well indicated, if we can only carry them out. They are sug-
gested 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 out-
lines 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 exec-
utives 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 dominated 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 person-
ality. 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:
to vote for that person. Many times an organization's nominee is not even supported by the very people who chose him as a representative!

Others will argue that only through caucuses does everyone have an equal opportunity to win. "You support us and we will support you" is the philosophy they stress. Why not let the candidates prove themselves worthy of the honor? If caucuses were eliminated they could do just that, and in ninety-nine percent of the elections the most deserving person would triumph.

Caucuses create in many students a lack of perseverance. "Why try? We have no chance of winning this time" is a feeling that prevails near election time. One organization may externally do extensive campaigning for another, but internally the desire for victory is not passionately strong. However, that internal desire exhibits itself in external form when one's own candidate is being supported.

Caucused voting leaves no suspense, no excitement in elections. Winners can be predicted accurately in almost every instance. When this point is carefully considered, we see that it is rather useless to conduct elections at all. The University of Michigan, for this reason, banned queenship elections from campus activities and dispensed with caucuses altogether.

The only advantage I can see in the caucus system is that it has a positive effect in uniting campus organizations. Caucuses do teach college students how to work together and how to compromise when it becomes necessary. Because of the inevitably close association of caucus members, a deep sense of understanding and responsibility exists among the participating organizations.

If caucuses were eliminated from college campuses, and if politics were confined to state and national affairs, our student elections could be made cleaner, fairer, and more worthwhile.