

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRISONERS OF HOPE:
THE STRUGGLE FOR NAMIBIAN INDEPENDENCE, THE CHURCH, AND THE GOSPEL

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF DIVINITY

BY
DENA M. STINSON

DUBUQUE, IOWA
APRIL 2010

Copyright © 2010 by Dena M. Stinson

All rights reserved

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	5
A. COLONIZATION AND CHRISTIANIZATION OF NAMIBIA	
B. APARTHEID	
C. RESULTS OF OCCUPATION	
D. THE UNITED NATIONS	
E. THE UNITED STATES	
III. A THREAT TO THE GOSPEL	16
A. AFRIKANER CIVIL RELIGION	
B. TWO KINGDOMS	
C. COMMUNISM	
D. FREEDOM	
E. UNITY	
IV. THE CHURCH	28
A. CHURCHES IN NAMIBIA	
B. THE OPEN LETTER	
C. THE CHURCH OUTSIDE OF NAMIBIA	
1. APARTEID AS <i>STATUS CONFESSIO</i>	
2. NAMIBIA CONCERNS COMMITTEE	
3. NATIONAL NAMIBIA CONCERNS	
V. CONCLUSION	38
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	39

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the Center for Global Theologies and the Faculty of Wartburg Theological Seminary for nominating me to work on this project. We did not know what to expect when beginning this project, and many people helped along the way.

I would like to thank Susan J. Ebertz and the library staff for their help with resources and bibliographic information, Barbara L. Fritschel for taking the time to teach me the basics of archiving, Bill Link and the maintenance crew for setting up shelves and relocating many boxes of materials into the new Namibia Archives location, and everyone who had conversation with me about their memories of the Namibia Concerns Committee.

I especially want to thank Dr. Winston D. Persaud and Dr. Craig L. Nesson for all of their guidance. I would not have even begun this project without their encouragement, and this thesis project would not have taken shape without their careful reading, thoughtful questions and suggestions, and sound advice.

Lastly, I would like to thank Ilah Weiblen, whom I have not met, but who has put great effort and time into organizing the Namibia Archives. This paper would not have been possible without all of her hard work.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is difficult to capture the joy that freedom brought to the people of Namibia and those around the world who struggled with them against South African occupation and the imposed apartheid system. Shortly after independence, the *Namibia Newsletter* captured one image of the celebration in this description:

Freedom came to Namibia at midnight, 21 March 1990 — *like a torch in the night* — just as Lutheran Deputy Bishop Zephania Kameeta had imaged it in his paraphrase of Psalm 126:

*When the day comes on which our victory
will shine like a torch in the night,
it will be like a dream.
We will laugh and sing for joy.¹*

The article continues:

All over the country, Namibians gathered in the night at regional independence ceremonies to lower the South African flag at midnight and to raise the beautiful new flag of the Republic of Namibia. It was an electric moment in the Windhoek Stadium as thousands of Namibians who had gathered in their capitol city shouted “down, down, down” as the South African flag was lowered at 17 minutes past midnight. As the Namibian flag was raised cheers rose, tears flowed and women’s voices trilled with the traditional and distinctive sound of celebration. An athlete carrying a flaming torch entered the stadium and ran to light a huge freedom flame. A spectacular fireworks display lit up the night sky, completing a grand evening of speeches and traditional music and dancing, witnessed by heads of state and dignitaries representing most of the world’s countries.²

¹ “Namibia's Freedom Shines like a torch in the night,” *Namibia Newsletter* (Denver, CO, Spring 1990), Volume 13, No. 1.

² Ibid.

The day that Namibia³ officially celebrated their independence was a day for the world to celebrate. The struggle for independence had become the struggle of Christians around the world who joined in solidarity with the Namibians. The fight against the occupation by South Africa had become the cause of Christians around the world because the ideology of apartheid and the consequences of its implementation posed a serious threat to the gospel. The leadership of South Africa claimed apartheid as a Christian principle, using Scripture to justify it. The severity of the situation in Namibia caused the churches to take action against apartheid and South Africa. In doing so, they called into question not only the actions of Christians in South Africa, but also the very definition of the gospel.

During the time that Namibia was fighting the occupation of South Africa, the Namibian people called themselves the “prisoners of hope.” This phrase comes from Zechariah 9. When the people were struggling to rebuild the temple and their efforts were being frustrated by neighboring nations, the prophets encouraged them, and Zechariah described them as prisoners of hope.⁴ Like the people of Israel, the people of Namibia were in the midst of a great and difficult task, but they continued to work toward the goal of independence.

³ Namibia was not officially recognized under this name until after the nation gained its independence in 1990. During German colonial rule and under occupation by South Africa, 1884–1990, the territory was known as South West Africa. During the struggle for independence, the native people referred to their country as Namibia. For this reason, I will refer to the country as Namibia henceforth, regardless of official historical recognition.

⁴ Edward C. May, *Churches in Namibia—Snapshots of History* (Denver, CO: National Namibia Concerns, 1987), 5.

The people of Namibia are mostly Christian. They found hope in the message of the gospel: that Jesus came to set the captives free. For decades, the people lived under military rule, refusing to abandon the hope they had in the knowledge that freedom would win in the end. They would have independence.

The struggle for independence was drawn out over decades, but, while the Namibian people lived in fear and oppression, they did not abandon hope; they looked to God, and to the church. The message of the gospel is of freedom in Christ, of justice, and of unity. For the Namibians, the gospel was, indeed, good news. Christians are united across the globe in the name of Jesus Christ. The fight for independence was not only the fight of the people of Namibia. It became the fight of many Christians around the world who chose to stand up against injustice and a political system that threatened the proclamation of the gospel.

For a time, the story of Namibia was entwined with the story of a small Lutheran seminary in Iowa. In 1971, a Namibian family, the Shejavalis, moved to Wartburg Theological Seminary in Dubuque, Iowa. Their story touched the lives of the people among whom they lived and with whom they learned. The people at Wartburg Theological Seminary learned the story of Namibia, about the occupation by South Africa, and about the danger in which the Shejavalis' extended families and friends lived and to which the Shejavalis would return. Their story would consequently unite Lutherans in the United States with their Christian brothers and sisters in Namibia. Together they walked through the struggle for independence, standing up for the message of the gospel: justice, freedom, and unity.

The small movement at Wartburg Theological Seminary became the largest grass-roots advocacy network for Namibia in the United States.⁵ The work that began with the Namibia Concerns Committee at Wartburg Theological Seminary grew too large for the small committee of volunteers to handle. The committee was expanded, formalized, and relocated to Denver, Colorado, as *National Namibia Concerns*, with a local branch still being run from the seminary campus in Dubuque. By educating people on the Namibian situation, by providing aid to the people in Namibia, by writing letters to the United States government, *National Namibia Concerns* became an integral part of the struggle for Namibian independence. Through these actions, the gospel of Jesus Christ, a message of unity, freedom, and justice, was proclaimed both throughout the United States and to the people of Namibia.

⁵ Solveig Kjeseth, "National Namibia Concerns," July 1985, XIV INT 100-21.II.A., Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.

II. BACKGROUND

A. COLONIZATION AND CHRISTIANIZATION OF NAMIBIA

Namibia was colonized relatively late compared to other African countries because of its unfriendly physical geography that includes a desolate coastline and the Namib Desert, which spans 40–80 miles and runs the length of the coast.⁶ In 1485, a Portuguese navigator landed on Namibia's coast seeking a route to India.⁷ He did not stay. The first Europeans to stay on a continuing basis were two German representatives of the London Missionary Society who arrived in 1805.⁸

The difficulty of penetrating Namibia's western geography only temporarily stopped Europeans from colonizing. Namibia became a German colony in 1884, with the Germans taking great advantage of the infighting between major tribes in Namibia to gain power.⁹ Like much of Africa, colonization and the spread of Christianity are intimately related in Namibia. Despite the early arrival of missionaries, Christianity did not come easily or quickly to Namibia. After the temporary work of the London Missionary Society, the German Rhenish Mission began its work in Namibia in 1842. It had little success for 20 years, but finally established the first Christian community, a small one, in 1863.¹⁰ Christian missionaries were conflicted. As the Germans colonized, they created a home with

⁶ Carl-J. Hellberg, *A voice of the voiceless: The involvement of the Lutheran World Federation in Southern Africa 1947–1977* (Skeab/Verbum, 1979), 18.

⁷ Roy J. Enquist, *Namibia: Land of Tears, Land of Promise* (Susquehanna University Press, 1990), 19.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 21.

⁹ Hellberg, *A voice of the voiceless*, 18.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

law and order familiar to the missionaries, but, as Christians, the missionaries were also concerned with the welfare of the people.¹¹ This created tension for them, and a question of first loyalty to the local people or to the colonial government.¹² The German emigrants were most interested in their own political and economic interests, often at the expense of the local population.¹³ The missionaries saw Western colonization as a way of bringing Christian and civilized society to the Africans.¹⁴ Those conflicting interests would combine to create a Christian community that tolerated the abuse of political power. Namibia remained a German colony for 30 years. Interestingly, the Finnish mission in the north did not have these questions of loyalty, so its community developed differently from the Rhenish mission.

In 1914, shortly after the outbreak of World War I, British-led South Africa invaded Namibia in order to seize it from the Germans.¹⁵ By July 1915, the Germans surrendered, putting Namibia under an interim military government and giving hope that the victory of the Allies would bring freedom to Namibia.¹⁶ That would not be the case. In 1919, the League of Nations entrusted Namibia to the administration of South Africa as a “sacred trust of civilization” because they were

¹¹ Enquist, *Namibia*, 25.

¹² Karl H. Hertz, *Two Kingdoms and One World: A Sourcebook in Christian Social Ethics*, 1976, 251.

¹³ Enquist, *Namibia*, 25.

¹⁴ Hellberg, *A voice of the voiceless*, 20.

¹⁵ Enquist, *Namibia*, 59.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 61.

not yet ready to govern themselves.¹⁷ Under this mandate, South Africa was allowed to govern Namibia as if it were an integral part of the Union of South Africa.¹⁸ In the final years of the League of Nations, South Africa would attempt to officially incorporate Namibia as the fifth province of South Africa.¹⁹ In 1946, South Africa refused to recognize the United Nations' claim to exercise the League of Nations' responsibility for Namibia.²⁰ South Africa claimed that because the original mandate had, from their perspective, lapsed, the United Nations could not be regarded as the legal successor of the League of Nations.²¹ In 1948, the Union of South Africa became a republic independent of Great Britain and rejected the involvement of the United Nations in the administration of Namibia.²² South Africa continued to exercise control and include Namibia as a part of their country. In 1963, South Africa announced a plan for the permanent imposition of apartheid on Namibia in the Odendaal Commission.²³

B. APARTHEID

Apartheid is the term used to refer to the official and systematic segregation in South Africa based on race. Apartheid, in Afrikaans, literally means "apartness."²⁴ Although the term apartheid was not used until 1948, segregation in South Africa

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Hellberg, *A voice of the voiceless*, 23.

²⁰ Enquist, *Namibia*, 153.

²¹ Ibid., 63.

²² Ibid., 65.

²³ Ibid., 112.

²⁴ Prexy Nesbitt, *Apartheid In Our Living Rooms: U.S. Foreign Policy and South Africa* (Cambridge, MA: Political Research Associates, 1986), 2.

can be traced back to the arrival of the first white settlers from the Netherlands in the mid-17th century.²⁵ The first people of European descent came to South Africa in 1652. They were traders in the Dutch East India Company who came to the Cape of Good Hope to set up a supply station for ships on their way to the Far East.²⁶

The first real conflict the Dutch people faced with the native people of South Africa was during the Great Trek, beginning in 1834. The Great Trek was the result of conflict between the British settlers and the Boers, the original inhabitants of Dutch background who kept their language and traditions.²⁷ The Boers moved north and encountered resistance from southward-moving African tribes. In the midst of ambush and attack from tribes greatly outnumbering them, the Boers attributed their survival to God. They identified themselves with the people of Israel, searching for the Promised Land, and considered themselves to be God's chosen people.²⁸ This identification would play a major role in the development of apartheid.

Though there was peace between the Boers and the British for some time, conflict would arise again when diamonds were discovered in the Boer territory. The Boers, now calling themselves Afrikaners, felt their independence was threatened by the British.²⁹ There was also the issue of the natives. During British

²⁵ *Apartheid: The Facts* (London: International Defense and Aid Fund for Southern Africa, 1983).

²⁶ Hellberg, *A voice of the voiceless*, 14.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid., 15.

colonial rule in South Africa, a system of segregation was introduced throughout Natal.³⁰ In 1910, Britain formally transferred power to the white minority in South Africa, and the Union of South Africa was established.³¹ Despite this, the Afrikaners thought the British were too liberal in their attitude toward the natives.³² This, combined with the threat the Afrikaners already felt from the British, created more suspicion, which served to intensify the feeling of Afrikaner nationalism.

In 1934, the celebration of the centenary of the Great Trek emotionally boosted Afrikaner nationalism. They celebrated the “Voor-trekkers” as the defenders of Christian civilization, and this task now fell to their descendants.³³ In 1948, the Nationalist party won the election based on a policy of separation of the races. This was considered the ultimate success of the Afrikaner people. The chosen people were now a nation—the authority of the state was ordained by God.³⁴

The apartheid system was based on a model of “separate development,” in which people of different tribes and cultures, especially those of African descent and of European descent, were separated into “ethnic reserves known as homelands” in order that they could live their lives in a way that was true to their native cultures.³⁵ The apartheid regime presented its policy as one that promoted the development of

³⁰ *Apartheid: The Facts*, 102.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² Hellberg, *A voice of the voiceless*, 15.

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ May, *Churches in Namibia—Snapshots of History*, 1.

Bantustan³⁶ areas, but evidence showed that the practices actually promoted underdevelopment.³⁷

C. RESULTS OF OCCUPATION

The hope for freedom that Namibians had upon the cessation of German occupation did not last long. Namibia came immediately under military control. The Herero people asked for the land that the Germans had taken from them to be returned.³⁸ Instead, they were given a portion of land where thousands of Herero had died in 1904.³⁹ The old German laws regarding natives were retained or expanded.⁴⁰ The laws were enforced violently. In 1922, legislation was passed requiring blacks traveling outside of their designated home areas to carry documentation showing police approval. In the same year, the South African troops killed more than one hundred Nama because they wouldn't pay the new tax on their hunting dogs.⁴¹

The policies under South African occupation were largely influenced by economics. Namibia has large reserves of diamonds, copper, uranium, and other

³⁶ *Bantu* was a term used to refer to Africans from about 1948 to 1976, replacing the term "native." *Bantustan* was the term for the areas designated for Africans to reside. *Apartheid: The Facts*, 104.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ Enquist, *Namibia*, 62.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ UNESCO, *Racism and Apartheid in Southern Africa: South Africa and Namibia*, illustrated edition. (Paris: The Unesco Press, 1974), 138.

⁴¹ Enquist, *Namibia*, 62.

minerals. Thus, along with resources such as fish, Karakul pelts, and cattle, Namibia brought great wealth to the whites in South Africa.⁴² In 1925, it became formal policy from the central government that black laborers from the north could be recruited to leave their families to work in mines and on farms in the south.⁴³ In 1974, De Beers Consolidated Mines of South Africa Limited made a net profit of about £25 million and brought the government about £15 million in taxes and duties, an amount more than twice what was spent on all services, including education, for Africans.⁴⁴ Almost all minerals development was outside of black reserve areas, and even iron ore in one of the “homelands” would be exploited by white authorities with black Namibians doing the unskilled work for low pay.⁴⁵

The principle behind the National Party’s policy after 1948 was to “separate politically, economically and socially the different races and population groups of South Africa by means of legislation.” With the Odendaal Commission in 1964, a plan for apartheid to be officially imposed upon Namibia was introduced. Under this plan, 10 homelands would be established and given some political independence. However, the economic structure would remain, and the South African government would have final authority.⁴⁶ It was proposed that these native areas would eventually be declared independent, but that independence would be severely restricted. Independent native areas would have no control over such

⁴² UNESCO, *Racism and Apartheid in Southern Africa*, 143.

⁴³ Enquist, *Namibia*, 63.

⁴⁴ UNESCO, *Racism and Apartheid in Southern Africa*, 128.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 143.

things as military, arms or foreign affairs, banking currency and customs, harbors, roads and other transportation—among other infrastructural needs in the country.⁴⁷

D. THE UNITED NATIONS

In 1945, after WWII, the United Nations, as the successor body to the League of Nations, was faced with the question of what to do with the former German colonies.⁴⁸ Namibia was still under the “sacred trust” of South Africa. South Africa refused to recognize the authority of the United Nations. After the failure of a prior attempt to make Namibia the fifth province of South Africa under the League of Nations, South Africa again requested to incorporate Namibia.⁴⁹ The request was denied, but did little to stop South Africa from continuing with its plan. The U.N. had no way of enforcing its decisions.⁵⁰

“For economic and strategic reasons, the West’s leading powers would prove to be more interested in preserving the political status quo than in encouraging a fundamental transformation of Namibian society.”⁵¹ With the exploitation of the Namibian population as cheap labor, and the wealth of resources available, Namibia became incredibly profitable to South Africa and to foreign investors. Many of these

⁴⁷ Ibid., 144.

⁴⁸ Hellberg, *A Voice of the Voiceless*, 23.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Enquist, *Namibia*, 69.

investors were member states of the United Nations; their investment made them reluctant to take steps against South Africa's control.⁵² South Africa could count on the United Kingdom, France, and the United States to use their power of veto to prevent any punitive action from the United Nations Security Council.⁵³

In 1948, when the National Party came into power, South Africa refused to continue sending reports to the Trusteeship Committee, completely ending any acceptance of the U.N. mandate. The U.N. would face years of struggle to enforce any authority over South Africa. In 1966, the U.N. General Assembly terminated South Africa's mandate and claimed direct responsibility for the administration of Namibia.⁵⁴ In the same year, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) would begin the armed struggle against South African rule.⁵⁵ It took until 1969 for the U.N. Security Council to terminate South Africa's mandate over Namibia, and until 1971 for the International Court of Justice to declare South Africa's occupation of Namibia to be illegal.⁵⁶ In December 1973, the United Nations officially declared SWAPO to be "the authentic representative of the Namibian people."⁵⁷

In 1977, the United Nations appointed the Western Contact Group to negotiate with South Africa to come up with a plan for an "internationally acceptable

⁵² UNESCO, *Racism and Apartheid in Southern Africa*, 143.

⁵³ Enquist, *Namibia*, 69.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 153.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 69.

election” in Namibia.⁵⁸ In May 1978, the U.N. Security Council passed resolution 435, calling for the implementation of the contact group’s plan.⁵⁹ But the implementation of resolution 435 would be delayed for far too long due to the economic complexities and the linkage between Namibian independence and the removal of Cuban troops from Angola.

E. THE UNITED STATES

One of the member states who had investments in South Africa was the United States of America. A study by a Senate subcommittee in 1978 found that \$2.2 billion, or one-third of all South African bank claims, was owed to U.S. banks or their foreign branches.⁶⁰ The same study reported that “the net effect of American investment in South Africa has been to strengthen the economic and military self-sufficiency of South Africa’s apartheid regime.”⁶¹ The foreign policy and interest of investors in the United States made apartheid an American problem. American companies and investors could be implicated in supporting apartheid.

While some support of apartheid was based in foreign investments, for the general American public, support of apartheid was often a matter of fear of something worse: the communist threat. The political situation in southern Africa was complex: Angola was occupied by Cuban troops, which were keeping South

⁵⁸ Ibid., 154.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Nesbitt, *Apartheid In Our Living Rooms: U.S. Foreign Policy and South Africa*, 32.

⁶¹ Ibid.

Africa at bay. South Africa claimed that Communism was a huge threat to their country and to Namibia. As long as they claimed to be fighting Communism, Americans were reluctant to side against them.

The major U.S. media were used to present a view of apartheid that represented only the apartheid government's perspective.⁶² In order to make this happen, the South African government heavily regulated areas that might have been reported on both in South Africa and abroad.⁶³ Many American reporters, especially those of high status, took all-expenses-paid trips to South Africa and returned to report a favorable view.⁶⁴ The challenging task of reporting a true and accurate picture of apartheid would fall to anti-apartheid organizations.⁶⁵

⁶² Ibid., 49.

⁶³ Ibid., 51.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 50.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 51.

III. A THREAT TO THE GOSPEL

Many churches in Namibia were staunchly opposed to the model of separate development. For them, this model was in violation of the gospel, which has at its heart a message of freedom and unity. The separation enforced by the apartheid system, imposed by whites, was clearly racist and oppressive. Namibian theologian Zephania Kameeta, while speaking of those who had been imprisoned for opposing apartheid, compared all of Namibia to a prison.⁶⁶

[Kameeta] describes the isolation caused by the separation of people—blacks from whites—whites from coloreds—one ethnic group of blacks from another. Families are separated by a labor contract system that takes the wage earner away from home and family for months at a time. In some jobs, men are separated from the rest of the community by forced housing in single-sex barracks. He describes the limitations of denial of passports to Namibians and the denial of visas to brothers and sisters from abroad who want to visit. He mentions the people in the north locked behind their own doors from dusk to dawn. He mentions the censored news, the lack of education and opportunity. You begin to understand what he means when he says, “All Namibia is indeed a prison.”⁶⁷

This prison was one of division and injustice, imposed by a political system that threatened the message of Christ that brings freedom and unity.

A. AFRIKANER CIVIL RELIGION

Apartheid, a political system, threatened the proclamation of the gospel which brought up the relationship between religion and politics. Reformation theology played an important role in the understanding of this relationship in

⁶⁶ May, *Churches in Namibia—Snapshots of History*, 5.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

Southern Africa. The church of South Africa ruled the moral culture of the region “by means of a rigorous, if probably specious interpretation of the Calvinist Reformation.”⁶⁸ T. Dunbar Moodie, a South African sociologist, claimed that belief in the religious basis of national life was central to South African culture.⁶⁹

The divine agent of the Afrikaner civil faith is Christian and Calvinist—an active sovereign God who calls the elect, who promises and punishes, who brings forth life from death in the course of history. The object of his saving activity—the Afrikaner people—is not a church, a community of the saved, however; it is a whole nation with its distinct language and culture, its own history and special destiny.⁷⁰

While Calvin may not have intended his teaching regarding the sovereignty of God to be used in this way, the Afrikaners used this theology as a basis for the power they exercised. Apartheid was justified by an understanding that God’s created order was to preserve the purity of each nation and, furthermore, that God had done this for the Afrikaner people.⁷¹ This understanding of a sovereign God who gives ultimate authority to a particular people or nation is a misrepresentation of the gospel that contributed to the oppressive government of apartheid South Africa.

The ideology of apartheid developed easily out of this perspective on Calvinist theology. In regards to mission, one critique of this strain of Calvinism was that it had no interest in saving souls, but instead with “filling the number of the

⁶⁸ Enquist, *Namibia*, 76.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 77.

⁷⁰ T. Dunbar Moodie, *The Rise of Afrikanerdom: Power, Apartheid, and the Afrikaner Civil Religion* (University of California Press, 1975).

⁷¹ Enquist, *Namibia*, 78.

chosen” in order to bring about the coming of Christ.⁷² In response to this critique, P.H.S. de Klerk’s understanding of missionary vocation relies heavily on the understanding that the People is a unique sphere of God’s creation:

Calvinism teaches that God gave each People its particular task...The missionary does not suppress the nationality of a People; he enlists it and raises it to a unique and native Christendom. Therefore the right method is to found native churches. Their own confession, their own hymns, and their own form of prayer must develop from within their own bosom.⁷³

This conception of mission sounds very modern.⁷⁴ It presents an alternative to the traditional approach of imposing Western culture upon those with whom the gospel is being shared in order to Christianize people of all cultures. This approach seems to critique the understanding of mission with the goal of saving souls. Allowing for each People to retain their own culture seems to be a gentler approach; however, it led directly to apartheid, a system that divided the people rather than uniting them in Christ.

Lesslie Newbigin claims that true contextualization allows the gospel to penetrate every culture and speak in every culture a message of judgment and grace.⁷⁵ However, he believes that in order for this to happen, the gospel must be truly local and truly ecumenical.⁷⁶ While Newbigin was not speaking of apartheid in this argument, his point is relevant and valid. The goal of apartheid was political,

⁷² Moodie, *The Rise of Afrikanerdom*, 64.

⁷³ *Koers in Die Krisis*, 1(1935): 126–127, quoted in Moodie, *The Rise of Afrikanerdom*, 67–68.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 68.

⁷⁵ Lesslie Newbigin, *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society* (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989), 152.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

not religious, but was easily supported by this branch of Calvinism, which taught it was God's will to keep the Peoples separate and for their own purpose. In the system of apartheid, the importance of being local was imposed upon all to the detriment of ecumenism. It precluded the universality of the gospel, which speaks to all people in all times and places and unites Christians with one another.

B. TWO KINGDOMS

In opposition to the civil religion of South Africa, Martin Luther's teaching on the two kingdoms was crucial to the approach of the Namibian churches in opposing apartheid. Luther taught the left-hand kingdom is human society and human order, including institutions, government, and stations in life. The right-hand kingdom is the spiritual realm, where the Gospel, forgiveness, salvation, and the Holy Spirit reside. Luther taught that God rules both kingdoms. Christians live and function in both worlds, a situation that creates tension and ethical dilemma.

The challenge for Christians is how to be ruled by the right-hand kingdom while also living in the left. One of the greatest challenges is interpreting Luther's teaching for a different context. His purpose was to stand against the corruption of the church, which had become a political power.⁷⁷ He argued that the church should not use its power of declaring the forgiveness of sins as a source of enrichment.⁷⁸ While arguing against the church's exploitation in the political realm, Luther also

⁷⁷ Walter Altmann, *Luther and Liberation* (Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2001), 70.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

insisted that the political function of nobility arose out of their universal priesthood as baptized Christians.⁷⁹ His positive response to Christians' assuming public roles in law, education, and the military supports the argument that Luther never intended to make the church and the state autonomous entities.⁸⁰

However, by claiming that God rules the left-hand kingdom as well as the right-hand kingdom, Luther's teaching gave rise to an incorrect interpretation: that since God has put powers in place, the powers must be obeyed without question. Outside of Christendom, with the church no longer the political authority, this interpretation separates the two kingdoms and disregards the responsibility of Christians to proclaim the Word of God, both in the left-hand and right-hand kingdoms.

The misinterpretation of two kingdoms theology in the Namibian context can be traced all the way back to the original missionaries from the Rhenish mission society. Like most missionaries at the time, they supported colonization because they saw Westernization as a way to educate people and spread the gospel. Unfortunately, the early missionaries overlooked the serious oppression of the natives, including the almost complete genocide of the Herero people.⁸¹ Because Luther taught that God uses the office of government in order to preserve the world according to God's will, the missionaries took the view that the actions taken by the

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 70.

⁸¹ Enquist, *Namibia*, 36.

government were an expression of God's plan for law and order.⁸² This misunderstanding of the relationship between church and state resulted in the mission's complete obedience to government and the lack of engagement from the Lutheran churches in Namibia until 1971.⁸³

Until then, the churches in Namibia were socially passive due to the lack of an authentic two-kingdoms tradition.⁸⁴

Instead of the classic dialectic that holds the Word of God to contain both judgment on sin and mercy for the sinner, the mission's theology preached an obedience to the status quo coupled, however inconsistently, with the Gospel of life and salvation. Instead of a nuanced dialectic of law and Gospel, the mission settled for a convenient contradiction. Accordingly, the Gospel itself was undercut. Instead of being a word of unity for the faithful, the Gospel was not permitted to allow them to share in the fellowship of one church.⁸⁵

In a new approach, the black church in Namibia reinterpreted the doctrine of two kingdoms. Instead of justifying the church's withdrawal from politics, the new understanding gave the church the freedom, in fact the obligation, to witness to "divine demands for social justice."⁸⁶

C. COMMUNISM

The problem with the relationship between religion and politics was compounded when the opinion arose in South Africa that Christianity was to be

⁸² Hellberg, *A voice of the voiceless*, 21.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Enquist, *Namibia*, 112.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 113.

equated with anti-communism. Fear of communism provided a basis to unite all Afrikaners, regardless of their different interpretations of civil faith.⁸⁷ “Since communism advocated racial equality and was envisaged as the inevitable concomitant of British imperialist liberal capitalism, anti-communism combined both anti-British and anti-black sentiment of the civil religion.”⁸⁸ For Afrikaners, the communist disregard of racial differences was an attack on the heart of their ethnic existence.⁸⁹

From this point it became easy for the Afrikaners to claim that anyone opposing apartheid was communist.⁹⁰ In a global context where communism was a genuine threat, including in South Africa (where Cuban troops occupied Namibia’s neighbor, Angola), Christianity was equated with anti-communism, and communism with anti-apartheid. The logical deduction from this reasoning was that Christians must support apartheid.

Equating any issue with Christianity falsely condemns and limits the freedom of Christians to proclaim both law and gospel to all people in all contexts. According to Newbigin, one of the problems with an issue-oriented approach to preaching the gospel is “a new kind of moralism: being a Christian is identified with commitment to a particular ‘line.’”⁹¹ In this case the line would be anti-communism. Newbigin’s

⁸⁷ Moodie, *The Rise of Afrikanerdom*, 251.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 258.

⁹⁰ *Strategies for Action on Namibia* (Denver, CO: National Namibia Concerns, 1984), 3.

⁹¹ Newbigin, *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society*, 153.

argument again applies to the South African context because Christianity was being falsely identified with a particular issue. Because the Afrikaners found that communism threatened their understanding of God's plan, they equated Christianity with the commitment to fight communism or support apartheid. This equation gets in the way of truly proclaiming the gospel because the sovereignty of the Afrikaners is proclaimed instead of Christ. "But when the gospel truly 'comes alive,' the one for whom this happens knows that sovereignty now lies elsewhere. A new Lord is in control."⁹² This new Lord is not limited to the moral issue at hand, but is the Lord of freedom.

D. FREEDOM

Christians are not limited to the issues of their time and place, but focus instead on the message of freedom in Christ. The struggle of Namibia was physical, a battle with occupying forces. The struggle of Namibia was political, against the structure of apartheid. The struggle of Namibia was spiritual and theological, against a theology that threatened the gospel message of freedom.

This gospel message would become the cry of the people who called themselves the "prisoners of hope" (Zechariah 9.12).⁹³ The Namibian people held firmly to their hope for liberation based on an understanding that the good news of Christ is the good news of freedom. The approach of Namibian theologian

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ May, *Churches in Namibia—Snapshots of History*, 5.

Zephaniah Kameeta is highly contextual, rooted in experience of oppression and suffering. He believes that “the major themes of classical theology are enlivened by a Namibian contextualization.”⁹⁴ The gospel theme of freedom is not unique to those who are imprisoned, but the circumstances of Namibia bring it to light in a unique way.

“Freedom is far more than the negative term it has become for those who use it to designate independence from restraints placed on the individual. Freedom is the positive gift that enables one to praise and serve God, a gift that enables human beings to withstand all oppression.”⁹⁵ This understanding of freedom is based in the biblical narrative of creation. God, the Creator, created humankind in the image of God. White theology has frequently obscured the understanding of the *imago Dei* by ignoring the basic element of freedom.⁹⁶ God is essentially free and created the world, including human beings, a free creation.⁹⁷ “To be created in the image of God is to be destined for freedom, which implies having the capacity to struggle against everything that would seek to rob one of one’s God-given dignity.”⁹⁸

The central hope for Namibia is the gospel: Jesus Christ. “It is clear that hope for Namibia does not arise out of its present situation. Only God’s Son, who became oppressed in order to free the oppressed and thus to show God’s liberating power

⁹⁴ Enquist, *Namibia*, 115.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 118.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 117.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 118.

for the world, is Namibia's hope."⁹⁹ In Christ is freedom. The birth narratives of Christ tell of a child born in solidarity with the poor and the oppressed because he was born, in Bethlehem, as one of them.¹⁰⁰ His life shows his identification with sinners. In his victory over temptation he refused to use his power for his own aggrandizement, thus identifying fully with outcasts and sinners.¹⁰¹ Most important, in the passion and resurrection Jesus demonstrated the good news: "through the resurrection, Christ has broken the bonds of slavery and has given his people freedom."¹⁰² This understanding of the gospel gave Namibians a Christ-centered source of hope.

Freedom is such a central theme for Namibian Christians that Abisai Shejavali, the first Namibian student to attend Wartburg Theological Seminary in Dubuque, IA, wrote his doctoral dissertation on it. Entitled *The Idea of God in Liberation Theology*, Shejavali's dissertation is a study on Christ as the liberator, both in his context of Southern Africa, and in other contexts around the globe.¹⁰³

E. UNITY

Many churches in Namibia were staunchly opposed to the model of separate development. For them, this model was in violation of the gospel, which has at its

⁹⁹ Ibid., 121.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Abisai Shejavali, "The Idea of God in Liberation Theology" (Dubuque, IA: Aquinas Institute of Theology, 1978).

heart a message of unity. The theme of unity would be a prevalent theology in the battle against apartheid. The message of unity is grounded in the Lutheran principle of justification by faith. "Justification by faith discloses the church to be that community into which entry depends not on birth or race or natural affinities, but solely on the call of God, confessed in faith and bestowed in baptism. As the body of Christ, the church is thus literally 'super-natural,' and has as its essential task that of clearly showing its God-given unity."¹⁰⁴

One of the major challenges of defining the gospel as uniting all Christians in the context of occupied Namibia was that Christians were not only surrounded by violence, but were also involved on both sides of the fight. To seek unity in these circumstances meant seeking to be united to those with whom they were fighting.

Newbigin addresses this issue when speaking about powers and principalities.

When Christians have to fight their battles, they are not just fighting with this or that person, this magistrate or that temple priest, or that angry mob in the theater; they are not fighting against flesh and blood. Their conflict is not against human beings. It is against the spiritual power that is...behind, within, and above human beings.¹⁰⁵

Newbigin brings up a very real challenge in defining the gospel: that of acknowledging the power that exists apart from specific people in the structures created by humans. He specifically mentions the power in apartheid that is counter to the message of the gospel:

¹⁰⁴ Enquist, *Namibia*.

¹⁰⁵ Newbigin, *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society*, 203.

Race is another element in the structuring of human life. Family, kinship, tribal community—these are all parts of the structure of human life which play a vital part in the nurturing the developing of authentic humanity. It was therefore with good intention that missionaries in South Africa insisted that African Christians should be able to organize their churches and conduct their worship in their own traditional ways and using their own languages. But when this good provision was given an absolute status as part of the order of creation, not subject to Christ, it became the demonic power of apartheid. No one who lives in South Africa can doubt its reality and power, and the task of Christians in the country is not to wrestle against flesh and blood, not to attack the God-fearing Afrikaner, but to wrestle against the demonic power which is as real as it is invisible.¹⁰⁶

Acknowledging the reality of the destructive power that took over was an important part of reconciliation with the people who supported and carried out apartheid and all of its negative consequences. This power must be identified in order to resist it without turning against those with whom the goal is unity.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 207.

IV. THE CHURCH

A. CHURCHES IN NAMIBIA

The unity of the churches in Namibia would play an integral role in the opposition to apartheid. Challenges to a unified church in Namibia included a denominationalism that was transplanted from Europe through the different missionary societies working there.¹⁰⁷ Indigenization of the church was a factor that helped to unify the people as indigenous leaders reached out to other churches.¹⁰⁸ In 1960, the Evangelical Lutheran Ovambokavango Church (ELOC) was the first to elect an indigenous leader, Bishop Leonard Auala.¹⁰⁹ In 1963, the same year that South Africa announced its plan to impose apartheid on Namibia, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in South West Africa (ELCSWA) and the ELOC established a common seminary, The Paulinum.¹¹⁰ “This proved to be the first unifying step for the Lutheran churches and became a factor in uniting the indigenous people of the territory.”¹¹¹ From The Paulinum Seminary came the Open Letter, probably the most significant statement the church made against the occupation and apartheid. The first organized cooperation between the churches in Namibia began in 1974. It was founded by Lutherans, Catholics, and Anglicans, and supported by the Lutheran World Federation. In 1978, the Council of Churches in Namibia organized with membership from many churches (including the German

¹⁰⁷ Shekutaamba V. V Nambala, *History of the church in Namibia* (Lutheran Quarterly, 1994), 150.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ May, *Churches in Namibia— Snapshots of History*, 2.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

Evangelical Lutheran Church), ultimately representing 80% of Namibia's population.¹¹²

B. THE OPEN LETTER

In 1971, the International Court of Justice stated an advisory opinion that South Africa was under obligation to withdraw from Namibia and end its occupation of the territory.¹¹³ The United Nations agreed, but South Africa rejected the opinion and remained in violation of the charter of the United Nations.¹¹⁴ In response, a group of students at The Paulinum Seminary began to question the religious implications of such an action.¹¹⁵ They attended closely to Romans 13: "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God" (Romans 13.1). This passage had traditionally been used to justify apartheid, but the students began to ask what the real task of church in this situation was.¹¹⁶ A new understanding of this passage from Romans was coming about, one that questioned the true intentions and purpose of legitimate authority. "South Africa's government is not God's servant for the good of its subjects (Romans 13.4). It is indeed under obligation, not only by

¹¹² Ibid., 3.

¹¹³ Ibid., 2.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Enquist, *Namibia*, 91.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 92.

international law, but by God's justice, to withdraw. Its refusal to do so is just cause for rebellion."¹¹⁷

On June 30, 1971, an open letter to the Prime Minister of South Africa was issued from Bishop Auala, a prominent leader of the blacks, in consultation with the boards and students at The Paulinum Seminary.¹¹⁸ The Open Letter "deplored racial discrimination, separate development, censorship, disenfranchisement of blacks, and labor restrictions—all parts of the apartheid system."¹¹⁹ The Open Letter was a major step in declaring apartheid a threat to the gospel.

The Open Letter was published in the press and distributed to every congregation along with a Pastoral Letter explaining how the policies of the government were in opposition to the gospel.¹²⁰ "Instead of creating conditions leading to friendship and peace, apartheid leads to hostility and war; instead of unity, to division; instead of freedom, to bondage; instead of community, to isolation; instead of development, to exploitation."¹²¹

While the Open Letter met opposition from certain Christians in Namibia, including the small and mostly white German Evangelical Lutheran Church in

¹¹⁷ May, *Churches in Namibia— Snapshots of History*, 3.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 2.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 3.

¹²¹ Ibid.

Namibia, many other churches, including the Anglicans and Roman Catholics, joined the Lutherans in their efforts.¹²²

C. THE CHURCH OUTSIDE OF NAMIBIA

1. APARTHEID AS *STATUS CONFESSIO*NIS

An important step in the church's fight against apartheid came in 1977, when, at its general assembly in Dar-es-Salaam, the Lutheran World Federation declared apartheid a *status confessionis*. A *status confessionis* is a situation in which the confession of Christ is at stake.¹²³ Study and discussion of the issue had been carried out over many years. The issue had been first raised at the fourth Assembly of the LWF in 1963.¹²⁴ At the time, it was not discussed as an issue pertaining directly to southern Africa, but instead as a racial issue concerning the entire constituency of the LWF.¹²⁵ Division and discrimination meant the racial issue was a concern for the unity of the church, which prompted the LWF to take a serious look at the doctrine of the two kingdoms in the context of southern Africa.¹²⁶

The 1977 decision to declare apartheid a *status confessionis* was of great importance. In its declaration, the LWF made a public statement about the unity of the church, rejecting any system that promotes division.¹²⁷ They continued in their

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ "Apartheid as a status confessionis," <http://www.warc.ch/dcw/bs25/03.html>.

¹²⁴ Hellberg, *A voice of the voiceless*, 68.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 69.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 67.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 174.

efforts to help the churches in southern Africa promote unity and spread the gospel in a very difficult political situation.¹²⁸ The declaration was helpful in the efforts of the church to bring freedom to Namibia. In 1982, the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (WARC) would follow the actions of the LWF in declaring apartheid a *status confessionis*.¹²⁹ It also condemned the position concerning apartheid of the two white churches in South Africa that were members of the WARC.¹³⁰

2. NAMIBIA CONCERNS COMMITTEE

Dubuque, Iowa, seems like an unlikely place for the center of an activist movement concerning Namibia, but it is where National Namibia Concerns, the largest network in the United States working for Namibian independence, began. In 1971, Abisai and Selma Shejavali became the first Namibians to attend Wartburg Theological Seminary. They came on a scholarship from the Lutheran World Federation. During the seven years that the Shejavalis were in Dubuque, they shared their story, the story of the Namibian people.

It was the Shejavalis who taught us where Namibia was and how to say the word 'Namibia.' Little by little, they—especially Dr. Shejavali's wife Selma—taught us about what was happening in their country. And little by little we learned and little by little their struggle became our struggle. So it was very

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ "Apartheid as a status confessionis."

¹³⁰ Ibid.

personal—it wasn't that we set out looking for a cause. One moved in with us.”¹³¹

The story that the Shejavalis shared was one that became less and less hopeful. During the time the Shejavalis spent at Wartburg Theological Seminary, Selma's cousin was killed for collaborating with the South Africans. In 1975, Abisai's foster parents were brutally attacked by South African soldiers, who severely beat Abisai's father and raped and blinded his mother.¹³²

Peter and Solveig Kjeseth had a history of working for justice through political activism. Promoting Namibian independence would become their life's work.¹³³ The Namibia concerns committee at Wartburg Theological Seminary began as a sub-committee of the student Global Concerns Committee while the Shejavalis lived and studied in Dubuque. Originally the committee was small, consisting of approximately eight volunteers. In 1978, the committee began the Namibia Newsletter to continue to tell the story of the Shejavalis, to educate Wartburg students about Namibia, and to continue the work that had already begun.

The committee decided to help fund the Shejavalis' final five months in Dubuque after Abisai's funding from the Lutheran World Federation ended.¹³⁴ A letter was sent out to people who knew the Shejavalis asking for donations to this fund. The money was to be used to cover living expenses for five months, airfare for

¹³¹ “South Africa is Next to Namibia: The Lutheran Connection,” http://www.noeasyvictories.org/select/10_kjeseth.php.

¹³² Solveig Kjeseth, September 1, 1978, XIV INT 100-21.III.A., Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.

¹³³ “South Africa is Next to Namibia: The Lutheran Connection.”

¹³⁴ Susie Burchfield and Solveig Kjeseth to friends of Abisai and Selma, Lent 1978, XIV INT 100-21.III.A., Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.

the return of the youngest child,¹³⁵ costs for typing Abisai's doctoral thesis, books for the family, clothing for the mission field, and money to help the Shejavalis get started once they had returned to Namibia.¹³⁶ Response to the letter was so great that more money was raised than was needed, so the extra funds went to help the people of Namibia. Originally these funds were dedicated to two areas: to work with women and to provide children's books for black children.¹³⁷

The committee continued to send letters updating a network of friends about the Shejavalis and the circumstances in Namibia. Reports were not positive. Upon their return, the Shejavalis, including the children, were almost immediately detained.¹³⁸ They were not held long because, according to Dr. William Weiblen, president of Wartburg Theological Seminary at the time, "Shejavali has too many influential friends in America and in Finland for him to be kept in jail long."¹³⁹ During a phone call several months later, Selma indicated that they lived in fear because people disappeared every day.¹⁴⁰ She was also worried about the safety of their daughters and was considering sending them out of the country.¹⁴¹ These

¹³⁵ Kandiwapa was not a part of the Shejavali family when they came to the United States in 1971, so the Lutheran World Federation funding would not cover her plane ticket.

¹³⁶ Burchfield and Kjeseth to friends of Abisai and Selma, Lent 1978.

¹³⁷ Solveig Kjeseth to friends, June 9, 1978, XIV INT 100-21.III.A., Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.

¹³⁸ Kjeseth, September 1, 1978.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ Solveig Kjeseth, 1979, XIV INT 100-21.III.A., Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

first-hand accounts of the circumstances under which Namibians lived were essential for getting accurate information to the people of the United States.

The personal connections also allowed for the Namibia Concerns Committee to identify and help meet the needs of the people of Namibia. These needs and efforts multiplied over time. Funds continued to be raised for children's books as well as theological books for The Paulinum Seminary.¹⁴² Efforts were begun to create an exchange program between The Paulinum Seminary and Wartburg Theological Seminary.¹⁴³ Throughout all of the fundraising for programs supported in Namibia, the Namibia Concerns Network was also busy writing letters: letters to the Prime Minister of South Africa and leadership in Namibia demanding the immediate withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia, and letters to Congressional Representatives in the United States.

Over time, the Namibia Concerns Committee grew and made connections reaching across the United States. Wartburg Theological Seminary is structured in a way that allowed connections to be made quickly and easily. In those years, from the early 1970s to the early 1990s, every year a class of approximately fifty students would graduate and be sent out as pastors to congregations. In addition, a class of about the same size would be sent out as interns to congregations around the country. All of these people had become familiar with the Namibian situation and

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

brought stories and information with them to their ministry settings, making for a very effective means of spreading the cause to a broad group of people.

3. NATIONAL NAMIBIA CONCERNS

The work of the Namibia Concerns Committee was well received, and its network of people and organizations grew. Soon it was no longer reasonable to continue as a volunteer organization. The Namibia Concerns Committee was comprised of full-time students and faculty at Wartburg Theological Seminary, and the demands became too great for them to handle.¹⁴⁴ In April of 1984, the Namibia Concerns Committee at Wartburg Theological Seminary decided to reorganize and form a non-profit corporation called National Namibia Concerns. Besides the need to expand the committee beyond volunteers, the decision to form National Namibia Concerns was also prompted by the Kjeseths' move to Denver, CO, in the summer of 1984. Previously, they had provided continuity for the Namibia Concerns Committee at Wartburg, training incoming students and developing resources.¹⁴⁵

The work of National Namibia Concerns can be divided into two categories: providing material aid for church projects in Namibia and doing education and advocacy in the United States.¹⁴⁶ Examples of the first included financial support for scholarship aid, a Council of Churches in Namibia irrigation project, work of the

¹⁴⁴ Solveig Kjeseth, et al., eds., *Namibia Newsletter* (Wartburg Seminary, May 1984), 2, XIV INT 100-21.III.A., Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ Kjeseth, "National Namibia Concerns."

women's departments of the ELC and ELOC, the ELOC Humanitarian Aid Fund, evangelism training in the ELC, and the shipping of twenty to thirty thousand used textbooks to Namibia and SWAPO camps.¹⁴⁷ Examples of the second were the printing of the *Namibia Newsletter*, special communications with the network about legislation and important developments in Namibia, maintaining a resource center of printed materials and films/videos to be distributed upon request, providing speakers and educational programs on southern Africa, and holding two-day education and advocacy training events.¹⁴⁸

It is challenging to measure the effects of the work of National Namibia Concerns or the full extent of its reach. In 1985, the mailing list for the *Namibia Newsletter* included 6,200 names. Most of its accomplishments came from individuals in their local areas with no formal reports or even contact made with the National Namibia Concerns office.¹⁴⁹

The efforts of Wartburg's Namibia Concerns Committee, National Namibia Concerns, and their network demonstrated unity and solidarity with Christian brothers and sisters in Namibia. These actions gave hope to the people of Namibia in this time of struggle. In response to the gift of funding to purchase a car, the Shejavalis gave this statement:

This gift of love is a great encouragement to us. And we need a lot of support in these days. It is difficult for our people. Your great gift makes it clear that we are not alone—you are with us in faith, love and hope. Everywhere the

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.

van goes, our people will know that there are a lot of people in the U.S.A. who stand with them. Our people thank God that in Christ we are brothers and sisters working together in the Church of our one Lord Jesus Christ.¹⁵⁰

V. CONCLUSION

Their focus on Christ gave the people of Namibia hope in their time of crisis. The gospel of Jesus Christ was proclaimed to the people in the solidarity of Christians around the world, and particularly in the work of the Namibia Concerns Committee coming out of Wartburg Theological Seminary. The relationships built during this time made connections between the Lutheran churches in Namibia and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The relationships were personal, and so the struggle for independence was personal for people in both Africa and the United States. It cannot be known what the outcome of the struggle would have been without the work of the Namibia Concerns Committee, but the role it played in the education of Americans on the Namibian situation, the pressure it put on American politicians, and the work it did to help the church in Namibia is unquestionable. The committee's work was to proclaim the gospel of freedom, justice, and unity through Jesus Christ. Its words and actions did just that, and became a concrete source of hope for the Namibian people.

¹⁵⁰ Solveig Kjeseth, *Namibia Newsletter*, February 22, 1981, XIV INT 100-21.III.A., Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Altmann, Walter. *Luther and Liberation*. Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2001.
- "Apartheid as a *status confessionis*." <http://www.warc.ch/dcw/bs25/03.html>.
- Apartheid: The Facts*. London: International Defense and Aid Fund for Southern Africa, 1983.
- Burchfield, Susie, and Solveig Kjeseth. Letter to friends of Abisai and Selma, Lent 1978. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Cain, Peggy, ed. *Namibia Newsletter*. National Namibia Concerns. Denver, CO, December 1984. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Dumeni, Kleopas. *The Cry of the Churches in Namibia*. Waverly, IA: Dell Association for Peace and Justice, 1987.
- Enquist, Roy J. *Namibia: Land of Tears, Land of Promise*. Susquehanna Univ Pr, 1990.
- Hellberg, Carl-J. *A voice of the voiceless: The involvement of the Lutheran World Federation in Southern Africa 1947-1977*. Skeab/Verbum, 1979.
- Hertz, Karl H. *Two Kingdoms and One World: A Sourcebook in Christian Social Ethics*, 1976.
- Isaak, Paul John. *Religion and society: A Namibian perspective*. 1st ed. Out of Africa Publishers, 1997.
- Katjavivi, Peter. *A History of Resistance in Namibia*. James Currey, 1988.
- Kjeseth, Peter, and Solveig Kjeseth. *Namibia*. Capetown, South Africa, 2004.
- Kjeseth, Solveig. Letter to friends, June 9, 1978. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- . Letter, September 1, 1978. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- . Letter, 1979. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- . Letter. *Namibia Newsletter*, February 22, 1981. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- . Letter. "Namibia Fund," September 30, 1981. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.

- . Letter. “National Namibia Concerns,” July 1985. XIV INT 100-21.II.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Kjeseth, Solveig, Dan Heath, Peter Kjeseth, Maurice Wick, and Kathy Gerking, eds. *Namibia Newsletter*. Wartburg Theological Seminary, May 1984. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- May, Edward C. *Churches in Namibia—Snapshots of History*. Denver, CO: National Namibia Concerns, 1987.
- Moodie, T. Dunbar. *The Rise of Afrikanerdom: Power, Apartheid, and the Afrikaner Civil Religion*. University of California Press, 1975.
- Nambala, Shekutaamba V. V. *History of the church in Namibia*. *Lutheran Quarterly*, 1994.
- Namibia Action*. Denver, CO: National Namibia Concerns, March 1989. XIV INT 100-21.III.B. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Namibia Concerns Committee. Letter to Mark Thomsen, April 19, 1984. XIV INT 100-21.II.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Namibia Newsletter*. Dubuque, IA: Wartburg Theological Seminary, December 1982. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Namibia Newsletter*. Dubuque, IA: Wartburg Theological Seminary, May 1983. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Namibia Newsletter*. Dubuque, IA: Wartburg Theological Seminary, December 1983. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Namibia Newsletter*. Dubuque, IA: Wartburg Theological Seminary, October 1984. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Namibia Newsletter*. Denver, CO: National Namibia Concerns, May 1985. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Namibia Newsletter*. Denver, CO: National Namibia Concerns, June 1986. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Namibia Newsletter*. Denver, CO: National Namibia Concerns, November 1986. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Namibia Newsletter*. Denver, CO: National Namibia Concerns, December 1987. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Namibia Newsletter*. Denver, CO: National Namibia Concerns, Fall 1988. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Namibia Newsletter*. Denver, CO: National Namibia Concerns, Fall 1989. XIV INT 100-

- 21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Namibia Newsletter*. Denver, CO: National Namibia Concerns, Spring 1989. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Namibia Newsletter*. Denver, CO: National Namibia Concerns, Summer 1989. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Namibia Newsletter*. Denver, CO: National Namibia Concerns, Winter 1989. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Namibia Newsletter*. Denver, CO: National Namibia Concerns, Spring 1990. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- Namibia Newsletter*. Denver, CO: National Namibia Concerns, Winter 1990. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- "Namibia's Freedom Shines Like a Torch in the Night." *Namibia Newsletter*. Denver, CO, Spring 1990, Volume 13, No. 1 edition.
- Nesbitt, Prexy. *Apartheid In Our Living Rooms: U.S. Foreign Policy and South Africa*. Cambridge, MA: Political Research Associates, 1986.
- Newbigin, Lesslie. *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989.
- Shejavali, Abisai. "The Idea of God in Liberation Theology." Dubuque, IA: Aquinas Institute of Theology, 1978.
- Shejavali, Abisai, and Selma Shejavali. Letter to Friends of Namibia. "An Appeal From Namibia," 1988. XIV INT 100-21.III.A. Wartburg Theological Seminary Namibia Archives.
- "South Africa is Next to Namibia: The Lutheran Connection."
http://www.noeasyvictories.org/select/10_kjeseth.php.
- Strategies for Action on Namibia*. Denver, CO: National Namibia Concerns, 1984.
- UNESCO. *Racism and Apartheid in Southern Africa: South Africa and Namibia*. Illustrated edition. Paris: The Unesco Press, 1974.
- Wallis, Jim. "Falwell's Foreign Policy." *Sojourners*, February 1986.

