21-23; cf. 13:34-35). Paul repeatedly affirms that Jews and Gentiles form "one new man" in Christ because the "dividing wall of hostility" has been abolished through the cross (Eph 2:11-22), and the "mystery" of the Gospel has now been revealed in Christ (Eph 3:1-6). Jew/Gentile equality is also seen in the fact they are baptized by the same Spirit (1 Cor 12:14). Hence, the distinctions between Jews and Gentiles are gone; they are now one (Gal 3:28; Col 3:11). As a result, the NT shows the importance of Jews and Gentiles experiencing table fellowship,

---

[4] See for example Mark DeYmaz, *Building a Healthy Multi-Ethnic Church* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2007); George Yancey, *One Body, One Spirit: Principles of Successful Multiracial Churches* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2003); Rodney M Woo, *The Color of Church: A Biblical and Practical Paradigm for Multiracial Churches* (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2009); David Stevens, *God's New Humanity: Biblical Theology of Multiethnicity for the Church* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2012).

[5] This is not to imply that Australia does not also have a history of slavery: https://theconversation.com/was-there-slavery-in-australia-yes-it-shouldnt-even-be-up-for-debate-140544.

[6] Richard Hardison, "A Theological Critique of the Multi-Ethnic Church Movement: 2000-2013" (Unpublished PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2015) 4. https://repository.sbts.edu/handle/10392/4853.

overcoming their cultural differences. When Peter allowed the church in Galatia to move in a homogeneous direction, Paul rebuked him for denying the "gospel" (Gal 2:11-14).

In addition, Paul's sending church in Antioch displays multi-ethnic leadership (Acts 13:1-2). The church at Jerusalem even created seven new leadership positions to overcome a rift in the church that could be traced back to ethnic differences. The churches in Rome, Corinth and Ephesus were also multi-ethnic. Finally, John's description of the heavenly assembly is certainly multi-ethnic, for the innumerable crowd surrounding Christ's throne was "from every nation, from all tribes and peoples and languages" (Rev 7:9), and the heartbeat of every Christian should be that God's will be done on earth as it is in heaven (Matt 6:10). Hence, those who favor the multi-ethnic mandate poignantly ask, "If the kingdom of heaven is not segregated, then why on earth is your local church?"[7]

In response to this evidence, Hardison asks five questions about the application of these texts to the US context:[8]

1. What is the relationship between the local church and the universal church, and which is in view in a particular passage?
2. To what extent do first-century Jew/Gentile relations correspond to ethnic distinctions in the United States today?
3. How does the NT concern for table fellowship between Jews and Gentiles influence this debate?
4. When the NT presents a church as multi-ethnic, should the interpreter treat this picture as descriptive or prescriptive?
5. How is the atonement related to racial reconciliation?

In answering these questions, Hardison reaches these conclusions about the mandate for all churches to be multi-ethnic:[9]

- Yes, Babel and Pentecost may be related, but Pentecost should lead Christians to contextualize the Gospel more, not less.
- Yes, Scripture commands believers to show hospitality to the foreigner, but hospitality can take many forms.
- Yes, Jesus said it would be a powerful evangelistic witness when Christians love one another, but such love does not have to be across ethnic lines to be meaningful.
- Yes, Scripture teaches the oneness of the church, but such unity is often expressed beyond the congregational level.
- Yes, Jews and Gentiles are now one in Christ, but this new reality is primarily the result of a covenantal shift happening in redemption history—not the result of the need to achieve ethnic diversity in the local church.
- Yes, the atonement destroyed the wall of hostility that separated Jews and Gentiles (Eph 2:11-21), but Paul's "wall" is neither racism nor a homogeneous worship environment—but the Mosaic Law.
- Yes, heaven is multi-ethnic, but we are not in heaven yet.
- Yes, the church at Antioch was probably multi-ethnic, but their diverse leadership was the necessary by-product of first-generation missionary activity in the area.

As one who has been previously convinced of the theological mandate for all churches to strive to be multicultural, I find Hardison's argument that Scripture does not mandate churches to be multi-ethnic quite robust. Even if not all of his arguments are thoroughly convincing, they at least bring into question the suggestion that *every* church *must* be multicultural or multi-ethnic. He does not let white mono-cultural

---

7 Hardison, "A Theological Critique," 14–16.
8 Hardison, "A Theological Critique," 16.
9 Hardison, "A Theological Critique," 16–17.

churches in ethnically diverse neighbourhoods off the hook, though, and concludes that they should be working towards being more ethnically diverse: "If the reader agrees that Scripture does not require churches to be multi-ethnic, perhaps there is still an ache in his or her heart that longs for it anyway. If that groaning persists, be glad. I believe the instinct is right."[10] I encourage those who remain convinced of the universality of a multi-ethnic mandate to read Hardison's thesis in full.

However, as a first step towards a more nuanced and contextually appropriate approach to the mono-ethnic church, whether it be Anglo or non-Anglo, Hardison's work at least suggests they are not necessarily operating in an unbiblical manner. But what can we conclude when we look at mono-ethnic churches through the lens of church health?

ARE MULTICULTURAL CHURCHES HEALTHIER?

One of the hypotheses of the multicultural church movement is that multicultural churches are healthier. Based on the 2011 Australian National Church Life Survey (NCLS), Duncum, Pepper, Hancock and Powell have compared the vitality of Anglo mono-ethnic, non-Anglo mono-ethnic and multicultural churches based on the NCLS's well-developed model of church vitality.[11] They defined non-Anglo mono-ethnic churches as those with at least 60% of their attenders who were born in a particular non-English-speaking country or set of countries. There were 44 mono-cultural non-Anglo churches in the dataset. Mono-cultural Anglo churches (n = 2,147) were those churches in which at least 80% of attendees were born in an English-speaking country. The remaining churches were classified as multicultural (n = 623), defined as being comprised of at least two cultural groups.

The NCLS model of church vitality is based on nine core qualities:[12]

Core quality	Core quality headline indicator
Alive and growing Faith	I have experienced much growth in faith at my church
Vital and nurturing Worship	I always/usually experience inspiration during the service here
Strong and growing sense of Belonging	I have a strong & growing sense of belonging here
Clear and owned Vision	I am strongly committed to the vision, goals & direction here
	Our leaders encourage us to a great extent to use our gifts here

---

10 Hardison, "A Theological Critique," 193.
11 Ian Duncum et al., "A Comparison of the Vitality of Monocultural and Multicultural Churches," *NCLS Occasional Paper 24* (2014). The NCLS research is largely based on church attender's self-perception and so is somewhat subjective. However, it is still a very sound basis for reflection.
12 Duncum et al., "A Comparison of the Vitality," 5.

Inspiring and empowering Leadership	
Openness to imaginative and flexible Innovation	I strongly agree our church is always ready to try new things
Practical and diverse Service	I have helped others informally in at least three of a number of listed ways (Secondary indicator: I regularly take part in community service, social justice or welfare activities of this church)
Willing and effective Faith-sharing	I invited someone to church here in the last year (Secondary indicator: I regularly take part in evangelistic or outreach activities of this church) (Secondary indicator: I feel at ease talking about my faith and look for opportunities to do so)
Intentional and welcoming Inclusion	Certain I would follow up someone drifting away from church

The model also includes three attendance measures:

- Newcomers – the percentage of the congregation who joined the church in the last five years and who never previously attended or have not attended church for a long period.
- Young adult retention – the percentage of the congregation who are 15-19 years old and who have been attending for more than five years.
- Attendance change – percentage change in the size of the congregation over the previous five years.[13]

The analyses by Duncum et al. were conducted for young adult retention and newcomers, but not for attendance change due to a lack of longitudinal data.

The research revealed that mono-cultural non-Anglo churches performed better than mono-cultural Anglo churches across all core qualities, except that Anglo churches performed better on informal helping and no differently on participation in community service/justice/welfare activities and vision. The mono-cultural non-Anglo churches also performed better than multicultural churches in all the core qualities, except for informal helping and participation in the church's outreach/evangelistic activities.[14]

However, the multicultural churches performed better than Anglo mono-cultural churches in most areas, except for service and participating in the evangelistic/outreach activities of their church where Anglo churches performed better.

---

[13] Ruth Powell et al., *Enriching Church Life*, 2nd ed. (Adelaide: Mirrabooka Press & NCLS Research, 2012). Of course, such growth measures do not reflect the witness borne by a church to the character God and the kingdom either corporately or individually.
[14] Duncum et al., "A Comparison of the Vitality," 5–6.

Mono-cultural non-Anglo churches were found to be particularly strong in three areas:

1. Worship (46% of attendees always experienced inspiration in worship, compared with 28% of attendees at Anglo churches and 35% of attendees at multicultural churches).
2. Faith-sharing (e.g. 52% of attendees had invited someone to church in the last year, compared with 35% and 37% of attendees at Anglo and multicultural churches respectively).
3. Inclusion (24% of attendees said they would certainly follow up a drifter from church, compared with 9% and 13% of attendees at Anglo and multicultural churches respectively).[15]

Mono-cultural non-Anglo churches were also strong in the area of sense of belonging — 60% of participants identified that their sense of belonging was strong and growing, compared to 51% for multicultural churches and 50% for Anglo churches.

These strengths are not surprising. One can understand that in the midst of the unsettling consequences of unwilling migration, worship services in your mother tongue would be highly inspiring. Given the dislocation associated with migration, it is relatively easy for Christians to reach out to others within their ethnic minority who do not go to church. They can offer them a very attractive "homeland" experience and a powerful sense of belonging in a strange land. The strong sense of community in non-Anglo mono-ethnic churches makes the follow-up of those who are drifting away not unexpected.

In terms of newcomers, 11% of mono-cultural non-Anglo attendees were not attending any church five years earlier compared to 7.2% for multicultural churches and 6.6% for mono-cultural Anglo churches. Similarly, mono-cultural non-Anglo churches were strongest at retaining young adults (3.3%), compared to 2.3% in multicultural churches and 2.0% in mono-cultural Anglo churches.

Mono-cultural non-Anglo churches also have higher percentages of young adults attending the same church as their parents. This would seem to confirm anecdotal evidence that second-generation migrants are less inclined to reject the mono-cultural church of their parents than some have expected. It is suggested that as a result of thankfulness and loyalty to their parents, that Australian-born children of migrants remain committed to the church of their parents even though it is largely irrelevant to them. It is the third generation who are more likely to move away from the ethnic churches of their grandparents. As DeYmaz says:

> it has been my experience in discussing this very thing with ethnic pastors that virtually all agree (despite what they and their congregants might otherwise desire): 1.0s[16] will have "two feet in" the ethnic-specific church; 2.0s will likely have "one foot in and one foot out;" and third generation offspring will in most cases have "two feet out."[17]

However, it should be noted the statistical variance around young adult retention in non-Anglo mono-cultural churches is quite large — some churches are doing much better than others in this area.[18]

The research conclusions are not definitive for a number of reasons apart from the relatively small sample size of non-Anglo mono-cultural churches. The results from the mono-cultural non-Anglo churches may be explained by their stronger evangelical persuasion than the other types of churches, rather than just

---

[15] Duncum et al., "A Comparison of the Vitality," 6.
[16] "1.0" refers to first generation migrants, "2.0" to second generation migrants.
[17] DeYmaz quoted in Duncum et al., "A Comparison of the Vitality," 7.
[18] Duncum et al., "A Comparison of the Vitality," 7–8.

their mono-cultural nature.[19] In addition, there were too few non-Anglo churches outside urban areas to test for the effect of location on the comparisons.

However, the research is strongly suggestive. It would appear that in terms of the well-developed NCLS measures of church vitality that non-Anglo mono-cultural churches are healthier than both Anglo mono-cultural churches and multicultural churches. This adds strength to the argument that not all churches must be multicultural to be healthy. A notion supported by the Homogenous Unit Principle.

THE PROBLEM OF THE HOMOGENOUS UNIT PRINCIPLE

Ever since McGavran introduced the Homogeneous Unit Principle (HUP) it has been controversial. Simply put, the principle is that "[People] like to become Christians without crossing racial, linguistic or class barriers."[20] It is essentially an application of the principle of gospel contextualisation to local churches. Contextualization, a term that emerged in the missionary movement in the 1970s, concerns the relationship between Gospel, church, and culture.[21] It incorporated words such as "adaptation," "accommodation," and "indigenization." It remains a core strategy of most cross-cultural missionary endeavours as the missionaries learn the language of those they are trying to reach, translate the Scriptures into their dialect and seek to foster churches that are contextually appropriate.

Although emerging from missionary experience, the Church Growth Movement applied the HUP to Western churches. The principle has been widely used in Australia. It has resulted in churches intentionally "targeting" certain demographic segments and designing their operations to focus on meeting the cultural needs of that particular segment. One manifestation of this is church plants that focus on a particular demographic.

However, the outworking of the HUP can also be seen in the relative health of mono-ethnic churches, whether they be Anglo or non-Anglo, as discussed in the previous section. It also questions the potential effectiveness of multicultural churches because they seem to deliberately ignore the advantages of exercising one's religious life in one's own culture and language.

Wagner argues for the HUP based on the fundamental Christian ethic of love and can be interpreted as follows:[22]

- Love admires creation — homogeneous churches celebrate cultural diversity.
- Love protects human dignity — homogeneous churches accept people as they are. Only a lack of love will insist that the price of God's grace is to abandon culture.[23]
- Love respects peoplehood — homogenous churches recognise that "group identity is powerful and will affect the way in which most people hear the Gospel."[24]

---

[19] Duncum et al., "A Comparison of the Vitality," 6.

[20] Donald Anderson McGavran, *Understanding Church Growth* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1970), 198.

[21] Darrell L Whiteman, "Contextualization: The Theory, the Gap, the Challenge," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 21, no. 1 (1997): 2.

[22] C. Peter Wagner, "How Ethical Is the Homogeneous Unit Principle?," *Occasional Bulletin of Missionary Research* 2 (1978): 12–22.

[23] Wagner, "How Ethical Is the Homogeneous Unit Principle?," 14.

[24] Wagner, "How Ethical Is the Homogeneous Unit Principle?," 16.

- Love throbs with a passion for the lost — homogeneous churches feel compelled to be sure that the Gospel is not just preached but also heard.[25]
- Love constructs no arbitrary barriers to the Gospel — just as the Council of Jerusalem concluded that Gentiles did not need to abandon their culture in order to be believers, homogeneous churches acknowledge the same reality.
- Love seeks theological integrity — contextualised theology is dependent upon independent homogeneous unit churches for authentic development.[26]

Wagner concludes that peoplehood (group identity), cultural integrity, and the church as a "place to feel at home" can be maintained in the intra-congregational sphere but that tangible expressions of brotherhood and interdependence should be expressed in the wider inter-congregational sphere. In other words, homogeneous churches are fine as long as they belong to a diverse association of churches. People should be free to join heterogeneous churches if they so desire, but they should not be forced to as long as the unity of Christ is expressed in the inter-congregational sphere.[27]

However, others are not convinced of Wagner's conclusions regarding the value of the HUP. Although conceding that people generally prefer to become Christians without having to cross the barriers between one context and another, Padilla[28] rejects the application of the HUP to local churches. Quoting Ignatius ("Where Jesus Christ is, there is the whole Church") he rejects Wagner's intra/inter congregational argument and concludes that each local congregation should manifest both the unity and the diversity of the body of Christ.

Padilla is wrong, however, in concluding that HUP's "advocates have taken as their starting point a sociological observation and developed a missionary strategy; only then, *a posteriori*, have they made the attempt to find biblical support."[29] Contextualisation clearly has a biblical basis.[30] He is right, though, in recognising the sociological support for the principle. Even ardent multicultural church advocate DeYmaz concedes, "undeniably, churches do grow fastest when they're homogeneous."[31]

As a result, more recent scholars have concluded that the HUP has a place in cross-cultural mission, but not in established churches. For example, DeYmaz argues that McGavran's primary intention for the HUP was never church growth but cross-cultural evangelism and discipleship.[32] He then proposes a model of church that involves homogenous churches targeting specific ethnic groups but also an intentional process of "graduated inclusion" guiding mature believers into a multicultural congregation.

To conclude, the problem with the Homogeneous Unit Principle is that it appears to work! For those of us who warm to the idyllic concept of multicultural church it is an "inconvenient truth." However, its apparent functionality and theological foundation in contextualisation also lends credibility to the existence of mono-cultural churches. Even if mono-cultural churches are only transitionary as DeYmaz has

---

[25] Wagner, "How Ethical Is the Homogeneous Unit Principle?," 14–15.
[26] Wagner, "How Ethical Is the Homogeneous Unit Principle?," 17.
[27] Wagner, "How Ethical Is the Homogeneous Unit Principle?," 18.
[28] C. Rene Padilla, "The Unity of the Church and the Homogeneous Unit Principle," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 6 (1982): 23–30.
[29] Padilla, "The Unity of the Church and the Homogeneous Unit Principle" 29.
[30] David J. Hesselgrave, *Contextualization: Meanings, Methods, and Models* (Pasadena:William Carey Library, 2013).
[31] Mark DeYmaz, *Should Pastors Accept or Reject the Hup?* (Little Rock: The Mosaix Global Network, 2012), 9.
[32] DeYmaz, *Should Pastors Accept or Reject the Hup?* 11.

advocated, there is a recognition of their place and value in multi-ethnic contexts. A case study from church history affirms this conclusion.

THE CURIOUS CASE OF THE GERMAN BAPTISTS

Finally, we turn to the discipline of church history. There are numerous examples of mono-cultural churches flourishing in largely homogeneous contexts in cross-cultural mission textbooks.[33] However, there are also examples of where non-Anglo mono-cultural churches have flourished in Australia. One such example is the curious case of the German Baptists in Queensland. During the last decades of the 19th century, over 15,000 Germans migrated to Queensland largely for economic, not religious reasons.[34] Some of these migrants were Baptists, and they settled and formed a number of churches in the farmlands to the West of Brisbane. A number of these mono-ethnic German-speaking churches experienced extraordinary growth. There is a photograph taken in 1905 of over 50 candidates for baptism, all dressed in white, lined up outside the Kalbar Baptist Church. Another church at Normanby Reserve grew from five to 60 in about four years.[35] A large group of German Baptists moved to Zillman's Waterholes in the West Moreton area in 1869. However, they were replaced with so many new converts that within two years it was necessary to build a church to house the flourishing congregation. Only 30 German Baptists arrived at Tarampa, but by 1877 the membership was 300.[36]

English speaking Baptists, when visiting the German Baptist churches, remarked on the intensity of the spiritual life they observed. In analysing the revival-like growth of these churches, Parker suggests that the migration to a strange land coupled with the relative isolation of their existence must have given intensity to their Christian fellowship.[37]

One Rev. Samuel Blum who visited Queensland from the USA in 1900 commented:

> We believe that there is a great deal of genuine piety in the hearts of German Baptists. They hold a sharp separation from the world. The candidates for baptism are examined very carefully, and church discipline is frequent. In missionary enterprises they are up-to-date, but in doctrine they are as old fashion as the first church in Jerusalem. In contribution they are liberal, and firmly believe on the expansion of the Lord's kingdom, even if their views of political expansion are narrow. It will take some time before they accept views of some doctrines, which are common in our English Baptist churches. We must take the German as he is.[38]

Despite his somewhat politically incorrect posture, it is clear that Blum is describing an extraordinarily vital collection of churches. By the 1920s the German Baptist churches were losing their identity as a separate community especially as a consequence of World War I at which time many of the churches became English speaking and generally Anglicised themselves. However, some of the churches continue to this day

---

[33] Hesselgrave, *Contextualization*.

[34] David Parker, "German Baptist Churches of South-East Queensland and Revival," *International Conference of Baptist Studies* VII (2015): 3.

[35] Parker quoting a letter in the collection of the Baptist Church Archives, Queensland.

[36] Richard Scanlan and David Parker, *Tarampa Baptist Church* (Brisbane: Baptist historical Society of Queensland, 2000), 7.

[37] Parker, "German Baptist Churches of South-East Queensland and Revival," 7.

[38] *Queensland Baptist Magazine*, August 1901, 108 as reported cited in Parker, "German Baptist Churches of South-East Queensland and Revival," 8.

as English-speaking congregations. They stand as a remarkable testimony to the effectiveness of non-Anglo mono cultural churches and appear to be a manifestation of the findings suggested by the NCLS and the validity of the HUP.

CONCLUSION: IT'S NOT THAT SIMPLE

As one who has in the past strongly advocated that, if only for the sake of their children, non-Anglo mono-ethnic churches should move to be multicultural churches utilising the English language, I am now more inclined to say, "it's not that simple." The factors discussed in this article highlight that to merely think of non-Anglo mono-ethnic churches as something to be tolerated in the short term, is unnecessarily simplistic (especially if espoused by a person who worships in an Anglo mono-ethnic church.) As much as I love being in a multicultural church, and as much as I am committed to the theological impulse that drives multicultural worship, I must accept that there is no such thing as the multi-ethnic or multicultural church mandate. Further, the empirical, sociological and historical evidence cited in this paper means that I cannot be as definitive about mono-ethnic churches as I would like to be.

This awareness should drive church leaders towards a more compassionate and understanding attitude towards those who embrace non-Anglo mono-ethnic churches. And it certainly should not give permission for Anglo mono-cultural churches to justify their mono-cultural make up when they are situated in ethnically diverse communities. Majority culture churches should acknowledge that there is a difference between the responsibilities that can legitimately be laid on a majority culture or host society and what is required of, or possible, for minority cultures and immigrant groups. Although some non-Anglo mono-ethnic churches can, and should, make the transition to English-speaking multicultural churches, this may not be the destiny of them all. Some of the non-Anglo mono-ethnic churches will flourish and grow and achieve much for the kingdom within their distinct ethnic communities. Their mono-ethnic ministry should be celebrated and their part in the collective diversity of an association of churches honoured. Some of these churches will continue to flourish to the second and third generation. As such they may outlive some of the Anglo mono-ethnic churches that judge them.