

This PDF is a selection from an out-of-print volume from the National Bureau of Economic Research

Volume Title: Corporation Contributions to Organized Community Welfare Services

Volume Author/Editor: Pierce Williams and Frederick E. Croxton

Volume Publisher: NBER

Volume ISBN: 0-87014-015-9

Volume URL: <http://www.nber.org/books/will30-1>

Publication Date: 1930

Chapter Title: Part III: Corporation Contributions to Community Chests by Chief Industries

Chapter Author: Pierce Williams, Frederick E. Croxton

Chapter URL: <http://www.nber.org/chapters/c4843>

Chapter pages in book: (p. 139 - 208)

PART III.

CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS TO COMMUNITY CHESTS, BY CHIEF INDUSTRIES.

In Part II corporation contributions to 129 community chests have been looked at as a whole. This general view has necessarily revealed only the outstanding features in the picture of corporation contributions. It needs to be supplemented by a closer examination of the data by industries. The 129 community chest cities, being widely distributed geographically, and of different size, have their own characteristics. These peculiarities are to some extent reflected in variations in corporation contributions to community chests in those cities. In order to bring out these differences in higher relief, it is important to look at the total contributions to the different community chests industry by industry. Corporation contributions, it must always be remembered, are not the result of chance, but of human decisions. These decisions are based on many factors, the relative strength of which it is not the purpose of this study to appraise. In different industries, however, the different factors operate with varying effect in the determination of charitable contributions. In the manufacturing industry, for example, contributions from corporations are probably based on recognition of the fact that the employes of these concerns are subject to conditions which the welfare agencies of the community are called upon to prevent or correct. These services are therefore regarded by many corporations as of tangible benefit to stockholders. In other industries in which the number of employes is relatively small in comparison to the volume of business, (e.g., banking, public services, chain stores, etc.) corporations probably base their contributions to the community chests on the desire to enjoy the good-will of the community, and good-will is of monetary value in business. As already indicated, the National Bureau is not in a position even approximately to weigh the factors that determine the amount of corporation contributions to community chests. However, by presenting the data, industry by industry, and calling attention to the more obvious points about the contributions from each industry, the way may at least be opened to more exhaustive

inquiry as to corporation support by the boards of community chests.

The order in which the chief industries will be discussed is as follows:—

- I. Manufacturing
- II. Trade—(a) Retail chains; (b) Retail and wholesale trade, other than chain stores.
- III. Finance—(a) Banks and trust companies; (b) Insurance; (c) Other finance.
- IV. Transportation and other public utilities—(a) Steam railroads; (b) Water and other transportation (excluding electric traction); (c) Public utilities, other than transportation, (electric light, power, traction, gas, water, etc.)
- V. Miscellaneous—(a) Service, (1) Amusement, (2) Service, other than amusement; (b) Construction; (c) Mining and quarrying; (d) Agriculture.

For each of the above mentioned industries the data will be presented with a view to showing the following things:—

- (a) Relative importance of the industry in respect to total corporation contributions to community chests for the 10 years 1920-1929, inclusive.
- (b) The trend of corporation contributions in that industry, both absolutely and relatively. The effort to show the trend of corporation contributions is complicated by the fact that the number of community chests studied is not stationary. It will be recalled that five of the community chests included in our study have submitted data for the year 1929 only, that 73 have submitted data for the years 1924-1929, inclusive, and that only 13 have submitted data for the full ten year period—1920-1929, inclusive. This last mentioned group will be used in seeking for discoverable trends of corporation contributions in the various industries.
- (c) The outstanding differences in number, amount and per cent of contributions from each industry as between cities. Obviously, only the fact of variation between cities can be pointed out; the data do not permit of any conclusions as to the reasons back of the variations in contributions to different community chests from corporations in the same industry.

For two industries, viz., manufacturing and retail chain stores, data will be submitted in the hope of shedding light on a special aspect of the problem of corporation contributions to community chests. What proportion of these corporation contribu-

tions are traceable to a relatively small number of nationally organized and operating corporations, carrying on producing or distributing activities in a large number of community chest cities, and therefore called on for contributions to several community chests? This special aspect of the problem was touched on in the introduction to this study. Community chest directors and executives had expressed the fear that the financial support of organized community welfare work might be imperilled by the increasing dominance in certain industries of corporations organized on a national, rather than a local basis. Decisions as to charitable contributions by such corporations are usually not made by the local representatives, in close contact with community needs, but by headquarters officials, not always in touch with the communities in which the requests for corporation contributions originate. Before proceeding with the discussion of data as to corporation contributions by industries, it may be worth while to point out which industries, in respect to community relationships, are considered in this study as essentially local, and which are considered as either regional or national.

In the first group, obviously, are banks and trust companies, (excepting in certain sections of the country in which branch banking is carried on). Electric light, power, traction, gas and water companies may also be regarded as local, as far as community relationships are concerned. Few of them are called upon to contribute to more than one community chest. The fact that many of these public utility companies are controlled by great holding corporations does not alter this fact of local community relationship. Telephone companies, on the other hand, notwithstanding the fact that so many are associated in the Bell Telephone System, are organized and give telephone service on a state-wide basis. Some of them cover more than one state. So far as contributions to community chests are concerned, however, each telephone company seems to have complete autonomy. Few of them are concerned with only one community chest. Several are called upon to contribute to fifteen or twenty community chests.

The telegraph business, on the other hand, is clearly to be considered as national for the purposes of this study. Both of the great telegraph companies are involved in relationships with thousands of local communities, and not more so with one community than with another.

Steam railroads are also considered as national in this study, even though the system serves a particular region of the country. Any given railroad system has community relationships with a large number of places. This is also true of the important railway express companies. The Pullman Company is an example of what is meant in this study by a nationally organized and operating corporation.

Transportation corporations, other than steam railroads, may likewise be considered as national, even though many of them (i.e., lake and river steamboat lines, autobus lines, and air transport companies) serve limited regions only. Such corporations are necessarily involved in community relationships with the various places they touch in connection with their business.

The great majority of wholesale and retail trade corporations, always excepting the important chain store concerns, are still local as far as community relations are concerned. However, a tendency toward merging of existing wholesale and retail merchandising units is at work which is gradually destroying the purely local character of many such concerns.

The construction industry, notwithstanding the importance of a relatively few corporations handling building and contracting work all over the United States, may, for the purposes of this study, be regarded as local. That is to say, in a great majority of cases, the contracting corporation carries on its business in a region centering in the city in which the construction corporation has its headquarters. Here again the problem of the construction corporation, as far as community chests are concerned, is usually the relatively simple one of deciding how much to contribute to one community chest.

While the manufacturing industry, speaking numerically, is still local, so far as community relations are concerned, mergers and consolidations are resulting in an increasing degree of dominance by a number of nationally operating, publicly owned corporations. This is especially true in the fields of electrical equipment, motor vehicles, tires and accessories, gasoline and lubricants, food products, tobacco, and iron and steel.

In the field of amusements, half a dozen national or regional chains of "legitimate" and motion picture theaters are the dominating factors. The federal income tax authorities classify amusement corporations under the heading of "service". This classification also includes among other businesses restaurants and hotels. In

these last two fields of service, chains are of increasing importance, although taking the service group as a whole, relatively few of the corporations are involved in public relations with more than one community.

As to insurance, shall the great corporations that write the bulk of the country's life and general insurance be called local or national? In their operations, by reason of the geographical distribution of their business they are clearly national, although there are a number of insurance companies that are regional or even local in their field of operation. From the standpoint of community relationships, however, insurance companies may be considered as essentially local, and, as will be brought out later in this section of the report, insurance companies, when they respond to requests of community chests for contributions, generally recognize only the chest in the city in which the company has its head office.

The classification other finance includes a variety of corporations outside the fields of banking and insurance. Most of them are local in their operations and privately owned, (i.e., "close" corporations). They are not called upon to contribute to any other community chest than the one in the city in which the corporation is located. While the above mentioned group comprises many corporations that are national in scope and whose stock is widely distributed, e.g., holding companies, investment trusts, etc., their relations with local communities are so incidental as not to afford a very solid basis on which community chests can obtain contributions. Moreover, the fact that so many of the large holding companies and investment trusts have their headquarters in New York or Chicago (non-community chest cities) takes them outside the reach of community chests.

I. Manufacturing

Forty-seven and two-tenths per cent of all corporation contributions to 129 community chests for 1929 came from manufacturing corporations. The number of contributions from that group of concerns for 1929 was 14,794 or 43.5 per cent of the total number of contributions from corporations. As Table 28 shows, there has been a steady increase in the number of manufacturing contributions each year since 1920, but this increase has been offset by a progressive decrease in the proportion of corporation contributions from the manufacturing industry. In 1920, 64.6 per cent of the amount of all corpora-

TABLE 28

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM MANUFACTURING CORPORATIONS, TO ALL COMMUNITY CHESTS STUDIED, 1920-1929.

Year	Number of chests	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from manufacturing corporations	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from manufacturing corporations	Number of contributions from manufacturing corporations	Per cent of total number of corporation contributions from manufacturing corporations
1920	13	\$ 2,535,819	\$ 1,637,769	64.6	1,379	52.0
1921	22	2,815,983	1,619,733	57.5	2,297	49.2
1922	29	3,134,134	1,761,983	56.2	3,329	49.3
1923	49	4,975,961	2,607,824	52.4	5,061	46.8
1924	73	7,711,208	4,038,974	52.4	7,907	45.9
1925	94	9,042,012	4,504,507	49.8	9,774	44.7
1926	109	10,757,339	5,209,158	48.4	11,690	44.4
1927	119	12,015,222	5,892,997	49.0	13,354	44.1
1928	124	12,265,850	5,855,334	47.7	13,988	43.7
1929	129	12,954,769	6,112,576	47.2	14,794	43.5

tion contributions came from manufacturing as against 47.2 per cent in 1929. This does not indicate an actual decrease in contributions from manufacturing corporations but a proportionate increase in the contributions from other industries.

The foregoing table shows that manufacturing contributions for 1929 were \$257,242 more than for 1928. If, however, the total contributions from manufacturing corporations to the five community chests reporting only for 1929 are eliminated (\$167,649), the increase for the other 124 community chests for 1929 over 1928 is only \$89,593 or 1.5 per cent. If the 514 manufacturing contributions to the five community chests reporting only for 1929 are deducted from the total, the number of manufacturing contributions to the other 124 community chests increased but 292 over 1928. Examination of the city tables for community chests (Appendix

Table II) indicates that a number of community chests did in fact show a loss in number of manufacturing contributions for 1929 as compared with 1928. Also there are a number of community chests whose total numbers of manufacturing contributions for 1929, while more than for 1928, are less than for some prior year.

Of course, a continuous increase in the number of manufacturing contributions to any given community chest is hardly to be expected. It may be assumed that by the fifth or sixth year of a community chest's existence, it has canvassed corporation contributors with fair thoroughness. Some loss of contributions through merger or consolidation or even from bankruptcy is to be looked for.

This apparent decline in support from manufacturing corporations takes on a greater significance when the figures are assembled for the 13 community chests that have been in continuous operation for the ten year period, 1920-1929. As Table 29 shows, these 13 community chests, taken as a group, have never received in contributions from manufacturing corporations in any year after 1920 as much as they did that first year. This table reveals the fact that for these 13 community chests, manufacturing contributions reached their lowest level, as far as amount is concerned, in 1922. From this low level manufacturing contributions have (except for a slight recession in 1925) risen steadily to \$1,539,606 in 1929. At this level, however, they are still \$98,163 under the total for the year 1920. Keeping in mind the fact that these corporation contributions were pledged in the autumn of the year preceding the one to which the contributions are credited, it is evident that the severe business depression prevailing in the latter part of 1921 resulted in the sharp decline in manufacturing contributions to the community chests then in operation. On the other hand, it will be noted that the number of manufacturing contributions to these 13 community chests has grown steadily since 1920.

It will be seen that these 13 community chests lost \$455,636 in manufacturing contributions between 1920 and 1922 and that the loss between 1920 and 1921 was \$312,302. This last mentioned decline cannot be explained by business depression. One is tempted to offer the explanation that many of the corporations that had contributed relatively large amounts in the autumn of 1919 cut their contributions the year later.

CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS

TABLE 29

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM MANUFACTURING CORPORATIONS, TO 13 COMMUNITY CHESTS REPORTING FOR EACH YEAR, 1920-1929.

Year	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from manufacturing corporations	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from manufacturing corporations	Number of contributions from manufacturing corporations	Per cent of total number of corporation contributions from manufacturing corporations
1920	\$2,535,819	\$1,637,769	64.6	1,379	52.0
1921	2,226,826	1,325,467	59.5	1,732	51.8
1922	2,047,300	1,182,133	57.7	1,828	50.0
1923	2,238,545	1,301,506	58.1	1,958	49.7
1924	2,305,172	1,347,989	58.5	2,125	49.7
1925	2,319,690	1,325,455	57.1	2,229	49.0
1926	2,413,031	1,363,316	56.5	2,242	48.8
1927	2,608,317	1,450,062	55.6	2,416	48.3
1928	2,756,182	1,528,352	55.5	2,432	48.4
1929	2,799,192	1,539,606	55.0	2,487	48.5

Reference to Appendix Table II for the 13 cities that reported data from 1920, will show the varying movements present in manufacturing contributions to these community chests between the years 1920, 1921 and 1922. Detroit, Minneapolis, Cincinnati, Rochester, Youngstown, and Grand Rapids, seem to have been especially hard hit, while on the other hand, Toledo, Dayton, and Springfield, Mass., gained manufacturing contributions from 1920 to 1922.

On the basis of the foregoing data, the inference is probably not justified that contributions from manufacturing corporations to these 13 community chests have reached a stationary level. It is significant, however, that the tenth year of these 13 community chests finds them with only 2.9 per cent more manufacturing contributions and only 6.2 per cent more in amount than they had in 1927, while the total corporation subscriptions increased 7.3 per cent between 1927 and 1929. A more thorough analysis of the available

data would show how much of this net increase of \$89,544 in manufacturing contributions was due to the 71 new contributions, how much was due to the increases in old contributions and how much of these was offset by a loss through reduction in old contributions. It has not been feasible for the National Bureau to make this analysis, but community chest boards would probably find it worth while to make the study for their own local organizations.

For the 129 chests studied 47.2 per cent of all corporation money received came from manufacturing corporations. Table 30 shows the chests that received more than 47.2 per cent of their 1929 corporation contributions from manufacturing and those that received less. Community chests that are considerably above or considerably below the average for the 129 community chests in the year 1929 may find it worth while to analyze their own figures in the hope of finding the explanation for their deviation from the figure for all chests studied.

How many of the 14,794 manufacturing contributions, and how much of the \$6,112,576 contributed by this industry, for the year 1929, can be traced to nationally organized and operating manufacturing corporations, i.e., corporations with community relationships in several community chest cities? The method of arriving at an approximate answer to this question has been described in the introduction to the study. After posting onto the cards for nationally known manufacturing concerns, all contributions reported by community chests as coming from that corporation or a subsidiary company, the cards were classified according to the branch of manufacturing in which the corporation was principally engaged. These sub-classifications of the manufacturing industry are given in Appendix C. Only those corporations found contributing to three or more community chests in any year since 1925 have been included in this particular tabulation.

This special analysis of the data shows that 164 nationally organized and operating manufacturing corporations accounted for 2,255 of the contributions reported from the manufacturing industry for the year 1929. This is 15.2 per cent of the number of all manufacturing contributions. The total amount contributed by these 164 corporations for 1929 was \$1,616,446, or 26.4 per cent of the total amount from the manufacturing industry. This means that the other contributions from manufacturing are accounted for by an indefinite number of corporations that contributed to so few

CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS

TABLE 30

PROPORTION OF CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS FROM
MANUFACTURING CORPORATIONS, FOR EACH
COMMUNITY CHEST, 1929.

Those exceeding general average of 47.2 per cent	Those falling below general average of 47.2 per cent
Rochester, N. H.	46.8
Rome	46.1
Bristol	46.0
Corning	45.8
Pontiac	45.7
Lansing	45.8
Flint	45.6
Warren	45.4
Attleboro	45.4
Worcester	44.4
Pittsfield	44.1
Youngstown	43.2
Saginaw	42.1
New Brighton	42.0
Jamestown	42.0
Schenectady	40.8
Canton	39.5
York	38.1
Kansas City, Kan.	38.0
Reading	38.0
Lancaster	37.7
Hamilton	37.3
South Bend	36.8
Pittsburgh	36.8
Holyoke	36.1
Aurora	35.9
Pawtucket	35.4
Battle Creek	35.4
Spartanburg	35.0
Brockton	34.8
Moline	34.4
Kalamazoo	33.7
Grand Rapids	33.7
Bridgeport	33.6
Springfield, Mass.	33.5
Milwaukee	33.3
Tacoma	33.2
Cleveland	32.6
Detroit	32.5
Plainfield	32.4
Toledo	32.4
Dayton	32.0
Springfield, O.	25.9
Mason City	25.7
Cincinnati	25.7
Syracuse	25.6
St. Louis	25.6
Ft. Wayne	25.1
Indianapolis	24.6
Birmingham	24.6
Port Arthur	24.4
Louisville	24.4
Newark	24.3
Auburn	23.9
Columbus	23.5
St. Paul	23.5
Richmond	23.2
Watertown	22.5
	22.3
	20.6
	20.6
	20.6
	20.0
	19.2
	19.0
	18.2
	16.6
	16.1
	15.1
	9.6
	8.2
	7.6
	6.1

TABLE 31

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM 164 MANUFACTURING CORPORATIONS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE IN COMPARISON WITH TOTAL MANUFACTURING CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS REPORTED BY ALL COMMUNITY CHESTS STUDIED, 1925-1929.

Year	Total manufacturing corporation contributions		Contributions from 164 national manufacturing corporations		Per cent of total manufacturing corporation contributions from 164 national manufacturing corporations	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
1925	9,774	\$4,504,507	1,301	\$1,143,922	13.3	25.4
1926	11,690	5,209,158	1,687	1,335,675	14.4	25.6
1927	13,354	5,892,997	1,899	1,487,991	14.2	25.3
1928	13,988	5,855,334	2,101	1,559,793	15.0	26.6
1929	14,794	6,112,576	2,255	1,616,446	15.2	26.4

community chests in any year as not to be confronted with the problem here under consideration.

Table 31 shows the number, amount, and per cent of all manufacturing corporations accounted for by these 164 manufacturing corporations. It should be kept in mind, of course, that just as the number of community chests has increased each year so there would be new corporations appearing in the list of contributors each year. This is explained by the fact that a nationally operating corporation might not appear as a contributor to a community chest until a branch was organized in the chest city, or until a chest was organized in the city in which that particular nationally operating corporation had a manufacturing plant or some distributing business.

The degree of centralization varies with different branches of the manufacturing industry. Taking these 164 national corporations as a group, the sub-divisions of the manufacturing industry in which concerns made the largest number of contributions, are miscellaneous metals and machinery, food, petroleum, chemicals and drugs, and motor vehicles.

CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS

TABLE 32
 NUMBER AND AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO COMMUNITY CHESTS FROM 164
 MANUFACTURING CORPORATIONS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE, GROUPE
 ACCORDING TO CLASS OF PRODUCT MANUFACTURED, TOGETHER WITH
 NUMBER OF CORPORATIONS IN EACH CLASS, 1925-1929.

Product manufactured	Number of corpora- tions	1929		1928		1927		1926		1925	
		Number of contri- butions	Amount of contri- butions								
Food.....	26	459	\$145,084	458	\$139,002	402	\$135,666	301	\$102,695	301	\$86,490
Beverages, liquors, tobacco, etc.	4	40	16,641	46	10,065	43	15,865	39	13,495	30	10,765
Textiles.....	2	32	22,045	27	19,845	25	17,184	23	13,850	18	12,180
Shoes.....	5	105	7,880	95	7,971	81	7,197	72	7,272	56	7,143
Rubber and rubber products.....	5	41	18,815	39	19,738	40	14,753	36	16,930	25	12,562
Lumber and wood products.....	2	15	14,375	11	8,838	11	6,325	9	6,650	7	1,410
Paper and related products.....	4	40	20,435	33	19,200	26	15,646	25	13,854	16	11,025
Printing and publishing.....
Petroleum refining and rel. prod.....	21	331	102,535	293	174,372	263	198,560	213	175,204	152	113,980
Chemicals, drugs, etc.....	16	212	162,538	196	161,165	181	159,260	182	121,362	126	146,876
Stone, clay and glass.....	6	49	24,930	49	21,225	45	20,985	42	16,915	34	14,400
Manufacturers of metal iron and steel works.....	13	88	221,341	88	184,659	81	176,367	77	172,213	55	159,331
Motor vehicles.....	15	202	242,564	184	478,390	161	406,782	140	371,321	103	317,608
Misc. metals, machinery, etc.....	32	510	287,898	477	272,868	446	278,566	388	272,953	308	225,793
Miscellaneous manufacturing.....	13	112	59,385	105	35,745	94	34,835	89	30,961	70	24,360
Total.....	164	2,255	\$1,616,446	2,101	\$1,559,793	1,899	\$1,487,991	1,687	\$1,335,675	1,301	\$1,143,922

CONTRIBUTIONS BY CHIEF INDUSTRIES 151

TABLE 33

NUMBER OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND AMOUNT CONTRIBUTED TO COMMUNITY CHESTS BY EACH OF 45 MANUFACTURING CORPORATIONS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE, 1929.

Corporation	Amount of contributions	Number of contributions
Largest 3 *	\$374,021	186
4th largest	41,005	6
5th largest	39,000	5
6th largest	37,200	7
7th largest	32,950	15
8th largest	32,125	11
9th largest	31,875	4
10th largest	29,305	8
11th largest	26,928	48
12th largest	26,300	7
13th largest	25,565	8
14th largest	24,745	20
15th largest	23,300	21
16th largest	22,875	5
17th largest	22,800	28
18th largest	21,375	18
19th largest	18,975	11
20th largest	18,529	5
21st largest	18,223	5
22nd largest	18,100	21
23rd largest	17,864	56
24th largest	17,050	4
25th largest	16,875	19
26th largest	16,640	39
27th largest	16,175	11
28th largest	16,150	42
29th largest	13,400	11
30th largest	13,250	6
31st largest	13,115	11
32nd largest	12,785	50
33rd largest	12,725	16
34th largest	12,490	86
35th largest	12,385	6
36th largest	11,750	8
37th largest	11,669	32
38th largest	11,635	30
39th largest	11,200	5
40th largest	11,118	40
41st largest	11,100	7
42nd largest	10,880	39
43rd largest	10,705	30
44th largest	10,525	3
45th largest	10,306	34

*Combined to eliminate the possibility of identification.

Table 32 classifies these 164 nationally known and operating manufacturing corporations according to their principal line of business and shows the number of contributions and total amount contributed by each to community chests in each year from 1925 to 1929, inclusive.

Table 33 shows the contributions credited to each of 45 nationally organized manufacturing corporations found contributing the largest sums to community chests for 1929. Whether these figures indicate a situation perilous for the future support of community chests is a question which can be answered only by a fuller analysis than it has been feasible for the National Bureau to make.

How National Manufacturing Corporations Endeavor to Systematize Contributions to Community Chests

Of the 14,794 contributions made to community chests by manufacturing corporations in 1929, 2,255 have been shown in Table 33 to have come from 164 nationally known concerns. These average between 13 and 14 contributions each. Closer examination of their contributions to community chests, however, shows that the number of community chests to which a single corporation in this group of 164 contributed in 1929 ranged from 3 to 99. Taking the 45 nationally known manufacturing corporations that contributed the largest amounts to community chests for 1929, it is found that 28 of them contributed to 10 or more chests; that 19 contributed to 20 or more; and that 5 contributed to 50 or more. It is apparent then, that for a number of large nationally known manufacturing corporations there exists a special problem growing out of the extension of the community chest plan to 325 American cities and towns. That problem is how to determine which community chests out of those asking for contributions shall receive any contribution, and how much shall be contributed to each one recognized as having a justifiable claim on the corporation. It is obvious that the corporation faced with this problem will seek for some principle which will help it to decide the question. As far as the National Bureau has been able to learn by inquiry among leading nationally known manufacturing corporations in different lines, no company has succeeded in evolving a formula which automatically tells how much the corporation is justified in contributing to a particular charity. One fairly

broad principle, however, seems to be relied upon. The principle is that contributions are made only to charitable organizations carrying on work which can reasonably be assumed to be in the nature of a direct service to the company's employes. Such services are recognized as of benefit to the corporation's stockholders. Notwithstanding the increasing liberality in the interpretation by corporations of their responsibilities to the communities in which they do business, many of the largest manufacturing concerns in the country still require that their policy as to charitable contributions shall be in harmony with this somewhat limiting principle. In a number of corporations this principle is laid down in a carefully prepared opinion by corporation counsel. From the standpoint of the manufacturing corporation with interests in many places, the advantage of using service to employes as a criterion of the extent of corporation responsibility for the support of charitable work in a given community is that the charitable organization asking for a contribution can always be required to show in what way and to what extent its work is of benefit to the stockholders of that corporation.

However, something more than a general principle is required satisfactorily to handle the problem of contributions to community welfare organizations in the case of such corporations. Equally necessary is a *system* for handling the large number of charitable requests received. Few of the nationally known manufacturing corporations studied leave any considerable discretion to branch factory superintendents or district managers in respect to charitable contributions. One of the largest corporations in the United States permits presidents of subsidiary companies to make charitable contributions up to \$100. Any request for more than \$100 must be referred to the head office of the parent company. In other companies, the limit of local expenditures on any single charitable contribution is \$25. The reasons actuating this policy are the following: In the first place, head office officials and the directors are aware of the pressure that can be brought upon a local manager by those interested in getting contributions. More will be said about this pressure later on. In the second place, decisions as to charitable contributions often involve qualifications and knowledge outside the realm of specialized technique in which the local factory superintendent ordinarily functions. Finally, charitable contributions in one place in which the corporation carries on business need to be related logically to contributions in many other places.

Only a central authority can see all the parts in relation to the whole.

What, then, is the method by which requests for charitable contributions originating in many localities are decided upon by the central office officials? The system followed by most large manufacturing concerns envisages a carefully established, systematically administered, annual budget of charitable contributions. The method followed in several concerns is somewhat as follows: Toward the end of the fiscal year managers of subsidiary companies or branch factories and wholesale warehouse organizations are asked to send in to the head office a list of all charitable contributions which, in the opinion of the local representatives, should be authorized for the ensuing year. In some corporations where charitable contributions have been on a fairly large scale for a number of years, the head office prepares a tentative budget for each local branch, based on previous contributions, and sends that list to the local people for their consideration. Under either method, the various local contributions that are favorably recommended are assembled in the budget in the central office. In some corporations this budget, after having been carefully gone over by a committee of the central office executives concerned with production, sales, public relations, etc., is referred to a committee of the board of directors. In other corporations the matter of contributions does not apparently receive any formal consideration on the part of the board, but is left to the president to decide. Whatever the method followed, all requests for charitable contributions usually come to one official charged with the duty of passing on contributions within the general framework of the established budget and the general principle above enunciated. Some corporations have a rule not to authorize a contribution to a charitable organization that has not been foresighted enough to get the request into the hands of local representatives in time for inclusion in the total corporation budget.

In most of the national corporations studied, there seems to be no tendency to make the budget for the year a hard and fast one which cannot be exceeded in case of requests being received later which have special merit. Corporations recognize that emergencies may arise to which the corporation will wish to contribute and the size of the contribution will have to be determined by the central office in the light of circumstances. Red Cross disaster appeals are cases in point.

Factors Determining Amounts Contributed to Community Chests by Nationally Known Manufacturing Corporations

The foregoing outlines the system in operation in typical nationally known corporations for handling requests from community chests for contributions. How is the amount to be contributed actually decided? In other words, how is the principle of service to employes applied in practice? The first question a corporation with interests in a number of community chest cities must answer is this: Is the corporation justified in contributing to this particular community chest at all? The answer to this question depends upon an affirmative answer to another question: Are the employes of this corporation in that particular city served by the organizations that receive funds through the community chest?

Most nationally known manufacturing corporations seem to apply the foregoing principle with considerable liberality. The larger the number of employes in a place, the more likelihood there is that some of them will at one time or another have to call upon organizations participating in the community chest for service. Among those ready to give medical service are the hospitals, the anti-tuberculosis and other specialized clinics. In many cities both the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A. conduct clubs and classes of special interest to the employes of industrial plants. The family welfare or charity organization society often constitutes the chief bulwark for many wage earning families in the event of unemployment.

Basing the decision as to contributions on the extent of actual or potential service to employes immediately raises the question whether the nationally known manufacturing corporation is justified in contributing to a community chest in a city in which it has only a sales office, with a sales manager and a few office employes at work.

Several of the national manufacturing corporations consulted have said that in such places no benefit to stockholders growing out of service to the corporation's employes can be shown, and therefore the corporation should not be expected to contribute. Officials of certain large national manufacturing corporations claim that in some cities community chests refuse to acquiesce in this view of the situation and bring pressure to bear upon the corporation to get it to contribute. In a few cases it has been stated that this pressure takes the form of a veiled threat to have business withheld from the corporation. There is no evidence either that community

chests in general practice this method or that the officials of the community chests tolerate the practice when they know about it. What probably happens is that over-enthusiastic campaign workers—and among these may be business men occupying positions of great influence in the community—attempt to apply this form of pressure in their eagerness to see the required sum of money speedily subscribed to the community chest. It must be plain that such a practice would in the long run do harm to community chests. The fact that differences of opinion exist between community chest boards and the officials of nationally known manufacturing corporations as to the responsibility of the corporation to support organized community welfare work in places where only sales offices are maintained, suggests the importance of clearer definition of the principles underlying corporation responsibility in this respect.

The contention that the corporation represented in a particular place only by a sales office draws profits from that community and ought therefore to put some of its profits back into the community welfare services, receives little sympathetic response from corporation directors and officials. These latter reply that business, when conducted on the right basis, is an exchange of values and the community in the long run is as much the beneficiary of sales made by the corporation in that community as the corporation is. Whatever the merits of this argument, the fact as disclosed by inquiry among typical national manufacturing corporations appears to be that only in exceptional cases do they contribute to community chests in places where only a sales office is maintained.

Besides sales offices such as those just referred to, a typical nationally known manufacturing corporation may be represented in community chest cities by either or both of two types of industrial organization: (a) manufacturing plants, (b) wholesale distributing plants. These latter frequently involve some kind of manufacturing, such as assembling or packaging. The exact nature of the organization and the character and extent of the employe personnel will of course vary from one line of manufacturing to another. In practically all cases, however, the labor employed in manufacturing or wholesale distribution will include many persons employed on a wage rather than a salary basis. These are the individuals most subject to the hazards of accident, sickness and unemployment. They are the persons likely to need the services of public health or relief agencies such as are included in

practically all community chests covered by this study. Service by community chest member organizations to such employes would be considered by the corporation as a benefit to its stockholders.

In places where manufacturing or wholesale distributing is carried on, the problem of the corporation resolves itself into determining how much shall be contributed to the community chest in that particular city. In general, manufacturing corporations endeavor to fix the amount of the contribution in relation to the number of wage earners employed. On the other hand, it is doubtful if any corporation has succeeded in applying this principle consistently. The amount contributed by a corporation will be determined by several factors. One of these is the relative financial need of different community chests. In cities of approximately the same size, the amounts needed by the community chest will not be the same. Analysis of the community chest budgets in the cities studied shows wide variation in the amount raised on a per capita basis. Corporations, like individuals, will endeavor to find out approximately how much is being contributed by other concerns of approximately their own importance in the community when volume of business, number of employes and payroll are taken into account.

The fact that corporations in general endeavor to apply the principle of service to employes as the basis for contributions to community chests does not mean that they require charitable organizations to submit to them records showing services actually rendered to their employes. In general, manufacturing corporations appear to feel justified in contributing to community chests if the type of service rendered by any charitable organization in the community chest is of a kind likely to be utilized by the corporation's employes in case of necessity. For example, the incidence of sickness among the employes of a certain corporation in a given year in a particular community might be exceedingly low because of the favorable working conditions. Nevertheless, the fact that sickness is always to be reckoned with as something that may disable an employe of that concern at any moment justifies it in contributing to the community chest. The employes of a corporation in a particular community chest city may have been very fortunate in respect to steady employment over a number of years, and the corporation may be so managed and its business of such a character that there is relatively little seasonal unemployment. A corporation in this fortunate situation would not for that reason feel that it

was exempted from contributing to the local community chest which in times of stress would, through its constituent organizations, act to alleviate the suffering due to unemployment.

There are, however, a few corporations that prefer to contribute directly to hospitals and certain other charitable organizations participating in community chests rather than to the community chest itself. Corporations following this practice do so because they wish their records to show that the money has actually gone to an organization rendering direct service to the employes of the corporation. One leading manufacturing corporation with plants in several cities subscribes to the community chest in the regular way but pays the subscription in four checks of equal amounts, made out to charitable organizations participating in the chest. These four organizations are regarded by the corporation as rendering services to employes constituting a direct benefit to the stockholders. This practice is exceptional, but it embodies a point of view expressed by other corporations which nevertheless continue to make payment of their subscriptions direct to the community chest. In several corporations, the objection is voiced that practically every chest includes as participants charitable organizations to which the corporation would not feel justified in contributing if the appeal came directly from that organization and not from the community chest.

The foregoing discussion would indicate that the amounts contributed by any single nationally known manufacturing corporation vary considerably as between different community chests, in accordance with the difference in the degree of responsibility felt by the corporation for the support of organized community welfare services in those different communities. This statement finds confirmation in records which have been made by the National Bureau of the contributions by a number of selected national manufacturing corporations. The records for sixteen of the largest manufacturing contributors to the 129 community chests included in this study have been analyzed. Table 34 summarizes the contributions of different size made by these sixteen nationally known manufacturing corporations.

This table will repay close study because of the light the figures shed upon the application in practice of the principle of service to employes.

For Corporation Number One, 84.6 per cent of the total amount contributed in 1929 to 99 community chests is represented

TABLE 34
DISTRIBUTION, BY SIZE, OF NUMBER AND AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO COMMUNITY CHESTS BY 16 SELECTED NATIONALLY KNOWN MANUFACTURING CORPORATIONS, 1929.

Size of contribution	Corporation Number One			Corporation Number Two			Corporation Number Three			Corporation Number Four			Corporation Number Five		
	Num-ber	Amount	Per cent of amount	Num-ber	Amount	Per cent of amount	Num-ber	Amount	Per cent of amount	Num-ber	Amount	Per cent of amount	Num-ber	Amount	Per cent of amount
\$ 25	2	25	*	1	25	...	7	175	...	1	25	...	1	15	...
50	10	265	1	1	50	...	8	425	1.7	5	100	...	5	143	1.5
100	46	1,710	1.7	5	500	1	6	910	1.5	1	100	...	6	325	1.2
150	25	2,500	1.0	7	700	2.5	8	1,200	2.0	1	100	...	12	1,245	4.6
200	1	150	...	1	150	...	2	300	...	2	200	...	6	900	3.3
250	3	600	...	1	200	...	4	865	1.4	2	500	...	2	400	1.5
300	2	500	...	2	300	...	7	1,250	2.0	2	500	...	2	500	1.9
350	3	900	1.2	4	1,200	2.0	2	500	...	2	300	1.1
400	...	400	10	6,200	10.1	3	1,300	3.9	1	400	1.5
450	6	3,000	1.3	4	2,151	2.9	10	6,200	10.1	3	1,300	3.9	1	400	1.5
500	1	3,000	...	5	5,000	6.8	2	2,500	4.1	3	3,875	11.8	2	2,700	10.0
1,000	5	5,800	2.4	3	12,370	16.9	1	5,000	15.2	2	4,500	16.7
2,000	...	6,000	...	1	4,500	6.1	1	4,000	6.5	1	5,000	15.2
3,000	2	6,000	2.5	3	47,000	64.1	1	16,000	26.1	1	21,000	63.7
4,000	...	16,000	6.7	3	27,500	44.9
5,000	3	202,500	84.6	3	47,000	64.1	1	15,000	23.5	1	10,000	46.8	2	12,500	46.4
10,000 and over	6	202,500	84.6	3	47,000	64.1	1	15,000	23.5	1	10,000	46.8	2	12,500	46.4
Total	99	\$ 239,450	100.0	32	\$ 73,346	100.0	58	\$ 61,225	100.0	15	\$ 32,950	100.0	48	\$ 26,928	100.0

Size of contribution	Corporation Number Six			Corporation Number Seven			Corporation Number Eight			Corporation Number Nine			Corporation Number Ten		
	Num-ber	Amount	Per cent of amount	Num-ber	Amount	Per cent of amount	Num-ber	Amount	Per cent of amount	Num-ber	Amount	Per cent of amount	Num-ber	Amount	Per cent of amount
\$ 25	2	50	...	3	75	...	4	100	...	1	25	...	4	100	...
50	6	325	1.3	3	150	1.6	3	150	2.7	4	200	...	8	400	2.2
100	2	200	...	3	300	1.3	6	600	2.6	10	1,050	...	10	1,050	5.9
150	199	150	...	1	150	2	150	...	2	300	1.7
200	249	200	6	1,200	5.3	2	400	1.9	6	1,800	10.1
250	299	250	...	3	750	3.2	3	750	3.3	2	400	1.9	5	1,250	7.0
300	399	300	...	1	300	2	600	2.8	5	1,550	8.7
400	499	400	3	1,500	6.6	6	3,450	16.1	3	1,200	6.7
500	999	500	...	3	1,825	7.8	3	1,500	6.6	6	3,450	16.1	5	2,714	15.2
1,000	1,999	1,000	...	1	1,000	4.3	1	1,000	4.4	4	4,250	19.9	3	3,000	18.8
2,000	2,999	2,000	1	2,500	11.0	1	2,500	11.7	2	4,500	25.2
3,000	3,999	3,000
4,000	4,999	4,000
5,000	9,999	5,000	...	3	18,750	80.5	1	15,000	65.8	1	10,000	46.8
10,000 and over	1	15,000	60.6	3	18,750	80.5	1	15,000	65.8	1	10,000	46.8
Total	20	\$ 24,745	100.0	21	\$ 23,300	100.0	28	\$ 22,800	100.0	18	\$ 21,375	100.0	56	\$ 17,864	100.0

*Less than one-tenth of one per cent.

CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS

TABLE 34—Concluded

Size of contribution	Corporation Number Eleven			Corporation Number Twelve			Corporation Number Thirteen		
	Number	Amount	Per cent of amount	Number	Amount	Per cent of amount	Number	Amount	Per cent of amount
\$ 25 Under \$ 25
25 — 49	10	\$ 255	1.5	4	\$ 1006
50 — 99	1	50	.3	17	935	5.6	7	350	2.2
100 — 149	5	500	3.0	5	500	3.0	14	1,400	8.7
150 — 199	6	925	5.5	1	150	.9	2	300	1.9
200 — 249	4	800	4.7	2	400	2.4	3	600	3.7
250 — 299	1	250	1.5
300 — 399	1	350	2.1	2	650	4.0
400 — 499	1	400	2.4
500 — 999	1	750	4.4	2	1,500	9.0	4	2,000	12.4
1,000 — 1,999	3	3,000	18.6
2,000 — 2,999	1	2,500	15.5
3,000 — 3,999
4,000 — 4,999
5,000 — 9,999	1	5,000	31.0
10,000 and over	1	13,500	80.0	1	12,500	75.1
Total	19	\$ 16,875	100.0	39	\$ 16,640	100.0	42	\$ 16,150	100.0

Size of contribution	Corporation Number Fourteen			Corporation Number Fifteen			Corporation Number Sixteen		
	Number	Amount	Per cent of amount	Number	Amount	Per cent of amount	Number	Amount	Per cent of amount
\$ 25 Under \$ 25
25 — 49	5	\$ 125	1.0	9	\$ 225	1.8	11	\$ 275	2.5
50 — 99	5	300	2.3	44	2,490	19.8	7	375	3.4
100 — 149	20	2,035	15.9	17	1,700	13.5	11	1,180	10.8
150 — 199	5	775	6.1	2	325	2.6
200 — 249	5	1,000	7.8	6	1,200	9.5	1	200	1.8
250 — 299	1	250	2.0	3	750	6.0	1	250	2.3
300 — 399	1	300	2.3	1	300	2.4
400 — 499	2	800	6.3
500 — 999	2	1,000	7.8	3	1,600	12.7	2	1,100	10.1
1,000 — 1,999	2	2,000	15.6	5	5,500	50.6
2,000 — 2,999	2	4,200	32.9	1	2,000	18.4
3,000 — 3,999
4,000 — 4,999	1	4,000	31.8
5,000 — 9,999
10,000 and over
Total	50	\$ 12,785	100.0	86	\$ 12,590	100.0	39	\$ 10,880	100.0

by six contributions. Analysis shows that these six contributions ranged from \$12,000 to \$85,000, and that they were made to community chests in cities in which the largest manufacturing plants of the corporation are located. At the other end of the scale of contributions for this corporation it will be seen that 70 contributions of less than \$150 account for only 1.8 per cent of the total. In these cities the corporation is represented by wholesale and "servicing" activities. In a few of them the corporation is represented, as far as could be learned, only by a sales branch.

From Corporation Number Two, thirty-two of the 129 community chests studied received contributions for 1929 totaling \$73,346. The largest three of these contributions accounted for 64.1 per cent of the total, and the smallest 14 contributions, ranging in amount from \$25 to \$399, accounted for only 3.2 per cent of the

total. In the places in which the 3 largest contributions were made the corporation carries on extensive manufacturing. In the places in which the 14 smaller contributions were made the corporation, through its subsidiaries, maintains wholesale stocks of considerable importance.

Corporation Number Five is engaged in the manufacture of supplies and equipment purchased by contractors for installation by them in office and apartment buildings and dwellings. The corporation distributes its products through a number of regional warehouses. Display rooms are maintained in several cities. Manufacturing plants are situated in 12 of the 129 community chest cities included in this study. The total amount contributed by the corporation to these 12 community chests for 1929 equalled 84.3 per cent of the total. These contributions ranged in size from \$500 to \$7,500. The other 36 contributions, ranging in size from \$15 to \$400 were made to community chests in places where wholesale distributing (i. e. selling to installing contractors) constitute the chief activity of the corporation.

In the case of Corporation Number Nine, 46.8 per cent of the total contributed went to one community chest. It is in a city where the corporation maintains one of its most important petroleum refineries. Eleven contributions of between \$500 and \$2,999 account of 47.7 per cent of the total. These are cities in which bulk oil and gasoline storage and distribution are carried on on a large scale.

Corporation Number Ten shows no contribution of over \$2,500 to any of the community chests included in this study. Ten contributions varying in size from \$500 to \$2,500 account for 57.2 per cent of the total. The largest manufacturing plant of this company, however, is not situated in a community chest city, and the amount contributed to charitable organizations in that city, is, therefore, not known by the National Bureau. Another important manufacturing plant is situated in a community chest city which did not submit data for this study. Inquiry brings out that the two largest contributions (\$2,500 and \$2,000) were made to community chests in cities in which important manufacturing activities are carried on. The city in which the larger of these two contributions was made is also an important wholesale distribution center for the corporation. Eight contributions ranging in size from \$500 to \$1,000 were to community chests in cities where, with one exception, the corporation's chief

interest is in wholesale distribution to contractors installing its product. In the case of the one city referred to, while both manufacturing and wholesale distribution are carried on, the city is, from the standpoint of the company, less important as a manufacturing center than as a point for the wholesale distribution of its product. In all of these cities the corporation employs varying numbers of wage earners who might occasionally be served by organizations participating in the local chest. The other 46 contributions ranging in size from \$25 to \$400 account for 42.8 per cent of the total. From the information available it is not possible to say with certainty that contributions were made only in cities where some warehousing (involving possibly some light manufacturing) is carried on. Judging from the location of the 12 cities in which contributions of \$25 or \$50 were made, they would in all probability be places where stocks of the company's product would be carried. This corporation was one of those emphasizing that contributions were ordinarily made only on the basis of some direct service to employes.

Corporation number Sixteen is a large packer of meats. Its principal slaughtering establishment is not in a community chest city. Four contributions of \$1,000 each, one of \$1,500 and one of \$2,000 are the largest of 39. Together these six account for 69.0 per cent of the total. All but one of the six were made to community chests in cities in which some slaughtering is done. Thirty-one contributions ranging in size from \$25 to \$250 account for 21.0 per cent of the total. As far as available information discloses, no manufacturing is carried on in these 31 cities. They are, however, important wholesale distributing points, where large stocks of meats are carried. This concern was one of those which emphasized strongly its unwillingness to contribute in places in which a sales branch with a few traveling salesmen constituted the company's chief activity.

These few examples, selected more or less at random, illustrate the point mentioned above, that in general national manufacturing corporations make their chief contributions in places where large numbers of wage-earners are employed; that they contribute lesser amounts in cities where their chief interest is in wholesale distributing involving warehousing and the reshipment of products; and that only in exceptional cases do they contribute to community chests in cities where the corporation is represented merely by a sales branch.

II. Trade

(a) Retail chains; (b) Retail and wholesale trade other than chain stores.

Contributions from corporations engaged in both wholesale and retail merchandising account for 22.4 per cent of all the corporation contributions reported by 129 community chests for 1929.

Because of the essentially national character of the retail chain store business, a separate classification has been made of contributions from such corporations.

Unfortunately it has not proved feasible separately to tabulate contributions from retail corporations that are purely local in operation. The retail concern, especially when locally owned and depending for its profits on one community, is particularly susceptible to influence when it comes to charitable contributions. Local good-will and the friendship of small but organized groups in a community are of great importance to the retail department store. This may be one reason why the department stores are shown by the data to be among the large contributors to community chests. It would doubtless be of significance to compare the amounts received in contributions from locally owned and operated retail establishments as a group and nationally known and operating retail chains. However, on the original schedules sent in by community chests, it was noted that many contributing corporations were indicated as being engaged in both wholesale and retail trade. It was found impracticable, therefore, to make a separate classification for retail concerns other than chain stores which are engaged exclusively in retail trade. For this reason, while contributions from retail chain store corporations have been separately classified, those from other retail and wholesale trade corporations are combined.

IIa. Retail Chain Store Corporations

In this section the term "chain store corporation" is used in a somewhat limited sense. Purely local chains have been classified under IIb, "retail and wholesale trade", and only those contributions reported from corporations having fifteen or more retail outlets operating under the name of the parent corporation in fifteen or more cities have been included under the present heading. The local chain concern operating in one or a few cities has a problem no different from that of the great majority of local manufacturing

or retail establishments, insofar as the community chest is concerned. The local chain, regardless of the number of stores, is called upon to contribute to but one community chest. Since it is desired to focus attention in this section on those chain store corporations that are called upon to contribute to many community chests, it has seemed desirable to include only those covered by the definition given above.

Another type of corporation has been excluded from this classification. This is the chain of department stores in which each local unit continues to operate under its own name. Often the local unit maintains its own corporate identity even though stock ownership is vested in a holding corporation. It also appears from inquiry that has been made that in such department store chains, the local unit usually retains authority to decide how much to contribute to the local community chest. This practice seems to justify treating such department store units as local enterprises and excluding their contributions to community chests from a classification primarily concerned with national chain store contributions.

While chain store corporations do not as yet account for more than a small proportion of the total corporation contributions to community chests, the proportion, in respect to both number and amount, has grown steadily in every year since 1920. This is clearly shown in Table 35.

Even when deduction is made of the 34 chain store contributions to the five chests reporting only for 1929, and amounting to \$16,170, the increase for the other 124 chests for 1929 over 1928 is 226 in number, or 18.3 per cent, and \$63,016 in amount, or 21.0 per cent. Only twelve community chests reported smaller chain store contributions for 1929 than for 1928. On the other hand the increases in amount of chain store contributions reported by many community chests for 1929 over 1928 are in many cases more than fifty per cent (see Appendix Table II).

If the 13 community chests that have reported data for the ten years 1920-1929 are taken as a group, the growth in chain store contributions is equally striking. In Table 36 the proportion of total corporation contributions coming from chain stores in different years closely parallels those shown in Table 35 for all chests. While the amount received by these 13 ten-year chests for 1929 is two and three-quarters times the amount reported for 1920, the number of contributions in 1929 is three and a half times

TABLE 35

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM CHAIN STORE CORPORATIONS, TO ALL COMMUNITY CHESTS STUDIED, 1920-1929.

Year	Number of chests	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from chain store corporations	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from chain store corporations	Number of contributions from chain store corporations	Per cent of total number of corporation contributions from chain store corporations
1920	13	\$ 2,535,819	\$ 24,647	1.0	47	1.8
1921	22	2,815,983	30,248	1.1	93	2.0
1922	29	3,134,134	40,098	1.3	139	2.1
1923	49	4,975,961	70,318	1.4	256	2.4
1924	73	7,711,208	123,623	1.6	437	2.5
1925	94	9,042,012	161,541	1.8	622	2.8
1926	109	10,757,339	225,233	2.1	844	3.2
1927	119	12,015,222	257,409	2.1	1,018	3.4
1928	124	12,265,850	300,079	2.4	1,233	3.9
1929	129	12,954,769	379,265	2.9	1,493	4.4

the number in 1920. Reference to the summary tables (Appendix Table II) shows that all of these thirteen older chests have enjoyed an increase in the number of chain store contributions.

To the question, has the growth in number and amount of chain store contributions been at the expense of contributions to community chests from purely local retail corporations, no satisfactory answer can be given. For reasons given in the preceding section it has not been feasible to separate local retail contributions from wholesale. The data submitted in the following section show that there has been an increase in number and amount of contributions from the wholesale and retail group (exclusive of chain stores) but the growth has not been as pronounced.

When the term "chain store" is used, the average person naturally thinks of a group of concerns engaged in various kinds of retail merchandising, and maintaining retail stores in a large number of cities the country over. A person familiar with the

CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS

TABLE 36

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM CHAIN STORE CORPORATIONS, TO 13 COMMUNITY CHESTS REPORTING FOR EACH YEAR, 1920-1929.

Year	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from chain store corporations	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from chain store corporations	Number of contributions from chain store corporations	Per cent of total number of corporation contributions from chain store corporations
1920	\$2,535,819	\$24,647	1.0	47	1.8
1921	2,226,826	18,758	.8	54	1.6
1922	2,047,300	22,260	1.1	60	1.6
1923	2,238,545	24,654	1.1	76	1.9
1924	2,305,172	28,505	1.2	89	2.1
1925	2,319,690	32,950	1.4	101	2.2
1926	2,413,031	38,485	1.6	113	2.5
1927	2,608,317	42,450	1.6	127	2.5
1928	2,756,182	54,836	2.0	151	3.0
1929	2,799,192	67,305	2.4	164	3.2

chain store industry would perhaps be able to name from memory fifty such corporations. The average person would probably not be able to name more than twenty. For the purpose of this study, a list of thirty-four has been prepared. These are the chain store concerns whose names, if stated, would be familiar to most readers.

The question to be answered is this: How many of the contributions from all chain store corporations, and how much of the total chain store contributions to community chests for 1929 came from these thirty-four nationally known chain corporations?

Table 37 answers this question. Figures for the years 1925, 1926, 1927 and 1928 are also shown, for comparative purposes. In 1925, it may be seen that the thirty-four national chains made 363 contributions amounting to \$112,948. By 1929 the number of contributions had grown to 957 and the amount to \$279,427. The increase in number and amount of contributions by these thirty-

TABLE 37

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM 34 CHAIN STORES OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE IN COMPARISON WITH TOTAL CHAIN STORE CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS REPORTED BY ALL COMMUNITY CHESTS STUDIED, 1925-1929.

Year	Total chain store corporation contributions		Contributions from 34 national chain store corporations		Per cent of total chain store corporation contributions from 34 national chain store corporations	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
1925	622	\$161,541	363	\$112,948	58.4	69.9
1926	844	225,233	502	155,022	59.5	68.8
1927	1,018	257,409	638	185,087	62.7	71.9
1928	1,233	300,079	775	224,025	62.9	74.7
1929	1,493	379,265	957	279,427	64.1	73.7

four corporations from 1925 to 1929 is explained by the fact that each succeeding year saw the organization of community chests in cities in which those concerns were already doing business, as well as by the fact that the amount of business done by these corporations and the number of stores operated by them had increased. More significance may be attached to the data of per cent of chain store gifts coming from the chains of national importance. These larger organizations, in 1925, gave 58.4 per cent of the number of gifts from all chains and 69.9 per cent of the amount. In 1929 these thirty-four concerns accounted for 64.1 per cent of the number of contributions and 73.7 per cent, nearly three-quarters, of all money given by chain stores.

In Table 38 the number of contributions and the amounts contributed to community chests in each of the years 1925-1929 inclusive by these thirty-four national chain store corporations, are shown. This table indicates that approximately fifty per cent of all the chain store contributions reported for 1929 (Table 35) came from 7 corporations.

In respect to contributions to community chests, chain store corporations have a different problem from that of national manufacturing concerns. Unlike the latter, the chain store does not

TABLE 38

NUMBER AND AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO COMMUNITY CHESTS FROM EACH OF 34 CHAIN STORE CORPORATIONS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE, 1925-1929.

Corporation	1929		1928		1927		1926		1925	
	Number of contributions	Amount of contributions								
1 and 2*	185	\$ 82,075	143	\$ 68,155	117	\$ 46,967	105	\$ 38,591	83	\$ 27,189
3	71	34,322	68	31,050	68	29,477	62	26,571	51	23,130
4	47	28,220	42	22,140	36	20,450	29	18,890	24	13,735
5	89	19,850	80	15,295	67	12,145	41	7,525	26	4,831
6	29	17,350	6	13,050	5	12,250	5	11,750	4	9,350
7	27	14,950	23	7,655	20	6,560	12	5,715	8	1,645
8	4	7,100	4	6,850	4	6,250	3	4,400	2	3,750
9	14	6,700	14	6,700	14	6,800	13	6,600	9	3,675
10	9	6,650	6	6,150	6	6,150	5	5,900	3	5,300
11	45	6,257	39	4,728	35	4,425	30	3,985	22	2,820
12	41	6,165	33	5,182	28	3,030	23	2,195	12	1,240
13	6	5,950	6	2,275	5	1,225	2	125		
14	32	5,610	29	4,511	25	4,090	20	2,910	13	2,235
15	56	4,450	50	4,160	43	3,710	29	1,910	22	1,635
16	8	4,215	10	4,405	7	3,780	6	2,115	3	1,550
17	33	4,090	28	2,235	15	1,125	16	1,125	11	675
18	32	3,743	26	3,150	23	3,330	17	2,765	10	860
19	3	2,600	2	2,100	2	2,100	2	1,950	1	1,850
20	22	2,450	20	2,250	7	1,400	3	1,125	3	70
21	4	2,300	4	2,225	3	2,375	4	2,975	4	3,075
22	3	2,100	2	1,750	1	750	1	750	1	750
23	37	1,620	34	1,428	35	1,565	25	1,115	16	803
24	9	1,540	6	1,700	6	1,290	5	1,305	2	350
25	9	1,450	5	850	6	900	3	400	2	300
26	25	1,300	11	325	2	50
27	24	1,160	21	1,000	15	580	14	715	14	810
28	13	1,005	5	300	6	650	6	500	5	625
29	15	940	6	261	5	215	2	70
30	20	905	17	605	12	481	8	350	6	225
31	14	510	12	410	7	215	2	75	1	25
32	9	585	7	440	3	215	2	420	2	370
33	10	450	8	210	6	187	3	75	1	25
34	12	815	8	480	6	400	2	75	2	50
Total	957	\$279,427	775	\$224,025	638	\$185,087	502	\$155,022	363	\$112,948

*Combined to eliminate the possibility of identification.

employ large numbers of people in relation to volume of business. Chain store corporations therefore do not think of their relationship to the community chest as one involving a direct benefit to the stockholders by reason of personal service which employes may receive from the social welfare organizations participating in the chest. While, like some of the great national manufacturing corporations discussed in the preceding section, chain store corporations feel an imperious call to systematize contributions to a large number of community chests, their relationship to the chest grows out of a different concern.

The local chain store, as has been amply demonstrated, is dependent on community good will. An attitude of hostility on the part of consumers can seriously affect chain store sales. The leading chain store corporations of the country are conscious of the value of community good will and are increasingly taking measures to enlist that good will in their favor. Inquiry among leading national chain store corporations brings out clearly that they are now actively trying to bring about the most satisfactory possible relations with the communities in which they do business. The chain store executives and directors recognize that anything that makes a community a better place in which to live means in the long run more business to the chain store. As long as the community chest can satisfy the chain store corporation that its efforts make for community betterment, the policy of the leading chain stores, as unequivocally stated by their representatives to the writers of this report, is that they will support community chests.

It must be kept in mind that the chain store industry is a new one. It is just emerging from the period of extensive development. During the past few years consolidations of existing chains, the opening of new stores, and other problems immediately related to the actual business of the chain store, have absorbed the attention of executives. Chain store men have stated that the industry is now entering upon an era of intensive growth. Scientific management looking toward the development of more economical business methods is now receiving attention. Community relations as having a vital bearing on sales is one of the problems to which chain stores are paying more and more attention as a factor in their intensive development. There is evidence that a few old established corporations which formerly ignored the matter of community relationships have recently adopted a more sympathetic attitude. Today the policy of most of the leading concerns is one of active participation in local community affairs. Not only is the chain store corporation contributing money to community chests and other civic institutions, but the local managers are being instructed to take on responsibilities as workers in community activities. The writers have been shown copies of letters from chain store headquarters to their local managers clearly indicating that this personal participation in community life is now a definite part of chain store policy. Chain store corporations express sympathy with the community chest idea. As one chain store executive put it, they are themselves centralized organ-

izations and they understand a movement which, like the community chest, embodies a centralizing tendency in social organization. They admit that the community chest simplifies the problem of charitable giving for the chain store. It will be apparent that the chain store corporation is a prominent target for any and all charitable appeals in the community. The community chest, where it includes the responsible welfare organizations of the community, makes it possible for the chain store corporation to refuse to make contributions to organizations that cannot show a worth-while purpose and program.

As to administrative practice in respect of community chest contributions, national chain store corporations may be grouped in two classes:

- a. Those that authorize the local manager to expend a fixed per cent of the preceding year's gross sales on charitable donations.
- b. Those that allow the local manager discretion to make charitable donations on behalf of the corporation up to a fixed amount, (usually \$25) all requests for larger contributions than \$25 being referred to the headquarters office for decision. In some corporations the district manager is authorized to decide such questions.

Where system (a) is in operation, the local manager is usually authorized to apportion the charitable budget among different organizations applying for contributions. The assumption is that where the local community chest includes most of the local charities, the bulk of the charitable budget will be expended in a contribution to the chest. Where system (b) is in force, the national headquarters office usually has a budget to which local contributions, when authorized, are charged. This budget is usually made up at the beginning of the year and is based on the accounting department's record of charitable contributions made during the previous year. In some cases the head office of the chain store corporation draws the check and sends it to the local manager to be handed by him personally to the community chest. It will be apparent that the object in doing this is to secure for the corporation whatever benefit may accrue from the publicity attendant upon this more formal handing over of the money.

That the basis of chain store contributions is still full of uncertainties is evidenced by the fact that the National Chain Store Association during the early months of 1930 made a study

of the subject for its members. The hope of the National Chain Store Association is that the various factors involved in arriving at the amounts to be contributed to the community chest can be determined, and the relative weights to be given the different factors likewise arrived at. For example, it is pointed out by chain store executives that a uniform per cent of local sales for all national chain store corporations would not meet the situation because of the varying rates of net profit in different branches of the chain store industry. Grocery chains, ready-to-wear chains, drug chains and department store chains, operate on different rates of profit on sales.

The difference in the degree of centralized control exercised by the national chain store corporation over its local branches also determines to some extent the method of handling community chest contributions. Some national chain corporations receive daily reports of sales and expenses from their local branches. Others receive weekly reports. Such corporations can of course leave a fair measure of authority with the local manager in respect to charitable contributions and at the same time have complete control over such contributions by merely scrutinizing periodic expense sheets.

Another factor in the contributions of national chain stores to community chests is undoubtedly the extent to which the local manager participates in profits. In most chain store corporations the local manager's chief income is from his bonus or other form of profit sharing. This means that the local manager has every inducement to keep expenses down to the lowest possible level. Chain store executives admit that the profit-sharing principle may sometimes work to defeat the community relations policy of the corporation because niggardliness on the part of the local manager may be involuntarily encouraged. For this reason the national chain corporations are obliged to oversee carefully the matter of charitable contributions even where the local manager has authority to decide the amount of contributions.

National chain corporation executives admit that their contributions to community chests at present show inconsistencies. That is to say, contributions by a corporation to community chests in cities of approximately the same population and in which the chain corporation does approximately the same volume of business, will vary widely. The basis of a fixed per cent of sales is a "rule of thumb," and most chain corporations treat it as a very flexible rule

in order to enable them to consider local situations on their merits. Chain store executives recognize that the community chest budget in one city may be larger or smaller than in a city of similar size because of variation in the living and employment conditions in different places.

Some chain store executives have expressed doubt as to the wisdom of the present method of solicitation of contributions employed by community chests. As has been pointed out elsewhere in this report, the community chest raises its contribution budget by an intensively organized campaign of a week or ten days' duration. Corporations are usually solicited to make contributions in exactly the same way that individuals are solicited. In other words, some individual solicitor is given the names of corporations which it is hoped will contribute. Some community chests distinguish between corporations which are locally owned and managed and those that are owned and directed out of town. In some cases a special committee is made responsible for getting the contributions from these out-of-town corporations. However, the practice is fairly uniform. The volunteer solicitor approaches the local chain store representative with a request for a contribution. In some cases, as indicated above, the local chain store manager can decide the matter then and there. In other cases, he is obliged to refer the request with his own recommendation to the head office. In any event, charitable contributions will be determined on the basis of net profits even where the amount of the contribution is charged up to advertising or other expenses. The amount of the charitable budget of the chain store corporation will, in most cases, be determined by the net profits of the preceding year. Under the circumstances, some chain store executives wonder why the community chests make their appeal for contributions in one certain week of the year, requiring the expenditure of considerable time and effort on the part of both the volunteer solicitor and the chain store manager, when the matter could perhaps be handled more effectively at the time of the year when the chain store corporation was making up its budget for the current fiscal period. It should be kept in mind that many chain store corporations operate on a budget system for major items of expense as well as for such relatively small items as charitable contributions.

One other point involving the relationship of the national chain stores to the local community chest may be cited in conclusion. As stated, it is now the policy of most leading national chain store

corporations to have their local managers participate actively in local civic affairs. This policy necessarily focuses attention on the extent to which the local manager may possess the qualities that make for effective participation in community activities. Undoubtedly in this respect the local merchant has an advantage. Not only has he grown up in the community and is therefore familiar with most aspects of the community life; not only does he have a wide acquaintance among members of the community; but the very fact that he has had to rely on his own efforts to build up his business has developed qualities of personality that make him an effective participant in community affairs. Chain store corporations admit that in selecting local managers they have looked for those qualities which in their opinion would bring about increased sales and reduced expenses. Usually the reward dangled before the eyes of the local chain store manager for successful administration of the business consigned to him is transfer to some larger place. Community chest officials and directors complain that some chain store managers are as temporary in the town as some preachers, and that an even more serious deprivation to the community than the mere loss of cash contributions is the loss of man-power needed to develop civic projects and thus promote community betterment. Community chests and other civic institutions have not been developed by men and women whose hearts were in other communities. The chain store corporations recognize that if they are to arrive at a satisfactory basis of relationships to the local communities in which they do business, they must not only make it a definite policy to contribute as generously as possible to the support of local activities, but they must also place at the disposal of the communities local managers who can serve as community builders

IIb. Retail and Wholesale Trade, Other than Chain Stores

Table 39 shows that the per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from retail and wholesale trade corporations, other than chain stores, has risen from 18.0 per cent in 1920 to 19.5 per cent in 1929, but that the high point was reached in the year 1923, when wholesale and retail trade contributions accounted for 22.9 per cent of all the corporation contributions to the 49 community chests included. Since 1923, there has been a steady decline in the proportion of corporation contributions coming from wholesale and retail trade concerns.

TABLE 39

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE CORPORATIONS, OTHER THAN CHAIN STORES, TO ALL COMMUNITY CHESTS STUDIED, 1920-1929.

Year	Number of chests	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from retail and wholesale trade corporations other than chain stores	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from retail and wholesale trade corporations other than chain stores	Number of contributions from retail and wholesale trade corporations other than chain stores	Per cent of total number of corporation contributions from retail and wholesale trade corporations other than chain stores
1920	13	\$ 2,535,819	\$ 457,350	18.0	741	27.9
1921	22	2,815,983	597,647	21.2	1,317	28.2
1922	29	3,134,134	673,979	21.5	1,822	27.0
1923	49	4,975,961	1,139,610	22.9	3,122	28.9
1924	73	7,711,208	1,654,429	21.5	4,920	28.6
1925	94	9,042,012	1,982,178	21.9	6,216	28.4
1926	109	10,757,339	2,322,567	21.6	7,353	27.9
1927	119	12,015,222	2,453,117	20.4	8,329	27.5
1928	124	12,265,850	2,455,580	20.0	8,678	27.1
1929	129	12,954,769	2,526,242	19.5	9,073	26.7

If the 326 contributions to 5 community chests reporting only for 1929 and amounting to \$76,017 are deducted, it will be seen that there was an actual loss of \$5,355 in the amount received in contributions from wholesale and retail trade corporations in 1929 over 1928 by the other 124 community chests. As against this net loss in amount there was an increase of 69 in number of contributions to these 124 chests. Reference to the Appendix Table II shows which of the chests lost wholesale and retail trade contributions in 1929 and which gained them.

Taking as a group the 13 community chests that have reported data for the 10-year period covered by the study, a somewhat different situation is disclosed. As Table 40 shows,

TABLE 40

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE CORPORATIONS, OTHER THAN CHAIN STORES, TO 13 COMMUNITY CHESTS REPORTING FOR EACH YEAR, 1920-1929.

Year	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from retail and wholesale trade corporations other than chain stores	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from retail and wholesale trade corporations other than chain stores	Number of contributions from retail and wholesale trade corporations other than chain stores	Per cent of total number of corporation contributions from retail and wholesale trade corporations other than chain stores
1920	\$2,535,819	\$457,350	18.0	741	27.9
1921	2,226,826	439,448	19.7	899	26.9
1922	2,047,300	415,253	20.3	970	26.5
1923	2,238,545	432,412	19.3	1,054	26.8
1924	2,305,172	422,306	18.3	1,125	26.3
1925	2,319,690	425,251	18.3	1,158	25.4
1926	2,413,031	436,441	18.1	1,160	25.3
1927	2,608,317	457,137	17.5	1,236	24.7
1928	2,756,182	459,479	16.7	1,211	24.1
1929	2,799,192	473,808	16.9	1,233	24.0

these 13 community chests have together gained 492 contributions from the wholesale and retail trade corporations or 66.4 per cent. The amount, however, has increased in 10 years only \$16,458 or 3.6 per cent. On the other hand, after reaching a low level in 1922, contributions from this group of corporations have increased steadily each year with the exception of a recession in 1924. The data in Appendix Table II for the 13 ten-year community chests will repay study by those seeking to discover possible trends in contributions to community chests by this particular group of corporations.

III. Finance

In this section will be discussed data as to corporation contributions by three groups of finance concerns, as follows:—

- (a) Banks and trust companies,
- (b) Insurance companies,
- (c) Other finance companies.

IIIa. Banks and Trusts Companies

The increasing importance of banks and trust companies in the financial support of community chests is clearly shown in Table 41 which indicates that the per cent of the total amount of corporation contributions from banks and trust companies has risen from 6.1 per cent for 1920, when there were only 13 community chests, to 10.7 per cent for 1929, when 129 community chests reported.

The 5 community chests that reported only for 1929 together account for 50 bank and trust contributions, totalling \$41,583. If allowance is made for these contributions, it appears that the net increase over 1928 for the 124 community chests was \$40,082, or 3.1 per cent, in amount, and 24 in number, or 2.6 per cent.

Reference to the city tables (Appendix Table II) shows that for most of the community chests reporting for both 1928 and 1929, the banks and trust company contributions seem to be fairly stationary. In some cities, the decreases may be the result of consolidations of local banks. On the other hand, the increases, both in number and amount, of bank and trust company contributions shown by a number of cities, must be taken as indicating a change in attitude on the part of local banking institutions towards contributions to the community chests.

Since the banking field has not been characterized by a high rate of increase in the number of banks in the past ten years, the growth in the number of contributions from banks and trust companies reported by the 13 community chests that have been in continuous operation for the ten years 1920-1929, inclusive, is especially noteworthy. Table 42 shows that the number of banks and trust companies contributing to these 13 chests has grown from 79 to 142 or 79.7 per cent, whereas the amount contributed to these 13 chests has increased by \$89,933 or 58.5 per cent.

In considering the number of contributions coming from banks and trust companies it must be noted that some cities received a number of gifts directly from the local banks while others received a single gift from the local clearing house which ordinarily pro-rates the gift among the various member banks. Table 43 shows the chests which, in 1929, received part or all of their gifts from banks

CONTRIBUTIONS BY CHIEF INDUSTRIES 177

TABLE 41

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM BANK AND TRUST CORPORATIONS, TO ALL COMMUNITY CHESTS STUDIED, 1920-1929.

Year	Number of chests	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from bank and trust corporations	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from bank and trust corporations	Number of contributions from bank and trust corporations	Per cent of total number of corporation contributions from bank and trust corporations
1920	13	\$ 2,535,819	\$ 153,804	6.1	79	3.0
1921	22	2,815,983	229,459	8.1	160	3.4
1922	29	3,134,134	232,665	7.4	219	3.2
1923	49	4,975,961	410,857	8.2	331	3.1
1924	73	7,711,208	667,981	8.7	505	2.9
1925	94	9,042,012	816,399	9.0	622	2.8
1926	109	10,757,339	1,021,543	9.5	750	2.8
1927	119	12,015,222	1,185,321	9.9	891	2.9
1928	124	12,265,850	1,308,272	10.7	933	2.9
1929	129	12,954,769	1,389,937	10.7	1,007	3.0

and trust companies through the local clearing house. In the twenty cities in which data were available as to the number of banks participating in the clearing house gifts in 1929, it appears that these twenty clearing house contributions embraced 134 banks.

There are only 14 community chests reporting no contributions from banks and trust companies in any year. They are: Rochester, N.Y., Kansas City, Kan., Knoxville, Tenn., Wilkes Barre, Pa., Terre Haute, Ind., Mt. Vernon, N.Y., Jamestown, N.Y., Auburn, N.Y., Spartanburg, S.C., Mason City, Iowa, Ithaca, N.Y., Morristown, N.J., Goldsboro, N.C., and Rochester, N.H.

Another fact worth noting is that many of the community chests that show contributions from banks and trust companies report that certain of their local banking institutions have never contributed.

TABLE 42

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM BANK AND TRUST CORPORATIONS, TO 13 COMMUNITY CHESTS REPORTING FOR EACH YEAR, 1920-1929.

Year	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from bank and trust corporations	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from bank and trust corporations	Number of contributions from bank and trust corporations	Per cent of total number of corporation contributions from bank and trust corporations
1920	\$2,535,819	\$153,804	6.1	79	3.1
1921	2,226,826	171,799	7.7	99	3.0
1922	2,047,300	149,911	7.3	100	2.7
1923	2,238,545	183,892	8.2	110	2.8
1924	2,305,172	183,161	7.9	107	2.5
1925	2,319,690	179,818	7.8	110	2.4
1926	2,413,031	194,673	8.1	120	2.6
1927	2,608,317	216,129	8.3	137	2.7
1928	2,756,182	248,184	9.0	135	2.7
1929	2,799,192	243,737	8.7	142	2.8

Apparently bank boards are not as yet by any means completely unified on the subject of charitable contributions. Of course, each banking institution is a law unto itself as far as charitable contributions are concerned, and it may be assumed that the differences in the attitudes of bank officials with respect to contributions to community chests reflect clear-cut policies in these institutions.

IIIb. Insurance

Taken as a whole the insurance industry supplied only 1.5 per cent of the total amount contributed by all corporations to 129 community chests for the year 1929. Only 259 contributions out of 33,977 for 1929 came from insurance companies. Sixty-four of the 129 community chests reported some contributions from

TABLE 43

NUMBER OF BANKS CONTRIBUTING THROUGH CLEARING HOUSE AND NUMBER GIVING SEPARATELY, FOR EACH OF 22 COMMUNITY CHESTS REPORTING CLEARING HOUSE GIFTS, 1929.

City	Number of banks contributing through clearing house ^a	Number of banks contributing separately	Total number of banks contributing
Atlanta	0	2	0
Colorado Springs	6	1	7
Columbus	7	6	13
Dallas ^b	8	9	17
Dayton	5	..	5
El Paso	3	..	3
Grand Rapids	6	5	11
Green Bay	8	..	8
Hamilton	4	..	4
Kalamazoo	4	..	4
Lincoln	4	3	7
Little Rock	12	..	12
Long Beach	0	..	0
Los Angeles	15	16	31
Memphis	6	5	11
Minneapolis	6	18	24
Nashville	8	1	9
New Orleans	6	1	7
Roanoke	5	..	5
San Jose	5	2	7
South Bend	12	2	14
Springfield, Ill.	4	..	4

^aThese gifts are shown elsewhere as a single contribution for each city since the gifts were from the clearing houses and not from the banks.

^bFigures for Dallas are for 1928. In 1929 Dallas banks gave separately rather than through the clearing house.

^cData not available.

insurance companies for 1929 and 65 showed none. Table 44 shows the part played by the insurance industry in the support of community chests for the different years covered by the study.

The true significance of the foregoing figures is more clearly shown by looking at contributions to community chests from the standpoint of the insurance companies themselves. The relatively large number of companies writing various kinds of insurance in the United States should be kept in mind in connection with the relatively small part played by the insurance business in the financial

TABLE 44

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM INSURANCE CORPORATIONS, TO ALL COMMUNITY CHESTS STUDIED, 1920-1929.

Year	Number of chests	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from insurance corporations	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from insurance corporations	Number of contributions from insurance corporations	Per cent of total number of corporation contributions from insurance corporations
1920	13	\$ 2,535,819	\$ 26,400	1.0	15	.6
1921	22	2,815,983	47,250	1.7	28	.6
1922	29	3,134,134	50,190	1.6	39	.6
1923	49	4,975,961	59,243	1.2	74	.7
1924	73	7,711,208	82,226	1.1	105	.6
1925	94	9,042,012	99,758	1.1	128	.6
1926	109	10,757,339	130,444	1.2	170	.6
1927	119	12,015,222	154,360	1.3	206	.7
1928	124	12,265,850	165,974	1.4	226	.7
1929	129	12,954,769	189,360	1.5	259	.8

support of community chests. The preliminary report of "Statistics of Income from Returns of Net Income for 1927" published in 1928 by the United States Bureau of Internal Revenue, shows that 1,729 "insurance companies—life, mutual or stock companies (not agents); accident; casualty; fidelity and bonding; marine; mutual and title; mutual benefit associations, etc." made returns for the year 1927. Of these, 959 reported some net income subject to taxation. In round numbers, then, there were close to a thousand insurance companies that were in a financial position to contribute to some community chest.

As a matter of fact, the 259 contributions reported by 64 community chests for 1929 were made by 239 different companies, all but 6 of which are domestic companies.

It will be apparent, therefore, that few of the contributing companies made contributions to more than one community chest. The figures are as follows:

- 2 insurance companies (one of which was foreign) contributed to 4 community chests apiece for 1929,
- 1 insurance company contributed to 3 chests for 1929,
- 12 insurance companies contributed to 2 chests apiece for 1929,
- 224 insurance companies contributed to 1 chest for 1929.

The few companies that contributed to more than one community chest for 1929 suggests the obvious query: To what extent were these insurance contributions made exclusively to the community chest in the city in which the contributing insurance company had its home office? The answer is that 217 insurance companies contributed only to the chest in the home office city. Seven insurance companies that had their home office in a community chest city are reported as contributing to chests in cities in which they were represented by agencies. These did not contribute to their local chest. This at once raises the question: Were these last mentioned contributions perhaps made by the local agent in the name of the company, but actually paid by the agent out of his own pocket? This is possible. However, to guard against the possibility of counting contributions from agents as contributions from the insurance company itself, the community chests reporting insurance contributions were all specially queried. Only where definite assurance was given that the reported contribution actually came from the insurance company itself was it included.

At this point, it becomes desirable to differentiate between life and accident insurance companies and fire and general insurance companies. Table 45 shows how many out of 1,047 nationally known insurance companies were reported as contributing to any of the 129 chests studied for 1929, and how many apparently did not contribute.

That nearly half of these 1,047 insurance companies are not reported as contributing to any of the 129 community chests studied is explained by the fact that their home office is not in a community chest city. The method of selling insurance through local agents would naturally make it more difficult for a community chest effectively to establish sympathetic contact with the offices of the insurance company, situated in some other city.

However, the fact that 353 insurance companies having their home office in one of the community chest cities studied did not contribute even to the community chest in the home office city may strike the reader as needing explanation. As stated elsewhere in this report, it has not been within the scope of the inquiry to

search for the reasons why some insurance corporations contribute to community chests and some do not.

The number of companies writing life insurance in the United States is close to 300. According to figures published by the Association of Life Insurance Presidents in January, 1930, the total amount of life insurance in force as of December 31, 1929 for 264 companies reporting was \$98,441,747,000. Nine companies accounted for 60 per cent of this total and 18 for over 75 per cent. The fifty companies reporting the largest amounts of life insurance in force on December 31, 1928 were the following (companies having their home office in one of the 129 community chest cities studied are indicated by an asterisk)¹:

Metropolitan N. Y. City	*Prudential Newark	New York N. Y. City
Equitable N. Y. City	*Travelers Hartford	Mutual N. Y. City
*Northwestern Mutual Milwaukee	*Aetna Hartford	John Hancock Boston
*Mutual Benefit Newark	*Penn Mutual Philadelphia	*Massachusetts Mutual Springfield
*Union Central Cincinnati	*Missouri State St. Louis	New England Mutual Boston
*Connecticut General Hartford	*Provident Mutual Philadelphia	Bankers Des Moines
*Connecticut Mutual Hartford	*Western & Southern Cincinnati	*Pacific Mutual Los Angeles
*Lincoln National Ft. Wayne	*State Mutual Worcester	Equitable of Iowa Des Moines
National Montpelier	*American National Galveston	*Phoenix Mutual Hartford
Guardian N. Y. City	*Reliance Pittsburgh	*Fidelity Mutual Philadelphia
*Kansas City Kansas City, Mo.	Home N. Y. City	*Jefferson Standard Greensboro, N.C.
*Life Ins. Co. of Va. Richmond	*Acacia Mutual Washington, D.C.	*Northwestern National Minneapolis
National of U.S.A. Chicago	*State Life Indianapolis	*Southwestern Dallas
*American Central Indianapolis	Columbian National Boston	*Franklin Springfield, Ill.
*Berkshire Pittsfield	Great Southern Houston	Central Des Moines
Illinois Chicago	*Pan-American New Orleans	Peoria Peoria
*Minnesota Mutual St. Paul	*Atlantic Richmond	

Thirty-three of these largest life companies have their home office in some one of the 129 community chest cities included in this study. Of the above 33, 13 are reported as contributing to the chest in the home office city for 1929, and one as contribut-

¹Houston, Des Moines, and Peoria have community chests, although no data were submitted for this study.

CONTRIBUTIONS BY CHIEF INDUSTRIES 183

TABLE 45

NUMBER OF INSURANCE COMPANIES CONTRIBUTING AND NOT CONTRIBUTING TO COMMUNITY CHESTS, CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO WHETHER HOME OFFICES ARE OR ARE NOT IN A CHEST CITY AND ACCORDING TO GENERAL TYPE OF INSURANCE WRITTEN, 1929.

Type of insurance written	Home office in chest city				Home office in non-chest city			Total number of corporations
	Contributing to chest in home office city	Contributing to chest in an agency city	Not contributing to any chest	Total	Contributing to chest in an agency city	Not contributing to any chest studied	Total	
Life and accident	81	2	87	170	5	77	82	252
Fire and General	136	5	266	407	10	378	388	795
Total	217	7	353	577	15	455	470	1,047

ing in an agency city, but not in the home office city. One of the 18 largest that does not have its home office in a community chest city is reported as contributing to one community chest for 1929.

The amounts contributed by insurance companies to community chests for 1929 vary widely. Of the 259 contributions 121, or 46.7 per cent, were less than \$200, 171, or 66.0 per cent, were less than \$500, 88, or 34.0 per cent, were \$500 or more, and 50, or 19.3 per cent, were \$1,000 or more.

The permanency of contributions made to community chests by insurance companies is also worth calling attention to. Apparently, once an insurance company decides it is justified in contributing to the community chest in its home office city, it is satisfied to continue the contribution. Eliminating from consideration Washington, D. C. and Pittsburgh, in which community chests were not in operation prior to 1929, no instance is found of a contribution from a life insurance company made during 1928 being cut off in 1929. In several instances contributions have been continued uninterruptedly (not always in the same amount, however) from the year of the chest's organization. On the other hand, if Washington and Pittsburgh are again left out of consideration, 9 chests received 12 contributions from insurance companies for 1929 for the first time². These initial contributions amounted in all to

²Dallas, Knoxville, Memphis, Detroit, Wichita, Springfield, Mass., New Orleans, Little Rock, and Toledo.

\$725. Turning to the fire and general insurance companies, only 2 contributions made in 1928 were lost in 1929³. On the other hand, 17 new contributions from fire and general insurance companies were reported for 1929⁴ by 16 community chests, the total amount received being \$5,620. Whether this indicates a permanent addition to the ranks of insurance company contributions cannot be stated at this time. In general the conclusion seems justified that a situation of comparative stability has been reached as far as insurance company contributions to community chests are concerned. If the relatively large number of insurance companies not at present contributing to community chests even in cities in which their home office is located, are to be brought into the ranks of contributors, some more precise basis for expecting contributions will probably have to be established by the community chests as a group. Appendix Table II shows for each city the insurance company contributions that have been received by community chests. Community chests reporting no contributions from insurance companies in any year are: Louisville, Rochester, N.Y., Syracuse, Worcester, Youngstown, Flint, Scranton, Bridgeport, Albany, Oranges and Maplewood, N.J., Kansas City, Kans., El Paso, Canton, Duluth, Reading, Lowell, Tacoma, Utica, Schenectady, Wilkes Barre, South Bend, Terre Haute, Pontiac, Holyoke, Kalamazoo, Long Beach, Charleston, W. Va., Mt. Vernon, Pittsfield, York, Lima, Lexington, Battle Creek, Aurora, Jamestown, N.Y., Auburn, Green Bay, Moline, Colorado Springs, Joplin, Asheville, Plainfield, Warren, Spartanburg, Port Arthur, Washington, Pa., White Plains, Bristol, Mason City, Attleboro, Ann Arbor, Santa Barbara, Ithaca, Corning, Morristown, West Chester, Goldsboro, Rochester, N.H., New Brighton, and Texarkana.

IIIc. Other Finance

The variety and number of corporations whose contributions are classified under "other finance" makes it somewhat difficult to analyze satisfactorily this particular group of contributions⁵. Table

³St. Louis and San Francisco.

⁴Harrisburg, San Francisco, Cincinnati, Wichita, Baltimore, Los Angeles, Dallas, Lansing, Minneapolis, Sioux City, Newark, Grand Rapids, Roanoke, New Haven, Springfield, and Indianapolis.

⁵Other finance includes corporations of the following types: stock and bond brokers; companies financing the retail sale of automobiles, furniture, etc.; real estate companies; holding companies (not operating); note and pawn brokers; dealers in acceptances; insurance agents; customs brokers; dealers in oil leases or royalties; financial promoters, and others.

TABLE 46

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM FINANCE CORPORATIONS, OTHER THAN BANK, TRUST, AND INSURANCE, TO ALL COMMUNITY CHESTS STUDIED, 1920-1929.

Year	Number of chests	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from finance corporations other than bank, trust, and insurance	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from finance corporations other than bank, trust, and insurance	Number of contributions from finance corporations other than bank, trust, and insurance
1920	13	\$ 2,535,819	\$ 71,119	2.8	122
1921	22	2,815,983	83,352	3.0	249
1922	29	3,134,134	95,808	3.1	385
1923	49	4,975,961	181,512	3.6	597
1924	73	7,711,208	278,591	3.6	1,041
1925	94	9,042,012	390,137	4.3	1,463
1926	109	10,757,339	519,421	4.8	1,878
1927	119	12,015,222	583,143	4.9	2,226
1928	124	12,265,850	602,995	4.9	2,418
1929	129	12,954,769	641,514	5.0	2,582

46 shows, however, that for this group of corporations there has been a steady growth in the per cent of total corporation contributions. If allowance is made for contributions to the 5 chests reporting only for 1929 there is still an increase for 1929 over 1928 for the other 124 chests. The net increase in number for the 124 chests is 61 and the net increase in amount is \$15,201. The city tables for the 129 community chests (see Appendix Table II) show a good deal of movement up and down in respect both to number and amount of contributions from "other finance" corporations during the past three or four years. One of the striking facts disclosed by examination of the city tables is the wide variation in number of contributions from "other finance" corporations in cities of approximately the same size. One possible explanation for this wide variation in number may be that many of the cor-

TABLE 47
SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND
OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM FINANCE CORPORATIONS,
OTHER THAN BANK, TRUST, AND INSURANCE, TO 13
COMMUNITY CHESTS REPORTING FOR EACH YEAR,
1920-1929

Year	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from finance corporations other than bank, trust, and insurance	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from finance corporations other than bank, trust, and insurance	Number of contributions from finance corporations other than bank, trust, and insurance
1920	\$2,535,819	\$ 71,119	2.8	122
1921	2,226,826	72,302	3.2	173
1922	2,047,300	74,549	3.6	229
1923	2,238,545	85,433	3.8	250
1924	2,305,172	90,501	3.9	278
1925	2,319,690	99,662	4.3	327
1926	2,413,031	106,507	4.4	328
1927	2,608,317	134,448	5.2	380
1928	2,756,182	130,333	4.7	378
1929	2,799,192	138,909	5.0	387

porations classified under other finance are closely owned concerns, resembling partnerships. In some cases, the three or four individuals owning the corporation might make personal contributions and in other cases, the contribution might be made in the name of the corporation. In the first case, of course, the contributions would not be included in this study.

Reference to the city tables will also show that many community chests registered fairly serious losses in the amount of other finance contributions between 1928 and 1929. A careful analysis of the 129 community chest schedules would of course show the extent to which these losses were due to reduction in amount of old contributions and how much was due to complete loss. It has not been feasible for the National Bureau to make this analysis, but community chests will probably find it worth while to do so.

Another feature of the trend in contributions from other finance corporations is shown by taking the experience of the 13 community chests that have submitted data for the 10-year period 1920-1929, inclusive. This is shown in Table 47 which indicates that there has been a decided growth in the gifts from other finance. In 1920 these 13 cities received \$71,119 or 2.8 per cent of their corporation gifts from 122 concerns, and in 1929 they obtained \$138,909 or 5.0 per cent of all corporation gifts, from 387 other finance corporations.

This classification, of course, includes a good many corporations that are properly described as national. Investment trusts and holding corporations of various kinds are included. The absence of these large concerns from the ranks of contributing corporations is perhaps explained by the fact that such a large proportion of the more important holding companies and investment trusts have their headquarters in New York, Chicago or Boston, which are non-community chest cities. Even where such companies have their headquarters in community chest cities, the basis of the relationship between the finance corporation and the community is exceedingly tenuous. Corporations of the type of investment trusts and holding companies have practically no direct relations with the community. They employ relatively few people in proportion to the volume of business and the element of community good-will is probably of comparatively little importance to the holding company. Again, many of these finance corporations are interested in operating companies primarily from the investment standpoint. On the other hand, it is obvious that the growth in number and importance of corporations that do not come into direct relations with any community through their own operations, but which have, because of their ownership of other companies, diminished the responsibility of the subsidiary companies to the community in which they operate, may constitute a problem which the community chests will have to face in the future. So far, however, the practice seems to be, even where the operating companies are entirely owned by holding companies, to leave full authority as to charitable contributions to the company which is in direct relationship with the community.

IV. Transportation and Other Public Utilities

In order to bring out the relatively insignificant proportion of total corporation contributions to community chests by steam

TABLE 48

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM RAILROAD CORPORATIONS, TO ALL COMMUNITY CHESTS STUDIED, 1920-1929.

Year	Number of chests	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from railroad corporations	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from railroad corporations	Number of contributions from railroad corporations
1920	13	\$ 2,535,819	\$ 5,000	.2	1
1921	22	2,815,983	5,000	.2	1
1922	29	3,134,134	7,602	.2	6
1923	49	4,975,961	8,626	.2	10
1924	73	7,711,208	16,425	.2	7
1925	94	9,042,012	20,650	.2	11
1926	109	10,757,339	36,840	.3	17
1927	119	12,015,222	44,018	.4	29
1928	124	12,265,850	36,250	.3	33
1929	129	12,954,769	38,175	.3	37

railroads, and the relatively important amount coming from other types of public utility corporations, the Internal Revenue grouping has been divided into three sub-groups as follows:

- (a). Steam railroads
- (b). Water and other transportation
- (c). Public utilities other than transportation
 - Electric light, power, and electric traction; gas; telephone and telegraph; water companies, etc.

IVa. Steam Railroads

The relatively small part played by railroads in contributions to community chests (in no year more than four-tenths of one per cent) is shown in Table 48.

Only 17 of the contributions reported for the year 1929 actually came from main line railroads. The rule followed in classifying corporation contributions in this study has resulted in contributions from subsidiary companies being counted as from the railroad corporations owning or controlling them. Before entering upon a discussion of contributions made by the steam railroads to community chests, it will probably be well to call attention to the above mentioned contributions. Clearly to picture the situation, as it relates to railroad contributions, the following should probably be left out of consideration:—

Baltimore, Md. \$700, 1929; \$500, 1928; \$450, 1927; \$250, 1926.

Beaumont, Tex., \$100, 1927-1929, inclusive.

Detroit, Mich., \$3,500, 1928 and 1929; \$2,500, 1927.

Duluth, Minn., \$200, 1928 and 1929.

Harrisburg, Pa. \$25, 1928.

Indianapolis, Ind., \$3,050, 1928-1929, inclusive.

Kansas City, Mo. \$25, 1925 and 1926.

Lancaster, Pa. \$25, 1928 and 1929.

St. Louis, Mo. \$500, 1927-1929, inclusive.

St. Paul, Minn. \$150, 1927-1929; \$15, 1926; \$100, 1925; \$100, 1923; \$25, 1922.

Toledo, O. \$50; 1926-1929, inclusive.

The above contributions came from such corporations as terminal companies, connecting and belt line railroads, wharf companies, and coal, water, bridge, stockyards, and restaurant companies owned by railroads. Seven other contributions in 1929 came from a concern so closely associated with the railroads as to be classified with them.

When the discussion is limited to contributions from main-line railroads, it appears from the data studied that only 13 main-line railroads contributed to any of the 129 community chests for the year 1929. The total contributed by them was \$28,550. Two roads contributed to 4 community chests apiece in cities along their lines, one road contributed to 2 chests; the other 10 roads contributed to one community chest apiece. The picture of railroads in relation to the financial support of community chests can be shown in another way. It will be recalled that the Interstate Commerce Commission recently proposed a grouping of railroads into 21 systems. Table 49 shows the number and amount of contributions to community chests for the year 1929 reported as coming from the railroads in each of the proposed systems.

CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS

TABLE 49

NUMBER AND AMOUNT OF RAILROAD CONTRIBUTIONS
TO COMMUNITY CHESTS IN 1929, FOR EACH OF 21
RAILROAD SYSTEMS PROPOSED BY THE
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

System	Number of railroads	Number of contributions to community chests for 1929	Amount of contributions to community chests for 1929
1	27	1	\$ 50
2	11	.	..
3	48	.	..
4	59	4	1,900
5	63	4	11,400
6	51	2	12,950
7	63	1	300
8	58	.	..
9	43	1	100
10	44	.	..
11	20	.	..
12	31	.	..
13	19	.	..
14	34	1	1,500
15	35	.	..
16	63	.	..
17	28	.	..
18	77	1	250
19	43	.	..
20	8	.	..
21	5	.	..
Not classified	2	2	100
Total	832	17	\$28,550

The size of the 17 contributions made to community chests for 1929 is as follows:—

3 of \$ 50
5 of 100
1 of 200
1 of 250
1 of 300
1 of 500
2 of 1,500
1 of 4,700
1 of 8,250
1 of 10,700

From the foregoing data, it would appear that the railroad industry of the United States is characterized by a clear cut policy of not contributing directly in money to community chests. While it has not been within the scope of this study to ask corporations why they contribute or do not contribute to community chests, it may not be amiss to put down some thoughts which may possibly account for the fact that the steam railroads of the United States have contributed so little of the total amount received by community chests from corporations.

It was suggested that perhaps the contributions by railroads to Railroad Y.M.C.A.'s might, in the minds of railroad executives and directors, constitute an adequate discharge of their responsibility for the financial support of organized community welfare services. In this connection, however, information supplied by the railroad department of the National Council of Y.M.C.A.'s shows that in only 34 of the 129 community chest cities covered by the study are Railroad Y.M.C.A.'s in operation. In 10 of these cities, the community chest received a railroad contribution for 1929. The absence of an organized Railroad Y.M.C.A. in many of the community chest cities that received no railroad contributions disposes of this ground of explanation for the abstention of railroads from financial contributions to community chests.

Contributions made directly by railroad companies to local Travelers Aid Societies should be taken into consideration in measuring railroad support for organized community welfare services. In most cities where there is both a community chest and a Travelers' Aid Society, the latter is a participating member of the chest. Apparently, in some cities, the railroad companies prefer to contribute directly to the Travelers' Aid Society. Table 50 shows contributions from steam railroads reported by local Travelers' Aid Societies for 1928 to the National Association of Travelers' Aid Societies, New York.

Another reason which has been suggested to explain the absence of almost all leading railroads from the lists of corporation contributions to community chests is the governmental control exercised over them after the entry of the United States into the world war.

In Part I of this report it was shown that the participation of the United States in the world war brought about, among other changes, a new attitude on the part of corporations towards contributions to organized community welfare activities. It seems hardly possible that the present measure of corporation support

TABLE 50
 AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM RAILROAD, TERMINAL, AND STEAMSHIP CORPORATIONS, TO LOCAL TRAVELERS AID SOCIETIES, 1928.

City	Amount	City	Amount
Alabama		Nebraska	
Birmingham.....	\$ 900	Omaha.....	\$ 3,153
Mobile.....	427	New Jersey	
Montgomery.....	300	Trenton.....	100
Arkansas		New York	
Fort Smith.....	Salaries, (approx- imately 1,800)	New York.....	10,400
California		North Carolina	
Los Angeles.....	600	Asheville.....	300
San Jose.....	900	Greensboro.....	300
Colorado		Salisbury.....	300
Denver.....	960	Wilmington.....	120
Dist. of Columbia		Winston-Salem.....	600
Washington.....	1,200	Charlotte.....	750
Florida		Pennsylvania	
Jacksonville.....	240	Philadelphia.....	4,100
Georgia		Pittsburgh.....	2,150
Atlanta.....	2,400	South Carolina	
Savannah.....	380	Charleston.....	240
Idaho		Columbia.....	550
Pocatello.....	360	Spartanburg.....	300
Illinois		Tennessee	
Chicago.....	6,900	Chattanooga.....	360
Peoria.....	956	Texas	
Kentucky		Galveston.....	1,300
Lexington.....	300	El Paso.....	720
Louisville.....	1,895	Houston.....	2,100
Louisiana		Temple.....	900
New Orleans.....	1,704	Utah	
Shreveport.....	915	Salt Lake City.....	660
Maryland		Virginia	
Baltimore.....	1,800	Danville.....	300
Maine		Lynchburg.....	720
Bangor.....	120	Norfolk.....	2,420
Minnesota		Petersburg.....	1,265
Duluth.....	125	Portsmouth.....	600
Minneapolis.....	600	Richmond.....	4,375
Rochester.....	1,440	Roanoke.....	1,800
St. Paul.....	632	Washington	
		Seattle.....	1,059
		Tacoma.....	924
		Spokane.....	600
		Yakima.....	448

could have developed without the incentive of the war, and its influence in creating a new spirit of unity among all elements in the community. That corporations felt the urge of this new spirit is evidence by their widespread and generous contributions to the 1917 and 1918 war relief appeals of the Red Cross, the Y.M.C.A., the United War Work Campaign and the local war chests. It is significant that railroads participated to a very limited extent in contributions to the war time welfare appeals. Perhaps the fact that they came under Federal control soon after the entry of the United States into the war has some bearing on their lack of participation. This is one hypothesis offered to explain the present lack of contributions from railroads to the community chests, which were the inheritors of the war-created policy of corporation contributions to community welfare activities. Being under Federal control, there was no more reason why railroads should expend money in the form of charitable contributions than there was for any other government department to do so.

IVb. Water and Other Transportation

The number and amount of contributions to community chests from corporations engaged in water and other transportation are so small that the data could perhaps have been included with the other industries discussed in section V following, miscellaneous. However, it has seemed more logical to present such data as are available in the section dealing with transportation and other public utilities. This classification includes a variety of businesses, among which the following should be noted: refrigerator or tank car companies; warehousing, packing and shipping companies, (union stock yards thus are included in this classification); water transportation companies; air lines; auto bus lines; taxicab companies.

Table 51 shows the number, amount, and per cent of total contributions to community chests for the years 1920-1929, inclusive, from this group of transportation corporations.

Deducting the 16 contributions, amounting to \$3,829 to the 5 community chests reporting only for 1929, the net increase shown by the other 124 community chests for 1929 over 1928 is only 18 contributions, totalling \$990. Reference to the city tables (Appendix Table II) will show that many of the larger community chests reported no increase in contributions from water and other transportation companies for 1929 as compared with 1928.

TABLE 51

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM TRANSPORTATION CORPORATIONS, OTHER THAN RAILROADS, TO ALL COMMUNITY CHESTS STUDIED, 1920-1929.

Year	Number of chests	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from transportation corporations other than railroads	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from transportation corporations other than railroads	Number of contributions from transportation corporations other than railroads
1920	13	\$ 2,535,819	\$ 16,291	.6	34
1921	22	2,815,983	19,062	.7	62
1922	29	3,134,134	14,484	.5	97
1923	49	4,975,961	49,900	1.0	203
1924	73	7,711,208	98,901	1.3	342
1925	94	9,042,012	136,382	1.5	501
1926	109	10,757,339	151,868	1.4	588
1927	119	12,015,222	162,290	1.4	680
1928	124	12,265,850	172,182	1.4	718
1929	129	12,954,769	177,001	1.4	752

If union stock yards and other warehousing and shipping corporations are left out of consideration, then water transportation is of course the most important branch of transportation covered by this classification. It is obvious also that not all community chests will be in a position to get contributions from water transportation companies, but only those in cities which are located on the Atlantic, Gulf, or Pacific Coasts or on the Great Lakes or navigable rivers. As a matter of fact, 203 contributions reported for the year 1929 came from water transportation companies and the total amount contributed by such companies was \$91,971, or slightly more than the amount attributable to the 549 other transportation corporation gifts for that year.

Taking into consideration the number of community chest cities which might reasonably expect to receive contributions from

TABLE 52

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM PUBLIC UTILITY CORPORATIONS, OTHER THAN TRANSPORTATION, TO ALL COMMUNITY CHESTS STUDIED, 1920-1929.

Year	Number of chests	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from public utility corporations other than transportation	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from public utility corporations other than transportation	Number of contributions from public utility corporations other than transportation	Per cent of total number of corporation contributions from public utility corporations other than transportation
1920	13	\$ 2,535,819	\$ 56,503	2.2	22	.8
1921	22	2,815,983	77,248	2.7	38	.8
1922	29	3,134,134	106,915	3.4	57	.8
1923	49	4,975,961	210,402	4.2	120	1.1
1924	73	7,711,208	327,833	4.3	206	1.2
1925	94	9,042,012	427,331	4.7	264	1.2
1926	109	10,757,339	530,800	4.9	317	1.2
1927	119	12,015,222	609,807	5.1	378	1.2
1928	124	12,265,850	686,084	5.6	408	1.3
1929	129	12,954,769	787,680	6.1	450	1.3

water transportation companies, because they are in terminal cities of steamship lines, the number of contributions from water transportation companies seems small. As a matter of fact, a number of community chests reported inability to get contributions from steamship lines. The reason might be that the relationship existing between a steamship line and the community is not a clearly defined one. Ordinarily, the steamship company, whether engaged in ocean, lake, or river transportation, does not maintain a plant or factory. While it may employ large numbers of men, they are only casually related to the communities touched by the steamships (this is especially true of the steamship crews), or else the labor depended upon to handle cargo at terminal points is picked up by the company as occasion demands. The nature of

TABLE 53

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM PUBLIC UTILITY CORPORATIONS, OTHER THAN TRANSPORTATION, TO 13 COMMUNITY CHESTS REPORTING FOR EACH YEAR, 1920-1929.

Year	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from public utility corporations other than transportation	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from public utility corporations other than transportation	Number of contributions from public utility corporations other than transportation	Per cent of total number of corporation contributions from public utility corporations other than transportation
1920	\$2,535,819	\$ 56,503	2.2	22	.8
1921	2,226,826	58,483	2.6	20	.6
1922	2,047,300	69,075	3.4	27	.7
1923	2,238,545	77,250	3.5	34	.9
1924	2,305,172	85,235	3.7	43	1.0
1925	2,319,690	94,225	4.1	44	1.0
1926	2,413,031	103,185	4.3	44	1.0
1927	2,608,317	117,775	4.5	48	1.0
1928	2,756,182	132,225	4.8	53	1.1
1929	2,799,192	138,783	5.0	54	1.1

the water transportation business probably develops a feeling on the part of steamship company boards and executives that they are only incidentally interested in communities touched for taking on or discharging passengers or cargo. The same reason might logically be applied to bus and air transportation companies. In the absence of any considerable number of employes who might make use of the services of the welfare organizations participating in the community chests, these corporations are not yet aware of any community relationship which would normally find expression in a contribution to the community chest.

IVc. Public Utilities Other than Transportation

By elimination of the transportation industry, this classifi-

cation necessarily includes electric light, power, traction, telephone, gas, and water corporations.

In this group, we are dealing with types of service which are handled practically on a local and monopolistic basis. This means that a relatively small number of corporations is involved as compared with such industries as manufacturing, trade, etc. The reason for the relatively small number of contributions to the 129 community chests from public utility corporations (other than transportation) is thus apparent. Notable, too, is the fact that only 450 contributions accounted for as much as \$787,680 or 6.1 per cent of all of the corporation contributions for 1929. Table 52 shows how the proportion of the amount of total corporation contributions coming from this group of public utility corporations has increased steadily during the 10-year period covered by the study. This increase is still noteworthy if 26 contributions amounting to \$51,900 to the 5 community chests reporting only for 1929 are deducted. For the other 124 community chests, the net increase for 1929 over 1928 was 16 contributions and the net amount of increase was \$49,696 or 7.2 per cent. Reference to the city tables (Appendix Table II) shows what one would actually expect, that the *number* of contributions to community chests from this group of public utility corporations is now nearly stationary. On the other hand, the increase in *amounts* received from public utility corporations in 1929 as compared with 1928 is marked. The only cities reporting no contributions from public utility corporations are Charleston, S. C. and Plainfield, N. J.

The experience of the 13 community chests that have submitted data for the entire 10 year period 1920-1929 inclusive, likewise reflects the increased measure of support from public utility corporations other than transportation. Although the number of public utility concerns in these 13 cities can hardly have shown any great increase in the ten year period, the number of contributions (Table 53) has risen from 22 in 1920 to 54 in 1929. As against 2.2 per cent of the total amount of corporation contributions in 1920, public utility corporations supplied 5.0 per cent of the total amount of corporation contributions to these 13 older chests in 1929. The increase in amount for 1929 over 1920 for these 13 cities is \$82,280 or 145.6 per cent.

While the industry at present being discussed is one in which great national holding corporations play a preponderating role, this factor of non-local ownership apparently does not enter into

the matter as far as contributions to community chests are concerned. Each local public service company, even if its stock is completely owned by a nationally known holding corporation, appears to have complete autonomy in the matter of charitable contributions. The increase in number and amount contributed by public service corporations may be taken as reflecting the new attitude of such corporations towards the public. The electric light company, the telephone company, the local traction company are in the most personal relationship with the individuals making up the community. The effort which the great public service corporations are making to secure the good-will of their customers is shown in many ways. The important part played by public utility corporations in the support of community chests is doubtless only another manifestation of the desire on the part of such corporations to have the good-will of the community.

Analysis of the data submitted shows that of the \$787,680 contributed by public utilities other than transportation to community chests for the year 1929, \$137,170, or 17.4 per cent was credited to telephone companies.

V. Miscellaneous

Four industries together account for only 5.6 per cent of the total corporation contributions to community chests. These industries are the following:

Service corporations	Per cent
Amusement	.6
Other than Amusement	2.0
Construction	1.9
Mining and quarrying	1.0
Agriculture	.1
	<hr/>
Total	5.6

Va. Service Corporations

Amusement—Under the above classification are included contributions from corporations in the following lines of business: Theaters (legitimate); motion picture producers, distributors and exhibitors; parks; bathing beaches, golf links; race tracks; skating rinks; etc.

Table 54 summarizes the contributions shown by community chests from amusement corporations for the years 1920-1929, inclusive.

CONTRIBUTIONS BY CHIEF INDUSTRIES 199

TABLE 54

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM AMUSEMENT CORPORATIONS, TO ALL COMMUNITY CHESTS STUDIED, 1920-1929.

Year	Number of chests	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from amusement corporations	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from amusement corporations	Number of contributions from amusement corporations
1920	13	\$ 2,535,819	\$11,415	.5	30
1921	22	2,815,983	19,975	.7	50
1922	29	3,134,134	19,266	.6	63
1923	49	4,975,961	23,900	.5	87
1924	73	7,711,208	44,316	.6	134
1925	94	9,042,012	57,866	.6	177
1926	109	10,757,339	61,752	.6	199
1927	119	12,015,222	75,280	.6	241
1928	124	12,265,850	77,479	.6	266
1929	129	12,954,769	80,794	.6	266

As has already been pointed out in the introduction to Part III. the theatrical industry is characterized by increasing centralization in a few large corporations operating chains of theaters.

In order to bring out the extent to which contributions received by community chests came from five national corporations controlling through their subsidiaries, nearly 3,000 legitimate and motion picture theaters, a special analysis was made. Table 55 shows the results.

It is rather significant that nearly 17 per cent in number of all the contributions received from amusement corporations for 1929 are traceable to 5 national amusement corporations or their subsidiaries, and that 31.7 per cent of the total amount came from these concerns.

It is not easy to trace the affiliation of local theaters with these 5 national concerns. In many places a local theater may only be leased to the national chain corporation. It is possible that if

TABLE 55

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM 5 AMUSEMENT CORPORATIONS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE IN COMPARISON WITH TOTAL AMUSEMENT CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS REPORTED BY ALL COMMUNITY CHESTS STUDIED, 1924-1929.

Year	Total amusement corporation contributions		Contributions from 5 national amusement corporations		Per cent of total amusement corporation contributions from 5 national amusement corporations	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
1924	134	\$44,316	20	\$ 5,620	14.9	12.7
1925	177	57,866	22	7,145	12.4	12.3
1926	199	61,752	28	14,215	14.1	23.0
1927	241	75,280	37	19,375	15.4	25.7
1928	266	77,479	41	19,040	15.4	24.6
1929	266	80,794	44	25,627	16.5	31.7

TABLE 56

NUMBER AND AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO COMMUNITY CHESTS FROM EACH OF 5 AMUSEMENT CORPORATIONS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE, 1924-1929

Corporation	1929		1928		1927		1926		1925		1924	
	Number of contributions	Amount of contributions										
1	19	\$ 4,390	20	\$ 5,315	19	\$ 5,975	15	\$ 3,815	13	\$ 4,265	10	\$ 3,440
2	14	6,750	13	6,175	11	5,900	8	4,950	5	2,425	7	2,025
3	7	5,887	5	5,450	4	5,400	5	5,450	4	455	3	155
4	4	9,100	2	2,000	2	2,000
5	1	100	1	100
Total	44	\$26,127	41	\$19,040	37	\$19,375	28	\$14,215	22	\$ 7,145	20	\$ 5,620

TABLE 57

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM SERVICE CORPORATIONS OTHER THAN AMUSEMENT, TO ALL COMMUNITY CHESTS STUDIED, 1920-1929.

Year	Number of chests	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from service corporations other than amusement	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from service corporations other than amusement	Number of contributions from service corporations other than amusement
1920	13	\$ 2,535,819	\$ 20,482	.8	79
1921	22	2,815,983	36,333	1.3	160
1922	29	3,134,134	59,394	1.9	281
1923	49	4,975,961	96,881	1.9	450
1924	73	7,711,208	153,757	2.0	720
1925	94	9,042,012	180,699	2.0	951
1926	109	10,757,339	222,810	2.1	1,098
1927	119	12,015,222	238,920	2.0	1,288
1928	124	12,265,850	249,362	2.0	1,348
1929	129	12,954,769	256,861	2.0	1,434

every local theater owned or controlled by one of these 5 national chains could be identified, the number and amount of contributions credited to them would be even larger than that shown in the foregoing table.

Table 56, disguising the identity of the 5 corporations, shows the part played by each in contributions to community chests in different years. It would greatly increase the value of the appended table if the number of community chest cities in which each of these 5 corporations owns or controls theaters could be shown. In this way it could be brought out whether these national amusement corporations contribute to community chests in all the cities in which they own theaters or only in some. However, it has not been possible to show this fact.

Service Other than Amusement—The variety of corporations whose contributions are included under the above heading is shown

by the following list, which closely follows the classification used by the Bureau of Internal Revenue (see Appendix C):

Domestic—Laundries; hotels; restaurants; beauty parlors; barbers, etc.

Professional—Curative; educational; engineering and legal; etc.

Business—Corporate management; credit and protection bureaus; detective bureaus; advertising and selling advertising space; accountants; actuaries; business promoters, etc.

Other Service—Sight seeing tours; undertaking establishments; cemeteries; newspaper syndicates; cloak room commissions; photographers, etc.

In no year has this group of service corporations contributed more than 2.0 per cent of the total contributed by all corporations. Table 57 summarizes the amount, per cent and number of contributions for the years covered by this study.

In this group of corporations are found several of nation-wide extent, their operations bringing them into the class of chains. Hotel and restaurant corporations are classed as service. Chains of hotels are becoming more common. The tendency toward consolidation, on a regional if not a national scale, is making itself felt in the laundry business. One advertising company has branches in many community chest cities.

In order to bring out the extent to which the 1,434 contributions from other service corporations could be traced back to important national corporations, a special analysis of the data was made by summarizing the contributions reported by the various community chests from five restaurant chains, one national hotel chain, one national advertising corporation with branches in many cities, and two laundry concerns which are consolidations of local laundries. Only 72 of the 1,434 contributions reported by community chests for 1929 were credited to these nine national corporations, and the amount which they gave was only \$16,338 or 6.4 per cent of the total.

Vb. Construction

Corporations whose contributions to community chests are discussed in this section comprise the following lines of business:—

Building and construction above ground—installing machinery and equipment; moving, razing or wrecking buildings;

TABLE 58

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM CONSTRUCTION CORPORATIONS, TO ALL COMMUNITY CHESTS STUDIED, 1920-1929.

Year	Number of chests	Total contribution from corporations	Contributions from construction corporations	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from construction corporations	Number of contributions from construction corporations
1920	13	\$ 2,535,819	\$ 49,599	2.0	91
1921	22	2,815,983	41,061	1.5	173
1922	29	3,134,134	56,110	1.8	272
1923	49	4,975,961	82,700	1.7	418
1924	73	7,711,208	133,834	1.7	696
1925	94	9,042,012	162,342	1.8	896
1926	109	10,757,339	203,746	1.9	1,091
1927	119	12,015,222	222,679	1.9	1,245
1928	124	12,265,850	225,867	1.8	1,311
1929	129	12,954,769	241,859	1.9	1,413

construction underground and on surface (not buildings), road building; bridge building; irrigation systems; laying pipe for gas or sewer systems; water front construction and related industries; ship construction and repairing, etc.

In no year of the ten covered by this study has the amount of construction contributions to community chests exceeded 2.0 per cent of the total of corporation contributions. Table 58 summarizes the data and shows that while the proportion of corporation money received from construction has undergone little change over the 10 year period, there has nevertheless been a marked increase in both the number and amount of gifts from this source. As can be seen from the relatively constant percentages, the growth in amount from construction has very closely kept pace with the growth in gifts from all corporations.

TABLE 59

SUMMARY OF ALL CORPORATION CONTRIBUTIONS AND OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM MINING AND QUARRYING CORPORATIONS, TO ALL COMMUNITY CHESTS STUDIED, 1920-1929.

Year	Number of chests	Total contributions from corporations	Contributions from mining and quarrying corporations	Per cent of total amount of corporation contributions from mining and quarrying corporations	Number of contributions from mining and quarrying corporations
1920	13	\$ 2,535,819	\$ 4,950	.2	9
1921	22	2,815,983	7,835	.3	29
1922	29	3,134,134	13,725	.4	39
1923	49	4,975,961	30,047	.6	64
1924	73	7,711,208	85,077	1.1	167
1925	94	9,042,012	95,705	1.1	204
1926	109	10,757,339	113,615	1.1	283
1927	119	12,015,222	127,225	1.1	359
1928	124	12,265,850	121,454	1.0	356
1929	129	12,954,769	123,928	1.0	356

Vc. Mining and Quarrying

The corporations whose contributions are included in the above classification are those engaged in the following lines of business: Mining metals—copper, iron, lead, zinc, gold, silver, quicksilver, manganese; also extracting processes. Non-metal mining—coal, lignite, peat; oil and gas, drilling, exploring and prospecting; other minerals— asbestos, borax, sulphur; quarrying—clay, sand, marble, rock; grading and washing; salt mines, producing and refining; lessors or holders of mining or quarrying property.

Large petroleum corporations that refine their own oil are classified along with manufacturing corporations, even though they have their own oil wells. Of the 17,999 mining and quarrying corporations that filed returns to the Federal government for 1927, net income was reported by 5,127. In view of the importance of

this industry, both in point of number of producing companies and value of product, the relatively small part played by mining and quarrying corporations in the total corporation support for 129 community chests for 1929 stands out. Table 59 shows the mining and quarrying corporation contributions reported by community chests for the years covered by this study.

The explanation for this relatively small number and amount of mining and quarrying contributions doubtless is that such concerns do not carry on their principal operations in urban, but in mountainous sections of the country. In many instances the mining community is one almost exclusively dependent upon a single mining corporation. The number of community chests reporting contributions from mining and quarrying corporations for 1929 is 70. The only community chests reporting a proportion of corporation gifts from mining and quarrying corporations for 1929 in excess of 5 per cent are Tulsa, Okla., 11.5 per cent; Wichita, Falls, Tex., 24.8 per cent; Salt Lake City, 11.4 per cent; Wilkes Barre, Pa., 27.4 per cent; Springfield, Ill., 11.1 per cent; Washington, Pa., 6.8 per cent. The first two are important oil producing centers; the third is important in the non-ferrous metals industry; the fourth, fifth, and sixth are coal mining towns.

However, as Appendix Table II shows, many of the 70 community chests reporting contributions from mining and quarrying corporations are not in mining or oil and gas centers. This leads to the inference that some community chests have succeeded in getting contributions from the mining and quarrying corporations that have either their principal office, or an important sales branch, in the city, or else got small contributions from sand and gravel companies. Many community chests apparently believe the presence in their city of the principal or sales office of a mining, quarrying, or petroleum company is ground for expecting a contribution from such a corporation. This attitude is indicated by the fact that a number of community chests specifically listed mining, quarrying, and petroleum companies as not contributing. Only a few of these community chests are in cities that could reasonably be called mining or petroleum centers. It was not within the scope of this study to ask corporations to state the grounds on which they either gave or declined to give to community chests. However, a few corporation officers have expressed the conviction that the fact that their concern had a sales office, that is to say, an "order taking" office in a community chest city did not justify

the corporation in making a contribution to the local community chest. In the case of the mining and quarrying industry, however, it appears that some corporations contribute to community chests in cities where they maintain an important sales office, or where the principal office of the corporation is maintained. The latter may be the case, even though the mining operation is carried on elsewhere. Of course, if a mining company actually extracted minerals in or near a community chest city, its position in regard to the local community chest would appear to be analogous to that of a corporation actually manufacturing in the community. But relatively few mining companies are in this situation. In the non-ferrous metal industry metal may be refined in a plant situated in a city. But few of the 129 community chests studied have metal refineries of this sort. In the case of the petroleum industry, corporations extracting oil and gas frequently have their headquarters in community chest cities, although the actual extraction takes place in a rural region. Coal mining is not usually carried on in urban centers, though Scranton, Pa., is an exception. In that city, anthracite coal mining is carried on underneath the city itself.

The Pittsburgh Welfare Fund reports several contributions from bituminous coal mining companies, but reports an equal number as not contributing. If the field of the Pittsburgh Welfare Fund be taken to be the area known locally as "Greater Pittsburgh," now almost contiguous with Allegheny County, much coal mining actually is carried on within the limits of that area. The fact that in important mining centers like Scranton and Pittsburgh some coal companies contribute to the local chests while others do not, indicates that there is not as yet a complete meeting of minds as to when a mining corporation is justified in spending stockholders' money in the form of contributions to community chests

A mining and quarrying corporation, judging from the data analyzed, seems to contribute to a community chest only if in that particular city the corporation

- (a) carries on mining operations (including smelting or refining, in the case of some mining companies), or
- (b) has its head office in that city, or
- (c) has a branch sales office of some importance in that city.

In the case of (a) the ground for the contribution is doubtless that men are employed by the company who receive service from the welfare organizations participating in the community chest.

Taking the mining industry as a whole, there is a comparatively small proportion of companies that actually carry on mining or smelting operations in or near a community chest city.

In the case of (b) the contribution is probably based on the personal relations existing between the head officials and directors of the mining corporation and the community. That is to say, the corporation has come to be identified with the life of the community, regardless of the fact that mining operations are carried on elsewhere.

In the case of (c) the contribution may be based on the fact that important customers of the mining corporation are among those active in raising the community chest fund. In other words, "good will" is the *quid pro quo*.

It has not been feasible to examine each and every one of the 356 contributions from mining and quarrying corporations reported by community chests for 1929 to determine in which of the three above mentioned categories they fall. It would seem, however, that if community chests are greatly to increase the number and amount of contributions from mining and quarrying corporations, they must find more solid grounds on which such contributions can be based than appear to exist at present. As indicated above, there is probably not much room for growth in contributions from mining and quarrying corporations, in view of the fact that few of these corporations employ large numbers of men in community chest cities. Evidently the possibilities of increasing contributions from mining and quarrying corporations lie in finding some mutually satisfactory grounds on which contributions can be made to the chests in those cities where the corporation is represented by a sales office.

Vd. Agriculture

In no year covered by this study have agricultural corporations⁶ accounted for more than one-tenth of one per cent of the total corporation contributions to community chests. Only 61 such contributions were reported for 1929 and the total contributed was \$9,577. The reason is obvious. Agricultural corporations

⁶As classified by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, corporations engaged in agriculture and related industries comprise the following: Farming, cotton growing, ginning, and baling in connection with growing; grain; horticulture; livestock; other agricultural pursuits such as sheep shearing; threshing; growing coffee, hemp, rubber, tobacco, hops; lessors or holders of farm lands. Related industries—fishing; forestry; ice harvesting; trapping; rubber gathering; maple-sugar camps, etc.; lessors or holders of timberlands.

carry on their activities in rural regions. The community chest, on the other hand, is an urban institution. Few of the communities included in this study could be classified as rural. Only thirty-two community chests reported any contributions whatsoever from agricultural corporations for 1929.