

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

Democratic Party of Trumbull County

Political Experience

O. H. 505

BISHOP KILPATRICK

Interviewed

by

Mark Dittmer ,

on

June 2, 1977

BISHOP KILPATRICK

Bishop Kilpatrick, a native of Warren, Ohio, was born into a legend of family democratic politics in Trumbull County. When he was born in December of 1906, his father W. B. Kilpatrick was beginning his first of four terms as Mayor of Warren. His father later held position in the Ohio legislature in 1928 and served as County Chairman of the Democratic Party from 1925-1950. Bishop's brother, W. B. Kilpatrick Jr., served as County Commissioner for sixteen years.

Bishop became interested in politics in 1928 helping his father run his campaign for representative in the Ohio legislature. In 1935, B. Kilpatrick ran for a position as a rep in the Ohio legislature and was elected. In 1941-1943 he gave up his post to serve in the Army Air Force. He later returned to active politics in 1948 and was elected into the Ohio Senate and remained there until 1972. His chief commitments to the Ohio Senate were that of taxation reform bills. He was also instrumental for the proceedings and building of Route 11 in Ohio. His main concerns during the 1930's in politics was the bringing about of stubbed ballots to try to rid the area of illegal voting processes. Kilpatrick's whole career was based in Ohio politics. Now retired from politics, Kilpatrick presides in Warren, Ohio with his wife, Dorla T. Kilpatrick.

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

Democratic Party of Trumbull County

INTERVIEWEE: BISHOP KILPATRICK

INTERVIEWER: Mark Dittmer

SUBJECT: Senator's roles, Diffusion of two party system,
Political and Social Backgrounds, Labor-Party
Relations

DATE: June 2, 1977

D: This is an interview with Bishop Kilpatrick for the Youngstown State University Oral History Program. Today's interview is located in Warren, Ohio, on June 2, 1977, at 9:00 p.m. The topic discussed will be on the history of the Democratic Party in Trumbull County by Mark Dittmer.

First, Mr. Kilpatrick, I would like you to give a description of your political background and your family background and relate whom or who has motivated you to go into the field of politics.

K: Well, I was raised in a political family. My father was the mayor of the city of Warren at my birth in 1906. W. B. Kilpatrick was the mayor of the city of Warren four different times. In his lifetime, he was a member of the legislature and a member of the Ohio Constitutional Convention in 1912. Also, he was a county chairman here for about 25 years. So, therefore, I was born and raised in a family of politics. I came by it naturally. My brother, W. B. Kilpatrick Jr., was county commissioner for sixteen years.

D: Could you possibly go into an analyzation of your years in service from when you started into politics?

K: I started into politics back in 1928 in the Al Smith campaign. My father ran for Congress. I was very active in his campaign as a young man. I went around with him to various political meetings and became indoctrinated with politics. I found out the fundamental principles. In those days, we attended a great deal of meetings. There was no such thing as communications that we have today in politics. It was all,

then, personal contact with different people and different groups, so as to get them interested. At that time, there was no such thing as labor organizations or groups of people gathered together for political purposes like there is today in politics.

I was educated in the early days of politics where you had to make personal contact and get certain people in different districts. At that time, it was more of precinct work and ward work, right down to the grassroots of politics to see your next door neighbor and talk to him and have him talk to his next door neighbor. It was done entirely by that kind of contact. Then, of course, there were some different ones in different shops and organizations to support and work for you. Then, today, of course, it's now union controlled. It's an entirely different ballgame than it was in those days.

In 1935 I ran for state representative and he was county chairman at the time. My father became county chairman in the days of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the New Deal. I worked all the way through that period in politics. I was first elected to the General Assembly in 1934 under the administration of Martin L. Davey, very strong party organizations where, at that time, they voted a straight ticket and they advocated a straight ticket. You voted under the rooster or you voted under the eagle.

I know the coming of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his New Deal, he put through unemployment insurance and social security and welfare programs that took over. The government took care of the people and took over the responsibility of political parties that those days used to hold. They used to find a man a job and they used to get the coal and the food for the families during the Depression or hard times. But now the government, under the New Deal, put all those things in the movement or government and there was no need for party organizations.

So, in the years to come and follow, why, they come in with Massachusetts style and did away with strict party voting and did away with a great deal of the chores and duties of the political party. And the political parties, of course, became weaker and weaker. Politics is really controlled now by pressure groups, the labor organizations, manufacturer's associations, Chamber of Commerce, and all kinds of social orders, different groups of people, welfare people, retired people, mental hospital advocates, teachers. All these things are brought about by different groups organizing and becoming interested in one certain thing about government, and then working along that line. It's entirely different from the early days of politics. It's different now and it'll be different in the future. The individual is becoming more important. Of

course, it always was true to a great extent that names had a great deal to do with who was elected president, who wasn't. If you go through history, you'll find these names stick out in different candidates and locally too this was true. Labor organizations are becoming very powerful today and, also, manufacturer's associations, in other words, instead of one group. There used to be the days when the American Legion used to be quite a bit of a political power. Before that was the GAR [Grand Army of the Republic] of Civil War Veterans. The veteran organizations, at one time, were very powerful. But today, they're not, because war isn't very popular today. The Vietnam War, of course, turned an awful lot of people off from war.

The patriotism that this country used to have is very lacking today. Times have entirely changed and the views of people have entirely changed. The people are interested in their pocketbooks today; they are interested in how much money they can make or whether they're going to have a job or pensions. Interests are entirely different constantly, all the time, and the individuals become individuals. What I mean by that is that they promote their name and their views and not rely upon party affiliations.

Carter, of course, was elected president. He out-politicked them all. Labor didn't have its say. Of course, we don't know yet, trying to read everybody's idea of how he was elected and how he was nominated. My theory is, he was nominated because of the times, because Wallace, the governor of Alabama, was a candidate and the democratic party was so fearful that Wallace would be the nominee that, in the Florida primary, they all centered on Carter; like Jackson of Washington, Udall of Arizona, Shaft of Pennsylvania. All the candidates, at that time, centered behind Carter to go down to take on Wallace in Florida. That was a two-man race and Carter came out victorious in the Florida race. After he won, that they got rid of Wallace and he was out of their hair, and they didn't have to worry about Wallace. Now, they could go ahead and nominate one of their own kind. Also, labor, Mr. George Meany and the rest of them all thought that the ballgame could be now handled because they were fearful of Wallace. Wallace was a threat because they were afraid that he might start a third party if he didn't receive the nomination. But now that he had been beaten by a democrat in the primary, it took the threat away of Wallace being an interest to the democratic party and the third party being created.

Then they went to get rid of Carter. Carter was too clever, too lucky, and was able to ward them off and go on and win the nomination. He won the nomination down in Florida by beating Wallace. By then, not being able to get rid of him in the subsequent weeks that followed the Florida primary, they trotted out Church of Idaho; they trotted out Brown of California.

Brown and Church both beat Carter in whatever contest they went into, but they weren't successful in getting the ducks all in order. Carter was successful in keeping them separated and off of base and therefore captured the nomination and captured the election.

Of course, the republicans were in the same kind of trouble with their Reagan and with their Ford. Ford, being the incumbent, was able to win out in getting the nomination and put up an excellent campaign under the circumstances because I felt that no party could ever be reelected that had Nixon and Watergate on its neck, no more chance than the man on the moon. Of course, we have been able to go to the moon now, so that expression isn't very potent because we can go to the moon and it isn't like it used to be, an impossible proposition.

Ford was able to develop large support. Now, I don't know, analyzing it and trying to find out and reading and trying to find out different people's opinion, just how it did come about or how the people felt. But, after the Watergate scandal in the Nixon days, how in the world Ford was able to get the support that he did with his fight with Reagan too . . . which was always, in my estimation, death in politics to have a bitter fight in the primary, then be able to come out and out on a showing, which he did.

Of course, there are two ways of looking at those things. One is candidate and politics, and being in it all my life I know a great deal of it is a matter of timing, a matter of luck, which in the turn of events, keeps the opposition unorganized. Carter, right after the nominations of parties, was an out-and-out favorite. By election day . . . the pollsters must have been right because they pared him down to a close race. They must have been right when they said he was so far ahead. If the race had gone on a couple of more weeks, I doubt if he could have won because he seemed to be able to run a campaign, but absolutely didn't know the first principle of how to get any votes. He went backwards instead of forward so it made Ford look really good because he came up from practically nothing. I mean, very poor showing against a strong candidate. The strong candidate got weak.

I read some articles that said that Carter, being a southerner, didn't know how to run against a republican. He didn't know what a republican was, coming from Georgia. He never had to run against a republican because there is no such thing in Georgia as a republican party as a power of any kind. So he didn't have any idea how to handle it. Of course, the question is whether the debates had anything to do with the election or not, I don't know. I think . . . the way I looked at it and listened to them being active in politics, I didn't think either candidate, Ford or Carter, was worth

their salt. Neither of them, in my estimation, were capable of being president of the United States. Neither one of them knew what they were doing. But, that's my opinion, I've been listening to politics for forty-some years. I figured Ford was the better candidate of the two as far as meeting the issues of the day. He being a republican and I being a democrat, it's hard for me to say that, but I felt that he put on such a poor campaign. And being that Watergate had ruined the republican party, in which in the end, as Reagan said after the election was over . . . They asked him if he could have won and he said he didn't know. Of course, you couldn't tell, never could tell. But the Watergate situation came into the campaign the last couple of weeks. You can draw your own conclusions as to whether he would have won or not. Ford was very successful in overcoming the great deficit he had.

Carter was such a bum campaigner that he darn near lost the election. So as president I hope to God that he's a wonderful president and has good luck. Of course, it's too early to tell at this stage of the game when he's only been in a few months or whether he is going to be successful in his program. What I have seen so far, I think he's running it just like he ran his campaign. I don't think he knows yet what it's all about or how the public in general feels. In politics, I have never known of a politician that would come out and tell the people in the democracy, "You must pay more taxes, you must do this and that. You do all the sacrificing and do away with your big cars and get small ones. You have to pay all this extra," and not come along and tell us how to get more gasoline or how to produce more or drill for more, or put out the money and get some more oil into this country. Instead of that he says, "Save it and conserve. Don't drive your car. Be uncomfortable and get a small car." How can a politician win and continue to win and put out the propoganda in a democracy that you're going to have nothing but hardship all the time and not give them any good news, such as, times are going to be good and times are going to be well.

Because I came up in the political field and my first real president in my years of youth was Franklin Delano Roosevelt . . . You never heard anything out of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in his fireside chats that was not encouraging. At that time he was talking on radio and telling the people that times are better, times are going to get fine. He went in his first one hundred days following the Depression. Of course, one thing about it, he couldn't do very much wrong because everything was wrong and anything that moved in the Depression days had to go forward. They closed the banks, as you know, in the first days of business and opened them up in a few weeks, months. He assured the people that everything was going to be fine and he was powerful enough and a man enough, knew

enough and convinced the people that he knew the problems and had the answers. If they would just stick with him he would get them through this Depression. And, of course, he had everybody working, passed programs after programs and put things through Congress so fast it made their head swim. I know he was under certain conditions.

Now, this man [Carter] is under entirely different conditions than Roosevelt. He was such a disappointment to me in the campaign that I haven't been able to get over it. How ignorant he ran the campaign; I mean ignorant. I think it was the dumbest campaign that I've ever seen conducted nationally. Of course, I never was subject to southern campaigns. He, being a southerner, and naturally I'm prejudice to southerners, but if that's the way they campaign I don't see how anybody ever got elected down in the south.

D: I would like for you to discuss your main political philosophies and creeds, if you have any, and how you applied them to practice when you were in the Senate or in the House of Representatives in Columbus.

K: My political philosophy is to always follow the democratic party lines. I've continued to do that all of my life regardless of my views on different issues. I've always said that the only way you can do anything in government and accomplish anything is that it has to be done along party lines. That is, in other words, you can't get one hundred senators to agree in the United States Senate or 33 senators in the Ohio Senate to agree unless you go along party lines. Certain issues have to be and you have to vary even your own thoughts, personal views and go along with your party to accomplish anything if a party sets out a policy.

Now when it comes to other things, where there is no party policy set on either side, then of course, you do your own thinking and your own philosophy of how government should be run. But under the two-party system, and I'm a two-party man, to have anything accomplished, it must be done by a two-party system and by loyalty of the party. A lot of the trouble in the United States today has been because we haven't had party loyalty and the party loyalty has fallen down. That's because of the falling down of the strength and so forth of the political parties.

I don't think this country's democratic system will ever be successful until we become more party oriented. The party, to my estimation, should be more along party set lines. The party shouldn't be made up of all the philosophies we have in the party today. A person can be a republican or be a democrat and have the same feelings and philosophies in either party. There isn't a great deal of difference between the parties. I think there should be more of a difference, more of a straight

line difference between the parties and therefore the party loyalty can be brought about. I don't know, I might be wrong, but as the years have gone by, I've seen that it's getting away from parties rather than more party. My philosophy is that I'm very sorry to see the way the country is going in the leading in this democracy. I don't think it's helping it any.

D: Speaking on the democratic party in Trumbull County, when do you think it was at its peak of existence and why?

K: The democratic party reached its peak in this county . . . This county was always a republican county and controlled by the manufacturers of this industrial area, steel mill area in this valley. It was controlled by the steel interests at that time, the republican party from the days of William McKinley and the full dinner pail. Then along came the Depression of the 1930's and the labor unions were born. The labor unions started to organize and become creative to some extent and became a power and the democratic party came into force. The change of the party was reached in the Mahoning Valley in 1936, but it constantly has gained every year, year after year. It has become more democratic in every election with the exception of a few. I would say for the democratic party, today, with the Carter election, in the valley was the greatest democratic victory we ever had. It was at its peak. Carter's election throughout the United States, a very close election here in Ohio, but yet Northeastern Ohio including Ashtabula was always strong republican down even as far as Columbiana. Down in the Steubenville area was solid democratic and the most strong democratic we've ever had in this district in history.

D: Do you have any recollections of past party campaigns and strange events that ever happened here in Trumbull County?

K: Oh yes, there have been some strange events over the years. Of course, in different campaigns, locally there have been a few scandals. The most noted one that I can remember was the Frank Caciale scandal. The city council scandal in the city of Warren was over sewer contracts. The county chairman, Frank Caciale and two or three councilmen went to the penitentiary. The strangest thing about that scandal was that you would think it would ruin a party locally, but the election results showed it never phased it one iota. Republicans didn't gain a thing. Well, maybe a couple of offices or something like that did, but as a party, as a whole, it didn't gain a thing. Within about two years the citizens had forgotten. You would have thought it never happened. That was about the only time that I can remember of anything that was out of the ordinary, but it didn't have the ordinary effect that any politician would think. I thought the same about the Watergate proposition.

It's strange to me too that Ford came that close. Of course, I blamed it all on the campaign that Carter conducted. Well, you say, "How could he conduct it any different?" I feel that he should have made Ford answer several questions. I would never have gone through the campaign if I had been Carter and not asked him the question: How come he pardoned Richard Nixon? I would have made him answer that question-- not put himself in the position that he would never bring up pardon. The pardon was the whole thing in that election. When the essence was down, it was a question of Ford pardoning Nixon and Carter won out because Ford did pardon Nixon and Carter didn't. That was the whole issue. To see the presidential candidates go through the whole campaign, both sides, and with so many important questions up, energy questions and everything else in this country, and yet, when all was said and done, it was a question of the pardoning of a man, a president. They didn't carry on the campaign on a high plane at all.

- D: Also speaking on Trumbull Democratic Party, can you bring about speculation on your favorite politicians in the area over the years?
- K: Among leading politicians in our country here: Lynn B. Griffith. He ran for years and years. He was a law partner of my father's and was elected to judgeships, prosecuting attorney and has been on the ballot for forty or fifty years in this county. So, over the years, he has had a long life in politics, three or four decades. What distinguishes the family above all is their longevity in politics. How long they can stay in, because keep in mind, when they first start out to run and they're in office for any length of time at all . . . how many generations of people who have died supported them and the new generation of unborns support them, why, they have a pretty good record of following. That to me is a test of their ability as a politician. That's one reason I'm always proud of my family. I started out in 1935 and over a period of forty years, four decades, of course, the party grew. In 1936 it started out and I grew with it. It's the same. Any of us in the political field couldn't help but win under the conditions of growing popularity. And old Griffith's family rode the same horse at that time.
- D: Changing to the senate of Ohio, in what ways did you represent Trumbull County?
- K: My county, I was state representative in Trumbull County. I was elected by all of the people of this county for twenty-four years. I was elected every two years. The Trumbull County politician never had an opportunity because of the selfishness of Mahoning County never giving up any offices to anybody in Trumbull County. Then the redistrictive bill took Mahoning County away from Trumbull County and put Trumbull

County in the Ashtabula district to the north. I was successful in running for the State Senate and was elected and reelected. The only way that they could get rid of me was to change the district and take Ashtabula County away and put me down in Mahoning County. That's how they accomplished it because nobody from Trumbull ever has any success running in Mahoning County. That is no-man's-land for the Trumbull County politicians.

As for doing anything for Trumbull County, I was instrumental in getting a Kent State University branch here and getting the highways, Route 11, through. I was active in that for twenty-some years--getting it started, getting the center line established, getting the bond issues voted upon and passed to get the people to build Route 11. There are a lot of other things. There are so many of them that happened that you can't take full credit for them because in the legislative body, you cannot take credit for any one thing. It has to be accredited to the legislature itself, when you get them convinced to go along and get the majority to get it passed, you get those things accomplished.

D: Did you have some colleagues in the Senate who were standouts as far as progressive reform for this area?

K: Oh no, everyone represents their own districts. You never see them getting out and advocating anything publicly, for another district is very envious of it and of course you don't do it because you don't want to step on toes. No, each man keeps the forefront for his district. Now, of course, your friendship in the legislature with the different men of power is important. You've helped get those things accomplished and they help you, but they never take the lime-light away from the man who represents the district. That's legislative courtesy and that's adhered to very strictly. If it isn't, it becomes not a happy place to work. You have nothing to be congenial in the legislature or accomplish nothing.

D: What committees did you serve on within the Senate?

K: In the Senate I served on Ways and Means. In the House, I served all twelve years on the Taxation Committee. Also, in the Senate I served on what was called Ways and Means, the same thing as taxation. My interest has always been in taxation and I served all my thirty years in the legislature on the Taxation Committee. That was my main one and the next one was the Insurance Committee.

D: Do you think the tax system in Ohio is fundamentally good?

K: The tax system in Ohio is one of the lowest in the United States; the best state in the Union for taxes. I'm very proud of our

tax system in Ohio and I think we have the best tax system of anybody in the United States. We cover full spectrum; we have an income tax, a sales tax, and we cover the broad section and our taxes are not high. Of course, a lot of it that we can't take credit for because under our system and our constitution the people voted the taxes and most all of the taxes we have on books have either been voted by the people or a referendum has been taken on them. Our constitution makes it a very good tax state.

- D: Talking about the democratic party in Trumbull County, if you were ordained the chairman at the present time, what type of platform would you run and what changes would you like to make?
- K: My father was county chairman for twenty-five years here in Trumbull County from 1930 to 1955. After his experience and being very close to him politically all those years, being kind of his right-hand man, being younger, and him having an active law practice, I did a lot of field work, running around making contracts with people in the county. I wouldn't be county chairman under any conditions today at all. Even then it was beginning to get to be not the most pleasant job in the world, to be county chairman. I certainly wouldn't want to be one now because they have very little power at all anymore. The only thing a county chairman today does is sit on the board of elections and draw his salary. Otherwise, he doesn't do very much of anything. Of course, he can't. He is in a position he can't do it because he runs into labor organizations which dominate the democratic party. Labor organizations veto anything he has to say if he doesn't meet with their approval. The only way he can get along with the labor organizations is to go a long and carry out their programs rather than his own. So under those circumstances, I would be county chairman because you're not your boss at all; you adhere to the labor party line or you're nothing.
- D: Speaking about the chairman, do you see anything adversely wrong with the party in Trumbull County?
- K: No, nothing wrong with this party, in this county, anymore than it is in any other county. They're all the same. The chairmen and the secretaries of the party that have become members of the board of elections and draw their salary and meet once or twice a year. The county chairman does get to serve as toastmaster at some dinners or something for the candidates that have been nominated, but he has very little to do with the nominations or anything in the county because the labor unions have moved in and taken over in this particular district.
- D: Do you think the central committee has any power in Trumbull

County?

- K: They have the power under the law to a point to fill vacancies when a man resigns, get some kind of county office. Yes, we in the legislature give the party some power by filling the vacancy rather than have different officers do it in the county. The public offices, to fill vacancies, leave that to the central committees of each respected party. Whichever one loses the office, they fill the vacancy. It's a duty.
- D: Talking about labor now, can a labor party exist without the democratic party here in Trumbull County? Is there a fusion between the two and can the two work without each other?
- K: Labor and the democratic party should be separate, down to the theory of the party. But being in a county of our time here, strong with labor, why, naturally they dominate the party. They control it by the votes and votes control the party and if the county chairman doesn't go along with the labor movement, why, he isn't county chairman. In other counties that don't have labor, but have the Chamber of Commerce, the management, or the farmers or somebody else dominate them. This democracy is getting into pressure groups all over the nation, farmers or what have you, or labor or manufacturers or anything of that kind dominate the parties. It's dominated by their votes or dominated by the money in contributing to run parties.

Contributions are becoming a big thing and we're having to put through these different ethnic propositions in politics and contributions. Everything now is being scrutinized with a fine tooth comb: Where you get your money, how much you're getting and all this and that. We're cutting down on the amount people contribute because there's a conflict of interests and so forth. So you see, it's becoming a much more complicated business than it used to be. Money speaks and money talks and then, also, votes talk. People talk about money, and votes are just as important as money, in fact, more important. Labor has that and therefore can control it.

- D: How much is the average politician here in Trumbull County manipulated by labor or big business?
- K: He doesn't go out and call them names. He tries to get along with them or put up with them. It might not be losing friends, but it doesn't last long in politics unless he makes some concessions along the line, any more than the republicans get along without the money boys giving them unless they get the votes for the labor movement. Of course, the trouble is, as time goes on, different leaders come into the labor party and it's a different ball game each time. One fellow will go along with labor, vote for labor and everything else and in come a new bunch of labor officers and they don't happen to

like the fellow that was in office before, whether he's 100% labor or 90% labor, out he goes and put in their own. So he's subject to even the leadership of the labor movement changing too, just the same as anything else.

D: Do you think labor has changed between 1950 and 1970 in this county?

K: No. Labor hadn't changed much except it became more dictatorial over the years. Each and every year it becomes more dictatorial in their demands. People once followed their line and, of course, the reason for that is they're coming faster and faster now, everyday when your county employees or your public employees become members of labor unions. Even the people who work for you belong to the union and that union belongs to amalgamated unions or the Trumbull County Council with the steelworkers and everything else intermingled. Everyday, day by day, it becomes more and more tightly drawn together. It's entirely different. It isn't getting any better and the same is true on the other side [the republican side].

D: Doyou think the days of Mayor Daley are over?

K: Oh yes. Mayor Daley parties are over. He's the last of them. It used to be in the early days when I first went into politics there was the Kelly Nash machine in Chicago, the Trump machine in Tennessee, even Tammany Hall in New York and Penrose machine in Pennsylvania. I could go on and name all kinds of machines all over this country that were political machines, political parties, both democratic and republican, on either side. Those days are all gone. The last of them now are gone. Death took him, Daley. He hung on better than any of them. Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the New Deal put through the welfare state. In other words, did away with what the parties were. Parties were welfare parties in those days. They took care of the people when they were hard-up and when people were oppressed, out of jobs, and hungry and cold. Now the government takes care of them. They go on relief. They don't have to kowtow to anybody to help them out because the government does it. They don't owe anybody anything, they don't even have to vote. They don't vote, a lot of them, because they're afraid if they vote they'll get cut off of welfare.

D: Did you approve of his system in Chicago, Daley's system in Chicago?

K: I wasn't familiar with it firsthand at all. I read the papers, but what I could read in the paper, being that Chicago is made up of all ethnic groups and the melting pot of the world, of course, he was a past master controlling all those factions. He was the past master in getting the votes and getting these great ethnic groups and colored groups and all of them to work together and he was one man that seemed

to be able to run the city of Chicago and run it successfully. Of course, he had lots of scandals and lots of corruption in Chicago, but you never could tie it up directly to Mayor Daley. He was an Irishman who was hungry for power, but it didn't give any impression that he was hungry for money. He was just hungry for power. If somebody in his administration stole some money, it didn't rub off on him. He was able to live through it because he was one man. As I read in the papers, he was backed by really all people, by all groups because he could run the city and they were afraid to turn it over to anybody else. It had been run so badly under the Kelly Nash machine and so forth. When Daley came in, he was from the old Kelly Nash machine, but he was able to run the city successfully and with some degree of harmony where the rest of them had never been able to do it. That's why he lasted, but the days of political machines are over. The government has taken over all the functions.

D: What future do you see for the democratic party in Trumbull County?

K: There's no future for any part in any county under our new welfare government, under government today. It takes care of all the needs of the people. They have an agency that takes care of everybody in the United States: hospitalization, sickness, health, and welfare. All things are taken care of. Parties have no function of any kind anymore.

D: Do you call this socialism?

K: No, this is a welfare state under our democracy.

D: Do you see an end of the party system?

K: Yes. The party system has been over with, as far as I'm concerned, for twenty-five years, or passing out for twenty-five years. No, there's no need for parties anymore. There's no function for them.

D: These are all the questions I have to ask. Is there anything you would like to add?

K: Oh, I think I've probably said enough. We've covered the spectrum, I think, pretty good.

END OF INTERVIEW