

The Need for Modern Democracy

William C. Powell

Democracy, literally meaning rule of the people, is an ideal whose meaning has changed and whose political effectiveness has increased as men's ideas about how to achieve rule of the people have developed. Historically, the development has been from direct or pure democracy, in which the citizens actually assemble to discuss and settle issues, to representative democracy, in which the citizens delegate authority to elected representatives, and from political democracy, which defines rule of the people in terms of the machinery of government, to social democracy, which insists that rule of the people can be effective only in a democratic society—a society characterized by liberty, equality, justice, tolerance, and political democracy.

Liberty, justice, tolerance, and political democracy—these are four principles by which the world can be made better for all men; these are principles to which the nations of the world must adhere if freedom is to flourish. Because of modern inventions and the advance of science, the world has become too small for its nations to isolate themselves and continue to exist. As each day our world figuratively becomes smaller, the need for a social, political, and economic common denominator to promote man's freedom and a better way of life becomes more apparent. The common denominator might be found in international cooperation, which is merely another way of saying **world democracy**.

Not only is world democracy an absolute necessity if freedom is to flourish, but the ways in which it can be beneficial are unlimited. There are, for example, the controls and laws pertaining to the use of airways, the financing of goods in trade, and the growth and distribution of food. So often in the past we have seen an abundance of food in one part of the world and starvation in another part. Nature seldom distributes her bounties with an even hand. Surely the combined ingenuity of human brains can solve this question of distribution once the fear of war and loss of freedom are removed by world democracy.

Forms of world organizations have been discussed by experts and will continue to be discussed by them; in all probability, any form that is finally decided upon will be subject to change and amendment, and it should be if it is to endure. However, the outlines of the world today and the world to come are

well indicated, if we can only carry them out. They are suggested by the late Wendell Willkie's **One World**, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt's **Four Freedoms** and Henry Wallace's **Century of the Common Man**. But above even such broad outlines must be the general attitude of the representatives in a world organization. If they are actually representative of the peoples of their lands, freely selected by freely chosen executives and if they function in the manner President Wilson attempted many years ago, actually drafted "open covenants, openly arrived at," a tremendous stride toward a long period of freedom and peace - a people's peace - will have been made.

‡ ‡ ‡ ‡ ‡

Campus Caucuses

Beverly Siegel

Politics has become almost as prevalent on the college campus as it has on the national scene. All elections, no matter how trivial, are domineered by this or that "party" — the caucus. It no longer seems that a person is elected to a college office or honor because of his own personal abilities or personality. He is now elected because members of his caucus demand it, and, with rare exceptions, the largest organization claims the victor.

The best way I know to illustrate the advantages and disadvantages of caucused politics on college campuses is to cite examples with which I am familiar. For the most part these examples must be taken from the political system here at Butler University, since the situations vary at every school and since most of them are foreign to me.

I am convinced that the advantages of caucuses are far outnumbered by the disadvantages. I say this not because of prejudices which have arisen from previous campus elections but because it is an opinion I formed long before I came to Butler.

Like any other person at Butler who is affiliated with an organization, I am a member of one of the caucuses on campus. My membership was certainly not voluntary; if it had been, I would have had no part at all in the caucus system. My main objection to this type of voting system is that everyone does not have an equal chance. Each social organization nominates candidates, but only occasionally is the organization allowed