

# A Chest Commander's Vision

By WILLIAM COOPER PROCTER

**W**HEN I was asked to take the chairmanship of the campaign, I was loath to do so and hoped that some other way might be found. So I first looked into the chest's expenditures and then at the quotas given the various agencies. I discovered that everything was being handled in a very efficient way. I checked the salary lists for stenographers, clerks and general employes with those of Procter and Gamble and found them not so high as those of Procter and Gamble for similar services.

The budgets of the different agencies, I found, are gone over by their trustees, checked by the Executive Budget Committee of the chest, and finally compared item for item with similar institutions. For example, the cost of feeding in one hospital is compared with the cost in other hospitals. The budgets are analyzed and the expenses compared, and if the expenses in one department are excessive as compared with a similar department in another institution, the reason why is ascertained and adjustment made. I have no hesitancy in saying that the chest is efficiently and economically administered. I felt also that the allotments made to agencies were properly apportioned. I could find no chance for retrenchment.

Under such circumstances, what should we do? Limit the agencies' work, check growth, kill spirit—or find the additional \$200,000 they imperatively need?

For several years the chest had not quite reached its quota. The experience in other cities had been similar. It grows harder and harder—and this in spite of the fact that the population of the country is increasing and never before has prosperity been so great and so widespread in this country. I was told that chests throughout the country were wondering why the impulses of giving, mostly due to the war-time, were fading away.

I came to the conclusion that the trouble was that we, and the other cities in the country, were lacking in faith. If we go out to meet the needs of humanity there will come a spirit of brotherhood, a feeling of responsibility, which will bring a forward advance in humanitarian work. We offer no excuses for asking an increase, we have no reserve in saying that this campaign must succeed.

The whole inspiration of the chest lies in the teams. Unless this is a *community* chest, a chest to which the entire

community gives, unless the teams bring home to the minds of the people the needs to be met and the personal responsibility of each citizen and enlist his sympathy and interest, the movement itself is doomed to failure. Your campaign, and your community chest rest on the teams and not on the large givers.

I would like to bring home to the individual solicitor in the ranks the fact that his work is important. The acid test for success in men and women is whether they can recognize the importance of a piece of work that is a part of a whole. The man who succeeds is the man who takes up his work and realizes its importance. At Procter and Gamble, if a cub salesman gets a job and takes it up as if he thinks it is the most important work in the whole company, he soon goes up. His attitude may be boyish, but it is very fine. So, it seems to me, the fundamental test of success, and almost of character, is the realization by the individual that his work is big work and worth the utmost he can put into it.

If we fail in this campaign, it will be a long time before another community chest campaign will succeed. There is a better spirit abroad among people than in any campaign since the War. There is money here, too, if you will do the work necessary to get it. If we do not go over, if that impossibility should happen, what would be the condition of the chest? Can any organization function efficiently if it is without the resources for proper expansion?

And, furthermore, not only is the success of this campaign important to Cincinnati, it is important to the nation. I am told that the community chests throughout the country are looking to Cincinnati during this campaign. Cincinnati stands high; its success or failure will be felt in every city. What is at stake in this

campaign is the question: Can the Community Chest continue to meet the needs of this city as the city grows and expands?

We were drawn together during the War by a great impulse. That impulse is with us no longer, but during the past seven years the Community Chest has been the great agent that has united us, that has drawn us together in a true bond of brotherhood. It has given new life to our charities; it has elevated our ideas and our ideals of social service; it has strengthened our religion; it has improved our business and our politics. So, I appeal to you to think of it as more than civic work, for it is religious work.

*MR. PROCTER was chairman of the campaign in which the Cincinnati Community Chest not only broke through a dead level of contributions which had held stubbornly for four years, but set a new high standard for a large city. The large-scale operations of a chest, which in Cincinnati raises an annual budget of \$2,030,000, has challenged the interest of men of affairs, like Mr. Procter, who is the president of The Procter and Gamble Company, the makers of Ivory Soap. His vision of the meaning of the chest was given first to the solicitors who successfully carried out the campaign.*



# Everyman's Chest

By ALLEN T. BURNS

*Drawings by C. O. Westland for the Toledo Community Chest*

**L**AST spring the Young Men's Christian Association of New York set out to raise \$6,500,000 for new buildings. They secured barely \$4,000,000 in the richest city of the world—and the Y.M.C.A. makes a strong appeal to the wealthy. Two years before, Detroit, a city one-sixth the size of New York and certainly with no greater proportionate wealth, raised \$5,800,000 for Y.M.C.A. buildings. This year, at the same time that New York was failing, Detroit raised \$4,200,000 for buildings for the Y.W.C.A. and other women's organizations.

What made the difference between the two cities? What made the smaller, less well-to-do city the more generous? Both used the same methods; in fact, the intensive high-power campaign for social welfare finance originated in the Y.M.C.A. and spread from New York to other cities and other organizations, and New York employed this spring the same campaign director that Detroit had used two years before. Certainly the technique of money-raising does not explain the difference in giving for identical purposes. Some similar contrasts in other cities will suggest an explanation.

A year ago the citizens of New York contributed \$7,000,000 for building hospitals in connection with the medical center being developed at Columbia, the country's richest university in its richest city. But this year the people of Cleveland contributed \$8,000,000 for hospitals at the medical center of the relatively poor university of their much smaller and less wealthy city. In 1925 Baltimore raised \$1,500,000, only half its original quota, toward the jubilee endowment fund of its great Johns Hopkins University. The same year Rochester, less than half the size of Baltimore, contributed \$7,000,000 to the development of its local university. What made the difference? Why the discrepancy between gifts and ability to give?

The leaders of New York's Y.M.C.A. campaign stated at the outset that they lacked one great asset that Detroit had possessed—the community sense of responsibility for welfare institutions. They said they must try to make up for this disadvantage from New York's greater resources. But even the wealth of New York did not offset the stronger sense of responsibility and community spirit of Detroit. How did Detroit get that way? And Cleveland? And Rochester?

The community and philanthropic leaders of these three cities are in complete agreement on an explanation: their cities had learned to give, to meet large responsibility for community enterprises, by the training received in their community chests. A more thorough analysis of chest giving will tend to substantiate the explanation, for these new community organizations have gone far in making both giving and the sense of responsibility well-nigh universal in cities where they have existed for as long as ten years.



Analysis of giving in chest and non-chest cities will make this clearer. Chests are proving successful to the extent that they make certain fundamental contributions to community life. These contributions are inherent in any adequate chest.

Recent studies in Chicago and Boston, and in Philadelphia just before starting its chest, showed about one person in thirty of the population contributing to charity. Chest contributions, on the other hand, average one in eight of the population and a chest does not consider itself really successful until its givers are one in five. Many chests equal this ratio and some exceed it. A giver for every family is a chest's ambition.

Such giving, outside of community-wide funds, has not been known in America, except during the War. The single exception brings home the value of such universal giving. The country in its crisis felt the need of marshalling all its resources and many have wondered how the War lessons in common action could be made permanent. The chest has done it so far as giving habits are concerned, for fund cities are showing an ability to secure contributions for all community purposes out of proportion to their wealth as compared with non-chest cities. By teaching everybody to give to chests they establish giving habits which increase the resources available for all other community projects.

**O**N a smaller scale, these instances of a larger and general giving could be paralleled in many chest cities, for example, the Oranges and Toledo. The point is that the chest, by systematizing and popularizing philanthropic appeals, has awakened a community-wide responsibility for them. The successful chest exists not to protect citizens from appeals but to relate appeals to each other in such a way as to secure the greatest possible response. The effective chest has become a teacher, not an opponent of giving and community obligation.

Adequate as well as general support of community benevolence is the aim of a chest. Chests are an answer to the growing insufficiency in the funds of social agencies. Just as mother's pensions from public funds grew out of insufficient relief by private agencies, so chests have developed from a conviction that the resources of the whole community must be tapped for adequate social service. In general, chests have raised more money for community welfare than