



Currents

New Scholarship in the Human Services



MENU

- [Home Page](#)
- [Guest Book](#)
- [Our Editorial Board](#)
- [Submitting a Paper](#)
- [Review Form](#)
- [About Currents](#)
- [Search](#)
- [Reference Help](#)

Index

- [Author](#)
- [Abstract](#)
- [Introduction](#)
- [Chalmer's Primitive Method](#)
- [Loch's Purposeful Method](#)
- [Richmond's Purposeful Methods](#)
- [Conclusions](#)
- [Research Notes](#)
- [References](#)

[Printable \(PDF file\) version](#)

© Currents: New Scholarship in the Human Services, 2004

T. Chalmers, C.S. Loch and M. E. Richmond's Development of Increasingly Secular, Interpersonal, and Purposeful Helping Methods

Joel Majonis, Ph.D.

Abstract

The early nineteenth century Presbyterian cleric and philosopher Thomas Chalmers was a seminal influence upon the lives and work of British charity organizer Charles Stewart Loch and American theoretician Mary Elizabeth Richmond – both pioneers of social work in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Based upon a theological system, Chalmers introduced a primitive method of moral problem solving encouraging charitable exchanges coexisting in Divine and secular realms to reorganize recipients' "natural contexts." This method influenced C.S. Loch's development of a more complex method of pre-World War I English charitable "interventions" intending to perfect social life for recipients. Both charitable methods, in turn, directed M.E. Richmond's formulation, in the World War I period and shortly afterwards, of a charitable method of interpersonal "contacts" and an empirical social work method of social study, diagnosis and treatment of clients' social situations.

[Return to index ▲](#)

This article is dedicated to the author's teachers and mentors, Professors William A. Bourke and Max Siporin.

[Return to index ▲](#)

Introduction

The early nineteenth century Presbyterian cleric and philosopher Thomas Chalmers influenced English charity organizer Charles S. Loch and the American social work pioneer Mary E. Richmond to use social charitable and social work methods of interventive activities - perfecting aid recipients' social units. Initially, Chalmers recommended parish deacons employ four fountains of charity containing a method of moral problem solving stimulating collocative charities between recipients. Chalmers described a fountain of charity as benefactors' and recipients' participation in collocative charitable activities exerting mutual influences constituting helpful social processes in a specific social system. Within each charitable fountain, collocation refers to Divine and secular persons' charitable exchanges, fashioning bodies and personalities into persons, along with physical objects, and social relations into a natural "context" (Chalmers 1833, p. 29-34 & 42-4). Chalmers influenced Loch's systematic charitable method administering purposefully "interventive charities" improving recipients' caring social relationships, conditions and personalities into "perfect unities of life." Afterwards, Chalmers' and Loch's ideas influenced Richmond's formulation of a charitable method of collecting significant social facts about recipients; exchanging interests, information and, caring/friendly activities with recipients; and creating a charitable spirit healing of recipients. Her mature social work method organized social worker treatment processes collecting social-psychological facts about clients and directed task interventions towards improving clients' social situations and functioning.

This article discusses Chalmers' charitable method, moral reasoning and other activities encouraging recipients' collocative exchanges with one another. These collocative charities fashion physical bodies and personalities into persons acting morally, industrially and caringly in relationships and social "systems." Next, the essay article explores Chalmers' influence upon Loch's charitable method of "interventions" inducing secular and Divine Persons' mutual helping processes to perfect recipients' caring relationships and personalities as life unities. Finally, the argument examined how Richmond developed these ideas into a charitable method of interpersonal "contacts" and an empirical social work method of social study, diagnosis and treatment.

Current literature examined reviews Chalmers' and Loch's ideas without providing evidences of how they influenced one another and Richmond's methodical treatment of the social situation. Several researchers examined Chalmers' charitable fountains without discussing collocative charities while one study refrained from discussing these ideas (Loch, 1910a; Leiby, 1984; Siporin, 1972; Woodroffe, 1962; de Schweinitz 1943). Other studies examined Charity Organization founders' ideas about Chalmers' artificial and natural types of helping (Leiby, 1984; Loch, 1910a). However, the literature did not discuss empirical linkages between Chalmers, Loch and, Richmond's developing ideas on purposeful helping methods, reciprocal helping processes and fashioning of social units (Brown, 1982; Leiby, 1984; Richmond, 1917; Leiby, 1987; Woodroffe, 1962; Young & Ashton, 1956).

[Return to index](#) ▲

T. Chalmers' Primitive Method of Stimulating Collocative Charities Within Four Charitable Fountains of Aid Forming Social Relationships, Persons and Physical Things

Thomas Chalmers was born on March 7, 1780 in Anstruther Fife, Scotland. He was a Presbyterian minister, theologian, author, social reformer and first moderator of the Free Church of Scotland. Chalmers affirmed faith's importance in achieving personal salvation. As minister of one of Glasgow's largest and poorest parishes, St. John's, Chalmers developed a charitable method helping the poor while reducing costs in 1819. Afterwards, city officials allowed Chalmers to use donated funds from all churches to improve conditions of poor persons throughout Glasgow. He accepted Chairs of Moral Philosophy at the University of St. Andrews in 1823 and Divinity at the University of Edinburgh in 1828. After becoming leader of the Evangelical party which sought the Scottish Church's independence from civil interference and parishioners' right to choose their minister, he became moderator of the Free Church of Scotland and Principal of the Church's New College for ministerial training in Edinburgh. Chalmers died on May 30, 1847 in Edinburgh (Hoiberg, 2001).

Chalmers stated that collocative charities occurred within "innumerable fountains" of charity containing benefactors' helpful or kindly activities plus abundant resources for the poor (Hunter, 1912, p. 213-4). These fountains of charity were thought to enrich and develop a community, family members and members of rich and poor classes.. Chalmers described collocative charities within the first Fountain of Charity as:

The first, and by far the most productive of these four aims [fountains of charity] is situated among the habits and economies of the people themselves. ... There is a common feeling among the men of the operative classes, inspired by the very condition which they in common occupy; for fellow-ship with one in his lot is felt as a sort of claim to fellowship with him in his love and liberality. In these, and in many other principles of our nature, there are daily and most powerful excitements to charity, which, if never interfered with by pauperism, would have yielded a far more abundant produce to the cause. ... It is the little, combined with the numerous and the often, which explains this mystery. Each offering is small-but there is an unknown multitude of offerers, and under incessant application too, from the near and the constant exhibition of suffering at their very door ... of those kind offices which are rendered, and those humble meals which are served up, and those nameless little participations into which a poor householder is admitted with the contiguous families, and all that unrevealed good which circulates, unseen, throughout every neighbourhood. (Hunter, 1912, pp. 214 & 219 - 20)

Chalmers stated that the second fountain of charity consists of the "kindness of relatives" based upon "the ties and feelings of relationship" (Hunter, 1912, p. 214-5). A third fountain of charity referred to wealthy persons providing charity to the poor (Hunter, 1912). Chalmers described it as love, benevolence, good will, or compassion of the rich for the poor. For Chalmers, the fourth Fountain of Charity is more important than the third as the poor express "sympathy" for one another (Hunter, 1912). Chalmers and his volunteer deacons employed a primitive moral problem-solving method encouraging reciprocal collocative charities within each charitable fountain improving community members' relationships and personality functioning. Chalmers recommended dividing the parish into small manageable districts supervised by a deacon (Hunter, 1912). He added that a district's administrative structure established "a ready inter medium of communication among himself and parish residents accomplishing ... a pretty close and habitual intercourse with the more remarkable cases" (Hunter, 1912, pp. 245-246).

Initially, deacons acquired knowledge of applicants' and other significant persons' necessities, conditions and, well-being before guiding them to a "good" end. Chalmers explained that a deacon's measured observations and charitable activities balanced applicants' wants and merits in accordance with their distress and appropriate needs within community social relations (Hunter, 1912, pp. 300-303). He recommended that deacons converse, make inquiries and become intimate with applicants in their homes helping them acquire "a tenfold more thorough knowledge and discernment of every particular case" over time (Hunter, 1912, pp. 244-246). Consequently, deacons scrutinized members in their homes before determining and employing the most limited method of charitable activities helping recipients achieve moral and economic well-being (Hunter, 1912). Specifically, Chalmers suggested that a deacon act charitably with family members "to find access to their hearts" (Hunter, 1912, pp. 248 - 249). Thus, deacons' acquired knowledge guided flexibly their provision of charitable activities, necessities and conditions for each recipient. Deacons also made "manifold adjustments to each individual peculiarity" bringing about "a far milder yet clearer atmosphere" among family members (Hunter, 1912, pp. 322 - 326). Chalmers stated that a deacon administered sternly charitable duties in accordance with Gospel truths, moral principles and tendencies (Hunter, 1912). As a "friend of the poor" but an "enemy of their vices," he stated that a deacon affirmed truth, sobriety and righteousness to applicants. Deacons used moral charm, attention, advice, civility and good-will in a "gracious operation" purifying applicants. Additionally, they instructed, counseled, and persuaded family members through moral reasoning to change their habits used benefactors' gifts in a morally right, industrious, and parsimonious manner, saving resources for future use (Hunter, 1912). If recipients did not use appropriately monies provided then they would suffer punishments and negative consequences. He stated:

It were well to let the object of his bounty know that what he does give is at his own expense, therefore with a personal sacrifice on his part, and not as the agent of a society or an almoner for others. They utterly misconceive the poor who do not understand how this, simple revelation should call forth a delicacy on their part which operates as a check on their else indefinite demands and expectations. ... He should tell them frankly and fearlessly both of their duty and of his own- that it is as much their part to, be moderate in their demands as it is to be liberal in his dispensations of charity. He should lecture them well on the virtue of not being burdensome to others; and not be sparing of his most serious remonstrances, when he comes to observe that they have been practising on the simplicity of the benevolent, that they have been making a trade of their alleged poverty, and that the ill-gotten money thus obtained by them, they have spent worthlessly or even carelessly. Let them know that you will not by, your heedless and indiscriminate giving counteract the wholesome discipline of nature; and that if they will persist in being lazy epicures or irreclaimable drunkards, they must just be left to the fruit of their own ways, or to feel the weight of these chastisements which both indolence and dissipation are sure to meet with, and rightly, at the school of experience. Proclaim in their hearing, that while you wish yours to be a beneficent, you wish still more anxiously that it should be a moral administration; and seeing that the great use of money is to do good with it, by ministering to the vicious habits or propensities of those whose part it is, ere they draw upon the help of others, to strive how much they can help themselves by doing their uttermost to labour diligently and live soberly. (Hunter, 1912, p. 303-307)

Deacons also encouraged charitable recipients to accept lesser amounts of aid and provide aid to more unfortunate recipients than them. Chalmers concluded that deacons' moral and charitable reasoning generated more (collocative) charities among district recipients compared to charities relieving the indigent (Hunter, 1912, p. 303-7). As a result, charitable applicants refrained from accepting charity as a pauper from parochial authorities (Hunter, 1912, p. 326-8).

Chalmers explained that God's intelligence, wisdom, planning, design, skilful handiwork, and benevolent purposefulness are evident in manifold collocations arranging "matter" into physical entities, social relationships into societies and individuals' perceptions of physical reality into minds creating an orderly universe instead of "a turbid and disorderly chaos" (Chalmers, 1833, p. 9-10 & 22-25). According to Loch, reciprocal collocations created manifold action arrangements in processes linking matter into complex and adaptive parts forming physical objects and persons' physical bodies. These ordered and beneficent action arrangements, physical objects and persons formed "reciprocities" within social, familial and political systems harmonizing individuals relations with "general interests" insuring nations and families' well-being ([Research Note #1](#)). Chalmers stated that:

For it is not strictly the mental constitution of man which forms the subject of our prescribed essay, but the adaptation to that constitution of external nature. We have to demonstrate, not so much that the mind is rightly-constituted in itself, as that the mind is rightly placed in a befitting theatre for the exercise of its powers. It is to demonstrate that the world and its various objects are suited to the various capacities of this inhabitant-this moral and intelligent creature, of whom we have to prove that the things which are around him bear a fit relation to the, laws or the properties which are within him. There is ample room here for the evidence of **collocation**. Yet there remains this distinction between the mental and the corporeal economy of man, that whereas the evidence is more rich and manifest in the bodily structure itself, than even in its complex and numerous adaptations to the outer world; the like evidence, in our peculiar department, is meagre, as afforded by the subjective mind, when compared with the evidence of its various adjustments and finesses to the objective universe around it; whether of man's moral constitution to the state of human society, or of his intellectual to the various objects of physical investigation. (Chalmers, 1833, p. 42-4)

Individuals' reciprocal and collocative relationships ("mind and mind") developed their moral constitutions while collocative relationships between persons' bodies and physical objects ("mind and matter") built their moral and mental constitutions into minds. Additionally, collocative relationships connect and coordinate persons' moral and intellectual natures fashioning minds and bodies into persons and society (Chalmers, 1833, pp. 29-34 & 42-44). Chalmers stated that:

It is true that, with even but one solitary human mind in midst of the material creation, certain relations could be traced between them that would indicate both skill and a benevolent purpose on the part of Him who constructed the framework of nature ... there would still be preserved to us certain striking adaptations in the external system of things to the intellectual, and some too, though fewer and less noticeable, to the moral constitution of man ... it must be evident that the main tendencies and aptitudes of his Moral constitution should be looked for in connection with his social relationships with the action and reaction which take place between man and the brethren of his species, We therefore understand external nature to comprehend in it, not merely all that is external to mind, but all that is external to the individual possessor, of a human mind, - who is surrounded not only by an economy of complex and extended materialism, but who is surrounded by other men and other minds than his own ... we propose to consider not merely those relations between **mind and matter**, but those relations' between **mind and mind**, the establishment of which attests a wise and beneficent contrivance ... it will be part of ours, more especially, to point out the evidences of a forming and presiding ... benevolent intelligence in the mechanism of human society (Chalmers, 1833, p. 8-9).

After individuals acted and reacted to one another and with physical objects "reciprocal influence[s]" were upon their minds enabling them to reason, experience affectionate impulses and, perceive "unities" in the "marks of a divine intelligence in the mechanism of human society" and in its "social and economical systems". (Chalmers, 1833, pp 5-8; [Research Note #2](#)). Additionally, these mental functions employed action sequences of remembering, judging, willing, and intellectual or emotional states constructed in each mind (Chalmers, 1833).

Chalmers asserted that deacons used collocative charities developing family member exchanges of rewards, confidences, kindness, common feelings and goodness (Hunter, 1912). Additionally, deacons and recipients exchanges of collocative charities harmonized benefactors aid with recipients' wants while developing their pro-social and caring attitudes. He concluded that developing recipients' morality, thriftiness and, productivity generated ample resources and eradicated pauperism (Hunter, 1912). Chalmers' four charitable fountains containing reciprocal collocative activities and influences organizing persons and things into social systems established the theoretical bases for his charitable method of assessment and interventive problem-solving with recipients.

[Return to index](#) ▲

Loch's Purposeful Charitable Method, Social Reciprocities and the Creation of Social Situational Components

Charles Stewart Loch reworked ideas and practices of Jewish Tsedakah, Aristotelian philanthropy, and Pauline charitable ideas into a charitable science and method used within the English Charity Organization Society (E.C.O.S.) founded in 1869. In 1875, Loch became Secretary to the Council of the E.C.O.S. enabling him to develop and implement his charitable method and activities within its operations. He resigned his position as Secretary because of ill health in 1914 and died in 1923.

Chalmers' charitable method of moral problem-solving stimulating recipients collocative activities influenced Loch's development of a systematic and purposeful charitable method. Loch's esteem for Chalmers is expressed in his statement that "to the theory of charity it might almost be said that since Aristotle and St. Paul nothing has been added until we come to the economic and moral issues which Dr. Chalmers explained and illustrated" (Loch, 1910b, p. 198). Loch stated that his charitable method stimulating recipients' social activities developed from Chalmers' charitable method (Loch 1910a; Loch, 1923, pp. 46-47). He described Chalmers' four fountains containing reciprocal and collocative charities as "endless links of sympathy and self-support" between society, families and persons as the basis for his charitable method employing social principles, collected data, and charitable practices helping recipients achieve social purposes. Loch stated that:

But perhaps, in regard to charity in Great Britain, the most important change has been the revival of the teaching of Dr Chalmers (1780- 1847). ... His view, which he tested in experience, may be summed up as follows: Society is a growing, self-supporting organism. It has within it, as between family and family, neighbour and neighbour, master and employee, **endless links of sympathy and self-support**. ... There is thus a large invisible fund available and constantly used by those who, by their proximity to one another, know best how to help. ... Charity becomes a science based upon social principles and observation ... not alms giving but charity the means. To charity is given a definite social aim and a desire to use consistently with this aim every method that increasing knowledge and trained ability can devise (Loch 1910a, p. 885). Chalmers influenced Loch's method of benefactors collecting and interpreting facts about recipients' spiritual and social relationships, personal functioning and conditions (Loch 1910a; Loch, 1923). For Loch, such information directed benefactors use of charitable practice principles and practices improving purposefully recipients social relations and psychological functioning (Loch, 1910a; Loch, 1923).

Loch stated that the purposeful use of social reciprocities necessitated that benefactors and recipients agree and use a scientific and moral plan based upon benefactors' knowledge of laws of love, observations of recipients "ways of life," social practice principles directing charitable activities with recipients and recipients' moral imperatives and benevolent purposes improving their functioning and relieving distress (Loch, 1923, p. 42). Loch conceived of charity as a **science** ("an organic whole"), an ethical plan, and a **method** achieving purposefully the "definite social aim of keep[ing] alive the saving health of the family" (Loch, 1910a, pp. 871 & 885 - 886). Loch stated that when benefactors and recipients agree upon principles, method and social purposes then charitable recipients accomplish social purposes in their relationships while ordering charity into "an organic whole." Such "an organic whole" constitutes a helping discipline with constituent parts agreed upon by everyone. He stated that:

The springs of charity lie in sympathy and religion, and, one would now add, in science. To organize it is to give to it the "ordered nature " of an organic whole, to give it a definite social purpose, and to associate the members of the community for the fulfilment of that purpose. This in turn depends on the recognition of common principles, the adoption of a common method, self discipline and training, and co-operation. (Loch, 1910a, p. 886)

Thus, Loch formulated a socially oriented and methodical charity as a discipline and field of practice which developed into social work.

Loch stated that the thoughtful use of methodical charitable activities, resources, principles, and forces organized charity into an "organic whole" effectively and purposefully helping poor persons improve their conditions and achieve independence from want (Loch, 1910a; Loch, 1923). Specifically, friendly visitors' use of an ordered charitable method of principles, activities, and resources formed sequences of interpersonal helpful causes and effects. These helpful sequences of causes and effects reordered recipients' material conditions, behaviors, and outcomes. Thus, Loch assumed that benefactors and recipients participated in two **interpersonal** chains of mutually helpful reciprocities improving recipients' abilities and conditions. Loch stated that:

Those who are present will understand our great central purpose -- to draw the resources and the forces of charity together on settled and effective lines 'in order to improve the conditions of the poor. And the word charity we use not as an equivalent to relief but in its true meaning -- as inclusive of all those voluntary efforts which improve conditions and prevent dependence. ... And, one thing more, we believe in organisation, in ordered and thoughtful method applied persistently to carry out a definite and well-considered purpose. These are principles in charity, we believe; and principles are the guiding and containing forces of organisation. They suggest the general line to be adopted, serve as a kind of contour map of the country through which we have to march out of the land of dependence into that of contentment, and, as nothing else can, they give effective unity to our endeavours--they hold us together and give us faith and hope, as year by year we test them. and do not find them wanting. Without principles, indeed, there can hardly be organization. (Loch, 1923, p. 174)

Elsewhere, Loch identified "guiding" principles as the forces organizing charity into an ordered and thoughtful method accomplishing a purpose with recipients (Loch, 1923, p. 183). Overall, Loch's method, principles, and purpose are Aristotelian and teleological as they move from first principles, to actions, and then ends.

Loch's charitable method employed a local committee or conference using general principles for collecting information about recipients' distress and employing charitable activities with recipients. These charitable activities consisted of registering applicants, making inquiry, providing aid; training staff; and, exchanging cooperatively charitable activities with recipients (Loch, 1910a, p. 886-887). Loch stated that:

The aim of charity is to bring about moral reform, to make the weak kneed and oppressed independent, and to remove distress. But if this be so, we must in each case know the facts sufficiently for our purpose. We must have inquiry, and the inquiry must show the position of those in distress from the financial or economic side who is helping them, and who can help them, and how they can be helped. This is not done merely by asking a few questions. The knowledge of a case, begun in inquiry, grows during the endeavour to help it. Often there is someone who is well acquainted with all the facts already. (Loch, 1923, p. 167)

Inquiry consisted of staff collecting interpersonal information on applicants' lives and character: Names, address, ages, previous addresses, past and present employment, wages, rent, liabilities, helpful social relationships and types of relief already provided (Loch 1910a, pg. 886-887). Staff also observed, ordered and assessed data about benefactors' charitable activities and recipients' achievement of specific outcomes like the modification of their social habits (Loch, 1923, pg. 44 & 143-4). Afterwards, staff planned and provided counseling or material aid to encourage recipients' self-supportiveness. Staff's inquiries about agency personnel, employers, or social relations raising funds or providing charitable activities encouraged co-operative activities helping recipients accomplish good and purposeful outcomes. Loch stated that:

The Relieving Officer should be asked if the applicant has received relief from the Guardians, and the clergy and ministers, or those acting for them, if they have helped.....it prevents overlapping, and it, should promote co operation. To inquire about a common matter brings people together. District visitors of all denominations, if this plan is adopted, come into touch with one another. If there is goodwill, this is the beginning of co operation, and co operation depends on friendliness. And the more people co operate the more sufficient will be their help, the more good will their charity do.....They must think the difficulty out..... As co operation grows gifts become less casual. United we can do what is so much better worth doing so much more remedial. And so co-operation gives a new social value to charity. (Loch, 1923, pp. 143-144)

Loch explained that co-operation also occurred between givers and receivers as they developed knowledge, a plan, and employed charitable activities to achieve purposeful and effective outcomes. He stated that:

Thus the first and most elementary form of co-operation is between the giver and the receiver. Unless the giver gives to good purpose and the receiver takes and turns to account with as good a purpose, both fail. ... Without co operation between giver and receiver there must be insufficiency of knowledge and of plan; or, in other words, we have not been really charitable enough. ... Givers and helpers are friends, or should be. Even when they overlap they really want to do good to the same people. Co-operation means that in charity their friendliness has become recognized. They act as friends and help one another. (Loch, 1923, pg. 141-2)

Loch asserted that "interventionist" and "organized" charities, successive reciprocal and caring behaviors, developed recipients personalities with friendliness, caring and benevolent attitudes and purposes as they performed social duties. Loch understood "charity" as recipients' development of a new social unit, akin to the later social work concept of a social situation (Loch, 1910a) . He stated that "The sphere of its [charity's] realization, the medium in which it has to express itself, is the actual development of social life and the complex relations of members and groups of members one to another." Loch (1910a, p. 886) was the first charitable theorist to state "using modern terms one may say that charity is 'interventionist.' It has sought to transform the world by the transformation of the will and the inward life in the individual and in society. It would intensify the spirit and feeling of membership in society and would aim at improving social conditions" (Loch 1910a, p. 886). Furthermore, Loch linked interventionist charity with "organized charity" developing individuals' personalities. Initially, he based "organized charity" on his understanding that Divine and secular persons' (including recipients') charitable exchanges generated friendly relations and spiritual love between them. Consequently, individuals developed charitable functions of love, gifts, graciousness, intelligence, spiritualized motives acts enlivened intellects and wills (Loch, 1910a; Loch, 1910b). Additionally, he conceptualized "organized charity" as individuals exchanging charitable activities constructing and perfecting complex social relationships and life into groups. Loch concluded that "organized charity" with its charitable exchanges fashioned individuals' social relations, activities, and thoughts about physical objects as well as attitudes of love, friendship, justice satisfaction, knowledge, deliberation, and definite purposes within a "social life" (Loch, 1910b, pp. 199-200).

As stated previously, Loch used the phrase "endless links of sympathy and self-support" describing Chalmers' concept of collocative charities (Loch, 1923, pp. 46-47). He also employed the descriptive term "social reciprocity" which described friendly visitors' and recipients' reciprocal exchanges of charitable activities and benefits. Loch perceived social reciprocity as strengthening recipients' social relationships. Loch stated that:

Social reciprocity I would also define. It is a kind of exchange. ... But in reciprocity the exchange lies on the one side the desire to confer a benefit and on the other in the effectual use of the benefit conferred—the use that, in fact, makes what is done or given a benefit. Thus A gives the community an endowment: but on the other hand the acceptance of the gift implies that the community will so use the endowment as to strengthen the 'membership' of the community— enable members to fulfil their function as members better. So the gift made to anyone that can use it—that is, whenever the case is not one of mere maintenance under the control and guardianship of others—implies a reciprocal use of the gift. The exchange is thus a gift (or service, etc.) on one side, and in return for a fulfilment of the purpose of the gift consistently with the preservation and development of membership..... Charity, indeed we may say, is the art of ensuring social reciprocity (Loch 1910a, p. 870).

Loch concluded that friendly visitors' and recipients' charitable exchanges nurtured and integrated recipients' friendly feelings for one another with their social relationships, social conditions, pro-social psychological characteristics and enabling activities forming a "perfect" unity of life (Loch, 1923, p. 41). He explained that charitable exchanges developed recipients' personality functioning into competent actions, relieving personal distress and increasing well-being completing "the life of its members and groups of members" (Loch, 1923, p. 41; also refer to Loch, 1910a; Loch, 1910b; Loch, 1923; Witmer, 1942). Overall, Loch theorized about sequential and hierarchically arranged activities occurring within first "interventionist" and "organized" charities perfecting recipients' personality responses towards others and physical objects as well as social units of life. Loch's "interventionist" and "organized" charities influenced Richmond's formulation of a social work method of interventive treatment processes improving clients' social situations (Richmond, 1917; Richmond, 1930; Richmond, 1971; [Research Note #2](#)).

[Return to index](#) ▲

M. E. Richmond's Development of Purposeful Charitable and Social Work Methods Fostering Mutual Helpfulness Among Helpers And Aid Recipients

Initially, Richmond thought that Chalmers' primitive and methodical charitable practice was developed by Loch into a more purposeful charitable method, with interventions and case recording increasing mutual helpfulness among aid recipients (Richmond, 1917). Richmond asserted that Chalmers' ideas about charitable practice influenced later "English pioneers such as ... Octavia Hill and Charles Loch who provided the inspiring writings and theory for the practice of 'charity' and 'friendly visiting'" Richmond (1917, p. 28-29 & 484). Additionally, she referred to an edited collection of Chalmers' writings and Charity Organization Papers regarding recording of case activities (Richmond, 1917). Furthermore, her employment experiences with the Baltimore and New York Charity Organization Societies, personal contacts with Loch and acquaintance with his writings introduced her to Chalmers' ideas. Richmond linked Chalmers' charitable practices of "thorough investigation" and personal services freeing "the powers of self-help and mutual help within the people themselves," with increasingly effective and purposeful charitable practices of Charity Organization Societies and social work's use of social diagnosis and treatment practices (Richmond, 1924, p. 5; Richmond, 1930, p. 573). She indicated that Chalmers' "old method of falling back upon a few general classifications" limited personal services and, hence, powers of self-help and mutual helping because it lacked a modern social work method of performing social diagnosis ... [which had] the power to analyze a situation closely ... and get things done [with clients]." Thus, Richmond asserted that social workers use a social work method consisting of a social diagnosis productive of interpersonal knowledge directing their social treatment practices. In turn, Richmond associated social treatment practices with fostering client mutual helping and hence self-help processes. As a result, clients improved their interpersonal functioning, achieved functional outcomes and re-created their life situations. She stated that:

Charitable reforms attempted in the first quarter of the nineteenth century gave rise to the phrase 'a thorough investigation.' Thomas Chalmers used it in Glasgow as early as 1823 in connection with his parish work. ...Chalmers himself was a man of genius and vision who saw the need of liberating the powers of self-help and mutual help within the people themselves and who realised the part that personal service might play in this task. But he had not then at hand most of the materials out of which modern **social diagnosis** are now in process of being built ... the power to analyse a human situation closely, as distinguished from the old method of falling back upon a few general classifications, grows with consciousness of power to get things done. Richmond, 1917, p. 29)

After Richmond acknowledged Chalmers' influence upon later charitable theorists as well as her own social work ideas and practices, she stated that Charity Organization Society founders Octavia Hill, Helen Bosanquet and C.S. Loch influenced her own charitable thought and practices (Richmond 1969). Additionally, Richmond implied that Loch influenced her development of social work in the statement that "there is not a family social worker in America today, not a social case worker of any sort, in fact -- who does not owe him [Loch] a heavy debt" (Colcord & Mann, 1930, pp. 559-560; also refer to Woodroffe, 1962, p. 29) . Richmond's "debt" referred to Loch's use of charitable activities and case recording accomplishing specific purposes and her resultant inference that only a method of charitable activities could achieve effective practice. In 1895, Richmond first met Loch when he addressed a meeting of the Baltimore Charity Organization Society on his Aristotelian (teleological) definition of Charity Organization as "love working with discernment." At this meeting, Loch explained that "love working with discernment" referred to friendly visitors' use of knowledge to influence their charitable activities and recipients' achievement of specific behaviors and outcome(s). She stated that Loch defined "discernment" as friendly visitors' purposeful and recorded visits:

One of the cities visited by the London Secretary [C.S. Loch] has been Baltimore, and it was during that visit that I saw for the first time a case record - one brought from England - which marched from definite premises toward a definite conclusion. The conclusion was one with which I could not now agree, but he made me see, as I had not seen before, that we had been faithfully recording many aimless visits; that the constructive, purposeful mind was not behind our entries. (Richmond, 1924, p. 5)

Richmond concluded that Chalmers, Loch and other charitable theorists' development of methods and the increasing accomplishment of its purposes led her to the realization that methodical social work practice of social diagnosis produced social work knowledge and interventions that achieved effective services and outcomes (Richmond, 1917).

Like Chalmers and Loch's development of a methodical and purposeful charity, Richmond's original charitable ideas affirmed that charitable practices provided without "thoughtful planning" demoralized the poor, weakened their powers of self-help, and left them without the sympathy of others (Richmond, 1930, p. 133). Instead, Richmond stated that the "charitable impulse" be accompanied with "organization and direction" eliminating "pauperism and crime" (Richmond, 1930, p. 40). Richmond moved beyond Loch's scientific and charitable explanations of how Divine Persons, including the "Pneuma" (Holy Spirit), performed helpful functions with recipients. Instead, Richmond urged that friendly visitors search sincerely and objectively for factual and religious truths about recipients such as the "setting of circumstance and opportunity in which the facts [which] exist" (Colcord, 1930, pg. 138) are the "facts of life" (Richmond, 1969, pp. 186-190; also refer to Richmond, 1922). In turn, these "facts of life" determine charitable practices with recipients. She stated that:

In getting acquainted, the visitor has the definite object of trying to improve the condition of the family. This is impossible unless he has a fairly accurate knowledge of the main facts of the family history. ... Charitable skill is not a sort of benevolent magic; it is based on common sense, and must work in close contact with the facts of life. ... We must have the facts before we can find out the best way to help them. (Richmond, 1969, p. 186-190)

Richmond suggested that friendly visitors collect facts about families' social, health, medical, work, and financial functioning forming them into well-developed histories. These facts about "setting," "life," or "family" represented Richmond's initial conceptions about recipients' social functioning within situations guiding charitable practices to improve their functioning (Richmond, 1930). Similarly, she conceived of friendly visitors' methodical charitable practices as "contacts" or activities improving recipients' functioning (Richmond, 1969, pp.186-190; Richmond, 1912, p. 105). Richmond explained that friendly visitors' and recipients' "reciprocal contacts" of repetitive, caring, intimate, and patient "human activities" shared information and interests in a friendly relationship with a charitable spirit (Richmond, 1969, pg. 185, 189-190, 193; also refer to [Research Note #5](#)). Additionally, Richmond stated that friendly visitors' and recipients' "permanent relationship" of friendship through secular and social, instead of spiritual contacts, are "healing and helping" to them. She stated that:

Contact is indeed the cure for many wounds and for many prejudices, and one who has had the privilege for years of introducing friendly visitors to families at some time of crisis or especial distress can testify that in the permanent relation thus often established the healing and help are never all on one side. (Richmond, 1912, p. 105)

Richmond defined "healing and helping" as a long term friendship characterized by the friendly visitor's intimate and knowledgeable sympathy for recipients' joys, sorrows, opinions, feelings and life views helping the latter learn functional duties and behaviors (Richmond, 1969). Richmond's more mature social work thought differentiated between two sets of secular and reciprocal relationships, the first being those among clients causing them distress corrected by social workers' curative and purposeful activities. She stated that:

Finally, what, in its essence, is social work? Mr. Loch preferred the older term charity, and defined it as "the central mood of the good life, the mood of deliberation and consideration in which knowledge and emotion are blended. It seeks to learn and to appreciate the real relation of things—of the father to his family, of the child to the father, of the man's weakness to the man's strength, of the actual cause of trouble or distress to the probable cure. It regards the future as well as the present, considers it as in many ways the more important..... It is indeed a far reaching social force. (Richmond, 1930, p. 573)

Additionally, Richmond conceived of clients' relationships as **social situational facts** within social work. These social situational facts became the basis for planned performance of "**constructive work**" in accordance with accepted practice principles, rules, and recipients' needs (Richmond, 1912; Richmond, 1930). Overall, Richmond associated friendly visitors' and then social workers' social diagnostic knowledge with the use of social treatment interventions helping clients achieve beneficial activities within social situations. Underlying Richmond's association of socially oriented knowledge and interventions lies her earlier idea of friendly visitors' charitable activities supplementing and making whole recipients' social activities and lives to help and heal them.

Richmond's mature practice ideas discussed a methodical social work of social study, diagnosis and treatment interventions constituting social treatment processes (Majonis, 2002). Richmond stated that social workers initiated social treatment processes by collecting and transforming clients' social evidence into hypotheses and scientific knowledge about their social situational and personality functioning (Richmond, 1917). She added that social workers' diagnostic knowledge guided their interventive (task) activities (Richmond, 1930). Richmond stated that social workers formulated complete social diagnoses of social worker-client treatment processes based upon client interactions with other persons and physical objects (social situational processes) as well as social workers' task performances accomplishing associated functional client outcomes. Following Chalmers' and Loch's charitable ideas about reciprocal social and interventive activities, Richmond (1930, p. 477) asserted that methodical social work treatment "interplay[ed]" different social work interventions with significant social systems strengthening individuals' social relationships and personalities (Richmond, 1917, 1930, 1971). By rearranging and developing clients' social situations, Richmond explained that social caseworkers' task processes improved clients' significant social and reciprocal relationships, social situational adjustments, capacities, endowments, idiosyncrasies, and personal handicaps (Richmond, 1930, 1971). Thus, Richmond developed Loch's "organized" and "interventionist" charities into sequential treatment (activity) processes productive of different types of knowledge culminating in effective social work services for clients. Like her predecessors Chalmers and Loch, Richmond organized such knowledge and services in a social work method creating the field of social work.

[Return to index](#) ▲

Conclusions

T. Chalmers, C.S. Loch and M.E. Richmond developed increasingly complex and socially oriented charitable and social work methodical practices collecting and diagnosing social facts; formulating knowledge about recipient interpersonal processes and contexts; and employing such knowledge to guide interventive practices to improve recipients' interpersonal functioning and social contexts. Initially, Chalmers recommended deacons employ a primitive charitable method to influence Divine and secular persons' exchanges of collocative charities fashioning recipients' minds and social relationships into harmonious communities and societies. Later, Loch asserted that friendly visitors employ a purposeful and more complex method of charitable practices utilizing love's laws. Friendly visitors' knowledge of recipients' social responses directed their use of "interventionist charities," influencing Divine and secular persons' exchanges of caring activities, developing "organized charities" helpful of groups and persons. By using different activities (Committee or, Conference; inquiry, providing aid and registration; training; and, co-operation) within a charitable method Loch specified that friendly visitors collect facts about recipients role functioning and social situational circumstances directing their formulation and use of charitable interventions encouraging recipients' competent participation in social relationships (Loch, 1910a, pp. 886-887; Loch, 1923, pp. 6, 8-9 & 33; Woodroffe, 1962, p. 33). Chalmers and Loch influenced Richmond's methodical and purposeful charitable and social work practices employing knowledge collection and interventions helping clients. Unlike Chalmers and Loch's charitable methods, Richmond's charitable and social work ideas did not discuss how Divine Persons and forces helped secular persons. Instead, her empirical, methodical and interpersonal approach explained socially helpful activities occurrence within social study, diagnoses, and treatment within social work. Richmond stated that social understandings, facts about recipients lives and friendly visitors helpful contact with clients lives directed the "interplay" of different methods of intervention helping clients achieve purposeful social well-being within the social and physical environments of their social situations constituting social work's field of practice.

These theorists' increasingly detailed helping methods rested upon ever more differentiated understandings about how collocative charities, social reciprocities, or mutual helping enabled recipients' achievement of purposeful outcomes. Initially, Chalmers conceived of Divine and secular persons' collocative charities as organizing matter into entities in accordance with God's harmonious, benevolent, and purposeful plan (Chalmers, 1833, p. 29-31). As part of collocative charities, activity exchanges between entities adjusted, organized, and re-created them within a social context. Later, Loch's idea of "social reciprocities," based upon laws of love, incorporated Chalmers earlier ideas and practices regarding collocative charities. Loch used a more differentiated charitable method of social reciprocities to perfect recipients' personalities, social relationships, spiritually enlivened situations, and social groups. Later, Richmond developed "social" understandings of the reciprocation of individual clients functioning, social relationships and their responses towards physical objects in her theory of the Wider Self ([R.N. #2](#)). Thus, Richmond completed Chalmers and

Loch's development of charitable method and intervention by using social knowledge about clients' functioning in her formulation of Social Diagnosis and Treatment as important components of the emerging field of social work. Richmond developed Social Treatment as social process of sequential interventive activities performed by social workers upon clients social activities into a social work method.

Chalmers, Loch and Richmond's development and integration of different kinds of social knowledge about interpersonal helping with differentiated social work intervention continued in social work's formulation of a separate treatment method for each type of client social situation. By 1930, other social work theorists developed more specific social understandings about client social processes and conditions within different social situations as bases for different social work methods and interventions (Coyle, 1930; Follett, 1924; Lindeman, 1924; Richmond, 1917; Richmond, 1922; Richmond, 1930; Sheffield, 1937). For example, M. E. Richmond, E. Lindeman and, A. Sheffield recommended naturalistic research to examine holistically member responses, social interactions and associated influential conditions before using different social work methods and interventions upon client social situations (Richmond, 1971; Lindeman 1924; Sheffield 1937).

[Return to index](#) ▲

Research Notes

(1) Chalmers conceived of collocative charities as arranging physical objects in the universe, persons bodies and minds, and social relationships into societies. These conceptual arrangements of Chalmers constituted a primitive idea of social arrangements of life. Later on, Loch stated that his charitable method of "interventions" created perfect "unities" of life within a social context influencing Richmond's development of a social work treatment method ameliorating and organizing client social situations (Loch, 1910a; Loch, 1923; Richmond, 1917).

(2) Chalmers' phrase described the "relations between mind and mind" in fashioning personality is similar in meaning to Richmond's ideas of the "Wider Self." Richmond stated that the "mind of man" developed from and is equivalent to the sum of his/her social relationships (Richmond, 1917, p. 368 & 369-70; Richmond, 1922, p. 7-24 & 129-132). At the National Conference of Social Work in 1917, Richmond stated that social workers discovered that social relationships fashioned individuals' personalities (Richmond, 1930, p. 399). She stated that "in fact, the distinguishing marks of their work were, first, skill in discovering the social relationships by which a given personality had been shaped....." At this Conference, Richmond stated that the "social," generated through "mental interaction," is an interaction between minds. She stated that:

The criterion of the social, its indispensable element always, is the influence of mind upon mind. This influence may be excused in a small group, such as the family, the kindred, or the other personal contacts of a given subject, or it may be the result of a loose jointed but vital international fellowship. Many things termed social lack this essential element utterly because there is no mental interaction within the group. ... One may be deeply interested in the manifestations of social relationships in the individual, realising, indeed, that the individual is their product, that his central self is bounded "by his conscious interests and affections"; or one may instinctively begin at the other end and seek a better adjustment of social relationships by the manipulation of larger units, by what we call mass betterment. Social work includes both approaches; so closely do they interplay that it would be a top-heavy and ineffective thing if either were neglected (Richmond, 1930, p. 397-9).

Richmond discovered the Theory of the Wider Self in Mrs. Helen Bosanquet's work. She stated that:

The mind of man (and in a very real sense the mind is the man) can be described as the sum of his social relationships. Mrs. Helen Bosanquet expresses this for the layman more clearly-perhaps because she is a social worker – than others who have written about it (Bosanquet 1898, p. 131). She says: The soul literally is, or is built up of, all its experience; and such part of this experience, or soul life, as is active at any given time or for any given purpose constitutes the self at that time and for that purpose. We know how the self enlarges and expands as we enter upon new duties, acquire new interests, contract new ties of friendship. (Richmond, 1917, p. 368)

In turn, Mrs. Bosanquet stated that the theory of the Wider Self consisted of a self-built up of experiences obtained from the doing of activities. She stated that:

Finally, a conception which I take to be all important from the point of view of social progress is that of the wider self; or, as we may call it, the elastic self. What do we mean by the self ? From a psychological point of view it is enough to say that it is the mind or soul, and that includes the body and much more beside, for it includes all experience. The soul literally is, or is built up of, all its experience; and such part of this experience, or soul life, as is active at any given time or for any given purpose constitutes the self at that time and for that purpose. We know how the self enlarges and expands as we enter upon new duties, acquire new interests, contract new ties of friendship; we know how it is mutilated when some sphere of activity is cut off, or some near friend snatched away by death. It is literally, and not metaphorically, a part of ourselves which we have lost (Bosanquet, 1898, p. 131-2).

(3) Aristotelian and Pauline ideas about the performance of caring activities developing caring relationships and attitudes influenced Loch's formulation of a charitable method of reciprocal caring activities improving recipients functioning and accomplishment of purposes constituting a social helping process. Aristotle's assertion that a benefactor and recipients philanthropic activities accomplish benevolent purposes became the basis for Loch's idea of benefactors determining purposefully uses of certain kinds of knowledge and activities with recipients (Loch, 1910a). According to Loch (1910a), Aristotle stated that a person developed friendships and their "best self" by engaging in activities modifying their personalities (Loch, 1910a, p. 870; R.N. #4). Aristotle's ideas influenced Loch's understanding of benefactors' and recipients' activities within a helpful social process achieving purposeful outcomes (Loch, 1910a; Loch, 1910b). Additionally, Loch developed St. Paul's ideas of spiritual and caring associations with Jesus Christ into a social process of activities constituting a charitable method linking Divine and secular persons in spiritualized and caring relationships. Loch conceived of a three-way relationship of secular persons exchanging charities with one another as well as with "The Spirit" as "the Christ Life" enabling them to become one with "the body of Christ." Christians participation in "The Christ Life," lovingly bonds them together in friendships and spiritual associations forming community social life while perfecting their personalities (Loch, 1923, p. 43). Loch states that: St. Paul's position ... lays stress on motive force rather than on purpose. ...[He] considers charity in relation to a community of fellow believers-drawn together in congregations. His theory springs from this social base, though it overarches life itself. He is intent on creating a spiritual association. He conceives of the Spirit ... [as] "an immaterial personality." It transcends the soul ... and is the Christ life, the ideal and spiritual life. Christians participate in it, and they thus become part of "the body of Christ," which exists by virtue of love, love akin to the ideal life. ... The word represents the love that is instinct with reverence and not love ... which may have in it some quality of passion. This love is the life of "the body of Christ. ... For love ... cannot be love at all unless it quickens the intelligence as much as it animates the will. ... And to create a world or "body" of men and community linked together by love, even though it be outside the normal life of the community, was to create a new form of religious organisation, and to achieve for it (so far as it was achieved) what, *mutatis mutandis*, Aristotle held to be the indispensable condition of social life, friendship. (Loch, 1910a, p. 871)

(4) Aristotle was the first systematic thinker associating human activity with personality development (Aristotle, 1941, p. 21, 543, 547-548, 553, 557, 561, 564-5, 935, 952, 980a1, & 991b1-3; Copleston, 1946, p. 62). For Aristotle, material objects in nature, like individual bodies and souls moving one another to perform activities, change actions in a process moving to some end. He stated that movement of souls and bodies on one another ended their activities. He explained that the soul developed from the body's actions, of being "besouled." But Aristotle concluded that soul is the "cause or source" of the "living body" as soul is "...the origin of movement and the essence of the whole living body." Thus, soul and body engaged in interactive movements which mutually influenced each other. Furthermore, Aristotle showed that movement of the soul, originating from bodily movements, led to sensations, knowledge, perceptions, opinions, desires, wishes and, "...all other modes of appetition" accomplishing a good purpose. Thus, teleological activities of body and soul accomplished a "good" as a particular virtue. Elsewhere, Aristotle associated the development of certain moral virtues with specific habituated activities.

(5) M. Richmond' "Charitable Spirit" and C.S. Loch's "Pneuma" both referred to a caring and healing presence between charitable participants. However, Richmond' secular definition of a "charitable spirit" referred to a friendly attitude among participants engaged in charitable activities while Loch's spiritualized "Pneuma" denoted the ameliorating presence and activities of The Holy Spirit among persons engaged in charitable activities.

[Return to index](#) ▲

References

- Aristotle (1941). *The basic works of Aristotle*. R. Mckeon (Ed.). New York: Random House.
- Bosanquet, H. (1898). *The standard of life and other stories*. London: Macmillan.
- Brown, S. J. (1982). *Thomas Chalmers and the godly commonwealth in Scotland*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chalmers, T. (1833). *On the power, wisdom and goodness of God as manifested in the adaptation of external nature to the moral and intellectual constitution of man*. Vol. #1. London: William Pickering.
- Chalmers, T. (1968). *On political economy in connexion with the moral state and moral prospects of society*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley.
- Copleston, F. (1946). *A history of philosophy*. Vol. #1. Garden City, NY: Image Books.
- Coyle, G. L. (1930). *Social process in organized groups*. New York: Richard R. Smith.
- deSchweinitz, K. (1943). *England's road to social security*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hoiberg, D. H. (ed.) (2001). *Encyclopaedia Britannica 2001 DVD edition*. Chicago, IL: Britannica.com.
- Follett, M. P. (1924). *Creative experience*. New York: Long Mans, Green and Company.
- Hunter, H. (editor) (1912). *Problems of poverty, selections from the economic and social writings of Thomas Chalmers*. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons.
- Leiby, J. (1984). Charity organization reconsidered. *Social Services Review*, 58(4), pp. 522-538.
- Leiby, J. (1987). History of social welfare. *Encyclopaedia of Social Work*. 18th. Edition, Vol. I, pp. 755-777, Anne Minahan (editor), Silver Springs, Md .: NASW.
- Lindeman, E. C. (1924). *Social discovery*. New York: Republic.
- Loch, C.S. (1833). *How to Help Cases of Distress*. (Publisher not listed in book)
- Loch, C. S. (1910a). *Charity and charities*. The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 5, 11th. edition, New York City: The Encyclopaedia Britannica Company.
- Loch, C. S. (1910b). *Charity and social life*. London: Macmillan.
- Loch, C. S. (1923). *A great ideal and its champion*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Majonis, J. (2002). C.S. Loch and M. Richmond's genesis of the social situation. *Journal of Social Thought: Journal of Religion in the Social Sciences*, 21 (2), pp. 57-74.
- Richmond, M. E. (1912). *The good neighbor in the modern city*. Philadelphia, PA.: J.B. Lippincott.
- Richmond, M. E. (1917). *Social diagnosis*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Richmond, M.E. (1922). *What is social casework?* Philadelphia, PA.: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Richmond, M. E. (March 1924). Sir Charles Stewart Loch . *The Family*,1, pp. 3-7.
- Richmond, M. E. (1930). *The long view*. J. C. Colcord and R. Z.S. Mann (Eds.). *The long view*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Richmond, M. E. (1969). *Friendly visiting among the poor: A handbook for charity workers*. Montclair, NJ: Patterson Smith.

Richmond, M. E. (1971). What is social casework? New York: Arno Press and The New York Times.

Sheffield, A. E. (1937). Social insight in case situations. New York: D. Appleton-Century.

Siporin, M. (1972). Introduction to social work practice. New York: MacMillan.

Witmer, H. L. (1942). Social work, an analysis of an institution. New York: Rinehart.

Woodroffe, K. (1962). From charity to social work. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Young, A .F. & Ashton, E. T. (1956). British social work in the nineteenth century. London; Routledge & Kegan Paul.

[Return to index ▲](#)

Joel Majonis, Ph.D. is with the University of Waterloo, Renison College, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada. E-mail: mojo_phd@hotmail.com.

[Return to index ▲](#)



FACULTY OF SOCIAL WORK

...making a world of difference!

