

A Persuasive Speech On An NGO “Project Concern International”

Posted on July 26, 2022

Introduction

Imagine a community in which a pregnant woman can obtain reliable health information, a family facing hunger can reach local support, and a farmer can make better decisions before drought destroys a season’s income. These outcomes do not appear simply because an outside organization arrives with money. They become more likely when communities, public institutions, local organizations, and responsible international partners combine knowledge, resources, and accountability. Project Concern International, commonly known as PCI, offers a useful case for a persuasive speech about nongovernmental organizations because its history includes work in health, nutrition, humanitarian assistance, women’s empowerment, and community resilience. PCI is no longer an independent organization: it became part of Global Communities through a merger completed in 2021. That change makes the central message of this speech more important rather than less important. Effective humanitarian action should be judged not by a familiar name or an emotional appeal, but by whether it strengthens local capacity, protects dignity, uses evidence, and remains answerable to the people it serves. (Global Communities, 2020; Global Communities, 2021)

A Persuasive Speech on Responsible Support for Community Development

Good afternoon. I would like to begin with a simple proposition: concern becomes meaningful only when it is translated into informed and accountable action. Many people feel compassion when they see hunger, preventable disease, unsafe housing, disrupted education, or the effects of conflict and climate shocks. Compassion matters, but compassion by itself does not determine which intervention will work, who should lead it, or whether it will continue after a project ends. Responsible support requires us to ask harder questions. Are local residents involved in identifying the problem? Are women, young people, people with disabilities, and marginalized groups able to influence decisions? Does the program coordinate with existing health, education, and government systems? Are results measured honestly? These questions separate durable community development from short-lived charity.

What PCI's History Can Teach

PCI began in 1961 and developed programs in several regions of the world. Its work evolved beyond emergency relief to include public health, food and nutrition security, economic opportunity, disaster response, and resilience. Historical PCI initiatives described in the original discussion illustrate this range. Community health projects in India worked with women and families to improve knowledge and access to care. Nutrition programs attempted to identify and assist children at risk of malnutrition. In pastoral areas of Africa, technology-supported information services helped livestock keepers evaluate vegetation and water conditions. These examples are valuable not because every intervention was perfect or because one organization can solve structural poverty. They show that a problem such as hunger has several causes and therefore requires more than one response.

A malnourished child may need immediate food and clinical attention, but the household may also require reliable income, clean water, transportation, and access to functioning health services. A pregnant woman may need accurate information, yet information is not sufficient if the nearest facility is unaffordable or unsafe. A pastoralist may benefit from satellite-derived grazing information, but that tool must be understandable, locally relevant, and connected to decisions about mobility, land access, and animal health. Responsible development therefore combines short-term protection with longer-term capacity. It also recognizes that communities possess knowledge and institutions of their own. External partners should support those resources rather than treating local people as passive recipients.

The Merger and the Importance of Institutional Continuity

PCI and Global Communities announced their intention to combine in 2020, and the merger was completed in September 2021. PCI's programs, experience, and personnel became part of the larger Global Communities organization. This is an important factual correction because a persuasive speech written today should not ask an audience to support PCI as though it still operates independently. The current institution describes its work through the Global Communities name, while some country histories continue to identify programs that originated under PCI. (Global Communities, n.d.-b)

Organizational mergers can offer advantages, including shared technical expertise, broader geographic networks, and reduced duplication. They can also create risks. Community relationships may be weakened when names, leadership structures, funding priorities, or reporting systems change. Staff may face uncertainty, and local partners may struggle to understand who is responsible for commitments made under the earlier organization. The ethical test is continuity: are communities informed, are obligations honored, and are programs changed through consultation rather than administrative convenience? Supporters should not assume that a larger organization is automatically more effective. They should look for transparent governance, accessible reporting, local partnerships,

safeguarding systems, and evidence that programs remain responsive to community priorities.

Why Community-Led Work Deserves Support

The strongest reason to support a responsible NGO is its ability to connect resources with locally led action. Governments hold primary responsibility for protecting rights and providing essential public services, but public systems may face conflict, disaster, limited revenue, geographic barriers, or exclusionary practices. NGOs can sometimes fill urgent gaps, test new methods, train local personnel, convene partners, and help communities advocate for better services. Their role should complement rather than permanently replace accountable public institutions.

Community leadership improves both legitimacy and practical design. Residents know which households are being missed, which communication channels are trusted, when seasonal work affects participation, and why a technically sound service may not be used. Women's groups, health workers, teachers, farmers' associations, youth organizations, and local disability advocates can identify barriers that an external project team may overlook. When these actors participate in planning, budgeting, monitoring, and evaluation, the program is more likely to fit local realities. Participation must be genuine, however. Inviting residents to a meeting after the major decisions have been made is consultation in name only. Community members need meaningful power to shape objectives and question results. (United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, n.d.)

From Charity to Rights and Capability

A persuasive appeal can easily rely on images of helplessness. That approach may attract attention, but it can also reduce people to their hardships and reinforce the mistaken idea that outsiders are the sole source of progress. A rights-based approach begins differently. It recognizes that people experiencing poverty, displacement, hunger, or illness retain agency, knowledge, and legal and moral claims. Assistance should protect dignity and expand capability rather than demand gratitude.

This distinction changes the language supporters use. A child is not merely a symbol for fundraising; the child has rights to protection, nutrition, education, and privacy. A woman participating in a livelihood program is not simply a beneficiary; she is a decision-maker whose unpaid labor, safety, property rights, and access to finance affect the program's success. A community responding to disaster is not an empty space waiting for rescue; local responders are usually active before international organizations arrive. Ethical communication should obtain consent, avoid exposing personal details, and explain structural conditions instead of suggesting that poverty results from individual failure.

Evidence, Transparency, and the Duty to Learn

Support for an NGO should be informed rather than automatic. Organizations need to explain what they are trying to change, how they will measure progress, what risks they have identified, and what they learned when an intervention did not work as expected. Counting activities is not enough. The number of training sessions, food packages, or mobile messages sent does not by itself prove that health, nutrition, safety, or income improved. Evaluation should examine outcomes, distribution, unintended effects, and sustainability.

For example, a maternal-health project might measure whether participants can reach skilled care, whether respectful treatment improves, and whether preventable complications decline, not only how many educational meetings occurred. A food-security program should consider diet quality, seasonality, market effects, and whether assistance reaches excluded households. A digital information service should evaluate access for people without smartphones, literacy barriers, privacy, and whether users can act on the information. Honest evaluation may show mixed results. That is not necessarily failure; it is an opportunity to revise the design. Concealing weak results, by contrast, prevents learning and wastes public trust.

What Volunteers and Donors Can Responsibly Do

People often ask how they can help. The answer is not that every person should travel abroad or attempt work for which they are not trained. Short-term voluntourism can consume staff time, displace local labor, or create safeguarding risks when participants lack relevant expertise. Responsible involvement begins with research. A prospective supporter should review the organization's current legal identity, program descriptions, audited financial information, safeguarding commitments, and evidence of local partnership. Because PCI is now part of Global Communities, current inquiries and support should be directed through that organization rather than through outdated PCI pages.

Financial contributions are most useful when they are flexible enough to support local priorities while still subject to clear accountability. Skilled volunteers should work within defined roles, professional standards, and supervision. Community members can also support organizations close to home, advocate for policies that address the causes of poverty, and challenge misinformation about migrants, displaced people, and communities receiving aid. Ethical support does not end with a donation. It includes attention to how trade, climate policy, conflict, debt, discrimination, and public investment shape the conditions humanitarian organizations are asked to address.

Answering Common Objections

Some critics argue that NGOs are inefficient, dependent on donor priorities, or insufficiently accountable. These concerns should not be dismissed. The sector has experienced examples of waste, fragmented projects, abuse of power, and programs designed more to satisfy funders than communities. The appropriate response is not to assume that every NGO is untrustworthy, nor to suspend critical judgment because an organization has a humanitarian mission. It is to demand stronger standards.

Supporters should ask whether an organization has independent oversight, mechanisms for complaints, protection against sexual exploitation and abuse, transparent procurement, and procedures for investigating harm. They should examine how much decision-making authority and funding reaches national and local partners. They should also recognize the limits of overhead ratios. Administration, staff safety, monitoring, cybersecurity, training, and financial controls are necessary for responsible work. A low overhead percentage is not proof of impact, just as a higher percentage is not automatically evidence of waste. The more meaningful question is whether resources are governed well and produce equitable, sustainable results.

A Call to Informed Participation

My appeal is therefore not simply “support an NGO.” It is: support community-led, evidence-informed, and accountable action. Learn what became of PCI, understand that its work now continues within Global Communities, and judge the current organization by transparent evidence rather than historical reputation alone. When you contribute time, money, expertise, or public advocacy, do so in a way that strengthens local leadership and respects the people whose lives are being discussed.

A cleaner, healthier, and more secure community is not created through sympathy alone. It is built through public responsibility, capable local institutions, fair policies, and partnerships that listen before acting. NGOs can contribute to that process when they remain humble about their role, rigorous about evidence, and accountable to communities. Our responsibility is to replace distant concern with informed solidarity: to ask who leads, who benefits, who may be excluded, and how progress will continue after a particular grant or organization has moved on. (Global Communities, n.d.-a)

Conclusion

Project Concern International provides a meaningful historical example of an NGO that worked across health, hunger, resilience, and humanitarian assistance. Its merger into Global Communities demonstrates that institutions evolve and that persuasive advocacy must rely on current facts. The strongest case for support is not that any organization can rescue vulnerable people. It is that

responsible organizations can help communities secure resources, strengthen systems, test solutions, and expand their own capacity to shape the future. Support should therefore be thoughtful, transparent, locally grounded, and accompanied by a willingness to examine both achievements and limitations.

References

Global Communities. (2020, April 6). *Global Communities and Project Concern International announce merger*.

Global Communities. (2021, September 1). *Global Communities and Project Concern International complete merger*.

Global Communities. (n.d.-a). *Our history*.

Global Communities. (n.d.-b). *India: Our history and programs*.

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. (n.d.). *Participation and accountability to affected people*.