



INTERVIEW WITH
James A. Farley

American Politics

produced by Howard Langer

JK
2281
F23
1959

MUS LP

INTERVIEW WITH JAMES A. FARLEY

FOLKWAYS FC 7355

James A. Farley

Descriptive notes are inside pocket

Rosenhouse

INTERVIEW WITH
James A. Farley

American Politics

produced by Howard Langer



INTERVIEW with JAMES A. FARLEY

MR. LANGER:

What's right--and what's wrong--with American politics? This is Howard Langer in New York. In a few moments, we will be asking one of America's most famous "practical politicians" to discuss this topic with us--James A. Farley.

Jim Farley has been in politics since he was eight years old--when he carried a torch in a campaign parade for William Jennings Bryan. At the age of 24, this affable American Irishman entered professional politics. He started by winning a town clerkship--as a Democrat--in a Republican stronghold in New York. At 30, he was elected Democratic chairman of Rockland County. This launched him into state politics.

Jim Farley helped Al Smith and Franklin D. Roosevelt become Governors of New York. He is considered by many historians to be the man in America most responsible for the nomination and election of FDR as president. In 1940, he split with Roosevelt over the third term issue. At that time, Jim Farley left his Cabinet post as Postmaster General to become chairman of the board of The Coca Cola Export Corporation.

Now, here we are in the midtown New York office of Jim Farley. All around the walls of his office are autographed photos of some of the outstanding political leaders of our time: Winston Churchill, Dwight Eisenhower, Harry Truman, Herbert Hoover, and--of course--Franklin Roosevelt. There is a

framed statement of appreciation to Mr. Farley from the Democratic National Committee. Here at his desk--tall, genial, smiling--is Jim Farley.

MR. LANGER:

Mr. Farley, at one time or another, most of us have said things like, "Go fight City Hall" or--"What can you do? That's politics". Now just exactly what is politics?

MR. FARLEY:

Well, politics is being associated in an activity in a political party for the public good. It starts at the precinct level or district level which is the lowest level in political activity. It goes up through the villages; and towns, the counties to the state and finally to the Federal Government in national elections. It's being active in all of those levels of society, in trying to do something good or to be helpful to the people with whom you come in contact in the particular political sub-division in which you operate.

MR. LANGER:

And yet we have terms like "party boss" and "political machine." Now these terms that we throw around, are they legitimate?

MR. FARLEY:

Well, everytime you have a leader in a political organization, his own people look upon him as the leader. The opposition refers to him as the boss. We have had good leaders, and we have had bad leaders. We have had good bosses and we have had bad bosses. In the years in which I was active in state or national politics, I was referred to as a leader and I was referred to as a boss. Neither term bothered me very much. I did the very best I could in all those fields of activity wherein I was engaged. The term boss is never really bad unless the boss is guilty of some offenses that incur the wrath of people within his own political sphere of activity.

MR. LANGER:

Now what about the term "political machine"? You were talking about the precinct level and there's where it's used most often.

MR. FARLEY:

Well, a political machine is really the organization of the particular party -- not in the precinct, because the precinct is small. But it is the organization in the town, in the village, in the county, and in the state and finally all of the 48 states of the union.

JK
2281
F23
1959
MUS LP

Now, you have to have an organization. I want to repeat on that the same as I did in referring to the boss and the leader. You have to have an organization in both parties. I want to say, in that case, the opposition refers to it as the machine and the particular party itself or those who are associated with it, refer to it as the organization. We have had good organizations and we have had good machines. We have had bad organizations and we have had bad machines. In the early days of this republic, particularly after the Civil War, it was the political organizations then termed the machines, that rendered much help and aid to immigrants who came to this country from all parts of Europe. They became associated with the political organizations in the city wherein they resided and if the machine or leader of the organization was a Republican as a rule, they became Republicans.

If on the contrary, like in New York where the Democrats dominated, they became Democrats. They went to the political organizations, or machines for help - for homes, for assistance, for food, for shelter and for many things that are now being handled by virtue of all the welfare legislation that has been passed down through the years, particularly since Mr. Roosevelt's first election in 1933.

Much of the work that is now done through Federal and the State - city (agencies was) performed by political organizations or political machines if that's the way you want to term them.

May I say in passing that in my experience, political machines - political organizations, if you will, did more to make the life of the immigrant to this country happy and pleasant, not only for the parents, but for the children, than many of the welfare organizations of that day and many of the welfare organizations that are probably still in operation. That is not said to be unkind in my reference to welfare organizations. But having seen and known and read of the activities of political organizations along welfare lines, I can appreciate full well the work that they did in those days. Their work and the assistance that they rendered to the immigrant families will never be forgotten, I'm sure, by those families who were thus benefited.

MR. LANGER:

Well, do you feel then, that the political organization plays a role in keeping the government representative of the will of the people?

MR. FARLEY:

Well, I believe it does, and I'm a firm believer in the two-party system. I don't believe in what might be termed splinter parties. I think the things that have happened in France and other European countries show that splinter organizations are very detrimental. I believe that there's sufficient room in this country -- I'm talking nationally now -- for the people of this country to operate within the framework of the two political parties. If they're not satisfied with the work of the administration under a Democratic regime, they have ample opportunity to go to the polls and they can still remain as Democrats, if

they're so enrolled, and they can still vote for the Republican nominees. And the same is true of the Republicans.

MR. LANGER:

How does a political organization work? Where does it get its money from?

MR. FARLEY:

Down in the early days when I first was elected county - town chairman, our money in those days came from interested Democrats who wanted no favors and there were none really to grant - but they were brought up within the confines of the party organization. Their families were Democratic and they contributed maybe \$5, or \$10 or \$15, or maybe \$25 to the town campaigns. Later on when I became town chairman, or county chairman, the same kind of people in more communities in Rockland County contributed like amounts of up to \$100. \$100 was a big contribution in those days from any individual and so that's the way they - that's the way the money was secured in those days.

Then later on I became state chairman and the money came from interested Democrats, too, in every field of life's activity. A lot of people try to make it appear that men contribute because they expect favors. Now that isn't quite correct. There are thousands of men and women in both political parties here who are interested in their particular party because they believe that their particular party can render greater aid to the community and to the well-being of all concerned than the opposition party, and so they make their contribution. Not with the idea of getting favors.

Of course, there's some people who feel that if they do contribute, if they want a favor, they'd be more likely to be given consideration than someone who hadn't. Now later on back in the 30's - during Mr. Roosevelt's first administration, we started these \$100 dinners as an easy way to collect money. Now all over the United States in every city of any size they have \$100 dinners and they have \$50 dinners and \$25 dinners and in some of the smaller communities they have \$10 and \$5 dinners. They've raised a lot of money. It's extracted rather easily that way. A person doesn't mind paying \$100 for a ticket to a dinner and of course there's a lot of vanity involved in it too, a lot of people like to feel well I contributed \$100 - I'm a big shot. Now that's said in an uncomplimentary way, but it's done.

You don't have the large contributors they had in other days because as you know, contributors now can only contribute I think \$3,000 is the maximum amount. Now persons in the family can contribute \$3,000 each, but you can't make the large contributions that used to be made \$25,000 or \$50,000 or even \$100,000 in other days. That isn't permitted anymore.

MR. LANGER:

Now, the American Heritage Foundation is launching a campaign so that each American citizen, they hope, will contribute \$1. Do you think this is a good idea?

MR. FARLEY:

I think it's a good idea. On a program some days ago, Mr. Len Hall, former Republican National Chairman, and Mr. Thomas D'Arcy Brophy who was one of the active movers in the American Heritage Foundation, (And I) appeared on a program under one of the national chains and urged that everybody participate. I think it's a good thing. I think if you contribute to the advancement of a party there'd be more interest and you'd be more likely to go to vote. I think you ought to vote anyway whether you contribute or not. But then a lot of people I think - if approached would contribute \$1 or \$2 or even \$5 to the party of their choice. I think it's a good thing and I sincerely hope and trust that both political parties in every state in the union, in every county in the union, in every city and town will make the most of it because I think they'll find it successful and worthwhile. I think it will also contribute to the strength of the political organization - both party political organizations, if you will.

MR. LANGER:

Now we've spoken about politics generally. Let's talk a little bit about politicians. Who do you feel have been the most successful American politicians of this generation?

MR. FARLEY:

Well, I think Mr. Roosevelt is the outstanding man. Al Smith, was a truly great politician - would have been a great president had he been elected president. He ran in the wrong year. Had he been run in 1932 instead of 1928 he would have been elected. I think you'd have to concede that Mr. Dewey has been a pretty successful politician. Certainly former President Truman has been a successful politician. Mr. Hoover while not looked upon as a politician in the same sense that the others were - I think you'd have to admit that he was a fine leader. President Eisenhower has certainly given evidence of being quite a superior politician. He operates differently than the others.

I think of all the men I've mentioned in this particular generation, I think you'd have to say that Mr. Roosevelt stands out above all of the others, and that's not said to be unkindly in my reference to the other men whom I've mentioned and many others whom I haven't mentioned. But he was brought up in politics, so to speak, he was elected as State Senator in New York before he went to Washington as Assistant Secretary (of the Navy). He was Governor for four years, he spent more time in what might be termed political activity than any of the other men with the possible exception of Mr. Truman - and for that reason he had more experience and he had a better knowledge of it.

I want to, of course, include Governor Smith in that field because Governor Smith was in political activity practically all his adult life. From the time he reached the age of 21, he was active in politics and he was one of the great politicians of his day and generation and will always be so regarded.

MR. LANGER:

What characteristics did these men have that made them good politicians?

MR. FARLEY:

Well, in the first place, they had to like people and they had to - by their own actions -- convince people of the sincerity of their motives. To be a good leader you have to be able to convince people that you're honest yourself and they trust you and believe you. Telling the truth in politics is a very necessary element. Unfortunately some people get along pretty well without telling the truth but I always found that it was the easiest thing to do. People have confidence in you (when you) tell the truth. They may not always agree with what you say and they may not always feel happy at a statement that you made to them if you say no. It's hard to say no to people because you disappoint them, but in the long run it's easier to tell the truth because as I've said on many occasions, the truth saves a lot of embarrassing explanations. You don't have to remember what you said.

MR. LANGER:

What are the logistics involved in setting up a presidential campaign. Let's say I'm the Governor of New York and I want to become president. All right, some people come to me and say that I'll be a good presidential candidate. What happens then?

MR. FARLEY:

Well, of course anybody who becomes talked of as a presidential candidate or a possibility must, as a rule, be a governor of his state, or United States Senator. There've only been a few occasions in the history of the republic when Congressmen have been named for the presidency. I think the last one of any note was President McKinley. He was a Congressman from Ohio. But as a rule the Democratic nominees for the presidency are men who have occupied the position of governor and some, United States Senator.

Now Harding was a Senator, nominated and elected. I think Senator Harding was one of the few Senators elected President, at least in the last 25 or 50 years and McKinley, of course, was one of the few Congressmen nominated and elected president. I think William Jennings Bryan was a Congressman from Nebraska when he ran for the Presidency the first time. I think my memory is correct on that.

MR. LANGER:

What are some of the other characteristics that are necessary besides being, say, Governor. Is there some kind of ...

MR. FARLEY:

Well, no, by the Governor of a state - he gets plenty of publicity. He, by his own activities in his own state in the advancement of legislation and the promotion of ideas for the well being of the citizens of his state, he becomes well and favorably known. If he isn't favorably known, he doesn't get too far in his desire to be president.

But if he's well and favorably known in his state, and newspapers regard him as a competent and capable man, his reputation and his record for public service, get to be known beyond the confines of his own state, not only the neighboring states but states beyond that.

Even now, where the national election is two years off, they're beginning to talk and have been for a long, long time as to the possible nominees on the Democratic side and not so much on the Republican side because it's rather conceded that as of a moment at least, that Vice President Nixon will certainly be the Republican nominee. There are many names mentioned and many more probably will be mentioned as the Democratic possibilities.

But a man has to be well known within his state. Some men, however, -- President Eisenhower, of course he wasn't a known political. He was known as a great --successful general and of the American forces in World War II, so he won his reputation and became well and favorably known in that position and not through his political activity which is quite unusual.

MR. LANGER:

Well, is there some area of a country that it's better for a man to come from? For example, it would be very hard for, say, a Southern Governor at this time to be nominated...

MR. FARLEY:

Well, in the light of the situation that exists -- there would be a possibility, however, of Senator Lyndon Johnson as being discussed. He's well and favorably known throughout the country. Whether or not the difficulties that are ensuing now in the South would affect his candidacy is something that I don't want to comment on now because what's happening now could be clarified within two years and might or might not affect his candidacy if he decided to become a candidate.

Now of course it's generally understood that a candidate for the presidency if he comes from a populated area of the country is better off. In the early days - they used to come from Virginia and later on a number of them came from Ohio.

We've had a number of presidents from New York. President Eisenhower was a resident of New York at the time he was elected and of course Mr. Roosevelt was. Grover Cleveland was from New York. Tilden was a candidate for the presidency and he was a resident of New York and there were many others. Now of course Ohio and Illinois have probably contributed more nominees to the presidency than many of the other states.

Nixon, of course, was nominated for Vice President. He's from California. We've had nominees for Vice Presidents from small states. One of the (first) national campaigns I can remember was when Bryan and Sewall ran away back in the 1900's. Sewall was from Maine. Mr. Wilson as you recall, was a governor of the state of New Jersey.

But both of the candidates for President and Vice President come as a rule from fairly largely populated areas. Mr. Garner of course came from Texas. But Mr. Garner had been speaker of the House for many years and probably one of the best known men in American life at the time. Mr. Hull who might have been nominated for the Presidency if Mr. Roosevelt hadn't run in 1940 I'm sure he would have been the nominee. He was from Tennessee, which is probably construed to be more of a border state than a southern state.

MR. LANGER:

You mentioned before that you thought Al Smith could have been elected President in 1932. Some people - some historians have said that it was difficult for - at least up until the last few years, for a Catholic to be elected President. Now what...

MR. FARLEY:

There wouldn't have been any difficulty in my judgment for Smith to be elected in '32. In '32 the issue was purely economic. In 1928 it was a bad year and during that year Mr. Hoover was extremely popular. The country was prosperous. Smith was advocating the repeal of the 18th Amendment and at that time that wasn't a popular thing to do. The whole situation changed between '28 and '32. It was seen on all sides that it was impossible to enforce the 18th Amendment. It was an entire change in sentiment. The country was in a lower economic ebb at the time and millions of people were out of work and in my judgment if Governor Smith had been nominated - any man like Governor Smith or Governor Ritchey or former Secretary of War Baker, or Mr. McAdoo - former Senator McAdoo, any one of those men whose names were placed before the Democratic Nomination for President with Mr. Roosevelt would have been elected.

And that is true of Mr. Smith - his religion would have been a factor, but it would have been a disastrous factor. He would have been elected because they would be voting on the economic issue and the question of a man's religion if that was being held against him wouldn't have (been) reflected (in) the ultimate outcome. It would have had some effect, but in my judgement he would have been elected.

MR. LANGER:

Do you think in line with what we've been talking about that there is such a thing as a Catholic vote or a Jewish vote or a Negro vote, and so on?

MR. FARLEY:

Well I don't think that's true to the extent that it may have been in other days. I think we're gradually getting away from that. There isn't any doubt that people naturally have a feeling of friendliness for someone of their own.

I think there isn't any doubt that there are some people who feel that they should vote for a Protestant if you will, or a Catholic, or a man of Jewish faith. But in the main, that isn't true. There isn't a Catholic vote, and there isn't a Jewish vote, there isn't a German vote, and there isn't an Italian vote, and you can go on and mention any of the other nationalities now a part of American life.

MR. LANGER:

It has been said...

MR. FARLEY:

Pardon me - I don't want to stop at just those four. There's a large Polish population in this country and population from other countries in Central Europe - a lot of French - so I don't want to just limit the groups to the four I previously mentioned.

MR. LANGER:

It's been said that people vote for one of three reasons. The head, the heart and the pocketbook, meaning reason, emotion and economic well-being. Do you think this is so?

MR. FARLEY:

Well there's some measure of truth to that. I think in the final analysis, the economic issue, particularly on national elections, is most important. Of course the leadership - the nominee of the party of course is very, very important. I think it's more important in a sense than the platform because the impression the leader of the party makes in enunciating the principles of the party and the platform planks - I think that has a very decided effect.

You could have the finest platform in the world for a presidential candidate, but if you didn't have the candidate - the platform in my judgment wouldn't be sufficient to carry him through. He has to have something about him, he has to be - may I use the word attractive.

He has to have an appeal. Call it political sex appeal if you wish, but he must have to have an appeal.

MR. LANGER:

You mention political sex appeal. Which brings up the subject of television in politics. Now has television changed politics at all?

MR. FARLEY:

It has changed it some and I think it will continue to change it more, because when men appear on television and (deliver) a talk, they are subject to questions like many of them are at these conferences; their facial expressions I think betray their emotions and betray their feelings. It's different on television than it (is) on radio. When a man is asked questions on television, you can see the expression on his face, whether he's receptive to the question or whether he doesn't like it.

And I think it's more obvious to those who are watching TV as to whether the man is completely telling the truth. I think it's going to have a wholesome effect.

Some televise well and others don't televise well. Now Mr. Roosevelt, of course, was an exception as far as his voice was concerned. Mr. Roosevelt on television would have been a truly great campaigner. He was great as it was, but on television with the voice he had, he would have been most remarkable.

MR. LANGER:

Television has also entered into the factor of costs of political campaigns. About how much did it cost to get FDR elected President?

MR. FARLEY:

If my memory serves me correctly, it was something I would say within \$3,000,000. Now don't hold me to that, but I would guess that that was what the national campaign itself cost. Now it may have run more than that.

I was talking to some fellow the other day who told me that when President Lincoln was elected president, the campaign cost in round figures, let's say \$100,000. Someone told me that a national hook-up for 1/2 hr. on TV -- now I don't know whether that's on one or two chains -- would cost \$100,000 odd.

MR. LANGER:

Well what would it cost today to get a man elected president?

MR. FARLEY:

That's hard to answer. You see, they're limited now in the amount of money they're (permitted) to expend. I think they've limited it to \$3,000,000. Now as the maximum amount that a political organization can spend nationally. They get around the law by contributing to state organizations and city organizations and county organizations and town organizations and they're also permitted, I think, to contribute to independent committees in the state. So it costs many more times the \$3,000,000. If that's the figure than you would think. The law was well intentioned but rather loosely drawn.

MR. LANGER:

Would you make any kind of guess - even a rough estimate as to how...

MR. FARLEY:

I would say \$15 million wouldn't be amiss. It's a guess and it's purely a guess.

MR. LANGER:

What are your own plans for the political future? There's talk you may plan to handle Senator Kennedy's campaign.

MR. FARLEY:

I haven't made plans at all for the future. I tried, as you know, to secure the nomination for the United States Senate but the leaders of the party in the state and Governor Harriman had other ideas and so I wasn't nominated.

Now I haven't any - I'm not making any complaint about that at this interview, but I haven't any plans for the future. I have no plans and don't intend to manage anybody's campaign for the presidency.

That's said - not to be unkindly in my reference to any of the men who are favorably being mentioned for the post, but I think that's the duty of someone who's been more closely active in the political field - more closely active than I have been in the last given number of years. I resigned as Postmaster General in '40 and State Chairman in 1944 - I haven't been terribly active on the political scene.

I have been interested and helped as best I could in the different campaigns as they come along during all those years, but I haven't been active in the organization effort.

MR. LANGER:

Would you advise a young man with an inclination for government service to enter politics?

MR. FARLEY:

Yes, I would. I think it's one of the things that's wrong in this country is not enough young men - women, too - enter politics and become active. Being active in politics means that you're active in your government on the local level and your school district and your town and in your country and in the state and in the nation. I think we'd get just as much - we'd get the kind of government we work for and vote for. Some people try to make it appear that politics is a dirty business. I don't think it's a dirty business. There's a lot of things happen in politics that people don't like; a lot of things happened that I didn't like. I spent upwards of 40 years in it and very active in it and every field from the precinct level to the national scene, and I'm very happy to say that I never considered it a dirty business and I felt that it was a great compliment to me to be referred to as a politician and someone who had been active in the political field.

MR. LANGER:

Well what should a young person study to prepare himself?

MR. FARLEY:

Well in the first place, he ought to try to - ought to try to get familiar if he can, with political records of the two big political parties - the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. They've been in existence for many, many years. The Republican party came into existence as you remember back in the '60's or thereabouts; the Democratic party has been in existence for many, many years - long before that - I think a fellow has to - a man or boy or girl ought to first familiarize himself with the record of the parties and their accomplishments, and be familiar with causes - that they espoused and the laws that they advanced and the legislation that they have been responsible for down through the years.

And then of course you'd have to look into the situation on the local level, whether it be in the town or the county or the city in which you live. So that you can determine whether or not you can find a more fruitful field in one party than in another, but whatever party a young man or woman decides to go into, they ought to go into it sincerely and honestly and not for the purpose of trying to advance themselves in that party as much as feeling that by being a member of that party, they can thus make a contribution to the well-being of their community.

MR. LANGER:

Finally, Mr. Farley, what advice can you offer this generation of young people - a generation which some observers have tabbed a "beat" generation?

MR. FARLEY:

I don't think this is a "beat" generation. I don't think any generation of Americans can be construed as being a beat generation. This generation of Americans in my judgment will come along and make the same fine contribution to the success and well-being of the country as did previous generations and I think they're in a better position to do it. This generation is better educated.

When I was a young boy and finished going to high-school, there weren't many boys or girls finished highschool in those days. I was born and raised in a small community and very few people - boys and girls in my community went off to college. There were more girls than boys because the girls went off to normal school and became members of the teaching profession. But now in order to advance in life's activities you have to - you can't get along too well without a college education so the boys and girls of this generation are better trained in my judgment, to meet the problems of the day than were the boys and girls of my generation.

We'll come out of all our problems all right. Every generation of Americans made a better contribution to the well-being of their country than did preceding generations because they were better fitted to do it. This generation in my judgment will make a better contribution than did the previous generation and I think that will be true of all the generations that followed. I think the boys and girls of this generation are better informed than were the boys and girls of my generation.

The radio and television have made a great contribution to that. In my day, all the news you got was through the daily newspapers and maybe you wouldn't see them very often. Now we have many national magazines that cover many fields of information, so that the boy and girl of this generation going to highschool is more well-informed than (those of mine) -- and the next generation will be even more greatly informed.

MR. LANGER:

Thank you very much, Mr. James A. Farley.

JAMES A. FARLEY TEACHING GUIDE

Bibliography:

Jim Farley has written two books on politics. Both are well worth reading. In Behind the Ballots (Harcourt, Brace, 1938), Mr. Farley describes the first two Roosevelt presidential campaigns. In Jim Farley's Story, The Roosevelt Years (Whittlesey House, 1948), he devotes a major portion of his book to the third term issue.

TEACHING GUIDE SECTION

Journalism classes:

The news peg here is Jim Farley's estimate that it would cost about \$15,000,000 today to get a man elected president. This figure would have to be compared with Farley's estimate that it cost about \$3,000,000 to elect Franklin D. Roosevelt president, and \$100,000 to elect Abraham Lincoln.

English and core classes:

There are plenty of leads here for both composition and debate topics:

"The High Cost of Political Campaigning"
"Can a Catholic Be Elected President?"

"The Political Machine: Friend or Foe of Democracy"
 "America's Two-Party System"
 "Why Every Voter Should Contribute to His Political Party"
 "Great Politicians of Our Time"
 "The Influence of Minority Groups in Political Campaigns"
 "The Head, the Heart, and the Pocketbook"
 "How Television is Changing the Face of Politics--and Politicians"
 "Why I Would (Would Not) Like to Enter Politics"

History and social studies classes:

See if you can find any figures on the costs of the very early presidential campaigns (Adams, Jefferson, Jackson). Draw a chart showing the fantastic increases in political campaigning, culminating in Farley's present estimate of \$15,000,000 to elect a President. Account for the reasons for these huge increases.

How have the mass media--both radio and television--changed political campaigning? Try to get recordings--or transcripts from the library--of President Roosevelt's famous "Fala" speech of 1944 and Nixon's "Checkers" speech of 1952. In what ways were these speeches similar? In what ways were they different? What emotions did F.D.R. and Nixon play on? F.D.R.'s reference to Fala was obviously tongue-in-cheek. Nixon's reference to Checkers was done with a straight face. Yet both speeches were enormously successful. Why?

Analyze a group of presidential elections by the "head, heart, and pocketbook" issues. Which issue do you think plays the biggest part in most elections?

Before playing the recording, have students fold an 8½ X 11 sheet of paper in half lengthwise. On one side of the sheet, at the top of the page, have them write the word "statesman." On the top of the other side, the word "politician." Ask them to list the characteristics of each. Have students list some of the outstanding American "statesmen" and "politicians" of the 20th Century. After the recording has been played, ask students what changes they would make on their lists.

Do you feel that any minority group swings the balance of power in your city or state? Give reasons for your answer.

Invite the leader of the local political organization to address the class on the so-called political "machine." Question him very closely about the party primary. Ask him how many voters actually turn out to vote at the primaries. Why does the South always have a huge turnout of voters in the Democratic primary? Why do the other states rarely have such turnouts?

Howard Langer is managing editor of Scholastic Teacher magazine. He is also producer of the Folkways recordings Interview with William O. Douglas (FC-7350), Robert M. Hutchins (FC-7351), Margaret Chase Smith (FC-7352), Al Capp (FC-7553), and Margaret Mead (FC-7354). The latter are all 10-inch discs. Mr. Langer has also written and produced Human Rights, a Folkways documentary on the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, featuring an interview with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt (FH-5524), a 12-inch disc.