

ATTEMPTED PRIMARY MURDER
NAMES OF FORMER GALAMBOS COLLEAGUES
DELETED FROM V-50 DD BY THE TRUSTEES OF GALAMBOS' ESTATE

In my letter to Wayne Joyner of February 4, 2014, I complained that while listening to the online version of V-50, known as V-50 DD, I noticed that Jay Snelson's name and the surrounding verbiage had been edited out. (I didn't mention that other names had been deleted as well.) It had been done so skillfully that if I hadn't been reading my copy of *Sic Itur Ad Astra* as I listened I wouldn't have noticed. My complaint was that it is a historical fact that Galambos referred to Snelson in a positive way. I remarked to Joyner that Galambos had called the act of removing people from history, as practiced by such people as Joseph Stalin, "primary murder." I thought that the names of people should be left in for historical accuracy, with a note explaining that Galambos had later fallen out with them.

I hoped that Joyner didn't know of the deletions (and other errors), would agree with me, and, as a guardian of Galambos' reputation, would thank me and see to it that Snelson's name was restored and the errors corrected. But in his reply of March 21, 2014 he defended the deletion, saying that it followed Galambos' standard practice, and that in any event Snelson had committed "primary suicide." I was up to Session Four or Five when this correspondence occurred, and Joyner sent me a refund check. I didn't hear the rest, and realized that I had ended my attempt to hear V-201 again.

I defended Snelson by attaching two key documents to my reply of June 28, 2014, and have posted them here under "Galambos and Snelson." Galambos' students can decide whether the deletion of someone's name, and in a secretive way, is a moral thing to do.

Based on what Joyner told me, if you have taken V-50 DD or are taking it now, these are the people whose names have been removed: Jay Snelson, Alvin Lowi, Jr., and Harry Browne. Here is how they were mentioned by Galambos in *Sic Itur Ad Astra*:

Session 1, pp. 9-10. What would you say is the single most important problem we've got, above and beyond all other problems? What's the most significant question you can ask today, in 1968? Do you think it is "*Who is going to win the World Series?*" Is that the most significant question of the day? Or, "*Who is going to be the next president?*" Is LSD the most important question? Is it communism? Is it internal socialism? **Mr. Snelson**, my colleague, put it this way: "*What will be the human population of the earth in one hundred years? The answer is one of two things — large or zero.*" That's the most important question.

Session 2, p.51. All science without exception, physical, biological and volitional, depends upon observation as the source of facts. Some people say, "*Well, there are other ways of learning things besides observation. Aren't you restricting the field?*"

"Not in the least! Name for me another useful way of getting facts."

"Well, there must be some other way" people, in general, will like to contradict and interject and argue. For example: "*How many angels can dance on a head of a pin? That is not obtainable observationally, yet it's a useful question.*"

"Useful to whom?," I ask. That is one of the questions that occupied the thinking effort of many so-called scholars during the Dark Ages. That's why they're called Dark Ages because this was the best kind of question they had to think about! [Scattered chuckles from the audience.] I didn't make up that question. That was a standard question then! How many angels could dance on the head of a pin? To settle the matter once and for all my colleague, Mr. Snelson, one day said, "732!"; his answer was just as good as anybody else's. [Laughter from the audience and AJG]

Session 7, p.245. To me, a person who fights for freedom by fighting communists, especially when he calls people communists who aren't communists, and then promotes American controls over our free market mechanism, such as anti-trust laws and statism — this man is just as much of a statist as anybody I know. This led me, back in the first year of the institute, to coin the expression: "You can't fight Russian communism with American socialism." Or to put it the way my colleague, Mr. Snelson, put it, referring to the Vietnam War, we are trying to "teach the enemy that our brand of socialism is better than their brand of socialism." This is another way of saying it.

Session 14, pp.578-9. Do not teach this Course out of context. It is a disaster! I can't do it, let alone anyone else. So the problem is not to teach the course, but to get them to be exposed to it, and, of course, that involves the concept of advertising. There is a way to get people here, and the easiest way to do it is not to tell them anything except that it's a "value." You know, that's how you sell television sets. You don't say, "This is a great device to make a practical development of Maxwell's equations" which they never heard of and don't care about, but: "This brings pictures into your living room." Or tell them, "Well, this has improved my whole life." Or, "I have benefited from it. I understand things I never could see the connection of before." But don't tell them the actual conclusion because that's disastrous.

Let me illustrate. This is a brochure we've developed. I won't say it's a good brochure, but it's at least not as damaging as the earlier brochures the Institute has had. The first brochure was essentially an essay on the subject of Capitalism. I should have sold it! Instead it was a promotional brochure — terrible! Mr. Snelson then wrote a better one that didn't give an essay on the subject of freedom and Capitalism; it, on the other hand, gave some of the high points of the course. It was also poor — good brochure but it doesn't sell. This one doesn't do as much harm. This one says nothing about the course itself; just other people's opinions of it or comments: "V-50 has improved my life." "V50 has opened up a whole new world for me." "V-50 is the best investment of time and money I've ever made." "These are the comments we hear most often about the bold new concept we call V-50, so if you're afraid of change, don't open this folder; you may never be the same again." It hopes to provoke and stimulate curiosity. It does not create any information about the course itself. Some people, of course, are not curious, so they won't come. Of course, that's the majority of them. The back page gives some actual endorsements from real people who have taken the course, just a few of the many comments. This is the "brand name."

If you say, "it has done thus and such for me," and if they have a respect for you, knowing who you are, then they might try it themselves. That is the most successful

technique. The course is education, but you've got to stimulate their curiosity to want this information in the first place. Until that curiosity exists, the course cannot do any good for anybody. First, they have to have the curiosity to want it. And it might be some casual remark. The less stimulation that is required, the more innately curious the person is. Some people require very little exposure; others require a great deal of exposure, and this is the difference in people, and we'll come to that concept of exposure in the next session.

Session 16 pp.626-627. Before forgetting to do so, I think it's time I gave you the name of this Course. Did anyone notice that it hasn't been given until now? Did this occur to anyone before, that the name of the Course has not yet been presented? Did you wonder if it had a name? Of course, the Course has a name; it's just that from past experience I've found it wasn't too safe to use it in public. We used to have it on our brochure, and Mr. Snelson talked me out of using it there. The name of the Course sounds very tame now, but you may not have reacted that way to it before. The name of the Course is: "*Capitalism—the Liberal Revolution.*"

Session 1, p.9.

I'd like to read to you one particular thing written by Fred Shannon. It's a one-paragraph extract from something called "*America's Economic Growth*"³, which was provided to me a year ago by a friend of mine, Mr. Lowi, and I think it's apropos. It describes the costs of WWII. It says...

Session 4, p.112. [In discussing Galambos' use of the terms "tribal chief" and "witch doctor," as the two kinds of political leaders, and after discussing the Pharaohs.] Later on, in England and other places, it was watered down a bit. The king was more of a human being. But he did rule by divine right. You think this is a discussion of ancient history, I'm sure. No it isn't. We've still got divine right, except it's called by a different name. The new concept of divine right is based upon economic gobbledygook. [Again chuckles from AJG.] Please note that I have called the two instruments of leadership, the tribal chief and the witch doctor. This distinction I will maintain through the Course.

I'd like to acknowledge at this point where I developed this usage. I'd been using "tribal chief" for many, many years myself, and then I developed the concept of the fellow who helped the tribal chief, and I kept referring to him as the "intellectual partner" of the tribal chief. Then it was made clear to me by one of my colleagues, Alvin Lowi, that that is essentially what a witch doctor does, so I started calling this character a witch doctor. It didn't occur to me to associate this with the primitive African and voodoo titled witch doctor but, of course, that's what he really is — the intellectual partner of the tribal chief. And back in 1960, when I met Ayn Rand, I had a discussion with her on the subject and brought this up, and Lowi and I were there and we mentioned "tribal chief" and "witch doctor" and she got all shook up about this. "*Where did you get those words?*" she asked. Well, I'd been using this all along. It turned out that her associate, Nathaniel Branden, had already coined the expression "Attila and the witch doctor" but they hadn't published it yet. It was later published in a book called *For the New Intellectual*⁴. They also used this designation, except that instead of saying "tribal chief," they called it "Attila," and I don't see any

reason to glorify one particular hoodlum over all the others. *[Chuckles from AJG]* So I'll continue to refer to it in the general sense of "tribal chief." We independently have developed the same usage, although I believe mine to be a more general one.

Session 5, p.149-150. There's also a positive concept of justice, of which the other is a sub-case. You can define justice positively, directly. Justice, in a positive sense, is simply the natural, rational and moral — not artificial or coercive — consequence of any act. By the way, that way of stating it was developed by **Harry Browne**, after he took my original Course. He added this way of saying it, so I'd like to give him the credit. The way I stated it originally is that positive justice — and this, by the way, is partly mine and partly **Alvin Lowi's** way of saying it — is to recognize that whenever some act is performed by an individual, if it injures someone, then there is some form of loss of reputation to that person. And if it benefits a person and he profits from the act of another, then he receives gratitude and reward for his achievement. That's also justice. This is the natural consequence to an act; reward for positive achievement and punishment for negative or destructive achievement.

Session 6, pp.204-205 That's why there are no questions in this Course until *the* workshop, because you don't know any questions to ask yet. *[Scattered laughter from the audience and AJG.]* You're beginning to get some, but the Course is now six sessions along. It reminds me of something my colleague **Mr. Lowi** once said. When someone gave him an answer that sounded very good, he would say, *"That's a wonderful answer. Now what's the question to which that's the answer?"* You have to know enough to ask a question.

Session 15 pp. 604-605. Let's analyze some of the physical characteristics of images in more detail. I'm going to pass to a technological application of optics, which is photography. My colleague, **Alvin Lowi**, many years ago suggested I use the camera and camera concepts as the basic way of demonstrating this. The kind of an image you have first depends on the light flux — the flow of light. That, in turn, depends on the size of the opening, which is the aperture in a camera. Then you have to determine how long the aperture is kept open. The amount of light that goes through depends on three things: the size of the opening, how long it's kept open and the intensity of the light that goes through. That will determine the intensity of the image.

Session 16 p. 642. The Present World As Flatland. Well, you see, this has an ideological translation for which I'm indebted to **Alvin Lowi**, my colleague, who was with me when I founded the Institute, and was once a lecturer for us. In 1964, I put this into the Course. I had shown *Flatland* to **Mr. Lowi**, and with unusual depth of perception, he immediately extended this from the obvious geometrical, mathematical, physical analogy, to an ideological one that I'd like to transfer to you. The people you are dealing with in the rest of the world live in ideological Flatland. They handle problems on the basis of what's known to them, just like the geometrical Flatlander can only talk in terms of two dimensions. Well, these people have only one way in which they solve problems, that is, somebody's got to make people do things. Coercion. That's their dimension.