



Participatory Development Working Papers No 07/05. December 2007.

Religion and Civil Society: the case of religious NGOs in the development arena.

Kate Crowe



**Master of Applied Anthropology and Participatory
Development (MAAPD) Program**

Telephone: (612) 6125 4041
Fax: (612) 6125 2711
E-Mail: maapd@anu.edu.au
Web: <http://rspas.anu.edu.au/maapd>

Given that many religions today are internally contested by increasingly polarised interpretations it is difficult, yet essential, to know where views are represented by a given religious NGO, particularly those claiming a global membership. An organisation with clearly defined ('transparent') views based on a just representation of its membership, although it's unclear how this would be ascertained, appears much more legitimate and minimalises the confusion surrounding its aims making it a more attractive partner to other religious or secular organizations. (Berger 2003, p.36)

Introduction

Religions Non-Governmental Organisations (RNGOs) often have to manage the problem of how to engage with both their religion, and the local context in which development occurs. This paper will investigate how the religious beliefs framing a development agenda can conflict with local and state requirements, pluralist tropes, and become the basis for exclusion and/or control. RNGOs embody an immensely diverse spectrum externally, in regards to traits such as intent and structure, and internally as Berger in the above quotation suggests, in regards to religious opinion within these organizations. There is also significant diversity within scholarly circles and the media as to how the independently complex and controversial areas of development, religion and civil society should relate. Does religion positively contribute to developmental pursuits? Or should development be a purely secular 'industry'? While there is little empirical evidence to support either argument, this paper will examine the views supporting the various perspectives of this debate and analyse the many assumptions regarding RNGOs and the complex role religion plays in the arena of development.

The aim of this paper is, by surveying the diversity of intent and practices of RNGOs, to investigate how RNGOs achieve and maintain legitimacy. The nature of development and religion make it difficult for RNGOs to avoid accusations of illegitimacy; even purely secular approaches to aid face intense criticism. This paper argues that the legitimacy of an RNGO is dependant on how the RNGO engages with the context in which the development occurs and also on the structure and attitude of the organisation; how it engages with its religion. I will first define RNGOs, then address how particular forms of RNGOs can positively contribute to developmental pursuits, and conclude by investigating the notion that development should be a purely secular industry. The influence of faith can represent a pluralist and potentially effective approach to development, but it can also stifle local approaches to growth as well as limiting freedom from constraints and/or oppressions associated with colonisation.

Some Definitions

I will be referring to what are variously called religious, spiritual, or faith-based NGOs as RNGOs. Theorists such as Dicklitch and Rice (2004, p.662) define RNGOs 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". The intent of RNGOs generally extends

beyond purely religious conversion. They can represent explicit religious services or simply be motivated by faith-based values to perform humanitarian tasks. Berger describes them as:

Formal organisations whose identity and mission are self-consciously derived from the teachings of one or more religious or spiritual traditions and which operate on a non-profit, independent, voluntary basis to promote and realise collectively articulated ideas about the public good at the national or international level (2003, p.16).

Despite there being generally agreed upon definitions of RNGOs they encapsulate immense conceptual ambiguity, ambiguity of religious identity, and an overwhelming diversity of activities, structure, size, intent, form and practice. Berger (2003, p.25) believes the pervasiveness of religious actions also varies. Candland (2000, p.368) refers to pervasiveness as the level of piousness. This 'degree' of religiousness is difficult to measure and varies dramatically, but the degree of religious preoccupation in informing a developmental approach often undermines the RNGOs the level of effectiveness as developmental organisation.

Despite significant diversity, definitions generally reflect a significant transformation of religious discourse, the evolution from missionary style conversion to humanitarianism. Modern RNGOs often signify tolerance and pacification, the religious golden rule 'love thy neighbor'. This could be interpreted as aligning closely with civil society ideology, but can RNGOs be considered a legitimate part of civil society? Anhelm argues that:

A religious institution can be termed civil only if it at least recognises the rules of the human rights catalogue and rejects the use of force as an element governing its own actions. It turns into a true agent of civil society only when it sees itself as part of this communication process (1999, p.99).

There is significant debate as to the difference between NGOs and RNGOs, though some theorists suggest the history of civil society corresponds with that of the religious community. The goals or mission statements of RNGOs are often indistinguishable from NGOs but whether implicitly or explicitly, RNGOs influence development through their religious framework. The difference between RNGOS and NGOs depend on whether it is a religious institution, organisation or voluntary association. The issues and self-perception of voluntary associations are more closely aligned with civil society and they are believed to be a more co-operative organisation. But regardless of the form of RNGO, a distinct difference is that NGOs rely on establishing a supporter basis to legitimize their actions, while RNGO generally act for 'the greater good', on behalf of humanity. Berger (2003, p.16) states RNGOs "differ from congregational and denominational structures, which tends to focus on the development of their membership; RNGOs seek to fulfill explicitly public missions". The degree of difference between RNGOs and NGOs possibly relates to the characteristics of the RNGO, its form and how it embraces religion and local contexts. This paper will now examine RNGO traits which positively contribute to development.

Does Religion positively contribute to developmental pursuits?

The argued failure of the neo-liberalist approach to development has in a sense paved an opportunity for RNGOs. Manji and O'Coill (2002, p.580) believe "neoliberalism saw the possibility of enforcing the unjust social order they desired by consensual rather than coercive means". Other scholars such as Kilby (2004, p.16) and Scott M Thomas (2004, p.133) also suggest that the significant increase in RNGO numbers is a result of public disillusionment with

modernity. The 'moral' non-state approach is suggested as appropriate in this 'era of anxiety' (Kilby 2004, p.16). As Kilby states

...the whole concept of service and altruism is a fundamental precept of most religious traditions; private aid for addressing injustice and alleviating poverty at home and in foreign lands occurred well ahead of any thoughts by government to do the same (2004, p.72).

RNGOs have the opportunity to gain legitimacy by distancing themselves from economic or political approaches to development which scholars such as Manji and Carl (2002, p.580) describe as aiming to "expand and consolidate neoliberal hegemony". However RNGOs can also be criticised for being influenced by their own religious beliefs and community, rather than being influenced by the development of local infrastructure and community empowerment.

This section will critique perspectives as to how religion can positively contribute to development, and will argue that religion can be effective in a developmental environment but only when it embraces debate, acceptance and ideological difference. Theorists such as Scott M Thomas (2004) suggest that RNGOs signify the recognition of a pluralist international development community. While RNGOs may represent a pluralistic religious approach to the field of development, the implication that the RNGO recognises other values and goals can not be assumed. RNGOs can potentially undermine alternative local culture and approaches to development: the discourse of religion is often in opposition to pluralism. For example in 1993 the Parliament of World Religions, in an attempt to create a 'new global order', produced a Declaration Toward a Common Global Ethic. Anne Hope and Sally Timmel note that it:

... includes a commitment to a culture of non-violence and respect for life; commitment to a culture of solidarity and a just economic order; commitment to a culture of tolerance and a life of truthfulness; and a commitment to a culture of equal rights and partnerships between men and women. All authentic development work should aim at developing this type of culture (2003, p.95);

indicating that RNGOs are capable of representing a universalism of specific values.

I will first refer to RNGOs whose actions engage explicitly with the promotion of their religious beliefs, then discuss RNGOs whose motivations may be religious but religious promotion in no way influences their developmental activities. Leban (2003, p.3) describes RNGOs which engage explicitly with their religion as "organisations whose mission statements articulate explicitly religious values, and staff members express pride in their non-secular provision of aid". By contrast, theorists such as Hope and Timmel (2003, p.95) believe that religion signifies a powerful motivating force for development by providing hope through community and inclusion, an awareness of justice, and a different perspective on local problems. Explicitly religious RNGOs transcend the goal of social responsibility, and their beliefs explicitly inform their development agenda. This form of RNGO gains guidance from its religious faith; it informs its agenda and its practice within the field. Berger argues that:

A central feature of many RNGO mission statements is recognition of the spiritual nature of the individual and of a divine source of guidance, which provides a 'blueprint' for the development of the individual and of society (2003, p.29).

RNGOs could be interpreted as positive within the development arena because they are a valuable source of social capital, but this social capital can also be the basis for marginalisation, mistreatment and disregard for local context. Many religions regard their beliefs as superior to all others, and can treat individuals of other beliefs poorly. Scott M Thomas (2004, p.141) defines development as "... building a community of character". RNGOs can provide an environment of

social connections, trust and co-operation. Social capital, such as value networks and infrastructure, are believed to be crucial elements for effective development. Scott M Thomas (2004, p.141) suggests that RNGOs are not more intrusive than NGOs that also transgress social, religious and class boundaries, and can also represent loaded cultural traditions. RNGO beliefs, he believes, can empower local communities. Scott M Thomas (2004, p.141) uses the civil rights movement as an example of how religion can transform negative social capital into positive. Although Christianity inspired self-worth and equality in African Americans, Scott M Thomas (2004) fails to acknowledge the role religion played in creating the environment of intolerance, extreme violence and social exclusion in the first place, in short an environment of racism. Theorist such as Candland(2000) believe religion can be used as the ideological basis for hierarchical treatment. Candland argues that religion can be

...seemingly the source for prejudice and violence...Thus, in much social science literature there is an aversion to treating religion as the basis for progressive social solidarity (2000, p.256).

RNGOs appear more effective when its religion corresponds with local morality, ideology and structures. The RNGO can claim a degree of legitimacy as it is less intrusive when the religion of the RNGO aligns with that of the local community. When the religions do not align, and an RNGO engages with its religion heavily and explicitly, it can be incredibly detrimental to the local community and to the RNGOs legitimacy.

Religious engagement is particularly explicit and potentially highly detrimental when it involves conversion to a particular religion, and this type of active engagement with religion can imply the act of salvation. Proselytising is more commonly identified with the history of missionaries, and is deemed illegitimate by most NGO activists, and is publicly and officially frowned upon, but conversion is still evident in some contemporary RNGOs and actively supported. Organisations such as Concerned Women for America, or anti-abortions campaigns, advertise their religious agenda/conversion intentions explicitly. George M Thomas (2001, p.5) claims globalisation has set a context in which individual identity is a complex set on choices determined by the individual, no longer by the nation-state, and is essentially 'up-for-grabs'. He believes (2001, p.1) that article 18 of the universal declaration of human rights (UDHR) supports this argument, as it recognises the individual right to thought, conscience and religion. The notion that RNGO workers are voluntary is believed by George M Thomas (2001, p.7) to legitimise proselytisation: perhaps a misplaced legitimacy. While RNGOs have the right to religious freedom, and this liberty is used to justify religious promotion, developing communities often do not have the financial luxury of religious choice. In addition it is also often difficult to distinguish between community inclusion and the use of religious structures, and the individual embracement of the values attached. The conversion agenda is also highly criticised by the nation-state even when the religion is not contradictory with predominate national religion when funding can be limited for organisations to pursue such activities.

Closely aligned with social capital and conversion is the 'virtue-ethics' approach which can inform development. Scott M Thomas believes this:

... recognises that character, empowerment and participation must go together if there is to be long-term political stability, democracy and development in poor countries (2004, p.145).

This can be more problematically labeled as moral formation. Scott M Thomas (2004) believes this to be a vital part of development which recognises pluralism, builds up faith and increases participation in determining the direction of individual lives. This approach is thematically

reminiscent of missionary tropes, but may be viable if the organisation is in a position to assist a developing community consolidate its own identity, but not if the RNGO imposes its own ethics or assumes the community is not 'moral' in the savage sense. This moral formation can include the partnerships the RNGO can bring to development.

RNGOs often have access to valuable developmental social and practical infrastructures and to established partnerships and developmental networks. Berger (2003) believes this is "by virtue of the long-standing presence of religious establishments and communities around the world" (p.20). These partnerships provide crucial communication pathways. Unfortunately these social networks often exist within a particular religious framework and, aside from conferences such as the World Conference on Religion and Peace (WCRP) and the International Association for Religious Freedom (IARF), there are few religious affiliation bodies. Although the IARF is considered by the UN as an NGO encompassing multiple religions and beliefs, the number of members is limited and the differing religious absolute truths and independent communities can potentially stunt religious and secular dialogue. Anhelm argues that

... all these globally active NGOs...constitute a world of their own, even if committed to inter religious dialogue. As global players, they always reflect the concerns of their respective religious base (1999, p.103).

I believe it is possible for RNGOs to bring these partnerships to development without imposing their religions. RNGOs can be committed to development, poverty reduction and empowerment but not the promotion of religious activities. This is when RNGOs are more commonly considered legitimate and effective. An example of an organisation that claims it is guided by values derived from its religion but not by the religion itself is CARITAS (Catholic Agency for International Development and Aid). Kilby (2004, p.7) suggests religious values can be emulated as humanitarian values. Berger states:

While some organisations focus on education and propagation of a particular religion or spiritual tradition, most are concerned with the practical expression of their religious beliefs and consider themselves duty bound to be a source of positive change in society (2003, p.32).

Problems associated with this model are that the value based aspirations may not reflect the religious values of the constituency and that there is the possibility that any focus on values, religiously inspired or secular, can have an adverse effect. Joshi and Moore (cited in Kilby 2004, p.74) believe "a focus on values can lead to a moral hazard. In order to receive a service there may be a tacit or explicit requirement for the constituency to adopt the values of the NGO". Value driven NGOs, for example those with a democratic agenda, are potentially just as illegitimate as religious value driven RNGOs and should be regarded just as critically.

There is also significant debate as to whether the religious beliefs and emulated humanitarian values can be legitimately separated or should be separated. Berger (2003, p.32) believes they can not be separated while Scott M Thomas (2004) believes one should not attempt to distinguish the two. Scott M Thomas (2004) believes RNGOs are more powerful than secular NGOs precisely because they embrace their religious motivations. Religion, he believes, is a significant tool of individual empowerment — religion may also be the ultimate motivating source but some RNGO are reluctant to advertise their religious affiliation as it influences perceptions and possible funding.

Funding mechanisms frequently influence the approach that RNGOs approach to development, if and how the RNGO embraces its religion. This, in turn, influences the organisation's legitimacy

in a number of ways. For example, when an RNGO receives funding from the government it has the potential to undermine legitimacy, particularly if that RNGO is trying to influence policy. Berger states “in most cases, excessive reliance on government funding can affect an organisation’s posture toward government and have negative repercussions for its reputation” (2003, p.29). RNGOs often advertise themselves as impartial, neutral organisations as they gain significant legitimacy from the perception of distance from any political agenda. RNGOs legitimacy can also be undermined if they abuse their soft-power, their apolitical influence over developing communities. RNGOs often advertise the fact that they only receive funding from government if there are no requirements attached but funding can often require that RNGOs do not advertise themselves as religious.

While funding can undermine the RNGOs’ apolitical stance it can also simultaneously require they do not incorporate religious imposition or even advertise their religious motivations. Contemporary RNGOs, particularly in Western countries, more commonly fall into this category as a response to public perception and increased government regulation. Kilby (2004, p.70) states there has been a “crackdown on those NGOs involved in instigation, ie. more direct form of advocacy”. In countries such as Australia, RNGOs appear reluctant to advertise their activities in religious terms though this can differ dramatically in other contexts. The secular environment and negative assumptions surrounding RNGOs conflict with existence and growth in the development arena. This could relate to developing countries aid often being offered instead of state welfare systems. How aid is funded can see Western international NGOs rather than local organisations tackling domestic problems (Manjii and O’Coill 2002, p.568).

The Mennonite Central Committee

An example of a model of RNGO which positively contributes to the development of a community by not imposing their religion and engage with the local context is the Mennonite Central Committee (MCC). The MCC is a religious organisation that separates humanitarian values from religious practice and promotion in development. Its developmental agenda and activities are not influenced by its faith. All MCC volunteers must be Christian however, which has the potential to undermine the claim that practices are non-religious, questioning the plausibility of truly separating religious beliefs from a developmental framework. The MCC is also considered a legitimate RNGO because its agenda is driven by field operations not donors, because it works through in-country offices or at the request of local institutions, it respects local culture and solutions, is both short and long term focused, works with civil society and local partners, hires local staff and volunteers on a 3 year basis and treats its community partners as equals. Dicklitch and Rice (2004, p.667) claim:

The MCC works ecumenically with a variety of organisations...local and international. Thus the MCC has the indigenous trust and legitimacy that has eluded many other Western Organisations.

The MCC also does not accept funding from a state if it does not agree with its policies. The MCC could be considered a good-practice example due to its philosophical and programmatic approach to development. There is general consensus (though not complete agreement) that for RNGOs to exist legitimately in the development arena, they must not impose themselves in religion terms.

Should Development be purely secular?

This section aims to identify why RNGOs may be considered inappropriate development organisations. This argument is often based on the argument that development should be focused on the provision of services not faith-based self worth and community empowerment. Whether it is because RNGOs find it difficult to integrate into the international system or they are an inappropriate organisation for development, there has recently been significant demand for professional, secular approaches to development. I will address how this could be due to, among other things, the history of RNGOs, fundamentalist RNGOs' religious imposition, the inability of some RNGO to consider local needs, the notion that RNGOs are irrational and the state perception of RNGOs as something to be strictly regulated. These factors cannot be applied to all RNGOs and are often reliant on how the RNGO engages with its religion.

Illegitimacy surrounding RNGOs and demand for secular approaches to development, often relate to missionary history, to intense involvement in racial oppression, and violent conversion methods. Manji and O'Coill argue:

With the rise of the anti-colonial movement colonial missionary societies and charitable organisations were clearly tainted in the eyes of the majority by their association with racial colonial oppression (2002, p.572).

In countries such as Vanuatu explicit missionary activities continue but generally RNGOs have made an ideological shift from overt exclusion to development based on pacifism and peace. There is still skepticism that this shift represents only a transformation of discourse not action. While the discourse adopted by missionaries has dramatically evolved, it can still potentially represent the same hierarchical logic of paternalism. Manji and O'Coill (2002, p.573) believe this suspicion is warranted and that despite the lack of racial signifiers even the new discourse signifies paternal control. They believe that some RNGOs in Africa "represent a continuity of the work of their precursors, the missionaries and volunteer organisations that co-operated in Europe's colonisation and control of Africa" (2002, p.568). Some pro-RNGO theorists (Hope and Timmel 2003, p.96) go to the extent of describing aid not as development but as a transformative process which can only be guided by religion as the role of a 'nurturing parent'. Manji and O'Coill (2002) do not suggest abandoning RNGOs, but believe they should instead embrace a discourse of emancipation and achieve legitimacy from distancing themselves from the injustices and control of colonialization. Development, when appropriately approached and managed can offer such an opportunity. Legitimacy then becomes very much dependant on whether faith prevents local growth and freedom or represents political, cultural or economic control. Manjii and O'Coill identify the options available to RNGOs:

Some consciousness of the need to engage in supporting emancipatory movements has been emerging, even among those Western organisations (such as Oxfam, Save the Children and Christian Aid) for whom development project work has been (and remains) their 'bread and butter', as well as many local NGOs...Alternatively, they can continue their work in projects that serve, as was the case with their missionary precursors, to shore up those forces that have come to subjugate and immiserate the majority (2002, p.573).

Occasionally fundamentalist religions aggressively assert notions of truth, and religion is used as a basis for exclusion and stifles the voice of local minorities. Edwards and Sen (cited in Kilby 2004, p.74) suggest "when the values of communities or organisations become the basis for separateness, exclusivity or righteousness they can become internally oppressive as well as

externally xenophobic". Anhelm (1999, p.104) also believes "when such zeal becomes tied to political objectives, charged with racist or ethical elements, and fed by social conflict, it may tempt entire populations to break away from any civility in the way they deal with each other". RNGOs can be accused of being manipulative and coercive and religion potentially becomes the basis for cultural supremacy. RNGOs religious imposition can also result in religious conflict and individuals that are converted may not be compatible with the local community or state.

Religious values do not always correspond with local requirements or desires, such as independence, ecological sensitivity and civil conflict management. Buddhism, Hinduism, and Christianity are examples of religions whose values often do correspond, but this paper has indicated what actually corresponds are the humanitarian values of the organisation not religious-cultural traditions. How the RNGO engages with the religion and context can undermine such consistencies. Conversion agendas, or a clash of religions or culture, can result in an RNGO being economically and socially inequitable, ecologically insensitive and culturally disrespectful.

Leban provides the example of World Vision and United Methodist Communities in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the early 1990's: "the organisations were generally deemed inflexible, operating according to their own standard codes of practice rather than responding to local situations" (2003, p.4). RNGOs can often have little interest or expertise in economic development, focusing on religious/social growth. While the separation of economic growth and social capital could actually be argued as being positive, allowing RNGOs to focus on social justices and not being driven by market demands, RNGOs are sometimes accused of preventing the social growth of an independent community, its community specific structures and self-reliance. The application of faith-orientated structures can overwhelm specific community needs, their cultural and political structures and relationships and result in a dependent relationship. The level of effectiveness and legitimacy of RNGOs can correspond with the degree to which they interact or value local religion or culture.

Multiple and unclear accountabilities also threaten an RNGOs legitimacy. The values RNGOs represent are hard to determine as there are so many different religious bodies and differing interpretations of who they represent. Are RNGOs accountable to their religious beliefs, their role as a civil society actor or to their performance in providing effective aid?¹ Berger believes:

...representation is a key issue for secular and religious NGOs alike as organisations derive much of their legitimacy and persuasiveness from the degree to which their views are considered to be representative of the membership (2003, p.25).

How the RNGO negotiates potentially conflicting responsibilities also influence the RNGOs legitimacy. Anhelm (1999, p.104) states: "their profile within civil society results from the tension between their loyalty to the cause and to the institutions". Other tensions include that of the state (if funding the RNGO) and its constituents. While I believe conflicting accountabilities do undermine RNGO legitimacy, legitimacy is also heavily reliant on the values of the RNGO and how it promotes them. It is commonly argued that religion-based values are more problematic than secular values, which are presumed to be based on reason.

Another criticism of RNGOs is that their actions are defined by faith, and notions of 'right' and morality, as opposed to reason (Berger 2003, p.17). This argument assumes that secular NGOs are purely rational and are never morally coercive, which is not the case. NGOs also appeal to moral duty but RNGOs often legitimise their appeals through moral discourse. Counteracting the

¹ Tandon's accountabilities cited in Kilby 2004, p.74.

'moral' legitimisation of RNGOs is the accusation that RNGOs target minorities, the young, poor and vulnerable, who are not in the position to reject aid because they disagree with the values attached. George M Thomas describes instances where RNGOs: "prey on vulnerable tribal people and untouchables who convert out of material exigencies or opportunities rather than conviction of conscience" (2001, p.9). Regardless of whether RNGOs are morally appropriate in an era of globalization and anxiety or not, it is how the religious or secular values are embraced and frame actions which is of consequence. It can be argued that notions of rationality or democracy are just as a culturally inscribed tradition or value. Weber (cited in Scott M Thomas 2004, p.135) suggests it is okay to embrace values as long as they don't obstruct the practical developmental goals. Religion, like democracy, can be used in a way that is detrimental to a local community. Religion and secular values should be equally open to critique.

The final significant obstacle facing the legitimacy and existence of RNGOs that I will address in this paper is when a state perceives an RNGO as a threat, imposition or inconvenience. RNGOs can be perceived by the state as embodying the expansion of a Western Christian agenda. Berger provides an example where:

The Eritrean government shut down clinics operated by the Presbyterian church and stipulated that religious organisations may fund but not initiate development projects... Because their association with a specific system of spiritual or theistic values along with a view to personal transformation, RNGOs raise difficult questions for governments and development organisations alike (2003, p.35).

RNGOs pose a problem for states when they try and influence the policy or ideology of a state. States can restrict the activities of RNGOs or deny funding on the basis that the RNGO does not adhere to accountability mechanisms or because they could instead be providing funding to local individuals or to NGOs. Despite this, states often revert to using RNGOs because they are already active within local communities and have the capacity to undertake programmes required by the state. Occasionally states, silently and reluctantly, recognise that RNGOs can often be a quicker, less costly and less complicated alternative to state run activities. Though this may be the case in a secular context such as Australia, when state legitimacy relies on a civic religion, such as in Thailand, RNGOs are not supported by the state and can be relatively ineffective.

Conclusion:

RNGOs face the complex challenge of consolidating a legitimate relationship between religion and development. Some theorists believe the two are irreconcilable while others believe religion and development to be appropriately matched. My paper has highlighted the diversity of perspectives on how religion and development should relate. By addressing the diversity of intent, practice and scholarly argument of RNGOs this paper argues RNGOs can legitimately administer aid, but they represent significant problems if they disengage from local values and structures, do not participate in international and domestic interreligious and non-religious dialogue and partnerships, or use religious absolutisms to judge local communities. How each individual RNGO engages with its religion - through its intent, its practices and its interaction in the local context - will determine the RNGOs legitimacy and problems it will face. Despite the lack of evidence supporting or contradicting the effectiveness of RNGOs, analysis suggests when RNGOs impose religion and where their religion does not correspond with the local community RNGOs are considered illegitimate, and they can have detrimental effects on local sustainability and culture. The imposition of religion can stimulate supremacy, intolerance, terrorism and

global fragmentation, but when embraced appropriately can make a positive contribution to civil society and humanitarian achievement.

References

Anhelm, Fritz Erich 1999, "Religion and Civil Society: What is the relationship between them?" in *CIVICUS, Civil Society at the Millennium*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press.

An-Na'im, Abdullahi 2002, "Religion and Global Civil Society: Inherent Incompatibility or Synergy and Interdependence" in Helmut Anheier, Marlies Glasius, and Mary Kaldor (eds.). *Global Civil Society 2002*. Oxford: Oxford University Press,

Berger, Julia 2003, "Religious Nongovernmental Organisations: An Exploratory Analysis" in *Voluntas*. 14: 1. March. pp.15-39.

Candland, Christopher 2000, "Faith as Social Capital: Religion and Community Development in Southern Asia" in *Policy Science*. 33. pp.355-374.

Clark, John 2001, "Ethical Globalisation" in Michael Edwards and John Gaventa (eds). *Global Citizen Action*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Dicklitch, Susan and Heather Rice 2004, "The Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) and Faith-Based NGO Aid to Africa" in *Development in Practice*. 14:5 August. pp.660-672.

Hailey, John "Indicators of Identity: NGOs and the Strategic Imperative of Assessing Core Values" in *Debating Development*. pp.163-170.

Hope, Anne and Sally Timmel 2003, "A Kenyan Experience for Faith-Based Transformative Action" in *Development*. 46:4 Local/Global Encounters. pp.93-99.

Keck, Margaret and Kathryn Sikkink 1998, "Historic Precursors to Modern Transnational Advocacy Networks" in Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink (eds). *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Kilby, Patrick 2006, "Accountability for Employment: Dilemmas Facing Non-Governmental Organizations" in *World Development*. 34:6, 2006. pp.951-963.

Kilby, Patrick 2004, "Nongovernmental Organisations and Accountability in an Era of Global Anxiety" in *Seton Hall of Diplomacy and International Relations*. Summer/Fall.

Leban, Mojca 2003, "Faith-Based NGOs in Bosnia and Herzegovina" in *IJNL*. 6:1 September 2003.

Manji, Firoze and Carl O'Coill 2002, "The Missionary Position: NGOs and Development in Africa" in *International Affairs*. 78:3. pp.567-583.

Thomas, George M 2001, "Religions in Global Civil Society" in *Sociology of Religion*. Winter. pp.1-14.

Thomas, Scott M 2004, "Building Communities of Character: Foreign Aid Policy and Faith-Based Organisations" in *SAIS Review*. XXIV: 2. Summer-Fall, 2004. pp.133-148.

Author contact: cat-crowe@hotmail.com