



United Nations Alliance of Civilizations
Many cultures. One humanity.



WORKING PAPER

NOVEMBER 2011



**BRINGING INTERCOMMUNAL COOPERATION
AND RELIGIOUS VOICES INTO HUMANITARIAN AND
DEVELOPMENT POLICY**

BY KATHERINE MARSHALL

Senior Fellow at the Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, and World Affairs, Georgetown University

INTRODUCTION

Respect for diversity and peaceful dialogue are key to building interfaith cooperation, and respect among communities. At the United Nations Alliance of Civilizations, we support efforts by states, civil society, and other actors to learn about the other and work together beyond religious and cultural differences.

Religion may properly be regarded as a subset – although an important one – of the cultural web. Various faiths and beliefs often misunderstand each other's motives and modes of operation. In particular, faith-inspired organizations and secular organizations are suspicious of each other. These suspicions, misunderstandings, and sometimes sheer lack of knowledge about each other, inhibit cooperation for common goals in areas where both organizations have interests, talents, and capabilities. One such area is the area of humanitarian cooperation.

As a practical, result-oriented activity in this field, the Alliance has created a thematic platform within its Group of Friends, which focuses on 'Bridging the divide in the field of humanitarian and international cooperation'

The Platform, led by Switzerland, aims to address the lack of cooperation between Faith Based Organisations (FBO) in the development and humanitarian field, and in particular between so called "Western" and "Muslim" organisations from different religious backgrounds.

Encouraging cooperation between these organizations can enhance the global response to humanitarian and development needs, increase efficiency and take advantage of synergies.

This cooperation makes the best of the largest area of common ground between religions: the shared heritage of charitable and humanitarian work. This area, which unites religions rather than dividing them, must be used as a non-political common ground on which understanding and cooperation can be built.

Countries of our Group of Friends are currently working on possible areas of work for more NGO cooperation, in order to build trust among partners -- otherwise unfamiliar to each other -- to create a positive experience in interfaith cooperation.

We are grateful for Switzerland for covering the production of the research and for Georgetown University's Berkley Center for Religion, Peace and World Affairs and Katherine Marshall for undertaking the research that led to this accompanying paper. In the paper, Katherine Marshall has astutely analyzed the issues involved in bringing religious voices into humanitarian and development policy. The paper addresses the gaps, priority issues, and provides practical ideas for actions that can be taken by all the actors involved – IGOs, faith-inspired organizations, governments, and the media. We hope this paper will therefore stimulate discussion and action.

Marc Scheuer,
Director of United Nations Alliance of Civilizations
New-York

BUILDING BRIDGES: THE THEMATIC PLATFORM

In our globalized world, with societies composed of people of different worldviews, and characterized by a great diversity of religious and cultural references, the United Nations Alliance of Civilizations (UNAOC) promotes pluralism and good governance of cultural diversity. In so doing, the UNAOC aims at engaging in practical, result-oriented activities and at focusing on so-called “glocal deliverables”, i.e. measures taken at the local level to achieve results at the global level. As a practical and result-oriented contribution to this goal, Switzerland actively supports the UNAOC thematic platforms, as a mechanism to foster joint cooperation between country and organization members within the UNAOC Group of Friends, on issues related to the UNAOC mandate and objectives. The idea of thematic platforms stems from the observation that a mere exchange of views is not sufficient to build and foster trust and practical result-oriented cooperation, and can in some cases even be counter-productive as words are often not followed by acts. On the other hand, experience shows that joint practical cooperation succeeds in bridging gaps that are perceived as irreconcilable on a conceptual level.

One of the two UNAOC thematic platforms works on identifying ways to bridge the divides between and among faith-inspired actors in the field of humanitarianism and international cooperation (the second works on media literacy). Working to bridge the divides is so necessary because in many crisis contexts, where nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) are doing great work on the ground helping civilians in need, there is a lack of interaction with and between NGOs with different worldviews and cultural backgrounds. This behavior stems from a lack of information and a widespread suspicion between communities, caused by gaps (real or perceived) between communities and by differences in capacity or willingness to recognize a different form of capacity. At the same time, faith-inspired NGOs receive increased attention and government funding. Several countries have initiated research programs on the role of faith-inspired organizations (FIOs) in the development and humanitarian field. However, cooperation between development and humanitarian organizations with different religious backgrounds is still rare.

This causes a divide in the field of humanitarianism and development cooperation in “receiving countries” as well as in “donor” countries, both at a national and international level. This hampers the global response to humanitarian and development needs, since it accepts inefficiencies (e.g. in use of funds and coverage of programs), and fails to take advantage of synergies (e.g. new funding sources, complementary skills and in building sustainable and plural communities).

The large area of common ground between religions and cultures – the strong heritage of charitable and humanitarian work – should be used as a non-political common ground on which understanding and cooperation can be built. Exploring and promoting cooperation between NGOs rooted in different value systems and religious cultures creates a common positive experience and builds trust among partners who otherwise would rarely encounter one another. There are good examples of such co-operation that we could learn from, e.g. Aceh, where Muslim and Christian organizations work together on a daily basis.

Such practical cooperation is a concrete contribution to the promotion of peaceful coexistence and pluralism between and within societies across the world. We trust that the following UNAOC working paper prepared by Professor Katherine Marshall demonstrates “how inter-communal engagement in the development and humanitarian field advances intercultural understanding and improves aid effectiveness” and will motivate further action.

Ambassador Fasel
Assistant State Secretary (UN and other International Organization)
UN Alliance of Civilizations Focal Point
Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Switzerland



BRINGING INTERCOMMUNAL AND RELIGIOUS VOICES INTO HUMANITARIAN AND DEVELOPMENT POLICY

KATHERINE MARSHALL

Senior Fellow at the Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, and World Affairs, Georgetown University

On March 7th and 8th 2011, Switzerland hosted the second meeting of the platform on “Cooperation With and Among Faith-Inspired Organizations.” Representatives from Azerbaijan, Ethiopia, Finland, Russia, Jordan, Malaysia, Paraguay, Sweden, and Switzerland and a representative of the UNAOC Secretariat participated. The two-day meeting confirmed the critical nature of bridging the divide affecting both the field of development cooperation and humanitarian affairs. It is particularly relevant to the mandate of the UNAOC, as it deals with perceptions of realities, worldviews and the narratives of the “clash of civilizations.” Development cooperation and humanitarianism are indeed fields in which the obstacles to cooperation between actors of different worldviews are immediately visible. The group discussed possible avenues for joint action and recommended the concept of the platform to be further developed.

1. WHY FOCUS ON RELIGION?

Many public sector institutions, national and international, are engaged in processes to review the roles that religious leaders and organizations play in relief and humanitarian aid and in international development work (examples include Switzerland, Norway, the UK, the Netherlands, and the U.S.). Many factors explain this renewed focus; four have special significance.

(a) First, the shocks of terrorism in various countries have shone a spotlight (wisely or otherwise) on religious links and ideas as well as the anger generated by perceived disrespect and injustice linked to specific religious identities; this anger can be combustible material

for those who promote identity politics and, as many observe, who misuse and abuse religion.

(b) Second, global migration dynamics highlight, close to home, the day to day significance of religious adherence and diversity. For example, the past decade has been rife with examples of migrant Asian and African Muslim populations conflicting with the traditionally Judeo-Christian or secular populations of Western European nations over issues of integration versus multiculturalism. From the banning of burkas and minarets to discussions of “capping” Muslim immigration into European Union (EU) countries, the religious element in the migration debate is unavoidable.

(c) Third, in the academy (academic institutions but also policy think tanks) a significant paradigm shift has substituted a widely held “secularization” thesis (which assumed that religious practice would decline steadily with modernization) with a new appreciation of a robust religious reality and often a resurgence of religious adherence in many regions. Many policy institutions have yet to come fully to terms with the shift, but the evidence is compelling.

(d) Fourth (and most important in linking religion to understandings of development and humanitarian action) is growing appreciation of the profound significance of religion – meaning both beliefs and identities and institutional “social capital” realities - for the people this action aims to serve. Survey after survey highlights the importance of religion for people, especially but not exclusively in Africa. How this importance translates into their behavior and practice, including how they view the dynamics of modernization, is only partially and patchily

understood. Also important are the historical and contemporary links among religious and humanitarian values and the role of religious faith and community ties in motivating action and support for development and humanitarian aid.

We are thus coming to appreciate that both humanitarian and development work, as well as peace-building and sustainability, cannot succeed without taking religion in its various forms better into account, both at the community level and in understanding the dynamics behind political will and governance. This appreciation is similar to and related to parallel intellectual awakenings such as appreciation of gender dynamics and culture.

The essential questions before us are thus far more about HOW to take religion better into account than WHETHER or WHY. The consequent questions that arise include: what does it imply for overall strategic approaches? Specific policies and partnerships? Selection and training of staff? Evaluation of performance and results? All these questions deserve careful treatment: religion is immensely complicated, diverse, and sensitive, and it cannot be readily discussed in technical terms or with sweeping generalizations. An intelligent, nuanced approach, well grounded in history and ethics, appreciating widely different circumstances by time and place, and drawing on (and building) pertinent data, is essential.

2. THE SETTING: NARRATIVES, CONCEPTS, AND “MAPS”

2.1 Narratives

Rightly, most histories that analyze both humanitarian and development institutions and work take off from the post-World War II period. It was then, in the context of deep reflections on what had caused the war, concern for rebuilding shattered societies, the winds of decolonization, and hope for new international governance structures, that the complex institutional framework we call the humanitarian and development systems took shape. Obviously, there are deeper roots, notably the birth of the Red Cross institutions in the mid-nineteenth century and Geneva Conventions but the divide post 1945 is nonetheless significant.

However, looking much further back and beyond formal global institutions, and for all world regions and “civilizations”, religious traditions and institutions played central, often determining roles in emerging approaches to both charity and rights. This is true for Christianity and Islam, the world’s two largest religious communities today, but also for most other traditions: Buddhism, Sikhism, Judaism, Hinduism, and Jainism stand out for their special contributions. Most charitable ideas and debates can trace their roots to religious beliefs, whether it is through calls to compassion, social justice, admonitions to give to charity, or a focus on helping vulnerable and marginalized groups. The long and complex

history of charity and religion need not be considered in reflecting on contemporary policies in this area, but what is important is to acknowledge the deep and diverse ways in which ethical and practical approaches to poverty and misery have emerged from the various religious traditions.

Also important is the *perception* that much of the framing of contemporary discussion of humanitarian and development institutions and approaches is shaped by a European, largely Christian ethos. Indeed, that is who was at the table at the critical period. Consequently, a common, if not always directly articulated, refrain is that many approaches to humanitarian and development work – and, at a more mundane level, the biases that determine institutional arrangements and behavior – take little account of non-Western traditions and approaches.

2.2 From concepts to practices

Different institutions use different definitions of what is humanitarian and what is development. Very often there is a considerable overlap. Some institutions which began with a humanitarian mandate shifted towards a broader approach with a development focus. Both groups of institutions and approaches share common ethical concerns and dilemmas. While there is still a general division of institutional labor, concerns are increasing around how to prevent disasters through more effective development and how to assure a more meaningful continuum from relief to development. The school of “peacebuilding”²² reflects an effort to link important elements shared by both sets of institutions and policy approaches. It promotes a focus on inclusive and sustainable approaches, adapted and sensitive to local realities, and grounded in the community.

“FAITH-BASED” OR “FAITH-INSPIRED” INSTITUTIONS

The most common entities that serve both humanitarian and development causes are often termed “faith-based institutions” (FBOs), a subgroup of the larger group of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). We prefer the term “faith-inspired organizations” because it captures a broader group. It places less emphasis on what can be seen as formal affiliations to specific religious bodies.³ These institutions are only part of the picture, however, because they are rarely understood to include church/mosque/temple structures themselves, which of course have complex hierarchies, institutional traditions, personnel, land and buildings, etc. In focusing on communities, after all, the central challenge, what matters most, are congregations, which may be formal but are often far looser groupings of parish councils, women’s groups, youth groups, and so on.

Defining religion is still more perilous. Two points bear highlighting. First, religious beliefs and institutions have a complexity before which other complex institutions pale. What this means in one practical sense is that it is foolish and misleading ever to speak of “religion” as a monolith. Without appreciating the complexity and diversity, as well as the dynamism of institutions, practices, and beliefs, overgeneralizations and mistakes will surely follow. Second, many different kinds of actors, grounded in religious institutions and beliefs are significant players in both humanitarian and development work.

In this paper, the focus is on several fairly tangible sets of religious institutions: (a) formal religious structures -- the Roman *curia* for example, or Cambodia’s *Sangha*; (b) service institutions run directly by religious bodies -- schools, hospitals, theological training institutions, orphanages; (c) faith-inspired organizations, which may take many forms -- international, national, and local, large and small, consciously religious or less so; (d) religious movements, such as the Art of Living or the Community of Sant’Egidio, many of which span international boundaries; and (e) congregations, largely grounded at the local, community level.

These institutions are involved in humanitarian and development work through several, often overlapping channels: (a) advocacy, political influence and mobilization; (b) direct service provision, either through church bodies or through faith-inspired organizations; (c) community work and mobilization; and (d) shaping of ideas.

2.3 “Maps”

The complex institutional framework, which can be likened to a galaxy in its range of very different elements, is poorly known, at an aggregate and at a national level. The Berkley Center at Georgetown University is engaged in a geographically focused “mapping” exercise, focusing on the different types of institutions, the work they do, and emerging policy issues.⁴ It has engaged in a region-by-region exploration of the development work of faith-inspired organizations. Some preliminary findings are as follows:

(a) The work of faith-inspired organizations on development issues is extraordinarily diverse and covers virtually all sectors of development activity. Much of this work, individually but particularly as an aggregate, tends to be poorly known and understood in development institutions (including the United Nations system). Systematic evaluation of results and impact is

minimal for many such organizations. Financing of this work comes from widely different sources and often falls outside development financing frameworks. The situation demands a region by region -- and often country by country -- approach to build knowledge, the more so given the significant differences in basic approach and structure.

(b) Poor coordination among faith-inspired organizations and poor integration with government strategic frameworks is a common challenge in many countries and world regions. Many institutions’ work falls outside the reach of country-led development coordination mechanisms, with the exception of the largest institutions. Best practice knowledge is rarely captured fully to the benefit of national policies and strategies. It is safe to argue that the work by faith-inspired organization offers a large untapped potential to contribute towards national and global human development goals.

(c) Ambivalent attitudes towards religion in public life take different forms in different countries, but such attitudes can explain a significant part of the poor knowledge and limited policy engagement. The disconnects are often based on poor knowledge among policy makers, or attitudes and preconceptions that are often firmly held. The disconnects hamper learning from relevant experience and “adding and scaling up” that can come with effective strategic coordination and harmonization of effort.

(d) Important generic issues that exacerbate tensions in several regions include inadequate codes of conduct around proselytizing and evangelizing activities by faith-based/faith-inspired organizations involved in humanitarian

and development work, and varying views on appropriate approaches to issues. On the other hand, the large potential that many faith-inspired organizations offer for peace building, from community to national levels, is inadequately known and pursued. In sum, while the negative influences of religion tend to garner attention, the positive influence of religion tends to be underplayed.

(e) The ethical focus and practical experience of many faith-inspired organizations with leading development dilemmas, including marginalization of some populations, gender equity, environmental destruction, and income inequality, offer important avenues towards meaningful dialogue on these topics (including addressing latent disagreements that block action).

“The ethical focus and practical experience of many faith-inspired organizations with leading development dilemmas, including marginalization of some populations, gender equity, environmental destruction, and income inequality, offer important avenues towards meaningful dialogue on these topics (including addressing latent disagreements that block action).”

THE SRI LANKA EXPERIENCE⁴⁴

In the summer of 2006, the fragile cease-fire between the Sri Lankan government (representing the country's Buddhist majority) and the forces of the Hindu Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) in northeast Sri Lanka was fraying swiftly, and a humanitarian crisis was fast approaching. On August 6, the LTTE invaded the majority Muslim town of Muttur. Inhabitants fled and international aid agencies were unable to broker peace. This exodus of 57,000 villagers sparked inter-ethnic tension and stress in the majority Sinhalese town next door. Most NGOs had left, but two were still working in the area: Muslim Aid (MA) and United Methodist Committee on Relief (UMCOR).

As the crisis deepened, MA and UMCOR banded together to tackle the situation, setting up a joint field office and sharing staff, resources, and logistical support. Together with their local partners, the Muslim group and the Christian group worked in tandem to help the refugees and facilitate the return of other international aid groups – a partnership that enabled economies of scale and effective coordination.

An unprecedented level of trust and engagement emerged among the interested parties. MA engaged with local imams, assuring these crucial community leaders that UMCOR's staff was engaged in purely humanitarian efforts, not proselytism. In the same way, UMCOR discussed MA's relief efforts with local Methodist priests in Christian areas, who in turn persuaded their Hindu counterparts of the UMCOR/MA team's neutrality. MA and UMCOR jointly reached out to a local chief Buddhist monk in order to get aid to the suffering local Buddhist community. Surprised by the unexpected partnership of two groups whom the media often portrayed as enemies, the chief monk spoke with his community, who were themselves suspicious of NGOs and other faith groups. The result? The Buddhist temple became an aid distribution center and inter-faith cooperation grew further.

After the emergency was over, both sides realized the power of their partnership and wanted to scale it up. After intense and sometimes difficult negotiations, in June 2007 at Britain's House of Lords, the two faith inspired groups signed a global partnership agreement worth tens of millions of dollars in aid to the disadvantaged around the world. The country directors for MA and UMCOR commented, "Discussions centered on the imperatives of both faiths to serve humanity and reduce the suffering of the disadvantaged. This was language which people could understand and relate to."⁴⁵

Lessons include the power of a common belief in serving humanity to unite disparate cultures; how teamwork between faith inspired organizations and local religious leaders can pave the way for more effective aid; faith leaders serving as powerful agents for sustainable change and empowerment; how dialogue can truly benefit disadvantaged or embattled communities; and the importance of courage and persistence, even in the face of initial opposition. Concerns about the erosion of a group's faith identity can be allayed by focusing on operational and advocacy issues, not theology; keeping a partnership relevant to and rooted in local communities can be a major challenge when scaling up.

(f) Five areas for action offer potential for deeper exploration in many if not most world regions: (i) public health including malaria, HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis⁵, child immunization, and maternal mortality; (ii) education, especially values content in curricula; (iii) experience of conflict management and peacebuilding in fragile⁶ states because of the intertwining of

development, conflict, and capacity challenges and potential roles for religion; (iv) approaching and addressing corruption issues; and (v) confronting reticence and ambivalence on gender approaches and the appropriate role that the state should play in this (and other) areas.

3. BUILDING ON COMMON INTERESTS AND ADDRESSING DIFFERENCES AND TENSIONS

Building on significant common, shared interests and concerns is important in defining paths forward. Virtually every religious tradition has not only a broad interest in poverty and the alleviation of suffering but also complex histories of charitable and human development work, an apparatus of institutions, and stories and teachings supporting such work. The growing role of many religious institutions in promoting the MDGs reflects both their commitment and some obstacles that have strewn the path.

The globally agreed-upon framework for human development and human security, exemplified and set out in the Millennium Declaration, offers a groundwork for building a sense of common purpose that links public, governmental institutions to the range of religious actors. It also give an outline of an agenda for exploring disconnects and disagreements.⁷

At the global and local levels, many areas of common ground as well as shared global challenges truly link religions and cultures. They can serve as a non-political foundation on which understanding and cooperation can be built. As the thematic platform group observed in their first meetings in Berlin in October, 2010, “exploring and promoting cooperation between NGOs rooted in different value systems and religious cultures creates a common positive experience and builds trust” among partners who are otherwise unfamiliar to one another.⁸

MAPPING DIALOGUE AND ACTION

Several past and current efforts highlight dialogue and action that builds on common interests for human development. Among these are two books on partnerships among faith and development actors published by the World Bank¹³ and the World Economic Forum’s Council of 100 Annual Report on *Islam and the West*¹⁴, the Center for Interfaith Action on Global Poverty (CIFA)’s recent Global Task Force¹⁵, and a Joint Learning Initiative currently under development spearheaded by Tearfund and McKinsey. These efforts highlight a wide range of experience, some ambitious (like the Nigerian anti-malaria campaign) and some rather limited in space and scope. Much more work, though, is needed to move beyond what are essentially anecdotal and partial reports of cooperation towards a useful and actionable database with elements of “models.”

Various other strategic frameworks also exist, some built around quite direct religious engagement.⁹ These frameworks reflect profound expressions of common interests and concerted efforts to mobilize support and action. Some have a more specific focus: for example, an American evangelical Christian group (the New Evangelical Partnership for the Common Good) recently undertook a common reflection with Moroccan Muslims around shared interests in averting nuclear threats and global climate change, as well as exploring tensions around religious freedom.¹⁰ Another important foundation for reflection and building common ground is the rich tradition of Catholic social thought. The recent Encyclical *Caritas in Veritate*¹¹ is a detailed exploration of development issues and a call to common action.

The central challenge for such efforts to build on common ground is to link the vision and reach of global perspectives to local action. This is where the MDGs are proving most difficult to translate, both because of their rather technocratic and general framing, and because they lend themselves rather poorly to specific community understandings. Some communities in poorer countries even perceive the MDGs as instruments of a largely Judeo-Christian North, imposing its idea of progress on the rest of the world. The emphasis on the priority to girls’ education and focus on specific infectious diseases (HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis) are examples, as is the emphasis on children’s rights. Building on the MDG framework but adapting it specifically to local circumstances is essential for addressing such concerns.¹

A “success case” in interfaith cooperation was the Aceh experience following both the 2004 tsunami and the subsequent peace agreement (Text Box 2). This case is of special interest because it involved Muslim and Christian organizations, had to overcome tensions around proselytizing in the early stages, involved national and international organizations, bridged immediate humanitarian relief and development programs and institutions, and illustrated a government commitment to devolution of authority to the local level. The case is cited by Muhammadiyah, Muslim Aid, World Vision, the Salvation Army, and others as an instance of successful, meaningful cooperation.¹⁶ What were the issues? Observers comment that the large international and national organizations did overcome important obstacles to cooperation among themselves, including initial skepticism from their respective faith constituencies, and that the actual execution of works was often of high quality. Two concerns deserve more exploration: a failure, in the crisis environment, to engage local religious leaders and communities well enough, so that legacies of bitterness accentuated existing communal tensions; and the distortions to local capacity building that came with the presence of the “giants” on the ground.

Amidst the shared common ground discussed above, important

THE ACEH EXPERIENCE⁴⁶

For 29 years, the Indonesian province of Aceh on the island of Sumatra was the epicenter for a bloody and paralyzing civil conflict between the Indonesian government and rebel fighters of the Free Aceh Movement (GAM). On December 26, 2004, Aceh was the epicenter for another kind of disaster: a massive earthquake just off the Sumatran coast set off a massive tsunami. While Aceh's civil conflict was estimated to have claimed approximately 15,000 lives over almost three decades, the tsunami killed over 130,000 people and left half a million homeless. Both the man-made and natural disasters left Aceh utterly bereft of schools, its economic development stunted, facing massive internal displacement.

Yet, the beginnings of positive change were just around the corner. The day after the tsunami, GAM started working seriously for an immediate cease-fire with the government. The government in turn granted local authorities greater autonomy to organize relief efforts. The devastation of the tsunami actually provided a way around the roadblock of conflict and paved the way to an enduring peace agreement in August 2005.

Meanwhile, international humanitarian aid money, personnel and attention flooded the province, for the first time in decades. While commitments of support came from a broad range of humanitarian actors, many faith inspired organizations were among the first-responders on the ground, including global institutions like World Vision and Islamic Relief, as well as large domestic relief organizations like Muhammadiyah.

All the humanitarian organizations faced an avalanche of difficulties in Aceh. Besides the total lack of infrastructure, severe mistrust of outsiders, and communications difficulties, many Muslim Acehnese viewed the tsunami as God's wrath upon the impious province, adding religious tensions right from the start. Some faith inspired organizations did not treat this sensitive situation with the necessary finesse, resulting in disheartening missteps. For example, one Christian group tried to adopt 300 orphans into a Christian home, leading to distrust of many Christian groups. At the other extreme, some groups were fearful that the chaotic post-tsunami region would provide a foothold for Islamic extremism – leading to the March 2010 bombing of an extreme Islamic recruitment camp, highlighting the continuing difficulties to create lasting peace.

Yet Aceh was also the site of amazing interfaith partnerships that have helped to give hope that true and lasting peace can be achieved. As international faith inspired organizations launched reconstruction plans, they learned to rely on local networks and beliefs. Non-Muslim groups found that engaging with local Muslim communities or partnering with Muslim organizations (especially with those established in the area) allowed NGOs to implement reconstruction efforts in communities normally suspicious of outsiders.

Interfaith partnerships were crucial for achieving results. In one example, the Christian group World Vision International partnered with the Islamic and Indonesian group Muhammadiyah to build schools. By working together, both organizations could leverage their advantages and avoid programmatic holes. Furthermore, when World Vision worked with its Muslim counterpart, World Vision gained credence in the local community, while Muhammadiyah gained credence in the international humanitarian world, due to World Vision's prestige. Perhaps most tellingly, though, the schools often featured the Muhammadiyah logo, painted in World Vision colors, on the outside of each school, signaling that interfaith partnerships bring the most good to the local community.

Lessons include the real risks that accompany proselytizing in crisis situations, the strong advantages of working with local religious organizations, and benefits from interfaith partnerships and cooperation.

areas of tension exist -- some clearly defined, others less so.¹⁷ Such specific tensions divide not only one faith tradition from another (Muslim from Christian, Buddhist from Hindu, for example) but also fracture communities. There are sharp divisions about the limits of proselytizing within Christian communities, and also within a single denomination, such as Catholicism, and the same is true within Muslim communities. For example, in Cambodia, Catholic and Protestant leaders express concern about the damaging effects of groups that link development benefits to participation in religious organizations, or even “knocking on the wrong doors” and sparking resentment. For humanitarian work, meaning relief following disasters, there are both international laws and voluntary codes of conduct. In the far broader development field, however, such boundaries are far less clearly defined.

A second obvious area of tension is the financial restrictions that target charities, especially Muslim organizations, which are suspected of having ties to terrorists groups. Though such regulations have existed on the books of many Western countries since at least the 1990s, the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, led governments to create even more far-reaching restrictions.¹⁸ While nothing in these government edicts explicitly deals with faith-inspired organizations, the ties, both actual and perceived, between religion and terrorism are likely to embroil faith-inspired organizations in legal problems¹⁹, to close down channels of communication, and to hamper good work. Several initiatives²⁰ aim to increase understanding of the many negative effects of these regulations which not only discourage or complicate charitable giving and activity, but also accentuate the perception of a gulf separating Muslim inspired charity from its Christian and other faith counterparts. That is exactly the opposite effect to the cooperative approach that is both the humanitarian ideal and the practical imperative in a world where intercultural understanding is a prerequisite for peace, and prosperity.

Finally, competition plays a role in an environment of straitened finances; perceived complex, often incomprehensible funding rules and procedures; rigid requirements for reporting and so on generate considerable tension and sometimes resentment.²¹ Even legitimate and above-board organizations face increased red tape and a lower threshold for suspicion and persecution –

making efforts at dialogue and coordination that much more difficult. Because of this, the tendency is towards reliance on a limited number of large, well-heeled and well-known actors²².

Looking ahead, continued proliferation of institutions seems likely. This calls both for stepping up and refining mapping exercises, looking closely at coordination mechanisms, and facilitating more dialogue about the framework for civil society engagement.

4. RELIGIOUS APPROACHES TO HUMANITARIAN RELIEF:

What many term the international humanitarian system today involves a large, complex growing, and highly diverse set of institutions and principles -- roughly aligned around a core objective -- to allow those “caught up in a crisis to articulate what they need to

alleviate their suffering while allowing others in the human family, who are better off, to provide the resources to meet those needs.”²³ In many respects humanitarian action has never been as important as it is today – nor has it been subject to as intense scrutiny.

Religion is significant for humanitarian debates today from several different perspectives. These include: the long history of religious ideas that have shaped many approaches to humanitarian problems (obviously different by region, faith, etc.); the active roles of many religiously inspired organizations in humanitarian work²⁴; the leadership by specific religious leaders in setting standards and “speaking truth to power”; the engagement of religion in the underlying disputes that are

often the cause of humanitarian crises and efforts to resolve them; and the religious beliefs, prejudices, passions, and needs of affected communities. These religious threads, important as they are, are complex and can pull in different directions.

Effective ways to address these multiple dimensions of religious engagement in any coherent fashion are currently lacking. Rarely are religious dimensions of a specific crisis approached in a systematic way, and at the aggregate level (i.e. the international system), there is little to no recognition of religion as an integral or special part of the system. What there is instead is an implicit assumption: that religious actors form part of the neutral, altruistic system, subject to the basic norms and standards that apply to all non-state actors. There are, however, periodic challenges involving

“A second obvious area of tension is the financial restrictions that target charities, especially Muslim organizations, which are suspected of having ties to terrorists groups.”

THE SPHERE STANDARDS

An important example of the growing synergy between faith inspired and secular humanitarian actors are the Sphere Standards, born of the Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response (SCHR). SCHR, comprised of eight of the world's major humanitarian agencies, both secular and religious³⁰, was active in the creation of accountability standards for humanitarian work from its inception in 1972. SCHR spearheaded an effort in 1996 to formulate a universal set of standards for humanitarian relief. Based on a core belief in the individual's right to a life of dignity, even in the midst of disaster and conflict, these standards have become the premier field manual for aid and relief agencies. Its handbook, called *Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards for Disaster Response*, has been printed in multiple languages and adopted by secular and faith inspired NGOs, donors, UN agencies, and host countries.

Though Sphere has detractors,³¹ it is seen by many as a success story of disparate agencies coming together for a common purpose that promotes professionalism and has facilitated worldwide training.³² For instance, from June 2009 to August 2010, the Church World Service – Pakistan/Afghanistan (CWS-P/A) worked with Lutheran World Relief (LWR) to build capacity in LWR's Sri Lankan and Filipino offices, using Sphere tools. Through a series of workshops, field officers were exposed to humanitarian standards for the first time and adapted those standards to their diverse communities. In the process, positive relationships were formed between different faith actors.³³ Relationships have also been forged across faith lines through the creation of formalized networks, which take various forms.³⁴ (Such networks work to promote commonalities between sometimes-opposed groups, share information amongst each other, and create a safe space for disagreement and discussion.

religious actors, such as those involving tensions around the proselytizing activities of religious actors during crises or disputes about the treatment of orphans or gender issues. There are also myriad examples of case-by-case and institution-by-institution engagement, some individual and some in cooperation²⁵. Again, some are notably successful, some less so.

It is legitimate to ask whether this implicit and case-by-case approach makes the most sense, or whether a more probing

analysis of the scale of religious involvement might illuminate missed opportunities for more effective intervention, or address problems linked to the failure to recognize the religious dimensions of humanitarian challenges. Here is one prime scenario: since we know, even if precise figures are lacking, that well over half of all those affected by humanitarian crises are Muslims²⁶, could assistance be enhanced by better awareness and more purposeful efforts to engage Muslim leaders and thinkers in strategies and specific efforts to address their problems?

The humanitarian system has evolved to deal with acute suffering, especially in situations of crisis. Over time, the principles and ideals of impartial approaches aimed at serving victims without discrimination have emerged as a central feature of this system, largely in the form of the body of humanitarian law and the Geneva Conventions. It is worth stressing that the laws and Conventions extend rights and protection explicitly to religious personnel.

In recent times, the politicization of humanitarian assistance – a product both of the dramatically changed nature of warfare and the pattern of crisis-by-crisis learning, especially seen during the Rwanda tragedy of the 1990s – is propelling change. Another change includes the strengthening of coordination mechanisms, in part to contend with the explosive growth in the number of relevant institutions.²⁷

Perhaps the most significant recent trend and challenge is the co-opting of humanitarian aid groups into governments' political objectives. Lines between "combatants", "aid workers", and "civilians" have been blurred far beyond the original distinctions laid out by the Geneva Conventions. Again, religious institutions are involved in the trend but not central to it.

In the context of the UNAOC's mandate, the concentration of humanitarian challenges, work, and spending in areas with majority Muslim populations, juxtaposed against the dominance in recent history and present reality of humanitarian organizations based in Europe and the United States (many with Christian links), gives rise to specific concern. Reflected in obvious tensions in Afghanistan and Pakistan, as well as in Sudan and other places, these concerns have led to important and creative efforts to bridge divides there.²⁸

Along with all agencies involved in humanitarian work, faith-inspired organizations wrestle with the complex politics that surround all humanitarian crises, but must also must address issues specific to faith dimensions. Where either an institution or its staff share a faith with the people they serve, they may be able to build on the resulting shared understanding and sensitivity to issues that range from specific practices²⁹ to a broad philosophy in approaching life. Obviously cultural sensitivity and intelligent approaches to cultural differences is not a monopoly of faith-inspired organizations. However, the benefits of shared beliefs and

the capacity of institutions to work in multifaith environments are significant. Governments and institutions need to work more proactively to ensure that those partners they engage truly value and display such cultural sensitivity and skills.

The implementation of universal standards and the creation of supra-networks of faith-inspired organizations are only part of the story. On the ground, in the heat of crises and disasters, astonishing partnerships have been formed between groups of different faiths, united in their goal to alleviate suffering. Understanding, appreciating, and building on such success stories is an important path forward.

5. RELIGION IN DEVELOPMENT WORK

If an accepted and understood framework for integrating religious elements in humanitarian coordination mechanisms and approaches is patchy at best, then in the broader field of development it is essentially absent. To a significant degree, this is reasonable, given the diversity of situations, issues, and institutions involved today in the development enterprise.

A country-by-country approach to policy and practice is appropriate, even essential. Never will this be a simple matter, given the complex dynamics of contemporary religion – even in a state where there is an official established religion. What emerges most prominently in many countries where religious actors are significant players in development work³⁵ is the fragmentary nature of information and the degree to which a constructive approach to engaging civil society affects the ways in which religious entities are involved both in dialogue about strategies and on the ground, and in participating in community-level implementation. While there are important positive cases, the anecdotal evidence suggests far more missed opportunities.

What is much less explicable, however, is the insensitivity of most development institutions to religion. Review after review of policy

papers, research, sector evaluations, and other white papers points to a failure to mention religion, much less to address it with the careful thought that it deserves.

In reflecting on religion and development, issues emerge on several fronts. The earlier summary of the Berkley Center mapping work highlighted some of the very pragmatic issues emerging from consultations with practitioners in different world regions. Taking a step back, the following are worth highlighting:

(a) *Policy engagement* – “visions of development”: Faith institutions were central players in the major challenges to development approaches and strategies that the Jubilee 2000 movement presented. That movement focused on poor country debt specifically but it also reflected an opening to questions about the “development paradigm”. The voices of religious bodies will clearly continue to be part of the discourse and perhaps even dialogue about social justice, equity, and economic systems.

“Especially in situations where capacity is weak or where religious bodies have clearly defined and durable positions in the society, direct management of services by religious institutions needs to be seen as critical to achieving the MDGs.”

(b) *Policy engagement - national and sectoral*: The Highly Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) debt initiative resulted in the Poverty Reduction Strategy paper process, a central feature of which is participation and consultation by populations in shaping national strategies. The process has had mixed results, and many faith leaders and communities have expressed qualifications about the process itself and their own sense of being marginalized in the process. In parallel, aid harmonization and coordination is encouraging moves towards both budget support and sector programs, led by countries and normally their governments. Again, the place of religious voices at the tables where decisions are made is a point of unease, if not discontent.³⁶

(c) *Program implementation*: Especially in situations where capacity is weak or where religious bodies have clearly defined and durable positions in the society³⁷, direct management of services by religious institutions needs to be seen as critical to achieving the MDGs. The Berkley reviews highlight

many potential areas where stronger partnerships could play critical roles in achieving better development results.

(d) *Community action*: Religion is engaged in communities in

countless ways, whether by building wells, running schools, advocating for road construction, influencing parents' decisions on children's education, monitoring land holdings, influencing health behaviors, etc. This vast body of experience has yet to be systematically assessed, beyond micro-studies. Given the development community's commitment to community-driven development and empowerment, this is a priority area for action.

(e) *Mobilization and advocacy*. This applies from global and international to community levels. The Jubilee 2000 debt campaign is the best single example but Catholic Bishops mobilizing on extractive industries and faith mobilization on environmental issues such as global warming are prominent contemporary examples.

FIVE UNFPA SUGGESTED STRATEGIES

Within the United Nations system, a pioneering, systematic effort to bridge divides has been led by UNFPA. It has resulted, *inter alia*, in an Inter-faith Network on Population and Development, and a 2009 publication of "Guidelines for Engaging with Faith-Based Organizations (FBOs) as Agents of Change."⁴² Here, UNFPA outlines a practical framework of partnerships, including five principles, strategies and operational suggestions, at national, regional and global levels:

- (a) Strategic, issue-based alliances: by focusing on specific issues, FBOs and UNFPA can find common ground and make customized, time-bound alliances.
- (b) A level playing field: UNFPA seeks to cooperate as an equal partner, allowing each side's respective strengths and comparative advantages to work complementarily, not competitively.
- (c) Diversity of outreach: UNFPA explicitly ensures that outreach is multi-faith and balanced, including any preexisting interfaith collectives, according to religious diversity in the community, nation and globe.
- (d) Clarity, accountability and consistency: The definition of mutually agreed-upon concrete goals and expected outcomes, as well as the instillation of a collective sense of ownership, leads to the trust necessary to establish a legacy of realistic partnerships.
- (e) South-South engagement and global continuity: Within each UNFPA region and between headquarters and local offices, there is much scope for knowledge-sharing amongst the offices, strengthening of interfaith networks, and creating feed-back loops.

6. CULTURAL PROXIMITY OF FAITH-INSPIRED ORGANIZATIONS

A central reason to pursue engagement with religious communities more actively in humanitarian and development work is that they have deep roots in communities and thus substantial capacity to relate to the cultural norms and understandings of the communities involved. Looked at more negatively, shared faith makes it less likely that even an outside group will encounter suspicions and negative preconceptions. It makes obvious sense, to take a particularly relevant example, that organizations that have explicit Muslim roots argue that they find it easier in Muslim areas to establish local contacts, communicate with populations, and develop more grounded, durable plans than institutions that have no such common bond. This applies also for Buddhist organizations in Buddhist communities that can understand the ethos and workings of the temple, Catholic organizations that are able to navigate the hierarchies of bishops and priests as well as religious orders, and Hindu organizations that are familiar with Hindu village rhythms and festivals. It is also commonly asserted that a community that holds closely to its religious values and identities may well be more comfortable working with an organization inspired by religious values, even if the religion is different.³⁸

These observations argue for more purposeful efforts to seek partnerships that build on community ties, whether religious or not, and that give some form of preference to local institutions. The argument for local preference is also made in relation to what are referred to as "briefcase NGOs"-- whether from the country itself or overseas-- bodies seen as skilled in maneuvering the intricate mechanisms of fund-raising and thus securing the finance that is available, particularly from multilateral agencies and donor countries.

Another path is to work purposefully towards interfaith work and alliances. Such arrangements are seen to carry the dual benefit of avoiding preference of any single religious community and helping, through practical collaboration, in building relationships and knowledge that can serve in times of crisis.

7. POTENTIAL AREAS FOR FURTHER ACTION.

- ***Cultural training of deployed (humanitarian) personnel.***

A review of best practice in training for humanitarian relief personnel would be desirable, including how it approaches issues of religion. A number of institutions, public and private, have invested substantially in such training.³⁹ Given the shallowness of real understanding of such work at an aggregate, comparative level a specific consultation could serve to jumpstart a long discussed but little acted upon priority.

- ***The involvement of diasporas***

This offers great potential, with well known successes⁴⁰ and areas of well known concern⁴¹. An objective review of experience with a focused report could highlight potential action areas, such as effective use of *diaspora* personnel, building on the momentum and creative energy of remittance patterns, as well as pitfalls such as salary differentials and unclear expectations greeting new arrivals on their responsibilities.

- ***Government/public roles in bridging divides***

Governments obviously can play key roles in bridging divides, whether international institutions or national governments. The general reticence about religion highlighted above has dampened such activities particularly at the international level, a gap that explains the mandate of the UNAOC and focuses the importance of its work.

- ***Aid harmonization and coordination:***

Given the substantial coordination issues highlighted above that have special pertinence for faith-inspired organizations, the next forum on aid harmonization (Busan, November 2011) and the UNAOC should undertake country reviews to highlight issues and opportunities.

- ***Focus on fragile states***

The wide presence of faith organizations in virtually all such situations speaks to extensive and often informed knowledge and experience in the community. This should be tapped in a far more systematic fashion.⁴³

- ***State of knowledge: mapping, levels of understanding and gaps***

The ongoing research work within universities such as Georgetown University, the University of Birmingham, and others, deserves continuing support, as does the Henry R. Luce Foundation initiative on religion and public affairs. UNAOC can highlight the importance of continuing work along these lines and help to draw lessons from findings.

- ***Specific actions to enhance interreligious/inter-communal cooperation and secular/faith bridges***

UNAOC's secretariat and the Thematic Platform have the opportunity to highlight important opportunities for inter-religious or religious-secular collaboration and ensure monitoring of its social impact. Examples where such focus seems warranted include Nigeria, DRC, and Ethiopia.

My concluding comment returns to the importance of an informed, sophisticated, and humane approach to the issues of engaging both individual faith communities and working purposefully to engage them in bridging divides.

What is needed is a reasoned and more professional approach. This is as complex a topic of international life as there is: religion engages passions and emotions as few others, yet it is for many citizens the very essence of what life and human relations are about. There is great potential for damage, pain, and harm. But there is also a vast potential for good, and for nobility.

ABOUT KATHERINE MARSHALL

Katherine Marshall is a Senior Fellow at the Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, and World Affairs, and Visiting Professor in the Government Department at Georgetown University. She is also Executive Director of the World Faiths Development Dialogue (WFDD). Her current work focuses on teaching and research on a wide range of topics at the intersection of development and religion. Ms. Marshall's background is as a leader and practitioner on international development. She has close to four decades of experience on a wide range of development issues, in Africa, Latin America, East Asia, and the Middle East, with a focus on issues facing the world's poorest countries. Her long career with the World Bank (1971-2006) involved a wide range of leadership assignments, and she led the World Bank's faith and ethics work from 2000 through 2009. Her books include *Development and Faith: Where Mind, Heart and Soul work Together* (World Bank, 2007) and *The World Bank: from Reconstruction to Development to Equity* (Routledge, 2008). She sits on several non-profit boards, including the Opus Prize Foundation, the International Selection Committee for the Niwano Peace Prize, IDEA (International Development Ethics Association), the International Anti-Corruption Advisory Council, and AVINA Americas. She has two children, a daughter Laura at the University of Chicago medical school and her son Patrick at Colby College.

ABOUT THE BERKLEY CENTER FOR RELIGION, PEACE & WORLD AFFAIRS

The Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, and World Affairs at Georgetown University, created within the Office of the President in 2006, is dedicated to the interdisciplinary study of religion, ethics, and public life. Through research, teaching, and service, the Center explores global challenges of democracy and human rights; economic and social development; international diplomacy; and interreligious understanding. Two premises guide the Center's work: that a deep examination of faith and values is critical to address these challenges, and that the open engagement of religious and cultural traditions with one another can promote peace.

RESOURCES: UNAOC WORKING PAPER

Allen, John L. blog. "Irish Bishops reject 'bonus culture' of capitalism run amok." Entry by John L. Allen. February 21, 2011. Accessed March 4, 2011. <http://ncronline.org/blogs/ncr-today/irish-bishops-reject-bonus-culture-capitalism-run-amok>.

Benedict XVI. Charity in Truth, Encyclical Caritas in Veritate. July 7, 2009.

Berkley Center for Religion, Peace and World Affairs. "Global Mapping of Faith Inspired Organizations and Development", accessed March 3, 2011, <http://berkeleycenter.georgetown.edu/projects/global-mapping-of-faith-inspired-organizations-and-development>.

Bohnett, Thomas and Claudia Zambra. Experiences and Issues at the Intersection of Faith & Tuberculosis, accessed March 3, 2011, <http://repository.berkeleycenter.georgetown.edu/100914TBReport.pdf>.

"Case Study: Quality and Accountability Collaboration between Church World Service -Pakistan/Afghanistan and Lutheran World Services". Accessed March 4, 2011. <http://www.sphereproject.org/content/view/652/83/lang.english/>.

De Cordier, Bruno, "Faith-based aid, globalisation and the humanitarian frontline: an analysis of Western-based Muslim aid organizations", *Disasters*, 2009, 33(4): 608–628.

Delaney, Augustina and Michael Scharff. Faith-Inspired Organizations & Development in Cambodia. Accessed March 3, 2011. <http://repository.berkeleycenter.georgetown.edu/101209CambodiaReport.pdf>

Donini, Antonio et al. "Humanitarian Agenda 2015 – The State of the Humanitarian Enterprise". Feinstein International Center. March 31 2008. <https://wikis.uit.tufts.edu/confluence/display/FIC/Humanitarian+Agenda+2015+--+The+State+of+the+Humanitarian+Enterprise>.

Gourevitch, Philip. "The Alms Dealers: Can you provide humanitarian assistance without facilitating conflict?" *The New Yorker*, October 11, 2010, pp. 102-3.

Humanitarian Forum. "Response to consultation paper from European Commission 'Enhancing Transparency and

Accountability of the Non-Profit Sector". September 1, 2010. Accessed March 3, 2011. <http://www.humanitarianforum.org/resources.php/en/788/enhancing-transparency-and-accountability-of-the-non-profit-sector>.

Hyder, Masood. "Humanitarianism and the Muslim World". *Journal of Humanitarian Assistance* August 22, 2007. Accessed March 3, 2011. <http://jha.ac/2007/08/22/humanitarianism-and-the-muslim-world/>.

Islam and the West: Annual Report on the State of Dialogue, January 2008. World Economic Forum, 2008. Accessed March 3, 2011. https://members.weforum.org/pdf/C100/Islam_West.pdf.

Gunderson, Steve. Letter to Henry M. Paulson, Secretary of the U.S. Treasury. December 18, 2006. Accessed March 3, 2011. www.cof.org/files/Documents/International_Programs/TreasuryLetter.pdf.

Marshall, Katherine and Lucy Keough. *Mind, Heart, and Soul in the Fight Against Poverty*. World Bank, 2006.

Marshall, Katherine and Lucy Keough. *Development and Faith: Where Mind, Heart, and Soul Work Together*. World Bank, 2008.

Mudd, Philip. The Atlantic blog. February 20, 2011. <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/02/why-the-us-should-engage-the-muslim-brotherhood/71434/>.

UNFPA. "Global Forum of Faith-based Organisations for Population and Development". UNFPA, 2009. Accessed March 4, 2011. <http://www.unfpa.org/public/cache/offonce/publications/pid/4501>.

UNFPA. "Guidelines for Engaging Faith Based Organizations." Accessed March 4, 2011. http://www.unfpa.org/culture/docs/fbo_engagement.pdf.

Walker, Peter and Daniel Maxwell. *Shaping the Humanitarian World (Global Institutions)*. New York and Oxford, UK: Routledge, 2009.

ENDNOTES

1. This paper was prepared as background for the Bern discussion. Katherine Marshall is Senior Fellow at the Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, and World Affairs at Georgetown University and Executive Director of the World Faiths Development Dialogue (WFDD). Research support from Amelia Salyers is gratefully acknowledged, as are comments from UNAOC meeting participants.
2. “Peacebuilding” is used in contrast to “peacemaking”, negotiations, and post conflict reconstruction. The term highlights the continuing effort involved in “building” (as opposed to making) peace, and encompasses a wider range of actions that include for example conflict prevention. In practical terms, peacebuilding spans development and humanitarian work.
3. For example, the Aga Khan Development Network is a critical player in the development work that accepts the term faith-inspired but not faith-based
4. This work is available at <http://berkeleycenter.georgetown.edu/projects/global-mapping-of-faith-inspired-organizations-and-development>; similar work focuses on development issues (tuberculosis, governance, gender for example). An in-depth review of faith inspired work in Cambodia is at <http://repository.berkeleycenter.georgetown.edu/101209CambodiaReport.pdf>
5. The Berkley Center and WFDD recently completed a review of faith and tuberculosis which highlights important potential for common action; see <http://repository.berkeleycenter.georgetown.edu/100914TBRReport.pdf>
6. This term and grouping of countries is of course subject to debate; some definitions highlight poverty, some weak capacity of states, some vulnerability to crises and conflict. What is most relevant here is that religion is almost universally important both in shaping identity and in providing services. Since many such states are fragile because of actual or threatened conflict, peace-building has special importance. The vicious circle phenomenon accentuates linkages among different issues so such states are less able to respond to humanitarian crises (Haiti versus Chile) and arguably to resolve social conflicts; delayed or failed development translates into high unemployment and corruption worsens the situation all around.
7. Two large interfaith organizations, Religions for Peace (WCRP) and the Parliament of the World’s Religions, are both seeking to build alliances and commitment to action around both the MDGs and concern for environmental action
8. Examples of such efforts are the ambitious programs to engage religious leaders in the national campaign to combat malaria in Mozambique and Nigeria. Many HIV/AIDS programs also have moved from fractious tensions among different actors (including different faith communities) to something approaching common purpose and practical modalities for setting strategies, implementing programs, and even evaluating results (even though this is often the most difficult area where faith inspired organizations are involved).
9. Examples include Karen Armstrong and TED’s Charter of Compassion (<http://charterforcompassion.org/share/the-charter/>), the Earth Charter (<http://www.earthcharterinaction.org/content/>), the Common Word dialogue, launched in Jordan (<http://www.acommonword.com/>), and the Initiatives of Change Caux Call to Action (<http://www.cauxcalltoaction.net/>)
10. <http://www.newevangelicalpartnership.org/?q=node/113>
11. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate_en.html
12. Promising examples of explicit links include current efforts supported by the UN Millennium campaign in Kenya to draw faith communities into monitoring specific targets like girls’ retention in school and domestic violence, through the use of cell phones and other new technologies).
13. Katherine Marshall and Lucy Keough, *Mind, Heart, and Soul in the Fight Against Poverty*, and *Development and Faith: Where Mind, Heart, and Soul Work Together* (Katherine Marshall and Marisa Van Saanen, 2008)
14. https://members.weforum.org/pdf/C100/Islam_West.pdf
15. <http://www.centerforinterfaithaction.org/initiatives/the-global-initiative-for-faith-health-and-development-2010.html>
16. A short write up is available from the Berkley Center on request
17. The tension most commonly mentioned in Berkley Center consultations centered around proselytizing but there are many others
18. In the U.S., for example, Executive Order 13224 and Section 805 of the U.S. Patriot Act (In which, the U.S. government prohibits transactions with entities deemed by the Executive Branch to be associated with terrorism and freezes all assets controlled by or in the possession of those entities and those who support them) and Section 805 of the U.S. Patriot Act (in which, the U.S. government prohibits transactions with entities deemed by the Executive Branch to be associated with terrorism and freezes all assets controlled by or in the possession of those entities and those who support them) particularly exposed NGOs, including faith inspired ones, to greater liability and persecution under the law,

regardless of whether their central missions were benign and humanitarian.

19. See, for example, the June 21, 2010 6-3 ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court to uphold the broadened definitions of “material support” in Section 805 of the Patriot Act, whereby any assistance, even if humanitarian, to designated terrorist groups makes an individual or organization liable to federal prosecution.

20. Including the Humanitarian Forum and the Montreux Initiative

21. For example, anti-terrorism financing guidelines released by the U.S. Treasury and the EU created uproars in the international humanitarian and development communities for what NGOs characterized as the guidelines’ vagueness and lack of understanding of the work that both Muslim and Western NGOs do on the ground (see the open letter to the Treasury Department on December 18, 2006, by the President of the Council of Foundations or the Humanitarian Forum’s response to the EU’s July 2, 2010 consultation paper entitled “Enhancing Transparency and Accountability of the Non-Profit Sector”).

22. World Vision is a notable giant.

23. Peter Walker and Daniel Maxwell, *Shaping the Humanitarian World*, 2

24. Examples include Islamic Relief, World Vision, and the Knights of Malta

25. Aceh and Haiti are examples

26. “The majority of those receiving humanitarian assistance worldwide are Muslim. This simple fact has remained insufficiently examined, although its significance is evident and growing.” Masood Hyder, “Humanitarianism and the Muslim World” *Journal of Humanitarian Assistance*, August 2007.

27. These changes are giving rise to shifts in the definitional foundations of the system, epitomized by Clare Short’s important 1997 speech, which highlighted a “New Humanitarianism” whose role goes beyond just saving lives. Short highlights in the speech the political nature of aid, the complex comingling of human rights and human needs, and the sad fact that humanitarian aid can in practice do harm as well as good

28. A notable example is the Humanitarian Forum, founded by Islamic Relief and partners not only to put these issues on the table, but also to prompt discussion and specific problem-solving.

29. For example, observance of Ramadan or other religious holidays

30. Organizations include: Care International, Caritas Internationalis, the International Committee of the Red Cross, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, International Save the Children Alliance, Lutheran World Federation, Oxfam, World Council of Churches, and World Vision International.

31. Walker and Maxwell lay out two lines of criticism: the first is general, that these standards have led some agencies to ignore context in pursuit of “following the rules”, while the second concerns details in the standards, such as why one right over another. Walker 132

32. Walker 132

33. Case study taken based on SPHERE documents: Sphere’s website is <http://www.sphereproject.org/>

34. Examples are Humanitarian Forum, established by Islamic Relief to create dialogue between Muslim and Western organizations, or the United Nations Populations Fund’s (UNFPA) Interfaith Network for Population and Development, established in 2008 to strengthen ties between faith inspired organizations and UNFPA (UNFPA, “Global Forum of Faith-based Organisations for Population and Development”, 2009)

35. Examples include Cambodia, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Mozambique, Guatemala, and Haiti

36. The detailed WFDD Cambodia country review of faith work in development (cited above) found that few religious development actors of any faith, Buddhist, Christian, or Muslim, were convinced that they had a meaningful place at any policy table.

37. Examples are Catholic health institutions in Zambia, madrasas in Indonesia,

38. To cite one example, Douglas Johnston, a Christian and former US diplomat, who works with madrasas in Pakistan often makes this argument.

39. UNFPA’s website describing such training and its work to develop toolkits and networks of organizations. UNAOC is building an extensive body of resources, including such toolkits.

40. India, Haiti, Pakistan

41. Sri Lanka

42. http://www.unfpa.org/culture/docs/fbo_engagement.pdf

43. The Netherlands Government has undertaken work along these lines, focused inter alia on DRC

44. Much of this case study is based on Guy Hovey and Amjad Saleem’s article “Faith, Relief, and Development: the Sri Lanka experience,” www.fmreview.org/FMRpdfs/FMR30/66-67.pdf.

45. Hovey, Ibid.

46. This case study is based on a draft written by the Berkley Center graduate assistant. For more information, please request a copy from the Berkley Center

ABOUT THE FRONT COVER:

A word cloud highlighting the most commonly used terms in the working paper.

November 2011

Design by Sarah Amos

The Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, & World Affairs
Georgetown University



United Nations Alliance of Civilizations
Many cultures. One humanity.

