As to my early involvement in politics, it did not take place in Philadelphia. I was a young man travelling extensively at that time because my occupation at that time was the theater. I was a youngster when I learned that trade in Philadelphia and became a grip -- that is, a stage hand. I travelled through the West coast and I used San Francisco as my base city and I did much travelling from that area with shows. I worked with RKO studios for a while. I worked with the Western Women's theater which at that time produced many many of the new shows that originated on the West Coast. Also, I did radio programs such as the Carefree Carnival of which Meredith Wilson began to be prominently known, so that my experience in the theater was always back stage. And I became quite expert in lighting and then finally I became an assistant manager and from that I became a manager of shows and did a lot of travelling. So I covered much territory and I had no interest in politics at that time, being a very young man. In fact, I wasn't even of voting age at the time. But when the Depression hit this country it became more and more evident, in the early 1930's, the Depression had already spread not only from the big cities but it was devastating out in the hinterlands of the country. I'm talking about the rural areas and the small town areas. And I began to observe the suffering and the problems that the people had in this country. It sort of moved me and although I was doing well financially I began to concern myself deeply about the direction that the country was going in and then when I got back to San Francisco after being on the road for a while, I became interested in politics. By that I mean the Roosevelt era was just about to begin and when he was selected as the candidate for the Democratic party I decided that I wanted to do something about it and I became active in politics in San Francisco just as an ordinary volunteer. But I was what I would call hooping and hollering and carrying on for Roosevelt to effect a change.

(WMP: What was your educational background that you saw the light with the New Deal?)

The educational background really doesn't relate to the feeling that a person has or develops a sort of a kinship for the plight of others. You don't have to be a college graduate or a university graduate to develop that kinship when you observe what goes on in the country and although I had a fair education it wasn't anything that would direct me towards politics or towards government. I saw many of those who had extensive education who were disinterested in politics and if they were at that time, you found many of them in the better classes, so to speak,
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and the educated classes who were Republicans. They weren't Democrats. So you must remember at that time the people who were more fortunate tended to be Republicans. And those who were the unfortunates tended to be Democrats. Now of course, with the emergence of Roosevelt, it did stir the consciences of other people who had been considered to be in the upper classes. They became Democrats too because they wanted a change in the country, so it wasn't a case of class, it was a matter of being concerned for the country and the direction it was going in.

(WMP: But you had to make the judgment that Roosevelt was doing the right thing.)

That's what I'm getting at and if you remember what was taking place in the country at that time many people became disturbed by it and people from all walks of life. You mentioned Wallace earlier in our conversation. Now he was a man whose background certainly was in both education and culture and so forth and he was a man who was deeply moved by the conditions in the country. So were others. And as a result of it you had a mixture not only of the poor, the deprived, the dispossed, but you also had the wealthy classes and others who became active on behalf of Roosevelt. And of course at that time those who were considered to be people of station and wealth were considered to be Hoover supporters and they referred to at that time after Roosevelt's election in a critical way as "that man" Roosevelt because he had seemed to abandon his class in some of the proposals he made affecting the lives of the entire nation and they felt that he was both Communist and socialistically inclined and they wanted to maintain the status quo and the status quo for the country was a bad status quo. It wasn't a good one. Anyway, from that, from my observations and from my deep feeling of concern for those that were cast out of their homes and dispossed of their farms, this is what aroused me. And if I can explain for a moment what I mean by that. In travelling through many areas of the country, especially the heartland of the nation, you find that what we called the Oakies later on -- well, I saw many of them in their broken-down Fords and wagons and what-not after being dispossed, on the road, going to the promised land of California where they were encouraged to go there because their principal occupation was work you do with your hands -- farming and picking fruit and what-not and having nothing to look forward to and there were many brokers -- labor brokers, if I can call them that -- who encouraged these people by sending out all sorts of invitations for them to come to California and there they would find work and a new beginning. What they really realized when they got there was that there was nothing but peon wages and more deprivation and more denial.
But they travelled to California -- the golden land at that time. That was what everyone was saying to these farmers and the families and the old people and the young people all travelling along down the roads heading for California and certain areas of the Imperial Valley and so forth. I observed that and it was something that would stir anyone.

(WMP: The New Deal really moved you.)

Yes. But prior to the emergence of Franklin Roosevelt I felt terribly upset about the plight of the people. That was just about the time that the Depression really hit those people hard. It was much more difficult for them to survive, so to speak, than it was for the big city people. The Depression hit harder there than it did in the cities. These people, in their travels to try to find work -- to try to make what I call bread and beans to put on the table which would have been sufficient then -- that's how poverty stricken they were. After all, they were disposed. They were thrown off their farms. They had no place to go. No money. Nothing. And the government at that time cared nothing about the plight of the people. That wasn't the policy of government -- to get involved with the plight of the people. And they came -- the worse of the Depression was about 1931 -- it really affected those people much more than it did in the big cities. Although we had apple sellers in the big cities and all that -- yet there was bread lines and soup lines and many other agencies were at work trying to stave off hunger and trying to do their best to help these people. But in the hinterlands of this country, as I say, in the heartland, in the rural areas, there was really nothing there to help these people. They had to shift for themselves and the only place they felt that they could make a living and survive was to find work in the agricultural areas and at that time California attracted them. So on their migration towards the West -- the so-called promised and golden land -- you saw them on the highways and you saw these caravans of cars and broken down vehicles, piled with furniture and whatever meager belongings they had. Plus their children, grandmothers, grandfathers, and so forth. The whole family -- it would move you. Many times I stopped the bus where the performers would travel by bus -- we would stop the bus and I would make a collection in the bus plus unload my pockets and stop this caravan and distribute money to them. And they were so grateful. In fact, when I stopped them many times they were afraid I was someone in authority. They were frightened. And they would say we haven't done anything. And I'd say I know you haven't. I haven't stopped you for that. I just want to know how many children there are in this family. And he would say four or five or eight -- so whatever money I collected I would quickly figure it out and distribute it according to the number of children in that particular family -- like a quarter for each. And that meant food for maybe two or three days for them. Because as I say it was a bread or beans kind of existence. If they had that they had enough to survive till the next day. That's how bad it was. I don't think I have to go any further to explain how I felt at that
time because as a young man I could have been oblivious to that but suffering is suffering and you have to recognize it and understand it and do something about it. So in my limited way --

(WMP: You probably had a religious upbringing, did you?)

Oh yes. That was part of my upbringing. In fact, I was an altar boy in the Episcopal church, so you -- Church of the Advent -- that's where I began my education. Anyway, from these observations, from these feelings, when I got back to San Francisco Roosevelt had been selected. Not knowing much about him but knowing quite a bit about what was going on in the country and knowing also that Hoover was doing nothing about it. Although he did make some attempts to alleviate some of the problems here. Of course, you remember Congress wasn't doing much to support him to help people.

Getting back to my present involvement, I began to look around for some way to support Roosevelt. I became active there, doing my bit, making my feeble speeches, and whatever I could do to encourage them to vote for Roosevelt. And then when he won, of course there was a bright hope for the future and in the first 100 days of the Roosevelt administration it became apparent to most people who were observers of the governmental scene that there was a movement to change the direction of the country. Things were being done. The experimentation, innovation began. There was renewed hope and that Happy Days Are Here Again theme. And this uplifted the spirit of the people. There was a new era and a new attitude about the future of the nation because there was despondency and despair prior to that on the part of millions. So I had the satisfaction of being involved in a limited way with the election of a man who I believe that we feel the effects of his greatness and those around him -- we feel its effects of it today. It changed our society. It changed the entire country and had we continued on the pathway of the Hoover idealism, or the Republican idealism, which was the rich and powerful and the vested interests shall direct the affairs of the nation and the people really didn't have a free choice to do anything about it during those years. At least they felt that way. It cast a new direction in the country and the results of it are felt today.

(WMP: We want to get to the things you did, now.)

Well, I did that. And then I was active in the labor movement at that time because labor was still considered to be an enemy of many people and I got myself involved very deeply -- although I belonged to the stage hands union we went out in sympathy with a strike along the waterfront in San Francisco. That was one of the most dramatic periods for labor. They were fighting the extension of what they considered were their rights and improvement and Harry Bridges, who was considered to be a Communist, and he admitted he was Communistically
inclined. He was the head of the Dock workers union. And they called a strike against the Grace Lines, who dominated shipping in that area. And I became involved in it and we had quite a few very interesting episodes with the police and the strikers going at it. Killings took place. I was deeply involved in that -- I won't go into all the details because some of them are a little gory, but nevertheless, the thing degenerated from a localized strike along the riverfront into a general strike and closed down the entire city for a few days. What had occurred, there was a killing of one of the longshoremen while he was on the streets of San Francisco. He was killed and that aroused the people. San Francisco was one of the best union towns in the country, perhaps better than New York. So this aroused the people and it brought a tremendous storm of protest and the result of other unions joined in the strike and we finally closed the entire city down. Nothing moved. Can you imagine that? Automobiles, trolleys, nothing moved. You couldn't even buy food in the restaurants. That was 1931 or 1932.

(WMP: It sounds as though you personally got right into it?)

Oh yeah. I don't want to talk about that. I really was active in it, both with my tongue and my physical being, if you know what I mean. They charged us on their horses, cracked a lot of heads, and we retaliated. But anyway, the town was closed down, the city was closed down, we permitted food to come into the hospitals and others and then it began slowly to open up and that broke the back of the Grace Lines. They had to capitulate and finally they arrived at a contractual settlement.

(WMP: When you say we how would you designate the group?)

It started with the strikers only.

(WMP: But you were not one of the strikers?)

Well we went out in sympathy with the strikers so that therefore when you are out in sympathy with the strikers you join them on the picket lines. And everyone else joins. That's how the whole city was tied up. In fact that was the only general strike, I believe, that ever took place in the country. Where the entire city came to a complete halt. In fact, just recently, about a year and a half ago there was some visitors here in Philadelphia from San Francisco who were union representatives and I was introduced to them at the Bellevue Stratford and when I began to recount -- they
had learned that I had lived in San Francisco for a while and we began talking about it and I told them about the general strike. I said do you remember that strike. And they said they didn't. But they had heard a lot about it. And then I said I had participated in it and I recounted the story to them in more detail than I had now and they were just so amazed at the detail that I had available to explain to them just what happened. What had developed from a strike of the longshoremen and then it developed into a general strike and closed down the entire city. Now when I say closed down the city, when you ran out of gas, that's where your car remained.

(WMP: What happened to open it up again?)

Well, the strike was settled. The Grace Lines did settle the problem with the Longshoremen's Union and of course the strike was lifted. But up until that time you couldn't even get a glass of water. That's the only strike I know of that could be truly called a general strike. That means it tied up the city where nothing moved. If you wanted a trolley car, it didn't run. If you wanted to go anywhere and you had some gas in the tank, you better make sure you had enough to get back because there were no gas stations open. Restaurants weren't open, except on the second day they opened up two or three restaurants where you could go in and get a cup of coffee and a sandwich and you had to be in line to do that. And then they finally began to open it up. You have to understand that San Francisco was pro union all the way. It was a great city. I love that city. But at the same time the brutality of the police -- in those days a striker or a union person wasn't considered to have any rights.

(WMP: How long did you stay out there?)

I lived there for four years. Between my travels. That was my home base. And then after that -- and I did extensive travelling -- and being a lover of the outdoors every chance I got I was on horseback somewhere out in the wild country. So I travelled quite extensively throughout this country both on foot and by horseback and of course by other means of transportation. I'd say for six years I was almost a gypsy and I enjoyed every moment of it and that's why perhaps you understand why I'm a farmer too, because it takes me back. I had curiosity and what I call itchy feet. I had to keep going. And I went through many areas where very few people ever went.

And then my mother became ill. I had no intention of returning to the East coast. I was going to make my life there. Then
I got a telegram and I came East and I was always a favorite of my mother's although I was the most troublesome one, I suppose, in the family from the standpoint of disappearing for days when I was a youngster and going outdoors. I loved to camp out and all that. But I was her favorite. She always worried about me. So when I got home she had heart trouble and she told me then that -- and I had thought that I was going to leave and go back to California -- I arrived here in September and she told me Pete, don't leave, because if you do you'll never see me again. You know how mothers are. And that weighed heavily on me and I decided I'll stay.

And I became active in the same business. I began to supply scenery and transportation here in Philadelphia. And at one time I supplied transportation facilities -- moving equipment, scenery, plus supplying it to all of the theaters in Philadelphia. That's when we had a lot of variety theaters and such from burlesque to the Academy of Music. Many an afternoon I spent at rehearsal periods at the back of the Academy of Music listening to the rehearsals of the finest orchestra there was at that time and also the finest conductors. Anyway, many many years later I was at the Academy in the 1973 election after we won. I was the master of ceremonies at the swearing in ceremony. That was when we swore in all those judges and the district attorney and the controller. So it was quite an event. And as I walked into the academy early in the morning before the program began, one of the stage hands yelled down the stairwell to the other, Pete's here, Pete's here. And they all came up and they said well, by God, one of our guys finally made it. They were all friends of mine. Many of them had passed away. But that was a strong union -- the stagehands union. Very little is heard of it but it is one of the strongest unions in the worlds, I'd say.

At any rate I stayed here and this was September. In October I became involved in Democratic politics in that area because the Republican party held full sway complete control over that entire area and you had leaders such as Lou Hamberg and Phineas Green. That was September 1935 and that was when Jack Kelly ran and I became active in that campaign. Now you must understand when I say that was the 11th ward. There were no Democrats to speak of in the 11th ward. Everything was Republican. The police at that time were completely controlled by the Republican party. You couldn't become a policeman unless you had support of the councilman in that area. The same thing with firemen and the graft and whatnot was well known. In order to become a policeman you had to pay $1,000 or $500 and you became a policeman. That's the way it was. That was a very corrupt period. And they had a master's power, this hold over the people. There was fear. They used the city
agencies somewhat like Rizzo is doing today to browbeat people. To frighten them. To intimidate them. And that meant if you were a storekeeper, you dare not be registered Democrat. If you were you had those visitors in there and you had plenty of trouble. So naturally they all registered Republican and even the residents of the area were fearful of control by the police. The police did their bidding. The same thing with these detectives. And the same thing with every city agency. It was the kind of control that took quite a few years to be able to overcome but when Jack Kelly ran it was the first attempt to really fight them openly. And then at the same time the Democratic party prior to that was under the control of the O'Donnell leadership, if you could call it that. It was a complete sell-out to the Republican party. In fact, O'Donnell and his cohorts were employees of the Republican City Committee, you might say. In fact, they even paid the rent for the Democratic headquarters -- the Republicans did.

Anyway, with that election in '35 it was fueled first by the Roosevelt election and then in 1934 it was the -- did I say 35? It was '34 when I came to Philadelphia. The election of George Earl. So the Democratic party began to have some meaning in this state and in this city. There was a revival of it. Prior to that it was just completely subservient to the Republicans. With some exceptions -- you always had the young Turks in there, younger people and the others who just didn't buy the O'Donnell rule. But they were able to control the city committee by controlling the sell-out ward leaders. And so a revolt took place, sparked by Jack Kelly and Matt McCloskey and others and that was a great period of unrest politically. And within the Democratic party there was a ferment going on.

(WMP: Did you get into that?)

Yes. I did. That's when -- I returned to Philadelphia in 1934 and I was deeply involved in the '35 election. In '34 I did get involved. I returned in September and by October I was involved in politics because when I decided to stay after my mother's fear of me leaving and my fear of upsetting her if I went so I decided to stay and get involved in the same business I was in out there and then got interested in politics immediately and began to agitate for the Democratic party. I became the leader in December of that year -- the 11th ward. That's how easy it was in those days because there were no Democrats around. And the Democratic committeemen in that ward and many other wards were usually the brothers or some relative of the Republican committeemen. That's how cozy it was. Or their friends. So that you had no real representation for the Democrats in these wards. So being of a different mind I began to agitate
for the Democratic party and began to get young people involved and we formed a new Democratic party and I became the leader of it almost by acclamation of 10 or 15 of us -- a big party to lead!

(WMP: Was this city-wide?)

No. Locally. I was a young fellow, just past my majority. So this is how you get involved and where there is a void someone has to fill it. And that's what I did. And I became the leader of the 11th ward. So from that point on I began to bring in more and more people. The fear was absolutely terrible -- it's hard to explain it. But people feared being a Democrat. To be a Democrat they used to point you out on the street as if you were some escaped animal out of the zoo. In other areas of the city it was different but the riverfront area was totally controlled by the Republicans. In fact that was the last area of their power. When that was broken then the Republican party started to slide everywhere. But this was what they always depended on. In fact, in the election of 1939, when Bob White ran for Mayor, it's the riverfront that defeated Bob White. They only won that election when they elected Lamberton by 25,000 votes and the thing about it -- the irony of it was this -- that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was trying to spur development and aid cities and so forth. The city of Philadelphia was totally bankrupt at that time. They weren't paying the cops, firemen, nor the city employees. There was tremendous dissatisfaction even in Republican ranks. After Jack Kelly had been defeated in 1935, in 1939 we had the Controller at that time, Bob White. And he ran against Lamberton. It seemed that we were going to carry it -- the city, for the first time for a Democratic mayoral candidate. But what happened, the RFC was making loans all over the country to spur growth and bail many of the cities out of their problems and Philadelphia was one of them. Philadelphia hocked the Gas Works at that time for $60 million to the RFC Corporation and that money was sent up here to rescue the city and it arrived here a short time prior to the election. The Council at that time paid off all of their policemen, there was tremendous dissatisfaction on the part of many of the Republicans in the administration because they weren't being paid. Some of them hadn't been paid for six months. And they were ready to flop over and become Democrats. They were contacting Democratic leaders and trying to make arrangements with them. But when the money came in -- when they paid them off -- paid off their back salaries -- they went right back to the Republican party and we were defeated by them. By 25,000 votes. And when the money came here, then of course the contributions from these job holders went into the Republican kitty. They spent enormous amounts of money on election day in the riverfront in order to defeat our candidate, Bob White, and they did. They only beat him by 25,000 votes in the general election. So it was RFC money coming to Philadelphia
this continuation of bickering and fighting and what-not, he resigned and Bill Green became the Chairman. But during that period I had broken the backs -- after my election to the Senate, I reorganized that area and got rid of most of the old leaders there who I thought were not really dedicated Democrats. They were self-serving sort of guys. We began to build the Democratic party and we broke the back of the Republicans and after the first couple of years of my activity there we really built a strong Democratic party there and the Republicans didn't have a chance.

(WMP: Didn't Mike Byrne come from down there?)

Mike Byrne came from the 18th ward and Mike Byrne was a co-leader with Jim Byrne. That's when you had two leaders for each ward and three committeemen for each division and then later on it was changed back to one leader because you have a co-leadership throughout the entire city committee.

(WMP: You and Mike Byrne worked together pretty well.)

Oh yeah. Mike and I are very close friends and I was a member of the state committee of that time long before I ran for the Senate. I was a member of the state committee with Joanna Hughes, who later became his wife. Mike and I go way back to the '30's you know. And every once in a while I get a call from him, we're still in touch. He's a great friend of mine. And Mike was one of those young men who entered politics with a different vision of what things should be, both in politics and in government. And he was an open-minded more liberal type. And of course there was a tremendous resistance towards liberalism within the Democratic party, although the Democratic party nationally and otherwise was known as the more liberal of the two parties, yet internally within political organizations you still had many vestige of a desire to keep control in a very few hands and it almost brought along bossism or dictatorship in the organization and its committeemen.

(WMP: Would you agree that Mike Byrne was indispensible to Joe Clark?)

Absolutely. He was a right hand to Joe Clark and he was the bridge between Joe Clark and the city committee and people within the organization and he was a fine bridge that Joe could walk over and back again to a safe haven while Mike kept that bridge open for him. It didn't get to a confrontation as it did with others. Joe Clark wasn't put in the position where he had to defend himself at the bridge and cause a cleavage because Mike was always there putting a little oil on the waters to calm them down. And people trusted Mike and they knew that Mike was working in the best interests of the administration, of the man that he represented and at the same time trying to keep a
balance so that these conflicting forces or ideas or even positions wouldn't come to a definite open warfare. He was very very instrumental in Joe Clark's administration.

To go back -- from 1934 to 1952 I had no interest in seeking any office, either appointive or elective. My only interest was the betterment and the success of the Democratic party because I felt that I was committed to the idealism and philosophy of the Democratic party and my only interest was to see that it succeeded and continued to carry on the traditions of Roosevelt, then Truman, and so forth. But in 1952 the party slated a candidate for the State Senate in the 3rd Senatorial District, whom I violently disagreed with. I felt that he was not going to represent the Democratic party or its philosophy and that he was just another person who was seeking political office for his own aggrandisement and I decided to oppose him. There were nine leaders in that district at that time. Nine ward leaders. Seven of them supported him. I had the support of one other leader besides myself. The City Committee invoked the rule wherein the majority should be supported by everyone and I disagreed with that and I filled against him and fought both city committee and the leaders of that district successfully. I took the nomination and then we had some problems about whether I would run as an independent or whether I would join the Democratic party and I decided that in that district the incumbent senator was the brother of the then leader of the Republican party; John Meade was the incumbent senator and Bill Meade was the leader of the Republican party in Philadelphia. That district was still Republican and they had a strong holding there, but although it was conceded that I could not win in November, or no Democrat could win in November, I worked very diligently and put on a campaign and it culminated in my chairman at that time, who I respected and admired and had great affection for, erroneously predicted the day before election that the one district that the Democrats expected to lose was the 3rd Senatorial district. The following day the results were in my favor. I carried the district very very handsomely. I had done a tremendous amount of work to build up the Democratic party in that area and of course Jim Finnegan did not know just what was going on there at that time so he made this judgment that the Democratic party had not built enough strength to defeat the Republicans. But we did and I carried several other candidates for the legislature with me and that was a real upset. In fact, some have said that it attracted the attention of Drew Pearson, who wrote an article on it at that time.

(WMP: What year was that?)

1952, when it was conceded to be a Republican year because the candidate for President at that time was Eisenhower. So we were fighting against the tide of popularity of Eisenhower.
And of course the Democratic party throughout the country had suffered some rather serious setbacks because of the Eisenhower victory, but we here in Philadelphia in my district, we acquitted ourselves well because Philadelphia did go for our candidate.

Anyway, I went to the Senate. The one thing that I recognized at that time was that there was an increasing and a very very serious concern on the part of some people about the drug problem. And I once made in effort in the senate to create an independent narcotic agency in Pennsylvania. The narcotic agency in Pennsylvania at that time was under -- was one of the bureaus in a large conglomerate of bureaus in the Health Department. Nothing really was being done at the time when we could have done much to stave off the rise of narcotic addiction. I felt that it was ruining many many young lives -- it was a death trap for many. And that the narcotic problem was becoming more and more serious in our big cities. Of course at that time it was principally a problem amongst the Blacks. There were very few Whites involved. But I saw that this cancer would spread and I began my efforts to convince both the Governor and the legislature at that time to establish a narcotic commission in Pennsylvania completely independent of any other department of government and to address themselves to the problem of narcotic addiction, both in the treatment of narcotic addicts to alleviate their dependency on narcotics and at the same time to educate -- it was prevention, education, and of course treatment. It was a very very fine program. It was recognized as a fine program. Many people came up to testify on it including the then head of the federal narcotic bureau, Henry Anslinger (?), who thought it was a step in the right direction. It was a little bit of pioneering at the state level in the area of narcotics. But evidently he didn't have enough money in the treasury at that time because the government told me that the budget couldn't allow for a billion dollar expenditure. I saw that it was useless to try to convince the majority of legislators and senators to go in that direction because at that time the narcotic problem was principally a Black problem. So it was hard selling and then of course as time went on the various local groups began to attack the problem, but it was only attacked from one area -- to prevent distribution. But all the other factors that should have been put into motion at that time, such as education, prevention, treatment and rehabilitation which would have saved the lives of many youngsters. Had we begun back in 1954 with that kind of program I'm sure we could have saved a lot of lives. You know sometimes an idea comes along way in advance of its time, so to speak, so I wasn't successful with it. But we did get some changes in the laws pertaining to the method in which the health department treated what were known as medical addicts. Medical addicts have a tremendously difficult time in being certified to receive the narcotics that they need to relieve their suffering because the health department, the big bureaucracy that it was, paid very little attention to the needs of these people. And these were certified as medical addicts by their physicians, but they had to be approved by the health department and there were
hundreds of them throughout the state, many in Philadelphia, who never got the certification that they had to have. I appealed to the Governor and I proved to him that this was a terrible injustice and created a tremendous amount of suffering and finally when I made my investigation in the health department I convinced Gov. Leader to fire the head of that particular department because she was incompetent.

Then of course generally I became more and more active in the internal affairs of the Democratic party in the city committee. Then, again, when Bill Green died — and Bill Green had learned to depend on me for a number of things. He was busy down in Washington as a Congressman and he couldn't devote the time up here, so I did some work in his behalf and began to build the strength of the Democratic party. At the same time Joe Clark had been elected the Mayor and the city was blossoming. The renaissance began and this was a great period in my eyes anyway. This great city of ours was moving forward under new leadership, under intelligent leadership, and under the kind of leadership that was missing in Philadelphia for 67 years. So this was a new bright era dawning in Philadelphia. Then of course there was the great man who I admired greatly, Dick Dilworth, so I felt that we were going in the right direction with that kind of governmental leadership. Most people didn't realize that Joe Clark and Dick Dilworth and Bill Green were not in conflict all the time, that there was cooperation, and that Bill Green supported many of the programs that they were interested in and City Council was cooperative. So it was a good era. An era in which there was cooperation in the city government. That was a very happy period, both for Philadelphians and for me. I really enjoyed that period. I had not only great admiration for Joe Clark and Dick Dilworth, but I felt what they were doing was something that Philadelphia needed to take it out of its doldrums. Lincoln-Stephens said Philadelphia, corrupt and contented city. We wanted to change the image of it and they did.

So I went on and when Bill Green passed away there was a vacuum created and of course the man who was working with Bill Green at that time in City Committee was Frank Smith. Frank Smith became the leader and I felt that he wanted to do the job and he was competent and I aided him in any way I could. I was called upon many times and being one of the old-timers and knowing what had to be done and being helpful to them. Then Frank asked me to become the First Vice Chairman. I really didn't have the interest and I said Frank get someone else. He said no, Pete, we need you. So I became the First Vice Chairman. In fact, I wasn't even present when I was elected, that's how much of an interest I had in it. Because I considered it really a ceremonial post. And I really had no interest in it.
But strange things do occur. When Frank Smith and Jim Tate began to quarrel and then it broke out into open warfare and Smith decided to support Hemphill and you know the history. Tate did win and defeated Hemphill and then Tate had a real struggle to win in November against Arlen Specter and he did win by about 11,000 votes. So then Tate decided that he was going to oust Smith. Under the rules of the Democratic party when a recall is brought about to remove the Chairman he immediately must turn over to the first Vice Chairman not the operations of City Committee but the function of examining the recall and conducting any recall meeting that is held. So the duty fell on me. They served a recall petition on me. I ruled against it because it had some faults in it and then I got into a public quarrel with Tate. I criticized him publicly. I told them that I didn't want to see a Taminy Hall situation created in Philadelphia. I felt that it was an evil thing to have all the power concentrated in one man's hands and I'm going back now to 1969 -- no, '67. And I got into a public debate with Tate about that. I criticized him for reaching out for total power. I likened it to the Taminy Hall situation which brought some evil results in New York and I didn't want to see it happen in Philadelphia. I did say that I didn't want City Hall and City Committee to be one in the same. I wanted City Committee to be cooperative with City Hall in the interests of the people but I didn't want that kind of domination and I really quarrelled with Tate publicly. And we had the recall meeting and then they held the meeting and I took them to court and we quarrelled about it in court and we won. I won that case. Then later Smith decided in the interests of party harmony to resign. I became the acting chairman because of his resignation. The rules of the party dictate that whenever there is a resignation and a vacancy it must be filled within 30 days so I then called a meeting of the City Committee to reorganize it and young Bill Green was elected the Chairman and chaired the meeting and we gave him a good start.

Bill as the chairman of the City Committee found that again any changes that he wanted to make they were always thwarted by someone else. He talked about a more open party. He talked about a number of things that would have further democratized the party or liberalized it, but him being down in Washington most of the time he didn't have the time nor the support in city committee to make these changes except for a small group -- myself and others. Because Tate was able to dominate.
The strong mayor form of government also gives power to that strong mayor to dominate everything. And that's what's wrong with it, although it was right at the time that the powers were vested in the mayor under the strong mayor form of government under the new city charter. Yet it was desirable in the days of Clark and Dilworth but it wasn't desirable to those who were not interested solely in the welfare of the city but also were interested in political considerations. So the strong mayor could also become a dictator. Now a strong mayor is desirable if he is benevolent and if he is interested in the city itself and its welfare, but there is a tendency on the part of all elected officials to dominate and control and completely control and this is what has taken place during the Tate administration and then of course we see it very clearly under Frank Rizzo. He dominates everything. And the power given to him through patronage and other things -- control of finances -- give him that power to dominate politically. And that's the undesirable feature of it because some men are tempted to reach out for total power and form a political dictatorship.

Anyway, getting back to that period -- after Bill was elected I tried to help him but there arose in the City Committee again this desire for no change -- don't rock the boat kind of a thing. Maintain the status quo. No changes. Anyone who was liberally bent or liberally inclined, rather, was considered to be someone who didn't fit into the picture and Bill Green was liberally inclined. So therefore, he began to have trouble almost immediately from the powers that be -- the mayor and the leaders. There is a tendency on the part of elected officials once elected and put into positions of responsibility and power to maintain the status quo because they build up their own little organizations and not allow those who have other thoughts or ideals to come in and have a voice in the party. So that Bill couldn't achieve what he wanted to achieve. He had his problems with Tate and he had his problems with other leaders and finally he resigned in disgust. There is a Senator Joe Scanlon, a very fine man, who always had in his mind that being the Chairman of the Democratic party was the greatest achievement for a man. I never considered that. But he came out of the Kensington area and his father was a legislator -- one of the old-time pols. And to be a chairman of the political organization was the epitome of success and he wanted to be the chairman badly. And of course Tate supported him and he was elected the Chairman. Immediately after that trouble arose between Tate and Joe Scanlon because there was as I said earlier the need for the division of powers of influence to be maintained. But that is pretty hard to sell to any man who is the mayor of the city that has a strong mayor form of government, control of patronage, control of many of the things that concern both political party and the citizen. So that there was a reluctance to give up any of what they assume were their prerogatives -- that is, the elected officials. They want to maintain it and yet have political clout. Rather than concentrating on doing a good
job as an elected official to earn the respect and support of the people they care more to control the political organization. That's what's wrong about it. And I think it is foolish, too. Because a man who does a good job publicly and has the support of his party doesn't have to control his party because they want him as a candidate for reelection. They will seek him out and say please run again. Instead, they feel that their party may deny him the nomination so they try to build a political base of their own and dominate.

When Joe was elected he was a man who had some problems physically. Shortly after that he was reelected again because he filled the unexpired term of Bill Green and then a few months later -- he tried, but he ran into the same conflicts that Bill did with Jim Tate. Jim Tate wanted to call the shots and Joe wanted to be the leader. There is always that, you know. Bill Green said I'm not going to be a puppet. I'm going to run this city committee in the best interests of the Democratic party and the people and there was that conflict always of who is boss. Who runs things. But there shouldn't have been a boss. There should have been a cooperative situation. But it is hard to tell that to people who are reaching out for that status quo and that control. So when Joe Scanlon was reelected and he was very ill at that time. I chaired the meeting for his reelection. I still remained -- they insisted that I remain, even after I fought with Tate and others -- they made no move against me to remove me as a First Vice Chairman. In fact they reelected me. I didn't care whether they did or not. I had no real interest in it. But they said please stay. I said all right, fine. And I had the support of the leaders too. So when Joe after he was reelected -- I chaired that meeting for him. He got up to accept the office and said that because of his health he had to have time to recuperate -- he would be gone for two or three months -- but he said I want you all to know that although Pete Camiel and I have had our differences and he fought me and he denied me and all that, I want you to know that he has my full trust and confidence and he is going to run the City Committee in my absence. And many of them didn't like it, but Joe said Pete, I can trust you, everybody else can trust you. So therefore, Tate didn't particularly care for that. But it worked out. A short time later Joe passed away. And then at that time I was just getting ready to phase out slowly out of politics because I thought here I have been working all my life and active all my life in different things, I wanted to do a lot of travelling. I wanted to go to India, I wanted to go here and there and the old itchy feet were bothering me again. And I felt it was time for me to do some adventuring and go and see the rest of the world that I hadn't seen. And I was preparing for that.
I was going to phase out of politics slowly. And here came along these things and by circumstances this void was created and they decided that there was one man who could run city committee and who could take the position and I did. I became the chairman that way. And I decided that I was going to do those things that I believed should be done. I began to expand. I opened the door to everybody. I began to send messages clearly to the independent liberal groups such as ADA and others that they had to have a voice within the party. Now there was opposition to that idea within City Committee. But nevertheless I pursued it. And at the same time the people in the ADA and in the NBC (?) , the liberal independent groups, and others held me in suspicion. Another old party hack, loyalist and all of that. And that's the problem. They always put you in a certain category and keep you there. Unless you can demonstrate to them that what you say, you mean. And I did that. I opened doors to everyone. At first they didn't believe me. They couldn't understand that a guy like Camiel, associated with the party all these years -- they forgot that I fought the party. That I had an independent bent. 'That I was independent in many of my ideas. And I had proven it. It was a case where I put my political neck on the line and fought the Democratic party in 1952 and prior to that. I told you about fighting them on many occasions. I differed with them because I am an independent thinker -- at least I think I am -- and I'd like to chart my own course. And I have always believed in one thing -- I wasn't born and raised in America to give my right to a free choice away to anybody. Or to be dictated to. It runs strongly in me and in my family. My father taught us that. And another thing, you only live once and after that it is eternity. And live it like a man, is what I was taught. And that's what I've done. When I think it is right to agree, I've agreed. When I thought it was right to disagree, I did, and I didn't give a darn about the attitudes of others. So anyway, I began to open the doors to these people. At first they were very suspicious and wouldn't accept it. Then they began to see that I meant what I said.

Now the one place I could give them an input and that is in the decision-making process within the Democratic party. And that is, when we select candidates for public office, it is done through the policy committee which makes the recommendations to city committee. So in order to be a member of City Committee you had to be elected a ward leader, but in order to be a member of the Policy Committee and have a voice you could be appointed by the Chairman so that is the vehicle I used to give them a voice within the selection process of the City Committee of the Democratic party. So I explained to the Policy Committee, which was made up formerly of ward leaders and a few labor leaders. A total number of about 30. I expanded the
Policy Committee to 81, included labor, elected officials, Blacks, various other ethnic representations, business, finance, the academic community, -- I had people like the Dean of the Women's College out at the University of Pennsylvania was a member of the Policy Committee. John Blum, member of the Policy Committee. Paul Weinberg. And people like that which were never given an opportunity and what I did is I gave representation on the Policy Committee to all of the elements of our society because I thought it was fair and I thought it was right and I thought it was in the best interests of the Democratic Party not to try to stifle dissent, but to encourage it because many times dissent is beneficial to create the kind of changes that should be made. Well that, I feel, wasn't easily accepted by the status quo boys in the City Committee. The status quo always intrudes there -- the desire to maintain the status quo.

Anyway, I was successful in doing that. I ran into problems with that. There was opposition to it but nevertheless I had these people on the policy committee and of course then they began to realize, these independents and liberals, that I meant what I said that they should be included and helpful in making these decisions and they began to believe me then and they knew I was sincere in what I was saying. Putting on the ballot for the first time one who was very active in the ADA movement and that was Shelly Yanoff, she became a candidate. And others like that.

(WMP: What did she run for?)

She ran for Council. Council at large. And I put up a few others who had come out of the independent community. And of course the Rizzos and the others didn't care for that and that was part of my disagreement with all of those who thought in terms of the 1930's rather than in terms of the 1970's.

So that the -- we have to come to the Rizzo period. How did he become elected? Now you must understand that Rizzo is enormously gifted in one thing -- propaganda. Great propagandist around. First, he has the physical presence to impress people. Secondly, his background as a cop -- a super-cop -- and the period that he emerged on the political scene there was -- not only in Philadelphia but throughout all the other cities because of the excesses of the '60's -- there was a strong desire on the part of the population for law and order. The law and order theme was running very strong at that time, not only here but everywhere. And in effect this created in the minds of the people the idea that a cop could bring about the
kind of order that they wanted — safe neighborhoods, safe streets, and all of that. Rizzo had engaged in a propaganda movement with the press a long time before he became a candidate for mayor. The press, if you recall, while he was the Police Commissioner, practically eulogized him. Think back — Rizzo this, Rizzo that. The press helped to build an image for him as an honest, forthright, and good person. They will admit that today. They have admitted to me, yes, we're at fault too. The Democratic party at that time was searching for what they always search for — a winner. All political parties do that. They want a winner. And he had the popularity. Plus he had the support of the Mayor. Now again, we come back to the strong mayor and what influence he has with the political organization. It is a tremendous influence because of patronage. It all boils down to that. The self-seeking, self-serving people always look to the man who has the goodies in his hands that he can hand out. And they will sell themselves for it. Patronage is the only thing that they know has any meaning. Service to the public, building a democratic party of ideals and principles — that is secondary. It's what can I get for myself, my friends, and my committeemen. That's the way it is. It is a reality of political life.

(WMP: Didn't the city charter of 1951 cut back patronage severely?)

Patronage? It was expanded under Rizzo. And a bit under Tate, but not much.

(WMP: It was nothing like the Republicans used to have?)

Oh no. Nothing like that. It was almost total then. Don't forget that civil service under the Republican regimes was practically non-existent. It was all patronage. Practically every office — the row offices, the courts, a lot of things. Even the courts were patronage plums. So it was a situation — the 1951 charter did limit that but it never limited a mayor from expanding the patronage area as Rizzo did. Now Rizzo was expanding patronage jobs by about 2,000 since he has been in office. At a tremendous cost to the taxpayers of the city. In fact, I claim that — and I claim publicly — that the $80 million deficit that we had was largely caused by the people he put on the public payroll for political purposes and I can prove that with facts and figures. It was published a number of times. So that the power of the mayor through patronage is enormous to influence the people who are the leaders of the party to do his bidding. City Committee, conversely, does not have that kind of a direct hold on patronage. It has some of it coming from the state when you have a state administration, but that is limited, especially under Shapp, where the patronage appointments are minimal compared to the
Civil service area and another thing is that we had the movement of the unions within the public service employees so that the committeemen working in that area where they unionized were no longer beholden totally to the whim of the leader. But the mayor has under his direct control without any union requirements thousands of employees that will do his bidding and go out and work for the candidates. That is a liability for the opponents.

(tape change, a few remarks lost) ... the candidate that was supported by then the incumbent mayor, Jim Tate, and why the majority of the ward leaders in the Democratic party favored him was that they felt he was a winner and secondly, they felt that we had to have some strong personality during that period where law and order was running uppermost in the minds of most people. He had promised to be a good mayor and if he was going to bring about -- he was going to be cooperative and so forth. To the ward leader that is important because he felt that he had an open door to the mayor. Also, as I mentioned earlier, the press had really at that time been very very favorably inclined towards Rizzo, so they had created an image for him which was an asset. That's the way the majority of the leaders looked at him -- people like Congressman Barrett, others.

But I still maintained in my conversations with Tate that the policy committee would be totally open to anyone who wanted to vie for that position and it was not locked in for Rizzo. He tried to convince me it should be Rizzo and I said nothing doing.

What had occurred was a meeting of the policy committee -- Bill Green was invited and so was Councilman Cohen and of course Rizzo. Now the first time I ever met Rizzo -- this I must recount -- it came as a surprise to Jim Tate. Jim Tate had called me and said I understand you are scheduling the candidates to appear before the Policy Committee. I had scheduled other candidates for other offices and the last was the Mayor. And I said yes. He said well, have you talked to Rizzo about it? I said no. If Rizzo is interested in becoming a candidate, let him call me and make his arrangements. And he said what do you mean? I said it's not that easy, Jim. And you know my rules. When it comes to the Policy Committee anyone who is a resident of Philadelphia and who is a registered Democrat has the right to come before that Policy Committee, even the least of us. And I proved that because we had hundreds that appeared before the Policy Committee in my time. It wasn't a closed thing. You talk to some of the people who were on the Policy Committee. It was wide open. And I felt that was
democratic and everyone had a right to come to the Democratic party and say here I am, this is what I represent, here are my credentials. So we had extensive hearings for all candidates.

Jim Tate said to me, you mean you haven't scheduled him (Rizzo)? And I said he hasn't called. It's been publicized, it's been in the newspapers and I made the invitation to everyone and that includes him or anyone else. He said oh come on, Pete, you're going too far. I said look, that's the way it is. He said ok. How about if I arrange a meeting? And I said fine. So we arranged a meeting for Rizzo to come in and talk. There was Jim Tate there, Bill Barrett, Herb McLinchy. Rizzo came in and as he came in the door; Jim Tate said, Senator, Commissioner Rizzo -- you two know each other. And at that point Rizzo stepped forward, shook my hand, and said no I haven't had the pleasure of meeting the Senator. I've heard a lot about you. Tate was sort of surprised at that. He thought I knew or had met Rizzo. I never did. In all the years that he had been in the police department, I never did. And Rizzo sat down and I began to ask him what he had in mind for the future of Philadelphia if elected and so on and I told him what the rules of the Democratic party were, that he had to come before the Policy Committee, he had to explain himself, he had to make an appeal to them and so forth. And Jim Tate began to answer for him. I said wait a minute, Jim. I'm not asking you. I'm asking him to tell me what his thoughts are on the future of Philadelphia. And Rizzo said he would work with Jim Tate and he would work with the Democratic party and he would try to be a good mayor and all of that. I said you better tell that to the Policy Committee and you better be prepared to do it. He asked me how does it work and I said you come before the Policy Committee and you place your credentials before them. That's the requirement. Then the Policy Committee takes a vote and makes its recommendations to the City Committee. So then he left and I had told him that I would schedule him at the same time that I would schedule the other candidates.

(BFV: What was your impression of him? )

At that time I wasn't overwhelmed one way or the other. He was another guy seeking the nomination and I thought everybody is going to have a shot at it. I had also scheduled Bill Green and it was Cohen and one more. No, there were several others but some didn't appear. They were, I suppose, not serious about it. When Rizzo left Jim Tate said to me, I didn't know you didn't know Rizzo. I said no and at that moment while the four of us were sitting in the office after Rizzo left it was McGlinchy who blurted out oh Jim, long before you were a leader this guy was out on the riverfront fighting cops. He doesn't like cops. And I said now wait a minute. Don't leave the impression that I don't like the police. I respect the police that are doing their work, but I don't like political cops. I never will.
Now what had occurred when I first started in politics and the Republican party had complete sway -- they used policemen in uniform to canvass the people. The intimidation was there. The police were a very important item in the riverfront area for the Republican party because they could intimidate. And they would openly solicit votes for the Republican party. And I caught a couple of them doing it one time and there was an altercation -- I won't go into that. Anyway, some damage was done. And they took a club and clubbed the policeman after he was down on the ground and they threw him in the sewer. And in those days I felt that I had to break the fear that the people had of the police and the Republican party. And the only way you could do it was where they could understand. Where it was visible. You didn't talk about it. You did it. If you understand what I mean. So there was a reputation that I was a cop fighter. I wasn't a cop fighter. I just didn't like political cops who interfered and who didn't do their duty in the first place as policemen but who intimidated people politically. And I took issue with those cops. And Herb McGlinchy, the young leader like myself back in those days, he remembered that and he blurted it out and I had to correct him and say no, I respect the police who do their work but I don't like policemen involved in politics.

So then Tate said you know, Rizzo would make a fine candidate. He made a pitch for him. So did Barrett. Barrett was very much for Rizzo. So was McGlinchy. And the majority of the leaders in the Democratic party were for Frank Rizzo because at that time you must understand that he and the press had a romance going on. After all, he did hire 35 or 36 of them after he became mayor. Let me recall that to you. He hired many of the reporters who he was friendly with and gave them jobs in the administration. Now, it showed you the close relationship between him and the reporters who were writing good stories for him. That's what I meant earlier. What a propagandist he is. He is very smooth in that direction and he knows how to use the press and they were favorable to him after he was elected. The first break that came that really disclosed what Rizzo really was was when I challenged him to the lie detector test and I also was able to divulge to the public the existence of the secret gestapp squad that he had. Let me finish this one point. It's very important. Jim Tate, on a number of occasions said to me my God, what are you doing with that Policy Committee? You are putting a lot of Green supporters on there. Now I did put on the Policy Committee people who told me that they were going to support Green and some of them said I guess I won't be a member of the Policy Committee because you know I'm for Green. I said you are on the Policy Committee. So that I did give Green a clear number of members of that committee who would speak for him and would support him and the Policy Committee at that time
was, I would say there were about 15 or 18 of them that hadn't made up their minds which way to go and I knew that their minds were still open but there were some Rizzo supporters on it and some Green supporters and it was almost 50/50. So that Green was no in any way thwarted from getting that nomination. It might have been close, but he had a lot of supporters. But what happened was when Green appeared before the Policy Committee he made a very very serious error. He probably didn't know that he had supporters and he just lost his head, came before the Policy Committee, insulted the members of the Policy Committee, told them that they should disband, they were useless and so forth and so on. So much so that one of the members of the Policy Committee which was Wendell Young, a boyhood friend of Bill Green's got up and apologized for him. These are the facts. Wendell Young took the floor after Bill Green left and said I apologize for Bill Green's behavior. I didn't like what he said. Mr. Chairman I would like to withdraw as a member of this Policy Committee because I can no longer function as a member because I feel that it is useless for me to continue, but I am very very apologetic for what Bill Green did. He had no right to do that. You've been fair to him. I know this is a fair hearing that he would have gotten. But he didn't appeal to them for support -- he rejected their support. Now Cohen had appeared earlier, he did the same thing. Bill did the same thing. I think someone had talked them into it. It was foolish.

Then the members who were on the Policy Committee that were favoring Bill Green became inscensed by this. They said who does he think he is to insult us this way -- I'm one of his supporters. So anyway, the next to appear was Rizzo. He bowed and scraped. Told them how he'd like to be the mayor, he'll do this, he'll do that, work harmoniously with the party and so forth. And naturally there was no other choice but to endorse him and to send his name to the City Committee. When the City Committee vote was taken it was overwhelmingly in favor of Rizzo. So he got the endorsement that way. And Jim Tate had campaigned all along amongst the Policy Committee members and amongst the ward leaders. He was totally for Frank Rizzo. Now, I've asked Jim Tate -- I said look, Jim, you know this man and I don't. I only know what I read about him in the newspapers. Now tell me, I've heard many disquieting things about him. Is he an honest man? Is he competent? He says, oh he's my good friend and Pete I'm telling you that this man is honest and he's decent and all that. I said he's worked for you. I have had no contact with him. I can only go by what others tell me. But I had these reservations and I wanted to know from the mayor and from others and they were
all telling me what a great man he was. Well, Frank Rizzo was able to hide what he really is. Because let me tell you this -- three days after he took his oath of office -- in the meantime he had been scraping and bowing before Jim Tate. Yes, Mr. Mayor, whatever you say, Mr. Mayor. Going to work closely with him. Going to take advice from him and all of that. And he asked me about that and I said well, Commissioner, Jim Tate has spent 10 years in there as the mayor. He evidently knows government. You are right when you say you will seek his advice because he knows that much. He knows how the government works. But when it comes to policy making you will have to do it in conjunction with the City Council and in the best interests of the people of Philadelphia. That is something that you will have to develop. Oh yes, and he will seek advice, and all that. Now, about a few days after he took his oath of office I received a call from him in my office and this is the first time I began to learn what Mr. Rizzo is really like. He said he would like to come over to City Committee and see me. Very important. And he's not going to take any more calls and he doesn't want Tate to bother him. I was surprised at that. After all, just a short time ago he was scraping and bowing and currying favor with Tate. Now suddenly something must have happened. I did not know what it was. And I told him that he shouldn't be visiting City Committee. That he was the mayor and if there was a need for a meeting between the City Chairman and the mayor that we could do it at his office, which would be proper, or do it in some neutral place.

(WMP: How long had you been Chairman of City Committee?)

Oh, I'd been Chairman since 1970. I conducted the election for Governor in Philadelphia as the Chairman and that's when we gave Shapp 178,000 majority. And we did a good job -- I put the organization together. And it was floundering there for a while. There were a lot of divisions in it. Because the carry over from the Smith-Tate feud and the Smith-Green feud and the Smith-Joe Scanlon feud -- there was a lot of feuding going on there for a while. Then when I came in I began to establish a different position. And that's why -- I got along with Tate fine but we had quite a few disagreements about things. But he knew with me that once I made up my mind -- here again, is the factor which I would like to say is important in a leader. You have to be independent. Both financially -- in every way. From the standpoint of his principles and if he's going to believe in something he's going to have to fight for it regardless of who he has to oppose. Well, you didn't have that with the others but it began to emerge with me. And Jim Tate saw that. He didn't always agree with it but he respected it, I'll say that for him. He said you're a strong-minded guy. And I said Jim I can't always agree with everyone and I can't disagree with everyone, but when there is time for a disagreement, you'll hear from me. When it's time to agree I'll say so and I'll say the reasons why.
Anyway, Rizzo came to my office and began to tell me a story that shocked me. And that is when I saw the real Rizzo emerge. I knew Jim Tate -- from the time he came into politics I was already a leader in the Democratic party. He was a committeeman first time I heard of him he was aide to the then chairman who was Jim Clark and then later when Clark became the Treasurer of the City Committee he continued to assist him as his secretary and so forth. So he then became a leader of the 43rd ward and then of course was elected to Council and then subsequently he became the mayor after the resignation of Dilworth. So I knew Jim Tate all those years. But I knew one thing about him -- he is about one of the most moral men I know. Personal morality. Extremely religious. And wouldn't drink. And morally, I've often said he missed his calling -- he should have gone into a seminary. He is a very moral man. And you'll find amongst politicians, you'll have the others who are quite loose morally. They do a lot of running around and all of that. Anyway, there was no reason for anyone to manufacture a dastardly dirty story about him. Now Frank Rizzo came to my office and he sat there and said to me Senator I want you to know I'm not going to receive any more phone calls from Jim Tate. I don't want him around me. I'll never forgive him what he did to me.

I said what do you mean what he did to you? He supported you for mayor. He said yes, Senator but you don't know -- here's the evil that came out of that man and I never recognized it before -- he said you don't know what he did to me when I was an inspector. And I said what did he do to you? He said when I was an inspector Jim-Tate would go out on the town, get drunk, run around with (I'll use his term) broads, meaning women, and he would call me up and get me out of bed at 2 or 3 in the morning and I had to come down and take him home. I looked at him and I said which Jim Tate are you talking about? You talking about Jim Tate the former mayor? He said yes. I said and you are telling me that Jim Tate used to get drunk, run around with women, and he would call you at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning and get you out of bed for you to drive him home? I said Frank Rizzo, that's a dastardly, filthy lie. I know Jim Tate and if I ever know a man that is completely without these inclinations, it's him. I don't want to hear any more about it. I'm saying that's a lie.
Now, he left in a huff. I can never imagine anyone in their right mind accusing Jim Tate because I know Jim Tate is the kind of a fellow if there is an affair -- I've kidded him about this, over the years. Now I'll take a drink, I'll take a number of drinks and I'll have a fine time at various parties that are held and that would be true of most anyone. You know, you have a few drinks and you relax and you enjoy yourself. Jim Tate -- I said to him I don't like you because you are too straight-laced. He said what do you mean? I said why don't you relax and enjoy -- be one of the fellows. I said there's a time to work and a time to relax. He'd 't have one drink and he'd nurse that all night long. And I used to kid around about that and I would say Jim, that's a stale one. Let me get you a good one. Because I was going to go to the bar and have them load it up with liquor just to see how he'd react -- because he would have ginger ale, he's not a drinking man. And I used to kid him about being too straight-laced. He'd say I can't be like you. Jim and I had our problems, but we got along. We could fight one day and be friends the next. Because there was the give and take. No acrimony after that. No viciousness or anything of that sort. And I think this is true of people who think logically -- you can have your differences today, but you don't have to hate anyone the next day. So that was a dastardly, rotten lie that he (Rizzo) tried to perpetrate in telling me that. And I told him he was a liar. Then after that I thought to myself, what do we have here? If this man will stoop so low, then I thought to myself, if he will stoop so low to invent a story about another man questioning his morality and his sobriety -- that takes a dirty, filthy, rotten mind to do that. Now no man, no real man, would stoop that low. Then I knew we had a problem on our hands because this man was a liar. Then I found out from others that he engages in this kind of character assassination. That this is one of his fortes. He will do that to anybody. Anyone that will oppose him or differ with him, he will find ways to demean them or tell lies about them. I didn't know that. But I found it out.

Anyway, things began to deteriorate because I began to question his motives and I began to question many of the things he stood for. And then when he began to try to dictate, that is when we began to quarrel. You back off, mister, you go back to City Hall and run City Hall. I said I told that to Jim Tate back in 1967, City Hall stay independent of City Committee and City Committee stay independent of City Hall. The only reason for us to be cooperative is in the best interests of the people where I could help you to have a better administration, but you stay out of it. And he didn't like that. And the fact is born out by my actions. He was elected in 1971,
took office in 1972 and by the Spring of 1972 he then
decided to support Richard Nixon. He was elected as a Democrat
and was out there supporting Richard Nixon. And at the
convention in '72 I did not support George McGovern and I
told McGovern why -- I didn't feel that he was reaching the
people of America with his appeal. I had been a supporter
of Muskie's and a supporter of Humphrey's, but when they
pulled out I then created -- I created down at that convention
a new Jackson delegation, not only in Pennsylvania but in
other areas and in 48 hours we were able to put together
700 some votes for Jackson because I wanted to keep -- although
we knew that McGovern was going to carry that convention,
I'm the kind of a guy who feels that there should always be
an alternative to any candidate. I did it with Bill Green
as an alternative to Rizzo. Bill Green did himself damage
that way. Once the decision was made in favor of Rizzo,
then I had to abide by that decision as the Chairman of the
party. But I still favored Green. My ward went for Green,
if that's an indication.

I came back to Philadelphia after McGovern was selected,
although I opposed him down there I went to work here for
him. I'll give you an example of what I'm talking about --
although I opposed McGovern's nomination and it was a hopeless
cause, but I felt that we raised the standard at that convention
that it will always be recognized that the opposition doesn't
die because there is an overwhelming majority. That the
opposition to dissent should continue. And that was my way
of showing my attitude about keeping alive dissent. I
supported Jackson, worked for him, and as I told you we had
36 votes committed to him when we began to form the new
Jackson delegation. In 48 hours we were able to get some
700 delegate votes for him and they had to go -- the Governor
was for McGovern; he had originally been for Muskie and then
he switched to McGovern and the others and the majority of
the delegates of Pennsylvania went for Jackson. Not for
McGovern. But at the conclusion of the vote and after the
convention had been adjourned, Dan Rather got I. W. Able,
the leader of the steelworkers and myself on the floor and
interviewed both of us -- he came to me and said Pete, I'm
going to put I.W. Able on and I'd like to put you on and I
think Cronkite was the guy up in the booth and he asked
questions to both of us. He asked I.W. Able first -- he said
Mr. Able, now that the convention has acted are you going
to support McGovern? And he said no way. I can't support him.
He turned to me and he said Senator, you've opposed McGovern
and you were a Jackson leader, will you support the nominee
of the convention and I told him let it be understood that
I'm not a sometime Democrat. I'm philosophically oriented
towards the Democratic party and always have been. This is
the candidate of the Democratic party. The Democrats have
chosen him as our standard bearer. I'm going to go back to
Philadelphia and work my tail off for him. (I didn't say
tail -- I'll work my head off for him, because he is our
candidate.) And right after that Mankiewitz sought me out
on the floor and he said my apologies to you. That was beautiful and so forth. I said look you go back and tell McGovern I'm going back to Philly and I'm going to break my neck for him because he is our candidate. That's the way I work. I came back to Philadelphia and as you recall, the election went sour for us all over the country. There were only two bright spots on the whole country -- Boston and Philadelphia. Out of the major cities. Philadelphia carried McGovern where they expected to lose. All the other cities -- Chicago, all of them. Philadelphia was one of the bright spots. In fact, we did the best job in the entire country for McGovern as a major city. So I kept my word and I worked for him and I really organized and worked for him. And it was difficult because Mr. Rizzo was out there for Nixon. Called him the greatest President the country ever had at that time. It is incredible for anyone to call Nixon the greatest President this country ever had. He evidently never studied history to know that there were the greats of the past that he couldn't possibly in his wildest dreams imagine that Nixon was anywhere comparable to any of them. In the smallest sense. Not in the large sense. So he supported Nixon. We carried Philadelphia. That was a disappointment to him. He continued to try to subvert the City Committee. He began to offer things to the leaders underhandedly -- behind the door, so to speak. Then he began to be critical of me and first it was well, he doesn't agree with Camiel, which was fine. I didn't mind him disagreeing with me. I wanted him to disagree if he had anything to disagree about, but he wanted total power and I was standing in his way. So that what happened -- he tried to influence me in many ways. He was on the phone almost daily. Senator, don't be so harsh, don't be so -- we've got to work together. At that time in the press he was calling me the greatest chairman the Democratic party ever had. This was all buttering me up. And I had no ego in that direction. I know who I am. I'm just another guy doing what I believe in. But you know some people are influenced by others who will pat them on the back and prod their ego a bit by telling them how great they are. It didn't work with me. I think I'm mature enough to know that I'm just another person. I do what I think is right and if I succeed I expect people to say well, he did the right thing, but I don't expect them to pat me on the back and tell me how great I am. I've only done what I believe in. No credit is necessary.

Rizzo then began his campaign. He and the people around him. (unclear) -- I said just a minute. How were you chosen the mayoral candidate? You went before the Policy Committee and they made the decision. You went before the City Committee and they made the decision. The decision is not going to be made by you or me. It is going to be a decision made by the Policy Committee made up of these people. Well, you are too liberal, the boys are saying that you are in too closely with the independents. I said you know when I became Chairman, Frank,
I hung a sign on the door of the entrance to the City Committee and it said Welcome to All and by that I mean everybody. And he hated what he called the ADAers. And he still does. And he couldn't understand that I was giving them a voice in the decision-making process. And he just couldn't accept that because of his hatred for the so-called liberals. You know, he's taken off on the liberals time and time again. It tells you something about the man. He lacks maturity, actually, and he has a strong dictatorial bent. That's what dictators are made of. In the mind I am the only one who can make a decision, all others must serve my interest.

Anyway, having learned a little more about the things that he will attempt in order to discredit or injure people who oppose him or even differ with him I then became satisfied that I will not in any way be cooperative with him in any political adventure that he would engage upon and his political adventure at that time was geared in one direction — to totally dominate the selection of candidates and everything else. So he began by suggesting to me possible candidates for District Attorney and for Controller. Mostly District Attorney. He wanted Hillel Levinson or Marty Weinberg or Joseph Greg(?), or Sprague and so forth. Now he had asked me to come to his office because he had a meeting there with Sprague and I sat there with Sprague and he said Richard, you want to be the candidate for District Attorney and Sprague said no, I worked for Arlen Specter and I will not oppose him for election. Although I'm a Democrat, but that's my feeling. I can't work for a man and then oppose him because he said in his mind he felt that there were too many things involved in his employment, in his relationship with Specter that should not be brought into a campaign or used in a campaign. In other words, he felt, and he was right, that you don't work for a man and then you go out there and betray him.

I could understand that. And Richard Sprague refused. Frank Rizzo tried to encourage him and he did everything to encourage Sprague to run. I told Sprague that the door was wide open to him if he wanted to run but he had to come before the Policy Committee like everyone else and sell himself. He said absolutely not. He would not engage in that. So then Rizzo began to suggest Levinson and Brague (?) and Weinberg and several others. He would suggest one and then call the next day and say no, I thought it over, he's no good. With Joe Brague he said he would make a fine District Attorney, but he looks too much like a Nazi storm-trooper because he is short, has a crewcut, and he wears glasses. I said that's a terrible thing to say. So then he finally settled on Levinson and he called the leaders, called me and said he would be the man who could win, I'll support him, etc. I said look Frank, let me tell you something, you've
been calling here and calling here. If Levinson wants to be a candidate or anyone you have in mind wants to be a candidate all they have to do is let me know and I'll place them before the Policy Committee, but they had better have a background in law and an expertise in law that would qualify them as a candidate for District Attorney. And I said I want to tell you something about Levinson. I don't think he ever practiced before any court in the city. He might be a lawyer, but he didn't. I don't think he ought to be a candidate, I'm telling you now, but I'm not going to thwart him or you. Get before that Policy Committee. But I will speak against him. I seldom do that. I chair the meeting and let the people make their own decision, but I do not influence them by saying I'm against this one or that one. I don't do that. You don't put people on the Policy Committee and then manipulate them. Check with anyone. I've never done that.

He kept it up and kept it up. Then he began to put the pressures on. He began to put the pressures on leaders within the Democratic party. And I learned about it and I had my belly full of that so he came to my office -- John O'Shea was there in my office. He came over. Called me up and said I'd like to see you. Now I told him all along the Democratic party is going to make an independent choice of its candidates and it is going to be done by the party, not by any individual, you or me or anyone else. There's not going to be any hand-picked candidates. There is going to be a consensus candidate selected by the party. Well, Fitzpatrick and others, Glancy and others were scheduled to appear before the Policy Committee. This was about -- Monday was the final meeting of the Policy Committee where we were going to make a final decision. None of his people dared to appear. All the others did appear. Fitzpatrick appeared and gave a good account of himself before the Policy Committee and Klenk appeared. And others, of course. But I'm saying these were the two outstanding candidates in the minds of the Policy Committee because after they would appear what would happen was many of the Policy Committee members would come to me and say gee, I like Fitzpatrick. He put on a fine -- Or I like Klenk. And I knew what they were thinking.

Frank Rizzo, in an desperate attempt to finally influence me came to the City Committee and he began to plead for Levinson. And I said Frank I told you and I told Levinson and if I told you once I told you a dozen times, if Levinson wants to be a candidate, let him appear before the Policy Committee. Now that's it and that's final. Everyone else appeared. Why didn't he? What's he afraid of? How can you talk about a candidate who will not have the ability to appear before the Policy Committee and speak for himself? I said until he appears he is not even being considered. Well, you and I can run this whole thing. Now, hold it right there. I told you before and I'll
tell you again. It's going to be done by the Policy Committee and then the City Committee.

Then, he said that's the way it's going to be I'm going to turn the spigot off and he made a fist like that. I said what spigot are you talking about? That was a veiled threat that he was not going to give me any patronage. Now, he had been in office a year and I had taken one job from him. There was no patronage that I took from him because he was distributing the patronage himself and I let him do it because I don't think patronage is that important in the long run because out of 3500 committeemen that we have 2/3rds of them were in private employment but you had to get good candidates, you had to give them the motivation to go out and campaign for them. I think that is much more important than patronage itself. As a be-all in politics, because that's where the corruption comes in.

That's where the control comes in. So I told him what it was and he left in a huff. Then on a Sunday night he tried again because the Monday was the final meeting.

He tried again on the phone. I told him I would open up the final meeting with Levinson. He knew he had failed. Monday he blasted me. He said Camiel is corrupt. Camiel is a dictator. Camiel is this and is that. Well, I reacted to that. If there is a dictator, it is he and I began to tell about his attempts to subvert and so forth. But the Policy Committee selected Klenk and Fitzpatrick. And Rizzo announced he was going to support the Republican ticket again. In 1972 he supported Nixon and in 1973 he supported the Republican ticket. And he did everything. Raised money for them. So did Gaudiosi and so forth. In fact, in 1972 Gaudiosi was the coordinator for Nixon here in Pennsylvania. He and Specter were raising money and coordinating for Nixon in the state. So that you can see Frank Rizzo elected as a Democrat truly is a Republican. Philosophically Republican and I'm talking about the kind of Republicans that went out of style even in the Republican party back in 1918. Talk about a throw-back to those days.

Anyway, we did nominate our candidates and then of course at that time there were a large number of judicial candidates and there were many on there that you recall Rizzo was chastising them publicly. Do you remember that? His public castigation of the judicial candidates. Called them soft judges and they are corrupt and everything else. All you have to do is look in the newspaper files. The whole story of Rizzo is there and what a story that will make some day if somebody researches it. In fact there is something that appeared in one of those girlie magazines -- it's called Chic magazine. Someone read it to me. Just this month I was told about it. I wouldn't buy the magazine because it is a filthy magazine.
That is a story done by a fellow who I met in 1972 who was attached to the BBC who interviewed me many times down in Miami during that convention. I got to know him. His name is Dan Grotta and he put together this story strictly out of the newspaper files. The lying. The deceit. What he said one day and how he changed it the next -- about taxes. It's a damaging article. But all of it came out of the newspaper clippings. Just go into the newspaper files from the day that Rizzo emerged as an important figure in Philadelphia and follow it and follow his comments and his position one day and a week later what it is. How he has cut down everybody who ever disagreed with him. Typical dictator mind.

Anyway, the election was held. What I had done there -- the press at that time, as you will recall, practically every writer, every story that came out said this was a hopeless adventure on the part of the Democrats. They called Fitzpatrick's effort with his young people around him campaigning as Troop F. Troop F on TV, they are always bungling and what not. And both of them were virtually unknown to the public. Fitzpatrick was unknown and so was Klenk. Klenk was an unknown person except in his own locality down in Chestnut Hill. So that we had two unknowns. But I had something else going which completely missed the attention of everyone. We had a plethora of candidates that year that we never had before. There were 25 candidates -- judicial appointments made by the Governor. Twenty-nine in fact. And there were 10 more that were running for reelection. So that the total candidates in both political parties were 39 each. Now, while the Republican candidates for judicial office were floundering around, I took our judicial candidates and put them to work. Not depending on Fitzpatrick and Klenk to win that election, but depending on large group of very fine candidates -- Lisa Richette, people like that. And I put on a number of women -- Harris, Myrna Marshall, Lisa Richette -- about seven women we had on the ballot. We had a mixture representing all of the ethnic and all other groups in there too. So each area had representation of one candidate or another. That's the way it was. Realizing that, I thought our greatest strength to win the impossible election -- and after all, as you recall, the press had said this is an impossible election for the Democrats to win because of the popularity of both Gola and Specter. After all, they were immensely popular names and they were practically household words. Both of them. And it appeared to the press and to the pollsters who told us that we were going to lose by at least 100,000. But I had put together the kind of a team where the judicial candidates were put to work as candidates to do the kind of a job they could do. And there was never a judicial slate of candidates that
worked as hard as they did. And I made the ward leaders work like they never worked before. You pick a Friday during the campaign — any Friday — the meetings would begin at 9 o'clock in the morning with small groups of ward leaders going through every detail, every division, reports on everything. The following week a report on every division's activities -- distribution of literature, canvassing, things of that sort. I mean I really whipped them. They were grumbling, but I kept pushing and pushing. Then we would finish our meetings without any break for lunch or anything because I had different groups coming in so I would be there from early in the morning until about 4 o'clock and then I would have my candidates meeting with the judges separately from all the other candidates and there we went down the line. Now understand, these meetings were held with the judicial candidates with the press being present, which the Republicans never did nor would Rizzo allow the press to attend meetings. I'm the first chairman that allowed that. In fact, I was violating the rules of the democratic party when I did that for this reason -- our rules say that it is closed only to the members of City Committee. That nobody else can be present. I opened up those meetings. The meetings of the Policy Committee were open to the press. Now that is something else that hadn't been done. Now if you talk about an open party, the press should be allowed to attend all these meetings to report back to the people rather than assume that we are always working behind closed doors in smoke-filled rooms conniving. When you run a political organization it should be open so that the people know how you function. And there is nothing that any political organization must hide. But I don't know why they insist on closing the doors to the press. I think the people ought to have access to what goes on in both political parties.

Now I didn't only say it, I acted upon it. So the press was present. They were also present at these meetings with the judges so they could report back to the people as to the candidates we had and also as to the way we conducted the campaign. But I would have these meetings with the judicial candidates and impress upon them the duties and responsibilities and how they should conduct their affairs. And I went through the whole gammit. Every week. Every Friday they met with me. I had them doing the kind of work that any judicial candidate never did and it was all good, solid policy. And they were the ones that won that election.

I predicted that we were going win by 30,000. The press pooh-poohed that. I had a conference with the press in my office a few days before the election and said to them you know there is more sophistication in running a political organization than you think it is. I have gone to the trouble of having a complete analysis made, division by division, in every ward in the city
the attitudes of the people, regardless of the pollsters—we were going to win it by 30,000. That was the bottom line. They couldn't believe it. I had all the reports there for them. Broken down. To bring this result about. They wouldn't even look. They said, Pete, you can't win this election. There's no way you can win. And we did. But the secret to winning that election was the judicial candidates out there doing a masterful job. By going to the people. I made them go everywhere. There were coffee clatches by the hundreds. There were meetings of all kinds of organizations. That's how we won that election. That was a set-back, both to the Republicans and Mr. Rizzo. Because this, in effect, was the last heavy blow to the Republican party in Philadelphia. Billy Meehan, when I met him the day after the election—we had a meeting with John Bunting—we were walking into the building together and he said Pete, I don't know how you did it. You took everything. Because when we took the DA's office and the Controller's office, that was it. That began the decline of the Republican party as a vital political force in Philadelphia. Had they been able to retain those offices, they would have had still an image of some vitality and some representation in the administration. That was very damaging.

(WMP: What year was that?)

1973. We won what was considered to be an impossible election and if you will go back into the newspaper files...you will find that they were saying no way could they win. But we did. This set Rizzo back and the Republican party back. Not Specter. I respect Specter. I think he is a good man -- unfortunately he belongs to the wrong party.

Now the same thing with Gola -- a very fine young man. But again, he was with the wrong party. Had he been a Democrat, I'm sure we would have endorsed him.

The point is this -- that we had two unknowns, and we elected them. Now one of them went sour -- and that is Fitzpatrick. The other one I'm emmensely proud of. Bill Klenk has done an extraordinary job as a protector of the people in exposing the wrong-doing in this administration and telling the people the truth while Rizzo was lying time and time again. One of the most monstrous lies that took place in the 1975 campaign and that is the campaign for Rizzo's reelection. You remember the signs all over the city, the propaganda -- Rizzo fights for you; Rizzo held the line on taxes. Moak and Rizzo both were telling the public that we are not like New York. We have no fiscal problems. We have 11 million 600 thousand dollars surplus in our treasury. While Klenk was telling the people that you had a 65 million dollar deficit. Later on, it went up to 85 million dollar deficit, while Rizzo was claiming there was a surplus and Moak was claiming there was a surplus, it was really true what Klenk was telling the people
that there was a huge deficit. Two weeks after the election they admitted that they had been lying to the public because they admitted that Klenk was right and that there was this huge deficit. They had to pass those enormous taxes to cover it. So that Rizzo had engaged in public lying time and time again. If you will go through the newspaper files you will find how many times he lied.

But what tripped him up -- and you want to get to this -- how did the lie detector test come about? In the Spring of 1973 Rizzo, after being thwarted in his attempt to give us a candidate for District Attorney and Controller of his own choice and being told no, went on a campaign of vilifying me publicly and George Schwartz and others. Anyone who disagreed with him was corrupt and dishonest and everything else and he was going to put all of us in jail and so forth.

What had occurred was that a young man came to my office -- now, incidentally, the attempt for him to bribe me took place a week prior to the election. What he did was he called my office -- please, I've got to see you. He can beg. Said he wanted to have lunch with me and there were matters that he would like to discuss with me that were very very important in this campaign and so forth and so on. I said look, we discussed this time and time again. I told you what the score is. We're going to make our decisions and we're going to finalize our ticket and it is going to be done in the proper democratic way. Yes, but you don't know what has been going on. I've got investigations that have been going on -- and that's before he attacked me. He attacked me about a few days after that. He insisted that I should have lunch with him and others of his administration. I said what is it all about? We've gone over this, and I'm tired of hearing about it. Please, we've got documentation that you've got to see otherwise there is going to be a lot of trouble. So I said look, I have a luncheon engagement with John O'Shea. I want to tell you something, Frank. John O'Shea has been trying to see me -- and he's on the upper floor -- for the last two weeks and we can never get together because when I was free, he was busy. When he was free, I was busy. And we were trying to get together because we had a number of things to discuss relative to the campaign. So John called me and said Pete we've got to get together, the two of us, out of City Committee so that we have a chance without having a lot of interruptions, to discuss this whole program. I said fine, John, you're right. How about lunch tomorrow? So he said fine. And he said now neither one of us will cancel the lunch -- because sometimes we would set up a luncheon appointment and I would call and say John I can't make it. Or he would call me and say he can't make it. So that we hadn't seen each other for two weeks. So I got a call
that morning after setting up this appointment with John the previous day. I got a call from Rizzo. And he begged and he told me that there was much information that I had to have before we finalized our choice of candidates and what not. That it was imperative that I meet with him and have lunch and all of that. So I said I had an appointment with John for lunch. So he said why don't you bring him along. So I said let me call him. I didn't know what he had in mind. He was talking about all kinds of documents and reports. And I was wondering what he had in mind.

So I told John you come to the luncheon and after we are through with the luncheon and hear what they say then you and I will stay at the hotel and we will have our own meeting. Fine.

And I called him back and I said all right. I'll meet you for lunch. And he told me the suite number. I said fine. And the time came and I went over there and as I walked into the suite there they all were sitting around a big table set up for lunch. And as I walked in they all stood up and greeted me and I said, look, I'm pressed for time so I hope this is not a long meeting. Rizzo at that point said to me, Senator -- he never called me by my first name and I constantly called him by his first name and I said why don't you call me Pete? Oh no, I respect you too much. He's the biggest bull thrower I've ever seen. He's very adept at that kind of stuff. So he said Senator, I've got to talk to you privately. Will you come into the next room? And he says Phil Carroll, you come along. So I said all right. I walked into this other room, which was a bedroom. And he's walking ahead and he keeps motioning to me -- come on back here, Senator. So I kept walking. And he walks into the bathroom! I follow, and Carroll comes in and Rizzo closes the door. I said what is this Frank? He says I don't want them to hear what I'm going to tell you. Now they are all his people out there. He doesn't want them to hear. I said what is going on?

He says Phil, give me that list. Phil Carroll handed him a white sheet of paper. On it was handwriting, script. I didn't know what it was. Rizzo held it in his hands and said see this, Senator, these are city projects. You had better grab these before George Schwartz grabs them. I said what do you mean? He said these city projects, if you don't get them -- they will help you in City committee with contributions and what not and he said there is Market St. East and the Tunnel Project and all these other projects. They are all yours. Then it suddenly dawned on me. I said now wait a minute, Frank. I'll have none of this. You'd better grab it he says. That's the way he talks. You'd better grab it. That George Schwartz is no good and he began to castigate George Schwartz and not only George, but his wife. It shocked me. He said George walks around all duded
up. Diamonds on his fingers. His wife has Paris gowns. My wife doesn't have Paris gowns. And the envy of the man -- I look anywhere and I see women dressed nicely -- God love them, let them enjoy it. I don't care where they get their gowns. I don't think any man should. But he notices things like that. Now, Mrs. Schwartz dresses well and she has jewelry. Don't millions of other people dress well and have jewelry? Why be envious? But his envy came out. This big macho man -- gives you a good insight of what he really is inside. So he castigated George Schwartz and his wife too. Criticized them for the way they dress and the way they live.

I said look Frank, I've had enough of this and I'm getting out of here. I knew it was a bribe. I reached for the door and out I went.

He saw my anger and as we were walking through the adjoining room, the bedroom, he said please Senator, don't be that way, I didn't mean anything by it. I said I'm leaving. He caught up to me in the foyer -- please, I was only trying to help you. I said don't you ever try anything like that again.

By that time John O'Shea had arrived and was seated at the table with the others. And when they saw this hub-bub between me and Rizzo they all said what's the matter, Senator, come on, let's have lunch and all of that. And John didn't know what it was about either. And they calmed me down -- please don't get mad about anything. Evidently, they must have known what he was doing. Because when I walked into that foyer, the door was wide open, they could see me and I could see them -- they were all perturbed by it. Because I said don't you do that again. And I was expressing myself in an angry way.

So I finally said all right -- the waiter was there, who knew me, and said Senator could I get you a drink? And I said yes and make it a quick lunch too. He said what will you have? I said get me anything. Anyway, I consented to sit down at the table. They had documents that they were going to show me. And I didn't know what they were referring to. So I sat down and Rizzo began -- Senator, look, I don't want you to get angry but don't you think -- take a look at Hillel Levinson. Don't you think he is beautiful? His exact words. And I looked at him -- beautiful? I never knew a man that was beautiful. I think only women are beautiful. I said what is the purpose of this? He said well, wouldn't he make a good DA? I said look, Frank, I told you, I'm telling Levinson, Weinberg, all of you -- any of you who want to be a candidate for DA you appear before that Policy Committee. That's easy. All you have to do is get yourself prepared and go. But there are no deals. And nobody is going to be handpicked. Do you understand me? Now Moak was there, Gaudiosi was there, Levinson was there, Weinberg -- now you
follow this. And Carroll. Plus Rizzo. There were nine altogether. You have to understand how dastardly of a liar this man could be.

Now the meeting did take place. There was an independent observer there, which was the waiter that served us. There were nine people in the room. They saw what had gone on -- the discussions that were held. You realize that Rizzo denied this meeting ever took place? When asked about it -- did you have a meeting with Camiel at the Bellevue Stratford and you wound up in the bathroom? What bathroom? There was never any meeting like that. Is what he said. Notwithstanding the fact that there were all these witnesses there. Notwithstanding the fact that it was on record in the Bellevue Stratford records that there was a meeting held there that day. That's how boldfaced a liar he is. Can you imagine anyone denying the meeting? He said Camiel is crazy. He doesn't know what he is talking about. He is a liar. Now, we finished the lunch quickly. I said what else you got on your mind? He says come on over here -- and they had a stack of folders on one of the side bars there in the suite. He said Senator I want you to know I can't support these candidates that you are examining for judges. I said well don't support them. I don't even know who they are yet. But I told you that each candidate is going to be selected the same way. Now what's all this about? Take a look at this -- see this judge, I can't support him because he is this and that and so forth. He showed me about three or four of them. These were dossiers put together by his secret police squad on these judicial candidates and he had in those reports -- all phoned up, they were all made up -- they reflected his hatred of these people, not any wrongdoing on the part of them. Because when I read one -- I just glanced at it -- this one is no good because he is a soft judge and he doesn't do this and he doesn't do that. He was criticizing the judicial decisions, not their conduct as men or their honesty or anything else. Understand this, in other words, I don't like him. Put it in the report, but gimmick up the report so that it reflects badly on the person. Inferences, innuendos, things of that sort. I looked at two or three of them and realized this was an attempt to vilify people through the use of the secret police squad. Now he had no right to use the police in investigations of candidates unless they had committed some crime. You don't involve policemen in investigating personalities for political purposes.

But he did it. Now I didn't know who did these investigations or who compiled these reports at the time. I found out later. In the meantime, I was busy with putting together the ticket and we finally made our selection of candidates and the campaign began.
After this incident with Rizzo in the bathroom, John and I left the meeting. John said my God, Pete, they really tried to put you through an ordeal. I said they didn't get away with it did they? John, this was another attempt to subvert me and he tried to buy me. He said what do you mean? I said he offered me contracts in the bathroom. What? Is that what you went back there for? I said yes. Market Street and others. I didn't even bother to look at the others. He held them. And don't forget, it was written in script and on pencil on white paper. Remember that. It's a very important factor as it relates to the lie detector test itself. Now, there were two reporters that I told the story to and told them not to print it until I was ready. One of them was John Giunther and the other was Joe Lowrey of the Bulletin. I said off the record, confidentially, it shall not be disclosed until I'm ready to go with it. And I told them the story about Rizzo's attempt to influence me and bribe me. And they both kept their word. They didn't betray the confidence. I said at the right time I'm going to let the public know.

Now he begins his attack on me right after we selected our candidates. Suddenly I became the worst human being alive. Corrupt and all of that. Well, the press comes running and I gave my replies. I told them there are certain factors that Rizzo will never accept and that is that decisions could be made by a group of people rather than one man and another thing is he is a liar and he attempted to corrupt me. They said what do you mean? I said at the proper time I'll disclose it.

I let him go and he was really rolling with his criticisms and whatnot. I figured go ahead. It's like a fighter that is in the ring and waits with the other guy jabbing at him to get his haymaker in and that was what I was waiting for -- the opportune moment. I felt the public ought to know what this animal is like. But why I didn't let the story out at that time, I wanted to find out more about this squad that I had heard about, but I could never put my finger on it because I didn't have the information. And I didn't want to make accusations based on rumors. Fortunately what happened -- my secretary, Mary, told me that a woman had called and she wouldn't give her name but she insisted on speaking to me. She said it is very important. And I would be in and out of the office, so I never got her call. So finally I said to Mary if she wanted to talk to me, fine. I didn't know what the woman had in mind. But what had been circulated around was that Rizzo had investigations going on. Now I knew I was being followed everywhere I went. My daughter was being followed. My wife was being followed. Oh yes. They even followed my daughter up at the campus at the college she attended -- Ursinus college -- and investigated her up there. I'm telling you -- you're dealing with a Hitler. My wife was spied upon. Later on, when we began
to receive threats -- he tried to kill me and everything else. Not he, but his cohorts. My wife received calls and my daughter did. And I had taken certain precautions to safeguard them -- in fact, I had them protected around the clock for about two months out at the farm. I wouldn't let them come into the city. But anyway, knowing this -- that something was going on that was rotten -- I decided to wait and get more information. And in the meantime, fortuitously, this woman had been calling who wouldn't give her name. So finally I took the call. And the woman said Senator Camiel? I said yes. She said I recognize your voice. I've heard it many times on tv and radio. I said what can I do for you? She said I can't give you my name because I am the wife of a policeman. I said madam, at this point if you wanted to give me your name I wouldn't take it. She said well thank you very much. From what I read about you you are a decent man and all that -- fighting for what is right. Do you know that you are being followed and being investigated? I said well, I have an idea. She said do you know who is doing it? I said I don't know, but I suspect it might be the police. She said yes. Do you know that there is a large secret squad investigating you and your family? I said I didn't know that there was a large squad but -- she said my husband has been on the police force for 18 1/2 years and that's the reason I didn't give you my name because if Rizzo ever found out who he was and what he knows he would crucify him. I said madam, I don't want your name and I don't want your husbands name. I will protect you and keep you anonymous. I said what is the principal reason for your calling? She said will you take a call from my husband so that he can give you the information so that you will know who is following you? I said I will be grateful for that.

So I got a call about a half hour later and he identified himself as a policeman and told me the story that there are 34 policemen and high-ranking officers investigating certain people. They had investigated judicial candidates and they were investigating me and George Schwartz and a few other people, but principally concentrating on me. I said 34! Under the control of Rizzo and Carroll. Even the head of the police department didn't know what was going on and they were reporting directly to Rizzo and Carroll. So I said thank you for the information but if I knew who they were --- and he said I'll give you names. And he proceeded to give me the names of those who he knew were on that secret squad. And he gave me about 15 of them. I said how about the rest? He said my partner will get the other names. He said I want you to know that there are quite a number of policemen who know about this and they deplore it. They don't like this -- they don't like the use of police for this business. Rizzo's bad. I know that so and so for a number of years and I know all about him. He's a crook. This is the policeman. He despised him.
I get a call the next day from his partner, who is also a policeman. He filled me in on the rest and between the two of them I had the 34 names, with their ranking officers and everything else. I then did one other thing.

Anonymous phone calls come in and they give you information, but I always feel in fairness, even to an enemy, you check it out for its truth. Fortunately, I had a friend in a high-ranking area of the police department who checked it out and verified it. He said it was absolutely true.

Ok. I called a press conference and disclosed it to the press. I disclosed the existence of the gestapo squad, as I called it, to the press. They went back to Rizzo and he denied the existence of it. No secret squad! He denied it and Carroll denied it and they all denied the existence of it.

Then the press began to check and they found out on their own. Yes there was. He finally, after about 3 weeks of denials and lying, he finally admitted that there was a squad and had it disbanded. Now that's what I'm talking about -- the constant lying and getting away with it too. Because he denied it existed. Denied it was formed. Denied that he knew anything about it. Then it was disclosed that he and Carroll were the ones that put it together and he and Carroll were in charge of it. And what were they doing? They were illegally investigating people who were their political opponents and using the police department for it.

In the meantime I found out another thing. That while this squad was in existence they had a headquarters down on Arch St. where they were culling out police records and taking them to the incinerator and burning them every night. Bags and bags of records. I never found out why they were doing it but I suspect the reason was that they wanted to clean the police records up before someone else would come in there and begin looking.

Anyway, that's how the press and the public learned that Frank Rizzo, supercop, used the police department to spy on his political enemies. Right after that, I then disclosed and made the challenge to Frank Rizzo to take a lie detector test and how that happened was I had been visited in my office by a young reporter from the Daily News, Zachery Stallberg. And he interviewed me on a number of other matters and then at the conclusion of it he said Rizzo denied this and Rizzo denied that. I said well, he's been denying a lot of things and then finally after the truth comes out he admits it. I said he is a constant liar. And I said he also lied about there being no meeting at the Bellevue Stratford in the bathroom. I said I call him a liar and I call Phil Carroll a liar and I call all of them liars that deny it and I will challenge all of them that were there in that room on that date to a lie detector test and I'll take them all on. He said you will what?
I'll take them all on. The only way we are going to disclose the truth is to have some independent agent bring out the truth and the only thing I know of is a lie detector test. He asked me to use my phone, called his editor, and told him of my challenge. His editor then called Rizzo and told him of my challenge. Now remember, Rizzo had denied that this meeting had ever taken place. Now he picks up the challenge and he says he'll call back. Finally after some negotiations between them -- between the editor of the Daily News and Rizzo -- Rizzo finally said that he and Phil Carroll will take the test but that the others wouldn't. Now the others were involved in this way -- they were all members of his cabinet. There is a prohibition in the City charter against their political activity. Well, they were there politicking. Anyway, to make a long story short, Rizzo finally accepted the challenge and so did Phil Carroll, but the others refused to take the test.

I thought two better than none. I was very very happy with that arrangement. Ralph Neil was the editor. Called me back and says Rizzo and Phil Carroll will take it. I said how about the others? He says they refuse to take it. I said what's the matter are they chicken? Are they afraid that the truth will come out? He said you've got a lot of guts taking on all nine. I said the more the merrier and another thing -- I said what would nine men who are telling the truth be afraid of one man? I said I'm going to go against two of them now. I might as well go against nine. Words to that effect. We discussed it. I said it is under your control. You do what you want with it. You just tell me when the test will take place.

Now, not knowing what was going on later on, which Ralph Neil finally disclosed the story to me after the test was complete and after the results were known -- is that Rizzo tried to subvert Ralph Neil. Ralph Neil and the paper of course would select the top expert in the country. They aren't going to put their reputation on the line by selecting somebody that claims to be -- this man, Mr. Holmes, was regarded as the top man in the entire country. He was the head of the polygraph experts association nationally for years. He was highly regarded. Had a tremendous record. They picked the best.

Rizzo had been on the phone time and time again trying to induce Ralph Neil to use the police departments lie detector people. Ralph Neil said absolutely not. We've got the best. Failing that, he then tried to influence him to use Arlen Specter's lie detector men and Ralph Neil refused again. Now what he was trying to do was to set up this lie detector test with his people giving the test. And it has been well known, even in the last few days, that the lie detector experts that he has over there in the police department are really some pretty shady characters. You've been reading that expose about some of the things they do when they interrogate people? (referring to the Inquirer series on police abuse, 1977)
Anyway, Ralph Neil said absolutely not. It's going to be done by an independent source. I was satisfied with it.

Now, after that conversation with Ralph Neil I never called him again about the ground rules or about anything. I said you set it up. Whatever the rules are, I'll obey them. I'll go for broke.

Ralph Neil told me that Rizzo was constantly on the phone trying to get things changed to satisfy him. I also learned that at one point prior to the test Rizzo actually had some of the lie detector agents over there teaching him how to beat the lie detector. He practiced how to beat the lie detector. All this was disclosed to me after the test was over.

I received a call that the test was going to take place on a certain day at a certain hour. Rizzo and Carroll took the test at 10 or 11 o'clock in the morning. I was scheduled to take it at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. Rizzo even tried to influence Mr. Holmes. I learned that later. When he walked in to take the test the press greeted him and he said I have full confidence in the lie detector and so forth. When that machine says a man lies, he lies. That's Rizzo's statement. Then he takes the test and when he meets Mr. Holmes, who is a totally professional person, even in appearance. He's almost clinical. Like a surgeon ready to operate. Very austere. He looks the part. Anyhow, he walks in -- hello, Mr. Holmes, how are you? Now Holmes had done some work for the police department in Miami and the Chief of Police down in Miami and Rizzo were friends -- Rocky Pomerantz. So when Rizzo greeted Holmes he said how are you Mr. Holmes, my friend, that kind of thing. He said to Holmes you know Rocky Pomerantz and I are buddies. He said you worked for Rocky and with his arm he nudged Holmes and said to him -- we know how this test is going to turn out, don't we, Mr. Holmes? As much as saying you worked for the police department, I'm a policeman. The inference and the suggestion was that there was a buddy buddy thing going on between them. Now this shows you the extent this man will go to to influence anyone. He must have a very low opinion of everyone and their mentality or even their integrity. He thinks he can buy and manipulate everyone and this is a good example. Even a man like Mr. Holmes, who was unknown to either of us, he tried to influence him. And Holmes, being totally professional and cold-blooded more or less about it, said Mr. Rizzo would you please sit down? Now Rizzo brought a whole coterie of people with him -- all his hangers-on. And Holmes told them to leave the room and Rizzo says let them stay. You know, the big bombastic bully. Let them stay, Mr. Holmes. He said no we don't give tests that way. This is going to be done in the proper way. Out. He put them all out and closed the door -- cause I know what he did when I was there. He put a huge bath towel right under the door so that you couldn't even hear through the crack in the door. And the only one that was in there was Holmes and Rizzo. That's the same way with me. That's the way tests are given.
No distractions. So he put Rizzo through the test. And he put Phil Carroll through the test.

About 12:30 or so I went over to have lunch and went back to the office and I was working, going about my normal day. My secretary, Mary, and everybody in the building were like this — what's going to happen with this test, and having a lot of anxieties. And Mary said Senator, how could you keep working? I said Mary we've got a day to finish here. How could you be so calm? I said Mary, let me tell you something. I've got only one duty to perform. That's go over there and tell the truth. And I don't worry about anything else. And if the lie detector will recognize the truth and recognize lying then there is nothing to worry about. She says yeah, but you know him — I said forget it, now let's go to work.

Then about 1;30 or so a call comes in and Mary picks up the phone. It's someone on the phone who says Mary, I'm a friend of the Senator's. I can't give you my name, but I just learned that Rizzo and Phil Carroll passed with flying colors, 100%. She comes running in to me and tells me the story. I said why don't you go in and sit down? Lie detector test results are not given until they are concluded. Everyone appears. I said somebody is trying to shake you up. Twenty minutes later I get a call. A guy on the phone -- Pete, I'm your friend, but I've got to let you know -- I said, look you creep, if you are any kind of a man why don't you tell me where you are and I'm going to come down and see you and you tell me what you are telling me, you Rizzo bootlicker. They were on a campaign to try to shake up my staff.

This was before I made my appearance. Anyway, 3 o'clock arose, I walk over to the hotel by myself. Rizzo had come in there with a big retinue. I get in the elevator and no one is in the elevator with me. I go up to the second floor and there is the press and they descend on me and we talk and I go in to take my test. I met Mr. Holmes. He closed everything off and he sat me down and he put me through the paces and they asked me all the questions and then one of the final questions was -- he had a sheet of paper in his hands, yellow, legal paper. On it is printed, not in script, any number of projects, all private projects. No city projects. He says Mr. Camiel I'm going to show you the list that Mayor Rizzo said he showed you in the bathroom. Can you identify any of these projects? He put it in front of my eyes and I said Mr. Holmes, that is not the list he showed me in the bathroom. The list that he showed me in the bathroom -- and I looked up at him because I just glanced at the paper and it was yellow and printed in ink rather than in script and in pencil on white paper. This is how far they will go to trick and provide false information.
And I looked at him and I said Mr. Holmes, that's not the list he showed me. And he said how do you know, you haven't looked at it. I said because it was on white paper, written in script and in pencil. And this is printed. Then I looked at it and I said none of these projects were on there. The only two projects that I saw on that white paper in the bathroom -- the first one was Market St. East and the second one was the tunnel. And I said he began to explain to me the rest but when I realized what he was showing me I realized this was an attempted bribe so I looked up at him and began to quarrel with him about it. But this is not the list he showed me in the bathroom. He was even stumped. That they tried to pull something on him by presenting this phoney list of projects and remember, none of them were city projects. That was designed to protect them against an offer of a bribe of city projects. These were private projects.

Then he finalized the questions. I left. Went back. I didn't know what was happening after that. I was busy with other things. I went home and I get a call from Ralph Neil, the editor. He said to me I just wanted to call you -- this was about 11 o'clock -- and let you know that Mr. Holmes has not finished his written report. He will not leave Philadelphia until he finishes it and he has another engagement elsewhere tomorrow, so he must catch a plane sometime early in the morning and he's going to be here until all hours of the morning to finish that report. He says I may have to call you at one or two o'clock in the morning. I said that's fine. I said after two o'clock I'll be in bed. He said you stay up that late? I said yes, I do a lot of reading. And I am an avid reader. I never go to bed anytime, regardless of how tired I am, I always have something I'm reading. I go through book after book that way. Mostly history and biography and things of governmental interest. It's been my reading habit for many, many years.

Anyway, I assured him it would be no inconvenience for me to take a call at one or two o'clock in the morning. He said I'm going to let you know I'm going to call the mayor first. I said you should. He said how do you feel. I said fine. He said aren't you nervous? I said no. He said to me -- it's a strange thing. You made your challenge and you never called me to question me about the ground rules or any of the arrangements that were being made or who was going to give the test. I said to him, you represent one of the fine newspapers in Philadelphia. You would not put your credibility or your honesty on the line to do anything wrong. I know that. Therefore, I trust you implicitly and I'm satisfied. That's why I didn't question you.
Well, that's not true of Rizzo, he says. Then he began to disclose to me that Rizzo was constantly on the phone from the time the challenge was made until the lie detector was taken and after the lie detector was taken. Constantly on the phone.

Anyway, about one o'clock in the morning, I get a call from Ralph Neil. He said the test is finished. I gave the results to the mayor and to Phil Carroll and now I'm going to give you the results. He said are you nervous? I said no, I told you that before. He said well I'm going to tell you something. You are a cool character. Then he told me the story of Frank Rizzo's attempt to get him to use the police to give the lie detector test and then when he failed at that he tried to get him to use Arlen Specter's lie detector men. Of course he refused it.

Then he said are you ready for the result? I said go ahead. He said Frank Rizzo failed, Carroll failed, and you, although you were asked an additional question answered every one of them 100%. He said I have only one comment to make to you. The man that gave the test said to me, that Camiel is a man. Because I never questioned anything. I just took the test. And the truth had to come out. He said how do you feel now? Are you elated? I said no. I'm sad. You know, it's not in me to try to injure anybody or to demean anybody publicly, but this had to be done. Why I feel sad is I'm thinking about his wife and his children and the effect on them to know that their father is a certified liar. And this would bring disgrace to any man's family. I feel sorrow for them and not for him. He said that is an unusual statement. You would think that you would be whooping and hollering and be very happy about it. I said no I'm not happy about it. In fact, I'm sad about the fact that this thing had to take place. But the truth had to come out and I've been fighting for the truth to come out. And he said I'll tell you, Camiel, I've got to admire you. I've talked to you many times, we've had luncheons together, but I never really got to know you until now, in a moment of crisis. He said I've got a gift that I'm going to send to you and that was a drawing which he sent a letter with and said Pete Camiel, you deserve this. And it was one of those fine drawings of me and Rizzo at it -- a cartoon. So that caused Rizzo to go into a shell. And you remember that lie detector test disgraced him so much -- or at least I thought it did -- that he reacted to it in a way that you would expect a liar to react to it and that is he denied any access to him by the press for close to two years. Remember, he was mute for about two years? So that is one thing I think I have done for the people of Philadelphia -- I've kept him mute for two years.
He announced that he would not talk to the press again and for two years he did not talk to the press. That was a little bit of history that people forget, but the mayor was mute for close to two years. The press tried to get to him and he absolutely wouldn't talk to anyone. He claimed that the press was against him. He claimed that he was injured by them. All this time the press had been very kind to him. Very fair to him. In fact, they were even, I think giving him the best of it. But he was of course a very charismatic character who, with his one-liners, remember those? The one-liners he would use that were both humorous and devastating to people and that he always made by attacking something. Rizzo was always right and the world was always wrong. If you go into the records of the newspapers you'll find this documented. Because it is all there. That's why I told you earlier that this Dan Grotter, who wrote this article that is damaging to him and shows lie after lie being documented -- nobody has to accuse him of it, he accused himself and that is the basis of Dan Grotter's story. They called him the worst mayor America ever had. That was the title of the article.

Anyway, that is the history of the man who is the mayor of Philadelphia. And sadly, the people seem to have forgotten that for veracity, for truth, this man doesn't know the meaning of the word. And it has been proven so many times because he has denied and then because of the pressures on him he finally had to admit that which he was lying about before, so that there is a constant stream of denials and then admissions. Lies and then admissions. But the people can't put that together -- the average reader can't put that together because they forget what he did earlier. But when you take the whole history of it you will find that one of the most serious breaches of the truth in government is taking place right here in Philadelphia by the present mayor. I mean the distortion of the truth. The misuse of an office is one thing, but the cost of lying, public lying, and then expecting the people to believe him. But evidently they were fooled in 1975 and they reelected him. And of course he is bombastic and he is dangerous. The use of the secret Gestapo squad is a good example of what can happen in any city in America if the people are looking for law and order only, not with justice, not with fair play. That is the danger that we face here in America. Well, Nixon's administration proved that, didn't they? So you always have got to be vigilant and always ready when anything like that begins to develop. Disclose it to the public, disclose it to the press, and begin to fight it. Because our liberties can be chipped away. Individually and even collectively by those who misuse police powers and misuse governmental powers. I think we've gone through the most sad period in history, both for America and Philadelphia. They parallel one another. Nixon's Watergate and Rizzo's mini-Watergate. The elements are all the same.
Police being used. Surveillance. Secret squads. Spying on people. Publicly excoriating people. Lying about people. This is the same pattern that you found down in Washington under Nixon.

(WP: I think it is interesting that they had an affinity for one another.)

Well they did. Birds of a feather flock together. Nixon and he were of the same mind as regards the people and government. Anything to justify the end. Any means, regardless of how rotten, that justifies the end and brings more power. And that's why I said we have to be constantly vigilant, regardless of who it is who begins to use police power for political purposes. We've got to root it out. If we don't then our liberties are slowly chipped away because one individual has a difficult time fighting government, but when the press knows it and when the people know it they become alarmed about it and that's what happened with Watergate and that's what happened here in Philadelphia when they began to -- and I may say that I have no doubts that he has a secret police squad right now investigating people.