

HOW IT ALL WENT WRONG: GALAMBOS' THEORY MISAPPLIED

by Richard Boren
September, 2016

“...IT'S OK IF THE BOOK TAKES SEVERAL MORE YEARS TO COMPLETE...SEVERAL MORE DECADES WOULD BE BETTER.”

Who wrote this, and when? Many of those who purchased Galambos' book decades ago (the most common year probably being 1978) but still haven't received it will be surprised to learn that it was Peter V. Giansante, one of the trustees of Andrew J. Galambos' estate. He made the statement early in the year 2000, less than a year after the first volume of Galambos' book was published. The document in which he expressed this opinion and attempted to justify it is below. Also below is my analysis of the situation.

In April, 1999, two years after Galambos' death, Volume One of *Sic Itur Ad Astra* was published at the direction of the trustees at the time, Wayne Joyner and Charles W. Hayes. The book was distributed to the prepaid buyers at a special event, and publication of the remaining volumes was said to be on track. But then something changed. No more volumes were produced, and the first volume was withdrawn from sale. Why? Peter Giansante, a man who thought it would be a good idea to ignore the contract and withhold publication for decades, was made a trustee.

Mr. Giansante apparently convinced Joyner, Hayes, and other colleagues, including more recent trustee Cheryl Cerell, that the rest of the book should not be published and that what had been published should be withdrawn from sale. Following Giansante's "leadership" the trustees reneged on the contract Galambos had entered into with his students, whereby they had paid for his book in advance. As any Galambos graduate would recognize, this interference with property (and without even a mention of restitution) was a criminal act. With each day of non-publication the crime continues. Giansante appears to be on the way to achieving his goal—delaying publication for decades. The original book buyers will, of course, be dead by then.

I read what Giansante thought in a document provided to me in July 2014 by the operator of the Volitional Science discussion group on Yahoo. To the best of my knowledge only a handful of people know of this document's existence, and it is being disseminated here to a wide audience for the first time.

The positions of Mr. Giansante as stated therein are his public positions today, and recent graduates and current enrollees would accept them as the "official" FEI policy. However, at one time he kept these ideas to himself, and for good reason. I believe that the vast majority of Galambos' graduates, especially those who went beyond V-201, to say nothing of the Professor himself, who actively solicited students to purchase the book, would have been

shocked and repelled by them. A suggestion that this man should be made a trustee would have been looked upon as madness. And yet that is what happened.

I hope that every Galambos student, both past and present, will read what is below and act on it by voicing your opinion to the other trustees and, if you are a book buyer, insist that they publish, demanding arbitration if they refuse.

Now let's proceed to the document and an analysis of its content.

At one time the Volitional Science discussion group allowed people to join under pseudonyms, and that's what Peter Giansante did, possibly using six or seven false names, one of which was "Miss Stovetail." Here's part of what the discussion group operator wrote in telling me about Giansante's communication:

Our first interactions were with Miss Stovetail, who eventually claimed to be Vandra Duquesne. Vandra claimed she would only communicate some details to us via PGP encryption. We exchanged keys, via the list, to verify we were each other, and could send signed and encrypted email. Vandra sent me a Microsoft Word doc about how someone wanted to kill her, or some such. I'll have to search for the document. Sadly for Vandra, inside the metadata (I predate the NSA capabilities by many years!) was a field that had the author's real name: Giansante. That was the smoking gun on his aliasing shenanigans, as the document was sent encrypted and signed thus proving it to be an original document from Giansante.

During one of the list discussions, around March 20, 2000, I wrote:

The more I think of it, the publication of the book might be at odds with the original purpose, in terms of building Freedom. Perhaps the whole thing should have been done contractually, without resorting to traditional publishing. The book might be a big mistake - the biggest mistake ever - because there is, at least in the current society, a loss of control associated with the publication of it.

Miss Stovetail then sent me a long missive in response.

The key paragraph from the email below, where I think Giansante (Miss Stovetail) agrees that Galambos did intend to give away his work, as he says it was a mistake, thus indicating that was in fact Galambos' intention to publish openly:

Here is what Peter Giansante, using the alias, "Miss Stovetail," had to say in March, 2000. I have redacted the proper names of others at their request, and the yellow highlighting was added by me. Note: As additional evidence of the source, someone familiar with Giansante's writing style says that it bears his "thoughtprints" (a Galambos term).

[Salutation name redacted]

I apologize for not having responded to your gentlemanly and thoughtful response to my original posting ("Rather No Blather"). My response to your note is in progress, but it had no particular

urgency in context with other matters. However, the comment that you have made above is of such import that I must respond immediately.

First let me say that I originally wrote this response intending to post it on the forum. However, I'm not sure that such a posting is appropriate. In the first place, my comments below contain language that must certainly be provocative to some readers of the forum. While I support the "free exchange of ideas" (to the extent that it is constructive rather than destructive, and consistent with proprietary considerations), it is not my purpose to irritate or anger others.

Additionally, as you read what follows, it will be evident that I have very strong opinions on the subject discussed herein, and I fear that my comments may be perceived as arrogant. I acknowledge that there are perspectives from which such a criticism may be justified. I have eschewed such arrogance on your forum, and do not wish to inflict it on others. On that basis, I have elected to forward my response directly to you, so that you may determine its suitability for posting. I must defer to your judgment in that matter, as the forum is your property.

Whatever our disagreements (yours and mine) may be, I am impressed by your intellectual honesty. I believe that you are fair-minded and civilized, qualities that I respect in a man. I have formed an opinion of your sensibilities, and I believe that you are trustworthy and of good character. I do not agree with everything you have said on the forum, but I also recognize that you are not in possession of all the facts. I hope that you will forgive my boldness for speaking out of place, but you should listen to [name redacted] (grin). [Name redacted] knows things that you don't know.

You have my permission to post my message (below the asterisks: your comment and "Stovetail's response") in its entirety, if you believe it is consistent with your purposes. If you decide that it is acceptable, recognize that it may be more appropriate for me to post it directly, so it will not appear to have come from you. You may indicate your disposition by e-mail reply. I apologize in advance for my presumption that operationally places you in an editorial position, something that is perhaps contrary to the spirit of the "free exchange of ideas" that I assume is part of your purpose in having created the forum. I regret any burden that my transmission of the accompanying message may place on you, and I will understand completely if you decline to review it. I am acting in deference to your ownership of the forum, according to my best ability to identify and respect the associated property boundaries.

I would request, however, that you consult with [name redacted] first, so I am copying this message to [name redacted] (assuming that I have used [name redacted] correct e-mail address). I apologize for what might appear to be non-rational female chauvinism, but it does appear that "her heart is right" with respect to AJG's theory. I do not know her, but I have an intuitive sense about her, based

on her comments, and on yours about her. I imagine that her belief in the rightness of AJG's theory is profound, sincere, and rational, but not over-intellectualized. I trust her.

Here is the message that "Miss Stovetail" authorized [name redacted] to publish.

I am at risk of exploding some institutionalized paradigms as regards the method of disclosure of primary property theory. I am at additional risk of severely irritating or even offending some people whom I would rather not offend. Nonetheless, I will share my thoughts on your reflections on the impending publication of that theory, because your musings hit the bullseye.

I apologize in advance to those who might be offended. Sometimes the truth hurts. It is not my intention to offend. **If any reader wishes to continue to believe in the rightness of a general non-contractual disclosure of primary property theory via a general publication in book form, I respectfully advise him or her NOT to read this message. I will not argue the point further in this or any other forum.**

[Name redacted], you are the only person I know (other than myself) who has identified the MOST crucial fact in connection with the publication of "the book". I am about to set myself up for charges of blasphemy at best and heresy at worst, but you have proposed this forum as a safe place for the honest exchange of ideas among those who seek to better understand (or at least purport to seek to understand) AJG's theory. I accept your proposal, even as I anticipate the responding clamor of the Boeotians. [I'll admit that I had to look up the meaning of the word "Boeotian." It refers to the inhabitants of an area of Greece in ancient times, that were said to be, variously, "stupid, foolish, dull-witted, or dolts." This is Giansante's view of those who disagree with him on this matter.RB]

Here is my heretical assertion: The publication of AJG's theory as a general, non-contractual disclosure is the greatest strategic blunder in history. It is fundamentally wrong-headed and completely inconsistent with the theory itself. It would be laughable if it weren't so tragic, so blind, so preposterously incongruent an action.

If you find that assertion offensive, I implore you to read no further. You'll only upset yourself all the more, and then you'll want to write messages of stern rebuke to me. I will not respond to them, so save your time. You have my permission to chalk me up as an infidel who is completely insensitive to AJG's work, and you are entitled to your opinion, however incorrect it may be. I apologize in advance for my apparent arrogance. But if you read what follows with the same intellectual honesty that correctly convinced you of the profound rightness of AJG's theory in the first place, you will perceive that I believe in the rightness of that theory as much as anyone else you know.

If you have decided to read on, I beg your indulgence as I set forth the thinking that underlies my apparently radical perspective. Forgive my imperfect paraphrasing of a quotation from Albert Einstein's discourse on relativity theory: "It is difficult to overcome prejudices, but there is no other way."

As an innovator of profound genius, Galambos is an ideological anchor point in his own right. Unfortunately, he wasn't much of a disclosure strategist. In fact, while V-201 contains some brilliant examples of strategic mechanisms by which the "bridge to freedom" can be constructed, he had no [sic] virtually no ideological strategy at all for the actual disclosure of primary property theory. In short, he left a gaping hole in the critical path between the creation of his theory and its disclosure to those who constitute its most immediate market.

I am not making a criticism; I am stating an observed fact. In the absence of a well-defined cosmology and technology for strategic disclosure, there can be no non-entropic progression of product development from hot end to cold end. AJG never solved the disclosure barrier problem for his own theory, and every bit of his behavior in the way he handled the mess that now afflicts the publication of V-201 is the irrefutable evidence thereof. I believe that he knew it, and that's why he never published.

Tragically, he had already dug himself into a deep hole with the promise to publish, a promise he couldn't fulfill. His physiological afflictions ultimately overcame him and precluded his ability to remedy the problem. His contractual mechanisms for handling the mess were in disarray or were non-existent. Long before he died, he lost the mental acuity to effectively address the problem, and had no mechanisms in place to allow others to do so. He evidently was despondent about the prospects for the immediate success of his theory, and possibly may have seen the long-term prospects as similarly bleak.

(Actually, AJG did understand that there is a normal process by which, if the overall level of societal coercion is low enough or the level of technological advancement controlled by proprietary entities is high enough, proprietary mechanisms will naturally evolve toward more effective protection of property. But that is an effect that is intrinsic to volitional factors that work in the aggregate on the civilizational level, or that are attributable to and are derivative from the advancing body of knowledge that is increasingly available as civilization becomes increasingly interconnected. AJG is not the innovator of such processes, nor does he explicitly address those as any integrated part of his theoretical construct. I'm just saying that, although it is evident that he implicitly observed that they exist, he hasn't earned any primary credit for the incremental moves toward freedom that derive from them. The basis of their continuing evolution is purely empirical, not theoretical. Even a blind dog can find his way home if he sniffs enough stuff.)

Here is AJG's strategy in a nutshell, operationally defined by the historical record of his behavior: blow the theory across planet Earth in a promiscuous disclosure via a book that he himself never knew how to write (and mercifully had enough sense not to let anyone else write as long as he was alive and coherent), and then after he's dead let "the book" consist of an adapted form of the only medium of disclosure with which he had any familiarity or confidence, the live lectures. Then, once "the flood gates have opened", there will be a miraculous transformation of the same short-term species-wide behavior in which he previously had essentially zero confidence to apply his theory correctly, and the construction of the bridge to freedom can begin in earnest.

To those who might feel compelled to utter the mantra about AJG's theory being immune to misapplication, I would suggest that he evidently thought otherwise. Did he not present an entire course on misapplications of the theory? The evidence says that he greatly feared misapplication. Additionally, new civilizational factors have emerged since his original disclosure of the theory, factors that significantly enable the potential coercive capability of such misapplications. AJG's protestations to the contrary notwithstanding, the tool he created has every opportunity of being converted to a weapon by those whose concepts of pursuit of happiness are inclined toward fulfillment by coercive means.

The fact is that he was not perfect; he didn't think of everything. It is perhaps revealing of the quasi-religious insistence of some of his followers that every aspect of everything he said is automatically correct. The false belief in AJG's infallibility is why they doggedly insist that his wishes about the ultimate form of disclosure of his P1 must be followed to the letter, no matter how destructive the fulfillment of those wishes ultimately may be to the acceptance and success of the theory itself.

If one is to be consistent about "honoring the professor's wishes", why be selective about which ones to honor? Why ignore the obvious fact that some of those wishes are mutually exclusive of others? What are the criteria for selecting a successful course of action in the absence of a clearly defined strategy? Since when does a single event--the promiscuous disclosure of a significant body of high-leverage theoretical work into the communist warehouse of ideas--constitute a "strategy"? How can anyone who claims to understand AJG's theory fail to see that profound inconsistency? Why is AJG expected to have thought of everything, as though his pre-eminence as a creator of unique and profoundly important knowledge in the volitional domain qualifies him as a master ideological strategist? Why is the obvious not seen--that you cannot serve the long-term purpose of successfully installing the theory by beginning with a violation of that theory? Why is the most important product of AJG's life, his theory, to be squandered and--dare I say it, desecrated and dishonored--by an action that it proscribes, because "that's what the Professor wanted"?

I suppose that those questions are rhetorical. There is probably zero chance that reason will prevail in this matter, nor is it even clear that it CAN prevail. Even if the trustees of AJG's estate were to be persuaded that the general publication of V-201 in book form is antithetical to AJG's theory, there are other individuals waiting in the wings who think nothing of plundering the theory in the name of its alleged best interest. Those individuals are transparently egomaniacal to everyone but themselves, and hold up the theory as a relic upon which The Sacred Theoretical Wonder of Galambosian Nirvana may be founded, with them as the pre-eminent high priests, of course. I enjoy their occasional epic letters of self-justification.

Maybe the last hope for an eventual true strategic disclosure was the clause that Jonathan Wilkinson identified, the one that accommodated the plunder of the trust's assets as a contractual basis for non-publication. That certainly could have arrested the impending travesty of traditional, promiscuous disclosure.

But it appears that it's too late for that. It appears that the mythology of the nostalgic and sentimental belief in general non-contractual disclosure as the critical path element in AJG's non-strategy is more powerful than the market for rationality. It appears that the myth of "the opening of the floodgates" is more powerful than the market for an innovative solution to the mess that AJG's dearth of strategic vision created in his own market. It appears that the myth that AJG was all knowing in the area of ideological strategy is more powerful than the market for such a strategy as it relates to the moral and rational dissemination of his theory.

What's the solution? A failure by TUSPCO to publish now could be disastrous in the amount of unauthorized, promiscuous disclosure that is likely to result from a market that has been frustrated for decades in its desire for broad disclosure, a market that AJG himself erroneously created. There is a huge potential for such destructive disclosure in the impatient, self-serving, short-term, visionless blabbing forth of those whose main interest in AJG's theory is their own self-aggrandizement.

It's not clear that TUSPCO has any choice now...the publication thing has gone too far. Although they have made some errors in judgment about the individuals with whom they have contracted in the past, it appears that they have acted and continue to act in good faith. Lack of vision is not a crime, and I do not condemn them, as I do some of the criminals by whom they have been victimized. Frankly, they're damned if they do and damned if they don't. On the one hand they've got a market full of book customers who were set up by AJG's lousy judgment about how to disclose. On the other hand they've got people like me (and now you), questioning the very idea of publishing at all. Can we get them some kind of award for courage in the face of mass confusion? I wouldn't want to be in their shoes.

I don't see any solution that will not precipitate worse consequences than the current course of action. I frankly agree with Jonathan Wilkinson's perspective, that it's OK if the book takes several more years to complete. I can't speak for him, and he probably would disagree, but several more decades would be better. By that time, some of the natural evolutionary mechanisms that occur on the civilizational level (mechanisms to which I alluded earlier in this message) might have a chance to arrest the current decline of civilization, or create the prototype of some alternative civilizational structure.

Maybe there's another solution, but this is pure speculation. It is my understanding that AJG actually DID disclose his theory by specific individual contract to some individuals, although I have no way of knowing who they are, or what the specific terms of those contracts might have been. Maybe some of those individuals are working, rationally and morally, outside the entire mess that attends the subject of promiscuous disclosure. Maybe AJG was a better strategist than I have given him credit for being. Or maybe he just got lucky. I'll bet that would frost the worshippers of The Myth of Total and Completely Self-Contained Universally Elegant Galambosian Strategic and Theoretical Internal Consistency more than anything else would. As if Gödel's Proof counted for nothing.

Respectfully yours,
Miss Stovetail

After reading this letter several times, I'll admit that Giansante makes some interesting arguments against publication, and he's right in some of his criticisms of Galambos (to which I could add a few). However, Galambos must have considered the most obvious of the points himself, ultimately rejecting them. The arguments should be clear to Galambos graduates, but may be confusing to others. No matter what, they are arguments that should have been made to Galambos before he accepted payment for the book, and plenty of people were in a position to make them. Failing that, they could have been made during the several years following the execution of the book contract. Had that been done, and had he listened (or had he thought of reasons for not publishing on his own) he could have sought the buyers' agreement to amend the contract, as provided by Paragraph 7.9.

Giansante, being close enough to Galambos to have served as his "Podium Assistant," could have voiced his concerns. But did he think Galambos was making a mistake at the time? I don't know, but his name is on the list of book buyers. With that in mind, you'd think he would be a little more forgiving of the other book buyers who haven't adopted his current view. And don't forget, he and the other trustees have access to all of Galambos' material while denying it to the rest of us, in the meantime doing all they can to avoid telling us why.

Perhaps Galambos' decision to publish a book without requiring the buyer to sign a confidentiality agreement was a bad one, but I'll support it below. We could argue about it forever, but Galambos made the decision to publish after teaching his own creation, volitional science, for over 15 years. The ideas that were to be in the book were his property, to do with as he pleased, and *he chose to publish them*. He agreed to do that, using a contract that he himself designed, and he accepted payment for the book. That contract is the elephant in the room, and it's not going away.

If anything was sacred to Galambos it was the concept of integrity. To perform on a contract—even when you believe you've made a mistake—is a measure of integrity, and that example is used in V-50 (Session 16, p. 637 of SIAA). The responsibility to meet that standard of integrity extends to his trustees. Please note that never once does Giansante comment on the contractual obligation, other than in the course of seeking a way to renege on it. To the best of my knowledge none of the trustees has made any sort of apology for the financial loss to book buyers that they have intentionally caused, nor for the ideological loss (in Galambosian terms, the secondary and primary losses). Rather than issuing an apology, even one in which they might defend their actions, the Trustees continue to cover them up.

Trustee Wayne Joyner, in his letter to me dated October 29, 2015, admitted that he believed that the publication of Volume One in "unprotected" format had been a "mistake." He also said the same thing in his sworn testimony given in 2006 or 2007 which, not surprisingly, few people have read. *No general announcement has ever been made to the 600 or so people who are waiting for the rest of the book.*

Joyner's last letter to all FEI customers, on May 20, 2009 (yes, he has not written a letter to all since 2009) was in the nature of bringing everyone up to date after a long silence. It would have been a perfect place to announce the trustees' new view that it had been a mistake to publish Galambos' work without a non-disclosure agreement, and that the people who had already received Volume One and had paid for the entire book were not going to get it. Instead, he dodged the issue—the most important one of all—by saying in reference to the book, "there is a great deal to say on that subject—much more than is appropriate to include in a letter that discusses so many other subjects with the FEI market in general, which includes individuals who are not book subscribers."

This bit of sleight of hand seems designed to ensure that the general market would not learn that the trustees were violating Galambos' contract. The book subscribers—the ones who had paid for and were expecting to receive the rest of the book—were told to contact Cheryl Cerell. I did, and she stonewalled me, saying that there was no information beyond that contained in the letter that had referred book buyers to her. Of course, as I now know, she supports Giansante and Joyner. I should add that she also offered the blatantly false reason that "Because of Fred Marks' lawsuit there is no money with which to publish." Never mind the facts that according to Joyner in his letter of May 18, 1998, "Funding is in place to publish

Book One,” and that there would have been no lawsuit had the trustees done so, and that Galambos’ debt-free home was sold for \$975,000 in 2005, and that offers to fund the project had been made, and doubtless would be made again, if solicited. I got the feeling that she didn’t really believe money was a problem, but was simply spouting the official line.

Returning to Joyner’s testimony and the view that he tried to keep hidden from most, why did he call the publication of Volume One, something he had once enthusiastically supported, a “mistake?” For most of my life, the word mistake has been used to describe such things as incorrectly measuring a board and cutting it to the wrong length. Mistakes like that are cases where people have tried to do the right thing, such as performing an assigned duty to the best of their ability, but have made an error. Joyner and Hayes, in publishing Volume One, had done their duty. The transcription wasn’t perfect, a result of bona fide mistakes, but the people that I knew were pleased to have their copy of the book and excited by the prospect of receiving the remaining volumes. Was publication itself a mistake? Such a view, had it been expressed then, would have been considered preposterous.

But at some point Peter Giansante became a trustee. Joyner’s new opinion shows that Giansante’s view has prevailed, and that the supposed “mistake” of the pre-Giansante trustees was that they did not override Galambos’ decision to publish. In other words, they were too “Boeotian” to see that *Galambos* had made a mistake, one that they should have corrected by not publishing. Having now seen the light as shone to them by Mr. Giansante, Mr. Joyner and Ms. Cerell think it’s the rest of us that don’t “get it.”

Additional details of all of this are contained elsewhere on this website, primarily in the 2006-2007 litigation documents, and in my correspondence with Wayne Joyner beginning in 2014.

During the litigation, initiated by Frederic G. Marks and others to prompt the trustees to honor the contract by publishing and delivering the prepaid books, it was revealed that Giansante had been made a trustee. That raises an interesting question: were Joyner and Hayes aware of Giansante’s anti-publishing views when they brought him into the fold? If so, then their appointing him to the position of trustee, but keeping those views secret from Galambos’ eagerly waiting customers, would be very difficult to explain. If not, then Giansante must have kept his opinion secret until, like the fox, he was in the henhouse. The sense of his words above, and the use of the cowardly device of writing under a pseudonym rather than openly declaring his views, suggests the latter, and the deceptive actions of the trustees as a group post-Giansante are evidence of his influence. Were it not for Mr. Giansante’s persuasive powers, there is little doubt that *Sic Itur Ad Astra* would exist in its entirety today.

Hayes left some time ago, and Cheryl Cerell (some graduates may know her by the surnames Croxall or Spehar) is now a trustee along with Joyner. There could be others, but Giansante seems to rule. It’s no wonder that the world doesn’t have Galambos’ book.

How much influence did Giansante have, and when? I'm not sure when he became a trustee, but just compare Wayne Joyner's 1998 enthusiastic comments about the upcoming publication of Volume One of Book One ("We are absolutely committed to publish Book One") and his solicitation of sales of additional copies without any qualifications or any restrictions, with the testimony he and Giansante gave in the Marks litigation.

This is an excerpt from "Plaintiff's Rebuttal to Defendant's Closing Argument, entered July 27, 2007, which is posted elsewhere on this website. The questioner is Jonathan K. Golden, a Galambos graduate and attorney for Plaintiffs Marks, et al.

Defendants contend there is no evidence that they are seeking to impose additional burdens on Plaintiffs by reserving the right to require all Subscribers to sign a Non-disclosure Agreement as a condition of receiving Book 1.

Response: Defendants' trial testimony confirmed that if, as and when Defendants publish Book 1, they intend to impose limitations upon its use, disclosure of its contents, and transfer of the Book itself.

First, the evidence showed that Defendant Joyner refused even to discuss with Plaintiff Marks what the Trustees of the Natural Estate Trust were doing to publish Book 1 unless Marks first signed a written Non-disclosure Agreement. This alone is highly indicative of Defendants' mind set.

Second, Joyner insisted that Marks sign such an agreement because he [Joyner] had signed a Confidentiality Agreement with Peter Giansante (his co-Trustee). He further testified as follows:

"Q. Mr. Joyner, do you intend to impose contractual terms of (*sic*) the usage of Book 1 on the Subscribers?"

"A. There will — well, there may be. That decision has not really been made. It would be consistent with what the professor taught in V-201 to have contractual terms of usage of his ideas. It's consistent with what he had in the supplementary proprietary notice that all students sign before they took V-201."

Joyner also testified that the publication of Volume I of *Sic Itur Ad Astra* was a "mistake" in that it didn't protect Galambos' work:

"Question: How did it, it didn't protect his work?"

'Answer: No.'

'Question: How did it — why did it not protect his work? How did it leave his work unprotected?'

'Answer: It was available to anyone who wanted to buy a copy, no restrictions on use, no inquiry into the qualifications of the person that may want to use the ideas expressed there. Generally, just giving it to anyone.'

"So, you're opposed to just giving the book, Book 1 to just anyone, right?"

"A. Yes."

"Q. So, if a Subscriber were to get the book from you, would there be restrictions on, for example, selling the book?"

Mr. Godsill: "Calls for speculation."

The Witness: "It hasn't been decided."

By Mr. Golden: "Q. 'There might be, though.'"

A. "There might be."

Q. "And there might be restrictions on use of the ideas in the book, correct?"

A. "As I said, those decisions have yet to be made."

Q. "But you reserve the right to make those decisions, don't you?"

A. "It's certainly something that will need to be considered in order to be consistent with the ideas taught by Galambos."

Mr. Giansante further confirmed that whatever the Trust publishes as Book 1 will come with a Confidentiality Agreement.

Q. "And when this Book 1 gets published by the Trustees, is it going to have a Confidentiality Agreement that goes with it?"

A. "Well, any contractual terms that accompany the disclosure of the book will be consistent with the principles of Galambos' theory and, in general, and, in particular, with the terms of the V-201 proprietary notice which every book subscriber also has signed."

Q. "There's going to be a non-disclosure agreement with your book, isn't there?"

A. "There has been no determination as to what the terms of disclosure will be."

Q. "Is it your intention to publish Book 1 without any restrictions on the disclosure of its contents?"

A. No.”

Q. "Do you reserve the right to require recipients to sign a nondisclosure agreement, before they get the book?"

A. "The Trust reserves the right to determine the disposition of the intellectual property of Andrew J. Galambos because that was the purpose of the trust and that's the fiduciary obligation of the trustees."

Q. "So you do retain that right, don't you?"

A. "The trust has that right."

Q. "I'm asking you do you reserve the right to impose limitations on what subscribers can do with the book?"

A. "Oh. Thank you. I understand that question very well, yes."

So here we have Joyner and Giansante in 2006 or 2007 advocating the position that Giansante had secretly put forth in 2000, a position that Giansante admitted in so many words was a violation the book contract. It's no wonder that Marks, beginning as early as 2004, could not get any information from Joyner regarding the publication schedule—there wasn't one. *And yet all during this period and since, most prepaid book buyers have never been told that this was now the view of the trustees.*

When Joyner wrote and distributed his May 2009 Open Letter, the evidence shows that his non-publishing attitude had been in place for years. However, in an apparent effort to conceal that, in his letter to me of October 29, 2015, he said, "After sending the 2009 Open Letter I came to realize that it was a mistake to publish the SIAA book in an unprotected format [without a non-disclosure agreement]." By claiming that his change of heart had taken place *after* May 2009, no one could accuse him using deception in the May 2009 letter. His problem is that his sworn testimony in 2006-2007 shows that his decision not to honor the contract had already been made, a decision that he failed to disclose in that 2009 letter, thus avoiding what would surely have been a firestorm of complaints from book buyers, and a loss of credibility with everyone.

Now I'll comment on a few of the items that I highlighted in the above remarks by "Miss Stovetail."

First, Giansante (Stovetail) says he "will not argue the point further in this or any other forum." From what I can tell, beyond obviously having subsequently argued the point to his fellow trustees, convincing them in the process, he has remained doggedly true to his pledge. And so have Joyner and Cerell. Rather than do the moral thing and make their case to the book buyers, hopefully convincing them to reconsider the terms of the agreement on ideological grounds, and/or on the basis of an offer of restitution, the trustees hid their decision not to publish from those buyers. My request to Joyner in my letter of March 26, 2016 that I be

invited to appear before an assembled group of FEI graduates went unanswered. Just as cult leaders do, they are seeking to limit their group's access to any information that disagrees with their view.

For years the trustees, when asked, have gotten away with making misleading statements that implied that they were going to publish. How do we know the promises were misleading? It's 2016 and there is no book—that's how we know. Few people have challenged the actions of the trustees because few people would suspect that they weren't doing all they could to publish. But the reality is that if they keep stalling long enough the original book buyers will eventually be dead, or no longer care, and newcomers will never find out what they had done. The current crop of students have no idea what it was like to hear Galambos talking about the book in the classroom, and no idea that a crime had been committed. Giansante's explicitly stated goal is to avoid publication under the terms of the contract, and if that means stiffing the book buyers, so be it. This is about as clear a case of "end justifies the means" action as you can get. Today's trustees don't want anyone to hear this.

Second, Giansante claims to worry that Galambos' ideas might be misapplied, and cites the fact that the Professor offered a course on that topic. The course, V-213, Misapplications of the Principles Taught in FEI Courses, was combined in alternating sessions with V-214, Successful Applications of the Principles Taught in FEI Courses. If Mr. Giansante took these courses, and he probably did, I'd say that he flunked. The evidence of this lies in his misapplication of the principle of contractual disclosure, using it to justify the commission of what Galambos would call a crime.

Throughout history, men who were known for following correct moral principles have occasionally violated those principles by committing acts that they considered a "necessary evil" in order to promote their concept of the greater good. This appears to be what the trustees have done. But, as Galambos explained, if it's evil it's not necessary, and if it's necessary it's not evil.

Third, please note Giansante's stunningly sophomoric musing that perhaps several decades from now "some of the natural evolutionary mechanisms that occur on the civilizational level (mechanisms to which I alluded earlier in this message) might have a chance to arrest the current decline of civilization, or create the prototype of some alternative civilizational structure."

"Might have a chance?" This is a variant on the view that "somehow we'll muddle through," a concept that Galambos ridiculed and warned against in Session One of V-50. Every student knows that Galambos had a concern that we humans, having developed technologies capable of exterminating our own species, might not have decades to wait. Further, the "alternative civilizational structure" that might save the day *was offered to us by Galambos*. That's what his volitional science courses were all about.

As just one example of where “muddling through” has gotten us, there is now a strong movement that promotes the theft of primary property (intellectual property, for people not yet familiar with Galambos’ terminology) based on, among other things, the claims that ideas are not property, that you cannot own ideas, and that the theft of ideas does no harm. It was to counter that movement that I wrote a book, *For Intellectual Property*.

To hold off publication of Galambos’ ideas while waiting for the longshot possibility that civilization will evolve to some acceptable level (note the vagueness of his description) is simply wishful thinking, accompanied by ongoing criminality. Apparently we’re all supposed to wait until Mr. Giansante deems it safe to publish.

And let’s remember Galambos’ criteria for getting value from his courses: curiosity, intelligence, aspiration, and intellectual honesty. There are plenty of people who qualify today, but the barriers to enrolment in the online courses offered by the trustees, and the inadequate and incompetent marketing of them, assure us that very few of them will be reached. Will there be more such people decades from now? There could easily be fewer.

Fourth, Giansante’s approval of a proposed excuse for not publishing, allegedly the proposal of Jonathan Wilkinson, implies a devious mindset—one that he carried with him when he became a trustee. Here’s the proposed excuse, worthy of having come from a politician, and why it is ridiculous.

The book purchase contract contained a number of things that would “void, cancel, and terminate” it. These were mostly apocalyptic events, such as the overthrow of the Constitution, a foreign nation’s occupation of the United States, a war on the U.S. mainland involving weapons of total extinction, a condition of continual rioting, a pollution catastrophe that caused over one million deaths in a year in the United States, a police state, and several others. Among the items was Paragraph 6.5 (5) which reads, rather innocuously:

“Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein, if the assets of the trust fund are seized or made unavailable for the purposes of this agreement by any state, or by any coercive force, the obligation of TUSPCO to make or guarantee any refund to subscriber shall cease, and shall be null and void.”

How would this clause, which addresses *refunds*, justify non-publication? It clearly wouldn’t. And yet Giansante contemplated using it for that purpose. Let’s look at what happened.

The book contract called for customer payments to be held in a special trust fund. Galambos’ students turned over their money to their esteemed professor for safekeeping until the book was published or they requested a refund. Galambos selected his friend, Mitchell J. (“Matt”) Lange, and his audio-visual technician, J. A. (“Jerry”) Miller, each of them also his student, as trustees of the trust, putting them in charge of the money.

Using techniques common to embezzlers, in this case exploiting Galambos' trust in him, over a period of time Lange stole that money, in an amount of approximately one and a half million dollars, and lost it in an ill-fated real estate speculation. He disclosed this to Galambos in 1984 via a letter, was sentenced to four years in prison, and served two. FEI customers were formally advised of this in a letter from Galambos' wife, Suzanne J. Galambos, dated March 15, 1988.

Amazingly, Peter Giansante tried to turn this tragedy to his advantage in his quest to stop publication of Galambos' book. He approved of the suggestion allegedly made by Wilkinson that Lange's theft qualified as an event that fell under Paragraph 6.5 (5), thus giving the trust a "contractual basis for non-publication." (I don't know Mr. Wilkinson, and have nothing more than Giansante's word that this was his suggestion, hence my use of the word "allegedly.")

This approach could hardly be more ridiculous, as well as desperate and dishonest.

- As noted, the clause only covers refunds, not publication.
- In the context of the full agreement, the phrase "any coercive force" refers to some sort of overwhelming force, beyond that which ordinary individuals could defeat. It did not mean embezzlement, which Galambos could have—and should have—prevented by using ordinary safeguards, such as signing every check, and reading brokerage and bank statements rather than relying on a summary of assets from a "trusted" aide. In addition, the loss caused by Lange's theft could have been insured by what is known as a fidelity bond. Had the first measures been in place Lange quite likely would have never attempted the theft or would have found it impossible. Galambos had a duty to ensure that the money in the trust fund was adequately protected, and he didn't take the reasonable and ordinary steps to do so. Lange's crime, and the damage it caused, was only possible because of Galambos' error, an error for which he alone was responsible.
- Although Mrs. Galambos claimed that the clause would allow them to deny refunds, I ascribe that wrong conclusion to the huge emotional blow of the theft and of her husband's heart attack, also disclosed in the letter. However, she also pledged to fund the publication of her husband's books out of their own pocket, "a moral decision which Professor Galambos has made." Wilkinson and Giansante certainly knew this.

The really disturbing thing about Giansante considering using Lange's theft as a justification for not publishing is that he was seeking to conceal his real reason—his belief that publication was a bad idea. And according to Giansante it was Wilkinson, who at that time was running the websites of TUSPCO and of FEI, who proposed this plan. If this is true, we have to wonder what Joyner and Hayes knew about Wilkinson's views.

You'd think that by now the trustees would have given enough thought to the failings of this excuse that they would never use it. And yet Wayne Joyner did use it, in his letter to me of October 29, 2015.

"As you know, the trust assets were stolen in 1984 by Lange. The contract became null and void as a result of his act of coercion."

As the saying goes, "You can't make it up."

By the way, since Joyner and Giansante are so worried about publication in an "unprotected" format shouldn't we ask how much protection they expect from their protection mechanism, a simple non-disclosure agreement? The actions of just one person could render it totally ineffective. For example, had I wanted to I could have continued taking classes online from FEI, recorded every one, and then posted them to the Internet. Of course I didn't, nor would I ever do such a thing, but it is clear that protection is only available via the integrity of individuals. I would tend to bank on the integrity of those people who entered into the book purchase contract. They were Galambos' most supportive students—the people likely to be the most trustworthy, and yet the very ones who have been victimized by the trustees.

Fifth, and last, Giansante claims that Galambos "wasn't much of a disclosure strategist. In fact, while V-201 contains some brilliant examples of strategic mechanisms by which the 'bridge to freedom' can be constructed, he had no [sic] virtually no ideological strategy at all for the actual disclosure of primary property theory. In short, he left a gaping hole in the critical path between the creation of his theory and its disclosure to those who constitute its most immediate market." To examine this, and indeed Giansante's entire premise that he is right and Galambos was wrong, we need to make a distinction between "strategy" and "tactics." I'll use these definitions, from Wikipedia:

The terms **tactic** and **strategy** are often confused: **tactics** are the actual means used to gain an objective, while **strategy** is the overall campaign plan, which may involve complex operational patterns, activity, and decision-making that lead to **tactical** execution.

You can see that Giansante uses the word "strategy" when he means "tactic." Here's how I see it.

Galambos' *strategy* was to educate people who were intelligent, intellectually curious, aspirational, and intellectually honest, in what he lumped together as "volitional science." Then, operating on the principles they had learned, these people would constitute what he called a "moral island" in the midst of present-day society, growing, prospering, and "building freedom" as that society decayed and collapsed, leaving them to carry on as the Natural Republic. At his most optimistic, he believed that this could be accomplished in one generation. (As an aside, I cannot help but think that this all might sound crazy to anyone who hasn't received the education offered at FEI.)

Galambos was hampered by the range of short run *tactics* that were available to him. Other than offering his ideas in print, virtually his only option was to deliver his courses via live or recorded lectures to an assembled audience. There was not yet an Internet, nor was there even home video. As it happened, his courses were lengthy, making them all the more difficult to populate with students, most of whom worked during the day and had to take the FEI courses in the evening or on weekends. Taking the two basic courses, V-50 and then V-201, was a commitment of about 200 hours, plus travel time to and from the lecture hall. And one lecturer can only reach so many people. Fortunately he found a surrogate, Jay Snelson, whose exceptional speaking ability and overall presentation brought in thousands of customers. But even Snelson could only lecture a few times a week.

Galambos had to have realized that lectures alone could not reach enough people. And of course his prohibition on students teaching the material piecemeal to anyone else was in effect, and removing it wouldn't have worked because no student would have been a qualified presenter of the material. With that set of circumstances there was no way for his ideas to "catch on" and to enter a period of exponential growth and ultimate widespread acceptance, to say nothing of exposing them to further study and development. A higher level of success might have been realized had Galambos established a cadre of "Snelsons" but he didn't, and instead fired the one he had, a major tactical mistake. The decline thereafter was predictable.

In my view Galambos made several serious tactical errors over the course of his control of FEI, but I won't go into more of them here other than to say that the net effect was to squander the resource of motivated FEI graduates that he had created. Today it appears that only a relative handful of people are actively engaged in taking Galambos' courses online.

There was only one way to reach people in the numbers needed to effect fundamental social change—a book. That was always looming as the solution, and it became official when Galambos started actively selling subscriptions. Releasing a book was a logical tactical decision because there was, and probably still is, no other way to reach the number of people necessary to ensure that enough people are exposed to the ideas, resulting in some number of them doing something beneficial. In that regard I'm reminded of two books that Galambos referred to again and again, Newton's *Principia* and Paine's *Common Sense*.

Mr. Giansante says above, "The publication of AJG's theory as a general, non-contractual disclosure is the greatest strategic blunder in history. It is fundamentally wrong-headed and completely inconsistent with the theory itself." Here we must take note of the fact that the means by which an innovator discloses his innovation is a *tactical* decision. Publishing a book was Galambos' choice of the best *tactic* to move his *strategy* forward. It was Galambos' opinion that the tactic of publishing was appropriate, and it is simply Mr. Giansante's opinion that it is not. With Galambos dead and having no opportunity to discuss the matter, Giansante not only convinced the other trustees to override Galambos, but to violate

Galambos' fundamental precept that it is immoral to intentionally interfere with someone's property, in this case the property of Galambos' students/customers.

Let's face the facts: without a book, how is any significant number of people supposed to learn the principles of volitional science? It is obvious that despite all good intentions, the present method is not working. How can it? FEI's system requires mature or nearly-mature people to "unlearn" a lifetime of wrong inputs through the inefficient mechanism of listening to recordings online. It cannot be counted on to produce a significant number of graduates. And where is the incentive for anyone to enroll in the first place? FEI has nothing to show them. Of those who discover the FEI website on their own, how many leave it without inquiring further when they see that they must be referred by a "qualified" graduate? Hardly anyone knows a graduate, let alone a "qualified" one. And of the few who enroll, how many will have the unique combination of intelligence, talent, and motivation to do something with the material? Most such people, as adults, are already doing something else that they see as productive, are supporting families, and are past the point of enrolling in anything.

Many more people would read a book!

And how are children to be reached? As I point out in *For Intellectual Property*, a society that trains its children to see ideas as property will be a society where that view is the norm. If children aren't taught the principles of volitional science, then we face the prospect of having to convince adults to change their world view, which is difficult, to say the least. That can be done, as V-50 demonstrated, but reaching a significant number of people via the lecture method will never produce a high yield.

The ideal time to learn the fundamental principles of volitional science is in childhood. But children do not have the maturity to fully grasp the nature of contracts, nor to abide by them. You cannot teach a child using a non-disclosure agreement and expect that agreement to be honored. And non-disclosure is counterproductive when the goal is to establish widespread acceptance and use. A child can be taught the simple principles of volitional science using proven training and educational techniques, but there is little hope of that as long as access to those principles is restricted to a miniscule number of people.

Galambos taught that there was a distinction between education and training. In the initial stages of learning acceptable behavior we are all *trained*, not educated. We are trained in "do's" and "don'ts" as toddlers. Parents and other adults conduct this training by explicit means, and by exemplary behavior which children imitate. It would be easy for children's educational books and schoolwork to incorporate Galambos' ideas. It is clear that the only way for any of this to happen on a significant scale is for a large number of adults to be reached first, with the subsequent filtering process described by Galambos reducing that number substantially.

At one time FEI used a three-session introductory offer for V-50 as the initial filter. People who didn't respond to what they heard in the first few lectures were "filtered out." I took advantage of that offer, loved what I heard, and stuck around for five years. Today even that possibility doesn't exist, with admission to V-50 allowed only after referral by a "qualified" graduate. This is not a recipe for growth, but a recipe for hanging on by a thread.

Galambos has to "catch on" with enough people (but, as he stressed, not with the "masses," which would not only be hopeless, but is unnecessary) for society-wide change to occur. However, based on what can reasonably be inferred, the current number of enrolments in FEI courses, and the rate of growth in those enrolments, if any, is insufficient to achieve success.

It seems obvious that Galambos concluded that the lecture method was unlikely to reach a large enough quantity of educable people to generate the sweeping societal change that he felt was both desirable and necessary. It just wasn't going to work, and that's why he planned to write a book. Books were then, and still are, a way to rapidly bring ideas to a wide audience and that's what he chose to do. And when a book's subject matter is serious, the initial filters are that only a relatively small number of people will read it, and of those an even smaller number will do anything with the knowledge they obtain.

I believe that graduates of V-201 saw that releasing his theory via a book was true to the model of what is referred to in that course as "ARD," an acronym for a method in which the user of primary property sets the price paid to the innovator. (This is discussed in the Appendix of my book.) Had he written his book I suspect that he would have made a point of that in the book itself, and on the first page. If he had thought of everything, when he created the book contract he could have required that a clause to that effect be published with the lecture transcripts if he died before writing the book.

But no matter what, he certainly didn't want his trustees to dishonor him by cheating his customers through the act of denying them the book for which they had paid. Judging by my own sense of the man, and by the opinions of many others who knew him, the actions of the trustees would have made him livid with rage, and he would applaud those who attempted to reverse them.

This takes us back to the book contract. Paragraph 4.3 reads in part: "Successor Trustees for any trustee shall be appointed by TUSPCO in the event of the death, disability, incompetency or insanity of any trustee, or in the event that any trustee defaults in any contract or conducts himself in an irrational manner."

Readers can decide whether this bears on the current situation. As noted, the original trustees were Matt Lange, who became a thief, and Jerry Miller. Presumably, Lange was removed for cause by the Galamboses. I don't know when or why Miller was replaced, nor do I know the circumstances or timing of Hayes' and Joyner's appointment. But now that Andrew and Suzanne Galambos are no longer with us, who oversees the trustees? Who appoints

new ones? What if all of the trustees qualify for replacement, such as by defaulting on the book contract as they have done? This is the dilemma.

There seems to be no recourse in the Flatland judicial system. And that system should only be used as a last resort, as Galambos did in attempting to recover the Trust's funds from Lange. (He was represented by Joyner in that matter.)

We book buyers are suffering an injustice, defined by Galambos as "a crime to which there is no recourse to the victim." However, the book contract offers the path to a resolution, in Paragraph 7.3:

Arbitration. The parties hereto agree that any dispute between the parties shall be submitted to arbitration which shall be conducted pursuant to the principles of volitional science as developed by Andrew J. Galambos. The decisions of the arbitrator(s) made herein shall be final and binding and shall not be subject to appeal or review by any federal or state court.

In a letter to Wayne Joyner dated August 18, 2015 I demanded arbitration, the contractual right of everyone who subscribed to the book. Knowing that the trustees would lose, he rejected that demand, which is in itself evidence of bad faith. (Apparently desperate to legitimize his refusal, he says that after someone at FEI had pored over some presumably musty old records, it was discovered that I had been expelled in 1981. This was news to me but, even if true, would not deny me the right to arbitrate because such right covers *any* dispute.) His rejection of my demand, coupled with not allowing me to put forth my arguments at a meeting of FEI alumni and students (the tactic of cult leaders and dictators) caused me to create the website on which this is being published.

If you are owed a book, I encourage you to contact the trustees and demand that they publish or arbitrate. If numerous people do this it will be harder for them to say no, and we can pursue the arbitration process together. It is my belief that we will certainly win an arbitration that is based on the principles of volitional science as the contract requires. At the very least, your effort will become part of the historical record, and you will be on the right side.

The trustees are volitional beings. They can change their minds. They vote on matters concerning the trust, and if two of them vote to publish, we will have the book. But if no one asks them to, it is unlikely that they will. Please take at least the minimal action necessary to make your opinion known: contact the trustees. And please let me know if you do.