

Dear Friends,

I have pleasure in sending to you a copy of James McMurchie's letter, dated december 10th 1980 and a communication of my hand.

Both copies are forwarded to:

Grondvest Amsterdam

James H. McMurchie, Scotland

Vic Blundell, London

Basil Butterworth, England

Bob Clancy, New York

Phil Grant, Maryland, where

copies of W.W.M. are obtainable.

Ernie Bryan, Canada

Morgan Harris, Culvencity, Ca

McGahan Matamata, New Zealand

Geoff Forster, Melbourne.

Dear Robert,

I hope that you start a broad social discussion. Make it a dialogue. If required, I am willing and can assist. On my part, everything from this letter is free to be published. Sincerely, Wim Born

Bob Clancy sent me following letter:

Jan, 20 1981

Dear Mr. Born,

Thank you for your recent communication which I am holding for our Spring journal. (The Winter issue is already out).

I will first get confirmation from London that the Conference will indeed be held in Holland.

You say the land-value-tax approach has not done much good, but apparently Grondvest has not done much good, either.

Any way, I am glad to know of your continuing efforts,

Sincerely, Robert Clancy.

James H. McMurchie is the author of Open Sesame, Wealth for all, founder of the Scottish movement: Ground-rent for State Revenue. David A. McMurchie is the author of: For God's sake, Set the people free and end legalised theft!

Mr. Blundell, editor of Land & Liberty wrote in response of my letter, dated 24th november 1980: L&L does not usually discuss "domestic matters" in its pages as we wish to show a united front to the many uncommitted readers we have. (unq) Why wants L&L show a united front? Is there any newsmedia of movement that shows a united front? Isn't true what the French say: du choc des opinions jaillit la verité, what means: the truth escapes from the collision of opinions.

The same practise is followed by Grondvest. Between the two principal members Jan Pot (electrical engineer) and Wim Costerus (lawyer of profession) a difference of opinion regarding indemnification to landlords exists and has always exist. There is no lack of dedication, there is lack of insight. In the past ten years Pot has written about 700 pages "internal discussion" to prove that he is right. He considers landlordism as a stupidity of society in the past, the present holders are not responsible and therefore they have a right to be indemnified. On page 73 (1981) he wrote: from Costerus' article is to be understood that he claims that gift (sic) with retrospective effect. I shall never allow such a reasoning under the flag of Grondvest.

Pot not only claims the right of veto, he also exercises that right. In 1977 I imported 300 copies of Wonderful Wealth Machine (W.W.M.) and wrote an article to be published in Grondvest to promote selling. This article was refused by Pot on account of using terms that are not familiar with Dutch readers as rent, rentpayer, rentoffice. He was wrong for the word rent is used in Dutch economic issues and in one of our reclaimed polders the government exploits a rent office. Farmers pay "rent", leasehold participants pay "canon" I resigned from the board. After two years the board haven't succeeded in attracting a substitute for me.

FAIR COPY

99, Main Street,
EAST KILBRIDE,
GLASGOW G74 4LN
SCOTLAND.
10th., DECEMBER. 1980.

Mr. Wim A. Born,
3e, Helmerstraat 84.II
1054, BM Amsterdam,
HOLLAND.

My Dear Friend Wim,

Thank you for welcome letter, dated, 4th., DECEMBER, 1980 which arrived today, with copies of letters you have sent to Mr. Blundell, LONDON, and to Mr. Harris, CULVER CITY, U.S.A.. Thank you for asking kindly about my eyes.

Right away I reply that the cataract operations to left and right eyes were successful. Glad to say that my sight has been somewhat restored. Obtaining suitable spectacles is quite a different matter. Near and far distance is good. When it comes to concentrating on work close at hand, such as reading and typewriting I am obliged to use my left eye. I cannot focus as formerly.

The OPTICIAN examined me on 22/9/80, yet he made no alteration. My next appointment is fixed for 22/9/81, which means that is the best the eye specialist can do meantime. At that I have a great deal to be thankful for.

You say that our viewpoints slightly differ. That is to be expected. It all depends on what ascertained knowledge one possesses. On this subject-matter the climate is thick with misinformation. The vested rights and vested interests see to it that a stream of false propaganda is kept full blast. Here is where the Heuristic method comes into operation---the pupil finds out for himself. Research is all important. 'ABSCISSIO INFINITI.' That means in English: "Carefully examine hypotheses till truth is ascertained."

A 1975 reliable 'American Dictionary of Foreign Terms' holds that English is the universal law of business. So if one consults English Dictionaries one sees the precise symbols used in the SCIENCE OF WEALTH, POLITICAL ECONOMY, or in common language, 'How men living in society obtain a living.' My dictionaries are well-thumbed in searching out the correct meaning of the words I come across in daily reading matter.

In thinking about or discussing the Science of Wealth, all one has to do is to keep the same meaning to the same word. Chopping and changing is fatal. LABOUR: CAPITAL: LAND: WAGES: INTEREST: RENT: such terms in the production of wealth never change. These terms represent PROFIT in the distribution of WEALTH. Out of every product, process or service, LABOUR earns a PROFIT: CAPITAL takes a PROFIT and the STATE collects (or should collect,) RENT as a PROFIT. Were there no PROFIT in the production of goods and services, there would be no civilisation. Profit-making is the prime mover of civilisation.

By the way, Political Economy is an old science so there is no call on the part of our contemporaries to make abstractions, invent new words, or drop, or seek to drop key words, such as GROUND-RENT. A consensus of English dictionaries shall prove that GROUND-RENT IS RENT PAID TO A LANDOWNER FOR THE USE OF GROUND FOR A SPECIFIED TIME. Thomas Paine, Adam Smith, Henry George and other qualified authorities used that term, meaning the Profit which belonged to the State.

Additionally, I draw your special attention to the PREFACE of the Robert

wrong elsewhere. My age is 74, two of us are engaged in the movement over fifty years, two over thirty years, Siebe over 75 years, his father was engaged from the beginning. When we have passed away, most likely the movement will be extinct and that I want to prevent.

+++

On occasion of the Centennial conference James sent in an address of 7 pages to three important members of that conference. Until yet no response. He also sent an address of 6 pages to the Scottish League for land value taxation. These communications are up to date; if anyone wants to have copies, I am willing to deliver them. On the same occasion I sent in a message of 3 pages to Mr. Floyd L. Morrow requesting him to represent me at the conf and to have it read. No response. Grondvest wants another copy of the film For the Land is mine in order to be able to make a Dutch over voice. I sent a letter to 454 Mission Valley Center West and one to 2242 Morley street San Diego. No response. Georgist Journal nr 28 summer 1980 reports that LEAF has suspended operations as of june 30th, of which Floyd Morrow is president. Where can I get a copy of Leaf's Centennial echoe?

Mr. Morgan Harris pamphlet circulated at the conference, I didn't hear of any comment. Isn't he right when he asks: how was Henry George able to run on tens of thousands of people, and his followers have turned off tens of thousand? By the way, I have written Mr. Harris twice, no response.

Phil Grant wrote to me (december 21st): and yet, as in Pandora's box, after all of the world's evils have been released, hope will remain. We human rarely lose hope. Whether that is a human blessing or curse, I do not know. (unq)

I have reasons to have hope. But that is a matter of the future. I do hope to have incited all of you to start an international discussion about rent and Ricardo's law of rent. Let us all reflect our teachings and tactics and the result might be to get rid of the formula: taxation of land values.

+++

Free to choose.

In Holland prof. Milton Friedman's television series supporting the free market and minimal government are presented by the Tros Aktua-TV. That organization is promoted by our biggest conservative and hypocritic boulevard press The Telegraph. I pointed out their incompleteness of the information given about Adam Smith. In my second letter I summed up the statements of other prominent writers. From Quesnay: laissez faire, laissez passer. From Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Paine, Henry George, Albert Einstein, Leo Tolstoy and sent Winston Churchill's On Human Rights. Winston speeches are still up to date, strictly to the point, still very usefull, only one sentence has to be altered, on page 11: then at least you shall be taxed at the true selling value. (rent is not a tax) Mr. Newcomb wants to see a Georgist reply on television. I like to participate in the discussions, if the action has not yet finished. In 1976 the Erasmus University of Rotterdam celebrated the publication of Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations anno 1776. They emphasized the free market system but no word about rent. I have sent them copies of my letters to Tros Aktua-TV and Churchill's On Human Rights.

+++

I should appreciate very much to have your comment,

Sincerely yours,

Wim Born

favour. That apt French phrase is used by socialists to mean, 'a-free-for-all', 'no holds barred', and the Devil take the hindmost.' So when a socialist says, 'laissez-faire' his hearers translate that phrase into MONOPOLY-CAPITALISM and its restrictive practises.

I agree that "LAND & LIBERTY" is of next to no importance. If it set out to confuse the issue it could scarcely do better. The TAXATION OF LAND VALUES MEANS NOTHING, so it is an asset to the rich. While the rich favour TAXATION as the means of finding State revenue, they would fight to the bitter end any move to apply a tax on GROUND-RENT. They fear that is the key to the equal distribution of wealth, and having the possession of LAND, law or no law, they would not stand for a tax on GROUND-RENT. Legislation to tax the value of LAND has been promoted at least eight times in recent years and has always been defeated by the TORIES. From that one can take it that LVT will never pass through the House of Commons. Every move to promote LVT is a waste of time and money and confidence trickery. As I told Michael Foot, now leader of H.M. Opposition, on a 'walkabout' here in East Kilbride, that LAND REFORM, so-called, by the Labour Party, had proved a fiasco---'TOP OF THE FLOPS.'

Never before have I witnessed Mr. Foot stuck for an answer---but as he walked away I saw in his face that he had no answer.* Churchill, in his day had no answer either. (This interview was recorded on ITN television.) *

To return to this question of GROUND-RENT: Where unimpeachable authorities aver that GROUND-RENT is the correct term for that payment identified with leaseholding of LAND---there is no occasion for uninformed persons to boggle over it. No matter what one thinks of other items, he is obliged to keep to that meaning---or his thinking is confused. If one knows any other authority who holds an opposite point of view, it ought to be submitted as evidence to the contrary. (May I remind you Wim, English is the language of business?) (the film says (You say, Wim, "No man should be allowed to hold idle land without payment to the State." That's what Single Taxer's believe---but that is half-baked.

No man: no company: no State should hold an exclusive ownership in land, nor be able to buy and sell land. Land is like air (food), like rainwater (food) like sunlight, which promotes life and living, or like the earth itself, all gifted to mankind. Never mind how you see it---see it in a natural setting. No man should be allowed to hold land without payment to the State. If a man holds land idle---and thousands do in Scotland---as long as the State received the GROUND-RENT, there is nothing to quarrel about there.* Man is entitled to access to nature's storehouse and the profits of his labour---but not the LAND---res communes. Put that way, this discussion is elementary---no diagrams have been necessary thus far---nor are graphs and maths required. Though the State should not own LAND, yet the State ought to be empowered to auction all LAND on leasehold, and the resulting GROUND-RENT would give ample revenue. As leaseholds fell for renewal, existing occupiers would have right to bid for renewal of lease. *(Few would hold land idle in a wasteful sense.)

Suppose in Holland a private enterprise reclaimed land. For a number of years that company would enjoy a nominal GROUND-RENT. When it came to a renewal of lease---the greater having incorporated the lesser, GROUND-RENT would possess economic worth and let accordingly.

Yet as I visualise Holland, the State must bear a large expense in LAND reclamation. So that is all grist to the mill.

Perhaps I have not dealt with all the points of your welcome letter; nor in the way you would have preferred them answered, but I have discussed them at some length and I would appreciate a reply in your own good time.

I reciprocate your kind regards and send the Compliments of the Season.

Yours sincerely, James H. MacMurchie

POSTSCRIPT: Unless all LAND is reconstituted Common Land annihilation of civilisation by ever-rising taxation cannot be much longer averted. The next step is to offer all LAND on leasehold and collect GROUND-RENT as the natural State revenue. J.H.M. *JHM*