

Chapter 3

Globalization and Economic Justice

Source: Richard W. Gillett, “The Global Household: Public Policy Choices in the New Global Economic Order” and “Another World Is Possible: Organizing and Theologizing”. In the *New Globalization: Reclaiming the Lost Ground of Our Christian Social Tradition*. (Cleveland: The Pilgrim Press, 2005), pp. 147-166, pp. 182-194. Adapted by permission.

What is Globalization?

Globalization refers to the wave of transformative change that has come to the world’s political and economic systems with new breakthroughs in technology, communications, and transportation. Although globalization in some respects has been a part of the world order for at least five hundred years, the acceleration of these trends which began around the early eighties has shrunk the globe even more dramatically than before. Although there are positive benefits, such as a rising standard of living in some countries, the human costs of the present wave of globalization are enormous: the increased disposability of people and their increased vulnerability in the job market, the increased transfer of financial and commercial assets, and the increased commercialization of everyday life. We are, in short, witnessing the accelerating domination of an all-engulfing global capitalism whose sole ethic is the market.

We know that in the new globalization of the last few decades the world has slid deeper into global poverty at the same time it is seeing increased wealth concentrating at the top. This reality is overwhelmingly the principal challenge to public policy across the board, from global to local levels. But our primary challenge is not just one of advocating new economic policies to address these inequities. It is the more serious task of breaking free from the shackles of an economic determinism that in our time has elevated itself to dogma in the “free market” approach to the world economic order; and to look at the world once more as one indissolubly human community bound together.

At the tenth Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation held in 2003, that international church group identified “neoliberalism” as the philosophy that appears to undergird the new global economic order. Said the document: “This false ideology [neoliberalism] is grounded on the assumption that the market, built on private property, unrestrained competition, and the centrality of contracts, is the absolute law governing human life, society, and the natural environment. This is idolatry, and leads to the systematic exclusion of those who own no property, the destruction of cultural diversity, the dismantling of fragile democracies and the destruction of the earth.” Other church documents at the international level also were beginning to apply that descriptive term to globalization.

A Christian Theological Response to Globalization

How can we take what we learn about the new global economy and about our rich religious tradition that can speak strongly to the issue and begin to think theologically about it? Can we begin to envision, even if only dimly, a “theology of globalization”? Even raising the question sounds pretentious at this point. What we can do is identify some theological points of departure that can serve as a foundation.

First, we should note that the proponents and purveyors of globalization invoke a theology, at least in form, which we might think of as “the Market as God.” The coronation of capitalism has been loudly proclaimed especially in the United States as the sole remaining economic ideology following the fall of communism. Theologian Harvey Cox, deciding several years ago on a friend’s advice to read the business pages of the daily newspapers to find out what was really going on, tells of making a surprising discovery, namely that his reading of the Wall Street Journal and other periodicals revealed a striking resemblance to the book of Genesis, the Epistle to the Romans, and St. Augustine’s City of God. “Behind descriptions of market reforms, monetary policy and the convolutions of the Dow, I gradually made out the pieces of a

grand narrative about the inner meaning of human history, why things had gone wrong, and how to put them right," writes Cox.¹ "Theologians call these myths of origin, legends of the fall, and doctrines of sin and redemption. But here they were again, and in only thin disguise: chronicles about the creation of wealth, the seductive temptations of statism, captivity to faceless economic cycles, and ultimately, salvation of free markets." One fears to touch the Ark; yet as the Old Testament prophets did relentlessly, the "idol" of global capitalism must be named and dethroned as must any false gods.

Christian theology and spirituality would have a very different reading of the increasing commodification of the world and its people. The theological concept of the Incarnation is a principal underpinning to understanding our task in confronting economic globalization. The belief found its fullest acceptance in the 19th and 20th centuries in England, and continues to be a central theological idea in the Anglican Communion. The Incarnation expresses a belief that when Jesus became incarnate in our human world as the Son of God, the whole creation at that moment became charged with Christ's presence--in every human being (not just in Christians) in every place, and forever after. It is a radical theological statement of the worth of all human beings in every aspect of their condition, including that of economic man and woman.

The liberation theologies which came to the fore in the last half of the last century also provide us with strong theological reflections on the current economic globalization. From Latin America, from Black and feminist theologians, and from ecological theologies of liberation we are provided both with the perspective of Jesus' own "preferential option for the poor"² in the scriptures, and that of the victims of economic and social oppression. They help save us from viewing the world, and our

¹ Harvey Cox, *The Market as God* in the Atlantic Monthly, March, 1999

² The Medellin (Colombia) conference of Latin American Bishops in 1968 gave prominence to this phrase, a prominence unfortunately subsequently downplayed by the Catholic Church.

theologies, through the lens of Western affluence and privilege. In this regard, we are slow to absorb the fact that by 2050 only about one-fifth of the world's estimated three billion Christians will be non-Hispanic whites. Those of us who are white, particularly white males, must clearly become radically open to new perspectives.

In addition to beginning to formulate a Christian theological position on globalization, we need to acquaint ourselves with the views of the other great world religions—Judaism, the Muslim faith, Buddhism, Hinduism—to find common spiritual ground to confront the injustices of globalization. Each of these religious traditions has a universal vision of unity. Another interesting fact—one worth pondering when you apply it to the current global economic order—is that they all agree that greed is not an admirable human trait! Writes Chandra Muzaffar in the summary chapter of *Subverting Greed*: “The similarities are so overwhelming that one can talk with some confidence about the religions evolving a shared universal moral and spiritual ethic vis-à-vis the global economy. However, for such an ethic to evolve, we have to go beyond our present endeavor...these traditions have not as yet really dialogued with one another.”

From a Christian perspective, we have new religious approaches to globalization. As the millennium year 2000 approached, Christian churches around the globe embraced the biblical concept of Jubilee, based upon the divine exhortation in the book of Leviticus (chapter 25) to “proclaim liberty throughout the land,” and launched the Jubilee 2000 Campaign.

Likewise seizing upon the new millennium as opportunity, in September 2000 the United Nations, in a formal vote, adopted its own vision of a renewed world community, calling it the Millennium Declaration. The eight goals of this Declaration committed the international community to an expanded vision of development, one that “vigorously promotes human development as the key to sustaining social and economic progress in all countries, and recognizes the importance of creating a global partnership for development.” Setting the year 2015 as the date for achieving such

goals, the Declaration also set specific targets for each goal so as to be able to measure progress.

So we have these two formulations—one theological, the other programmatic—as a guiding moral backdrop for public policy considerations.

Global Problems Require Global Policies

As a global institution itself, the church (and the Anglican Communion in particular) has both a responsibility and a platform to address the human consequences of globalization and the need for public policy responses to them. When we say “public policy” we mean the laws, regulations or agreements, formal or informal, entered into by international bodies (the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund [IMF], The World Bank, The World Trade Organization [WTO], North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA], and others) and nations; and also the economic development policies of states or municipalities that have to do directly or indirectly with the global economic order. In the case of states or cities, such policies may be less obviously related to the global economy, but it is very important to understand that there can be a global causal relationship at lower levels, especially when considering action strategies.

The global imperative for advocating alternative public policies arises from the urgent need to “impose some order on the global marketplace, to make both finance and commerce more accountable for the consequences of their actions, and to give hostage societies more ability to determine their own future,” in William Greider’s words. Against this backdrop, broad policy recommendations can emerge for church consideration. The recommendations that follow are a broad sample of what is currently under discussion by a wide segment of opinion as alternatives to the present global economic order.

- Reform the international rules of trade

- The international trade policies promoted by the WTO, IMF, and World Bank have pressured developing nations to open themselves to free trade, privatize public investments, and reduce government controls as conditions for financial assistance. The crucial task is to work toward change in the governance and voting rights of these bodies in order that voices from the developing nations affected by their decisions can have real weight.
- Maintain national sovereignty over corporate profits
 - National laws are coming increasingly under assault from the drive for profits by multinational corporations. For example, a particularly reprehensible aspect of NAFTA allows corporations to sue countries for perceived loss of profit due to governmental “restrictions” on their activities (yes, you read that sentence correctly!). This provision raises profound issues for state sovereignty and the capacity, for example, to legally provide environmental protection to citizens, and by implication the democratic participation of people in their own governance. Increasingly, international free trade agreements could undermine state or municipal laws regulating wages and working conditions on the theory that their effect could be seen as “impacting the conditions of competition.” We should support calls for a major reordering of trade priorities toward respecting the rights and needs of the peoples of developing countries, and in particular to require the IMF and other trade groups to place highest priority on the specific local and regional labor and environmental impacts of a pending trade agreement.
- Advocate food sovereignty, especially for developing nations
 - Food sovereignty, as defined by Via Campesina, (the world’s largest farmers organization) is “the human right of all peoples and nations to

grow food in ways that are culturally, ecologically and economically appropriate for them.” According to Anuradha Mittal, co-director of Food First and The Institute for Food and Development Policy, current WTO rules operate to keep power squarely in the hands of export producers, large businesses, and elites, at the expense of family farmers. Advocating food sovereignty is in fact a continuation the long-standing goals of many churches in addressing world hunger in a more systemic way.

- Impose international restrictions on the global movement of capital
 - Both internationally and nationally, new laws and regulations are necessary to begin to require banks to use their funds more to strengthen job-creating enterprises and less to create wealth for their investors. International law should outlaw the existence of major offshore banking centers that permit investors to hide their money from the banking and security laws of their own governments and evade the payment of income taxes.
- Cancel Third World debt
 - The huge long-term burden placed on Third World nations to repay debts owed for “economic development” is well known. Loan repayments for some nations have constituted as much as forty percent of their annual income. The success of the Jubilee 2000 campaign in marshaling the support of the international religious community to pressure the developed countries to cancel more than \$1.3 billion annually of the debt owed by the twenty-six Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC)s, needs to continue, for this amount represents only a third of the total indebtedness owed by the poor nations to the wealthy nations. In April of 2006, the Jubilee USA Network rallied thousands of calls and emails to successfully persuade the World Bank to remove administrative delaying

- tactics and go ahead with its debt cancellation schedule that world leaders agreed upon at the G-8 Summit in Edinburgh in August 2005. It was a powerful demonstration of the religious community's ability to affect public policy.
- End the legal fiction of corporations as persons
 - Current American law (as established in 1886 by the U.S. Supreme Court) establishes that a private corporation is a "person," and as such is entitled to the legal rights and protection the Constitution affords to any person. This equation of persons with property, says David Korten, establishes a presumed right of the corporation to the security of its property and profit over a person's right to make of living. We should find ways to work for legislative reform of the incorporation of large corporations by the state by requiring corporations to meet certain labor and environmental standards that are in the public interest, to pay living wages to their workers, and to agree to pay substantial penalties should they decide to transfer their workers offshore, as a condition of being granted a charter to do business.
 - Strengthen international labor standards and build strong unions
 - The insistence upon minimum standards for the working conditions of people is based on two principles that find resonance in the Christian tradition: first, the inherent dignity of work as a human enterprise directed both toward personal creative fulfillment and the wider upbuilding of the human community; and second, the understanding of workers not as commodities to be bought and sold, but as "human capital" — a precious asset at the heart of the productive process. Any fair global economic order must include the policies upheld by the International Labor Organization: freedom of association in the workplace, i.e. the right to organize; the abolition of forced labor; the

elimination of child labor; and the elimination of discrimination (race, ethnic, gender) in employment and occupation.

- Make environmental sustainability a requirement for development projects
 - The global capitalist engine of the twenty-first century is simply not compatible with the urgent need to prevent its industrial and economic activities from destroying the global ecological balance. The Report on Alternatives to Economic Globalization puts it this way: “Economic globalization is intrinsically harmful to the environment because it is based on ever-increasing consumption, exploitation of resources, and waste disposal problems.” Almost universal current practice both in and beyond the free trade organizations, however, places the burden upon community groups or governmental entities to prove that a new technology, process, activity, or chemical causes environmental damage. Instead, we should insist that technical advances be demonstrated as safe and sustainable by those introducing them. This “Precautionary Principle” — a principle already adopted as a regulation by two European countries — should be an integral component of the policies and procedures of the WTO and the various other international trade groups and associations.
- Ensure the upholding of the United Nations Declaration of Universal Human Rights
 - The Declaration, subscribed to by member states of the U.N., is the moral undergirding for the principal civil and political goals aspired to by all who strive for the creation of a just and peaceful global community. The Declaration declares universal human rights to include “a standard of living adequate for...health and well-being, including food, clothing, housing, and medical care, and necessary social services, and the right to

security in the event of unemployment...” In recent years, these rights have been interpreted to include the cultural rights of peoples to preserve their cultural and historical heritage in the face of economic pressures.

Addressing Globalization at Local and State Policy Levels

It isn't only in the distant halls (and behind the closed doors) of international economic gatherings that globalization should be addressed; the economic development policies and practices of our cities and states are absolutely related to the larger currents of the new globalization. Global corporate and financial power in the twenty-first century is exactly that: global. The same corporations and banks that are consolidating their power and presence in Bangladesh, China, Mexico and Argentina are also expanding their influence in our cities and states. They seek the same legislative advantages: tax breaks, reduction or suspension of labor and worker safety laws, the setting aside of environmental and social standards, and other lucrative benefits that have characterized their global operations. The resulting rise in low wage poverty in the U.S.—now fully twenty percent of the work force, or 26 million people who earn \$8.23/hr. or less—mirrors the global stagnation of wages and increased poverty in the last twenty years.

Over against these trends in our cities and states, however, surprisingly effective new movements and strategies have developed and are beginning achieve new government policies to address this poverty imbalance. Chief among this is the living wage movement. To date the movement, active across the country in small and large cities and on college campuses, has achieved the passage of living wage ordinances in over 116 cities, with several dozens more pending. Moreover, ACORN, the national community activist organization, is now directing some of its living wage community organizing campaigns at statewide levels in a half-dozen states.

Why is the living wage movement a globalization issue? The reason may not be immediately obvious. It is a response at municipal levels to the increased poverty in our cities resulting from at least three trends, the first two of which are also prominent at global levels: expanded free market opportunities flowing from lower taxation and regulation of business, the privatization of government services, and (in the case of the U.S.) the flood of immigrants from Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean in recent years. The new immigration flows have proven a bonanza across the country for businesses seeking low-wage, non-union labor.

The expanding living wage movement and the expansion of worker and community rights and benefits at municipal and state levels are key public policy counterparts to global policy measures and strategies. These lower-level policy objectives become crucial and highly visible pressure points that help make the link with policies at the global international level. (For more on the living wage issue, see the issue paper on Living Wages in the Advocacy appendix.)

Think Globally, Organize Locally

Most religious slogans, even good ones, are apt only for a short time, then fade away. An exception, one relevant for us as we address the new global economic order, is *Think Globally, Act Locally*: strikingly pertinent today after being around for several decades.

Four questions should be fundamental starting points for any organizing effort on globalization, questions we must continue to check in with at every juncture of our work. They may seem elementary; but the consistency and thoroughness of their asking will go far towards determining a successful outcome of any strategy.

The first question is: *Where is the pain?* That is, where are people and their communities hurting (there is a lot to choose from!)? Obviously, since the global scene is our “household,” the question pertains to both near and far, from Filipino corn farmers

to sweatshop workers in Honduras, to immigrant janitors and hotel workers in Boston and Los Angeles, and beyond. And what, exactly, is the hurt? For example, is it low wages? exploitation at work? lack of work (due, for example to the inability to sell a vital crop on the world market)? lack of land? lack of life-saving drugs (as in the African AIDS pandemic)?

Second, *Why is this happening?* What particular public policies, corporate practices, or other influences are the leading or contributing causes of the situation? There are obvious culprits on the global scene that might be identifiable: the current policies of the international financial and trade organizations (IMF, NAFTA, WTO, FTAA); or our own agricultural policies that severely hinder poor farmers overseas; or current investment and tax policies, or many others we could identify. In such areas, there are frequently impacts felt on our local scene that may provide opportunities for involvement. If a local issue is decided upon as a focus, prevailing local policies and business practices usually need to be addressed. In modern-day America, urban economic policies and practices invariably are tilted toward favoring large developers and their economic interests. Whether a particular development proposal will create not only jobs, but living wage jobs, affirm the right to organize, preserve the neighborhood, safeguard the environment, and generally enhance the social well-being of all the people in the community: these are the conditions we in the churches should be organizing to fight for. Furthermore, these questions are globalization questions. They have to do with how political and economic power are used to truly benefit human development. So churches that work on this level are doing “globalization work”; they are an authentic part of the larger global push to humanize and transform the global economic order.

Third, in assessing the possibilities for action, whether locally or beyond, we need to find out *who our allies might be, not only in the wider religious community, but in the community at large.* We have an imperative to be interfaith not only in dialogue together

but in our action strategies if we are to be at all effective. It should be clear by now that Presbyterian, or Lutheran, or Episcopal or Catholic responses are by themselves totally inadequate to the task. Moreover, such interfaith endeavors must join in partnership with the secular community. In the words of one British theologian, we in the religious community are now in the “new secular age of partnerships,” representing a growing recognition at all levels of our global context that the complexity of problems we now face means that no one discipline can explain them fully, and no one sector, public or private, can engage them effectively.

Fourth, *What are the economic and political roots of the problem?* A project that does not take the time to analyze the roots of a particular situation and use the information effectively will find itself addressing the periphery of the problem, with little prospect for real change. The good news is that we church folk don’t have to do this by ourselves; there are college and university economists and sociologists in almost every community who would be delighted to lend a hand (and it goes toward validating for them why they went into teaching!). And the trade unions, especially the progressive ones, usually have excellent research departments. The need for such professional analysis becomes indispensable, for example, in campaigns to persuade elected officials to adopt positions favorable to real human empowerment. For national and overseas projects, there are many progressive non-profit organizations whose research is available online, for example Global Exchange, the Center for Economic and Policy Research, the Economic Policy Institute, and others.

Here I also want to stress the need to travel. By that I mean the necessity of going across town (or even just a few blocks), or across the country, or the globe where possible, to acquire a first-hand acquaintance with the people for whom we would be advocates. In so doing, we will discover that those who are the “victims” of the injustice do not need our help in setting their agenda; they know better than anyone else what their situation is. They are the primary actors and protagonists in building a new world.

Our role is to find out in being alongside them and in listening to them, how we can support them as sisters and brothers.

The Commission: Final Thoughts to Go Forward

Organize to win! And build from small victories to larger ones. We in the churches frequently become used to social action modes of operation that assume that a kind of “gesture for justice” is sufficient; i.e. we will “do our part”, hope that others do theirs, and leave the rest to God. *This is a flawed mind-set:* instead, we must design and take part with others in campaigns that expect not merely to “make a statement” but to win a tangible victory. In campaigns in which I’ve participated in Los Angeles, I’ve been inspired by the workers of Local 11 of the hotel workers union, who at demonstrations and marches exude the spirit of winning— they and we chanting together, “*¡Sí se puede!*” (Yes, we can!) as they organize to win a new labor contract. And it is obvious that in Seattle, and in Cancún and Miami in 2003, the organizers believed—correctly—that they could really tilt the battle towards justice.

And, of course, *winning requires long-term commitment.* Setting a realistic time line--of years rather than months for major goals--is a must, and helps keep us focused. Setbacks are inevitable, but as we know, the struggle for peace and justice is not for the faint of heart.

Use, to the max, the moral authority of the church and the interfaith community. There are various ways to use this moral authority effectively. For example, symbolic actions that contain religious significance, such as singing and praying in various ways, invest a protest or demonstration with a spiritual significance. Also, very crucial to such actions is learning how to use the press as ally. For example, a large protest march of clergy and lay people down Rodeo Drive in Beverly Hills left a plate of bitter herbs at one hotel refusing to sign a contract with the hotel workers, while another hotel that had just

signed the contract got milk and honey—all well covered by the press.³ So the forms of taking religious actions in support of the group or groups that are our concern are limited only by our imaginations.

There are many opportunities, including of course those mentioned elsewhere in this Manual, for involvement. But taking seriously the political and economic dynamics of twenty-first century global capitalism, and finding opportunities for meaningful involvement and truly systemic change involves a decisive break from past tendencies in our religious communities to focus on charity rather than justice. It demands a commitment to a kind of advocacy that will question structures and power arrangements. Such advocacy, if it is truly effective, will almost always invite resistance from entities comfortable with the status quo (including of course, the church), and will entail an element of risk, sometimes great risk.

So seeking opportunities for engagement with specific projects that address the negative effects of globalization, we must approach involvement carefully and with the above reflections in mind. In the Episcopal Church, companion diocese relationships is one possibility. Episcopal Relief and Development also offers volunteer opportunities in overseas countries. There are also opportunities offered by activist groups with a global reach such as the 'Reality Tours' of Global Exchange(www.globalexchange.org) and other groups. A subscription to Yes! Magazine, a Journal of Positive Futures (www.yesmagazine.org) brings you quarterly, a basketful of ideas, reflections, and opportunities that are attuned to the realities and promises of our globalized world. Finally, a new book, *What Can One Person Do? Faith to Heal a Broken World*, by Sabina Alkire and Edmund Newell (Church Publishing), is a valuable resource. Formed around the Millennium Development Goals adopted by the United Nations

³ Bitter herbs and milk and honey are part of the Jewish Passover meal to recall to the faithful the memory of the slavery of the Israelites in Egypt, and their deliverance to the Promised Land. Three weeks after this Beverly Hills march the recalcitrant hotel signed the new labor contract.

which were endorsed by the Episcopal Church's General Convention in 2003, this book is rich with how-to suggestions for church congregations.

If we look at our own two thousand-year tradition, I hope we can see that “the saints” in the Church have many times traveled this path before us and have fought the good fight; that our present struggles, while new in detail and aspect, are essentially the same: against greed, injustice and oppression—everything that dehumanizes; and that we can feel their presence among us and be inspired by their example. And as we move toward solidarity with our brothers and sisters both at home and overseas who have been denied the chance to participate in the dream of basic human equality, let us be grateful that so many of them have nonetheless shown the way for us, and persisted in the dream of a world made new. Together with them we can reclaim the ground lost to injustice and oppression, and join in this great struggle, witnessing to the power of God working among us, in Isaiah's words, to

*loose the bonds of injustice,
to undo the thongs of the yoke,
to let the oppressed go free,
and to break every yoke.*

(Isaiah 58)

Immigration and Economic Justice

As indicated in the above section by Dick Gillett, ENEJ sees immigration as an aspect of globalization. Globalization is just a fancy word to describe the movement of capital, labor, and goods across national boundaries. Or, as Dick Gillett defines it, “Globalization refers to the wave of transformative change that has come to the world's political and economic systems with new breakthroughs in technology, communications, and transportation.”

Our society seems to have reached a stalemate on immigration policy. As a result, the issue is being fought out at the state and local level where it is often framed as a law enforcement issue. The result might be called “the war on the immigrant” which might be said to parallel the often disastrous “war on drugs.”

As George Lakoff points out in the article below, the pursuit of solutions is determined by how the issue is framed. It is currently framed as the “immigration problem” and, of course, the way to fix the problem of immigration is to repair the immigration system, i.e., build walls and enforce the law.

The Episcopal Church frames the issue in radically different ways. It uses the Biblical framework of the treatment of strangers and it uses the language of justice by referring to secular documents such as the International Declaration of Human rights. We also believe that the issue of immigration must be framed in terms of globalization. All around the world millions of people are desperate to immigrate. They are political or economic refugees. “Comprehensive immigration reform” in the narrow context of American law is not enough.

Perhaps, as a society, we know this at some level and this is part of the reason we are stalemated. In the rest of this chapter, we will present George Lakoff’s article on framing and offer advice on how your congregation or organization can develop a tool kit for advocacy and service ministry with immigrants.

The Framing of Immigration

by George Lakoff, Sam Ferguson

Framing is at the center of the recent immigration debate. Simply framing it as about “immigration” has shaped its politics, defining what count as “problems” and constraining the debate to a narrow set of issues. The language is telling. The linguistic framing is remarkable: frames for illegal immigrant, illegal alien, illegals, undocumented workers, undocumented immigrants, guest workers, temporary workers, amnesty, and border security. These linguistic expressions are anything but neutral. Each framing defines the problem in its own way, and hence constrains the solutions needed to address that problem. The purpose of this paper is twofold. First, we will analyze the framing used in the public debate. Second, we suggest some

alternative framing to highlight important concerns left out of the current debate. Our point is to show that the relevant issues go far beyond what is being discussed, and that acceptance of the current framing impoverishes the discussion.

The Framing of Immigration

By George Lakoff and Sam Ferguson

(c) 2006 The Rockridge Institute (We invite the free distribution of this piece)

On May 15th, in an address from the Oval Office, President Bush presented his proposal for "comprehensive immigration reform."

The term "immigration reform" evokes an issue-defining conceptual frame — The Immigration Problem Frame — a frame that imposes a structure on the current situation, defines a set of “problems” with that situation, and circumscribes the possibility for "solutions."

"Reform," when used in politics, indicates there is a pressing issue that needs to be addressed — take "medicare reform," "lobbying reform," "social security reform." The noun that's attached to reform — "immigration" — points to where the problem lies. Whatever noun is attached to “reform” becomes the locus of the problem and constrains what counts as a solution.

To illustrate, take "lobbying reform." In the wake of the Jack Abramoff scandal, "lobbying reform" was all the talk in the media and on Capitol Hill. The problem defined by this frame has to do with lobbyists. As a "lobbyist" problem, the solutions focused on Congressional rules regarding lobbyists. The debate centered around compensated meals, compensated trips, access by former Congressmen (who inevitably become lobbyists) to the floor of the Senate and House of representatives, lobbying disclosure, lobbyists' access to Congressional staff and the period of time between leaving the Congress and becoming a registered lobbyists.

Indeed, if the reform needed is "lobbying reform," these are reasonable solutions. But, the term "Congressional ethics reform" would have framed a problem of a much different nature, a problem with Congressmen. And it would allow very different reforms to count as solutions. After all, lobbyists are powerless if there's nobody to accept a free meal, fly on a private plane, play a round of golf in the Bahamas and, most importantly, accept the political contributions lobbyists raise on their behalf from special-interests with billions of dollars in business before the federal Government. A solution could, for example, have been Full Public Financing of Elections and free airtime for political candidates as part of the licensing of the public's airwaves to private corporations. The “lobbying reform” framing of the issue precluded such considerations from discussion, because they don't count as solutions to the “lobbying” problem. Issue-defining frames are powerful.

“Immigration reform” also evokes an issue-defining frame. Bush, in his speech, pointed out the problems that this frame defines. First, the Government has “not been in complete control of its borders.” Second, millions are able to “sneak across our border” seeking to make money. Finally, once here, illegal immigrants sometimes forge documents to get work, skirting labor laws, and

deceiving employers who attempt to follow the law. They may take jobs away from legal immigrants and ordinary Americans, bear children who will be American citizens even in they are not, and use local services like schools and hospitals, which may cost a local government a great deal. This is his definition of the problem in the Immigration Reform frame.

This definition of the problem focuses entirely on the immigrants and the administrative agencies charged with overseeing immigration law. The reason is that these are the only roles present in the Immigration Problem Frame.

Bush's "comprehensive solution" entirely concerns the immigrants, citizenship laws, and the border patrol. And, from the narrow problem identified by framing it as an "immigration problem," Bush's solution is comprehensive. He has at least addressed everything that counts as a problem in the immigration frame.

But the real problem with the current situation runs broader and deeper. Consider the issue of Foreign Policy Reform, which focuses on two sub-issues:

- How has US foreign policy placed, or kept, in power oppressive governments which people are forced to flee?
- What role have international trade agreements had in creating or exacerbating people's urge to flee their homelands? If capital is going to freely cross borders, should people and labor be able to do so as well, going where globalization takes the jobs?

Such a framing of the problem would lead to a solution involving the Secretary of State, conversations with Mexico and other Central American countries, and a close examination of the promises of NAFTA, CAFTA, the WTO, the IMF and the World Bank to raise standards of living around the globe. It would inject into the globalization debate a concern for the migration and displacement of people, not simply globalization's promise for profits. This is not addressed when the issue is defined as the "immigration problem." Bush's "comprehensive solution" does not address any of these concerns. The immigration problem, in this light, is actually a globalization problem.

Perhaps the problem might be better understood as a humanitarian crisis. Can the mass migration and displacement of people from their homelands at a rate of 800,000 people a year be understood as anything else? Unknown numbers of people have died trekking through the extreme conditions of the Arizona and New Mexico desert. Towns are being depopulated and ways of life lost in rural Mexico. Fathers feel forced to leave their families in their best attempt to provide for their kids. Everyday, boatloads of people arrive on our shores after miserable journeys at sea in deplorable conditions.

As a humanitarian crisis, the solution could involve The UN or the Organization of American States. But these bodies do not have roles in the immigration frame, so they have no place in an "immigration debate." Framing this as just an "immigration problem" prevents us from penetrating deeper into the issue.

The current situation can also be seen as a civil rights problem. The millions of people living here who crossed illegally are for most intents and purposes Americans. They work here. They pay taxes here. Their kids are in school here. They plan to raise their families here. For the most part, they are assimilated into the American system, but are forced to live underground and in the shadows because of their legal status. They are denied ordinary civil rights. The “immigration problem” framing overlooks their basic human dignity.

Perhaps most pointedly, the “immigration problem” frame blocks an understanding of this issue as a cheap labor issue. The undocumented immigrants allow employers to pay low wages, which in turn provide the cheap consumer goods we find at WalMart and McDonalds. They are part of a move towards the cheap lifestyle, where employers and consumers find any way they can to save a dollar, regardless of the human cost. Most of us partake in this cheap lifestyle, and as a consequence, we are all complicit in the current problematic situation. Business, Consumers and Government have turned a blind eye to the problem for so long because our entire economy is structured around subsistence wages. Americans won't do the work immigrants do not because they don't want to, but because they won't do it for such low pay. Since Bush was elected, corporate profits have doubled but there has been no increase in wages. This is really a wage problem. The workers who are being more productive are not getting paid for their increased productivity.

A solution to the “immigration problem” will not address these concerns because they are absent from the “immigration frame.”

Framing matters. The notion of this as “an immigration problem” needing “immigration reform” is not neutral.

Surface Framing

We now turn from conceptual framing of the current situation to the words used and surface frames those words evoke.

The Illegal Frame

The Illegal Frame is perhaps the most commonly used frame within the immigration debate. Journalists frequently refer to “illegal immigrants” as if it were a neutral term. But the illegal frame is highly structured. It frames the problem as one about the illegal act of crossing the border without papers. As a consequence, it fundamentally frames the problem as a legal one.

Think for a moment of a criminal. Chances are you thought about a robber, a murderer or a rapist. These are prototypical criminals, people who do harm to a person or their property. And prototypical criminals are assumed to be bad people.

“Illegal,” used as an adjective in “illegal immigrants” and “illegal aliens,” or simply as a noun in “illegals” defines the immigrants as criminals, as if they were inherently bad people. In conservative doctrine, those who break laws must be punished — or all law and order will break down. Failure to punish is immoral.

“Illegal alien” not only stresses criminality, but stresses otherness. As we are a nation of immigrants, we can at least empathize with immigrants, illegal or not. “Aliens,” in popular culture suggests nonhuman beings invading from outer space — completely foreign, not one of us, intent on taking over our land and our way of life by gradually insinuating themselves among us. Along these lines, the word “invasion” is used by the Minutemen and right-wing bloggers to discuss the wave of people crossing the border. Right-wing language experts intent on keep them out suggest using the word “aliens” whenever possible.

These are NOT neutral terms. Imagine calling businessmen who once cheated on their taxes “illegal businessmen.” Imagine calling people who have driven over the speed limit “illegal drivers.” Is Tom Delay an “illegal Republican?”

By defining them as criminal, it overlooks the immense contributions these immigrants subsequently make by working hard for low wages. This is work that should more than make up for crossing the border. Indeed, we should be expressing our gratitude.

Immigrants who cross outside of legal channels, though, are committing offenses of a much different nature than the prototypical criminal. Their intent is not to cause harm or to steal. More accurately, they are committing victimless technical offenses, which we normally consider “violations.” By invoking the illegal frame, the severity of their offense is inflated.

The illegal frame — particularly “illegal alien” — dehumanizes. It blocks the questions of: why are people coming to the US, often times at great personal risk? What service do they provide when they are here? Why do they feel it necessary to avoid legal channels? It boils the entire debate down to questions of legality.

And it also ignores the illegal acts of employers. The problem is not being called the Illegal Employer Problem, and employers are not called “illegals.”

The Security Frame

The logical response to the “wave” of “illegal immigration” becomes “border security.” The Government has a responsibility to provide security for its citizens from criminals and invaders. President Bush has asked to place the National Guard on the border to provide security. Indeed, he referred to “security” six times in his immigration speech.

Additionally, Congress recently appropriated money from the so-called “war on terror” for border security with Mexico. This should outrage the American public. How could Congress conflate the war on terror with illegal immigration? Terrorists come to destroy the American dream, immigrants — both documented and undocumented — come to live the American dream. But the conceptual move from illegal immigrant (criminal, evil), to border security to a front of the war on terror, an ever expanding war against evil in all places and all times wherever it is, is not far.

It is this understanding of the issue that also prompted the House to pass the punitive HR 4437, which includes a provision to make assisting illegal immigrants while they are here a felony. It is seen as aiding and abetting a criminal.

But how could this be a “security” issue? Security implies that there is a threat, and a threatened, and that the threatened needs protection. These immigrants are not a physical threat, they are a vital part of our economy and help America function. They don't want to shoot us or kill us or blow us up. They only want to weed our gardens, clean our houses, and cook our meals in search of the American Dream. They must be recognized as Americans making a vital impact and contribution. And when they are, we will cease to tolerate the substandard conditions in which they are forced to work and live. No American — indeed, no person — should be treated so brashly.

Amnesty

“Amnesty” also fits the Illegal Frame. Amnesty is a pardoning of an illegal action — a show of either benevolence or mercy by a supreme power. It implies that the fault lies with the immigrants, and it is a righteous act for the US Government to pardon them. This again blocks the reality that Government looks the other way, and Business has gone much further — it has been a full partner in creating the current situation. If amnesty is to be granted, it seems that amnesty should be given to the businesses who knowingly or unknowingly hired the immigrants and to the Government for turning a blind eye. But amnesty to these parties is not considered, because it's an “immigration problem.” Business has no role in this frame, and Government can't be given amnesty for not enforcing its own laws.

The Undocumented Worker Frame

By comparison, the term “undocumented worker” activates a conceptual frame that seems less accusatory and more compassionate than the “illegal” frame. But a closer look reveals fundamental problems with this framing.

First, the negative “undocumented” suggests that they should be documented - that there is something wrong with them if they are not. Second, “worker” suggests that their function in America is only to work, not to be educated, have families, form communities, have lives — and vote! This term was suggested by supporters of the immigrants as less noxious than illegal aliens, and it is, but it has serious limitations. It accepts the framing of immigrants as being here only to work.

Temporary Workers

“Undocumented workers” opened the door to Bush's new proposal for “temporary workers,” who come to America for a short time, work for low wages, do not vote, have few rights and services, and then go home so that a new wave of workers without rights, or the possibility of citizenship and voting, can come in.

This is thoroughly undemocratic and serves the financial and electoral interests of conservatives.

This term replaced “guest worker,” which was ridiculed. Imagine inviting some to dinner as a guest and then asking him to pick the vegetables, cook the dinner, and wash the dishes!

Frames Not Taken

Most of the framing initiative has been taken by conservatives. Progressives have so far abstained.

Progressives could well frame the situation as the Cheap Labor Issue or the Cheap Lifestyle Issue. Most corporations use the common economic metaphor of labor as a resource. There are two kinds of employees — the Assets (creative people and managers) and Resources (who are relatively unskilled, fungible, interchangeable). The American economy is structured to drive down the cost of resources - that is, the wages of low-skilled, replaceable workers.

Immigration increases the supply of such workers and helps to drive down wages. Cheap labor increases “productivity” and profits for employers, and it permits a cheap lifestyle for consumers who get low prices because of cheap labor. But these are not seen as “problems.” They are benefits. And people take these benefits for granted. They are not grateful to the immigrants who make them possible. Gratitude. The word is hardly ever spoken in the discourse over immigration.

Now consider the frame defined by the term “economic refugee.” A refugee is a person who has fled their homeland, due to political or social strife, and seeks asylum in another country. An economic refugee would extend this category (metaphorically, not legally, though it might be shifted legally in the future) to include people fleeing their homeland as a result of economic insecurity.

Refugees are worthy of compassion. We should accept them into our nation. All people are entitled to a stable political community where they have reasonable life prospects to lead a fulfilling life — this is the essence of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

To frame the debate this way is to advance a progressive understanding. While immigrants are here, they should be integrated into society either temporarily, if conditions improve in their home country, or permanently, if they can integrate and become productive members of our nation. It will focus solutions on US foreign policy to be about people, not profits. The only way the migration of people from the South to the North will stop is when conditions are improved there. As long as there is a pull to the North and a push from the South, people will find their way over, no matter how big, how long or how guarded a border fence is. (As an aside, who will build that fence if all the undocumented immigrants leave?) Increased security will force people to find ever more dangerous crossings, as has already happened, without slowing the flow of immigrants. More people will die unnecessarily.

Even if we could “protect” ourselves by sealing the border and preventing businesses from hiring undocumented immigrants by imposing hefty fines or prison sentences for violations, progressives should not be satisfied. This still leaves those yearning to flee their own countries in

search of a better life in deplorable situations. The problem is not dealt with by making the United States a gated community.

While these refugees are here, they must be treated with dignity and respect. Indeed, if they cannot return home, we have a responsibility to welcome them into ours. And we must treat them as Americans, not as second-class citizens, as they are currently. If they are here, they work hard and contribute to society, they are worthy of a path to citizenship and the basic rights we are entitled to (a minimum wage, education, healthcare, a social safety net).

Currently, the undocumented immigrants living amongst us are un-enfranchised workers. They perform all the work, pay all the duties, and receive many fewer of the benefits — especially voting rights. They must be given an opportunity to come out of the shadows and lead normal lives as Americans.

The answer to this problem isn't an “open-border.” The United States cannot take on the world's problems on its own. Other affluent countries need to extend a humanitarian arm to peoples fleeing oppressive economic circumstances as well. How many immigrants the United States should be willing to accept will ultimately be up to Congress.

In presenting these alternative frames, we want to inject humanitarian concerns based in compassion and empathy into the debate. The problem is dealing adequately with a humanitarian crisis that extends well beyond the southern border. The focus must shift from the immigrants themselves and domestic policy to a broader view of why so many people flee, and how we can help alleviate conditions in Mexico and Central America to prevent the flow in the first place. Only by reframing of the debate can we incorporate more global considerations. Immigration crises only arise from global disparity.

Why It's Not a Single Issue

The wealth of frames in this debate has made it confusing. The frames within the debate have been divisive. But the absence of frames to counter the idea of the “immigration problem” has also been divisive. Since each frame presents a different component of the problem, it's worth noting who stresses which frames, and which problems that frame define.

Conservatives

The conservative views:

- Law and Order: The “illegal immigrants” are criminals, felons, and must be punished - rounded up and sent home. There should be no amnesty. Otherwise all law will break down.
- The Nativists: The immigrants are diluting our culture, our language, and our values.
- The Profiteers: We need cheap labor to keep our profits up and our cheap lifestyle in place.
- The Bean Counters: We can't afford to have illegal immigrants using our tax dollars on health, education, and other services.

- The Security Hounds: We need more border guards and a hi-tech wall to guarantee our security.

Progressives

- Progressivism Begins at Home: The immigrants are taking the jobs of American workers and we have to protect our workers.
- African-American Protectionists: Hispanic immigrants are threatening African-American jobs.
- Provide a path to citizenship: The immigrants have earned citizenship with their hard work, their devotion to American values, and their contribution to our society.
- Foreign Policy Reformers: We need to pay attention to the causes that drive others from their homelands.
- Wage supports: Institute a serious earned income tax credit for Americans doing otherwise low-paying jobs, so that more Americans will want to do them and fewer immigrants will be drawn here.
- Illegal Employers: The way to protect American workers and slow immigration of unskilled workers is to prosecute employers of unskilled workers.

We can see why this is such a complex problem and why there are so many splits within both the conservative and progressive ranks.

Summing Up

The “immigration issue” is anything but. It is a complex melange of social, economic, cultural and security concerns — with conservatives and progressives split in different ways with different positions.

Framing the recent problem as an “immigration problem” pre-empts many of these considerations from entering the debate. As a consequence, any reform that “solves” the immigration problem is bound to be a patchwork solution addressing bits and pieces of much larger concerns. Bush's comprehensive reform is comprehensive, but only for the narrow set of problems defined in the “immigration debate.” It does not address many of the questions with which progressives should be primarily concerned, issues of basic experiential well-being and political rights.

Ultimately, the way the current immigration debate is going — focusing narrowly on domestic policy, executive agencies and the immigrants — we will be faced with the same problems 10 years from now. The same long lines of immigrants waiting for legal status will persist. Temporary workers will not return home after their visas have expired, and millions of undocumented people will live amongst us. Only by broadening the understanding of the situation will the problem, or, rather, the multiple problems, be addressed and adequately solved. The immigration problem does not sit in isolation from other problems, but is symptomatic of broader social and economic concerns. The framing of the “immigration problem” must not pre-empt us from debating and beginning to address these broader concerns.

Assembling Your Immigration Ministry Tool Kit

Episcopal Church Center

Contact: Episcopal Migration Ministries

Ana White, Director

815 Second Ave.

New York City, NY 10017

(212) 716-6000 / (800) 334-7626

www.episcopalchurch.org/emm/

The Diocese of California has assembled a rich array of resources on its website:

www.diocal.org. These include:

- Immigration and the Episcopal Church in PowerPoint and Adobe formats and a web version for online viewing.
- Foreign born in the U.S. (a map of the U.S.)
- Protection for Immigrants and Their Families
- Statement by the Most Reverend Katherine Jefferts Schori, Presiding Bishop
12/14/2007
- Resolution by the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church (6/2006)
- Immigration Reform, Episcopal Migrant Ministries
- Resolution on Immigration, 75th General Convention of the Episcopal Church,
(6/2006)
- *The Alien Among You*, General Convention (6/2006)
- Migration and Ministry Resolution, Diocese of California, 2006 Diocese Convention.
- Curriculum Outline for Immigration Education in Christian Groups
- *Myths about Migration*, 3 page handout from the Migration and Immigration Task Force. Contact the Rev. Anna Lange Soto 650.245.7759; ablange@aol.com

- New Sanctuary Movement and Immigration

The New Sanctuary Movement offers a pledge form and tool kit for congregations to use in immigration advocacy work and service to immigrants. See

www.newsanctuarymovement.org. In Washington State, contact ENEJ President Dianne Aid who is on the national steering committee – sanmateo921@yahoo.com.

In California, the Rev. Alexia Salvatierra at CLUE-CA, asalvatierra@cluela.org. In other states, contact Wesley Aten, Interfaith Worker Justice, at waten@iwj.org.

- Christians for Comprehensive Immigration Reform

This organization is associated with Sojourners. At their web site,

www.sojo.net/immigration, see *A House Divided: Why Americans of Faith are Concerned about Undocumented Immigrants*, November 2007. This 20 page document explains the issues and provides a bibliography.

- INMEX: Informed Meeting Exchange

Support Immigrants and other low wage workers by your choice of hotels and meeting spaces. www.inmex.org.

- Episcopal Network for Economic Justice

See examples of ministries listed in the chapters on Advocacy and Organizing in this manual. See the local ministries listed in Appendix D, especially St. Paul's, Paterson, San Mateo, Auburn, WA, Lawrence Community Works, Massachusetts, El Centro, Inc., Kansas, Hacienda CDC, Portland, and ACCION, Texas, Inc. See our issue paper on immigration in Appendix D.

In addition to this manual, ENEJ offers six popular education modules which are downloadable under Resources at www.enej.org.

This section on Immigration was compiled by Michael Maloney and Dianne Aid in January 2009.

The Millennium Development Goals

by Mike Kinman

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are eight goals agreed to in 2000 by 189 heads of state and government -- including the United States -- from around the world that address the deepest material brokenness in the world today. Poverty the likes of which we just don't see within the United States. Poverty like:

- 1.2 billion people living on less than \$1 a day.
- 110 million children who aren't allowed even a full course of primary education
- Half a million women a year dying of complications from childbirth and pregnancy.
- A child under 5 dying every three seconds from preventable, treatable causes
- 8,000 people (more than died in the September 11 attacks) dying each day of HIV/AIDS

and much, much more.

What are the MDGs?

1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger.
2. Achieve universal primary education.
3. Promote gender equality and empower women.
4. Reduce child mortality.
5. Improve maternal health.
6. Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases.
7. Ensure environmental sustainability
8. Create a global partnership for development with targets for aid, trade and debt relief.

What's so special about the MDGs?

- **They are specific** - These aren't just broad wishes and dreams. Each goal has specific targets and indicators of success. There are precise monitoring mechanisms in place to assess progress and report cards issued regularly (Click here to access the past three years of reports, statistics and progress charts in English, Spanish and French.)
- **They are time-bound** -- We're not going to achieve the MDGs "someday" ... we are going to achieve these goals by 2015. The clock is ticking.
- **They are achievable** -- The MDGs will not end extreme poverty. For example, the first goal will only cut in half the number of people living on less than \$1 a day -- leaving much work left to go. The MDGs are an achievable first step (and there will be more after the MDGs are achieved). Some have even argued that they are not in fact millennium, but 'minimum' development goals. To set the bar any lower than this would be morally unacceptable. Individual Goals have already been achieved by many countries in the space of only 10-15 years.
- **They are collaborative** -- The problems we face are so huge no one nation or people can solve them alone ... but working together we can get the job done. The MDGs are less a centralized program and more a global social movement. Governments, civil society, international financial institutions, faith communities and many more have signed on to work together to achieve these goals. This partnership is itself the eighth Millennium Development Goal.
- **They are appropriate to our 21st century world** -- For the first time in human history we have the combination of the resources, technology and delivery systems to achieve these goals and more. All that is lacking is the will. The MDGs give a focus for that will ... if we are willing to give it.

Why should we as Christians care about the MDGs?

The MDGs aren't a new idea for Christians ... we've been doing this stuff as long as there's been a church! Our scripture and tradition is overflowing with God calling us to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, care for the sick, nurture children, steward creation and everything else the MDGs are about. The MDGs give us a structure not only for answering a divine call that has echoed through the millennia, but a structure for connecting our work for God's mission of global reconciliation and healing to a worldwide effort that can bring the whole planet together.

The MDGs are about mission, plain and simple. The Church is about mission, plain and simple. The two are a natural fit.

What has the Episcopal Church done to embrace the MDGs?

The first step toward embracing the MDGs happened before they even existed. In 1998, all the bishops of the Anglican Communion meeting at the Lambeth Conference, called on "all dioceses to fund international development programmes ... at a level of at least 0.7% of annual total diocesan income" (Lambeth 1998 1.15(k)) 0.7% is the portion of the Gross National Income of the rich nations of the world it would take to achieve the MDGs and has become the benchmark for minimum giving toward those goals. The statement also raised important issues of international debt and economic justice and called on all members of the Communion to "co-operate with other people of faith in programmes of education and advocacy within our dioceses, so that we may help to raise public awareness of these vital economic issues that impact so deeply the daily lives of the poor." (Lambeth 1998 1.15(j))

At the 2000 General Convention in Denver (held two months before the Millennium Summit, at which the MDGs were signed), the Episcopal Church passed Resolution A-001, affirming the portions of Lambeth 1998 highlighted above and urging all dioceses to participate in education, advocacy and 0.7% giving. Presiding Bishop

Frank Griswold also established "Jubilee" as the theme of that 2000 Convention, bringing to the forefront issues of global relationship and renewal as well as those same international debt and economic justice issues championed by the Jubilee 2000 movement -- of which the Anglican Church was a primary mover.

At the 2003 General Convention in Minneapolis, the Episcopal Church passed Resolution D-006, which:

- endorsed and embraced the achievement of the MDGs
- challenged all dioceses and congregations to embrace 0.7% giving
- directed the Episcopal Office of Government Relations advocate for the U.S. government keeping its promise to give 0.7% of GNI to international development programs, and urged all Episcopalians to contact their elected representatives and likewise advocate.

By General Convention 2006 in Columbus, Ohio, 41 dioceses had pledged a minimum of 0.7% of their budgets to ministries working toward the MDGs, with work toward that commitment happening in an additional 24 dioceses. Several major church bodies, including Episcopal Relief and Development and the Office of Government Relations, had adopted the MDGs as the structure for their work ... and Episcopalians for Global Reconciliation (the prime mover of D006 in Denver) had begun to grow a grassroots movement of individuals, congregations, dioceses and organizations throughout the church to ignite, inspire and resource engagement with the MDGs.

General Convention 2006 was a giant leap forward for the Episcopal Church and the MDGs. More than 700 people attended Episcopalians for Global Reconciliation's U2charist kicking off what the House of Bishops later affirmed as a convention "overlighted and inspired" by "our commitment to the ministry of reconciliation and the relief of global human suffering." At that Convention, the Episcopal Church passed:

- A010, which received and affirmed the "Call to Partnership" -- an ecumenical and interfaith communiqué for the achievement of the MDGs

- D022, which
 - established work toward achieving the MDGs as a mission priority of the Church for the next triennium (this was affirmed in the budgeting process and "Justice and Peace," with the MDGs as its framework, was named the church's top mission priority for 2006-2009)
 - urged the creation of a line item of no less than 0.7% (circa \$900,000) for work that supports the MDGs (this was later included in the budget)
 - designated the Last Sunday After Pentecost as a special day of "prayer, fasting and giving in The Episcopal Church toward global reconciliation and the MDGs."
 - urged all diocese to establish a body or commission to mobilizing their people toward the achievement of the MDGs
 - endorsed "The ONE Campaign" through establishing "ONE Episcopalian" and urging all congregations, dioceses and individuals to join it.
 - -The Most Rev. Dr. Katharine Jefferts Schori was elected Presiding Bishop and Ms. Bonnie Anderson was elected President of the House of Deputies, both of whom have been tireless advocates for God's mission of global reconciliation in the MDGs.

Since then, the following has happened:

- The Executive Council, in partnership with ERD and Jubilee Ministries has taken the 0.7% national budget line item, rounded it up to \$1 million and established the Millennium Development Goals Inspiration Fund, to which "individuals, congregations and dioceses be encouraged to contribute an additional \$2 million." \$2 million of the funding will be allocated to NetsForLife -- an Anglican partnership for malaria prevention in Africa. The remaining \$1 million will be allocated to "initiatives in the Caribbean and Latin America focusing on public health issues."

- An estimated 85 dioceses are giving at least 0.7% of their budgets toward ministries that support the MDGs .
- A worldwide Anglican Communion gathering for the MDGs (TEAM - Towards Effective Anglican Mission) was held in March in Boksburg, South Africa and galvanized support around the communion for God's mission of global reconciliation. Find out more at the conference's website and download the final conference report.

But more than that, the energy throughout the Church for God's mission continues to grow in ways big and small. As we look to the future, there's no limit to how God can use us to further this mission ... and how the church and the world can be transformed in the process.