

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

Public Affairs: Youngstown, Ohio

Political Experience

O.H. 187

JACK C. HUNTER

Interviewed

by

William Manser

on

May 13, 1975

JACK C. HUNTER

Jack C. Hunter was born May 13, 1930, the son of Charles and Margaret Corbett Hunter. He was educated in the public school system of Youngstown, Ohio and is a graduate of South High School. He holds an undergraduate degree in Economics from the University of Denver and one in Political Science from Kent State University. Mr. Hunter served in the United States Marine Corps from 1950-1954 and is a Korean Veteran.

Jack Hunter's occupations have been as; Tower Operator for the Erie Lackawanna Railroad from 1948-1958; Assistant Trust Officer for the Mahoning National Bank from 1960-1969; part-time instructor at Youngstown State University from 1962-1968; elected Councilman in November, 1965 and re-elected Fifth Ward Councilman in 1967. Mr. Hunter was elected Mayor in November, 1969 and was re-elected in November 1971, 1973 and 1975, being the only Mayor of Youngstown to be elected for four terms.

Mr. Hunter married the former Pauline Pieton on September 1, 1973. He is a member of many organizations such as the Organization of Protestant Men, The American Heart Association Incorporated, The Mental Health Association of Mahoning County, the Republican Associates of Mahoning Valley Incorporated, the Trumbull County Men's Republican Club, The West Side Merchants and Civic

Association, Pleasant Grove United Presbyterian Church and many others. Among the awards he has received are the Youngstown Chapter of M.P.M.A., "The Iron Mike Award": 1972 Frank Purnell Award from Youngstown Area Jaycee's; Croatian Lodge No. 66 - 1973 Award; Kiwanis Club Special Award.

Mr. Hunter's hobbies are gardening, fishing and reading.

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSTIY

ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

Public Affairs: Youngstown, Ohio

INTERVIEWEE: Jack C. HUNTER
INTERVIEWER: William Manser
SUBJECT: Local government; communication between mayor and public; elections; voter apathy; effect of Watergate on Republican Party; environmental protection; public opinion's influence on the courts; annexation of outlying areas to Youngstown; city manager type government; partisan and non-partisan elections; administration's accomplishments; renovation of downtown Youngstown; coping with organized crime

DATE: May 13, 1975

M: This is an interview with Jack C. Hunter by William Manser for the Youngstown State University Oral History Program in Youngstown, Ohio at the Mayor's office on May 13, 1975 at 9:14 a.m.

Mr. Hunter, how did you ever become started in politics?

H: Well, probably always having had an interest in matters as it relates to politics. We came to a situation where the councilman in the ward I lived in had to withdraw as a candidate for re-election because of business commitments and I was asked to place my name in consideration for taking his place on the November ballot in 1965. After giving it a great deal of thought and having an interest in politics, I decided to give it a try.

M: What particular difficulties or encumbrments did you encounter in becoming first involved in local affairs?

H: First, it does take quite a bit of one's time when you run for elected public office, getting out, meeting people, going door to door. At the time, I was running for councilman in the Fifth Ward, which had a population of something like 27,000 people. So, this would mean, oh, probably 6,000 or 7,000 households and you have to get to as many as you can to make yourself known. So, that is a logistical problem trying to find the time to go out night after night and weekend after weekend to get your candidacy across, let them know who you are,

and let them know some of your ideas for both the ward and for improvements in the city.

M: Would there be any established organizations or institutions that might, more or less, inadvertently discourage young men from becoming involved in politics?

H: I think sometimes your political parties as such can act as an impediment for young men under the philosophy that you have to come up through the ranks of having performed services for one of the political parties, having served as a precent committee person. In other words, coming up through the ranks. Fortunately or unfortunately, the Republican Party, at the time I got into politics, was badly disorganized in Youngstown. So, you didn't have to go through all these various steps in apprenticeship to secure elected public office.

M: How about other organizations and local institutions? How might they react?

H: Of course, we have a number of ethnic groups in the City of Youngstown, labor groups, business groups, consumer groups, social groups that are actively interested in politics and rather take a good look at the various candidates and either support them on the basis of mutuality of interest or oppose them because of lack of mutuality of interest. So, you can perhaps have labor support and then maybe the business community might not be too enthused with your candidacy. You can have, perhaps, support from smaller ethnic groups and then, in turn, not have the support of other groups. So, it's kind of a balancing act between the various interests that make up the City of Youngstown.

M: As a successful Republican in an area where the Democratic affiliation prevails and with a strong labor movement, how have you managed, so to speak, to keep from alienating either segment, either labor or business?

H: I'd have to say that at the local level of government, more so than anywhere else, it's extremely nonpartisan. And in many instances, if I attract new industry, that's good for business and it's also good for labor because it means additional jobs. If we undertake capital projects in the City of Youngstown, this means that various businesses can bid on city business and in so bidding and receiving the contracts, this means that people work in the City of Youngstown. So, I think the things that bind the total community together are much greater

than those few things that might be a divisive factor between groups.

M: What role do you feel partisanship should play in local government?

H: I really feel that partisanship should be there in evident in the primaries so that each political party puts forward their absolute best candidate for the elected offices, then come on line again in the Fall when we have the municipal elections to make sure the best man is elected. But other than that, I don't believe you run a Republican or a Democrat city. I believe you just run a city for the purpose of serving the most people in the best manner possible.

M: I believe you appointed several Democrats?

H: Yes, that's part of my philosophy of just bringing the best men and women into government irregardless of their political affiliations.

M: Did you receive any flack on account of that from your local Republican organization or perhaps, the people who might have disagreed with you?

H: Oh, I received some flack, quite definitely. Some people felt that I should have just appointed, solidly, Republicans to all positions, but my answer to that was, of course, I was elected by all the people, not by just a narrow segment of it. I'm appreciative and I'm not ashamed of my Republican credentials, but again, a mayor of the City of Youngstown is mayor of 140,000 people. If I'd just received Republican votes, I would never be elected. So, I believe the people are not too partisan at the local level, that they just want the best man. In electing what they might consider the best man, they want him to bring the best people into government to serve all the people.

M: How can a local politician particularly a mayor, who is in charge of the local bureaucracy, best maintain his relation with his local party organization?

H: I think, by and large, if you do a very good job for the citizens, they're going to, perhaps, look more favorably upon that party affiliation. In other words, a lot of people say a Republican can't be elected in Youngstown, although, in fact, we have elected a Republican mayor and a Republican controlled council. So, I think the sharp, perhaps, hostile image for the Republican Party that might have existed in the past has been moderated a great deal simply because of the performance

in office over three terms now.

M: Why do you feel you were elected in the first place?

H: I feel really the first time a person is elected to a public office, especially when they're in the minority party is kind of a vote against the other guy and you're just the beneficiary of it. I think the previous mayor of the City of Youngstown had been mayor during a phase of urban renewal that we call the Demolition Phase. In other words, buildings were being ripped down all over Youngstown. There wasn't any progress in the building of new buildings, so people tended to, perhaps, vote against him because of this.

And I came along when we were in the transition between the demolition and the rebuilding of Youngstown. And now, since I've been mayor, they've seen street projects completed, bridge projects completed, new buildings constructed in downtown Youngstown, a re-dressing and refacing of our Federal Plaza; so that I think they tended to look upon the previous administration--and probably not correctly so, but nonetheless, they did--in a negative light, where the things that my administration has been able to build on as a result of what has gone on before has been rather more affirmative and something more visual. In other words, instead of vacant lots, you now see buildings going up on these lots.

M: So, it was sort of--you came in at the right time?

H: Yes, the right place at the right time in a very real sense.

M: You established the proper relations.

H: Yes.

M: What do you think has accounted for the fact that you have been re-elected?

H: I think, again, having been in office at the time when the City of Youngstown was physically undergoing a rather dramatic rebuilding. The first major office building in downtown Youngstown since, I think, 1926, before I was born, the renovation of some of our downtown buildings, these are physical things that people can see that a mayor can point to with pride.

M: About the time you were first elected in 1969, the country was, more or less, going through a period of

very noticable, still perhaps not very deep violence, but seeming lawlessness. It was perhaps, overexaggerated at the time when people were concerned about law and order at that time. Do you feel that, perhaps, since the Republican Party was more associated with strict law enforcement than the Democratic Party, that this may have helped you in the past six years?

H: This surfacely might have helped, but I think then you have to go beyond the surface and look at a record. And rather consistently, although we have in the last year or so had some increase in crime in our city, it has been at a substantially smaller rate than nation-wide. In a few of the years we actually had a major substantial reduction in the crime rates in the City of Youngstown. So, I believe that we have worked for quality law enforcement, I'd have to say I've had the support of both Republican and Democrat councilmen in attempting to bring Youngstown quality law enforcement.

M: Wouldn't you say the declining crime rate has inflicted favorably on your administration?

H: Oh, very definitely. I think anything of a positive nature that you can point to with pride, so to speak, has to show up in the ballots and the way in which the general populace view any any particular administration that holds office at the time.

M: You stated that when you first entered politics, the Republican Party was in a state of disorganization and disarray. In other words, it was in pretty bad shape. This isn't what went on in the Democratic area. What made you decide to go into the Republican Party since it didn't seem to be a fruitful area for a young man to go into?

H: It was both fruitful and unfruitful. Fruitful from the context that you didn't have to come up through a party mechanism or perhaps, what some might be referred to as a party hack. So, I felt, in this context it offered tremendous opportunities. And of course, the first time I was elected, of our thirteen elected municipal officials, councilmen, president of council, mayor, clerk of courts and judges, I was the sole Republican. In other words, of thirteen I was the only Republican officeholder in the City of Youngstown. So, I think, that perhaps, gave me more visibility than the average councilman might have. And people were aware of what I was saying and what I was doing more so than if I had been just one of, say, six Democrat councilmen at the time.

- M: What do you think has accounted for the renaissance of the Republican Party since the mid 1960's?
- H: It's like that ad you read in you national newspapers and magazines about Avis--they're number two and they try harder. In a very real sense, there's about five Democrats registered for every Republican in the City of Youngstown. So, if a Republican is going to get elected, he has to work a lot harder and if he's going to get re-elected, he has to serve a lot better. So, I think we work a lot harder. I think we serve a lot better.
- M: You stated that at the local level there is less partisanship and so forth and, perhaps, more cooperation across party lines than at other levels of government. That's true, but even so, people, the ordinary voter who doesn't take an intense interest in politics, still tends to let his image of the local party organizations be influenced quite a bit by what goes on at the national level so that national Republicans and local Republicans tend to, more or less, blend to a degree in his mind. He knows they're different, but still what one does affects his image of the other. The same thing goes for the image of the other party. Do you feel that, perhaps, national politics and national affairs might have helped in the local renaissance of the Republican Party?
- H: Of course, Mr. Nixon would have been elected in 1968 as President and I was elected mayor in 1969, so, whether this had a moderating influence at the time I really don't know. But the really big distinction is, my wife and I went down to a Dairy Queen the other day with our son to get a Dairy Queen and the people can see you. You're there; you're physically there. They might see me at one of the department stores or a grocery store or a church or any number of various and sundry places, but they'll never see a Governor Gilligan, a Governor Rhodes, a President Ford there. So, I think there is a much warmer bond between your local elected officials than you state and national, simply because they can see you. People see me out riding my bicycle around, cutting my front lawn. I think a local elected official is a much more human being in the eyes of the average citizen than is the Governor of the State of Ohio or the President of the United States or a U.S. Senator.
- M: How can a local official best keep in touch with public opinion, with what the people are confronted?

H: I think, there again, it means getting out to certain functions that are periodically held in the City of Youngstown; it's having a listed phone so that a person can call up with their gripe; it's going to the supermarket for your wife periodically so that some of the ladies there can bend your ear about the things that are of concern to them. It's just going for a walk in the park and riding your bicycle around the City of Youngstown and driving your car around to see some of the problems. It's have maximum accessibility. Now, I'll grant you that when you're mayor of the City of Youngstown you don't have the occasion to talk to all 140,000 of our citizens, but you try to make yourself available to as many as reasonably possible.

M: Well, you say you can't be in touch with all the citizens and so forth, you have to get feedback from people who are familiar with the citizens. What role would the local party play in providing you with some sort of feeling of the public's problems?

H: The local party is another of many mechanisms through which public opinion can be funneled to you. When you have a cabinet that you attempt to have rather broadly based, representing the total city, they're out and about and they're hearing things. If people are pleased with the administration, they transmit the message. If they're unhappy, you also get that message transmitted. And then you get specifics. If there's a road that should be resurfaced or if it should be cleaned up because of dumping of litter, you rather quickly, at the local level, get this message. In other words, I'll hear pretty quickly about a pothole on Market Street or Mahoning Avenue. I'm certain President Ford doesn't hear about a pothole on Interstate 80 or Governor Rhodes, a pothole on State Route 7. So, you do have this accessibility that's not found at any other level of government.

M: What role do local churches and civic organizations play in articulating public opinion?

H: I think they play a very important role and that's why, as mayor and councilman also, you make yourself available as much as possible to the various functions they have and make yourself known to the various ministers and molders of public opinion in the community so that they can transmit to you both the pluses and minuses of what's happening in Youngstown on any given day.

M: As you've stated, there has been a decline in crime and lawlessness since your administration has come to office. What would you attribute this, not only locally, but also

nationally since they do tend to overlap?

H: Of course, I think that the role and function of the police department, both locally and across the nation has been reformulated since the chaos of the 1960's to the point where we're attempting to attract a higher quality of young man and woman to the police department where we have improved the training, improved the equipment of the law enforcement agencies. It used to be that they were very second class citizens as to wages and as a result, didn't attract the highest quality of people. So, we've attempted to make adjustments now so that the average policeman, after two or three years on the force, is making an excess of ten thousand dollars. So, we have had rather a dramatic increase in wages and fringe benefits and training and equipment and the like to really bring the police department into the mainstream of our American economy.

M: How can a local official, particularly an executive, best maintain good relations with his public service workers, particularly in regards to unions and wage advance and so forth.

H: It's kind of a balancing act to be quite honest. You can never give anybody everything they want as an elected official. I think it's being available to them to sit down to hear their complaints. Many of the complaints are what you and I might think to be of a rather minor nature, but I think it's quickly getting to these problems and getting them resolved so they aren't a continuing constant source of irritation. So, again, I try and get out to my various operating departments periodically, not as often as I'd like, because this desk here, you're almost chained to it after awhile. But I do meet with the union people whenever they want a meeting. And they aren't capricious about it.

If they can't get a problem resolved at the departmental level, only as a last resort will they come to the mayor and they'll know, from past experience that I will immediately address myself to the problem. If they're correct, it'll be resolved in their favor. If it's wrong, it will not be resolved in their favor. So, I think we've established a sense of fairness and equity in dealing with our employees.

M: Do you think the trend today is towards greater unionization of public employees?

H: I would have to say yes. This appears very definitely to be the trend. It has, like anything else, it has

some pluses and it has some minuses. I think when you have strong unions, you're going to have more substantive demands made on the city. But again, it's a lot easier to deal with a couple unions representing 1,500 city employees than try to individually deal with 1,500 city employees. From an administrative point of view, I think we'd like to have strong, healthy, responsible unions in our cities.

M: How can the public interest best be balanced with the interest of these unions?

H: Again, this is a policy determination made both by a city council and a mayor. I think we owe an obligation to our work force to provide an honest day's wage for an honest day's work and, at the same time, providing quality services for the citizens of the City of Youngstown. And I think we have been, by and large, able to do this. In the collective bargaining process, you establish a good rapport with the unions and if some of the members are, perhaps, errant and not doing a job, our unions have not hesitated to tell their rank and file, "Hey, get on the ball; you're getting a decent wage and provide a decent service for the people because they pay your salary." So, I think the unions have tended to help us to improve the quality and delivery of our services in Youngstown.

M: Communications seems to be the chief thing as a key to good relations in this field.

H: Yes, it's a very important thing. They have some things that you may not seem to think that are important that, to them, are. There might be some things that you feel are important that the union couldn't care less about. So, it's having an ongoing dialogue with the union people, not just when there's problems, but on a continuing, recurring basis. It's kind of getting to be on a first name basis with the local union representatives.

M: What role do committees play in helping to funnel opinion and communications from the mayor, perhaps, to various orders of the community at large?

H: A lot of the committees serve a worthwhile function. In other words, you can use them as a conduit to get your message out to the community. In other words, sit down in the office with ten or fifteen men and women and tell them what you're trying to accomplish and if they agree then they can go out to their various organizations and assist you in this goal. And conversely,

if they want something, they can come in and kind of be a conduit for what the opinion of the general populace is and goals and aspirations of our city.

M: It has been said that increase in good communication has played a vital role in helping quiet things down for the past six or seven years. And there's no doubt this facilitates the effectiveness of local government. Now, we know there are trends towards bigger city governments on the local scene if it was more unified like governments of smaller sections. But also, there has been a tendency towards decentralization in city government particularly in some of the bigger areas. The ideas have been bandied about of mini city halls in some places and others have a small communication center type city hall in some cities and other ways of getting the public's pulse also. What do you think about such ideas?

H: I think it depends a lot on the size of the city. Now, Youngstown is 140,000 people. By car or by bus, no one is probably more than twenty minutes away from downtown. If you live in a city with a couple million population, then I think mini city halls, substations for police department and for other agencies of local government become a very worthwhile and necessary item. It's much more expensive. In other words, if you maintain a downtown city hall and five branch city halls, you have a certain fixed overhead that is a duplication which costs money. And when you spend money on that, you can't spend money on other worthwhile projects. But for the larger cities I think it is important and a very good product. For a city the size of Youngstown, I don't really think it would cost itself out. In other words, I don't think the benefit would be commensurate with the cost to the citizens in other projects that would have to be sacrificed.

M: How about the idea of an ombudsman? Do you think that might be effective in a community the size of Youngstown?

H: It could have some merit, except in Youngstown I think you have a unique situation where each councilman represents 20,000 people. Almost any given night you can pick up the phone and call your councilman and tell him what your problem is. I think where an ombudsman comes into effect and becomes a very vital consideration is when you have an elected official representing just so many people that he can't adequately service them all. And then I think an ombudsman tends to be a very worthwhile office to cut through the bureaucratic red tape. So again, we don't close our mind

- on that concept for Youngstown sometime in the future, but at this time we just aren't really impressed with the immediacy of the need for an ombudsman to be the people's advocate in city hall.
- M: Often time the people that are most in the need of help, say the very poor or the old, are least able to take advantage of the avenues of communication. Sometimes they don't even have telephones and they can't get downtown. How do you feel these people can be reached?
- H: Well, of course, we have worked with some of our community agencies and even established some community agencies to help meet and alleviate this problem. You mentioned the aged, We have, in Youngstown, established a project on aging with Outreach workers. We've worked with our Community Action Council for Outreach workers that can go into the neighborhood and physically assist people and make known their problems and their dilemmas to city hall.
- M: You suggested that better ways should be achieved for transmitting information from the state level to the local level of government. And what did you have in mind? What would be the ways of doing it?
- H: I would suggest that it would be very beneficial, say, the governor and members of his cabinet, the state representatives and their staff, and even your national senators and their staff would come into the local community maybe once a year. In other words, have Governor Rhodes and a few members of his cabinet come in and visit city hall and hold forth in city council chambers one day a year and maybe another day in Canton or Akron or Toledo or Cincinnati or Marietta, just kind of scattered across the state where they can get away from the rigid structure of government in Columbus and be out here to hear what the problems are of the people at the local level. I think it would be very, very beneficial.
- M: How about committees, what role might they play in this respect?
- H: Again, it's easier for a committee to say, "Sit down and meet with Governor Rhodes in Youngstown, Ohio," than it is to make a trip to Columbus, or to meet with Senators Taft or Glenn in Youngstown than it is to go to the considerable expense of going to Washington for such a meeting. In other words, in an election year, the state and national politicians come to the people to talk to them and maybe in off election years

it wouldn't hurt for them to come to the people and listen to them.

M: Do you think they might be able to establish any organizations? Not organizations that exist on the bi-levels between local and state, but do you think the officials themselves might be able to establish any organizations for this?

H: We do have some organizations. You might call it interpolitical where we have a Mayor's Association here in Ohio; we have Association of Cities at the national level, where through these associations, we meet with both elected and appointed representatives at both state and the Federal level. But I think, at the local level, whether it be city or township or county, this is the government that's closest to the people. And I think this is the government that the people should avail themselves to to transmit their problems, their complaints and then, in turn, if it's a problem that can be resolved in Youngstown, then we'll resolve it here. If it has to be transmitted to Columbus or Washington, we so transmit it.

M: Mr. Hunter, there has been much said recently about bureaucratic insensitivity in government at all levels, particularly at the larger levels, at the state and the Federal level. How do you think this can be avoided and remedied?

H: It's never going to be easy because people keep asking for more services from government at the local, state and Federal levels. This means more state employees, more state programs, more state projects, for projects at all levels of government. So, it really is putting bureaucrats, in a very real sense, more and more between the elected officials and those that elect them. And it becomes very difficult for you to attempt to determine who you call at the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio to complain about a possible rate increase for your telephone or for your gas or for your electric. And I don't know whether there's ever going to be an easy solution there.

We have the same problem at the City of Youngstown. Somebody calls up the they wanted to complain about something and they aren't really certain who they want to complain about. Maybe they got the wrong department and that wrong department really isn't quite certain what the person is talking about. So, they transfer him and transfer him until the person gives up in utter disgust. Well, I'm willing to take half the blame. Half the blame is governments fault, but, of course,

half the blame may be the individual who is complaining's fault for not really articulating or communicating, as we spoke about earlier, the essence of their complaint.

I hate to say it, but I think it's going to get worse before it gets better as people want more and more government to play an advocacy role for like, the consumer. You're going to have more government and the more government you have, the more difficult it's going to be to work with additional levels of government, and especially the bureaucracy. In other words, city hall would be a lot more responsive if we didn't have so many various and sundry agencies. But these agencies of government at all levels are created, by and large, in response to the desires and wishes of the people.

I think government can continually strive for better procedures in addressing themselves to complaints of people. And then, I think, people have to kind of know how to quickly articulate their problem. I'll get calls at home complaining about the school board. I explain to the caller, "Well, I really don't have any responsibility there except being a taxpayer like yourself. Why don't you call a member of the board?" Well, they want to go through and give me their whole problem and if I won't resolve it for them, they think I'm buck-passing. If you have a water problem, you don't call the dog catcher. So, if you have a school board problem, you don't call your councilman or the mayor. So, it's a two-way street really.

Unfortunately, a lot of people might think that we elect too many people while others contend we don't elect enough. But the average person may know their councilman, may know their mayor, but ask them to name their seven members of the board of education that they vote for and all the county offices they vote for and all the state offices they vote for and the federal offices. You might quickly find the average person's mind rather boggled by the number of people they vote for.

M: Do you think the future is going to see a greater number of elected offices?

H: I don't know. The trend has seemed to be maybe away from some of the elected offices. They're talking about, at the state level, doing away with the municipal clerk of courts and combining that and the county court function under the previous governor that talked about eliminating the position of county coroner, which is elected in Ohio, county engineer, which is elected,

and a couple others that they were suggesting they abolish, while at the same time, you have some people actively lobbying to elect members of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.

M: Do you think that will be a good thing?

H: I think it would be a good thing to have at least one person from the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio elected to be somewhat the consumer's advocate in Columbus.

M: How about the election of judges, do you think that's going to become more and more common?

H: Elections present a person with a great deal of opportunity that, unfortunately, all people don't avail themselves of. In Ohio, we have certain popular names: O'Meill, Brown, Woodling. These have been historic names, where sometimes people without qualification have been elected to office just because of the confusion the name creates in the minds of the voters. I'm not about to sit here and say that I think we have the seven best attorneys that are possible to have on the Ohio Supreme Court. I'm not going to say that they aren't, but I'm not going to say they are. And I don't think you could make that statement either. And, but yet, these are the people that are elected by the citizens of the State of Ohio to be on the highest court in the State of Ohio.

Would it be better if we had them appointed by elected officials, maybe subject to the advice and consent of the Ohio House and the Ohio Senate? It could be, if politicians always chose the best person for the job, but you and I know that politicians don't always choose the best person. Maybe it's somebody that has been a political friend or crony for a number of years. Maybe it's somebody that has contributed a large sum of money to a campaign. Maybe it's to influence an ethnic vote at a future election. You have some merit to both the people electing officials and you also have some merit to them being appointed and no one stands out as the clear answer to the dilemma we find ourselves in.

M: Do you feel the electorate is improving itself in the efficiency of picking good officeholders?

H: I think, by and large, they have. When they've made mistakes, they've corrected them two or four or six years later, whenever the opportunity prevails. I think the most disturbing thing is we have probably 75,000 people that could be eligible to vote in the November election coming up this year. Probably some-

thing less than 60 percent of those that could vote will, in fact, go and vote. So, if only 60 percent vote--and it only takes a majority of one to be elected to a public office--you could have a person elected to public office that just received the vote of 30 percent of the eligible voters, but yet, is out there serving the whole 100 percent. So, in a very real sense, although we don't talk about it, we do have, in many instances, minority government.

M: In some countries they make it a law that people that don't vote are punished in one way or another.

H: Yes, I had an Australian student in here from Tasmania last week that's a student at Liberty High School. And there is a fine that you pay in Australia if you don't vote in the national elections. Now, they don't have it at the local level, like in their town or township or burrough elections. But if you don't vote in the national elections and you don't have a doctor's excuse, you're fined, I think he said something equivalent to ten dollars.

M: How do you think that might work here?

H: Forcing a person to vote doesn't make them a discerning voter. In other words, if you don't know anything about the issues and you don't know anything about the candidates and you aren't willing to find out, does it behoove us to send you out to vote? I wonder about that. If you don't know whether this guy or that guy is qualified to be mayor or councilman or judge or president of the council or clerk of municipal court, do we really want to force you to come out and just vote for the sake of having said you voted?

You can walk in a voting booth in Ohio, stand there a minute, flip the lever and come out, and never have pulled down lever one. So, I don't know. You'd like to think that there would be a time and a place that we would arrive at when all the people study all the issues and all the candidates very carefully with a very open mind and go out and vote for the issues that will best serve the total community and the candidates that will best serve the total community without letting any little prejudices or the like, influence their voting. But I think you and I would have to candidly admit we haven't arrived at that day yet.

M: Do you think we might ever remotely approach it?

- H: I don't really know. You hear about the science fiction of sitting in your living room and voting on TV, by a closed circuit process, for your candidates for local and public office. I don't know whether this is good or bad. In that case, I'd hate to be running against a Rock Hudson because I know I would get slaughtered if they vote on the basis of good looks; or a guy that has, say, majored in speech and can present a real beautiful speech with dripping sincerity and all the proper catch-phrases, but that may be totally ignorant about local government. It's the quality of candidate that you want. He doesn't have to be good looking. He doesn't have to have wavy hair to be a man or woman that can well serve the community. And you wonder how many of these surface considerations, that are really unimportant considerations, how often do they affect the way a person votes?
- M: Yes, the problem is though, when you get past the local level, the low local level, just about the only way people know the men that are running is by seeing them on TV and how photogenic they are; this counts a lot. And how well packaged and how well fit they are counts a lot.
- H: Yes, you'd think sometimes in selling a president they're selling a bar of soap or a box of cereal or a cake mix. This is unfortunate. And hopefully, the American people can see through this, hopefully they can see through that.
- M: How do you think they might be educated to improve their perceptions?
- H: Well, I'll tell you, I think a lot of these programs where they put the two candidates for elected public office on the same platform and ask them rather incisive questions can start separating the men and the boys rather quickly from that person that is knowledgeable about government. Because I think, as an elected official, the thing you fear most--and it happens periodically--you get an opponent that's promising he's going to increase all the services that the city provides and cut all the taxes. Well, this is impossible. Or you get a person that has lived in the community forty or fifty years that can come down and address council on any given Wednesday night and put forth their ideas and suddenly comes forward, out of the blue, with a package that will completely remake the City of Youngstown in 24 hours if they're elected to public office.

This can, in a sense, be an insult to the intelligence of the voter because I don't like paying taxes and I, as Mayor of the City of Youngstown, pay taxes. I pay my city income tax; I pay my five dollar licensing tax; I pay for my water that's consumed in the Hunter household; I pay my sewer service charge; I pay my sales tax; I pay for my license for my bicycle; I pay all the same taxes everyone else does and I don't particularly like paying taxes. Except, I know that government never gives people something for nothing. In other words, you have to pay a dollar to the city to, in turn, get a dollar's worth of services and there's no other way it can be.

M: You said though, that one way of cutting through all of this propaganda and all of the photogenic appeals and so forth on TV is by incisive questioning, to put it to the man, "What exactly do you stand for? How do you stand on this? How would you operate on this problem? How would you try and solve that problem?" Don't you think that a substantial portion of the public really doesn't want to hear that stuff and doesn't want to get into that?

H: I don't think they want it night after night but . . .

M: Just a little bit?

H: I think a lot of them will take a little bit of it. And again, not large doses where all you have is politics on TV and radio the six and eight weeks before an election, but I think incorporated with the news and a lot of people watch the news. If they get the mayoral candidate on, say, "Okay, Mr. Smith, candidate for mayor, you've said that if you're elected mayor you're going to provide this additional service, that additional service, that additional service and that additional service and you're going to cut taxes. How are you going to do it? Be specific." Well, 99 and 44/100 percent of the time that person is not going to be able to answer that question.

I mean, politically it sounds beautiful on a billboard or on a radio jingle or on a little paid political ad in the newspaper, but in other words, I think it's required the media call the bluff. And of course, the minute the media does this they're going to be accused of favoring the other candidate. But I think the media then, has to be very fair, very impartial. But get past this Madison Avenue packaging of the candidates.

M: A lot of people, though, don't seem to really go in much for numbers and cutting taxes and so forth. Once

you start talking about technical things, it turns them off. They don't understand it. They aren't inclined to understand it; a lot of times they can't. What if the man simply starts hitting on the problems that are caused by certain social problems like young people and that sort of thing in response to that?

H: Well again, I think, as a, perhaps, incisive newsman you can say, "Mr. Candidate, the question is this: How can you increase services and cut taxes simultaneously? You say there's fat in city government. Where is the fat. What jobs or what departments would you abolish?" We've had the occasion where councilmen have said, "Lay off people to economize." And I say, "Okay, you tell me who to lay off. Who is not providing a function that is necessary and worthwhile as it relates to the cost of that function?" And they clam up. But then a week later they're saying there's fat in the city government and I came back and say, "Where is the fat?" And then they shut up.

M: You're right on that. Responsible officials will say that and they will stick to that point. But the man can always come back and say, "Well, we're going to cut services by taking services away from this group. We're going to cut taxes because we won't have to pay for this; this group, this group, this group is responsible." And it has worked. Men have gotten elected on that. Men appeal to the public on that. Why do you think that appeals to, a part of the public, I should say?

H: Maybe this is more applicable at the local level. If a person says they're going to cut back on expenditures by reducing the police department by twenty people and cut the patrol, then people can make a determination whether they want more or less or a level amount of police department. If we say, "Okay, we pick up your garbage and trash at the curb once a week to save money." Candidate so and so says he'll do it every two weeks. Then you, as a citizen, have to start weighing how much trash do you carry to the curb every week and will you have a storage problem if the service were every two weeks. Would it constitute a health hazard for your kids playing in the back yard storing garbage for up to two weeks? I think you could start to come to grips with some of these things.

And again, this isn't to say politicians won't double-talk because you know it and I know it and we've both seen it.

M: The trend admittedly is on, particularly in larger and larger areas and higher levels, towards a more or less simplistic view of politicians.

H: Oh yes. That's the problem. The generality, "All politicians are thieves," you hear that out there and the the politicians tell you, "We're all honest," and the truth is somewhere in between.

M: Why do you think people tend to believe that all politicians are thieves?

H: Oh, I think it's probably a lack of understanding with what local government is about. The thing that has always amused me, as an elected official, and I get to Washington periodically and Columbus as you can well imagine, and I'll see tour after tour of school children going through the nation's capitol and the state capitol, looking at the historic artifacts of Ohio or the U.S. But you ask how many people have attended a city council meeting or have attended a board of township trustees meeting or a board of county commissioners meeting and you aren't going to be very impressed with the figures. But people will make special trips to Washington and to Columbus to show their children a level of government that is very vital and affects our everyday life, but is somewhat removed from you.

And again, it gets back to the point, you can call me tonight or you can call Councilman Starks or Councilman Catsoules and tell them there's a pothole in your street and you can get through to them. But try and call Governor Rhodes or President Ford to tell them that there's a pothole, or try to call your senator or congressman. You might talk to their staff and I'm not faulting them because they're very, very busy men, but the government that most people can influence is local government. And this tends to be the stepchild. Maybe it's without glamour and pizazz, but we're dealing with problems that affect you more intimately.

Nothing can be more important to you than having water when you turn on the faucet, having your trash picked up, having a fire unit ready to answer a call to your home. This is much more important to you than what our foreign trade policy is, what our policy towards national parks is. And these are important things. But yet, you influence local government more quickly. You can bump into a mayor or councilman at church or on the street or at the movie and give him a piece of your mind if that's the proper terminology, but you can't do it the higher up you go in elected offices.

- M: Do you think the electorate is more cynical now than when you began in politics?
- H: I don't think you can really generalize on something like that. I think they found Watergate a disappointment. And then when they found out that it wasn't just Mr. Nixon and his people, but Senator Humphrey--who's a great American senator--his finance chairman is sent to jail. When you find out that there were irregularities in the Johnson campaigns and the Kennedy campaigns, there is some cynicism there. It's like going out searching for an honest man. It's a problem. It's a very real problem and I don't have any pat little answer for it.
- M: As a Republican, how did you manage to avoid the possible backlash from Watergate during the election of 1973?
- H: Yes, well, to be quite honest, Watergate hadn't reached it's full dimensions by the Fall of 1973 when the election was. If you recall, it really hit and hit hard in early 1974 although there was a lot of indications of what was coming, but no idea of the magnitude or the depth of it. Again, I think I was able to get around whatever influence Watergate could have had by the fact that the people basically know me. I imagine within twenty minutes you can find somebody that's a friend of yours that knows me that could pretty much tell you whether I'm a good guy, a bad guy, honest, dishonest, whether I beat my wife or whether I don't, whether I'm a good administrator or whether I'm not; a peer, who you value their judgement and know they aren't a dyed-in-the-wool Hunterite or trying to submarine me. Get a pretty candid opinion quickly. You can't do this with a governor or a president or a senator. It becomes much more difficult the further away that government goes from the local level to have somebody that you trust that you can get a candid opinion of somebody on.
- M: How do you think Watergate might affect Republicans in the future elections?
- H: I don't think Watergate is going to have that adverse an effect on Republicans per se. I think it's fairly well established in the minds of most people that it wasn't the Republican Party that was doing that, that it was a small group within the Committee To Re-Elect the President that did that. I think if Watergate had had a major impact, there probably wouldn't have been a Republican elected to office in 1974 and there

were quite a few elected. Not as many as we had had heretofore, so there was a Watergate effect, but again, it wasn't a total effect where every Republican at every level was voted out of office.

M: You've noticed something of local government and that is that local government is more susceptible to public opinion. It's easier for the public to reach and therefore it's more responsive to the public. It represents the public better than other levels because it's at the grassroots. Do you feel, therefore, that there might be some justification in putting more and more power at the local level, into local hands?

H: Yes, I'll tell you, that's the reason I favor the concept of general revenue sharing because it gave local government the added ability to address itself to the problem. So, yes, I'm a firm believer that as much power as can be placed in the hands of local government should be there. Because, just to cite an example, I got married on a Saturday, September 1, 1973. The day before I got married, on a Friday morning at 6:00, I was out checking a problem in one of the wards because it was a real problem to the people. And, needless to say, preparing to get married, preparing for a honeymoon, I was just bombed on time. And when the people called the night before on a Thursday night and said, "We have this problem. Can you help us?" I said, "Well, the only time I can get out and look at it is at 6:00 in the morning. If you want to be there, I'll be there." And we met at 6:00 in the morning to resolve this problem. And I come back to the office, dictated a memo to the appropriate department to get it resolved, cover the problem completely. And when I come back from my honeymoon and I checked, the problem was resolved.

The point I'm making is you can get hold of a mayor; you can get hold of your councilman. You can't really do it as a one on one situation the higher up you go in elected public offices.

M: Up until recently, particularly up until Nixon came to office, there was a big tendency towards more and more power concentrated at the higher level of government, particularly in big bureaucracies. Do you feel that tendency is subsiding? Do you feel the public might have possibly projected it?

H: I think that tendency is always going to be there to ask government to do it, ask government to do it, ask government to do it. And the question is: Where do you stop? As our society gets more complex, I think the

average individual feels more intimidated by bigness, whether it be a big automobile producer or a big telephone company or a big corporation or a big union or big government, that they feel intimidated. They feel like, "Oh, what's the use?" And government can help people. There are legitimate areas that government can get into, but there are also areas that government really can't get into.

You'd be surprised the number of times I'm called up to give money to somebody for something. And I don't really believe--no matter how humanitarian it might be--that you should be calling the mayor because you need Christmas presents for your kids because you're unemployed. Because let's face it, I'm on a salary just like the other guy is on a salary and if everybody in Youngstown who is unemployed felt a mayor, councilman, or a municipal judge should be buying Christmas presents for their family because the kids would go without--well, I'm very emphathetic about kids going without--but again, a mayor works for his salary just like a steelworker works for his salary.

So, sometimes people ask the impossible of government and at that time I think government has a right and an obligation to say, "Hey, that is a problem that the city can't resolve." If you're having a problem with your wife, I don't really believe the police department should have to dispatch a unit to your house every hour all Saturday night to try and resolve your domestic squabble. Citizens have to take upon themselves some of the responsibilities that just don't fit in with the nature of government.

M: Do you feel this is being more and more recognized by citizens?

H: We're hoping that it is and attempting to create this understanding with our people and it's a basis of communications again.

M: Do you feel people can found their own organizations that aren't affiliated with the government to solve their own problems? Do you see this expanding in the future?

H: I think there is an area for the private organization. I think in organization there is strength in presenting a problem to government. If you're the only person complaining about the possible adverse effect of aerosol cans on the atmosphere and the stratosphere, you might as well forget it if you're the only person in this country that's complaining. But if you can convince a

number of your associates, peers, neighbors, friends, coworkers, that this gas that comes in aerosol cans that attacks the ozone that surrounds the planet Earth is having an adverse effect, then you might get some action. So, yes I believe that there is a very real place for these private groups to promote concerns amongst themselves and also to represent that concern with government.

M: The environmental issue seems to have cut through all levels of government to the bone in public affairs and if anything is going to shake up public life in the future, that stands as likely a chance as any other big issue. Which level of government do you feel might, at the present time, be more capable of dealing with the environmental issues?

H: I think it's going to have to be a split answer. I don't think you can say burning of combustible materials is completely banned in Youngstown and say it's okay in Boardman because that is not equal protection of the law. So, I believe you have to have some standards, either by the state or nation, that are enforced at the local level. It wouldn't be fair to say that you're not allowed to pollute the Mahoning River. It has to be fit for swimming and fish and everything else and let them pollute to the Cuyahoga River because we have firm laws and Cleveland doesn't have firm laws on the book.

So, I think you get into this equal protection clause of our Federal Constitution that implies that you have to have some type of standards that are fairly uniform across the country. Why should I make you put an adapter on your steel mill that might cost you fifty million dollars where a steel mill in California doesn't have to have that same adapter on because of a different state law out there. And it adds to the cost of your steel and they save the cost out there. So, you have to have some uniformity for equal protection.

M: When you're dealing, though, with a higher level of government such as the Federal Government, in it's attempts to impose uniform standards, perhaps they'll appoint people, bureaucracies and so forth. These people will not be elected; they will be appointed. Eventually they're going to get down to the situation where some bureaucrat who is several echelons away from an elected official and probably never sees the man or talks to him is going to be telling local people what they have to do. This is a possibility. How do you think such situations might be avoided so that public opinion does have a proper influence on Federal stan-

dards and policies?

H: Unfortunately, I don't really have the answer to that question. And if I did, I would probably be sitting at the right hand of the President of the United States advising him because that is the whole crux of the problem. I think you, living here in Youngstown, if you're married, you want your kids to go through the school system and get a quality education that will put them on a level with a kid in Nome, Alaska; Plantation City, Florida; Bangor, Maine; or San Diego, California. And if your child doesn't have that, your child is going to be handicapped. You want the same criteria to apply to steel mills in Youngstown that apply in Fortuna, California.

M: Mr. Hunter, we were talking about ways that the Federal Government's policies might be better influenced by public opinion at the local level.

H: Well again, the fact that the United States is a republican form of government, this means that we're governed by the rule of law. You want the same law, by and large, to apply in Youngstown, Ohio that applies in Sacramento, California because our Constitution says there shall be equal protection of the law. And this isn't to say you aren't going to have your regional differences. The Mahoning River, case in point, it's an industrial stream. Ninety-five percent of the abutting shoreline is owned by industry. It's not a river that's used for boating. It doesn't lend itself to boating because of a series of rapids in it as it goes down to the Ohio River. So, I think you have to have a certain standard, but recognizing that there are exceptions.

If there's a rule in the gym class in your school that all students shall be able to lift their weight over their head, I think you may decide, well, if your child has a birth defect that the child should be exempt from that requirement how otherwise valid it might be for the average student. So, this is where we get into problems in a republican form of government. The mob doesn't rule whimsically one way today, a different way tomorrow.

M: A stable government or policy is needed?

H: Yes.

M: What effect do you feel a standard Federal environmental policy might have on a middle sized community, say the size of Youngstown?

- H: If the so called bureaucrat much removed from Youngstown says that there shall be absolutely no thermal pollution in the Mahoning River and no air pollution over Youngstown, it could cost every steelworker in Youngstown their job tomorrow. Then I would have to say this is arbitrary and capricious. And this is why I say that you have the law, that you have to have a mechanism within the law to adjust to very valid-- now I'm not talking about capricious--but very valid local considerations.
- M: How do you think society might react to such a capricious and arbitrary interference in the lives of the citizens?
- H: To cite the Youngstown example, I think our people would be up in arms. I think they would be marching on Columbus and Washington. But how would this affect a congressman from the State of Washington or Idaho or Utah or Wyoming? They may just figure, "Oh well, it can't happen here so I'm going to be an environmental puralist. I'm going to demand that the Mahoning River be sparkling clean and the air over Ohio fresh as a spring morning." Then you could have problems. You could have very real problems.
- M: Do you think congressmen or officials from those areas might react that way?
- H: I've seen instances, and I'm certain you have, in studying the voting of the congress where they take regional concerns or local concerns as paramounts and rather don't stop to consider the concerns of other parts of the country.
- M: So, we might have a situation where a group of officials refuse to compromise and say things will be this way and the other group takes an equally adamant stand?
- H: I would venture to say, with fifty states, 435 elected representatives in the national Congress, you might have ten states with a substantial steel producing capacity representing maybe thirty or forty Congressional districts. Well, if those were the only congressmen that were lobbying for laws to protect steel, they could see a steel industry wiped out. It's like everybody wants to cut down on air pollution, but nobody wants to pay higher prices for the cars. You can be an environmentalist, an advocate of clean air, but you have to realize you're going to have to pay the price. And of course, that's part of what the increase in prices in domestically produced automobiles is, the greater cost for air pollution.

And let's face it, when it comes to ecology and what's harmful to the health, you might recall four or five years ago they said swordfish steak was harmful to your health because of its mercury content. So, they killed the swordfish industry. And if you were in that industry you got devastated. Then they found out about three years later that you had to eat a swordfish a day for ten years to have been adversely affected by the mercury content in it. Well, if you were a guy that was completely put out of business because of this, I'm certain you're going to take great comfort from the environmentalist saying, "I'm sorry. We made a mistake." Your whole livelihood has been just decimated; your whole investment has been ruined and somebody says, "Well, I'm sorry. We made a mistake." Well how sympathetic are you going to be to their apology?

- M: So, if but one segment of society decrees that another segment must lose its employment then you can have some sharp disagreements. When that happens, though, you lose a consensus on government policy and as somebody with considerable background in political science and political theory, what would happen when such a consensus would be lost, when there is such a sharp disagreement?
- H: Of course, then I think your relief has to be to the courts and I think if anything has come out of Watergate, it has left our courts, by and large, in much better shape at least for their national image than, perhaps it had heretofore. We had judges that were appointed by Republicans finding against Republicans. We had judges that were appointed by Democrats finding against Democrats. I'm certain that this created a good feeling about the judicial branch of government amongst the people of the United States who stopped to think about it.
- M: Many people have claimed that the courts are the least or one of the least sensitive parts of the government to public opinion.
- H: I don't really think that the courts should be swayed by public opinion. In other words, I would have wished that a Japanese American in 1941, 1942, could have gone into a Federal Court and said that they were not receiving equal protection under the Constitution by being put in concentration camps by the then national administration and the court would have stopped that pernicious movement. Unfortunately, the courts fell far short of the mark then because they listened to public opinion. That is a despicable chapter in the

history of the United States, just one of the most despicable things this country has ever done. Taken a group of people that were loyal Americans and because of their national origin, threw them in concentration camps. We didn't do it to other members of the Axis powers at that time. We singled out one group of people because of their high visibility and it was despicable.

M: Do you feel such things might be possible in the future?

H: I would hope not. I would hope that this nation has come of age and had a greater degree of maturity. Now I'm not saying that during wartime that a person who is a suspect of being an enemy agent should not be incarcerated, but I don't believe a whole group of people just because of their national origin should be. Again, that could have been popular in 1941, 1942, to put all the Japanese in concentration camps, but it sure was not the American way.

M: How much do you feel public opinion has changed on such issues since then?

H: I'm hopeful that it has changed. I saw an initial bad reaction that I wasn't too happy about in bringing some Vietnamese and Cambodians to the United States because they probably had death warrants against them if they had stayed in their country. I heard on the news today that every officer in the Cambodian Army, lieutenant on up to general is being executed along with their wife. So, I think the rationale of the Ford administration in allowing these people to immigrate to the United States was a very wise decision, but the initial reaction wasn't too good. And I hope it wasn't because they were Oriental and not Caucasian. But since then the public opinion has seemed to turn around. President Ford's opinion seems to be prevailing more and more. So, I would just hope that public opinion isn't always the thing that the politician and the courts hang their hat on because sometimes public opinion is wrong.

M: A lot of people, in regards to those things, have talked about an increase in isolationist attitudes. I don't know if that's accurate or not, but speaking of domestic affairs, even before Watergate a lot of people noted a tendency on the part of the public, an increasing tendency to sort of disassociate themselves from public affairs on domestic issues, sort of a domestic isolation. Do you feel that that might be a nicer description?

H: I don't know. I saw a letter from Ted Kennedy the other day suggesting that people aren't voting because they don't want their names on jury lists and this is shirking of a duty and responsibility. If I ever went to court, I would hope that I had a jury of my peers that would be sympathetic that justice prevails, not just somebody that wants the five or ten dollars a day that you get as a jury fee. So, there are problems.

Of course, you get the population in excess of 210,000,000 people, your problems aren't going to get easier. They're going to get more complex. When our life is governed by computers and public opinion polls seemingly, I don't think it augurs well for the average individual.

M: Well, a lot of people claim that our traditional way of operating our courts and law system is declining and some people even claim it's breaking down. Do you feel that this is accurate?

H: We have over our courthouse the old saying--and I think it's as valid today as when that courthouse was put up-- "Justice delayed is justice denied." When you have continuance of court cases for weeks and months and in some cases, years, I think justice is being denied both to the victim of crime and to the accused criminal. I noticed Chief Justice O'Neill of the Ohio Supreme Court, who is probably one of the most respected jurists in the United States, is now attempting to install procedures--and he is, of course, in charge of all the courts in Ohio--to speed trials so that there won't be inordinate delays. And again, if your attorney is sick on the day you're supposed to go into court, that's a valid reason, but if your attorney has booked five other cases into five different courts on that same day, that is no longer a good and valid excuse in the State of Ohio.

M: Why do you think this situation has come to pass where our court system is no longer functioning as efficiently as it once did?

H: I think it's probably, in part, due to lack of good administrative practices in our court systems at all levels.

M: Is it possible that certain opinion groups, certain pressure groups have helped to aggravate this situation.

H: I think some have tended to aggravate it and some have tended to work to alleviate it. So, if you committed

an armed robbery and you know you're guiltier than the dickens and when you get tried you're going to jail and you're out on bail, it probably behooves you to delay coming before the bar of justice as long as you can. So, you have to balance your desire not to go to trial with society's need to bring you to trial to show that for crime there is punishment. In other words, I think we have to be as empathetic and as sympathetic with the victim of crime as we are with the person who comits the crime. And I think we have tended, there for awhile in the late 1960's to just bend over backwards to protect the rights of the criminal totally disregarding the rights of the victim of crime.

M: It has been often claimed that they've been more concerned for the criminal and that there's been much pampering of criminals.

Okay, Mr. Hunter, what advantages do you feel might there be in annexing outlying areas of Youngstown?

H: I don't know whether I'm more a proponent of annexation or cooperation. If a political subdivision feels that it is under-subsidized and that it can benefit from annexing to an abutting city, I believe that's a determination to be made by the two political subdivisions at question. I believe the argument for regional cooperation--and this isn't regional government, it's regional cooperation--are very large today. I can cite examples where a small community that can't afford to have a tie-in with a state computer or a record room to give their police that added advantage in the field can subcontract with a larger abutting political subdivision to have these services provided at the fraction of the cost it would cost a small community if it went on its own. So, I believe that regional cooperation is important.

M: I believe if we're going to build a sewer line that runs through the city limits, we should sit down and ask that abutting political subdivision, "Do you have any plans for development in this area? Because if you do, rather than laying a sixteen inch line, maybe we should lay a twenty-four inch line, and you pick up the cost of the additional expense to the city rather than having to duplicate that cost at a future date and maybe waste taxpayer's money." So, I believe determinations like this can be made in cooperation between various levels of government. And I think we've had more cooperation the last few years here than we have had before. We've kind of swept some of the suspicion of the big city or the big county out and have approached

it with a spirit of cooperation and working togetherness.

M: I believe we just described earlier that the suburbs are disenfranchised Youngstowners.

H: In many cases they are and I say that from the context that if you live in Poland or Canfield or Austintown or Boardman and the City of Youngstown goes downhill, I mean, just goes all the way, well, your kids can come into Youngstown and engage in vice that might be running wide open in our city, be victims of crime that might rage in our city. And if it got so bad that finally all the steel mills and the fabricating plants threw up their hands and said, "We quit. Youngstown isn't our cup of tea anymore." These are the jobs that a lot of people in the suburbs are dependent on for their livelihood. So, I make that from the context that a healthy, viable Youngstown is good for Boardman just like a healthy, viable Boardman is good for Youngstown.

In other words, we have imaginary lines in the center of streets that separate Youngstown from Boardman, but corporate economic determinations aren't influenced by those lines, crime isn't influenced by those lines, disease is not influenced by those lines. So that, I think it requires us to work together. In other words, I think Boardman would suffer if there were a bad administration in Youngstown, whether it's Republican or Democrat. Boardman would suffer if Youngstown went down the hill.

M: Why do you think many suburbanites oppose annexation to Youngstown?

H: Oh, I think a lot of them moved out of Youngstown to get out into a more suburban type of an atmosphere, a more casual type of an atmosphere. I think they want to preserve and protect this. I think some felt that the Youngstown Public School System wasn't all that they felt it should be so that they moved out to get their children in what they felt were better school districts. I'm certain some of them didn't like the political structure in Youngstown and thought, by moving to Boardman, Canfield, or Poland they could get away from it.

M: There has been some opposition to annexation in Youngstown itself.

H: Yes.

M: What accounts for this?

- H: A lot of people feel it would dilute their votes if there were more people voting. So, it's just protecting one's own best and self interest, maybe not to the benefit of the total community.
- M: What groups tend to feel this way about this?
- H: Oh, I think you have some ethnic groups. There's the thought that some of the Democrats may not favor annexation of some of these outlying areas because they might tend to more vote Republican. There are some racial groups that figure the suburbs are basically all white while there's a larger percentage of minorities in Youngstown and if you annex the suburbs, you dilute the effectiveness in the vote of the minorities in the City of Youngstown.
- M: Wouldn't annexed areas increase Youngstown's tax base?
- H: Not necessarily because you have a pretty high tax rate out in those outlying areas. In fact, it would probably cost Youngstown more because of the immediate need to provide the same quality of services in the outlying areas as you provide in the City of Youngstown. And in many instances, those people that live in the outlying areas that work in Youngstown are paying our city income tax and not getting any services except for the hours that they are working in Youngstown, where then you'd have to go to the trash collection out in the suburbs, you'd have to go to the same superior snow removal and street resurfacing programs, the superior fire protection et cetera. So, it could really cost the city more because in a sense, we get their money without providing the total service to them, but once they would become part of the City of Youngstown, then we would have to give them the same quality of service there that is provided in Youngstown and that could be expensive.
- M: Yes, they would have many advantages to coming into Youngstown.
- H: I think they would have many, but again, in the final analysis, it's their determination to make. You might feel if you go for your Ph.D. that would give you an additional advantage, but maybe you want to stop at your Masters because you're content. So, I'm not saying they're right or wrong in wanting to or not wanting to come into Youngstown. That's their determination to make.
- M: What advantages would there be to Youngstown if it was to annex these areas?

H: I think the first thing that would pop into ones mind, of course, when you have monies coming in from the Federal and State governments that are based on population, you would be able to attract more Federal dollars locally. And historically, larger cities have gotten more per capita than have the unincorporated areas. Sometimes the unincorporated areas don't get anything.

M: How much does ethnic identification affect people's sentiments on this issue?

H: I really couldn't make a value determination because many of the ethnics that lived in Youngstown or were raised in Youngstown have moved to the outlying areas. So, I don't think it would make too major an impact although I've never really studied that so that I could give a real solid answer.

M: Does the ethnic affiliation still affect politics as much as it used to?

H: I don't think as much as it did. There is still an influence, but I don't think it's a major effect.

M: Why would it decline?

H: I think as you get into second and third and fourth generation, the ties to the home country aren't there. You find very few of the second and third generation ethnics speaking the mother or father language and they get further away from the customs. You have a Polish boy that marries an Italian girl and you have a French boy that marries a Greek girl. And then, in turn, they get married so that, rather than the average person being 100 percent Slavic or 100 percent Polish or Greek, by the third generation, maybe they're one eighth Greek and one eighth Irish and one quarter Italian and one eighth German and one eighth English. So, there is no strong national tie by the third and fourth generation. It starts to break down.

M: Do you think the fear that minority people might have about annexation might be justified?

H: I've never seen any group that would intentionally give up it's power base. And right now, if the figure serves me right, the minority population is 25 percent of the total population of Youngstown. If you were to suddenly bring in Austintown, Boardman, Liberty and Canfield townships into Youngstown, then they would be 12.5 percent of the total. So, I could see very logically that they would weigh the benefits of annexation

to the loss of the political power that the minority group exercises. I can see the Democrats weighing how many Republicans would be brought in versus how many Democrats.

M: Recently, how has local government helped people from predominantly rural backgrounds, relatively uneducated people to adjust to life in the city?

H: Well, recently you haven't had the immigration. In fact, the migration has been and out-migration, the city people going to the country rather than the country people coming to the city.

M: Are the city people who go to the country predominantly middle class?

H: Yes, a lot of them middle class.

M: Do you think a lot of the poor people from rural areas are coming into the city?

H: No, the job opportunities just haven't been there in recent years, at least in this region of the country.

M: The people who have already been here, how are they adjusting to urban life?

H: They usually adjust through the school system, through the churches, through neighborhood patterns. In other words, it's not enough of an in-migration to affect the operation of government or having to tailor-make programs and projects to assist people in this situation.

M: Wouldn't your predecessor in the mayor's office have had a great amount of those problems considering the fact he's . . .

H: I think that migration was probably mainly during World War I and World War II,

M: How about more recent years?

H: We've had some in-migration of Puerto Ricans, but with their historic close family ties and that has been kind of a family adjustment that they've made. We had some of the Hungarian refugees come over after the Hungarian uprising and they came into kind of, like a family in a nationality context for the adjustment. We've had some Cubans come in and the like. And nationality background have helped these people that have come in from other countries.

M: So you see an integration of all groups in their public life coming about?

H: Oh yes.

M: No difficulties in that respect?

H: Oh, for the individual, I'm certain there's going to be difficulties, but there haven't been difficulties on a magnitude that have been transmitted to city hall in a sense that we've had to cope with them.

M: How do you feel that metropolitan government has worked in other areas?

H: There's only about, really, half a dozen examples of it, Dade County, Florida; Marion County, Indiana; and I've never had the chance to go study them, but I've read enough about them to know that there are some very real pluses and some very real minuses. And in the final analysis, it's an emotional decision that people make.

M: What improvements do you feel might be made in local government around here?

H: I think the main thing that I would strive for is to get more people involved in their local government, not just when government affects them either favorably or adversely, but an ongoing commitment to making local government strong. This would mean quality people lending themselves to candidates for public office, supporting men and women they feel that are qualified, getting involved in some of our community projects to improve the city, whether it be housing or cleaning up neighborhoods or supervised recreation for our young people. There's a lot that the average individual can do, a tremendous amount that they can do.

M: What effect do you feel changes toward nonpartisan elections might have?

H: They have tried that in the past and it's like our school board and our judges, you know who the Democrats and who the Republicans are, so I don't really believe that is a panacea like people thought it might have been in the past.

M: Do you feel it might be an improvement?

H: Not necessarily so.

M: How do you feel the public might react to it?

H: Right now I don't think America is in a mood to go through too much of a change. I think there is a pause right now in the American mainstream to re-analyze where we've been, where we are, how we got here and where we want to go from here. So, I don't think we're going to see any dramatic changes in a short run; long range, I don't know what it will be because we're still in the analyzing process.

M: How long do you think this process will continue?

H: I'd say through this decade, through the 1970's.

M: What do you feel might be some of the chief problems in the future?

H: I feel coming to grips with our environmental problems is going to be a problem, coming to grips, on the national and international level, whether the United States can be a policeman for the world, whether we can be a bread basket for the world, how much the United States is going to extend themselves to help their fellow man. We're one of the few countries with, probably the exception of the Spanish-American War, haven't fought wars of territorial aggrandizement. In fact, basically everything we got during the Spanish-American War has been given back. The Philippines are now a free and independent nation rather unheard-of without a revolution and rebellion. The Marianas, our trust territories in the Pacific seem to want to join us in a commonwealth partnership such as Puerto Rico, at the voting booth, elected to do. So, I think America has rather clean hands when it comes to international relations.

Maybe Vietnam was a mistake. MacArthur and Eisenhower said never get involved in a land war in Asia. And I think they were proven rather correct as the Vietnam fiasco shows. Plus, I think we have always been taught in basketball, and football, and hockey, and ping pong, and tennis that you play the game to win. That seems to be the American way, that there's a winner and a loser. And when we fight wars like Korea and Vietnam where there's no real winner or no desire to win on the American side, I think it flies in the face of the training and tradition of our society, our country. So, that creates problems.

M: Plus, society isn't oriented towards competition and winning good will, it's orientation will be . . . ?

H: I don't know what it's going to be. We might come back and decide to win. I noticed the Cambodians nailed an

American merchant ship and we're talking very beligerently right now, much more so than we have lately.

M: How is Congress reacting to that?

H: Congress, it's kind of too early to get a handle on it because it just happened last night, but the rhetoric I read in the paper this morning seems to be strong in the Plain Dealer.

M: How do you think the people feel? Do you think they would be in favor of a strong reaction?

H: They're going to be in favor of a reaction, but here you get back into public opinion. How do you sample the opinion? It's like the Pueblo incident. I think that grated Americans that a second rate nation like North Korea could capture one of our ships, the first capital ship of the United States that had been captured in a century.

M: If our country does though, go away from the orientation towards competition in willing, how do you think that might affect our capitalist existence?

H: I think it could conceivably, if we decided to settle for Avis' position in second place and don't compete for first place, I think we can see a slow decline of our national greatness. I think we're seeing that in some of our scientific fields where we aren't making the major capital investments that we had in the past that have lead the United States to be number one in a number of fields of new scientific invention. And of course, out of scientific investigation comes jobs and new industries and the like.

M: Do you feel that's as much a tragedy as some people say?

H: I feel that if carried on long enough it can be a national tragedy.

M: Do you know something though, a lot of people have been able to be number two, a lot of other countries in recent years because we were number one and able to protect them from potential aggressors.

H: Yes.

M: How can we be number two without being last?

H: That's about the sum and substance of it.

- M: Do you feel the American people might still suspect the intentions of foreign powers?
- H: I think the United States has always been suspicious of foreign powers and people themselves. They're both suspicious and amored with them. In other words, we wouldn't want a monarchy, but we fall head over heels in love with the Queen of England or Princess Grace of Monaco, the like. In fact, sometimes we're accused of making the President and his family the king and queen of our country.
- M: There's been a lot of talk, I don't know how serious, about the counterculture recently and that sort of thing. Now, if this flattening and decline of our old values continues, do you feel that might gain and possibly become preeminent in some areas?
- H: I think when you talk about a counterculture we go cyclically and I think we are in the tag end of this most recent counterculture, which deals with narcotics; it is having a last hurrah because a lot of the dudes we busted in the early 1970's are back out on the street again. They'll be back in jail in very short order. And I think, if anything, we're going to see a more fundamental type of America from our political institutions. I'm not certain that's going to be all too fired bad.
- M: Mr. Hunter, what would you think of the idea of possibly having a council or an organization of retired or semi-retired politicians who have been active during their lifetime in local government possibly sitting together after they have ceased to be active and being a forum for discussion and for advice for our current political leaders and for political opinions?
- H: I think, in theory it sounds very good, but I don't know how well it would really work in practice. There would be no way to force a current officeholder to seek the advice of his peers that had held office before. And I think many public officials that now hold office do check back with prior officeholders for advice on a more or less informal basis. The one dilemma I see: if Joe Doe is elected to say, mayor of the City of Youngstown having beaten a gentleman in a very hot partisan contested contest, it's very unlikely that he would then go back and seek the advice of the person who he had defeated for public office. So, but on the other hand, if he would want to do this in an informal manner, of course, he always has that opportunity.

I've talked, on a number of different occasions, with former mayors and former councilmen of the City of Youngstown and got some of their ideas and some of their thoughts on a very informalized basis. So, I think it does occur at the informal basis and I'm just not too certain if, in fact, it would work well if it was in a formalized structure.

After my initial election as Mayor, I've had two contests for re-election with former mayors of the City of Youngstown and if they were on an advisory council or board or panel then, the question would be: Is that going to be used as a political forum? And of course, that would not be the intent of it. So, you could get into problems that way.

M: So, you feel that advice from experienced men is available under existing conditions?

H: Yes, I think it's always available if one wants it and I know I have availed myself of the advice of former mayors, former councilmen, former state legislators, along with incumbent other officeholders. So, I think it's there if you want to use it, but I think the minute you formalized it, it could conceivably be used as a political forum or a former mayor would say, "You should do this; you should do that." And if you don't, then he comes back and runs for mayor and uses it as political fodder in a campaign. So, I don't think you'd want that. I think it would abrogate the intent of establishing such a forum.

M: Sometimes citizens are heard to complain that political legislation and political programs are put into effect without ample discussion, in particular, without ample information being given to the electorate. Do you think such a forum as we've been discussing, such a council might--since the men involved most likely wouldn't have any political ambitions left--might possibly be a good forum for getting these ideas to the public and to discuss this?

H: I don't know. Again, I go back to my experience running the last two times for re-election. Both times I've run against former mayors who conceivably would be on panels such as this. The council caucuses and council meetings were open to the general public. The council I've worked with--what you might call housekeeping legislation--it probably has passed without a great deal of discussion because there's very little controversy. If there is controversy about it, normally it goes through three readings where it's published in the local newspaper, radio, TV over a period of a couple weeks and public hear-

ings are held so citizen input can be secured, acquired, the opportunity there for the interested citizen. So, I know this charge is made periodically, but it's usually somebody that doesn't avail themselves of an opportunity to address council and, in a sense, tends to second guess council after legislation is passed.

M: Do you know if there's the apathetic type?

H: I think there is a great deal of apathy. The average person doesn't care what's going on someplace else in the city or the county or the state; it's only when it intimately affects them.

M: What do you think causes poor voting turnout since this is a big manifestation of apathy?

H: Well, it can be any number of things. A lot of people just don't care. I can't force you to be concerned about local, county, state, or national government. Other times you'll have some people who think, "Well, there's no difference or no real choice between the two candidates for a given office so it doesn't matter who gets elected." So, you have this attitude, then you have the attitude of a lot of people, "I'm just one vote. I can't affect the election so why even try?" I don't think the first two you're going to do much with. I think the third type of person you can convince, through various media, that one vote has many times been critical in determining elections anywhere from precinct committeemen on up to United States Senator.

There's a contest in New England now on the seating of a senator and just the last time I heard, there were two votes separating the Republican and Democrat candidate for United States Senator. Here, five months after the taking of office, the person hasn't been seated because they can't decide who is the winner of that race. So, here in the senate race, two votes between the two men. So, one vote can count. It can count tremendously.

M: Often times it's claimed that voter apathy, to a degree, is caused by people feeling that the parties dominate things too much, that issues don't play a sufficient role and possibly personalities don't. Do you feel that a nonpartisan approach might help alleviate this?

H: Well, every time that I've seen nonpartisan and we have that in our judicial races . . . If you go into a November election and you know which candidate for judge is the Republican and which is the Democrat, although it shows nonpartisan on the ballots, I think we're kidding ourselves there. In fact, I've always

contended that the primary is the most important election because if the Republican Party, the Democrat Party, nominate the best possible men for the office in your June primary, then it really doesn't matter who's elected in the fall because you have a choice of two good men. If there's voter apathy in the primary and both parties nominate scalawags and scoundrels, you don't have a choice in the fall. It's a choice between the lesser of two evils.

So, I think the people that say they are independent are kind of kidding themselves because if you're an independent voter, you have to choose from what the Republicans and Democrats have selected in the primary. That's your choice in the fall and it's not a very wide choice. Like today in Youngstown, on the June 3 primary you can go out and hopefully vote for one of the four best Democrats for the office of mayor. Hopefully, out of the Democrat primary will come the best man. But if for some reason, out of that primary comes the worst man, you don't have much of a choice in the fall. So, I think it's more critical to vote in the primary, select the very best men in the primary from both of the ranks of the Republican and Democrat than it is to go out and select between the two that have been selected by the party in the fall election.

- M: Do you feel possibly that city manager type government might have advantages over a more partisan system?
- H: Well, a city manager still has to go to the councilmen for appropriations, confirmation of appointees. So, a lot of people think city manager form of government is totally removed from the realm of politics. Unfortunately, it is not and it can't be removed completely.
- M: That would be impossible under our system, but people might get the impression that a city manager is, to a degree, above politics. That might help.
- H: I think there is a certain professionalism that a city manager can bring to a government. And of course, in many communities where you don't have full-time mayors, that the determination of the people may be a full-time city manager as part of the solution, but I think you're kidding the people if you ever indicate that it's totally out of the realm of politics.
- M: How much do people tend to consider a mayor in a situation like Youngstown to be above politics?
- H: I think a great deal of the time. I think most of the people go out and vote for their choice and whoever is

that is their mayor. Now, maybe in the next election they're going out and get him or support him, but I don't think there is that great sense that the mayor is a politician. I think especially at the local level of government that is delivering services, in a very basic form of government, that it is that all fired partisan. There's not one party in Youngstown coming out for quality law enforcement and one against quality law enforcement. There's not one party saying we should have good trash and garbage collection and the other party saying we shouldn't have good trash and garbage collection. So, I think at the local level, it's darn near nonpartisan right now after the elections. The elections were very partisan, both the primary and general elections, but once you're in office, I think there's just a working together for the common goal. There's really no philosophy about the way you collect garbage or you repair or patch streets or you remove snow. This isn't philosophical; this is just basic service.

M: Do you think it's possible that an organization of politicians or so forth, either ex-politicians or current active politicians might have some sort of retardant effort on bureaucratic initiative in local government, sort of, say, the way British House employs ex-British government?

H: Well, you have of course, a lot of interesting little influences in the ability of government to innovate. You have Civil Service where once a person is in a job, he has the job for the rest of his life unless you can prove mis-, mal- or nonfeasance in office. So, where you have a new mayor or a new council coming in that might be innovative and imaginative in their approaches to problems of the city, I could see where the entrenched bureaucracy figures, "Well, Mayor Hunter, Mayor Jones, Mayor Smith, Mayor Sowinsky is just here for two years and why get upset? I see mayors come and I see mayors go." So, I think that the bureaucracy may tend to stifle the initiative and the imagination brought into government by councilmen, presidents of council, mayors. There is this very real possibility.

M: Mayor Hunter, what do you feel have been the chief accomplishments of your administration to date?

H: I think the one I'm most proud of--and there are many that I'm proud of--is the improvement in the quality of services provided to the total citizenry of the City of Youngstown. I think we have a very fine trash and garbage collection. I think our street repair and re-surfacing program is much improved, not perfect, but much improved. I think our ability to kind of cut through the

red tape to address ourselves to the problems of the people is much improved. And I think I can say this on the basis of having been mayor now for five years and councilman four years before. I know the type of calls I received as a councilman and when I was first elected as mayor and I know the type of calls I'm receiving right now. They're a completely different type. I think the basic delivery of services is there. The improvement is extremely noticeable when you compare the number of phone calls, say, on garbage collection six years ago today. It used to be you can get thirty and forty calls a day on, "Why wasn't my garbage picked up?" It's a rare thing if we get one a week now. So, I think that shows a tremendous improvement there. I think there has been more individual initiative on the part of city employees.

Other areas, I think we've completed the East River crossing, we're on our way to completing the Boardman expressway. We've done a lot of road work as far as widening the radii of intersections, synchronizing our traffic lights. We inherited a water distribution system that was just positively suffering from decay and neglect and we have turned this situation around where there's improved water pressure. It used to be, in the hot months of August and September where City Hall would have to make an appeal: "Don't wash your car; don't water your lawn; don't water your garden; don't take a bath till late in the evening;" simply because of lack of water pressure, because of the decay of the system. This has all been turned around now. I can't remember having had to make an announcement like this since 1970. So, this is an area.

We've attempted to send many of our city employees to professional seminars to improve their expertise in the delivery of services. We've expanded civil service protection and coverage for our city employees. We've gone into central purchasing and realized real savings. We've worked with the private sector for the redevelopment of the central business district in downtown Youngstown. We've worked with the hospitals for new additions at South Side Hospital. I think it has been an imaginative approach to government while, at the same time, doing the nuts and bolts functions that people come to expect from government.

- M: How has local government managed to bring about the renovation of the downtown area?
- H: It's a cooperative effort between the business sector and council and a large segment of interested citizens to try and attempt to determine what they wanted. And

of course, when you talk to a broad sector of the community, you don't get one voice back, but you get the thesis and the antithesis and come up with a synthesis and that's what, basically, our Federal Plaza treatment is. It's not maybe all I wanted or maybe not all the merchants wanted, but it's a reasonable compromise. And let's face it, government, in it's very finest sense, is compromise.

M: Do you think dialectics play much of a role in American politics?

H: Probably in a sense they do without the people realizing that it's there. Say if you want a six-lane highway built and I want a two-lane highway built, we can argue, talk, and compromise, and negotiate and we get a four-lane highway. You aren't as happy as you would have been if you had got your six-lane highway. I'm not as happy as I would have been if I got my two-lane highway, but I didn't go to the extreme that you wanted to go and you didn't go to the extreme that I wanted to go, but we met one another halfway. And I think this is what government is all about.

I think one of the problems in many European countries is that people are, what you might call, philosophical purists, they'll never compromise their position. And sometimes compromise has a bad connotation to it, but by and large, I think this is what has made the American system work, the ability to compromise. When one administration replaces the other, they don't completely repeal everything that has occurred during the previous administration. Because, let's face it, again, at the local level, what's political about a stop sign or a street light or an interceptor sewer? It just isn't.

M: There had been discussion about the possibility of more than one large party or at least large vote-getting parties running in 1976 for the presidency, possibly one on the right and one on the left and two, more or less, towards the middle. Do you think that there might be a tendency in our politics towards fractionalized, ideological parties?

H: I would hope not, because I think, like France, it has been the weakness of France and Italy and some of the other European countries that are democracies. Our republican form of government has been really based on two strong, viable political parties that you have all elements represented in the Democrat Party from the most conservative to the most ultra-liberal and in the Republican Party you have from the most conservative to the most liberal. You have disagreements within the

party and between the parties. But I think, by and large, there has been an ability to compromise.

In other words, the social legislation under Franklin Delano Roosevelt was thought to be ultra-liberal in its day in the 1930's when those acts were being enacted by the Congress of the United States, especially after 1936. When General Eisenhower took office in 1952, there was no thought about repealing the 1930's and the 1940's. It was found that that was sound legislation in retrospect. It is not supported by both Republican and Democrat alike. Some of the innovations that occur today that are highly controversial, tomorrow are accepted as very commonplace.

The labor legislation passed by the Republicans in the 1890's was unheard of. Everyone thought that the Republicans had just gone out of their minds, but when a Democrat administration came along, they didn't repeal the labor legislation. It recognized the Trade Labor Movement that provided some standards for decent treatment by employer of employee. So, all I'm saying is that this legislation has been a compromise that has been supported by both parties after its enactment. There's no thought of repealing the Twentieth Century if, say, a Goldwater would be elected or a Wallace would be elected.

M: How do you think the public might react to a more ideological oriented politics?

H: I don't really think they would react too favorably because most Americans, at least, don't recognize in themselves a great deal of ideology. How can you have a large labor vote for, say, a person who's anti-labor? And it happens all the time. How can you have a large liberal vote for an arch-conservative? And it happens all the time. So, I don't think Americans, by their bent, at least recognize what their ideologies are if, in fact, there are ideologies that are closely held by the average voter.

M: Do you think public sentiment is tending more towards the conservative in politics or more towards the liberal?

H: Talking to an awful lot of people, I think they're tending more towards conservatism, but still voting more towards the middle of the road. In other words, I think there is a lag time or a lapse time here.

M: Why is this?

- H: Again, I think it's just that most people haven't sat down and thought what their philosophy is towards government and then tried to translate this into a choice of candidates that might be offered at any given election time.
- M: Why do you think people are tending to be more conservative?
- H: I think it's a, perhaps, reaction to the awe that people stand in of big government, the thought of an inability to influence big government, that policy is made in the corporate board rooms and the union offices affect their lives and they have no say in that the Arabs can shut off the oil, that the Cartels can corner soybeans. They just don't understand this and I think it makes them nervous. I think it has an indrawing in more of a conservative manifestation. People tend to get back, perhaps a little more to the basics.
- M: Do you think this might lean toward some form of populist?
- H: I see a movement towards a populist movement although I don't consider the populist movement totally conservative in its nature. It has elements of both arch-conservatism and arch-liberalism in it and it also has the element of irresponsibility in it at times.
- M: Do you think there is any really reactionary American political traditions since all of them say that they are conservatives?
- H: Not reactionary in the sense of European politics. I think American politics is more evolutionary than reactionary.
- M: Speaking of your accomplishments during your administration, how can local government best cope with increasing crime and particularly organized crime?
- H: Organized crime is a very real problem for local government, simply because it doesn't respect boundary lines. In other words, that there is an element in this community that has ties with the L.C.N. [La Cosa Nostra] out of Buffalo or Detroit. Well, our jurisdiction ends at our municipal boundary lines. So, if somebody is calling shots on, say, the numbers operation from Buffalo, New York in Youngstown, you might get his number and his local lieutenants, but you never can go to the heart for that problem, which would be the L.C.N. headquarters in Buffalo. So, this does present a problem.

And I suppose, when it comes to the area of vice, if you want to go out and gamble tonight, you're going to find some place to gamble. Maybe it's in Youngstown or maybe it's out in one of the outlying political subdivisions, cities or townships, but as long as people want gambling and want vice, it's going to be very difficult for government to totally stop it. In other words, the only way I can keep you from going out and gambling tonight or drink at a cheat spot or cohorting with prostitutes is to have a uniformed policeman with you 24 hours a day and we can't afford to have policemen, around the clock, watching each and every one of our citizens. I wouldn't want it that way.

M: What do you think has been the public's reaction to government efforts to cope with organized crime?

H: I don't think there has been a tremendous reaction as such. I think the organized crime, the Mafia, the La Cosa Nostra; this is beyond the comprehension of the average citizen except as they see it on the "Godfather" and programs like the "FBI" [television program] and the like. I think they know it exists, but if they play a number today, they may not have the realization that they're supporting organized crime in Buffalo or Detroit with their dollars. If a kid buys a nickle or a dime bag of "grass" [marijuana] tonight out in the Southern Park Mall, I don't think he realized that maybe this has come through organized crime to the final purchase that he makes. He is, in effect, supporting organized crime. So again, I think people know it exists, but that's it. It's kind of an academic knowledge that there is organized crime, but they don't see the guy that's selling them marijuana or writing their bug number down on the little flash sheet as organized crime.

M: Do you feel there's a tendency to glorify the criminal?

H: I think out of the "Godfather" came some type of glorification of crime. The folklore that has gone up around Bonnie and Clyde tends to romanticize crime. So, there is an element of that.

M: Does this indicate a shift of values?

H: I don't know whether it indicates a shift in values or whether it's just that Hollywood has done a darn good job.

END OF INTERVIEW