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I. Defining Terms:

The terms "homogeneous" ("one kind") or "homogeneity" ("the principle/occasion of one kind") and "heterogeneous ("many kinds") or "heterogeneity ("principle/occasion of many kinds") is normally understood for the purposes of this discussion to address the issue of unity and diversity in the city.

Generally, homogeneity or heterogeneity is thought to describe people groupings usually on the basis of ethnic or racial differences. However, it can include many different kinds of groupings including linguistic, cultural, political, lifestyle (i.e. homosexuals) division, age sets, professional associations, sociological and class identities, or even special needs such as the disabled. What it suggests is that these groupings function in much the same way as tribes used to function with their commonness based on self- and other- perception; who are we? who are they?

The commonalities that bind groupings together include initiation rites into the groupings, shared rites of passages, symbols, totems, rites, who you must marry (endogamy, within the tribe) and who you can’t marry (exogamy, must marry outside, or it is incest), common worldview, language, taboos, gestures—in all, a general sense of “sharedness.”

Life was relatively simple when a community shared all the same characteristics, i.e. language, religion, worldview, value systems, ethnicity and general needs. However, in the increasing complexity of modern day cities brought about by increased communication, mobility, political realignments, and economic pressures, populations are moving around the globe with the flair of climactic changes.

II. Understanding the Historical Context of the Discussion

The terms “homogeneous” and “heterogeneous” came into vogue in missiological theory in the 1970’s through the writings of missionary Donald McGavran. Having served as a career missionary in India, he observed that within the limits of the caste and social class systems there, the Gospel spread the quickest and most efficiently where the “natural bridges” of relationship already existed. People who had commonality of “face, place, race and grace” are more inclined to receive the Gospel than those who are sociologically or culturally distant. As he describes this phenomenon, he doesn’t sanction it or make value judgments about it. He merely suggests that these connections are a natural advantage in communicating the Gospel. He also was concerned that the Gospel address people groups in their entirety and not just one at a time. Obviously, within the Indian context where the Brahmins do not touch the “Untouchables” nor have dealing with them, homogeneity ruled social relationships on a scale unknown in the West.

The Church Growth Movement of Fuller Theological Seminary, where McGavran later taught, opened up a discussion about accountability, efficiency and the placement of resources where receptivity was heightened. The combination of homogeneous evangelism and efficient application of resources led many proponents to see homogeneity as “prescriptive” rather than “descriptive,” with the result that focus was placed less on cross-cultural evangelism than on seeking connectedness with one’s own kind of person.
Homogeneous evangelism may see quicker results and may allow for a greater degree of contextualization. However, over time it can become an excuse for developing a culturally convenient and skewed form of the Gospel that does not challenge its core assumptions and becomes more cultural than Christian.

Heterogeneous evangelism struggled to integrate a variety of cultural expressions. Its appeal may be broader but more tedious, more reflective and more uncertain. Yet its survivability in changing contexts is more assured because of its adaptive qualities.

III. The City and Diversity

Urban areas concentrate this diversity. They are usually the “port of entry” locations where moving populations land first. Recently, I was in Anchorage, Alaska, where much of the world imagines that “Eskimos” live. I didn’t see any Eskimos, now variously called Native Peoples, Inuits, Aleuts, First Nations (in Canada), etc. Instead, I found that there were Spanish-language congregations, Samoan and Chinese congregations, and Filipinos attending Nazarene churches. What one might think was a hotbed of homogeneity really displays considerable heterogeneity.

Though the mythology of the past thought that migrant people would blend into the whole in an assimilation process known as the “melting pot,” the results look more like a “salad bowl” where diverse elements maintain their uniqueness but contribute to the whole, or a “stew pot” where the blending does not rob the constituent elements of their uniqueness but shares the flavor of culture with the new whole.

IV. Responses to Diversity:

Many urbanites are threatened with this influx of diversity within their communities. Any time two diverse groups come into contact with each other, they either reject, appropriate (borrow from), cooperate, or amalgamate. Often, the early encounters are based on curiosity. Later, they are rivals. And finally they accommodate.

However, generally speaking, considerable tension occurs before people groups reach some sort of satisfactory accommodation. From there, groups may acculturate, assimilate and finally truly integrate into a new whole.

Urbanites are threatened or respond negatively to the inclusion of new groups for the following reasons:

1. **Fear:** They fear the loss of stability, security, values, and resources
2. **Perception:** They generate a culture of rejection, with labels, stereotypes, jokes, and institutional and social discrimination to favor themselves over the newcomers, and to do so until they convince themselves of a real threat.
3. **Threat:** The newest group on the block represents displacement of the old structures and relationships. They are a real economic threat and challenge to those who have previously worked their way into cultural acceptability. This is especially true in those poorer communities which draw in newcomers but which struggle endemically with economic hardships and blight. The concept of “limited good” (a static “pie” being divided more ways) versus “the American dream” (“the pie infinitely grows”) is in constant battle here.
4. **Ethnocentricity:** Each group has its own “ethnocentricity” that is, its own sense that its shared culture is superior to every other. A variation on this is that each group feels that it has earned its status and that new groups need to be “hazed” before enjoying equal status.
5. **Theological Attitudes:** Added to these is the power of the Judeo-Christian ethos which suggests that its value-systems are superior to all others. Any alien religious tradition
is not just inferior but is either “uninformed” by the “light” or is “damnable.” Those proceeding from other traditions or religions are, by default, under the spell of sin and its curse and are either candidates for evangelism or, rejecting such, a threat to the whole.

Yet the urban area ferments with diversity on a scale greater than ever before in human history. This represents both challenge and ominous future to Western Christianity.

V. Myths About Homogeneity:

The facts are something other than the exalted myths that perpetuate an ethnocentric attitude about homogeneity.

1. It is Not New:

The mixing of cultures has gone on from time immemorial. It is nothing new. Indeed, in the U.S. the percentage of foreign-born peoples in the early 20th century was twice what it is now. The Biblical history of Israel shows population movement and mixed marriages of all kinds through this little land that served as the nexus of national and empirical aspirations.

2. Groupings are Not “Pure:’

Most peoples of the world are genetically mixed. Blacks are not Black in that they have large genetic strains from other racial typologies. Most Whites are mixed, at least from a variety of European populations that once, themselves, were mutually antagonistic.

3. Cultures are in Constant Flux and Change

Most people live in cultures that are an amalgam of many cultural influences. One article entitled “100% American” narrates a typical day in an American’s life, probing into the history of all the artifacts that are being used, only to find out that little is American.

4. Individuals Express Role Shifts with Regards to Culture

A person in cultural transition may become adept at survival techniques that require him/her to constantly be changing roles. For instance, in the U.S. an African-American in the Black subculture may talk, act, and comport him/herself in one fashion while, within the majority culture, s/he may express a whole different response.”

5. Change Varies within a Culture

Culture involves not just artifacts, but also ideas and behaviors. Typically new artifacts are borrowed and adopted more quickly and readily than new behaviors; and new behaviors, more quickly and readily than new ideas. Hence new “ideas” lapse behind changes in artifacts and/or ideas already integrated into a receptive culture.

6. Static Culture is a Dying Culture

Cultures are always changing, either through innovation, or borrowing. Change occurs in two forms: “We went on a journey” (innovation) or “A stranger came into our midst” (borrowing). The journey takes us to a new world of ideas, artifacts, and behaviors. The stranger introduces us to a new world of ideas, artifacts, and behaviors. These may integrate positively into a culture, or may disrupt it. In either case, it changes it. On the other hand, a static culture that rejects both innovation and change is a dying one.
7. Homogeneity/Heterogeneity is Not Limited to Cultural Identity

Unfortunately, a lot of homogeneity and heterogeneity identity discussion gets fixated into solely ethnic, racial, cultural, and linguistic categorization, resulting in our overlooking other emerging people groupings that require just as much a “cross-cultural” witness as these others, i.e. “the British, “working class”, the underclasses, the “filthy” rich, the disabled, sex traders, etc.

8. Anthropological Conflict of the Future of Urban Homogeneity/Heterogeneity

Anthropologists who study the city divide into two camps with regards to their future anticipations on the direction of the homogeneous/heterogeneous discussion. Some believe that there is an emerging “world urban culture” where people from major urban centers, complete with credit cards, McDonalds, universal English, internet, etc. will share culture understood around the world at a level not shared with countrymen in their neighboring rural districts. These anthropologists are referred to as the “lumpers.”

On the other hand, there are those anthropologists who believe that there is something innate in human nature that seeks particular subgroup identity. If it is not based on race, ethnicity, language, or geography, new forms of group identity will emerge, often contrived, to fulfill the same purposes. For instance, rock music groupies, gangs, professional associations, sports allegiances, denominational or religious affiliations, etc. complete with rites, symbols, passages, language—all are comprised with many of the traditional components of culture. In other words, while cosmopolitan cities mold this supracultural world urbanite, there is an equal and contrary force that seeks to split group identities into much smaller, distinct segments. The anthropologists who tilt in this direction are called the “splitters.”

VI. The Heterogeneity of the Bible

The Bible informs us about its heterogeneous attitudes at several levels: 1. by its implicit heterogeneous composition; 2. by its theological presuppositions; 3. by its specific images and exhortations; 4. by specific New Testament examples; 5. and by the teleology of the Gospel.

1. Its Heterogeneous Composition

Unfortunately, the way the Bible is often interpreted is not generally nuanced into its appropriate cultural context. It is a heterogeneous book written in three languages, expressing both Eastern and Western cultures. The earlier passages speak more out of a “tribal” cultural paradigm. Most of the later part of the Old Testament is much more “peasant-oriented.” The New Testament presents more of a “pre-industrial” and urbanizing culture. As such, the entire Word speaks to a wide variety of cultural orientations.

Christianity was inseminated in the Middle East, distinctively different from Western Christianity, birthed in a multicultural tradition, swaddled in North African clothes, transplanted first to Turkey, Armenia, and India before it made its long journey to far Western Europe and the Western World.

2. Its Theological Presuppositions

For a theology that respects diversity, there are many passages in Scripture to affirm this:

- All peoples are made in the image of God. Hence we share common origins, common paternity, imprinting, and common destiny.
- All peoples come under the curse of sin; this includes not only individuals but entire cultures. There is no one culture that is optimal, but all have a demonic crack across them.
• All peoples are the object of God’s love and redemptive intentions. God does not favor one group over another. Though he showed special attention to the Israelites, this was not because they were superior, but rather, because of their absolute weakness and dependency. By exalting them, he wanted to show the rest of the world his love and desire for their redemption. Therefore, the Israelites were not the exclusive object of his affection but rather, the vehicle of it.

3. Its Specific Images and Exhortations

A repeated theme in the Bible is that of the importance of caring for the alien and strangers in one’s midst, because in so doing, 1) they remember their own status of being aliens; 2) a gesture of hospitality might result in entertaining angels unawares.

The Bible does vacillate between two archetypal metaphors (a “rod of iron” and a “light” with regards to the relationship of Israel to the Gentiles: Earlier passages (in Joshua and Judges) express the “rod of iron.” motif. However, in an evolving theology, this seems to be effaced by deuter-Isaiah and Christ’s “light” images. This would suggest a cultural extension rather than cultural suppression.

The Bible shows great care for non Jews: Rahab, Ruth, Job, Nineveh, the Samaritans, the Ethiopian Eunuch, Cornelius of the parables, and the experience of Jesus and the early Church. Indeed these are set up as models in contradistinction to the pettiness and perversity of certain Jews.

Very quickly, the Christian Church reached beyond its population. With the announcement of the coming of the Holy Spirit, the Church was birthed in diversity, 16 languages, ethnic groups, etc. and was brought into unity of communication and purpose. Indeed, it has been speculated that the need of the apostles to appoint stewards was to attend to these internationals who wanted to stay on with the movement.

4. An Example of a Heterogeneous New Testament Church

And in Acts, we have the depiction of a racist church in Jerusalem that failed to understand the universalization of the Church and so this particular church was shunted aside while “Christians” were first called such in Antioch of Syria.

It was this church that was the prototype of the Christian Church, as it exhibited the following qualities, according to E. Stanley Jones:


A church that reaches out cross-culturally (Acts 11:20)
A church that expresses God’s power (Acts 11:21)
A church that discipiles its converts (Acts 11:25-26)
A church which defines Christ to the world (Acts 11:26)
A church open to new God-sent messages (Acts 11:27-28)
A church which is compassionate and generous (Acts 11:29)
A church that balances future (“prophets”) with the past (“teachers”) (Acts 13:1)
A church which is racially diverse (“Niger” [black], “Lucius” [Cyrenian], Greek, Latin and Jewish surnames) (Acts 13:1)
A church which is not class conscious [high class, “Manuen”, Saul] (Acts 13:1)
A church that prays and fasts (Acts 13:2-3)
A church that sends out missionaries (Acts 13:3)
A church which defends itself from false doctrine (Acts 15:2)
A church accountable to “denominational” headquarters (Acts 15:2)
A church which is unified and encouraged (Acts 15:31)
A church which preaches “Christ” (Acts 15:34-35)
A church that allows different opinions (Acts 15:38)
A church that takes those opinions and doubles the mission (Acts 15:39)
A church that forgives and gives “second chances” (Acts 15:39)
A church that has leaders that can change and grow (2 Tim. 4:11)

Other Biblical scholars have examined the names and titles given of the church affiliate in Romans 16 and have been led to the conclusion that here was another key urban church that exhibited a remarkable degree of heterogeneity.

5. The Teleology of the Gospel

Our actions should be governed by our “teleology,” that is, our understanding of where things are going, or ought to be going, as implied in Scripture. This is not measured by politics, urban planning, economic trends, or prevalent needs. It is the envisioning of where human history is bound. In the apocalyptic vision of John, a key picture is given of the great multitude, “from every nation, tribe, people, and language” (7:9) standing before the throne.

As one of my colleagues once stated, the closer one gets to the throne, the closer they get to each other. An illustration of this comes from our theological mentor, John Wesley, who was challenged, upon hearing of the death of George Whitefield, to comment on whether he would see Whitefield in heaven. The two had long sparred over doctrinal issues. But when asked, Wesley immediately said “No! Whitefield will be so much closer to the throne than I am that I may never see him.”

It was in this same spirit that Wesley, in writing to a “despised” Roman Catholic with a most magnanimous presentation, closed it with the scriptural words, “If thy heart is as mine towards God, then give me your hand?”

Of all religious traditions, the Wesleyan-Arminian position is one that risks building bridges rather than walls to people of differing traditions.

VII. The Reality of Group Differences

Yet one must not overlook or underestimate real and conflictual differences between people groupings.

Some of these differences can be attributed to lifestyle issues: i.e. sexual orientation or practices; cycles of days, i.e. people who sleep on Sunday mornings because in their culture they party on Saturday nights; or those who work on Sunday. Frequently we moralize on these issues before understanding the context that frames their reality. More frequently, we merely create our Christian lifestyles around calendar and clock and habits convenient to us but inaccessible to others.

Some of these differences can be attributed to worldview differences: secularism, hedonism, New Age religion, etc., all call for an apologetic of the faith that addresses each of these worldviews. However, we are loathe to engage, confront, or even find ourselves in the presence of any of these. It is easier to complain and castigate them in the safe confines of our religious communities than to confront their issues and disarm their arguments.

1. Areas of Differences: Value Orientations
Some of these differences may be as innocuous as holding differing “value orientations”: Lingenfelter and Mayers have posited six polarities of differences between cultures. These are cultures and/or individuals that are “time-oriented” rather than “event-oriented”; “dichotomistic” (either/or) thinkers rather than “holistic” thinkers; those who are “non-crisis-oriented” (that is, in the words of a population song, “que sera, sera, whatever will be, will be”), versus those that are “crisis-oriented” (constantly anticipating and planning for crises); those who are “task-directed” rather than “person-directed”; those that attribute higher honor to status (based more on ascribed roles) than achievement focus; and finally, those entities that feel more comfortable in “concealing vulnerability” rather than being “willing to expose” it.

Lingenfelter and Mayers have created a testing device to measure on a grid—the scoring of each contrasting pair. Depending on the distance from the line of balance, one can judge which orientation most influences him/her. The authors then ask what the Bible position is on each of these. Invariably, there are Biblical passages to support both sides of each pair, though some circumstances may call for an emphasis one way or another.

What is important is to recognize that there is no absolute right or wrong with these values, that perhaps the context determines the appropriateness.

Lingenfelter and Mayers do make the point that overriding cultural norms in any particular culture can make a cross-cultural communicator quite uncomfortable if his/her values are skewed very differently from the locally-held values orientation. If such is the case, here are the seeds of cultural conflict.

2. Areas of Difference: Identity-Based Conflict

Some of these differences are “issue-based” and will require getting the facts, confronting the issues, opening up the options and seeking reconciliation. However, some of these differences are “identity-based” and are much more intransient unless there is a mutual surrendering of identity.

Paul, in a key passage in I Corinthians 9, argues polemically about human rights. “Am I not free?” “Am I not an apostle?” “Don’t I have right to food and drink?” “Don’t I have the right of companionship?” “Don’t I have the right to leisure?” “Don’t I have the right to adequate compensation for my services?” “Don’t I have the right to social status?” “Don’t I have the right to my ethnic, racial, religious, and denominational identity?” “Don’t I have the right to live beyond antiquated legalisms?”

Implicit throughout is the affirmation, “Yes!” to each of these rights. However, Paul sees a higher right that reaches beyond these, and that is the right to suspend “rights” pragmatically where they get in the way of communicating Christ to others, or where they violate the potential of Christian community. He affirms that “to the weak, I became weak to win the weak” (22).

Eric Law in a little book entitled, The Wolf Shall Dwell with the Lamb: A Spirituality for Leadership in a Multicultural Community, say this: “If we stretch the analogy of the ‘wolf and lamb’ scenario further, one might say that the cultures of the world are as numerous as the kinds of animals inhabiting this earth. Each culture has its own characteristic, values, and customs. Some are perceived as strong and some as weak. Some are more aggressive and some are considered passive and timid. People in one culture survive as individuals while people in another culture find their own liveliness as part of larger groupings. If cultures are analogous to the different animals, the Isaiah 11:6-9 becomes a vision of culturally diverse peoples living together in harmony and peace. . . In order for the animals to co-exist in this Peaceable Realm, very ‘unnatural’ behaviors are required from all who are involved. How can a wolf, a leopard, or a lion not attack a lamb, a calf, or a child for food? . . . It goes against an animal’s ‘instinct’ to be in this vision of the Peaceable Realm. . . Perhaps we need to go against the ‘instinct’ of our cultures in
order for us to stop replaying the fierce-devouring-the-small scenario of intercultural encounter” (3-4).

When identity issues are not resolved, they are swept under the carpet by a variety of pernicious responses:

- Calculated Disregard
- Intentional Separation
- Legalized Separation
- De facto Segregation—it just happens without the need for laws
- The Creation of Islands of Distance
- Isolated Violence
- Systematic Violence—institutionalized, policy action
- Systemic Violence—built into the entire society
- Ethnic Cleansing

Sadly, all of these have been exhibited in their various malevolent forms even right to the heart of formalized Christianity itself, in communities as disparate as Serbia-Bosnia and Northern Ireland; the Anabaptist Movement and Nazi-ism. In each of these instances, the battlegrounds are more over identity-based self-understanding than any specific issues.

VIII. The Changing Demographics:

The world is moving West and North. Cities in Western Europe and in North America exhibit more of the “browning” effect. In the British Isles, the “Empire Strikes Back” with the influx of those immigrants from the former colonies. One survey indicates that 13% of the British population is now something other than Caucasian. Most of these will have settled in urban areas, thus contributing much higher statistics than that of the nation generally.

In the United States, long an immigrant nation, 13% of the population now is Hispanic; 12% African-American and 6% other. One study suggests that by the year 2050, 63% of all American children will be of multi-racial genetic stock.

Worldwide, the shifts are notable. One breakdown divides the current world’s population into 100 people of which 12 are Europeans and 15 are North and South Americans. 13 are from Africa and 60 from Asia. Altogether 73 are nonwhite. However, by the year 2050, demographers predict that only 7 will be from Europe, 13 from North and South America, and 20 from Africa. 80 will be nonwhite.

This, of course, does not compute urban demographics, in which the skew is even greater in that the extreme growth of cities is occurring in the two-thirds world outside of North America, Japan and, Western Europe, and is proliferating populations with the following characteristics:

- The aforementioned “browning” of the world’s populations
- Greater inequities between the rich and the poor
- The creation of new intentional and spontaneous subcultures
- Increasing numbers competing for diminishing space and resources
- Greater mobility both geographic and sociological
- The breakdown of support systems and communication between groups
- A pragmatic attitude of “What can you do for me?” as the basis of functional relationships
- Increased hostilities between individuals, groups and nations.

IX. The Situation in Many Denominations
Many denominations are skewed in terms of power structures towards North American and European leadership even though the growth edge is centered increasingly in the Two Thirds World. And within these regions, our churches in diverse ethnic centers continue to look remarkably homogeneous.

One might ask the question, “If the Gospel is for all peoples, why does the Church not adequately reflect similar diversity?

Responses have been given following these arguments:

1. The Church was founded primarily among poor urban Whites and has difficulty shaking off that identity.
2. Other groups have picked up the slack and offer a more indigenized form of worship and practice, compatible with minority culture.
3. Evangelical “culture” is somewhat incompatible with the cultural needs of newer groups.
4. There have not been the means or structures for the development of “ethnic” leadership.
5. Limited financial budgets and resources have restricted initiatives into these new populations.
6. These populations are young; majority congregations are old, and therefore not appealing.
7. There is an inherent racism, prejudice, or fear in the majority congregations that stifles cross-cultural initiatives.
8. Our theological watchword of “order” has been made an entry-level standard that discourages the distressed and the disappointed from bringing their disorder and their “needs” into the church.
9. The churches that are numerically most successful are generally found in the suburban areas. Hence, there is the problem of accessibility to where the new cultural groups reside.

It is not within my research capability, nor interest, to affirm or deny any of these points made above. Suffice to say that somewhere in these rationales or beyond them is a constellation of explanations that reflect the dilemma that the Nazarene Church faces today.

The good news is that the non-White (non-Hispanic) populations are the groups that are growing at the greatest rate in North America. If the trends continue, the church demographics will more nearly reflect the whole within the next 20-25 years.

What is sad, though, is that, after all of the investment in “foreign missions,” so little of that initiative is preserved among the immigrants who come to the developed world. Retention and redeployment of these newcomers hold great possibilities if, indeed, the Church can be receptive, creative, and supportive in preserving its ranks.

X. What Can Be Done to Change the Situation?

At an individual level, I would recommend the following Biblical general principles exhibited by Jesus himself:

- Engagement—John 4:1-34
- Redemption—John 4:41-42

Yet because most of us represent “wolf-like” tendencies, there is the need for us to walk the journey of Paul in allowing our “weakness” to be the point of identity with those who believe
themselves to be weak, or different, or disadvantaged. Some difficult and dangerous steps must be taken to recover relationships and reconcile differences:

- Hearing one’s accusers
- Seeing prejudice’s consequences
- Admitting one’s feelings
- Seeing one’s shortcomings under the rays of Biblical light
- Confessing one’s sins, arrogance, neglect, violence
- Confessing collective sins—Neh. 1:6-8 and Dan. 9:20
- Confessing to those who are the transgressed
- Finding forgiveness and alternate patterns of communication
- Seeking redress for those hurt and injured
- Leading the Church to do the same
- Maintaining open dialogue and communication
- Reorganizing life to better reflect Kingdom values

At a church community level, I would suggest the following steps:

- Research the community. Understand the demographics and its trends
- Make friends of leaders of immigrant groups
- See if there are any “mission field” connections within groups where credibility is already established
- Offer hospitality on “their terms” (not just offering meals but offering that precious private space of intimacy around your heart—Nouwen)
- Examine local Church to see what “shame-inducing” behaviors or attitudes inadvertently are being communicated
- Develop practical programs that build friendship, i.e. ESL, tutorship, legal aid
- Offer available facilities
- Invest in quality leadership
- Do mutual worship together, or retreat, or small group Bible Study that confronts mutual issues.
- See the ministry as “friendship-building”. “I call you no longer to be servants but to be friends.” (John 15:15)
- Make gestures of acceptance, i.e. learn their music, congratulate them on their service, etc.
- Be patient! Be wise!
- Have fun in the foolishness of our mutual ignorance and foibles! Laugh when they laugh; weep when they weep.
- Remember, that history reminds us that we are all strangers in a foreign land, and that someday, the tables may be turned so that we ourselves become the strangers. “Do unto others that which we would, that they should do to us!”

The world is intrigued and enticed by the qualities and character of others that they see as different, exotic, etc. and is quite ready to engage them at some level—entertainment, business, sports, and medical care for example.

The Church has a different motivation, to love, accept, and appreciate God’s varied creation at many levels (not all), so that the Kingdom of Heaven may be enhanced, so that we can grow not just numerically, but in our understanding of that Kingdom.
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