

small cities which have the misfortune to be located close to competing small cities live harried and worried lives, just like small businessmen in a competitive market. In both cases, we as customers gain from this competition. This competition, needless to say, is available only in the federal system in which power is decentralized.

Granted all of these advantages for local government, one might inquire why the United States does not immediately disintegrate its central government and become fifty (or indeed eighty thousand) nation-states. In some ways, this would be an attractive solution and Scandinavia is an illustration of the advantages of having small national units. Switzerland, surely the best governed country in the world, is not only very small in itself, but is a federal state with the individual cantons having considerably more power than the American states — even though they are frequently smaller than our countries. These cantons themselves are broken down into smaller units — the communes — which have a great deal of government authority. Generally speaking, once again the commune has more authority than does American local government.

Nevertheless, although we can dream of the prospects, it is clear that transferring all government activities to local government would not be wise. To give but one obvious example, the Mississippi River requires uniform management if it is to be kept in a reasonably navigable state, prevented from having more than a minimum of floods, and kept reasonably clean. Only a governmental unit covering the entire basin could carry out this kind of control. Similarly, defense is best done by a large governmental unit, and there are many other activities which require central control.

We should agree, however, that efficiency will be highest if, in those areas in which it is possible, government is decentralized down to state control or, better yet, local control. The contrary or Hobbesian approach looks to efficiency in terms of neatness and superficial appearance, not in terms of what people actually want. We are extremely fortunate to have a federal system of government, and the centralization of power in the

national government which has been such an important trend in recent history is retrograde. The net effect is that we will find our government less efficient than it was before.

Not only have we recently centralized much power in the central government, but we have also put great restrictions on the ability of local governments to experiment with new techniques. The Supreme Court, for example, has made it impossible for local governments to experiment with different voting procedures. Presumably, one of the reasons for this was a feeling that it might turn out that a voting procedure which was distasteful to the Supreme Court was actually more efficient. Preventing experimentation thus protected the prejudices of the Supreme Court from confrontation with data from the real world.

But not only the Supreme Court has been in the business of preventing experimentation. Many federal government programs sharply restrict the degree to which states can choose programs different from those of their fellow states. Once again this should greatly reduce the ability of the states either to serve as scientific laboratories for different policies or to provide specialized combinations of taxes and services for people whose tastes are not exactly those of the national norm. These changes are sensible from the standpoint of those people who feel that uniformity is, in itself, desirable, or those who feel that the federal government program is "eternally right." If we agree, however, that diverse institutions to fit diverse tastes are more efficient than cramming everyone into the same mold and that we need experimentation in order to make progress in government, then the federal system is clearly superior to a centralized government. □

---

*Mr. Tullock is a member of the Council of the American Political Science Association. Since August 1968 he has been Professor of Economics and Public Choice at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.*

---

## President Stewer and the Key

George Carey

We reprint here an excerpt from Arturo Slysinger's monumental work. *The Age of Reason: A Complete History*. (New York: Hoopla and Roll, 1985. 60 pp. \$250).

The worst finally came to pass in 1971. Kingster Stewer, president of Yahoo University and one of the most outspoken defenders of human liberties and student rights, was seized by members of a radical group called "Free Universities Now," (FUN for short). Because at this time university presidents were being abducted

at a rate of three a day, this particular abduction would not have merited much attention save for the following two facts.

First, Stewer was almost certain to win a Nobel Peace Prize because of his outspoken concern for humanity. His eloquent defense of the New Heaven rapists of 1970 captured the hearts and minds of the entire intellectual community. The New York Times enthusiastically praised President Stewer for pointing out that all criminal acts (arson, bombthrowing, murder, etc.) are really the fault of

society. These original observations provided an entire generation of intellectuals with food for thought. And he even expanded on this thesis when he wrote: "Justice is not of this world. We had best leave punishment of alleged offenses against society to god, any god."

Although an enlightened agnostic, President Stewer was quick to point out that every man is entitled to his own opinion and that to attack his prescriptions on grounds of his non-religion constituted character assassination of the basest kind. The Washington Post put the issue this way in one of its lead editorials: "Those attacks upon President Stewer's reflective and enlightened positions, simply because he is an agnostic, are simply irrelevant to his central arguments and his vision of a better world. These attacks would do the late Senator Joseph McCarthy proud."

A second and more important factor, was this: After being bound and gagged the FUN abductors locked Stewer in his office and then threw the key away. As Fate would have it, disposing of the key eventually became the key issue in the events which followed.

We present here a chronicle of what actually transpired.

(a) Reporters from the Colossal Broadcasting System were making their weekly pilgrimage to President Stewer in order to gain further insight into the increasingly critical question, how to run a university and keep the student and faculty militants content. They knocked at President's Stewer's door and all they could hear were muffled groans. They tried the door and found it locked. Sensing something wrong, they contacted other administration officials. Soon the word was out: President Stewer, bound and gagged, was locked in his own office.

(b) The faculty senate met immediately to discuss this situation. Various resolutions were offered at the meeting. Some, a very few, argued that the office should not be opened because university presidents were not needed and, besides, President Stewer presented a positive menace to the goals and purposes of higher education. This very small minority was quickly hooted down. Despite this, the faculty by unanimous vote decided that the office should not be opened.

Two principal reasons can be given for this unanimity. One school of thought held that President Stewer would like to suffer his inevitable fate because this would be a genuine and meaningful gesture, a positive indication to the world that he was willing to make the ultimate sacrifice for the principles and beliefs which he had espoused during his lifetime. As one proponent of this position put it so eloquently: "Now President Stewer will get his Nobel Peace Prize. Yes, it will be posthumously awarded. But think of it! He will be a martyr...a symbol for those generations yet unborn. We cannot let this opportunity pass."

Another dominant line of argument, presented by Professor Rodelent of the law school, ran as follows: "To hire a locksmith would constitute an abridgement of academic freedom and the sacred privacy of our academic institutions. Beware my friends. If you hire a

locksmith to open President Stewer's office, none of us will be safe. Soon you will find locksmiths snooping around our campus in droves. This will endanger our right of privacy. None of us will be secure. Allow one transgression of this nature and all our precious freedoms will be lost."

(c) The students following the lead of the faculty adopted by referendum (3000 to 15) a resolution which called for the sealing of all entrances to the administration building with bricks and mortar in order to insure that there could be no outside interference. They also voted by the same margin to rename the administration building from Washington Hall to Stewer's Tomb.

(d) The Colossal Broadcasting Company managed to get Erraticus Serverous to produce an instant special on the plight of President Stewer. In the course of this program several functional illiterates were interviewed. The comments of Irving Sunhill, a sixth grade dropout from Topeka, Kansas, are representative of this segment of the population. Said he, "I think it wrong for any group no matter how well intentioned to engage in any such activities. The poor chap, Mr. Stewer, will eventually die for lack of water and food. Something should be done."

Amazingly, Sunhill's view finally prevailed. After agonizing deliberation, the Governor of Commeticus sent the National Guard into New Heaven with specific orders to protect the locksmith, whose sole function was to unlock the door. The faculty of Yahoo University denounced this as "fascistic." Members of FUN physically tried to bar the entrance of the locksmith. Tear gas was used and approximately thirty members of FUN suffered bruises and cuts in the scuffle. This was duly noted in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Its editors asked: "What kind of universities do we have when innocent kids are subject to these brutalities?"

President Stewer was finally rescued. He was immediately taken to a hospital. A week later he was able to hold his first press conference. Here we can only highlight the more significant questions and answers as duly recorded by the New York Times.

Question: Were you at any time afraid for your life?

Answer: Not for one moment.

Question: But you did go through some ordeal. You had no food or water for three days. Weren't you a bit concerned?

Answer: Yes. A bit so, I guess. But you must recognize that we all have to pay a price for the preservation of freedom. This was a very small price to exact of me. Besides which I had to lose weight anyway. (Laughter).

Question: Are you at all upset about the faculty senate's resolution not to seek your release? Are you upset about the students' resolution to construct a Stewer's Tomb?

Answer: Not at all. I think this shows that we are a free and liberal university with diversity of opinion. I am proud of the behavior of the faculty and the student body during these moments of crisis.

Question: Where would you place the blame, if any, for the fact that you spent three days without water and food—bound and gagged no less?

Answer: Squarely on the shoulder of our present national administration, particularly Spiro Agnew. He is responsible for the fact that FUN abducted me. His intemperate statements about universities were clearly responsible for my plight. How can I possibly run a university with such men in high public position? He should be muzzled. (Applause).

President Stewer, we hasten to add, did win his much deserved Nobel Peace Prize. The citation ran, in part, as follows: "He could see beyond the immediate situation to the transcendent truths of man's existence. He was willing to sacrifice his life for these truths." □

---

*Mr. Carey is Professor of Political Science at Georgetown University and recently published, with the late Willmoore Kendall, The Basic Symbols of the American Political Tradition.*

---

## Youth Against Castro

### Educational Crisis in Cuba

*Enrique Encienosa*

Fidel Castro has ruled Cuba for a dozen years. Therefore, an eight-year-old child when Castro took over the government, would now be twenty. With the indoctrination methods used by the communists in their school systems, one would logically expect that most Cuban youths of today are adherents to marxist ideology.

Yet, the Castro government seems to have failed in its educational goals. Indications point to a strong feeling of rebellion among both university and pre-university students.

Minister of Education Armando Hart stated recently, that because eighty thousand students between the ages of fourteen and twenty refuse to attend classes, "Oriente Province should be declared to be in a state of educational alarm." The province of Oriente was the section of Cuba where Fidel Castro was born and where he started guerilla warfare against the Batista regime.

The students' anti-government feelings are apparent at many of the more than eight thousand schools and one dozen universities in Cuba. Guido Garcia Inclan, spokesman for the government, stated in a broadcast on Radio Havana-Cuba that the students at the University of Havana refer to the city's Central Park as Miami. Inclan admitted that he feels many thousands of youths would like to leave Cuba and join 600,000 exiles in the United States. Inclan also complained that "youths always have a derisive joke to make against our revolution."

University students were among the

first opponents of the regime. Only a year after taking over the country, Castro was faced with eliminating many of those students who had once supported him. For it was the students, believing Castro to be a democratic leader, who swelled Castro's guerilla units, while Batista was still in power. But after Batista fled the country, the students' demands for free elections and a constitutional government were ignored. The students then regrouped into an organization called the D.R.E. (Student Revolutionary Directorate).

In 1960, Porfereo Ramirez, a former Castro guerilla, who was elected President of the Student Federation at Santa Clara University led a revolt in the Escambray Mountains of Central Cuba, until he was captured and executed. Pedro Luis Bortel, another student leader publicly opposed communist tactics and indoctrination programs. Bortel's reward was a forty-two year prison sentence for "counter-revolutionary crimes." Two other student leaders of the D.R.E., Alberto Muller and Virgilio Campaneria, fled to the United States to save their lives, returning clandestinely to bring weapons and to organize insurrection. Both were captured. Campaneria died before a firing squad, while the twenty-one year old Muller was condemned to twenty years imprisonment for his defiance. Two years later, Castro smashed the D.R.E. and arrested hundreds of students in a large raid.

There are those who maintain that as long as students oppose Castro, there is hope for a free Cuba. For it is from the universities that the government will have to draw its future leaders in administration and technology. In present day Cuba, only those students who are considered good communists are permitted to attend the university. Because of this, enrollments have decreased almost seventy percent in the last ten years, anti-communist professors have been expelled from their jobs and often jailed, textbooks have to be in accord with government policies, and the standard of education is constantly changed to suit the government's need. But even with the careful selection of a privileged elite to attain a higher education, university students in Castro's Cuba have been everything but submissive in their actions. There have been more than twenty riots in five years protesting the poor quality of education, mass indoctrination, and the arrests of students who are suspected of belonging to anti-government resistance movements.

Several thousand Cuban exiles in American colleges have banded together to form the FEC (Cuban Student Federation) dedicated to the liberation of Cuba. Among these youths, there are many who arrived in exile while only young children, and remember little about their country. Other members are veterans of the resistance, the ill-fated Bay of Pigs Invasion, and graduates of Castro's concentration camps. The FEC has lobbied in Congress, organized rallies, prepared exhibits of photographs and charts denouncing Castro as a totalitarian. Further, they have collected money for the cause of a Cuba "without a firing wall."

These exiled students represent a strong