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Abstract
The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund (PWRDF) is the international development and relief agency of the Anglican Church of Canada. There are increasing expectations that relief and development work will be aligned with efforts to promote environmental sustainability. Resituating the principles that guide the work of the PWRDF within an eco-theological framework will not only provide a stronger theological rationale for the work of the PWRDF but will also link its relief and development work with efforts to promote environmental sustainability.
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INTRODUCTION

**Thesis Statement**

Theologian Douglas John Hall argues that “If the first presupposition is that there is something wrong with our civilization, the second is that there is sufficient wisdom, energy, and courage in the churches both to identify what is wrong and to begin to change it.”¹ Accordingly, the work of any church-based organisation that seeks to address that which is “wrong with our civilization” would undoubtedly benefit from a clearly articulated theology that will help it to “identify what is wrong and to begin to change it.” Various church-based organizations have sought to address some of the ills of our civilization through relief and development work. Increasingly, environmental stewardship is being recognised as an integral component of that relief and development work. Silo-thinking that had previously not only isolated human relief efforts from environmental concerns but had even made them hostile competitors is now being replaced with a new appreciation for the links between human health and ecosystem health, and human viability and planetary viability.²

---


² Theologian Larry Rasmussen articulates the need for a new way of thinking and acting that embraces the full integration of human beings and their environment. “If the great new fact of our time is that cumulative human activity has the power to affect all life in fundamental and unprecedented ways, then what might and ought to be is precisely what needs to be taken into account. This means the ascendancy of
The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund (PWRDF) is the international relief and development agency of the Anglican Church of Canada. There are increasing expectations that relief and development work will be aligned with efforts to promote environmental sustainability. This thesis will examine the policies and practices of the PWRDF and will determine that the PWRDF has not yet articulated a theological basis for its relief and development work. Accordingly, this thesis will suggest an eco-theological framework that can both inform and support the relief and development work of the PWRDF and link its relief and development work with efforts to promote environmentally sustainability.

Method

This thesis will follow a methodology of analysis, critique, and response, considered through a lens of eco-theological anthropology. This perspective considers the intricate interconnection between humans and the rest of God’s creation, embracing the goodness of creation even in the midst of suffering, and recognises human viability and justice as coupled with Earth viability and justice.

Analysis

Chapter One will begin with a brief overview of the work of the PWRDF including the overarching mission and vision of the organisation, its strategic themes, and the areas of its work in relief and development. The work of the PWRDF is primarily completed through partnerships established in communities in the global south. This ethics for our era, as an utterly practical affair. How *ought* we to live, and what *ought* we to do in view of a fundamentally changed human relationship to earth, a relationship we only partially comprehend?” Larry L. Rasmussen, *Earth Community, Earth Ethics* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1996), 5.
practice of partnership will therefore need to be reflected in the eco-theological framework, demonstrating that Christians “are not exempt from the world’s pain; rather, they stand in this world and take part in its groaning.”

This chapter will include a brief outline of how the culture of the PWRDF (both the Board of Directors and staff) has grown to articulate a desire for more eco-friendly principles and practices. A brief history of environmental concerns within the PWRDF will be described, specifically the “Environmental Policy” and the “Environmental Assessment Sheet.”

The current “Environment Policy” of the PWRDF, approved in April 2002, was based on guidelines from secular organisations and therefore lacks an adequate theological basis. As a religion-based agency, the PWRDF’s policies should demonstrate a “spiritual counterbalance,” without which “the material emphasis in modern thinking about development may actually be detrimental to the personal and societal betterment it purports to bring about.”

The PWRDF needs a new policy which will both include an eco-theological framework and demonstrate how that theology will inform and support the PWRDF’s work. One aim of this work will be to ensure that future relief and development work does not cause any additional ecological harm. While the intention of the PWRDF has never been to inflict harm upon the planet, current research reveals that most human endeavours (even those with the best of intentions) have often had negative consequences for the planet. Accordingly, relief agencies like the PWRDF must discern

---

3 Marijke Hoek argues that the entirety of creation suffers when there is environmental degradation, and that humans are in an unique position to partner with the Earth in an effort to ensure justice for all. Christians have a particular responsibility due to their faith. Marijke Hoek, “Divine Power in Human Weakness,” in Marijke Hoek and Justin Thacker (eds.), Micah’s Challenge: The Church’s Responsibility to the Global Poor (Milton Keynes UK: Paternoster Publishing, 2008), 54-55.

if their relief efforts are unintentionally causing harm to the planet. This discussion will also consider some of the benefits of having a clearly articulated eco-theological framework for the PWRDF’s mission and ministry. The most significant benefits would be: to ensure that the work of the PWRDF is consistent with the theology of the Anglican Church of Canada; to act as a means of strengthening connections between members of the Anglican Church and the PWRDF; and to ensure that the work of the PWRDF follows environmental stewardship.

**Critique**

In order to respond to the weaknesses discerned through the analysis, Chapter Two will begin by briefly identifying how some secular aid agencies operate without clear guidelines for environmental sustainability, and consequently are actually harming the people they are purporting to assist because they are harming the eco-systems in which these people live. Cross-cutting issues such as the environment, gender, participation, and rights, are seen to be ‘development’s poor cousins’ as interest in them “has come in waves, and only the future will tell whether the current interest will be sustained.”  

Current interest towards environmental sustainability has become integral to relief and development work.  

---


6 The United Nations’ 7th Millennium Development Goal, “Ensure Environmental Sustainability” identifies as a target: “Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes; reverse loss of environmental resources.” See: The United Nations General Assembly, “Goal 7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability,” www.un.org/millenniumgoals/environ.shtml. Since the development of the Millennium Development Goals, the Canadian International Development Agency, which funds relief and development agencies such as the PWRDF, requires agencies to demonstrate that they have policies compliant with the MDGs as a necessary component of funding applications. See: Canadian International Development Agency, “Your Guide to Working With CIDA,” http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/acdi-cida/ACDI-CIDA.nsf/eng/NIC-56143212-PRB.
Christian theologians are increasingly calling for “a new theology of nature and a new ethic for the earth.”7 As such, faith-based aid agencies are adding Christian values of care for creation to existing environmental interests. While the theology behind this care for creation can be articulated in several ways, this thesis will focus on three: by understanding the communion between humans and the rest of God’s creation; by re-considering the role of humans as part of the ecosystem; and by recognising the potential for all to be contributors to a community.

Considering the communion between humans and the rest of creation, as human activity increasingly overwhelms the Earth’s systems, “[a] truly human intimacy with the earth and with the entire natural world is needed.”8 Such intimacy views God as active within the created world and invites humans to demonstrate their faith through a respect for the Earth. Humans will be invited to celebrate unlimited compassion and shared responsibility by responding to the “ongoing disruption of the basic connectedness with the whole of the universe and with its Creator” through self-limitation and an awareness of the connection of Earth health and human health.9

The second focus will re-consider the role of the humans as part of the ecosystem rather than separate from it. Current structures of development and progress that encourage and require human supremacy over the environment will be rejected. Furthermore, the notion of dominion will be rejected, reconsidering the human-earth relationship to be one of stewardship, moving from a functional and financial understanding of stewardship to a more complex one of partnership in which the faithful

---


9 Leonardo Boff, Cry of the Earth, Cry of the Poor (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1997), 81.
“respond to the earth and to the whole cosmos with respect and with wonder.” The notion of *imago Dei* will also be reconsidered, not as an assertion of domination, but as an invitation to embrace the responsibility of dominion. In this understanding of dominion, “imaging God is acting in a godly way toward one another and other creatures. Imaging God is loving earth fiercely, as God does.”

The third theological element informing a care of creation asserts that every individual has a role within the universe story. In communities where relief and development work is necessary, not all members of the community are contributing to their fullest potential. As such, every member of the community – human and other-than-human alike – must have their role recognised, then be enabled and empowered to fulfill that role in promoting the health of the community. The denial of such contribution denies the essence of that individual. All members of a community bear the potential to be contributors, subject to the rights and restrictions of all other members of that community. As the understanding of community evolves, its future shape “depends on the entire earth in the unity of its organic functioning, on its geological and biological as well as its human members.”

**Response**

Chapter Three will provide an eco-theological framework for the PWRDF, derived from eco-theological sources as well as from studies on the environmental

---

13 Berry, *The Dream of the Earth*, 23.
assessment of international relief and development, which were explored in the Critique step reported in the previous chapter.

As “concern for the poor has always been at the heart of the missional sense of the church,” the PWRDF’s relief and development work will respond to immediate needs and challenge structural imbalances in a number of carefully planned, sustainable ways. The PWRDF and its partners will develop and support education which explores sustainable practices and rationales, decreased dependencies on outside agencies, and increased benefit of exposure to the natural world. This new education will ultimately focus on living in full communion, which will necessitate radical new cultural forms that will “place the human within the dynamics of the planet rather than place the planet within the dynamics of the human.”

Summary

The connection of humans to their natural environment needs to be more than use, analysis, or appreciation. For relief and development work to focus on sustainability, it must be based on within an eco-theological framework. This relief and development work must also be completed with a full understanding and integration of environmental (and other) impacts. Christian aid agencies, such as the PWRDF, who recognise their responsibilities to the natural world, have the potential to be “a leavening influence on the


societies of which they are a part.”\textsuperscript{16} The involvement of Christians has had major impacts on social issues in the past, including the abolition of slavery, the establishment of American civil rights, the overthrow of repressive communism in eastern Europe, and the fall of apartheid in South Africa: it may well be that Christians could have a similar impact on action to address global climate change.”\textsuperscript{17}

At this time, there is a distinct lack of an articulated eco-theology within the Christian relief and development community. The agencies of several mainstream church traditions have developed resources concerning the ecological impact of their relief and development work, yet they have not yet articulated the theological basis for that work.\textsuperscript{18}

The proposed eco-theological framework within this thesis will promote environmental stewardship as a priority in the work of the PWRDF. While this framework will require a new Environmental Assessment to be created, and new means for assessing projects and programmes, that work lies beyond the scope of this thesis.


\textsuperscript{17} Nick Spencer, Robert White and Virginia Vrobletsky, \textit{Christianity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Living} (Peabody MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2009), 85.

\textsuperscript{18} This was confirmed in early 2011 in conversation with representatives of KAIROS, Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace, Presbyterian World Service & Development, and Canadian Lutheran World Relief.


CHAPTER ONE:
THE ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT OF
THE PRIMATE’S WORLD RELIEF AND DEVELOPMENT FUND

Chapter One will articulate the structure and work of the PWRDF as the agency for international relief and development of the Anglican Church of Canada. Having first identified the lack of an articulated eco-theology within the PWRDF, this chapter will then identify three benefits of adopting an eco-theological framework for the relief and development work of the PWRDF.

Context

The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund “was created in 1959 as a ministry of the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada” in response to the Springhill, Nova Scotia mining disaster.¹⁹ The PWRDF is the Anglican Church of Canada's agency to deal with issues pertaining to sustainable development, relief, refugees, and global justice. Separately incorporated in 2000, the PWRDF remains an essential part of the ministry of the Anglican Church, sharing office space with the General Synod and participating in major Church governing bodies. Governed by an elected Board of Directors, the PWRDF aims to be part of the outreach ministry of every parish and “an expression for all Anglicans of their baptismal covenant to strive for justice and peace and to respect the dignity of every human being” through extensive Diocesan, parish, and refugee networks. The PWRDF is financially supported by

donations from members of these networks; additionally the PWRDF presently receives a generous CIDA grant.\(^{20}\)

In addition to emergency response, the relief and development work of the PWRDF is organised around three regional programmes (Africa, Asia-Pacific, and Indigenous Communities and Latin America-Caribbean). Within these regions, work is categorised into a number of sectors: gender, maternal and child health, disease education and care (including HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other preventable diseases), nutrition and food security, water and sanitation, youth, primary health, and rural development.\(^{21}\) This work is primarily completed through partnerships established in the communities receiving relief and development support. These partnerships are cultivated by experienced staff, and regional representatives are included on the PWRDF’s Board of Directors.\(^{22}\) By encouraging local action and local involvement in the relief and development process, the PWRDF establishes and nurtures relationships of temporary assistance rather than long-term dependency. The PWRDF partners receiving aid

---

\(^{20}\) The PWRDF’s CIDA programme is currently funded by an annual grant of $1,106,250. See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Programme Profile: CIDA” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2011), 1.

\(^{20}\) Additional historical and structural information for the PWRDF can be seen at The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund. “Who We Are,” and, The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Programme Profile: Public Engagement” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2011), 2.


\(^{22}\) At the time of writing, one partner from each region of work is appointed to the Board of Directors – namely, from Africa, Asia-Pacific, Latin America-Caribbean, and Canadian Indigenous Communities. See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, Board of Director’s Manual, 224-232.
understand that their temporary state of weakness “does not equate to powerlessness but rather it forms the occasion for God’s power to overcome.”

The PWRDF Board of Directors is comprised of members of the Anglican laity, clergy and bishops representing geographic and gender balances while meeting diverse skills and experience requirements. The Board is accountable to the PWRDF membership, consisting of the Anglican Dioceses of Canada.

The PWRDF operates on basic Guiding Principles, divided into two categories (things affirmed, and things denounced). Despite a declaration of belief in “a theology of action, in response to God’s call, that strives to make a positive impact in a world of suffering,” there is no scriptural foundation provided for these principles. The affirmations focus on how humans are to benefit from the PWRDF’s development work. The specified ‘ways of working’ promote partnerships and processes that empower all those involved in the relief and development process. The denunciations

24 Additional structural information for the PWRDF can be seen in The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Who We Are.”
26 “PWRDF’s development work revolves around five main principles, all aimed at attacking the root causes of poverty and violence and promoting the basic right to development: 1. We contribute to provision of basic necessities for all people living in vulnerable and emergency situations, especially those in situations of crisis and extreme marginalisation; 2. We promote human rights and freedom so that all people will be able to benefit from their own development; 3. We foster development processes consistent with preserving the integrity of creation and people’s right to live in a safe and healthy environment; 4. We work for the creation and strengthening of just and accountable social, economic, political institutions and structures at the global level that facilitate the advancement of human freedom and respect for human rights; 5. We advocate for changes to policies and practices of Canadian actors that contribute to the perpetuation of global injustices.” Ibid., 11.
27 “We believe that there is a direct and positive relationship between how we work and development success. The principles that guide PWRDF’s ‘ways of working’ are as follows: 1. We recognise people as the authors of their own development; 2. We commit to development processes that are inclusive, respectful of each other, and based upon a participatory approach; 3. We base our work within a framework of socio-economic, cultural, civil, and political rights, respecting the principles of equality and non-discrimination; 4. We strive to create development relationships based on partnership, solidarity, and
section identifies systems of negative human impact against which the PWRDF works, at both individual and systematic levels.\textsuperscript{28}

The ethos of the PWRDF is articulated in its vision, mission, and values. These have recently been amended to be more clear, concise, and inclusive. The vision aspires to “[a] truly just, healthy, and peaceful world” while the mission statement toward achieving that goal reads: “As an instrument of faith, PWRDF connects Anglicans in Canada to communities around the world in dynamic partnerships to advance development, respond to emergencies, assist refugees and act for positive change.”\textsuperscript{29} The articulated value of the PWRDF is the biblical challenge of Micah (“What does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?”).\textsuperscript{30} The PWRDF’s response to this value is articulated in four specific areas of the “Strategic Plan 2012-2015:” mutuality, giving and receiving, the beauty and harmony of mutual exchange; 5. We are open to partnerships that transcend denominational, religious, and ideological divides while staying true to our own Christian and Anglican roots and principles; 6. We pledge to maintain relationships and ‘ways of working’ that are accountable and transparent; 7. We confront sources of injustice in non-violent ways.” The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, \textit{Board of Director’s Manual}, 12.

\textsuperscript{28} “What we denounce: 1. The chronic, systematic, and enforced nature of poverty and suffering in the world; 2. The concentration of power in the hands of the few, and the use of violence and human rights abuses as the means of retaining that power; 3. All forms of social marginalisation in the world, including those based upon national or ethnic origin, race, class, religious identity, political persuasion, gender, sexual orientation or age; 4. Patriarchal practices that create discrimination and inequality between men and women; 5. Development ideologies that promote abstract processes over human needs and desires; 6. Practices that allow institutional preservation to take precedence over our work to promote human freedom; 7. The greed that allows unceasing environmental degradation and the exploitative use and ownership of the earth’s finite resources; 8. Ongoing and unresolved injustices in the world; 9. The silence of those who benefit from privilege created by oppression.” Ibid., 12.

\textsuperscript{29} The changed vision and mission statements were approved by the Board of Directors, November 2010, motions B/10/11/182 and B/10/11/183. The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting November 3-5 2010,” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2010), 20-21.

\textsuperscript{30} Micah 6:8, NRSV.
creation, and solidarity with the oppressed. The four goals of the “Strategic Plan 2012-2015” include strengthening humanitarian response, strengthening work in sustainable community development, nurturing dynamic partnerships, and working toward financial sustainability for programmes, with specific directions identified for actualizing these goals.

The “Strategic Plan 2012-2015” reflects significant changes in the culture of the PWRDF, particularly in the aid industry in general (through such events as the staff re-structuring in 2010), and in the world as a whole (such as through membership in alliances). Within the context the former, for example, the PWRDF decision to strengthen its humanitarian response recognises that “[c]limate change is likely to produce more extreme events than at present, droughts that last several years, or floods that are more ferocious, and this is likely to be a bigger problem for agriculture than is the

---

31 The extended definition of these goals reads as follows: “Mutuality: The means by which people have equal access to what they need to live life abundantly. Giving and receiving: The means by which decisions are made for sustainable community development, social justice and human rights. The Beauty and Harmony of Creation: A lens through which we seek to contribute to a healthy environment and uphold the integrity of creation. Solidarity with the oppressed: Our Gospel mandate to identify with the vulnerable and the suffering, and to work with those who challenge poverty, violence and other injustice.” See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Strategic Plan 2012-2015,” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2011), 1.

32 The “Strategic Plan 2012-2015” was approved in principle by the Board in May 2011, by motion B/11/05/213, to be forwarded to the PWRDF Staff to inform the operational plan which is to be returned for final approval at the November 2011 Board meeting. See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting May 4-6 2011,” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2011), 19.


34 In 2009 the PWRDF staff underwent a significant staff re-structuring, and voted to unionise. See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Strategic Plan 2012-2015: Edge Habitat, A Reflection on PWRDF Context,” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2011), 1-2.

35 Many relief and development agencies are doing work through membership in alliances, such as ACT Alliance, the Canadian Council for International Cooperation. Furthermore, the new policy on untied aid allows international competitive bidding, which means that “Canadian suppliers, as with suppliers from other Committee member countries and Least Developed Countries, are eligible to bid on such projects.” See Canadian International Development Agency, “Your Guide to Working With CIDA.”
average temperature change,” thereby escalating the need for humanitarian responses. The articulated valuation of the beauty and harmony of creation, while identifying environment as a cross-cutting issue, acknowledges the complexity of climate change as “not one big, intractable problem but billions of tiny, tractable ones.” As such, the PWRDF does not intend to engage specifically in environmental programmes within this Strategic Plan, but will place intentional focus on evaluating environmental impacts within programmes and projects. To that end, the Board of Directors has included “environment” into the skills matrix utilised by the Nominations Committee when evaluating Board composition.

This overview offers a brief account of the history and structure of the PWRDF as the relief and development agency of the Anglican Church of Canada. As such, this context provides the basis for examining the growing culture of ecological concern within the PWRDF.

A Culture of Ecological Concern

“[W]hile humans increasingly dominate nature, we have proven to be very poor managers of natural systems.” Acknowledging that the need is not for better management of creature by humans, but a better management of humans by humans, the issue of environmental sustainability has been discussed within the Anglican Church for a

36 Spencer, White and Vrobleisky, Christianity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Living, 38.
37 Ibid., 62.
39 The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting May 4-6 2011,” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2010), Appendix E.
number of years. Based in the understanding that “religion not only should help effect our conversion to earth but can help it,” the PWRDF tries to provide a means through which to actualise this conversion. These efforts include the PWRDF “Environment Policy” (approved by the Board of Directors in April 2002); the creation of a staff task force (established in 2004 to oversee implementation of the “Environment Policy” and to provide an update to the Board of Directors in 2009); the development of a list of “Institutional Practices” (created and implemented in 2006); an “Environmental Analysis Sheet” (which partners must complete prior to receiving funding); the articulation of “the natural environment” as a cross-cutting issue (first articulated in the “2007-2010 Strategic Plan”); the suggestion of “healing Mother Earth” as a strategic


42 Rasmussen, Earth Community, Earth Ethics, 10.

43 The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Environment Policy” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2002)


45 The “Institutional Practices” within the PWRDF office include: working towards a user- and environmentally-friendly docket; recycling paper; making paper note blocks from used paper; being mindful of content and quality of photocopying. The practices for meetings and gatherings include: use of reusable plates, cups, knives and forks; providing pitchers of water rather than bottled water; use of fair trade coffee and tea, and support of Church House use of same; providing as much as possible locally made and produced food for gatherings; and providing Blue Boxes at Board meetings for the recycling of paper. See Ibid., 1.

46 Ibid., 3-4.

theme (made by the Board of Directors in November 2010); and the articulated value of “the beauty and harmony of creation” identified in the “Strategic Plan 2012-2015.”

Recognising that “natural law orients human persons to the pursuit of the good in their actions,” the “Environment Policy” highlights the PWRDF’s pursuit of the good concerning care for creation. The “Environment Policy,” however, needs to be updated from its 2002 edition both to incorporate advances in environmental science and changes in the global situation, and to reflect and inspire involvement from all levels of constituents to maintain the ‘spirit of partnership’ upon which the PWRDF functions. An updated “Environment Policy” is necessary for the work of the PWRDF to effectively “contribute towards eliminating poverty and developing a greater level of justice.”

The current “Environment Policy” statement, written in 2002, identifies three commitments of the PWRDF: 1. promoting sustainable practices; 2. planning, monitoring and evaluation with partners; and 3. conforming to guidelines of secular agencies. The policy articulates that the PWRDF is committed to the promotion of sustainable practices that improve both the natural environment and the holistic quality of the lives of people and their communities. In the programmes it supports [the] PWRDF commits itself to participatory needs assessment, planning, activity and site selection, implementation, monitoring and evaluation processes with its partners that enhance the natural and sociocultural environments, and to integration of environmental objectives with other objectives. Moreover, [the] PWRDF commits itself to act in conformity with the environmental policy guidelines and analytic

---

48 This theme was not included as the format of the “Strategic Plan 2012-2015” changed from that of the 2007-2010 version. See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting November 3-5 2010,” 22.


frameworks of the Canadian International Development Agency and the Canadian Council of International Cooperation. 52

Although these commitments claim to be “rooted in scriptural teachings that link creation, justice and redemption,” no scriptural references are made. 53

While the goal of the “Environment Policy” is “to enhance the mission of [the] PWRDF by contributing to ecological stewardship,” for which imprecise and indeterminate suggestions are made, the policy does not, however, identify how these actions will enhance the mission itself. 54 However, there are two rationales given for the policy. The first reflects the “sustained commitment of the Anglican Communion” to respond to “God’s call for renewal of the earth.” The second “seeks to promote a healthy environment as part of building a moral political economy” and suggests “repayment of the ‘earth deficit.’” 55 Both of these need to be updated, as much work has happened within the relief and development field since the time when the policy was written. For example, the three-year Canadian Ecumenical Jubilee Initiative project is mentioned,

53 See Ibid., 2-3.
54 In the “Environment Policy, the goal states that contributions will be “through respect for, and awareness of the natural environment; the promotion of its just and proper use, and self-critical reflection for remedial environmental action on the part of its staff, partners, supporters and constituencies.” There is no requirement as to quantity of actions to be undertaken by partners, nor to the extent in which they are to be followed. Furthermore, there is no specified provision for follow-up by staff. Ibid., 2.
55 Thomas Berry claims that ‘deficit’ often refers to GNP, national debt, annual budgetary deficits, infrastructure disintegration requiring repairs, trade deficits, Third World loans unlikely to be repaid, or military expenditures. “All of these can be considered in some manner as financial deficits, leading eventually to what I have termed earth deficit.” The earth deficit is “the deficit involved in the closing down of the basic life system of the planet through abuse of the air, the soil, the water, and the vegetation. ...the earth deficit is the real deficit, the ultimate deficit, the deficit in some of its major consequences so absolute as to be beyond adjustment from any source in heaven or on earth. Since the earth system is the ultimate guarantee of all deficits, a failure here is a failure of the last resort. Neither economic viability nor improvements in life conditions for the poor can be realized in such circumstances. These can only worsen, especially when we consider the rising population levels throughout the developing world. This deficit in its extreme expression is not only a resource deficit, but the death of a living process, not simply the death of a living process, but of the living process, a living process which exists, so far as we know, only on the planet earth.” See Berry, The Dream of the Earth, 72.
while the Millennium Development Goals are not; the work from the past decade is absent; some terminology has become somewhat obsolete (such as “global warming”).

The policy goes on to provide an analytic framework for the environmental component of programme implementation. This framework identifies that environmental assessment will systematically integrate human and non-human environmental factors within the planning of programmes in a manner that promotes sustainable development and documents the process. This framework, however, allows for the exclusion of certain programmes and projects which do not have an immediate environmental impact, seemingly rejecting the very notion of environment as a cross-cutting issue within the work of the PWRDF. The “Strategic Plan 2012-2015” identifies environmental responsibility as a cross-cutting issue or “primary concern” (along with finance, gender, justice, and human rights), seeing these as “issues which touch on all aspects of our work, not as stand-alone pieces of the Plan.” If, then, the environment is to be respected as fully cross-cutting, it must not be excluded from assessment and planning (both immediate and long-term) of any programme or project supported by the PWRDF.

According to the 2002 “Environment Policy,” programmes and projects involving physical work (as defined by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act) are subject to environmental assessment as early as possible in the planning stage. Those projects expected to produce “significant adverse environmentally effects” are not to be funded, though alternative solutions may be proposed. Projects expected to have relatively minor

---


57 This exclusion allows that “[p]rojects exclusively involving such programming as good governance, community organizing, public education, human resource development, capacity building, human rights advocacy, and research may, with documented diligence, be screened out of this analytic framework process.” See Ibid., 4.

environmental impact (which are therefore not subject to CEAA standards) undergo an alternate assessment. These alternative assessments are facilitated by best management practices and checklists available from secular agencies such as CIDA, and do not reflect scriptural foundations. These alternative assessments are to be completed by the partner organizations, potentially leading to a lack of consistency in the reporting.

The implementation of the 2002 “Environment Policy” was to take place within one year. The work was divided into four organizational components: 1. “support for public policy and education on global warming and Canadian societal consumption” was designed to be an on-going piece of work with lead responsibility held by KAIROS Canada (of which the PWRDF is a member); 2. “development education,” a training session where Development Team staff were made aware of the new “Environment Policy” in order to integrate it into the programmes they oversaw, was planned and carried out by the PWRDF development staff within the year; 3. “institutional practices” were developed by early 2003 by the newly formed PWRDF Staff Reference Group in order to integrate the mandate of the “Environment Policy” within the work of the

59 All of the PWRDF projects involving physical work will ask the questions: “How have any environmental objectives been integrated into the projects other objectives? What are the environmental features of the project site? What project components could lead to adverse environmental effects? What are these effects? What is their significance? What effect might the natural environment have on the project? What strategies and specific measures will be implemented to alleviate or eliminate any negative effects and increase its benefits? How will the project be monitored to ensure the effective implementation of these measures?” Those meeting the CEAA standard will also address the following factors: “the environmental effects of the project, including the environmental effects of malfunctions or accidents that may occur in connection with the project and any cumulative environmental effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with other projects or activities that have been or will be carried out; the significance of those effects; comments received from the public, if any; measures that are technically and economically feasible and that would mitigate any significant adverse environmental effects of the project; and any other relevant matters such as the need for the project and alternatives to the project.” See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Environment Policy,” 4-5.

60 The PWRDF continues to support KAIROS Canada (through funding and promotion) in their environmental advocacy and educational work, though the PWRDF is not directly involved. The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Update on the Implementation of the PWRDF Environment Policy,” 1-2.
PWRDF staff and volunteers; and 4. “programming around the theme of building a moral economy relating to the environment” was designed to be an ongoing piece of work by the PWRDF Development Programme staff. This led to an internal Environmental Analysis of all programmes funded by the PWRDF within the year (2002), and those requiring an in-depth environmental assessment (as per the requirements articulated above) were to be initiated by the partner organization by March of 2003.\(^{61}\)

The “Project/Programme Environmental Analysis Sheet” was updated and finalised in 2006 (see Appendix A).\(^ {62}\) This analysis, completed by staff, provided staff with a concise overview of the environmental component for each CIDA-funded project and programme. In 2008, staff decided that all new projects and programmes would undergo a similar analysis.\(^ {63}\) If further assessment was required, a simple checklist would be sent to the partner for completion.\(^ {64}\) Partners were asked to list any perceived problematic environmental features and identify strategies or measures to mitigate, alleviate or eliminate the negative effects, subject to monitoring; in-country firms would

---

\(^{61}\) This infographic of the PWRDF Environment Policy Implementation Planning can be seen in The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, *Board of Directors Manual*, 163.

\(^{62}\) The Sheet was translated into French, Spanish, and Portuguese to facilitate use with partners. The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Update on the Implementation of the PWRDF Environment Policy,” 1.

\(^{63}\) The questions ascertain whether a partner has an environmental policy, if environmental considerations were integrated within the project’s objectives, what the environmental impacts of the project would be, if the community (especially women and marginalised groups) had been involved in the impact discussion, and if the project will require an environmental assessment as per CEAA standards. Ibid., 3.

\(^{64}\) The checklist required an assessment of areas and type of change. Areas include: “surface water, ground water, soils, vegetation, animals, fish & aquatic, socio-economic (population and culture), number of sites, and the effect of environment on project/programme.” (The latter area corresponds to question 3 of the Environmental Analysis Sheet and should read “impact” rather than “effect” as it is attempting to specify the connections between the environment and the project or programme being considered.) The types include: Positive (either preservation/conservation or rehabilitation), Neutral (no change expected), Negative (insignificant, significant and mitigable, significant and unmitigable) or unknown. Ibid., 3.
be engaged to assist in conducting assessments and writing any required reports. While the intention of the process undoubtedly is to provide an analytical assessment of human impact on the environment within the relief and development work, the assessments lack consistent follow-through.

While there are environmental components within existing development programmes supported by the PWRDF, the primary focus of these programmes rests in other areas such as food security, health, water, nutrition, etc. These foci are easily categorised through the results-based management style of reporting used by the PWRDF. The environmental impacts, however, tend not to be easily categorised within this style of reporting and as a result are not reported. The PWRDF does not currently support any projects or programmes that are specifically ecologically based, nor is there an intention to do so within the 2011/2012 year, according to budgeted allocations.

Much of the work in humanitarian response of the PWRDF responds to “communities in crisis where people’s lives have been severely or totally disrupted” due to natural

---


66 For example, the food security programme run by UBINIG (Bangladesh) also promotes “educating the community to protect the biodiversity that will ensure a healthy balance of the eco-system” through such activities as seed saving. See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Programme Profile: CIDA,” 2. The self-sustaining agriculture programme of Gami Seva Sevana (Sri Lanka) teaches farming in a manner which “promotes environmentally-friendly organic agriculture.” See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Programme Profile: Asia-Pacific,” 3. The Directorate of Social Services of the Anglican Church of Kenya is doing rural development work; including linking health with food security, clean water, and nutrition. See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Programme Profile: Africa,” 2. Partners in Latin America and the Caribbean are focusing on community development programmes, part of which acknowledges environmental sustainability. See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Programme Profile: Indigenous Communities and Latin America-Caribbean Development,” 1-3.

67 This style of reporting is necessary for CIDA proposals. Canadian International Development Agency, “Your Guide to Working With CIDA.”

disasters. The results-based management style of reporting does not assess the environmental impacts of the work of the PWRDF in both development and relief work. Without this environmental impact reporting, it is impossible to determine how the PWRDF’s financial grants have been allocated towards environmental aspects of the relief and development work. What can be seen, however, is an increase in the number of emergency response allocations (including designated donations to high-profile disasters) as the number of natural disasters increases.

---

69 Approximately 26 million people live as Internally Displaced People while 14 million flee their countries and live in refugee camps or slums. The PWRDF supports refugee programmes (such as the Anglican Cathedral in Cairo and OfERR), and emergency response (such as the earthquake in Haiti and the floods in Kingcome Outlet, BC). See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Programme Profile: Humanitarian Response” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2011), 1-4.

70 For example, in 2003-2004 the PWRDF supported 34 relief projects covering 31 emergencies totalling $396,965; in 2004-2005 32 projects covering 29 emergencies (including the Asian Tsunami response) totalling $1,402,099; in 2005-2006 44 projects covering 33 emergencies (including Hurricane Katrina response) totalling $1,647,353; in 2006-2007 37 projects covering 32 emergencies totalling $1,425,137; in 2007-2008 42 projects covering 37 emergencies totalling $403,186. Reporting styles changed in the 2008-2009 fiscal year; partially as streamlined reports no longer identified individual communities being aided but grouped response by emergency, and partially as the PWRDF generously supported the “Rapid Response Revolving Fund” of Action by Churches Together, thereby supporting ACT partners to offer relief services through their partners on behalf of the PWRDF. This support of ACT, while a more effective system of delivering emergency aid, does not allow comparable data in the grants and allocations documentation. Donations, however, continued to be generous, with allocations for 2008-2009 totalling $827,799 and in 2009-2010 (including the Haitian earthquake response) over $2.2million (with $1,241,328 allocated). See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Grants: A list of projects supported by the PWRDF in 2004” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2004), 1-2; The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Summary of Allocations, 01 April–30 September 2003” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2003), 1-2; The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Summary of Allocations, 01 October–31 March 2004” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2004), 1-2; The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Grants: A list of projects supported by the PWRDF in 2005” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2005), 1-2; The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Summary of Allocations, 01 April–30 September 2004” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2004), 1-2; The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Summary of Allocations, 01 October–31 March 2005” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2005), 1-2; The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Grants: A list of projects supported by the PWRDF in 2006” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2006), 1-2; The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Summary of Allocations, 01 April–30 September 2005” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2005), 1-2; The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Grants: A list of projects supported by the PWRDF in 2007” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2007), 1-2; The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Summary of Allocations, 01 October–31 March 2007” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2007), 1-2; The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Grants: A list of projects...
As this trend continues, it will become necessary for the PWRDF to become more intentional in the reporting of the environmental impact of their relief and development work.

A new “Environment Policy” is required to inform the systems and practices of the environmental components in the ongoing work of the PWRDF. While some of the PWRDF reporting is logically patterned on CIDA requirements, as a scripturally-based organisation, the policy will best suit the needs of the PWRDF if it is based not only in a secular or corporate framework, but also in one of an eco-theological framework. The integration of these frameworks will support relief and development work in fully sustainable ways. Rasmussen argues that

[s]ystems and practices largely determine our lives, and the systems and practices of even green globalism are massively faulty. Wrapping the environment around a globalizing economy as the centrepiece of sustainability is the extension of a course with deep roots in earth-destructive modernity, rather than the needed paths not yet taken. The roots are institutional (corporations and nation-states) as well as sociopsychological, cultural, and epistemological (humans as a set-apart manager-engineer-entrepreneur-consumer species).71

Under a new “Environment Policy,” the PWRDF’s work would reject such faulty systems and practices and work to create a new sustainable structure for relief and development work based in an eco-theological foundation.

71 Rasmussen, Earth Community, Earth Ethics, 328.
Benefits of an Eco-Theological Framework

Although there are many benefits of having an eco-theological framework, this thesis will focus on three that apply directly to the PWRDF’s mission and ministry.

These benefits will be: 1) to ensure that the work of the PWRDF reflects the theology of the Anglican Church of Canada; 2) to strengthen connections between members of the Anglican Church and the PWRDF; 3) to ensure that the work of the PWRDF is consistent in its application of environmental stewardship. The articulation of these three benefits will demonstrate how a clearly articulated eco-theology is needed to form an Environment Policy that will benefit the relief and development work of the PWRDF.

1. Ensuring that the work of the PWRDF reflects the theology of the Anglican Church of Canada

As a component of the Anglican Church of Canada, the PWRDF’s work should have a theological base that informs its mission, judgements, culture, etc. The work of the PWRDF already has an environmental component and is arguably trying to become more ecological and sustainable, yet it still requires an eco-theological focus. This eco-theology will ensure that the work completed by the PWRDF is in line with the mission of the Anglican Church of Canada. Without such an eco-theological framework, the relief and development work done may be understood simply as philanthropy rather than as an act of faith. There are four aspects of the mission of the Anglican Church of Canada that merit distinct consideration in this context: 1) the heritage of biblical faith; 2) the focus on reason; 3) the call to better stewardship in God’s creation, and 4) the call
toward a stronger resolve in challenging attitudes and structures that cause injustice. The first two are articulated as values, the others as a response to God’s call.72

The focus on scripture and reason reference the “material ingredients of the Anglican synthesis.”73 It must be noted that while relevant scriptural passages will be acknowledged, a deep textual analysis lies beyond the scope of this thesis. More than a component of self-definition, Anglicans believe that “Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation.”74 The actions of the Church must, therefore, reflect the messages of those scriptures. A distinct connection must be made linking the cause for an environmental focus in the work of the PWRDF with the Holy Scriptures, such as the Hosea depiction of the voice of the earth in her oppression.75

In addition to scripture, Anglicans also value reason as a basis of their faith, and “[t]he ecological crisis challenges us to be reasonable.”76 The PWRDF must therefore demonstrate how the environmental component of its relief and development work is a logical extrapolation of the Church’s mission. Anglicans celebrate the gift of “memory,

---

72 The Anglican Church of Canada’s mission statement reads: “As a partner in the worldwide Anglican Communion and in the universal Church, we proclaim and celebrate the gospel of Jesus Christ in worship and action. We value our heritage of biblical faith, reason, liturgy, tradition, bishops and synods, and the rich variety of our life in community. We acknowledge that God is calling us to greater diversity of membership, wider participation in ministry and leadership, better stewardship in God’s creation and a stronger resolve in challenging attitudes and structures that cause injustice. Guided by the Holy Spirit, we commit ourselves to respond to this call in love and service and so more fully live the life of Christ.” See The General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada, “Our Beliefs.”

73 Anglican self-definition is sometimes referred to as a three-legged stool; the components of Scripture, Reason and Tradition are considered equally important yet potentially separate. See Paul Avis, “What is Anglicanism?,” in Stephen Sykes, John Booty and Jonathan Knights (eds.) The Study of Anglicanism, eds. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1988), 464.

74 This is the 6th of the 39 Articles. See The General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada, The Book of Common Prayer (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1959), 700.


reason and skill,” and so require that the relief and development work of their Church incorporate expert advice into its actions. For four decades, such environmental experts “have warned us that the present form of development is threatening the viability of the human project within the ecosystems of the planet.” As the Church’s instrument of that faith, an eco-theological framework will link the PWRDF’s environmentally sustainable work with reason to better serve the mission of the Anglican Church of Canada.

The mission of the Anglican Church of Canada further articulates an invitation for Anglicans to respond to God’s call, both for better stewardship in God’s creation, and to challenge attitudes and structures that cause injustice. These ideals address a call to action in the present and future Church. This call to action challenges Canadian Anglicans “to reflect more deeply on our purposes and to align them with our best understanding of God’s purposes.”

Stewardship is specifically identified as an area of interest within the mission of the Anglican Church, on which the PWRDF is called to reflect. While the theological basis for stewardship is not given until Chapter Two of this thesis, the call to environmental stewardship will be briefly discussed here. This call responds to the ever-increasing awareness that “[e]nvironmental crises result when humans deny their place in creation as its integrated consciousness reflecting on itself and as its complexity evolving...

---

77 These gifts are celebrated in Eucharistic Prayer #4. The General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada, The Book of Alternative Services (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1985), 201.


79 Herman Daly, quoted in Spencer, White and Vroblesky, Christianity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Living, 220-221.

80 It must be noted that some scholars are dissatisfied with the notion of stewardship. See, for example, H. Paul Santmire, “Partnership with nature according to the scriptures: Beyond the theology of stewardship,” Christian Scholar’s Review, 32, no. 4 (Summer 2003): 381-412. However, further analysis of this topic lies beyond the restraints of this thesis.
beyond itself.” The increased desire for a clear understanding of environmental stewardship suggests an intention to regain a sense of place within the cosmos. John Hart maintains that

[w]hen humans lose their sense of place – their setting and their role – they lose a sense of the sacred, they reject intrinsic value in abiotic nature and in species and individuals of the biotic community, they deny natural rights to nature, and they reject humanity’s situation in creation as one of the uncounted numbers of all species who have complementary roles in the community of life, and are related to each other as the common offspring of cosmic becoming. 

A clearer eco-theology to inform the work of the PWRDF will aim to reverse the role of humans as “the affliction of the world, its demonic presence ... the violation of the earth’s most sacred aspects” and instead re-establish a healthy sense of place.

Canadian Anglicans are also called, as an expression of their faith, to challenge unjust structures and attitudes. To this end, Canadian Anglicans are aware that religious institutions have the ability to shape peoples’ worldviews, wield moral authority, connect with multitudes of like-minded people, access financial and institutional assets, and generate strong social capital. These assets, present within the Anglican Church of Canada, may be used to “help build a socially just and environmentally sustainable world.” The use of these assets to challenge unjust structures will demand a renewal in personal, cultural, and societal structures. A clear eco-theological framework will aid in this renewal as it will inform future relief and development work of the PWRDF to reflect intentional focus on environmental issues within economic, social, and political systems.

---

82 Ibid., 203.
83 Berry, *The Dream of the Earth*, 209.
2. Strengthening connections between members of the Anglican Church of Canada and the PWRDF

The second benefit of an eco-theological framework will be to strengthen connections between Anglicans in Canada and the PWRDF. Three connections will be considered here: 1) the PWRDF’s global outreach ministry on behalf of Anglicans across Canada; 2) the funding of the PWRDF by Canadian Anglicans; and 3) the means by which the PWRDF permits Anglicans to live out a portion of their baptismal vows, specifically addressing issues of peace and justice. As a means of responding to an increasing desire for environmental stewardship, the eco-theological framework will provide a forum for Anglicans to connect environmental concerns with their faith, and by extension, their outreach.

Throughout history, “Anglicans have made a considerable contribution to the mission of the Church universal.” The current Primate, following his election as president of the Board of Directors, expressed his desire “to help the PWRDF strengthen its official standing within the denomination.” Additionally, one of the specific strategic directions for 2012-2015 reads: “Ensuring the Anglican Church of Canada affirms the PWRDF as its official development and relief agency and as central to its mission.” This direction responds to an increased desire of Canadian Anglicans “to be engaged on a personal level in international development.” To that end, the PWRDF is (at the time of this writing) engaging in conversation to re-vision the work of mission

---


86 The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Primate becomes PWRDF board president.”


with the former Partnerships Department of the General Synod. This engagement celebrates a global interconnection and interdependence of humanity, and indicates the potential addition of an eco-theological component to that re-visioning process.

The financial realities of promoting relief and development cannot be ignored as approximately 80% of the PWRDF’s total revenue comes from individual and parish donations. Canadian Anglicans make these generous contributions because they believe in the mission and ministry of the PWRDF, supporting the PWRDF’s work for solidarity with the oppressed, whether the oppressed are human or non-human. As environmental awareness and concern continues to increase among its constituency, the PWRDF will undoubtedly benefit financially as it demonstrates that all its work is informed and supported by a clearly articulated eco-theology.

Thirdly, Canadian Anglicans might strengthen their connection with the work of the PWRDF as an expression of their baptismal vows. One of the scriptural foundations of baptism emphasises the “liberation into a new humanity in which barriers of division, whether of sex or race or social status, are transcended.” Baptism is historically a sacrament of community, of justice for all of the created order, as reflected in the questions of the covenant.

---

89 The former Partnerships Division of the Anglican Church of Canada has decreased dramatically due to restructuring and budget cuts; many mission-based programmes such as Volunteers in Mission and international theological student placement programmes have been eliminated. See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Executive Director’s Report: November 3, 2010—May 2, 2011” (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 2011), 2.

90 The 2010 revenue allocation consisted of 69.52% from parish/individual donations and 1.17% designated donations for the 50th Anniversary; 10.52% from bequests, 17% from CIDA, and approximately 1.82% from other sources. See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Who We Are.”

All of the questions of the baptismal covenant might be interpreted to have an environmental component, and all might be connected with the work of the PWRDF. Among the questions, the covenant asks the baptismal candidates to proclaim by word and example the good news of God in Christ. The Primate proclaims the PWRDF as “our fund, our way to reach out into the world, and it is one of the best good news stories of the Anglican Church of Canada.” Baptismal candidates are also asked to seek and serve Christ in all persons, loving their neighbours as themselves. “Neighbours” is not restricted to human beings; an eco-theological reading of this vow may inspire an intent to view the entire earth community as ‘neighbour;’ for “[i]f humans will not become functional members of the earth community, how can humans establish functional relationships among themselves?” Finally, the baptismal covenant asks candidates to strive for justice and peace among all people, and respect the dignity of every human being. The PWRDF responds to this through work “dealing with justice, human rights, poverty, and homelessness.” As Anglicans renew their own personal baptismal covenant regularly, they are re-committing themselves to the mission of the Church and thus the mission of the PWRDF. An eco-theology articulating this reality will help Anglicans to live their faith and commitment through supporting the work of the PWRDF.

---

92 The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Primate becomes PWRDF board president.”

93 Berry, The Dream of the Earth, 219.

94 The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Primate becomes PWRDF board president.”

95 The congregation renews their baptismal covenants at baptisms, in the recitation of the Apostles’ creed, during the entire season of Easter, and at every celebration of the Eucharist. See The General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada, The Book of Alternative Services, 150.
3. Work of the PWRDF and environmental stewardship

The third benefit of an eco-theological framework is the provision of a more consistent approach in the application of environmental standards. Clearly articulated standards of programme planning, evaluation and monitoring must be followed to regulate and minimise any negative environmental impact of relief and development work. The work of the PWRDF must meet consistent environmental standards if it is to be effective in bringing about the community development it purports to embrace. These standards will prevent the development work of the PWRDF from perpetuating “the myth of progress and uninterrupted and unlimited growth. ... From an ecological standpoint, the dream of unlimited growth means the invention of destructive (rather than productive) forces and the historic and social production of illness and death of Earth’s species and of everything composing the Earth.”

New standards, rooted in the eco-theological framework will be clear, concise and useful, and more easily applied to programme planning and implementation. They will be based in theology, because “[w]ithout a spiritual counterbalance, the material emphasis in modern thinking about development may actually be detrimental to the personal and societal betterment it purports to bring about.” Furthermore, these standards within the eco-theological framework will seek to discern and respond to the voice of the Earth. Additionally the integration of religious teachings and modern

---

96 Boff, Cry of the Earth, Cry of the Poor, 65.
98 “The SBL Consultation for Ecological Hermeneutics (2004-2006) developed a methodology seeking to discern the voice of the Earth. In this approach Earth is interpreted as the total ecosystem, the web of life. The interpretive strategy involves a hermeneutics of suspicion, identification, and retrieval. ... The interpretive strategy of identification involves readers taking the side of Earth, and seeking to empathize with Earth during the events described in the gospel. ... A hermeneutics of suspicion has
development practices will address the full spectrum of the PWRDF’s constituency, from Anglican donors through staff to the partners. David Ben Gurion details the reasons for this integration: “The energy contained in nature – in the earth and its waters, in the atom, in sunshine – will not avail us if we fail to activate the most precious vital energy: the moral-spiritual energy inherent in man (sic); in the inner recesses of his being; in his mysterious, uncompromising, unfathomably, and divinely inspired soul.”

The interpretation of the current “Environment Policy” and “Environmental Assessment Sheet” can be indistinct and allow for great variance in the application of environmental practices depending on regional or sector factors. As detailed above, the language is often ambiguous with the assessment process being inconsistent and potentially incorporating personal or organizational bias. A clearer policy informed by eco-theology will provide a common context to ensure that projects and programmes of the PWRDF strive to meet consistent levels of ecological responsibility as much as possible.

While “[t]he various peoples of the earth find themselves caught between a dissolving industrial economy and a ruined natural environment,” the connection between the two cannot be ignored. The solution lies within a cultural change; for the Church to take its role in relief and development work seriously, it must challenge the very
structures which are leading to injustices. For that challenge to be successful, it must be firmly rooted and grounded in a cohesive and coherent eco-theology.
CHAPTER TWO:
AN ECO-THEOLOGY FOR
RELIEF AND DEVELOPMENT WORK

Chapter Two will briefly identify how some secular aid agencies operate without clear guidelines for environmental sustainability and how they consequently harm the ecosystems that support the people they are purporting to assist. Similarly, although Christian faith-based aid agencies should include care for creation within their activities, this is not always the case. Although the theology that informs this care for creation can be articulated in several ways, this thesis will focus on three: 1) by understanding the communion between humans and the rest of God’s creation; 2) by reconsidering the role of humans as part of the ecosystem; and 3) by recognising the subjectivity of the individual.

Environmental Concerns in the Aid Industry

Environmental protection is increasingly being recognised as central to relief and development work, and environmental concerns are prevalent within the aid industry. By 2007 “[t]he aid industry, along with global and national institutions, had become keenly aware that environmental changes were posing great risks for future and even present generations.”101 Environmental issues have been integrated into development work, and

---

101 de Hahn refers specifically to Al Gore’s documentary, An Inconvenient Truth, for which Gore received the 2007 Noble Peace Prize jointly with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. de Hahn, How the Aid Industry Works, 152.
When Development Harms: A Case Study

Following the 2004 tsunami, some development projects in Tamil Nadu (India) actually caused harm to the ecosystem by not adequately considering the impacts of the aid itself. Some housing reconstruction created homes of foreign design, constructed with foreign materials (including imported wood), in new settlement layouts, sometimes in new locations altogether. These homes do not adequately meet the needs of the people, as they lack the space around houses for vegetation.

Some of these projects cleared the land of up to 1,200 existing trees (along with other vegetation and demolished homes) prior to beginning work, and did not plan their replacement. Trees in Tamil Nadu maintain a central role in community. Materially, they provide (both for family use and for income generation) food, fodder, firewood, and material for utensil construction. Culturally, trees are linked to notions of health, protection, beauty, and sacredness. Trees are used for shade from the sun, as landmarks within community, and as locations for social gatherings.

The removal of trees occurred with the best of intentions for development work; however it disrespects the people receiving this assistance, and carries long-term negative implications to the social networks, the ecosystem, livelihoods, and general well-being of the village community. One resident claims “Without the trees the village is not alive. It is another village, not our village anymore.”


overarching concepts of environmental sustainability have been embraced. In some ways, environmental commitments have been integrated into the aid industry through investment in environmental conservation and through environmental appraisals or assessments. However, in some situations, these concepts have not been implemented enthusiastically because many assessments depend on results-based management (often

---


103 See examples in de Hahn, How the Aid Industry Works, 153-155.
limited to fiscal considerations and more difficult to measure in environmental assessments) without considering the full interconnection of humans and their ecosystem. Without a standard definition for “poverty” or “development,” and with these terms often being used only in relation to financial matters, these environmental assessments therefore can vary greatly. Although interest in matters of environmental concern has increased in recent years, the aid industry must focus on sustaining this interest. Until the aid industry considers the environment as a mainstream concern rather than an optional preference, it will remain one of “development’s poor cousins.”

While environmental degradation especially affects the world’s poor, the links between poverty and environmental degradation are not always straightforward. According to de Hahn, the world’s poor are both victims of, and contributors to, environmental degradation as a result of their poverty. Often living in the most vulnerable areas, with the least capacity to protect themselves or the resources which sustain them, the poor “often have no options or alternatives, and variability in income … may lead to environmentally degrading practices.” Specifically, de Hahn articulates that environmental stress and resource entitlement can negatively impact human conflict and power relations. Moving beyond identifying the link between poverty and ecology, and as a basis for his theological assessment, K.C. Abraham argues that poverty itself is, among other things, “a source of ecological degradation, and the alleviation of poverty by the poor through their struggle for justice is an ecological concern.” Abraham continues

---

104 De Hahn argues that the aid industry does not consider environmental sustainability as a mainstream concern, as “[d]ifferent parts of the industry and different people within agencies continue to define main objectives in different ways - and continue to differ on whether they can focus on issues” such as environmental sustainability. De Hahn, How the Aid Industry Works, 170.

105 Ibid., 154.

106 Ibid., 154.
that these concerns for human poverty and the environment cannot be separated, and that
“[u]nless the poor have alternate sources of food and basic needs like fuel, they too will wantonly destroy whatever natural environment is around them.”107 Some movements approach and solve this dilemma through community empowerment, education, and advocacy.108

Despite empirical awareness of the links between ecology and poverty, the practical integration into programming remains problematic as aid agencies strive to reduce and eliminate such poverty. In order for their aid to be effective it must address the issues at the root of the problem, namely the social systems promoting unsustainable practices, and the present model of industrial society. While missiologists estimate that these social systems make up only about 5 per cent of the elements of a culture that need changing, “these are usually central structures.” According to Melba Padilla Maggay, these structures are rooted in “the ancient structure of inequality which allows the elite to perpetuate privilege and corner much of the resources,” and are demonstrated through such structural systems as colonial governance, caste structures, and gender inequality.109 Theologian Leonardo Boff articulates how these central structures in need of change are also anti-ecological and produce misery, identifying “the worldwide capitalistic order” as a continued system of conquest, one that is “based on the exploitation of human beings


108 For example, Wangari Maathai’s Green Belt Movement in Kenya recognised that “behind the everyday hardships of the poor—environmental degradation, deforestation, and food insecurity—were deeper issues of disempowerment, disenfranchisement, and a loss of the traditional values that had previously enabled communities to protect their environment, work together for mutual benefit, and to do both selflessly and honestly.” See: The Green Belt Movement, “Our History.” http://www.greenbeltmovement.org/who-we-are/our-history

109 Maggay details three general approaches to effecting social change: the empirical-rational approach, the normative-re-educative approach, and the power-coercive approach. See Maggay, “Justice and Approaches to Social Change,” 123-128.
and nature.” Beginning in sixteenth-century Latin America, labour practices and private ownership of resources (namely land and water) led to “exploitation of workers and the accompanying deterioration of the quality of life.” Present day manifestations include a resource-extractive economy dependent on exportation, and on foreign debt and its interest payments all dependent on global trends. The results of attempting to meet such volatile financial obligations lead to reduced state investment in social and environmental areas, leading to a “cycle of dependence, neo-colonialism and domination.” There is no simple solution, however, as the “[s]ocial consequences of global climate change are more difficult to predict than is the physical response of the Earth’s environment to temperature changes because they are dependent on the complexities of human and social response as well as on the changes in the physical environment.”

Industrial society, described as a “counterproductive, addictive, paralyzing, manifestation of a deep cultural pathology,” is equally challenging to the aid industry. Melba Padilla Maggay views these industrial-based social systems as perpetuating unsustainable practices to both the environment and the community as they are an “ancient structure of inequality which allows the elite to perpetuate privilege and corner much of the resources.” The disparity between low- and high-income countries with regards to industrial development adds another layer of difficulty; low-income countries tend to be more concerned with economic development to raise their citizens out of

110 Boff argues from a socio-ecological perspective, claiming that “we must denounce the deeply anti-ecological character of the social system we live in – the worldwide capitalistic order. Every phase of this system has been and is based on the exploitation of human beings and nature.” See Leonardo Boff, “Social Ecology: Poverty and Misery,” in David Hallman (ed.), Ecotheology: Voices From South and North (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1994), 240.

111 Spencer, White and Vroblesky, Christianity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Living, 37.

112 Berry, The Dream of the Earth, 32.

poverty than with environmental restrictions, while higher-income countries are less interested in sharing clean technology, seeing a business opportunity rather than an opportunity to benefit the entire planet.114

**Christian Environmental Care within the Aid Industry**

Christians embrace a unique relationship to the environment because of their faith. Christians are meant to care about the environment for four reasons, two of which are connected to their religion, and two of which are secular. The specifically religious reasons include: 1) because God cares for it; and 2) to obey God’s command to love one’s neighbours (with care for creation as an important element of loving other people, as discussed in Chapter One). Within Christianity, the doctrine of hope provides a reason for Christian care in the secular reasons, which include: 1) because human well-being is “tied up” with that of the environment; and 2) because of hope for the future.115 In light of this care for creation, Christians are challenged to a new thinking about God, no longer distinguishing God as existing apart from creation but recognizing “the presence of God *in* the world and the presence of the world *in* God.”116 Christians are challenged to re-evaluate their daily actions to reflect this new thinking, integrating their actions with their beliefs. As Hall articulates, for Christians “the fate of the earth is at the core of the

---

114 “Low-income countries, many of whom already are experiencing some of the predicted consequences of climate change such as famine, drought, and disease, have primarily been concerned with economic growth to raise their citizens out of poverty and have resisted any emissions restrictions that might hamper that growth. In order to grow their economy without climate impacts, low-income countries want open access to clean technology from the West. But Western nations perceive clean technology as business opportunities and want to protect their intellectual property rights.” Spencer, White and Vroblesky, *Christianity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Living*, 211-212.


As a conscious response to their faith, Christians will act in a way that cares about, for, and in creation. For, as Hart details, Christians are called to integrate their practices to care about, for, and in creation as a response to the consciousness of their faith. Responding ecumenically, the World Council of Churches has established a process which has “become a pattern of integration with a number of dimensions” including theological reflection and action, ecclesiology and ethics, social and ecological justice, and the Church at global, regional, national and local levels. These gatherings have greatly informed the environmental work of the World Council of Churches toward sustainable practices. They are one way in which the Christian community acknowledges that the gravity of the situation demands a bold response “otherwise there is no salvation for the community of the planet.” The proposed responses from the Christian community vary; some theologians propose dramatic structural changes while others encourage change through more individual means.

---

117 Hall, *Imaging God*, 42.

118 Hart expands on each unique level of creation care from the Christian perspective. “Care about creation: people are lovingly concerned about the integral universe emerging from the vision and through the creativity of the Spirit; Care for creation: people responsibly use their intellect and skills to integrate the needs of ecosystems and of Earth in those areas of the planet under their care, and to responsibly draw from creation those goods needed for human life and health; Care in creation: people respect and serve creation as their community, home, and habitat, and live as kin in the biotic community, concerned about individual and species well-being.” See Hart, *Sacramental Commons*, 67.


120 Boff, *Cry of the Earth, Cry of the Poor*, 131.

121 Leonardo Boff articulates his basis for structural change: “First, we must always keep before us the global perspective; ... Second, we must move toward a planetary ecological and social democracy. The ecological crisis affects us all and hence it demands that all be involved in establishing a new covenant with nature; ... Third, the meaning of politics and economics must be redefined in terms of this more advanced form of democracy.” Ibid., 131-133. From a different perspective, Spencer, White and Vroblevsky identify their proposal for individual change: “We should value and protect creation, seeing that as a joy rather than a burden; ...We should reflect the close bond between society and environment in our decisions; ...We
Although the aid industry presents a variety of reasons and means to actualise environmental protection, its intentional engagement in more environmentally sustainable practices indicates that the industry agrees on the need for change. Theologian John Hart suggests that this engagement in environmental action is best experienced through religious traditions, as religious people are challenged to both see the holistic cosmos as sacramental, and to re-engage with the social teachings of the Bible.122

**A Theology for Creation Care**

1. *Communion between Humans and the Rest of Creation*

All of creation exists in community, and that community is larger than any one species. Humans are challenged to recognise a spiritual appreciation for the larger sacred community to which they belong since “to be alienated from this community is to become destitute in all that makes us human. To damage this community is to diminish our very existence.”123 Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, argues that the relationship between humans and the rest of God’s creation must be understood not just as community but as full communion, wherein “the human task is to draw out potential treasures in the powers of nature and so to realise the convergent process of humanity and

should pursue justice for the vulnerable and marginalized; ...We should not confuse wealth and value: our goal should be relational health rather than money or personal freedom; ...We should favour regulated, market-based solutions that take account of natural, human, and social capital; ...We should express commitment to our immediate environment and favour local solutions; ...We should aim to offer just and equitable access to natural resources; ...We should respond seriously and with hope.” Spencer, White and Vroble Sky, *Christianity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Living*, 148-152.

122 Each part of the cosmos is to be a “sign and experience of the divine creativity and a revelation of the Spirit’s presence; an occasion of grace and a conveyor of blessing; and a bearer of the sacred creatures, all called ‘very good’ by their Creator.” The social teachings seek to address and “eliminate structural injustices and social problems in the commons.” See Hart, *Sacramental Commons*, 12, 179.

123 Berry, *The Dream of the Earth*, 81.
nature discovering in collaboration what they can become.”¹²⁴ For the Christian, this collaboration is a call to care not only for fellow human beings, but also for their surroundings. This communion will challenge Christians “to experience a change of consciousness from an anthropocentric domination of nature to a relational interdependence with creation, and act accordingly. They will have to acknowledge the intrinsic value of creation and respect the natural rights of nature.”¹²⁵ A logical means for Christian relief and development work to embrace such a communion is through the New Cosmology, which challenges humanity to re-invent human culture to new and mutually enhancing patterns of benign human-Earth relationships oriented to find “expression in politics, in economics, in education, in healing, and in spiritual reorientation.”¹²⁶ This re-orientation is identified in the United Nations’ “World Charter for Nature,” which highlights the human community’s need both to preserve the natural world and to strive for integration within it; it also acknowledges the spiritual dimension of creation.¹²⁷ Thomas Berry associates three implications of understanding this spiritual dimension, challenging the modern scientific view of the universe “as a collection of objects rather than as a communion of subjects.”¹²⁸ Firstly, since humans and the rest of creation have a spiritual dimension that links them to the Numinous Mystery that penetrates all of creation, human flourishing is linked to creation flourishing, thereby calling humans to an allegiance with the larger Earth community. Secondly, once we recognize the spiritual

---

¹²⁴ Williams, “Renewing the Face of the Earth.”  
¹²⁵ Hart, Sacramental Commons, 117.  
¹²⁶ Berry, The Great Work, 69.  
¹²⁸ Berry, The Great Work, 16.
dimension of all players in the evolutionary story of the universe, we see them as creative subjects within that epic and not as mere objects. Thirdly, with every component of the universe deriving from the one source which is the foundation of this recognised spiritual dimension, each reality of the universe exists and interacts in communion with every other reality.  

The complexity and richness of full communion between humans and their environment through “creative intervention in nature, sensitive care for nature, and awestruck contemplation of nature” is biblically based. Biblical scholars such as Brueggemann detail the distinctive binding of God and God’s creation, commencing with the creation narrative. Brueggemann specifically articulates this communion in his analysis of Genesis 1.1-11.29, emphasising that the “pathos and involvement of God” is most explicit in Gen. 6.5-8 and 8.21. He denotes this binding to such a complete extent that even the lexicon and grammar of the text “is a proclamation of covenanting as the shape of reality.” Moltmann explores the theological implications of this communion, noting that “[i]n God there is no one-sided relationship of superiority and subordination, command and obedience, master and servant…. In the triune God is the mutuality and reciprocity of love.” Human activity is to mirror this reciprocal relationship rather than to enact an attitude of domination. As God’s image on earth, humans are given

129 Berry, Dream of the Earth, 43-45.
132 Moltmann, God in Creation, 16-17.
responsibility to care for creation rather than to overtake it. Moltmann refutes interpretations that claim that Genesis 1 sanctions the notion of domination, arguing

[t]he creation of God’s image on earth is followed in v. 28 by the commission to rule over the animals, and in vv. 28 and 29 by the charge to ‘subdue the earth’. These commissions are not identical with the likeness to God; they are a specific addition to it. This means that the likeness to God is not, either, to be found essentially in these commissions to rule. The two different charges evidently complement each other, and the second limits the first.

Anne M. Clifford goes even further than Moltmann, rejecting traditional notions of “image of God” and “subdue the earth” as she discusses the redeeming and “Christic” presence of God both in humanity and in the natural world in general. Lisa Sowle Cahill continues this discussion as she articulates how all things (not just humanity) came into being through the Word that was God (John 1.2-3), how Wisdom is considered to have been present at the beginning of creation (Prov. 3.19; 8.22-31) and active throughout creation (Wisdom 8.1), and the interconnection of all creation described throughout Romans chapter 8. These examples provide just a glimpse of the scriptural foundation of the communion between humankind and the created world.

The underlying scriptural basis of Christian action in the world, particularly in relief and development work, cannot focus simply “on God and humanity, with nature included only in some instrumental sense or even as an afterthought.” Relief and development work must embrace the human involvement as part of an ecosystem. To

133 Moltmann, God in Creation, 224.
134 Ibid., 224.
137 Santmire, “In God’s Ecology”
better understand this involvement, Christians must re-read the scriptures from the perspective of communion with the earth. One suggested approach for such a re-reading comes from the Evangelical Foundation of Canada, who propose “six Biblical principals about creation,” namely:

1) God loves and provides for all of creation – Ps. 104 celebrates all of creation, and Mt. 6.29-30 and 10.29 detail God’s care for non-human creatures.

2) Creation reveals God – all of creation worships God in Ps. 96.11-13, and humans understand God better through creation in Rom. 1.20.

3) Humans are an inseparable part of God’s creation – from the first breath in Gen. 2.7 to our resurrected physical bodies of 1 Cor. 15.40-44.

4) Humans have both role and responsibility within creation – Ps. 8 describes the gift of control given to humans, while the land use laws of Ex. 23.11 and Lev. 25.1-8, 19-22 give an example of human limitations to the use of creation.

5) Humans are alienated from creation in the fall – having rejected good care for the created order, God expels humanity from Paradise in Gen. 3.

6) God’s plan of salvation includes the restoration of creation – a plan of love and communion declared in the John 3.16 incarnation, affirmed throughout the Pauline writings, and in the promise of God to dwell among mortals in Rev. 21.3.\textsuperscript{138}

Adopting a focus on the communion between humanity and creation provides new insights when reading scripture, as identified by the following theologians.\textsuperscript{139}

1) **Partnership with the earth** – Santmire discusses partnership with the earth through specific references to Genesis, the Psalms and Job as he writes that “God does fashion us and invite us, however, to be in partnership – a limited partnership – not only with Him and with one another, but also with the beautiful and harmonious world of nature and to encounter its deep mysteries and its occasionally horrendous ambiguities.”\textsuperscript{140}

2) **Service to creation** – Wirzba discusses Noah’s service to creation in the ark narrative by learning about “the prerequisites, requirements, and consequences of servant life. ...The effect of Noah’s life, in turn, would be to restore proper relations between the elements of creation and their creator.”\textsuperscript{141}

3) **Moral elements of sustainable living** – Spencer, White and Vroblesky study the moral elements of sustainable living, recognising that the vision of Isaiah (Isa. 40 – 46) suggests that “there is an irreducible and far-reaching moral element to the issue of sustainable living. The created order is inherently moral and, if we wish to sustain it, we cannot ignore our moral obligations.”\textsuperscript{142}

\textsuperscript{139} This list is not to be considered exhaustive, but rather a sampling of insights by theologians.\textsuperscript{140} Santmire, "Partnership with Nature According to the Scriptures," 412.\textsuperscript{141} Norman Wirzba, *Paradise of God: Renewing Religion in an Ecological Age* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2003), 141.\textsuperscript{142} See Spencer, White and Vroblesky, *Christianity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Living*, 109.
4) **Invitation to learn from the earth** – Alice Sinott discusses the earth as teacher through the narrative of Job. “Earth teaches by direct experience, on a one-to-one basis. Job attests to this when he speaks for Earth and makes Earth central in his speech by shifting the issue from what is not accessible – the boundary of God’s knowledge – to what is readily accessible. Knowledge and experience of how Earth works is well within reach of creatures.”

A new scriptural focus will guide Christians to reject biblical interpretations that promote “a clear call to limitless demographic growth and unrestricted *dominum terrae.*”

Instead, a new focus will invite Christians to eschew anthropocentric arrogance and to stand humbly with creation before God, “unhindered by attempts to control and dominate.”

An understanding of full communion with the natural world will also focus a sharper attention on human limitations. Thomas Berry states that “every species should have opposed species or conditions that limit them so that no single species would overwhelm the others.” This practice of limitation, or in the human example self-limitation, is necessary (although admittedly difficult for humans). “The law of limits is what makes the functional rapport between the various life-forms an urgent necessity.”

The practices of relief and development, therefore, must incorporate these limitations into their programme and project implementations. This work must not be a demonstration of authority or superiority from the Western culture of arrogance and dominance, but rather

---


144 Boff, *Cry of the Earth, Cry of the Poor*, 79.

145 Williams, “Renewing the Face of the Earth.”

146 Berry, *The Great Work*, 92.
reflect that “the human, as every species, is bound by limits in relation to the other members of the Earth community.”\textsuperscript{147} Effective self-limitation demands humility, a recognition that to exercise the responsibility of dominion is to reflect the will of God (not the will of humans) for all of creation, and also a recognition that humans might control, at most, only a small portion of the created order.\textsuperscript{148} Faith-based relief and development work must embrace an awareness of such limits, both in the present and for future benefit.

Earth-human communion can also be understood through the links between human and ecosystem health. The definition of human health varies within communities; in Western culture, definitions of health have changed from the minimalistic “capacity for work and enjoyment” of an individual to an idealistic “complete physical, mental, and social well-being” which demands societies to be healthy in order for their inhabitants to be healthy.\textsuperscript{149} Human health, according to Moltmann, is further understood to be either an ascertainable state of being (indicating an objective assessment of physical, mental, and social well-being), or an attitude (indicating a subjective adaptation to changing conditions). Moltmann cautions that “[i]f health as a state of general well-being is declared to be the supreme value in a human life and in a society, this really implies a morbid attitude to health. Being human is equated with being healthy.”\textsuperscript{150}

Human health is intricately connected with the health of the environment as there can be no healthy humans supported by an unhealthy planet. Therefore, environmental

\textsuperscript{147} Berry, \textit{The Great Work}, 89.
\textsuperscript{148} Such limited control comes in the form, for example, of tending a garden. See Bryant, “Imago Dei, Imagination, and Ecological Responsibility,” 48.
\textsuperscript{149} Moltmann, \textit{God in Creation}, 270.
\textsuperscript{150} Ibid., 272-273.
factors have a direct impact on human health; one estimate from 2005 suggests that “human-produced climate change over the past 30 years already claims over 150,000 lives annually.” More current research (published in 2011) places this number at 500,000.\textsuperscript{152} Faith-based relief and development work will therefore be challenged to respond appropriately to the issues of climate-induced health problems including droughts, flooding, and famine, requiring emergency relief and medical access.\textsuperscript{153}

To appropriately respond to these ecological challenges will require the healing of both people and the earth which supports them. When humans work cooperatively with the planet, the earth has the potential to be a source of healing. Faith-based relief and development work must therefore work with the earth in collaborative ways for the sake of healing and justice. This will then demonstrate that the earth can become once again “‘sacramental’ of the infinite gift from which it originates.”\textsuperscript{154} This communion for the sake of healing will benefit humans and non-humans alike through the promotion of both a healthy state of being and a healthy attitude.

2. The Role of Humans within the Ecosystem

As discussed above, current structures of development and progress encourage and require unsustainable human supremacy over their environment. Humans need to both recognise and embrace their unique role within the community, not over it, to move toward a more sustainable future. Rosemary Radford Ruether challenges humanity to see that “human-nature relationships [are] deeply threatened by Western technological

\textsuperscript{151} Spencer, White and Vroblesky, \textit{Christianity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Living}, 39.


\textsuperscript{153} Spencer, White and Vroblesky, \textit{Christianity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Living}, 42.

\textsuperscript{154} Williams, “Renewing the Face of the Earth.”
exploitation” and to engage in “a deep metanoia that is necessary to bring about a new ecological consciousness.”\textsuperscript{155} From this perspective, relief and development work will benefit from the creation of a new incarnation of the human-nature relationship. Douglas John Hall concurs with Ruether, articulating that this human-nature relationship is especially important for Christian relief and development organisations as the “Christian faith implies a decisive orientation toward this world, which makes the question of ‘the fate of the earth’ a matter of ultimate concern for Christians.”\textsuperscript{156}

Relief and development work demands that humans be aware of their distinct role within the broader environment. The Christian expression of this role can be described in at least four ways. Firstly, Wirzba notes that “the nature of humanity’s place within creation…must be worked out in terms of the divine-human relationship.” He observes that “Genesis 1 merely establishes that the divine-human relationship exists and that it is constitutive for human identity and vocation. The rest of scripture will contextualize and develop the nature of this relationship and so better equip us to understand our place and role within the created order.”\textsuperscript{157} Secondly, God maintains sovereignty over the earth; as Psalm 24.1 states, “the earth is the Lord's and all that’s in it.” Rowan Williams reflects that this declaration “is primarily an assertion of God's glory and overall sovereignty. And it affirms a relation between God and the world that is independent of what we as human beings think about the world or do to the world.”\textsuperscript{158} Thirdly, all life is sourced from God, where “[t]he term ‘create' asserts distance from and belonging to. It is


\textsuperscript{156} Hall, \textit{Imaging God}, 59.

\textsuperscript{157} Wirzba, \textit{Paradise of God}, 124.

\textsuperscript{158} Williams, “Renewing the Face of the Earth.”
affirmed that the world has *distance* from God and a life of its own. At the same time, it is confessed that the world *belongs* to God and has no life without reference to God.”

Finally, the healing Sabbath rest that the earth requires is to be of benefit to the whole of creation. Moltmann discusses how

> [t]he Sabbath rest is to benefit the whole house, strangers too. On the seventh day creation is ‘restored’ and celebrated every week. ...The weekly Sabbath corresponds to the Sabbath year. ...This ‘Sabbath year of the land’ makes it clear that the Sabbath is not merely a feast for human beings. It is the feast of the whole creation. In the seventh year the land celebrates. ...The Sabbath year then corresponds to the Year of Jubilee. ...It was to be sanctified through the restitution of the original righteousness of God’s covenant among his people. ...The special thing about this Year of Jubilee seems to be that God’s laws and edicts were to be imposed on the people, and were then to be passed on by the people to creation, to strangers, to animals and land.

These theological perspectives provide a uniquely Christian awareness of humankind’s role within the ecosystem.

In order to embrace their unique role within the environment, humans will need to recognise the rights of all species, and begin to act with appreciation for the source of those rights (acknowledging that these rights all come from the divine creator). These rights are for all beings, human and non-human; they “originate where existence originates” and are limited as species-specific without the authority to cancel out the rights of others. “Every component of the Earth community has three rights: the right to be, the right to habitat, and the right to fulfill its role in the ever-renewing processes of the Earth community.”

Recognising the universe as the source of these rights, all components of the earth fall under six principles of eco-justice: the principle of intrinsic worth, of interconnectedness, of voice, of purpose, of mutual custodianship, and of

---

159 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 17.


161 See Thomas Berry, “Ten Principles of Jurisprudence.”
resistance. Given the added responsibility of dominion as self-reflective beings, human beings (particularly people of faith) are uniquely challenged to defend these rights through technology (Berry), social activism (Maggay), and a revisionist theology of nature (Santmire).

Santmire’s discussion of eco-theological anthropology explores theological insights in conversation with the scriptures, speaking of human responsibility as a call from God. He describes a theology that is biblical, Christological, ecological, and ecclesiological: “It will be incarnate in the life of the Christian community.” Santmire maintains that God has called humans (and all of creation) to live within “their divinely allotted and protected places and vocations;” that the human duty of care is to benefit not just humans but the entirety of the created order; that humans are to respect God-given limits; that humans exist in community “for a unique life of praise, communion and self-giving;” that human life is meant to be one of relationship “with God, with each other and with all creatures;” and that human rejection of God has led to violent destruction of


163 Berry articulates seven ways in which technology may be used to defend rights: “First, human technologies should function in an integral relation with earth technologies. ...Second, we must be clear concerning the order of magnitude of the changes that are needed. ...Third, sustainable progress must be progress for the entire earth community ...Fourth, our technologies need to be integral. ...Fifth, there is need for a functional cosmology, a cosmology that will provide the mystique needed for this integral earth-human presence. ...Sixth, nature is violent as well as benign. Our technologies have a defensive role to play. ...[W]hile these assaults on the human are all-pervasive, nature has so arranged its balance of forces that the remedy is already available. Much of the assault that we perceive as natural is really human in origin. ...Seventh, our new and healing technologies need to function within a bioregional context, not simply a national or global scale.” Berry, The Dream of the Earth, 65-68 (emphasis in the original). Melba Padilla Maggay calls for Christian action to defend rights with suggestions that are both scriptural and pragmatic: “Constructively engage the powers, ... Think contextual, act local, ... Nurture a strategic minority.” Maggay, “Justice and Approaches to Social Change,” 128-131.
human-human and human-other relationships. This theology “seeks to announce the rebirth of nature in a time of global environmental crisis.”

Working within this context of the human responsibility to defend rights, the relief and development community must embrace that humankind maintain specifically human rights. These human rights share the same benefits and limitations as the rights of all other species. Property is to be recognised as a potential community benefit, a social trust (whether used to meet public needs or to meet private needs such that individual people may earn a livelihood and thus contribute to their community). As part of this social trust, “[p]eople have a right to land to produce their food, clothing, shelter, or fuel; to air that is clean in their lungs; to unpolluted water to satisfy their thirst and irrigate their fields; and to sunlight for agriculture and for gardens and to be converted through solar heating, hot water, and electrical generation systems into usable energy.” Human beings will therefore benefit from establishing themselves as members of a commons within their environment; this is a goal to be supported by relief and development efforts. By emphasizing a community’s work to “nurture the members of the biotic community,” the rights of all species will be upheld.

The role of humans within their environment requires not just a theoretical appreciation of rights, but also a practical participation in stewardship. Environmental stewardship calls for the careful and responsible management of all of God’s creation.

---


165 See Hart, Sacramental Commons, 151.

166 In order that it might fulfill this function, the commons should be able, without human intervention (except where prior human interference has disrupted these roles), to promote the common good of Earth inhabitants: enable living creatures’ access to food and shelter, and to space to meet reproductive needs (and, for humans, access to Earth goods needed to provide clothing, energy, and health care); provide breathable air, potable water, and uncontaminated soil; integrate competitive needs; stimulate adjustment to interdependence; and provide a context for collaborative relations.” Hart, Sacramental Commons, 68.
For Christians, environmental stewardship is “precisely a stewardship exercised by way of participation in the divine rule and is always subject to it.” This is exercised through increasing scientific understanding of the universe, through responsible actions for all members of the natural world, and by protecting biological integrity.\textsuperscript{167} However, according to Santmire, this theology of stewardship focuses anthropologically on ethical issues and thus “remains anthropocentric, not theocentric or christocentric.”

Stewardship, he argues, is a functional, manipulative and operational term associated with money, and as such “does not allow the faithful to respond to the earth and to the whole cosmos with respect and with wonder.”\textsuperscript{168} While a more environmentally sustainable model of stewardship is complex, Santmire asserts that it may be found through true partnership with nature.\textsuperscript{169}

Stewardship can be understood as a vocation, a responsibility, a duty which comes to humans with the charge of dominion over the earth. Some humans have used the concept of \textit{imago Dei} to support abusive behaviour against the earth; others believe they are “to serve as God’s image through an actual exercise of dominion that is to be a reflection of the divine dominion.”\textsuperscript{170} A broader understanding of \textit{imago Dei} includes the notion that all creation is made in the image of God and remains so as long as it exists in ways that reflect the goodness and justice of God. This relationship is seen in relief and

\textsuperscript{167} International Theological Commission, “Communion and Stewardship,” 243.

\textsuperscript{168} Santmire, “In God’s Ecology,” 1300-1305.

\textsuperscript{169} Santmire prefers the term “partnership” over “stewardship,” rejecting the latter as rigid, connected solely with financial affairs, manipulative, and one which denies the faithful an inspired relationship with the created order. However, deeper analysis of this subject lies beyond the scope of this thesis. Since the PWRDF uses stewardship, and since it would be a significant project to update that thinking, such a revision will have to wait until the primary task – inserting a theology into the PWRDF’s policies – is accomplished. See Santmire, “Partnership with Nature According to the Scriptures,” 381-383.

\textsuperscript{170} Bryant, “Imago Dei, Imagination, and Ecological Responsibility,” 35-37.
development work which seeks to effect change not only in individual circumstances but in wider communities. Christian relief and development agencies therefore demonstrate that to care for the entire world is to care for the community that God created and loves. To be imago Dei is to see the entire world through God’s eyes and thus to respond with God’s compassion. Rasmussen argues for a moral aspect of imago Dei stating that “[i]maging God is acting in a godly way toward one another and other creatures. Imaging God is loving earth fiercely, as God does.”

3. The Subjectivity of the Individual

All members of the earth community have a purpose within creation, and “God has a powerful purpose for his creation. Creation is not a careless, casual, or accidental matter.” This assertion is affirmed in scriptures, which recognise that “every being in the universe articulates some special quality of the universe in its entirety.” For example, Thomas Berry identifies a purpose in continuing God’s good works because of a complete interconnection with God and as a revelation of God’s ongoing work in the world, such as can be found in the scriptural reference of the Trinity being known through one another and through their works – including the work of creation (see John 14.10-26). Walter Brueggemann also makes an argument that God intended creation to celebrate unity and communion, with and through all its members, as is echoed in Eph. 1.9-10 and Isa. 45.18-19.

As relief and development work evolves to appreciate that all components of creation are making an unique contribution within their community, the work will
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171 Rasmussen, Earth Community, Earth Ethics, 280.
172 Berry, The Great Work, 32.
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recognise that “[t]hings are no longer merely objects for the human subject. They are at the same time seen in their own environmental structure and their own environmental communication.” Additionally, humans will gain increased understanding and awareness of their own “ways of knowing and working, in the context, and in the light, of [their] closer and more remote surroundings.” Each member of each community has an unique role within the universe story and must be enabled and empowered to fulfill that role. This present moment is the result of 13.7 billion years of creative evolution wherein countless players and countless events have contributed to the eventual development of this moment. Each player has played a unique and necessary role for this moment to manifest as it does; change any player or any role in the preceding 13.7 billion years, and this moment would not manifest as it does.

One of the main purposes of all players in the universe story, human and non-human alike, is to be a contributor to their community and to be subject to the contributions of others. All players must be empowered to contribute creatively for the benefit of entire community, recognising that all players have an unique role. Humans, particularly Christians, must be open to humbly accept that theirs is a limited role within an integrated Earth community, which will allow for full participation and contribution from all members. The Earth must be recognised as an integral part of the community, and be equally empowered to contribute.

Injustices are present when situations arise that prevent this contribution to society. For example, as the number of environmental refugees increases, “huge numbers...”

---

of stateless people will provide both a humanitarian and a political challenge.” The work of relief and development is to assist a community to re-establish itself so that all members of that community are contributing as they are able. The denial of such contribution denies the essence of that individual. For Christian relief and development work, this valuable and community-building work is based in a biblical tradition. Rowan Williams argues that the Garden of Eden narrative reminds us that

we are not left simply to observe or stand back, but are endowed with the responsibility to preserve and direct the powers of nature. In this process, we become more fully and joyfully who and what we are…. In other words, the human task is to draw out potential treasures in the powers of nature and so to realise the convergent process of humanity and nature discovering in collaboration what they can become.

Similarly, citing Job 12:7-9, Alice M. Sinnott proposes that Job’s actions demonstrate a clear solidarity with that of the earth in his call to recognise the contributions of the animals, birds, plants and fish: “Who among all these does not know that the hand of the Lord has done this?” According to Sinnott, Job asserts that full contribution allows all members of a community to demonstrate and utilise their God-given gift to participate in creation.

Gender inequality denies the contribution of approximately half the human population by blocking certain forms of participation. Mercedes Canas promotes ecofeminism – “a global movement founded on common interests and respect for

---

176 “[T]he approximately 20 million environmental refugees forced to leave their homes because of deteriorating environmental conditions exceed all other refugees from war and political repression combined.” Spencer, White and Vroblevsky, Christianity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Living, 38.

177 Williams, “Renewing the Face of the Earth.”

178 See Sinnott, “Job 12,” 89-90
diversity, in opposition to all forms of domination and violence” – as a viable solution.\(^{179}\)

Additional support is offered by Ruether, who comments that ecofeminism strives toward “a mutuality in which there is no hierarchy but rather an interconnected web of life.”\(^{180}\)

However, under the present hierarchical system, women in the Third World are more directly impacted by environmental crises than those in the First World.\(^{181}\) For relief and development work to be most effective, it must consider the connection between gender and environmental issues. Within the faith community, this work must reflect a more integrated understanding than what has been offered from the tradition, where patriarchy and male-dominated God language perpetuate gender inequality.\(^{182}\)

In order for relief and development work to be truly effective and just, it must embrace issues of (among others) encouraging full participation of all members of a community, seeking out justice, and working toward gender equality. Projects and programmes must reflect “careful listening to nature and mimicking its basic design strategies.”\(^{183}\) Recognising the subjectivity of the individual contributes to an holistic care for creation, which for Christians becomes “a redeeming activity grounded in the

---


\(^{181}\) Ruether describes aspects of gender inequality in the Third World as “Deforestation means women walk twice as far each day to gather wood. Drought means women walk twice as far each day seeking water. Pollution means a struggle for clean water largely unavailable to most of one’s people; it means children in shantytowns dying of dehydration from unclean water.” Rosemary Radford Ruether, “Introduction,” in Rosemary Radford Ruether (ed.), *Women Healing Earth* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996): 4-5.

\(^{182}\) For example, patriarchy is identified as one point of anti-ecological accent in the Jewish and Christian traditions. “Male values are most prominent.” Boff, *Cry of the Earth, Cry of the Poor*, 78. Additionally, Ruether argues that the very language needs to be re-considered; “[t]he God language we need today must be ecofeminist, overcoming the domination of the (male ruling class) human over the earth.” Ruether, “The Politics of God in the Christian Tradition,” 337.

\(^{183}\) Rasmussen, *Earth Community, Earth Ethics*, 323.
character of our own redemption, a revelation of the true 'face' of creation as we ourselves undergo the uncovering of our own human face before God. “

**Conclusion**

In general, though the international aid and development industry has identified the environment as a concern, there has been little effort to integrate these concerns within the existing construct of the aid and development work itself; the PWRDF is not different. As a self-identified Christian organisation, however, the PWRDF must incorporate a theology of creation care into all levels of programme and project planning and implementation. This eco-theology for relief and development work highlights the essential connection between people and the Earth. The first eco-theological principle calls for a spiritual awareness of the communion that exists between humans and the rest of creation, inviting humans to demonstrate their faith through actions respecting the ecosystem. The secondary principle considers the role of humans within the ecosystem, challenging unsustainable structures of human supremacy and domination. The third principle addresses the subjectivity of the individual and the ability of all beings to be contributors within the society. Chapter Three of this thesis will apply these principles to the relief and development work of the PWRDF.

---

184 Williams, “Renewing the Face of the Earth.”
CHAPTER THREE:  
ANOTHER WORLD IS POSSIBLE

The overarching philosophy of the PWRDF is to be a response by Canadian Anglicans to the Gospel call to bear witness to God’s healing love in a broken world. To that end, and inspired by Christian hope and concern, the PWRDF establishes partnerships both in Canada and overseas to share in the creation of a more just and peaceful world. While these partnerships work at many levels, the guiding principle of the PWRDF is to listen and learn from partners in its development work. The PWRDF strives to be committed to a system of international development and global justice that is founded on theological reflection and faith-based analysis. At present, the PWRDF has identified a desire to incorporate earth-friendly perspectives into its work through its vision, mission, and values.

Chapter Two of this thesis proposed some eco-theological guidance for relief and development work. These principles were defined as the communion between humans and the rest of creation, the role of humans within the ecosystem, and the subjectivity of the individual.

This chapter will propose a comprehensive eco-theological framework to support and inform the relief and development work of the PWRDF. The relief and development work of the PWRDF will explore and promote ways in which we might live in full communion with our environment. The work of the PWRDF will be influenced by the integration of such an eco-theological framework to express that communion in both immediate relief and long-term development; for example relief work will ideally be derived from sustainable and renewable local sources, encourage long-range sustainable
planning, and promote education around embracing a healthy interconnection with local ecosystems. Long-term development work will ideally be focused on addressing structural imbalances with a goal to assisting local partners in their work to benefit the wider community.

An Eco-Theological Framework for the PWRDF

This framework will connect the eco-theology specified in Chapter Two of this thesis to the PWRDF’s core relief and development principles within the vision, mission, and values. If the proposed eco-theological perspective is applied to the policies of the PWRDF, the following revisions could be seen: the framework will extend immediate influence on the writing of an updated “Environment Policy,” and will gradually extend to all areas of the work of the PWRDF, including the focus on community, long-term development, and education; the PWRDF’s “Guiding Principles” will shift from their anthropocentric perspective to a more holistic approach; and the strategic goals set out in each new strategic plan will incorporate this eco-theology. This extended application, however, lies beyond the scope of this thesis.

1. Vision

As previously noted, the vision of the PWRDF is for “a truly just, peaceful, healthy world.” The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting November 3-5 2010,” 20.
implications possible. Of specific note was that “a healthy world includes the
environment and justice.”\textsuperscript{186} As such, any of the eco-theological principles might be
applied to an extrapolation of the vision statement. This application, however, will be
more specifically focused in the discussion on the mission and values that follows.

The vision statement reflects the considerable trend of environmental discussions
taking place within the aid industry in general. The world of international development
cannot ignore the reality of environmental concerns, regardless of how that awareness is
realised.

2. Mission

The mission statement of the PWRDF, adopted at the same time as the vision
statement, was also carefully crafted to convey as much information as possible in a
simple statement. The mission reads that “[a]s an instrument of faith, [the] PWRDF
connects Anglicans in Canada to communities around the world in dynamic partnerships
to advance development, respond to emergencies, assist refugees and act for positive
change.”\textsuperscript{187}

It is within this mission statement that the discussion of Christian environmental
care within the aid industry becomes particularly relevant. International development and
aid demands a level of care for creation. This responsibility of creation care is
particularly important to Christians as it is rooted in the scriptures, history, and tradition
of the Christian faith. As the PWRDF is the outreach branch of the Anglican Church of
Canada, it is the organisation best equipped to faithfully address all issues of international

\textsuperscript{186} The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Minutes of the Board of Directors
Meeting November 3-5 2010, 21.

\textsuperscript{187} Ibid., 20-21.
aid, including care for creation. In order to accomplish the mission statement, the understanding of dynamic partnerships must reflect both human and non-human communities.

The mission statement’s first declaration identifies the PWRDF as an instrument of faith; this faith is rooted and grounded in scriptural analysis. The application of this faith is therefore backed by scripture. By embracing a new environmentally focused reading of the scriptures, as guided by a variety of theological resources, the scriptural basis for the work of the PWRDF will aid in the development and integration of an eco-theology into programmes and projects. Three brief examples of such biblical analysis address the notion of community. For example, Hoek details how the prophetic writings offer hope for creation and the restoration of glory.\(^{188}\) Similarly, Spencer, White and Vroblesky show how the redemptive promise in Isaiah celebrates that “humanity and ‘environment’ are intimately and inextricably linked. Both are part of the created order.”\(^{189}\) Finally, Moltmann argues that the biblical notion of community rejects the destructive objectification of the planet and inspires “a finite, temporal world [to] co-exist with the infinite, eternal God.”\(^{190}\)

3. **Values**

The PWRDF identifies the Micah challenge, “to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God,” as its overarching value, the scriptural passage acting as the basis for four articulated values. These values, detailed in the “Strategic Plan 2012-2015,” are: mutuality, giving and receiving, the beauty and harmony of

---


\(^{189}\) See Spencer, White and Vroblesky, *Christianity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Living*, 105.

\(^{190}\) See Moltmann, *God in Creation*, 147-148, 279.
creation, and solidarity with the oppressed.\textsuperscript{191} Each of these will be discussed below, connected with the eco-theological principle that most directly applies.

\textbf{Mutuality} is defined as “[t]he means by which people have equal access to what they need to live life abundantly.”\textsuperscript{192} This value relates directly to the eco-theological principle of the communion between humans and the rest of creation. Mutuality depends on the interconnection of humans and their environment, and therefore must be an integral component of faith-based relief and development work. Humans are called to acknowledge all of creation as part of their community, respecting creation as the “special treasure of God”\textsuperscript{193} as presented in the scriptures. While the work of the PWRDF currently focuses on human interactions, mutuality under the new eco-theological framework will include directions toward communion with the entire Earth community, embracing “the human being as ‘a creature in the fellowship of creation,’ ...a being that can only exist in community with all other created beings and which can only understand itself in that community.”\textsuperscript{194}

Encouraging all of humanity to demonstrate their faith through a respect for the earth, the PWRDF will encourage and require this respect and support within all the communities with which it works. This will be accomplished through a new, holistic paradigm in which a connectedness to the Earth is celebrated in the relief and development work, as articulated in a new “Environment Policy.” This holistic approach

\begin{footnotes}
\item[192] Ibid., 1.
\item[193] Brueggemann, \textit{Genesis}, p. 19
\item[194] Moltmann, \textit{God in Creation}, 186.
\end{footnotes}
may at first be difficult “because it involves changing the way people view the world and their place in it.”

The eco-theological framework will allow the PWRDF to offer leadership for this paradigm shift through acceptance of responsibility, investment, and participation. This leadership will also extend to aid agencies’ alliances in which the PWRDF is a member. These alliances allow for an increased number and scope of global partnerships; the extension of the PWRDF’s eco-theological framework within these alliances will increase the impact of relief and development efforts in the four stages of relief and development work.

As part of the compassion and responsibility they must offer to the entirety of creation, this impact will be realised as programmes are designed from a mindset of mutuality, highlighting issues of self-limitation, and the link between human health and the health of the planet. As Rowan Williams articulates, “[t]here is no guarantee that the
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195 Gardner, Inspiring Progress, 155.

196 This work may be informed by such frameworks as Wendell Berry’s “17 Sensible Steps” quoted in Rasmussen, Earth Community, Earth Ethics, 333-334 or Berry’s “Peace of Earth” in Berry, The Dream of the Earth, 220-221.


198 For example, the PWRDF did not have a partner relationship in Haiti at the time of the 2010 earthquake, yet through membership in ACT Alliance was able to connect with those in need. As such, Canadian Anglicans offered both immediate response and ongoing development. See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Program Profile: Humanitarian Response,” 3.

199 The four stages of relief and development work are: relief, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and sustainable development. See: The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Four Stages of Emergency Response.”
world we live in will 'tolerate' us indefinitely if we prove ourselves unable to live within its constraints.”

Additionally, the eco-theological understanding of communion embraces the mindset of ecological design. This mindset follows basic principles, namely: “Solutions grow from place ... Ecological accounting informs design ... Design should be done with nature ... Everyone is a designer ... Nature should be made visible.” This mindset is realised within the eco-theological framework through such examples as the use of local experts, sourcing locally sustainable materials, and minimising overall external dependency to thereby strengthen the community.

**Giving and receiving** is defined as “[t]he means by which decisions are made for sustainable community development, social justice and human rights.” This value relates directly to the eco-theological principle dealing with the role of humans within the ecosystem, and encourages humans to recognise their own intimacy with the world “in a single community of existence.” Current structures of development and progress, however, tend to reject this intimacy when they demand human supremacy over their environment. The application of an eco-theological framework will support the work of the PWRDF to re-examine and challenge traditional notions of sustainable development.

---

200 “Climate change has been characterised as a matter of justice both to those who now have no part in decision-making at the global level yet bear the heaviest burdens as a consequence of the irresponsibility of wealthier nations, and to those who will succeed us on this planet – justice to our children and grandchildren. ... We can't easily set out a straightforward code that will tell us precisely when and where we step across the line into the unintelligence and ungodliness I have sketched. But we can at least see that the question is asked, and asked on the basis of a clear recognition that there is no way of manipulating our environment that is without cost or consequence – and thus also of a recognition that we are inextricably bound up with the destiny of our world.” Williams, “Renewing the Face of the Earth.”

201 Rasmussen, *Earth Community, Earth Ethics*, 342.


to prevent continuation of underlying destructive behaviours. For this, “[t]he deceptively simple first law of ethics, ‘Do no harm,’ is still good advice.”

An eco-theological framework recognises the interconnection between the goal of sustainable development, justice, and rights and the structural imbalances now present in the world. These imbalances include (but are not limited to) colonial governance, caste structures, and gender inequality; the continued existence of or only minor adaptation to these structures prevents truly sustainable community development.

This type of imbalance is demonstrated in the “groaning of creation” (Paul’s letter to the Romans, chapter 8), including human-provoked disasters (such as oil spills or accidentally lit forest fires), political oppression, and tragedies of injustice. Hoek highlights “that the transgressions of God’s people, the social balance and the ecological concerns are interwoven.” An eco-theological framework will inform the work around these interconnections by re-considering the language and theology of stewardship (considering this as a partnership with all of creation) and of *Imago Dei* (considered a call to action by the faithful rather than as a description of being). As a result, long-term development programmes will more intentionally apply these notions to engage in a way that is not to “conceive, design, build, and maintain a better version of the old world” but to participate in a new sustainable one, one unencumbered by today’s social structure.

---

204 Rasmussen elaborates that “[s]ustainable development as green globalism is rejected here. It is rejected despite its standing as a sincere attempt at good stewardship of ecumenical earth. Our argument is not with goals or motives. Most sustainable-development goals are, of themselves, proper guides for actions and policies: maintaining the integrity of ecological systems in the process of meeting basic human needs, thus integrating resource development with quality of life advances; observing cultural diversity and promoting local participation and empowerment; pursuing social justice and equity as essential to sustainability itself. Rather, green globalism is rejected because its starting point, framework, and means are fatally askew.” Rasmussen, *Earth Community, Earth Ethics*, 328.

imbalances. The long-range planning does not call for a denial of “those pleasures that make life worthwhile but to rediscover what in fact does make life worthwhile.”

An eco-theological framework will also inform the work of the PWRDF by embracing the biblical notion of Sabbath, taking into consideration the need for holy and healing rest of both humans and non-humans. As the work of the PWRDF and its partners embraces this holy rest, the Earth will be able to begin a healing process which will in turn benefit the wider community. As the health of the whole community increases, so will the ability of that community to engage in efforts toward other right relations. As such, the work of the PWRDF and its partners will intentionally support creation’s own relief and development work, for “[i]n the Sabbath stillness men and women no longer intervene in the environment through their labour. They let it be entirely God’s creation.”

Solidarity with the oppressed is defined as “Our Gospel mandate to identify with the vulnerable and the suffering, and to work with those who challenge poverty, violence and other injustice.” This value relates directly to the eco-theological principle of the subjectivity of the individual.

Acknowledging that all things contribute to the universe story, the work of the PWRDF in this area is to be based in scripture and focused on the empowerment of those striving for justice. With an eco-theological reading of the scriptures, the work of the PWRDF will act to enable and empower all (humans and non-humans) to be full contributors within their community. The denial of such contribution denies the essence
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206 Spencer, White and Vroblewsky, Christianity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Living, 223-224.

207 Moltmann, God in Creation, 277.

of that individual, and subsequently denies the whole community. The work of the PWRDF and its partners will aim to decrease unhealthy dependencies on any individuals, governments, or corporations and will instead promote just, healthy, and peaceful relationships, which will in turn enable and empower all within the community to fulfill their role.

The development programming will work with communities to re-establish a spiritual connection with the Earth, and to take action promoting its overall wellbeing. This spiritual connection is best informed by scriptures, a sampling of which has been provided in this thesis. An eco-theological framework will link human domination over the environment with the PWRDF partners’ stories of oppression; these situations occur in unjust systems of control and in the promulgation of fear, which theologians such as Walter Brueggemann connect to biblical stories of slavery and oppression.\textsuperscript{209}

Incorporating the Earth into analysis of community and the common good, the PWRDF staff, Directors, donors, and partners will embrace a holistic definition.

One such definition is Thomas Berry’s ‘Peace of Earth’ model, which requires an understanding that “the earth is a single community composed of all its geological, biological, and human components, ... is not some fixed condition but a creative process, ... [has a] progressive dependence on human decision, ... [and demonstrates] hopefulness.”\textsuperscript{210} This model will encourage healthier relationships and

\textsuperscript{209} For example, Old Testament scholar Walter Brueggemann offers reflections on unjust control, identifying slavery in story of Joseph (Genesis 37-50) “because the strong ones work a monopoly over the weak ones, and eventually exercise control over their bodies. Not only that: in the end the peasants, now become slaves, are grateful for their dependent status.” On fear, Brueggemann details that “[t]he anxiety system of Pharaoh precluded the common good. The imperial arrangement made everyone into a master or a slave, a threat or an accomplice, a rival or a slave. For the sake of the common good, it was necessary to depart the anxiety system that produces nightmares of scarcity (emphasis in the original).” See Brueggemann, Journey to the Common Good (Louisville KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010), 6-13.

\textsuperscript{210} See Berry, The Dream of the Earth, 220-221.
interconnectedness between humans and their ecosystems, it will allow for a decreased dependency on external aid, and it will truly celebrate the beauty of creation.

By seeking links between environmental degradation and existing situations of oppression (such as gender inequality), the solidarity efforts of the PWRDF and its partners will more effectively work against the causes and effects of that oppression. An eco-theological framework informs the work of the PWRDF to consider the environmental component in all areas of injustice, raising questions of ecological concern and involvement when considering all levels of oppression and injustice. In identifying with both the vulnerable and with those who fight injustice, the PWRDF focus will no longer simply be on traditional understanding of cost and availability of resources, but will include an assessment of how much injustice is set loose on people and the planet by the use of certain practices.

The fourth value mentioned in the “Strategic Plan 2012-2015” is the **Beauty and Harmony of Creation**, and is defined as “[a] lens through which we seek to contribute to a healthy environment and uphold the integrity of creation.” This value speaks to the need for this proposed eco-theological framework to be applied to the programmes and projects of the PWRDF. It is the clear expression of the changed culture of ecological concern within the Anglican Church of Canada and the PWRDF. This value demands that the PWRDF implement an eco-theology within its relief and development work. The ministry of the PWRDF is to hear and respond to the interconnected cry of humans and environment in matters of justice.

---

Through their baptism Christians believe that “[h]uman beings, as part of nature, cannot escape their distinctive work as moral creatures.”212 This work toward moral action involves “sorting out the demands and claims that emerge out of the precious moments when life is whole and new,” which for Christians means perceiving that God is active in those precious moments when change is occurring. It is in reflecting on those changes where faith is nurtured, as “[s]uch moments address us and insist that we be transformed. Such events claim us. They overwhelm us with a demand, which then comes to be morality.” These moments have a positive influence on the lives of those changed, as “a people claimed, loved, and identified can’t live like nonentities.”213 Equally, an environment claimed, loved, and identified cannot exist like a nonentity. Humans have a moral obligation to fully care for the earth in these ways, and to allow themselves to be changed through that care.

More than just an agency of morality, the PWRDF follows “a theology of action.”214 Once an eco-theological framework is fully integrated into all aspects of the work of the PWRDF, these actions will truly demonstrate the response to God’s call in making positive impacts on a suffering world. These new actions will be “[a] thousand things, all done in the name of the sacredness of Creation, all designed to make a real, visible, luminous difference.”215 They will be carried out by local people, embracing traditional and sustainable ways of life for all; thereby celebrating the communion

212 Rasmussen, Earth Community, Earth Ethics, 347.
213 Examples of this can be found from the miracles in the gospels: a beggar healed (John 5.1-9), a blind man healed (John 9.25), an empty tomb (Matthew 28.1-10). “Free people can’t live like slave people, a man who can see can’t act like a blind man, a live person can’t settle for the mortality of death, a son found again can’t play the part of a lost one.” Brueggemann, Peace (St. Louis MO: Chalice Press), 68-69.
214 See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, Board of Director’s Manual, 11.
between humanity and the rest of creation. The actions of the PWRDF partners will acknowledge that development actions purporting to help people while harming the earth are merely shifting oppression and injustice, and still enacting it; this is denying the proper role of humans within the ecosystem. The treatment of “Earth as blood and soil,” an entity to be used but not appreciated, will not be tolerated; a subjectivity of the individual must be incorporated. All programmes and projects supported by the PWRDF must incorporate into their practices these eco-theological principles in order to meet the new environmental requirements embedded in the vision, mission, and values of the PWRDF. This will necessitate regular examination and assessment of programme planning and implementation as well as institutional practices, not only to ensure compliance but to allow for continual improvement.

CONCLUSION

Faith-based relief and development work is a church’s response to a call for justice, for all of creation. This response is rooted in the church and its agencies, which are called to positions of leadership. The eco-theological framework proposed in this thesis is rooted in scripture, tradition, and reason. It connects the philosophy of the PWRDF with relevant eco-theological principles. This framework promotes environmental stewardship as a priority in the relief and development work of the PWRDF. Moving beyond resource development, this proposed eco-theology may be applied to all areas of the work of the PWRDF and its partners.

The Call for Justice

The church has long been a voice in the cry for justice. The church has recently come to realise that justice for humanity is fully integrated with justice for the planet. Within human cultures, it is the poor and marginalised who will suffer most from climate change, “indeed who are already suffering, and who have the least resources to enable them to adapt to the changes forced on them,” these concerns could equally be applied to the Earth.217

Faith-based relief and development work seeks ways to support and empower these suffering communities through acts of mercy. Maggay argues that traditional approaches to changing social behaviour such as education, value formation and the use of power are important, “but even more important than these is the ability to constructively engage structures, help communities to resource their own needs within

their own context, and nurture a strategic minority that (sic) will create a presence and a voice in public space on behalf of the poor.”

When considering ecological issues, “there is a strong mandate for the Church now to engage with these issues and to begin to challenge, both within our own community and in the wider world, the attitudes and behaviours which have led to such widespread environmental degradation in the world which God has entrusted to us.”

The role of the church is undeniable in responding to God’s call for justice.

**The Role of the Church**

While the Church has a significant and unique role in the environmental movement, “the deepest religious insights on the relation between (sic) God, nature, and humans may not emerge until religious people, acting on the terms indicated by their traditions, join these movements. The act of engagement will itself spur new thinking, new understanding.” It is through this engagement that the PWRDF believes that another world is possible.

The work of the PWRDF is not just philanthropic, but understood by Canadian Anglicans to be an extension of their faith, because “[f]aith, inspiring as it is, must not stand alone.” The PWRDF’s unique position “as an instrument of faith” encourages support and engagement from its members to bring about “a truly just, healthy, and
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220 McKibben, “Where Do We Go From Here?”
221 Spencer, White and Vroblesky, *Climate Change, and Sustainable Living*. 225.
peaceful world” through sometimes unconventional and frequently inspirational ways of thinking and doing mission.222

Despite Christianity’s history of environmental negligence and exploitation in that missional effort, “there is a strong mandate for the church now to engage with these issues and to begin to challenge, both within our own community and in the wider world, the attitudes and behaviours which have led to such widespread environmental degradation in the world which God has entrusted to us.”223

This mandate includes biblical references of servanthood, of unjust policies stemming from economic exploitation, and of human responsibility. For example, on servanthood, Wirzba proposes that Noah’s experience of the ark teaches Noah the responsibility of care for family and land. “Here we see played out the servant mentality that submits the ego to the needs of others.”224 Concerning policies, Brueggemann discusses unjust structures from Exodus 5, which “is permeated with harsh pharaonic commands to the cheap labour force, unbearable labour conditions, and unrealistic production schedules,” incorporating policies grounded in fear that seem “deliberately designed to produce suffering.” The oppressed people then cry to YHWH, turning away from the oppressor toward God. This cry features “a fresh divine resolve for an alternate possibility, a resolve that features raw human agency.”225

Furthermore, some theologians propose ways for the church (both individuals and communities) to engage the issues. Regarding human responsibility, Spencer White and
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223 Spencer, White and Vroblesky, Christianity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Living, 99.
224 Wirzba, Paradise of God, 142.
225 Brueggemann, Journey to the Common Good, 7-11.
Vroblesky argue that “Those of us who live in the high-income industrialised nations with standards of living purchased on the back of profligate use of natural resources have a responsibility in our use of resources, an imperative to care for those elsewhere in the world marginalised by climate change.”  

Gary Gardner offers hope that while most of the world’s religious traditions have come to environmental issues late in the movement, “when religious groups get involved, they do so in powerful ways.”  

Encouraging Christian involvement, Maggay proposes the use of the Word and the Spirit, as the resources of faith, as the primary means to engage “the deep structures of our cultures” to effect positive, lasting change.  

Leadership

Religious involvement in responding to a call for justice demands strong religious leadership. Those who strive to enable change and those who need to receive comfort and consolation “await with eagerness the messages of religious leaders. For when one’s physical and spiritual foundations are shaken, it is important to be able to hold onto the resources of faith, hope and life.”  

The PWRDF has a history of offering strong leadership for Canadian Anglicans in relief and development work.  

This leadership now extends to applying an eco-theological framework to the relief and development work of the PWRDF. The work of the PWRDF is guided and directed by the articulated vision, mission, and values of the organisation. The eco-theological principles corresponding to this work includes the communion between ...
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226 Spencer, White and Vroblesky, Christianity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Living, 99.
227 Gardner, Inspiring Progress, 67.
228 Maggay, “Justice and Approaches to Social Change,” 123.
humans and the rest of creation, the role of the human within the ecosystem, and subjectivity of the individual. The ecological framework identified in Chapter Three of this thesis weds these concepts together, identifying in broad strokes how they will be incorporated into the ministry and mission of the PWRDF.

The introduction of an eco-theological framework into all areas of its work will allow the PWRDF to maintain and extend its leadership role. Embracing environmental concern through an articulated eco-theological framework and an updated “Environment Policy,” the PWRDF will continue to wield influence as a faith-based aid agency. This eco-theological framework will inform and support the work of the PWRDF by referencing scripture, the Christian tradition, and contemporary eco-theology. Additionally, the PWRDF must continue to learn from the past and from other like-minded organisations and movements, engaging in conferences and alliances to share past successes and discern ways to put new ideas into action. One way to do this will be to identify “the remarkable religiously inspired environmental initiatives already happening in many parts of the world.”

This engagement has already begun within the PWRDF; this framework will provide the necessary structure to both demand and inform new ways of thinking and working for the PWRDF and its partners.

\[ \text{References} \]
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231 The engaging process of analysis, critique, and application has begun through a series of ‘mapping’ exercises in Anglican Communion development work, international NGO work in Canada, ecumenical relationships in Canada, PWRDF and General Synod ‘Relationships Division’ work, and PWRDF landscape, with a goal to envision and explore continuing and new connections. “It indicates to me the need to overview the lay of the land, to see how things are shifting, discern what movements are coalescing and how alliances might be re-negotiated to meet changing and uncharted needs.” See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, “Executive Director’s Report: November 3, 2010—May 2, 2011,” p. 1


Practical Application

The foundation for the eco-theological framework developed in this thesis is sourced from scripture, theology, scientific awareness, and the experience of faith-based aid delivery. This foundation allows for a comprehensive understanding of the component factors which are faced by the PWRDF and their partners in their work. It also allows glimpses of God to shine through the created order, as “[t]he totality of nature is the theatre of grace.”232

The ultimate purpose of articulating this eco-theological framework is to directly influence and support the relief and development work of the PWRDF. This theology will go beyond the creation of a programme or a resource on environmental issues, to embrace these concerns as a foundational component of all of the PWRDF’s efforts through “appropriate scale and action.”233

Presently within the PWRDF, when attention is paid to environmental concerns, there is a lack of both consistency and expertise in this area. The “Environment Policy” and “Environmental Assessment Sheet” are inadequate when considered from the perspective of an eco-theological framework. Presently, programmes and projects are planned from an anthropocentric mind-set which, at best, applies environmental concerns as secondary. Despite mentioning the environment within the “Guiding Principles” and identifying environment as a cross-cutting theme in both the “2007-2010 Strategic Plan” and the “Strategic Plan 2012-2015,” the application of that concern has been lacking. The increasing culture of environmental concern within both the Anglican Church of
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Canada and the PWRDF demands that more attention be given to environmental sustainability within the ongoing ministry of the PWRDF.

While the application of the eco-theological framework will directly impact the relief and development work of the PWRDF, it will permeate throughout the PWRDF’s work in other areas, including public engagement, youth programming, volunteer management, and finance.

This thesis demonstrates that the implementation of a strong eco-theological framework will benefit the work of the PWRDF by aligning the work of the PWRDF to the theology of the Anglican Church of Canada as an agency of the church’s mission, by strengthening connections between members of the Anglican Church (who have articulated their care for creation) and the relief and development work of the PWRDF, and by ensuring that a consistent application of environmental stewardship is present in all programmes and projects supported by the PWRDF. The implementation of such an eco-theological framework demonstrates that “Christians around the world are in a distinct and key position to turn their faith into collective action.” As such, Canadian Anglicans will be living and promoting “responsible and collaborative behaviour.”

The impact of this action may be difficult to immediately assess. There is, at this time, very little published on the environmental impact of relief and development work. However, some studies of secular aid agencies have demonstrated insufficient environmental involvement in programme planning and implementation. This differs from Christian relief and development agencies as the work represents not just care for creation but active participation in caring for God’s creation. Bryant articulates that for
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Christians, “[o]ur situation calls for envisioning new ways to live that will reflect the divine creativity and love for creation, thereby allowing both nature and ourselves to flourish.”

**Next Steps**

A key component of the application of this eco-theological framework will be education with all constituents of the PWRDF: Canadian Anglicans as members and donors, the PWRDF staff, and the partners receiving aid. Within Canada, a public engagement campaign will be necessary for all members and donors to understand the rationale and structure of the eco-theological perspective, staff will need training in how to implement this cosmological perspective into programme planning, and the PWRDF partners will need to learn to integrate new and different ways of delivering relief and development work. The training and teaching will incorporate areas of eco-theology, biblical foundation, and scientific knowledge to be best understood, supported and integrated.

Although the proposed eco-theological framework within this thesis promotes environmental stewardship as a priority in the work of the PWRDF, there is much work to be done that lies beyond the scope of this thesis. The “Environmental Policy” and “Environmental Assessment Sheet” need to be updated, and existing programmes and projects will need to be rigorously re-assessed accordingly. Staff will need specific environmental training; an environmental expert may need to be hired on a full-time basis to ensure partner consistency and compliancy with the new policy. The governance of

---

the PWRDF will need to address this prevailing eco-theology, including the re-writing of the *Board of Director’s Manual* in such areas as the “Guiding Principles,” “Partnership Policy” and “Global Context.” Future resources such as print materials, advertising, and liturgical resources need to be written from this new perspective, a shift which will have considerable impact on the public engagement staff. The requisite changes are significant, yet they are essential; they speak of a positive shift in the way Canadian Anglicans can respond to and engage with God’s creation. These changes speak of hope; they celebrate that “[h]ope is real. There are good grounds for it.”

---

236 The “Guiding Principles” only briefly hint at the need to protect creation within The PWRDF programmes. The “Global Context” and “PWRDF Partnership Policy” do not address the environment at all. See The Primate’s World Relief and Development Fund, *Board of Directors*, 11-12, 16-21, 187-192.

**APPENDIX A**

PWRDF Environmental Analysis Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PWRDF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT/PROGRAM APPROVAL CHECKLIST (PPAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><del>Appendix C</del></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS SHEET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Program name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Partner: ___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed by: _________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: ________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section A. is to be completed for all projects/programs. Section B is found on page 2.

Section A. Questions to be asked of all projects/programs (circle and fill in responses as appropriate):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y / N</th>
<th>1. Does the partner have an environmental policy or statement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y / N</td>
<td>2. Are environmental objectives/considerations integrated in project/program objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y / N</td>
<td>3. a) Will there be any impacts on the environment and/or will there be any impacts of the environment on this project/program? If yes, please complete 3 b) b) If impacts are possible please explain both negative and positive impacts: ________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y / N</td>
<td>4. Was the community, especially women and other marginalized groups, involved in identifying possible negative or positive impacts? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y / N</td>
<td>5. Does the project/program involve any of the following activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y / N</td>
<td>• &quot;physical work&quot; relating to building of roads, latrines, sanitary systems, wells, dams, irrigation systems, or aquaculture basins?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y / N</td>
<td>• constructing a building covering more than 100 m² and/or over 5 m high?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y / N</td>
<td>• constructing a building within 30 m of a body of water?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y / N</td>
<td>• buildings or activities that could release polluting substances into a body of water?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If the answer to any of the questions in 5. is Yes, an environmental assessment is required.*

6. If required, is environmental assessment completed with copy in our file? If not, who will do it? By when? (NB grants **cannot** be disbursed until environmental assessment is completed.)
Section B. Environmental Analysis Tool

Section B is to be completed if:

a) concerns surface from Section A question 3;
b) if the answer is Yes to any question in Section A question 5;
c) project/program involves a start-up, pilot program, or capital expenses in Good Governance; Community Organizing; Public Education Activities; Human Resource Development/Capacity Building; Human Rights Advocacy; Research and Development.

Completing Section B is to help determine whether an environmental assessment must be undertaken.

Mark an “X” in only one box in each column, including “socio-economic” (population and culture), in the following table to identify the type and significance of expected change in the environment affected by this project/program or how the environment might affect the project/program. Use “N/A” box if you believe a category does not apply to your project/program. Your best judgment may be used to complete this analysis, while referring to partner and available sectoral best practices/checklists as needed. Also, indicate the number of sites where this change occurs (especially in relation to multiple wells and latrines). This does not replace an Environmental Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Change</th>
<th>Surface Water</th>
<th>Ground Water</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Vegetation</th>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Fish &amp; Aquatic</th>
<th>Socio-Economic (Population &amp; Culture)</th>
<th># of Sites</th>
<th>Effect of Environment on Project/Program (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation/ Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant &amp; Mitigable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant &amp; Unmitigable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects, Mitigation Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Please list any problematic environmental features and project/program components, and what strategies or specific measures will be implemented to mitigate, alleviate or eliminate such negative, or potentially negative, effects, which may be monitored.
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