

# **“ZAMA DAY” LETTER**

**October 19, 2020**

**REGARDING THE NATURAL ESTATE TRUST OF ANDREW J. AND SUZANNE J. GALAMBOS  
AND THE CURRENT TRUSTEES OF THE FREE ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE**

**(Wayne Joyner, Peter Giansante, Cheryl Cerell, Jerry Miller, Bobby Greenberg)**

***A PRESENTATION OF “NEW” INFORMATION***

***BY***

**Bill Cobb**

***“It is necessary to be bold. Some people can be reasoned into sense, and others must be shocked into it. Say a bold thing that will stagger them, and they will begin to think.”***

**—Thomas Paine in Letter to Elihu Palmer  
Paris, Feb. 21, 1802  
(*Orbit!*, page 90)**

## What You Will Learn

The Trustees have:

- Claimed expertise in Galambos' theory but have now been, *as of today*, exposed as **frauds**
- Completely **disregarded** Professor Galambos' explicit written instructions to have his books published
- Carelessly **exhausted the assets** of Galambos' estate to almost nothing
- Produced digitized "courses" that have **deleted** important sections of what Galambos actually said
- Produced digitized "courses" that, *upon TODAY'S disclosure of this "new" information*, are proven **worthless** and of no educational value
- Put the remaining course tapes in **dire jeopardy**

## You Will Also Learn

Galambos' Book One was completed over twenty years ago to the exacting standards of Galambos by his Literary Executor, William W. Martin. It was offered to the trustees for them to publish, but they refused. The mere *existence* of this book today, and the disclosure of the "new" information within, *automatically makes the trustees and their "digitally produced courses" obsolete by default.*

# Contents

PREFACE.....	4
BACKGROUND .....	5
“NEW” INFORMATION.....	6
WHAT GALAMBOS ACTUALLY SAID ABOUT "CONTRACTUAL DISCLOSURE" IN THE FORM OF A BOOK .....	7
WHAT GALAMBOS ACTUALLY SAID ABOUT "PUBLICATION" IN THE FORM OF A BOOK .....	8
GALAMBOS INTENDED TO RELEASE COSMOLOGICAL PORTION OF THEORY IN THE PERMANENT FORM OF A BOOK .....	11
GALAMBOS EXPECTED MISAPPLICATIONS AND PLUNDER - IN THE SHORT TERM - BUT DESIRED TO TAKE THAT RISK.....	14
GALAMBOS INTENDED BOOK TO BE RELEASED "ARD" .....	16
EDITING THE COURSES: MORE CRIMES AGAINST PROFESSOR GALAMBOS .....	20
TRUSTEES' "V-50DD SESSION 1" VS. WILLIAM W. MARTIN SIC ITUR AD ASTRA V-50 SESSION 1 .....	20
GALAMBOS ROBBED OF HIS RIGHT TO REPEAT HIMSELF .....	22
GALAMBOS EMPHATICALLY EMPHASIZED THE IMPORTANCE OF REPETITION FOR COMPREHENSION .....	24
"COW'S TAIL": EXAMPLE OF "BLIND LEADING THE BLIND" .....	28
“IDEOLOGICAL LEADERSHIP”: TRUSTEES DO NOT “PRACTICE WHAT THEY PREACH” .....	31
INDIVIDUALISM VS. COLLECTIVISM .....	32
A) The Trust Operates As A Committee .....	32
B) Trustees Not Cured Of “Political Disease” .....	37
THE CONCEPT OF “PROPERTY IN A MARKET” NEITHER UNDERSTOOD NOR PROPERLY APPLIED BY “EDITOR” OF DIGITIZED COURSES.....	40
THE CONCEPT OF “RESTITUTION” NEITHER UNDERSTOOD NOR PROPERLY APPLIED BY TRUSTEES ACCORDING TO GALAMBOS’ THEORY .....	42
THE TRUSTEES’ “MARKETING STRATEGY” .....	46
TRUSTEES’ “MARKETING STRATEGY” OPPOSES GALAMBOS’ STRATEGY THEREBY FAILING TO ACHIEVE "MARKET PENETRATION” .....	46
TRUSTEES’ WEBSITE IS INACCURATE, AND EVIDENCE OF INCOMPETENCE.....	49
MIR: "MORAL ISLAND REJECT LIST“ PLAYS MAJOR FUNCTION IN FEI MARKETING EFFORTS.....	51
THE TRUSTEES’ MISHANDLING OF GALAMBOS’ PRIMARY AND SECONDARY PROPERTY.....	55
TRUSTEES’ MISHANDLING OF GALAMBOS’ PRIMARY PROPERTY (P1) .....	55
TRUSTEES’ MISHANDLING OF GALAMBOS’ SECONDARY PROPERTY (P2).....	56
WILLIAM W. MARTIN, LITERARY EXECUTOR OF PROFESSOR ANDREW J. GALAMBOS.....	59
END NOTES .....	59

## PREFACE

*Because, as a result of this theory, in the future, there will be a market for innovation. But it's too early for me. This is, you might say, a personal piece of irony and unhappiness.*

*Anyway, I have no succession at this time, in the durable sense. Whether my company itself becomes durable or not remains to be seen. The concept is durable. The concept itself is durable. The concept becomes durable upon publication. It's already been published orally. With tapings, it's better than oral as it was in past centuries. With taping, there's a permanent record of it. In written form, it's still better. This is intended to come, as you know. [AJG drinks.] The further development of the operation to put it into the visible flow stream for the masses requires corporation technology to manufacture things. What things? All kinds of tangible things. So far my products through my companies have been basically limited to intellectual products, mainly the courses, the forthcoming publication of this in book form, the occasional paraphernalia that are incidental to it such as literature that has some ideological compatibility with what I have taught, including some of the books that we have offered which are written by and published by others which we have sold through our book affiliate, some mementos of some sort such as the various coin medals that the institute has struck and is striking in the future. These are mementos of what has happened.*

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, V-201, Vol. VII, Session 44, Part B  
pages 263 – 264

A website by “**SPACELAND PUBLICATIONS**” was introduced this year, promoting an important new book:

[www.spacelandpublications.com](http://www.spacelandpublications.com)

***Orbit!: Being an examination of Sic Itur Ad Astra's creation and final triumph, by William W. Martin, Literary Executor of Professor Andrew J. Galambos.***

*Orbit!* is available through the above named website, and Amazon. It is a *must* read for anyone interested in the works, ideas, and history of Andrew J. Galambos and his Free Enterprise Institute. It is a detailed history of the many obstacles that the author, Mr. Martin, had to overcome in order to produce Galambos' “Magnum Opus”, *Sic Itur Ad Astra*.

From this website one can ALSO see that *Sic Itur Ad Astra* (aka “Book One”) **is complete**. Any “trustee” and/or “Book One pre-publication subscriber” knows what “Book One” was *supposed* to be. And that it was *never* published by Galambos' trustee even though book subscribers paid money and contracted for it. William W. Martin completed *Sic Itur Ad Astra* in the year 2000. The complete book was offered to the trustee, Mr. Joyner, on April 14, 2000, for the sum of \$328,748.91 (See *Orbit!*, Appendix 50: “WWM's Letter to Joyner with Invoice”, pages 443 – 444). Mr. Joyner refused. This story is told in *Orbit!* in great detail, complete with appendices of supporting documentation. The information and facts contained in *Orbit!* are supplemental to the *additional* information presented in this letter, and inspired me to write this letter. This letter provides some **important new information**; *Orbit!* (and *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, of course) provides the rest.

## BACKGROUND

I obtained a softbound copy of *Sic Itur Ad Astra Vol.1* through Amazon in 2007. I read “*SIAA Vol.1*” *two full times* and **studied it very closely for four years** between 2007 and 2011. I contacted The Free Enterprise Institute (FEI) through the website ([www.fei-ajg.com](http://www.fei-ajg.com)) in January of 2011. I was later informed that I was their very first website customer.

“*SIAA Vol.1*” changed my life. I soon realized “*everything I had ever learned before was wrong.*” It “*revolutionized*” my thinking, and I changed my occupation as a result. That is a very powerful thing, from reading just one book! I am proud to say I did this alone. I had no mentors, nor anyone to talk to who was remotely familiar with Galambos, or his ideas. I *loved* “*the big red book*”, and through it, I came to *love* Andrew J. Galambos. This is why I care, and why I have an obligation to professor Galambos.

I was hungry for knowledge and therefore I trusted everything I was told from FEI. I was a blind follower. I blindly followed *because I did not know better*. I did not have *all of the information*.

“*SIAA Vol.1*” is an incomplete, unauthorized, inauthentic representation of Galambos’ course “V-50”. I learned this by reading and acquiring *new knowledge*. I wondered how *powerful* the ideas of Galambos *really are*. That if his ideas, presented in an incomplete version of Galambos’ course “V-50” can be so powerful; then how much **more** powerful could the **complete book** be? (The complete, authentic, authorized *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, containing *V-50, V-201, V-50X, and The Joe Pyne Interview, combined*).

In a May 18, 1998 letter to the FEI Market from co-trustees Wayne Joyner and Charles Hayes, they stated (*Orbit!*, Appendix 36: “TUSPCO’s First Update Letter to the FEI Market”, pages 373 – 376):

WE ARE ABSOLUTELY COMMITTED TO PUBLISH BOOK ONE AND OTHER PROPERTIES OF PROF. GALAMBOS AND WE ARE TAKING ACTION TO ACHIEVE THIS GOAL AS EXPEDITIOUSLY [sic] AS POSSIBLE. Funding is in place to publish Book One. Further, we are taking steps to archive the secondary property and personal effects of Prof. & Mrs. Galambos. We intend to transform their home into a permanent museum, which would be reflective of the Professor's stable and durable primary achievements. We are also taking steps to secure and stabilize the secondary storage media (tapes, slides, notes and manuscripts) containing his spoken and written words. We will use the finest technology now available to preserve this material for posterity.

What fantastic lies! The trustees have since **sold** the Galamboses’ home. Not to mention that their letter was written twenty-two and a half years ago and it has taken them this long just to move forward with “digitized” courses – which are now proven to be inaccurate, incomplete, and therefore worthless! Whatever “steps” they had taken to “stabilize the secondary storage media” have failed. This makes one wonder how much the trustees have been paying themselves these past twenty years. On what basis are their salaries determined? ***How much money is left in the estate?***

The trustees believe Galambos did not know what he was doing; that he was *mistaken* to want to publish his book; and that he was not a very good “*disclosure strategist*”. The Trust claims that *because “SIAA Vol.1” was not a success, his theory has “made no significant ideological penetration in*

*the marketplace of human interaction to date*". Therefore, the trustees claim, the publication of *anything* – in the form of a book – will be unsuccessful as a market strategy. This, in spite of the fact that it was **Galambos'** "market strategy" to publish the books!

What the trustees *believe* about Galambos' "market strategy" is *not important*. **Galambos did not put a trustee in place to second guess him!** He put the trustee in place to **ensure the publication of Book One, period**. Regardless, the trustees claim that the *very idea (Galambos' idea, by the way)* of publishing a *written book* is inconsistent with the theory itself. That to disclose the theory in the *form of a book* would go *against* what Galambos "*actually said*". That to engage in such an action would be "*promiscuous, nonproprietary*" and "*noncontractual*".

In this letter I will prove that Galambos *did intend* to publish *written books*; he *did* know exactly what he was doing; and he *knew full well the risks, ramifications, and marketing significance of what the publishing of his books in writing would entail*.

Furthermore, as a result of this new information, it will be necessary for the **current** trustees of The Free Enterprise Institute to *cease and desist all marketing efforts of their digitized courses*. This will not be "necessary" because of any legal, or other action; it will be *necessary* because *the trustees themselves will have no other choice*. As of today, **there is no longer a market for their products**. As they admit that "SIAA Vol.1" was a mistake, they will now *also* admit that *the digitized courses are an even bigger mistake!* The digitized courses are now known to be incomplete, inaccurate, inauthentic, and *intentionally (therefore maliciously) misleading*. This means the trustees will need to *immediately discontinue their website and all digitized courses*, including "V-50DD", "V-111DD", and "V-201DD"; and *immediately discontinue any production efforts that may currently be in place*. Whatever "trusteeship" that remains (if any) will *necessarily* understand that their *only* priority, and *only* function from today on, will be to **protect and preserve** Galambos' course transcripts, tapes, and other "secondary property" (aka "P2" – tangible materials).

I wrote this letter to stress the ***importance and urgency of preserving Galambos' course tapes and materials until such time as they can be handed over to someone qualified who can competently publish, protect, and perpetuate Galambos' books in accordance with Galambos' explicit instructions***. I am writing this on behalf of Andrew J. Galambos.

## "NEW" INFORMATION

*Now that is beyond my capability to predict, as to how long that takes. I have a more important task for myself than any entrepreneurial activity in the short run, which transcends even the corporation's achievements in value. That's getting this thing finalized in book form. That is more important than any other single thing, because THAT is what will put it into the species time scale; not these lectures."*

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-201: Workshop Two, Part B  
Vol. VII, p. 48

The "new" information is "new", only in the sense that it has "newly" come to light. The information itself is actually fairly "old". Keep in mind what the trustees believe about "book publication" as you read what Galambos *actually* said:

## WHAT GALAMBOS ACTUALLY SAID ABOUT “CONTRACTUAL DISCLOSURE” IN THE FORM OF A BOOK

*You are in a class for which you paid tuition. **That tuition makes this a contractual disclosure.** Not just any bum can drift in off the street. If he does, he’s kicked out. Why? He hasn’t paid his tuition. That’s a beautiful filter. Anybody who hasn’t paid the tuition doesn’t stay. Now, that ensures me your attention for awhile. For awhile only. Now, if you don’t like what you’re hearing, you’ll drift away and you won’t come back. That’s of course the problem, that many don’t come back. Of course, they’re not curious. They haven’t been stimulated. But that’s the way it is...**But that’s how you get people’s attention—by contractual disclosure.** The fact that you paid a tuition, you’re going to keep your mouth shut long enough to find out if you’re getting your money’s worth, and then you can ask all the questions in the world at the end of the course, because then I’ll guarantee to answer them. That’s included in the guarantee.*

*But the point is, I have your attention first, and you can’t get a person’s attention unless he has gone through some such a situation. **He buys a book and reads it, that’s one way to get his attention.** If he won’t buy it he won’t read it, unless he’s a moocher and used to dealing with the library, but that’s part of our degenerative structure, the so-called free library. A rental library would be the same thing as buying a book, except on a temporary basis. **In any event, a book is a proper disclosure because only those read it who want to.** A course is a proper disclosure because only those take it who want to and those who don’t want to won’t, and that is the proper way to do it.*

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-50: Session 14, Part B  
pages 805 – 806

With these remarks Galambos established that **the sale of a book is a contractual disclosure.**

Galambos: ***“He buys a book and reads it... If he won’t buy it, he won’t read it... a book is a proper disclosure because only those read it who want to.”***

He states that not only is the course he is giving a **proper disclosure** - but a **contractual disclosure** as well. **So too is a book!** What makes it contractual? ***“That tuition makes this a contractual disclosure.”*** This applies equally to the purchase of a book. What is the purchase of a book? A contract. And how did the professor define contract?

***Contract: any voluntary agreement between two or more persons involving mutual exchanges of property.***

The trustees *should know this* because nearly the same quote that I just shared can also be seen in “SIAA Vol.1”, pages 577 – 578. Do the trustees’ words and actions show that they know this? No. Anyone who owns a copy of “SIAA Vol.1” can look this up for themselves.

## WHAT GALAMBOS ACTUALLY SAID ABOUT “PUBLICATION” IN THE FORM OF A BOOK

Although the trustees have complete access to Galambos’ unedited transcripts, it is now known that very important parts of Galambos’ lectures have not been included in the trustees’ digitally produced course “V-201DD” (And “V-50DD” as well). If the trustees claim that they *did not know* this, then one can only speculate as to *why* that might be. It is very probable that this “new” information was *intentionally not disclosed* in course “V-201DD”; for the simple reason that ***because to do so would have been to point out to the market that the trustees were absolutely wrong for not publishing Book One.***

Whether or not the trustees *knew* what was being edited out does not matter - ***operationally, this is a CRIME.***

Keep this in mind as you read what Galambos *actually* said:

*This theory, for example, is not available in print, so for you people it’s either this class or nothing at all, at the moment. This will not always be true, but at the moment that is the fact. But once it’s in print, for education you really don’t even need the course; that’s an assistance... in principle, as long as the knowledge is permanently recorded, you don’t even need a school or a lecture. All you need is access to books.*

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-201, Vol. VI, Session 14  
page 280

Galambos: ***“In principle, as long as the knowledge is permanently recorded, you don’t even need a school or a lecture.”***

***Sic Itur Ad Astra*** is already “out there”, in “orbit”, and it is ***“permanently recorded”***.

***So... WHERE DOES THAT LEAVE FEI TODAY?***

***After my book is published, one of the early things I plan to do about things after that, and that’s not the end, that’s the beginning of other things; that’s actually the opening of the floodgates to a lot of things that cannot be done now properly. The publication of the book will open an enormous number of floodgates. This would be one of them. Payment of accrual royalties will be possible because there will be a small booklet to go with it that refers to the large book. A small pamphlet will explain the payment of a royalty for a first time recipient, referring to the large book. Whether a person reads the large book or not is immaterial. At least he will find that there is intellectual respectability to the concept. That alone is the image value it will require and it does not exist now. The pamphlet written now out of context with the book would be a ludicrous farce.***

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-201, Vol. VII, Session 44  
page 288



*This is a good illustration, a teaching lesson for you people why it is not easy to teach flatlanders and why you should not try. When I say don't try to teach your neighbors and your friends and your associates and your colleagues and your relatives out of context, this is the reason. You cannot convince them; they will interrupt you and they will interrupt the interruption, and they will interrupt the interruption of the interruption. And nowhere can you get through as much as three sentences without an interruption and they won't listen. That is totally beyond the possibility. **That's the reason why this has to be a unidirectional transmission, as all new ideas are, and that comes best in the book. You can't argue with a book. You can argue, but the book doesn't hear it. In the absence of a book, a lecturer without interruptions is the next best thing, which is the way you are getting this. And it is necessary to do it in such a manner, because otherwise the train of thought and the logical sequential presentation is lost.***

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-201, Vol. III, Workshop 1  
page 141

Galambos says that **“teaching”** the course **“has to be a unidirectional transmission ... and that comes best in the book.”** He did not say “a” book; he said **“the”** book.

Galambos says **“you should not try”** to teach the course. **But the entire “marketing strategy” of the current trustees of The Free Enterprise Institute is founded and grounded on their “teaching” of the courses! And the trustees were never authorized to do this!** The **only thing** the trustee (not “trustees”, plural) were ever authorized and *instructed* to do, was to **PUBLISH Galambos’ book!** Thereby **protecting** and **perpetuating** his work and ideas. The *instructions* from Galambos were *explicit* (see *Orbit!* for details), yet the trustees feel the need to *complicate* this. They are what Galambos called **“Problem-Seekers”**. The trustees’ “marketing strategy” is burdensome, costly, temporary, non-profitable, and unsustainable. **In addition to this, the trustees are paying themselves NOT to honor Galambos’ wishes!** If that is not a **CRIME**, I don’t know what is.

***The problem-seeker, as I say, looks upon the problem as an end in itself. And when he is told what the solution to his problem is, he will say, invariably, ‘Oh, well, it can’t work; it’s too simple.’ As a matter of fact, I can tell you not all simple things are right, but all right things are simple. And it is necessary for the idea to be simple for it to be right, and the problem-seeker will not recognize anything that is simple. His nature is to seek complexity. He’s anti-Occam’s Razor in his talents and his capabilities.***

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-201, Vol. V, Session 31  
page 236

These are important points to keep in mind as you read on:

***Once Newton published Principia Mathematica, his work was there for the ages, for the duration of man’s civilization. And what’s more, after that, all of those yapping dogs in his wake who were yapping at his heels and saying, ‘You’re wrong.’ Or, ‘This is no good.’ Or quibbling about this. Or, ‘You stole this from me, Mr. Newton, I did this first.’ All these little yapping dogs passed away. There’s an old saying that dogs bark but the caravan passes on. When Newton published that, not only***

*was the idea secured forever—well, let's say as long as the human species endures—what's more, his credit for it was assured. And ultimately all of the yapping dogs who were annoying him, who chased him to the mint and destroyed his personal happiness—that was behind him. And pretty soon there was no question as to who discovered the law of gravitation, who developed the World Machine. Everything else was so puny by comparison. These little ideas and idealets of other people, the Robert Hooke who said they developed gravitation, was a joke. A total joke. He couldn't even prove that the planets moved in ellipses. If he can't prove that very basic application, how can he claim to have developed the theory? The thing became a joke. A very bad joke. It injured Hooke. In the same way publication is the strongest form of protection for an idea, as long as it's a cosmological concept.*

*There's no real basic hazard in that. You don't even need my theory to protect the idea's authorship on that basis, as long as the book exists.*

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-201: Volume V, Session 32, Part B  
pages 296 – 297

*And so, consequently, by the time this course has been offered to ten thousand people, far more than half of the ideological problem of expansion has been achieved. The first ten thousand are the hardest. The next hundred thousand won't be that hard. As a matter of fact, by that time there will be a book, and the book, of course, puts an intellectual responsibility and an intellectual respectability upon an idea far in excess of what it has when it's in oral form only. Please note that Isaac Newton did not do very much with the theory of gravitation as long as it was not in printed form. When it was in printed form, it changed the world completely, even though he wrote it in Latin.*

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-50, Workshop 3, Part A  
pages 1006 – 1007

Galambos says, "... publication is the strongest form of protection for an idea...". This is pure genius from Galambos in its simplicity. All the trustees ever had to do was ***publish according to Galambos' wishes, and the protection and perpetuation would automatically follow. SIMPLE AND INGENIOUS!***

Mathematically, ***Galambos' marketing strategy*** could therefore be expressed like this:

## **PUBLICATION = PROTECTION = PERPETUATION**

Galambos:

*The book that will follow this, when it is prepared and ready for publication, will probably have a bigger, deeper, and certainly more durable effect. The oral presentation must take its place prior to that and I think the oral presentation will still have a place afterwards, although it will be on tape and not live after the book is published. But this is the basic purpose of the theory of primary property's presentation in this course—to find the relatively few people of integrity, and where there isn't a full integrity, to cultivate it, and to inspire it.*

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-201, Vol. V, Session 30, Part A  
page 157

*If there were just one—one—I repeat one totally competent entrepreneurially oriented graduate of V-201, or alternatively a reader of the book once it's published who has never even had 201 but read the book, just one who totally understands this theory and applies it properly to the industry I'm about to describe, it could change the entire future of the world. That's how high the leverage could be. That's better than having to count noses and get somebody elected president only to try again in four years, is it not?*

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-201, Vol. VII, Session 41, Part A  
page 63

So, how do the quotes that I just shared from what Galambos “actually said” in regards to “publishing” compare with this statement made by Mr. Giansante in the “Cow’s Tail” document? (“Cow’s Tail” document: The highest level “screening” document of the **current** Free Enterprise Institute):

**“Cow’s Tail”: “Maybe it’s time to ask ourselves whether we understood what AJG meant when he talked about publication of his theory.”**

I whole heartedly agree. Maybe it *is* time to ask ourselves “**whether we understood what AJG meant**” when he talked about **publication**. The answer to that question resides within the “new” information I just shared with you – **and it is in Galambos’ own words**. You cannot take the word “publication” out of context. The context that Galambos defined publication was in terms of **a book. Period.**

Mr. Giansante states in the “Cow’s Tail” document:

**“Maybe it’s time to re-examine our assumptions about what constitutes a successful market strategy for disclosing AJG’s theory to its market – that is, to the people who are actually going to apply it successfully.” “... to qualified people.”**

Is it the trustees’ *duty* to question what Galambos *meant* about publication? Is it the trustees’ *place* to “re-examine” Galambos’ “market strategy”? Is it the *right* and *duty* and *place* of the trustees to *question or re-examine ANYTHING* Galambos ever said or did? Are the trustees *applying the theory successfully* themselves? Are they *applying the theory with full knowledge* of the theory? And, just exactly who is it that *qualifies* the “qualifiers”? *Themselves*?

I realize these are very inconvenient, uncomfortable questions for some people, and they are meant to be. They must be asked. I did not say these things. Galambos and the trustees said them. I am only pointing out – *and going to continue to point out* – some things that Galambos *actually said*, and some things that the trustees *actually said*, **which are diametrically opposed.**

## GALAMBOS INTENDED TO RELEASE COSMOLOGICAL PORTION OF THEORY IN THE PERMANENT FORM OF A BOOK

*At the moment I’d like to say that cosmological discovery is the easiest to release with relatively minor hazard. **Cosmological discovery can, in my judgement, be released at the time of permanent publication.** For example, what I’m doing here is*

*not permanent publication; it's temporary publication; it's an oral discussion on which you are permitted to take notes but not to publish them. Publish them means to make any copies and distribute them in any form whatsoever, in writing, orally or otherwise, or in pictorial form. It is, in fact, a temporary disclosure. The permanent disclosure would be a book, published by the author, not by somebody else. And when that happens, the cosmological portion of this theory will be released, and I so intend it, and that is a thing that I can hardly wait for, frankly. I can consider that would be probably the greatest burden off my back, and also make things easier for you.*

*... Cosmological discovery is basically the most important kind, and yet that's the one that can be released the soonest. That has been done always. It has always been done, except differently from what I say, but it has been done. What did Newton do when he published his book? He published it. Period. And then what? Well, it belongs to everybody. It's called the public domain in the legal sense. Oh, you can copyright it, which is just a little legal formality about the phraseology is yours, but the ideas can be stolen. And even the phraseology becomes public domain when the copyright expires. But you're still protected without any law.*

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, V-201: Volume V, Session 32, Part B  
pages 296 – 297

I took extremely good notes from the digitally edited “V-201DD”. Any student of that course has the ability to start and stop, rewind, etc. So whenever a “pictorial graphic” was shown on the video screen, I would stop and take notes on it. Sometimes the video screen showed a graph, or a quote from an important historical figure, or something else. OR, many times **a direct quote from Galambos**. According to my notes, at approximately “1:00” hour in to Session 32A of “V-201DD”, the pictorial video “screen” had the following quote. I always copied down **exactly** wherever an exact quote from Galambos was presented visually. I will now compare the quote from “V-201DD” below, with the quote I just shared with you:

V-201DD Video Screen:

*What I'm doing here is not permanent publication, it's temporary publication, it's an oral discussion, you are permitted to take notes but not to publish them. 'Publish' means to make any copy and distribute it in any form whatsoever, in writing, orally, or otherwise... it is in fact a temporary disclosure. In the meantime, NRD is the necessary and right way to do this... the plunder can exist, but not with my consent.*

— “V-201DD”, Session 32A

Compare that quote, to *this* quote from the book, *Sic Itur Ad Astra* (**NOTE: Everything in bold WAS EDITED OUT, and is NOT present in the quote from “V-201DD” above**):

***At the moment I'd like to say that cosmological discovery is the easiest to release with relatively minor hazard. Cosmological discovery can, in my judgement, be released at the time of permanent publication. For example, what I'm doing here is not permanent publication; it's temporary publication; it's an oral discussion on which you are permitted to take notes but not to publish them. Publish them means to make any copies and distribute them in any form whatsoever, in writing, orally***

*or otherwise, or in pictorial form. It is, in fact, a temporary disclosure. The permanent disclosure would be a book, published by the author, not by somebody else. And when that happens, the cosmological portion of this theory will be released, and I so intend it, and that is a thing that I can hardly wait for, frankly. I can consider that would be probably the greatest burden off my back, and also make things easier for you.*

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, V-201: Volume V, Session 32, Part A  
page 296

Mr. Giansante has **INTENTIONALLY** edited out: “*or in pictorial form.*” Why would Mr. Giansante edit out “*or in pictorial form*”? Well, much of “V-201DD” is presented in “*pictorial form*”. Is it possible that the trustees did not want to be accused of “*publishing*” in “*pictorial form*”? That is entirely possible, but still somewhat of a mystery.

More importantly, what is **not** a mystery to anyone, is the fact that Mr. Giansante/the trustees **INTENTIONALLY** edited out these three sentences: “*The permanent disclosure would be a book, published by the author, not by somebody else. And when that happens, the cosmological portion of this theory will be released, and I so intend it, and that is a thing that I can hardly wait for, frankly. I can consider that would be probably the greatest burden off my back, and also make things easier for you.*”

Why did Mr. Giansante and the trustees edit this out from their digitally produced course “V-201DD”? Obviously, it is because Galambos clearly states that he intends “*permanent disclosure*” in the form of a “*book*” and “*so I intend it*”!!! But this is 180 degrees **OPPOSITE** to everything written in the “*Cow’s Tail*” document! Therefore, *in the trustees’ opinion*, these words of Galambos’ **must be deleted from history!** Is this anything less than **PRIMARY MURDER OF THE PROFESSOR?!**

I could end this letter right now and easily make the case that the “trustees” are not qualified to handle professor Galambos’ estate, in *any* capacity whatsoever. That the current trustees should all resign immediately and hand over the reins to a **COMPETENT PERSON**. **BUT THERE IS SO MUCH MORE “NEW” INFORMATION TO SHARE!** It would be a travesty, and a miscarriage of **JUSTICE**, to deny this “new” information to posterity. The *quantity* of new information presented in this letter is **not** all there is to share on this subject. This is only the *tip of the iceberg!*

According to Galambos, the cosmological portion of the theory would be released upon permanent publication of “*a book, published by the author, not by somebody else*”, and, “*... when that happens, the cosmological portion of this theory will be released, and I so intend it...*”. So adamant was the professor that he said, “*...that is a thing I can hardly wait for, frankly. I can consider that would be probably the greatest burden off my back, and also make things easier for you...*”

So why do the trustees so *stringently* release the “cosmological portion” of AJG’s theory, on a *temporary* basis? Why must any potential customer be referred by a “qualified graduate”, then be *required* to answer a “preliminary questionnaire”, and then be *tested* all along the way while going through course “V-50DD”, the “*cosmological*” portion of the course? Galambos certainly never did this, nor did he intend his trustee to do it. Maybe it’s because the trustees are following Mr. Giansante’s “*Cow’s Tail*” document **to the TEE – BUT NOT following the actual words, actions, and instructions of Galambos himself!** Is this because it’s possible that **ALL** of the trustees do not have **ALL** of the facts? Or is it because the trustees **DO** have all of the facts, but do not wish to disclose them to the

market, for personal reasons? Again, whether the trustees knew this or not, operationally it is a **CRIME** against the professor.

The digitized course “V-50DD”, by the way, is still only a **“temporary publication”**, as Galambos states: **“... it’s temporary publication; it’s an oral discussion on which you are permitted to take notes but not to publish them...”**. This is what the trustees are still currently doing – “temporarily” disclosing the theory, AND *without disclosing all of the facts*. “Temporary disclosure” is not what Galambos intended, and was not what Galambos had instructed the trustees to do:

**“The permanent disclosure would be a book, published by the author, not by somebody else. And when that happens, the cosmological portion of this theory will be released, and I so intend it, and that is a thing that I can hardly wait for...”**

In the “Cow’s Tail” document, Mr. Giansante includes some carefully chosen quotes from Galambos’ course V-201 to make his case for nonpublication, and for implementing a market strategy contrary to that of Galambos. Upon closer examination, given this “new” information, it becomes clear that Mr. Giansante did not include the *most important* parts of what Galambos *actually* said. Therefore, Mr. Giansante’s quotes of Galambos in the “Cow’s Tail” document must be viewed as *incomplete, and completely out of context*. This is yet another **CRIME** against the professor.

Mr. Giansante’s contention that “SIAA Vol.1” was “*promiscuous-nonproprietary-noncontractual*”, IS a correct statement; but a **FAULTY PREMISE**. If one reads the “Cow’s Tail” document, and changes the “premise” by replacing “SIAA Vol.1” with **Book One**, then one can easily see how the “Cow’s Tail” document becomes exposed as **a fraud**. This is for the simple reason that **Book One IS NOT** “promiscuous”, **NOT** nonproprietary, and **NOT** “noncontractual”. On the other hand, “SIAA Vol.1” IS all those things. Therefore, the entire premise of the “Cow’s Tail” document is misleading from the beginning and throughout. Anyone who has access to the “Cow’s Tail” document can discover this for themselves. A thorough examination of that document is beyond the scope of this letter. Nevertheless, in regards to the “Cow’s Tail” document, I will continue to point out some important points for any reader to examine on their own.

## **GALAMBOS EXPECTED MISAPPLICATIONS AND PLUNDER - IN THE SHORT TERM - BUT DESIRED TO TAKE THAT RISK**

***I’m not so stupid as to assume it cannot be plundered—this is flatland, you know, externally to here—I’m not so stupid as to assume it cannot be plundered. All I’m saying with NRD is that it doesn’t carry my sanction; and it’s designated, ipso facto, automatically, as plunder. And thereby, when a natural society begins to emerge in terms of a true clearinghouse and not a phony clearinghouse—not a guardian of stolen property produced by thieves—when that mechanism emerges, clearly anyone who has plundered it will have a credit rating of zero. In the short run, they will have an advantage during the statist, flatland world. In the short run, they have every advantage. That is characteristic, in general, of the flat world.***

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-201: Workshop Two, Part B  
pages 22 – 24

*There will always be plunder in the beginning of a release of ARD in today's world of transition. In the future world such things are not done, because it's no longer part of the traditions and the culture of a society. But in today's transitional bridge society, there will be plunder at the time of release, and prior to release as a matter of fact, because people don't wait for release. If they're going to plunder, they're not going to honor an ARD or NRD requirement anyhow; they'll just steal it. At the moment, the refusal to release from NRD to ARD, in all frankness, does not prevent plunder; it just refuses the sanction of the victim of the plunder to be transferred to the thief. In other words, by not releasing to ARD, I'm essentially saying: "If you're planning to steal, at least you're not stealing with my consent, Buster, and you'll be branded a thief. And when it matters, that's how you will be remembered, or not at all." And that's all that that means. And that is a very potent market concept. Because, actually, the release to ARD is a moral concept; not a legal one and not one with coercive teeth.*

*The one who's going to plunder in flatland is going to plunder with or without the release, except that it will not have any moral sanction to it. Once something is released, on the basis I mentioned - well, let me discuss that again later. When the release is made on that basis, as I say, it will somewhat reduce the strains of the transition from flatland to spaceland... Whereas, in the case of primary property, if a thought is created in someone's head and he never discloses it and dies with it, then obviously it will go with him. If he discloses it to one person, then it becomes an idea, but if he does not disclose it any further, and if they both die, it dies with them. But as long as there's some way of not having the idea lost, whatever that method may be, whether it's a publication or some oral transmission which will lose in the retransmission, which is why written is better - verba volant, scripta manent, which means words fly away, writing remains - after publication, an idea has little chance of dying unless every vestige of that publication is destroyed.*

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-201, Volume IV, Session 23  
pages 161 – 162

With these statements, Galambos clearly established that he fully expected misapplications and plunder – in the short run – upon publication of his book. He also knew that he would throw his cosmological innovations into the “public domain” – but again, in the short run. In spite of this, **he wanted his book to be released as soon as possible and the cosmological portions released to ARD upon publication.**

Galambos has the **absolute right to risk** exposing his theory to misapplication and plunder, and that is **his risk** and **his risk alone** to take. The trustees have **absolutely no right to ROB** the professor of his **absolute right** to take that risk. It is not the trustees' job to second guess him. This misapplication by the trustees is a direct result of the trustees' **poor comprehension** of the theory, among other things that will be pointed out, forthcoming.

And what did Galambos say about “misapplications”?:

*I do both request and warn all of you: **A misapplication is catastrophic to you as well as to me, as well as to the theory, as well as to the survival of mankind. Every***

*misapplication is a danger, because it creates a loss of credibility to the theory which it does not deserve.*

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, V-201, Vol. VII, Session 41, Part B  
page 90

And as every student of Galambos should know, he also said: ***“I would rather see no application than a misapplication.”*** And he would most likely rather “see no application” of his theory by the current trustees, as well.

## GALAMBOS INTENDED BOOK TO BE RELEASED “ARD”

In *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, “Question and Answer” section of Workshop Two, Part B, Galambos asks “Mr. Tripp” if he has a question:

Mr. Tripp: *“Yes, there are so many elements in your theory here, and I am not very clear as to which of those elements are open to ARD. Such as my decision to want to pay royalties to someone. Do I have your permission before I can do that?”*

AJG:

***The question is, which elements of my theory are open to ARD, and do you have to have my permission to pay royalties to anyone? All right, that’s two questions. All of the elements of my, or anybody else’s, theory are open to ARD when released.*** At this time, nothing has been released. I made that explicitly clear: nothing, zero, has been released to ARD as of now, and I discussed this in some detail. **The time to release to ARD for cosmological property is upon permanent publication, which is defined in terms of something other than oral but in writing of some form. I said that cosmological innovation is quite properly and even desirably released to ARD upon permanent publication. I went into some detail to explain that, as to why. Therefore, I said when my book on this topic—this is hardly a topic; it’s a way of life—on this subject is published, I intend in that book to convey a general release to ARD, subject to the two standard restrictions: noncoercive usage, nonzero positive royalties. I intend to release on ARD basis, subject to these two standard restrictions, all cosmological concepts, which are my property in the theory in the book. That answers that part—at the time of publication, in written form.** “The NRD on everything else remains until I choose to release it—either I or my natural estate proprietary trustee, or trustees—and that would include technological applications—the clearinghouse, specifically all components of the clearinghouse: the corporate mechanism, the compensation mechanism, the various insurance principles and concepts I just discussed and throughout the course, and especially now in the previous session. When will they be released?

*When I consider it feasible. And that is also covered in the course as to when that should be done: when successful application has been made to the point where all misapplications will be unsuccessful. That’s predictable. A misapplication cannot work. This is a pure theory; it does not get contaminated without injury. A pure concept cannot be contaminated without injury. A pure concept cannot be contaminated and be the same as without the contaminants, and therefore, **I do not wish to put my proprietary brand name on misapplications. That’s all NRD means. It***



*doesn't mean that it cannot be plundered. It just means I will not recognize as property anything that has been so used; and anything that has been used without my consent, I designate as plunder. And that's all that means.*

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-201: Workshop Two, Part B  
pages 22 – 24

In my well taken notes from the same Workshop Two, Part B of FEI's digitally produced "V-201DD", here is what is presented on this subject:

On the pictorial "screen" it is shown:

***"Nothing - ZERO - has been released to ARD as of now." AJG***

And then right after that screen is another "screen":

***"The NRD remains until I choose to release it - either I or my natural estate proprietary trustees." AJG***

***That is all*** that was ever presented on the "pictorial screens"! Look at this paragraph again, because this is ***important***. Notice all of the rest of Galambos' answer that Mr. Giansante has ***deleted out*** (EVERYTHING DELETED OUT IS IN BOLD, BLACK COLOR, and what Mr. Giansante presented remains in BLUE):

***"At this time, nothing has been released. I made that explicitly clear: nothing, zero, has been released to ARD as of now, and I discussed this in some detail. The time to release to ARD for cosmological property is upon permanent publication, which is defined in terms of something other than oral but in writing of some form. I said that cosmological innovation is quite properly and even desirably released to ARD upon permanent publication. I went into some detail to explain that, as to why. Therefore, I said when my book on this topic—this is hardly a topic; it's a way of life—on this subject is published, I intend in that book to convey a general release to ARD, subject to the two standard restrictions: noncoercive usage, nonzero positive royalties. I intend to release on ARD basis, subject to these two standard restrictions, all cosmological concepts, which are my property in the theory in the book. That answers that part—at the time of publication, in written form. The NRD on everything else remains until I choose to release it - either I or my natural estate proprietary trustee, or trustees - and that would include technological applications - the clearinghouse, specifically all components of the clearinghouse: the corporate mechanism, the compensation mechanism, the various insurance principles and concepts I just discussed and throughout the course, and especially now in the previous session. When will they be released? When I consider it feasible. And that also is covered in the course as to when that should be done: when successful application has been made to the point where all misapplications will be unsuccessful. That's predictable. A misapplication cannot work. This is a pure theory; it does not get contaminated without injury. Pure concept cannot be contaminated and be the same as without the contaminants, and therefore, I do not wish to put my proprietary brand name on misapplications. That's all NRD means. It doesn't mean that it cannot be plundered. It just means I will not recognize as property anything that has been so used; and anything that has been used without my consent, I designate as plunder. And that's all that means."***

***WOW! CAN YOU BELIEVE THIS? Talk about Primary Murder of Galambos' theory!!! This is what Mr. Giansante claims to be his "special knowledge"?***

From his “Cow’s Tail” document:

I was personally associated with Professor Galambos, and I know things about his intent and his behavior that are simply unknown to anyone who didn’t have a close association with him. Nevertheless, I realize it’s a lot to ask of you to accept any special knowledge I might have if you can’t independently verify it for yourself. So, in deference to what I hope should be a very healthy skepticism on your part, I’ve done my best to avoid any reliance on my special knowledge as AJG’s personal associate in preparing my remarks. Unless I say otherwise, everything I say here is rooted deeply and directly in P1 theory, and is supported by AJG’s statements in V- 50, V-201, or other FEI courses. In many cases, that’s exactly what I’m going to do; I will provide you with direct quotations in AJG’s own words to support the most important things I’m going to say. In fact, whenever you hear other people making noises about how AJG’s theory “should” be handled, I suggest that you hold them to the same standard; make them prove it using the theory itself as the basis of proof.”

***So, what has just been “proven” about Mr. Giansante, AND Galambos’ theory? I leave that for the reader to figure out!***

Continuing on:

***And I personally advocate a rapid release of everything to ARD, including technological things. But I would like to see a successful application, or two or three, before. In the case of cosmological property publication, that will come at the time of my book being published. And the other things will be released to ARD, as I say, when I find some successful applications, enough to satisfy my doing so. The NRD technology, incidentally, is quite difficult. That’s the most difficult part of this. Because, actually, it is burdensome, time-consuming, and it’s actually a real relief to an innovator to release something; except up to now, release meant plunder. As a matter of fact, there is no such thing as a release now. It’s automatically in the public domain. Practically everything he does is in the public domain. But negotiation is a very burdensome thing—for the innovator more than anybody else. He hasn’t got time for such things. So, as I say, I’m quite anxious for it, but I want to do it on a rational, proprietary basis.***

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-201, Workshop Two, Part B  
pages 22 – 24

Compare the paragraph above with the next “pictorial screen” in “V-201DD”:

***“As a matter of fact, there is no such thing as release (to ARD) now. It’s automatically in the public domain. Practically everything he does is in the public domain.” AJG***

This is ALL we get from Mr. Giansante on this subject?! ***I don’t think students, and possibly even some trustees, are getting ALL of the information, and certainly not ALL of the facts!***

Here’s another example of what Galambos *actually said* on this topic (as if anyone *needs* another example at this point!):

*In any event, a law of nature or even a major technovation such as a wheel or an airplane can more easily be released to ARD than some minor technological achievement. I mean, I'll tell you that the cosmological portions of this course will be released a lot sooner than the technological portions. As a matter of fact, I can tell you when the cosmological portions will be released. I can tell you the exact day: the day of the publication of the book. It will be contained in the book. All cosmological concepts in this theory will be released to ARD with the publication. That's easy to release - and safe. it's the technological portions that are less so.*

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-201, Vol. IV, Session 22, Part B  
page 103

**So then, how does what Galambos actually said, compare with the myths about the theory that are widely accepted amongst the trustees of the Free Enterprise Institute - some of which are deeply held and even cherished? How does this compare with the “company line” that is expressed in the “Cow’s Tail” document; the “highest level “screening document” for “comprehension” of the theory, and a document which is used to support the trustee's policy of nonpublication?**

In the “Cow’s Tail”, Mr. Giansante states:

AJG never stated that he guaranteed an automatic release to ARD upon publication. A further discussion of that matter is beyond the scope of this preliminary document.

Is it *possible* to believe this statement after reading the professor's *actual* words in V-201?! Again, the words of the professor:

*“Therefore, I said when my book on this topic—this is hardly a topic; it's a way of life—on this subject is published, I intend in that book to convey a general release to ARD, subject to the two standard restrictions: noncoercive usage, nonzero positive royalties.”*

**AND... :**

**“All cosmological concepts in this theory will be released to ARD with the publication.”**

How could professor Galambos have been more clear? Surely Mr. Giansante, the “editor” of “V-201DD”, must have known that Galambos intended “*that book to convey a general release to ARD*”. After all, Mr. Giansante was working off the *verbatim transcripts*. Why would he not point this out? Why would Mr. Giansante say Galambos “*never*” stated something that Galambos most emphatically *DID* state? And more importantly, did Mr. Giansante and the trustees *intentionally* edit these statements regarding ARD out of “V-201DD”? Or is this all just a “misunderstanding” on their part? Well, it’s either one or the other or both. The trustees’ “intent” doesn’t matter. Operationally this is a **CRIME**.

**The bits and pieces of “new” information I have shared thus far are individual puzzle pieces of evidence – among many, as you shall soon see – that support the fact that *the current trustees are completely unqualified to be trustees of Galambos' Estate.***

## EDITING THE COURSES: MORE CRIMES AGAINST PROFESSOR GALAMBOS

### TRUSTEES' "V-50DD SESSION 1" VS. WILLIAM W. MARTIN SIC ITUR AD ASTRA V-50 SESSION 1

Let's look at something simple. Let's compare:

#### **The unauthorized editing by Mr. Giansante of Galambos' Course V-50 which resulted in the production of "V-50DD Session 1"**

(For reference: V-50DD Session 1A: <https://youtu.be/JHu5UFSP9gU> ; V-50DD Session 1B: <https://youtu.be/LLFqkawWb04> )

#### **COMPARED WITH:**

**Galambos' authorized book, *Sic Itur Ad Astra V-50 Vol. 1, Session 1*, edited by Galambos' Literary Executor, William W. Martin.**

Below are a few important words, phrases, and names that Mr. Giansante INTENTIONALLY edited out, and therefore are not included in The Free Enterprise Institutes' audio/visual presentation of "V-50DD Session 1".

Note: Deleted material is in **BOLD**, below:

1. Of note is the removal of Mr. Lowi's name on page 6, edited out of "V-50 Session 1" at 17:50: *"... which was provided to me a year ago by a friend of mine, **Mr. Lowi**, and I think it's apropos."*

And especially the removal of Mr. Snelson's name on page 7, not once but twice. Note: The first deletion is just a flat out deletion; the second deletion changes the entire meaning of the discussion.

The first deletion. **This phrase is completely nonexistent** in "V-50DD Session 1A", and is **edited out** at 21:01:

***"Also, my colleague, Mr. Snelson, who teaches on The Free Enterprise Institute faculty, he put it another way. He used to be commenting about what the purpose of the war in Vietnam is about, and this was his way of expressing it: 'That's so we can teach the enemy that our brand of socialism is better than their brand of socialism.'**"*

The second deletion (in **BOLD**) is edited out at 21:45:

*"I think this is a good way to put it. **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."*

In FEI's "V-50DD Session 1", the second example states only, "I think this is a good way to put it... 'What will be the human population of the earth in one hundred years?' ". Mr. Giansante has **changed**

**this from being Mr. Snelson's idea to Galambos' idea!** And Galambos did not intend this nor would he ever approve. In fact, if someone in the future were to discover this to be Snelson's property and that Galambos seemingly took credit for it himself, that person could claim that Galambos fails his Credit Test, one of the major tests for independency!

It is FEI's current policy to remove from history the names of anyone that Galambos ever had an issue with, and FEI claims that is because it is what Galambos would have intended. But I have recently learned that long after Galambos dismissed Lowi and Snelson, Galambos continued giving these men credit, where due, in his open-end courses. So this is yet another example of a **CRIME** against Professor Galambos. And a crime against history, and crimes against Mr. Lowi and Mr. Snelson too, by the way.

2. In "V-50DD Session 1", all references to a money-back guarantee are removed, but these references exist in the book *Sic Itur Ad Astra* edited by William W. Martin. (Note: everything in **BOLD** is completely edited out of "V-50DD Session 1"):

- Page 5, edited out at 13:44: ***"Moreover, there is a one hundred percent, ironclad, unconditional, money-back guarantee on this course which you are free to exercise if you don't think that I will prove that contention."***

- Page 49, edited out at 1:04:09: ***"This course, of course, as every other course of this Free Enterprise Institute, has a one hundred percent unconditional money-back guarantee to those who attend every session of the course. If you do attend every session and you do not find that your time and your money have been, well - not spent - but invested for higher returns to you, you may ask for your money back. You will be the first one ever to do so. But I will have no hesitancy in saying so, and I will say at the end of the course with the same size typeface as I just said it now. In other words, this is not a promotional gimmick. It's a fact. There's no problem about that because no one can offer a money-back guarantee on that basis unless he's got a product on which he can deliver. There's nothing that I said this evening, however outlandish or ridiculous it may sound, that is not provable and is not capable of being proven in this course or its sequel."***

- Page 50, edited out at 1:05:30: ***"All questions in the course, without any exception, that are put to me will be answered without evasion. That's part of the money back guarantee. Now I may not know the answer. 'I don't know' is an answer."***

3. Most notable in regards to the publishing of a book are these two deletions below:

- Page 52, edited out at 1:07:36: ***"This course is not in books at this time. It will be when I write it."***

- Page 52, edited out at 1:08:12: ***"And except for things written by myself or one or another of my colleagues, the rest of the material is not part of the course."***

If I can find these deletions so early into "V-50DD Session 1", I think it's safe to conclude that Mr. Giansante has deleted ALL references to **Galambos' book** throughout ALL of the digital courses he has "produced"! **How many deletions EXACTLY? That would be a very good question for EVERYONE to ask Mr. Giansante, and to the other trustees.**

4. Under the heading “**The Definition of Coercion**” in *Sic Itur Ad Astra* (V-50, Session 1, page 24) it can be seen, in comparison, that the following sentences (highlighted in **BOLD**) have been edited out of “V-50DD Session 1”, at 1:13:29:

*“Coercion is the attempted, intentional interference with the property of another. **Actually the last two words of another are redundant. But I won’t push this at this early stage. You cannot interfere with your own property. It’s impossible. But I don’t want to push that at this early stage. You may cite exceptions, like a guy sets fire to his own house or commits suicide. This is not true. If you include primary property this is not an interference with his property. I want to stress that you may not see the importance of...**”*

I learned from Marketing Director Cheryl Cerell that Mr. Giansante adamantly takes the position that a person CAN interfere with his/her own property. This is an important point where Mr. Giansante’s view is in complete disagreement with Galambos’. Now, disagreeing with Galambos is not a crime. **But intentionally editing out Galambos’ words on the most critical subject of “COERCION”? That in and of itself IS COERCION, and it’s committed by the trustees!** This is an example, in the highest form, of COERCION!

*“The attempted, intentional interference with the property of another.” Galambos’ property! And these people call themselves “TRUSTEES”? WHERE IS THE “TRUST”?*

**Can there be a greater CRIME against the professor than this?!!!**

The *intentional deletions* above are **primary crimes** committed against professor Galambos. I’m only sighting a **few** examples. Is it too much of a stretch to conclude that there are **many more important deletions throughout “V-50DD”, “V-111DD”, and “V-201DD”?** I happen to know on good authority that the original V-50 Session 1 that was played on tape is **29 MINUTES longer than the edited version (“V-50DD Sessions 1A&B”) the trustees are selling.** And where is the authority granted from Galambos to do this editing? Naturally it does not exist.

**The “new” information in this letter will have long-lasting implications regarding the future of Galambos’ P1 AND P2.** Therefore, this letter will not be complete without further examination of the crimes, miscomprehension, and misapplications of the current “trustees” of The Free Enterprise Institute.

## GALAMBOS ROBBED OF HIS RIGHT TO REPEAT HIMSELF

Regarding the editing of Galambos’ V-201, in 2015 Mr. Giansante wrote to Cheryl Cerell:

The document is thirteen pages long, but don't freak out; most of that consists of the content that I've deleted, which is straight repetition of content in V-50, V-111 and V-201. There's an enormous amount of it, and the only connection that it has to what are supposed to be the subjects of discussion in Session 39B is that something he said reminded him of all these digressions, and then he went into AutoPlay Tape Mode. He was pretty much out of control for most of the session. I believe that all of the edits are straightforward — correction of some mistakes and deletion of some unnecessary digressions.

There are no controversial issues as far as I can tell.

Fondly, Vegno Pardouche, Editor [sic]

Ms. Cerell responded:

Pete: I approve your edits of S39B. (how do you do this on meds & pain anyway?)

From this exchange between these two trustees, one can conclude:

- 1) Mr. Giansante is editing the course while taking pain “meds”, apparently. This statement, in 2016, from Mr. Giansante to Cheryl Cerell may enlighten the reader: *“Just a quick note to say a big ‘Thanks!’ and send a big hug for the Cow’s Tail royalty check. :-\* It will come in very handy....another trip to the doctor for meds refills, and a fair amount of time on my back...I finally managed to clear all that stuff off my plate and got back into the tape digitizing work. I’ve got a huge supply of tapes that I can digitize...”*
- 2) Mr. Giansante states that Galambos delivers lecture “S39B” in “AutoPlay Tape Mode”, as if Galambos were some sort of non-thinking robot that was “out of control most of the session”.
- 3) Mr. Giansante edits out portions of Galambos’ course V-201 that he claims to be “... straight repetition of content in V-50, V-111, and V-201”, and “unnecessary digressions”.
- 4) Mr. Giansante states that there are “no **controversial** issues” in his editing of this session, “as far as I can tell”. Is he *sure* about that? And “controversial” to who? Controversial to Galambos, or controversial to the “trustees” when they all meet to discuss this? Well, I guess “two heads are better than one”, so Mr. Giansante runs these ideas by Ms. Cerell (highly “qualified” graduate of the theory?) for “approval”. Ms. Cerell then **approves** “of your edits of S39B”. (Is this an example of the “blind leading the blind”?)

One more point regarding “**controversial**” editing:

In 2015, Mr. Giansante wrote this to Cheryl Cerell regarding a speech that he was in the process of writing for the FEI AJG Day yearly “Event”:

No, wait...there's one other thing that I can easily talk about, but it's a taboo subject: Why it's not possible to “publish” a book that meets all of the specifications that AJG talked about in V-201, and still satisfies the requirements of the theory itself. Actually, we’re doing it the only way we possibly can do it...but I guess we'll have to just let people figure that out for themselves. **I fear that any mention of “the book” is going to open a can of worms we’ll never be able to control.** Anyhow, I’m going back to work on V-201DD now. I’m feeling great pressure to keep that moving forward, and the remaining three sessions in Module 2 (S31, S32, and S33) are not going to be easy. **They will have some of the hardest and most controversial edits in the entire course. I warned everyone it was coming.** Well, now it’s here.

Aside from everything that is completely wrong about this exchange between these two “trustees”, it should be pointed out that **repetition for comprehension** was a very important part of Galambos’ courses, and very important in the way that he conveyed the information to his students. Mr. Giansante’s editing out of Galambos’ material that he deems “repetitive” is not only “controversial”, but it’s also another major **CRIME** against the professor.

## GALAMBOS EMPHATICALLY EMPHASIZED THE IMPORTANCE OF REPETITION FOR COMPREHENSION

As many students of Galambos *should* know, the professor's teaching style was to present major points in his lectures, from time to time, in a different context and from a different angle and approach. William W. Martin, Galambos' appointed Literary Executor, always said that is how he really learned the theory – and NO ONE knew the theory better than Mr. Martin did. Galambos knew this. It is true that in Galambos' declining days, when dementia began to set in, he would often ramble on and on for hours. That was one thing. **But repetition for emphasis is not “rambling”**. When AJG was in his prime he used **repetition** as the great teaching tool it is. The trustees have deprived their students of this invaluable tool.

It is to my advantage that I may access some “special knowledge” in regards to this topic of **REPETITION**. This knowledge is contained in *Sic Itur Ad Astra*. In it, there is a specialized index, or “Concordex”. This allows one to quickly search ANY topic regarding Galambos' theory, and quickly find answers to questions. **It is a tremendous tool to aid in comprehension!** We have **Mr. William W. Martin** to be grateful for this:

From the *Sic Itur Ad Astra* Master Condordex:

*"repetition:*

- *as part of advertising, 843, 847, 856*
- *major teaching function of, VIII-122*
- *not burdensome and not annoying, VIII-122*
- *significance of is missed by people who are short-term, impatient types, VIII-122"*

I consider these three points from the Concordex to be most compatible with the topic of **REPETITION**, as it relates to Mr. Giansante's cavalier attitude toward this subject:

- *“major teaching function of”;*
- *“not burdensome and not annoying”;*
- *“significance of is missed by people who are short-term, impatient types”.*

Galambos says:

*There is no way you can improve the rate at which this is going other than having the respectability of having something in print. The difference between a printed and an oral disclosure is the following - not that an oral discussion cannot be as good under optimum circumstances, but it's not as durable: verba volant, scripta manent. That means words fly away, writing remains. With a tape recorder, it's not quite so bad. The tape recording remains which can be transcribed. However, from the standpoint of the oral listener, he has only his memory and his notes, and the two are in contradiction to each other; the better his notes, the worse his comprehension; the better his comprehension, the fewer notes he takes, because while he's busy taking notes, he misses the point. There is no possible way you can take notes on this so fast that it will keep you getting everything down. I know people who take so voluminous notes that it exceeds everything I have written on this so*



far, combined in the form of notes to myself and chits to remind me what to talk about. And usually I find their comprehension is the least good...

I'd like to point out that even **repetition**, where it's intentional and not accidental, **has a major teaching function: emphasis**. Nowhere when I studied physics did anyone ever point out to me the supreme function of the unification of physics through the concept of energy. From none of my teachers, with the possible exception of thermodynamics where it was hinted at, but only hinted at, did this come through to me with the clarity of a clear bell. It had to gradually grow and accrue in my mind. Yet, it is the complete exposure that you have in studying physics, especially from many different teachers, many different courses which are disjointed, uncorrelated, and unintegrated - this is on this topic, this is on another topic, this is on electromagnetic theory, this is on thermodynamics, this is on mechanics, this is on optics, physical optics, and then there are separately geometrical optics; then you have this and that; and you have elementary quantum theory, more advanced quantum theory, still more advanced quantum theory. The more advanced it gets, the more mystical it becomes, I assure you. [Audience laughter.] I was wondering at first whether it's me or them. I'm completely convinced now it's them. [AJG chuckles] Very burdensome. That's only the part of physics I was really annoyed with. I still am. I have covered this in my physics course. That's in a complete disarray. It's almost like William Jennings Bryan's brain. [Laughter from the audience and AJG.] Anyhow, it is in all the branches of physics. Ultimately, you're talking about energy. Ultimately, when you go deep enough into the subject, it's energy, and it's the great unifier. **So when you finally find this out, then it becomes not a matter of burdensome repetition, but an emphasis that there is something that is uniform and completely correlated with everything within the subject of physics, which ties everything together.** That's of course the way I teach the physics course as a single course, which is a panoramic sweep of all these branches and is a detailed analysis of none, but is a panoramic sweep of the whole subject of physics as the basis of all knowledge. **It is the emphasis and repetition** of energy here and energy there, and there's a relationship. When you find that relationship between one branch of physics and another, you've got one of the major theoretical advances.

When it became known that heat is a form of energy in the same sense as mechanical energy, this was one of the all-time great integrations of all time. It ultimately came out as the first law of thermodynamics. And then separately but nonetheless ultimately linked to that, is the second law of thermodynamics. They are quite different laws of nature. They're different in type of law. They're not only different in content but in what kind of law they represent. But they are basically correlated. They both deal with energy. One deals with the quantity of it, the other is the quality of it. One deals with the nature of the exchanges and the other is the direction of the exchanges. The second law of thermodynamics tells you which direction the universe is moving. **The point is that if you know what things are important, they will always repeatedly crop up, and that repetition is not burdensome and is not annoying.**

**This is what happens. When you keep seeing the same thing, there must be a connection. The teaching must reflect that. People who just are short-term, impatient types will miss altogether the significance of that.** I have many times recommended Ayn Rand in the early days before I had an Institute. I was working at

the boondoggle, and I was recommending Ayn Rand to be read by other people I knew at the boondoggle. Also, later when I taught at Whittier College I was recommending to my students to read Ayn Rand's books - Fountainhead, Atlas Shrugged, and her short classic, Anthem. Atlas Shrugged, the most universal commentary was: 'Oh, it's all right, except that it's much too long; it's repetitive.' Interestingly enough, I got more out of it than anybody in the world, including Ayn Rand. [Chuckles from the audience.] That might sound pompous. I apologize for the fact that it sounds that way. But I have my reasons for saying that, because Ayn Rand only sees it in the framework that she put it in. I see it in the framework of something broader. And I don't mean to in any way derogate her achievement. It's an enormously important book, but she doesn't recognize the full scope of it herself.

I who got the most out of it on one single reading - I never had time to read it twice - I started to read it twice, and I got one-third of the way through. It is a regret to me I didn't finish it, because I can tell you from the first one-third, that I got much more out of it on the second reading than the first reading. **The same principle as why you get more from the second take of any good course, mine or otherwise. Any course you take a second time, if it has worthwhileness, you will get more out of. You already know what the end is. So when you start from the beginning, you know where it's going.** See, when you come into V-50, or you come into V-201, all you know is; **Is there enough in here to keep my attention so I will want to bother to finish it? But you really don't know where it's going. And at the end, you see where the course has moved along towards, what purpose, what goal. Then you take it from the beginning. Then you see the framework of the whole. You've seen the whole now. Now you're going through known territory, not unknown territory, and you see with each step along the way familiar things, and you know where it's heading, and therefore you are more able to see the surrounding territory - what this means in the context of the whole. I found that there's an enormous amount in Atlas Shrugged you have to miss the first time because you don't know where it's going.**

Well, anyhow, I only read it one and a third times, which is my shortcoming and my mishap. Nonetheless, I did not find that book boring or repetitious. To be sure, Ayn Rand says it I don't know how many times, but it must be countless - it was countable except that I didn't count it - but **regularly, repetitively, she says, 'Man lives for his own sake [AJG hits the podium] and not for the sake of others.'** And some mental lightweight, some mental midget would say, 'Why does she keep repeating herself? - yah, yah, yah, yah?' She's not repeating herself. She's emphasizing a significant concept in many different contexts, and there are no two contexts which are identical. And she shows it from all kinds of postures, all walks of life, all kinds of people, under all kinds of circumstances. **The words are repetitive, but not the context in which they're immersed.** I have the same hang-up with people. They hear Newton. 'Oh, he's still on that kick on Newton.' Even though I'm discussing a different aspect of it, they don't hear the rest. Or the most common thing you can say, 'Doesn't this Galambos have anything to say other than property?' [Laughter from the audience and chuckles from AJG.] As a matter of fact, he does. He's a physicist. He speaks about energy, too.

And so, therefore, you can say, 'Doesn't he have anything to talk about except energy and property?' Yes, and they're related, as a matter of fact. If you don't realize

that energy and property are related, you're quite backward on the subject by now. It's also related to life which is in between. Life comes from the concept of energy in physics. You try for life without energy. [AJG chuckles with the audience.] And then property comes from the energy that life possesses, so the three are related. It's simply a smooth flowstream from energy to life to property. And then you go to volition, and then you go to subvolition. There the main word is ego. So you have energy, life, property, ego. And you want to know something out of context? No extra charge. A slopover from 273: ego is property. A human being's ego is his property; it's his own opinion of himself. It's the composite, the totality of his own opinion of himself. The subjective evaluation of oneself is your ego; and that being your idea, it's your property. And therefore there's a continuous flow there, and you have a unified, integrated four subjects: the supreme subject -physics which includes everything else; the sub-subject which deals with life; the sub-subject which deals with volition within life; the sub-subject of your ability to evaluate yourself, which is your motivational factor, which depends on your opinion of yourself, which can either improve or deteriorate but not stay static, in general. [AJG stops to take a drink.]

So, you may say, 'Doesn't this Galambos have anything to talk about but these subjects?' Do you want an honest answer? No, I have nothing else to talk about. You say, 'See, he admits it.' [Audience laughter.] Yes, I do. [Laughter from AJG.] That's all I have to talk about: energy, life, property, and ego. Now, I might develop new subjects, but so far as we're restrained to these subjects, that's it. [AJG drinks.] If you want to be more total about it, and even more Occam's Razor-like, I have nothing to talk about except energy because the others can be derived from this. All of the others are simply derivatives of this. So you start with energy. [AJG drinks again.]

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, V-201, Vol. VIII, Session 48  
pages 120-124

**Galambos clearly emphasizes the value of repetition**, and yet Mr. Giansante insensitively, and backhandedly sloughs this off with the back of his hand when he states that Session 39B is “*straight repetition of content in V-50, V-111, and V-201*”, and that the professor makes “*unnecessary digressions*”. As I have access to the real, authorized *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, I can say that Galambos said nothing about anything reminding him “*of all these digressions.*” And he certainly was not “*out of control for most of the session*”! As a matter of fact, please find below just *SOME* of the topics in this fantastic half session that Galambos covered. I ask any reader, no matter how well they think they know Galambos' theory, to be honest and ask themselves if they could give a short discussion on each topic (?):

1. Property in the use of a market.
2. When morality becomes the custom and habit follows the custom.
3. The universal characteristic of incompetence today.
4. The largest source of personal entropy.
5. The Peter Principle and its relationship to flatland compensation.
6. Parkinson's laws.
7. Flatland vs. Spaceland compensation.
8. Guaranteed pay for unguaranteed work.
9. Good vs. bad griping.
10. NRD/ARD

11. War of Rebellion vs. the American Revolution.
12. The world of witchcraft resulting from the American Revolution.
13. Compensation and competence.
14. Requirements of living the theory and rewards following.
15. Trivia curve vs. culture curve.
16. Introduction to two additional kinds of royalties: the Inspiration Royalty and the Hybrid Royalty.

**WOW!** All of this and more from a man “*out of control.*” So how much of this wonderful achievement has Mr. Giansante “edited” to oblivion? By the way, there were several references to Mr. Snelson in this session too, so we already know the trustees edited that out.

***Compare Mr. Giansante’s attitude toward “repetition” to the work of Galambos’ Literary Executor, William W. Martin. Mr. Martin has been vilified by many in Galambos’ market for his revisionist views of history, especially the history of WWII. Yet not once did he edit out ANYTHING the professor said no matter how much he might have disagreed. He knew that was the property of the professor and he had no authority to remove it from his great work. So while Mr. Giansante cavalierly removes chunks of the professor’s property, his Literary Executor stayed true to his instructions.***

***This is explained in William W. Martin’s book, Orbit!***

I hope Galambos has made it clear to the reader that *repetition for comprehension* is extremely important to the subject of “editing” Galambos’ work. And if Mr. Giansante has edited out things because he feels they are too repetitive, then that is yet another **CRIME** against the professor.

By the way, the concept of the “*hybrid royalty*” was introduced in this session and Galambos makes an important point which I will include here for the reader in order to give them a flavor of how great this session is, and how Galambos is certainly not “*out of control*” :

*And so, I’m much later, for example, than all the people, such as the inventor of the wheel on through Archimedes and Newton and Thomas Paine and Albert Einstein. But none of them would have ever gotten a royalty. So this is a value provided for someone earlier by something that came later, and I expect the same will be true in the future. My work will be rendered more valuable by some competent farther accounts that will come after my own work has ended by virtue of termination of life. And therefore I expect that my work will be enhanced in value by some other people.*

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, V-201, Vol. VI, Session 39, Part B  
page 373

**It can be seen that the underlined sentences above obviously do NOT apply to Galambos’ current “trustees”.**

### “COW’S TAIL”: EXAMPLE OF “BLIND LEADING THE BLIND”

The “*Cow’s Tail*” document is currently held up by the trustees of FEI in such high regard, one would think that it is a religious text. I believe if Galambos were alive today he would say something like this: “*That Cow’s Tail document of Mr. Giansante’s is a remarkable piece of witchcraft*”, or some such thing.

Below is an example of how the “Spell of the *Cow’s Tail*” has been cast over the unsuspecting/unknowledgeable masses. It is an example of “the blind leading the blind”. ***(By the way, I’m no better than anyone else; I fell for this witchcraft too. But if I can help it, no one else will ever have to fall for this “witchcraft” EVER again):***

Of the “*Cow’s Tail Document*”, Cheryl Cerell, Marketing Director, for FEI had this to say:

It is my opinion that this document and the comprehension of it, are absolutely critical to the progress and success of Volitional Science. I call it the Doorway to Spaceland!

Well, we all believe what we believe for reasons we honestly think are good reasons; **until we learn differently.**

So *why* was this “*Cow’s Tail*” document created in the first place, and *how* did it come to be held in such high regard amongst the current trustees of FEI?

FEI “Marketing Director” Cheryl Cerell had this to say:

This was in the early days of Galambos’ Trustees, Mr. Joyner & Charles Hayes, hard learning curve and realization of what a mistake it was to publish SIAA in the first place in 1999. Pete is the one who made this clear to them and me. **When I first talked to Pete in 2001 I could see that Pete understood the concept of NRD/ARD (and I knew I didn’t understand it at all)** and I asked Pete to give a presentation on it at our 2002 Annual FEI Event. Actually it was as a result of this that a lot of things happened both positively and negatively. I don’t have time to write much more on this here, but let me just say... this is what led to the lawsuit by Fred Marks (due to the not well **screened** market at that time hearing this presentation) and the beginning of my development of the need for **screening** for future FEI events, and... also the development of our highest current **screening** document that only someone who has had V-201 and seems fairly positive versus hostile, ever sees. It is a clearinghouse document of ones [sic] understanding of NRD/ARD principles and their agreement of the importance and acceptance to operate with these principles or we won’t deal with them, PERIOD!"

That’s a lot of “screening”. ***How does Cheryl Cerell “qualify” herself to “screen” information from anyone? How did she become a trustee in the first place, if she “didn’t understand” NRD/ARD “at all”?*** Well, apparently she ***did understand NRD/ARD after she learned the concept from Pete!***

Then there is this:

... the *Cow’s Tail* (CT) document **which I took over handling contractually in 2005**, and is the next phase to tell you about regarding the 48 page document clarifying NRD & ARD. The history of this is important for you to know and understand. **But up to this point almost NONE of Galambos’ original market understood (including me) NRD and ARD. I helped Pete edit the document and I have a contract with him for using it to screen the past 201 customers** to separate those who agree with and understand more clearly the need to contract (NRD) for the use of someone else’s IP. This had been extremely helpful to **move the market to a higher screened level.** **But I had Pete cut out his efforts to promote his course on communications in that document but let him refer to it as a footnote only.** This whole story goes way back to 2001 which I will explain when you are ready to go through

the CT process for receiving the document. I should probably record the conversation for historical preservation of the evolution of all this and why the document has been important to our being able to move forward during the time the Trustees were being sued by Fred Marks. And... to understand the problem with Pete now regarding this and what he hopes to do with the course on communication he gave with permission to a 2001 group of FEI people. But this presentation also led to the Fred Marks lawsuit. So there is SO MUCH TO explain as to how it is we are here dealing with this problem now.

“... there is SO MUCH TO explain...” Indeed. **AND a LOT to answer for, too!**

And if this “Cow’s Tail process” isn’t bad enough, there is another, even “higher level screening” document – an “NRD License Agreement” which is a further violation of Galambos’ theory and ***further evidence of complete misunderstanding of NRD/ARD concepts by the Trustees.*** I will not go into this in detail in this short letter, but this is what Ms. Cerell has to say about this ***“higher level” NRD document:***

In 2017, Ms. Cerell wrote:

In 2005 I started using the *Cow’s Tail* document via contractual arrangements with Galambos [sic] Trustees at that time to help me start **screening what I called the “Positive Market” from the hostile “Negative Market” who were past FEI customers** anxious to skip NRD contracting for the use of Galambos’ IP. It has been our **highest level of screening up to this point in time with the past market**, and is the last step of our new online V-201DD course. **After a person successfully completes the online V-201DD course they are given the Cows [sic] Tail document and if that is successful process, then the NRD document. This last phase with the NRD document gives them a basic outline guide for how to approach contracting with the Galambos Trustees for the use of Galambos’ concepts.**

Regarding “NRD”, here’s something that Galambos *actually said*, that should enlighten the reader:

*I’d like to discuss the things that can be accomplished in the near term future. First of all, as you know, everything in this theory is subjected to the theory of primary property itself. **In all due honesty, there is no stronger way to develop anything that is permanent knowledge than in written form. This does not exist in the written form at this time. That prevents the release to ARD of the things in this course. You might think this is a restriction of your ability to know or use these ideas. That’s ridiculous.** [AJG drinks]. The knowledge is within your capability; you’ve heard it. What you do with it, I cannot preordain for you. That’s up to you. **The reason for the limitation through NRD is very simple.** [AJG takes another drink.] **A book has to come out first. You may say, ‘What’s that got to do with it?’ Misapplications are catastrophic. That’s what is the problem.***

*It will take you a long time to understand this. To ingest it is a relatively rapid process. You may be thinking that this was not a rapid process; it took you a long time. It is not a long time. This is one of those places where things are relative. As Einstein himself said to a girl who once asked him, ‘What is relativity?’ He said, ‘Well, it’s very simple. If you put your hand on a hot stove for one second, you will find the time to be an eternity. [Audience laughter.] If you however are kissing your boyfriend for one second, you will find that it was so quick that you didn’t even know, it went by so fast.’ [More laughter from the audience.] This course was actually one*

*of the most rapid things that has ever happened in your life. It seems long because you're not accustomed to taking courses that are sixty sessions long, which involve about three and a half to four hours of lectures, exclusive of intermission time. And then, of course, you're not used to having three such sessions in one day, and the reason we had to do that is to keep the course within one academic year. We didn't have Sunday sessions in the beginning because we didn't have that many sessions, and you might find it long only in the sense of physical discomfort. 'Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom, must, like men, undergo the fatigues of supporting it.' That's all I have to say on that point.*

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-201, Vol. VIII, Session 47*  
page 81

Isn't that quote from Galambos beautiful? And he said:

***"The reason for the limitation through NRD is very simple. A book has to come out first."***

**And... :**

***"Misapplications are catastrophic. That's what is the problem."***

***These quotes from Galambos are one more puzzle piece for the current trustees of The Free Enterprise Institute to think about very carefully. And a puzzle piece for anyone in a position to DO something about this current situation, to think about very carefully, as well.***

The Blind have been, *and still are*, leading The Blind at FEI. They have created numerous enemies in the market that Galambos had built – the very “market” that Galambos left for his trustee to **GROW**. But the misunderstanding and misapplications of his theory have created enemies, resulting in non-productive, time- and money-consuming lawsuits. These actions by the trustees have not *grown* the market; they've *decimated* it!

I encourage others, many of whom are more knowledgeable and experienced than I am in these matters, **to ask more questions of, and to, the “trustees”**.

## **“IDEOLOGICAL LEADERSHIP”: TRUSTEES DO NOT “PRACTICE WHAT THEY PREACH”**

From the “*Cow's Tail*” document:

You know, nobody's perfect, and that includes AJG. That's not a criticism...it's just a fact of life. **In my opinion, one of the imperfections of the Free Enterprise Institute was the lack of role models** to demonstrate the proprietary behaviors that are specified by the principles of primary property theory that I've discussed here.

With this statement, the trustees have placed themselves in the position of being “***role models***” for Galambos' theory. To do this they must “live” the theory in accordance to the principles of the theory or, in other words, “...*demonstrate the proprietary behaviors that are specified by the principles of primary property theory*” as discussed in the “*Cow's Tail*”.

From the “Cow’s Tail”:

**Every PPSA subscriber is morally obligated to behave in a manner that is consistent with the principles of V-201. The Trust takes that obligation seriously.**

As a result of these statements, FEI students have counted on the trustees for their “*ideological leadership*” – especially those who make it as far as the “*Cow’s Tail process*”. Their nonpublishing of Book One *has resulted* in a “marketing strategy” that is *completely dependent* upon the trustees being the best “*role models*” that they possibly can be. The trustees have placed themselves in the unenviable position of trying to live up to the theory in its purest form. In essence, for them to have *any credibility* at all, it must be observable to their market that they themselves are behaving in strict accordance to the principles of the theory – or at the very least, *trying their best!*

Now, not I, nor anyone else expects the trustees to behave like “saints”. But one would at least expect them to *give their best efforts toward behaving in accordance to the PRINCIPLES of the theory*. Unfortunately, it has been observable that the trustees do not “practice what they preach”; nor have they shown any recognition that their own behaviors may be in question; nor have they shown any signs of improving their behavior in order to come in line with the principles that they “*preach from on high*”.

So, exactly *which* PRINCIPLES, in regards to “*living the theory*” in “*accordance to the theory*”, have the trustees violated? It is now time to explore that subject.

## INDIVIDUALISM VS. COLLECTIVISM

### A) The Trust Operates As A Committee

This is a BIG topic, and a topic that deserves to be *thoroughly* explored. The trustees have *operated not as a single trustee but as a kind of board of directors* of which Galambos had this, among many other things, to say:

*Brainstorming is a form of cross-pollination, where everybody puts his idea into the hopper, and pretty soon nobody even knows where one idea ends and the other one begins, and you just get a hodgepodge out of it... This is hostile to progress! This is hostile to self-esteem! This is hostile to compensation! And therefore it's hostile to property and profit; hence, it's hostile to durability; hence, it's hostile to civilization. And all committees participate in this. Need I say more? Aside from the fact that it's totally inefficient, incompetent, committee mechanisms are always dependent upon getting a distribution of the responsibility so no one is responsible for what happens... The committee is basically an anti-proprietary, anti-personal responsibility concept ...*

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, V-201, Vol. III, Session 19  
page 394

*What does a board of directors add to a company? A committee... That's like adding cancer to otherwise healthy organs. [Chuckles from the audience.] When you add the committee, you have subtracted competence... a committee is only the lowest common denominator amongst various primary properties and it is arrived at by*



*either domination or vote. Either one member of the committee is psychologically or coercively superior to all the others and can dominate that committee, and it's his will and the others are rubber stamps. Or it is a true democratic distribution of authority, and thereby, no one has any responsibility in what happens because they all can say, 'Well, we shared the risk,' and, 'That wasn't my decision, we all voted on it.' ... And this sloughing off of responsibility is always contemptible and nonproductive.*

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, V-201, Vol. II, Session 13  
page 367

What's more, Mr. Joyner was the ONLY trustee appointed by Galambos. Miraculously, this point was even held up in a "flatland" court of law! (For more information on this I will direct the reader to *Orbit!*, pages 25 and page 66; and Appendix 43: "Statement from Hayes's and Joyner's Lawyer", pages 413 – 414). Of this, William W. Martin writes in a footnote on page 66 of *Orbit!*:

*It should be noted that Joyner and Hayes did not contest the invalidity of this amendment despite their having run the trust for more than two and a half years. On the contrary, they claimed with their attorney, on 1998, November 30: 'We have never taken the position that the First Amendment was valid.' An admission that further establishes their hypocrisy and culpability.*

And yet, in spite of this, since professor Galambos' death Mr. Joyner has opened the floodgates to the tune of **FIVE "trustees"**, which he was NEVER authorized to do morally, **or even legally!** Maybe that is **one** of the many reasons why Mr. Joyner, on May 10, 1999, converted Galambos' Natural Estate Trust to a "Charitable Trust". (See *Orbit!*, pages 72 – 73; see also Appendix 46: "Statement from Joyner Filed 1999, May 10", pages 427 – 431; and Appendix 47: "Declaration of Attorney Paul C. McEwen, Jr.", pages 433 – 434.)

The attorney who drafted the Galamboses' trust, Paul C. McEwen, Jr., made a formal declaration to the court declaring:

*The Trust was not designed as a traditional charitable trust in the normal sense of the word 'charitable', and it was not designed to qualify the Trust as a 'Charitable Trust' under Federal or California law.*

Nevertheless, Mr. Joyner wrote a petition to the court, wherein he stated:

The direction in the Declaration of Trust to terminate the Natural Republic Trust at the expiration of the period defined by the rule against perpetuities may indeed show that the Settlers did not possess the specific intent to establish a 'charitable trust' when they signed the Declaration of Trust. **Nevertheless, as discussed above, that specific intent is not a prerequisite to the establishment of a charitable trust. It is sufficient that the purpose for which the Settlers established the trust, in this case the promotion of and education relating to the Science of Volition, is a charitable purpose. Accordingly, the Natural Estate Trust should be classified as a charitable trust under California law.**

William W. Martin responded:

**Joyner argued that even if Galambos didn't want to create a charitable trust which would make the Attorney General of California the trust's beneficiary, his wishes were irrelevant to the court's 'determination of whether a trust is a charitable trust under California law'... Here was the very man who had said from the beginning that he would not acknowledge me as the literary executor, who claimed the literary executorship was too ambiguous to understand, who refused to allow me to sign the forward to 'Volume One' as Galambos' literary executor, yet was now, in brazen-faced contradiction to the above, claiming in a public document, in a court of law, and for all the world to see, that I was in fact Galambos' designated literary executor!... Why then this petition to convert Galambos' natural estate trust into a charitable trust answerable to the people of California? The answer is obvious: money! By reconstituting the trust as a charitable trust he created the grounds for requesting and getting back from the IRS a refund of federal estate taxes that he and his accessory Hayes had paid in high six figures if not seven figures following Galambos' death... Thus (Mr. Joyner) has overruled Galambos' testamentary terms and made them the victim of flatland law, reducing Galambos' life's work to the lowly status of being nothing more than a ward of the state, with the people of California its beneficiary! Can there be a greater crime? I say there cannot.**

That is just a small slice of the background story in regards to how the **“social structure” of FEI today has evolved into a committee of five.**

Galambos:

*Okay, so there is a law of the state. Now, the minimum number of directors that a corporation may have is three. The maximum number is, as far as I know, not limited... You please note, they're always odd numbers... Do you know why? [Various responses from the audience.] They don't want a deadlock. Because if it's fourteen on the board of directors, they could have a seven-to-seven tie in the vote, and then they don't know what to do. [Laughter from the audience and chuckles from AJG.] I would like to describe for you the ideal board of directors in a world where coercion requires one at all. The ideal board of directors has zero members, which is an even number. [AJG chuckles.]*

*But since that is not at the moment legally permitted, in the absence of that, three being the minimum legally permitted, I'd like to describe that under flatland conditions what the ideal board of directors looks like. It has three members. Why? Because that's the fewest the state permits. And it's Occam's Razor. And you have fewer people to worry about. One member of the board of directors, obviously and by nature, has to be the founder of the company, if alive and operating; otherwise, his rational and moral proprietary successor, the one he himself has chose or would have consented to having succeeded... naturally, if the board of directors operates at all, it should have this fellow on it. He should have two other people on there, and they should by definition be those people who can do him the least injury.*

*In my own case, I have selected as the board of directors, other than myself, my wife and my cat. [Laughter from the audience, then from AJG.] I'm not joking about*

that... He was Christopher... So he used to be a member of my board of directors, except the law would not appreciate that, neither the humor of it [AJG interrupted with audience laughter] the irony of it, the justice of it, the wisdom of it, and certainly not the legality of it... **this caused me to make a legal but not actual substitution, and so I had a stand-in for him, for legal purposes. That was Jay Snelson. And so the board of directors legally is me, my Wife, and Jay Snelson. And he just understands that his function is to vote in place of my cat who is not legally recognized. [Audience laughter.] And he has accepted this, you see."**

Now, some of you may think I'm insulting Jay Snelson, and you are absolutely, totally mistaken. I am paying him the highest possible compliment. I'm saying that I trust him as much as my cat [audience laughter] which means, I don't think he will injure me.

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-201, Vol. II, Session 13  
pages 368 – 369

I know for a fact that the trustees "re-elect" each other from time to time. How does that "concept" of "voting" compare with what Galambos says here?:

*Everything I said about voting stock in V-50 and its predecessor course, Course 100, everything I said about voting people and voting social structures there, is applicable with equal vigor to the corporation. And that's the way most people arrive at any decision. If there's more than one person, they vote on it. That's true of a committee of three... That's true of a congress. That's true of a Rotary Club... That's true of even a - I'm very upset to tell you - of the American Physical Society. And I have not voted in their damned elections now for I don't know how many years. A couple of years ago, I sent in the ballot. Instead of being marked up, I wrote them a letter, and I said, **'It is incredible to me that an organization which purports to be representative of the profession that is the intellectual heir to Galileo and Newton, should arrive at its solution, conclusions, and leadership by this archaic tribal mechanism [AJG interrupted by audience laughter, which is followed by laughter from AJG] and that's an insult to the memory of Galileo and Newton.'** Needless to remark, it was ignored. [AJG chuckles] And yet when you think of it, **how can you arrive at any intelligent decision on that basis?***

— Sic Itur Ad Astra, V-201, Vol. IV, Session 23  
page 123

In terms of "correct applications" of the theory, please note again what Galambos "actually" said:

*There's no room in this new type of organization for committees. **There's no organization chart for committees.** Isn't that a tragedy - for this omission? Unless it's a window dressing to soothe the state's feelings. Like a board of directors. That's a committee. Well, we have one just to make them feel good. It's legally required. Well I wouldn't want to interfere with their legality, especially because they've got a gun. So, I'll have a board of directors. I already told you how that's operated. Since they won't accept the cat, who really is the board of directors' other member, I replaced him with someone that is as reliable as my cat for not doing me*

damage. And they accept a human being - as long as he has a Social Security number. [Chuckles from the audience.] **But the day the board of directors makes a real decision in my company it isn't my company. Even the thought is nauseating. Have I gotten that point across?**

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, V-201, Vol. IV, Session 26  
page 370

The trustees should think about what Galambos says here **very closely**:

The very name "committee" nauseates me. It has almost the same effect upon me as fish. [Chuckles from the audience.] With this difference. The fish really can't help being fish, **but the committee members can help it. A committee member does not have to be a committee member or a committee participant. That's his own selection, weakness, and stupidity.** A fish can't help being a fish... I just mentioned that committee, I think, is as nauseating as fish, because you already heard my attitude on the word. So I just wanted to make you understand what the word "committee" does to me.

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, V-201, Vol. III, Session 19  
page 394

Let's quickly review what Galambos has said: **"Have I gotten that point across?"... "The committee is basically an anti-proprietary, anti-personal responsibility concept..." "... how can you arrive at any intelligent decision on that basis?" ... "A committee member does not have to be a committee member or a committee participant. That's his own selection, weakness, and stupidity."**

And something else to think about **very closely**:

... I founded the company and it's my property. And this is not a democratic institution; this is a proprietary organization that operates for a profit, in a rational way, and nobody is forced to be associated with it, and nobody is forced to be a customer of it... And I founded it. **It's my property. And the concepts are my property, and the company is my property; if they want to do something else, then they can do it in a different company. And so that's the point.** So only in a legal sense do they have a right to vote against it; **not morally. It will be coercive...** but I just wanted to show you right now that the nature of the corporation, in the present form, is strictly a state play. It's a state mechanism to fit the state's rules.

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, V-201, Vol. II, Session 13  
page 370

The current organization that calls itself "The Free Enterprise Institute", boldly declares on their website ([www.fe-i-ajg.com](http://www.fe-i-ajg.com)) that they are:

*"... the only site authorized to represent AJG's works in volitional science."*

But based on what we have just read, and based on the trustees' actions to date – according to Galambos, today's Free Enterprise Institute with five trustees/board of directors, **"... isn't my com-**

**pany.”** He clearly states this: “... **the day the board of directors makes a real decision in my company it isn’t my company.**” The trustees, by organizing themselves as a committee of five, have essentially stolen Galambos’ company *away from him*. The trustees, therefore, should go do whatever they are doing, in “a different company” – NOT Galambos’! This is another “puzzle piece”, and one more example of the commission of a **CRIME** against Galambos and his property.

## B) Trustees Not Cured Of “Political Disease”

*“Until you get cured of political disease, there is nothing you will ever do for freedom.”* (Galambos; Course “V-111DD”)

Course “V-111DD” is a course that the trustees require students to complete (to the “qualified” trustees’ *satisfaction*, of course) before they can move on to “V-201DD”; “V-111DD” is a “prerequisite” for “V-201DD”. But this is a “trustee” prerequisite, *NOT* a Galambos prerequisite.

In regards to “V-111DD”, I spoke in front of an audience at an FEI Annual “AJG DAY” event where I related some of the knowledge I had gained from course “V-111DD”. I said in that speech – and this is a quote from Galambos – that “V-111 is the pill you can swallow to cure yourself from political disease.” That course had a very major positive impact on me. However as time went on, it seemed to me that the trustees themselves had **failed** this very course that is so important for their students to complete and to understand. I found this to be hypocritical. This was one major catalyst that caused me to question the trustees’ “ideological leadership”.

In June of this year, 2020, after becoming weary of political ramblings in phone conversations with FEI’s Marketing Director, I finally felt the need to put a stop to this once and for all. I wrote to Cheryl Cerell:

*I must say, I'm quite upset after our last several conversations. I'm disappointed to learn that other trustees still have political disease after all of this time. People I looked up to. But I've learned that you are just as bad. They are on the right, you are on the left, and the whole world has gone completely hysterical. You wanted to drag me into this political discussion. That is NOT why I came to FEI. I am trying to help build a better world, but this kind of stuff is unproductive... It is upsetting to me that you... and (according to you) most, if not all of the other trustees still feel the need to discuss politics and discuss their own political views. It's one thing to discuss politics in the context of it being a completely wrong way of handling any problems, and that politics ITSELF is something to be soundly denounced. THAT is a discussion that I welcome! But when one finds themselves taking “sides” on any political issue, that is a symptom of one’s own political disease. I would think that it would be in all of the trustees proprietary interest to continue to work on curing their own political diseases. It takes hard work, but I would think that your main focus would be to cure yourselves of this FIRST, and make it a TOP priority. PRACTICE WHAT YOU PREACH!: From your website: “If you're looking for high-leverage knowledge and tools to build a stabilized, durable civilization, **immune to politics, religion, and war**, you've come to the right place.”*

I wrote this in response to a number of phone conversations that involved political topics over a span of several months that I did not want to get into. It started getting worse over the last year. That is

not what I would expect from a trustee of FEI. Political action *IS* a crime. It is not something I ever expected from those who claim to be “role models” for Galambos’ theory. And when someone takes such a self-righteous, high-handed, “Olympian” attitude (as you soon shall see), well, then they deserve to be exposed for all to see and deal with the consequences. If they can dish it out, then they should be able to take it as well. By the way, since I wrote that to Cheryl Cerell, I have not heard a word from her, nor will she respond to any of my emails. (See *Orbit!*, page 61 and “#52” on page 469. It seems that William W. Martin knew Ms. Cerell just as well as I do, and his experience with her was over twenty years ago!)

The point is, I always looked to FEI as a beacon of rationality in an irrational world, and as a safe haven for me to go to that was “immune to politics”. Boy, was I wrong, and SO naïve! I will cite some recent examples from 2019/2020 to illustrate the pitfalls that political thinking can bring.

FEI “Marketing Director” Cheryl Cerell:

My mind is going a mile a minute about the problem of those in the market who don’t get the importance of C≠C2 and show tremendous HATE towards Liberals. Anyway... I have to recover from being extremely appalled by such hate so I can respond non-emotionally & very carefully so as not to blow them away!!! It’s like the “good ol FEI Boys” ... who hate Hillery, [*sic*] Obama etc. & anyone who shows compassion for others less fortunate. I mean it is EXTREME HATE and they chose [*sic*] ANY Republican as a superior choice, instead of recognizing BOTH are political entities AND equally coercive. It is just a matter of how they chose [*sic*] to disperse the theft and controlling others to their preferences. SO... I'M now in the midst of BRINGING BACK the IMPORTANCE OF C≠C2 and WHY Galambos published it in the first place due to his experience with Goldwater & the movement of the “conservative” organization John Birchers.

I WROTE THIS to address his venom expressions against “democrats” “socialist” “communist” lump of people HATRED!!! BUT WHAT BOTHERS ME EVEN MORE IS... PETE ACTS THIS WAY, JONATHAN sort of too, and I think MANY males in our market as I experienced by BILL MARTIN, and some others at an AJG EVENT in 2004 and a recent call this year from \_\_\_\_\_ who took off in our phone call on the poor white male who is being victimized as second class citizens by the left movement and me too movement etc. YIKES... how about CRIME BY ANYONE is wrong even on the Religious Right or by women or by a child ETC???. They are [*sic*] swing towards Republican Right against to Liberal Lefts and not sticking to fundamental VS principles AT ALL!!!! Just ANGER towards anyone who shows compassion for the unfortunate, or pointing out wrongs of the past. I MEAN these are not Flanders [*sic*] which is understandable... It’s just SHOCKING to me with those who I thought KNEW BETTER!!! :( It is amazing to me where my mind had been going about all this to try to better understand WHY? I think you don’t know this about \_\_\_\_\_, but he is an X military guy and his father was big commander but I don’t recall in which branch. But this Male dominance thing is what cord I think this is hitting and probably unconsciously. Compassion has no place in their idea of creating FREEDOM as it is a sign of “weakness” not in moral solutions.

I asked him if he heard V-111? He said “no”. I told him that he had missed an absolutely CRITICAL interface between V-50 and V-201... and that many of the problems that developed in AJGs [*sic*] market in the 1990s and beyond could be traced to “graduates” never having heard V-111. **He will need to get rid of some of his MACHO White Male Supremacy attitude of hate of the democrats & stop following conspiracies [*sic*] stuff and Fox News etc etc. He can see what is wrong with Martin, BUT, has a ways to go to get back on a positive track.** As I have said, he is very close to Pete so I have to tread VERY CAREFULLY!

AND spending energy on HATE & ANGER of Democrats or bureaucrats isn't what is going to build a better world AT ALL!!!! :-{

It certainly seems that there is enough "Anger and Hate" to go around - *and it's not all one sided!*

In regards to this, it should be known that FEI currently has a "data system" whereby customer information is stored, and I have been informed that it is mostly a tool for the Marketing Director, and the other trustees rarely, if ever, use it, or access it. Within this "data system", there are "categories" that Ms. Cerell creates in order to "classify" people into certain groups, or "categories" – for example, Flatlander, or MIR are just two examples of this. Another example is POLITICAL - R. That goes in the file for someone who Ms. Cerell has deemed to be a Political Republican. Why this is important information for her to record, I do not know. However, it is important to her, otherwise that "category" would not exist. But does it not logically follow that if there is a POLITICAL - R category for Republican, that there should also be a corresponding POLITICAL - D category for Democrat? Curiously, no POLITICAL - D category exists.

I will now include one side note here, and then thankfully be finished with this *nauseating* topic:

It should be known that not only has the concept of Non-Politics been clearly violated by the trustees as "role models", but the concept of being involved in Non-Profit Organizations has been violated as well, as evidenced here below. Again, an example of Ideological Leadership that is clearly lacking.

[https://www.sos.arkansas.gov/corps/search\\_corps.php?DE-TAIL=342308&corp\\_type\\_id=1&corp\\_name=&agent\\_search=&agent\\_city=&agent\\_state=&filing\\_number=&cmd=](https://www.sos.arkansas.gov/corps/search_corps.php?DE-TAIL=342308&corp_type_id=1&corp_name=&agent_search=&agent_city=&agent_state=&filing_number=&cmd=)

**"Corporation Name: ETHICAL SOLUTIONS FOUNDATION, Nonprofit Corporation, Date Filed 08/07/2009, CHERYL SPEHAR , Director "**

Even "SIAA Vol.1" has passages in it regarding the principle of profit seeking vs. non-profit companies. Here's what I found with a quick search through my copy of that book:

*A non-profit organization, if left to its own devices, ultimately will become an anti-profit organization. In the short run, it's just nonprofit but, if left on that basis, it will either cure itself and become profit-seeking, or more likely, not cure itself and become anti-profit. You will have endless stories about volunteer organizations where nothing is done except committees meet and feasibility studies are performed and they quibble and hassle, and argue and prattle, and rattle, and make noises and a lot of fanfare, perhaps some entertainment, **but damned little to show for it.***

— "SIAA Vol.1", page 529

This is not a good "role model" example to set by those entrusted to handle Galambos' estate.

## THE CONCEPT OF “PROPERTY IN A MARKET” NEITHER UNDERSTOOD NOR PROPERLY APPLIED BY “EDITOR” OF DIGITIZED COURSES

I am still on the topic of “ideological leadership”, by the way, and this is another example of where I see none.

Mr. Giansante, in his communications with FEI students, attempted to use the FEI market in order to market his *own* course – a “communications” course. This is a clear violation of Galambos’ concept of “property in a market”. It’s a simple subject really, but Galambos pointed out that many “graduates” never really understood the concept. In my opinion, even a “flatlander” with any common sense at all should understand this property boundary concept without having to go to any school to learn it. But Mr. Giansante? Highly esteemed author of the “*Cow’s Tail*” and master editor of Galambos’ courses? Personally, I expected more.

**In May of 2016, Cheryl Cerell** sent me an e-mail:

*"Did you ever check out Pete's web page and writings (see link below)? It is VERY IMPORTANT to me to know what you think of it."*

*This is PVG's signature on all his emails..."*



[VitoSpace](http://www.vitotuxedo.com/VitoSpace/Home/=index.html) For those who like adventure!

<http://www.vitotuxedo.com/VitoSpace/Home/=index.html>

If one “clicks” on the “VitoSpace” web link above, one will find a personal website complete with links to “social media”, etc. I will only point out one link that I found that was particularly troubling, which is this: (one can get to these two links by going to the VitoSpace website then click on “information” > “vito’s links” > “you tube” > “channels” > then click on the picture of AJG under “subscriptions” and “FEI1776”)

<https://www.youtube.com/user/freevito/channels>

<https://www.youtube.com/user/FEI1776>

One can clearly see that Mr. Giansante’s “VitoSpace” website is LINKED to FEI!

Furthermore, if one goes to this link: <https://www.youtube.com/user/FEI1776>

... And then from there, if one goes to “About”, one will land here:

<https://www.youtube.com/user/FEI1776/about>

... And find the following:



*"Description: This is the official channel of The Free Enterprise Institute™—the only entity authorized to distribute the works of Andrew J. Galambos.*

*Stats: Joined Jun 21, 2013"*

**Would Galambos approve of this? What might Galambos himself say of this? I shudder to think...**

Bill Cobb wrote to Cheryl Cerell:

*I've seen Pete's page before, but let me look at it again.... Well, seems harmless enough, on its own, but I wouldn't think he would want to connect it to messages sent to those in FEI, students, etc. It's just unprofessional to link it to FEI business, which has nothing to do with what's on his site. He shouldn't be promoting himself with FEI communications, in my opinion. If you want more specific feedback on anything in particular just let me know... It just makes common sense, right? AND, I was also thinking that it also violates the "property in a market" concept which is the first question for the questionnaire in Mod 3 of V-201. Don't you think? So maybe that's also something to bring up to him.*

Around this same time I found this message at the bottom of an e-mail I personally received from Mr. Giansante:

Responsible communicants want to know whether their messages have been received. ... in my email signature blurb (below) is the shorthand version of a principle that's part of a larger and very profound theory of communication presented in an advanced FEI course for which (I believe) there is an enormous latent market. If I can manage to pull together the resources for it, I would love to produce it as an online course. In the meantime, I'll settle for message receipts.

Regarding all of this, Ms. Cerell wrote:

It is Pete & another person's course the Trustee [*sic*] (Wayne & Charles Hayes) let him give to a select market in 2001. It is also what inspired two from that to get Fred Marks involve [*sic*] and the lawsuit ultimately happening in 2006. Here is what he put in his communications with \_\_\_\_\_ (and apparently he plans to continue doing this):

(PVG): ' \*There is a special course on this subject—one that was presented in 2001 by invitation only. So far, there hasn't been much of a market for it. But if more people ask the kind of questions you're asking, I might be able to persuade the Trust to let me produce it.'

There is a LOT involved to try to explain regarding the evolving history of all this, but **when Pete and I became Trustees in 2004** Pete had me take the course. He thought as a result of it I would write and communicate better. Unfortunately it did not fix me to his standards as he had hoped. **But I became concerned when around 2009 he wanted to list the course as an FEI course. This [*sic*] other trustee at the time (Linda Hayes) and I said no way. Saying it is an FEI course should mean it was a course given by AJG. So he was to list it as a course approved by AGJ's [*sic*] Trustees to give to select individuals from the FEI market . BUT... this has NOT been approved to be given currently by the Trustees. I've known someday he might want to resurrect this... but that he is trying to do this at this time and in this way is TOTALLY WRONG and abuse of having access to the market with this hidden agenda. He is going about it in a sly way (for which [*sic*] and Wayne are only now aware of). He's hoping to generate enough interest to get the Trustees to approve him giving the**

**course asap to our current market I have built** up as the Trustee-approved “Marketing Director” now going on for 11 yrs. **His eye is now on stepping in at this point to the arena of dealing with the market more directly.** (without approval per se). It would have been a logical step with our more advanced students, but this is for “HIM” ... not for whats [sic] good for the growth of our customers and continued growth of the FEI market. And it is off track from Galambos’ courses and advancing comprehension of them. He is wanting to mix his stuff with Galambos’... PETE IS FISHING to get you & \_\_\_\_\_ and is his hidden motive to now get more customer’s email addresses from me to respond to him in a supposed innocent “query” with follow up stuff with his stuff, not just FEI. The thing is, IT IS NOT an FEI course, and he does NOT have permission to use FEI’s market to try to promote his stuff at this!!! It’s appalling and shocking actually!... **“It is a GROSS & unbelievable violation of the theory which he should of all people know.”**

Compare this with what is written in the “Cow’s Tail” document:

It is also clear that he did not intend that all subscribers who ever purchased a subscription to Book 1 under the Pre-Publication Subscription Agreement (PPSA) would be permanently and irrevocably entitled to do whatever they wanted to do with his theory. In fact, the PPSA has **a termination clause that obligates all subscribers to behave as though they actually understand the principles in AJG’s theory.** Under PPSA Section 6.6, each subscriber is subject to termination if any of the following conditions apply:

1. Behavior of Subscriber in a manner contrary to the principles taught by AJG;
2. Subscriber is expelled from FEI classes;
3. If Subscriber has committed any act of coercion or attack on property without making appropriate restitution.

So, even under the current PPSA, there is already a presumption that **all subscribers will conduct themselves in accordance with the principles of V-201. In fact, it is a contractual obligation!** Every PPSA subscriber is **morally obligated to behave in a manner that is consistent with the principles of V-201. The Trust takes that obligation seriously.** Unfortunately, not all PPSA subscribers do.

Clearly, Mr. Giansante and other trustees have violated points 1 and 3! So shouldn’t the trustees be held to these standards as well? ***Shouldn’t they now be “expelled”?***

## THE CONCEPT OF “RESTITUTION” NEITHER UNDERSTOOD NOR PROPERLY APPLIED BY TRUSTEES ACCORDING TO GALAMBOS’ THEORY

In a letter to the “book and course subscribers” and in regards to the “Lange theft”, Suzanne J. Galambos wrote (*Orbit!*, “SJG’s letter of 1988, March 15”: Appendix 3, pages 275 – 282):

***We have been funding the presentation of trust courses out of our personal resources, those few remaining assets to which Lange had no access. We also are funding the publication of Galambos’s books... out of our own pocket since Lange embezzled the trust funds. This is a moral decision which Professor Galambos has made.... Anything that prevents or even delays getting volitional science and primary property theories into a more permanent form cannot help but have a damaging effect upon the future of the species - not even speaking of the future of each of you... We are paying for the publication of the books on the trust out of our own pocket... every thing you value is “riding” on the moral publication and***

**utilization of Galambos' theories as soon as practicable. This means publication by Galambos himself or by his explicitly named successor.**

What more did the "trustees" ever need to know? How can the trustees take the position of the "Cow's Tail" document **OVER** these clear intentions of the Galamboses to publish the book? It could have been very simple for the trustees back in 2000: William W. Martin finished Book One and presented an invoice for the complete Book One to Mr. Joyner on April 14, 2000, for the sum of \$328,748.91 (see *Orbit!*, page 74 and Appendix 50: "WWM's Letter to Joyner with Invoice", page 443). Mr. Joyner refused. The trust could have made a bundle off those books at that time, thereby keeping FEI profitable, as well as honoring the Galamboses' wishes and the book subscriber contracts. It could have been so SIMPLE! Instead, the trustees refused, and since then have squandered whatever funds that remained in their attempts to "market" digitized courses. The trustees made the Absolutely Wrong decision back then, and are paying for it now. **Actually, AJG is paying for it!**

SO... *WHY* this overly complicated "Cow's Tail" process that permeates through every fiber of FEI? Thanks to Mr. William W. Martin at least the book is now "out there". It's at least *some* consolation for professor Galambos. But do the trustees recognize their mistakes? No. Have they ever *once* attempted to offer any restitution to the Book One subscribers? No.

The answer to the question "WHY" this overly complicated "Cow's Tail" process may be found in this exchange of words between two of the current trustees that I will soon share below. And I believe the answer relates to **MONEY**. Did the Galamboses care about the "money"? Yes, of course – BUT the *difference* is – they were still "**funding the presentation of trust courses out of our personal resources, those few remaining assets to which Lange had no access. We also are funding the publication of Galambos's books... out of our own pocket since Lange embezzled the trust funds. This is a moral decision which Professor Galambos has made.**" As devastating as the "Lange theft" was to them, they never once used that as an **excuse** not to publish the book.

For the "trustees", the "Lange theft" continues to be a MAJOR excuse for not publishing. *Along with the other MAJOR excuse* that the "Martin Suit" and the "Mark's Suit" drained even more time and money. So which "excuse" is it? Time and Money as a result of lawsuits? Or that to publish the book would go against what Galambos "*actually said*"? Or all three? Those are all LOUSY excuses. **This could have ALL been avoided by publishing the book years ago as instructed!**

THIS is what Galambos said on the topic of RESTITUTION:

*Any time there's a contract default, whether it's intentional or not, if it's non intentional, you can still make restitution, and if you fail to do so, it becomes a crime [AJG smacks the podium] and the clearinghouse will so note it.*

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, V-201, Vol. VI, Session 40  
page 423

*How many people do you know who paid for their mistakes to you voluntarily? How many people have you ever had that - for example, somebody made a mistake on your account - and not only reversed the error upon your calling it to their attention the first time, but then offered you voluntary restitution for your trouble? This ever happened to you? it would if it happened to us. [AJG drinks.] If we just misspell*

*your name, and you call it to our attention, you'll get restitution. How many companies would do that? [AJG chuckles with the audience.] The point I'm making is, people in general don't give a damn.*

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, V-201, Vol. VI, Session 40  
page 424

**How does the Galamboses' attitude toward the concept of Restitution compare with the attitude of the trustees, as shown below?**

(NOTE: *At the time, I was in agreement with the trustees on this issue, and I fully regret this today. But it must be recognized that this was well before I had **learned** the things that I know today, and that I now hope others will **learn** as well, **especially those in a position to DO something about it**):*

**In a letter dated March 26, 2016, a customer demanded arbitration of the trustees for the book that was never delivered.**

**Here is a behind the scenes look at the "trustees'" handling of this situation:**

**2016, April 7, Mr. Joyner email to Ms. Cerell:**

Sorry to spoil your Thursday. Attached is the latest from The Boron. To invoke the PPSA paragraph we quoted to him would require sending a full refund, without interest. He would have no say after that. **I'm just not sure how to do it without causing an avalanche of refund requests.** I'll review the PPSA again and see what our options are.

WJ

**2016, April 8, Ms. Cerell to Mr. Joyner:**

WJ: **Well since there is no money as the money was stolen by Lange**, and since the contract is null & void due to Vis Major clause of coercive act such as the theft of the money for publishing, and since the court in the Marks lawsuit ruled the contract was honored via TUSPCO's publication of Vol 1, and basically time has run out for contesting the contract anyway... and since he was expelled from Galambos' courses in 1981 (?)... what the hell position does he have to stand on to warrant [*sic*] a refund or anything else?

C

**2016, April 8, Mr. Joyner to Ms. Cerell:**

CC: **Whether his position is weak or strong isn't the issue. He threatens to bring this to arbitration which will involve time and money, especially if he is successful in getting others to join him.** Does this mean you will not be inviting him to address the group at AJG day?

WJ

**2016, April 8, Ms. Cerell to Mr. Joyner:**

"Uh right!!!!!! NO WAY!!!!!!! Thank goodness he was NEVER INVITED. I was relieved to see he didn't mention a date or location mentioned for the event. So hopefully he doesn't know either one. For what it's worth (which ain't much I know)... so far his request to have others join in with him in his rants & threats against the Tz & TUSPCO when he posted all

communications on \_\_\_\_\_'s site... no one ever came forth to support him. That was about 2 yrs. ago. And he then disappeared and moved on to his writings & posts on the Voluntarist site, for which no one [sic] seems to be responding much to either. Paying him off seems to me it would open the door though for others and he would love to send others to try to collect also, I'm sure. If the contract is dead/and or no longer valid, how can he invoke arbitration?

C

**2016, April 9, Ms. Cerell to Bill Cobb:**

I said to Wayne both in a message I newly copied you below and in our conversation last night "If the contract is dead/and or no longer valid, how can he invoke arbitration?" Turns out this will be our best defense. It's called "Statue [sic] of Limitations" and there is another term called the "document [sic] of Latches" (I don't know much about what that means, but Wayne does)." (NOTE: For the record, what Ms. Cerell was referring to is, in "flatland legalese", the "doctrine (not "document") of latches". That is essentially the same thing as "statute" (not "statue") of limitations").

What did Galambos say about the "law" and "lawyers"? A LOT. But here's just one quote that I think is appropriate to this topic:

*When we talk about lawyers - the whole profession is a farce - they think that I'm making them obsolete. No I'm not! Not them - just their profession. And by the way, I'm not making their profession obsolete. They already took care of that themselves. It is their profession that has driven mankind into the cultural decay that we're in. And if I had never been born, and the theory of primary property had not been thought of by me or anyone else, the situation that you now have, decay, already exists without me. And that is caused by the coercive mechanisms of which the legal profession is, you might say, the apology for. It makes theft look acceptable because theft, if it's done by a single private individual, is looked upon as a deplorable concept, but if it's done in the name of all the people because that's the law of the land, that makes it okay.*

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, V-201, Vol. II, Session 8, Part B  
page 66

Is it comments from Galambos like this that has turned Mr. Joyner against Galambos? That has caused Mr. Joyner to bury Galambos' work, and toss items from the Galamboses' warehouse into the garbage bin? Something to think about, for sure.

In summary, the trustees refused to arbitrate, citing "flatland legalese", which further establishes their track record for creating enemies. This is evidenced by this former customer's response:

**2016, Sept. 16, "Customer" to Trustees:**

"To Wayne Joyner, Cheryl Cerell, Peter Giansante, and the FEI staff: Given your failure to publish and your refusal to arbitrate, this is my response [www.galambos-fei.com](http://www.galambos-fei.com)"

Note that Mr. Joyner is not concerned with the issue of “who is right” or “who is wrong”, when he states, **“Whether his position is weak or strong isn’t the issue.”** The ONLY issues that he is concerned with are **“time and money”**:

Mr. Joyner: **“He threatens to bring this to arbitration which will involve time and money, especially if he is successful in getting others to join him.”**

Was “time and money” the Galamboses’ greatest concern? No. Was restitution the Galamboses’ greatest concern? Yes. Did the Galamboses provide ideological leadership when it comes to the concept of restitution? Yes. Did the trustees? No.

Not only are the trustees in violation of the professors’ policy on restitution, but this is another example of how for the last *TWENTY YEARS* the trustees have been **doing everything in their power to PREVENT publication of Book One, in direct conflict with Galambos’ explicit instructions**. This is no less than **criminal mismanagement** of his estate.

## THE TRUSTEES’ “MARKETING STRATEGY”

### TRUSTEES’ “MARKETING STRATEGY” OPPOSES GALAMBOS’ STRATEGY THEREBY FAILING TO ACHIEVE “MARKET PENETRATION”

Imagine you took courses from Professor Galambos back in the 1960s or 1970s, and obtained much knowledge and tremendous value from Galambos and his courses. Then, years later, you see that “The Free Enterprise Institute” has a website promoting Galambos and his courses. So you decide to contact FEI to “inquire within”. Below is an example of one former student who did:

#### Former student:

*“There is not a day goes by that my classes at FEI do not give me clarity. I just thought I would look up FEI, see if anything is being continued, and thank you.”*

#### Marketing Director Cheryl Cerell’s response:

Hello \_\_\_\_\_,

Glad to know you still recognize the importance of Galambos' concepts and courses! We still have our online Galambos' [sic] courses going: V-50DD; V-111DD & V-201DD and have had some high level individuals coming through them who plan to become very actively involved!

Unfortunately the former market of 70's-olde days just didn't seem to have the energy or desire that the current enrollees do, so it is sure a good thing we created the courses on line to keep his concepts moving forward.

You should enroll in the first three sessions of our online V-50DD course at 1/2 price is just \$50.00 and experience the improvement of the course with the visuals & study-guide provided.

If you are interested you can enroll at this link:

<http://www.fei-ajq.com/v-50courseinfo.html>

Hope you choose to check it out!

For a Better VS World!  
Cheryl Cerell  
FEI Marketing Director

Of course this potential customer was not heard from again. No wonder! To come in and ask a very innocent question and then be greeted with insults!

*"... the former market (which implies YOU, Mr. Customer from the "olden days") didn't seem to have the energy or desire that the current enrollees do..."*

It's unusual that Ms. Cerell responded to this customer with her *real name* in this instance. Most often she hides behind the alias "*David Johnson, Marketing Assistant*" when first "welcoming" in customers. Is this not hypocritical? To demand that inquiring potential customers give their full legal name, and then not offer your own "full legal name" as well? If a person is so sure that they are "absolutely right" about everything they are doing, then why feel the need to hide behind an alias? Why not have the courage to stand up and be accounted for, and answer *all questions* in an open and honest manner? But there is more. The "marketing director" attached the "FEI Questionnaire" (aka the "preliminary questionnaire") at the end of that response to the potential customer, in the example above. The "Questionnaire" is *the first step in a very long list of "screening" documents* that are *required* from customers before they can "advance" to the "next step".

Let's examine the "FEI Questionnaire":

Is it proper, and in line with what Galambos would do, to greet incoming potential customers with a litany of REQUIRED personal questions? From the very beginning, the trustees ask, and even ***require people they don't even know, to answer such personal questions!***

For example, here's a quick summary of the "Questionnaire":

"What is your current occupation?"; "please state your highest level of formal education"; "any professional licenses you hold"; "are you a member of any trade or labor union and if so please specify"; "have you heard any of Galambos' courses before, and if so, in what format?"; "have you read the book Sic Itur Ad Astra in whole or in part and if part, how much have you read"; "do you own or contribute to any websites or blogs or create any form of digital content, including music, podcasts, website design, electronic publications, software, or any other medium that provides electronically deliverable content?"; "please indicate any social networking service accounts you hold"; "please list the addresses of all *publicly* accessible mailing lists, bulletin boards, chat services, discussion groups, or any other public internet forum of which you are a member"; "please list the addresses of any *private* (!!!) mailing lists, bulletin boards, chat services, discussion groups, or any other public internet forum of which you are a member, *if the subjects of discussion include volitional science*"; "if you are involved in any way with the entertainment, film, music, broadcasting, or publishing industries please state the nature of your involvement"; "list the names of any individuals you know who have taken FEI or AJG courses"; "have you ever been a victim of intellectual property theft?"...

As anyone can plainly see, this "Questionnaire" can be likened to a ***Politburo styled interrogation!*** This "Questionnaire" ***frightens*** off customers all the time – as it should! So... *This* is the first step of FEI's

“marketing strategy”? *This is the first step of the “marketing strategy” that was created to develop “significant ideological penetration in the marketplace of human interaction”? This is the “marketing strategy” that will eventually lead the customer – IF the customer “successfully” jumps through all of the hoops (like a trained seal) – to the “holy grail” of the “Cow’s Tail process” also known as the “Doorway to Spaceland”?*

*IF someone actually agrees to this **massive invasion of privacy** and answers the questions to the “satisfaction” of the “trustees”, they are then tested on their comprehension after each session before they are allowed to move forward through the course, and the courses. **Did Galambos do this? Of course not!** His enrollment form requested only the most basic of information: “name, date, course, occupation, high school graduate?, and who were you referred by, if anyone.” But the real irony is that **those who are determining what the comprehension of the theory is and should be, are the very same people who have misunderstood and misapplied the theory in the worst possible ways!***

Here is a comment from a recent student of FEI, when this student was presented with one of FEI’s course “tests”:

*Without a method for review and study, it appears that the opportunity to move forward, other than individually living the philosophy are limited. All of this leads to the reason I have not completed the final exam. I have come to understand the reasons not to “promote” the philosophy. However, after I read the final questions, it appears that this test is not designed to increase my understanding, but rather to reinforce the limitations. From that perspective, I saw no need to proceed. As I expressed to Bobby, if I had seen a reason, I would have completed the final.*

**Another “satisfied customer”? This is just one of the many reasons that FEI, if it continues to operate on this same path, will not survive. I “suggest” that *the time has come for some MAJOR change.***

The “second step” of this “marketing strategy” includes the signing of the “**Licensing Agreement**”, which can now be found on the “new and improved” automated enrollment process FEI’s website:

*“If you are interested you can enroll at this link:”*

<http://www.fei-ajq.com/v-50courseinfo.html>

If one clicks on that link, they will arrive at a page where they will learn that before enrolling in any course, they must read and agree to this document, found here:

<http://www.fei-ajq.com/licenseagreement.html>

Now, can you imagine anyone coming in cold off the street and reading through this entire “agreement”, let alone agreeing to sign it? With this, the trustees have already eliminated the vast majority of the curious and rational people on this planet, right from the beginning!

As a result of the “marketing strategy” that FEI has adopted – where each student is hand picked and hand held and “mentored” by a “qualified” graduate (Again, who “qualifies” the qualifiers?) who purports to know the theory better than everyone else, and then this customer is dragged “upstream” like



a fish that jumps through locks – Preliminary Questionnaire > Licensing Agreement > V-50 Modules 1/2/3 and all the tests for comprehension that are involved > V-111DD and tests > V-201DD and tests > and then finally, you reach the HOLY GRAIL! ... *“The Cow’s Tail”* document, which is in reality **another “course”, which was NOT created by Galambos, that one must pay money to read, and the project that Ms. Cerell “took over in 2005” and that Mr. Giansante collects “royalty checks” for?** THAT is what the “trustees” call “NRD”? I call it witchcraft. At the very least, it’s gross incompetence.

Furthermore, how can the trustees approve of the *“Cow’s Tail”* document, and not Mr. Giansante’s “communication course”? Neither are courses created by Galambos. If the trustees recognized the “communication course” to be highly inappropriate, **then why didn’t they recognize the “Cow’s Tail” to be equally inappropriate?**

For those customers that somehow manage to jump through all of these hoops, they are then going to somehow build this magical “clearinghouse”, with and alongside of, their “role models”, the “trustees”? And *then*, this so-called “clearinghouse” needs to be up and running with successful applications ***before anything can be called ARD?*** Doesn’t this sound a lot like the “burden” that Galambos would rather avoid? Something a “problem-seeker” would create?

***This all shows a complete and total misunderstanding and misapplication of the concepts of NRD/ARD by Galambos’ “trustees”, and the product of “problem-seekers”!*** What did Galambos say about “misapplication” again?:

***“I would rather see no application than a misapplication.”***

***Well, I’d like to point out further that this concept of secrecy is not what is being taught here. That is only the superficial false illusion amongst those who hear about, but do not understand, what the theory of primary property is.***

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, V-201, Vol. 1, Session 1, Part B, page 56

With the “marketing strategy” that the “trustees” have adopted, they have in essence enacted a plan of “secrecy”, and, like the “problem-seeker”, have ***complicated and distorted Galambos’ theory beyond recognition! This is because the trustees have not applied Occam’s Razor as it relates to the subject of whether to publish Galambos’ book, or not.***

The topic of “marketing strategy” is yet another example of a **CRIME** against the professor.

## TRUSTEES’ WEBSITE IS INACCURATE, AND EVIDENCE OF INCOMPETENCE

I learned some new information from *Orbit!*, by William W. Martin, which prompted me to ask many new questions to, and of, Ms. Cerell. After reading *Orbit!*, I prepared a “Timeline of events” for Ms. Cerell, to her request for information. I wrote to her in an e-mail on 6/28/20:

*...I think it would be an important book for you to have in your possession. The information contained within the book is bound to bring up questions from the “market” today and most likely in the future, and this might help you anticipate what those new questions might be, and how FEI might satisfactorily answer questions to customers in the future as well. I have many questions of my own (moral*

**questions, absolute right, technical questions of the theory itself, questions of FEI's structure, how courses that are currently available have been edited, how NRD/ARD fits in, natural estate trust vs. charitable trust and 'beneficiaries', the relative importance of V-50X, "serialization", the true intent of AJG and SJG, and many others) but I am going to hold on to them for now until you can have time to review the "Timeline"...**

On 7/2/20 she responded, saying that she had not had time to read it all, and so in response, I wrote back on 7/3/20:

***I know you say you haven't finished the Martin Timeline that I put together yet, but as your primary friend I want to strongly urge you to get on top of that as soon as you can... For right now I have only two of the simplest questions for you, and they concern your website. If your website is in error on either of these points, then you might want to make the corrections as soon as possible. And not even just for your image - but think of what AJG would have said if he saw these errors! That is, if in fact they are errors...***

***1989 - October 29. WWM: "On the last Sunday of October of the year 1989, during the intermission between Parts A and B of the penultimate session of his open-end course, the professor's wife came forward to the podium. The hour was 11:40 A.M. She said, 'There will be no OEC next year, no OESC next year, no BFSC next year - the open-end course is closed'." OEC: Session 203, Recorded Intermission, 1989, October 29. (page 11)***

***1989 - November 5. AJG gives last 2 lectures he would ever give, OESC in morning, BFSC in afternoon and evening. Holiday Inn, Montebello, Ca, room 327. (page 16) According to Martin, the last lecture AJG ever gave was November 5, 1989. Is this true?***

***From your website on AJG's Bio:***

**Galambos continued to develop and integrate important concepts for human progress, and taught those concepts in his lecture courses until he ceased presenting live lectures due to deteriorating health in 1987.**

***And from your website on under "Courses":***

**All of FEI's courses were originally offered in live presentations by Andrew J. Galambos and other faculty members from 1961 through 1987. Subsequent offerings of most courses were presented via audiotape copies of the original lectures with supporting visual aids. Following the cessation of live course presentations in 1987, FEI's courses were available only through a limited number of tape course contractors. The Free Enterprise Institute's catalog contains over 50 courses spanning a wide variety of subjects, all based on or related to the science of volition.**

***Also, Martin says that there were 117 courses in all. Do the trustees have all 117? Is that the correct number? Do you or any of the trustees know for sure? The website***

*only says “over 50”. These statements from the trust on the website have been lingering there since 2013. Do they still deserve to be there?*

*Now, I never met Professor Galambos as you know, but I think I have read and listened to enough from him to know that if he saw this lack of precision it would give him a coronary! You knew him! What do you think? BUT, I do reserve the right to be completely wrong on this and will stand corrected if I am. **But if Martin is right on these points then I would think that you would go to all of the other trustees and scream to the roof tops to change your website immediately, on behalf of AJG! What do you say? Your PF, B”***

In spite of a couple more attempts to reach Ms. Cerell since, I have not heard from her nor have I received any “receipts” from my last two messages; one in July to wish happy birthday, and one in August to ask if she was “OK”.

The point of all of this is, shouldn't a “marketing director” always attempt to answer customers questions as best as possible, especially if the person who is asking the questions is their “best student”? I would have thought that by pointing out these supposed errors on the website that I would have been thanked for it, and that something might have been done about it. However, to date I have received no thank you, nor any update on any progress that might be occurring in regards to website corrections. This example points towards inaccuracies and incompetence, whether they be “minor” examples or not. The question is, would Galambos consider these inaccuracies to be “minor”? I leave that for the reader to consider.

## MIR: “MORAL ISLAND REJECT LIST” PLAYS MAJOR FUNCTION IN FEI MARKETING EFFORTS

It is no secret that Galambos himself had a “moral island reject” (MIR) list. But his list was largely used to have a record of customers who “reneged” on payment for courses. It was not used as an all-encompassing marketing tool, as it is by the current trustees. The trustees have taken the concept of MIR to an entirely new and higher level! It is largely a pet project of Ms.Cerell's, and regrettably, a project that I had helped her with, entering data and information into FEI's data system. The MIR list is used to “screen the market”, and to make sure no one associated with this list has access to any of FEI's digitally produced courses. In effect, it is an **Anti-Marketing tool**.

These are *just a few* of the reasons that a person might be included on FEI's “MIR Master List”:

Anyone who supports or has supported any number of people that were involved in law suits against the trustees; anyone who is deemed to be a “universal blab-forth” (“blab-forth”: putting Galambos' writings/ideas on internet or writing “unauthorized” books); anyone who did not agree with Galambos' definition of “Absolute Right”; anyone who does not believe in the concept of “primary property”; anyone who supports or supported Jay Snelson; anyone who was listed in Suzanne Galambos's “moral hazard” card file; anyone who has shown in any way that they have “attacked” or not supported Galambos and/or any of the trustees; anyone “associated” with any names currently listed on the “MIR Master List” (there is a special category for them: “MIR (?)”).

Can anyone think of a more *colossal waste of time* than this? And yet, *this is a MAJOR focus for the "marketing effort" of FEI to this very day!*

In August of 2019, I asked Ms. Cerell how I should enter the names on the MIR Master List into the system, and under which "category":

**Ms. Cerell wrote to Bill Cobb** (FYI: "TZ" = trustees; "CC" = Cheryl Cerell; "WJ" = Wayne Joyner; "AJG" = Andrew J. Galambos):

RE: types: MIR ? means maybe not sure MIR plain is my additions before we now have a master list. Those on the master list that you are putting into the system now need to say who the MIR status came from TZ; CC; WJ as the master list shows but this NOW should be not in the categories I guess but now specifically in the NOTES SECTION. I NEED TO THINK ABOUT THIS ACTUALLY. BECAUSE IT DEPENDS ON IF WE WILL WANT TO SORT SEPARATELY, LIKE LETS [sic] SAY: JUST ALL AJG'S LIST (WHICH COMES FROM WHILE HE WAS ALIVE) OR ALL CC'S IDENTIFIED; OR THE TZ IDENTIFIED LIST. I THOUGHT IT WAS IMPORTANT TO KNOW THE SOURCE SO I HAD \_\_\_\_\_ MAKE THE MASTER LIST THAT WAY THAT YOU HAVE. SO WHAT ARE YOUR THOUGHTS? I LEAN ON IDENTIFYING IN THE CATEGORIES WHO'S LIST BECAUSE THEN IT CAN EASILY BE PRINTED OUT THAT WAY AND ONE CAN SELECT EACH CATEGORY TO SEE OR PRINT.

**Bill Cobb responded to Ms. Cerell:**

*OK, Let me think on this overnite [sic] and I'll get back to you tomorrow. I'm all for simplicity, and consistency. B*

**Ms. Cerell to Bill Cobb:**

*After talking to \_\_\_\_\_ who was a programmer for a bank and considering things more completely it was agreed by both of us that for now to proceed by adding the source of the MIR as shown on the master list when working on that list. So it would be MIR- AJG; or MIR -Trustees; or MIR -WJ (meaning Wayne Joyner) ETC. MIR- CC. **So the "Categories" list will show the MIR source when known. OK?***

**Bill Cobb to Ms. Cerell:**

*This sounds good to me, but I was also thinking, **is there a good working definition of "MIR"/"Moral Island Reject"?** Maybe something to think about in a precise way, because what you may consider to be an MIR might be different than other trustees' "definitions", or what Galambos' criteria was. B*

**Ms. Cerell to Bill Cobb:**

*Ok I will think about it, but look at my additions to Harry Browne as to why he is a MIR category. **If you don't know but think they might be fore [sic] now just put them in MIR? catagory [sic] which will mean we need more information. C***

**Bill Cobb to Ms. Cerell** (Note: "CC" = Cheryl Cerell):

Regarding your comments on Harry Browne:

**You wrote:**

***“MIR according to AJG because he used AJG’s name without permission in his 1970 book and AJG let CC know explicitly how he would have NEVER given him permission to use it for such a short term, make a quick buck & scare people into ‘speculation’ vs REAL INVESTMENTS into positive production entities. Also in his his [sic] 1973 book again short term idea of ‘FREEDOM’. Cheryl also considered Browne an MIR due to his article which calls Galambos a thief and other ugly things (along with Lowi) in his article “FREEDOM’S UNKOWN GURU” yet trys [sic] to cash in on Galambos market for political gain when AJG died in 1997. CC was appauld [sic] at the mis-representation of Galambos in the Liberty Magazine by Browne who was using Galambos rand [sic] name as he ran for politica [sic] position of Presendent [sic] in 2000.”***

As I see it, “MIR - Moral Island Reject”, is a term used for business purposes in accordance with FEI, or any other Volitional Science related business that AJG created. In other words, it’s a term associated with the type of person AJG, or any of his contractual associates within the context of his “Natural Estate”, would not want to do business with, contract with, or share information with. This type of person, I assume, should have a proven track record of behavior that is not in accordance with AJG’s definition of Moral, and not in accordance with general VS principles. It’s someone who has accumulated enough knowledge of VS and been exposed to, and completed, V-50 at a minimum, I would think. Therefore, a person who should “know better” – not just any Flatlander.

So, maybe a good start to an “MIR definition” might be, in short, anyone who commits a “crime” as defined by AJG against the “Natural Estate/FEI”, and would include the following:

An individual who violates the principles of Volitional Science, which would include a documented track record of any of the following behaviors, especially if exhibited on a consistent basis:

1. Violation of Contracts.
2. Non-Contractual behavior, e.g. using another persons property without the owners permission, which includes all P1, P2, P3 and their name in association with that property.
3. No Restitution, e.g. not making, or refusing, to make restitution for any violations.
4. Violation of Market, e.g. using another persons market to sell personal products and or services, without the owner of that market’s permission.
5. Misrepresentations and slander of AJG property, business, and/or contractual associates in a public forum.

In short, maybe just this: “someone who has proven to be untrustworthy and who FEI would not be comfortable working with on a contractual basis”.

In building my own personal “moral island”, that is the definition I use. But I don’t call those people “moral island REJECTS”, because in general, they are all Flatlanders, and I don’t expect as much from them. And, personally, I’ve never really been a big fan of the term “Moral Island Reject”, and I think potential customers might find it to be off-putting, and might cause them not to continue finishing the

course V-50 or other courses. I know the term is used in SIAA, but I can't remember if he actually discussed the concept of MIR in V-50DD. Do you know? I'll have to check my notes. I think the term can come off to be offensive, exclusive, dividing, confrontational, high-handed to others, especially Flatlanders. But I understand AJG's use of the term in the context of what he was trying to teach and achieve, and in the context of running a business and creating a better world in the process. I just think there could be a better term for such people. "VS Criminal"? That would be more cut and dried, and differentiate it from what "the state" calls "criminal". MIR's should be held to a higher standard, and are. The term "Moral Island Reject", then, is what AJG used; therefore, any trustee, associate, etc. working with FEI should be "OK" with it. However, I think the more that the term can be specifically defined, the easier it would be for current and future trustees, associates, etc. to determine exactly who should be on the list, and who should not. And, are there different "levels" or "degrees" of MIR's? I think there are. There are Major MIR's that we know of. But there seems to be a lot of "grey area" surrounding many on the current list. Some may be on that list unfairly and maybe, just maybe, should be given the benefit of the doubt. I know for a fact that you have worked very hard in that regard and have been extremely patient, even with the known MAJOR MIR's! So please don't take this as a criticism in any way, because it certainly is NOT. It's just that now that I am a little bit more involved in it, I have more questions about it – hence my questions about the "definition". I hope you understand.

**Ms. Cerell to Bill Cobb:**

Well I appreciate your thoughts below and there is much to discuss about this however, for now I think the best course is to proceed as is since the master list you are working from was determined by AJG himself, or Wayne Joyner, or all the TZ when Charles Hayes & his wife were Trustees etc. And due to the fact we only found AJG's list of the past a few years ago (which would have been VERY HELPFUL for me to have known in advance that I needed to be extra careful with a person he or WJ determined or anyone else who officially worked for the Tz. It also of course would have been good to know WHY! BUT there was no record made back then to determine this. We did not have Bobby's Data system to even allow such a thing to be recorded for a past history for future TZ or staff to be working from. THAT'S WHY IT IS IMPORTANT TO GET THIS PAST PART DONE NOW WHILE WE CAN.

The list is PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL, so most who are on the list don't even know they are on it. From AJG's perspective it meant they were no longer allowed access to his material nor would he associate with them in anyway unless they made apologies & restitution, depending on the damage of course.

Anyway it is important for now that we at least get what we have recorded as is for now in Bobby's data system for future reference for others to follow up with operations in the future. This is why it is important to put the source from the master list from now on, OK? Bye [sic] he [sic] way, most of those people from AJG's list, which is in black (other sources are identified by a different color), I've never heard of nor did I even know he had such a list (it was on a card file that he kept that we found a few years ago).

Did you realize that Harry Browne was listed as MIR on AJG's List? You did not have him in Bobby's data system listed in the "category" as AJG's list, you had NO NRD. I changed it to MIR-AJG. So I guess there is some confusion about the master list, yes?

Hope this help explains things a little better. What we do with future MIR's or problem people we can discuss in our next phone conversation, OK

**Bill Cobb to Ms. Cerell:**

*Thank you for all of this explanation. I will do all I can to help, just trying to communicate to you some of my own questions and concerns. Yeah, the master list I have is kind of confusing so that's why I was wondering what direction it might take and how to categorize certain things...*

There is much more on this *nauseating* topic, but I think the point is made. **THIS IS A COLOSSAL WASTE OF TIME, MONEY, AND RESOURCES IN THIS "MARKETING"/"ANTI-MARKETING" EFFORT.**

## THE TRUSTEES' MISHANDLING OF GALAMBOS' PRIMARY AND SECONDARY PROPERTY

### TRUSTEES' MISHANDLING OF GALAMBOS' PRIMARY PROPERTY (P1)

The trustees have allowed a watered down, rearranged version of Book One to be published with over ONE THOUSAND MISTAKES, on the cheapest possible paper, and a binding so poorly done that Heritage Bindery said:

*"If used at all this book, Sic Itur Ad Astra Vol. One, will probably have a 'life expectancy' of a few hours. As we discussed, pages are already beginning to pop out."*  
(Orbit! page 317, Appendix 18: "Letter From Heritage Bindery", 3/14/2000).

If you have a hard copy of "SIAA Vol.1", and have opened it up and read it to any degree, you will know that this is true. **THIS** – in spite of the trustees having the professor's *explicit instructions on how the book was to be done!* For a detailed analysis of the incompetence regarding the publishing of "SIAA Vol.1", I refer the reader to *Orbit!*. To go into this any further is beyond the scope of this letter, and that topic has already been covered in exquisite detail by William W. Martin.

So is it any wonder that the digitized courses are **also a mistake?** **Knowing what we know now, how can anyone continue to promote and offer those courses?** It is now proven that the digitized courses are an even more **grandiose mistake** than "SIAA Vol.1" ever was! At least with "SIAA Vol.1" the trustees were successful in convincing the "market" that they were making a sincere effort to try their very best to publish *at least something*. With the publishing of "SIAA Vol.1", the trustees achieved some moderate success in getting the pre-subscribers off their backs. This, *while behind the scenes stealing the work that Mr. Martin had done!* In the end, the trustees were too incompetent of a committee to produce anything of any value at all, and certainly not in a timely manner. So now, with the digitized courses, they have blatantly *attempted* to erase history! **AND** Galambos' P1 in the process! All to **SAVE FACE!** Their justification of this, at least to the "market", is that this is all being done in the name of "protecting" the professor!

Do courses "V-50DD", "V-111DD", and "V-201DD" **still deserve to be on the market?** **Given this "new" knowledge, would ANYONE want to have ANYTHING to do with the current trustees of FEI?**

## TRUSTEES' MISHANDLING OF GALAMBOS' SECONDARY PROPERTY (P2)

I learned that the trustees are having problems competently storing and preserving Galambos' course tapes, and have even considered whether the content is worth preserving at all.

**On Sep 30, 2018, Ms. Cerell wrote:**

Subject: Re: Erase Multiple Course 100 Presentations?

*This Tuesday will be a very important meeting about much of the problems we have going forward **as we run out of money to be paying Pete** to digitize the VOLUMES of AJG's tape recordings over a period from approx 1960 to the ~1990. That is 30 yrs of inventory and over 1,000 recordings some on cassettes even... **Not to mention we got hung up on the progress of the website; homepage; V-50DD Newly designed information & enrollment page & and some other work I need to do for it.***

Isn't the year 2018 a bit too late to be thinking about this? Shouldn't this have been the TOP PRIORITY of the "Trust" from the beginning? This process should have been completed DECADES ago! Why not?

Ms. Cerell explains: "we got hung up on the progress of the website; homepage; V-50DD Newly designed information & enrollment page & and some other work I need to do for it."

**Mr. Giansante to Wayne Joyner** ("OJ" is Mr. Joyner's nickname):

Subject: Re: Erase Multiple Course 100 Presentations?

OJ:

*I think we need to be clear. The statement "\_\_\_\_ can provide safe storage at his \_\_\_\_\_ location" does NOT mean "preserving the tapes". I've seen \_\_\_\_'s \_\_\_\_\_ location; it's an uninsulated steel shipping container in \_\_\_\_\_, which is subject to moisture and extremes of temperature. It is not a climate controlled environment; so, Cheryl's proposal only means storing the tapes, not actually preserving them. They would be better off in \_\_\_\_\_, where conditions aren't perfect, but they're better than what \_\_\_\_ can offer. Actually, even storing them under perfect conditions isn't going to preserve them. **What the Trust should decide is whether the content is worth preserving. If so, then we'd better do it NOW...not later.** We're talking about old acetate tapes. I have not burdened y'all with a blow by blow account of the unbelievable pains in the ass I have gone through just to get these Course 100 tapes digitized. But I can see that y'all need more information to make a more informed decision. Here are some of the things that Cheryl's proposal does not account for:*

- *I have had to splice leader onto each end of each tape just to get them threaded through the transport and onto the take-up reel. Otherwise, the tapes break because they're brittle. I splice a leader onto one end, then fast-forward the tape through to the other end and splice a leader on that end too. In that way, I get the heads and tails digitized. Otherwise, I'd be missing the content at the ends because AJG consistently ran the tapes off the reel, and kept right on talking. There are no overflow tapes.*
- *In some cases the tapes are stretched, or curled, or the oxide has flaked off the backing, so there are dropouts...places where the content is simply gone because there's no oxide on the backing to hold the original magnetic information.*



- *Most of the tapes are incredibly noisy, and suffer from low signal level. Some of that is due to lousy recordings, but I some of it is due to long-term deterioration of the tape media. Entropy takes its toll, especially with acetate. The noise isn't just tape hiss; if it were just that, I could deal with it. It's degraded signal quality. If you want to hear how bad it is, just call me up, and I'll play some for you. I don't have any DSP plug-ins that restore content that has partially degraded itself out of existence.*
- *Magnetic media are not permanent. Eventually, the magnetic dipoles that store the information lose energy, or are partially reoriented by the magnetic dipoles on the adjacent layers ("printthrough"), and what started out as an analog representation of the audio information becomes randomized. It's less a problem with digital information storage than with analog (tape) audio storage, which is why we're digitizing the things we want to preserve. But storing is NOT preserving. In this case, storing is the same as destroying. The point is this: Forget about "the tapes can possibly be digitized at some future date"; that's simply unrealistic. The acetate tapes have already gone way downhill, and their condition is only going to get worse. If \_\_\_\_\_ takes them and stores them in a shipping container in \_\_\_\_\_ where they'll be in an oven in the summer, they'll freeze in the winter, and they'll be exposed to plenty of moisture in the process, that will destroy them. **We might as well just erase them right now and save everyone the trouble.** What's more, I had a hell of a time rounding up a complete set of tapes to digitize. I wouldn't look forward to spending the same amount of time rounding up the rest of the Course 100 tapes just to send them to oblivion. Hanging onto the acetate tapes is a pointless exercise. If they were mylar tapes, then we could keep them somewhat longer. At least that medium is more stable. But acetate? No way... Actually, we already agreed about this. The only reason I asked the question is because the quality of the original Course 100 acetate tape recordings is so lousy. I didn't know that was the case when we agreed to digitize the "official" version and erase the rest. But now that I've heard how bad the original audio recordings are, I figured that maybe it might be a good thing to digitize another one or two presentations (but not all of them). That would have some value. But if so, that's a decision we need to make NOW. Putting it off because we can't make a decision is the same as deciding to send them to their doom. I don't see any value in that at all.*

*UPDATE: I just noticed that Jerry sent a message and said essentially the same thing, in a lot fewer words. **It also has occurred to me that the notion of keeping the tapes presumes that they'll be digitized by someone who has at least the same amount of skill, experience, and equipment that I've pulled together for this project. I suppose that's possible (assuming whoever it is can still find the tape machines, and knows how to keep them running), but it sounds like a long shot to me.** The truth is that the best possible chance of preserving the content is right now, not "at some future date". We should either decide what we want to digitize and do it, or get rid of them. I have no delusions about this; sending them elsewhere is essentially the same as getting rid of them, only much less efficiently, and **out of an inability to make a decision.***

*PVG*

**Mr. Joyner to Mr. Giansante** (aka "Vito"; "AQ" is Ms. Cerell):

*Vito:*

*I just spoke to AQ who proposed an alternative to erasure. She suggests all undigitized tapes be preserved so the tapes can possibly be digitized at some future date. Apparently \_\_\_\_\_ is willing to do this. Meanwhile, the \_\_\_\_\_'s can pick up the tapes from you and hold until \_\_\_\_\_ is available. This seems*

like a reasonable plan, and preserves the chance to record content that may not be available elsewhere. I agree with her proposal. \_\_\_\_\_ can provide safe storage at his \_\_\_\_\_ location. It would require coordination with the \_\_\_\_\_'s for pick up, which can be done directly with them or through AQ.

**THIS WOULD NEED APPROVAL FROM ALL TRUSTEES.** Please let me know your thoughts.

OJ

Because the Trust is a committee, which "would need approval from all trustees", these problems continue "out of an inability to make a decision". If Mr. Joyner had only followed Galambos' instructions from the beginning! If he had only adhered to the principles of volitional science, they would not be in this mess today!

***I happen to know a competent man who knew Galambos personally and certainly knows the theory better than anyone alive today. He has encountered this very same problem with tapes before. He says, "There is a solution but it's a one shot deal" that requires a special "technology", and "it should only be done by a profit seeking business with plenty of experience with this". Hopefully Mr. Gian-sante did not try to do this on his own.***

If that isn't enough, there's also this:

**Oct. 27, 2019 Ms. Cerell wrote:**

*I'll be talking to \_\_\_\_\_ Tuesday and know more about my idea for the stuff stored at \_\_\_\_\_'s for selling. **The stuff in her garage I saved from the warehouse for some future "Silent Auction" to raise \$ for the Trust making select items available to "Highly Screened" FEI people.** I didn't know at the time that there would be no more FEI annual events. Anyway, I'm looking at possibly mid April as an open time for me to possibly to go out there and see what I can do. There are quite a few things to try to pull together first, and two of those things are \_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_. I will be keeping you posted as I know more.*

The squandering of Galambos' assets on the "**website; homepage; V-50DD Newly designed information & enrollment page & and some other work**" has resulted in a "Trust" which is so financially strapped that they now need to "**raise \$ for the Trust making select items**" from some "**garage**", "**available to 'Highly Screened' FEI people**" in "**some future 'Silent Auction'**"!

**And just what is it that the "Trust" will do with this "\$"? Pay off debts? Create more "courses"? Line their own pockets for their retirements?**

As the reader can now clearly understand, the **incompetence** and **criminal neglect** of those currently entrusted with Galambos' property **knows no bounds**. The trustees are running FEI like it's their own personal garden, where they cultivate the flowers and pluck out the weeds. Well, that is not what Galambos had instructed them to do. He required the "trustee" to publish his books, and that is all. If the people who are entrusted to Galambos' estate want to grow their own "garden", they should do it somewhere else, not under the umbrella of Andrew J. Galambos and The Free Enterprise Institute.

## WILLIAM W. MARTIN, LITERARY EXECUTOR OF PROFESSOR ANDREW J. GALAMBOS

Book One is a book of *Galambos'* genius. It also happened to be **completed by a genius**: the *genius* of ***Galambos'* appointed Literary Executor, William W. Martin.**

William W. Martin is the ONLY person that could have completed Book One. He was with Galambos from the beginning to the very end. No trustee can claim that track record. Like ***Scipio Africanus***, he did this alone, and without any committees.

What Mr. Martin achieved is a truly remarkable feat of strength, determination, intelligence, love, intellectual honesty, capability, understanding, empathy, struggle, endurance, and so much more. He demonstrated that HE ALONE is the ONLY man on this planet who could have completed *Sic Itur Ad Astra* to Galambos' exacting specifications! Talk about a HERO. He was John Galt and Howard Roarke wrapped up into one! Most of all, both of these works – *Orbit!* and *Sic itur Ad Astra* – are works done by a man of **INTEGRITY, as Galambos defined it.** Mr. Martin, like professor Galambos, demonstrated *complete honesty, especially when he did not have to or was subject to detection.* Or, if it was not in his best interests – according to “the public eye” at the time – to be so honest. I can see why both of these men respected and admired each other, and why Galambos chose Mr. Martin to be his Literary Executor. **That was the best decision Galambos ever made!**

Galambos has been done a grave injustice by the “trustees” of his estate. Likewise, so has Mr. Martin. He has been unjustly vilified in the worst ways and for the worst possible reasons. Both men have. The trustees of Galambos' estate owe restitution and justice to both. Read *Orbit!*. It's all in there for anyone with *true intellectual honesty* to see.

## END NOTES

Galambos said that it is *possible* to achieve “freedom”, as he defined it, in ***one*** generation! But for over the past twenty years, ***the trustees of Galambos' estate have committed nearly every primary crime they could think of in order to prevent the publication of the complete Sic Itur Ad Astra.*** They also have done everything in their power ***to prevent anyone from ever learning the truth about what Galambos actually said and instructed the trustee to do.*** So much time, money, human resources, and *energy* wasted! And with nothing to show for it but whatever remnants of Galambos' tapes and course materials are left!

At the beginning of this letter, I stated:

***“I wrote this letter to stress the importance and urgency of preserving Galambos' course tapes and materials until such time as they can be handed over to someone qualified to competently publish, protect, and perpetuate Galambos' courses in accordance with Galambos' explicit instructions.”***

***It is time for the “trustees” to resign and turn over all P1 and P2 assets of Galambos' trust to Space-land Publications so they can immediately publish the works of Andrew J. Galambos. This is the best decision the “trustees” will ever make!***

**THIS LETTER IS A "CALL TO ACTION"** for those in position to DO something about this.

If not for the efforts of William W. Martin, Book One would *never* exist. I wish to personally express my deepest gratitude to William W. Martin for completing both *Sic Itur Ad Astra* and *Orbit!*. Without *Orbit!* this information may never have come to light in time to do something productive with it. Without *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, our species has no chance at all.

I also wish to express my deepest gratitude to the people at **Spaceland Publications** for making this information available. Without them it would not be possible to share this important and urgent information. The people at **Spaceland Publications** are the **ONLY** people on the planet today who are **qualified to competently publish, protect, and perpetuate Galambos' books in accordance with Galambos' explicit instructions.**

**THEY DESERVE TO BE GIVEN THIS OPPORTUNITY, IMMEDIATELY.**

***Give me a lever and a place to stand and I will move the earth. Give me a fulcrum, and I shall move the world.***

— Archimedes

***The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.***

— Edmund Burke

***If there were just one—one—I repeat one totally competent entrepreneurially oriented graduate of V-201, or alternatively a reader of the book once it's published who has never even had 201 but read the book, just one who totally understands this theory and applies it properly to the industry I'm about to describe, it could change the entire future of the world. That's how high the leverage could be. That's better than having to count noses and get somebody elected president only to try again in four years, is it not?***

— *Sic Itur Ad Astra*, V-201, Vol. VII, Session 41, Part A  
page 63