Abstract

The purpose of the article is to study how a church-based welfare agent (Kirkens Bymisjon, the Church City Mission, in Drammen) can act as a value guardian in social action and public discourse, how this agency is received in the local community and how this agency is significant in a sociological perspective. The material presented in this article derives from the Norwegian case study in a European research project (Welfare and Religion in a European Perspective), carried out in a middle-sized town, Drammen. Findings show that the local majority church, the Church of Norway in Drammen, including church-based voluntary agents, is expected by the local public authorities to participate in the public welfare debate issues. The local church does not live up to expectations, mainly with the exception of the case organisation studied here. It is perceived to act as a value guardian in practical social work and in the public discourse. Values supported are the human dignity of everybody and the collective solidarity of the welfare state. It is reasonable to explain the organisation’s role in the public sphere in connection with the general appreciation of the practical social work it performs.
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Introduction

In the Nordic value study on «folk churches and religious pluralism» (Gustafsson and Pettersson 2000) a majority both in Norway and in the other Nordic countries grant a high degree of legitimacy to church-based social welfare work, with reference to the majority churches, the Lutheran churches, in each country (Gustafsson 2000; cf. Sundback 2000). The support for this kind of work is significantly higher than for work more directly related to attention to religious functions. It has been claimed that in late modern society the primary welfare function of the church is related to its contribution to identity and meaning (Bäckström 2001), what may be called a symbolic function. The outcome of the Nordic value study may be interpreted in a way that modifies such a claim.
Research in the Nordic countries on the specific roles of faith-based or church-based voluntary organisations and their role in the welfare field has increased significantly during the past ten to fifteen years, especially in Finland, Norway and Sweden. The studies concern the contemporary role of parishes and diaconal organisations as providers of social work or welfare services in the welfare state (Angell 1994; Angell and Wyller 2006; Beckman et al. 2006; Bäckström 2001; Engel 2006; Jeppsson Grassman 2001; Sagatun 1998; Svendal 1998; Yeung 2006), including more historically oriented studies (Hvinden and Pettersen 2001; Leis 2004; Lorentzen 1994). Some studies focus more on interorganisational relationships than the particular (church-based) agencies involved (Sagatun 1998) and emphasise organisations working in the field of relief and development aid (Schjørring 2001; Tønnessen 2007). Several studies address what I term the value guardian role of the church-based agents (Angell and Wyller 2006; Beckman et al. 2006; Leis 2004; Lorentzen 1994; Yeung 2006) but less explicitly than this article does. In addressing the value guardian role this article includes both social action and participation in the public welfare debate.

The article is primarily a case study of a local Norwegian voluntary welfare organisation called Kirkens Bymisjon, the Church City Mission (CCM). The purpose of the article is to focus on how a church-based welfare agent can act as a «value guardian» in social action and public discourse. The concept of value guardian refers to US professor of social welfare Ralph Kramer’s analysis of the functions of voluntary organisations in the welfare state (Kramer 1981). Kramer specifies four main types of organisational roles of voluntary agencies in the welfare state, the vanguard role, the improver or advocate role, the service provider role and the value guardian role. The vanguard is the pioneer, the innovator; the improver or advocate is the critic or watchdog vis-à-vis the state and its services. In this article special attention will be paid to the value guardian role, by which «a voluntary agency (among other things) is expected to promote citizen participation, to develop leadership, and to protect the special interests of social, religious, cultural and other minority groups» (Kramer 1981:9). We may take this definition as a guideline without restricting the role the way Kramer does. The value guardian role is thus associated with the role of the «critical voice» (cf. Lundström and Wijkström 1995). Participation in the public discourse refers to how the voice of the church-based agents is made visible in the local media.

The church as an institution is by definition a guardian of (religious) values. The focus of this article is how a church-based voluntary welfare organisation takes on a value guardian role, and how this agency is received in the local community, especially by the public sector. A church-based welfare agency may be seen as a form of religious practice and in theological terms closely connected to the concept of diaconia (cf. Heitink 1999; Tønnessen 2005).

Methods
The material presented derives from the Norwegian case study in the European research project Welfare and religion in a European perspective - A comparative study
of the role of the majority churches as welfare providers within the social economy (WREP) (see Bäckström 2003). The case study was carried out in the town of Drammen, a middle-sized town south-west of the capital, Oslo. Data were collected on the welfare agency of church-based agents, on interactions and relationships between public authorities and the local majority church, the Church of Norway, in matters of welfare agency, including each party’s perception of and attitude to the other in its role as welfare agent. Data were collected in 2004–2005 and consisted of interviews and document analysis. We interviewed representatives of the local church (clergy at parish and deanery level, parish deacons, parish council leaders and leading administrative staff at the deanery level and representatives of other church-based welfare organisations), the public authorities (managers at different levels in the municipality and members of the municipal council) and the political editor of the local newspaper, Drammens Tidende. Data were also collected from the newspaper, partly from a web source, the electronic archive for the period 2001 – 2005, partly from the paper edition, mainly for the period the data collection took place. Data include altogether 27 interviews of which 14 were with local public authorities and 12 with church-related representatives.

Theoretical perspectives

In the analysis of the empirical data I will draw mainly on welfare theory and ethical theory. Modernity is characterised by individualisation. Individualisation as a cultural phenomenon is associated with the idea that each individual human being is responsible for his/her own life choices, for his/her life situation. The Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor’s analysis of the «malaise of modernity» or «the ethics of authenticity» (Taylor 1991) is based on the premise that in modern societies, authorised, taken for granted, shared sets of norms and values are by and large missing. According to Taylor, there is a demand put on the individual to fulfil oneself, based on the moral ideal of being true to oneself, of authenticity. This moral ideal of constructing one’s own personal identity cannot be conducted by the individual in isolation, as the making and sustaining of our identity (…) remain dialogical throughout our lives», according to Taylor (Taylor 1991:35). This line of reasoning resembles Anthony Giddens’ theory on identity formation in modernity as a reflexive process (Giddens 1991).

On the one hand, individual responsibility has freedom as its basis. On the other hand, freedom is not for everyone to enjoy (Bauman 2001). From a structural point of view, there are those who do not command sufficient resources to choose and live their lives as they would like. Their life situation should not be seen as a result of personal choices only, when they are displaced to a position on the margins of society. When every individual basically is thought to be responsible for his/her life, s/he is the one to blame in case of failure (Beck and Hviid Nielsen 1997) and to take the consequences thereof. Consequently, there is a tension between the ideal of collective solidarity built into the welfare state and the ideology of individualism.
This tension may be mitigated through the concept of responsibility as a basic political value particularly associated with the Christian democratic language in the European political context (Stjernø 2005:249). Responsibility includes both individualism in the sense used above and its modification, meaning that it is the individual’s obligation to help those in need. Combined with a social democratic perspective, this obligation may well be perceived as a collective responsibility, giving priority to public arrangements, or alternatively to voluntary organisations in co-operation with the public sector.

Social arrangements and social work with the aim of helping those in need represents moral work. Those in need are themselves imbued with moral value and what is done in response to their situation and the way they are treated as users are «anchored in a moral context» (Hasenfeld 1992:5). For example, visiting a welfare office implies in many cases stigmatization and conveys a statement of negative social worth by observers – and even by the visitors themselves. The way in which they are met by the service providers will have a normative basis. It represents moral choice and has symbolic meaning affecting the moral status of the user.

The local setting: The welfare system and the local church as a welfare agent

The Nordic welfare state models are characterised by their inclusiveness, their universalistic orientation. Help is offered to those who are unable to make ends meet on their own. The Nordic welfare systems are characterised by a large public sector, a system of «full employment» and a high labour market rate for women, a wide-embracing system of more or less universal rights, a residual system of social assistance, and a comparatively strong element of vertical re-distribution (Hatland et al. 2001). The basic values of the Nordic welfare state are equality, justice, solidarity and freedom (Stjernø 2005). There has been an ongoing process of devolution of central power to local governments, with the aim of focusing as much as possible on the municipal level. It means that for most people, their encounter with the welfare state takes place at the local level in the form of the «welfare municipality» (Nagel 1991). Against this background it is to be expected that church-based welfare activities, as part of the voluntary welfare sector, will be of little importance, quantitatively speaking (Salamon and Anheier 1998). Generally this is true both at the national level (Angell 2000) and in Drammen (Angell and Wyller 2006).

We may distinguish two principle roles of church-based agents in the field of welfare, the provider role and the ideological or political and cultural role. The characterisation of the Norwegian welfare system and the role of the majority church in the previous paragraph primarily concern the provider role. In the locality of Drammen, the Church of Norway includes two main types of collective welfare agents, parishes on one hand and organisations and associations not formally linked to a parish on the other (a more detailed description and analysis of the role of the local church in welfare pro-
vision is provided in Angell and Wyller (2006). The ideological dimension of welfare refers to the role of the church in the public discourse on welfare.

Public authorities interviewed in this study seem to have limited knowledge of the welfare activities of the local church. They perceive it, with a few exceptions, to be relatively invisible in the public discourse. It does not take part in political debates on welfare issues and local policies; its voice is not seen or heard in the media, in public meetings or in the streets. Church representatives interviewed agree with this characterisation of the role of the church in public discourse, and especially parish vicars seem to be sceptical of taking this kind of public role. On the other hand, there is an almost unanimous view among the public authorities that the church ought to be more active in such debates. Their views may be interpreted as concerning the viability of participatory, political democracy. A typical statement would be:

The more participants holding an opinion (on matters of welfare), the better for society. A public debate is important.

The most notable exception regarding the invisibility of the church in the public discourse on welfare is said to be the Church City Mission (CCM). In what follows I will describe the organisation and analyse its roles as practical welfare agent and participant in public discourse.

The CCM as social work agent

The CCM runs a café and an activity centre in Drammen. The activities are based on a staff of a few persons and on the efforts of some thirty volunteers. The CCM has formulated its main goal as «making everyday life a little better for people in difficult life situations», especially those who struggle with substance abuse problems. The organisation is dependent upon external funding. Close to half of the running expenses are funded by grants from the municipality (Drammens Tidende 2003). Other funding consists of private, individual donations, and offerings and donations from private foundations and associations.

Although the activities of the CCM are limited from a quantitative perspective, the activities are of some significance since little is done to serve the needs of substance abusers who are not in treatment centres besides the activities that the CCM organises. A token of the appreciation enjoyed in the local community is that the local bank that provided the loan needed to finance the premises in which the organisation runs its activities, decided to relieve the organisation of its debt (€ 210,000) (Drammens Tidende 2004).

A brief summary of the statements provided by the interviewees representing the local church and the public authorities on the role of the CCM may go as follows: The organisation demonstrates through its activities solidarity with those at the bottom of society, as illustrated by the following citations:
The Church City Mission has taken on work that no one else will do.

The Church City Mission takes care of those who fall outside every (public arrangement).

Moreover, CCM is said to speak up for those at the margins of society through its role in the public discourse on welfare. The interpretation of the social welfare activities may be indicative of the organisation’s value guardian role. No other church based agent, agency or activity is described and evaluated as favourably as the CCM.4 The statements may be interpreted as an expression of the organisation’s symbolic function in the town. In support of such an interpretation is the role the leader of the organisation plays in the local news media.

The CCM as contributor in the public welfare discourse

Based on local newspaper data and interviews it seems that the leader of the CCM is the only person connected to the local church (comprising representatives of the parish organisations, the deanery and the church-based voluntary organisations) who takes the opportunity to act politically, in the sense of trying to influence public opinion and political decision making. We counted more than 70 hits in the electronic archive of the newspaper on the CCM and its leader in Drammen during the period 2001–2005. From the statements presented in the newspaper an important part of this public message seems closely related to the nature of the activities that the CCM organises in Drammen and the social situation of the primary users of the services offered. The message emphasises that people and the political system acknowledge the dignity of those who live in the community, be they «straight» citizens or poor substance abusers. The message is aimed at reminding people and politicians in particular, of the values on which the welfare system and the Christian religious tradition are based.

The following citations from the leader of the CCM illustrate his view on the role that the church should take as a contributor to the formation of public opinion and public policy:

(W) e need to have two legs to stand on: we are obliged to help people in need; at the same time we must be outspoken about injustice. I am a columnist in the local paper every fourth week. We must confront the authorities. We must use the media and our political contacts.

I think that the role of the local church is related to traditional church activities. To me it seems more important to improve the public welfare system.

An editorial concerning the plans for the local town square seems to have spurred the involvement of the CCM in public welfare discourse. The editorial contained the following formulations:

To make (the development of the town square) a success – to make parents dare to send their children and youth to the (town) centre in the afternoon and at night, a thorough housecleaning is
required. In plain English: Addicts, pushers, beggars, taggers, troublemakers and other rabble must be chased away from the «town parlour» (Drammens Tidende 2002b).

The leader of the CCM responded to this and another editorial with the same content, with the following statement:

To call somebody «rabble» is nothing but destructive. (…) If we choose to call people by that term it only reinforces an experience of powerlessness. It strengthens their hatred against society and «straight people» in Drammen. «If I am garbage, all I can do is just garbage». I have seen the opposite. I have seen drug addicts taking responsibility when met with trust. Of course, I have been cheated and had my moments of dejection. Nevertheless, I have seen people grow and become confident in themselves and their personal resources when praised for their good choices and the way they act (in life). For rabble, there is little hope (Drammens Tidende 2002a).

This public expression of the values of the CCM and its consistency with its welfare work drew the attention of the local newspaper - despite their expressed criticism of the views espoused in the editorials. However, the editor resigned shortly after the editorials had been published and the editorial line of the newspaper changed. In an interview some three years later, the then political editor explained the reason for their adoption of the leader of the CCM as a moral voice it was the deliberate intention of the newspaper to influence the social atmosphere in Drammen, more specifically, to counteract the «tough climate» and marginalisation processes going on in the town, as these were perceived by the newspaper. It is worth noticing that in the interview, the editor stated that religion or church affiliation was not among the reasons for «adopting» the leader of the CCM as the newspaper’s voice.

The church may have taken over some of the critical function which the labour movement traditionally has had in the public welfare debate. The long-lasting tension between the social democratic movement, especially the Labour Party, and the church institution (the Church of Norway) has gradually waned. The Labour Party came to acknowledge that the Christian religion represented a set of moral principles that were in congruence with those of the party. The change in position towards religion becomes evident in the decisions made in the party conference in 1975 (Midttun 1995). The Labour party made a distinction between (a progressive) religion (i.e. Christianity) and the (more reactionary) institutionalised church. Within the party the distinction is expressed from fairly early in the twentieth century, but becomes more pronounced after the Second World War (Midttun 1995). Over time the distinction became obsolete. The party became all the more politically moderate and the church became less politically conservative. As seen and expressed by central members of the party, church representatives took a critical role in the political discourse and no longer criticised left wing radicalism. This was part of the argument for the Labours Party’s formal change in its relationship to religion in 1975 and gradually in its relationships to the church institution (Midttun 1998:71). In this context it is interesting to note that a recent study on power elites in Norway concludes that the church elite appears to be the most radical elite in Norwegian society based on, among other things, the values they espouse, e.g. supporting the central role of the state in society, redistribution of resources in favour
of the economic and geographical periphery, and that priority be given to environmental protection over economic growth (Gulbrandsen et al. 2002). But the study also demonstrates that the radicalism has its limitations. It shows that in matters affecting internal affairs, such as support for measures to improve gender equality, the church elite is less radical than most other elites. The same holds true when it comes to support for equal opportunities for persons living in heterosexual and homosexual partnership in own sector. The radical profile of the leaders may have to do with the value tradition of the church, leading in the direction of support for social equality and solidarity with the poor and marginalised, the social background of the church elite and possibly its lack of power in society (Repstad 2005). Moreover, it may contribute to the current radicalism that, on average, the church elite, as defined and included in the study, belong to the baby boomers and were students in period around 1970 (Repstad 2005). In such a context, and with few vested interests related to its power position, the elite has an easier time maintaining its somewhat radical principles. Analogous reasoning may be applied to the position of the CCM in Drammen (see Angell and Wyller 2006).

The ambiguous character of the church as an agent in public discourse

What has been stated above about the role of the local church – and the CCM as part of it – as a participant in public welfare discourse, places it as one type of agent among many, as one voice among many voices in society. Further analysis of how the church is perceived as an organisation requires a more nuanced description. The extent to which the church is described as the same or different from other organisations in society with respect to its welfare functions seems to depend on the position of the interviewee and the function in question. The representatives of the church tend to think of the church and its functions both in secular and religious terms. On the one hand, the basic ideas and values of the church may bestow a special role on it. On the other, the voice of the church in public space is supported by many interviewees with no distinction between the significance of the possible contributions of the church and other organisations, as in the context of deliberative democracy. With regard to the role of the church in welfare service provision, the same ambiguity is expressed. On the one hand, the church is perceived along with any other voluntary organisation. On the other hand, the religious character of the church implies that it has a special role. This ambiguity is expressed by interviewees representing the church as well as the public authorities.

The ambiguity and the specific views on the role of the church, especially in public debate, as it was approached in the study, may indicate that the (local) church, including the local voluntary church-based welfare organisations, is perceived as one among many agents in civil society, and not as a state agent. This is interesting considering the fact that the church in question, the Church of Norway, is an established church or a state church, and therefore formally, even at the local level in the form of the parish
organisation, not part of civil society (Sagatun and Eide 1998). The other type of church-based agents discussed in this article holds another position (Angell 2004). The ambiguity observed may be interpreted as reflecting a perception of the (local) church as a religious agent, and as yet another voluntary organisation. The public sector may have a preconceived sceptical attitude towards the former type of welfare agent, and a more positive inclination towards the latter. An agent combining the two properties may be a source of ambiguity.

The CCM as a moral agent

The agency of the CCM in its social work and participation in the public welfare debate may be seen as moral agency in two social spaces. Its social work that benefits people with substance abuse problems represents moral work in its own right. The response to the editorial in the local newspaper (Drammens Tidende 2002a) illustrates this point and exemplifies the values espoused by the CCM, intended to apply to their social work. With Hasenfeld’s framework the CCM has engaged in social work to help a category of people whose social worth is associated with negative connotations. The fact that the CCM does so is appreciated by those who were interviewed. The social work it does may, thus, be seen as an expression of responsibility and solidarity. Moreover, the manner in which the work is carried out – if it lives up to the values espoused by the organisation as in statements referred to above – may represent moral work conveying values of human dignity, solidarity and mercy (CCM 2003).

From the perspective of welfare theory, the role of the CCM in the public discourse may be related to the scope of the welfare state and the limits of solidarity. The editorial in the local newspaper (Drammens Tidende 2002b) makes a moral dividing line between those on the fringes of society, «the others», and those who are well within the borders of decency, «we». The dividing line is the line between the insiders and the outsiders, between the included and the excluded. It is a dividing line between social order and disorder, society and its waste (Bauman 2004). Against the exclusion of the others, the leader of the CCM responds by making the distinction less clear, extending the «we» to include «the others» holding up one of the fundamental values of the welfare state, collective solidarity. The succeeding «inclusive» response of the local newspaper may reasonably be interpreted as a support of the value of inclusive solidarity. In this way, the newspaper may be interpreted as a moral agent, not only in its consequence, but by intention (see Angell Forthcoming). The use of the leader as a voice in matters of morals and ethics related to the diaconia of the church and the welfare state, as a kind of local moral authority in such matters, may be interpreted as an expression of a felt need for a social ethics in welfare policy. The voice of the CCM and its leader in Drammen was intended by the local newspaper to contribute to filling this void, not only by the words spoken, but by the deeds which form a basis for the significance of the words they accompany. This function may be related to Charles Taylor’s analysis (Taylor 1991:6). In the process of developing an identity, we need partners, either through a genuine personal dialogue or someone to relate to indirectly, e.g. through
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mass media. The leader of the CCM, through his visibility in the media, may be constructed as a potential dialogue partner by the local newspaper and perceived as such by the reading public.

In isolation, the response of the CCM to the editorial may be understood in a liberalistic perspective, as an acceptance of difference, including the right of those who suffer substance abuse problems to be part of the public sphere, using the town square. If each individual basically is thought to be responsible for his/her life and s/he is the one to blame in case of failure and the one to take the consequences thereof, a liberalist would leave it there. Another more collectively or communitarian inspired interpretation is closer at hand when we consider both participation in the public debate and the social welfare agency of the CCM. The inclusive attitude espoused in the public debate is combined with practical social action to benefit those who struggle with substance abuse problems which may be taken to be an expression of neighbourly love or solidarity, as a step towards social integration. To speak out in the public sphere in this way is a political action. One may ask for the response of the politicians in Drammen on this issue. There was no indication in the data sources of such response. Their silence, as it seems, may indicate the importance of the CCM in its function as a value guardian in the local community, most likely with wide popular support, but definitely not unanimously as the editorial (and many supportive responses) demonstrates.

The CCM as a political agent

Social and political influence requires a relation of (mutual) understanding between people to motivate action. In order to convince others of the validity of one’s claim, one has to refer to shared cultural knowledge and valid social norms (cf. Habermas 1987). This is one way of understanding the basis of the CCM leader’s participation in the public discourse on welfare in Drammen and its reception. The participation is compatible with the expectations of the public authorities concerning the church, and with the «mission» of the local newspaper. There is still massive support of the welfare state and its system of contributions and benefits in the Norwegian population (see Kjølsrød 2005). Nevertheless, if the values expressed by the CCM generally may be institutionalised in the welfare system at the national level, they are not self-evident. They should not be taken for granted and are subject to continuous debate as regards their (re)interpretation and implementation. In this sense, the participation of the CCM in the public discourse on welfare is maintenance work because it reiterates the discussion of the character of the welfare state, solidarity and conditions for social integration. It represents the work required in civil society to maintain or renew the legitimacy of the welfare state in the present form or in a revised form. This points to the political function of the CCM in its public agency. The views expressed in the interview with the leader, elucidate the organisation’s support of the welfare state.

This interpretation may be framed within a more general religious perspective where the Lutheran context is relevant since we may claim that Lutheran ideology or theology contributed to institutional secularisation through the doctrine of the two
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kingdoms, whereby autonomy from the church is granted to the state: a doctrine which contributed to a state-friendly society (Kramer 1992; Manow 2002; Selle 1993).

Conclusion
The empirical data show that the Church City Mission in Drammen engages in social work to benefit a category of people living at the margins of the local community, those who suffer from substance abuse problems and who are visible as such in public space. In addition, the CCM, in contrast to other church-based welfare agents, notably the parishes, participates in the public discourse on welfare issues, as a moral and political agent. Among the values expressed, espoused and promoted through social work and participation in public debate are solidarity and the dignity of every human being irrespective of life situation. Based on the interviews it is reasonable to conclude that the organisation gains credibility and trust in its role as a value guardian in the public sphere not least through its performance in social work. It does so not by quantitative measures but by the symbolic function and the values associated with this form of practice by its observers. What seems to matter is the perceived congruence between words and action. The organisation performs moral work both in its words and its social work.

The values guarded through the agency of the organisation are dressed in a language of secular rationality, in the sense that it is presumed that the moral norms on which the arguments and evaluations are based are not given any explicit religious reference. They are likely to be shared by people irrespective of their religious affiliation. The ambiguous character of church-based agents in the perception of the interviewees demonstrates that when faith-based or religious agents appear in the public sphere, they are not necessarily perceived as religious agents. The leader of the CCM was «adopted» by the local media as a moral voice, not because of the religious anchoring of the organisation, representing the church, but because of the message, including the language used, and its presumed credibility. The media did not seem to be attracted to this person because of his organisational affiliation. For those persons who were interviewed, the organisation was associated with the church and may have been perceived as an expression of values inherent to the Christian religion. If we interpret the position of the leader of the CCM in the local media in terms of the public influence of the church or religion in the locality, we should perhaps conclude that our data show that a church-based welfare agent may represent a potential source of public influence as a value guardian. This does not necessarily mean influence for the religion and the religious values in which it is rooted. The case demonstrates the relevance of the church, in this case the Church of Norway, as a potential source of moral authority. The relevance is based on the authority that more generally follows from participation in civil society, presenting a message that calls attention to and supports widely shared norms and basic values in the welfare state, what we may term social democratic values. It involves protecting the interests of people at the fringes of society, and with credibility based on the congruence of words and deeds, without any specific reference to religion.
Notes

1. The CCM in Drammen is a member of a national family or network of city missions based on a more or less common religious and social ideology.
2. Whenever reference is made to the (local) church and collective church-based agents in this article, we mean organisations belonging to or identifying with the majority church, the Church of Norway.
3. Until the early 1990s there were local newspapers, Drammens Tidende being characterised as politically conservative, the other more left wing oriented.
4. The organisation that comes closest to the CCM in its positive reputation in the field of welfare work is the Salvation Army.
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