

ARTICLE V.

THE CHRISTIAN CHARITY OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY CHURCH.

BY THE REVEREND H. FRANCIS PERRY, PH.D.

THE marvelous growth of the modern city makes it at the same time a storm-center and a light-center. World-wide problems are now confronting us in the modern American city. A century ago about one-thirtieth of the population of the United States lived in cities. To-day one-third of our people are urban residents. This is only a part of the great world-movement of the present day from the country to the city. This migration, known and feared by other centuries, is strangely accelerated and intensified in our own times. No insignificant problem is constituted by this gravitation toward the city. If democracy is to fail anywhere it will be in the great city, the headquarters of discontent, of the saloon, of the social evil, of hunger, of overcrowding. Forth from the social cellar may come the assassins of free institutions.

We must not forget that while the city is the storm-center, it is also the light-center of our civilization. Here are the men of large enterprise and faith who are planning and executing great things for the Kingdom of God.

When Christianity was established, its leaders, under divine guidance, went at once to strategic centers of the world's life; and here, where men were massed together, its mighty work began. It was in the cities that Christianity first conquered, and it is in the cities where its greatest battles are now being fought. To Christianize the city of the twentieth century is the task before the Christian

church. The centers of civilization were taken for Christ in the first centuries of the Christian era. They must be taken by the same divine power in the last centuries of the world's life. Here dangers threaten. Here Christian service multiplies. It is well to know what is actually being done in Christian work by the church of our great American cities. It would be manifestly burdensome to take the entire city of Chicago and the work of the church in all departments for such a research. I have therefore chosen the South Side of the city of Chicago, and limited the inquiry to the work of relieving the poor. I sent out the following letter to the pastors of all the evangelical, Protestant churches on the South Side of the city of Chicago:—

“MY DEAR BROTHER:—

“I am anxious to make an investigation on a subject which will be vital, I think, to the interests of the Church of Jesus Christ on the South Side of the city of Chicago. More attention is given at present than at any time during recent years, to the thought of relief for the poor. I want to study the subject by a research on the relief for the poor which the Church is giving on the South Side of the city of Chicago. I know you are a busy man, but will you kindly take the time to send me answers to the following questions:—

“1. What is your plan of relief for the poor?

“2. Would you advise your church to contribute to the administrative work of the Bureau of Associated Charities for its common service of investigation, registration, information, and coördination?

“3. What classes of cases, if any, helped by you, should be registered in the Bureau of Associated Charities?

“4. Do you limit your relief to the members of your own church? Do you think there ought to be a place in the relief work of the church for individuals not members of the church and for relief societies and institutions?

“5. Do you know of cases where those helped have sought the relief of several churches, or relief institutions, at the same time?

“6. What is the duty of the church to the legal pauper?

“7. Will you state, approximately, the sums contributed by your church for relief in the city?

“For your own members, \$.....

“Through benevolent associations and institutions, \$.....

“Sincerely,

H. FRANCIS PERRY.”

In answer to the first question, "What is your plan of relief for the poor?" all but three report some plan, and those who have no special method declare that it is because they are small and poor. One of them says, "When we find any one more needy than the rest of us, we divide with him." The agencies of relief are:—

1. The pastor personally takes charge of this work, investigating needy cases, and distributing the help himself, assisted by some committee, composed usually of ladies. The needy are encouraged in some churches to make the appeal directly to the pastor.

2. The board of deacons or elders care for the needy cases within the church, and a committee of ladies, or a church visitor, look out for the needy outside the membership. In other churches the women's benevolent societies aid the officers of the church by giving clothing to the poor.

3. A popular method appears to be the giving of help through the Ladies' Aid Society of the church. In one church this society is divided into clusters of ten, and each cluster is willing to be responsible for the care of one or more families as the conditions demand.

4. The young people's societies in a few churches are appointed to care for the poor.

5. A good number of churches declare that they coöperate with the Bureau of Charities as their method of work. Some churches that have but few of the poor in their congregation distribute their aid under the direction of the Bureau of Charities. Thus the work of the Washington Park Congregational Church is carried on. Most of the money collected for the poor is gathered, as it was in Apostolic days, at the time when the church gathers about the memorial celebration of the Lord's Supper. This amount is augmented in some churches by special collections, and in others by systematic subscriptions gathered by the la-

dies of the church. In many churches the ladies' benevolent societies make clothing and sew for the poor, thus helping them to be more comfortable and respectable in personal appearance.

The forms of relief given are :—

1. *Goods, not money.*—It is the rule of most churches to give supplies, rather than money, in small quantities, frequently repeated, after personal investigation. Some churches report that emergency help is given at once, and then investigation is made in order to determine future assistance.

2. *Employment.*—One church has an employment bureau to which all ordinary cases are referred. Another church has a committee on charities which endeavors to secure employment for the needy. A third church follows the plan "of relieving immediate necessities, and then offering employment; if proffered work is refused, we refer them to the county agent; if work is accepted, this does away with their dependence on charity; it is a very unusual case where no one in the family is able to work, so it generally depends on willingness to work and ability to secure work."

3. *Temporary loans.*—Some churches have a fund, loaned in small sums, without interest, to aid in cases of emergency. My own church has followed this plan, but the people who return the money are so few as to nearly vitiate the plan.

4. *Giving of small sums,* as well as clothing and food, to all the needy, who are invited to come for help.—One church reports: "We open our church all day, and have some one in attendance to relieve need. Each case is decided upon its own merits. We spend about fifteen dollars per week, besides clothing and food. We invite all to come."

5. *Friendly visiting.*—By pastor, church visitors, deaconesses, ladies personally visiting the needy and giving

them systematic interest and love. The rector of an Episcopal church writes: "We have a Charity Guild. The parish is divided into districts. Friendly visitors are composed of communicants who do not come into contact with the poor from a humanitarian side, but who seek to bring them into touch with the spiritual life, in the worship and sacraments of the church."

On the whole the reports give evidence that much charitable help is wisely and scientifically given by the churches on the South Side of the city.

As to the second question, "Would you advise your church to contribute to the administrative work of the Bureau of Associated Charities for its common service of investigation, registration, information, and coördination?" more than three-fourths of the churches replying favor the idea. These affirmative replies range in sentiment from an enthusiastic indorsement, descending by the way of a simple "Yes," down to a hesitating acceptance of this method of work. There are many declarations which are very cordial. I quote some representative indorsements: "Most emphatically and enthusiastically, *Yes*. It is the only correct theory of charity ever advanced, and the churches ought to back it up in every way." "Decidedly, I think the Bureau most valuable, in fact essential." "I would, I have done so. I believe they are doing a good work. By their systematized work I have many times been protected from impostors. They are doing a work that the church does not do, and perhaps cannot do." "I would most strongly. I believe the Bureau of Charities when properly understood and wisely used, will be found to be a great agency for handling the problem of the poor. It works upon right lines, and my own experience with the Bureau has been very happy and satisfactory."

Another company of churches simply say "Yes" to the second question.

A few qualify their indorsement by such statements as these: "Yes; though their work is not as thorough as it ought to be." "Yes; they do a grand work, yet some think them too heterodox, as they are dominated largely by liberal churches." "To some extent." "I find that our people are growing more and more shy of the Bureau of Associated Charities. The fact is a majority have a private mistrust as to its utility." "I am not so enthusiastic as I used to be upon this point; see the inclosed criticism,"—which was a newspaper criticism of the way in which the Bureau of Associated Charities spends its money.

One pastor gives a laconic, Delphic answer to the question: "Yes and no. I am not so sure, but perhaps so. Their work has seemed to me often too cold-blooded."

Less than one-quarter reply in the negative, the adverse opinion running from a strong opinion against such contributions by the church, down through a straight "No," to a qualified objection. Those who are in the minority on the subject say: "Only under pressure of wide-spread want. I believe in hand-picked fruit, which no great organization can expect to accomplish." "No, the Lord left the poor as a legacy to his church. The church needs to see the need, so as to enter into sympathy with the suffering and to minister to want." "Our relation to the Bureau of Charities has not taught us to respect that work in this section of the city. There is too much 'red tape' and too little real work." "No, because I believe each neighborhood should work for its own poor, and true Christian charity is most effective where it is continuous and shows an abiding interest in the temporal and spiritual welfare of the people."

Two, only, reply with an unexplained "No."

Three do not care to do anything as a church, but give their judgment that it is wise for individuals to help the Bureau, "not as a church, but would advise individuals to

help." "No, not as a church, only as individuals." "I have not done so, and so far have not seen the necessity of doing so. Some of our members are identified with the Bureau, but as a church we have taken no action in the matter."

To the third question, "What classes of cases, if any, helped by you, should be registered in the Bureau of Associated Charities?" the replies are very interesting. Eight answer, "None." Six say: "Chronic cases"; "Dead beats"; "Professional beggars"; "Intemperate men"; "Impostors"; "Those who belong to the Catholic Church, and send their children to our Sunday-school for the sake of getting aid." Twelve say: "All except our own members," and two out of the twelve say, "And also *some* of the members." Four think, "All except where the utmost privacy is necessary," or where "the families were formerly well-to-do." Some think the cases which should be reported are those where the charge will be permanent. Three are ready to report "all cases," and another says, "Nearly all." The rest of the replies are slight modifications of these opinions.

Question 4: "Do you limit your relief to the members of your own church? Do you think there ought to be a place in the relief work of the church for individuals not members of the church, and for relief societies and institutions?" Here there is practical unanimity. All are agreed that while charity begins at home, it does not end there. The church on the South Side of the city of Chicago believes its duty is not done until it helps to relieve the distress of those who are not members of the church. Several say, "We help our own members first, and others as far as we can."

I quote some of the answers showing the consciousness of duty to those outside the church. "We do not limit our relief to our own church people; we help more out-

siders by far than we do of our own. I believe the scope and plan and purpose of the church is broad enough to admit and welcome individuals and societies to a place in the same." "We help as many as we can, regardless of church affiliation." "We do not limit help to members. Three-fourths of those whom we help do not go to our church or to any other." "Relief for the needy is an open door for the gospel." "We limit our relief work only by our ability. On our relief list are all creeds, classes, and colors. Catholics and Jews are helped by us. We have also from time to time assisted the Salvation Army and Volunteers of America in their relief work." "We aid every one who comes, and invite all to come." "We give the preference to the household of faith."

The part of the question which deals with the relation of the church to relief societies and institutions is but slightly touched upon. Most of the answers emphasize the necessity of caring for individuals. One correspondent says: "The church should help relief societies and institutions, but they should take a subordinate position to the direct spiritual needs of the church." Another writes: "If you mean to ask if the local church ought to recognize every city, county, state, national, or individual relief society or institution that sends its agents for help, No. It is better to do the work through the Bureau of Associated Charities, or some charity or relief organization recognized as having a right to exist."

To the fifth question, "Do you know of cases where those helped have sought relief of several churches or relief institutions at the same time?" thirteen fortunate brethren reply in the negative. They have not met this state of things in their ministry, but some of them suggest that it is doubtless a reality in other places, at least they have so heard.

The rest of the communications with sad frequency de-

clare themselves familiar with this form of hypocrisy. Some say they have known a few cases, others say, "Now and then," "One or two." Still others declare, "Many," "A large number," and one of the best-known men on the South Side says, "Hundreds."

The tactics of this parasitical host are revealed; as, "We have had several such people who have united with several churches, both Catholic and Protestant, in order to be helped." "We know people who have moved as often as necessary to 'greener pastures.'" "Yes, indeed, one good sister who tried to commit suicide twice, and whom our ladies did a great deal for, finally went so far as to apply for membership in a Congregational church, because she thought they were willing to do more for her than we did." "I regret to say that I do know positively of such cases; one case where the family received relief during the same time of the winter from three different denominations, each of the three churches being within ten minutes' walk of each other." "I have known several such cases; and, when they were found out, they moved to other sections of the city and began the same thing over again." One pastor is very pessimistic on the whole subject of relief, and says, "I have seen very few cases helped with any degree of success. Last year I personally endeavored to assist people in need. Only one case in some dozens turned out encouragingly."

Several answers are of great importance in showing the necessity of registration. "Unless there is some place of registration, these people will seek help from half-a-dozen churches." Many give valuable testimony to the practical working of the registration of the Bureau of Associated Charities in this respect. These are the replies: "I have learned of many through the Bureau of Charities, and no doubt it has done more than all other agencies to kill this prosperous, flourishing business." "I find them every lit-

tle while. The Bureau of Charities helps much in providing against this. We try to be extremely careful about it, for pauperism is worse than poverty." "Yes, many of them. Here is one of the great curses which the Bureau of Charities seeks to overthrow." "Yes, we have had much experience, but by the coöperation which now exists we have no trouble." "No, we have been saved from it in several instances by using the Bureau for investigation." I take the liberty of giving the name of Bishop Cheney of Christ's Church (Reformed Episcopal) with the next statement: "Hundreds of them. But this has been greatly obviated since the Bureau of Associated Charities became established."

Question 6, "What is the duty of the church to the legal pauper?" has drawn out all kinds of answers. Six answer squarely, "I don't know." Seven say, "I do not know what you mean by a legal pauper." Some of those who thus answer are among the most intelligent ministers of Chicago. One says, "Exactly what this question means I am not sure, and therefore do not attempt to answer." Another says, "I don't know what a legal pauper is—but he ought to be cured or beheaded."

Six answer, "Lead him to self-support." "Show him the greatest kindness by helping him to help himself." Three insist that "the first effort should be to regenerate his life, and thus change the motives of his being." "Try to be instrumental in his conversion." Others say, "Help him all you can." Still others reply, "Have a personal interest in him. Help along other lines than food and fuel. Have a personal interest in him."

Among the replies are these suggestions: "Close the saloon. Put down trusts and combinations. Restrict immigration, and let no foreigner vote until he has been a resident for ten years, and not then until he can read and speak the English language." "The churches ought to

be federated in their relief of the poor." "The worthy poor dread the poorhouse worse than death. Could not the church do something to prove whether there is just cause for such dread and have it removed?"

The three most important and most frequent answers are these :—

1. "Study the causes of poverty, and seek to remove the conditions which make paupers. Endeavor to bring out the real causes of poverty—not simply the wastefulness of the poor, but the unjust social conditions which favor the wealthy and oppress the poor." "Teach that the blood of souls is upon the greed of Christian men who themselves, or by their invested capital, compel poor men to work on the Sabbath day."

2. Let the church care for them as far as possible. "Not give him a cent, but provide for urgent needs, cases of extreme necessity, as in very cold weather or sickness." "Try to get him to work." "Christ places no limit upon our duties in this direction." "The church ought to care for its own members who are in distress." "The chronic pauper should be permanently cared for in 'church homes' as well as in state asylums."

3. Turn the legal pauper over to the legal authorities. Eleven thus recommended. "The church has no duty except for mercy's sake to help the state take care of them." "It is the wise plan to turn the legal pauper over to the city or state, then by its influence regulate the care of the pauper." "Let the law have her perfect work." "It is the county's place to see to such, but the church may help such as in her judgment are helpless and deserving." "That depends on the faithfulness of the legal authorities toward the pauper. In cases of neglect when the matter is urgent the church should act. Otherwise let the relief be given by the state." "If you mean by this question the pauper who is supported by the state, would say that

it is the duty of the church to seek him out and minister to his spiritual wants."

The answers to Question 7, "Will you state approximately the sums contributed by your church for relief in the city? for your own members? through benevolent associations and institutions?" were less satisfactory than those which were given to the other questions. Many gave no figures at all. Others gave the amounts contributed for their own needy, but did not fill out the space for outside benevolences. Twenty-one gave comparative figures. They spent for their own members, \$3,341, and for those not members, together with money given as a church to philanthropy, \$3,051.

It is certainly evident from this research that the church on the South Side of the city of Chicago is already doing valuable relief work for the poor, and that it sees the necessity for coöperative work in extirpating pauperism and helping those who are willing to help themselves, from the slough of poverty.

In order to get the opinion of workers in charity organizations concerning the attitude of the church in general to poor relief, I obtained answers from the General Superintendent and six district officers of the Bureau of Charities in Chicago, also from New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Detroit, Indianapolis, Cincinnati, and Dayton. The following letter was sent to the charity workers in these cities:—

"DEAR SIR:

"I am making a research at the present time on the Poor Relief Work which is being done by the churches on the South Side of the city of Chicago. I have received a great many answers to a list of questions which I have sent out to the pastors of churches, but I also want to get an opinion on this subject from the standpoint of the workers in charity organizations. Will you kindly answer for me, and return at your earliest convenience, the submitted questions:—

"1. What have you found the attitude of the church in your field to be toward coöperative, systematic, and scientific charity?

"2. Ought the church to attempt other charitable work besides the care of the poor among its own members and Sunday-school, in addition to contributing to the administrative work of the Bureau of Associated Charities?"

"3. What other systematic definite work could the church attempt?"

"4. How could this be carried into effect?"

"5. What cases do you think the church ought to register with the Bureau of Charities, (a) Its own members? (b) Families not members, but who are being helped?"

Sincerely,

"H. FRANCIS PERRY."

In answer to the first question, "What have you found the attitude of the church in your field to be toward systematic, coöperative, and scientific charity?" I am informed by all that the church at large is favorable to the work of the Bureau of Charities. One writer says: "If you mean all the churches, I should say on the whole, 'Yes!'" Another says, "We find the churches willing and many anxious to coöperate with us in their relief work; there are only one or two Catholic churches which refuse." The attitude of the church is expressed by some as being "wholly favorable," "Most of the churches are cordially coöperative," "Most of the pastors are cordial coöperators. The younger church-members, and about all the male membership as far as they know the work, believe in it. Of course a strong element of elderly ladies have done just what you are doing for twenty-five years, and they cannot be brought into actual sympathy. In general, however, the attitude of the church is most encouraging." "On the South Side of the city of Chicago the chief support of the Associated Charities movement comes from well-informed church leaders, and the number and interest of these is growing."

Others find it necessary to limit their statements: "Generally favorable, when the churches and pastors thoroughly understand the work." "Churches in our city are, as a rule, kindly disposed toward systematic charity, but it is difficult to get them to coöperate as fully as is desired."

"This season the expenses of the Bureau in this district have been paid by the churches, and in this way they have coöperated with the Bureau. But systematic, scientific charity is understood and practiced by only one church of which I have knowledge in the entire district." "Very rarely opposed, often indifferent; usually friendly, but not always efficiently friendly. Theoretically the church means to coöperate, practically it does so intermittently." "Upon the whole we have found the churches ready with expressions of sympathy with the Bureau in its systematic, coöperative, scientific methods of dealing with charitable work, but slow to act when called upon to do." "We find the attitude of the church, on the whole, most friendly. It waits, however, for us to make advances."

The second question was, "Ought the church to attempt other charitable work besides the care of the poor among its own members and Sunday-school, in addition to contributing to the administrative work of the Bureau of Associated Charities?"

The following answer is important in classification, and is therefore submitted first: "It depends upon the condition of the church. Some wealthy churches have very few poor of their own, and these certainly ought to go outside of their own membership in rendering assistance. Other poor churches have all they can do to help their own poor." It may be also well to state the implied criticism of this statement: "I should say the church as a church would be far more useful to the community if it were the generating place for all kinds of social service." Four think that the church does well if it cares for its own poor in a scientific way, and contributes to the administrative work of the Bureau of Charities. One simply answers the question, "I think not." Another says, "Relief work is the lowest level of service, and is often the laziest method of escaping service. The church should probably

limit its relief work to its own poor. Certainly that is the only method by which one working with a whole can bring about coherent, divisional effort with effective coöperation among a great many charities and churches." The third says, "In our opinion, if, in addition to contributing to the administrative work of the Bureau of Charities, each church cares for its own, it would seem that it was doing as much as could reasonably be expected. This, however, would leave perhaps the majority of needy ones outside such assistance." Another affirms: "The church cannot safely do charity work unless under the management of trained people. Comparatively few churches and benevolent societies have competent trained workers."

The rest believe it imperative for the church to go beyond its own members in doing charitable work. These are sample statements: "I think the church has a duty to perform in caring for poor families that do not belong to any church, in addition to the caring for the poor among its own members and contributing to the administrative work of the Bureau of Charities. It should, when possible, be willing to take up other families that may come to its notice or that may be referred to it by the Bureau." "It seems to me a selfish point of view for a church to say that it cares for the poor among its own members, and supports some large society to look after other poor. In so far as we can get all church workers interested in one or two families the better. This cannot be done usually without the help of some outside administrative office." "By all means. I am coming to believe that a city church should have more trained and paid workers who can develop the young people that they may become friendly aid visitors to the poor as representing the churches, not the charities. As a Christian man it is a source of deep concern to me that none of the good I do for the poor as a Christian man is any help to the church, or to the poor

churchward. I believe, with Washington Gladden, that it should be the Associated Churches, instead of the Associated Charities. . . . I would make my church the place for power and inspiration for service, the home whence should go out the powerful influences of wise workers." "While we owe special duties to our own family, church, and neighborhood, we shall contradict our Christianity and our duty to the city if we deliberately shut out or reject any class or neighborhood."

The third question was, "What other systematic definite work could the church attempt?"

Among the practical suggestions which were received, I state the following:—

1. *The activities of settlement work.*—"Nearly all the activity of what is commonly called settlement work could be easily undertaken by churches. Boys' and girls' clubs and classes for entertainment, sewing, cooking, manual training, etc., literary classes, penny-savings funds, require workers, but little money; and if their benefits are offered to all who need them without regard to creed, great good may result."

2. *The friendly visiting plan.*—I quote: "One great need of organized charity is a large body of good volunteer or friendly visitors. This work could readily be taken up in a systematic way under the direction of organized charities. Still another method would be, to select a neighborhood in some poor quarter of the city where the efforts of the church could be concentrated in elevating and improving the families in that district and in making their environment better."

3. *The churches should cooperate.*—"The churches should gradually form federations, like that of New York City for the cultivation of limited districts."

Question 4: "How could this be carried into effect?"

Most of those who answered Questions 2 and 3 also said

something about the present inquiry. Five additional suggestions as to plans are made:—

1. "Use the plan of Dr. Laidlaw, described in the *American Journal of Sociology*, May, 1898."

2. "By an organized committee in the church whose chairman should be connected with a central organized body."

3. "Let the Ladies' Aid Society help to clothe the poor."

4. "Utilize the energy of the young people who have energy, means, and desire to do something for humanity, but do not know how to do it."

5. "Begin work in a small way with large plans to be gradually achieved, all the time coöperating with established work."

Question 5: "What cases do you think the church ought to register with the Bureau of Charities, (a) Its own members? (b) Families not members, but who are being helped?"

All are agreed that families not members of the church, who are being helped, should be registered with the Bureau.

Four correspondents are about ready to recommend that all cases irrespective of membership should be thus registered. These four thus speak:—

"I believe that the attitude of the church toward registration is well-nigh ridiculous. I believe all cases should be registered. There can no possible harm result, and the good is far-reaching. I know of nothing of greater importance to the worthy poor or of higher friendliness to the fraudulent." "From our standpoint we think *all* should be registered, as our records are confidential. But if a church-member is under temporary pressure which a little immediate assistance will remove, we think the church should use its own discretion in the matter." "I think the church should register all its relief with the Charity

Organization Society. There can be no objection, for the record is absolutely confidential. It could be plainly understood that the name was sent, not for investigation but merely as a record of relief given. Of course a church hesitates to register the relief given to its own members where it knows all the facts, but we know of more than one instance where a woman has rented a pew in several churches and gets aid from the parishioners of each." "Yes, register the members so far as you can; but not cases that only have temporary aid, and are not likely to occur again."

Others think it unwise to register members of the church. "I think a church should not register its own members, but the Bureau should report to the church any applicants who are suspected of being in receipt of church relief under pretense of membership." "I do not think it expedient usually for a church to register its members with a bureau outside itself. . . . A good rule is to ask the Bureau about all cases that are new, leaving a statement that the family is in the care of your church; and, if later information appears from another church, the Bureau is to ask the other not to aid, but to leave the family in the care of the first hands." "I think the church should register all the families it may be helping or that may appeal to it for help who are not members, and in addition to it should register some of those who are members. There are usually some members who are not of long standing, who perhaps have recently moved into the neighborhood, and whose integrity may be somewhat a matter of doubt; and this I think should by all means be reported or, better still, inquiry should be made about them before any help at all is given."

Another important suggestion has been brought out by this question. Whether the church registers its members with the Bureau or not, let it seek information from the Bureau about those who are not well known, whether they appear on the church list or not. Philip W. Ayres of the

New York Charity Organization Society says: "It might be valuable, however, to ask the Bureau if it has registered information about certain cases." Dr. Van Dyke says that it is about "inside cases" that he finds "the knowledge of the Charity Organization Society most helpful." Professor Henderson also says: "The church almoner should usually inquire of the Bureau of Associated Charities for information about persons aided. My experience is that pastors and deacons do not know as much about members who appeal for aid as they think at first. Of course all publicity must be avoided in any case. It is only fair and just that the church almoners should register on the confidential list of the Bureau any cases where the persons have solicited help from various persons."

It is generally conceded by all that the church should care for the poor who are a part of its own membership, and doubtless most Christian workers would agree that help should also be given to families related to the church through the Sunday-school and congregation. The words of Christ are still true, "The poor ye have with you always." If this help in friendly visiting, in financial aid, and in helping to secure employment is wisely given by the church, a large number of the poor will be cared for. The research has shown that the Christian leaders believe that they have not fulfilled their broad mission to the poor by merely caring for the poor in their own churches and congregations. There is a wider obligation than this, and it becomes our duty to show this obligation, and to formulate some tentative program for the future relief work of the church.

It is a question whether the Protestant Church as a whole has not been more negligent in its care of the poor than it has been in the other departments of its assigned work. Why should not the twentieth-century church as well as the martyr church become distinguished for its love

for the poor? If the objection is raised that there were no costly churches with their sumptuous appointments to maintain in apostolic days, the rejoinder is at hand that the words of Peter at the gate of the temple, "Silver and gold have I none," are no longer true, but that now the church has wealth enough to girdle the globe with the white light of the gospel, and to bind up the wounds of the despoiled travelers, as well as to pay for the oil and wine and charges at the inn, for all the needy and suffering. The church ought not to delegate so much of its giving to secular institutions, but should disburse its own charitable help as a church, having the poor understand that it is done in the name of Jesus.

Dr. Laidlaw¹ forcibly declares that the genesis of the social conscience has been, as Professor Nash has so magnificently proven, at the altars of the church. But the primacy of altruistic movements is no longer conceded to the church as it used to be. The riches of the church in altruists and money places it in a position to carry out the ideals of Jesus Christ. If the position of Dr. Laidlaw be well taken, and if it is true that, measured by its resources and traditions, the church as a church is not taking the first place in social service, there should be an immediate attempt on the part of the church to get in the van on this important work, and assume its old primacy. Most of the workers who labor for social regeneration under other forms of organization than the church are those who are members of churches, and most of the money for all philanthropic causes is gathered from church-members. On the list of almost every church, besides the funds gathered monthly for its own poor and denominational benevolences, are offerings for the Bureau of Charities work, hospital funds, Law and Order League work, etc. In their private

¹"A Plea and a Plan for a Coöperative Church-Parish system in Cities," in *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. iii. p. 79.

capacity, church-members also aid the suffering in quiet ways. But does the community reckon the church chief almoner for the needy? Help should be given more directly by the church as an organization, and the reproach removed that this or that benevolent society is doing more for the poor than the church. Because the church has delegated its work to, and allowed its money and its service to be given in the name of, other organizations, many misunderstandings have arisen. The poor do not see Christ in the secular charity as they would in the benevolence of the church. Workingmen are alienated more and more from an organization which does not have money or method to attack in any large way the poverty of the neighborhood. The church to them is only a rich man's club. It is time for the church to return as an organization to the care for the poor.¹ One of the obstacles in the way of this reform is the fact that the church gives its money so meagerly that it only sustains the institution itself. In many churches the chief concern is the church treasury. Members of the church must be more liberal before any great work is done.

The church as a church has a duty to those for whose temporal wants the state cares. The state ought to expect, as one of the results of the exemption of the church from taxation, that the church will supplement by love and personal sympathy the formal giving of aid. Let the church recognize its duty to add the peculiar service which cannot be purchased for dollars, to the institutional care of the poor by the state. Cardinal Baluffi holds that there is no love in secular and Protestant charity. He declares that such aid as natural compassion, or a poor-rate, or any legal measure provides for the want of the distressed, is a poor substitute for what is most needed,—loving charity. Charity alone brings solace to every form of human affliction.

¹See *Isms Old and New*, by Dr. George C. Lorimer, pp. 341-344.

It is not only generous, but compassionate and sympathetic. It gives fraternal counsel, and dissipates darkness and perplexing doubts. It soothes; it makes the load of sorrow somewhat lighter. This charity is not the result of human force, nor of secular power.

Though we find in Protestant hospitals and houses of refuge cleanliness and good government, we do not find charity—that charity which tends the sick with maternal care, and soothes the heart of the afflicted. There is no reason why Protestant charity should not truly give that help which Cardinal Baluffi boasts is given by Romanism, without causing pauperism as Roman charity does.

How shall the church go to work to relieve distress and to expose pauperism on the South Side of the city of Chicago? By some plan of campaign so that an organized attack shall be simultaneously made on wretchedness and sin, and simultaneous watch-care and help shall be given to the needy. The collective church of the community, the federated church, must take hold of this work. The real difficulty of charitable inefficiency will be met when the real method of Christian efficiency is everywhere illustrated. We cannot afford to have desultory work when the forces of evil are in constant collusion in their work against us. The same call which has gone out to the church from high-browed, wide-horized men should be emphasized because applicable also to the problem of charity. The days of guerilla fighting are not over in spiritual warfare. Very many men are deceived into thinking that a free lance is of more importance than a man who fights under discipline. In religion and philanthropy a free lance is the man who, through a false conception of his own importance, proposes to carry on guerilla warfare against evil and poverty, but refuses to ally himself with the standing army of the kingdom. He does not fight against the kingdom of God, but, being under no special discipline, and

often under no trained officers, he wastes energy. He is unwilling to work with imperfect people, forgetting his own limitations; he objects to "pulling in harness," as Dr. Washington Gladden says of John Storm. As well might a Northern soldier have written to Abraham Lincoln, "I am with you in loyalty to the government, but I am going to fight secession in my own way. You will hear from me later on." President McKinley would not have been particularly gratified to have received a communication from fifty men in Illinois, saying, "We also believe it is time to deliver Cuba from Spanish oppression. We shall charter a ship of our own and attack the Spanish forces. Long live the beneficent influences of the United States!" It is a sign of weakness and poverty to engage in guerilla warfare when there is an organized army of which one can be a part. This call which rebukes guerilla warfare and advocates federated power is the best solution of the problem of the church and of poor relief.

The Protestant churches in the United States are not yet a church in coöperated effort. Dr. James McCosh several years ago showed that it was possible, without impossible organic unity, to have a practical unity of the church for the taking of the gospel to all men. Two methods have been used by the church in seeking to evangelize the unchurched. The first is the territorial or parochial system. A district or parish was assigned to the minister. The Reformers retained the parish system, and the Puritans brought it into New England. A pastor was to be responsible for the spiritual interests of all the people in his parish.

Denominationalism led to the congregational system. Men of similar belief associate themselves together and form a church, a pastor is called, and from all sides, without much regard to comity, a congregation is gathered. This is the prevailing system in the United States. The

great advantage of the territorial system was, as Dr. McCosh declares, that it covered the whole country and reached all the people. But this cannot be harmoniously done under denominational agencies. The congregational method is valuable in unifying the people on common tastes, and usually in creating more responsibility and enthusiasm. But the waste of this method is appalling. No one is absolutely responsible for the taking of the gospel to men who are migratory in their habits, and who go from one section of the city to another. "The Bedouins of the Boulevards," as they have been called, are unreached by the church. The call of Dr. McCosh and Dr. Josiah Strong, Mr. Loomis, and other strategists in spiritual warfare, is for the church to unite in congregational and territorial methods. Let the church be federated for comprehensive work. Let the churches of a given part of the city look over the field, divide it into districts, and each pastor agree to see that, without lessening his present work in the congregational method, the gospel invitation shall be carried to every person in his special district whom he ascertains has no real connection with any other evangelical church. His workers should know every family in the district and their spiritual condition. This could be attained by tactful workers who have patience and piety.

A general plan for practical union has been advocated for the definite work of the young people's societies of the various churches by those who have finally seen that organic unity is out of the question. Without any loss of denominational power the four and one-half millions of young people now enrolled in the young people's societies might be federated and move as a mighty phalanx with "a far-drawn battle line" against civic and personal iniquity.¹

¹ See article on "Federation of Young People's Societies," in *Literary Digest*, Vol. xiv. p. 768.

We hail with joy the suggestion of federation, and believe that this same coöperative effort has within it the solution of the care for the poor. When each church has accepted a certain district in its community to evangelize, it would be comparatively easy to secure also a purpose to purify and uplift the moral and social departments of the district. The poor could be thus handled by the church, and aided by wise crusades and discreet financial help and friendly visiting. The Bureau of Charities could utilize the district idea which the church had formed, and unify all the helpful agencies which were coöperating with the church in moralizing the given field. This is in my judgment the wisest program which could be suggested. Work toward a federation of all the churches for all necessary service. Let this be the purpose of all who are members of the church, and who love comprehensive work for men.

Already work along these lines is being pushed in different cities, through the federation and district plans. A notable example of this work on its relief side is seen in Buffalo, N. Y. The Buffalo method of the "church district plan" seeks to carry this federation for poor relief into actual execution in the city of Buffalo, and partially illustrates what could be done through coöperation. The plan originated with the Charity Organization Society in 1896, and the churches, as far as possible, were enlisted in the work. The city of Buffalo has been laid out in one hundred and ninety-five districts. Seventy-nine districts in 1898 had been taken by different churches. What it means to take one of these districts is stated to be—

1st. That you will feel a special responsibility for the moral elevation of that district by means of uplifting agencies, and for the removal of plague-spots.

2d. That either with or without assistance of the poor-master and the charitable institutions of the city you will become responsible for the material relief of those in your

district who are destitute and neglected. If such people in your district have spiritual relations with another church, the responsibility for their relief still rests upon you, if that church, after due notice, continues to neglect them.

What the plan proposed does *not* involve is almost equally important:—

No church is asked to interrupt any spiritual relations which it now holds with families in any part of the city, and each church is still free to give relief to its own poor wherever they live, though it is desired that each should confine its relief as far as possible to its own district.

The practical working of the idea is far from perfect, but it will doubtless increase in efficiency as the churches see the great necessity for concentrated action. Of the seventy-nine churches in 1898 coöperating in this plan, which geographically covered about one-half of the city, I am informed that six were deeply interested, a considerable number more were somewhat interested, and most of the rest were not very much interested. Nevertheless, even with this latter class the plan was of great help to the society. The poor can be referred often to these churches with a legitimate claim upon them. To many of these churches the Charity Organization Society has not had occasion to refer more than one or two families in a year, but even this was worth much to some of the poor.

During the first year of this plan, one hundred and ninety-seven families were referred to fifty-three churches which had not made themselves responsible for districts. Long before the church district plan was attempted, families were referred to churches, and many of these coöperate as formerly with the society, but have been unwilling to take a district, and become responsible for poverty not of their own denomination.

In a later report of the Committee on Coöperation of the Buffalo Charity Organization Society (1899-1900) most

encouraging results were presented. Out of eight hundred and twenty-seven cases reported from the church districts, all but ninety-four were referred to the churches responsible. During the year the number of churches which took districts, has increased to one hundred and one. There could be no more gratifying indication that the churches have confidence in the stability and value of the district plan than in this increasing application of it. Out of the one hundred and one churches which are now coöperating in the plan, thirteen took districts at a distance from their own comfortable section of the city, where they had not even a mission or a chapel. Thus the churches are united in an organized attack on the poverty of Buffalo. The seed of the plan lies in the following sentence: "If you could district the large cities and induce the churches to look after these districts as the politicians look after the voters in these districts, there would follow such an uplifting of the masses as has not been known since the coming of the Master." The higher side of the work consists not in the giving of alms and supplies, but in the development among those who take a district of such a spirit of loving friendliness and neighborliness as will make them seek to know as well as to help those who live within the neighborhood in their charge. What has been accomplished in Buffalo can be brought about in other cities by wise and persistent effort when the church feels its obligation to do this work in Christ's name.

There is no reason, then, why the church should not attempt this broad, blessed work of charity in the name of Jesus Christ. Let the state with its institutional help care for those who should be placed in institutions, but even here the influence of the church should extend in loving and helpful sympathy, and the reiterated demand should be made for an honest and capable administration, on the part of the officers of the state, of this most sacred trust.

Let the Bureau of Charities continue its scientific work of investigation, registration, information, and coördination, supported by the community and the churches, and Christianized and vitalized by the love for the poor which the church can impart even to routine work. Let social settlements be founded in the most destitute parts of the city to illustrate the spirit of helpfulness. Let the Salvation Army and Volunteers continue their valuable relief work for the needy. But let the church in federated strength, wasting no resources and committing no sin in creating a pauper class, care for its own poor with the loving spirit of Christ, and then accept its responsibility to take, in the name of the Master, help and cheer, and advice and work, to the poor of the city. When it is discovered that a man is an incorrigible pauper or a parasitical drunkard, let him be placed in some moral pest-house, where he will not infect the community-life any farther. The gospel thus preached in the language of brotherliness, with a crucified and risen Christ as the Saviour from sin presented in loving testimony, and illustrated by cheerful helpfulness, would I believe help to bring in the Millennium quicker than any method now in use by the Christian church. Can the Master who fed the hungry multitude with the bread of life and the bread of the fields be given any better chance to get into the lives of men than through the open doorway of a similar service?

When Benjamin West desired a model for the hand of Christ in one of his most famous paintings, he remembered the symmetrical hand of Mr. Morse, the inventor, and this hand became the model of the Christ hand. In the world's idea of Christ, let the cross stand for his heart, the Bible for his voice, conscience for his eye, but your hands and my hands for the Christ hands which reach down underneath the world's woe and alienation and destitution, and in his name raise it up into the sunlight of godliness.