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Introduction

The Task

The term “FBOs” (faith-based organizations) has emerged as a widely used acronym referring to a category of not-for-profit organizations that have seen explosive growth over the past two decades. The term “faith” evidently refers to both the source of inspiration and to organizational origins and links; when an organization is labeled as an FBO there is an assumption that its work will be linked in some fashion to religion. However, there are no hard and fast definitions or boundaries delineating these organizations from others that do not claim a faith link, which themselves take countless forms. The role that “religion” plays, both in terms of beliefs and practice as well as organizational form, varies so widely as to elude any precise description. In short, FBOs are extraordinarily diverse and come in many different shapes, sizes and natures.

Faith and faith-linked organizations play vital roles in international development work. In many respects (largely through missionary activities that first launched modern education and health services in many countries and contributed to accelerating social change) they were pioneers of the field we today call development—the effort to support processes of social and economic change that improve the lives of individuals and communities across the world and especially in the poorest countries. As the international development field has become increasingly complex, engaging an ever-widening set of actors and institutions, the role of faith-based organizations has grown in importance. The communications revolutions that form part of globalization have also affected faith organizations in most if not all of their manifestations, linking communities across geographic space but also encouraging a host of ecumenical and interfaith engagements. It is a paradox, however, that in this dimension of the international development scene, the roles played by faith-inspired organizations are both more controversial and less well understood than most others (bilateral and multilateral aid, non-governmental organizations, even the newest visible actors, from the private sector).

This report therefore takes as its first challenge a descriptive “mapping” of the work of faith-inspired organizations in the United States that are engaged in the international development and relief arena: what and where they are, what general categories may be distinguished, what they do, and what generic features characterize them. Short “snapshots” of organizations (presented as examples, not a complete compendium) are included, with more detailed listings and descriptive notes in Appendix 2.

For the purposes of this report, the term development refers to work centered on longer term social and economic change, which aims to fight poverty and promote social justice. Use of the term assumes a focus on poorer countries of the world, though the issues involved do arise everywhere. Relief refers largely to short-term emergency aid following natural and human-made disasters. Most of the organizations we reviewed are engaged in various stages of the spectrum of development and emergency assistance, sometimes simultaneously in the...
same region. In practice, many faith-inspired organizations began their work in response to crises and disasters and have progressively expanded their activities to incorporate work with a longer term horizon. We recognize, however, that the line between relief and development work is not always clear-cut. This complexity in drawing boundaries between relief and development is aptly illustrated by the HIV/AIDS pandemic, which can by many measures be considered an emergency or a crisis, but which is by its nature long term and intricately tied into the complex development processes in countries and communities involved.¹

The report’s second challenge is to review and present major elements in the academic and policy literature that focus explicitly on this group of organizations and their development work. This “state of the art” discussion is summarized in the report and in an annotated bibliography (Appendix 5).

The third topic is how FBOs, in general, and through major exemplary institutions and partnerships, are involved in the development community. This is briefly surveyed with a focus on the US Government, major UN organizations, and the US-based international financial institutions.

Fourth, the report briefly reviews several categories of focus on FBOs in the development field, largely as an illustrative exercise. The areas highlighted are HIV/AIDS, humanitarian and disaster relief, programs for children, and microfinance.

Finally, the report lays out major issues under discussion, again primarily within the United States and particularly among the faith-based organizations themselves. Because many of the organizations by definition have an international character and may well reflect this in their ethos and organization, this categorization is somewhat artificial; since international dimensions are the focus of a second stage of work, this exercise is largely grounded in the US perspective.

This report is largely a “desk study” drawing on a wide range of academic and policy sources as well as (and often primarily) the information available from the organizations themselves. It is not the objective of this project to survey either the data about or the detailed work of faith-based organizations. This calls for further work, as do the financial aspects, both collectively and in terms of trends within overall development assistance. We note that parallel work on these topics is underway elsewhere, for example at Harvard University, Johns Hopkins, and, with support from the British development agency, at the University of Birmingham. This report is, rather, an effort to take stock and delineate policy issues and agendas. The expectation is that the analysis in this report will be enriched through dialogue processes, during interviews with practitioners, and conference discussions.

History and Policy Context

Faith has always played a significant role in American public life, and religious fervor has often inspired influential social movements—abolition, civil rights, and prohibition, for example. Over the past twenty years, this phenomenon has received particular attention as an increasingly diverse US society vigorously debates the presence of religion in the public arena. With the 1996 welfare reform bill and its Charitable Choice provision, it appeared that the government had opened a door to acceptance of a new level of public-private cooperation between government organizations and religious organizations in the realm of social service delivery. George W. Bush made facilitating this partnership a major administration goal almost from the first days of his tenure as President.² A new Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (OFBCI) was created, charged above all to help such groups better navigate the federal grant system and ensure that they were not discriminated against during the application and review process. At first, efforts tended to focus primarily on domestic programs and organizations, but the OFBCI soon extended its reach to organizations with work overseas. Consequently, many faith-based organizations benefited from increased access to USAID funding.³ These FBO initiatives have raised many questions and proved contentious, with concerns focusing primarily on their legal and ethical parameters.

The Boston Globe surveyed data on USAID contracts going to faith-based organizations from 2001–2005 and documented a doubling of the share of resources over the period, from 10.5% to 19.9%, a marked increase. Another conclusion of the Globe analysis was
the heavy predominance (98.5%) among the 160 FBOs that received prime contracts.4

The approach and policies of the United States towards faith, in general, and to FBOs as an instrument of international development work and policy, more specifically, has been the subject of considerable discussion and often concern in the international arena.

A simple but profound question lies at the heart of debates about faith-based development work: just what exactly is a “faith-based organization”? It is telling that even the OFBCI has put forward no authoritative definition, a reality that may be conveniently vague policy but is problematic for practitioners and scholars trying to ascertain how these kinds of organizations do and should behave. The academic literature has addressed the nuances of this question in various ways, though not with the frequency suggested by its public profile and global footprint. Solid theoretical work especially is lacking.5 Nonetheless, certain recurrent trends can be discerned and offer some useful considerations for defining the field of faith-based organizations.

I. Categories of Faith-Based Organizations

Challenges of Definition

Defining and categorizing faith-based organizations and distinguishing them from secular organizations and from organizations of different faith traditions presents a host of special challenges. Most scholarly work to date has focused on the faith-based/secular division, with some branching off to study the variations present within the Christian tradition. Given the general predominance of Christianity in the United States, both practitioners and scholars have expressed concern that both theoretical and definitional work, as well as practices on the ground, will be subtly skewed against non-Western religions with less formal structures and different theological frameworks for compassionate action.6

Just as religions approach compassionate action differently, so too organizations with different goals can reflect myriad types of religious influence. Organizations dedicated to broad policy change, for instance, will likely call on different precepts than organizations focused on individual behavioral change. Some faith traditions tend to embrace an inclusive theology where that religious faith is reflected through a series of broad principles, such as compassion for the less fortunate, rather than specific doctrinal statements. When this occurs, faith connections can be much more problematic to discern. In many cases organizations may use similar religious terminology but operationalize it in very different ways: within the Christian tradition, for example, mainline and evangelical groups both claim to “witness,” but this means that members of the evangelical organizations are more likely to proselytize while those in the mainline groups will concentrate on exemplifying worthy behavior.7

Furthermore, not everything is in a name. A study of Houston-based agencies providing social services to the homeless found that almost one quarter of self-identified FBOs had completely secular titles. It is therefore important to examine other elements such as logos, mission statements, and, of course, direct knowledge of the origins and ethos of an organization when attempting to determine if an organization belongs in the FBO category.8

Funding sources can offer further clues to an organization’s faith connection. Many faith-inspired organizations solicit and support a large part of their operations through direct donations. This can mean that they are less dependent than some secular NGOs on government funding contracts. Generally FBOs are quite successful at maintaining positive yearly balances so that costs do not exceed revenues.9

In some cases faith-based organizations may have quite direct ties with or actually form part of religious congregations and, consequently gathering solid research information can be more difficult (due to difficulties in categorization but also because transparency of accounts may not be the norm). This is especially the case in financial matters, since religious congregations do not fall under the same tax filing requirements as nonprofit organizations (the legal tax status of most FBOs). If government monies are involved, the congregation may create a separate legal entity to avoid separation of church and state complications.
**Typologies**

“Faith-based organization” currently acts as broad shorthand for a wide spectrum of organizations that deserve more specific treatment in the academic literature. Those who have attempted to move beyond a brief dictionary-style definition frequently turn to a typology format to accommodate the diversity of organizations. This recognizes the relevance of the concept of religious integration: organizations incorporate religion “in a variety of ways and intensities.” The two typologies discussed below represent the kinds of broad criteria researchers find useful and important.

Steven Rathgeb Smith and Michael R. Sosin’s 2001 typology rejects the term “faith-based” in favor of “faith-related,” arguing that the more common term

---

**DEFINITIONS OF A FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATION: SOME EXAMPLES**

“Faith-based organisations include: religious and religion-based organisations and networks; communities belonging to religious places of worship; specialized religious institutions and religious social service agencies; and registered and unregistered nonprofit institutions that have a religious character or mission... In some cases they are led by clergy... In other cases laypersons (non-clergy) provide the driving force.”


“...Christian Faith-based Organisations (CFBOs). This group consists primarily of (1) churches, which can be categorized as either denominational or independent, and (2) faith-based non-governmental organizations, amongst which it is useful to distinguish Christian international NGOs (CINGOs) from Christian national NGOs (CNNGOs).”


“FBNs [Faith-based NGOs] can be defined as non-state actors that have a central religious or faith core to their philosophy, membership, or programmatic approach, although they are not simply missionaries.”


“While there is no generally accepted definition of faith-based organizations, they are characterized by having one or more of the following: affiliation with a religious body; a mission statement with explicit reference to religious values; financial support from religious sources; and/or a governance structure where selection of board members or staff is based on religious beliefs or affiliation and/or decision-making processes based on religious values.”


“Faith-related agencies may be defined as social service organizations that have any of the following: a formal funding or administrative arrangement with a religious authority or authorities; a historical tie of this kind; a specific commitment to act within the dictates of a particular established faith; or a commitment to work together that stems from a common religion. These agencies have some link to religion at the institutional level, either directly or because some individuals act on the basis of their relations to a religious institution, not simply on the basis of their personal belief system.”

is too exclusive and would preclude the typology from addressing the full range of organizations with religious connections. They identify three major sources of constraint: resources, authority, and culture. Organizations and faith “couple” along these dimensions, to varying degrees. Smith and Sosin derived their data from a case study of social service organizations in Seattle and Chicago. They described coupling variance among organizations categorized by mission, service focus, and bureaucracy. Smith and Sosin note that all of the organizations they studied maintain ties with secular culture and frequently encourage greater government responsibility for the poor; most faith-related organizations also attempted to mitigate concerns about desecularization through deliberate resource choices.\(^\text{11}\)

In 2004, Ronald Sider (a leading evangelical scholar in the field of development and social justice) and Heidi Rolland Unruh produced a typology based on case studies of domestic community service organizations. Their work offered distinct criteria for organizations and programs, rightly noting that programs run by religious organizations may be completely free of religious references, and vice versa.\(^\text{12}\) Sider and Unruh separated organizations into six different categories (listed from most to least faith-based): faith-permeated, faith-centered, faith-affiliated, faith-background, faith-secular partnership, and secular. They described categorical archetypes according to eight criteria, including mission statement, board member and staff selection, and financial support. Programs and projects were placed into identical categories using criteria such as religious program content and expectation of religious outcome. Sider and Unruh offer the caveat that their criteria deliberately address only the “tangibly expressive ways” organizations incorporate religion and do not address personal issues of belief and motivation, since the former are both more visible and controversial.\(^\text{13}\)

Much of the current academic literature on this topic reflects the researchers’ concern with (and access to) U.S.-oriented groups. Less work has been done on faith-based organizations with an international relief and development focus. Nevertheless, general definitional concerns are roughly similar, especially for global organizations with American roots.

An Operational Framework for Mapping Faith-Based Organizations

Table 1 (page 12) shows a summary of major categories of organizations involved in international development work.

What follows are broad comments on trends within some of the major categories; details on leading organizations are summarized in Appendix 2.

Interfaith Organizations

The major world interfaith organizations are increasingly engaged in development advocacy and work. While they are global in focus, the headquarters of the leading organizations are in the United States, giving them in some respects an American ethos and operational stance. Among the leading interfaith organizations are the World Parliament of the Religions, Religions for Peace (WCRP), and the United Religions Initiative (URI). All three have focused historically on issues of peace but are increasing their activities on various development fronts, notably advocacy of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and work on specific issues such as HIV/AIDS.

Christian

1. Catholic Organizations

Among different organizations linked to specific Christian denominations, the US Catholic community is unique in having a single, official, overarching relief and development agency, Catholic Relief Services (CRS). Headquartered in Baltimore, Maryland, CRS is one of the largest relief and development organizations in the United States, working in over 99 countries to provide emergency relief and orchestrating the organization's development programs in agriculture, community health, education, HIV/AIDS, and microfinance. CRS is a member of Caritas Internationalis, the international confederation of Catholic organizations with social justice and humanitarian missions.

CRS began in 1943 by resettling war refugees in Europe. In the 1950s, the organization expanded to include operations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Over time, CRS added additional development projects to its repertoire. The 1994 genocide in Rwanda, where CRS has worked for decades, prompted the organization to reflect upon its role in the conflict.
After reevaluating its work following the devastation, CRS added an additional aspect to its work based on Catholic social teachings. The “Justice Lens,” the perspective of peace and justice that now undergirds all of the work undertaken by CRS, seeks to address the underlying injustices that fuel many global conflicts.14

CRS partners with various Catholic and secular organizations in the United States and abroad. Most CRS partner organizations are affiliated with the Catholic Church and have missions independent from humanitarian aid. For example, the National Council of Catholic Women (NCCW) works with CRS on their “World of Peace” project, aiding children and mothers around the world. Projects in Africa are aided by the National Black Catholic Congress and the US Jesuit Conference. CRS also partners with FBOs of other denominations, US government agencies, and private corporations.

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Major Examples</th>
<th>Comments/Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interfaith</td>
<td></td>
<td>WCRP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can be globally or nationally based or centered in community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>CRS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainline</td>
<td>Lutheran World Relief, Episcopal Relief and Development</td>
<td>Traditional US denominations which historically dominated Christianity’s interface with the public sphere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>World Vision, Baptist World Aid, Compassion International</td>
<td>“Evangelical” was defined as groups that affirm the ECFA’s statement of faith (see <a href="http://www.ecfa.org/?PageName=StatementFaith">http://www.ecfa.org/?PageName=StatementFaith</a>), are affiliated with the NAE, or otherwise indicate their distinctiveness from mainline Protestantism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>Save Africa’s Children</td>
<td>Increasing interest focused on work in Africa; cut across traditional protestant and evangelical/pentecostal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>While not considered theologically mainline or evangelical, these churches have had a special influence on issues of international development policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Churches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>IOCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecumenical</td>
<td>Church World Service, NCA, Habitat, CCIH</td>
<td>Broadly appeals to Christians across different denominations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Islamic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Buddhism, Hindu, Bahá’í, Buddhist Peace Fellowship, BAPS Care, BIC.</td>
<td>Commonly linked to diaspora organizations and frequently small in size, with widely varying missions and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FBO/Secular</td>
<td>Interaction, WFDD</td>
<td>Networking organizations formed to encourage cooperation and prevent unnecessary duplication of efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Some smaller independent Catholic relief and development agencies exist in the United States, but most (if not all) partner with CRS as part of their work. For example, the Catholic Medical Mission Board and Trinity Health International are exceptions. They each focus on providing medical care to impoverished people around the globe.

2. Historic/Mainline Protestant
Many mainline Protestant Christian denominations have a long history of development involvement, beginning in World War II and earlier. Because they are usually connected to global denominational networks (e.g. the Anglican Communion), church agencies often have no trouble finding indigenous implementation partners. This can be especially true in healthcare as denominations build on a missionary hospital tradition. Most mainline denominations have established separately incorporated entities to carry out relief and development work since distinct legal status offers them greater financial freedom, both in receiving donor funds and in oversight; currently the Presbyterian Church (USA) is one of the only major denominations that has not yet followed this trend. Historically mainline denominations have been less wary of accepting government funds than their evangelical kindred, and now many must confront the ironic reality that evangelical FBOs currently seem to have greater access to aid money, with fewer legal caveats and restrictions. Nonetheless, Church World Service, the relief and development arm of the National Council of Churches (predominantly comprised of mainline Protestant and Orthodox bodies), continues to be a major stakeholder in the development arena, as do the individual denominational agencies.

3. Evangelical
Summarizing patterns and trends among faith-based development organizations with ties to evangelical churches is quite difficult. One of the difficulties in ascertaining the size of evangelical organizations is their reliance both on volunteers and in-country partners. Often the parent organization coordinates fundraising, financial disbursement, and broad project oversight, while volunteers and partners physically implement programs. This occurs partially because donors want to see their money used effectively and often (correctly) assume that local entities can best pinpoint the needs of their communities. Local partners also generally have greater legitimacy with the populations being served. This reality blurs the lines between operational and grant making bodies and allows charities with relatively small staffs to oversee million dollar budgets. Supporters often claim that this financial efficiency is one major advantage of faith-based organizations.

When HIV/AIDS first emerged as a major crisis in the late 1980s and early 1990s, evangelical groups were often reluctant to get involved since they viewed the disease as a result of immoral behavior (especially homosexuality). However, as the epidemic quickly began to spread to the general population, it wreaked havoc with development efforts. When evangelical groups perceived how vulnerable populations were suffering—especially children, often a key recipient of their programs—they began to offer more treatment and care programs. Many now highlight their efforts in this area. More recently evangelical groups have received attention for their efforts to encourage religiously-based behavior changes, which they argue has greater potential for long-term sustainability.

In some cases, evangelical HIV/AIDS efforts translate into augmenting existing development programs (e.g. child sponsorship with expanded healthcare options), while other groups may develop entirely new initiatives. A number of major evangelical charitable institutions are members of the ONE Campaign against AIDS and extreme poverty, as well as the Micah Challenge, which supports the Millennium Development Goals.

Outside of the major evangelical organizations like World Vision, many other smaller groups work to maximize their impact through networking organizations. The Association of Evangelical Relief and Development Organizations has 45 members. In many cases the historical structure of evangelical churches encourages this trend. Founders frequently rejected the hierarchical structure of established denominations and emphasized the freedom and autonomy of individual congregations. Consequently, numerous churches and denominations sprang up with few broader institutional ties. The post-WWII renaissance of evangelical social involvement spurred the creation of parachurch organizations that could unite members of various evangelical strains by emphasizing the common work of relief and development. Today this remains the
norm for large-scale evangelical development efforts, though many churches and denominations encourage their missionaries to engage in similar types of activities as part of their evangelistic work.

Many historically African-American churches delegate comparatively few resources to international projects, whether missionary or otherwise, and instead address domestic needs. It is possible that historical inequalities within the United States have led African-American churches to devote precious resources to proximate causes. More recently, African-American churches have demonstrated a willingness to involve themselves in global development issues. For example, Save Africa’s Children and founder Bishop Charles E. Blake have received significant support in their efforts to help children in Africa, especially those impacted by the HIV/AIDS pandemic. Other organizations such as OIC International and the Hope for African Children Initiative also focus on connecting concerned black Americans with needs in Africa. Still, overall, relatively few African-American organizations adopt an international focus; consequently, those concerned with international development issues are likely to contribute time and money to other ecumenical organizations, such as World Vision.

4. Orthodox
The International Orthodox Christian Charities, Inc. (IOCC), is currently the only major Orthodox charitable institution based in the United States. The various autocephalous churches all maintain independent humanitarian ministries (e.g. the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in America supports a number of orphanages in the Ukraine), but these are relatively small and usually emphasize the ties to the “home country” or local needs. The IOCC has effectively networked with larger organizations like Church World Service to broaden its impact and become a PEPFAR grant recipient.

5. Mormon
Latter-Day Saints Charities (LDSC) has been pursuing humanitarian work since 1996, though the Church of Latter-Day Saints has a long heritage of compassionate work. LDSC assists local projects in a wide range of health-related activities, including measles vaccination, neonatal resuscitation training, vision clinics, and wheelchair provision to disabled persons. Other efforts focus on helping communities create sources of clean water. LDSC has also been involved in post-tsunami reconstruction efforts in South Asia. The organization currently contributes to projects in 163 countries, often sending needed supplies such as hygiene kits to areas hit by disaster.

6. Ecumenical Organizations
These organizations include organizations that cut across various denominations as well as organizations that can be termed “religious coordinating bodies” that aim to enhance the effectiveness of work through coordination among Christian organizations. The National Council of Churches is the leading organization in this category.

Jewish
US-based Jewish groups involved in international development work are relatively few in number. They tend to focus primarily on global relief and development challenges. Most of the US-based Jewish organizations are members of the Jewish Coalition for Disaster Relief (JCDR), a Jewish umbrella group focused on funding relief and development projects in the US and abroad. This organization, orchestrated by the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (AJJDC), operates by collecting funds to address man-made and natural disaster worldwide. Structurally, the umbrella organization collects donations for specific projects and distributes the funds to its own coalition members or non-coalition organizations working on the ground in the target region. In recent years coalition groups have worked together to address crises in Central America, Pakistan, Indonesia, Kosovo, Turkey, Ethiopia, El Salvador and India.

Some of JCDR’s member organizations are independent relief and development organizations, while other groups, such as Jewish Woman International, the Rabbinical Council of America, the American Jewish Congress, and the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, have non-humanitarian missions, but fundraise for the coalition’s relief efforts. JCDR partners working independently in the relief and development field include American Jewish World Service, which gives grant funds to development projects related to civil society, development and human rights; MAZON, a grant-making organization committed to ending world hunger; and Global Jewish Assistance and Relief
Network which provides humanitarian assistance in the former Soviet states. These three organizations primarily operate by partnering with other organizations through grant funding or working through the established networks of others organizations. The American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee organizes the nonsectarian relief efforts of the JCDR. In its other work, AJJDC mainly focuses on rescue, relief, and rehabilitation. Though the organization works in Jewish communities, its aid is not limited to those of the Jewish faith.

Islamic
Islamic relief and development organizations represent a small part of the US-based FBO community. A handful of larger Islamic organizations collect money to conduct relief and development projects around the world and a larger group of smaller organizations have sprung up to address specific global crises. Because of the small number of organizations, it is difficult to generalize about US-based Islamic relief and development organizations—their missions, projects, and practices have similarities but each organization has unique features.

Most of the large Islamic relief organizations in the United States, including Mercy-USA, Islamic Relief USA, Helping Hands, Life for Relief and Development, and One Ummah International have a mission to help all people regardless of religion, race, or ethnicity. Despite this inclusive mission, these organizations primarily aid regions of the world where the majority of the population is Muslim because the disasters, both manmade and natural, that have befallen these regions. In recent years, efforts of the larger Islamic organizations have focused on aiding the victims of the 2005 tsunami, earthquakes in Pakistan and Indonesia, and conflicts in Lebanon, Israel/Palestine, Kashmir, Chechnya, Afghanistan, and Sudan. Many of the Islamic FBOs work in partnership with other non-governmental organizations and governmental organizations.

The projects undertaken by these globally focused Islamic organizations are similar to the projects of secular development organizations: disaster relief, education, health and sanitation, microfinance, and aid to orphans. Islamic relief and development FBOs also have some programs and practices that are unique to Muslim organizations. For example, during the holy period of Ramadan, when Muslims traditionally fast from dusk to dawn, donors are encouraged to give charitably for those who are hungry year round. During the annual Eid celebration, Muslims traditionally practice Qurbani, the sacrifice of an animal to commemorate Abraham’s willingness to sacrifice. Some Muslim organizations collect money to distribute meat to those who cannot afford it during this time. These organizations also provide a means for Muslims in the United States to make their zakat donations. Zakat is a required form of giving a percentage of one’s wealth to those who are less fortunate.

Many smaller Islamic organizations have sprung up to help specific regions affected by disaster. Some of these organizations now appear to be defunct but during the height of crisis the groups organized to support relief efforts. Examples of these smaller organizations include the Asia Relief Inc., Kosova Humanitarian Aid Organization, The Bosnia Relief Fund USA, the Somali Relief Fund, Fund for Afghan Relief and Development, and the Kashmir Relief Fund.

Muslim FBOs in the United States have been affected by the aftermath of the terror attacks on September 11, 2001. The FBI had begun scrutinizing Islamic charity organizations in the late 1990s, but these measures had little tangible effect until after 9/11. Four prominent Muslim relief and development organizations have had their assets frozen by the US government: Texas-based Holy Land Foundation, Illinois-based Global Relief Foundation, Missouri-based American Relief Agency, and Michigan-based LIFE for Relief and Development. No members of any of these organizations had been convicted of the charges against them at the time of this publication and investigations continue.

Other Faith Organizations

1. Buddhist

Most Buddhist charitable organizations in the United States are quite small (a number have budgets under $25,000). Buddhist peace advocacy is the most prominent aspect of the US Buddhist community, which also focuses on domestic causes (e.g. prisoner rehabilitation and reintegration efforts). Buddhist charitable organizations that do international work generally also tend to have a geographic focus, such as Burma or Tibet. Most large Buddhist charities and networks...
appear to be headquartered outside the United States, such as the International Network of Engaged Buddhists based in Thailand or Soka Gakkai in Japan. These types of organizations tend to establish national affiliates, which then address domestic relief and development needs as they arise. International members who wish to materially or financially assist are encouraged to donate through other charitable channels (e.g., the Red Cross).

In 2004 the Garrison Institute facilitated the creation of the International Buddhist Peace Service after recognizing that there was no “ecumenical, cross-cultural, cross-tradition Buddhist network” concerned with development and conflict resolution. Supporting research highlighted the role of regional organizations based in Europe and Asia. However, to date, this effort does not appear to have grown beyond the planning stage.

2. Hindu
The Hindu conception of charitable giving differs from its Christian and Islamic counterparts in that there is no formal requirement of tithing or zakat. However, dana (giving) is still an important part of an individual’s dharma (religious duty). This sense of duty clearly informs the giving patterns of the Hindu diaspora in the United States. Priya Anand notes that in the US context, “religion for most Indian immigrants provides the rationale for charity and remains central to philanthropic giving.” The Asian-Indian American community is some 1.7 million strong, growing more than 105% from 1990 and 2000. The group is generally highly educated, with average household incomes that are considerably higher than the US average.

There are two main vehicles for fundraising within the Hindu community: temples and social development arms of some movements. The temples tend to focus primarily on domestic activities that promote Hindu culture and religion in the United States, while religious movements are focused on mobilizing resources on behalf of broader international development efforts. Both types of organizations spring into action in response to South Asian natural disasters like the cyclone in Orissa (1999), the earthquakes in Gujarat (2001) and Kashmir (2005), and the Tsunami (2004). The vast majority of Hindu FBO resources are focused on countries with large Hindu populations. The majority of funds go to India: in 2000–2001, over $315 million came from the US.

In addition to humanitarian response, Hindu FBOs engaged in development work tend to focus on the education and health care sectors. The movements fund a large network of religious schools and many scholarship programs, and Hindu FBOs operate numerous hospitals, mobile health clinics, and health outreach projects.

Some of the key Hindu development FBOs, each linked to a particular movement, are BAPS Care, the All-India Movement for Seva, and the Ramakrishna Mission (for more detailed profiles, see Appendix 2). Each of these has a unique mission and a distinct theological rationale for their activities, reflecting the diversity that exists within the Hindu faith.

There has been some controversy surrounding some Hindu FBOs, namely the India Development and Relief Fund (IDRF), which is accused of dishonestly representing their work to divert funding to violent sectarian groups in India comprised of extremists in the hindutva movement. Hindutva is a form of Hindu nationalism that seeks unity of all Hindus and opposes secularism and special rights for religious and ethnic minorities. The movement is highly organized and is made up of a number of groups which together form Sangh Parivar (the Family of Associations). Sangh Parivar member organizations have been implicated in communal violence, most notably the Gujarat riots against Muslims and Christians in 2002.

3. Bahá’í
The Bahá’í International Community (BIC) is an international NGO representing the members of the Bahá’í religion. The Bahá’í faith does not have any designated development and relief organizations outside of the work of BIC. Instead, the religion’s decentralized nature means development projects are largely created by individual and group initiative at the local level. In May 1970, BIC was granted consultative status with the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and, in March 1976, the Community was granted consultative status with the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF).
II. Literature Review

[See Appendix 5 for an annotated bibliography of the literature discussed below]

Definitional Issues

Much of the English-language academic literature concerning FBOs and definitional issues focuses on domestic organizations serving the United States, although British scholars such as Gerard Clarke and Deryke Belshaw have also contributed to the debate. While this may partly be attributable to the databases used for this research (Ebscohost Academic Search Premier, JSTOR, and Proquest Research Library), it does seem to be the case that non-American scholars engaged in analysis of FBOs have had less concern about the definitional issues which are a common preoccupation in the US. This imbalance subtly colors the discourse by assuming certain institutional, legal, and cultural constraints that may or may not be present in an international context. Certainly the significant contribution of US-based relief and development FBOs warrants careful study, but it also highlights the need to develop a more pluralistic theoretical discourse that can better accommodate international perspectives. This remains especially true when discussing FBOs that emerge outside the Judeo-Christian environment (already a very diverse landscape).

Typologies that differentiate between types of FBOs—rather than only distinguishing them from secular organizations—often face the difficulty of assessing religious integration in an organization. Typically, secular and governmental donors’ willingness to contribute varies inversely with an organization’s overtly religious behavior—a spectrum easily found among Christian FBOs but often less apparent among FBOs rooted in other faith traditions. Scholars wishing to examine Buddhist-oriented FBOs, for instance, need to consider how Buddhist theology may impact norms of institutional engagement and consequently any typology-based assessment. Current typologies offer an excellent place to begin this kind of inquiry, but they should not constitute the entirety of the debate.

Evaluation

Over the past decade nonprofit organizations have faced increasing pressure to demonstrate their success through formal evaluations. (See “Section V: Evaluation” for more information on procedures and organizations.) More recently the academic literature has begun to reflect on the consequences of this shift, with a mixed verdict. Some reports have been positive, pointing out that the competition for ratings among organizations can be beneficial for donors. On the other hand, a number of scholars have noted that nonprofit organizations do not always use evaluation reports to address failures or areas for improvement, and religiously-affiliated organizations are less likely than their secular peers to conduct any kind of evaluation. Christian nonprofits such as World Vision that are headed by former business leaders also face increased pressure to submit to business-style evaluations, especially in financial matters. The results are not universally positive. One analysis describes how implementation of evaluation procedures had actually encouraged NGOs to “interpret” and massage data so that it would better fit the required format. Another common theme emphasizes the disconnect between demands for complex quantitative reporting and the desire to build internal NGO evaluation capacity. This can be especially problematic for small indigenous NGOs whose efforts encourage long-term changes in social behavior—an outcome not easily quantified. Overall, critics acknowledge the usefulness of evaluation in preventing fraud and promoting accountability but remain concerned that current procedures do not sufficiently encourage organizations to take advantage of this opportunity for learning and reflection.

Areas for Future Research

While some academic literature exists on issues of definition and evaluation (as discussed earlier), generally little research has been done on specific operational issues affecting FBOs in international relief and development. In some cases this may be part of a general paucity of information on development matters, but the phenomenon is exacerbated by general reticence to incorporate religion into social science research. Again referring to definitions, the terms “development” and “relief” could benefit from increased analytical clarity, especially since FBOs have historically gravitated towards one or the other for various theological and institutional reasons. Nevertheless, there are specific areas of FBO operations that could benefit from increased scholarly attention. First, the controversy surrounding proselytization remains one of the most unique issues relief and development FBOs face, but there is little systematic literature that examines specific issues and behavior. Research
that explores ways to control exploitative proselytization would be especially helpful. Second, the extremely diverse nature of FBO organizational structures (especially as related to institutional religious ties) affects areas like donor relations and in some cases can reflect a disconnect between elites and grassroots workers, a reality that has rarely been systematically documented or studied. Third, few case studies specifically examine FBO programs and their impact, and here longitudinal studies could greatly contribute to the study of an effort primarily oriented toward a long-term horizon.

The HIV/AIDS pandemic is one topic on which a rather extensive academic literature does exist. The explosion in infections and devastating social consequences have harnessed the attention of a number of researchers, while the controversy on appropriate prevention and treatment methodology has held the focus of FBOs and religious groups. However, most of the English-language literature addresses the Christian response to HIV/AIDS, and much more could be done to highlight the response of other religious traditions, such as Buddhism and Islam.

III. Partners in the Development Community

Local Faith-Based Partners

In recent decades, many working in the development field have recognized the important impact of local faith-based humanitarian efforts, especially in addressing HIV/AIDS. Large US-based FBOs often partner with these smaller grassroots organizations in the field. These partnerships have many benefits, including gaining local knowledge, greater reach into underserved areas, and employing local citizens. Though the academic literature is sparse on these relationships, it is evident that these partnerships present challenges. Lack of local capacity and the separation between religious practice and development work are issues faced by organizations partnering with local faith-based aid groups. Additionally, smaller US-based FBOs must rely more on local partnerships because they have fewer staff and resources, but they may not be able to support their partners in the way that larger US-based FBOs can.

Local organizations may suffer from a lack of capacity which affects their ability to follow the documentation and implementation procedures of the donor organization. When local partners cannot sufficiently follow evaluation procedures, the organization suffers a loss of accountability. This loss can be especially devastating for organizations that receive government funding.

In order to help larger organizations assess and assist the capacity of local partners working to address HIV/AIDS, the Communities Responding to the HIV/AIDS Epidemic (CORE) Initiative created “CBO/FBO Capacity Analysis: A Tool for Assessing and Building Capacities for High Quality Responses to HIV/AIDS.” This five-year program supported by USAID aims to “ensure that grantees and southern and strategic partners have the necessary skills and strategies they need to implement effective community based HIV/AIDS programs.”30 This tool assesses the capacity of local FBOs/CBOs along seven measurements: leadership, governance, and strategy; finances; administration and human resources; project design and management; technical capacity; networking and advocacy; community ownership and accountability.

The separation of religious practice and proselytism from humanitarian work is a second potential challenge faced by US-based FBOs working with local partners who are also faith-based. Most large NGOs have strict rules separating religious and development activities. For the local FBOs, this separation may not exist, either practically or conceptually. If the partnership is receiving federal funding, then the local FBOs will face the challenge of abiding by the rules separating religious activities from humanitarian activities in time and space as dictated by the US government.

The US Government

USAID has always had a productive relationship with FBOs, but since the George W. Bush Administration has been in office, these partnerships have grown closer and increasingly well-funded. In 2001, President Bush issued Executive Order 13198, which amended some of the restrictions that had been in place for government-funded FBOs. Now FBOs were allowed to pay the salaries of positions that required a statement of faith with USAID funds. Also, FBOs could deliver aid in the same building as religious services, as long as both of these were not occurring simultaneously. Finally, with this Order, FBOs were no longer required to inform
beneficiaries that participation in religious activities was not a precondition for receiving aid. In addition to rule changes that afforded FBOs much more flexibility in mixing their religious and developmental activities, there has been a sharp increase in FBO funding during the Bush Administration. Between 2001 and 2005, the share of USAID FBO primes grew from 10.5% to 19.9%.31

The President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) is a five year bilateral commitment that pledges $15 billion to HIV/AIDS prevention, care, and treatment programs, primarily concentrated in fifteen focus countries (12 in sub-Saharan Africa, 2 in the Americas, and 1 in Asia). It is the largest-ever government allocation of resources for combating a single disease. The determined engagement with FBOs throughout PEPFAR’s implementation illustrates the prominent role that these institutions have taken on in US development policy.

Faith-based organizations are an important component of PEPFAR’s strategic approach to fighting HIV/AIDS. In FY 2005, FBOs comprised 23.5% of all PEPFAR partners and more than $82 million was set aside for FBO-implemented projects.32 This funding is expected to increase significantly as projects scale up and FBOs build the requisite capacity to effectively absorb larger grants. The rationale behind this focus is that FBOs have unmatched moral authority and reach. They are a vast and readily mobilized network that is deeply rooted in the community. Moreover, FBOs are already caring for a large proportion of PLWHA and engaging communities in prevention and stigma-reduction initiatives. Finally, a body of research showing the effectiveness of FBO-led education and prevention, especially in Uganda (see e.g. Green 2003), has heavily influenced the Bush Administration’s thinking on the HIV/AIDS crisis.

PEPFAR’s emphasis on FBOs has not been without controversy. Critics argue that the Plan is overly reflective of domestic political dynamics and favors the Bush Administration’s political allies.33 The earmarking of one-third of prevention funds for the abstinence-until-marriage message and a requirement that organizations receiving PEPFAR funding sign an anti-prostitution pledge have provoked a significant outcry.34 The concern is that these domestically-driven restrictions will limit PEPFAR’s ability to respond to local dynamics and craft the most effective strategy for a given context. More generally, critics are concerned about the conservative attitudes about sex and prevention education held by many faith traditions, and by extension, FBOs. Finally, an implementation criticism that is leveled at PEPFAR highlights the limited capacity of many indigenous FBOs to absorb large grants and use the funds effectively. The OGAC has responded to this critique by using “umbrella” contractors at the country level, charging them with capacity-building and local funding disbursements.

**FBOs and the United Nations System**

The United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) has a relatively long history of working with faith-based groups to accomplish its mission, especially in Latin America where the Roman Catholic Church has an extensive presence. In Asia and the Middle East it has established partnerships with Buddhist and Muslim religious leaders to help disseminate crucial health information and build support for female education. More specifically, UNICEF has attempted to engage the support of faith-based groups in dealing with the HIV/AIDS pandemic and its prevention and treatment.35

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) recognizes faith-based organizations as a subset of a broader category of civil society organizations (CSOs). It encourages CSOs to get involved in every level of development work, from policy-making to implementation. UNDP generally limits its CSO networking by partnering only with organizations that uphold its principles on issues like human rights and female empowerment.36

The United Nations Population Fund also approaches its works with faith-based groups from the perspective of cultural sensitivity. This entails developing programs with the aid of community input and using local “agents of change” (who may or may not be religious) to demonstrate program worthiness. UNFPA especially attempts to engage faith-based groups because they often have networks that can reach the most vulnerable members of the population.37

Generally organizations within the UN system have shown the greatest willingness to partner with FBOs when addressing the HIV/AIDS pandemic. Both the
WHO and UNIFEM have acknowledged the crucial role that faith-based individuals and groups play in caring for those impacted by HIV/AIDS and have worked to build coordination between FBOs and their own efforts. Latent tension still exists on controversial issues such as contraception, but the magnitude of need has compelled both UN agencies and FBOs to find ways to better work together.

IV. Service Focus

HIV/AIDS

After an initial period of deafening silence and widespread denial of the scale and scope of the HIV/AIDS crisis, all the major faith traditions have begun to mobilize against the spread of this devastating disease. FBOs are becoming increasingly active in all aspects of the response to HIV/AIDS including prevention, education, advocacy, treatment, care, and support of orphans and vulnerable children (OVC).

Much scholarly and media attention has been focused on the tensions between faith-based and secular organizations over appropriate HIV prevention approaches. Very broadly, this can be described as a disagreement over “risk avoidance” (or ABC) and “risk minimization” (condom promotion) approaches. The work of Dr. Edward Green at the Harvard Center for Population and Development Studies has made the case for the ABC approach, but this prevention strategy has come under fire for under-emphasizing critical contextual factors relating to gender inequality, a lack of economic opportunity, and the key role of migration in spreading HIV/AIDS. In addition, Human Rights Watch recently came out with a report that scathingly criticizes the US government and US-based FBOs for imposing a prevention strategy that reflects US culture wars more than the realities faced by at-risk populations in Sub-Saharan Africa. At the same time, FBOs point out, the only significant reductions in HIV prevalence that have been recorded are in contexts where the faith community took on a leadership role, and where behavior change was heavily emphasized.

FBOs play an especially critical role in caring for and protecting OVCs. A study conducted jointly by UNICEF and the World Conference of Religions for Peace on OVC initiatives in Sub-Saharan Africa found that of the 690 FBOs surveyed, 349 supported more than 156,000 children. The majority of these initiatives focused on providing material support (i.e. food, books, and clothing), in order to keep the affected children out of institutions like orphanages and to care for them within traditional community structures. This study found that 82% of the initiatives were community-based and under-funded, suggesting that there is an important opening for US-based FBOs seeking to make a difference at the grassroots level.

In Sub-Saharan Africa, FBOs provide a large share of health care services. A WHO study estimated that anywhere between 30–70% of the region’s health infrastructure is owned by FBOs. This presence extends into HIV/AIDS care—the study found that almost 40% of care in Lesotho and 33% in Zambia were provided by FBOs.

Disaster Relief

A pattern has emerged with quite deep historic roots and important present implications for both the overall US national approach to disaster relief and to the FBO community more generally. It is the significant, often dominant role of FBOs in disaster relief. When major disasters hit, whether natural or manmade, FBOs are frequently some of the first organizations to react on the ground. In many cases they can capitalize on pre-disaster relationships to assist in both immediate relief and long-term reconstruction. Donors responding to urgent needs also tend to trust established FBOs to properly disburse their contributions, and these organizations in turn can use this to more effectively appeal for funds. FBOs’ access to in-kind donations may also be an advantage in situations where the local economy cannot supply sufficient quantities of necessary goods. The need to respond can also provide the necessary impetus for the establishment of an FBO in a demographic where none existed before, as was the case with the rise of Islamic FBOs during the early 1990s.

Programs for Children

Traditionally FBOs have gravitated towards programs that materially better the lives of children. Faith traditions that encourage their members to engage in compassionate action often highlight the importance of reaching out to the less fortunate, and children arguably remain the most vulnerable members of any
society. Moreover, as the “next generation” they often become the foundation for expansive long-term development efforts. Programs may not directly engage in child-focused service provision, preferring to support economic development and women’s empowerment measures that help mothers increase their own ability to care for their children. Nevertheless, direct child assistance programs do exist, and evangelical groups such as Compassion International have been especially influential in developing child sponsorship programs that address development issues on a more individual basis.

Microfinance
The provision of micro-loans, complemented by a broad range of financial services targeted at the poor, has grown into a major development sector. Prominent among the major microfinance institutions (MFIs) are a number of FBOs, the majority of which have Christian roots. Some of these organizations focus exclusively on financial services for the poor, while others have established microfinance programs as part of a holistic approach to community development. According to the Oxford Center for Mission Studies, there are currently around 1,200 Christian microfinance organizations worldwide, up from 505 in 2001.47

Faith-based microfinance programs are distinct from their secular counterparts because they often promote spiritual well-being along with their goal of alleviating poverty. Christian MFIs often seek to incorporate discipleship and evangelism into their programs.48 However, because there is such a wide range of faith-based MFIs, it is important to note the diversity of approaches within this category. Although by no means a universal practice, some Christian MFIs have been criticized for having an exclusionary lending policy that disqualifies adherents of other religions from their programs.49 Partners International, a Michigan-based Christian MFI that receives significant USAID funding, angered Muslims in Mombasa, Kenya with the Christian-only membership criteria of some lending groups, provoking critical reflection about the impact that US FBOs have on perceptions towards Americans in the Muslim world.50

To give some sense of the size and reach of Christian faith-based microfinance, the following table classifies faith-based members of the Small Enterprise Education and Promotion (SEEP) network. For more detailed overviews of these organizations, please refer to Appendix 3.

Another interesting trend in the sector that relates to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith-Based Organization</th>
<th># of Clients</th>
<th># of Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adventist Development and Relief Agency</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Relief Services</td>
<td>307,177</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Children’s Fund</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Relief</td>
<td>71,486</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food for the Hungry</td>
<td>29,974</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Talents*</td>
<td>&gt;10,000</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity International*</td>
<td>812,000</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope International*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mennonite Economic Development Associates (Canada)</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army World Service Office</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Hope International</td>
<td>12,350</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td>454,918</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Organization specializes in microfinance
faith is the development of innovative and context-specific approaches to Islamic microfinance. Secular MFIs are looking for ways of retooling their programs to work in countries where the Muslim prohibition of charging interest, which is a critical component of microfinance sustainability, is observed. These institutions have employed the Islamic concept of *mudaraba* (trustee financing) to adapt their programs to Muslim clients.51

**Health**

In many communities religion is intimately tied to the physical health of the community, and contemporary FBOs have reinforced this connection. In countries with weak, overburdened healthcare systems, FBOs often become the primary source of healthcare for impoverished people. In some cases this trend reflects the wide network of Christian missionary hospitals and health clinics established during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In others, it points to the reality of the church as an institutional presence in areas where the government may have little influence or real authority. In these situations, FBO workers frequently offer basic healthcare services (e.g. child weigh-ins or nutritional supplements) that can dramatically affect quality of life without major infrastructure investments.

**V. Major Issues**

**Proselytizing**

A core principle of humanitarian aid, codified in the Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, is that aid will not be used to further a specific political or religious standpoint. In particular, the code states that organizations “will not tie the promise, delivery or distribution of assistance to the embracing or acceptance of a particular political or religious creed.”52 Most FBOs subscribe to this idea, but as more FBOs work in the relief and development field and missionary organizations increasingly offer international aid, this principle is being challenged. Sometimes the challenge is overt, as in the case of Baptists delivering food aid with biblical verses in predominantly Muslim Iraq,53 or Christian aid workers in an earthquake relief camp staging plays about Jesus and hold healing prayer sessions.54 In other cases, the line between proselytization and aid organizations with religious affiliation is more subtle, such as a picture of Christ on the wall or prayer before aid workers begin their daily activities.

Evangelical activity in majority Muslim countries has increased in recent decades. According to the Center for the Study of Global Christianity at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary in South Hamilton, Massachusetts, Christian missionary activity in Muslim countries has almost doubled in the past two decades.55 Some of these missionaries will supply emergency aid as part of their efforts abroad, especially because many Muslim nations have stopped issuing “religious worker” visas.56 The increase in Evangelical missions in predominantly Muslim countries coincides with growing tension between Muslims and Christians around the world. Examples of this tension abound. The Christian Hospital Taxila, located in Taxila, Pakistan was attacked in 2002 by Muslim extremists who killed four nurses.57 Even before aid groups, including FBOs, arrived in Sri Lanka to provide tsunami relief in 2005, the parliament was trying to pass two anti-conversion bills to stop its citizens from converting to Christianity.58 In September 2006, the Uzbek government shut down a Massachusetts-based aid organization for promoting Christianity in the Muslim country.59

The International Missions Board of the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) and Samaritan’s Purse, the organization directed by Reverend Franklin Graham, are two organizations often cited as mixing aid work with evangelism. Ibrahim Hooper of the Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR) has suggested that SBC and Samaritan’s Purse are “seeking to exploit people in their moment of vulnerability.”60 Religious groups providing aid that do not completely separate their religious efforts from their aid distribution risk alienating those they are seeking to help or pressuring aid recipients to convert out of an interest in attaining more aid. These organizations negatively influence FBOs who do have a complete demarcation between humanitarian and proselytizing activities, or those who do not engage in proselytizing at all.

A second concern about proselytization has emerged in the United States as the government has provided increasing amounts of funding to relief and development FBOs through the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. In the US, some argue that the line between church and state is blurred when organizations receiving government funds have a religious agenda.
President Bush has led efforts to relax rules aimed at keeping the funding provided by the government separate from proselytizing activities. In Executive Order 13279, established December 12, 2002 President Bush declared “organizations that engage in inherently religious activities, such as worship, religious instruction, and proselytization, must offer those services separately in time or location from any programs or services supported with direct Federal financial assistance.” In practice, instructing FBOs that services must be offered separately in time or location means religious groups may worship or hold religious meeting directly before or after providing aid or other assistance.

Although this executive order bans outright use of government funding for proselytization activities, it states that:

faith-based organizations that receive Federal financial assistance may use their facilities to provide social services supported with Federal financial assistance, without removing or altering religious art, icons, scriptures, or other symbols from these facilities. In addition, a faith-based organization that applies for or participates in a social service program supported with Federal financial assistance may retain religious terms in its organization’s name, select its board members on a religious basis, and include religious references in its organization’s mission statements and other chartering or governing documents.

The clauses of this executive order preserve the separation of church and state in law, but in reality the line between delivering aid and promoting a specific religion is less clear. In February 2007, the Supreme Court heard a case regarding citizens’ right to sue the government for providing funding to religious organizations. The court ruled on June 25, 2007 in Hein v. Freedom From Religion Foundation that taxpayers do not have standing under Article III of the Constitution to raise an Establishment Clause challenge to the actions of Executive Branch officials when the conduct is financed only indirectly through general legislation and results from executive discretion.

With US government funding for humanitarian FBOs largely going to Christian organizations, many of whom will be working in predominantly Muslim countries, on-going controversy and backlash is almost inevitable. In addressing this issue in a speech delivered in 2004, the Secretary General of Caritas International Duncan MacLaren stated that the “imperative for Christian-inspired agencies is to separate entirely proselytism from humanitarian aid. Those self-styled Christian agencies who mix the two are playing a dangerous game, particularly in today’s global climate. “We do what we do because we are Christian not because we want to make others like us.”

**Accountability and Evaluation**

The U.S. government regularly responds to criticism suggesting that its contributions to international relief and development are stingy, or do not reflect the affluence of American society. The American public, on the other hand, is widely perceived to be generous when donating to a good cause; faith-based groups have been major recipients of this largesse. For a variety of reasons, over the past few years donors have increasingly turned to rating organizations to help guide their giving. In addition to organizations that strictly evaluate various aspects of a nonprofit’s performance, others serve as intermediaries that channel funds from donors to highly rated programs. Certain commonalities exist, but as a whole the sector is far from standardized.

A dedication to financial accountability is the unifying hallmark of all organizations engaged in evaluation. Donors want to know if their money will be well spent and make an impact, but few have the time or expertise to thoroughly evaluate financial documents. They also often want independent verification of a charity’s financial claims. Ratings organizations begin their research with an IRS 990 or IRS 990EZ form, the publicly available tax return document nonprofits are required to file annually. Raters then generally request additional documents from the organization under scrutiny, though they vary in the amount of material they require. The financial information is evaluated based on a set of criteria which varies among organizations; all include a comparison of a charity’s program spending versus its administrative and fundraising costs. Frequently raters also include a simple revenue breakdown that distinguishes between donations and other sources of income, such as investments. The size of available cash reserves is often another crite-
rion used to rate charities, though raters disagree on acceptable levels.

Some organizations have attempted to bridge the accountability gap between for-profit business and nonprofits by offering comprehensive financial analysis to potential donors. Typically for-profit ventures, they evaluate charities before making recommendations to wealthy donor clients. This kind of analysis is also popular with grant-making foundations. These rating organizations want charities that are financially healthy, have a successful track record, and address serious or unmet needs. They are also more likely to tailor research to groups in a donor’s particular area of interest, such as education.

Faith-based charities have also responded to the call for greater accountability. Many participate in national evaluation databases, and two ratings organizations specifically target nonprofits rooted in the evangelical Christian community. It should be noted that since some religious groups (such as houses of worship) are not required to make their tax status public, rating organizations do not evaluate them and instead focus on independently incorporated entities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Profit Raters</th>
<th>For-Profit Raters</th>
<th>Faith-Based Raters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Institute of Philanthropy</td>
<td>Calvin Edwards &amp; Company</td>
<td>Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Business Bureau Wise Giving Alliance</td>
<td>Geneva Global</td>
<td>MinistryWatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity Navigator</td>
<td>GlobalGiving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuideStar</td>
<td>National Christian Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1: Religion in the United States

This report makes no effort to link FBOs to the patterns and evolution of religion in the United States or its ties to faith organizations in other parts of the world. Nonetheless, as background to help in appreciating the wide variety of faith organizations, the following two tables provide data on religious affiliations:

### TABLE 4
Summary Breakdown of Religious Affiliations in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Percentage of US Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline Protestant</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Orthodox</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faiths</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### TABLE 5
Summary Breakdown of Protestant Sects in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protestant Christian Affiliation by Denomination</th>
<th>Percentage of US Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No denomination</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2:
Faith-Based Institutions by Major Category

Unless otherwise mentioned, all information is taken from the organization’s public website, along with non-profit rating organization websites such as GuideStar and Charity Navigator. If specific employee information was not available, GuideStar range estimates were used (e.g. “21–100”).

A. Interfaith

Founded in 1970, the World Conference of Religions for Peace (WCRP) is the largest international coalition of representatives from the world’s religions dedicated to promoting peace. Alleviating poverty is part of their three pronged mission to promote peace. By working through both large national and small local organizations, WCRP is active in 55 countries. Programs include helping African children orphaned by AIDS, establishing a Global Network of Women of Faith to provide support and resources to women’s religious groups around the world, and working with global religious groups to meet the Millennium Development goals. In 2004, WCRP partnered with UNICEF to bring together religious leaders in South Asia for the inaugural meeting of the South Asia Inter-religious council (SAIRC) to address the growing problem of HIV/AIDS in the region. In addition to on-going projects, every five years the WCRP brings together the world’s religious leaders to discuss approaches to the world’s most devastating problems. For more information, see http://www.wcrp.org/about/index.

B. Christian

1. Catholic

Founded in 1928, the Catholic Medical Mission Board (CMMB) works around the world on innovative community health programs that mobilize faith-based facilities and organizations. In 2003 they partnered with the Pan American Health Organization in a US$4.4 million campaign for child survival in Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador and Haiti. CMMB has mobilized other faith-based groups in these countries and provided medical volunteers to distribute essential antibiotics, anti-diarrheals, infant hydration kits, and basic vaccinations. CMMB has a significant presence in Africa where its anti-HIV programs such as AIDSRelief and Born to Live work to combat mortality rates and mother to infant transmission. These HIV/AIDS programs are currently active in 8 African countries, China, India and Papau New Guinea. In 2006, CMMB placed 286 medical volunteers in 32 countries across Africa, Asia and Latin America including a nurse-run health education program in Thailand. For more information, see http://www.cmmb.org/.

Catholic Relief Services, founded in 1943 by the Catholic Bishops of the United States, is the official international relief and development agency of the U.S. Catholic community. Its mission is “to assist the poor and disadvantaged, leveraging the teachings of the Gospel of Jesus Christ to alleviate human suffering, promote development of all people, and to foster charity and justice throughout the world.” CRS operates on five continents and in 99 countries with an operating budget of approximately US$566.5 million (2005). Funding for the organization comes from the American Bishops’ Overseas Appeal (ABOA), as well as public and private grants, and individual donors. CRS partners with a variety of US-based and international organizations, both secular and religious. CRS is a member of Caritas Internationalis. For more information, see http://www.crs.org/.

2. Mainline Protestant

African Methodist Episcopal Service and Development Agency (AME-SADA) concentrates its efforts on programs in Haiti and South Africa. In Haiti it operates a series of health clinics as a USAID subcontractor and also runs teacher training and microcredit programs. In South Africa AME-SADA has shepherded the reemergence of Wilberforce Community College, which was forcibly closed during apartheid. The class offerings include business administration and accounting, and the college is working to expand its program to include a four-year degree option. AME-SADA currently oversees an expense budget of US$1.3 million. For more information, see http://www.ame-sada.org/index.html.
Episcopal Relief and Development (ERD) has been working in relief and food security since 1940. As part of the worldwide Anglican Communion, ERD usually coordinates its work with indigenous Anglican and Episcopal partners. It often combines microcredit programs with initiatives that promote improved agricultural practices and food security. ERD also sponsors a number of health clinics and other HIV/AIDS programs that address both prevention and treatment; it concurrently coordinates an extensive anti-malaria effort in Sub-Saharan Africa. Like many other development FBOs, ERD has actively supported the Millennium Development Goals. ERD currently works in 37 countries across the Global South, with a US$16.7 million budget distributed by a domestic staff of “21–100.” For more information, see http://www.er-d.org/.

Since 1945 Lutheran World Relief (LWR) has been addressing the relief and development needs of people around the world. Its efforts generally focus on three major areas: peace and justice, emergency response, and sustainable rural development. In many cases LWR relief and development efforts are tied together to help reduce the vulnerabilities that exacerbate disaster situations. HIV/AIDS work forms a major component of LWR’s Africa program. LWR also concentrates on improving food security in impoverished rural areas. Their Wave of Giving campaign channels donations towards post-tsunami reconstruction in South Asia. Other programs there promote conflict management and social equality. LWR also runs agricultural and community development programs in Latin America. Currently LWR’s “21–100” domestic staff oversee a US$29 million annual operational budget directed towards 35 countries. For more information, see http://www.lwr.org/.

The Presbyterian Disaster Assistance (PDA) and its coordinating agency, the Presbyterian Hunger Program (PHA), are the wings of the Presbyterian Church (USA) charged with relief and development work. They often work with ACT International, a Swiss-based coalition of global Christian relief and development groups. PDA operates a wide range of programs that supply food and shelter in the wake of a disaster and also attempts to facilitate the transition to long-term recovery. PHA addresses development issues from the lens of hunger management, incorporating both domestic aid and advocacy with international development assistance and fair trade initiatives. It operates primarily by offering grants to organizations whose goals support PHA’s emphasis on simple living and hunger alleviation. For more information, see http://www.pcusa.org/pda/index.htm and http://www.pcusa.org/hunger/.

The United Methodist Committee on Relief (UMCOR) offers relief and development assistance on both the domestic and international scale. In urgent disaster situations the organization often utilizes its ties with indigenous Methodist partners, while its longer-term projects also rely on partnerships with other religious and secular development organizations. One of UMCOR’s key initiatives is its Farmer Field School program, which combines agricultural training with related assistance in areas like health and microfinance. UMCOR’s relationships with Methodist hospitals overseas also encourage an emphasis on healthcare, ranging from HIV/AIDS and malaria prevention to more general community health initiatives. The organization maintains 13 field offices across Europe, Asia, and Africa. UMCOR’s “501–1000” employees distribute a US$57.3 million budget in more than 80 countries. For more information, see http://gbgm-umc.org/umcor/.

3. Evangelical

Adventist Development and Relief Agency International (ADRA) oversees a broad spectrum of relief and development programs. Microcredit and agricultural training contribute to self-sufficiency and food security, while healthcare training and basic education help communities raise their own standard of living. Their HIV/AIDS program unites prevention, treatment, testing, and education efforts, along with special initiatives to protect the future of children whose lives are impacted by the disease. ADRA has also earned consultative status with the UN ECOSOC. The organization’s 4000+ employees work in more than 120 countries with an expense budget of US$116.2 million. For more information, see http://www.adra.org/site/PageServer.

Baptist World Aid is the arm of the Baptist World Alliance charged with overseeing its relief and development work, along with providing religious materials to local Baptist congregations. Working through affiliated national groups, the organization channels funds towards projects targeted at acknowledged local needs. These can include agricultural training, business educa-
Baptist World Aid programs exist in 30 countries on five continents and channel nearly US$10 million in donations. The organization has made HIV/AIDS efforts a priority for 2007 and is currently working to compile a comprehensive database of global Baptist efforts in this area. HIV/AIDS education and care programs exist in Bangladesh, Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, and Sudan. Baptist World Aid has “11–20” domestic employees and operates in 30 countries. For more information, see http://www.bwanet.org/BWAid/index.htm.

Bread for the World, a US-based Christian agency and grassroots organization dedicated to ending hunger, sees its central mission as domestic political advocacy but its role extends to international social justice issues with a food focus. David Beckman, the current head, plays a strong personal advocacy role in US and international politics. Bread for the World activities include participation in the ONE campaign and producing background papers and annual reports on the state of hunger in the world (with its research affiliate, the Bread for the World Institute). Its reports combine research data and integrative analysis with policy prescriptions. Bread for the World frequently mobilizes its supporters in letter-writing campaigns designed to remind lawmakers of the important need to address hunger and justice issues. Bread for the World currently focuses on fair trade practices and has been especially active in lobbying for agricultural trade liberalization and a revised U.S. farm subsidy program.

Compassion International works primarily through child-focused development services anchored around its hallmark one-on-one child sponsorship program. Throughout its 50 years of operation it has remained committed to an operational philosophy that is unreservedly “Christ-centered, child-focused, and church-based.” Compassion International partners with local churches in all areas of service delivery: educational and vocational training, healthcare, and planned social interaction. It seeks parental advice as it tailors a program for each child’s needs. The organization also operates smaller programs that focus on ensuring prenatal health, as well as leadership training for children who complete the Compassion program. Compassion International has expanded its sponsorship efforts to address the specific needs created by the HIV/AIDS pandemic. These programs incorporate both prevention and treatment for those already infected, including provision of antiretroviral medicine. Country offices currently exist in 24 nations across Africa, Asia, and Latin America; its domestic employees (between “501–1000”) oversee the spending of US$247 million in expenses. For more information, see http://www.compassion.com/default.htm.

Faithful to the evangelical Christian perspective of its founder, Dr. Larry Ward, Food for the Hungry works to facilitate community transformation based on biblical principles and actively partners with local churches on a wide range of development issues. Its economic development and healthcare initiatives work symbiotically with its one-on-one child sponsorship program, while agricultural training and irrigation projects contribute to food security and better hygiene. Food for the Hungry also incorporates HIV/AIDS education and treatment into its programs when relevant. In addition, it operates emergency relief programs following disasters and violent conflict. Food for the Hungry encourages its supporters to spend time volunteering, either through short-term missions, as long-term development workers, or as students on a semester abroad. The organization maintains a presence in 45 countries on five continents. Food for the Hungry has a matching-funds program with USAID, though it is primarily funded through corporate and private donations. Its expenses total about $64 million annually. Its staff size is between 101–500 US-based employees. For more information, see http://www.fh.org/home.

The Salvation Army World Service Office, a subsidiary body of The Salvation Army, uses local officers and personnel to implement development programs around the world. In addition to disaster relief, the World Service Office supports income generation and healthcare programs, including attempts to address the HIV/AIDS pandemic. Its WORTH initiative in Kenya, implemented in partnership with PACT Inc., focuses on increasing women’s financial stability through networking and microcredit services. The organization has also taken a lead role in combating international human trafficking, throwing its support behind domestic legislation and developing programs to address the needs of
trafficking victims. In 2005 programs in 35 countries disbursed over US$8 million in aid from a US$19 million budget. Domestic operations are run by 11–20 employees. For more information, see http://www.sawso.org/index.html.

Samaritan’s Purse, headed by evangelist Franklin Graham, unabashedly combines relief and development work with evangelism. Its medical missions arm arranges short-term mission trips for doctors and other health professionals, while its HIV/AIDS initiative, Prescription for Hope, addresses both prevention and treatment. Samaritan’s Purse programs especially focus on children, including one that helps children with heart conditions find advanced treatment in North America. The organization is best known for its Operation Christmas Child, which coordinates the dispersal of gift-filled shoes boxes to impoverished children around the world. The 101–500 US-based employees of Samaritan’s Purse oversee an expense budget of over US$216 million, with work in over 130 countries. For more information, see http://www.samaritanspurse.org/default.asp.

World Concern champions women’s empowerment as a crucial element of its relief and development efforts. Its special “Women of Purpose” program partners North American women with women’s groups overseas to provide training and microcredit opportunities. The World Concern Development Organization, a partner entity, channels money for development from the US government and various foundations; since 1991 it has received over US$23 million in USAID and foreign development assistance funds. World Concern programs help people obtain the education and training they need to become self-sufficient, either through improved agricultural practices or marketable trade skills. The organization is also a founding member of the anti-poverty ONE campaign. The organization currently works in 32 countries, with a US-based staff of 60 and an expense budget of almost US$87 million. For more information, see http://www.worldconcern.org.

World Relief, a partner body to the National Association of Evangelicals, has evolved from a post-WWII assistance organization to one committed to broad relief and development efforts. It often works through local churches to provide mentors to vulnerable children, along with material assistance to help them escape the vicious cycle of poverty and exploitation. World Relief also runs refugee assistance programs that help introduce new immigrants to life inside the United States. Other programs include agricultural assistance and microfinance opportunities. The organization’s health programs include an HIV/AIDS component, which encourages churches to provide compassionate care for those affected by the disease. World Relief currently sponsors programs in 18 countries, while its 1000+ US-based staff oversee a budget of over US$51 million. For more information, see http://www.wr.org/.

World Vision, founded in 1950, is one of the most well known Christian humanitarian organizations. Many of its programs address core development issues via their impact on children. These include provision of basic healthcare and access to education. World Vision is also a major aid distributor for the UN World Food Programme. In addition to an extensive child sponsorship program, its Hope Initiative addresses the widespread impact of HIV/AIDS through prevention, care, and advocacy. Currently the relief arm of World Vision is helping build capacity in local Jordanian groups working to address the needs of the growing number of Iraqi refugees. Worldwide the organization employs 23,000 people in nearly 100 countries; its total budget exceeds US$860 million a year. For more information, see http://www.worldvision.org/.

Historic Black Churches
The Church of God in Christ runs a small child sponsorship program through its Department of Missions, as well as providing short-term opportunities in areas such as medical missions. Numerous individual congregations also contribute to the Save Africa’s Children project (see “Non-denominational”). For more information, see http://www.cogic.org/.

OIC International (Opportunities Industrialization Centers) emerged out of the US civil rights movement as a domestic program to offer skills training and job placement to unemployed African-Americans and continues to focus on economic development issues. The program rapidly expanded to include overseas efforts, primarily in Africa (affiliates also exist in the Philippines and Poland). They have been relatively successful in creating sustainable development partnerships with
large private-sector organizations such as oil and mining companies, and their skills training programs emphasize in-demand professions. These can include both agricultural and basic entrepreneurial opportunities. OIC International also incorporates conflict management and HIV/AIDS prevention efforts into the programmatic offerings of its training centers. The organization has managed programs in 25 countries and currently oversees an expense budget of about US$10 million. For more information, see http://www.oicinternational.org/index.php.

Since 2001, Save Africa’s Children has been a driving force in the campaign to involve African-American churches in the fight against the global HIV/AIDS pandemic, with a special focus on assisting AIDS orphans. SAC distributes grants to small grassroots community organizations to provide housing, food, healthcare, and education to children left vulnerable by HIV/AIDS. Actor Denzel Washington has endorsed SAC, and the organization received significant publicity when the founder’s visit to Africa was profiled by People magazine. It continues to build a domestic advocacy network to encourage lawmakers to address HIV/AIDS and relevant development issues. For more information, see http://www.saveafricaschildren.com/site/PageServer.

**Historic Peace Churches**

The American Friends Service Committee upholds a long history of Quaker commitment to peace and equality, a heritage that was recognized in 1947 when the organization was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. The AFSC combines a strong domestic advocacy focus with active development programs overseas. After the 2004 tsunami devastated Indonesia, AFSC responded with immediate relief services and followed up with peace educations targeting Indonesian youth. Domestic advocacy strongly supports issues such as nonviolence and fair trade practices. In 2002 it launched the Africa Initiative, designed to energize and coordinate advocacy and development projects on both sides of the Atlantic. Overall the AFSC’s “101–500” employees oversee a budget of US$42.2 million and programs that operate in 22 countries. For more information, see http://www.afsc.org/default.htm.

The Mennonite Central Committee views its development work as an extension of its commitment to peace, justice, and non-discrimination. In addition to its work in health and agriculture, MCC also operates a sponsorship program that targets both groups and individuals. All MCC efforts incorporate a peacemaking dimension and emphasize the need to promote reconciliation between conflicting parties. Operationally it prefers to facilitate the work of existing programs, rather than develop new projects under its own purview. One of its trademark initiatives is its network of Ten Thousand Villages fair trade stores, which bring handicrafts from the developing world to the North American consumer. It has also worked to foster mutual understanding between the United States and Iran, helping to coordinate religious exchange visits. Its 1,078 employees work in 70 countries, with a budget of about US$90 million. For more information, see http://www.mcc.org/about/what/.

**4. Orthodox**

International Orthodox Christian Charities represents the combined efforts of the US branches of the various national autocephalous bodies of the Orthodox community. The IOCC works primarily with existing Orthodox bodies in targeted areas, though its projects are exclusively humanitarian and do not involve mission work; recipients receive service regardless of faith or ethnicity. Projects focus on restoring local capacity, whether in agriculture, civic administration, or education. The IOCC does not shy away from conflict-prone areas and has projects in the countries of the former Yugoslavia and the West Bank. The IOCC has also partnered with networking organizations like Church World Service and received funds from USAID. Though relatively young (founded in 1992), the IOCC has quickly become the premier internationally-focused Orthodox charity in the United States. With work in 30 countries, IOCC domestic employees (between 101–500) monitor US$32 million in total expenses. For more information, see http://www.iocc.org/

**5. Mormon**

Latter-Day Saints Charities (LDSC) has been pursuing humanitarian work since 1996, though the Church of Latter-Day Saints has a long heritage of compassionate work. LDSC assists local projects in a wide range of health-related activities, including measles vaccination, neonatal resuscitation training, vision clinics, and wheelchair provision to disabled persons. Other efforts focus
on helping communities create sources of clean water by drilling wells and installing purification systems, for example. LDSC has also been involved in post-tsunami reconstruction efforts in South Asia. The organization currently contributes to projects in 163 countries, often sending needed supplies such as hygiene kits to areas hit by disaster. For more information, see http://www.providentliving.org/about/0,12983,2936-1-1693-1,00.html.

6. Ecumenical/Nondenominational

**Church World Service** (CWS) provides a common coordinating structure for the humanitarian and development activities of 36 American denominations, including Protestant, Orthodox, and Anglican bodies. It emphasizes partnerships with indigenous organizations as most effective for long-term development and incorporates capacity-building elements into as many projects as possible. CWS programs include a broad range of activities: emergency and disaster relief, refugee resettlement, community health and development initiatives, and domestic political advocacy. The refugee resettlement program recently received national attention when the film “God Grew Tired of Us” featured John Bul Dau, a Sudanese “Lost Boy” resettled by CWS. CWS offers constituent congregations free materials to raise awareness about its work and operates an alternative-gifts program that encourages people to purchase fairly trade goods and tangible development assistance items (such as a goat) in lieu of a traditional present. CWS’s “101–500” employees oversee a budget of about US$92 million in funds. For more information, see http://www.churchworldservice.org/.

**Cross International** focuses on empowering local church-based ministries by giving them the resources they need to continue serving the poor. Their work began with programs in Haiti and has now branched out to include work in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. In addition to shipping medical supplies and equipment, Cross International also supports orphanages and feeding programs. They deliberately assume a community-based approach that encourages their church partners to act as development leaders within the community. Cross International allies with Cross International Catholic Outreach and Cross International Foundation to connect broad sectors of Christian donors with a variety of international programs. The organization currently oversees a budget of US$73.3 million in relief and development funds. For more information, see http://www.crossinternational.org/.

**Habitat for Humanity** is one of America’s most respected organizations addressing the need for decent and adequate shelter. Though inspired by Christian principles, the organization encourages people of any faith to participate in its program, either as a volunteer or potential homeowner. Local Habitat affiliates operate independently, while the central organization provides coordination and support services. Since 1976 they have constructed more than 200,000 homes and have affiliates in 93 countries on six continents. Homes are provided at cost, while Habitat homeowners must commit to repaying their zero-interest mortgages, as well as contribute hundreds of hours in “sweat equity” working beside construction volunteers. Former President Jimmy Carter remains Habitat for Humanity’s most famous advocate and leads a work project every year. In 2004 Habitat’s international headquarters (staffed by “101–500” employees) managed US$178.4 million in expenses. For more information, see http://www.habitat.org/default.aspx.

**Concern Worldwide US**, an affiliate of the Ireland-based Concern Worldwide, operates a broad spectrum of relief and development programs. Rural and urban development, food security, disaster relief, and education form a major portion of the organization’s programs, and numerous Concern health-related programs address the needs created by the HIV/AIDS pandemic. The organization especially dedicates much of its effort to helping those in absolute poverty sustainably support themselves. They are present in 29 countries, with a predominant focus on South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, and receive funding from a number of major donor agencies such as USAID and UNHCR. Concern’s innovative Global Concerns Project engages high school students on international issues related to development (e.g. hunger) by supporting student-led debates and presentations. The main US office remains small, with a staff of “6–10,” and distributes US$9.2 million in funds. For more information, see http://www.concernusa.org/.
tical donors, US development FBOs like Church World Service, and local healthcare initiatives. It has developed expertise in medical supply procurement and shipment and has recently branched out to running more on-the-ground programs. In IMA’s Medicine Box initiative groups contribute to a specific accumulation of supplies that can answer the basic healthcare needs of roughly 1,000 people over 2–3 months. The organization’s reach extends to 88 countries and currently manages a budget of US$110.2 million. For more information, see http://www.interchurch.org/index.php.

**MAP International** focuses on providing essential health services and supplies in a relief and development context. The organization supports the training and supply of community health providers who can then oversee service provision in their own locales. It has also developed good relationships with major pharmaceutical companies and often acts as a channel for top quality donated medicines. In the HIV/AIDS realm MAP has been a leader in developing theological resources that help pastors address the needs HIV/AIDS creates in their communities. Many raters consider MAP an excellent example financial accountability and efficiency. The organization’s “101–500” employees currently expend a budget of US$319.5 million on efforts in 115 countries. For more information, see http://www.map.org/site/PageServer.

**Medical Teams International** (MTI) has been involved in disaster response since 1978 and continues to send both medical professionals and supplies to affected areas such as Indonesia and Darfur. Many of their initiatives are directed towards children and vulnerable women. MTI’s development programs assist in creating sources of clean water and basic sanitation, and basic healthcare focuses on issues like disease prevention and nutrition. Programs often combine service provision with local staff training in areas such as midwifery. The organization currently has a budget of US$226.7 million, with 190 full-time staff overseeing initiatives in 36 countries. For more information, see http://www.nwmedicalteams.org/site/PageServer.

**Mercy Ships** uses floating hospital ships to make specialized surgical care available to those who might otherwise not have access to it. Procedures include cataract and tumor removal, fistula treatment, cleft palate reconstruction, tooth extraction, and other kinds of maxillofacial surgery. All services are free, sponsored by individual and corporate (often in-kind) donations. In addition to professional medical staff, Mercy Ships relies on volunteers to implement its community health training initiatives. The organization’s “501–1000” employees currently travel to 53 countries on a budget of US$35.7 million. For more information, see http://www.mercyships.org/site/c.agLOI4OFKrF/b.1025835/k.BE58/Home.htm.

With permanent stations in 38 countries, **Mercy Corps** is a faith-based organization that focuses on nearly every angle of the development challenge, including education, agriculture, women’s rights, health and disaster relief. With worldwide headquarters in the United States, United Kingdom and China, Mercy has worked in every region in the developing world since its founding in 1979. Since that time, it has provided more than US$1 billion in assistance to more than 94 countries. In 2005, they had an operating budget of US$185 million dollars, 90 percent of which was used for programs. They currently have a 3,200 person staff and reach nearly 13.5 million people every year. Among a myriad of successful programs in Honduras and around the world, one of the most groundbreaking for Mercy Corps as been their “Breaking the Silence.” Addressing one of the greatest threats to peace, and yet one of the most buried problems in Honduran society, the program is a grassroots effort to protect women and children from domestic violence. Rampant in the country where it is often ignored by police and even churches, domestic violence has been blamed on cultural norms and accepted as part of Honduran life, occasionally brought to the public sphere with the death of a woman or child. Through self-esteem workshops for women and legal aid provided in safe and inconspicuous municipal buildings in 4 Honduran cities, project DEBORAH has managed more than 750 counseling cases and offered advice and support to more than 2000 women. Through educational programs the project has gained unprecedented support from local authorities and has implemented a teacher training initiative to bring awareness to children of resources available to their families. For more information, see http://www.mercycorps.org/.
C. Jewish

The Jewish Joint Distribution Committee’s mission is to provide rescue, relief, and renewal to Jewish communities in need around the world. The organization was founded in 1914 in response to the suffering of Jewish Palestinians. Since then, JDC has helped Jews in over 85 countries. JDC launched an International Development Program in 1986, which provides relief and aid to all people regardless of religion. In times of disaster, the JDC also takes on a non-secular approach to help those most in need of relief services. The JDC’s operating budget in 2004 was approximately US$187.2 million. For more information, see http://www.jdc.org/.

The Jewish Coalition for Disaster Relief (JCDR) is an umbrella group of over forty global (but primarily US-based) Jewish organizations focused on funding relief and development projects in the US and abroad. Some members of the coalition have a relief and development related mission, such as American Jewish World Service (AJWS), MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger, and World Jewish Aid, while others only participate in aid work through the Coalition. Examples of these coalition members include the Jewish Council for Public Affairs, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, Jewish Women International, and Rabbinical Council of America. Each time the membership determines it will respond to a new disaster, a separate fund is established for that particular crisis. The organization’s funding is given to the relief and development member organizations and other non-coalition organizations that work in the country of focus. The Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) orchestrates the Coalition. Examples of the JCDR’s projects include raising US$15,000 for the earthquake in Pakistan, more than US$885,000 for tsunami aid, and over US$600,000 to aid victims in Sudan. For more information, see http://www.jdc.org/.

American Jewish World Service (AJWS), founded in Boston in 1985 by Larry Phillips and Larry Simon, is an international development organization motivated by Judaism’s imperative to pursue justice. Through grant-making, AJWS partners with other organizations to alleviate poverty, hunger, and disease for all people regardless of race or religion. The organization supports projects in 24 countries in the areas of civil society promotion, education, health, HIV/AIDS, sustainable agriculture, and women’s empowerment. In 2005 AJWS’s total operating budget was US$15.9 million. For more information, see http://www.ajws.org/.

D. Islamic

Islamic Relief USA is the US-based branch of Islamic Relief Worldwide, a global FBO founded in 1984 in Birmingham, United Kingdom by Dr. Hany El Banna in response to famine in Africa. Today Islamic Relief Worldwide provides emergency relief and development in twenty-seven countries. Development projects include promoting education through building schools, providing school supplies, and teaching classes; providing safe water through irrigation, well-drilling and sanitation projects; encouraging health through prenatal care, education of mothers, immunizing children, teaching about nutrition and increasing food security; and income generation projects include vocational training, interest-free loans, distribution of livestock and promoting agriculture. Islamic Relief also provides aid to orphans through an orphan sponsorship program. Opened in 1993, Islamic Relief’s offices in the United States serve to educate, inform, and raise awareness about its various relief and development projects, and humanitarian issues both domestically as well as internationally. The worldwide operating budget in 2005 was US$42 million (higher than normal due to tsunami donations). For more information, see http://www.irw.org/.

ICNA Relief-Helping Hand promotes humanitarian relief and development within the Islamic Circle of North America (ICNA). Based in Jamaica, New York, the organization primarily raises funds to help victims of disaster in regions with large Muslim populations. In recent years Helping Hands has aided those victimized by the Asian tsunami, the Pakistani earthquake, conflict Kashmir, Palestine and Southern Lebanon, and genocide in Sudan. Longer-term projects have been undertaken in Bangladesh, Kenya, and Afghanistan. For more information, see http://www.reliefonline.org/.

LIFE for Relief and Development is a Michigan-based humanitarian organization founded by Iraqi immigrants in 1992. The organization has 23 US-based employees and spent $10 million on operations in 2004 on projects in Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, the Palestinian territories, and Sierra Leone. The organization has partnered with USAID, UNDP, and UNICEF, and has had ECOSOC
Special Consultative Status since 1999. LIFE was one of the few organizations allowed by the US government to conduct humanitarian work in Iraq during the period of embargo after the 1991 Gulf war. In September 2006 the FBI seized computers and documents from LIFE’s headquarters and accused the organization of providing funds to Hamas. The organization continues to operate while under investigation. For more information, see http://www.lifeusa.org/site/PageServer.

The Aga Khan Foundation (AKF) USA in Washington, DC was established in 1981 to raise funds for the Aga Khan Development Network’s social development program. The Aga Kahn Development Network’s goal is “to realize the social conscience of Islam through institutional action.” The organization was founded by Prince Karim Aga Khan IV, who is the current spiritual leader of the Shia Ismaili Muslims. The network’s projects are primarily located in the poorest areas of Africa and Asia. The Aga Khan Development Network (AKDN) focuses on health, education, culture, rural development, institution-building and the promotion of economic development in regions of the world where people are the poorest. The Network partners with governments throughout the world as well as large development and relief agencies. A variety of separate agencies work under the umbrella of the Aga Khan Development Network including the Aga Khan Agency for Microfinance and Aga Khan Education Services. The Aga Khan Agency for Microfinance (AKAM), founded in 2005 by combining many banking and microfinance programs already in the Network, boasts distribution of over 183,000 loans totaling over US$139 million globally. Pakistan and Syria are home to the agencies’ other large microlending programs, though many other countries in Asia and Africa have microlending programs through the AKAM. The Aga Khan Education Services (AKES) operates over 300 schools as well as funding educational initiatives in non-AKES schools. Current initiatives aim to improve computer literacy and distance learning, education access for girls, advanced teacher training, and improvement to school infrastructure. For more information, see http://www.akdn.org/agency/akf.html.

The Hidaya Foundation, located in Santa Clara, California, was founded in 1999 with a mission to implement educational, social welfare, and charitable programs in economically depressed areas of South Asia, West Africa, and North America, with focus on projects that promote self-employment. Specifically the organization has worked in Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, West Africa, USA and Canada. The Hidaya Foundation focuses on education and tries to funnel 50% of its budget into educational programs. The foundation’s 2005 operating budget was approximately US$2.6 million; the organization received US$4 million in donations. For more information, see http://www.hidaya.org/.

E. Other

1. Buddhist

The Buddhist Peace Fellowship engages primarily in domestic peace advocacy and encourages the international development work of its affiliates. It also supports a few small development programs in Burma, Tibet, and Thailand, and a special push for donations occurred after the 2005 tsunami. The BPF maintains strong ties to the International Network of Engaged Buddhists. The organization’s 11 employees currently manages a budget of about US$.6 million. For more information, see http://www.bpf.org/html/home.html

The Tzu Chi Foundation USA is a branch of the original Tzu Chi Foundation, based in Taiwan. They insist on personally delivering services, which generally encourages national affiliates to address needs in their own locales. International development work combines speedy relief efforts with longer-term assistance. Tzu Chi emphasizes the importance of education in overcoming poverty, as well as the necessity of access to healthcare; both the Taiwanese parent organization and the US affiliate operate free clinics. The US organization, with a staff of “11–20,” spreads an expense budget of US$10 million between programs in 12 countries. For more information, see http://www.tzuchi.org/global/index.html.

2. Hindu

BAPS Care International is the relief wing of BAPS Swaminarayan Sanstha, a movement established in the late 18th century that emphasizes the symbiotic relationship between spiritual purity and social service. BAPS Care operates in 13 countries, with an annual operating budget of US$354,839. In addition, it claims to mobilizes more than 13 million volunteer-hours by
40,000 people every year. The organization’s mission is to serve the global community by expanding access to education and healthcare, providing disaster relief and rehabilitation, initiating environmental projects and other humanitarian services. BAPS Care’s activities extend beyond the Hindu community to include, for example, the donation of over US$3.3 million in medicine and supplies to earthquake victims in El Salvador. For more information, see http://www.bapscare.org/.

A storm of controversy has surrounded the India Development and Relief Fund, whose mission is to support volunteer-based, honest, and highly experienced non-governmental organizations in India in serving their populations’ critical educational, healthcare, and welfare needs, without regard to religion, caste or creed. IDRF partner NGOs carry out projects in education, healthcare, disaster relief, sanitation, and income-generation sectors. A coalition of watchdog groups, headed by the South Asia Citizen’s Watch, has launched the Stop Funding Hate campaign, which accuses IDRF of misrepresenting their activities and funding violent Hindu nationalist groups. The campaign also argues that programs like the “Martyrs for National Integration Fund” have a distasteful sectarian tinge. The IDRF’s 2005 operating budget was more than US$1.3 million. For more information, see http://www.idrf.org/ and www.stopfundinghate.org.

The Ramakrishna Foundation is the US fundraising arm of the Ramakrishna Math/Mission. Its mission is to support initiatives to promote religious harmony, foster the educational and cultural activities of colleges, orphanages, and hospitals affiliated with such initiatives, and to offer charitable assistance to individuals and organizations that share the foundation’s spiritual and developmental objectives. Foundation-supported projects are implemented in India, Sri Lanka, and Bangladesh. For more information, see http://www.geocities.com/rkfoundation/

The All India Movement for Seva (AIM for Seva) was established in 2000 to bridge the cultural, social, and economic divide between urban and rural areas in India. Its programs run in 20 states, and overseas (US and Australia) offices focus on fundraising. AIM for Seva supports projects in the areas of education, environment, culture, healthcare, income-generation, and women’s empowerment. Some project examples include and HIV/AIDS hospital in Madhya Pradesh and a vocational training program for unemployed artisans in New Delhi. In 2005, AIM for Seva had an operating budget of over US$1.6 million. For more information, see http://www.aimforseva.org/

3. Bahá’í

The Bahá’í faith does not have any designated development and relief organizations outside of the work of Bahá’í International Community (BIC). Instead, the decentralized nature of the faith means development projects are largely created by individual and group initiatives at the local level.

According to an international Bahá’í website: “Bahá’í efforts in the field of social and economic development generally take the form of grassroots initiatives carried out by small groups of individuals in the towns and villages in which they reside. As these initiatives evolve, some grow into more substantial programs with permanent administrative structures. Yet very few can be compared with the kind of complex development projects promoted and funded by government agencies and large multilateral organizations.”

At the heart of these grassroots projects is a process that begins with consultation, where all members of a community come together to problem-solve about development projects. Projects can be initiated by the Bahá’í administration or by groups and individuals. In addition to local projects, the Bahá’í community has initiated global campaigns in the areas of literacy, primary health care training, and the advancement of women. Bahá’í organizations run 378 schools around the world as well as tutorial programs.

The Bahá’í International Community’s submission to the 2006 Commission on Social Development on the review of the First United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty declares that a new framework must address development. This new framework takes the primary focus off the improvement of material conditions for alleviating poverty and instead focuses on social values, stating, “the purpose of development as contributing to the foundation for a new social and international order, capable of creating and sustaining conditions in which human beings can advance mor-
ally, culturally, and intellectually." For more information, see http://bahai.org/

F. FBO/Secular Partnerships

InterAction is the largest alliance of US-based international development and humanitarian non-governmental organizations. Formed in 1984, the two main goals of the organization are: enhancing the effectiveness and professional capacities of its members engaged in international humanitarian efforts, and fostering partnership, collaboration, and leadership among its members as they strive to achieve a world of self-reliance, justice, and peace. Membership includes 160 organizations, many of which are faith-based. For more information, see http://www.interaction.org

Global Impact is a not-for-profit organization dedicated to helping the poorest people on Earth. Established in 1956, its membership includes more than 50 US-based international charities. For more information, see http://www.charity.org/site/c.gtJUjfMQlqE/b.2401643/k.BDB9/Home.htm

Hope for African Children Initiative (HACI) unites six major development organizations (CARE, Plan, Save the Children, the Society for Women and AIDS in Africa, World Conference on Religion and Peace, and World Vision) to address the comprehensive needs of children impacted by the HIV/AIDS pandemic, especially those who have been orphaned. Their programs emphasize the need to support intact families for as long as possible and to “ease the transition” as infected parents die. In addition to providing assistance with healthcare and education, HACI focuses on helping communities fight stigmatization and develop effective prevention practices. Currently the coalition operates programs in 13 African countries. For more information, see http://www.hopeforafricanchildren.org/index.htm.

G. Grant-directing

Founded in 2001, Calvin Edwards & Company offers high-capacity donors research and advice to help guide their giving and has special expertise addressing the concerns of Christian donors. A for-profit company, it transfers the thorough analysis of the financial world to its research on charitable organizations. It has conducted research on a diverse group of charities, ranging from the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops to the First Victory Baptist Church in College Park, Georgia. Notable clients include Dr. Patrick Fagan of the Washington, D.C.-based Heritage Foundation. Calvin Edwards & Company also publishes The Edwards Report, a quarterly newsletter. For more information, see http://www.calvinedwardscompany.com/index.html

Geneva Global is a relatively new organization with a bold mandate aimed at guiding philanthropic giving by using expert research, analysis, and evaluation to identify grassroots development projects that truly produce “Life Change”. Their hallmark is a professional and business style analysis of programs including opportunities, risks, and challenges. Geneva Global claims a substantially greater success rate compared to international child sponsorship programs. Especially valued by foundations and wealthy individuals and families capable of funding entire projects, the organization matches donors and programs using both regional distribution and topical criteria such as health, disaster, or education. In December 2006 the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) tapped Geneva Global to manage a new US$12 million fund supporting AIDS prevention and treatment programs in Ethiopia and Ivory Coast. Geneva Global’s senior leadership has solid experience in the field of international business and finance, as well as ties to respected religious development agencies such as U.K.-based Tearfund. The organization has 126 staff worldwide and maintains a network of 600 local field experts from its headquarters in Wayne, Pennsylvania. For more information, see http://www.genevaglobal.com/about.

Founded by former World Bank executives, GlobalGiving provides a direct link between donors and charitable projects by creating a project marketplace. Projects are categorized via eight themes and six geographic regions, ranging from democracy and civil society promotion to economic development and environmental sustainability. An extensive verification process ensures that all listed projects can deliver results and are compliant with government regulations, including voluntary Patriot Act anti-terrorist guidelines. Programs are first vetted by partner organizations like the Acumen Fund, and GlobalGiving subsequently conducts random audits of individual projects to ensure their quality and efficacy. The organization facilitates giving from a variety of donors. Individuals can contribute to a common fund,
while companies can develop websites designed to channel employee contributions, including those done through payroll deduction. In January 2007 President Dennis Whittle participated in a National Public Radio segment on “Ordinary Oprahs” which highlighted the development work of ordinary Americans. Since 2001 GlobalGiving has channeled US$3.8 million in donations and maintains a portfolio of over 400 locally-based development projects (very few are faith-based). For more information, see http://www.globalgiving.com/index.html

Since 1982 the National Christian Foundation has helped donors make smart giving decisions while ensuring that all recipients do not violate Christian principles. Its services include charitable annuity and trust management, as well as tax-friendly liquidation of charitable gifts such as real estate. The NCF Giving Fund program offers donors the ability to direct their contributions without the hassle and cost of creating an independent foundation. The National Christian Foundation has also been tagged by Forbes magazine for its exemplary efficiency as a nonprofit organization. For more information, see http://www.nationalchristian.com/ncf_home3.htm.
Appendix 3:
Christian Microfinance Institutions and Large Programs

An MFI founded by Anglican Church leaders, Five Talents is a long-term response to the poverty that debilitates communities in developing countries. The organization’s operations began in 1999, and in 2005 Five Talents reached 10,000 direct beneficiaries. Their programs are headquartered in Vienna, Virginia, with offices in London and Kampala, Uganda, as well as an office in the southeast US that coordinates the Latin American program and curriculum development. Five Talent’s 2005 operating budget was about US$.8 million and they have “1–5” full-time employees. For more information, see http://www.fivetalents.org/.

Founded in 1971, Opportunity International (OI) now serves over 800,000 clients annually in 29 countries, working to create jobs, stimulate small businesses, and strengthen poor communities. With an operating budget of more than $25 million, OI is one of the leading MFIs in the world. By 2010, OI expects to be serving 2 million poor people. OI’s local partner organizations provide small business loans, training, and advice. Micro-loans are disbursed through trust banks—a self-selecting group of 25–40 individuals co-guarantee each other’s loans, and the group participates in educational and social activities under the guidance of a loan officer.

On February 27, OI received a US$5.4 million grant and US$10 million loan from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The organization has also recently received corporate gifts from the Caterpillar Foundation ($1.2 million) and Lenovo Corporation ($1 million in computer hardware). John and Jacque Webberg, long-time supporters of Opportunity International, announced plans in 2006 to give $5 million annually for the next 10 years, the largest individual gift ever to a microfinance organization.

With this new injection of capital, OI is opening and scaling up formal financial institutions in Ghana, Malawi, Mozambique, and South Africa. They will also implement microfinance innovations like biometric fingerprint identification technology, smart cards, mobile ATMs, savings accounts, low-cost money transfers, and health, life, and crop insurance. In 2007, OI will open new banks in Rwanda, Kenya, and Uganda, as well as DRC in 2008. For more information, see http://www.opportunity.org/.

Founded in 1997, HOPE International seeks to alleviate poverty through microenterprise development. HOPE works in twelve countries: Afghanistan, China, the Dominican Republic, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Haiti, Moldova, Romania, Russia, Rwanda, South Asia, Uganda, and Ukraine. Where possible, HOPE works in conjunction with local believers and the local Church. In all areas, HOPE seeks an appropriate means of sharing the eternal hope that comes from Christ. HOPE has a budget of US$2.4 million and employs “11–20” people at their headquarters in Lancaster, PA. For more information, see http://www.hopeinternational.org/.

The World Vision Microenterprise Development Network’s mission is to increase impact to larger number of poor clients and their children within World Vision’s Transformational Development and Emergency Relief programs, through integrated and viable services. World Vision is a major player in the microfinance sector, with more than 450,000 clients served by 43 members in 28 countries. World Vision-affiliated MFIs “are run on business principles, operate against business plans, seek self-funding sustainability and subject themselves to the demands of the markets.” These MFIs have a unique relationship with World Vision and are affiliated yet separate legal institutions. World Vision maintains the majority of seats on the board of directors and assists institutional development by providing financial resources, capacity building, technical assistance, and systems support. World Vision USA raises funds for microfinance through a number of appeals, including the Women’s International Loan Fund (WILFund). 66% of World Vision microfinance clients are women, and the average loan size is US$560. For more information, see http://www.worldvision.org/worldvision/appeals.nsf/stable/med_home.
Catholic Relief Services (CRS) has a network of 17 country programs supporting formal microfinance institutions (MFIs), 4 country programs with formal wholesale MFIs, 6 country programs supporting informal microfinance programs (including savings based community initiatives), and 2 country programs with regional learning centers. Together, these programs reach 850,000 clients, of which 74% are women, in 30 countries throughout Africa, Middle East/North Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, and the Caribbean. In 1988, CRS established a Small Enterprise Development Technical Unit at headquarters to direct microfinance initiatives. CRS launched pilot programs in Bolivia, Peru, Thailand, Togo, and Senegal. CRS works through partner institutions in the field and its operations are guided by the following principles: serving the poorest clients; emphasizing savings; relying on solidarity guarantees; managing programs in a participatory manner; investing in scale and self-sufficiency; and working towards permanence. For more information, see http://crs.org/microfinance.

World Relief specializes in microfinance for post-conflict regions. World Relief sees microfinance as an effective tool to assist families following complex disasters, while shortening the period during which traditional relief is necessary. Because World Relief is a multi-sectoral organization, the impact of their microfinance programs is strengthened through integrated initiatives with other divisions. World Relief has programs in recovering countries like Mozambique, Sierra Leone, Kosovo, Cambodia, and the MFI in Rwanda. Their Rwanda program has been honored with an award for the best national MFI. Since its establishment in World Relief has served more than 90,000 clients in 16 countries. For more information, see http://www.wr.org/whatwedo/microfinance.asp
Appendix 4:
Evaluation Organizations and Rating Lists

Ratings Organizations

The American Institute of Philanthropy uses audited financial documents, along with other government paperwork, to evaluate the financial health of nonprofit organizations, rather than relying solely on the self-reported material available in tax documents. Founded in 1992, its evaluators consider themselves fiercely independent and are funded solely through membership contributions. Hard copies of their reports are available via post, and their website also offers articles and tips for the savvy donor. Sources like Newsweek and the New York Times have argued that the American Institute of Philanthropy has the toughest standards of charity watchdog groups. For further information, see http://www.charitywatch.org/.

An affiliate of the Better Business Bureau, the BBB Wise Giving Alliance uses information provided by organizations to evaluate their financial health and accountability, governance, and truthfulness in fundraising. Charities that meet its criteria can apply for the use of the National Charity Seal, a logo that allows consumers to make at-a-glance evaluations of a charity. The Wise Giving Alliance measures charity performance in governance, effectiveness, financial accountability, and fundraising; reviews begin when either a potential donor or a nonprofit organization requests an evaluation. The Alliance's website lists all charities from which it has solicited information, even if a review has not subsequently been conducted. In a recent review of Samaritan's Purse, for example, the Wise Giving Alliance noted that the organization had not fully complied with its requests for information, though it did meet certain standards of accountability. For further information, see http://www.give.org/.

Using publicly available tax documents and independent research, Charity Navigator evaluates an organization's financial health, therefore offering donors a better understanding of how their money is likely to be used (fundraising, administration, charitable projects, etc.). Charity Navigator also evaluates the long-term stability of an organization, in addition to its financial solvency, and currently offers evaluations on 5,000 US-based organizations. It periodically develops Top Ten lists that highlight both the best and worst practices of nonprofits. Recent topics have included inefficient fundraisers and small organizations worth watching. For further information, see http://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm.

The Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability has been auditing and evaluating evangelical charities since 1979 and now has over 1,200 members. Its base criteria are the Seven Standards of Responsible Stewardship, which include extensive guidelines for fundraising activities. Members must submit yearly data and are subject to random reviews (performed on 10% of members annually); in return they are permitted to use ECFA’s logo. Donors may request member reports free of charge from ECFA. For further information, see http://www.ecfa.org/.

GuideStar (Philanthropic Research, Inc.) uses publicly available IRS documents and other data provided by an organization to fill its database of 1.5 million nonprofit organizations. The organization offers three levels of service at varying prices, allowing it to serve both casual browsers and serious philanthropists by progressively increasing the information available to the user. In addition to the database, GuideStar also offers a wide range of related services, including analyst reports and data processing software. In 2005 the organization launched its Edu@GuideStar program, which gives educational institutions and academic researchers free access to GuideStar’s premium service. As an information service, GuideStar refrains from evaluating or rating the organizations in its database. For more information, see http://www.guidestar.org/.

MinistryWatch is a Christian charity evaluation organization that considers worldview and faith perspective in its evaluations, along with various financial and operational criteria. Organization profiles in its database include a “supporters might say/critics might say” section for simple comparisons. MinistryWatch pub-
lishes an annual list of 30 Shining Light Ministries that represent the best charitable organizations from the past year and also issues Donor Alerts to warn donors about dubious organizations. For further information, see http://www.ministrywatch.org/mw2.1/H_Home.asp.

The 30-year-old National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy promotes reform in the philanthropic sector, especially in regards to financial accountability. Their research and advocacy highlights ethically dubious relationships between politics and charities and encourages better oversight and governance of philanthropic organizations. They claim to be “the sector’s only progressive watchdog.” In 2005 they published reports on the philanthropic agendas of conservatives groups and the motivation behind the philanthropy of Wal-Mart and the Walton family. For further information, see http://www.ncrp.org/index.asp.

The National Council of Nonprofit Associations brings together state and regional associations to offer technical assistance and advocacy coordination to smaller nonprofit organizations. They also support the Nonprofit Congress, designed as a forum in which nonprofits can develop a coordinated plan for the future. In 2005 they produced a report entitled “Rating the Raters: An Assessment of Organizations and Publications That Rate/Rank Charitable Nonprofit Organizations” which argued that evaluation procedures vary widely and may not always provide an accurate or well-rounded assessment of the organizations they target. For further information, see http://www.ncna.org/.

**Listing the Best**

*Forbes* magazine’s most recent charity list highlighted the 200 largest U.S. charities. Listings focus on financial efficiency and include basic financial information, often in graph format. The information is generally not original and taken instead from services such as GuideStar. Of the 200 nonprofit organizations listed, at least 56 could be classified as faith-based organizations (including well-known groups such as Catholic Charities USA and World Vision). See online at http://www.forbes.com/lists/2006/14/largest-american-charities-pf-philo_cz_wb_1122charities_land.html.

In 2004 *Reader’s Digest* magazine offered its pick of an exemplary charity in 12 different categories, such as AIDS and Environment. Charities are also occasionally included in its “America’s 100 Best” list, which offers a much more random sampling of good things in the United States. None of the nonprofits profiled were explicitly faith-based.

*Worth* magazine published its most recent list of recommended charities in 2002 (new ownership subsequently discontinued the practice and has no plans to revive it), offering top choices in areas like education, health, and the arts. Many organizations focus on domestic issues, though not exclusively. With only a few exceptions, the authors did not investigate religious groups since they are not required to follow the same standards of financial transparency. Of those listed, only Catholic Charities, Habitat for Humanity International, Lutheran Services in America, Mercy Corps, National Council of YMCAs (depending on the strictness of classification), Salvation Army, and Volunteers of America have any visible religious connections. See online at http://www.ashoka.org/node/1024.

Every year the *Chronicle of Philanthropy* conducts the Philanthropy 400 survey and uses the results to construct a better picture of the state of the philanthropic world over the past year. Members of the survey are ranked by contributions received. Three of its 2006 Top Ten are considered faith-based organizations, including the #2 Salvation Army. In a review of the latest Philanthropy 400 survey (published in October 2006), Chronicle writers highlighted 13% growth in donations over the last year—partly because of fundraising efforts in response to Hurricane Katrina and the tsunami in South Asia. Diversified fundraising efforts further increased the importance and quantity of online giving, while many nonprofits in the Philanthropy 400 reached out to new corporate partners. The high profile work of wealthy philanthropists like Warren Buffet and Bill Gates also spurred an increase in donations. However, tighter restrictions on tax exemptions led to significant drops in in-kind donations of things like cars and artwork. The review also noted that donor-advised funds are an increasingly popular option, especially for those donating appreciated stock.

One of the nonprofit sector’s major news outlets, the *Nonprofit Times*, publishes an annual list of the nation’s 100 largest nonprofit organizations as determined by
annual income. In addition to charts offering basic financial data, the report also includes analysis on trends and behavior. At least 24 listed nonprofits would be classified as faith-based, including two of the top five (#2 Salvation Army and #4 Catholic Charities USA). See online at http://www.nptimes.com/pdf/NPTTop1002006.pdf.
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This study explores the range of charitable activities and fundraising strategies of Hindu temples and movements in the United States. Priya contrasts the focus of temples, which are interested in preserving Hindu religion and culture in a “melting pot” context, with that of movements, which are more oriented towards international development initiatives. She points out that there is a wide range of fundraising approaches, ranging from aggressive and strategic, to a policy of non-solicitation of funds. This article seeks to move beyond some of the controversial aspects of Hindu FBOs, and points to the positive aspects of financial and technical contributions of the American Hindu community.


Bailey comments that organizations do not always use the product of an evaluation to improve their behavior. She encourages nonprofits to incorporate clear evaluation standards into program development that acknowledge the presence of both long- and short-term outcome goals.


The author suggests three areas where Christian FBOs can improve their performance by acquiring increased knowledge. He underscores the need to improve communication throughout the development sector so that organizations can discuss and examine best practices. The author also highlights how more formal development education can make development workers more effective.


Bornstein argues that many South African NGOs have been negatively affected by donor calls for more comprehensive monitoring and evaluation (M&E) mechanisms. Her research turned up a number of cases where data was tweaked or added to bring NGO results in line with the evaluation format requested. Bornstein also noted that rigid M&E standards often rely too heavily on quantitative, rather than qualitative, measurements, and this prevents small NGOs from adequately developing their own reporting capacity.


This piece examines the relationship between donors and FBOs, with a particular emphasis on shifting patterns of engagement by DFID. Clarke argues that although there is a much greater understanding of the potential for FBOs to be “agents of transformation,” donors have several conceptual and operational constraints that limit the effectiveness of these partnerships. First, donors have traditionally understood development as a fundamentally technocratic undertaking focused on improving material well-being at the expense of spiritual considerations. Although the pendulum is gradually swinging towards a
more holistic view, in practice, this understanding is still very influential. Moreover, engagement with FBOs has thus far been limited to certain faiths (primarily main-line Christian) and geographical areas (mainly SSA and Latin America). “Blind spots” that need to be addressed include Pentecostal and Evangelical Christian groups and Islamic, Buddhist, and Hindu FBOs. Factors like domestic politics and religious hierarchy help to explain these blind spots. On the operational side, DFID lacks a coherent department-wide policy of engagement with FBOs, resulting in a rather ad hoc approach. Also, the move away from project-based funding and toward PPAs, SWAPs, and increased funding for multilateral initiatives has distanced DFID from CSOs. This has had the practical effect of further complicating FBO engagement.


The authors conclude that MCC’s holistic approach to development produces successful long-term results that may not be easily quantified. MCC workers deliberately develop partnerships with local people and organizations to build social capital. These relationships in turn allow MCC to demand high standards of accountability. The scholars based their evaluation on in-depth interviews of MCC workers and analysis of organizational reports.


Christian nonprofit organizations are now monitored by two groups, Wall Watchers and the Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability. Though similar, the organizations provide slightly different information to potential donors.


The authors surveyed agencies offering services to the homeless in Houston, Texas, in order to find out what differences existed between secular and faith-based service providers. Before describing their findings, they offered a brief literature review that noted earlier attempts to establish criteria for differentiation. The authors noted first that, while it is not always possible to determine an organization’s religiosity by its name, generally some element of its public face (logo, etc.) will indicate its faith-based character. The study also found that faith-based organizations were not overwhelmingly reliant on government funding. Aside from executive and administration positions, they also depended much more heavily on volunteer support. Significantly, the authors discovered that secular and faith-based organizations did not differ in their desire to establish relationally-based client programs (a practice often considered a unique strength of faith-based programs).


Ebrahim highlights how an insistence on evaluation can have negative consequences for nonprofit behavior. Evaluation often emphasizes donor-organization accountability, without addressing other accountability relationships (e.g. between organization and recipient). This can, in turn, lead to a counterproductive focus on quantifiable short-term results, rather than long-term social change. This kind of evaluation approach can also discourage nonprofits from adequately analyzing their failure to provide lessons for future behavior, since unfavorable evaluation could result in a loss of funding. Ebrahim further notes that insistence on complex evaluation procedures can overwhelm the capacity of small nonprofits and divert resources better spent on programmatic offerings.


Ferris offers a brief history of humanitarian NGOs and then describes the basic context and function of NGO work in the contemporary world. She notes the tension between evangelical groups and traditional Christian organizations on operational behavior, along with the complexity of North/South partnerships.

The authors note that despite the rising profile of faith-based organizations, little coherent theoretical work exists to explain this phenomenon. Debate on the efficacy of faith-based organizations remains primarily anecdotal, with little empirical evidence to support either praise or criticism. Since social service delivery can be inherently political, the authors see this as a promising research sector. They especially encourage scholars to examine what insight regime theory can offer. The authors review various definitions of faith-based organizations, and they spend several pages developing specific research questions on what they consider some of the major challenges in the field.

Jeavons, Thomas H. “Religious and Faith-Based Organizations: Do We Know One When We See One?” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (2004): 140–144.

Jeavons, while generally supportive of Sider and Unruh’s typology of faith-based organizations, offers three points of criticism. First, the typology’s roots in the Protestant Christian tradition restrict its efficacy for other religious traditions. Second, various traditions interpret acts of compassion as distinctly religious expression, even if no explicit religious language is used; this could complicate the typology’s use of expressive characteristics. Third, the typology does not address the thorny status of religious congregations.


Kniss and Campbell surveyed 57 relief and development organizations (all religiously based) and found that they differed most from secular organizations in the area of legitimation. They quote an earlier author who remarked that, “although most researchers admit the significance of religious organizations in the nonprofit sector, few actually study them” (94). In addition to quantitative financial analysis, their study also examined mission statements, program activities, and religious links. Kniss and Campbell focused their data comparisons on mainline Protestant and evangelical organizations. While evangelical organizations tended to focus on relief more than development, with mainline Protestant groups acting in the reverse, the authors noted that “there appears to be an important distinction here between denominational agencies on one hand and parachurch or transdenominational agencies on the other.” The study also found that evangelical organizations remain least likely to distinguish between religious and non-religious program activities. Concurrently, while mainline Protestant and evangelical organizations often used similar language to appeal to constituents, the study found that identical words could have significantly different contextual meanings.


Sider and Unruh divide faith-based organizations into five categories based on religious integration and “expressive, explicitly religious” practices. The article includes a four page chart that describes a typical organization and program/project in each of the categories, plus a comparative description of a secular organization. Though developed in a domestic context, their typology offers helpful detail in considering what should count as a “faith-based organization”; in addition, the authors provide concrete examples of each category. This typology is also important because it represents the thinking of one of the foremost evangelical scholars in the field of development and social justice. For the past 30 years Sider, author of the seminal work *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger*, has encouraged Christians to actively address issues of social justice.


Smietana discusses the burgeoning trend of business leaders who leave successful careers to take leadership positions in nonprofit organizations. He pointed to World Relief, Habitat for Humanity, and the Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability as excellent examples. He notes...
that this shift also coincides with increased pressure on nonprofits to meet various standards of accountability, many of which mirror expectations of for-profit businesses that may not always be sufficiently sensitive to the less tangible products of nonprofit organizations.


Smith and Sosin describe the varying degrees of religious affiliation in social service organizations. They insist that the term “faith-based” is too restrictive, and instead “faith-related” should be used, since it more accurately encompasses the diversity of service organizations. Organizations are “coupled” (linked) to religion via three areas of constraint: resources, authority, and culture. The study suggests that larger, more effective service agencies will adopt more secular operational policies because they are more loosely coupled to religious resources, authority and culture. Concurrently, religious ties play a greater role in determining the type, rather than the content, of services.


Thomas uses social capital theory to explain how faith communities can catalyze transformational development. He contrasts a perspective of norms based on the rationality of the Western enlightenment with “rooted cosmopolitanism,” or the grounding of universal rights in local, usually faith-based, understandings. These “virtue ethics” are realized in practice as religious communities strive to live out their lives in accordance with their faith’s moral precepts. Thomas argues that the main challenge is to convert the “bonding” social capital that holds these religious groups together into the “bridging” social capital that links members to the broader constellation of civil society groups, generating opportunities for social change and sustainable development. He uses the case of the civil rights movement to illustrate many of his points. This piece argues very strongly for putting religiously-based “communities of character” at the center of US foreign aid policy.


Twombly compares the organizational and financial character of social service nonprofits. The study concludes that faith-based organizations are, on average, older than their secular counterparts, and they tend to be less involved in job training/workforce development and housing programs. Financially, faith-based organizations rely more heavily on donations and are generally more able to match revenue to expenses. Interestingly, Twombly found that expenditure patterns did not differ significantly between faith-based and secular organizations.


This piece examines the tensions between religion and mainstream development thinking. Tyndale argues that religions have a deeper conception of development than secular development agencies. This conception relates to how faith helps us understand what it means to be human. She specifies two criticisms of faith-based organizations, namely that they lack practical expertise and remain too small-scale to have any measurable impact on poverty levels. The rebuttal to these arguments is that the comparative advantage of FBOs lies precisely in their small-scale rootedness, and that there is little evidence that development agencies are any more successful than FBOs at meeting the practical needs of the poor.


Wilhelm summarizes reports from Independent Sector and the Urban Institute that confirm that most nonprofits (over 70%) evaluate their programs. Religious affiliation, budget size, and mission were three key factors linked to the probability of evaluation. Wilhelm also described factors that hinder evaluation efforts, such as inadequate computer software.
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