



Sydney 22nd June 1952

Bertrand Russell, O.M.
41 Queens Road
Richmond, Surrey,
Great Britain

Sir,

Please accept my sincere thanks for sending my letter to you, to Sir Stanley Unwin, who wrote to me. I enclose copy of my answer, and I also enclose two documents, of which I believe that you will find them most interesting.

As you know, the Christian Science Monitor is a world paper, of world repute. On the editorial page of May 17, 1952, an article appeared BLISS AND SEMANTOGRAPHY by Albert Norman, Chief of Bureau for Australia and New Zealand. You will find in it your name honourably mentioned, (attached)

Even before the article appeared, one of America's prominent lecture managers Mr. A. H. Handley of Boston has become so much fascinated with my work, that he decided to bring it to the attention of the people of America. Realizing, that my name is totally unknown, and won't draw any crowd, he was determined to bring my work to the knowledge of the men of the Universities and Colleges of the Eastern States of America "without personal profit." This is quite a different picture from that we are told to make when thinking of American businessmen.

He has now approached the President of Boston University with the suggestion that Boston University shall be "the first sponsor to bring it to the attention of the people of America." I am afraid however, that once the pictorial symbolic logic of Semantography (not to say of its semantics) will be applied to the utterances of a number of Americans, statesmen and otherwise, it will cause nothing short of a shock - but I am not afraid. I maintain that Semantography may prove the Doom of the Dictators and Demagogues, domestic and otherwise, right, left or in the "golden middle", including the littles ones, the dominant fathers and the cheeky sons, who know all the answers. (I am not mentioning the women, because my wife reads all my letters, so I am not saying anything.) The trouble is, that my wife has picked up enough of Semantography to counter many a statement, which I foolishly make (most strangely, it does not work the other way). Which poet shall I cite? "Das ewig Weibliche zieht uns hinan" or "Da werden Weiber zu Hyaenen." I think that ancient rib business was a mistake. The rib has reduced the rest of the skeleton to a mere breadwinning robot.

As you see, Sir, I am prone to fall prey to what Karl Kraus called "Die Schwarze Magie", the black magic of the printers ink. A few hopeful signs from the men who command the printers ink, be it Sir Stanley or the Editor of the Monitor, and I am up in the clouds again. One refusal, and down I go into the hell of bitterness and frustration.

Now, I want to return in a little way the efforts which Mr. Handley makes on behalf of my work. I have therefore drawn up the text of a leaflet (attached) to aid him in his task. This draft contains a few paragraphs with most exciting news, and I feel sure that, once you have taken the time to read the paragraphs marked in red (page 2 and 3) you will agree with me that they contain more practical and more breathtaking hope than the exertions and promises of evangelists.

Actually, in more elaborate statements about my discovery I have started with your saying that it must have taken primitive man untold generations until he realized that two boars and two girls (or two anything) have something in common, namely the abstract meanings of two (2). So, my theory begins actually with Bertrand Russell and then follows Brock Chisholm who said that it must have taken primitive man countless generations, until he invented the abstract meanings of "good" and "bad", which he first abstracted from boars and girls and anything, and then attached them to anything else. In this leaflet, there was no space to be more elaborate, as I was in my books and pamphlets.

But what I have found is not a theory, which is expressed in words only. I have found the proof, for everyone to see, who examines the cave paintings of paleolithic man. It was there for everyone to see, and archeologists and anthropologists have seen it and a few have interpreted it similarly, yet... As you see, the Monitor article mentions my discovery, but does not tell the full story. I have therefore said a few more words in the attached leaflet, but I have not mentioned the elaborate further proofs which I have found in books on archeology. These when pieced together, will soon make a tremendous stir in the whole world, because it gives mankind the exciting and practical hope that mankind's greatest scourge is a recent epidemic only, which can be stopped.

In using such exaggerating words about my anthropological "re-discovery" I know what is in store for me. The professional anthropologists will discard my find as "amateurish" (no "good") disregarding the fact that this word stems from the Latin Amator, lover, and disregarding the fact, that all the sciences have been founded by Lovers of Wisdom, and disregarding the fact that the most exciting anthropological and archeological discoveries have been made by Amateurs. Indeed one of the heroes of my boyhood was Heinrich Schliemann, and all my life I wanted to emulate him. Now I believe I have found something many times more valuable than all the treasures of Troy and Mycenae. And Prof. Ashley Montagu is on my side.

I sincerely hope Sir, that this part of my work will find the same benevolence which you have kindly accorded to my other work. And this brings me to the few lines in the attached leaflet, in which I say that you have given me some of the most controversial political and even religious statements to symbolize in Semantography. Now, the first purpose of this letter is to bring my further work to your knowledge. The second purpose is my approach to Sir Stanley Unwin, to whom I am going to send a copy of this letter. I beg therefore to be allowed to recall our meeting in Sydney, which has given my life a new meaning.

You will remember that I had the courage ("good") or the impertinence ("bad" whatever word is used, according to Chisholm's theory) to ask you to give me any word, any statement, anything you can think of, to be symbolized in Semantography, in order to prove that the Logic and Semantics of Semantography is the simple "Algebra of Thought", which Leibnitz had in mind, when speculating of a Symbolis Universalis, "which will give thoughts less absurd and verbal than we now have." (and "now" means the 17th century). Now (20th century) we are deeper than ever in semantic confusion. (See the prophetic words of Sir Richard Paget about the Babel of today, the prophecy of Leibnitz, and about Semantography, its first fulfillment, Semantography Series No. 53)

You made it very hard for me - or so you thought. You gave me the most controversial religious meaning of all times, the meaning of God. Fortunately, this was the easiest for me, because I had done nothing else than copy an age-old symbol used by philosophers of many and of no religion, and found in ancient and modern temples, churches and synagogues. It is a combination of two symbols, pictorial symbols of realities which in themselves are symbols of that something, which people call God, Creator, the eternal Spirit, the purposive Force, Evolution, and a lot of other blasphemous names.

The first symbol element is the most simple, most harmonious spatial structure, the equal-sided triangle, which Greek philosophers considered ample proof of the purposeful harmony in our Universe. The second symbol element inside the triangle, is the pictorial symbol of an eye, the most miraculous, most purposeful structure of our Universe, as it enables us to reach the furthest stars, weigh them and take their temperature.

You, and later on, students of the University of Sydney, agreed that this symbol for God could be acceptable to believers of various religions and factions and even acceptable to unbelievers - who are believers who fervently believe that they believe nothing.

Then you asked me the symbol for philosopher. I showed you the triangle (the symbol for the spatial Universe) contemplated from above by that fearful and mysterious and miraculous organ in which contemplation takes place, the human mind symbolized pictorially by the outline of the upper skull which houses the brain. The Imperial Typewriter Co. Ltd. of Leicester, England, has executed my order and has incorporated this symbol in my typewriter. Here it is:  This is the main symbol element in many of my symbols standing for emotion, reason, conscience, judgement, etc.etc. But I maintain that this is my symbol for the creative and purposive force in the Universe, the force which we observe in the circling of the electrons and stars, in the movements of communities of cells and humans: the creation of higher order out of lower order. In my Logic, it is the symbol for that great Variable (the mind) in propositional functions (with humble apologies to you).

Then you gave me the most controversial political meaning of today, the meaning of nation. Fortunately again, the chapter in my Book II, p. 342 is headed by a quotation from you, showing the fallacy of this meaning. Again it was easy for me to show you my symbol, a multitude of humans under the symbol of a flag, demonstrating forcefully that we are citizens of one Earth, and demonstrating equally forceful the idiocy, according to which Great Britain has one vote in the U.N.O. whereas Nicaragua, Panama, Bolivia, Venezuela have 4, simply because they have 4 different flags, symbolizing 4 "independent" territories (another fallacious meaning).

You asked me some more questions and then you studied later on, my 3 mimeographed books on Semantography. Then I received a letter, which transported me literally ^{to} transports of Bliss. You wrote: "Any man or men, who will spend the money necessary to get your work printed, will, in my opinion, be performing an important service to mankind." Will Sir Stanley perform this important service? I am sure he will - if he does not hand over my writings to an employee who has not the "vision" to recognize an entirely new work. Such employees are my handicap. Employees of publishers rejected my proposal for a book. An employee of Imperial Typewriter Ltd. rejected my proposal for an experimental adjustment of an ordinary typewriter model. But a day will come when people will correspond in Semantography across all languages, and this letter to you will be translated in Semantography so that people of all languages will learn of my gratitude towards you.

Yours Sincerely

C.K.Bliss, B.Sc.