

PIOTR KOPIEC

Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski Jana Pawła II, Wydział Teologii

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0581-0737>

The Christian Contribution to the Changes of the Development Aid System: The Lutheran Approach

Chrześcijański wkład w zmiany systemu pomocy rozwojowej: podejście luterskie

Abstract

Unlike the previous decades, the global development aid system is more willing to admit a significant role of faith-based organisations in promoting development thinking and in the distribution of development aid. The Lutheran World Federation (LWF) approach significantly contributes to this new thinking, especially as the theological background, global structures, and long-year experience in diaconal work enable the LWF's experts to make credible and feasible utterances in the field of development aid. The article outlines the meaning and global structure of the development aid and contrasts it with the Lutheran, Christian approach to development. It stresses the significance of the theological background of such terms as sustainability and sustainable development and specific assets ascribed to faith-based organisations. The text synthesizes information and observations from relevant literature on development and selected documents of the LWF.

Keywords: development aid, development, Lutheran World Federation, faith-based organisations, sustainability.

Abstrakt

W odróżnieniu od poprzednich dekad globalny system pomocy rozwojowej jest bardziej chętny, aby uznać znaczącą rolę organizacji wyznaniowych w promowaniu myślenia rozwojowego i w przekazywaniu pomocy rozwojowej. Podejście Światowej Federacji Luterskiej (SFL) znacząco przyczynia się do takiej nowej postawy, szczególnie że fundament teologiczny, globalne struktury oraz długoletnie doświadczenie uzdalniają ekspertów SFL do wiarygodnych wypowiedzi w obszarze pomocy rozwojowej. Artykuł przedstawia zarys znaczenia oraz globalnych struktur pomocy rozwojowej i zestawia go z luterskim podejściem do rozwoju. Podkreśla znaczenie teologicznego fundamentu takich pojęć jak: zrównoważenie oraz zrównoważony rozwój, oraz specyficznych cech przypisywanych organizacjom wyznaniowym. Tekst jest syntezą informacji i obserwacji zawartych w literaturze przedmiotowej oraz wybranych dokumentach SFL.

Keywords: pomoc rozwojowa, rozwój, Światowa Federacja Luterska, organizacje wyznaniowe, zrównoważenie.

There are many signs of the present-day prompting to look for a new economic and social order¹: a growing economic gap between rich and poor countries and the divisions within the societies; the humanitarian catastrophes, occurring despite a vast number of development and assistance institutions and mechanisms; the upheavals in human work brought about by the technological progress. The sociologists discover new social reality, which is said to be post-secular and post-material, featured by a more flexible social structure and more reflexive social relations. Of course, it is only a very rudimentary description of today's world. Nevertheless, there is a prevalent conviction that this world requires new development thinking and new thinking on development aid. A part of this change is a new attitude towards development organisations having religious (Christian) backgrounds. Unlike the previous decades, the global development aid system is more willing to admit a significant role of faith-based organisations in promoting development thinking and in the distribution of development aid. The article outlines the meaning and global structure of the development aid and contrasts it with the Lutheran, Christian approach to development. It stresses the significance of the theological background of such terms as sustainability and sustainable development and specific assets ascribed to faith-based organisations. The text synthesizes relevant literature on development and selected documents of the Lutheran World Federation.

1. The meanings of development

Development is the universal keyword in defining social and political reality. It is embedded in the Platonic-Aristotelian paradigm of seeing the world as a continuing shift toward a better future, of the endless unfolding of its potential.² Progress, emancipation, change, transformation, shifting wealth, combating poverty and social exclusion, growth – all these terms at the forefront of the political language stems from the socially internal compulsion of development. Goethe's thought: "He who moves not forward goes backwards" well depicts a mindset and an attitude approved by modern civilisation.

Jan Pieterse defines development as "the organised intervention in collective affairs according to a standard of improvement."³ However, such definition would have fallen short of expectations when lacking further re-

¹ The article was supported by the National Science Centre, Poland, nr 2018/31/B/HS1/01254

² Piotr Sztompka. 2010. *Socjologia zmian społecznych*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak, 25.

³ Jan Nederveen Pieterse. 2010. *Development Theory Deconstructions/Reconstructions*. London: Sage Publications, 3.

marks. Thus development is the social theory that precedes social practices, even though sometimes the former lags behind the latter. The theory of development may be regarded as an issue of social sciences and, on the other hand, as an ideology giving meaning to political strategies. The politics of development is a crucial component of the current international political agenda on the global level. Suffice to remind the utterance of the United Nations from the Copenhagen Declaration proclaiming that: “For the first time in history, at the invitation of the United Nations, we gather as heads of State and Government to recognise the significance of social development and human wellbeing for all and to give to these goals the highest priority both now and into the twenty-first century.”⁴

Development is, therefore, also an idea justifying and encouraging efforts, actions, activities of governments, international organisations, NGOs, FBOs (faith-based organisations), and individuals dreaming about a better world without poverty, exclusions, and military conflicts. Jeffrey Sachs’ ladder of development is a relevant example of such thinking; in his widespread opinion, the most efficient way to eradicate poverty is help to the poorest to climb this ladder: “Our generation’s challenge is to help the poorest of the poor to escape the misery of extreme poverty so that they may begin their own ascent up the ladder of economic development. The end of poverty, in this sense, is not only the end of extreme suffering but also the beginning of economic progress and of the hope and security that accompany economic development.”⁵

One could also shed more light on the thinking of development when examining different meanings the term carried over time. Pieterse offers such a historical survey when listing several approaches to the understanding of development. Firstly, it is the meaning given by the 19th-century political economists (i.a., Marx and Weber) who considered development in the socio-historical context of economic transitions from the traditional to the industrial society. Secondly, it is the tradition of distinction, or even opposition, between progress and development stemmed from the growing awareness of the catastrophic consequences of modernity driven by the ideology of progress. According to such thinking, shared by many observes in different contexts and different forms, the idea of development gives more attention to various side-effects of economic and social transformations.⁶ Thirdly, development thinking was at the head of the colonial economy and, more broadly, colonialism. Suffice to remind

⁴ United Nations. 1996. *Report of the World Summit for Social Development. Copenhagen 6–12 March 1995*. New York: United Nations, 3.

⁵ Jeffrey Sachs. 2014. *The End of Poverty. Economic Possibilities of Our Time*. New York: The Penguin Press, 24.

⁶ Pieterse. 2010. *Development Theory Deconstructions/Reconstructions*, 6.

the ideology of civilising mission, perceived as a duty bringing less developed countries to higher civilization.⁷

Nevertheless, development in the colonial world often denoted economic exploitation and destroying traditional indigenous cultural patterns. This position appears more critical for the current post-colonial theories driving a vast part of the development aid and development politics. The fourth meaning emerged within the modernisation theory and equated (and still equates) development with economic growth⁸; it appeared as accepting the basic tenet that the most affluent countries are the most developed. Over time, the thinking on modernisation went beyond the economic dimension and encompassed the political, social and cultural systems of a given country – such thinking echoes in many currently widespread worldviews and ideologies.

The last decades offer an even more coherent, comprehensive and holistic understanding of development, based on the political and social revolutions (like, for instance, the Counterculture of the 1960s, communitarianism and a mentioned above postcolonialism). Pieterse lists here the alternative development, with the approach focusing on the social structures and relations, as well as on “human flourishing”⁹; then the human development, that puts the stress on universal (referring to whole humanity) capacitation and entitlement. An exemption is the neoliberal breakthrough of the 1980s and a return to the previous equation of development with the economic growth; an economic and political model imposed by international agencies (like the World Bank or International Monetary Fund) on the selected countries qualified as underdeveloped.¹⁰

Nowadays, the global narration on development appears as an interplay between those who see economic growth as the first step on the development ladder and those who focus on the more holistic wellbeing of society and every individual. The globally approved idea of sustainable development, with the rudimentary definitions from the UN Report *Our Common Future* (“Humanity has the ability to make development sustainable to ensure that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”¹¹) is the best illustration of it. On the other hand, rapid technological progress raises altogether new challenges and sparks further questions (also ethical) on the scope

⁷ Cristina Rojas, Shannon Kindornay. 2014. The Politics of Governing Development. In *The Politics of Development. A Survey*. Ed. Heloise Weber, 25. New York: Routledge.

⁸ Pieterse. 2010. *Development Theory Deconstructions/Reconstructions*, 6.

⁹ Rojas, Kindornay. 2014. The Politics of Governing Development, 7.

¹⁰ Manuel Castells. 2002. *The Internet Galaxy: Reflections on the Internet, Business, and Society*. Oxford: University Press, 267.

¹¹ United Nations. 1987. *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: “Our Common Future”*. New York: United Nations, 55.

of development. Finally, the current ecological and social calamities worldwide lead to the post-development positions that see the results of developmental narration as destroying.

Pieterse completed the survey of the historical meanings of development with its various dimensions, with the crucial questions on its contextualisation. Thus, it is about the historical (and, consequently, social and political) context of usage of the term. The development addresses specific problems of the time. Furthermore, it is about epistemological and axiological measures of what development actually is, and it, in turn, raises the question about class nature of power and the way the power is distributed via social institutions and the legitimate knowledge (as for instance, Michel Foucault's governmentality).¹² It is, therefore, the question of who decides what development is. And finally, it is about the perception of development, therefore, about how it is perceived in the given context. Obviously, all these dimensions overlap themselves.

Today's widespread understanding of development illustrates the UN Agenda 2030 – Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). Seventeen points included in the Agenda encompass social, economic, cultural, and political objectives without prioritising any. Sustainability is one of the keywords; others are balance, growth, justice, equality, education, peace. The Agenda 2030 indicates another aspect of the current approach to development; it is regarded as reflexively stimulated, as planned on the different political and social levels: global, regional, and country-level. It also sparks harsh criticism of those who blame the SDG for being an ideology imposed coercively on almost all political and social institutions of the contemporary world.

2. An outline of the worldwide development aid system

Regardless of which meaning of development is taken, development thinking leads to the development aid. The latter relied on the former, and, as such, it reflects differences in defining the topic. Obviously, it provokes conflicts, misunderstandings, and polemics on adopted values and employed methods between particular development aid institutions.

Nevertheless, development aid became a permanent component of international political relations after World War II, though obviously, there were some aid initiatives before. The relevant literature mentions the international humanitarian aid provided to Venezuela after the Earthquake of 1812, the British Colo-

¹² Dominika Michalak. 2014. "Uniwersytet jako wspólnota komunikacyjna – trudna instytucjonalizacja seminarium". *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 4: 72.

nial Development Act of 1929 as the legal ground for development projects in the British colonies, and the U.S.’ “good neighbour policy” by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933. Yet, the flourishing of the institutionalised development aid system was taking place in the post-War world.

The definition of development aid is arguable. It depends on what a given approach emphasises, on its purpose, or on what worldview or ideology is behind it. Sometimes it can be equated with the term of foreign aid, though this latter has a broader meaning. Roger Riddell, when examining the institutions of foreign aid, distinguishes three main ways of it: official development aid, the aid provided by anon-governmental organisations (NGOs) and civil society organisations (CSOs), finally, the humanitarian and emergency aid given by official donors.¹³ All these three ways overlap themselves. Such a geometry converges with the definition of foreign aid as consisting of “all resources – physical goods, skills and technical know-how, financial grants (gifts), or loans (at concessional rates) – transferred by donors to recipient.”¹⁴

Even though the above definition appears as far from specificity, it provides a semantic and pragmatic development aid framework. It is understood as a type of foreign aid addressing “acute human suffering” and contributing “to human welfare, poverty reduction and development”. Thus, in general, development aid is being defined as a part of “foreign aid whose purpose is to contribute human welfare and development in poor countries.”¹⁵

Moreover, the term “development aid” is being interchangeably used with development assistance. It, in turn, leads to the Development Assistance Committee (DAC), a chapter of the Organization of the Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). The Committee, established in July 1960, was constituted “to consult on the methods for making national resources available for assisting countries and areas in the process of economic development and for expanding and improving the flow of long-term funds and other development assistance to them.”¹⁶ In 1969 the DAC adopted the Official Development Assistance (ODA) strategy, the best-known hallmark and target of the international development aid system. The idea of the ODA was initially offered to a global reflection by the World Council of Churches in 1958¹⁷, then was economically and institu-

¹³ Roger C. Riddell. 2007. *Does Foreign Aid Really Work?* Oxford: University Press, 2.

¹⁴ Riddell. 2007. *Does Foreign Aid Really Work?*, 3.

¹⁵ Riddell. 2007. *Does Foreign Aid Really Work?*, 4.

¹⁶ The Organization of the Economic Cooperation and Development. 2006. *DAC in Dates. The History of OECD's Development Assistance Committee*. Paris: OECD Publications, 36.

¹⁷ World Council of Churches. 1958. *Minutes and Reports of the Eleventh Meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches: Nyborg Strand, Denmark, August 21–29, 1958*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 124.

tionally refining and negotiating through the 1960s. In 1970 the United Nations General Assembly took up the Resolution claiming that “Each economically advanced country will progressively increase its official development assistance to the developing countries and will exert its best efforts to reach a minimum net amount of 0.7% of its gross national product at market prices by the middle of the Decade.”¹⁸

In the following years, the figure of 0.7% marked the international official development aid pursued by the governments of the affluent countries. However, the target was difficult to achieve due to the various polemics between member countries of the DAC on both the amount of assistance given to developing countries and the meaning of assistance itself. Moreover, only a few rich countries met the commitments related to the ODA. As Sachs noticed: “The rich world had famously committed to the target of 0.7 per cent of GNP devoted to official development assistance, direct financial aid to poor countries, yet the share of financial aid as a proportion of rich-world GNP had actually declined from 0.3 to 0.2 per cent during the 1990s.”¹⁹

Nowadays, the ODA is defined as “the flows to countries and territories” (on the DAC list of recipients) which “are provided by official agencies, including state and local governments, or by their executive agencies and each transaction of which is administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as its main objective and is concessional in character and conveys a grant element of at least 25 per cent.”²⁰

The endless polemics on the ODA refers to the goals, measures, donors and recipients, and instruments of development. Yet, it also reflects the controversies on the development aid in the current political circumstances in the globalising world. An answer to the international political system is, for instance, the UN Agenda 2030. Therefore, a good opportunity for asking the questions on the nature of development aid provides the Lutheran approach to the development and contributions of the Lutheran (as well as other Christian) FBOs.

3. Lutheran approach to the development aid system

As above mentioned, an interesting contribution to this new thinking is the Lutheran approach to the development aid presented by the Lutheran World

¹⁸ The Organization of the Economic Cooperation and Development. 2006. *DAC in Dates*, 43.

¹⁹ Sachs. 2014. *The End of Poverty*, 213.

²⁰ *Official Development Assistance: Definition and Coverage* (31.05.2021). <https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/officialdevelopment-assistancedefinitionandcoverage.html>.

Federation (LWF). The LWF is “a global communion of 148 churches in the Lutheran tradition, representing over 77 million Christians in 99 countries.”²¹ The activity of the LWF “takes a variety of forms from theological reflection and dialogue with other churches and faiths to deepening relationships, sharing about faith, serving those in need and advocating for a more just, peaceful and reconciled world.”²² From its inception in 1947, the community is involved in tackling global poverty and boosting development aid. One of the leading causes of the foundation of the LWF was the call for assistance to European refugees or displaced persons immediately after World War II. “This gave the LWF from the outset a strong humanitarian orientation, which continues to today.”²³

It is worthwhile to mention that the LWF is not the only organisation appealing to the Lutheran tradition in the assistance work – two years before the establishment of the LWF, the American Lutherans founded the Lutheran World Relief (LWR), an agency helping European homeless after the war. The LWR was present in many humanitarian catastrophes brought about by conflicts, wars, and natural disasters.

Both the LWF and the LWR understand their vocation as working for transformation, reconciliation and empowerment, “in a way that promotes human dignity and contributes to the construction of a just, participatory and sustainable society”, the way that may be simultaneously interpreted as “signs of God’s love and gracious care and thank God for them and, eventually, when moved by God’s Spirit, seek ways of growing in faith, hope and love.”²⁴ Such a social commitment relied on the foundations of the Reformation theology, appears as the hallmark of most contemporary Lutheran churches. The structural elucidation of the Lutheran approach to development would be more comprehensible when accomplishing with a theological background. The assets presented below like continuity, sustainability, balance between globality and locality, etc. have their source in basic theological tenets of the Lutheranism, in the teaching on God’s creation, God’s grace, human sin, and vocation.

The very starting point is the fundamental Christian truth: any belief and any value is grounded and shaped by the faith Christian confess in the Triune God.²⁵

²¹ *About the Lutheran World Federation* (31.05.2021). <https://www.lutheranworld.org/content/about-lwf>.

²² *About the Lutheran World Federation* (31.05.2021).

²³ The Lutheran World Federation. 2001. *Guiding Principle for Sustainable Development*. Geneva: The Lutheran World Federation, 9.

²⁴ Kjell Nordstokke. 2017. The Church and the Public Space, In *Liberated by God’s Grace*. Ed. Anne Burghardt, 39. Geneva: The Lutheran World Federation.

²⁵ The Lutheran World Federation. 2001. *Guiding Principle for Sustainable Development*, 7.

This tenet is a cornerstone of the teaching on man and woman, their creation in the image of God, their dignity and their equal rights, community and history they create, their conversion and transformation. Development and sustainability are merely reflections of endless human conversion from sin through God's grace and of the mandate to be a steward of God in the world's history. "Created in the image of God, human beings, both male and female, are called to be responsible caretakers or stewards in sustaining and developing what God has created. God bestows upon human beings the life, dignity, freedom, capacity, and potential know-how to participate productively – 'to till and keep the garden' – with one another and with respect for the limits of creation. Human beings are continually transforming this good creation, as co-creators with God in history. Through such activity, life in community continues to be provided for and sustained, according to God's creative wisdom."²⁶

This theological background, global structures, and long-year experience in diaconal work enable the LWF's experts to make credible and feasible utterances in the field of development aid. There are many documents, reports and diagnoses issued in the last ten years which concern the topic. They focus mainly on the particular cases (a sort of diaconal "case studies"); nevertheless, they also have more general and global references that allow to construct a Lutheran approach to the development aid and, at the same time, a Lutheran critique of the worldwide development aid system.

The starting point for this approach is the rudimentary observation that any change could be regarded as holistic and "sustainable" when not including values and beliefs. The Lutherans refer this general remark to the world of development aid organisations and state that down the decades, they were impacted by the Post-Enlightenment secularisation paradigm; by thinking of religion as a disappearing reality with any serious influence on economic, political and social fields. "Religion, faith and spirituality were not seriously taken into account within the discourse as relevant contextual factors for development and humanitarian programs."²⁷ It resulted in ignoring the religious dimension while planning, managing and providing aid to the given countries or communities. Nowadays the situation is changing. On the one hand, many varied experiences of the aid workers do not anymore let them ignore religion as the crucial factor of the social and cultural structures; on the other, even though the Lutheran theologians do not put it bluntly, there is a growing conviction the world enters into the post-secular epoch that stresses the importance of spirituality for human life. Moreover, the

²⁶ The Lutheran World Federation. 2001. *Guiding Principle for Sustainable Development*, 7.

²⁷ The Lutheran World Federation. 2017. *Called to Transform. A Lutheran Perspective on Religion and Development*. Geneva: The Lutheran World Federation, 5.

secularisation paradigm of science and rationality leading to universal wellbeing is rapidly eroding as the world faces new conflicts, poverty, pandemics, injustice etc. All this makes that “not only at the political level but also within the development sector, secular actors have started to accept religion as a highly significant given that cannot be ignored.”²⁸

Nevertheless, even though the development aid institutions seem to go away from ignoring religion as a crucial factor of social life, still there is a lack of familiarity and knowledge of what does this specific influence of religion actually mean; furthermore, what is a particular feature of the faith-based organisations taking part in the development work. Behind these questions, there is a vast lack of knowledge about religion itself. However, a new discourse on religion within the development organisations seems to address religion as a crucial factor of social life on the one hand and, to discern opportunities in cooperation with the religious organisations on the other, the secular development agencies too often reduce this discourse to the latter. Consequently, as the Lutheran theologians state, “religion *per se* is not being addressed holistically as a contextual factor of development efforts, nor is sufficient attention being paid to the meaning and significance of religion and faith beyond their direct relevance for development.”²⁹

4. The significance of the FBOs

A sort of religious illiteracy of secular development agencies corresponds with their inability to grasp various ambiguities referring to religion (including Christianity): fundamentalist/conservative/liberal/ecumenical – the list can be far longer – all these adjectives designate different theological positions and different approaches to diaconal work and development assistance. Suffice to remind discussions in missiology on the relation between evangelisation and humanitarian help. These ambiguities necessarily reflect a mess in definitions of faith-based organisations (FBOs) and leave the question about the strict definition of the FBO unanswered; as the Lutherans admit, the term of FBO “encompasses a vast diversity of organisations, which may express their respective faith bases quite differently.”³⁰

Nevertheless, while not insisting on an only definition, the Lutheran theologians expound somehow functionally their understanding of what the FBOs

²⁸ The Lutheran World Federation. 2017. *Called to Transform*, 5.

²⁹ The Lutheran World Federation. 2017. *Called to Transform*, 8.

³⁰ The Lutheran World Federation. 2017. *Called to Transform*, 8.

are, when distinguishing four assets attributing to them in the world of development aid organisations: a) religious literacy and expertise; b) the fact that they are globally connected and locally rooted; c) moral authority and credibility; d) sustainability.³¹ Referring to the first point, the FBOs are seen as religious experts, as having deepened knowledge about religious traditions, beliefs, values that create a background for the cultural patterns important for overcoming poverty and exclusions and promoting development. Then, and it seems to be particularly crucial in the ecumenical movement, the FBOs often base on the global structures of religious institutions (churches) and, at the same time, they are inherently involved in the life of given communities. This interdependence of a “global” and a “local” is a crucial component of the activities of the Lutheran World Federation. The third point links to the former two ones. The FBOs are regarded as not coming from outside but as ministries that share faith identity, values and beliefs with local societies and communities. They are able to identify, or overlap, the religious diaconia and secular development aid. Finally, the development aid provided by the FBOs is continuing in the long-term perspective; “FBOs are thought to be able more easily to build on local social structures such as churches, mosques or other religious institutions. This supports and sustains development initiatives, even after the specific project has come to an end.”³² Sustainability refers, therefore, to the continuity of the development aid regarded as a mission.

The assets above listed let to contextualise a descriptive definition of the FBOs better: it “is a term used to describe a broad range of organisations influenced by faith. They include religious and religion-based organisations/groups/networks; communities belonging to a place of religious worship; specialised religious institutions and religious, social service agencies; and registered or unregistered non-profit institutions that have a religious character or mission. At the international level, they include major humanitarian agencies, but the emphasis in this guidance is more at the local level.”³³

The short survey of the Lutheran understanding of development and approach to development aid needs a very important remark on the mutual influences of the World Council of Churches and the LWF. It’s no coincidence they both often appears as speaking with one voice. It is also the case in development thinking. The LWF “has fully participated in the fifty-year evolution of the ecumenical understanding of development through collaborative prac-

³¹ The Lutheran World Federation. 2017. *Called to Transform*, 7.

³² The Lutheran World Federation. 2017. *Called to Transform*, 7.

³³ The Lutheran World Federation. 2018. *A Faith-Sensitive Approach in Humanitarian Response. Guidance on Mental Health and Psychosocial Programming*. Geneva: The Lutheran World Federation and Islamic Relief Worldwide, 5.

tice at the local level and by strong Lutheran participation in the international World Council of Churches agenda. It is also reflected in these guiding principles for sustainable development.”³⁴ The ecumenical promotion of the idea of the sustainable development and an ecumenical contribution to the global development agenda are driven by the theological reflection worked out in the Lutheran theological milieu.

Conclusion

Unlike the “secular” meanings on development, the Lutheran approach has two overlapping “semantic” lines: an outward, which defines actions, strategies and policies leading to promotion and stimulate development and development aid; and an inward, which gives them religious-theological background. From this point, the Lutheran assistance agencies appear eligible to make proposals and suggest solutions on the meaning of development and mechanisms of development aid. It is particularly apparent in the activities of the FBOs; the list of four itemized assets convincingly shows their unique character. Moreover, the LWF has been involved for decades in the active searching for more just socio-economic order, in which the development and development aid would not be merely a chain of actions taken provisionally but rather an internal feature of this order. In both ways, the Lutheran theologians make a significant contribution to the global dispute on the transformation the world faces.

References

- About the Lutheran World Federation* (31.05.2021). <https://www.lutheranworld.org/content/about-lwf>.
- Castells Manuel. 2002. *The Internet Galaxy: Reflections on the Internet, Business, and Society*. Oxford: University Press.
- Michalak Dominika. 2014. “Uniwersytet jako wspólnota komunikacyjna – trudna instytucjonalizacja seminarium”. *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 4: 71–91.
- Nordstokke Kjell. 2017. The Church and the Public Space, In *Liberated by God's Grace*. Ed. Anne Burghardt, 29–42. Geneva: The Lutheran World Federation.
- Official Development Assistance: Definition and Coverage* (31.05.2021). <https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/officialdevelopmentassistancedefinitionandcoverage.html>.

³⁴ The Lutheran World Federation. 2001. *Guiding Principle for Sustainable Development*, 17.

- Pieterse Jan Nederveen. 2010. *Development Theory Deconstructions/Reconstructions*. London: Sage Publications.
- Riddell Roger C. 2007. *Does Foreign Aid Really Work?* Oxford: University Press.
- Rojas Cristina, Kindornay Shannon. 2014. The Politics of Governing Development. In *The Politics of Development. A Survey*. Ed. Heloise Weber, 10–30. New York: Routledge.
- Sachs Jeffrey. 2014. *The End of Poverty. Economic Possibilities of Our Time*. New York: The Penguin Press.
- Sztompka Piotr. 2010. *Socjologia zmian społecznych*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.
- The Lutheran World Federation. 2001. *Guiding Principle for Sustainable Development*. Geneva: The Lutheran World Federation.
- The Lutheran World Federation. 2017. *Called to Transform. A Lutheran Perspective on Religion and Development*. Geneva: The Lutheran World Federation.
- The Lutheran World Federation. 2018. *A Faith-Sensitive Approach in Humanitarian Response. Guidance on Mental Health and Psychosocial Programming*. Geneva: The Lutheran World Federation and Islamic Relief Worldwide.
- The Organization of the Economic Cooperation and Development. 2006. *DAC in Dates. The History of OECD's Development Assistance Committee*. Paris: OECD Publications.
- United Nations. 1987. *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: "Our Common Future"*. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations. 1996. *Report of the World Summit for Social Development. Copenhagen 6–12 March 1995*. New York: United Nations.
- World Council of Churches. 1958. *Minutes and Reports of the Eleventh Meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches: Nyborg Strand, Denmark, August 21–29, 1958*. Geneva: World Council of Churches.