

Andrew J. Galambos, the Free Enterprise Institute, and Freedom

by Jay Snelson on August 9, 2009

By Jay Stuart Snelson

This writing began in January 2007 as a short letter to former Senior Lecturer of the Free Enterprise Institute, Alvin Lowi, Jr. and was finished in July 2008 as a short paper on "Andrew J. Galambos, The Free Enterprise Institute, and Freedom." It would never have been written had it not been prompted by Alvin's earlier biographical sketch of Galambos, "A Lasting Encounter."

Your eight-page biographical sketch of Andrew Galambos—"A Lasting Encounter"—introduced me to many key details on the founding of the Free Enterprise Institute that I had either forgotten or was unaware of to begin with. My interest in FEI history remains more than casual. If for no other reason, I invested fourteen years (1964-1978) in building the Free Enterprise Institute, in part, by enrolling some 90% of all new students through my presentations of *The V-50 Lectures* in Los Angeles County, Orange County, Santa Barbara County, Ventura County, and Santa Clara County. Most of these students went on to enroll in Andrew's various graduate courses, which became the prime source of Institute revenue.

Alvin, your account of the origin of some of the ideas that led Galambos to found his Free Enterprise Institute is not only interesting, but it is important to record them for those who care about the intellectual history of social hypotheses and concepts that were conceived and developed for the advancement of human freedom. Among various inputs acquired by Galambos, you noted:

"Curiously, each of us (Galambos, Allen, and I) had previously and independently bonded with Rand, Paine, and Thoreau. So by the time we met, we were already confirmed individualists and Americanists. But until our exposure to the 'Austrians,' we were lacking key pieces of social knowledge and technology, specifically economics and free enterprise. The Austrian connection was a significant turning point for Galambos and subsequently for me."

And for me, too, because Don Allen (who lived only a mile from me in Westchester) introduced me to the writings of Von Mises (*Human Action*, et al.) some time before I first heard Galambos give an introductory talk on his Course 100: *Capitalism the Key to Survival* at a luncheon meeting of the Glendale Women's Club (c. 1962). I find it interesting that both you and Don Allen, independently of each other and Galambos, were all influenced by "Rand, Paine, and Thoreau." With eloquence and clarity difficult to match, they had shown both

liberty and individualism to be in sharp contrast to the servitude and collectivism imposed by political control of human action. Once this contrast and its implications are evident, the salient question remains: What can be done to reverse the encroachment of state coercion and the tyranny it imposes?

It seems to me unlikely that Galambos would have ever founded his institute without his accidental encounter with you and Don. It is remarkable that the three of you shared a common interest in the advance of individualism and freedom when we realize that nearly all who are trained in science and technology (as the three of you were) perceive the political state—with its legal seizure of wealth and freedom from the people—to be the practical model for governing a modern industrial society. Nevertheless, even with your and Don's influence on Galambos, he still had to possess the vision and fortitude to found a proprietary venture that aimed to market an ideology of near unfettered freedom that was clearly alien to mainstream thinking of the 1960s. As you have noted, Alvin, "What set Galambos apart from others in the 'freedom' movement was his utter disdain for politics and non-profit organization."

Except for Rand's proprietary institute, everyone else in the freedom movement existed on donations. Galambos was quick to decry these as "mooch" organizations where securing handouts took priority over nearly everything else. Yet, Galambos acknowledged the value of those publications on freedom that came out of Leonard Read's Foundation for Economic Education in New York. In my own case, as early as 1960, thanks to Read's foundation (FEE), I had been introduced to Frederic Bastiat, Henry Hazlitt, F.A. Harper, and other cogent writers on the benefits of advancing human liberty. With its founding in 1946, FEE became the first "think tank" that aimed to show the unique value of replacing human servitude with human freedom. Nonetheless, where the aim is to meet consumer demands for better and better products at lower and lower prices, Andrew's effective arguments for the market superiority and efficiency of proprietary corporations over nonprofit foundations are ideas yet to be equaled for the soundness of their logic and rationality of their conclusions.

Early in my exposure to Galambos, I believed his strategy for freedom held great promise. In defining the problem of expanding freedom, he asserted that our social crisis has a single source: Through the advance of physical science we have become smart enough to destroy ourselves, but in social science, we are not smart enough to prevent our own destruction. To counter this growing crisis, Galambos believed he could build a true social science founded on the same scientific method that came to fruition through the genius of Galileo and Newton. The Galambos idea of closing this critical gap by infusing science into the so called social sciences seemed to be a powerful strategy—then as now—for reversing the harmful trend away from human freedom toward human servitude. Yet, in aiming to close this gap, it appears that Galambos fell prey to various entrepreneurial, epistemological, and psychological pitfalls that led to the marginalization of—if not destruction of—his Free Enterprise Institute as a leader

in the creation of a true social science for the advancement of peace, prosperity, and freedom.

In disclosing win-win theory since 1978 through my own Institute for Human Progress and through my Human Action Seminars, I did not use my institute as a platform to criticize the ideas of my intellectual antecedents who include Von Mises, Galambos, LeFevre, et al. Rather than spend my time critiquing my view of their intellectual or epistemological weaknesses—if not intellectual errors—it seemed more productive to correct these faults by excluding them from my development of win-win theory. In brief, win-win theory is an observational strategy for maximizing the causes of peace, prosperity, and freedom, and minimizing the causes of war, poverty, and servitude. Nonetheless, for those who have an interest in how to apply the scientific method to solve social problems, I offer a few criticisms on the Galambos approach to reaching freedom through the protection of all property—an approach that cannot be easily separated from his erratic personality.

One criticism concerned a serious flaw in Andrew's personality that would have been of little or no consequence if he had not been trying to build his ideas of property on a foundation of science. This involved the negative effects of Andrew's unflinching intolerance for critical analysis of his social hypotheses. Of course, in this regard he was not alone. In a similar way, his contemporary, Ayn Rand, demonstrated her own intolerance for any criticism of her philosophical views. Yet, there is no reason for any of us to regret such intolerance—unless it somehow impedes the achievement of those aims that we care about such as the advance of human liberty.

In contrast to Galambos, Rand never claimed to be a scientist, only a philosopher—but one who would only listen to praise for her Objectivist philosophy as she called it. Galambos was a scientist, and like Rand, he too would only listen to praise for his hypotheses on property.

Lecturing with passion and eloquence, Galambos argued that human freedom is derived from "the complete protection of all property," which includes primordial property (human life), primary property (intellectual expression and creation), and secondary property (tangible belongings) as he named them with my parenthetical descriptions. One of his grand strategies was the building of freedom through the marketing of proprietary ventures that could protect all property from legal and illegal attack. His belief that the scientific method could guide us toward this noble aim was most compelling to those of us who had already gained respect for science and its magnificent achievements.

Both Rand and Galambos deemed criticism of their work, whether constructive or not, to be an unacceptable anathema. Rand's critics (real or imagined) were banished from her paradise she called Galt's Gulch. Meanwhile, Galambos and his critics (real or imagined) were banished from his paradise he had named the

Moral Island. But there is a crucial distinction between philosophy and science. Guarding philosophy from critical analysis is not the same as guarding science from critical analysis. Philosophy, as we know, is an a priori discipline that is insulated from the challenge to verify or falsify its conclusions through observation. Philosophers do not observe causality, they imagine it. Yet, in a posteriori science if you insulate yourself from the risk that observation may falsify your data and your theory, you have insulated yourself from science and its unrivaled power to identify and verify causality. At that point, there is no more science because a posteriori science has been converted into a priori philosophy—or a priori you name it.

Over time, Galambos purged all critics—even the most friendly ones—from his market, leaving those who had a priori faith in the absolute rightness of his authority. In comparing Rand and Galambos in your biography, Alvin, you noted, “The messianic personalities were destined to clash and the ‘followers’ were prone to worship, not collaborate.” And “followers” of Galambos were prone to neither verify nor falsify his hypotheses on property. Instead, they embraced its presumed scientific foundation on Andrew’s authority as a legitimate scientist and they accepted his ideology on their a priori faith in his scientific prowess.

Galambos was prone to hold everyone who aimed to solve social problems up to the strict standards of the scientific method—that is, everyone but himself. He acted as though his own ideas did not have to be tested by the final step of the scientific method. This is the crucial step of independent observation that determines if the various extrapolations (predictions) from hypotheses come true. In short, does observation verify or falsify the hypothesis? As we know, this critical test is a sine qua non of science.

For Galambos, his attempt to exclude his own work from the harsh light of the entire method of science was either a personal flaw or an intellectual error, or both. At the very least, he had converted what might have been an a posteriori science of property into an a priori philosophy of property. However, there was nothing intrinsically wrong with doing this, except you cannot turn a philosophy into a science by merely calling it a science. This is a lesson in semantic discrimination that I learned from Galambos, himself.

I will always be thankful for my own introduction to the scientific method through Galambos and his powerful exposition on its unique strategy of causality identification. Andrew’s exceptional skill at revealing the unrivaled importance of an evolving science from Archimedes to Einstein, along with the crucial development of the scientific method, is what captured my attention in the first place. In retrospect (and without disrespect), it seems that Galambos was a far better teacher of science than he was a practitioner of science. But he should not be faulted for this because we know that practicing science in the social arena as he aimed to do is no easy task for anyone regardless of their intellectual acumen.

and creative imagination—virtues of which Galambos was by no means in short supply.

By the early 1960s, Galambos had become evermore irritated by the growing acceptance of coercive models of how society ought to operate—models that were based on “relative standards of rightness” and that lauded the legal seizure of wealth and freedom. He understood that all collectivist schemes are based on the supposed virtues of relative standards of rightness that sacrifice the individual to the whim of the collectivist majority. But others understood this as well. In New York, Ayn Rand parried such anti-individualism by decrying the “non-absolutes,” as she called them, who introduced their coercive policies on confident grounds that, “There are no absolutes because everything is relative.” Of course, if this were true, as claimed by such relativists, that all social structures are relative and necessarily arbitrary, then who is to say that one model is right and another is wrong? Galambos countered this argument for relative rightness with his concept and definition of “absolute right,” which he saw as the core of an absolutely right social structure wherein all property is sacrosanct.

- At one time, I viewed this absolute standard of rightness based on Andrew’s definitions of rationality and morality to be a remarkable advance in social technology. Over time, however, observational experience revealed its operational difficulties, if not outright failings. For one thing, it seems that those who have found absolute rightness in whatever form it may take, thereby, assume a superiority and a self-assurance that incites them to an intolerance—that often turns deadly—toward anyone who does not get it, and who does not revere its presumed primacy from their first exposure to its singular superiority. The arrogation of superiority by such believers is grounded on their firm feeling that having found absolute rightness, absolute truth, and absolute morality, that its fidelity and perfection can never be overturned or diminished because it is flawless to begin with. Unfortunately, this leads the practitioners and guardians of absolute “rightness,” “truth,” and “morality” to believe that they are the supreme and sole judges of which human actions are right, true, and moral—in sharp contrast to those that are “wrong,” “false,” and “immoral.”

At the Free Enterprise Institute in Los Angeles, Galambos as the author of “absolute rightness,” assumed the ultimate authority to judge and rule on the absolute rightness—or its implied corollary, absolute wrongness—of all human actions and social exchanges. But the negative consequences of attempting to apply this paradigm of absolute morality ran counter to Andrew’s aim of marketing human freedom through the protection of property. It became an operational and entrepreneurial impediment for reaching the worthy aim of freedom. Tragically, Galambos used his self-proclaimed authority as supreme judge of absolute rightness, as a psychological weapon to intimidate and control his followers who had accepted his ideas on the sanctity of property. In Andrew’s judgment, those who violated his code of absolute rightness, as he saw it, were branded as absolutely wrong and immoral—and thereby: “Moral Island Rejects,”

as he scornfully called them. They had fallen from grace with little or no chance of salvation or redemption for their transgressions, that would restore them to rapture on the Moral Island. In the end, Galambos had cultivated his student's reverence for an ideal freedom, only to dash their hopes for its attainment due to their gross inadequacies. From the vantage of his pulpit on center stage, Andrew railed at them: "If you wonder why we don't have freedom, look in the mirror." Through salvos of such passionate censures of his loyal students, enrollees and customers, over time, Galambos converted their love of freedom into their fear of freedom. Yet, those who fear freedom are rarely good subjects for bringing it into fruition.

If in Andrew's opinion, his followers had breached someone's property rights, they were expected to make restitution to whomever they had offended through their alleged wrongful actions and supposed violation of absolute morality. But there was no equitable or consistent standard of what constituted "restitution" because it was usually based on the offended's arbitrary perception of what that should be. Or restitution for an alleged transgression was based on an outrageously high perception by the "transgressor" of what might be a necessary reparation, if not an equitable one, for a return to grace on the Moral Island.

At his Free Enterprise Institute, Galambos became the supreme and final judge of crime and punishment. He boldly claimed that he could not err in judging human action for its absolute rightness because he had innovated the standard that defined rightness in the first place. Curiously, at the same time in New York, Ayn Rand at her own institute became the supreme judge of who was absolutely right and who was not in applying her principles of Objectivism.

Galambos, in claiming to build a true social science on absolute foundations, ran into a serious epistemological problem. In claiming the discovery of any so called absolute, all such claims, whether absolute rightness, absolute morality, or absolute anything, cannot be verified through science. This is due to the subjective limitations of science. All hypotheses and theories in science are founded on individual observations that require unending verification by subjective observers. In contrast, if there were an objective truth—a truth that is beyond the bias of human subjectivity—then such a truth could be absolutely right. But for humans, absolute rightness is unreachable. They cannot escape from their subjective views of reality to experience an objective universe that is independent of their subjective observations. Humans can imagine absolute rightness, but they cannot observe it—which means they cannot verify it. (Andrew's cogent lectures on scientific epistemology included discussions of Arthur Eddington's arguments for the subjective nature of all knowledge.) Thus, without possibility of observational verification, all claimed absolute concepts must be accepted as articles of faith. Although faith may find a welcome home in philosophy and religion, faith and science are mutually exclusive.

Today's Middle East crisis is incited by the supposed "absolute rightness" and "absolute morality" of an Islamic religion that is imposed on unbelievers who have failed to embrace Allah's ultimate revelations. Beyond religion, if we follow the scientific method, science and "absolute rightness" are incompatible. Science cannot improve upon anything deemed absolute, including absolute rightness. There is no point in trying to improve upon what cannot be improved. Therefore, where the aim is finding absolute rightness, the scientific method can be abandoned as an impotent strategy for reaching such an ideal end. Yet, to abandon the scientific method is to abandon science itself.

For those who would follow Galambos toward building a society where its members enjoy 100% control over their property, there is a prime question to consider: Can they separate Galambos and his impetuous personality from Galambos and his thesis on property? Was his win-lose behavior (for me to gain, you must lose) toward so many of his associates, friends, and students, a consequence of his ideas on property, or did it have some other source? Could his penchant to betray his loyal supporters and to default on his most crucial and pressing contractual obligations have resulted from flaws in his "theory" of property and its evolution into an a priori philosophy of property—if not an a priori theology of property?

It is ironic that Galambos, in aiming to create a theory of property, created a theology of property to be sustained by those who have faith in the superiority of its absolute rightness. But where faith is the foundation of any doctrine, as we know, there is no science because faith and science are forever mutually exclusive. There can be no a posteriori foundation for absolute rightness, absolute morality—or absolute anything. Like all presumed absolutes, it can only be accepted on a priori faith because it can neither be verified nor falsified through observation.

Galambos never discounted the value of epistemology. After all, epistemology is the supreme subject of study in human affairs because it evaluates the efficacy of human methods of determining what is true in contrast to what is false. Where we strive for social peace, prosperity, and freedom, there is no more important subject to guide us in the direction of these lofty aims. To be sure, there was epistemology before there was science. But science gave birth to scientific epistemology. I will always thank Galambos for introducing me to the principles of "scientific epistemology," a concept named by and developed by one of Andrew's scientific heroes: Arthur Eddington. Galambos recognized that the application of scientific epistemology can enrich our understanding of social causality and defend our species from the inglorious prospect of self-destruction. This means that epistemology as an intellectual discipline has far more to offer than mere academic interest. Scientific epistemology can defend us from a diversity of intellectual blunders, many of which have deadly implications. One of these is the doctrine of "absolute rightness."

Those who see themselves as absolutely right in their social decisions are prone to act as if they can do no wrong. But in their superior role, they are at high risk of harming their

presumed “inferiors” in the name of absolute rightness. Historically, those who have been deemed absolutely wrong and thereby inferior by a superior class of those who are absolutely right, have been vulnerable to social dehumanization due to their alleged inferiority. Those who have been dehumanized by their self-proclaimed “superiors,” have become easy targets of coercive discrimination and violence.

The doctrine of absolute rightness is unavoidably divisive because it creates a social division between two classes: The first class involves those who are not only right, but who are absolutely right where their rightness can never be diminished, replaced, or superseded. But there is always a negative downside to this doctrine. It is only possible to have rightness where there is also wrongness. And to have the perfection of absolute rightness, there must be a contrary imperfection of “absolute wrongness.” Those who see themselves as absolutely right on any issue, unavoidably, have created a new social class. This second class involves those who are not only wrong, but who are absolutely wrong, which is the ultimate reach of wrongness.

Throughout human history, those who have been certain of their absolute rightness have been prone to adopt a deadly model of social causality that says: For right believers to gain, wrong believers must be forced to lose. The most harmful strategies for imposing human loss have been by way of organizing religious and political institutions of coercive action for win-lose gain. In the name of absolute rightness, religious and political leaders have imprisoned, tortured, and murdered millions upon millions who became victims of glorified tyranny. Theologians and politicians have sought to expand faith in the rectitude of absolute rightness by punishing unbelievers and disbelievers. Galambos was by no means ignorant of this tragic history. Yet, a question to consider is did he become the first intellectual in the history of social doctrines to promulgate an “absolute standard of rightness” that did not generate a cascade of destructive domino effects?

Many have tried to psychoanalyse Galambos to find the source of his destructive behavior, but these attempts—of course, no more than educated guesses at best—have raised more questions than they have answered. Did Andrew’s win-lose duplicity stem from a conscious aim to control his students and everyone around him, yet still a duplicity that had nothing to do with his ideas on property? Was his win-lose behavior toward his loyal customers and supporters a consequence of his property concepts, or merely the outcome of their misapplication—or a result of his psychological aberrations?

In fairness to Galambos, it is possible—but by no means certain—that his win-lose behavior was aggravated by his mental decline that ended in his unfortunate death from Alois Alzheimer’s disease? We know that such decline is usually a gradual degradation of mental acuity. But gradual or not, the question is difficult to answer because there is no way to determine if such decline drove him toward win-lose actions for win-lose gain. Therefore, only one question seems to matter in the long run: Independently of Galambos and his authority, can his novel hypotheses and their extrapolations on property be verified as a true social science through scientific observation?

Fortunately, the scientific method ignores the prestige and authority of all scientific innovators—Galambos and everyone else. And this remarkable method ignores the character flaws of its scientific innovators no matter how debilitating or outrageous they may be because such personal faults have nothing to do with either verifying or falsifying their work. Either Andrew's hypotheses and his predictions on the merits of protecting all manner of private property will be verified through the harsh reality of scientific observation—or they will not.

In the history of ideas, Galambos was unrivaled in presenting a powerful case for giving honest recognition and equitable compensation to innovators for their creation of useful ideas and products. Whether or not Andrew's schemes for compensating innovators for their marketable ideas will ever gain market approval remains an open question. In any case, for it to work, a greater number of producers must first be convinced of the equity and the profitability of such recognition and monetary compensation. Yet, with the evolutionary advance of a free market, unfettered by the social regression of political coercion, a spontaneous trend toward equitable compensation strategies and technologies for the commercial use of marketable innovations would naturally occur. This would be due to the prospect of greater profits (if not immense profits) to be earned by entrepreneurs who devise equitable contracts with innovators and inventors for the use of their marketable ideas.

Whether or not Andrew's compensation strategies for the use of intellectual property ever gain market acceptance, in the long run, if we are to optimize the social causes of human prosperity, then it is imperative to devise compensation strategies for innovators that are more equitable than those of the past, and that advance the innovator's incentive to create new ideas in the first place. Where freedom of market exchange prevails, multiple solutions will evolve for fair compensation to innovators for the commercial application of their ideas.

In a similar way, with the advance of free market exchange, there will also be multiple solutions to the problem of how to devise a monetary system with integrity. We do not have to create an ultimate and universal monetary system. Honest monetary currencies—backed by adamant integrity—will evolve in the market, some currencies preferred over others. Gresham's Law operates where state-issued currencies (by fiat decree) are legal tender and where a less preferred currency drives a more preferred one out of circulation due to caching or hoarding of the latter. But a reverse principle will operate in a free market as buyers and sellers may prefer stronger monetary currencies over weaker ones that may fall into disuse and thereby out of circulation. In any case, the free market will naturally create a monetary revolution with the replacement of fiat money (state regulated legal tender), with proprietary money regulated by the market without political coercion to enforce its acceptance. In an unfree market, as bad money drives good money out of circulation, so in a free market, good money drives bad money out of circulation.

Although these laws of exchange can guide us to the creation of honest monies that gain currency through market acceptance, yet, it is a mistake to expect that we can ever find an ultimate monetary system. And it is also a mistake to fix our sights on the realization of some "ultimate" compensation scheme for all innovators, living or dead, as envisioned by Galambos. In science, there are no ultimate aims—and if there are, it is not science, but merely a priori speculation.

The epistemology of a posteriori science limits the advance of science by excluding the attainment of "ultimate" or "absolute" knowledge. The best the scientific method can give us is better and better—truer and truer—identification and verification of physical, biological, and social causality. Yet, such limitations did not prevent us from reaching the moon, nor are they likely to prevent us from reaching the stars—a lifelong dream of Galambos. If we can prevent the demise of civilization and the extinction of our species, there is plenty of time to innovate our way to the stars.

Just as scientists at the end of the nineteenth century could not have imagined the reach of scientific advances by the twentieth century, we cannot imagine the advances to be reached by the end of our own century. And we cannot predict how the market of the future may give rise to both equitable and workable compensation schemes for innovators of both tangible and intangible products. Yet for this to ever happen, entrepreneurs and proprietors must be convinced that there are win-win profits to be earned by implementing such schemes. In the mean time, however, if good people with good minds and good educations cannot be convinced of the immense rewards to be gained from the protection of tangible property, it seems to me that there is little hope that they can ever be convinced of the huge gains to be earned from protecting intellectual property as well.

Galambos based his entire strategy for freedom on convincing innovators and intellectuals of the equity, utility, and morality of protecting intellectual property. But it seems he put the cart before the horse. It is far easier to show most people the merits of protecting tangible wealth rather than intangible wealth. And social history bears this out.

For one example, the Iron Curtain of Europe that once divided the communist east from the capitalist west finally fell, not because communist intellectuals and innovators behind the Curtain came to realize that they were short changed by communism for their innovative achievements; it fell because its communist bureaucracy set new standards of inefficiency and incompetence in the production of new wealth. This gross failure became so pervasive and so obvious, that its shortcomings could no longer be covered up by communist authorities and their ardent propagandists.

Yet, if we can show educated as well as uneducated people with good minds, the multifarious rewards to be gained by the protection of tangible wealth, they are then set up for the next paradigm shift, which is to convince them of the immense gains to be

reaped, for all to enjoy, from the protection of intellectual property and from fair compensation for the creation of intangible wealth. But intellectuals and innovators are usually harder to reach (than the more pedestrian among us) with ideas of freedom because it is far more likely that they harbor paradigms—carved in stone—that tout the efficacy, if not morality, of state coercion for the imposition of noble ends.

If in the short run, the property concepts of Galambos spur paradigm shifts away from the idea that political governing solves social problems while free marketing creates them, toward the idea that in reality political governing creates social problems, while free marketing solves them, then progress will follow greater acceptance of truer models of causality even if they are not perfect. In the long run, whatever flaws, epistemological or conceptual, that are an integral part of the property doctrines of Galambos, could possibly be ameliorated by his followers. But if they view his hypotheses as “absolutely right,” then amelioration or rectification would never come to mind because it would be seen as superfluous. This doctrine on the rectitude of “absolute rightness,” renders the fourth step of the scientific method—to verify or falsify hypotheses—superfluous.

The road to progress has always been strewn with unavoidable pitfalls. Our precursors have been unable to make advances in physical, biological, and social science without creating many intellectual errors that along the way have led to many flawed hypotheses or faulty applications of theory. Without the advantages of human infallibility, for all of us, error is the necessary price we pay for progress.

Galambos was most persuasive in showing his students how and why the superior arbiter in the separation of that which is true from that which is false is the unique strategy of science, viz., the scientific method. With the confidence of a trained and educated scientist, Galambos championed a new paradigm. From his podium he announced: The solution to our most pressing social problems can be found in going beyond merely naming the so called social sciences: “scientific,” but by creating a true social science founded on the scientific method. This crucial argument of Galambos remains as vital and relevant as ever. And it remains an ongoing challenge for those who would further the well-being of humankind by applying the unique strategy of science toward the advancement of human wealth and freedom. As for me, if it had not been for the positive influence of Galambos in revealing the potential power of the scientific method to build a true social science, it is unlikely that I would have developed what I now call the Science of Social Causality. And like any hypothesis in science it, too, will either be verified or falsified.

The history of innovation shows that great innovators are often difficult to deal with. Many of our creative heroes have been intolerant, hypocritical, deceitful, dishonest, duplicitous, and treacherous in their personal and professional relationships. Yet, even if we scorn their negative character traits, we do not discard their positive inventions, especially if our lives are enriched by their creative genius. As Galambos wisely taught

his students, who cares if Isaac Newton was an unstable neurotic who was often self-destructive, who was extremely difficult to get along with, who sent hundreds to the gallows as alleged counterfeiters—and who wrote little on science and much on theology. Yet, centuries after Newton, only a few historians of science would even know this, and still fewer would care.

Looking beyond the epistemological and character flaws of Galambos, he had the courage and tenacity to build a proprietary venture—as no one else had done—that aimed to market freedom and prosperity for all to enjoy. And even if his hypotheses on property are never verified through the scientific method, as he believed they would be, if his social innovations somehow move society closer to peace, prosperity, and freedom, that is not a small accomplishment. In fact, it would be an achievement that few have reached since Andrew's illustrious hero, Thomas Paine, unleashed the American Revolution that carried Colonists away from human servitude and toward human freedom.

J. Stuart Snelson

San Clemente, California

J. Stuart Snelson was Senior Lecturer and Professor of Volitional Science at the Free Enterprise Institute where he contracted with FEI to present and market The V-50 Lectures on protecting physical property, Course V-201 on protecting intellectual property, and other courses based on concepts developed by Andrew J. Galambos. Snelson's FEI courses were marketed and presented through his proprietary company: Volitional Science Associates.