

tion. In discussions about what Cincinnati school programs might have to be deleted as a result of the voters' turndown of a special school tax levy, business leaders on the committee emphasized the need to continue the school-sponsored OEO projects.

Business has cooperated in job entry for members of OEO youth programs, this respondent reported, "though sometimes it's double talk." He knew of no organized segment of the business community that had come out against the programs, although there had been a setback when attacks on government spending were emphasized in the recent political campaign. Nevertheless, the respondent himself had recently had an enthusiastic reception from a young businessmen's group to which he spoke on OEO programs.

(The attitude of the Clermont County businessmen was described by a CAC official as "by and large favorable." The Clermont Industrial Development Commission (a CAP group) he noted, includes manufacturers, real estate men, bankers, and others from the business community and sponsors a monthly discussion group.)

The target population is seen by almost all the respondents as favoring the CAC. Many also believe, however, that a large segment of the poor are still unaware of the programs' existence.

A CAC executive said that the dominant mood of the target population is apathy: "CAC gets no help from the grass roots." Despite a good beginning in getting the poor to take part in the CAC programs, there are still comparatively few involved—and a long job lay ahead. The respondent pointed out, however, that the reaction varies from one target neighborhood to another, depending on such factors as the type of residents, and the quality of the local staff. In some areas, there is strong support, with CAP activities well-attended.

Among the community leaders, an elected official said that the poor had responded when the programs reached them—but that the resources of CAC had been too limited to make strong contacts. A colleague, however, feels that the poor "have all been stirred up and so far still feel that OEO has helped them." This respondent takes a dim view of the future. "I'm afraid of their reaction when the program steadily recedes and they are forced to recognize that they won't be helped."

A school official describes the poor as "at first not satisfied with their own involvement in project planning, but pretty much so now." He added, however, that some feel "they should have representatives on the boards that actually operate the neighborhood service projects."

A social welfare worker involved in the CAC programs declares that "sometimes they are mad at us because we don't have enough money to do what we said we were going to do. Sometimes they are with us. Sometimes they don't know what is going on." Another social worker agrees that the response has varied. "The most difficult areas have been those with an existing organization," he said. "There the attitude toward CAC people has been 'what are you fellows doing here now?'"

A labor leader asserts that the target areas accept the programs. "The Neighborhood Houses have done a tremendous job—they talk easily to people and have had some quick successes that show what can be done." Another union man described the growing involvement—and continued reservations—of the poor in his own neighborhood. "In the beginning the poor were cynical and didn't believe in the programs, giving only nominal support. In the West End, CAC hired the natural leaders of the community. Now the people give CAC overwhelming support—but they still don't think the programs will work."

(A CAC official said that the response of the target population in Clermont County is difficult to evaluate. "They don't show much reaction." The poor there are not concentrated into neighborhoods but scattered widely over the County, so it is hard to get them involved. "The north-south roads in the County are very poor so that travelling 15 to 20 miles to meetings is a real chore." "But those that are serving on committees seem to like what we are doing.")

The respondents are divided about how the GENERAL PUBLIC of Cincinnati feel about the OEO programs, but nobody sees any enthusiasm or even very much friendliness. Almost half described the public as hostile to CAC. An equal number believe that the public is simply unaware of the programs—or at least not informed about them. A small minority suggest that the public is at least a little bit responsive to the programs.

A senior CAC official saw the public in general as not knowing what's going on but "if they did, their attitudes would range from disinterest to hostility."