

than the others. As for television—"I won't give you a nickel for all the TV stations—they run criticisms and never let us get in with our answers."

The community leaders divide into three groups in their views of press attitudes. One group thinks the papers have responded to the CAC programs, another that the papers are pretty much on the borderline between being responsive and unfriendly, the third and largest group sees the press as actively hostile to OEO.

Elected officials and labor are particularly inclined to see the press in opposition: "The papers fight Federal programs. Some articles are fair but they don't miss a chance to jump on mistakes and problems. They are certainly not a help to CAC." This was the comment of an elected official (who had himself been an outspoken critic of some Community Action Programs). Another describes the press as "a real problem. When OEO was in the developing stage the press was fair, but as it began to develop, the papers became very critical. They couldn't find anything to criticize locally so they ran a lot of national source stories that were very critical and this has promoted a generally negative attitude. The press has been the greatest single influence in creating hostility toward OEO."

Social workers among the respondents also see the press as hostile. "They have used national incidents to hurt local efforts," one declared. Another said that "The nature of the news stories depends on who's writing them and whether they are under orders to slant them politically to match the paper's policy."

Labor officials commented in a similar vein. "The papers talk about the War on Poverty in terms of distrust without digging into what the problems are," a union official declared. "The press has not been helpful; rather it has helped create an atmosphere of opposition to OEO." Another labor leader said that while the papers had supported—or at least not denounced—OEO programs as such, "they are biased against Federal programs in general. The press," he went on, "attacked CAC over proposals to hire a press agent for the programs and they ask snide questions about salaries, political activities, and so forth." This respondent felt that TV stations owned by the papers had taken a similar attitude. "The smaller radio stations are useful in publicizing programs but have not given them strong support."

Some local officials—not elected—see things differently. "The newspapers have done a damn good job," a housing official declared. "They've not been belligerent or bitterly opposed, but they print the news about defects in the CAC program."

A school department official agrees "In general the papers have been pretty good. They have run a series of articles on antipoverty programs in general and the CAC programs in particular that have had a positive approach. They of course quote critics of the program but overall have been cooperative. The editorials have been generally favorable." (The respondent referred particularly to an *Enquirer* editorial in December, which concluded: "The real issue in the present debate is whether the hope that has been so carefully nurtured in the last two years is to flourish or whether it is to be crushed. Those who would crush it are playing with dynamite.")

(In Clermont County, a CAC staff man reported, the situation is quite different. The half dozen weeklies in the County (there are no local dailies), as well as the Clermont pages of the Cincinnati papers, give favorable play to CAC releases. "We haven't had one hostile article yet," the respondent noted. There are no radio or TV stations in the area.)

Civil Rights Organizations are viewed by the respondents as generally friendly to the Community Action Program but not as playing a major role or providing leadership.

A senior CAC official describes the civil rights organization as essentially middle-of-the-road groups that "support OEO programs in a vague way" but do not really participate. (An exception, he noted, are the Black Muslims, who oppose the programs.) The civil rights organizations are not an important group locally, the respondent explained. "In Cincinnati even the Negroes are Germans"—that is, they are basically conservative.

By better than 5 to 1, community leaders see the civil rights groups as friendly to CAC; some view them as indifferent; only one, as really hostile. A housing official said civil rights groups were "if anything pretty strongly for CAC. Many individuals are pretty heavily involved in the programs." A publisher sees them as "with CAC all the way—their representatives always vote with the pro-CAC majority on that agency's board." Both civil rights leaders interviewed see their groups as supporting the programs. "Enthusiastically behind it from the early days," said one. Several respondents noted that there were many civil rights people working in the programs, and one declared that at the local level the civil rights and CAC organizations were almost identical.