

## **Church Based Micro-Development: Non-Companion Synod Partnerships and the Hybrid Case of Companion Synod Programming in Namibia of the Metropolitan Washington, DC Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America**

**Dr. Michael Kuchinsky**

Associate Professor of Political Science

Gardner-Webb University

Boiling Springs, North Carolina

USA

What can a religious congregation do for global development? If ever a question moved across the boundary diminishing landscape of globalization, this one qualifies. It entertains the idea of an organization functioning at the most local level of interest while connecting with a vast global set of needs. In the normative world of religious community, even individual faith lives, intersects with global structures of poverty. The resource allocation and decision-making process at one local parish enters into dialogue and activity with another in a different continent with both organizations functioning under different state jurisdictions and laws.

Such is one picture from the world of micro-development programming. Micro-development can be considered another step in the decentralization of development activities away from state-centered programs that have been underway for many years. It is a growing world of initiatives that moves development relationships to the most local levels of program activity, agency, and ownership. Its models and activities are diverse - one suburban congregation selling palm branch products from other religious communities in a developing country, and returning thousands of dollars in proceeds back for local development grants; another organization moving volunteers regularly and in *Habitat for Humanity* style to underdeveloped settings for an education program and construction project; or the thousands of individual volunteers now organized through religious based or commercial organizations to provide short-term labor in poverty stricken settings. Perhaps a door was never opened wider to local congregational micro-efforts in developing countries than the faith-based initiatives of former President George W. Bush. Discussions with an associate of United States Agency of International Development's (USAID) program for faith-based initiatives identified over four thousand faith-based recipients of HIV/AIDS grants in 2008 for millions of dollars of locally directed program grants.<sup>1</sup>

Efforts by religious communities and their non-governmental organizations (NGO) during natural or people-made disasters, or for the purposes of global development have been underway for more than half century. Some such as the Mennonite Central Committee have origins caring for the needs of conscientious objectors and refugees of World War I and the Russian Revolution. Many more (such as Catholic Relief Services, World Vision, or Church World Service) started operations during World War II. The works of religious organizations in the United State have often mirrored the trends of development assistance across time. An initial emphasis on European reconstruction in the aftermath of 1945 shifted outlook and audience moving operations into post-colonial settings during the 1950's. A general emphasis for human needs based development during the 1970's changed to building up the operational and social capacity of indigenous civil society institutions and the pursuit of sustainable development more than a decade later.

Advocacy based on gender, human rights, environmental sustainability, or post-conflict reconciliation would supplement the earlier menus for change such as rural integrated development. The process leading to building partnerships and networks that could promote indigenous organizational growth surpassed the first models for the direct delivery of services and resources by religious NGOs based in donor countries. There has been a long, sometimes distinguished, presence of religious agency in the fields of disaster relief and development among religious NGOs and faith-based organizations.

---

<sup>1</sup> Heather MacLean of USAID Faith and Community Initiatives addressed a class in Religion and Global Politics, through the Washington Center on Internships and Academic Seminars in Summer 2008 about the extent and directions of USAID efforts with the wider faith community.

Given a history for evolving relationships and projects across multiple societal levels (global advocacy and the anti-landmines campaign, national disaster relief, regional work in rural development, or the donations to create local credit and banking schemes), and alongside expanding opportunities for local inputs into global development needs, it should come as no surprise that local religious communities and in some cases through their self-formed NGOs are also becoming local non-state development agents. Micro-development theories and programs should not be considered new.<sup>2</sup> But their growth in number and presence are important. What has not been done with regularity has been a review of congregation based micro-development programs that contributes to understanding their place in an increasingly diversified profile of development agency. The Companion Synod Program (CSP) of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA)<sup>3</sup> fits into this world of micro-development...somewhat. It takes a hybrid shape by combining the relationships and work of non-state actors – the church denominations and their leaderships – with the ongoing congregational relationships from somewhere in the United States with somewhere in the developing world to make companion synods and partnerships of both development and non-development activity. What's more, the ELCA's CSP has the benefit of a decade and a half of activity and documentation, something that other religious based micro-development projects cannot claim.

This study<sup>4</sup> uses church-to-church (C2C) relationships fostered by the CSP anchored in one synod of the ELCA, the Metro-Washington DC Synod. The synod's parishes are in close geographic proximity of the nation's capital and the majority of nation's foreign policy agencies and institutions. Some church members work professionally for these agencies and institutions. It can be suggested that the synod's location offers its constituents more opportunities to become involved or knowledgeable about global issues, foreign policy, or international development. The Metro DC Synod is in full agreement with the goals of the CSP. As evidence for this, the Synod engages three sets of global partners working with Lutheran churches and staff in Namibia, El Salvador and Slovakia. Its geographic territory is compact, comprising the District of Columbia and its surrounding counties in Maryland and Virginia. It also has a small number of congregations making it more likely that all churches involved in the program could be included. So what change occurs for development through these micro-relationships?

Beyond being able to better describe the relationship and its activities, this study was interested in the following questions.

- 1) How is the partnership understood and communicated by those who participate?
- 2) Do the C2C relationships with overseas churches through CSP based commitments of one synod of the ELCA increase their activism over time? And if so, how?
- 3) Are there any differences in performance and purpose for C2C partnerships that are in CSP relationships versus those who relate to non-CSP linked overseas parishes?
- 4) If partnerships become more activist what influences separate them from more static programs? And, where there is a decline, what influenced those trends?

These questions lead to the following hypotheses:

---

<sup>2</sup> Guy Gran. *Development by People: Citizen Construction of a Just World*. New York: Praeger Publishing, 1983; Michael Edwards and John Gaventa. *Global Citizen Action*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishing, 2001; and the many articles and resource materials written on the micro-finance and banking movements worldwide.

<sup>3</sup> The following is taken from the website of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in order to briefly explain and advertise companion synod programs: Within the global Lutheran family, the ELCA has bilateral "companion church" relationships with many national Lutheran church bodies. These global relationships are deepened by the ELCA Companion Synods Program, which connects 65 ELCA synods in over 120 international companion relationships. Through these companion relationships, members of ELCA synods live out the [accompaniment](#) model of global mission and experience the rich gifts and witness of Lutheran churches in Africa, Latin America, Asia, Eastern Europe, or the Middle East. The Companion Synod program is a concrete expression of the communion fellowship among the 140 member churches of the [Lutheran World Federation \(LWF\)](#).

<sup>4</sup> It became apparent after beginning the study that there were more than one location of C2C partnerships taking place in the ELCA, and the numbers of churches independently moving ahead on C2C relationships is also growing, allowing for future comparative work.

H1. Congregational partnerships with overseas churches that become linked through CSP relationships, and congregational partnerships linked to non-CSP churches overseas will generally remain unchanging or declining, *unless* driven to grow the partnership through internal influences in one or both partner churches.

Whereas external influences may be important for a congregation to take a start-up interest, it will be internal influences that sustain and increase any activism. These will be true for both CSP and non-CSP C2C partnerships.

H2. US congregations, regardless of their level activism, will identify the purpose of the partnership more through “hierarchical” imagery (such as providers and receivers), and will understand the relationship through conventional or missiological values. This might be expressed as “the need to help” or “come to the rescue,” or “the value of education, and growth to better themselves and become part of the wider economic world.” It is surmised that little if any focus will be on any need to change a global economic structure.

H3. The major difference for choosing between participating in CSP or non-CSP partnerships will be determined by an internal influence (such as a formative trip to a region of the world, or a sizable sub-community of members in the congregation) in the American congregation.

Should these hypotheses hold true, than the answer to the earlier question about “any difference” would be that if there is any, that it would be very little or very little that would be innovative. This would not mean that there would have been *no change*. There may have been the likely transfer of useful funds, or there may have been individuals who have been motivated to consider global issues/realities differently, or simply, new information had been learned. The study moves through a brief description of definitions and methodology, and a summary of the general Companion Synod Program of the ELCA before moving into the case study.

### a. Theory, Definitions and Methodology

The theoretical and evaluative research done on the performance of non-state actors doing development or relief is substantial. Early and largely positive examinations of the roles for individual engagement, community organizing, and civil society cross-boundary interaction towards the planning, execution and evaluation of development programming has thirty years of historical exploration.<sup>5</sup> More critical assessments of the claims made for development from “below” would come later, but has been part of the literature.<sup>6</sup> Interest for the place of religious agency in foreign affairs in general and in the global political economy and the developing world more specifically has expanded since the end of the Cold War. Some of this has been for building up the theory of religious engagements in foreign affairs,<sup>7</sup> while others are more descriptive, normative and even self-appraising for religiously lead development.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Guy Gran. *Development by People: Citizen Construction of a Just World*. New York: Praeger Publishing, 1983.

<sup>6</sup> A very partial listing of case study driven material describing the opportunities, constraints, positive and negative contributions by non-governmental organizations, civil society, and religious agents would include:

Shamine Ahmen and David Potter. *NGOs in International Politics*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 2006.

Thomas Carroll. *Intermediary NGOs: The Supporting Link in Grassroots Development*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 1992.

Deborah Eade. *Capacit-Building: An Approach to People-Centered Development*. Oxford: Oxfam GB, 1997.

Daphne Josselin and William Wallace, editors. *Non-State Actors in World Politics*. New York: Palgrave Publishing, 2001.

Mary Lean. *Bread Bricks, and Belief: Communities in Charge of their Future*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 1995.

David Lewis and Tina Wallace, editors. *New Roles and Relevance: Development NGOs and the Challenge of Change*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 2000.

Jorgen Lissner. *The Politics of Altruism: Political Behaviour of Voluntary Development Agencies*. Geneva: Lutheran World Federation, 1977.

David Rieff. *A Bed for the Night: Humanitarianism in Crisis*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2002.

<sup>7</sup> A very partial listing of theoretically driven studies for the greater understanding of religious agency in international politics would include:

Eric Hanson, *Religion and Politics in the International System Today*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Jeffrey Haynes, *An Introduction to International Relations and Religion*. New York: Pearson/Longman, 2007.

David Hollenbach. *The Global Face of Public Faith: Politics, Human Rights, and Christian Ethics*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2003.

Mark Juergensmeyer, *Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

The literature is replete with material supporting various dimensions and program areas involving non-state actors and NGOs. Some focuses upon the normative vision and social capital provided by religious based actors in poverty settings. The critical assessment literature on the place of micro-development programming, specifically in the fields of micro-finance and credit has grown and sheds light on the importance of local projects that improve equity, growth, and sustainability. It is also worth noting how non-state actors and organizations have been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in recent years as one indicator of their growing importance and service in a globalized and organizationally pluralistic world. What is less documented are specific cases of C2C work, the micro-development work of individual religious communities. A recent work examined the “twinning” between Roman Catholic parishes in Michigan and Haiti. Diocesan offices in both countries organized the bridge building program giving formal legitimacy to congregational relationships. The researcher probed into the work done by the parishes, the language used to understand the relationships by pastoral leaders and lay people, the normative principles used in the programs, and evidence of sustainability. Finding it difficult to gain access to all the stakeholders, the researcher determined that it would not be possible to conclude that sustainable, equitable development and value change had taken place.<sup>9</sup>

Why are micro-development programs of local congregations worth understanding? Congregations across denominations and regions are seeing a spread of activism through parish missions and travel, C2C development projects, resource transfers of wealth and supplies, and other global involvements. There has been growing popularity of “voluntourism” approaches to international service that parallels actions taken by religious communities. In the case of the CSP of the ELCA, it has operated long enough to better understand if it has progressed. Having an understanding of past performance offers implications for future C2C relationships (partnerships, twinning options) potentially improving what has been successful while offering guidance to others. The CSP and its participating congregations finds itself in the middle of an ongoing US policy, the Faith Based Initiatives, which spreads across US government agencies and departments, and encourages religious groups and organizations to become more involved in social problems whether in the United States or abroad. The above realities would indicate a widening and increasing demand/effort for private and religious sector involvement in global service, mission, and/or development. Certain terms used in the study should be defined. Terms used by religious institutions may mean different things than in common use.

**Companion Synod Program (CSP)** – Evangelical Lutheran Church of America program of official relationships between an ELCA synod and a church body or synod, diocese or district of a church body in another country.

**Companion Synod Partnerships (CSP partnerships)** – those inter-judicatory relationships that have been formed through the CSP. In the case of the Metro DC Synod, these include Lutheran church bodies in Namibia, El Salvador, and Slovakia, and congregations that have created C2C relationships with congregations from an official Synod CSP.

**Church-to-Church relationships through CSP Partnerships (C2C/CSP)** – congregations that have started and continue to pursue inter-church relationships with a member congregation in a CSP partnership.

**Church-to-Church relationships with Non-Companion Synod Partnerships (C2C/NonCSP)** – those congregations that have created C2C relationships other than through a CSP.

**Accompaniment** – the stated process and content of the CSP for a mutual relationship between companion churches who walk together in service with each church having primary responsibility for the mission in its own area. The principles that inform the behavior of accompaniment include honoring each other’s integrity, mutual decision making, interdependence, respect for the other’s context, being open to new experiences and information, an emphasis of relationships over resources, acknowledging gifts of others, transparency, and primary responsibility for mission in one’s area.

---

David Little, editor, *Peacemakers in Action: Profiles of Religion in Conflict Resolution*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

<sup>8</sup> Some of these that are specifically related to individual religious agencies include Eileen Egan’s *Catholic Relief Services: The Beginning Years for the Life of the World*, New York; CRS, 1988; Charles Lutz’ *Loving Neighbors Far and Near: U.S. Lutherans Respond to a Hungry World*, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1994; and Ronald Stenning’s *Church World Service: Fifty Years of Help and Hope*, New York: Friendship Press, 1996.

<sup>9</sup> Hefferen, Tara. *Twinning Faith and Development: Catholic Parish Partnering in the US and Haiti*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 2007.

**Hierarchical perceptions** – where the partnership is described using non-parity terms such as that the US partner is the provider in the relationship and the non-US partner is more often the recipient, even when it is understood that “rules of relationship” stipulate that non-US partners decide what they want or need.

**Activism** – any observed behaviors, programs, or projects, within the context of the partnership.

**Increased or decreased activism** – when the number of activities, or the financial status of the partnership, or number of persons engaged in the programs increases/decreases in quantity; and when the type of activity shifts between educational programming and public/personal advocacy, and/or from charitable service to developmental projects, and/or from one directional to two-directional (mutual) relationships.

**External Influence** – external influences come from outside of the individual parish and can come at the beginning, middle or end of a partnership. The concept of the C2C relationship through the CSP is an external influence, whereas the C2C relationship outside of the CSP may be wholly internally developed. CSP is the structure in which all C2C/CSP partnerships find themselves. Other external influences of importance may include a crisis or some piece of political/economic information that may develop a C2C relationship; evidence of Faith Based Initiative relationships or funding; or comments on the importance of various learning events such as the ELCA Global Mission Events.

**Internal Influence** – these would be influences upon the partnerships that come from within the congregation. Certain membership relationships between potential partners might be formative for the partnership, so might a member’s travel experiences, or significant in-house leadership resources, or history of global mission activity from within the congregation.

**Stable programs** – when activism remains unchanged (either in content such as education or in number of activities undertaken).

**Decline/increase of activism** – when there has been a drop-off in activism across years.

The churches for the study are by necessity self-selecting. Somewhere in their history a determination was made to be involved with others through the CSP. They would be the congregations in the Metro Washington, DC Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America located in the District of Columbia, Maryland or Virginia that are partnered through the CSP to a church in Namibia. Currently, the CSP programs for the Metro DC Synod in El Salvador and Slovakia do not have the same micro-development relationships. For purposes of comparison, churches that perceive themselves to be in relationship with a C2C development partner but without having any relationship to the Synod’s CSP are also part of this study. Data comes from various sources. Variability of information and in reporting is expected from individual congregations. As a baseline, the study used “universal” information about the CSP as reported by the ELCA. The Metro DC Synod’s archives and interviews with Synod staff provided a history of the CSP’s evolution in the Synod.

The information from individual parishes is of the greatest value. Wherever possible, either interviews with pastors or a coordination committee for the parish were used to gather congregational information. Whatever documents might be available (reports, budgets, anecdotal accounts) were requested.

Lastly, information comes from Namibia and the religious partners there. These include denominational and parish leaders of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Namibia (ELCIN), the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Republic of Namibia (ELCRN), and to a lesser extent (because up until the latter half of 2011, little programming has been done) the German Evangelical Lutheran Church (GELK). A research grant through the American Political Science Association was helpful in offsetting some costs to carry the research to southern Africa and allowed for interviews with denominational leaders, visits to parishes reported to be in C2C partnerships, and a review of available documents pertaining to the partnership. The following persons and documents (where/when available) were used to address the research questions and hypotheses.

- 1) An individual from the ELCA Companion Synod Program
- 2) Official ELCA documents of the CSP
- 3) Synodical bishop (current: Richard Graham; and past: Theodore Schneider)
- 4) Synodical representatives of the CSP
- 5) Congregational pastors from participating congregations (sample)

- 6) Congregational representatives
- 7) Synod archival data
- 8) Congregational reports over time on its C2C programs, specifically budget allocation to global mission in general or the partner specifically, program reports

#### **b. The ELCA's CSP and a summary of Metro DC CSP in Namibia**

The Lutheran denominations in the United States, like most church denominations, have had mission programs in other nation-states. The resources transferred, missionaries sent, and the building of churches and social institutions describe portions of these relationships. It would not be unfair to characterize such historical relationships as having been more hierarchical or even dependence producing, with resources, missionaries, leadership and organization, and the construction and maintenance of churches and social institutions taking place in the recipient or colony states and districts, but funded and run from churches based in donor or colonizing states. The paradigm for the CSP began as a new method for building global relationships following the formation of the ELCA in the late 1980's through the merger of three former Lutheran denominations. The CSP was a means for linking the one hundred and forty member church bodies of the Lutheran World Federation (LWF), the global network of Lutherans, with the ELCA's sixty five synods (equivalent to a diocese or district) for multiple goals and program activities. Beginning with a formal covenant or contract of relationship where the programmatic activity is negotiated and signed by member bodies of the companion relationship, CSP was an effort to counterbalance the hierarchical and dependence creating relationships of past missionary relationships with a new model of accompaniment (see definition), mutual partnership and learning, advocacy, and the possibilities of assisted development led and guided by the non-USA church body where development would take place.

According to the ELCA's manual on CSP, leadership for CSP would reside in the negotiated covenant, the judicatory heads of the church bodies (bishops) and the judicatory or synod council, and a special committee that would oversee the working out of the covenanted relationship as it could be applied by local congregations and committees of the synod. The ELCA's recommendation for the content of CSP relationships included information sharing and communication, consciousness-raising, religious activities such as prayer or the experimentation of alternative worship styles, advocacy regarding the political and economic issues affecting the CSP partner, visitations, people exchanges, organization of service projects, and lastly the potential for providing financial and in-kind resources for development. Guidelines were developed by the ELCA to help evaluate the impact of financial and material resources provided by synods and congregations. When shared, resources ought to follow the recipient's agenda and need, benefit communities over individuals, have contextual relevance, support development and sustainability, preserve the balance of power in the recipient setting, be transferred through judicatory offices, and come to completion. C2C relationships also must be made through an application process of the synod, review by synod mission committees, matched to an interested partner in the non-American setting, and formalized through a written and voted upon acknowledgement of commitment.<sup>10</sup>

Metro DC Synod operates three CSPs. They include partnerships with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in El Salvador, the Slovakian Lutheran Church, and with the major Lutheran denominations in Namibia – the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Namibia (ELCIN), the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the Republic of Namibia (ELCRN), and to a lesser extent the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Namibia (GELN, where "G" stands for German).<sup>11</sup> This study concentrates solely on those relationships between the Metro DC Synod and its partners in Namibia, the longest running of its global partnerships. The three different Namibian churches represent a divided and hierarchical mission history where racial separation, separate state-based mission society origins from the 19<sup>th</sup> century onward, and the shadow of League of Nations and United Nations mandates concerning South African oversight of Namibia in the 20<sup>th</sup> century led to a divided Lutheran church presence. Besides the Metro DC Synod, there are other Lutheran Synods participating in the ELCA CSP in Namibia who after thirteen years of separate programming, contracted in 2005 to collaborate on CSP engagements with Namibian Lutheran programs. The other synods and their originating years of programming through CSP include the New Jersey Synod (1991), Northeastern Iowa (1990), and Southwestern Washington (1992).

<sup>10</sup> Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. *Global Mission: Companion Synod Handbook*. Chicago: ELCA, Summer 2006.

<sup>11</sup> Lutheran World Federation. *Lutheran Churches in Namibia*. Geneva: ELOC Printing Press, June 1995.

The start-up of interaction between Namibian Lutherans and the Metro DC Synod begins prior to national independence and through an earlier Lutheran denomination (The American Lutheran Church then headquartered in Minneapolis/St. Paul, Minnesota) that would merge in the formation of the ELCA. Correspondence between Namibian and American church officials can be traced back through archives to early 1985 when Namibian Bishop Kleopas Dumeni commented:

We have been following with great interest your movements and activities in your country on behalf of the people of Namibia. Some of us read with pleasure about the Lutheran Day of Protest at the South African Embassy in Washington D.C. and the arrest of our fellow Lutherans at that occasion. We as Namibians cannot thank you enough for it. We hope you will continue to work and pray together with all of us here until Namibia is free and independent.<sup>12</sup>

Pastors and lay people would later form a Namibia and Southern Africa education and advocacy networking committee within the synod, The Namibia Task Force. Those who would guide the task force would include Rev. Lynn Opderbecke, Rev. Ron Christian, Rev. Harold Jansen, Rev. Roy Enquist, Mr. Joe MacMahon, and Mrs. Carolyn and Mr. Benjamin Bartell, many who would continue their leadership for years. What is of interest is that the relationship began as a semi-political one bound by interest for justice in an expression of outrage over political realities and apartheid policies. These sentiments were made manifest by the circulation of publications highly critical of the then current conditions and policies for the purpose of raising the consciousness of church members and for advocacy.<sup>13</sup> The task group's hopes from the ALC continued into the first general assembly of the newly formed Metro Washington DC Synod of the ELCA where the synod would hear and pass a resolution that "urged the adoption of United Nations Resolution 435 on Namibian Independence, the supportive activism of the United States government, the ELCA's support for Namibia and its people, and the continued activism of Rev. Lynn Opderbecke and the Namibian Task Force."<sup>14</sup> This resolution was used to introduce the speech by then pastor and vice-president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Namibia and now Bishop, Rev. Dr. Zephania Kameeta, a leading spokesperson for Namibian independence.

The resolution carried. In the same spirit of protest, the Synod would offer a "memorial<sup>15</sup>" to the ELCA urging for the divestment of its Board of Pensions funds of any investments linked to South Africa. The committee responsible for global mission was asked to create educational materials and a workshop about Namibia, its independence, and the ongoing negotiations. The Synod would take similar stands at its 1989 and 1990 general assemblies in support of Namibian independence. The 1989 resolution of support for Namibia would pass citing in addition to the groups and pursuits of the previous year, the work of the National Namibian Concern Group of Denver, Colorado, the need for direct support to the individual bishops of the Namibian Lutheran churches, further advocacy of the U.S. Government and at the United Nations, and an increase of financial support for scholarship assistance to Namibian students studying at Lutheran Colleges and Universities.<sup>16</sup> A second resolution on Namibia that year specifically directed Bishop Harold Jansen of the Metro DC Synod to write letters of concern to President Bush, the Secretary of State, and the head of the ELCA expressing the concern of the Assembly for Namibia and its people. The 1989 Assembly proved to be highly politicized as the Namibian resolution was joined by other advocacy resolutions concerning the resumption of conflict in the Sudan, the pressing needs for increased HIV/AIDS research and assistance, China and its human rights policies after the Beijing massacre, the need for ecological sustainability on a global scale, and persistence of violence in El Salvador and other Central American states. In the 1990 Assembly, the last prior to the beginning of the ELCA CSP, the synod would again memorialize the ELCA for financial and other support for the Namibian churches:

---

<sup>12</sup> Memo from Bishop Kleopas Dumeni to the Rev. Ronald Christian, Assistant to the Bishop Eastern District of the American Lutheran Church, March 27, 1985.

<sup>13</sup> One critical publication that was circulated to churches and interested individual by the predecessor committee on Namibia was the publication *Dateline: Namibia*, written and published by The Africa Fund and Namibia Christian Community Trust.

<sup>14</sup> Metro Washington DC Synod of the ELCA. *Weave Us Together: Annual Report Proceedings of the First Synod Assembly, 1988*, p. 18.

<sup>15</sup> A memorial is a sense of support motion from one Synod to the larger church, urging an action for wider consideration and adoption.

<sup>16</sup> Metro Washington DC Synod of the ELCA. *Many Voices, One Song: Annual Report and Proceedings of the 1989 Synod Assembly*, p. 24.

Because of freedom on March 21, 1990, and because of the lessened funding from West Germany, we memorialize the ELCA to help ensure the growth of the new democracy and support the Lutheran churches of Namibia.<sup>17</sup>

In the following year (1991) and as part of the ELCA's "Mission 90" theme, the Metro DC Synod would formally adopt the Namibian (not white or colonial German) churches as their first CSP developing a structure of governance and oversight in keeping with the earlier identified guidelines from the national church. Certainly in part because independence had been achieved in Namibia, but also because of the less politicized parameters of the CSP, the years from 1985-1990 marked the Synod's most concentrated direct advocacy on behalf of Namibia.

### **c. Metro DC/Namibia CSP profile, 1991 to the present**

Although negotiations over the content of the CSP between Metro DC and the Namibian Lutheran Churches began earlier when members of the Synod's Global Ministry team held discussions with Namibian church officials in Namibia, the formal relationship was put in place by a resolution and vote at the 1991 Synod Assembly. The history of the church in Namibia, the denominational demographics of the country, and the difficult oppression by South Africa were cited as considerations for the relationship, one that would include exchange programs, Namibian commemoration Sundays, a task force to produce educational and worship materials, C2C partnerships, and a process to identify supportable development projects of the Lutheran Churches of Namibia.<sup>18</sup> The first C2C relationships would be running within less than two years (by 1993) and would become the early supports in the relationship. Eight churches from the Metro DC Synod would initiate and take on "sister" congregation partners.<sup>19</sup> The C2C origins evolved over time to a multiple synod program where it became necessary to provide a more formal statement of the intent and parameters of C2C relationships. An undated document (agreed to by all parties in late 2007) explaining the vision and purpose of C2C programs for the ELCA included the following definition and vision statement:

A sister congregation relationship is a bond of mutual respect and trust that is build through communication, prayer and a commitment to work together as shareholders in the Kingdom of God. The hallmarks of the relationship are respect, love, prayer, and an understanding for one another's background, culture, and unique characteristics. Each partner in the relationship is equal. Each brings to the relationship a willingness to learn and grow as members of the faith we all share in Christ Jesus. While a sister congregation relationship can provide many rewarding benefits for each partner, there are overall visions for these special relationships – accompaniment, consciousness-raising, reconciliation, and solidarity.<sup>20</sup>

The document promoted activities that might be done over the recommended five year commitment by both partners, including trips, educational events, worship services, and regular communications. The document excluded financial gifts, but advocated support of development projects and the initiation of "service" related projects. The document is included as an appendix. Alongside the beginning of the C2C program, the Metro DC CSP with Namibia initially promoted annual support of Namibian students studying in the United States (up to three students at its maximum in 1993), the two month long visitation of a Namibian pastor to be hosted by six to eight different congregations during their stay, regular meetings of the Namibia Task Force, a trip to Namibia, and educational materials and events. Of the twenty churches that participated in the C2C program, all but four would begin work by 1997, or in the first three years of the program.

---

<sup>17</sup> Metro Washington DC Synod of the ELCA. *New Dreams, New Demands, New Decade: Annual Report and Proceedings of the 1990 Synod Assembly*, p. 27.

<sup>18</sup> Metro Washington DC Synod of the ELCA, *Equipping the Saints Together: Annual Report and Proceedings of the 1991 Synod Assembly*, p. 25-26.

<sup>19</sup> These included Hope Lutheran Church of College Park, MD; Emmanuel LC of Bethesda, MD; St. John LC of Rockville, MD; Good Shepherd LC of Alexandria, VA; Faith LC of Arlington, VA; St. Matthew LC of Lake Ridge, VA; St. Andrew LC of Centerville, VA; Emmanuel LC of Vienna, VA; and St. Peter's LC of Washington, DC.

<sup>20</sup> From an undated document entitled "Sister Congregation Program ELCA Namibian Companion Synods", photocopied from the archives of the Metro Washington, DC Synod in May 2008.



New partnerships would only form in 2001 (Hope LC, Annandale, VA), in 2002 (Peace LC in Waldorf, MD), another in 2003 (Covenant LC of Woodbridge, VA), and the last in 2006 (Lord of Life LC of Fairfax, VA), with the latter having stopped its association after one year. Although the number of congregations in the Metro DC Synod is roughly equivalent across its three jurisdictions, only two partnerships come from the District of Columbia (neither active), five from Maryland, and thirteen from Northern Virginia. The majority of those in program leadership, whether as a pre-ELCA advocacy unit or in the first years of a CSP, were from Virginia and may provide a reason for the territorial disparity of interest. The CSP for the Metro-Washington DC Synod and its relationships with the Lutheran judicatories in Namibia is a hybrid program, that is, the C2C portion stands as one of three levels of activity to support the CSP.

The table below describes the general parameters of the program as it began and continues.

**Table 1**

**LEVELS AND ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN THROUGH CSP PROGRAMMING IN THE METRO WASHINGTON DC SYNOD WITH NAMIBIAN CHURCHES**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Relationship Building</b>	<b>Educational Activity, Information Sharing</b>	<b>Resource Development and Transfer</b>	<b>Capacity Building</b>
<u>Synod or Judicatory</u>	Bishop visits and Synod official visits	Synod Assembly presentations, and annual publications of Synod Minutes	Special gifts in kind or of money from the Bishop; annual line item amount from synod budget	Interfaith Voluntary Caregiver training project, 97-02;
<u>Synod Wide</u>	Namibian Pastoral Sponsorship	Yearly Companion Synod Newsletters and other Committee produced literature	Annual Gifts of Hope Campaigns; Special gifts in kind appeal such as mattresses or books for the seminary	Support for student scholarships, 92-98;
<u>Congregation to Congregation</u>	C2C communication efforts; member visits or pastoral visits to Namibia; Namibian pastoral sponsorship	Any education program done by a congregation for its own purposes; Namibian pastor presentations	Congregational gifts to visiting pastors; annual line item donations to partners; Gifts of Hope and gifts in kind;	Pastoral visitations in either direction

The CSP of Metro DC and Namibia takes place at the synodical level of activity that is lead by synod leaders (Bishop and staff) as well as the principle committees linked to global programming for the Synod (such as the global mission committee). An activity characterizing this level of interaction would be when the Bishop of Metro DC was invited to assist in the consecration of one of the bishops in Namibia as part of the CSP relationship.

The second level of the CSP relates to all of the congregations and organizations within the Metro DC Synod without any specific relationship to a Namibian parish, that is, it is programming in which any all of the churches might take part. Exemplifying such an inclusive effort would be the annual fund raising campaign for area-wide and international needs called the “Gifts of Hope Campaign,” from which projects were earmarked for the Namibian partnership (ex. money designated for water wells and administered by Namibian churches).

The third level of relationships in the CSP is the C2C partnerships linking the lives and work of an American church with those of a Namibian congregation. Covenants describing the relationship were negotiated between the two churches and were meant to ground and steer the activities of the partners.

An example of behavior at this level might be a planned (and usually much anticipated) visit to the other's mission territory to participate in the life of the local parish.

The framework of the CSP included four broad and discretely developed activity areas. CSPs were in part designed to develop and build relationships between separate portions of the global Lutheran communion.<sup>21</sup> This may be identified simply by the inclusion of regular prayers in worship services, an exchange of letters or electronic communication, or expressions of hospitality during visitation times. The second broad activity focused on education and information sharing.

Depending on the level at which the activity was aimed, educational efforts have included presentations about Namibia to all delegates at synodical assemblies; or it included an Africa related vacation bible school theme undertaken at a church with an added focus on Namibia, or the use of Namibian worship materials in American church services.

Resource development and the transfer of those resources was the third area of CSP activities. This program area meant the transfer of financial or in-kind resources from the United States to Namibia. Different forms of resource development were used at the different levels of CSP activity. A pastor-in-residence from Namibia may receive specific and personal resources (often clothing or books, but could include money) for his use while staying in the parish of a C2C church, or an American congregation provided the money required for the construction of a church education building by a Namibian congregation, while at the broadest level, an annual contribution came from the Metro-DC Synod to be used by Namibian judicatories. Thus, funds were raised and transferred at all three levels of CSP activity – synodical, synod wide, and between and from individual congregations. Though not necessarily regular, campaigns to raise gifts-in-kind were undertaken such as the collection of books for African seminarians, or the supply of mattresses for AIDS orphans cared for through Namibian parish programs.

Lastly are the capacity building activities of the CSP. Capacity building activities are identified as projects specifically designed to provide and increase skills through training or information sessions. Capacity building activities took place at all three of the CSP levels. Namibian pastors have been “in-residence” since the beginning of the CSP. A pastor comes to the US with their expenses taken care of by the Metro DC Synod to work with American congregations for a week at a time for approximately six weeks learning about American pastorates. They often provided educational services to the churches that they “adopt” fulfilling another activity of the CSP. The Synod raised funds to offset the costs of Namibian college students enrolled in American universities, while it partnered with an outside agency (Interfaith Caregivers of Prince William County) to provide training programs in community organization, the development of volunteer services, and service to those affected by HIV/AIDS.

Though a hybrid model, CSP still stands as a form of micro-development by religious organizations and individual congregations. With the exception of bishop-to-bishop relations, even the synod-wide activities have had a congregation as the principle recipient. The money collected for water projects through Gifts of Hope (GH) and sent onto Namibian judicatories was aimed at local water needs and how local Namibian parishes facilitated solutions to local problems.<sup>22</sup> What cannot be stated is that the CSP program moved forward at all levels simultaneously, or that all programs developed equally. Indeed a review of the evolution of the Metro-DC/Namibia CSP would indicate that evolution and devolution have taken place during its short history, and that some activity areas increased their importance while others were generally downsized. It will also be shown below that the embrace of the theology of accompaniment – a significant part of the CSP program and understood to be a new perception of mission between developed and less-developed states – was stronger among synodical church leaders and elites than the parish pastors operating as intermediaries, or their congregations.

---

<sup>21</sup> This is already established in a structured, formal and bureaucratic organization known as the Lutheran World Federation, headquartered in Geneva, Switzerland. CSP was never an effort at duplicating LWF activities or purposes. The CSP theology of mission through accompaniment stands as the principle motivation for the relationship and as a means for mutual edification and growth.

<sup>22</sup> What has not been undertaken, yet, is a research process that reviews the process from the Namibian side of the relationship or partnership. A synodically sponsored “fact-finding” trip scheduled for summer 2008 was canceled and pushed back to 2009. It is the aim of the author to be included in the next trip for research and follow-up assessment.

The following table profiles the evolutionary history of the CSP. The peak point of its activity took place during the last years of the 1990's, at least the years from 1997-2000 mark the largest amount of activity undertaken across three levels and four program areas. The timeline shows program continuity and discontinuity – changes of emphasis. In many ways, the Metro-DC/Namibia CSP partnership program begins with a stronger emphasis on C2C programs, but moves to emphasizing synod wide and synodical relationships as the program ages.

**Table 2: GIFTS OF HOPE MONEY FOR NAMIBIA, 1992 THROUGH 2006**

1992	\$10,700
1993	\$13,400
1994	\$16,500
1995	\$22,600
1996	\$20,200
1997	\$26,200
1998	\$27,800
1999	\$27,500
2000	\$27,500
2001	\$39,700
2002	\$31,600
2003	\$38,700
2004	\$36,850
2005	\$35,000
2006	\$26,000
TOTAL	

- The above table has been constructed from two lists, both undated and one handwritten from the Metro Washington DC Synod archives.
- Total for the list from 2000-2006 was \$239,800, or 52% of all money raised through the G of H program and designated for CSP.
- Beginning in 2005, money was split between the two Namibian Companion Synods.
- In 2006, a separate gift of \$4200 was given to the Paulinum Seminary in Namibia.

One of the first educational tracts developed for the Namibian CSP of the Metro DC Synod and written by Pastor Lynn Opderbecke, a leader of the pre-independence Namibian Task Force time, is almost entirely directed to potential activities available for congregational work.<sup>23</sup> Benefits that come to participating CSP congregations were identified (mission possibilities, educational outlets, cultural enrichment, service to an oppressed and struggling portion of humanity, etc.), and the program was framed as an extension of the good will that will come to the people in the post-independence years for Namibia. The overwhelming majority of congregations who became involved in the C2C process began in the first three years of the program with minimal growth happening in the second decade of operation. The earliest of these churches (and their pastors) participated with the pre-independence activities of the ALC, many of their pastoral leaders were also more heavily invested in the same activities, and were party to the discussions and drafting of the CSP covenant in Namibia in 1992. The strength of the earlier program was also anchored in Virginia, a relationship that continued into the CSP program as evidenced by the large number of churches from that state (as opposed to Maryland or the District of Columbia). The “south of the river” peculiarity has never been overcome. The pastor-in-residence program, where a Namibian pastor was hosted by American churches and learned and worked alongside their American counterparts began in 1993. The most significant change in this program would occur in 2005 when the four CSP American Synod partners with Namibia would share Namibian clergy across their territories for the eight weeks of time.

<sup>23</sup> Metro-Washington DC Synod, ELCA.

Two programs that also were present at the beginning of the CSP and were open to synod-wide resourcing were the solicitation of funds for student scholarships and the beginning of the GH fund. The availability of scholarships for Namibian students lasted six years and seldom amounted to more than several thousand dollars of investment annually per student. The one or two students supported by the synod were usually studying at universities further away from the Metro-DC Synod and had little direct relationship with area congregations. GH programming has always been Synod-wide including the churches who do or do not participate with CSP.

GH money for Namibia has been directed towards supplies (school kits and uniforms for students), for families (livestock bequests), and for communities being served by Lutheran parishes (community water projects). Each line-item gift can be linked to a developmental objective, but is at the same time a pass-through of money transferred from an American to an African church. The table below shows the growth of GH funds in the CSP relationship.

**Table 3: TIME LINE OF ACTIVITY FOR WASHINGTON METRO DC SYNOD COMPANION SYNOD PROGRAM, NAMIBIA**

1980's – American Lutheran Church precursor Namibian Task Force Activity	1990 – “Mission 90” framework of ELCA established for the church, paving the way for CSP programs.	1991 - CSP begins for Metro DC Synod with two Namibian Judicatories	1992 – Synod reps travel to Namibia to work out covenant agreement. Gifts of Hope program is launched synod-wide. The first scholarship money for a Namibian student in the US is provided and the program will continue through 1998.	1993 – The first Namibian pastor comes to the Synod to work with area churches, and will continue annually to the present.
1994 – 15 churches participate in the C2C program with the largest number coming from Virginia. The Synod provides a trip to Namibia organized through the partnership program.	1995 – A pastoral leader of the program travels for a sabbatical to Namibia and provides several weeks of stewardship training to Namibian congregations. Trip to Namibia	1996 – The Synod explores the possibility of working with an outside organization, “The Caregivers”, and its employee, Elizabeth Liske, to provide skill and community organization training workshops. Trip to Namibia. There are 16 congregations involved in the C2C.	1997 – Synod/Caregivers workshops begin and continue through 2000 and in 2002. Seminary book appeal is launched and sent.	1998 – Trip to Namibia.
2000-01 – Visits occur by Namibian Church leaders.	2002-2004 – The C2C program rises to 19 churches. HIV/AIDS program provided through Caregivers format in 2002.	2005 – Agreement is reached between the three American Synod working with Namibia to “covenant” there efforts, and is agreed to with the Namibian Churches. Bishop from Namibia visits.	2006 to the present – Total churches participating stands at 20. Synod “accompanies” Namibian churches process towards consolidation under the auspices of the LWF. Mattress appeal succeeds.	

With the exception of the final year where figures were available (2006) the trajectory of funds for Namibia projects modestly increases. The largest increases coincided with the terrorist attacks on the United States in 2001 and at the height of the Iraq war. The Namibian funds of GH have always represented the largest part of funds provided by the Metro DC Synod for all of its CSP programs, doubling the other two CSPs.

The second major increase in program activity began in the mid 1990's and was carried out into the next decade. Interfaith Voluntary Caregivers (IVC) of Prince William County (in Virginia), led by a Lutheran member of a C2C congregation, primarily works at developing service leaders in local US communities.

Visited by one of the first pastors-in-residence, the idea of using IVC to provide volunteer and skills training through CSP in Namibia was raised with church officials in both countries. With a budget of approximately \$30,000 per year through grants (from the Lutheran based Wheatridge Foundation), the capacity building project lived for six iterations providing various forms of training using both American and African trainers. The intent of IVC was to develop skilled volunteers in every parish who could train others for future efforts and parish based needs.<sup>24</sup>

Clearly the investment in IVC and synodical or synod-wide participation (even if only for the purpose of raising and distributing funds) had become important for the life of CSP. The presence of trips to the country of the CSP partner was encouraged in the original companion synod documents of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Almost all the trips taken in the 1990's (other than pastor-in-residence flights paid for by Metro DC Synod) were from the US to Africa. Most of those taking the trips were leaders of the synod's CSP program, or clergy from C2C supporting churches. In other words, they were those who were already heavily invested in the program. Efforts were taken in the second decade to widen participation for the trips without any large increase in the number of C2C partnerships. In the second decade more trips from Namibian church officials and bishops coming to the US and Washington, DC occurred, as did selective trips for the Metro DC bishop going to Namibia (for the consecration of a new Namibian bishop). A process to link activities of the four American synods (New Jersey, SW Washington State, NE Iowa, and Washington DC) working with Namibia was negotiated and signed through the ELCA Division for Global Mission in 2005. Invitations were extended through the LWF to the leadership of the four American Synods to participate in merger discussions among the three Lutheran judicatories in Namibia and held in 2007. Although not conclusive, the post 2000 trends show increasing importance for judicatory and synodical work coupled with resource transfers through established synod-wide programs.

Levels of Gifts of Hope funding would be sustained into the new decade and millennium prompting a former bishop to question whether the success of the one restricted expansion or lessened the ability and importance of C2C work.<sup>25</sup> The annual pastor-in-residence program continued with some C2C congregations taking a week every year (St. Matthew Lutheran Church in Woodbridge hosted fifteen pastors). From 1993 to 2005, thirty-two churches had hosted a pastor for a week, or only twelve more congregations than the total amount involved in C2C programming.<sup>26</sup> A leader of the Namibian CSP program indicated that by the second decade of the program, a significant number of C2C churches were either inactive or did very little to support their relationships.<sup>27</sup>

C2C level programming towards CSP-Namibia began to be surpassed in importance by synod-wide and synodical relationships between judicatories. The next table provides an overview of what has taken place at the C2C level of the Namibia CSP program. Information was gathered through Synod archives, a review of the files of program leaders, and interviews with clergy and church lay leaders. Although an interview request was made to every congregation that indicated it was involved in CSP C2C efforts, only those appearing with the asterisk at the side of their name in the table complied.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> According to the evaluation assessment of Director Elizabeth Liske and kept in the Metro Washington DC Archives, following the first IVS/CSP program in 1997, well of one hundred forty individuals received training for developing volunteer programs, leadership skills, community organization skills, and other training linked to congregationally based service operations. The final activity would be a training session in 2002 that provided information and skills required to serve the burgeoning HIV/AIDS difficulties in Namibia.

<sup>25</sup> Interview the Rev. Theodore Schneider, former bishop of the Metro-Washington DC Synod on July 8, 2008.

<sup>26</sup> Tally from an undated, unsigned, and handwritten summary statement in the program files of the Metro Washington DC Synod archives, researched in May 2008.

<sup>27</sup> Interview with the Rev. Lowell Knauff, Namibian CSP coordinator for the Metro DC Synod on July 9, 2008.

<sup>28</sup> The responses by some clergy leaders were remarkable. One insisted that there was no relationship even though the church appeared in Synod records for over fifteen years. Several refused or could not make any time during the course of four months of on-the-ground research. Others never returned repeated telephone calls or direct requests for appointments. An untested supposition that may be of use to CSP program leaders following the response to repeated information requests would be that a percent

age of partnerships are either no longer functioning or are in danger of discontinuation.

**Table 4**

Program Outputs of Companion Synon Congregational Relationships, Metro DC Synod and the Lutheran Churches of Namibia												
Churches	Start	Leader	InfoShare	Advocacy	Hosti ng	Trips	DevP roj	G of H	InKind	Line- item	OtherF und	Educ
<b>DC</b>												
Our Redeemer, *	1994	none	none	no	no	no	no					
Reformation		comm			yes	yes		yes				
<b>MD</b>												
Emmanuel, Beth	1993	none	none	no	yes							
Hope, Col Park *	1993	comm	none	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes		yes	SS,C,O
Peace, Waldorf *	2002	comm	initially	no	yes	yes	no	yes		yes		SS,C
Sjohn, R'Ville, *	1994	laity	initially	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	SS,C
Sluke,Sspring	1994				yes							
<b>VA</b>												
Abid Pres, Burk*	1994	laity	initially	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	SS,O
ChristKing,GF *	1994	Clergy	initially	no	yes		no	yes	yes	yes	yes	SS,C,O
Community,Ster												
Covenant,Wbrid	2002				yes							
Emmanuel,Vien*	1994	comm	semi-reg	no	yes	no	buildir	yes	yes	yes	yes	SS,C,O
Faith, Arlington*	1994	laity	none	no	yes	no	no	yes				O
GoodShep,Alex*	1993	laity	initially	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes		yes	SS,C,O
HolyCross,Hern*	1994	none	none	no		no	no	yes				
Hope,Annandal*	2002	laity	letters	1 letter	yes	no	no	yes		yes		O,
KingofKings,Fair					yes							
LordofLife,Fair	2006											
S.Andrew,Centr*	1994		initially	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	SS,C,O
S.Matthew,Wod*	1994	comm	semi-reg	no	yes	yes	buildir	yes	yes	yes	yes	SS,C,O

The table shows how longstanding the C2C relationships were, and how few new ones have come on line. The goal for widespread C2C relationships has not been met and is unlikely to be met. The program has not been embraced uniformly and is most active only in Virginia. Communication and the regular sharing of information between partners, a principle method in relationship building, had largely fallen off. The irony of this in an age of multiple communication outlets should not be overlooked, and the difference between this experience and those of two non-CSP C2C congregations is of interest. Most C2C clergy and lay representatives agreed that communication had been disappointing. Several objectives for C2C programming had been faithfully attempted. The hosting of pastors-in-residence was almost universal among those willing to be interviewed. Likewise, almost every congregation that could be reached could prove their involvement in the synod’s GH program. Nearly every congregation had provided some form of educational programming at least once during the years.

This may have been a Sunday school or vacation church school activity (SS), a clergy led program (C), or one that was led by the pastor-in-residence or some other educational activity (O). Educational programming could not be identified as regular or annual for the participating churches. If these activities were nearly universal among the congregations (the GH program being the only one that had something to do with development but little to do with anything put resource transfers to less advantaged locations), the effort of advocacy on behalf of Namibia, Namibian issues, issues affecting locations like Namibia, or Africa’s relationship to the US was seldom done.

Pursuing political, economic, and social justice was a goal of the original CSP documents of the ELCA. However several former and current Namibia CSP leaders agreed with the interview statement that the CSP had depoliticized the Synod's involvement with Namibia.<sup>29</sup> What the ELCA documents promoted for CSP programs was to avoid the increased reliance on financial and other resource transfer relationships.<sup>30</sup> A reliance on financial resource transfers hearkens back to more traditional missionary relationships and endangers the possibilities of accompaniment and partnership as a means for establishing common ground. Although not universal,<sup>31</sup> the majority of still active C2C relationships engage in some form of resource transfer. These annual gifts range from a low of \$500 annually to a high of \$4000 while between \$1500-2000 per year was a more common total. Most provide in-kind resources, along with the non C2C churches, when called upon through synod-wide appeals (such as the 1998 seminary book or 2005 mattress appeals). Some gifts in kind were unique to one congregation (a request for used trumpets to Christ the King Lutheran Church or Great Falls, Virginia). Almost all interviewees did not see themselves as engaged in development and could not remember ever providing funding or services to development through CSP. The relationship that links active or more active C2C churches with the data connects positively with having an annual line-item budget amount for their Namibian partner, oversight or direction by a lay committee in the church, and provision of more than one type of activity (education, visits, etc.) during the year.

#### **d. Some Differences between CSP Leaders/Elites and Others**

Although most interviews were with the parish leaders involved with C2C relationships, four Synod staff leaders were interviewed.<sup>32</sup> The multi-level hybrid model of the CSP provided them roles linking them not only to the synod's parishes, members, and pastors but also to the national ELCA and its agencies (Lutheran World Relief, Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services), and to the global ecumenical presence of the Lutheran church in Switzerland (LWF). The four are "elites" in CSP activities and programs.

There was a stronger, more unequivocal interpretation of the theology and purpose of accompaniment" by synod leaders than for pastors or lay people in the project. In the interview at Abiding Presence Lutheran Church, accompaniment was described as education and information sharing, for the learning of other cultures, and to be of help in the world for those who are not as well off.<sup>33</sup> The description of the program as an educational and cultural one designed to be of help to those overseas in need was not unique, indeed, it was more often the way C2C representatives described CSP partnership. For a pastor such as from St. Matthew in Woodbridge who had been associated with the program throughout its lifetime and who represented one of the most highly engaged congregations, "accompaniment" was meaningful and was the method he chose to understand his church's involvements with Namibia. Synod leaders did not share these interpretation tensions – between a more traditional and hierarchical relationship based upon help and service from the US to a less fortunate setting versus the sharing of mutually beneficial experiences, presence, understanding, and resources.

Yet all of the synod leaders acknowledged that accompaniment was not the general value undergirding the perceptions or purpose of CSP among the membership of synod congregations.

---

<sup>29</sup> Interviews with Bishop Schneider on July 8, 2008, and Lowell Knauf on July 9, 2008. Only three advocacy efforts were detected through the research. A letter from former Bishop Schneider to the Clinton White House requesting that the Administration reconsider visiting Namibia for the former president's trip to Africa; a letter from the pastor of Hope Lutheran Church about HIV/AIDS money for Africa; and a letter in the mid-1990's from Pastor Lynn Ofterbeck to the American Ambassador in Namibia requesting visa assistance for Namibian students intent on studying at U.S. universities.

<sup>30</sup> Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. *Companion Synods Handbook*, Summer 2006.

<sup>31</sup> Indeed, the pastor of Good Shepherd Lutheran Church in Alexandria in his interview with me repeatedly talked about this when it came to his church's involvement with its companion in Africa.

<sup>32</sup> Bishop Theodore Schneider was interviewed in his home on July 8, 2008. Bishop Richard Graham was interviewed in his office on July 23, 2008. Rev. Lowell Knauff was interviewed in his home on July 9, 2008. Rev. Robert Allard was interviewed in his home on July 31, 2008.

<sup>33</sup> Interview with Ms. Linda Lepkun, Church Administrator and only member working on global emphasis at Abiding presence Lutheran Church on July 10, 2008.

The four leaders gave tribute to the program's origins, to former staff and individuals from the ALC Namibia Task force. Former Bishop Schneider acknowledged the synod's debt also to Namibian Bishop Dumeini for the beginning of CSP.

By doing so, Schneider's comments provided an "accompaniment" perspective from the program's beginnings unlike the other synod leaders. The former bishop also expressed greater dissatisfaction that the C2C program had not broadened out further across the synod. Each leader acknowledged the importance of the program's multiple roles and levels of activity. The limited expressions of advocacy was identified by all four leaders, while Rev. Allard expressed his belief that education was a stronger attribute of the program's beginning and middle years. The capacity building activities brought on by the partnership between Interfaith Caregivers and the synod was identified by three of the four leaders as the most expansive time for the program, while the current bishop expressed belief about new possibilities ahead. Each uniquely described the lessening involvements by parishes as part of the program's evolution, and that there was an increasing dependence on financial resources in CSP partnership

The program's long relationships and consistent leadership were identified as strengths of CSP. Declining partnerships, a lessening pool of congregational leaders, and the relationship's financial inequity were ongoing challenges.<sup>34</sup> The reality of limited expansion and decreasing depth and sustainability of C2C relationships at one level, was offset by the greater coordination being pursued at higher levels of synod relations in the US or internationally. Elites spoke with sadness about the decline but commented about the covenantal cooperation achieved between four American synods and efforts underway to be a party of the Namibian process of church coordination. That these synod/bishop level activities with Namibia could leverage more C2C growth is not well evidenced.

#### **e. The View/Story from Namibia**

It is more difficult to reflect a perfectly parallel description of the CSP from the Namibian side of the relationship. Unlike in Metro DC, vast distances separate congregations. Roads (or their limitations) can make movement difficult. Communication is more difficult (and perhaps less frequent) between pastors, headquarters, and individual parishes. Computer applications and internet connectivity was not uniform. In the case of one of the partner bodies (ELCRN), current files of data for the CSP either could not be found or never existed more recently than 2003.<sup>35</sup> Three other ELCA synods are also in CSP relationships in Namibia with sometimes parallel or wholly different activities. The movement of pastors from church to church, or from parish to administrative position means that the institutional memory of the C2C relationships may be easily lost.<sup>36</sup> And then there is the reality that the CSP must cover more than one church body. Thus the information presented in this section cannot be seen as structured or uniform, but remains more random and anecdotal.

Three partners relate to the CSP of the Metro-Washington DC synod, separated from each other through their various European mission histories, geographies of activity, and the racial politics of pre-independence oversight by South Africa. These partners include the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Namibia (ELCIN) begun by Finnish missionaries and headquartered in the small northern community of Onippa outside of the larger commercial and administrative center of Ondangwa; the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the Republic of Namibia (ELCRN) begun by Rhennish Missionaries and headquartered in the capital of Windhoek; and the German Evangelical Lutheran Church (GELC or DELK), also headquartered in the capital and whose pre-independence history reflects the political history of racial division and class privilege.

---

<sup>34</sup> Assessment by the current bishop, Rev. Richard Graham from his interview.

<sup>35</sup> Research done at the ELCRN headquarters on archived data provided to the author by ELCRN staff concerning the history of the CSP relationship ended with 2003 materials. Requests and comment about the gap could not find the remainder of the files before the author's return to the United States.

<sup>36</sup> The author conducted a focus group with seven ELCIN pastors who were part of the CSP in the past, and who had traveled to the United States as part of the "Missionary in Residence" program. Other than a senior administrator, all other clergypersons had moved on to other parishes cutting the ties that C2C partnership implied. Another pastor said that he was unaware of any partnership for the congregation that he now led even though that church had been a C2C partner for years. Another congregation was unaware of their relationship nor had participated in any meaningful way for over decade, even though it was on an original Namibian list of C2C churches, and remained on the Metro DC list of partnered congregations!



Though efforts are currently underway to reduce separation by seeking connective opportunities of service, real avenues for collaboration are few. The ongoing work of the Paulinum United Lutheran Seminary in Windhoek is the most visible example of collaboration at least among two of the three partners (ELCIN and ELCRN). In many ways, the CSP represents a later effort at partnership with Namibian Lutherans that have already established patterns of relationship among each other and with their primary European partners.<sup>37</sup> The pursuit of Namibian Lutheran unity in the face of organizational separateness does not appear to be new. As early as at the start of the independent republic comes a resolution adopted by the three Namibian denominations stating:

Therefore, this consultation resolves that the three Lutheran Churches on the basis of their biblical testimony, to be united in one Lutheran Church in Namibia.<sup>38</sup>

What this means today is unclear, though relations between all of the Namibian Lutheran denominations at the leader and institutional levels appear congenial, and interactions take place among them on a regional basis. Turning to the interviews, what were some of the common and most identified specifics of the relationship? The responses to two of the questions – what was going right, and what was disappointing or in need of improvement – stood out as they were asked of bishops, parish pastors, church officials, and lay people.<sup>39</sup>

Two categories of responses cover most of the reaction to the positive qualities of the CSP relationship. These include gratitude about specific resources or physical and financial gifts provided from the American congregations, and the second a more broadly understood appreciation of capacities, skills, or knowledge gained through the relationship. Perhaps unsurprisingly, gifts and resources were identified by lay people and included such items as financial donations, other gifts in kind, the help received with building a building or repairing a roof, and individual benefits as in attending youth camps. Pastors more often spoke of the skills they had received, such as expanded theological training, and augmented capacities in social ministries or another aspect of parish life. Church leaders were quick to identify the benefits of expanded relationships among Lutherans, while a more cryptic response was being thankful in that “the relationship could have been something much less.”<sup>40</sup> Criticism of the program as it has evolved covered wider ground. At all levels (church leaders, pastors, lay people), the Namibian churches cited difficulties with communication both in their quality and quantity.

Another oft cited limitation was the pastoral centeredness of the program to date, that is, that in addition to pastoral exchanges there should have been an interest in exchanges and more involvements for lay people, social workers and social ministry personal, seminary exchanges, and/or more specialized capacity building for non-parish ministries and capacity building. Another broadly held impression was that Americans did not come over as often as they should, or for as long as either equality or accompaniment might have implied. What was often expressed was that American visitors should spend as much time in Namibia understanding its needs and opportunities as Namibian personnel do in the United States. Musings about past activities among American colleges and universities and the Namibian students who had been able to study there through the scholarships they received were mentioned by both the ELCRN and the ELCIN. Even pastors hoped for there to be more opportunities to come to the United States for extended study. On a more abstract plain, Namibian respondents spoke of the need for the C2C partnerships to better understand the demands for economic independence, new dimensions of social injustice, and the intentional discussion of real and unfolding issues in post-independence Namibia.

On account of the above, church leaders cited the current time as an appropriate one for “revisiting the agenda,” and “strengthening the base of the relationship,” and “assessing the progress and growth,” and “evaluating the program.”<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> During a research visit in July and August, 2011, church personal from Germany were in evidence as part of annual visits and conversations; records at the church guest house showed annual visitors from Finland; Namibian pastors spend time working and improving skills in Finland, while at the seminary a student from the Finnish Lutheran Church was completing some of her studies.

<sup>38</sup> Namibian Church Unity Consultation, June 26-27, 1992.

<sup>39</sup> The paragraphs describing positive elements of the CSP and those needing improvement are a compilation of responses from all of the interviews conducted while in Namibia.

<sup>40</sup> The comment was made by Bishop Kameeta during interviews with the author.

<sup>41</sup> The phrases specifically reflect thoughts from Bishop Nambala of the ELCIN said during his interview, but reflect similar ideas spoken by the Bishop and Associate Bishop of the ELCRN.

Perhaps almost universally held was the thought and belief that a potential set of meetings in 2012 of all partners and stakeholders from Africa, the United States, and the Lutheran World Federation would promise new measures of enthusiasm and recommitments, along with prospects for new directions and clarity. This set of beliefs was held also by the third and almost silent partner in the CSP, the DELK.

Several survey questions asked about any history of specific and shared programs in education, social services, advocacy, and development projects that were ongoing or could be remembered. If the CSP were to be graded on either the perception or reality of shared projects in ministry over time, then those grades would have to be disappointing given the limited recall. How else could they be otherwise when some minimum identifiers of the relationship, such as evidence of regular correspondence, the use of available electronic media for communication, or even knowledge of annual worship or prayer activities done to commemorate the CSP are neither known or done with any regularity. The irony in this is that similar criticisms were voiced by American partners, both pastoral and lay, and were identified above.

What seems to be the most regular and dependable quality of the CSP as it relates to C2C would be the annual arrival of Namibian pastors to the United States and now shared among the four American synods that link to the Namibian denominations for the purposes of partnership, ministry, and development. An ELCIN document from 2005 identified forty nine pastors and church leaders who had participated in one program or another to bring them to the United States. Other names would need to be added to cover the remainder of the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, as well as perhaps the pastoral exchanges that brought Namibian clergy to Scandinavia and Germany, and other various ELCA or LWF conferences. When asked, the ELCIN Secretary General thought that somewhere between a third and a half of his denomination's pastoral leaders had participated in such travel, skill-building, or study exchanges.<sup>42</sup>

For some individuals, these opportunities have been multiple trips and times living abroad.<sup>43</sup> From the perspective of the Namibian churches, the CSP sits within a broader context of actions taken by churches that extends across continents and time. Before there was even an independent Namibia, students were enrolled in American Lutheran colleges and universities, many of which are leaders today in government, the non-profit sector, or business.<sup>44</sup> The ELCA has provided annual financial allotments through its world hunger programs designated for Namibian HIV/AIDS services that are provided by the Evangelical Lutheran Church AIDS Program (ELCAP), a program that is shared by the Namibian Lutheran churches. At least two professors/pastors have taught for extended periods of time at Paulinum Lutheran Seminary now in Windhoek.<sup>45</sup> Wartburg College has made trips of professors to Namibia.<sup>46</sup> A tally of the transfer of gifts in kind, grants, and all exchanges would run to several hundreds of thousands of dollars, and dozens of different program applications over the decades.

It is easy to conclude that there is and has been a breadth of engagement between Lutheran institutions, leaders, and denominations in the United States, Europe and Namibia. But if the CSP and in particular the micro-development prospects represented by C2C partnerships were to represent "depth" or "sustainability", that conclusion would not be fulfilled. Indeed, Namibian C2C parishes mirror the experiences of American ones, at least in the Metro Washington, DC Synod. There are several Namibian churches where there have been more extensive and innovative and represent a relative consistency of effort (Okihau Lutheran Parish); there are others that have no relationship and are unaware of any relationship and want to have a relationship and were on the original list of C2C Namibian partner churches (Eengola Lutheran Parish); and there are parishes that for a period of time were involved in C2C like relationships but not with ELCA CSP partners with Namibia (Mupini Lutheran Parish). The latter category of independent C2C relationships and how they have operated in the Metro DC Synod is reviewed below.

---

<sup>42</sup> From the interview conducted with the ELCIN Secretary-General.

<sup>43</sup> Conversations between the author and the Rev. Paul Muha.

<sup>44</sup> Reference to the program that brought one hundred students from Namibia to the United States beginning in 1985 were scattered among both ELCIN and ELCRN documents, and are archived by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in Chicago.

<sup>45</sup> These included the Rev. David Preissinger of Washington State, and the late Rev. Dr. Roy Enquist.

<sup>46</sup> Indeed, while staying at the ELCIN Guest House in Oniipa, I was asked to sign the guest book which showed many of the names and their comments of their stay.

The point here is that there is no apparent extreme difference between American and Namibian congregation experiences, but rather sizeable amounts of similarity in their complaints and hopes. This recognition offers prospects for some reappraisal and renewal, or reappraisal and dismissal by the partners. The comments heard from Namibian congregations and their leaders were more often directed towards trying to begin something again, or add onto what already exists but with more equality of exchanges. Both a sample of the breadth of involvements with Namibia as well as the author's recommendations (as requested by the Namibian churches) is provided in the appendix section below.

Before leaving the general impressions and trends of the CSP C2C relationships and moving to a more focused discourse found throughout the Namibian church and at both the leadership and parish levels, are some personal "non-scientific" observations about the program's beginnings. Namibian documents files include the public evidence of warm and intimate correspondence between bishops and several pastors in the first years of the program. The correspondence between former American bishop Harold Jansen and Bishop Dumeini, and the correspondence of several pastors at the start of the program stand out in this regard. They exhibit a tone of relationship rather than only business or programmatic/budgetary needs, friendship and personalness stand alongside the need to discuss working elements of the partnership. Some later correspondence by Namibian leaders on the shock of September 11, 2001 (indeed, even a set of personal letters received by the author on the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the tragedy) or Secretary General Shaniika's letters after hurricane damage in 2008 are other examples. The personal quality of these earlier letters (as evidence of an ongoing relationship of value) does not strive to be some measurement of what it took for progress or success to be "necessary and sufficient", but was of interest and was noted.

One of the distinctive elements of the Namibian Lutheran Churches was the emphasis on a discourse of development as it pertains to Namibia and Namibians. Several social problems dominated this discourse the most obvious being the problem of unemployment. At the time of the research and this writing, unemployment was over fifty percent of the working population.

Knowledge of the problems of unemployment was universal discussed and described as much by church executives as church pastors; adult lay persons and teenagers preparing to leave a Lutheran High School. Poverty and households living in poverty was a constant reality. It made no difference whether conversations took place in ELCIN or ELCRN parishes, urban or rural, the evidence of poverty and its impact on diet, consumption, and life choices could be easily seen. Additionally, studies had recently revealed that the income gap among Namibians was higher than any other state in the Southern Africa region.<sup>47</sup> Not only was unemployment feeding the real presence of persistent poverty, but the factor of inequality among Namibia's population was increasing after independence. One more systemic approach to the national (and thereby religious and Lutheran) discourse on poverty was partially being lead by the ELCRN leadership and through the Namibian Council of Churches.

Advocacy, education, leadership, and resources were being used towards increasing awareness of the Basic Income Grant (BIG) approach to poverty alleviation with Bishop Kameeta writing and speaking on its behalf in various forums and publications.<sup>48</sup> The BIG approach provided a minimum economic intervention by the public sector towards all poor households with the assumption that this intervention would and could spear greater economic stability during hard times. An experimental trial and study were often pointed to as evidence for the approach and successful outcomes that could be duplicated and made nation-wide.<sup>49</sup> Public sector economic grants and interventions had occurred earlier across Namibian society and directed towards other sectors including veterans, the aged, and children. Certainly the reality of HIV/AIDS was also part of the common discourse over poverty, again whether among religious leaders or with lay people. A visit to the AIDS center in Reheboth and conversations with staff people there documented evidence of programs positively affecting community people's lives with reductions in levels of new HIV cases.

---

<sup>47</sup> Herbert Jauch and Phanuel Kaapama. *Social Justice and the Responsibility of the State: The Triple Burden of Poverty, Inequality, and Unemployment in Southern Africa*. (Windhoek: Friedrich-Ebert Stiftung [Namibia Office]; May 2011).

<sup>48</sup> Zephania Kameeta. "The Miracle of Sharing" from Jochen Motte, editor, *Think Big: Inputs and Reflections on Social Justice and the Basic Income Grant*. (Hannover: Foedus-Verlag, 2010), p. 20-22.

<sup>49</sup> Jauch and Kaapama, "The Basic Income Grant Pilot Project in Otjivero" from *Social Justice and the Responsibility of the State*...p. 10-14.

This level of success for this community, noted by both ELCRN and ELCIN officials was not a national reality as it was pointed out that levels in the Northern provinces were much higher and little movement to lower these rates could be detected.<sup>50</sup>

Finally in this discourse on poverty and development were efforts undertaken by both of the main non-white church bodies to open the door to private sector and for profit enterprises. ELCIN’s Business Foundation (EBF) was one such direction where assets such as the museum, the guest house, the printer, etc. were reorganized and accounted for differently than as only non-profit extensions of the church. This opened the door for conversations over the possibility of a development project trust that might be done in relationship with church partners. The point to be identified is the breadth and depth of the development and poverty discourse among Namibian Lutheran denominations. It is a discourse as presented above where the context of poverty, its persistence and growth, the relationships to unemployment and public health, as well as specific policy initiatives were evident among clergy and laity. Several pastors identified the above as evidence for Namibia’s need of an economic liberation following Namibia’s political independence. Pastors also spoke about economic conditions in Namibia and compared them with the approaches neighboring South Africa and Zimbabwe, where land reappropriation efforts had been underway for years and “nationalization of mines” was then part of the public and media discussions. One pastor agreed in informal conversation with the more popular idea in Namibia that less aggressive and voluntary plans for shifting land ownership had not succeeded in changing the equation of poverty and that something more aggressive was necessary.

Whether this discourse on poverty and development is happening between Namibian Lutherans and their European partners is not formally known, though a quick glance at the location of publishers broadcasting the above needs and concerns quickly point to Germany and Scandinavia. Other than through the annual Gifts of Hope campaign of the CSP, poverty and its alleviation through development is seldom incorporated in the C2C or Washington-Namibia discourse. The silence can lead to the possible question of the future relevance of CSP and C2C. Quoting Bishop Kameeta on this point from the concluding interview he remarked, “we need to have less talk; we need to have more activity.”

**Table 5**

LEVELS AND ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN THROUGH CSP PROGRAMMING IN THE NAMIBIAN CHURCHES WITH THE METRO WASHINGTON DC SYNOD

<b>Level</b>	<b>Relationship Building</b>	<b>Educational Activity, Information Sharing</b>	<b>Resource Development and Transfer</b>	<b>Capacity Building</b>
<u>Judicatory:</u> <u>ELCRN</u> <u>ELCIN</u> <u>G(D)ELK</u>	Bishop visits and visits to the USA from officials	Archived materials in Church headquarters; not regular	Moneys from the USA, including Gifts of Hope, go directly to the prescribed purposes	None that was visible
<u>Church Wide</u>	Namibian Pastoral Sponsorship, pastors selected to come to the USA	Reports to their judicatories from the returning pastors to the USA; no other regular activity	<i>Reception</i> of the Annual Gifts of Hope Campaign funds; Reception of Special gifts in kind appeals such as mattresses or clothing	None that was visible
<u>Congregation to Congregation</u>	Some C2C communication efforts or other means to relate to the American partner; this is limited and sporadic	It was unclear that any meaningful or regular education takes place on the accompanying partnerships	<i>Reception</i> of Congregational gifts or line-item donations from the USA; some mention of a traveling choir presentation in the history of the relationship	Pastoral visitations in either direction; pastoral presentations in US congregations

<sup>50</sup> This information came from interviews with ELCAP personnel in Reheboth, and reiterated by ELCIN staff.

**f. Non-CSP C2C cases**

Several congregations in the Metro-DC Synod chose to participate in C2C development/mission relationships without using the CSP framework. They were Christ Lutheran Church (DC) in El Salvador, St. Paul Lutheran Church (DC) in Zambia, Lord of Life Lutheran Church (VA) in Haiti, and Christ the Servant Lutheran Church (MD) in Liberia. Each country chosen are involved in CSP relationships across the ELCA, and El Salvador and Metro DC are a CSP though the actions taken by the local church were not part of this relationship. Several reasons stand out for choosing to do work outside of the synod’s programs. The principle one for beginning was that an individual had an experience to share or who had relationships to a different part of the world, provided motivation and leadership to mobilize the church and its membership to act. Such a relationship offers advantages of speed and flexibility for the start-up of projects. Thus, the C2C relationship outside of the CSP comes from an internal mobilization source rather than the external structure of the CSP. A table depicting general extent of the relationships is below.

Table 6: Program Outputs of Non-Companion Synod Congregations in C2C Activities, Metro Washington DC Synod, ELCA

Program Outputs of Non-Companion Synod Congregations involved in C2C							in C2C activities globally, Metro Washington DC Synod, ELCA							
Church	Service Site	Duration	Leadership	Structure	Trips	Purpose	Info Share	Advoc	GofH	In-kind	Annual	O-Funds	educ	Ongoing
Christ, DC	El Salvador	< 1 yr	Pastoral	Personal	yes	info	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	SS, O	no
CTS, MD	Liberia	> 1 yr	Committee	Partner	yes	project	yes	no.	yes	yes	no	yes	O, C	no
LOL, VA	Haiti	> 5 yrs	Multiple	Corporate	yes	multiple	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	O,C,SS	yes
S.Paul, DC	Zambia	< 1 yr	Pastoral	Personal	yes	service	no	no	yes	yes	no	yes	O	no

Several qualities in the non-CSP C2C relationships separate them from those of the CSP. The obvious difference is that there are no country overlaps. The second is their lack of durability. Only one of the partnerships has operated for more than two years and continues to be active. Like the Synodical CSP, this one has crafted institutions and regulations for maintaining its activity. All four had different purposes for the partnerships – from information gathering/consciousness-raising, to service, to development. No increased presence (over the CSP partners) for advocacy, information sharing, or line-item funds was in evidence adding to the evidence of limited sustainability. There would be some potential similarities from Lord-of-Life to others simply because it has multiple goals and strategies. Like their neighbors in the CSP program, these four participated in the GH program and provided educational experiences to their members relevant.

Beyond being unsustainable, their differences of origin, purpose, and outcome complicate any cross-learning among themselves or to others inclined to pursue non-CSP C2C development approaches. It appeared that no efforts had been taken to present their learnings to date. Technically, each project had a partner(s) to work with in their host country. These partners range from an individual congregation reminiscent of the Synod's CSP program, to an indigenous NGO, to an international non-state actor. For Christ Church this was an already established multi-mission organization serving the area called International Partners in Mission (IMP). For St. Paul's this partner was the faith based Sons of Thunder Orphanage in Zambia, where a church member had gone to provide earlier service. For Christ the Servant this was a Lutheran church in Liberia, St. Matthew, with whom earlier personal relationships had been made. For Lord of Life, partners include the large international NGO Food for the Poor (FFP), and the expansion of the Village of Hope ministry of an earlier missionary to Haiti.

Four styles of structural partnership emerge from the non-CSP C2C relationships. Christ church led by the pastor and her previous professional experience in Latin America contracted the services of another NGO to piece together an encounter with the developing world for church members. The project began and ended in 2008 with a small group of members traveling to El Salvador. IFP arranged visits for the group. No service project was included in the church's travels. Various educational activities took place in the congregation once the group returned from the region. One of the group's members returned to El Salvador to be involved in a construction-service project. Money was provided for the construction of a roof. The personal leadership of the pastor saw the project to its completion and participants paid for their own expenses. It is not clear that any further activity was anticipated by those interviewed.

In many ways the structure of the St. Paul partnership is similar arising from the personal leadership of its associate pastor who also had previous mission encounters as a student. Here a local agency in Zambia, also with a personal connection to the church on account of its member being an employee, provided an avenue of service. Thirty members of the church provided labor for two mission and service trips to paint and rehabilitate the orphanage as well as some education to the children. In-kind resources such as books and school supplies were also brought to the orphanage by the church. Travelers received several pre-trip education sessions before heading off to Africa and each was required to sign a covenant of their service. The church heard and received reports by the participants when they returned. No further work in Zambia was pursued although the associate pastor was researching possibilities for another trip to a different country. Neither of these personal structures could be sustained.

The structure used by Lord-of-Life is corporate in nature and the various missions and development activities continue on. A separate 501C3 organization, The Lazarus Project, was formed within the umbrella of the global NGO, Food for the Poor. The board of the Lazarus Project raises funds, develops mission objectives, and oversees the staffing of the various projects underway in Haiti. A board is also in place for the Village of Hope in Haiti. The on-site service or development projects include a school, a clinic, an orphanage, an annual round of service-mission encounters similar to that of St. Paul, a scholarship program for older students wishing to attend higher education in Haiti. Staff lives and works in Haiti while funding comes from the Lazarus Project. As a member of the Lazarus Board, Lord-of-Life works with over two dozen other churches from around the US to sustain and grow the activities and projects.

The investment by Lord of Life has been long term, sizeable in terms of time, money, and in-kind provisions, and part of a wider pool of its service-mission-development activities that are conducted both in the US and elsewhere abroad. As a member of the church interviewed remarked, they had been to Haiti on five different occasions. The pastor and several staff members had also been to the island state several times. There are multiple projects that get worked through the three institutions funded through the Village of Hope name – a school, a clinic, and an orphanage. The scholarship program for older Haitian children interested in pursuing careers in nursing or education also falls under the Village umbrella. Member churches of the Lazarus Project, of which Lord-of-Life is one, bring members down for mission experiences working with children or in the clinic. The annual budget of the Village of Hope activities is well over \$250K (\$258,450 in fiscal year 2007-08) and increases annually. To operate the clinic requires more funds. The clinic buildings and staff, having only begun less than four years ago, is an evolving step of the Lazarus Project Board, as was the scholarship funds, as well as interest in a para-commercial endeavor to supply solar cookers.

The Lazarus Project partners are currently engaged in augmenting their funding by providing moneys to rebuild facilities damaged by the earthquake in 2010.<sup>51</sup> The program between St. Matthew/Liberia and Christ the Servant followed a partner-like structure where both parties provided input and leadership. Lay lead committees anchored the project. In many ways, the project comes closest to being a micro-development project though without the durability of the Village of Hope. Greater detail is used to describe the case because of the partnership qualities, and to raise further questions about the prospects of individual congregation based micro-development. Christ the Servant church had not participated previously in the Synod’s C2C program efforts. It had been supportive of the GH campaigns throughout its history, but also included the Liberian ministry as a new outlet for GH interest thereby allowing others from different congregations to support its Liberian activities. Its church membership comes from five continents and includes several African families including ones from Liberia. The relationship with St. Matthew/Liberia began in September 2003 when in a regular meeting of the CTS church council a proposal about Liberia was discussed by one of the church’s Liberian members. The council approved the plan to “establish a relationship with a parish in Liberia to exchange information and ideas” and relegated the work to its Witness Committee.<sup>52</sup> An ad-hoc committee of lay people, some with international development related experience, others with family and friendly relations in Liberia, and representing several of the church’s ministry areas, would form to research and steer the work.

Table 7: TIME LINE OF ACTIVITY FOR THE C2C RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHRIST THE SERVANT LUTHERAN CHURCH AND ST. MATTHEW LUTHERAN CHURCH, LIBERIA: 2003-2008

<p>Nov. 2003 – a proposal to investigate the potential for doing mission work with a congregation in Liberia is proposed through the church’s council by individuals of Liberian heritage and experiences leading to the formation of an ad-hoc committee for investigation and oversight on how to help the people of Liberia in the aftermath of much turmoil and destruction.</p>	<p>2004 – discussions and consultations between pastors and other leaders in Liberia and the CTS ad-hoc committee leads to an action plan to supply the Liberian church with bibles, the fee and uniforms payments for students in the Liberian church’s school, a shipment of medicines through a third organization (Crosslink International) and other resources totaling apx. \$4300. Medicines were to be shipped and used by Phebe Hospital. CTS establishes contacts with USAID, Lutheran World Relief, and other agencies, and with a synod of the church in Pennsylvania whose CSP is the Lutheran Church in Liberia.</p>	<p>2005 – the year begins with a joint service of celebration between the two church partners. Transportation is arranged for two individuals associated with the partnership. Additional money for more bibles, school fees and uniforms, and financial resources to be determined by the Liberian leadership. Resource transfers total apx.\$4500.</p>
<p>2006 – the American congregation continued to supply financial needs but began in June of this year through its committee to seek out means to support money making activities by the Liberians. Within a month, the Liberian congregation submits a proposal requesting start-up funds to begin a business selling rice to the neighborhood. CTS essentially agreed with the proposal prospects and begin finding ways to supplement line-item budget funds with other funds raised.</p>	<p>2007 – the year was spent raising funds for the rice project of St. Matthew in Liberia. The request had been a little over \$3000.</p>	<p>2008 – the money for the rice project is wired to Liberia in February. No further action is taken. The ad-hoc committee no longer functions.</p>

<sup>51</sup> The files about the Lazarus Project, Village of Hope, and Haiti at Lord of Life were extensive and well organized with the pastor maintaining his own files. The researcher had access to both the church’s as well as the pastor’s personal materials and was able to interview both lay and clergy leadership.

<sup>52</sup> Christ the Servant Lutheran Church, Montgomery Village, Maryland. *Church Council Minutes, September 8, 2003.*

Communications between the two parishes were frequent, and meetings of the ad-hoc committee regular.<sup>53</sup> The committee would evaluate relationships with Lutheran World Relief, US Agency for International Development, Crosslink International for help with shipping and medical alternatives, a journalist, possible observers for the 2005 Liberian elections, and inquiries on shipping automobiles and electronic hardware to Africa. CTS received the initial requests from the church in Liberia, namely, VCR's for its education programs, assistance with tuition and fees for school children, replacement bibles for those lost during the civil war, and a four-wheel drive vehicle. It is remarkable that the congregation reviewed possible action on all of the requests.

The years between 2004 and 2005 were the high investment years of the project. Over \$8000 of financial resources, medical resources, bibles, and other materials were shipped to Liberia with funds raised by the congregation through different ministry projects (such as church youth car washes for Liberia) as well as a budgeted line-item from the church (at its peak \$600 per year). Committee leaders made contact with US State Department officials to secure visas for members of the Liberian church and its leadership. The ad-hoc committee would also contact and use the CSP resources of information and networking of another Lutheran Synod in Pennsylvania whose CSP partner was the Lutheran Church of Liberia, and invite a local Episcopalian church whose part-time Lutheran pastor had Africa related experiences to also become involved in their work for Liberia.

A shift in emphasis occurred in the third year as the Americans requested that the Liberian congregation draw up a business plan to raise funds and provide a more sustainable project (June 2006). The Liberians sent a counter-proposal (with budget and assessment criteria drawn up by the Liberians) in July 2006 for the promotion of a rice-selling business venture. The Liberian request was approximately \$3000 of venture capital as the rice purchased would be sold at a slight profit by the Liberians. It would take almost two years for CTS to raise the funds, transferred to Liberia in February 2008. The committee disbanded and there is no further work between CTS and St. Matthew/Liberia.

Several lessons stand out from these non-CSP partnerships. The first was the importance of "insiders" - from Liberia who motivated interest in the importance and tragedy of Liberia and its history, or a pastor whose personal experiences influenced them to want to influence others. Likewise when insiders leave, as in the case of Liberia, or when a project fails to attract more attention, programs falter.

The skill-set of the project is important but generally not enough to sustain the activity. Instrumental for the purposes of networking in the Liberia case was a significant leader and business entrepreneur who would leave the congregation to take on a pastoral position elsewhere. Some committee members had professional development experience and knew different approaches to pursue. A pastor had regional expertise to Latin America. As in the case of the CSP projects, breadth of lay leadership helps. The efforts by the CTS ad-hoc committee were intensive and broad-based self-researching possible partners for the congregation's plans as well as complex logistical information such as overseas container shipping costs or the most useful medicines for Liberia. The Lazarus Project structure brings together significant social capacity larger than any one church.

The issue over discourse – accompaniment or help – was difficult to determine. Pastors involved in El Salvador and Zambia discussed their efforts in the CSP mode of accompaniment. CTS documents and communications focused on the church's efforts "to help" the Liberians and their needs and did not use the term of accompaniment to describe its work. The Village of Hope document discourse emphasized service, help, love, or mission.

Consider further elements of the non-CSP project that may come closest to accompaniment. Liberians suggested programs with the American role seeking the means to fulfill the requests for worship materials, medical supplies, educational fees, technical equipment, and financial resources. In some ways, the pursuit of a sustainable, money making approach may signal a way to lessen the American commitment at the same time as leadership for the ad-hoc committee was changing or leaving. With the exception of a joint worship service by the two congregations conducted on the same day in January 2005 (and where the medical supplies were blessed as part of the service) but in two locations, the C2C relationship was primarily economic and project driven.

---

<sup>53</sup> A three inch wide binder of communications, proposals, e-mails, and other correspondence has been kept by a long time member of the church and who was Church Council President during the time of the program's start-up and major efforts. The materials represent the most complete collection of C2C materials housed by any participant congregation during the time of the study.



Members of the American congregation spoke about their belief in the global relatedness of the church and its work.<sup>54</sup> The non-CSP stories raise questions relating the sustainability of independent C2C work with the stability of leadership either pastoral or lay. In the Liberia case, as leadership changed, the program emphasis shifted and ultimately declined. The funds raised by a relatively small congregation<sup>55</sup> over a short period of time, as much as or more than many CSP C2C partnerships raised over the course of seven times as many years – though admirable – would also not be sustainable. Neither the St. Paul or Christ Church examples, led primarily by pastors, have been able to stay a course. Only the Village of Hope approach has combined resources, leadership, and durability, though it is not that different from historical missionary approaches.

#### **g. Closing Analysis**

A case study, even a complex one, cannot provide final answers regarding the role and efficacy of micro-development in today's globalizing world. Micro-development activities surely have a place as organizational and individual capacities increase and boundaries of service are lessened. The hybrid CSP case between an American synod and its parishes with those of Namibia as well as the non-CSP alternatives fit into such an evolving world of development initiatives and potential. The introduction offered basic questions and hypotheses for study in the micro-development of religious congregations. Some of these have been answered while others require still future research and Namibian perceptions. If the alternative case of CTS and St. Matthew in Liberia is indicative of other non-CSP congregational pursuits in micro-development, than hypothesis three is likely to be correct. In this case the internal motivation came from members who had experience and family relationships with Liberia that could match with the already existing social capacity resources in the congregation. The degree of innovation and experimentation undertaken by the non-CSP example needs further elaboration from more cases. What was accomplished and done within a relatively short period of time leads to the interesting question of whether privately secured relationships and partnerships are more innovative than those that follow the patterns of an established synod-wide or institutionalized program. And related to this, does innovation spark sustainable interest among the "followers" in a church? The end result of this relationship (for the present) does not appear very different from nearly half of the CSP C2C relationships for the Metro Washington DC Synod. The buoyant initial involvement overseas expanded and fell. In the case of CTS, committee leadership change was the likely difference over time.

Answering hypothesis two was more difficult because the response is mixed. There is a general difference in presentation between those who are leader elites in the synod and those who are not as to how to present the reasons for the partnerships. Though not as well tested, the same probably exists among Namibian judicatories and pastors. But it is not a firm line. The longstanding and very active CSP partnership (St. Matthew, Woodbridge) used the language of accompaniment to speak and educate its members and leadership about the purpose of Namibia partnership. Lesser involved congregations used traditional "help" and "cultural differences" language. More would need to be done in this area. But this conclusion would be in keeping with the available literature such as the "twinning" study. Given that educational activities have fallen off since the beginnings of the program, this finding would not be surprising. Even more to the point of a conventional understanding of the partnership is what most acknowledged as an increased reliance upon funding and fund transfers to profile the relationship.

Earlier it was identified what separated growing or at least stable commitments to C2C activities from the majority that were declining. This information related to the answers needed for hypothesis number one. Certainly the experience to date is that that it has been difficult to maintain the type of activism from the early years. Most congregations have not. They have become less active. The same seems to have occurred with the Namibian counterparts. But the hybrid model allowed for movement to expand and increase activity in one area while another decreases allowing the Synod to say that the program functions with results. Having an established leadership in the church beyond the pastoral level as well as having more than one activity directed at the program seemed to be two variables that separated evolving from devolving relationships.

---

<sup>54</sup> Telephone and direct conversations with Mr. Steve Garvey, former Church Council President, in July 2008.

<sup>55</sup> One correspondence from Liberia to Christ the King identified that the Liberian church budget was actually larger than the American church.

This may say little more than ongoing participation begets more participation. But if there is stable participation, it would imply that the partnership was believed to be meaningful by those who participate and continue to be engaged. If one looked at the CTS example in comparison with others, then similar changes in leadership, funding, or the captured interest of another issue or place in the world might help explain CSP C2C decline. A parallel experience appeared at one Virginia congregation that lost interest in Namibia CSP linkages.<sup>56</sup> The pastor recounted about the new connections he and several church members were fostering towards El Salvador, another companion synod. This was happening due to demographic changes underway in the neighborhood and vicinity of the church. In other words, a changing dynamic in the life of the congregation was at least partially responsible for a redirection of interest towards Central America. Another part of the answer to this hypothesis is that not all expansion or growth in the partnership is related to internal changes. In the brief case of CTS, and in the cases of more stable CSP partnerships, external requests and needs played a part in helping to foster interest. This was clear in the gifts-in-kind efforts as well as some construction efforts undertaken by different churches across time. This may point to an older form of missionizing, but it also may be part of what interdependence at a micro-level of interaction looks like. It appeared that at least some willingness to look at these issues was present among Namibian leaders and congregations.

Do the patterns of congregational decline, the increase in financial resource dependence for the relationship, the greater emphasis on synod-wide or synodical and judicatory relationships, and the non-sustainable efforts by non-CSP partnerships repeat from place to place? Does accompaniment as it is exercised differ dramatically from previous missionary and faith-based relationships? There is more that can and needs to be reviewed from these cases and how they may relate with other church or faith-based micro-development programs. More study should be done on the relationship between sustainability, leadership, and innovation. There are other synods in the same denomination (ELCA) with similar hybrid models active around the world (the Metro-DC Synod wishes to expand these activities towards its Slovak relationships!) operating at the present without assessment and comparative review, and could offer these opportunities for comparison and perhaps clarity. And lastly, the religious community of micro-development extends well beyond Lutheran influence and activity.

## **Appendix 1**

---

### **SISTER CONGREGATION PROGRAM ELCA NAMIBIAN COMPANION SYNODS**

#### **Definition of a Sister Congregation Relationship:**

A Sister Congregation relationship is a bond of mutual respect and trust that is built through communication, prayer and a commitment to work together as shareholders in the Kingdom of God. The hallmarks of the relationship are respect, love, prayer, and an understanding for one another's background, culture, and unique characteristics. Each partner in the relationship is equal. Each brings to the relationship a willingness to learn and grow as members of the faith we all share in Christ Jesus.

#### **Vision for a Sister Congregation Relationship:**

While a Sister Congregation relationship can provide many rewarding benefits for each partner, there are overall visions for these special relationships:

**Accompaniment:** Accompaniment can best be described as "walking together." Sister Congregations give and take in equal measure with full knowledge that each is fully valued for their unique contributions. The relationship is balanced in love and respect. Each seeks to listen carefully to and understand the other. Neither partner dominates the other.

**Consciousness-Raising:** Sister Congregations seek to become aware of one another as thoroughly and profoundly as possible, to learn each other's situation in life, and to understand each other's challenges and problems. As there may be injustice and oppression, every effort will be made to uncover root causes.

---

<sup>56</sup> Interview with the Rev. Doug Jones, Holy Cross Lutheran Church, Herndon, Virginia on June 21, 2008.

Reconciliation: Misconceptions and wounds sometimes occur within Sister Congregation relationships, those misconceptions and wounds coming often from previous experiences. Intentional efforts at seeking truth and reconciliation are an essential part of Sister Congregation relationships.

Solidarity: Each Sister Congregation seeks to form bonds with the other, to walk forward arm in arm, becoming one another's advocate.

Characteristics of a Sister Congregation:

A Sister Congregation:

Wants to grow in faith and understanding of the unity which is shared in Jesus Christ.

Has an interest and desire to experience ministry in another culture.

Wants to be open to all people.

Wants to deepen understanding of another's reality.

Wants to share in mutual ministry.

Wants to share resources: spiritual, personal, material, financial.

Wants to communicate regularly with "family members" in another part of God's world.

Wants to pray regularly for those "family members."

Wants to plan and share in a "Sister Congregation Sunday Service", observed at the same time by both Congregations.

Will arrange exchange visits with "family members".

Will, after getting acquainted over the first year in the relationship, consider undertaking a commonly supported service project.

Will seek to become part of a network advocating for Sister Congregations as they attempt to deal with challenges and problems.

Will commit to a five year "Sister Congregation" relationship, which after that time, may be changed or renewed.

Will be a "grace oriented" Sister Congregation.

Possible Activities:

1. Exchange letters, photos, videos, CD's, DVD's, Biblical reflections, and testimonies. Set a goal of a minimum of three such communications a year.
2. Incorporate your Sister Congregation into the worship life of your congregation:
  - a. Lift them up in your Congregation prayers every week.
  - b. Put announcements about them in your weekly bulletins.
  - c. Sing hymns suggested by them.
  - d. Hold an annual "Sister Congregation Sunday Service" that lifts up your commitment to your Sister Congregation.
3. Make a banner to be sent and hung in your Sister Congregation as a constant reminder of your connection and bond.
4. Send a delegation to visit your Sister Congregation. See for yourself the reality of their setting and situation. Share in their joys and struggles. In turn, invite them to visit your congregation, to share your faith and experience.
5. Hold an educational event in your church focused on your Sister Congregation. Learn about the culture of your Sister Congregation and the country in which they are located.

Explore the issues faced by your Sister Congregation. Become acquainted with the history and the role of the church in that place. Involve all ages of your religious education program through prayers, letters and drawings.

6. Hold a Sister Congregation festival meal for all ages which might bring in an outside resource person for a presentation while at the same time celebrating through music, food, and drama the life and culture of your Sister Congregation.
7. Help with supplies for the Sunday School program in your Sister Congregation. Explore ways you might contribute to self-sustaining development projects.

#### How to Participate:

1. Present the concept of the Sister Congregation to your congregation and engage in a process of education and discernment defining your commitment. Decide as a congregation whether or not you want to become a Sister Congregation. Have this decision voted on by the entire congregation in order to have the greatest possible support.
2. Contact the Global Mission Committee of your Synod about your decision to enter into a Sister Congregation relationship.
3. Establish a "Sister Congregation Committee" to oversee the relationship.
4. As you receive word from the Global Mission Committee of your Synod as to whom you have been connected as a Sister Congregation, send a letter of introduction, initiating the relationship. Include a description and photos of your congregation. Let them know that you would like to make it a "Covenant Relationship." It is done with commitment. It is a personal and solemn agreement.
5. Make plans to visit your Sister Congregation at the earliest possible date.

#### Appendix 2

##### Recommendations on C2C CSP Future Reforms

- 1) Regularize and improve communication
  - a. Identify Namibian C2C partners who do not have computer and e-mail communication prospects and seek to provide 100% availability or access.
  - b. Regularize conferencing between judicatory leaders through satellite or digital teleconferencing to improve interaction, discussion of needs, and anchor the relationships.
  - c. Encourage regular distribution of information materials between C2C partners as well as promote patterns of regular greetings, if not exchanges and visits.
  - d. Include C2C partner personnel and churches in synodical registries and directories as a symbolic expression of being "a part" rather than "apart".
- 2) Regularize capacity-building/skill training activities among the CSP programs in Namibia
  - a. Provide a four year cycle of training activities with one USA CSP taking the lead each year based upon an earlier established diaconal training model that would focus on specific mission and development program sectors – children, social service ministry provision, chaplaincy and education, etc. Namibian judicatories could create logistical plans.
  - b. Encourage more seminary and university/college exchanges, and/or evaluate whether the need for continuing education can be a partner activity.
  - c. Expand the missionary in residence program to include diaconal and lay ministry providers, social service delivery professionals, etc., and identify and evaluate the possibility for two-directional missionary in residence activities.
  - d. Encourage C2C partnerships to become better informed and equipped of Namibian current issues and realities through their own regular educational activities. Various reports and ELCIN/ELCRN/DELK publications can be used for such purposes.
  - e. Review possibilities for revitalizing student scholarships for Namibian students, as well as prospects of Lutheran University relationships with the University of Namibia.

- 3) Encourage development based mindset and programming.
  - a. Open the opportunity for C2C partnerships to devise meaningful and needs based development programs for social justice and extend the language of accompaniment to financial and deliverables options.
  - b. Consider using the ELCIN/ELCRN private operations programs such as the ELCIN Business Foundation, as a means to support a development trust fund, offering a vehicle for CSP C2C's as well as interested individuals the opportunity to contribute to local needs based micro-development options.
- 4) Regularized assessment
  - a. There should be a regular conference every five years that reviews the programs and purpose of the CSP and C2C partnerships.
- 5) The above should also be extended to include what is already happening in Namibia with the involvement of DELK.

### References

- Ahmen, Shamine and David Potter. *NGOs in International Politics*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 2006.
- Carroll, Thomas. *Intermediary NGOs: The Supporting Link in Grassroots Development*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 1992.
- Eade, Deborah. *Capacity-Building: An Approach to People-Centered Development*. Oxford: Oxfam GB, 1997.
- Egan, Eileen. *Catholic Relief Services: The Beginning Years for the Life of the World*, New York; CRS, 1988
- Emmanuel Lutheran Church, (Vienna, Virginia). *Emmanuel's Companion Congregation in Namibia, Program Orientation*. Congregational document received in July 2008.
- Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Division for Global Mission. *Companions by Continent: ELCA Companion Synods*. ELCA/DGM Document March 1997.
- Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Division for Global Mission. *Companion Synods Handbook*. Chicago: ELCA, Summer 2006.
- Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Division for Global Mission. *Companion Synods Program, Introduction*. ELCA/DGM Document, 1991.
- Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Division for Global Mission. *Chicago Consultation Minutes for Namibia Companion Synods, 11/9/05*. ELCA/DGM Document, 2005.
- Garvey, Steven, compiler. *Christ the Servant Lutheran Church (Montgomery Village, Maryland), "St. Matthew Committee Document Handbook, 2003-2006"*. Congregational archived file received July 2008.
- Gran, Guy. *Development by People: Citizen Construction of a Just World*. New York: Praeger Publishing, 1983.
- Hanson, Eric. *Religion and Politics in the International System Today*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Haynes, Jeffrey. *An Introduction to International Relations and Religion*. New York: Pearson/Longman, 2007.
- Hefferen, Tara. *Twinning Faith and Development: Catholic Parish Partnering in the US and Haiti*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 2007.
- Hollenbach, David. *The Global Face of Public Faith: Politics, Human Rights, and Christian Ethics*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2003.
- Isaak, Paul John, ed. *The Evangelical Lutheran Church in the Republic of Namibia in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Windhoek, Namibia: Gamsberg Macmillan Publishers Ltd., 2000.
- Isaak, Paul John. *Religion and Society: A Namibian Perspective*. Windhoek: Out of Africa Publishers, 1997.
- Jauch, Herbert and Phanuel Kaapama. *Social Justice and the Responsibility of the State: The Triple Burden of Poverty, Inequality, and Unemployment in Southern Africa*. Windhoek: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (Namibia Office), May 2011.
- Josselin, Daphne and William Wallace, editors. *Non-State Actors in World Politics*. New York: Palgrave Publishing, 2001

- Juergensmeyer, Mark. *Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Lean, Mary. *Bread Bricks, and Belief: Communities in Charge of their Future*. Broomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 1995.
- Lewis, David and Tina Wallace, editors. *New Roles and Relevance: Development NGOs and the Challenge of Change*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 2000
- Lissner, Jorgen. *The Politics of Altruism: Political Behaviour of Voluntary Development Agencies*. Geneva: Lutheran World Federation, 1977.
- Little, David, editor. *Peacemakers in Action: Profiles of Religion in Conflict Resolution*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Lutz, Charles. *Loving Neighbors Far and Near: U.S. Lutherans Respond to a Hungry World*, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1994;
- Metropolitan Washington DC Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. *Companion Synod Program Invitation, 1994*. Archived document researched May 2008.
- Metropolitan Washington DC Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. *Companion Synod Proposal, 1991*. Archived document researched May 2008.
- Metropolitan Washington DC Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. *Annual Missionary Visit Hostings, 1996-2004*. Undated archived document researched May 2008.
- Metropolitan Washington DC Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. *A Covenant of the ELCIN, ELCRN, ELCIN- GELC, and ELCA (Metro Washington DC, New Jersey, Northeast Iowa, Southwest Washington Synods and the Division for Global Mission, June 17, 2005, Windhoek*. Archived document researched May 2008.
- Metropolitan Washington DC Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. *Metro DC Companion Synod Programs, Gifts of Hope Contributions by Year 2000-2006*. Undated archived document researched May 2008.
- Metropolitan Washington DC Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. *Minutes of the Synod Assembly, 1987-2006*. Washington, DC: Metro Washington DC Synod, printed from 1987 through 2006.
- Metropolitan Washington DC Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. *Partnership Meeting Minutes, Tsumeb, Namibia, May 14, 1992*. Archived document researched May 2008.
- Metropolitan Washington DC Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. *Summary Table of Companion Synod Activities, 1990-2006*. Undated archived document researched May 2008.
- Motte, Jochen, ed. *Think Big: Inputs and Reflections on Social Justice and Basic Income Grant*. Hannover (Germany): Foedus-Verlag, 2010.
- Prince William Interfaith Volunteer Caregivers Program (Elizabeth Liska). *Narrative and Description and Summary 1997 IVC in Namibia, December 1997*. Metro Washington DC Synod Archives, researched May 2008/
- Prince William Interfaith Volunteer Caregivers Program (Elizabeth Liska). *Program Proposal for Diaconal Training Services*, July 1996.
- Rieff, David. *A Bed for the Night: Humanitarianism in Crisis*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2002.
- Schneider, Theodore. *Namibia: A personal Daily Journal on the 1996 Visit to the Lutheran Church in Namibia by the Bishop of the Metropolitan Washington DC Synod, ELCA*. Metropolitan Washington DC Synod Archives, researched May 2008.
- Sitari, Taimi. *People and the Church in the Northern Namibia*. Ondangwa, Namibia: The Evangelical Lutheran Church in Namibia (ELCIN), 1997.
- Stenning, Ronald. *Church World Service: Fifty Years of Help and Hope*, New York: Friendship Press, 1996.
- Totemeyer, Gerhard. *Church and State in Namibia: The Politics of Reconciliation*. Freiberg (Germany): Arnold-Bergstraesser-Institut, 2010.
- The World Bank. *Namibia Country Brief*. Washington, DC: The World Bank, 2009.

## **Interviews**

Rev. Robert Allard was interviewed in his home on July 31, 2008.

Rev. Bohannan (St. Matthew Lutheran Church, Virginia) was interviewed at his church on July 10, 2008.

Rev. Bradford (Faith Lutheran Church, Virginia) was interviewed at the church on July 25, 2008.

Rev. Craig Endicott (Peace Lutheran Church) was interviewed at the church on July 14, 2008.

Evangelical Lutheran Church AIDS Program (ELCAP) staff were interviewed at their national offices in Rehobeth, Namibia, on July 28, 2011.

Focus group interview of pastors participating in “Namibian Missionary to the USA” program, including Rev. Dr. David Iileka, Rev. Wilbard Shileshe, Rev. Paul Muha, Rev. Joseph Avia, Rev. Joel Alueenda, and Rev. Filippus Haulofu, was conducted at the ELCIN Offices in Ondangwa, Namibia on August 2, 2011.

Focus group interview at Eengolo Lutheran Church (ELCIN) including Rev. Joel Alueenda and lay members of the church took place at the parish on August 3, 2011.

Focus group interview of lay members and leaders of the Okahau Lutheran Parish (ELCIN), took place at the church on August 4, 2011.

Bishop Richard Graham was interviewed in his office on July 23, 2008.

Rev. Dr. Scott Gustafson (St. John Lutheran Church, Maryland) was interviewed at the church on June 26, 2008.

Rev. Gysan (Christ the King Lutheran Church, Virginia), was interviewed at the church on June 30, 2008.

Rev. Hagstrom and Ms. Karen Utter (St. Andrew Lutheran Church, Virginia) were interviewed at the church on July 21, 2008.

Bishop Erich Hertel, German Evangelical Lutheran Church, was interviewed on August 8, 2011 in his office.

Rev. Dr. David Iileka, Director of the Lutheran Investment Division of the ELCIN, was interviewed in his office on August 4, 2011.

Rev. Douglas Jones (Holy Cross Lutheran Church, Virginia) was interviewed in his office on June 21, 2008.

Phaniel Kaapama, Lecturer of Politics, Governance, and Development Studies, was interviewed in his office on August 8, 2011.

Rev. Zekania Sageus Keib, pastor of Immanuel Parish (ELCRN) Swakopmund, was interviewed on July 31, 2011.

Bishop Zephania Kemeeta (ELCRN) was interviewed in his Windhoek office on July 28 and August 8, 2011.

Deputy Bishop Paul Kisting (ELCRN) was interviewed in his Windhoek office on July 28 and August 8, 2011.

Rev. Lowell Knauff was interviewed in his home on July 9, 2008.

Ms. Linda Liptak (Abiding Presence Lutheran Church) was interviewed at the church on July 10, 2008.

Rev. Briaan Mbazuvara, pastor of Hosianna Parish of Walvis Bay, was interviewed in his home on July 30, 2011.

The Mission Team of Emmanuel Lutheran Church, Virginia (Rev. Neubauer, Mr. David Bartell, Ms. Nancy Motts, Ms. Barbara Topel) was interviewed at the church on July 20, 2008.

Mupini Lutheran Parish Council (ELCIN), including Hausiku Leeusia (elder), Salomu Raina (secretary), Hamutenya Petrusik (elder), Aune Muzumbai (elder), and Saima Nairenge Makuti (deacon), was interviewed on August 5, 2011.

Bishop Shekutaamba Nambala, ELCIN, was interviewed in his Ondangwa, Namibia office on August 5, 2011.

Rev. Dr. Paulus Ndamanomhata, Principle of Paulinum Lutheran Seminary in Windhoek, was interviewed in his office on July 29, 2011.

Rev. Lowell Scheutze (Good Shepherd Lutheran Church, Virginia) was interviewed at the church on June 30, 2008.

Bishop Theodore Schneider was interviewed in his home on July 8, 2008.

Rev. Glen Sea (Hope Lutheran Church) was interviewed at the church on July 21, 2008.

Rev. Eliakim Shaniika, General Secretary of ELCIN, was interviewed in his Ondangwa, Namibia office on August 4, 2011.

Mr. Charles Warren (Peace Lutheran Church) was interviewed at the church on July 14, 2008.