

*Comments on Events Leading to the Termination
of the Senior Lecturer and Professor of Volitional Science
of the Free Enterprise Institute.*

Note to readers: The following pages contain Jay Stuart Snelson's above-titled 1979 monograph. Also included are cover letters to three people to whom he transmitted this document in 1990 and 1999.

I received this material in March 2014, in the form of a PDF file that had been scanned from a typed original. Because that file is rather large (15MB) I believed that some people might have difficulty transmitting it via email. Therefore, using an optical character recognition software program, in a few steps I converted the documents to a PDF of much smaller size.

However, the software has its limits, such as not accurately reading stylized letterhead or handwritten notes. Therefore, the letterhead does not appear below, and two meaningful handwritten notes, each in the cover letters, have been replaced with type. In addition, the software created other "glitches," sometimes affecting font and font size, spacing, and margins. I've done what I can to correct these, but know that I have not succeeded in all cases. Therefore, the reader should attribute any irregularities to me and not to Jay Snelson, who typed the original in 1979 on an IBM Selectric typewriter. I am satisfied that the *content* of what follows is accurate, and believe that it is entirely readable, but will forward the original large PDF file upon request.

Richard Boren
June 2014

[Jay Snelson's letterhead]

October 1, 1990

Irwin B. Golden, D.D.S.
[ADDRESS REDACTED]

Dear Hank,

You now have between this cover a copy of my 43 [actually 37- RB]-page narrative: *Comments on Events Leading to the Termination of the Senior Lecturer and Professor of Volitional Science of the Free Enterprise Institute* that I wrote in 1979. It has been read by not more than a half dozen people. A few of the anecdotes therein I have disclosed to you in person. I have included you in the circle of readers because of your stated interest in writing a biography of A. J. Galambos. It has been more than a decade since I have read this, but I did read it again prior to sending you this copy. From the distance in time of eleven years, it is now even more apparent that I extended far too much loyalty to a man so undeserving of that loyalty. If I were writing this today, I would have stronger things to say about the magnitude of Andrew's hypocrisy, ingratitude, irrationality, and more — much more!

I have enclosed some of my course literature to keep you informed on what I am doing along with a brochure on the course we gave in Palm Springs in 1973: *PRivate PRactice for PROftt and PLeasure*.*

I hope all is well with you, Maryann, the humming birds and, of course, the avocados.

Warm regards,

Jay

* [Jay's note in longhand to Cheryl Croxall Spehar] *Cheryl, Hank and I gave this course to an auditorium of dentists in 1973 with the aim of also garnering a few V-50 enrollments which we did.*

[Jay Snelson's letterhead]

September 18, 1999

Cheryl Croxall Spehar
[ADDRESS REDACTED]

Dear Cheryl,

Because you expressed an interest in reading this, here is the paper I wrote twenty years ago: "Comments on Events Leading to the Termination of the Senior Lecturer and Professor of Volitional Science of The Free Enterprise Institute." I have included the cover letter to Dr. Hank Golden that I wrote to him nine years ago in sending him a copy of this.

Hank was a first class gentleman, successful dentist, FEI Tape Course Contractor, admirer and friend of Galambos who in the end, like many others before and after him, was attacked and betrayed by Galambos. Hank, by his own admission, was suicidal because of it all. It was for this reason I sent him a copy so that he would know he is not alone [what follows was apparently added to this sentence by Snelson in longhand before mailing] *as a victim of Andrew's duplicity.*

Kindest regards,

[signed Jay]

Jay Stuart Snelson

[Jay Snelson's letterhead]

December 18, 1999

Alvin Lowi, Jr.
[ADDRESS REDACTED]

Dear Al,

This is the monograph on The Free Enterprise Institute and Andrew Galambos, et al., that you asked me about some time ago and that I said I would send you. It has taken longer to get this to you than I anticipated because I decided to add some footnotes this year, to the original paper written twenty years ago. To include the footnotes, I had to scan the paper and correct the scan errors which took a while. In writing these eight footnotes, there was a temptation to generate many more, but the familiar saying applies: 'enough is enough' and the footnotes could have easily reached the length of the original paper.

As your only successor to the position of Senior Lecturer at the Free Enterprise Institute and as a contractual associate with FEI for about a decade after your departure, it would seem your exit from FEI—imprudently and foolishly provoked by Galambos as I see it—was, nonetheless, a timely departure for you. If for no other reason, I should think, your salient memories are those of a genteel 'Joseph' before he became a volatile 'Andrew' echoing the familiar tale of the protagonist who became antagonist in *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Your years of friendship with Joseph and Suzanne before there was a Free Enterprise Institute and during the early years of its development will remain for you, largely, a positive experience.

In considering the long-term prospects of recognition for Andrew's claims for developing a scientific theory of property, it seems to me there were more flaws

in Andrew's character than there are flaws in his grand scheme of building his Natural Society on the sanctity of property. However, none of what I would now call certain epistemological, semantic, and strategic flaws in his works were discussed in this 1979 paper. Flaws or not, if his ideas possess the vitality to garner new followers after the present ones are gone, then he may earn a measure of market acclaim in spite of himself and his bent toward self-destruction. And in the future, if any of Andrew's novel ideas—especially those in his lengthy course on "The Nature and Protection of Primary [intellectual] Property"—gain currency and launch an environment where innovators and inventors of useful products can earn both tangible and intangible equity for their intellectual achievements, then the world, undoubtedly, will be a richer and safer place in which to live.

J. S. Snelson
Huntington Harbour

Comments on Events Leading to the Termination of the Senior Lecturer and Professor of Volitional Science of The Free Enterprise Institute

by Jay Stuart Snelson

Copyright, 1979 by Jay S. Snelson¹

[Address redacted]

¹Footnotes have been added twenty years later (1999) to the original 1979 text that has not been altered except for half-a-dozen corrections that included some typos and spelling errors and minor changes in positioning of indentations denoting paragraphs.
[Page 2 is intentionally blank-RB]

DURING MY OVER THIRTEEN YEAR association with The Free Enterprise Institute, my principal goal as a member of the faculty was to present the ideas of Andrew J. Galambos in a manner that would motivate the students enrolled in the courses I was teaching to (1) continue expanding their knowledge of Galambos's science of volition, (2) apply this knowledge, and (3) expand the market for Institute products. My principal strategy to accomplish this goal was to present *The V-50 Lectures* in such a way that the students would be excited about the scope and magnitude of the science of volition and would look upon their attendance at V-50 to be the most important event of the week. This strategy proved to be effective. It ultimately produced a market for V-50 and V-201 that exceeded in its size Galambos's most optimistic expectations.

What I must now relate is painful to contemplate and traumatic to set down on paper. It concerns the origin of Galambos's personal hostility toward me. In the end, that hostility swelled into what must have been for him a form of intense hatred, and I was the object of that hatred, And yet, here was the man for whom I had the most profound respect, the man who without question was my intellectual father, the man whom I truly loved, the man for whom I would have walked into "hell" itself to rescue from danger, the man whose innovations were so grand that I chose as my life's work the promulgation of his cosmological achievements — and here was the man who betrayed me. How could this have happened? I have asked myself a thousand times, "How could he do it?" This paper is an attempt to answer that question.

(2)

GALAMBOS REPEATEDLY CLAIMED that a great source of his frustration involved my reluctance to meet his demands to maintain complete openness with him by always stating with unreserved candor what was on my mind. As the conclusion of our thirteen year association approached, Galambos further described my taciturnity as the "silence of guilt." He believed the psychological origin of my reluctance to maintain openness with

him to be a derivative of my early family environment.

The truth is, Galambos will not tolerate candor from me or from anyone else. The only candor he gets from his associates is what might be called "safe candor," that is, an openness that can be given with a minimum of risk. The longer the association with Galambos, the more sensitive one becomes on the subject of knowing when to keep his mouth shut which, to be on the safe side, is most of the time.

Galambos takes great personal pride in advertising the degree of his total openness. One of his favorite statements is, "What I am thinking is coming out of my mouth!" He² once said in a lecture, "There is only room for one temper at FEI." The same generalization applies to "openness." There is only room for one person at FEI putting forth a continual monologue of what he is thinking, viz., the Director of the Institute.

In order to have been open with Galambos, to have leveled with him, it would have been necessary to have stated my candid opinions on everything he was doing at FEI. This would have included those actions he had taken with which I both agreed and disagreed. The fact is, as a general rule, I preferred not to offer personal criticism of Galambos or his methods of running the Institute,

There were two main reasons why I chose this less than candid posture with Galambos. The first was due to the fact that since his ideas, per se, and his entrepreneurial methods had been the subject of much criticism in the past, and could be expected to be the target of even more criticism in the future, I did not wish to add to that criticism, even if any of my criticisms might prove, in time, to be right. Therefore, I chose to make few comments upon those actions he had taken which I truly believed to be negative, or counterproductive, or incompatible with his stated goals for FEI.

The other reason I chose to limit my degree of candor was that I had been convinced since my early years on the faculty that our contractual association would have come to an abrupt conclusion if I had complied with his demands for openness. One might ask, why then did I seek to continue the relationship? It was my firm opinion that it would always be in our mutual

²Free Enterprise Institute

interest to continue the contractual association. I looked upon the durability of the association as a long-term, permanent goal. Therefore, I remained largely silent. I believed this measure of short-term silence to be a price that must be paid to insure the acceptance of any contribution I might make to the long-term realization of the successful establishment of the science of volition. Now that Galambos has chosen to unilaterally terminate the contract, some of that longstanding silence will be broken.

(3)

IN THE EARLY DAYS OF MY ASSOCIATION with FEI I had a premonition that my success at the presentation and promotion of V-50 could lead to my own undoing.³ It was inevitable that FEI graduates would make comparisons between my presentation of V-50 and the innovator's. Later, when I was teaching V-201, comparisons of our respective presentations of that course were also made. I did not solicit, encourage, or sanction such comparisons.

During the time of this early association with the Institute, I was asked by the Whittier FEI course contractors to present Course F-50 (V-50) in Whittier. I gladly accepted this opportunity to further spread the knowledge of the science of volition. What I did not know at the time (Galambos related it to me later) was that he was furious over the fact the Whittier contractors had asked me to teach the course and not him.

Then there were those times when FEI tape course contractors would innocently ask Galambos if my V-50 taped lectures could be played rather than his for a V-50 tape course presentation. This would further augment his resentment toward me, and yet, I never suggested to any tape course contractor

³As early as 1964, I had been warned by various graduates of Free Enterprise Institute courses — some of whom had been in the FEI market longer than I had — that I had better not be too successful at teaching and promoting FEI courses out of concern that Galambos might perceive that he is being upstaged by one of his own faculty members.

that he should seek permission to substitute my V-50 tapes for Galambos's. When an FEI tape course contractor would pose the same question to me first, I would quickly inform him that it was Galambos's policy to play only the Galambos V-50 tapes.

Another source of conflict that I did not anticipate was generated by my teaching V-201. There were some V-50 graduates who chose to enroll at my V-201 location in preference to Galambos's. In particular he was offended by those who would travel a greater distance to take the course from me rather than from him. For instance, there was the Long Beach FEI tape course contractor and his fiancée who enrolled in my Newhall V-201. Galambos severely reprimanded the contractor and forbade them to take the course from me. The most extreme case of this involved several people who lived in Norco who drove past Galambos's City of Commerce V-201 and on to Newhall where I was teaching the course. Norco is at least fifty miles south of Commerce. They would drive that fifty miles plus another forty miles farther north in order to take the course from me.

There was at least one letter from a graduate who advised Galambos to let "Snelson" give all of the introductory courses including V-201, and that Galambos should remain in the background where he could concentrate on running the Institute and writing his book. Galambos was angry enough over this letter to take the time to read it to one of his classes. From time to time, other FEI customers would offer comments similar to those in that letter.

The sum total of all of these incidents over which I had no control occurred over a period of more than a decade and had a cumulative impact upon Galambos. His bitterness was clearly reflected in his vitriolic attitude toward me.

(4)

IN 1969, GALAMBOS GAVE ME THE RESPONSIBILITY of presenting all of the live V-50 lectures, and he continued his policy of having tape course contractors present his V-50T tape course throughout Los Angeles and Orange Counties during the summer months. Over the semesters the number of my V-50

enrollments increased significantly as did the number of V-201 enrollments that I was producing for Galambos. However, at the same time, this significant growth was not experienced by his many tape course contractors who were presenting his V-50T on tape. Even when the graduates would bring a substantial number of guests to a given V-50T location, in general the tape course contractors experienced a relatively poor percentage of enrollments from the guests in attendance. In contrast, I was enrolling a much larger percentage of the guests who attended my own V-50 presentations.

In recent years, Galambos would schedule each summer in the Los Angeles/Orange County area a dozen separate presentations of his V-50T tape course at various locations. These presentations would be promoted by some twenty tape course contractors, each contractor promoting his own location. In comparison, I was a single contractor with only three to four locations each semester, and I was far outproducing the combined efforts of these twenty contractors. They had the further advantage of presenting the actual tape recorded lectures given by the innovator of V-50. I was consistently producing each year 75% to over 80% of the V-50 and V-201 enrollments in the⁴Institute's largest market, Los Angeles and Orange Counties.

It became important to Galambos to come up with an explanation of why I was producing a significantly larger number of V-50 enrollments than were the combined efforts of some twenty of his tape course contractors who had the additional advantage of three times as many locations and, most important, the innovator's tapes. The one explanation, above all others, that Galambos would not permit himself to accept was that I, or anyone else, could present a Galambos idea more effectively than Galambos himself. Therefore, there would have to be some other explanation. Galambos finally came to a most astonishing conclusion. The reason for my much greater success than his at building and expanding the market for his ideas was that I must be doing something wrong. In other words, if Snelson is more successful at selling Galambos than Galambos is at selling Galambos, then Snelson must be doing

⁴The actual percentage was closer to 85% to 90%.

something wrong. The explanations he offered for my greater success were:

(1) Snelson plays to the gallery. He aims the content of his lectures to appeal to the lower quality people in order to increase the number of enrollments and as a consequence the highest quality people are not motivated to enroll, they are chased away. (2) Snelson's greater success at getting enrollments is due to the fact that he is a flamboyant actor. (3) Snelson gives live presentations of V-50, whereas Galambos, except for the live workshop sessions, can only be heard giving V-50 on tape.

From the very beginning my approach to V-50 was to always add to the quality of the course, never to subtract from it. If I were to identify that part of V-50 that I most enjoyed presenting, it would be the epistemological foundation of the science of volition. This was a great challenge, to successfully transmit some of the most lofty and difficult concepts to comprehend:

- (1) The significance of semantic precision applied to the physical sciences, and how to apply the same degree of semantic precision to build a true social science.
- (2) The importance and meaning of the commonly misunderstood concept in physics called "absolute" and how to apply it to volition.
- (3) Understanding the tool of tools, the builder of science, the Scientific Method.
- (4) Building the Science of Volition with the Scientific Method.
- (5) The criterion of rightness in physics, the Absolute Standard of Rightness, and how to apply this essential standard to volition.

- (6) The significance of "Occam's Razor" and how to apply it to volition.
- (7) An essential cornerstone of science — the postulate — and how to apply it to the construction of a right social structure.
- (8) The Eddington concept of the "subjective absolute," the subjective nature of all knowledge, and the application of this concept to volitional science epistemology.
- (9) The concept of property in its three forms.
- (10) Absolute morality versus relative morality.

These were the principal subjects that I discussed during the first through the fourth sessions of V-50. One of *my* goals was to convince all of those strangers sitting there from high school dropouts to Ph.D.s, from retail clerks to corporation presidents, from eighteen year olds to sixty-eight year olds that this was the most important subject they had ever heard. And the subject is: **SCIENTIFIC EPISTEMOLOGY AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF A RIGHT SOCIAL STRUCTURE**

Now if one could choose any subject that would not play well to the gallery, the "epistemological foundation of the science of volition" would do nicely. I mention this because one of the differences between the Snelson "version" of V-50 compared with the innovator's is that I would devote at least fifty percent more time than Galambos in explaining the meaning and significance of scientific epistemology and its application to the science of volition. This is why my guest session lectures (one through six) were greater in length than his. Some of his tape course contractors even used this knowledge promotionally, "Galambos's V-50 lectures are much shorter in length than Snelson's so you can get home earlier." If I had truly been interested in "playing to the gallery" and "cheapening" the course to increase enrollments as I have been publicly accused by Galambos, then I most certainly would not have chosen to present even longer lectures than the innovator on such premier subjects as epistemology, semantic precision, the scientific

method the scientific criterion of rightness, subjective absolutes, Occam's Razor, building with postulates, and finally the integration of these highly esoteric and recondite concepts with the social technology. If I had been catering to the so called "gallery," my lectures on these subjects would have been shorter than Galambos's, not longer.

For many years I had been told by various people who had attended my V-50 Lectures that as a lecturer I possess a rather stern countenance. Apparently my physical bearing and manner had a tendency to "scare" people off. It was said that the lecturer appears too serious strict, severe, and unsympathetic. To a large extent this was a reflection of the material presented in V-50 which involved serious subjects that were not intended to entertain. For the purpose of modifying this somewhat negative image that I was apparently transmitting, from time to time I would include in the lecture a humorous anecdote or make an amusing aside, but always with the intention of adding to the impact of the point I was making at the time. If nothing else, this would keep people alert. This approach was not unique to me, and will be employed by every competent lecturer. Galambos uses the technique himself and does not hide his pleasure when he obtains a favorable response from his students.

The positive effect of my putting a little more "laughter" into V-50 was to increase the percentage of three-session guests who enrolled for the entire course. This was accomplished, I believe, without in any way diminishing the quality of the course.

Nevertheless, for years I had been hearing the Galambos explanation of why I was getting a significantly greater number of enrollments in my V-50 classes than he was in his V-50T classes: "Snelson you're flamboyant, you're an actor, you play to the gallery, you chase away the good people." Finally, to please Galambos, by 1975 I had removed from V-50 most of those anecdotes and illustrations that he might construe as being "flamboyant." The result was that the percentage of three-session guests enrolling for the entire course fell to a lower level than had been achieved in earlier semesters. Therefore, I believe, the total number of V-50 enrollments was less than it

would have been had I continued to include in the lectures a greater number of relevant anecdotes and humorous asides.

This leaves for discussion the third reason given by Galambos for my greater success at getting V-50 and V-201 enrollments: "Snelson is 'live' and Galambos is on tape." To be sure, it is easier to promote a lecture series delivered in person by a lecturer than one that is presented on tape. However, that was not the major difference between the two presentations. The principal difference between Galambos presenting Galambos and Snelson presenting Galambos is that we had different goals. The goal of Galambos was to disclose his ideas and record that disclosure for posterity. In contrast, my goal was stated on the first page of this paper. It was to optimize the student's comprehension of Galambos' ideas so that the student would be motivated to (1) continue expanding his knowledge of the ideas of Galambos, (2) apply this knowledge, and (3) motivate others to pursue an understanding of this knowledge.

Here is just one illustration of the difference in attitude toward our respective methods of teaching. Many years ago Galambos was giving a V-201 lecture at the Rodeway Inn in Pico Rivera. The subject was the Entrepreneurial Mechanism. In the front of the room was a chart showing all of the important relationships between the Primary Property Company, the Secondary Property Company, and the Operating Company. This chart could not have been much larger than three feet across by two feet high. It was mounted on an artist's easel that held it not more than three feet above the floor. The detail on this chart could only be seen by those in the center of the room seated in the first and second rows. However, there were from ten to fifteen rows of students. After the lecture I suggested to Galambos that since the entire solution to the social crisis is presented on the chart, it would improve the comprehension of his students if they could see the chart. I pointed out that even those in the front row had to strain to see the detail, and that three fourths of the room could not see it at all. His reply was, "If anyone is interested, he can come up and look at the chart during the break or after the lecture." As I recall, one person did go up and look at it during the break.

When I was teaching V-201, I projected this most important chart on a six-foot screen and used a pointer as I discussed the various flows of property. After all, before I introduced this chart I had given more than forty sessions of V-50 and V-201 in preparation of the disclosure of the Entrepreneurial Mechanism. I certainly did not want them to miss the largest solution they had ever seen. Eventually, Galambos got around to projecting this chart onto a screen, but usually the size of the screen was too small for most of the students to clearly see.

(5)

MUCH WAS SAID BY GALAMBOS ABOUT his concern for the decline in V-50 and V-201 enrollments during what came to be my final year at FEI. At first, in private, I was blamed for this decline. Said Galambos on more than one occasion: "Snelson, you are too cocky. You can't rest upon your laurels." Later, Galambos made public statements to his classes blaming me directly for the decline of V-50 and V-201 enrollments. I will now give attention to the principal and true cause of this decline.

Over the years Galambos continued to both advance and expand his concepts on property and his science of volition in general. But each new intellectual step he took increased the intellectual distance between himself and those who might be hearing Galambos for the first time. The result was that for more than a decade all of the courses that Galambos presented, including his introductory courses (courses designed for people new to FEI), could only be understood and appreciated by those who had taken both V-50 and V-201. For example, Course V-76E: *The Declaration of Independence, Thomas Paine and Your Freedom* was an outstanding presentation, but it went farther than any course he had given up to that time in its exposure of the fraudulent concepts of theological mysticism. Even if someone in V-76E who was new to FEI was not offended or alienated by the discussion of theology, he or she would most certainly miss the significance of the discussion. One cannot even begin to understand the significance of Paine without an understanding of V-201.

V-40: *Concept 21* is another example of a post V-201 course, that is, it should have V-201 as a minimum prerequisite. Depending upon what version of V-40 one attends, sometimes even the physics course (P-100/101) should be a prerequisite.

Course V-30: *Investments and Insurance* was intended by Galambos to bring new people into the FEI market, but during the time I was presenting V-50, the overwhelming majority of V-30 enrollments came either directly or indirectly through my V-50 classes. Furthermore, of those whose introduction to FEI did come through Course V-30, the percentage of follow-on was not large. The physics course (P-100/101) was also intended to bring new people into the Institute's market, but the great majority of people enrolling in that course came through both V-50 and V-201. Course V-30: *Investments and Insurance* should have V-50 as a prerequisite and the physics course should have V-201 as a prerequisite.

This leads me to the subject of the January 10, 1976, presentation by Galambos of "The Flatland Program." Here was another course that should have been post V-201, but the effect of "The Flatland Program" upon the FEI market was different from any other course given by Galambos in which V-50 was not a prerequisite. For the past decade there had been only a relatively small number of non-V-50 graduates enrolled in courses such as V-30, V-76, P-100/101, and V-40. This meant that the total number of non-V-50 graduates enrolled in these courses that Galambos could alienate was relatively small. However, this was not the case with "The Flatland Program." There were more "flatlanders" (non-V-50 graduates) in attendance at that January 10, 1976, Galambos presentation than had ever been present at any previous FEI course in the history of the Institute. The total attendance, as I recall, approached one thousand. Over half of those people present had never attended any other FEI courses.

From past experience, it was with great trepidation that I promoted any course in which Galambos would be speaking to "flatlanders." He had proven on too many previous occasions that either he could not or he would not "pull his punches." When I was promoting "The Flatland Program," it appeared that Galambos had the potential to draw a larger attendance of non-

V-50 graduates than he had at any previous FEI presentation. Therefore, I was fearful of a potential disaster that could have a serious negative impact upon the growth of the FEI market. This did not stop me from actively promoting "The Flatland Program" even though I could see that I was again confronted with, a "damned if you do, and damned if you don't" alternative.

On the evening of January 10, 1976, Galambos gave "The Flatland Program." It was a most profound and magnificent tribute to Thomas Paine in commemoration of the 200th Anniversary of Paine's founding of the American Revolution. Nevertheless, my very worst fears were realized. Before Galambos had even completed what turned out to be the first half of the presentation, I was crestfallen. By the time he had finished, I thought that what I had heard would be so poorly received by the "flatlanders" present who represented the cream of our new V-50 prospects, that it could take me as many as three years to recover from the negative impact.

As I recall, there was only one enrollment in V-50 taken at "The Flatland Program," and that was a young girl who had come that evening with the intention of enrolling in V-50. The number of requests for refunds of "The Flatland Program" tuition was far greater in both number and percentage of enrollments than anything that had been experienced up to that time for any FEI course. But for every dissatisfied person asking for a tuition refund, there were many more who are also dissatisfied, but who for various reasons would not request a tuition refund.

The corroboration for my pessimistic prognosis came all too quickly. Soon I was promoting my 1976, Spring Semester V-50. Time and again I would get negative responses from graduates who would relate to me that they did not think they could ever get their people to return to any FEI session again, so poorly did they respond to "The Flatland Program." There were even many recent V-50 graduates present who had not yet taken V-201 who were alienated. The problem: Even though Galambos achieved a significant tribute to Paine, "The Flatland Program" could not be understood, accepted, or appreciated by anyone unless he had-taken both V-50 and V-201.

I approached the Spring Semester with the knowledge that I would have to work harder than ever before to build a successful semester. However, the magnitude of the negative feedback was too much to overcome in total. "The Flatland Program" turned out to be a great promotional setback for the Institute. I am convinced that had it not been for "The Flatland Program," enrollments for V-50 and V-201 would not only have been maintained at their previous levels, but probably would have increased.

Galambos has even admitted to others, but never to me, that "The Flatland Program" had a negative effect upon the expansion of the V-50 market. However, he chose to place the blame squarely on me for the subsequent decline in both V-50 and V-201 enrollments. When I informed Galambos of my opinion on the negative effect that "The Flatland Program" had upon acquiring new V-50 enrollments, he threw a tantrum. He screamed at me that there were less than seven hundred "flatlanders" in attendance at the course, but that there are seven million people living in the L.A. basin. True, but it is an established fact that we only have significant access to these seven million people through our FEI graduates. The great majority of people in attendance at "The Flatland Program," both graduates and "flatlanders," were a derivative of my successful efforts in building the market for Galambos's courses during the prior dozen years. Galambos in a single evening's presentation precipitated a major setback in the growth of V-50, post V-50 FEI products, and the Institute itself,

From the very beginning of the Institute, the only successful method of marketing Institute courses has been by word-of-mouth. That fact had not changed by the time of "The Flatland Program" and is still true today. A substantial percentage of those people new to FEI in attendance at "The Flatland Program" would have been good prospects to enroll in my 1976, Spring Semester V-50s, but most of them never got beyond that January 10, 1976, presentation. If I had personally presented "The Flatland Program," I would have accepted responsibility for the result, positive or negative. Since I did not present this "Program" or contribute to its negative result, why should I accept this role of scapegoat in which I have been cast? To do so would be the act of a masochist. I am reminded of Galambos's oft repeated challenge in the form of this

interrogative: "Have I ever been unfair?" The question answers itself.

(6)

THE NEGATIVE EFFECT of "The Flatland Program" on the V-50 market in turn led to a drop in follow-on enrollments into V-201 since there were fewer V-50 students to draw upon, But there were even more significant factors that led to a drop in V-201 enrollments.

As Galambos increased each year both the tuition and the length of V-201, the difficulty of selling the course increased. But an even more important factor that diminished the marketability of V-201 was the steadily increasing attrition rate during each successive offering by Galambos of the course. As the attrition rate increased, sales resistance also increased. With the exception of true sickness, and a few other causes, the principal reason for attrition from V-201 was a dissatisfied, unhappy customer. The fact that this dissatisfaction with the product may have been due to the student's own inability to grasp the significance of what he was hearing does not alter the fact that when he puts out negative feedback on V-201, especially when that negative feedback reaches the ears of someone he has enrolled in a current V-50, then the difficulty of getting that current V-50 enrollee into V-201 becomes a problem of greater magnitude. If that V-50 enrollee in turn passes on that negative feedback on V-201 to other enrollees in V-50, the difficulty is compounded.

In recent years, the attitude of the V-201 lecturer, Galambos, toward each successive V-201 class became increasingly negative and hostile. Perhaps the single greatest impediment to the successful promotion of V-201 in my V-50 classes came as a direct result of negative feedback from the 1975-1976 Galambos presentation of V-201 that continued on into the middle of the summer and lasted some 67 sessions. Galambos subjected this class to repeated admonishments, scoldings, and harangues. Even if this class had deserved the sum total of Galambos's wrath, the effect of the unfavorable feedback from V-201 greatly diminished the success of the

V-201 promotions in my V-50 classes.

(7)

IN ORDER TO COMPREHEND Galambos's resentment toward me, the source of his attitude must first be understood. This attitude fully surfaced in 1974 when Galambos, in a rage, decried his dependence upon me as the principal source of V-50 and V-201 enrollments as well as, either directly or indirectly, most of the Institute's sales of other courses and products.

The source of Galambos's resentment: I was too successful in the promulgation of his ideas. If I had only produced one fifth of the FEI market instead of four fifths or more, the resentment of Galambos toward me would have been greatly diminished. If I had given a less effective course, I could have cut my total enrollments in half or by two thirds. If I as a single contractor had only produced as many V-50 enrollments as had the combined efforts of twenty tape course contractors in presenting Galambos on tape, then the resentment of Galambos toward me would have been greatly diminished.

Yes, there would have been less resentment, but Galambos was always demanding more V-50, more V-201 enrollments. To use that popular expression, the "bottom line" was always the same. He needed more revenue. The only thing that changed over the years was the reason he gave for needing more revenue.

One year he said, *I have to have more enrollments from you. Jay, do you know what it costs me to keep my mother in a nursing home?* In another year he said, *You can't rest on your laurels. Jay, do you know what it costs me to run this office?* In a later year it was: *You have to get me more enrollments. Do you know what it costs me to rent the Wonder Bowl for just one year?* Still later he said, *Snelson, you can't afford to be cocky. Do you have any idea what it costs me to operate the Quadrangle for just one month? Do you want to destroy the Institute?*

The best description of Galambos's motivation technology is the cliché, "Damned if you do, and damned if you don't."

Time and again he would put me in the no win position. When I produced the greatest volume of enrollments for Galambos, he called me "usurper"! He would act as if he and I were in competition for a static number of enrollments. However, the historical record shows that as I increased the size of the FEI pie, it was Galambos who got the lion's share of the revenue earned from this increased market, which was proper. Later, after he had created market conditions that had a disastrous effect upon the acquisition of new enrollments, he then blamed me, calling me the "destroyer" of the Institute.

(8)

ON DECEMBER 24, 1977 (Newtonday Eve), Galambos called to inform me that my termination was immediate. He cancelled my V-50, 1978 Spring Semester that we had previously agreed would be my final semester. I was to complete the current V-50, 1977 Fall Semester on February 16, 1978 (my final lecture for FEI). I was to interrupt my plans for the evening and deliver to him at 12:00 a.m. midnight at the Institute my copy of the Galambos V-50T tapes.

By this time I had already secured contracts for four V-50 locations after having successfully negotiated for 78 lecture dates in order to present the 1978 Spring Semester, The V-50 literature had been printed, several thousand envelopes typed and the assembling of the mailing almost completed and ready to mail to the FEI market. Why did Galambos suddenly cancel the V-50, 1978 Spring Semester that we had previously agreed I would present?

I stated earlier that one of the principal sources of Galambos's resentment of me was due to the fact that Galambos depended upon me for the generation of most of the Institute's new business out of which most of the post-V-50 follow-on business would come. In order to correct what Galambos called his "greatest mistake," that is, having to rely upon one person for the bulk of his market, he decided to initiate a new marketing technique. This involved presenting his V-50T tapes in Orange, Los Angeles, Ventura, and Santa Barbara Counties, not only during the summer, but also during the rest of

the year as well.

Galambos's first market test of this new approach was to schedule seven V-50T locations in Orange and Los Angeles Counties to start in the winter of 1978 prior to the start of my Spring 1978 V-50s. The task of his tape course contractors was to generate a market in the winter prior to my Spring Semester. However, as the end of December 1977 rapidly approached, there were only a handful of preenrollments for all of the winter locations combined. At the time, the last report I heard in December was that there was less than one enrollment per location. Around the same time, several tape course contractors complained to Galambos that some of the FEI graduates they had contacted said that they were going to wait and send their V-50 prospects to "Snelson's Spring Semester."

To Galambos, all of this was a personal affront, a slight that he would not tolerate. In his eyes, his market was choosing Snelson over Galambos. He thought, I'll show those ungrateful bastards. I'm going to cancel that son of a bitch Snelson's Spring V-50s. Now their choice won't be between Galambos in the winter and Snelson in the spring, it will be between Galambos or no V-50 at all. Says Galambos to his market: "Your choice is between me or oblivion! Now make your choice!"

The fact is, the FEI graduates never made a choice between Galambos and Snelson. Whether it was Galambos who taught V-50 or Snelson who taught V-50, in both cases it was the Galambos theory of property that was being taught. To be sure, there was a choice between Galambos presents Galambos and Snelson presents Galambos. If certain V-50 graduates preferred to bring their V-50 prospects to Snelson's lectures it was not because they chose Snelson over Galambos. It was because they may have realized that there was a greater probability that their V-50 prospects would enroll for the entire course if they attended Snelson's guest sessions.

The goal of the FEI graduate was not to choose Snelson over Galambos, but rather to get their prospects enrolled in V-50. Any FEI graduate worthy of the appellation "graduate" recognized that V-50 was the only door through which the people they really cared about could enter Galambos' V-201. Once their referral was enrolled in V-201, it was not critical whether they originally came through Galambos or Snelson.

(9)

I DO NOT WISH TO BELABOR the subject of Mrs. Thelma Jefferson at this point, but since she played a principal role in those events that led to my termination from the Institute and, hence, departure from active promulgation of the ideas of Galambos, I will not neglect her altogether,

There was never any question that Jefferson was performing a valuable service to both my organization, Volitional Science Associates, and The Free Enterprise Institute. At least a year before she resigned her position at V.S.A. [Volitional Science Associates], she stated quite clearly that her principal concern was that, since she realized I would never marry her, if I married someone else, then she would lose her position at V.S.A. to my wife. I attempted to give her every assurance that her position at Volitional Science Associates would always be secure as long as she wished to continue. Because she was not totally insensitive to the significance of her position at V.S.A., I truly believed that the greater probability would be that she would continue. It was not until I told Jefferson that I was going to be dating that I was jolted into some realization of the magnitude of her jealousy. She threatened to "get" whomever it was. Since there was implied violence in her threat, I decided that it would not be wise to tell her the name of the person I was dating. However, I did tell Galambos that I was dating one of his V-50T and V-201 graduates: Miss Lauren Gilbert.

One Sunday afternoon Galambos telephoned me and demanded that I agree to tell Jefferson that very evening that it was Lauren Gilbert I was dating. "If you will not," he said, "as soon as our conversation is ended, I will call Jefferson myself and tell her that it is Lauren Gilbert."

It is not yet clear to me by what authority Galambos can dictate such an ultimatum. Nevertheless, I agreed to inform Jefferson that evening and, therefore, Galambos agreed that he would not. However, I was not able to get through to Jefferson because as soon as my conversation with Galambos was ended, he immediately got on the telephone again with her. They were on the telephone for several hours. During this conversation with her, apparently Galambos could not restrain himself and blurted out that I was dating Lauren Gilbert. After

repeated attempts to get through to Jefferson, only to reach a busy signal, I left my residence to keep an engagement in Newport Beach. While in Newport Beach, I was able, finally, to ring through on Jefferson's line, but there was no answer.

As a direct result of Galambos's disclosure to Jefferson, she came charging over to my residence. Her alleged mission, she later claimed, was to pick up her cats that I had been keeping for her since she was not allowed to keep them in her apartment.

A few days prior to Jefferson's unexpected arrival at my residence, Miss Gilbert had agreed at my insistence (and over her objections) to store some of her furniture, clothing and other property in my garage. I also made available to her an empty dresser that was in the guest bedroom. Her property had been previously stored in a garage which she could no longer use.

When Jefferson arrived at my residence, I was still in Newport Beach attempting to reach her. She was in possession of a key to the front door and to the Xplorer 224 parked in the driveway. She entered the premises and went to the garage for her cats. There she saw Miss Gilbert's bicycle, furniture, and other property. Seizing a hammer, she proceeded to vent her rage by attacking Miss Gilbert's property. She destroyed virtually all of it. In fact, the force of her hammer blows was great enough to penetrate a steel filing cabinet. Jefferson herself will tell any willing listener every minute detail of her hammer attack which also included some of my property. She then loaded some of my property (a sound motion picture projector and other property) into the Xplorer and drove off.

If Galambos had not interfered in the first place, the hammer attack probably would never have taken place. Miss Gilbert's property was to have been moved just a few days later into her newly rented apartment, but most of it was destroyed before that move could be made.

Galambos has reminded me several times that it was he who got Jefferson to pay for the damage to Gilbert's and my property (through my own error, the amount of damage I claimed was inadequate). It is unlikely that Galambos was thinking of me. He wanted Jefferson to work for him. However, he could not afford the risk of letting it be known that she had attacked property, but had never made restitution for the attack. Galambos did not want Jefferson to have a negative image if

she was going to be contractually associated with him.

Much of Jefferson's difficulty was rooted to the fact that her comprehension of Galambos' ideas was at best shallow. It was common for her to have a hostile reaction to a statement, comment, or point that Galambos would make in a lecture we would be attending. After one of these sessions, it would take Mr. M. J. Lange and me a considerable amount of time to calm Jefferson down by attempting to explain to her why she had misunderstood the point Galambos was making. Even when we were successful in calming her down, we were seldom successful in convincing her she was wrong. Nevertheless, Jefferson's hostility toward Galambos grew steadily over the years. On those occasions in which she would have a direct blowup with Galambos, she would in time make a "peace offering" to him, but usually only after I, and sometimes Mr. Lange, had given her strong encouragement to do so.

After Jefferson's hammer attack, she embarked upon an active campaign in the FEI market to gain sympathy for herself and at the same time malign me. She scheduled personal meetings with members of my V-50 staff and prominent people in the FEI market crying to them what a "good guy" she was and what a "bad guy" I was. She would plead how loyal she had been to me all of the past years, and now she was being replaced. The image she wished to foster was her personal loyalty to me, but the facts do not fit the image,

To illustrate, on an evening in December of 1974, a party was given by Jefferson and my V-50 staff at the apartment of one of my staff assistants to celebrate my tenth anniversary of teaching V-50. On that very evening, as I later found out, Jefferson went off to a motel with one of the invited guests. This guest, an active customer of the Institute for many years and a personal friend of Galambos, told me directly of the incident. He gave me explicit permission to disclose this information to Galambos and further, if it should be necessary, he would testify under oath in court to the truth of his statement,

Another active FEI customer informed me that after his separation from his wife became known, Jefferson approached him while at his residence with the statement: "Jay and I no

longer have an exclusive relationship," She made it very clear that she was in pursuit of a physical relationship, but this particular individual was not responsive to her overtures. The first incident, at my tenth anniversary party, occurred two and a half years prior to my initial date with Miss Gilbert. The second one occurred several months before I first dated Miss Gilbert. I mention this now not to embarrass any of the participants including even Jefferson, but simply to establish that Jefferson's self-proclaimed loyalty to me was clearly spurious.

If either one or the other of these individuals that Jefferson approached had wished to establish a continuing relationship with her, then she would not have been as hostile to me over the fact that I was dating Miss Gilbert. Jefferson had known for many years that I had chosen not to be her fourth husband.

While Jefferson was scheduling private meetings on a one-to-one basis with my V-50 staff assistants and other prominent customers in the FEI market for the purpose of touting her self-righteousness and disparaging me, she was also threatening me with a civil suit unless I would pay her the equivalent of \$50,000. When that threat failed, she followed with a blackmail and extortion letter threatening to mail copies of the contents of a large manila envelope (sent to me for inspection) to the FEI market if I did not meet her demands for \$50,000 net after I paid her taxes. That failing, she then followed with a written threat to turn me into the Internal Revenue Service for what she claimed were income tax irregularities.

Jefferson even threatened Galambos's attorney with blackmail since he was at the time representing me in an attempt to get matters resolved between Jefferson and myself. If all of these various attempts of Jefferson's employing (1) threatened court action, (2) blackmail, (3) extortion, (4) threatening to incite the state to attack me through the I.R.S., and (5) threatening FEI's attorney with blackmail, failed to extract from me the coveted \$50,000, then it was her admitted mission to muster every bit of leverage she could exploit to malign me and undermine my position with Galambos so that he would take the decisive action to "fire Snelson."

Galambos dealt a great blow to my morale when with full cognizance of Jefferson's blackmail and extortion threats

against both myself and the Institute's attorney, her physical attack upon property, her outright rejection of every concept of morality taught by Galambos in threatening to incite the state to directly attack me which could even escalate into an attack upon the Institute and Galambos himself; with full knowledge of this, Galambos invited Jefferson to again attend the Institute's course for "elite" graduates: the Open End Course. He even went so far as to offer Jefferson a permanent position with the Institute. Of course she would never accept any permanent position with the Institute since her antipathy toward both Mr. and Mrs. Galambos was in many ways even greater than her antipathy toward me. Even though Jefferson would never accept a position on the FEI staff, she was soon serving in a staff position for various FEI tape course contractors. If there had been a question in anyone's mind concerning the credibility of Thelma Jefferson, those questions were laid to rest with her full endorsement by the Director of the Institute himself. He personally invited her to represent the Institute in an important staff position.

(10)

"GETTING RID OF SNELSON" SEEMED to be an obsession with Galambos. He appeared eager to grab on to anything that could provide him with justification for throwing me out of the Institute. To be sure, there was an internal conflict. He was fully aware that some 80% of the Institute's new V-50 and V-210 enrollments came through myself and Volitional Science Associates. To use his own expression: "Do you think that I want to cut off my nose to spite my face?"

This obsession was strong enough that Galambos, acting on a suggestion from Jefferson, invented the existence of a most incredibly fabulous conspiracy. "This conspiracy," said Galambos, "was designed to harm the Institute, if not destroy it." According to this story fabricated by Galambos—Jefferson, the "conspiracy" was headed by one Gordon Smith. It included three other principals: Gordon Brown, James Hill, and Lauren Gilbert. But what was the evidence for this alleged "conspiracy"?

Galambos had sufficient cause to not like his former

student Gordon Smith, but that dislike for Smith was not unique to Galambos. My own contempt for Smith antedated that of ⁵ Galambos and was shared independently by Lauren Gilbert.

Lauren Gilbert first enrolled in the Galambos presentation of Course V-50T given on tape at the residence of Mr. and Mrs. William T. Black. Miss Gilbert enrolled in V-50T on the express recommendation of Mr. James Hill. In the history of the Institute, Mr. Hill ranks in the top half dozen producers of new enrollments, therefore, directly or indirectly, he is one of the top producers of revenue for Galambos. This does not alter the fact that Galambos considers Mr. Hill to be a "flake." Mr. Hill, on the other hand, is known to have the highest regard and respect for Galambos and continues to this day to promote both Galambos and his products.

Miss Gilbert completed V-50T and although she was profoundly impressed with what she had heard, the best efforts of Mr. Black failed to convince her at that time to enroll in Course V-201. In the meantime, the Blacks had been attending a language course given by Gordon Smith. Because of her respect for the Blacks, Miss Gilbert enrolled in the next offering of the Smith language course. However, during the fourth session of the course, Smith started denigrating Galambos in the lecture. Miss Gilbert, outraged by Smith's unwarranted attack upon Galambos, withdrew from the Smith course. That was the last time Miss Gilbert saw Gordon Smith.

Sometime later, Smith started promoting his "philosophy course." He telephoned Miss Gilbert to solicit her enrollment in his new course and to encourage her to promote his courses and work for him. She refused all three of his offers with the blunt statement that he, Smith, had openly attacked Galambos and plundered his primary property. In spite of this obvious rejection, Smith persisted in soliciting Miss Gilbert's support. For the apparent purpose of aiding in this objective, Smith even had the insolence to tell Miss Gilbert that he was having an affair with her sister, Mrs. Star Clark. During the time that Mrs. Clark had been taking the language course with Miss Gilbert, Smith had been making passes at Mrs. Clark and annoying her in

⁵ My use of "contempt" here for my view then of Smith is too strong a term; "displeasure with" is more precise.

general. Miss Gilbert told Smith that she was fully aware that he had been annoying her sister and that his assertion was a lie. Furthermore she said, "My sister would have nothing to do with you if for no other reason than you are too ugly." Smith reportedly flew into a rage. Miss Gilbert's opinion of Smith can be summarized as follows: (1) he is repugnant, (2) he is a liar, (3) he is an intellectual thief, and (4) he is insane. Since then, Miss Gilbert has given strong admonition to anyone who might be interested in Smith or his courses.

Galambos presented "evidence" to me of this alleged conspiracy. For example, the ex-wife of a man who at one time had been active in the Institute, but was subsequently representing Gordon Smith, had made a remark to Galambos that, "Gordon Smith, Gordon Brown, and James Hill were having an affair with a girl named Lauren." This ex-wife, however, did not know this "Lauren's" last name.

Further "evidence" offered by Galambos to support this "conspiracy" hypothesis included the fact that Lauren Gilbert's father is a Jew, but her mother is not, therefore, Lauren is a half-Jew. Galambos personally informed me that "some of the most vicious anti-Semites in history were half-Jew."

Further "evidence" included the fact that Galambos did not like Gordon Brown and the ex-wife had claimed that Brown was having an affair with a girl named "Lauren." Lauren Gilbert has not seen Gordon Brown since the night of some three years ago when she was present at a meeting held at the recreation room of the apartment house of Brown's parents in Glendale. She was invited there to see a play in which Thomas Paine was the central figure. After the play concluded, Brown announced that he was going to play a recently recorded tape of a telephone conversation between himself and Mrs. Galambos (recorded without her permission or knowledge). Miss Gilbert, upon hearing this announcement, immediately left the room in disgust. She does not know whether or not the tape was ever played. Sometime later, Gordon Brown telephoned Miss Gilbert to offer her a writing job, but she informed him that as a result of his immoral behavior in recording the telephone conversation with Mrs. Galambos, she never wished to speak to him again. To this day, she has not.

According to the Galambos-Jefferson "conspiracy" hypothesis, one of the objectives of this conspiracy was to "get Snelson separated from the Institute." If there was, in fact, such a conspiracy, then Galambos and Jefferson were the principals in Galambos's ultimate decision to render "Snelson's separation from the Institute" a reality. If there was such a conspiracy, then both Galambos and Jefferson fell victim to the conspiracy, and the conspirators must be enjoying a colossal victory celebration. My personal view of this conspiracy hypothesis is that the entire affair was a fabulous concoction whose origin could only have been conceived in aberration, apparition, and malice.

In the end, the Director of the Institute, the man who for many years had claimed to be my best friend, the man with whom had invested thirteen years building the market for his products — Andrew J. Galambos — told me:

Jay, I'm not telling you who to marry. You can marry anyone you want. But if you marry Lauren Gilbert, then you have just resigned from the faculty.

Now, understand, I have no objections to you getting married. If you want to marry someone, then — I give you permission to marry my number one "daughter" Cheryl [Croxall]. Then you can be my son-in-law.

If you don't want to marry Cheryl, then I give you permission to marry my number two "daughter" Sue Wallace.

If you don't want to marry Croxall or Wallace, then you will have to make your choice: Snelson, it's either me or Gilbert. Now which is it?

During the over thirteen years that I devoted to the successful promulgation of the intellectual property of Andrew Galambos, I only asked him of one single "favor." It was simply, "Don't make Lauren Gilbert the issue." His answer, "No! What's

in it for me if I let you remain on the faculty and marry Gilbert? You can't have it both ways, sonny boy. It's me or Gilbert! Now make your choice!"

Lauren Gilbert is one of Galambos's most loyal students, and even though she has been irresponsibly slandered and maligned by Galambos, she still to this day defends the science of volition, the theory of primary property, and even Galambos, from all detractors. Here is a beautiful woman with intelligence, integrity, and loyalty to principle whose only "sin" was in loving me.

(11)

I WILL NOW DISCUSS AN INCIDENT that took place on Thanksgiving Day in 1972, at the San Diego residence of Mr. and Mrs. M. J. Lange. I refer here to this incident because Galambos has called it, "the worst thing you ever did, Snelson."

During the summer of 1971, Thelma Jefferson and I spent several months touring Europe primarily in search of those places that were of ideological significance relative to the ideas Galambos had been teaching. We were aware of the fact that our sensitivity to almost everything we were seeing of cosmological and technological importance was due directly or indirectly to the inputs that had come from courses given by Galambos. Therefore, we were constantly in search of ideological mementoes and various places and things to photograph that would make suitable slide material for Galambos's personal use or for use in some of his lectures. Subsequently, Galambos did use in his lectures many of the photographic slides that were taken in Europe.

By 1972, we had not yet had an opportunity to present to Mr. and Mrs. Galambos the various gifts we had purchased for them in Europe, or to show the slides we thought would be of the greatest interest to them. When Jefferson and I were invited along with the Galamboses to the Lange's for Thanksgiving dinner, I thought this would be a good opportunity to include the Langes in our gift and slide presentation to the Galamboses. We also had a number of gifts from Europe for the Langes.

It was agreeable to the Langes and Galamboses that we

show the slides. However, Galambos said that he wanted us to arrive at the Langes an hour early to arrange the projection equipment so that he did not have to be involved in the set-up.

The evening prior to Thanksgiving, I gave a V-50 lecture in Orange County at the Inn of Tomorrow. Earlier, I had gotten together the slides we intended to show. However, in reviewing them again after the lecture, it appeared that there were too many slides that Galambos would look upon as a waste of his time. Therefore, it was decided to further edit the slides of which there were originally more than two thousand. Unfortunately, this took longer than I had anticipated. The editing continued through the night and on into the Thanksgiving morning and early afternoon. To add to the problem, the trip to San Diego took longer than was anticipated. The result was that we arrived at the Lange's residence at the original time we had discussed, but not the hour earlier that would have enabled us to set up the projection equipment prior to the arrival of the Galamboses. I entered the residence unshaven and with a somewhat disheveled appearance from having been up all night completing the editing. Galambos was justified in his irate reaction to what he later called my "slovenly" appearance. Clearly the evening was not off to a good start. Nevertheless, I was optimistic about the final outcome of the evening, since as far as I was concerned the evening was intended as our expression of gratitude to Galambos for his inspiration that made Europe 1971 not just another tourist trip, but essentially an ideological pilgrimage.

The fiasco that arose from that evening at the Lange's came from a source that could not have been anticipated. It started with a seemingly innocent action on the part of the Langes. They invited Jefferson and myself to stay over the night of Thanksgiving at their residence. I do not recall the actual time interval prior to Thanksgiving that the invitation was extended to us, but it was from several days to several weeks.

At this point it is appropriate to discuss another source of Galambos's irritation with me. When I lectured in the San Jose area and when Jefferson traveled with me to supervise the registration and staffing procedures, we would always stay as previously invited guests at the residence of a graduate. Jefferson and I always stayed in separate rooms. As

compensation to our hosts, they were given gifts of ideological significance or some other form of remuneration.

Galambos was irritated by the fact that I would stay at a graduate's residence and not at a hotel. He argued that it would be easier and even less expensive to stay at a hotel. His argument is correct, but I had another reason for preferring a private residence to a hotel or motel. If we obtained separate rooms in a hotel, few, if any, would know it. However, when we stayed in separate rooms in a private residence, everyone knew it. Since Jefferson and I were not married, I preferred it that way.

When Jefferson and I stayed Thanksgiving night at the Lange's, we stayed in separate rooms. I slept on a small couch in the living room. Jefferson slept in the second small bedroom on a small twin bed. However, the problem arose when Galambos learned in the next few days that we had stayed overnight at the Lange's.

When the Galamboses were leaving the Lange's, I walked with them to their automobile. Galambos asked me to get a motel room and stay the night in San Diego. My answer to him was either yes I would stay the night in San Diego or yes I would get a motel. When Galambos learned later we had stayed the night at the Lange's, he was convinced that we had imposed ourselves upon them without a prior invitation. When I explained to Galambos that we had a prior invitation to stay overnight, he was livid with rage. He said:

Snelson, you're a liar! How could you have possibly gotten an invitation from the Langes? Lange was my friend long before he was yours. Do you think, Snelson, that Lange would invite you to his house before he would invite me? Snelson, you're lying.

I was beginning to get the message that we had another problem that had failed to anticipate.

There was a perfectly logical explanation why the Langes had not previously invited the Galamboses to stay overnight. The Langes at that time lived in a relatively small two bedroom house. Their small second bedroom contained one small twin bed. This is where Jefferson slept. The Langes were aware that the Galamboses required their own private room with a king-size bed. These accommodations simply were not available. In contrast to the Galamboses, our requirements were not as strict.

I realized that Lange was suddenly thrust into a difficult position.

Galambos was determined to make a false alternative out of the situation. Either Lange was guilty of ingratitude by inviting me as an overnight house guest before inviting Galambos, or I was guilty of imposing upon the Langes without a prior invitation.

Galambos would not drop the subject. With him it was becoming a *cause célèbre*. He brought up the subject again at the Airport Marina Hotel after a session of Course V-76E. Again he accused me of lying and again I told him that we had been invited in advance to be house guests of the Langes. Finally, my tolerance over this issue was wearing thin and I said: *If I'm lying, then you have my immediate resignation from the Institute*. When the impact of my statement penetrated, Galambos shook with uncontrollable rage: "Drop it!" he said, "Drop it!"

The last time the subject came up was sometime shortly before my final exit from FEI. On this occasion I asked: *Did you ever get around to asking the Langes if we had been invited in advance to stay the night?* His answer, *Bonnie (Mrs. Lange) said something about you being invited, but I'm sure she was just covering up for you*. The free translation: not only am I lying on the subject, but now Mrs. Lange is a liar. One can only assume that Galambos found it easier at this point to implicate the Langes in a "coverup" rather than extend to me an apology for all the years since 1972 that he had been accusing me of lying on the question. One cannot easily forget the Galambos challenge: "Have I ever been unfair?"

(12)

THE RESENTMENT OF GALAMBOS toward me, due to my success with the presentation of his theory, rose to the surface in public on more than one occasion. I will never forget the incident that took place, many years ago, at the Airport Marina Hotel during one of the early Open End Course sessions. Without any warning to me, Galambos suddenly called me to come to the lectern to present my imitation of a fundamentalist preacher. He had heard me give an impromptu satire on a Baptist preacher some years earlier at a coffee shop table in the presence of Harry Browne and Alvin Lowi. At first I thought he was joking, but he soon made it clear that he was serious. As graciously as possible, I tried to decline this unexpected invitation. But Galambos refused to accept "no" for an answer. My diffidence in accepting his request was motivated by my reluctance to make an ass of myself in front of his OEC class and

my former V-50 students. It is one thing to mimic a preacher for a few minutes in front of a few of your friends, and quite another thing to do it in front of a room full of people and pull it off without any preparation. No less a speaker than Mark Twain would often invest several weeks of preparation for one of his famous "impromptu" speeches.

The more I declined, the more insistent Galambos became. Finally, his insistence was backed with overt anger and I came to the lectern, made a few remarks that drew laughter from the audience, and I again declined. I do not remember any of the exact words of Galambos — but he was livid with rage and he proceeded to severely berate me in front of the class. This even went on for some time after I had returned to my seat. He still refused to let the matter drop. Later, in private, he blamed me for ruining his lecture. At the time of these early OEC sessions, I believe that Galambos was still publicly claiming I was his best friend. One might conclude that to deliberately subject your best friend to public humiliation is a "different" sort of friendship.

However, in terms of the magnitude of my humiliation at the hands of Galambos, what took place at the final OEC I attended makes this earlier incident appear benign. Some witnesses have suggested that perhaps Galambos was inspired by the Dreyfus court-martial: the public rending of the epaulettes, the formal defrocking, the degrading for all to witness. If Galambos were to optimize the magnitude of humiliation, what else could he do? I do not think he left room for improvement upon the technique he employed.

The crowning insult during the "summary court-martial" came when Galambos had the incredible impudence to demonstrate his self-proclaimed gratitude by presenting to me, as part of this sham, a book by Voltaire, one gold coin, and one silver coin. These tokens must have been in lieu of the "gold watch." There are times when Galambos reaches the summit of naiveté. Did he think I would participate in this inglorious insult by publicly accepting his tendered crumbs? Did he think I would sanction the sham by becoming an accessory? The answer to both questions is — yes, he did.

Galambos is the master of many things. He is a consummate master of a device called the "insult." No one can insult with the degree of acumen displayed by Galambos. He is a virtuoso. He loves it. It is clearly one of his pleasures.

Galambos is a master "humiliator." Insult and humiliation are two of his favorite weapons. Future historians may dub him "Galambos the

Humiliator," a fitting tribute to the zeal he displays in destroying his friends who have fallen from grace.

The unvented hatred of Galambos for me must have finally reached its culmination at what was to be my last attendance at an OEC session. Galambos saved for the final "topic" of the evening his formal termination of the Senior Lecturer and former Professor of Volitional Science. I had no prior knowledge that he was going to make such an announcement. Yes, it took me completely by surprise, as it was calculated to do. Galambos must have thought he was Scipio, so complete was the surprise. By the time he was finished, I was stunned. I was literally rooted to my chair. I tried to stand, but my knees buckled. I waited a few minutes in my chair, struggling for composure. Again, I tried to stand, and again my legs would not support me. It must have been some five minutes before I finally made it to my feet. Then I feared someone might attempt to engage me in conversation because I did not think I could speak. A few people spoke to me. With the greatest will power, I managed to whisper a few words in return. As quickly as possible, I made my last and final exit from the Quadrangle.

Galambos now claims that one of his greatest achievements was the courage he displayed in "firing Snelson." At subsequent OEC sessions, Galambos has repeatedly castigated his students for their

6

Andrew's incredible and irrational hatchet job thrown at me as I sat in the first row of the Quadrangle — an educational facility established to be a center of learning rather than a center of betrayal for which I was not to be the last target — was a masterpiece of calumny, distortions, half-truths, pernicious innuendo, outright lies and, in my experience, a peerless example of win-lose strategy: for me to gain, you must lose; for Galambos to flourish, Snelson must perish. His was a colossal entrepreneurial miscalculation. The dozens of FEI Course Contractors that Andrew had rounded up to fill the void following his destruction of Volitional Science Associates were not equal to his assigned task of at least gaining, in the beginning as was said and hoped for, some "70% of the enrollments that Snelson" would have generated had V.S.A. continued as the prime FEI Course Contractor. Following the treachery of my dismissal, FEI enrollments soon fell off geometrically. In my role as a Course Contractor, my aim from at least 1970 and on was to increase the number of FEI enrollees and customers at a faster rate than Andrew and Suzanne could alienate them and drive them out of the FEI market. Even with that negative marketing handicap to overcome, within only two V-50 semesters after the "Flatland Program" debacle of 1976, V.S.A. had turned the trend upward in gaining new V-50 enrollments. Had I been allowed to continue, by this time, The Free Enterprise Institute, at the very least, would be a national — if not international — institution with hundreds of thousands of enrollees and customers,

gross insensitivity in failing to give him a standing ovation after he delivered his "summary court-martial," or as one prominent FEI graduate called the affair: "Galambos's assassination speech." In witnessing the special treatment meted out by Galambos against the one whose entire life's work was dedicated to fostering the market success of Galambos and his ideas, one is compelled to anticipate with much trepidation and even horror what Galambos must be reserving for his enemies.

(13)

DURING MY FINAL MONTHS AT FEI, Galambos increased in frequency the number of caustic insults fired at me in his various classes. At the last OEC I attended, Galambos announced in his "Snelson termination speech" that I had one remaining lecture of V-50 to give on the coming Thursday in Orange County. Subsequently, Galambos feared that during my final Lecture for FEI (February 16, 1978), I might take this last opportunity to return a few critical shots in his direction. On the day of my last V-50 lecture, Galambos himself arrived prior to the lecture to warn me: *Snelson, if you say anything during the lecture about your termination, then I will personally take the lecture stand and refute anything you have to say on the subject.* Galambos had a number of reasons for being present that night, but the principal one was to challenge anything I might say that he did not like.

For over thirteen years I had been paying tributes to this revolutionary social innovator, Galambos, in every lecture that I presented in association with FEI. By this time I had given some 2,500 lectures, each lecture being three to four hours in length. For me, it was not only a pleasure to pay credit and tribute to Galambos, but furthermore, it was a source of gratification to be able to impart to my classes an intellectual comprehension of the significance of what Galambos has achieved. I sought to instill within them excitement at the prospect of hearing the theory of primary property from the innovator himself.

After nearly fourteen years and twenty-five hundred lectures of paying tribute, gratitude, recognition, and honor to the founder of the science of volition, Andrew Galambos — he thought — with one remaining lecture to deliver, I would reverse my position of fourteen years and twenty-five hundred lectures, and attack him!

Many months before I finally gave that last V-50 lecture, I both witnessed and learned indirectly that Galambos was continuing to insult me in his lectures and announcements. This was a source of annoyance, especially since the overwhelming majority of his students had been at one time my own V-50 students. I had been instrumental in motivating them to enroll in Galambos's advanced courses in the first place. My principal reaction to Galambos's attacks and insults from the podium perhaps can best be described as one of almost overwhelming incredulity.

Nevertheless, I had no intention of returning Galambos's insults in my final lecture, or in any other lecture. I had known since December 24, 1977, that my very last lecture to be presented through The Free Enterprise Institute would be in Orange County on February 16, 1978. I decided there was one way that would be fitting and proper to conclude my last lecture of my twenty-fifth semester. I would extend to Galambos the greatest tribute I had ever attempted in a V-50 lecture. Quite by coincidence, the date of that final lecture, February 16, was also the anniversary of the death of Galambos's father. Since Galambos never would have developed his ideas on volition without his father's influence, I took the time to give a brief tribute to his father — Joseph B. Galambos.

(14)

GALAMBOS HAD A "SON" IN ME. I was completely devoted to this man, but he was too insensitive to recognize it. His sensitivity was commonly compartmentalized. Perhaps this was best summarized by one of his prominent students who added one word to the Galambos quote, *There is no such thing as a small interference with Galambos's property*. Galambos is super-sensitive about his own property and his own feelings. This may be the reaction of a man who has generated a great wealth of intellectual property and who is continually reminded of the extent of his vulnerability when it comes to securing that property. It may be that in his own eyes the magnitude of his primary property looms so large that by contrast it obscures all other property from view.

Galambos had earned my love, my affection, and my unwavering loyalty. In searching for every possible explanation for his attack upon me, I can find no other than the fact that he was blinded by a totally irrational jealousy. However, the Galambos ego could never accept this

less than glorious explanation. If questioned, "Why did you fire Snelson?" Galambos will answer: "I had to in order to protect my historical image."

There is only one person in a position to tarnish the Galambos historical image: Andrew J. Galambos. That image will be a product of Galambos' actions more than any other factor. Galambos sees himself as the paragon of total integrity, complete honesty, unblemished fairness, and the perfect gentlemen. If all of these noble virtues are truly the components of the Galambos character, then I am certain that that positive image will be the one that will survive throughout history.

(15)

GALAMBOS HAS TAUGHT US that one of the virtues of the magnificent Scipio was his master strategy of converting his strongest enemy into his strongest ally. In the domain of diplomacy, that's difficult to improve upon. In contrast, Galambos seems compelled to convert me, his strongest ally, into his strongest enemy. Yet, for myself, I fail to see the profit to be earned by assuming the role of the enemy of Galambos.

Even if Galambos by his ingratitude toward me has diminished my love and affection for him, this fact has not altered my sincere desire to see his ideas more broadly disseminated, to see him successfully publish those ideas, and to see him receive full credit for his intellectual achievements. I am still defending his property. Recently, my advice was sought by an individual who was intending to publish a book that he was concerned might possibly contain intellectual property from Galambos's courses. I critiqued some of this individual's material pointing out certain concepts that were clearly developed by Galambos. He agreed with my analysis of the intellectual property. As a result of our discussion, he has decided not to publish those concepts developed by Galambos.

But will Galambos ever publish? If he fails to write his book, he will be making a greater mistake than perhaps even he has anticipated. If he does not personally author the book but has it made from transcriptions of his lectures, then the sale of the book will be restricted mainly to those few who have taken at least V-201. I cannot visualize many beyond this limited circle of V-201 graduates paying the handsome purchase price. Even if the book were available without charge, I would not expect that many people would be motivated to read it. Once those who have taken

V-201 have passed out of existence, the potential readership will be negligible. I do not believe that a transcription of even his best lecture series can be effectively sold.

If I had not seen evidence to the contrary, I might think the problem that impedes the writing of the book is that Galambos just can't write. However, the few short pieces that he has published indicate that Galambos is potentially a brilliant author. For example, the five column pamphlet "(C ≠ C)" "Conservatism Is Not Capitalism — Capitalism Is Not Conservatism" is exceptionally well written. In spite of its short length, it packs a powerful punch.

If Galambos does personally author the book, I am certain that the potential readership will extend far beyond the FEI market. However, even then, the book will not sell itself. Therefore, I will make it one of my goals to see that the book does sell. If Galambos does not author the book, but instead it is made from lecture transcriptions, I will still seek the successful promulgation of his ideas and make it *my* aim to see that he receives complete credit for his intellectual achievements. This attitude is simply a reflection of my genuine gratitude to Galambos for having designed the foundation of a durable social structure.

I will always be thrilled by the scope and magnitude of the science of volition. My loyalty to the promotion of that science remains steadfast. If it should become necessary, and circumstances should force me into such a position, I would defend both Galambos and his theory of property with my life. As our society continues in its rapid decline and the magnitude of the tyranny increases daily, those of us who have been the most visible and outspoken advocates of total capitalism may in time find ourselves, either figuratively or literally, like Bruno, on one of those stakes. If this less than pleasant prospect should become a reality, we can depart from this world with the solace that in time the victory of total liberalism will reward us with at least a measure of vindication. The future is ours. The question yet to be answered is, will there be one?

Jay Stuart Snelson
Huntington Beach, California
May 31, 1979

Printed especially for Cheryl Croxall Spehar, September 18, 1999