

on a national basis, which is not surprising in view of the preoccupation of local Urban League officials with their immediate situations. Throughout, in response to this question, the emphasis was upon local CAPs rather than the national administration of the OEO.

With respect to local CAPs, it is felt that management deficiencies are caused largely by uncertainty of employment and the involvement of the poor, to some extent, in positions for which they have aspirations but not aptitude. This, again, reflects the need for more adequate funding arrangements and on-going staff development, professional and non-professional. It also underscores the need for a true marriage between the professional and non-professional in order for programs to be more effective.

It is widely felt that community attitudes hinder the effectiveness of the OEO, particularly in smaller communities. Jacksonville, Florida, for example, reflects a feeling that the anti-poverty program has to *fight* for everything it obtains. The smaller communities also tend to complain about the morale of personnel, about bureaucratic administration, and charge that the OEO is a political football.

In Fort Wayne, Indiana, it is noted that the CAP board is heavily weighted with members of the United Community Services.

These points again illustrate the need for guidelines spelling out the relationship between a CAP agency and traditional community agencies.

The sixth question was "*To what extent have poor people been involved in the war on poverty in your community?*"

As previously indicated, OEO guidelines have resulted in one-third representation of the poor on CAP boards in most instances. Prior to the guidelines, the poor were permitted very little participation. Even where the involvement of the poor is considered most successful, as in Washington, D.C., where 849 poor people were employed in CAP programs and 1,536 poor people serve on CAP advisory and policy-making bodies, it is pointed out that where the views of the poor conflict with those of the "professional," the poor tend to be ignored.

In both the Mid-western and Mid-eastern regions, and in smaller cities throughout the nation, there is a feeling that there is still some resistance to the meaningful involvement of the poor on CAP boards. In the Mid-western region, the larger cities indicate that the involvement of the poor has been, for the most part, in the role of client. The exception is Kansas City where the poor demanded and got representation at the planning level, but, at the same time, even there, CAP is being watered down because it "rocks the boat of the establishment." Fort Wayne, Indiana, among other cities, cautions that in many instances involvement of the poor on CAP boards is a matter of tokenism. "They come to meetings, they are seen, they sit, they say nothing, and they return home, while a handful of other people usually make the decisions."

An additional dimension to the problem of developing programs to help the poor help themselves is the potential vulnerability of organizations without reliable, responsible professional/non-professional cooperation. Where the non-professional in combination with a relatively inexperienced administrator are burdened with the full responsibility for a program, they are potentially fair game for individuals and organizations who may exert destructive influences over the indigenous group. Such individuals and organizations may have agendas of their own which have little to do with the objectives of the program or the needs of the poor. In fact, they tend to specialize in leading rather than developing leadership; they may even systematically work to bring about chaotic circumstances, resulting, in some instances, in violence and destruction.

There are a number of variations on the theme of the extent to which the poor have been involved, which again reflects the need to recognize the individuality of cities and their needs. In Jacksonville, Florida, Urban League officials consider the involvement of the poor the best in the Southeast, despite the fact that this city reports weak financial and community support for poverty programs. Another Southern city indicates that some of the poor regard Negroes serving on the CAP board as "selectively safe." Atlanta, Georgia, like Kansas City, points out that participation by the poor on CAP boards and advisory committees came about only after vigorous protest by the poor.

In sum, there is substantial room for improvement in the quantity and quality of participation of the poor in the poverty program.

The seventh question addressed to Urban League executives was "*To what extent has the Community Action Program been effective in achieving its objectives?*"

Again, reduction of funds from year to year and the unmet need for the expansion of program are identified as the key factors limiting the effectiveness of CAP.