

NEW ADDRESS
'BLISS' INSTITUTE
2 Vicar St., Coober
Sydney, N.S.W. Australia
Tel. FX 8140



A POSSIBLE PROOF AND TOOL FOR CHISHOLM'S THEORY
ON THE CAUSE AND PREVENTION OF HUMAN WARFARE

by Charles K. Bliss

"A more scientific approach would be to discover whether in fact war has always and everywhere been part of the human scene. It is not certain that warfare existed during the old stone age. The indications are that it was unknown during the earlier part of the new stone age in Europe and the Orient."

Clyde Kluckhohn (1)+

Dr. G. Brock Chisholm, the well-known psychiatrist delivered in 1945 and 1946 the William Alanson White Memorial Lectures under government auspices in Washington and New York (2). The title of these lectures were: THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF PEACETIME SOCIETY. THE RESPONSIBILITY OF PSYCHIATRISTS. The same thing has been said in the much quoted words: "Since war begins in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed." However, Chisholm's lectures go further. They indicate that waging war is due to an "extensive and serious sickness" of the mind, and that preventing war is a matter of psychotherapy and psychoprophylaxis.

Abe Fortas, Under Secretary of the Interior (2) predicted that Chisholm's theory "will undoubtedly startle many people." So it did. Indeed, it caused an uproar and outcry of many people in many quarters. His theory was so contrary to most teaching and thinking. It was most upsetting. However, the uproar quickly subsided, probably because Chisholm could not furnish any tangible proof to his startling assertion.

In dealing with Chisholm's theory, and in presenting a possible proof and tool for carrying out his proposed treatment and prevention, I shall follow his advice and express myself in "simple words" instead of "hiding behind a specific, difficult and variable vocabulary." "The most important thing in the world today is the bringing up of children," said Chisholm, and "Clear and honest thinking can almost always be expressed in simple words which are understandable by the people who matter in a democracy, (namely) the teachers, the young mothers and fathers, the parent-teacher associations, youth groups, service clubs, schools and colleges, the churches and Sunday schools - everyone who can be reached..." It is my hope that this article will reach these people.

Chisholm's Theory of the Cause of War.

Expressed in simple words, what Chisholm maintained is this (2): "Waging war...is as much a pathological psychiatric symptom as is a phobia or the antisocial behaviour of a criminal who has been dominated by a stern and unreasonable father." He went further and said: "Neuroses propagate themselves and affect whole families." "In principle, there seems to be no great difference between the control of other diseases and that of neuroses."

+ This article was inspired by Professor Clyde Kluckhohn of Harvard University. It is dedicated to him in gratitude.

The author is indebted to Douglas N. Everingham M.B., B.S., Division of Mental Hygiene, Department of Public Health, N.S.W. Australia, for most valuable suggestions. See (10) and end of article.

"Can we use the analogies provided by the methods which have led to more or less adequate control of such other human disabilities: tuberculosis, typhoid, diphtheria, smallpox, typhus, and others? The problem of neuroses, warped personality, and behaviour disorders is much more widespread and much more serious than has been that of any of these other diseases, but is there not something to be learned from the successes of prevention?"

It seems that everyone would agree to this train of thought, but Chisholm warned: "Children still die because their parents say: 'I do not believe in toxoids or vaccines.'" When the other disabilities were attacked at the preventive level...reactionary forces fought back. Ignorance, superstition, moral certainties, prejudice, and interests vested in exploiting the people resisted through anti-reform organizations, religious and political pressure groups, even political parties; and this is by no means wholly a thing of the past."

Chisholm referred to the resistance against vaccination and toxoids, because he was well aware that resistance against his proposed prophylaxis would be far greater. So the reader may brace himself against automatic prejudice before hearing Chisholm's startling assertion.

"The first necessity in effective control of any affliction has been understanding the cause..." said Chisholm. What then is the cause of that mind perversion, war? According to Chisholm, it is "the concept of right and wrong."

The Concept of Right and Wrong

The few angry words cited above, show that Chisholm can hit at and offend almost anybody. He went much further in his accusations and spared nobody. Worst of all, he presented his theory in a form which must have stunned all but a few. I may therefore be allowed to give my own explanation of Chisholm's theory, before I cite his own words.

Chisholm believes that waging war is not innate to human nature. True enough, we have always fought wars, he said, but he adds cautiously "as far back as we know anything of the race." He examines the "basic psychological distortion" which can be found in every civilization. Here again, he adds cautiously "every civilization of which we know anything."

In short, Chisholm believes that at a certain time in man's history man's natural way of thinking was "distorted" and "perverted." That disastrous event happened in a period of which we know nothing. We may try to reconstruct the possible course of events which led to the disaster, the emergence of the concept of right and wrong. In the slow evolution of human thought, this concept arose dimly in some minds, and was then commuted to other minds by language. We may refer to the ontologic analogy which presents itself to us daily. The evolution of a new human being parallels the evolution of the race. Children slowly learn the use of words. They know nothing of the concept of right and wrong, until they are told about it. Then they begin to think along these new lines, and according to Chisholm, their thinking becomes "distorted and perverted."

The doctrine of Mueller of Oxford is now commonly accepted by linguists, logicians and psychologists, that "Thought is Language." Whatever we think, we think in words. Freud (3) said: "It is probable that thinking was originally unconscious...and that it became endowed with further qualities that were perceptible to consciousness only through its connection with the memory traces of words." Bertrand Russell (3) said: "Almost all higher intellectual activity is a matter of words, to the nearly total exclusion of everything else."

During his evolution, man learned slowly and painfully to distinguish between the things and happenings of the world around him, and equally slowly and painfully he began to evolve words - sound symbols - to stand for these realities. At a much later date, he began to evolve abstract notions and the words for them.

Russell said once, that it must have taken primeval man untold generations until he realized that two boars and two girls and two any-

thing else have something in common, namely the abstract meaning of "two". Chisholm obviously referred to another stage in the evolution of human thought, when primeval man began to evolve the abstract meanings of "good" and "bad", and began to attach them to anything. A boar alive and dangerous was "bad", but a boar killed was "good". When man began to attach these meanings to people, some people across any real or fictitious borderline were declared "bad." War became imminent. With the invention of the notions of "right" and "wrong" every war between two humans or two tribes became a right and just war for either side.

The sinister influence of these meanings works for war even today. If children or adults, communities or whole nations are told persuasively and persistently that some people are "bad" and their doings "wrong", "wicked" and "evil", anything may happen to such victims, even mass murder. The executors will commit any crime with a clear conscience, especially if they are told that they are "right" and that they are eradicating "evil." Yes, Chisholm may be correct in assuming that the concept of right and wrong is the main cause of human strife and war.

But if his theory is correct, then there must have been a time in man's history, when warfare was absent. That was the time when the notions of "good" and "bad", "right" and "wrong" were not yet invented by medicine-men, elders and fñhrers, and so the thinking of men was not yet distorted and perverted.

But can we ever discover the existence of such a period? No matter how hard archeologists dig into ancient sites of human habitation, they can never uncover the thoughts of primeval man, nor what they said. Words are sounds, the most fleeting of all events. All we can do is to guess the "state of mind" of those people from the remains which they have left.

But then, at a later date, man invented drawing and writing. Now he had a medium to preserve his thoughts, his desires, his ambitions. He invented written symbols to stand for spoken symbols, which stand for thoughts. Perhaps if we search diligently enough, if we follow human symbolization as far as we can go, we may find signs of that period of paradise when man did not attack his fellow man.

In Search of Symbols

I have undertaken the search and I believe I have found valid proof for the existence of that period where human warfare was absent. Being no professional worker in these sciences, I beg to remind my critics that certain theories and discoveries in these fields, even when made by professionals have been very much disputed and rejected, sometimes to be recognized at a later date, often after the death of the originator. Important discoveries in these fields have been made by amateurs (from Latin amator - lover) - lovers of the search for knowledge.

In this particular case, the matter under consideration is of the highest importance. Even the tiniest bit of evidence, no matter how precarious, could give mankind the incredible and breath-taking hope that human warfare is only a "recent" epidemic, and that in accordance with Chisholm's appeal, we can stop the mental disease which has gripped modern man. No matter how much disputable the evidence may seem, the very fact that some evidence is brought forward, should be encouragement enough to go forward and intensify the search and research. We spend billions on defence projects, by which we mean greater guns, faster bombers, and bigger bombs. Here is a worthwhile project for defence research - humane humans.

I myself am an industrial research chemist, and I feel a personal responsibility for the disastrous activities of my own profession in the field of destruction. Indeed, Chisholm paints a horrible picture of what biologists and chemists might do soon to mankind. We must work in the opposite direction. I went through tragic experiences in World War Two. I have seen how those notions of which Chisholm spoke have brought untold misery and death to untold millions of people. Now, we are engaged in a "War of Words", which may indeed be the forerunner of the next world war. But this "War of Words" goes on in every family, community and nation. People are not taught in the schools how to recognize abstract, vague, ambiguous, and fallacious meanings. We have not been told about the fallacies which

are inherent in the meanings "good and bad", "right and wrong." Maybe something is not in order with our language, the way we learn and operate it.

I was always impressed by the "language" of mathematics, and even more by the symbolism of modern chemistry. Indeed, H_2O tells us something about the real properties of that liquid, more than the alphabetical symbols w-a-t-e-r, e-a-u, a-q-u-a, v-o-d-a, etc. Girls and boys have learned to operate this Logic and Semantics of Chemical Symbolism. Is there perhaps a possibility of evolving a new kind of symbolism, truer to nature, which could cover the whole range of language, the whole range of human thought, including the meanings of "good" and "bad" ?

300 years ago, these thoughts occupied the great mathematician Leibnitz. He speculated about the possibility of inventing a Symbolis Universalis, which, in his own words (4) "would guide the mind as do the lines drawn in geometry, and the formulas in arithmetic", and which "would be useful in giving thoughts less absurd and verbal than we now have."

However, this idea was considered a mere philosopher's speculation, impossible to realize. Now eminent scholars have agreed that my work forms the first realization of this idea of Leibnitz. (see below)

Throughout the 10 years of work on this new symbolism, the most difficult problem was the symbolization of the meanings of "good and bad", "right and wrong". When I read Chisholm's lectures, I found my own thoughts and symbols vindicated. Then I began a search into the earliest records of man.

The Earliest Records of Man

Studying the earliest writings of the Chinese, Babylonians, Egyptians, etc. I found that they extended not further back than about 5000 B.C. A simple explanation offers itself: writing was invented around this time. However, this "explanation" is not enough. Firstly, it seems fairly certain that the first attempts at writing were pictorial. At a later date, the picture was used to stand for an alphabetical letter. We have for instance the letter Beth in the Hebrew alphabet, which corresponds to our B, but means "a house" too, as in "Beth-lehem", "House of Bread". The letter itself looks like the outline of a house, a compartment, a room.

The beautifully executed pictorial writing of the Egyptian hieroglyphics seems to us to be the finest example of ancient pictorial writings. But here we are misled. The oldest hieroglyphics yet found (and timed by Flinders Petrie (5) to have been written in 4777 B.C.) are not a pictographic writing at all. They are a fully fledged alphabetic writing. The picture of a lion stands for the letter L only (Labo), and similarly for the other pictures. They are alphabetic sound symbols only. In short, pictographic and even phonetic writing must have been invented before 5000 B.C. Yet, we cannot find any trace of it.

Mason (5) said about Egyptian hieroglyphics: "That we cannot find any transitional stage of pictography or ideography antecedent to the alphabetical stage is no valid argument against the development of the latter out of the former; but rather an evidence of the immense age of Egyptian civilization through the furthest stretches of which much doubtless has been lost."

It is strange that recorded human history does not go further back than 5000 B.C. Even without writings, the memory of great happenings and of great men is very persistent in the minds of later generations. We should find something about the history before 5000 B.C. recorded by later historians. But all we find are curious legends, symbolic allegories and tales of catastrophic happenings.

There seems to be a "gap" in "prehistoric history", which needs some explanation. I couldn't help speculating about possible natural causes, besides the one presented in this article (6). In any case, very little is found in the stretch before 5000 B.C. which we call the

neolithic age. Then at an earlier date records of a high standard appear: the great cave paintings of paleolithic man, as exemplified in the beautiful cave paintings of Altamira, Lascaux, and elsewhere. Archeologists have estimated that these pictorial records were made between 30,000 and 50,000 B.C. They represent such high art, and are so beautifully executed that their first discoverer Marquis de Sautuola, an amateur archeologist, was accused of having faked them.

These cave paintings are not written records. Yet, they offer us an insight into the state of mind of the artist and his contemporaries. We are now able to make some comparisons between the state of mind of paleolithic man and that of modern man.

Paleolithic Man and Modern Man

The notion "modern man" is a wide one and comprises not only the civilizations from 5000 B.C. onwards, but also human cultures of today, including those of modern headhunters. According to Chisholm, all these civilizations have "one lowest common denominator...one psychological force capable of producing ...perversions", the worst of which is: they all wage war against one another. They all kill their fellowmen. Indeed, the professional killers have been, and still are with many peoples, one of the most honoured and honourable professions, the caste of warriors. Their deeds are among the greatest. Their feats are told and re-told, commemorated in books and paintings, in bronze and stone, so that their victories may be known for thousands of years to come.

This indeed is what we find throughout the last 7000 years: monuments of kings and conquerors, of bloody battles and of glorious victories, of booty bountiful and of slain enemies by the hundreds of thousands. Monuments to wars and warriors. The market places are full of them, in ancient Babylon as well as in modern Rome.

The sensation of victory is overwhelming. Let us remember our victories as boys, when we hunted butterflies and lizards, fish and rabbits. We could not stop telling again and again our enrapturing tale, full of the sense of gloating over our victory. Those who never stop being a hunter, make sure that their victories are properly commemorated. They decorate the walls of their hunting lodge, club house or drawing room with the stuffed heads of their slain vanquished.

Others like to match their strength not with a dumb animal but with a specimen of their own species. Here the sense of victory is even greater. And the urge to celebrate and commemorate the victory is greater too. Scalps or skulls are proudly displayed on kraals, walls and palaces. The custom of showing the head of slain kings and rulers is not unknown even in very modern times.

Primitive man was a hunter. He had to be one. The animals meant to him life and food, clothing and medicine and a great many other things. Indeed, they meant survival. With his primitive weapons, the battle was grim. Great was the joy when the hunters returned unharmed and laden with food and furs. And great were the tales, when they recounted the moments of suspense, of danger and of final victory.

We are therefore not surprised to find in the caves of paleolithic man the same overall "picture" which we find in modern hunting lodges: Pictures of animals all over. The caves in France and Spain and in other lands show hundreds and hundreds of pictures of animals, standing, grazing, fleeing and succumbing, pursued by hunters, wounded and killed by arrows, spears and axes.

"The paleolithic artist's range of models, wrote MacCurdy (7), "was confined almost wholly to the fauna."

In studying the monuments of modern times from 5000 B.C. I found a great many hunting scenes. Pictures of animals fill the records of many civilizations. But then I became dimly aware that there was a difference. Something was missing in paleolithic records: man hunts. We see men in pursuit of animals, but we do not see men in pursuit of men.

Was Human Warfare absent in Prehistoric Times ?

This question cuts across many of our ingrained beliefs: that war is innate to human nature, that in nature there is biological warfare, that war was, is, and ever will be with us, etc.etc. Let us remind ourselves that, according to Chisholm, human warfare is due to a mental distortion, a perversion, a serious sickness of the mind. In other words, human warfare should be non-existent with human beings whose minds are not distorted. Could it be that 30,000 years ago, the mind of man was in its "natural" state?

With my limited time and means, I searched the relevant books at my disposal. Other men must have been struck by the difference mentioned above. Kluckhohn's findings (1) are heading this article. (see page 1)

Paterson (8) wrote: "The prehistoric age, which extends over tens of thousands of years down to about 5000 B.C., enjoys a fairly pacific reputation."

Scott (8) wrote: "It is doubtful if serious war was known in Europe until the Bronze Age was established." The Bronze Age coincides fairly well with 5000 B.C.

At this juncture we may acquaint ourselves with the classification of the periods of man's "prehistory", that is the time before 5000 B.C. We have classified the paleolithic period and the neolithic period. Some archeologists favour a middle period, the mesolithic period. As the names imply these are the stone ages, divided by the way the chipped flint implements were finished. In the old stone age, the chips were unpolished. Later on, in neolithic times, they were polished.

There are a number of other features which help the archeologists to determine to which stone age an excavated site belongs, and I am full of admiration for the methods which the archeologists have evolved for counting the centuries and millenia. Yet, it is not surprising that clear-cut classification is impossible. Even in our time the difference between civilizations of various tribes is tremendous. We can easily imagine some tribes having lived 30,000 years ago on sites inaccessible to each other, and having different tools, customs, beliefs and cultures.

Archeologists cannot therefore say when the paleolithic period ended, and the mesolithic period began. They differ in their estimates. Paleolithic man is supposed to have lived about 30,000 to 50,000 years ago, neolithic man about 30,000 to 15,000 years ago down to about 5000 B.C. Yet, even in our times there are human tribes who live in the stone age, as for example, the aborigines of Australia. It may therefore well be that an excavation site of cultural relics ascribed to be paleolithic, might well be of a later date, or vice versa.

I say this because until recently the archeologist Graham Clark furnished a strong argument for Chisholm's theory. He based his assertion upon examinations of the kitchen refuse heaps of prehistoric sites. These heaps contain bones, broken as is done by people to extract the marrow. Some sites contain animal bones only. On other sites, animal and human bones are found, mingled and broken. This is interpreted as an indication of cannibalism. Clark (9) sums it up thus: "No certain evidence is forthcoming for paleolithic and mesolithic times in Europe, but cannibalism seems to have been an established practice among some neolithic communities."

According to information received (1) Clark has now changed his mind. Apparently, sites with mingled and broken human and animal bones have been found or ascribed to the paleolithic period. Yet, we may well imagine two different tribes living far apart from each other, and being of a very different level of cultures, some being cannibals, some others not. Moreover, as Everingham (10) points out, there is a type of "non-malignant" cannibalism with a number of tribes who eat the dead bodies of their people, who died peacefully. This is discussed in the next section of this article.

The consideration of different tribes on different levels of civilizations, as mentioned above, should apply also to a certain rock painting, which is different from all the other paintings of the paleolithic age. As far as I could ascertain (11), it is the only one which shows men with

drawn bows and pointed arrows, and no animals. However, scholars maintain that it should not be interpreted as a scene of human warfare, rather than as a repetitive pattern of the same figure in different positions. One bowman is drawn upside down. The whole of this painting is the size of an ordinary sheet of paper (12 inch square). It may well be that the artist has, in this small space, done exactly as most of us have done in our scribbling - repeating the same picture again and again in different positions. In any case, a re-examination of the site as to the period would be advisable in view of the present enquiry, and it may well be that it will be placed in the mesolithic or neolithic period.

The fact remains that paleolithic records as a whole show animals and animal hunts only, but no man hunts. The difference from the records of modern man, devoted greatly to "man hunts" - wars, is too striking to be put down to accident. It cannot be explained away. It may well be, that here is a proof, as clear as we can well expect, for Chisholm's theory. Before we discard this inference, let us again consider that there is nothing more important in our present world than just this inference. There is still more evidence to back it up in what follows.

Human Warfare and Biological Warfare

In a foregoing paragraph I quoted Paterson (8) concerning the "pacific reputation" of the prehistoric age. As to the historic age, he goes on: "War has been one of the most constant and distinctive features of human history and it may even be thought to be a sinister peculiarity of the human species that hordes should pursue horden of the same kind with a persistent purpose of rapine and destruction." (*Italics mine*).

This thought struck me forcibly. Is there really a difference between warfare in the human world and warfare in the animal world? Indeed, there is. Only man wages war against his own kind. In the animal world, there is no warfare amongst the same species. Lions don't kill lions and tigers don't kill tigers.

Occasional scraps about a female are fought with no intention to kill and devour the vanquished rival. On the contrary. The highest sportsmanship is the rule. The male, who has lost by points, retreats and leaves the victor to enjoy his victory.

Animals will die of starvation nobly together in their own community. The idea that they could easily attack and kill one of their own simply does not enter their mind. Wolves will roam the wintry forest, howling mad of unbearable hunger. But no wolf will kill a fellow-brother-wolf. It is reported (10) that ravenous wolves will devour one of their number, but only if it has fallen to a hunter whom the pack is attacking. This display of high rational and conscientious thought against the feeling of maddening hunger is most remarkable. Everingham (10) points out, that this "post-mortem" or "non-malignant" cannibalism is practised by Australian aborigines who wish to gain the virtue of a dead hero by eating his unfortunately dead body. The same kind of cannibalism might have prevailed with prehistoric communities.

I conveyed all this to my revered teacher Professor Emil Abel of London and he referred me to Professor Ashley Montagu of Rutgers University. This anthropologist has described recently (12) a number of experiments and instances to prove that among the same species "the highest ethics is supreme law." Cannibalism among the same species is exceedingly rare and as Montagu proved by experiments, due to extreme causes, not "natural" to the animal's or fish' "way of life." I corresponded with Professor Montagu and found him in complete agreement. He has expressed similar thoughts and came to similar conclusions in his books (13).

In short: the people who maintained that human warfare is part of biological warfare, and therefore innate to human nature, (and "you can't change human nature") have made a grave mistake. They have identified the hunt for food (from other species or plants) in the animal world, with the hunt for rapine and destruction (of the same species) in the human world. We can go further and maintain that the hunt for destruction of the same kind in the human world is not carried out to satisfy hunger by cannibalism. Why then go men out to kill their fellowmen?

What striking differences are between the animal and man? There is above all, one: articulate language, the capacity of forming abstract notions and the words for them, the ability to convey vague, ambiguous and fallacious thoughts to others. Men are ready to kill their fellowmen, when they are told that it is the "right" thing to do, that the others are "bad", "wrong", and "wicked."

This was the case with all the religious wars. Today, a similar perverted "religious" fervour has gripped those communists who carry out extermination and liquidation of men accused of harbouring "evil" capitalist designs. Hitler convinced the majority of the Germans that they are superior to other "bad" races, and that Germany had been wronged. He set out to right the wrong, and millions of people perished in the process. Similarly, in every war fought for economic gains or for outright plunder, the pretext was maintained that certain rights agreed upon had been wronged and that the only "right" thing to do was to punish the wrongdoers.

Chisholm quotes the Bible

The Bible as an historic document has been a guide to many archeologists and historians. Even the naive story of Creation contains much of significance. We can at least infer how our ancestors thought about the phenomena of their world. There are two passages in the story of Creation, relevant to the evolution of language. The first relates to man's unique power to give names to the things around him, "to all cattle, and the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field."

The second passage obviously refers to the emergence of abstract thoughts and notions and the words for them, especially "good" and "evil." It was a major catastrophe. We lost the Paradise. Chisholm refers to this passage when contemplating the "basic psychological distortion" which has gripped the minds of men, which "prevents the rational use of intelligence...which encourages prejudice and inability to see, understand and sympathize with other people's point of view. Is there any force so potent and so pervasive that it can do all these things in all civilizations?", Chisholm asks. He gives the following answer (2)

"There is - just one. The only lowest common denominator of all civilizations and the only psychological force capable of producing these perversions is morality, the concept of right and wrong, the poison long ago described and warned against as "the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil."

"In the old Hebrew story, God warns the first man and woman to have nothing to do with good and evil. It is interesting to note that as long ago as that "good" is recognized as just as great a menace as "evil." They are the fruit of the one tree and are different aspects of the same thing."

"We have been very slow to rediscover this truth...For many generations we have bowed our necks to the yoke of the conviction of sin. We have swallowed all manner of poisonous certainties fed us by our parents, our Sunday and day school teachers, our politicians, our priests, our newspapers and others with a vested interest in controlling us."

These are very strong words, and we can readily understand that a storm of protest arose. Surely, morality cannot mean what Chisholm thinks it means. Indeed, the idea that God warned man to have nothing to do with the conception of "good" seems so contrary to all our learning that it is necessary to look up the relevant passage. There we find that God warned man: "Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

We have here an unmistakable warning not to judge between good and evil. Seen from this angle, the moralists of many civilizations have acted contrary to the warning of God. The real meaning of this passage has been misunderstood, although the Bible tells the disastrous result. Man was driven out of the Paradise. Human strife began. Man killed his fellow brother man.

Summary, and what Chisholm prescribes

The possibility that human warfare may be only a recent epidemic mental perversion, that human warfare is not innate to human nature, that science may have a basis to work on and to bring the epidemic to a stop, offers a tremendous and breath-taking hope for humanity.

The evidence is there, so simple that anyone could grasp it:

The pictures of paleolithic man show animal hunts, . not man hunts.

In nature, there is no warfare among the same animal species, except among the human species of "modern times," from 5000 B.C. onwards.

Let us not try to find round-about explanations for the above mentioned facts. Let us tentatively assume that Chisholm's theory may be correct. Those who felt offended by Chisholm's words, may now reconsider the situation in the light of the present investigation. The hypothesis is advanced that the disaster happened somewhere in neolithic times, say 10,000 years ago.

Now that there appears to be some evidence for Chisholm's theory, let us examine what he proposes to do. "Psychiatry", he said, "has remained almost exclusively in the treatment field, and it is clear that its present resources are grossly inadequate for any attack of the problem of prevention." He thinks that one or two or three million psychiatrists are necessary not only to treat neuroses, etc. but also to prevent mental disorders in children and adults, behaviour disorders, etc. The ultimate aim is the bringing up of mature citizens.

But what does Chisholm propose to do with the concept of right and wrong, the cause of all the trouble? Apparently, he wants to do away with it, and this suggestion may have caused the uproar. He said: "The pretense is made, as it has been made in relation to the finding of any extension of truth, that to do away with right and wrong would produce uncivilized people, immorality, lawlessness and social chaos. The fact is that most psychiatrists and psychologists and many other respectable people have escaped from these moral chains and are able to observe and think freely."

The evidence is there, so simple that anyone could grasp it:

But can we ever do away with the concept of right and wrong, good and bad? Many times each day we face decisions which have to be made in every household, in every business, in every life. These decisions rest mainly on the question: Is it right or wrong, good or bad to do this or that?

among the human species of "modern times," from 5000 B.C. onwards.

It may seem perhaps, that Chisholm has in mind only the morality conception as far as religious taboos of many denominations are concerned. But this is not the case. He refers for instance at great length to a question which has beset bewildered parents of the last 50 years: Is it right or wrong, good or bad, to let children go out alone after dark? We might add: Is it right or wrong, good or bad, to vaccinate children? According to Chisholm, it is right and good. But these notions are one of the aspects of that "poison", and "good is just as great a menace as evil," he has said. Man has, through his mental powers, evolved the dangerous concept of fire, of electricity, of chemistry, of high speed, of flying, and many other concepts, including the dangerous concept of right and wrong. He cannot get rid of all these concepts, but he has learned to master their dangers -- by applying mathematical and scientific principles. Girls and boys in the schools of the world have learned to operate the symbols of mathematics, of chemistry, of physics, mechanics, etc. etc. and have learned to recognize dangerous situations arising of these concepts, and how to avoid and overcome them. In a similar way, we must apply mathematical and scientific principles and symbols to the concept of right and wrong. What we need is a simple "Algebra of Thought" in which notions like good and bad, right and wrong are treated according to mathematical and scientific principles. As said before, Leibnitz (4) prophesied that such a Symbolis Universalis "would guide the mind as do the lines drawn in geometry, and the formulas in arithmetic," and "would be useful in giving thoughts less absurd and verbal than we now have."

These decisions rest mainly on the question: Is it right or wrong, good or bad to do this or that?

among the human species of "modern times," from 5000 B.C. onwards.

It may seem perhaps, that Chisholm has in mind only the morality con-

Leibnitz was convinced that this idea will one day be realized. He wrote (4): "I think these thoughts will some day be carried out, so agreeable and natural appears to me this writing... for rendering our conceptions more real." Professor Oliver L. Reiser (Pittsburgh) told the Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (Philadelphia 1951): "Bliss realized the ambition of the great mathematician Leibnitz." (14). I have named this Leibnitzian Symbolis Universalis "Semantography", because it is, like the writing of mathematics and chemistry, a more "meaningful writing" than any writing in any language. (15)

Moreover, as Leibnitz predicted it, the symbols of Semantography are partly pictorial, and independent of any language. A statement in Semantography can therefore be read just like $1 + 2 = 3$ in any language. This offers great applications in science, as for instance in an international universal science abstract. In my lectures at the University of Sydney and the University of Technology of New South Wales, I have been able to show that any given scientific meaning can easily be symbolized. Other applications are found in industry, commerce, communication, education, etc., etc. Bertrand Russell wrote that assistance given to make Semantography known, means "performing an important service to mankind." Other scholars have used similar terms. (16) Semantography may provide a tool for Chisholm's proposed treatment with the aim of bringing up mature citizens. It can even be taught to children. Reports from Great Britain (17) state that children and youngsters are "fascinated" and even "thrilled" by Semantography. But it is a new idea. Professor Carleton Washburne (New York), who too favours Semantography, said "We take easily to technical innovations, but we resist any change, we even pride ourselves with the antiquity of our educational innovations." (18). In 1949, he wrote that Semantography should be subjected to controlled experimentation (16), but nothing was done. If this article is favourably received, and if interest in Semantography is mounting, I should be glad of the opportunity to follow it up with another article "A Tool for Chisholm's Theory" giving detailed explanations on Semantography, the new simple Logic and Semantics. I convey my thanks to all who have made this article possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Clyde Kluckhohn, MIRROR FOR MAN (Harrap, London) and personal communication.
- (2) THE PSYCHIATRY OF ENDURING PEACE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS, a reprint from PSYCHIATRY (Washington), Volume 9, No. 1, February 1946
- (3) M.M. Lewis, LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY (Thomas Nelson & Sons, London)
- (4) Gottfried W. Leibnitz, NEW ESSAYS CONCERNING HUMAN UNDERSTANDING (Macmillan, New York 1896)
- (5) W.A. Mason, HISTORY OF THE ART OF WRITING, (Macmillan)
- (6) Charles K. Bliss, THE GAP IN "PREHISTORIC HISTORY". Semantography Series No. 25 published by the Institute of Semantography, 55 Maroubra Bay Road, Pagewood, Sydney, N.S.W. Australia
- (7) George Grant MacCurdy, HUMAN ORIGINS, (Appleton & Co.)
- (8) W. P. Paterson, WAR, in: Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, (T. & T. Clark)
- (9) Grahame Clark, ARCHEOLOGY AND SOCIETY (Methuen & Co.)
- (10) Douglas N. Everingham, Personal communication 1952, (Penguin Books)
- (11) A picture of this rock drawing appears in PRIMITIVE ART by Leonhard Adams. It is discussed, as not representing warfare, in another book, which the author was unable to trace in the Library, where it has been before.
- (12) Ashley Montagu, SOCIAL INSPIRITS, In Scientific American, April 1950
- (13) M.F. Ashley Montagu MAN'S MOST DANGEROUS MYTH: THE FALLACY OF RACE (Columbia University Press 1945) and ON BEING HUMAN.
- (14) Oliver L. Reiser, UNIFIED SYMBOLISM FOR WORLD UNDERSTANDING IN SCIENCE. Paper read at the AAAS Annual Meeting 1951, publication in preparation.
- (15) Charles K. Bliss SEMANTOGRAPHY, 3 Volumes, and SEMANTOGRAPHY SERIES published by The Institute for Semantography, Address see above (6)
- (16) WHAT SCIENTISTS THINK OF SEMANTOGRAPHY, Semantography Series No. 6, see (6).
- (17) Dr. Peggy Volkov, Editor THE NEW ERA, London, personal communication.
- (18) Carleton Washburne, Broadcast, Australian National Network (1949)