

---

# The Voluntaryist

---

Whole Number 78

*"If one takes care of the means, the end will take care of itself."*

February 1996

## Liberty and Authority

By Lord Hugh Cecil

[Editor's Note: The following excerpts were taken from an address delivered on November 4, 1909, on the occasion of the inauguration of the author as president of the Associated Societies of the University of Edinburg. It was published in London by Edward Arnold in 1910. Its theme is a continuation of my remarks found in Whole No. 77 regarding "libertarianism and libertinism." The author's point is that "Only in the fresh air of freedom can wisdom and virtue grow strong." I disagree with a number of the author's statements, especially the arguments in which he accepts compulsory state schooling. Nevertheless, he recognizes coercion as a violation of his own first principles and his reservations and hesitations against it are strongly and clearly enunciated.]

... At the outset, let us inquire what we mean by Liberty for the purpose of this discussion. Without aiming at an exact or scientific definition, it is perhaps sufficient to say that Liberty consists in being able to obey your own will and conscience rather than the will and conscience of others. The question is how far can that liberty be pressed; how far is it right for society to respect and safeguard that liberty in the case of each individual, or how far must it be restricted for the common good, for the sake of the liberty of others or for any other sufficient object.

Now this question has been considered by many great men, and in particular I would direct your attention to the treatment of the subject by John Stuart Mill. His powers of exposition were certainly equal to any topic however difficult, and the singular lucidity of expression of which he was a master makes it always convenient to treat his writings as a theme—as a peg on which to hang other speculations. Now his solution of the problem of the limitations of political liberty is, as he himself says, very simple. It is that the individual should have liberty as long as only his own affairs are concerned, but should be liable to interference so soon as it becomes a question of the rights or interests of others. "Over himself," Mill says, "over his own body and mind the individual is sovereign"; and he proceeds to make a distinction between those things which are self-regardful and those which are not.

This theory is, as Mill says, very simple. But with all respect to so great a man it must be said that it is unsound and inadequate. For, in the first place, everything that we do concerns others than ourselves. There is no such thing as a self-regardful act or a

self-regardful word, and a thought is only self-regardful so long as it remains a thought and has no prospect of being translated into the region either of speech or of action. Indeed, no oppressor, no persecutor, has ever been so foolish—(unless it be perhaps some modern philanthropist)—as to desire to regulate action which is strictly self-regardful. People were burned in this island three hundred years ago, not because they held particular opinions, but because by propagating them they jeopardized, as was thought, the foundations of society in this world and the eternal welfare of humanity in the next. When the fires of Smithfield were lit, it was not to restrict self-regardful acts, it was to uphold the great moral and spiritual fabric of the Church and to save souls from hell. The disturbance of orthodoxy may be a healthy or an unhealthy process; but it is certainly not a process which only regards the heterodox. And if the teaching of heresy be not self-regardful still less is the practice of vice. It is, in short, plain that people are tempted to interfere with the liberty of others precisely because they believe that that liberty is being exercised in a manner which is not self-regardful. Mill was not blind to this objection. He supplements his main theory by additional arguments much sounder than itself. Indeed, as the student peruses the essay "On Liberty," he cannot help being reminded of some insecurely erected structure that is always needing to be shored up for fear of falling. Mill is forever bringing in considerations different from and independent of his original contention, in order to sustain what without that assistance must assuredly fall. At the very outset he is obliged to say that his principle does not apply to children or to savage nations, but only to those Western peoples who have become civilized. But how unsatisfactory, how arbitrary, is such a distinction as that. What is a savage? At what point do you graduate in civilization? Here we seem almost to encounter that vulgar notion that civilization consists of the British Isles and a few contiguous places, and that all the more distant parts of the earth are savage. No one who takes the trouble to con over all the different races and nations of the world but must be struck by the impossibility of drawing a sharp line, and saying that those who are on one side of it are savage, and that those who are upon the other are civilized. Let it be granted that the natives of Africa are savage, are we to say the same thing of those in India, with their ancient civilization, or those in Egypt, or those in Turkey, or the Chinese, or the Japanese, or the Rus-

*continued on page 2*

---

# The Voluntaryist

Editor: Carl Watner

## Subscription Information

Published bi-monthly by The Voluntaryists, P.O. Box 1275, Gramling, SC 29348. Yearly subscriptions (six issues) are \$18 or .050 ounce or 1.5550 grams of fine gold. For overseas postage, please add \$5 or  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the regular subscription price. Single back issues are \$4 each or  $\frac{1}{5}$  of the regular subscription price. Please check the number on your mailing label to see when you should renew.

Back issues of this publication are available on microfiche from John Zube, Box 52 Berrima, NSW 2577, Australia.

## Liberty and Authority

*continued from page 2*

sians, or the Spaniards? At what point in this nice graduation of human progress do we pass from savagery into civilization? And indeed, what authority have we to say, if liberty be a right at all, that the savage or the child is not entitled to it? If it be a right, it belongs to man presumably because he is man. At any rate, no other title to it can be suggested, and if it belongs to him as man how are we justified in excluding from the enjoyment of this human right so very large a portion—I suppose much more than half,—of the human race? The truth is that liberty is not a right. In this respect it differs from justice. Every human being, the savage man as well as the civilized, the child as well as the adult, is entitled to justice. Some invasions of liberty are indeed also breaches of justice; and against such the savage must be guarded. But while he must be secured justice as full and as exact as is granted to the most cultivated of men, he cannot be given as much liberty. For liberty is not a right. It is rather the essential condition of human progress as it is also in its perfection the consummation of that progress. ...

The principle which I venture to suggest to you ought to be substituted for that which Mill lays down, the sound ground for maintaining liberty is that liberty is the condition of human progress, and that without it there cannot be in any true sense virtue or righteousness. Virtue is attained in proportion as liberty is attained: for virtue does not consist in doing right, but in choosing to do right. This is the great distinction, surely, between the animal and the man. The animal always does right; it cannot do wrong. But it has no virtue, for it lacks the indispensable power to choose between right and wrong. The animal, though it never does anything but right, remains without virtue; but a human being is capable of wrong as well as right; and because he is capable of wrong his virtue is real virtue and not the mere performance of righteous acts. This great truth, a truth which is of course familiar to all those who have ever attempted to consider the problem of the origin of evil, is what enables us to see the value of liberty and to

prize it as it deserves. If it be true that without liberty virtue cannot exist, if without liberty man is no more than the first of the animals, we see at once in what place in the moral hierarchy liberty must be set, how great, how precious a thing it is, how serious is the mischief of any loss of what stands in so essential a relation to virtue itself.

Illustrations make things clear, and therefore let me give an illustration, one which Mill himself considers, and which will in a moment enable any one to distinguish the principle I am trying to lay down from that on which he insists. Let me take the problem of the inculcation of temperance. Now Mill lays down that it is an invasion of liberty to constrain any one to be temperate. It seems to me on the principle that he enunciates he is evidently wrong, because drunkenness certainly interferes with the happiness of others. He does indeed recognize that if drunkenness leads a man habitually to offend against his neighbor, he may be legitimately restrained from getting drunk; but it is manifest that drunkenness distresses and pains other people, even in cases where it never leads to anything like physical violence. Mill's theory really amounts to this, that it is not an invasion of liberty to stop a man getting drunk if it leads him to beat his wife, but it is an invasion of liberty if the drunkard only breaks his wife's heart. That seems to me an evidently absurd contention. Moral pain is just as real as physical pain, and if a wife is entitled to be protected against being beaten, she is also entitled, so far as liberty is concerned, to be protected against moral suffering. Nor on his principle can there be any adequate defense for the restrictions which by universal consent are put upon the consumption of alcohol in savage countries. What then is the defense, if defense there be, for insisting on liberty as against the extreme prohibitionist position? It is surely this, that the prohibitionist destroys true temperance. Temperance consists not merely in abstaining from getting drunk, but in choosing to abstain from getting drunk. There is no temperance except where it is open to a man to get drunk and he deliberately refuses to do so. This is the meaning of that sentence, often quoted and often denounced, of a great English Bishop who said that he would rather see England free than England sober. It would have expressed his meaning, I think, more accurately and less polemically if he had said that he wished Englishmen to be either temperate or intemperate rather than that they should all be neither the one nor the other. It is non-temperance that he denounced, that negative condition which is neither temperance nor intemperance, achieving indeed the physical results of temperance, but having none of its moral value or grandeur. It is the best that can be reached by those races who are far back on the road of progress; but the British people have passed beyond these beggarly elements. What the prohibitionist is really intent on doing is to destroy

that discipline of liberty, on which true virtue depends. He wants to cut down the tree that bears the forbidden fruit in the midst of the Garden of Eden, and if we accept the teaching in the sublime allegory that opens our Christian revelation, we must surely agree that there is something presumptuous in seeking moral progress by such an inversion of the Divine plan.

We recognize, practically, perhaps, rather than speculatively, that this theory of liberty is the true one in the ordinary regulation which we make for the education of youth. Why is it that a boy of the well-to-do classes has least liberty when he is at a private school, has more liberty when he goes to a public school, and has almost the complete liberty of manhood when he is at a university? Clearly it is so because the purpose is to allow him to choose between right and wrong as freely as he can without evidently worse mischief. Unless it is evidently mischievous, we wish to accustom the boy and the young man to choose between right and wrong, between what is wise and foolish; and accordingly we are constantly increasing the measure of liberty that is allowed to him, as he grows older and is more fit to use that liberty well. And that principle applied in the education of youth is the principle we must apply in the wider sphere of political and social action. We

*"All this talk: the state should do this or that ultimately means: the police should force consumers to behave otherwise than they would behave spontaneously. In such proposals as: let us raise farm prices, let us raise wage rates, let us lower profits ... the us ultimately refers to the police."*

*—Ludwig von Mises*

must give always as much liberty as possible. It does not seem to me that you can draw an absolutely defined theoretical line, and say, as Mill tried to do, restrictions on this side of the line are legitimate, and those on that side are illegitimate. No such line can be drawn. All we can say is that every restriction considered as a restriction is a mischief, and it is only to be justified if you can show that such an invasion of liberty is necessary to avoid some mischief plainly greater. And we must do this, keenly feeling that it is by the moral discipline of liberty, by allowing people to choose between what is right and wrong, wise and foolish, that alone human progress is achieved. Here let me say a word of caution even at the risk of uttering what sounds like a platitude. A great many people have never made up their minds to recognize that human liberty consists in the power of doing, not what others approve of, but what they disapprove of. Similarly they cannot perceive that property consists in something which you may misuse and not in something which you may only use as others think right. If you were to judge of the rights

of property by the controversies you see from time to time in the newspapers, you would certainly assume that an owner of property is not entitled to his property unless he uses it rightly. That is a doctrine destructive of property altogether, or rather it turns the idea into nonsense. And similarly with liberty. Liberty consists in the power of doing what others disapprove of. If an individual has not the power and the right to do what others deprecate, he is not free at all. We must therefore be constantly on our guard against supposing that this liberty which we have seen to be so essential to human progress is restricted or altogether taken away by those who in respect to each particular restriction may maintain with the utmost fervor and sincerity that they are only urging that people should do what is manifestly or demonstrably wise and virtuous. ...

[W]hile a case may sometimes be made out so extreme that normal principles of human progress must be laid aside, yet this must be an exception—a costly palliative which will bring evil as well as good in its train. For, let us be sure of it, that if we are right in supposing that humanity only makes true progress by choosing between right and wrong, we must pay a great price even for the most evidently necessary social reform which involves a diminution of liberty. Let me take as an illustration of this proposition something so estimable, so justly estimable, and so praised even above its just value as compulsory education. Now, we should all agree that it was necessary to apply compulsion to the great body of the population in order that the children of the rising generation might be suitably educated. But is it not becoming ever more and more plain that we have paid a not inconsiderable price for applying compulsion even for so precious and so necessary an object as the general education of the people? For what has happened? There is no growth but, on the contrary, so far as we are able to judge, a diminution in the sense of parental responsibility on the part of parents, and of parental authority on the part of children. The State has stepped in and taken education out of the hands of the parent; the parent has ceased to think that it is any business of his to educate his children, and, on the other hand, the children have ceased to think that parents have any right to determine their education. Accordingly when the State lays down its burden, which it does when the child has attained a comparatively early age, we find nothing, or nothing adequate at any rate, to take the State's place. The child is turned out from school at thirteen or fourteen, or whatever the age may be, and from that time onwards the parent does not in the common case assume the right to educate his child or to control his training, nor does the child look to the parent for such control. And accordingly we have statements made by those who are well qualified to judge, that a great number of youths become casual laborers and sink into distress because

in youth they are not properly trained to any methodical habits, or to any definite trade. You have smashed by your compulsory system the natural educational machinery, and when your artificial machinery comes to an end there is nothing to do the work. Thus, so soon as the children have passed out of the State school they have passed into a condition not better than would have existed if compulsory education had never been established, but much worse. There is no natural growth, as there ought to be in a healthy state, of the sense of parental responsibility or of the importance of parental authority. The working classes of this country are not approaching, so far as we can judge, the standard in these matters that has long prevailed among the well-to-do who are allowed to educate their children or not, as they think proper. The artificiality of your system has spoiled what was natural, and left you nothing in its place.

Then we approach the next stage. People are now beginning to say, "You must go further; you have compelled the children to go to school when they are of tender years; you must apply compulsion to a further stage; you must undertake something for the youths." All sorts of proposals are being put forward, and I do not doubt that sooner or later something on these lines will have to be done. But let it be observed that if you do it you will come a little later on to exactly the same sort of difficulty. You will find that if the youth is educated the young man must still be left free, and the State can never take the place, however far it prolongs its activities, of real home influence, of such influence as is exercised by the conscientious parent of the wealthier classes who does his duty by his children. There is no limit of age to that sort of influence. It goes on as long as the parent lives; it extends not merely through the period of youth, but far into the period of maturity. Nothing that the State can do will ever take the place of that. But you will say, this is all visionary, the great majority of the working classes will never exercise that sort of influence however much you leave it on their shoulders to do it. They are naturally and inevitably concerned with so much that is harassing and difficult in the ordinary maintenance of life that they cannot spare the mental energy, they can scarcely spare the time, for exerting that kind of influence over their children. There is much truth in this, but here comes in a principle which we ought never to forget, that it is of priceless value to bring even a few in a community on to the true paths of human progress. Matthew Arnold himself drew attention to the immense value of a remnant in a people: nations, as he said, were saved by their remnants. So it is not a conclusive answer to say that most of the working class would neglect to educate the growing youth of their children. It is not by itself a conclusive argument, because if some did so the community might gain far more in setting a few on the true path of

*"We believe the superior man can only be sure of his liberty if the inferior man is secure in his. We can only secure our own liberty by preserving it for the most despicable and obnoxious among us, lest we set precedents that could reach us."*

*—THE VOLUNTARYIST, August 1992*

progress, in bringing them up really to be all that they can be made by a healthy system than will be gained by a much larger body being compelled to do what depends for its highest value on being done by a man's own volition, and with all the elasticity and efficiency which belongs to voluntary effort.

But I must not be understood to argue that the adoption of compulsory education was wrong, nor even that its extension would be wrong. The circumstances may have made, may now make, an infringement of liberty necessary. My point is that such infringements always bring with them evil as well as good. We must agree to them with reluctance and discontent. And if we wish to see our country growing greater we must see to it that the sacrifice which is made of the true principles of progress is made only with the sense that we are to pass through some sort of temporary transitional stage, and return again to sound principles as soon as we are able. We must not allow ourselves to think that the action of the State and the machinery of compulsion can be allowed permanently to take the place of that natural system of liberty by which alone human beings rise in the scale of creation, by which alone true progress is achieved. I dwell on this subject of education because it is, from both points of view, a strong instance. No one denies that it has been necessary to use the machinery of compulsion as a temporary measure; no one, on the other hand, denies that we are face to face with grave difficulties, precisely because we have smashed the natural system of education, a system which depends upon the just liberty of the parent. By reflecting on the evils of compulsion even in this case, we shall acquire a spirit of caution in regard to proposals for further exhibitions of the same dangerous drug. ...

Patience is one of the moral qualities in which the devotee of liberty far surpasses his authoritarian opponents. He submits to see people often do wrong for the sake of their sometimes doing right. He knows that it is only by the choice between right and wrong that the true path of progress can be trodden, and that in freedom alone can humanity move onwards from the animal to the divine. Strong in this knowledge, he endures with tranquility much that is faulty, and invokes the aid of the State rarely, with reluctance and in extremity. ...

Why, we may ask, how comes it, that in our time [the Socialist] movement has grown and has become stronger, if indeed liberty has all that I have claimed for it? The reason, I think, is this. Although human-

ity is progressing steadily towards a greater capacity for freedom, although the normal progress has not been interrupted, and it is still the case, as it has always been, and must be, that men go forward towards the divine in proportion as they become more free; yet there has also grown with this moral progress an impatience of manifest evils which leads people to seek for some short cut by which they may escape them. And there are not wanting short cuts most attractively recommended. I must avoid allusion to quite contemporary politics, or I should be tempted to draw your attention to the position of the working classes at the present time, and to the happy prospect that seems to lie before them. They are being offered from two opposite points of view relief from some of the greatest evils from which they suffer, by alternative resources so agreeable as the taxation of dukes or as the taxation of foreigners; imposts almost equally attractive to the uncoroneted patriot. This desire for short cuts leads, I think, to many errors. In truth and reality there are no short cuts out of any of the greater evils from which humanity suffers. But the search for short cuts will become mischievous indeed if we are thus led away from what is the true path of progress. If we enfeeble human nature by removing from it the discipline of liberty, then certainly we shall not be merely standing still, we shall be wandering astray; and while we use the machinery of the State to get, as we think, somewhat nearer the solution of this problem or that, we shall all the time be destroying that on which the State itself depends, that from which alone any real and permanent good can come—the individual character, with its power of self-control and courageous choice between right and wrong, between wisdom and folly. ...

I hope the people of our country will inherit to the full that great tradition of fighting for the individual's rights, the great tradition which teaches each man to look for help and progress to himself, to his own capacity and his own strength, trained by self-discipline and self-control, and not to the State's enervating hand. If, in our haste to get rid of evils, we trust to the power of the State; if, still worse, we are misled by talk about an equality which never can be real and may easily be destructive, then assuredly we have parted from the true road; we are going astray over marshy and dangerous country, in which we may easily lose the way of progress altogether. I look, I confess, to the maintenance of liberty as to one of the greatest issues that can be before the people at the present time. If they value liberty with their whole hearts, if they really think that it matters most, not whether right is done, not whether evils are destroyed in our time or in the generation that succeeds, but whether we learn, and our children learn, to choose what is good and to reject what is evil,—if that feeling is deeply seated in the hearts of the people, then certainly we may have good

courage, whatever may be the particular trend of the party battle at one time or another. For it is in the growth of liberty, in the growth of the free choice of good and the free rejection of evil, that we move towards the ideal of a divine society which religion and natural reflection alike set before us as the goal of our hope. ...

So mankind will learn to be able to live in a society devoted to virtue and yet wholly unconstrained, altogether released from the restrictions of authority and yet altogether conformed to the standard of perfection, in a society built up into a symmetrical structure by the ordered inequalities of various talents and vocations, and held together not by coercive law and restraint, but by the spontaneous cohesion of virtuous wills. This is the ideal set before us, this is the true celestial city, guarded by walls which shall never be overthrown, illumined by light which shall never be extinguished. ▣

## **We Never Called Him “Andy”**

*continued from page 8*

your typical “man in the street.”

Following his introduction, Joe briefly outlined his political position. There was a hint that the ideal societal structure might involve some sort of corporate structure. He promised to elaborate on the concept in a special course planned for a future date.

My next contact with him was his phone call inviting me to a promotional meeting for his upcoming course in philosophy. My wife and I attended, bringing several interested friends. Later, we held similar promotional meetings at our home in Malibu. We contributed substantially to the enrollment of his first course, which he called “Course 100: Capitalism—the Key to Survival.” The first classes met at the Ivar Hotel in Hollywood during 1961.

Course 100 met weekly. Although scheduled from 8:00 to 10:00 p.m., it frequently continued until midnight. Some of the long presentation was tedious. But just when we thought we could not sit another minute, Galambos would come up with a gem that made the entire evening worthwhile. Later I learned that Joe did not arise from bed until almost noon each day. The late evenings were our problem, not his.

It is impossible to attempt more than a brief summary of the important ideas in Course 100 as it existed then. I am told that its replacement, V-50, bore little resemblance to the original course. Even during the brief period I knew Galambos, the course changed almost beyond recognition. I will, however, attempt to summarize some of the central ideas.

Galambos was educated in the physical sciences. His specialty was astrophysics. He left Ramo Wooldridge Corporation, Space Technology Laboratories (STL—which later became TRW and Aerospace



Corporation) because he saw that the new frontier in space could not be developed properly by government bureaucracy. This concern led him to found the Free Enterprise Institute. His aim in founding the Institute was to make the world safe for astronautics by teaching the beauty of the free market, thereby helping to bring about a societal structure based on the freedom of the individual. He saw that earth's political problems would have to be resolved before he could hope to carry out his primary dream of operating the first private lunar transport company.

As a physical scientist, Galambos saw the great contrast between the progress achieved in the physical sciences and the barbarism, at best, that dominated the social sciences. Given the existing social structure, he saw that physical science had made killing on a vast scale not only possible, but probable. He thought that if progress were to be made in the social sciences, it could only happen by using the methods common to the physical sciences.

Consequently, a substantial part of Course 100 was devoted to teaching "scientific method." He credited Isaac Newton with the original "integration" of ideas in the physical realm. He now wanted to do the same in the social realm. This approach attracted many of his first students and supporters from the physical sciences.

Galambos was an early admirer of Ayn Rand and thought ATLAS SHRUGGED should be required reading for any "Liberal." (Galambos did not at the time use the term "libertarian," feeling that the word "liberal" had been stolen from freedom lovers and that its recovery was essential to the freedom philosophy.) Despite his admiration for Rand's work, he recognized her to be a cultist. This was at a time when few people would have agreed with him.

Galambos based his concept of a "moral" society on the primacy of the individual and the institution of property. He defined "primordial property" as a person's own life and "primary property" as his ideas. All other property he derived from these two fundamental kinds. Although no one can reasonably argue against ideas as antecedent to all other property, Galambos lost many of his early supporters due to his manner and means of attempting to protect ideas as property.

Some of Galambos' early students and supporters included Harry Browne, then a syndicated newspaper writer and later to become a best-selling author; George Haddad, physician; Alvin Lowi, Jr., engineer and entrepreneur; Richard Nesbit, later to become vice president in charge of research for a major corporation; Billy Robbins, patent attorney and founding partner of one of the largest patent firms in Los Angeles; and Jerome Smith, economist and purchasing agent for a large manufacturing concern who became nationally prominent in the silver bull market of the 1970s. Each of these persons at one time or another in those early years taught Joe's

course. They, along with many others, added to the original offering, greatly improving its content and consistency. Most of the later course offerings were on audio tape. To my knowledge, the only other person to teach the course was Jay Snelson, who maintained his association with Galambos for fourteen years. In 1979, Jay founded the Institute for Human Progress and Human Action Seminars, based in Orange County, CA, in which he is developing a highly original presentation of his own.

With the exception of Billy Robbins, Alvin Lowi was chiefly responsible for recruiting this distinguished early cadre. It was he who originally persuaded Joe, then a fellow employee at TRW, to found the Free Enterprise Institute and teach his ideas. Unfortunately Galambos never led the Institute in the direction of becoming a true university, which was Alvin Lowi's dream.

Galambos' early societal models were modified versions of the United States republic, with the addition of the Resistor, a body empowered to repeal laws passed by Congress if it judged them to be contrary to the Constitution. He believed in a written

*"Stand on your rights, but  
always remember your manners."*

constitution, unlike the unwritten basic law of England. "CCI" was the motto of the Free Enterprise Institute, the letters standing for "Constitutionalism, Capitalism, Individualism." This seemed a strange ordering for one who professed belief in individual sovereignty. Galambos was then a proponent, as well, of capital punishment. These ideas would change radically as other people contributed their efforts.

The quality of the people drawn to Galambos' ideas is best exemplified by the participants in his first Course 100 graduation meeting. Richard Grant presented his poem, "Tom Smith and the Incredible Bread Machine," later expanded into a book of the same name. Don Balluck, playwright and later producer of television offerings, presented an original one-act play consisting of a dialogue between Ralph Waldo Emerson and a bureaucrat named "Binder." Pat Gilbert, now Pat Cullinane, presented a paper on her experiences in founding a (still successful) private, for-profit school. Alvin Lowi, Richard Nesbit and others also made contributions. I am still in personal contact with most of these people. To my knowledge, not one has had any involvement with Galambos for many years. Most of them, as I do here, speak of him only in the past tense; why?

A major reason might be that Galambos made a habit of abusively accusing each one of us—and much of the rest of Southern California—of stealing his ideas. Yet, ironically, he often used other people's ideas without credit. Like the best of us, he absorbed

ideas from those around him and often built on them effectively. But he used a double standard, demanding more scrupulous acknowledgement from others than he practiced. If he acknowledged a source at all, he was likely to do so derogatorily, inappropriately, superficially, ungraciously. Often he ignored the source altogether. If nothing more, his lack of manners was outrageous and offensive to his colleagues and patrons alike.

I cannot deny the many benefits of my association with Galambos. Among them was the opportunity to attend small lecture classes conducted by such giants as Leonard E. Read, originator of the Foundation for Economic Education; Ludwig von Mises, certainly one of the most important men of this century; and F.A. (Baldy) Harper, founder of the Institute for Humane Studies, who later became my good and valued friend. Meeting daily with these men for a week was an experience never to be forgotten. A fourth giant, Spencer Heath, author of *CITADEL, MARKET AND ALTAR*, was scheduled for this series of courses. Failing health prevented this, and his anthropologist grandson, Spencer MacCallum, gave a course in his place. I did have opportunities to meet and discuss ideas with Mr. Heath, however, and I credit Galambos for that. (Galambos had met Mr. Heath through R.C. Hoiles, founder of the Freedom Newspapers chain.)

The beginning of my break with Galambos probably occurred in 1963 when I informed him of my intention to participate in a two-week seminar at Bob LeFevre's Freedom School, in Colorado. He accused LeFevre of being not only a second-rate thinker, but an anarchist! I had decided to go, however, and I told Joe that if he was right, perhaps I could convince LeFevre of his errors. The Freedom School (later Rampart College) was another peak experience. I doubt that I ever learned more in a single two-week period. The following year, along with Alvin Lowi and two groups of Galambos's course contractors (Liberal Educators of South Bay and Liberal Educators of Santa Monica), I helped sponsor LeFevre at a three-day seminar in Los Angeles. Galambos attended. Course 100, which was undergoing major changes during that period, was soon modified to recognize the disutility of the political state. To my knowledge, Galambos never acknowledged either the change of philosophy or the source of the influence.

For many years I have considered that Galambos' intellectual manners exemplified the worst he imputed to others; when judged by his own definition at the time, he was an "idea thief."

Looking back, I think he demanded the impossible and expected perfection in others; not being perfect himself, however, he appeared somewhat hypocritical, to say the least.

I believe Galambos' main error was to ignore the reality taught by the common law on the subject of property. The common-law tradition holds that an

idea can be protected, if at all, only in its manifest forms. To be protected by patent, for example, an idea for a mechanical invention must be built or else described in drawings with enough detail to allow its construction. A book or an article can be copyrighted. In either case, it is not the idea that is protected but the device, drawing or arrangement of words used to represent the idea. The idea and its manifestation are obviously not the same.

Galambos offered an advanced course during this period, the intent of which was to describe a *de novo* method of protecting "primary property," i.e. ideas. His approach was contemptuous of the common-law tradition. I attended until the evening when he required the members of the class to sign a non-disclosure agreement. At that point, fearing my opportunities for future dialogue and discourse on freedom would thereby come under Galambos' exclusive control, I refused and left the course. I could not concede the ownership and control of the concept of human freedom to Galambos or anyone else.

Perhaps the most we can say with respect to property in ideas is that good manners call for acknowledging the benefit we receive from others. Civilized decorum requires that we not masquerade as someone we are not.

Joe's concern for all aspects of property was well-founded. In his particular treatment of intellectual property, however, I consider he went on a tangent and was seriously in error. In retrospect it was tragic, for it corroded his relationships on every side and led to the alienation of virtually all of his ablest supporters and colleagues.

Joseph Galambos must be credited with making an important contribution to the rebirth of libertarianism in Southern California. He ran the Free Enterprise Institute as a profit-seeking venture. He felt, and I agree, that it was inconsistent to promote free-market capitalism through a not-for-profit organization. His belief was strong enough that he left a secure aerospace job for an uncertain and potentially difficult future. Without doubt, he went through some difficult years. He contributed to my awakening and to that of many others.

Disappointing as it always must be to witness (and to suffer) someone's bad behavior with respect to an important subject, it is nonetheless encouraging to see how many FEI graduates have little trouble separating the content of the Institute courses from Galambos' behavior. Many a graduate of Joe's classes of those early years say that, as little as they can stand the man, he nevertheless radically changed their lives for the better, and for that they will always be grateful. ▣

[The author would like to acknowledge the contributions of Alvin Lowi and Spencer MacCallum to this article.]

[Editor's Note: For current information about the Free Enterprise Institute contact Box 4307, Orange, CA 92613; or The Liberal Publishing Co., Box 11252, San Bernardino, CA 92423.]

---

## **We Never Called Him “Andy”**

### **My Recollections of the Person and Philosophy of the Earlier Joseph A. Galambos Alias Andrew Joseph Galambos— The Liberal**

By Charles R. Estes

My first meeting with Joe Galambos hinted at, but did not foretell, the influence he would later have on me and on the libertarian movement. Galambos sought me out at a meeting held in Los Angeles as part of the early promotion of Barry Goldwater for president. The year was 1960.

Galambos noticed that I was carrying a copy of F.A. Hayek's book, *CONSTITUTION OF LIBERTY*, which identified me as a person interested in Austrian economics. He asked me if I was aware of Hayek's teacher, Ludwig von Mises. I was not. Introducing me to Mises' work was the first of a number of important contributions Galambos was to make to my free-market education. Galambos was an enthusiastic supporter of Mises and his work; he had, in fact, met personally with Mises in New York prior to our meeting.

That meeting was one of the formative meetings of “Californians for Goldwater.” The speaker was Adolphe Menjou, actor and former McCarthy-era “red baiter.” The place was “Poor Richard's Bookstore,” which I later learned was a major meeting place of the then unknown but later famous John Birch Soci-

ety. I was there at the invitation of an unsuccessful congressional candidate, Ann Redfield Heaver. Galambos was there because he said Goldwater was potentially the most electable, even if not an ideal, advocate of the free market. Galambos at that time clearly believed in political solutions to sociological issues. I, too, was a Goldwater fan and had given away more than a hundred copies of his book, *CONSCIENCE OF A CONSERVATIVE*. It appeared at that time, at least, that the path to freedom began with the conservatives.

Physically, “Joe” or “Joseph” as he was then known was about six feet in height and substantially overweight. (“Andrew Joseph” was the name his parents gave him at birth. He was called “Andy” by fellow soldiers when he served in the U.S. Army in World War II, and both experiences—soldiering as well as the nickname—embittered him. He legally adopted his father's name after the latter's passing. Subsequently he transposed the names again out of concern for his father's memory, lest his own future fame obscure his father's recognition.) He wore his clothes in the manner of one who considered dress of secondary importance, although he acceded to convention to the extent of wearing a coat and tie. His most arresting physical characteristic was his deep and resonant voice, a voice that did not easily escape notice. Later I was to hear him give a speech heavily excerpting from Thomas Paine's *COMMON SENSE AND THE CRISIS*, “These are the times that try men's souls...” I will never forget his presence, his dramatic voice, his forceful manner of speech. Joe was clearly not

*continued on page 5*

---

---

## **The Voluntaryist**

---

P.O. Box 1275 • Gramling, South Carolina 29348



### **FIRST CLASS-TIME VALUE**

Please renew your subscription if the number on your address label is within one digit of this issue's number.