



The Editors
LOOK Magazine
New York

Sydney, June 1952

Gentlemen and Gentlewomen of LOOK,

This is to thank you for the kind letter written by Michael Allen (May 21) to Professor Oliver L. Reiser, University of Pittsburgh, expressing your interest in a story on Semantography. As a little return for your kindness, I shall endeavour to give you herewith special details of special interest to pictorial journalists. I have duplicated this letter firstly to give a number of you the possibility to study this letter in leisure and to keep it for later reference. Secondly, a number of enlightened librarians have realized that a lone scholar in far-away Australia battles for a new world-embracing idea. They have therefore begun to collect all my writings, contained in my Semantography Series, which comprises all my leaflets, lectures, letters, pamphlets, brochures, correspondence courses, etc., etc. THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, Washington D.C., has given a standing order to a prominent Sydney bookshop to acquire anything I consider of value to be included in this and other libraries. Whatever the outcome of our connection, whether you will bring an article or not, the very fact that you are interested has stimulated my thoughts, and I believe therefore that this letter to you, which I would title LOOK AND SEMANTOGRAPHY is to be considered as a document in the history of a new idea, and worthy to be included in the world's great libraries.

However, I beg to draw your attention to a drawback of my writings. Working for a living and for a new idea, with an ever increasing flood of letters coming in from many parts of the world is no easy matter, and I have therefore employed a new technique. I type everything of value directly onto the waxstencil - without any draft, as the thoughts are coming into my mind, and then there is no time to eliminate all the shortcomings, because the new mail brings new stimulating enquiries. And so here it goes, the letter to the LOOK people - and Good Luck!

PROFESSOR O.L. REISER AND SEMANTOGRAPHY

Prof. Reiser read a paper UNIFIED SYMBOLISM FOR WORLD UNDERSTANDING IN SCIENCE at the recent Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (Philadelphia, December 30, 1951). He gave an exposition of my work, distributed an informative leaflet (attached), and said among others: "Bliss realized the ambition of the great mathematician Leibnitz." "Semantography provides a powerful stimulus and aid to President Truman's 'Point Four Program...' In the end, he termed my struggle 'heroic'.

He should know about the heroism in battling for a new idea. For 30 years he has fought for his "Scientific Humanism", the "Vision of a new Earth and a new Humanity." In his book THE WORLD SENSORIUM he cried out for a new medium which should encompass all languages, and which should bring the idea of Scientific Humanism to all the People of this Planet, speaking in all languages at once. This brought us together, because in my letter to him SCIENTIFIC HUMANISM AND SEMANTOGRAPHY, Semantography Series No. 27 I showed that Semantography is the new medium.

I beg therefore to state right in the beginning that any exposition of Semantography should include one or two examples of my symbols as illustrations of Reiser's writing that "the creative semantics of Scientific Humanism is an adventure - nothing less than a reformulation of the language of social communication", and that Semantography can demonstrate "a universal ethics, which shall transcend races, nations, religions and local cultures."

I submit this condition to you, not only out of gratefulness to Professor Reiser, but also because a new medium of social communication is of little value if it does not contain a new idea of bringing mankind together.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR AND SEMANTOGRAPHY

If you haven't seen it yet, I wish to draw your attention to an article about my work, which appeared in THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR on the Editorial page, May 17, 1952 under the title BLISS AND SEMANTOGRAPHY written by Albert Norman, Chief of Bureau for Australia and New Zealand. This article does not carry any symbols, but I have reason to assume that THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR will bring sooner or later a follow-up, showing such symbols as elements of the pictorial symbolic logic of Semantography. I maintain that the application of my symbolic logic to controversial statements, which convulses the minds of the American people inside and outside of Congress, will clear up much controversy and misunderstanding. The people of America, seeing such statements "translated" in Semantography might suddenly realize that they have thought and behaved as if $2 + 2 = 5$.

Now, the statements above are a mighty piece of arrogant exaggeration. But if true - if Semantography can do just this, then the knowledge of it might cause a sensation. Whether the MONITOR or LOOK will be the first American paper to bring this sensation, depends on who is quicker to realize the chance and put it to the test and in operation. As proof that Semantography can do the job unheard-of, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that Albert Norman has seen this application and in consequence thereof the Article in THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR begins by stressing the importance of my work for America's foreign policy, especially with regard to understanding among the people of the Pacific area, and the article ends by stressing the even greater importance of my work as a new tool in the defence against Communist influence. Lastly, I wish to draw your attention to

BERTRAND RUSSELL AND SEMANTOGRAPHY

He is the world's foremost logician and authority on logical symbolism. By a rare chance he happened to come to Australia, and so we met. Russell is a great authority on Leibnitz, the great mathematician-philosopher of the 17th century, whose idea of a simple Algebra of Thought, a Symbolis Universalis is known to every mathematician, logician and philosopher for the last 300 years, and known to be impossible to realize. Now, according to scholars I am the first man who have solved that logico-mathematical problem. Lord Russell, when I met him in his hotel room in Sydney, gave me some of the most controversial political and religious statements to symbolize in Semantography. Then he studied my 3 books on Semantography and a few days later I received his letter (facsimile attached) in which he said at the end that the men who will spend the money necessary to make ^{this} work known by printing will, in my opinion be performing an important service to Mankind."

Now, you people of LOOK you have the money and you have the printing presses. Just a few days ago, I received a personal letter from Sir Stanley Unwin LL.D. Dean of British publishers, and Chairman of the Publishing firm of George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 40 Museum Street London W.C.1. The question is now who will be first right now, to perform that important service to Mankind SIR STANLEY or LOOK ?

BOSTON UNIVERSITY, MR. A.H. HANDLEY OF BOSTON AND SEMANTOGRAPHY

Some time ago I approached the prominent lecture bureaus of America with the suggestion of a lecture tour. I based my proposal on the most flattering superlatives used by scholars and students and pressmen with regard to my lecturing abilities ("sheer fascination," "charmed and fascinated", "you cannot forget having heard Bliss lecture on Semantography", "delighted the audience", "spellbound...thunder of applause")

However, the theme "Semantography" seemed so absurd and outlandish and moreover "Who is Bliss? Never heard of him? Will he be a box office attraction?" The result was that they all declined - all, except one, Mr. A.H. Handley of 200 Berkeley Street Boston 16, Mass. He recognized immediately the value of my work for the people of America and for the peoples of this world. He realized too that this cannot be a business proposition for a Lecture Manager, and therefore he stated in his first letter to me that he will undertake to interest the universities and colleges of the Eastern States "without any personal profit". Praise to this Man, and praise to America which has such Men!

When the article in THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR appeared, Handley saw his chance. He sought and had a personal talk with Dr. Harold C. Case, President of Boston University and was apparently so favourably stimulated by the response of the President, that he followed up his talk with a letter, confirming the discussion and ending with these words:

"On the strength of the interest that is being shown in this subject (even before it has ever been formally presented by Mr. Bliss in this country) by the publicity of The Christian Science Monitor, Bertrand Russell and many other leading scholars of the day, I have wondered if there was not something in this new subject of Semantography that Boston University would consider, and be the first sponsor to bring it to the attention of the people of America."

Now, Gentlemen and Gentlewomen of LOOK, as you know, Boston has been first in a number of American events, teaparties and otherwise. Again it is a Boston paper which brought the first article on a new idea, and it is a Boston man, who undertakes it to bring it to the knowledge of the American people. The question I ask now is: Who will give the first teaparty (I hate cocktails) on the occasion of my first lecture in America, the people of Boston University or the people of Look? Or in short: Boston or New York?

SEMANTOGRAPHY - WHAT IS IT ALL ABOUT?

At this juncture, you might exclaim in exasperation: "Heavens Men, you are talking about this "new idea" and you don't give any hint what it looks like." Well, I enclose the draft for a leaflet which I have designed in support of Mr. A.H. Handley's efforts. This leaflet tells (as best as I could at present) what it is all about. Mr. Handley will send it out (after it has been properly printed) to Universities, Colleges, Societies and Circles, who are interested to hear about it. Now, what I am asking you is: stop reading this leaflet and read the other. Then you will know what Semantography is all about. Afterwards continue here:

WHY DID PROFESSOR REISER TERM MY STRUGGLE "HEROIC"?

From the Handley leaflet you have gathered that I have solved a logico-mathematical problem, known to be impossible to realize during the last 300 years. When, after a few years work, I realized that I am going to solve it, I believed fervently, that the phantastic advantages of it, will make the news spread like wildfire among the universities. I hoped too, that the idea will be taken out of my hands, and put to the test and put into the curriculae of the schools of the world. Today, after years of exasperating frustration I know differently, but I can't say that I have not received fair warning.

When, after 7 years of work, I believed that I have finished my work so far, I started with letters trying to interest university bodies. I received then a letter from a man, high up on the "educational ladder" of his country. He said among others:

"As for organising university committees to study your scheme, I can only wish you luck. There are no bodies, I think, harder to penetrate with a new idea than the universities, except through individuals. Your attack, therefore, would have to be on individuals such as those working in the fields of Languages and Anthropology."

He, as an individual, helped me greatly, but he could not give me more aid through the body he represented. As his disparaging remark is contained in a personal letter, I don't want to disclose his name. But, although my subsequent experiences proved the truth in his words, I had to disregard his forewarning, simply on the strength of the Logic of Semantography. The pivotal word in his assertion is the word THE in "THE universities". In conventional grammar this is called the "definite article" and the exasperating word about it is "definite". And in the conventional grammar of all languages this little word THE is of no consequence whatever. But in the unconventional "grammar" of Semantography this word is of terrifying consequence. Indeed millions of people have died just a few years ago on account of the semantic consequences of this word and a number of American boys are murdered outrageously right now on account of the implication of THE. This seems to be a ridiculous statement, so I have to prove it.

CONVENTIONAL LINGUISTICS AND SEMANTOGRAPHY

We are learning language and grammar in all schools of the world, and we have been taught to attach the definite article THE to any noun. So we have been taught to say THE Americans, THE Jews, THE Roman-Catholics, etc., etc. Then we have been

taught to form sentences as THE Americans are soandso, THE Jews are soandso. And such sentences have become death sentences indeed, because the words THE Americans imply directly: ALL Americans are soandso, ALL Jews are soandso. When you have learned the semantographic symbol for THE and for ALL you will realize the salutary effect which it could have when taught in the schools of the world.

UNESCO AND SEMANTOGRAPHY

As Semantography works, according to Leibnitz's stipulation, with pictorial symbols for "rendering our conceptions more real", it represents on the simplest level a "picture writing". Three quarters of the worlds population (3 out of 4) are illiterate, and scientists have found in Africa that primitive natives will not take to improvements in agriculture, etc. without the stimulus of literacy. They are engulfed in taboos and superstitions, and this can only be lifted if they are taught the magic of the white man, the magic of learning methods of better living by reading books and writing to others. These natives are split up in many thousands of linguistic stocks, speaking different languages and dialects. Printing thousands of different primers in different languages, with alphabetical letters for linguistic stocks comprising some thousands of souls only, is out of the question. And as the example of American settlers have proved, people will stick to their mother-tongue be it French, Italian, Swedish, German even after centuries of settlement in the new country. No one will learn an international language be it Esperanto or Basic English or any other constructed language. But the symbols of Semantography can be read in all the mother-tongues of the world.

Consequently, two great individuals, great educators in their countries, Professor Carloton Washburne, now Professor of Education and Director, Division of Graduate Studies of Brooklyn College, and Professor Joseph A. Lauwerys, Director of the Institute of Education, University of London have personally approached the Director General Dr. Torres Bodet of Unesco, and the Deputy Director General of Unesco, Dr. John W. Taylor of U.S.A. The result is a big file of letters on my shelf. No other result was obtained. "UNESCO", wrote Professor Lancelot Hogben, celebrated author of MATHEMATICS FOR THE MILLION and SCIENCE FOR THE CITIZEN, "UNESCO, ... a comic synonym for FIASCO." "Semantography," wrote the same scholar, "interesting... stimulating... fascinating... ingenious... worthy of encouragement as a possible aid to education of preliterate communities, and likely to promote... world unity."

THE PRESS AND SEMANTOGRAPHY

Now that you have learned Semantography for a few minutes, you know that the words THE PRESS can precede other words which may contain utterly false accusations lies, and usually do contain it. When you know a little more about Semantography you will know that the symbol for THE is derived from the symbol for THIS, because THE is an ambiguous THIS. And the symbol for THIS is derived from the photograph of a FINGER OF A HUMAN HAND POINTING AT SOMETHING. THIS is a shorthand word for POINTING AT SOMETHING, something which exists in the real world.

The student of Semantography who knows this, knows too what to think and what to say when he hears or reads the words: "THE PRESS". He will ask: "Please point it out for me what you mean! What Press do you mean? Ah, you don't mean a machine. You mean THE men who work the printing presses! No? Then you mean THE men who write the newspapers. Now, point out to me which particular men do you mean, Mr. X, Mr. Y. Mr. Z, and what they have said or written, where, when and under what circumstances?"

You may agree that starting to think and speak along such lines will take out the zest of arguing, of debating useless debates, of nagging and perhaps fighting. You will then be conditioned to my saying that so far, I have received a rough deal from the few men who have written articles about my work in various papers. Now, when you know my symbol for man and for newspaper man, you will know that the symbol of the mind "enters the picture" and this means the mind of the reporter as well as the mind of the editor, from whom the reporter takes his orders to write. Then you will know too, that the mind of the editor is conditioned by the many minds of the readers who wants to read this and not that, written in this way and not in that way, etc. etc. And then you will know that "a rough deal" may be a false word.

A REPORTER'S ASSIGNMENT IN THE 8TH CENTURY.

To explain what I mean let me draw a parallel. Let us go back to the 8th century A.C. An Arabian scholar has just announced that he is going to use symbols from the Sanscrit alphabet to stand for numbers. A reporter from the ARABIAN DAILY

is sent out to get the write-up. The scholar shows him the symbols, which look strange enough: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 and he shows him too a sentence in symbols: $1 + 2 = 3$. "This sentence," said the scholar, "can be read in all languages of the world. The reporter dashes off an article ARABIAN SCHOLAR INVENTS NEW SIGN LANGUAGE. The ancient newspaper reader dismisses the article as another oddity. He might have thought better of it, if the reporter would have quoted in full what that scholar told him: "These symbols have a Logic and Semantics of their own. Their meaning is not ambiguous. They represent truth. I imagine a time, when boys and girls in all schools of the world will learn to operate these symbols, and when science and industry, commerce and shipping and indeed the whole life would be unthinkable without these symbols."

Such words may seem quite an exaggeration to the reporter in view of the fact that life in the 8th century A.C. went on quite beautifully without those absurd symbols. But even if he grasped the prophecy of that scholar, and even if he said something to this effect, he knew all the time that he has to cater for that fabulous figure, the average newspaper reader, that is for those with the lowest intellect, and moreover he simply has no time to study or to show and explain the Logic of those symbols. He is harrassed as only newspapermen are harrassed. He has to deliver the article at the dead line (dead or alive) or else. The result of such articles is that the newspaper reader does as said above, and that the scholar falls into torments of rage.

Now you know how I feel about the various articles which have appeared in various papers. But I must say that the reporters I met were wonderful guys, understanding and helpful, and yet, when it came to showing the symbols, they selected those of which they thought that their meaning will be grasped instantly even by a half-wit reader. Nothing remained of the Logic and Semantics of Semantography, because even the intelligent reader had to ask himself: "How on earth could these childish picturegrams help in the fight against dictators and demagogues."

The article in THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR shows no symbols and any follow-up will show the symbols as I draw them (not another harrassed draughtsman in the artists room), and the text must be written by me, because I only know how to lead the reader from one symbol to the other, explaining the interpretation.

Meanwhile other articles have appeared in different parts of the world, written by people who did not care to get in touch with me, nor to extend to me the courtesy of sending me the clipping. I am now faced with the alternative: Either I am recognized all over the world as another crank with a crackpot idea, or as the inventor of a great medium for social communication. Articles which have appeared in the Paris L'intransigeant, in the Frankfurter Rundschau and elsewhere, although they mention Leibnitz, and Prof. Reiser's address to the AAAS, show symbols wrongly drawn and wrongly interpreted. Enough is enough. My symbols are copyrighted in all countries belonging to the Berne Convention, and in the United States. I am going to exercise my copyrights and to fight for them. I have been for a number of years Manager of the Patent Department of a large firm. I have fought in many a court and I know how to fight. I am ready to give all possible help to anyone who wants to write an article, and I am very grateful to anyone who will help me in my task of handing over this idea to younger minds. But the symbols must be selected by me, and described by me. If an editor will give me for an article a column of space or half a column or only one quarter of a column, I shall select as many symbols and describe them with the words which will fit exactly in the space given to me BUT I MUST DO IT, because I am the only man in whose mind this idea is well ordered and I believe I can explain my symbols better than anyone else. I do not mind if the article is written by somebody else, if it contains all sorts of thoughts on language, on communication on semantics, or on my personal life, as long as it contains the symbols in paragraphs which may begin somewhat like this: The following symbols are explained by Bliss in his own words as follows:.....

PROFESSOR G. PATRICK MEREDITH AND SEMANTOGRAPHY

This scholar of the University of Leeds who started as a physicist, but found psychology more exciting, has written a 2000word review in the London Educational Journal THE NEW ERA (November 1950) He classes his review as next to an "unconditional eulogy" (a terrific flattery), and he ends it with these words:

"Semantography is such an important creative advance in language design that the strategy of its presentation to the world merits as much care as the author has devoted to the system itself."

I was crestfallen at first. "Strategy" - a militant word. Heavens, I would not need to fight for this idea, I thought. Its advantages are so obvious. It will be taken out of my hands immediately - and this is what I want.

Today I know better. Meredith is right. Fight I must, and fight I will. But as my work has been misrepresented, I have no recourse than to apply the weapon which law has given to me - the Copyright.

THE COPYRIGHTS ON SEMANTOGRAPHY

The symbols of Semantography (except the few already international, like the numbers, etc.) are copyrighted in the United States and in all the Countries under the Berne Convention. This means practically the whole world, a few countries excepted. Furthermore, likely derivations and deviations of the symbols fall too under the copyright, and this includes mis-representations as occurred already. I have been Manager of the Patent Department of a large electrical concern and I have fought many a successful fight in patent courts. I am going to fight for a correct presentation of my work.

MY CO-OPERATION CONCERNING AN ARTICLE ON SEMANTOGRAPHY

I am ready to give wholehearted co-operation in every way possible. However, previous experiences have taught me, that I am the best man to represent my work correctly. After all, the author of a work is surely the most competent man to write about it. But how about criticism of my work? Yes, I want this too. Indeed, for years I have craved for criticism, in order to see how others see my work. I am a factory engineer, and I know how to drop or alter something which does not stand up to relevant criticism.

Relevant - this is it. A little knowledge is a dangerous thing, and I don't ask anyone to digest my 3 big volumes on Semantography. But, almost every intellectual, and even more a professional critic, when faced with the achievement of another guy, can't resist having a few whacks at him. So far, I have received great praise, but the representation of my work as a picture language (how odd) is going to be stopped, if I can help it. This is only a by-product. The Logic is the "thing."

I am therefore ready to accept any critic in any article, even a critic which is "beside the point." I ask only for the fairness, accorded to any prize boxer. If the writer of an article wants to criticise my work, he is free to do it, but he must know what my answer to his criticism is. If he then still persists in his critic, he must add my answer, somehow as follows: "To this, Bliss' answer is, that..." After all, if I get some punches "above or below the belt", at least, let me show my defence move.

An article in a newspaper or a picture magazine must have something of the human element. In short, bits of stories from my life. Here again, I have made exasperating experiences. What I told the reporter, and what he jotted down, came out quite differently. It will do me harm. For instance: Prof. Washburne of New York, promised me in Sydney a hearing and told me to wait for him at the airport, when he returns to Sydney from Melbourne to board the plane for America. At the airport, a farewell committee declared that I shall not going to speak to Washburne. He is too busy. To this I declared that Washburne promised me a hearing and he alone can cancel it. When Washburne arrived, and saw the farewell committee and me facing each other, he agreed to my proposal that I shall travel with him in a taxi to the City (as he had 6 hours to wait) and shall explain my work to him in the taxi. The Committee became my enemy ever since. Now, in the picture story in PEOPLE the farewell committee is changed ⁱⁿ to the reception committee, and I have swept away Washburne in a taxi when he arrived to begin his lecture tour. Every reader must gain the impression that I am a rude brute.

In short, let me do my own story. Just tell me how many lines, or space you are ready to give me, tell me whether my representation should be for simple people, or for children or for scholars or for all these different people, whether my examples should show applications for the straightening-out of domestic quarrels or political issues, or for scientific problems, etc. etc. - and I will deliver the goods. If you want pictures, Paul Byers, who did the picture story in PEOPLE is an excellent cameraman.

A WORLD SCOOP FOR A PICTORIAL MAGAZINE

If you would kindly read the paragraphs in the attached Draft of a Leaflet for Mr. Hand by (beginning end of page 2 and page 3) you will realize that they contain a phantastic discovery about the origin of human warfare. This can be illustrated by pictures from cavepaintings of paleolithic man, showing only animal hunts, and no

pictures whatever about man hunting man. This could be followed up by photographs of finds on neolithic sites, which show animal bones and human bones mingled and broken, which people do to extract the marrow, and which proves according to the archeologists that neolithic man became a cannibal, whereas paleolithic man was none.

Then other pictures could be shown, monuments from ancient Egypt, Babylon, etc.etc, glorifying manhunts, wars and victories. Then reference could be made to Professor Ashley Montagu of Rutgers University N.J, who supports my find. Pictures of Montagu's experiments could be brought, which demonstrate his teaching, that among the same species the highest ethics is supreme law, and that the evolutionary trend among the higher species is co-operation among their own, etc.etc.

Thus a terrific picture story could be put together to prove the theory of Dr. Brock Chisholm that human warfare is only a recent mental perversion, and caused only by semantic confusion and abstract language - something which is indeed only a prerogative of the human species. For further information, please read the paragraphs in the attached draft, and ask for more from me.

Such a picture story would give mankind more practical and breathtaking hope than the promises of evangelists and the doctrines of political saviours. One day my discovery might be termed as the most important discovery of the 20th century. And indeed, try to think of something more important than the discovery that the scourge of human warfare can be stopped by medical men, much in the same way as they stop epidemics. And I have found the proof, that human warfare was absent prior to about 5000 B.C. There will be of course a controversy - the more the better. Again, let me write the story, in co-operation with you.

A COMMITTEE FOR "BRINGING BLISS AND SEMANTOGRAPHY TO AMERICA."

Quite often, a scholar who has made a discovery, written a work of merit, is a poor teacher and an even worse speaker. With me, I am a firebrand as a speaker. I sweep every audience off their feet, no matter what the subject is, be it an exposition of the relativity theory or semantography. Listen to my listeners:

"...convincing logic, good humour,... the audience sat spellbound...thunder of appreciative applause..."

Paul Byers in PEOPLE Magazine

"You could not forget hearing Bliss lecture on Semantography...vital personality..."

Student Papers of the University of Sydney

"Bliss' forceful and energetic, yet humorous lecture delighted the audience."

Student Papers of the University of Sydney

"We have been charmed and fascinated...but we have also felt in Mr. Bliss a sincere devotion to an earnest purpose."

Prof.A.G.Mitchell, Sydney University as
Chairman.

From the attached leaflet you will learn that Mr. A.H.Handley tries to organize a lecture tour. This is such a novel subject that such a tour cannot be a business proposition. A committee is in formation, to bring me to the United States. I ask you, the Editors of LOOK to join this committee. A great idea is at stake, a world-embracing new medium of communication, a pictorial representation of human thought and language - and I am 55 years of age. I want to pass it on before I pass out. Help me to hand it over to young American minds.

Encl.

Yours Sincerely

C.K. Bliss

C.K.Bliss, B.Sc.

A Sequel to SEMANTOGRAPHY SERIES No. written for the Editors of LOOK Magazine

Mr. Michael Allen,
LOOK Magazine
488 Madison Avenue
NEW YORK 22, N.Y.

Sydney 23rd January 1953

Dear Sir,

In your letter of May 21 to Professor Oliver L. Reiser of Pittsburgh University, you expressed your interest in an article on Semantography and you asked him for more information which he duly supplied. You asked in another letter for Book I. In addition, I wrote to you on June 3, then on June 30, and included a number of leaflets and an elaborate exposition written specially for the editors of LOOK. I asked also my representative in the U.S.A. to send you more material, and I expressed my willingness to help you and to co-operate with you. You then wrote the letter of September 11 to Professor Reiser, informing him that the editorial board after much discussion has decided against an article. To this you added that "Semantography deserves better recognition." You then thanked Prof. Reiser for his co-operation and returned the book on Semantography and the material sent by him.

It would be futile to show you here the logical symbols for the meanings of "deserve", and "greater", and "recognition." Enough to say that these words are utterly vague and may mean many things. Within the context of your letter, they might mean that the recognition which the editorial board might have been ready to give me was not good enough. "Semantography deserves better recognition." So it was decided to give it no recognition at all.

Considering my previous experiences with a number of articles written about me and my work, I can only interpret your words meaning that the editorial board had in mind to give publicity to an article showing Semantography as a "picture writing", which words herald an oddity to anyone. If this was the case then indeed "Semantography deserves better recognition." If my firm stand that the symbols of Semantography must be interpreted from the logical and semantic viewpoint (the pictorial being a "by-product" only) has prevented the article you had in mind, it is alright with me. Either Semantography gets the recognition it deserves, or it should get no recognition at all.

But what I think is not alright is that you thought fit not to accord to me the meanest courtesy of a line: "Thank you for all the material which I return, I am sorry that..." Instead, you thought fit to ignore my letters, to withhold the material sent to you, and thus to add insult to injury. What do you think am I? A human being, or an object to write about, an object which can be treated as you treated me? I ask you for the return of the material sent to you. If you have destroyed it, you owe me a word of apology. Otherwise I shall protest to the editorial board. Even a man who pioneers a new idea, who has a creative work to his credit, deserves the meanest recognition: a little courtesy.

Yours faithfully

C. K. Bliss
C.K. Bliss