

Richard Boren's reply to Wayne Joyner

September 4, 2014

Mr. Joyner:

It has been approximately one month since I received your latest letter, shown below. In that letter you said, in the last paragraph, that you will not read any more letters from me. Nevertheless I am writing to you once again. My earlier correspondence with you was well-received by a number of persons and they, like me, have awaited your reply. I will share this with them both for their edification and to add to the historical record.

Richard Boren

THE ANDREW J. GALAMBOS AND SUZANNE J. GALAMBOS NATURAL ESTATES TRUST

3600 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1903, Los Angeles, CA 90010

Phone 213-382-7308

2014, August 4

Mr. Richard Boren

Scottsdale, AZ

Dear Mr. Boren:

This letter is in response to your lengthy letter dated 2014, June 28, which contains numerous questions whose answers are fully contained in V-50 and V-201. Unfortunately, you have disqualified yourself from taking those courses by your demonstrable lack of understanding of the concept of property boundaries, and it is not my job to enlighten you on that subject.

I cannot recall ever reading anything more stupefyingly ridiculous than this paragraph. It exemplifies what is meant by the term "Kafkaesque." I laughed out loud when I read it, and didn't read the rest of the letter until a day or two later, such was the recovery time required.

My letter did indeed contain numerous questions. However, in your twisted form of logic, the fact that I asked those questions became grounds for you to disqualify me from learning the answers!

I am reminded of Thomas Paine's words, as commonly paraphrased, "To argue with a man who has renounced the use and authority of reason is like administering medicine to the dead." Such is the way I view dealing with you.

If anyone fails to understand the concept of property boundaries it is you, who have violated the standards set forth by Professor Galambos in denying me the ability to read the material in course V-201, a *property right for which I paid and therefore own.*

The theory of primary property specifies the only proper methods and strategy for preserving, protecting, and promoting the works of Andrew J. Galambos (AJG). The Trust makes its decisions for handling those works based on the theory, and on AJG's instructions in the *AJGNET Declaration of Trust*, not on the opinions of those who have no risk, responsibility, or authority in administering AJG's property. The Trust is honoring his instructions.

Galambos' instructions were to deliver edited transcripts of his courses to the persons who paid for them. You have refused to do that, which, under the morally based justice system he created, is a crime. I agree with Galambos, and believe that you are engaged in an ongoing criminal enterprise.

The Free Enterprise Institute is currently in the process of producing Galambos' valuable courses in digital format to make them proprietarily and contractually available across the world. That disclosure methodology is fully consistent with the theory.

By contrast, your continued demand that the Trust release AJG's work without restrictions is directly contrary to the requirements of the theory itself.

And yet in 1999 you in fact published that work without restrictions. We both thought that it was the right thing to do. I still think so, but you do not. What has changed? Galambos died in 1997, so you haven't had any new inputs from him. For some reason you now call Galambos' explicit instructions a "mistake" and, in what appears to be an example of using the ends to justify the means, have intentionally reneged on a contract.

I have asked you to explain your reasoning and to show me the words of AJG that you say support it--words that you claim are in V-201 but have yet to produce. Now you say that I am *disqualified* from even hearing that evidence. I am starting to shake my head and laugh again as I write this.

The content of the 1999 publication was promiscuously proliferated all over the Internet, a flatland, communist warehouse mechanism where there are no controls or protections for primary property. You have no right to demand that the Trust repeat that error.

If the 1999 publication, a V-50 transcript titled *Sic Itur Ad Astra* (SIAA), was "proliferated all over the Internet" then where is it? Any item receiving that treatment would still be there, but I've never seen even one line from it, so I doubt that your claim is true. I can see no harm whatsoever from the publication of SIAA. The harm, as I see it, comes from your *de facto* suppression of Galambos' work

I believe that putting a copy of the V-201 transcript in my hands, something that I have a contractual right to have, would not place the work of the Professor in any jeopardy. In fact, I believe it would be safe in the hands of any person who originally subscribed to it. After all, each of those persons already has a copy of SIAA and as far as I know no pirate versions have surfaced, although it would be extremely easy to create one.

You have neither the legal nor the moral authority to dictate any demands or conditions concerning the disposition of the intellectual property of Andrew J. Galambos, whose property you do not own. **Nor do you, which makes all the difference.** The administration of that property is the responsibility of the Trust, which has the sole legal and moral duty to publish, protect, and perpetuate the works of AJG in accordance with the specifications of those works.

For purposes of this discussion, your appeal to Flatland* legality is out of place. What you have done would clearly be illegal under Spaceland* law. And when it comes to morality I know of no higher moral authority than the rights granted by a contract consistent with Spaceland principles, entered into freely. Such a contract was created by Galambos, and he and I entered into it.

You claim that Galambos made a mistake when he agreed to publish and that you made a mistake when you partially honored his contract. You have used the "mistake" excuse to violate that contract, an excuse that Galambos explicitly forbade. Further, you have done so without even making an offer of restitution, a fundamental component of the justice system he advocated. Finally, you have concealed your decisions and true intentions from Galambos' students in general and the book purchasers in particular, using deceptive language that implies that the V-201 book is forthcoming when you clearly are not going to deliver it.

To reject these concepts and act in these ways shows, as Galambos would say, that you have "flunked the course."

Paragraph 4.3 of the book contract reads in part: "Successor Trustees for any trustee shall be appointed by TUSPCO in the event of the death, disability, incompetency or insanity of any trustee, or in the event that any trustee defaults in any contract or conducts himself in an irrational manner." I believe that as many as four of these disqualifying conditions have been met.

Please stop spamming the Trust and the FEI staff with your threatening, demanding letters. They are neither constructive nor useful, and I will not read or respond to any more of them. The Trust will continue to focus on more productive and positive pursuits.

My "spamming" has consisted of emailing copies of my letters to FEI's website, info@fei-ajg.com, and to Cheryl Cerell directly. There will be more communications from me, containing new information, and the FEI staff can choose whether to read them. I hope that all FEI staffers will think about the role they are playing and how they will be viewed by history.

As to demands, I do demand that I be given that which I own, a V-201 transcript. However, there are no threats, either expressed or implied, in anything I have written to you. I will continue to share such facts as I believe I know, and such opinions as I may form. If I am in error as to the facts please tell me and, as always, if you wish to provide such facts and reasoning as would cause me to change my opinions please let me know that as well.

Sincerely,

THE ANDREW J. GALAMBOS & SUZANNE J. GALAMBOS NATURAL ESTATES TRUST

Wayne Joyner, Trustee

*** For those readers who have not taken Course V-50, the terms "Flatland" and "Spaceland" were used by Galambos as labels for the social structure as it exists today and the social structure he advocated, respectively. The terms were used by Edwin A. Abbott in his book, *Flatland*, to identify two-dimensional and three-dimensional space, respectively. Galambos gave credit to Abbott for the terms that Galambos had adapted to his own use, and sold Abbott's book to his students.**