

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE VII.

THE CURE OF PENURY.

BY THE REV. WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D., LL.D.

MY subject is not the cure of poverty, for I am not clear that there is any reason to expect that poverty will ever be completely cured. The saying of Jesus, "The poor ye have always with you," expresses, probably, a fact of universal experience. So long as sickness and accident are inseparable from the lot of humanity, so long there will be men and women and little children who, from no fault of their own, will be poor, and must be cared for by those more prosperous and fortunate. A considerable portion of the work of all our charitable organizations is done for persons of this class; it is work that claims the sympathy and support of all of us, and deserves our praise. Poverty may be perfectly honorable; the relief of such poverty is one of our simplest and clearest obligations, and those who receive such relief, whether from private charity or from the state, ought not to be degraded by it. The poor whose poverty is due to unpreventable sickness and unavoidable calamity will be with us to the end of time; we may lessen the causes which produce such poverty, and greatly reduce the amount of it, but we shall not be able to abolish it altogether. We must relieve its distresses, and this beautiful ministry to those in want and suffering will call forth the sympathy and kindness of human hearts as long as men live in this world.

Nor am I dealing now with the cure of pauperism. Pauperism is the poverty which seeks relief from the public treasury. As I have already intimated, those who are poor

with no discredit to themselves, may become a charge upon the state. When there are no kinsfolk to take up the burden of such helpless ones, the state should promptly assume it. It may well be, therefore, that in the Utopia of which we dream, some of the unfortunate will be cared for at the public expense. Such, according to the present use of terms, would be paupers. No stigma ought to attach to them; no stigma would attach to them, if only such as they received the state's assistance. The cure of pauperism I do not, therefore, look for. I only hope for the day when the word itself will be transfigured, so that it shall convey no sense of disgrace, or when some other word shall take its place as the designation of those who, in need, are cared for by the public authorities.

It is the cure of penury of which I ask you to think; and penury is not purely poverty, it is the poverty that is abject and effortless and apparently chronic; the poverty that is occasioned by, or that consists with, a spirit of dependence, with a willingness to live upon public or private charity. Sometimes penury is the offspring of poverty. Sickness or misfortune reduces human beings to the necessity of accepting aid, and the loss of self-respect, of courage, perhaps of physical vigor, which is thus entailed, is so great that they never fully recover their moral tone, and fall, thenceforward, more and more easily, into the ways of dependence. One of the great problems of our charitable organizations is to find a way of treating poverty so that it shall not sink into penury.

It is true, unhappily, that an increasing number among us are born to penury. Their physical and mental inheritance is such that they lack the energy and power of initiative by which men become independent; their environment also drags them down, and they sink naturally into habits of shiftlessness and mendicancy.

The fact to be reckoned with is, therefore, that we have

in society considerable elements which have sunk into this condition of penury—abject poverty, willing dependence; the condition in which little shame is felt by able-bodied persons at accepting alms, and in which more effort is often expended in getting a living without work, than in trying to get work by which a living might be earned. Children, by the thousand, are reared in homes, so called, in which sentiments and habits of this nature rule; many of them accept the ideal presented to them and grow up mendicants or criminals.

There are those who deny the existence of such a class, but that denial must be charged to ignorance. There would be a difference of opinion as to the extent of this condition—as to the percentage of those who may be said to be living in penury. Charles Booth thought that about eleven per cent of the people of East London were in or verging upon a condition which may be described by this word. Whether the proportion anywhere is as large as that or not, there is enough of it to make the cure of penury a pretty serious problem.

Observe that I have used the word “cure.” The word has much significance. Its implications are important. If penury is to be cured, and if the cure of penury is to be sought by society, then it is implied that penury is a social disease. And if the word “disease” is used in this connection with any propriety, then society must have the nature of an organism, for it is only an organism, a living thing, that can be diseased or cured.

I do not wish to base my argument on mere verbal usage, for words are often employed in a highly metaphorical sense. Nevertheless I believe that these words, when used in this way, do describe profound and important facts. That society has many of the attributes of an organism; that it is a living whole, composed of parts vitally related; that the parts live in the life of the whole, and cannot live

separated from the whole, and that the whole is more than the sum of its parts—all this I believe to be profoundly true. Society, as we shall find, is something more than an organism, but there is much in its constitution which the analogy of the physical organism helps us to understand, and which cannot be understood without a knowledge of the laws of organic life. And this fact of penury which we are now considering is one of the facts which is best understood when we recognize the organic character of society; it is a fact which can never, I believe, be rightly understood or wisely handled until the organic character of society is clearly seen.

Penury, we have said, is a social disease. In the healthy body every organ receives its part and performs its part; disease signifies that this relation is somehow disturbed or interrupted; that some organ or tissue is failing to perform its part. The existence of penury denotes, then, the failure on the part of certain individuals or groups of individuals to perform their proper social function. They must produce in the social organism conditions analogous to those which exist in the human body when a similar failure takes place. There must be inflammation, congestion, ulceration, waste and destruction of tissue, disturbance of the whole social organism. Such conditions are apt to be painful and distressing; they may become dangerous and fatal. Many societies have been destroyed by them. Disease, when it is finished, bringeth forth death. The diseased tissue, the diseased organ, are apt to create morbid conditions in other parts and organs; the disorder spreads until the whole is involved.

But the question may arise whether morbid social conditions of this nature do not tend to correct themselves; whether the organism will not eliminate its own disorders. It would not be safe to make this assumption for any physical organism. Sometimes the forces of health in the tree

or in the animal prove strong enough to expel disease and repair its injuries; but very often the morbid conditions prevail, and the life succumbs to them. The decaying branch may drop away, and the tree may survive and flourish; but, on the other hand, the dying limb may carry its decay into the heart of the tree and destroy its life. The abscess or the ulcer upon your body may be absorbed and healed with no intervention on your part, but it may extend until the whole system is involved; blood poisoning is possible. Diphtheria and scarlet fever may run their course, without fatal results, if no effort is made to control them, but we do not usually consider it safe to leave them in undisputed possession of our own bodies or of those of our friends.

Many of the ills that the social organism is heir to not only impair its strength, but also threaten its life. Penury is not the only social disease which has this fatal tendency; it is not the worst of them; there are congestions and inflammations and ulcerations of various kinds that are more alarming; but penury is a social disease,—a disease that has a tendency to extend its ravages and to fasten its hold upon society. Of this there is no lack of evidence. The number of the chronic dependents is rapidly increasing in all parts of the country. As wealth multiplies and the land is filled with plenty, the number of those able-bodied persons who are supported by public or private charity grows relatively larger, decade by decade. There are economic reasons for this, no doubt; the feverish condition of our commercial life, the alternation of booms and depressions, dislocates industry and periodically throws great numbers out of employment, crowding them into the slippery paths that lead down to penury. The Socialists tell us that the entire competitive *régime* has this tendency, to impoverish the many for the benefit of the few. Whether capitalism with competition necessarily bears this

fruit I will not undertake to say; nor am I entirely certain that the spread of penury is wholly or even mainly due to the present industrial system. I am not sure that we should not witness a considerable increase of this very social disease, if society were organized on a socialistic basis.

But I am not discussing the cause of penury; I am talking about the cure of it. You may say that we cannot deal with it effectively until we know its cause, and that is partly true; but if there is a case of typhoid fever in your house, you do not neglect promptly to employ the best skill and the most effective remedies. You do not say that it is useless to treat the patient until you have found out where those typhoid germs came from.

Just so in this case. We are all trying to find all the deeper causes of penury and to remove them; but meantime, if there are remedies that can be applied, we must find them and use them. It is a disease, a malignant disease, with a strong tendency to spread its morbid conditions, and if there is anything that we can do to arrest its progress we are bound to do it at once.

But when I speak after this manner, the fact is implied that society is something more than an organism. It is implied that a free intelligence is at work in society, or ought to go to work. We are not depending wholly on organic functions; we are depending also on moral and spiritual forces. There is something that we, as reasonable beings, may do; something for us to think about, and determine upon. Reason and judgment and conscience are called in to study the symptoms and apply the remedies. The cure of penury is not a merely organic process,—that is not what we mean by the word “cure.” It suggests the intervention of an intelligent will among organic processes, and such a control or re-arrangement of the forces at work in the organism as shall arrest the morbid

tendencies. If society can really do something to "cure" penury, society must be something more than an organism: it must be an organism presided over by a free intelligence.

Society is, in this respect, like a man. A man is something more than an organism: he is an organism *plus* intelligence and will; and the intelligence and will are responsible for the health and well-being of the organism. The human body is composed of many parts and organs vitally related, each of which shares in the life of the whole body and ministers to the welfare of the whole body; but the presiding intelligence constantly intervenes to direct and regulate these functions. If morbid conditions are set up, in any part of the body, the mind at once seeks their alleviation or removal. If its own knowledge is not adequate, it summons other free intelligence, in the form of the physician, to reënforce and direct its action. If there be diseased tissue or disordered organs, the remedial or corrective agencies which will arrest these injuries are at once sought and applied. It is not for a moment assumed that the derelict portions of the organism are to be let alone to spread inflammation or congestion; it is assumed that the presiding and responsible intelligence will take them promptly and firmly in hand and administer to them such treatment as shall restore them to their proper condition. This may require a measure of severity; it may involve pain; it may call for the administration of nauseous and pungent medicines, and the application of heat in uncomfortable ways, and a resort to counter-irritants of a very disagreeable nature. It may even demand surgery—the free use of the knife—the excision of the diseased portions of the body. There is not, perhaps, so much of the drastic practice in general medicine as once there was, but there is still much that is far from agreeable in the curative art, and surgery is much more extensively employed to-day than ever before.

We do not hesitate to apply these severities to those parts of our bodies which are suffering from disease. They are disagreeable and painful, but they are necessary. It is in the interest of the whole organism that this severity is practised. These diseased parts must not be allowed to involve the whole body in destruction. Even amputation may be resorted to to save life.

Now, as a man is a physical organism inhabited and presided over by a free intelligence, so what we call the commonwealth is a social organism inhabited and presided over by a free intelligence. And as the free intelligence of a man applies the necessary curatives to his body when it is diseased, so the free intelligence which is responsible for the social organism must apply the necessary curatives to those portions of society which are morbidly affected, even though this may involve pain and suffering. Penury is a social disease and the treatment must be applied to it which is calculated to cure it, even though that treatment may involve some severity in dealing with the diseased parts. Such severity is just as much justified in treating morbid social conditions as in treating morbid physical conditions. The neglect or refusal to apply the proper remedies, because they involve severity or suffering, is as irrational and fatal in the one case as in the other.

For my own part I have no doubt that the successful treatment of this social disease of penury will call for considerable wholesome severity. I do not say that this is the only kind of remedy to apply to those who are sinking into this condition of mendicancy and willing dependence; I shall have something to say shortly about methods of a very different nature; but I say that there are a good many men, and some women, in that submerged tenth of which we hear so much, who are not going to be restored to social health by rose-water methods. There are considerable portions of the morbid social tissue which can no more be

cured by mere good nature than gangrene can be cured by bathing it with cologne. The first condition of successful handling of this problem of penury is the recognition of this fact. The analogy which we have been so closely following ought to help us here. If society is an organism, it must be protected against diseases that assail its life; the intelligence which presides over it is responsible for that; and any theory of society which forbids society to save its own life by applying the needful remedies, is by that fact proved irrational and absurd.

Such, it seems to me, is the theory of anarchism—philosophic anarchism—as preached by Tolstoi, and many others,—the theory that force is never to be used in constraining human beings to obey the laws of society. In their theory the liberty of the individual is made the supreme good; that must never be encroached upon or interfered with: the individual must forever be a law unto himself. If he choose to be a beggar and a pauper, if he choose to bring up his children in ignorance and squalor, if he choose to make himself a burden upon his neighbors, if he choose to spread physical disease and moral infection through the community,—that is his right; he must never be forcibly restrained. He may be persuaded, but he must not be coerced. All this would be well if men were monads; if every man lived unto himself; if there were no vital bonds binding us all together. The social organism is clearly described in familiar words: “For the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body. . . . If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body: it is not therefore not of the body. And if the eye shall say, Because I am not the ear, I am not of the body: it is not therefore not of the body. . . . If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it.” Suppose now the foot should say: “If I choose to entertain an ulcer, with probable

gangrene, what is that to the hand or the eye or the heart or the brain? I stand on my individual rights as a foot. My liberty is my most precious possession, and I decline to permit that to be interfered with. Those other members of the body, whether they be more or less honorable, must not set up any authority over me. That is tyranny which I will not endure."

If there is any truth in the doctrine of a social organism, in the apostolic statement that we are members one of another, the Tolstoian denial of the right of society to control the individual is exactly of a piece with such a declaration of independence as we have imagined the foot to be proclaiming. If society is an organism, if we are members one of another, then the whole, or the intelligence which presides over the whole, must apply to the diseased parts the treatment that is necessary; it is fatuity, it is simple suicide to neglect it. And this may mean in some cases blisters, and hot bottles, and mustard plasters; it may mean the forceps and the lancet; it will often mean a regimen which will be very disagreeable and painful to those who are compelled to undergo it.

Will there be anything in this treatment analogous to that of the surgeon's knife? Sometimes it is needful to remove and cast away portions of the human body which are hopelessly diseased; it is profitable that one of the members should perish, and not that the whole body should be destroyed. Is anything like this ever demanded in our treatment of the social organism? Is it ever necessary to resort to amputation?

Capital punishment may, perhaps, be regarded as a case of this nature. But I am not concerned here to defend capital punishment. Grave doubts of its wisdom may be entertained. And I do not think that social amputation, like unto that which the surgeons are sometimes constrained to practise, is necessary or justifiable. No por-

tions of the social organism are ever to be cut off by us and cast as rubbish to the void. That is not our prerogative. But something analogous to surgery may be required in the treatment of social disease. The morbid elements may be separated from the social organism, not to be consigned to destruction, but to receive curative treatment by which they may be restored to their place and function in society. We separate from society in this way the criminal classes, so-called, that they may be reformed. They are rightly regarded as diseased social tissue, and we isolate them that we may make them whole. All our treatment of them ought to have this as the chief end in view.

And my contention is that there are considerable portions of the class that is sinking into penury which must be treated in the same way. They must be separated from society, and forcibly detained in places where they will be compelled to work and trained for self-support and usefulness. In farm-colonies, and reformatories, from which the penal element shall be as far as possible eliminated, but which shall rather partake of the character of social hospitals, in which the inmates shall be put under a treatment that shall wake up their manhood, and stimulate their ambition, and discipline their powers of body and mind, a certain percentage of those who have come to be chronic dependents will have to be treated. Those who have long been engaged in work of this nature are apt to know of cases that can be cured only by some such method as this. Efforts have been made to stimulate them to find work for themselves, but they do not find it; when work is brought to their very doors, they either refuse it or speedily abandon it. Indeed there is very little that they can do; no employer wants to hire them. Some of them—most of them—are intemperate; but the love of drink is a lesser fault than their chronic indolence. They do a few

odd jobs, but eschew regular employment. Many of them live on the scanty earnings of their wives and children, or on alms which the little ones are forced to gather.

That the cure of penury like this does require the kind of surgery of which I have spoken, is becoming more and more evident to all those who are grappling with the evil in daily encounter. In the National Conference of Charities at Cincinnati last summer, this opinion found frequent and positive expression. "The sterilization of the unfit," is the term by which it is sometimes described; that may mean, and ought to mean, simply the separation of the chronic mendicants from society, and of the sexes from each other, so that the race of "ne'er-do-wells" shall not be propagated; so that those thus segregated may be reclaimed and fitted for social service.

Most rational Socialists recognize the fact that something of this kind will be necessary when their millennium comes. Mr. Gronlund admits that coöperation implies discipline; this seems to mean that malingerers will not be tolerated in the army of labor. Mr. Graham, who criticizes Socialism sympathetically, points out that, "if Socialism were established, unless these classes were dealt with severely, were turned into slaves, or close prisoners, they would make very intractable citizens in the Collectivist commonwealth." And Mr. Bellamy in "Equality" explains what was done in his Utopia. "The new order, guaranteeing an equality of plenty to all, left no plea for the thief and the robber, no excuse for the beggar, no provocation for the violent. By preferring their evil courses to the fair and honorable life offered them, such persons would henceforth pronounce sentence on themselves as unfit for human intercourse. With a good conscience, therefore, the new society proceeded to deal with all vicious and criminal persons as morally insane, and to segregate them in places of confinement, there to spend their lives—

not, indeed, under punishment, or enduring hardships of any cost beyond enough labor for self-support, but wholly secluded from the world, and absolutely prevented from continuing their kind. By this means the race, in the first generation after the Revolution, was able to leave behind itself forever a load of inherited depravity and base congenital instincts, and so, ever since, it has gone on from generation to generation, purging itself of its uncleanness."

The fact that some severity will probably be needed in the cure of penury seems thus to be conceded even by the socialistic philosophers. I fully agree with M. Bellamy in saying that the state has no right to resort to this forcible segregation of the chronic mendicant until it has in some way offered to every man a chance to earn his living or freedom by his labor; the labor test must first be applied; the state must apply it; and those who do not meet it must be dealt with by means of these heroic remedies. I am sure that the time has come when this principle must be recognized and fearlessly and unflinchingly enforced.

But this is not the only cure for penury. I have dwelt upon it, because the principles involved seem to me important, and because I believe that we shall never be able to do the other work upon our hands until this truth is recognized as fundamental. It needs to be said, however, that the severity of which we have been speaking is a last resort, just as surgery in the treatment of the human body should be a last resort. We do not take up the knife until we have exhausted the less heroic remedies. In the practice of medicine the tendency has been to lessen, so far as possible, the infliction of pain. And the constant effort of the good physician is to reënforce the life of the organism, to stimulate the vital processes, so that they shall overcome the morbid tendencies; to send the tides of health through all these diseased tissues and organs, flushing out the germs of disease and absorbing the hostile elements.

And this is the larger part of the work which organized society seeks to do. There is, as we saw at the beginning, a large amount of purely merciful ministrations to the sick and the disabled and the unfortunate,—to those who have not fallen and are not likely to fall into the condition of penury. It is work that we are always glad to do. Such sacrifice costs us little; such labor is its own exceeding great reward. When we visit such needy ones and minister to their wants, we are always sure that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

But there are others whom it is far more difficult to help. "Ye have the poor always with you," said Jesus, "and whensoever ye will, ye can do them good,"—provided, I think I hear him adding, you know how. For those poor who have lost hope and courage and self-respect and the sense of shame—who have no other thought concerning those who visit them than of how much they can get out of them,—it is hard to do them any good. But this is our problem! To awaken the dormant self-respect, to spur the flagging purpose, to bring back the blush of shame to the cheek that has not for long worn that shade of crimson, to stir within the soul some expectation of a better life,—this is the task that is set before us, continually in our charitable work. It is a difficult task, but it is not hopeless. Many of these people can be saved.

But this means a great deal of patient, persevering, self-denying work. Individuals are not lifted out of this slough by the mere touch of a tender hand. In most cases it will be necessary to lay loving siege to them, to summer and winter with them, to keep yourselves for months or years in closest contact with them, to suffer with them and for them until you win their confidence. You remember Robert Falconer's father, in George Macdonald's story, and the long, persistent struggle of the son to bring his weak and degraded father back into the ways of life. It is only

by such untiring labor that the lost can be saved. And none of us can hopefully undertake many such cases. One at a time is enough for most of us. It is far better to save one man thoroughly than to administer to a thousand a little cursory kindness. We err in our charitable work in putting too much into the hands of one man. "The good Samaritan," says Dean Hodges, "stopped and devoted himself to one man; he might have hurried over to his side, and have paid him the visit of a busy doctor; he might have poured oil and wine into his hurts, and then gone on to do the same kind service for half a dozen other similarly afflicted wayfarers along the Jericho road. The result would probably have been that seven men would have had a somewhat more easy hour, and would have died that night of exhaustion and exposure. The Samaritan saved one. . . . It is characteristic of human nature that general blessings are not specially appreciated, and have but little moral value. No relief fund, whether in money or in nominal work, was ever distributed without hardening men's hearts, setting a wider separation between the rich and the poor, and making things worse instead of better. Men are men, and will never be satisfied with bread, they want the touch of a fraternal hand. . . . The matter comes back, then, in the last analysis, to the spirit of neighborliness. The great thing is for every family of any means to minister in personal and persistent friendship to one family in need."

This has been the aim of the new charity from the beginning,—to see that every needy family has a friend—and ordinarily, as I have said, the ministering family ought not to undertake the care of more than one family in penury. This means, of course, an enormous increase in the number of ministering families. It means that the friendly visitors in every American city shall be multiplied not by tens but by hundreds. And this is not a vis-

ionary proposition. In the German city of Hamburg on the Elbe, with a population of six hundred thousand, more than fifteen hundred such visitors are in service; in Berlin the number is above three thousand. All these, though appointed by the city, exercise a personal care over the families entrusted to them; the officialism in many cases is transfigured into friendship. I do not, however, quote the German method to recommend it for our use, but only to indicate the fact that it is not impossible to get a great many people to take part in personal work of this character. It is not a visionary suggestion that every needy family should be provided with a friend. There are enough men and women of good-will in every city to adopt, in this way, all the unhappy and the discouraged, and administer to them a care which shall prove to be a cure. In my own church in Columbus are between forty and fifty good women each one of whom has a family under her charge, whose good angel and special providence she is,—not for once or twice, but year in and year out. Not much alms is given; the main purpose is to prevent that; but there is constant and unwearied friendship; there is the contact of vigorous life with enfeebled life; there is the spur of fresh thought and a new outlook; there is practical counsel and suggestion, which is often of great value, aid in getting work for parents or children; there is always the steady call, "*Sursum corda!*" Lift up your hearts! Not all these visitors do all they might; with some of them, I fear, the service is infrequent and perfunctory; but some of them are doing faithful work, and their labor is not in vain. If all the other churches in my city would do as much of this kind of work, in proportion to their ability, there would not be a poor family in Columbus without a friend. There need not be in any city.

It is not impossible, it is altogether practicable, to secure for all the miserable and morally infirm this kindly

ministry. If there are any who will not accept it, they are the subjects for that heroic treatment of which we have spoken; but that, I say again, must be the last resort. And it must be one main purpose of any organization of charities to find for every needy family a friend.

There is, indeed, a work of prevention here—the prevention of that misdirected and mischievous charity, which becomes the propagator of penury and the accomplice of crime. One of the immediate causes of that evil condition which we are studying is the cruel and heartless almsgiving to beggars on the street and beggars at the door, which is simply godspeed to ruin.

“Twice two are four,” says Dean Hodges, “and four beggars fed to-day will be eight beggars to-morrow. ‘Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap,’ and the community which sows bread in the wallets of mendicants shall reap slums, and must pull down its jails and build greater. It must always be a disputed question whether the mistaken saints or the malicious sinners do the more harm in the world; but it is as certain as anything can be that the mistaken saint, who, out of the kindness of his heart, gives a dole to the unknown beggar on the street or at the door, thereby allies himself with the malicious sinner, and becomes an accomplice with him against the good of the poor and the welfare of the community. . . . It is a question of much debate whether the saloon-keeper or the housekeeper is more to blame for poverty,—whether the dram or the dole does the more harm. People who have studied the matter with much care are disposed to lay a heavy burden of fault at the kitchen door.”

We have something to do in putting a stop to this, and in preventing that careless confusion of charities which gives the social shirk his opportunity. But, after all, the greater work of organized charity must be this task of bringing together those who need to be ministered unto,

and those who need to minister, the helpless hand and the helping hand, those who are living "at a poor dying rate," and those who have abundance of life to impart. For this is the cure of penury, the radical cure, the only sure cure—the impartation of life, the transfusion of thought and hope and purpose, from the living to the dying. It can be done, and it is the one thing to do. Our charity, our religion, our evangelistic ardor, our missionary zeal come to a focus here, mingling and blending in an effort to restore these sinking souls, to lift up these sinking households. What is it that we propose to give them? Life and salvation. Is not that their deepest need?

Some may be inclined to say that what these people want most is the love of God in their hearts, and I agree with them. But the love of God will probably never get into their hearts until it is revealed to them by some human brother, some living epistle of the mercy and patience and grace of God, who stands by them, and clings to them and encompasses them with loving kindness, and shows them, in a demonstration which they cannot misunderstand, what the love of God is. This is personal work, purely personal; no institution can do anything more than to bring together the personal need and the personal supply. It is work that cannot be reported in meetings, or tabulated in statistics; the real things that make for the salvation of men are never told off in figures. This is the age of machinery, but, after all, the important things that are done in this age are not done by machinery, neither by political machinery, nor by educational machinery, nor by philanthropic machinery, nor by ecclesiastical machinery, but by the vitalizing touch of one life upon another.

Some may think that this way of curing penury is not very alluring: it cannot be boomed or advertised; it is not spectacular or sensational; this saving of one at a time does not appeal to a generation which finds its profit in

great combinations and wholesale processes. It does not; and yet I could wish that the men and women of this generation could understand how much is involved in the rescue of one man, of one household, from the ways of death. The Good Shepherd left the ninety-and-nine, and went after the one till he found it and brought it home rejoicing. His triumph, his exultation, were in the salvation of one. And is not this a lesson we may need to learn—that one is worth saving? Nay, is there not hope and inspiration in this thought that it is not a great multitude, a weltering mass of want and degradation which we are to take upon our hands, but rather that there is, somewhere, some one man or woman, some one household, that we can single out, and befriend, and rescue from the ways of death? Who is among us to whom the privilege and the hope of helping some sinking brother to find his feet, and go on in the strength and joy of manhood, does not appeal?