

A social worker says that CAC has been successfully kept out of politics—a view that is backed by several respondents. Another declares that “as a result of OEO efforts, the climate for acceptance of other Federal programs has been immensely fostered.”

“Somewhat grudging” is the way a labor leader describes the attitude of this group. “The city was slow to participate in the programs. Republicans opposed them in theory and the Democrats were ineffectual. The program may be in trouble from now on as attitudes change.”

A civil rights leader also believes that party feelings prejudiced Republican elected officials against the programs, but nevertheless felt that “The city administration has generally taken a middle-of-the-road stand.” Another civil rights official sees the city fighting the programs, while Hamilton County officials have been more cooperative.

In the eyes of at least one elected official, his colleagues have “not had much real effect. It takes a lot of time to keep up with this program,” he added, “and most don’t do it. A few have, and they are opponents.”

(In contrast, CAC leadership says that the elected officials in Clermont County have responded favorably to the antipoverty program. They are described as having put up cash, space, and such services as bookkeeping to make up the required local 10 per cent contribution. Office holders attend meetings and otherwise show an active interest.)

In contrast, Education Officials are described as one of the friendliest community groups. A senior CAC executive views the educators as spark plugs. “They spurred the effort and scrambled for school-related CAP programs. What’s more, they have shown an ability to develop their own programs.”

Almost all the community leaders interviewed see the educators as friendly and responsive to the program and about half of them feel that this group has been outstanding in their cooperation. A labor leader describes some school officials as “enthusiastic—some from a sense of responsibility, others because they want to get themselves in on the act.”

Several respondents, including all the private social welfare officials, describe the School Board as having opposed the antipoverty program at the outset (as well as such things as Federal support for “free milk and free lunches”). “Slow and reluctant,” “have dragged their feet,” “had to be coaxed and led by the hand,” were some of the comments. While some believed there had been a basic change, there were fears that there might be more difficulties ahead because of pressures on the school budget. An elected official saw the educators “now becoming negative as the school system has had its dollars cut.”

(CAC leadership gave a much more mixed report on Clermont County educators. The County School Superintendent reportedly gave little support to the programs after seeing that OEO grants weren’t coming his way. Out of nine local School Boards, two were described as having been outstanding supporters of the program, four as having responded to its demands, and the remaining three as having fought it.)

CAC leaders find Cincinnati Health Officials at best lukewarm to the anti-poverty program. An example cited is the long delays encountered in trying to get the Public Health Council to play its agreed part in submitting a proposal for health projects to HEW.

Among the other respondents, all but one describe local health officials as at least not opposed to the programs, while several consider this group as enthusiastic supporters. Two elected officials call the health people “spark plugs,” but one notes that “Their past director was excellent, but has recently quit because of a lack of money for his programs. At the Board level, there has been resistance.” This resignation was mentioned by several respondents as an unfavorable factor.

Several respondents agree with the view expressed by one that health officials had “made a minimal response and health is the weakest field of OEO activity.”

A labor leader made a further point: health officials “are conscious of the power structure and reluctant to take forward action on their own.” One respondent declares that this group is ultraconservative and has fought the program.

A civil rights leader said that the Health Department as a whole was “pretty good,” but complained about opposition to having Negro dentists serve in health clinics.

In the eyes of a senior CAP executive, Cincinnati’s Welfare Officials have been at best weak and ineffective—and at their worst an obstacle. “The Director