

Considering the basic conservatism of Cincinnati, "We're going upstream in this town and I don't think we'll ever win a popularity contest." The respondent quoted surveys carried out by Cincinnati's two Congressmen before the last election: they showed western Cincinnati about 4 to 1 against the programs and the eastern half divided about equally between opponents and supporters.

A civil rights leader pointed out that Cincinnati's large Catholic population is particularly conservative and that many oppose so-called giveaway programs.

A school official commented that some sections of the city "particularly middle-class suburban areas"—don't understand the programs. "They feel that too much is being done for these people—what do we get out of it?" He added, however, "when they are informed they respond differently. Five to six hundred volunteers, many from the suburbs—take part in the programs as tutors and participate in Saturday morning enrichment programs."

(Another CAP official said that despite press publicity and innumerable talks to service clubs, etc., people in Clermont County still ask what CAP is. "I would like to believe that the general public likes us, but I can't really give a reading on this—not too many of them know we are there.")

Effect on community costs

1. *Welfare.*—There is little tendency to see the CAC programs as having any major effect on Cincinnati's welfare costs. Half of the respondents who commented on this point agree with a senior official of the Welfare Department who said that he "knows of no reduction."

Among the few who speculate on a possible connection, a civil rights leader believes that OEO job placement and other programs had cut the number of welfare recipients. (At the same time he complained that CAC had not raised the level of individual welfare payments, which he felt desirable.) A housing official denied firsthand knowledge, but "had heard reports" that the programs had cut payments. The most positive opinion came from a labor official: "When the OEO programs are effective, the rise in welfare costs is arrested, but this is masked by the increase in population. It is too soon to see a decrease in welfare costs, but this is a possibility for the future."

Two respondents working in the social welfare field believe that if anything the programs would—and should—send welfare costs up. "Reduction of welfare costs will not be the purpose of the program until all those eligible are on the rolls and services reduce dependency."

2. *Crime.*—Several respondents believe the programs might be having an impact on the costs of juvenile delinquency and crime. One respondent declared: "It is hard to show a change on the record. But give a person something to do and you keep him out of trouble. Participants in the programs are not involved in incidents and vandalism has fallen off." A housing official reported that "there is less vandalism in the housing projects—and in some areas the crime costs have been cut. The programs have a potential for future gains in this area." A school official reported some indication of a decrease in juvenile delinquency arrests—"and the only new element in the situation is the OEO programs." On the other hand several social workers commented that juvenile delinquency was too complex to be clearly affected by a single factor, such as the programs.

A civil rights leader was not impressed by the impact of the programs, even if it were shown to be favorable. "By keeping kids off the streets you cut down the number of crimes—but you are not getting at the causes of crime. The OEO programs are essentially a baby-sitting job for potential delinquents."

3. *Other Costs.*—The civil rights leader says that the OEO programs were, "if anything, increasing the costs of municipal services because more services are now being asked for." Another civil rights leader sees an offsetting factor: "The programs have increased the city's revenues from its local income tax by the take from people whom OEO has trained to hold jobs." And a labor official saw one big economy: "The riots that didn't occur save Cincinnati a lot of money."

Matching funds in Cincinnati

In the past the required local contribution to OEO programs does not appear to have been a problem. In recent months, however, three developments have complicated the picture:

The required contribution has been increased from 10 to 20 percent, doubling the demand on local resources;

Defeat of the special school tax levy in referendums jeopardized the largest single source of local contributions;

Cutbacks in OEO programs raised questions of project priorities and the extent of local control over the selection and retention of projects.