

THE INSTITUTE FOR SEMANTOGRAPHY

A Non-Profit Institution for the Promotion of Semantics and Semantography

5 Maroubra Bay Road, Pagewood, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia

FOUNDER and DIRECTOR: C. K. BLISS, B. Sc.



SEMANTOGRAPHY SERIES NO. 119

THE NUFFIELD FOUNDATION AND SEMANTOGRAPHY

A Science Abstract. Applications for Medicine. The Role of Foundations

Year after year during my work on the 3 volumes of Semantography I relied on one great hope: help from the great scientific foundations, like Carnegie, Rockefeller, Nuffield and the many others. After all, their paramount purpose is to help new ideas and their originators. I was perfectly sure that this idea of a new Symbolism for Mankind, the advantages of which are self-evident, will find immediate attention by the men who administer the foundations. In 1949 I had finished the last volume and just then I found this notice in the Sydney Herald of 20th October 1949.

Foundation Wants to Help Leading Scientists

Mr. L. Farrer-Brown, secretary of the Nuffield Foundation arrived in Sydney yesterday to look for "unique men or institutions in advance of their time" whom the Foundation may help.

The men may be in any branch of science or medicine - the only qualifications being that they must be leaders in their particular work.

If Mr. Farrer-Brown selects any men they will receive a grant from the Foundation and will be given the chance to develop their ideas.

(Lord Nuffield, British industrialist, started the Foundation in 1943 with a capital of £10 million.

Since then it has given away more than £2 million, including several grants of more than £100,000.

The Foundation's aim is the promotion of the health and well-being of mankind.)

Well, I thought, I am not a "unique man", but surely my work may be so called and most surely it is "in advance of its time". And, therefore, my heart full of hope, I wrote immediately the following letter.

20th October 1949

L. Farrer-Brown, Esq.
Secretary of the
Nuffield Foundation
SYDNEY.

Dear Sir,

This morning's papers reported that you arrived in Sydney to look for "unique men or institutions in advance of their time."

This description fits, if not me, but the nature of my work, and the result achieved. After seven years of research, I have finished it in August 1949 and within 4 weeks I gathered the most favourable comments:

- (1) Professor Lancelot Hogben, University of Birmingham, Author of "Mathematics for the Million", "Science for the Citizen" etc. etc. writes that my work is "stimulating, fascinating, ingenious."

- (2) Professor Carleton Washburne, Brooklyn College, UNESCO Specialist, etc. writes that my idea is "ingenious".
- (3) Dr. Henry L. Brose, formerly Professor of Physics, University of Nottingham, President of the Australian Society of Inventors (Patron Prof. Oliphant) has commented most favourably on my work.
- (4) The High Commissioner for India in Australia, has forwarded a report to the Government of India.
- (5) Mr. Stuart Chase, famous American social reformer has put me in touch with the State Department Washington, Foreign Service Institute.
- (6) Two great American Companies have shown interest. One writes, that if necessary, they will invite me to the States.

The nature of my work cannot be told in a few words, but I feel sure that it will excite you, as something new and really in advance of our time. I ask you therefore to reserve half an hour for an informative talk, only in the forenoon, because I work in a factory from 3 - 11 p.m. in order to make a living and in order to have the fresh morning hours for my work and for visiting people and the university.

Kindly leave the date at the office, I shall call to-morrow morning.

Yours sincerely,

C. K. Bliss

Of course, nothing was left at the office of the Australia Hotel for me, but I was able to find out that Mr. Farrer-Brown left for Melbourne and I got his address. Four days later, I sent off the following letter. Uptill the time I wrote the letter, I had no idea in what field the foundation specialises and, therefore, I decided to start from the angle of motoring and symbols for motor roads, realising that Nuffield is the great British motor car builder and therefore anything in this line may be interesting.

24th October 1949

L. Farrer-Brown, Esq.,
Secretary of the
Nuffield Foundation
c/o Maurice Brown, Esq.,
University of Melbourne.

Dear Mr. Farrer-Brown,

The enclosed first letter (which I beg you to read first) was delivered at the Australia Hotel the day the newspaper notice appeared. When I called the next day, it turned out that you have left even before the delivery of the letter. I collected it, found out your address from Nuffield (Australia) Pty. Ltd. and write to you right now.

Now I will have to do some explaining, which I hoped to do verbally. Judging from other experiences, the following paragraphs may well jeopardize my approach to you. My work is so "in advance of our time" (to use your own words), that only a personal explanation with counter-arguments answered on the spot can do justice to it. I beg you therefore to withhold judgment and not to be annoyed by the following paragraphs which try to cope with the delicate situation.

Let us suppose the year to be 1749, and I write a letter to a man telling him that I have invented a car, which is not pulled by a horse but by a liquid, called gasoline. This would be well "in advance of the time", and consequently the letter would advance into the wastepaper basket. But if I could show him the car, and start it, let it sputter and let it run, he would be convinced. Still, he would have a thousand counter-arguments against this new-fangled contraption. Such

arguments can only be answered on the spot and verbally, not by letters.

I would make my approach in such a situation by strictly avoiding the two words "horseless carriage". Instead I would advance scientific theories well known at the time, as for instance, compressibility of gas, inflammable vapours, explosive mixtures, etc. etc. and then advance the hypothesis that all this may well be used for the transformation of chemical energy into kinetic energy, etc. etc. Thus I would wet the interest of the man, until he agrees to give me a hearing with sufficient time, to explain in detail my work, and to answer all criticism.

I have approached a few learned men with disastrous results. They heard the two words like "horseless carriage" and refused to give me a hearing even of 5 minutes only. For then my work was "Nonsense". This happened during the 7 years of my research work, and it made me sometimes despaired. I really believed that I shall go down the grave as a crank, similarly to the other pioneers, who have suffered the same fate.

So I plodded on for seven years, until I worked everything out and found that my idea worked. I ended my work just 6 weeks ago, and within 4 weeks I gathered the most favourable comments mentioned in my first letter. Still, my idea is too much advanced of our time, and I found it out a few days ago.

I approached a very learned man in a very high position. I showed him the written statements of Professor Carleton Washburne and Professor Lancelot Hogben, both declaring (and independently of each other) that my work is "ingenious". Impressed by these opinions of world authorities he had to give me a hearing, but after I explained it to him, I met with a flat "No comprende". He could not say it's "Nonsense", but it was for him such a new-fangled contraption, that he did not want to think about all the new aspects of human progress, which it opens up.

Such experiences make me very reluctant and shy, although they are offset by the overwhelming acceptance which I found in other quarters. But still, I hate to write about it in letters. Now, your coming to Australia is for me the coming of fate in person. But as your decision may well be fateful for my work (and the word "fatal" is derived from the one word "fate"), I feel that I have to advance with utmost caution in a letter like this. The alternative would be disaster.

So, let me tell you that my work has to do with Communication. Not Communication in the narrow sense, but in the widest sense, namely the Communication of Thoughts and Ideas. And as I have worked it out for practically every human activity, let me explain it for that human activity, with which the name of Lord Nuffield is indissolubly connected: the world of the motorist.

If a motorist in Australia travels at high speed along a road, what happens when he sees a sign: CURVE. Within less than, say 1/1000 of a second, he has to disentangle the jumble of geometrical lines, has to realize that the line C shall indicate a sound, but not "cee", but "k" and when he got it that all letters together means CURVE he has to translate it, that this sound means "a bend in the road". As soon as this communication has advanced in his brain, he has to communicate it to the eyes to look out whether the bend is to the right and the left. Furthermore his brain communicates to his hands and feet to do some watching and to be on the alert, etc. etc.

If this communication of thought and idea is slowed down so much as by 1/100 of a second (and if he drives under the influence of liquor - it is disastrously slowed down) it may mean Death and Disaster.

Now let us assume a Dutchman, driving on an Australian highway. He knows very little of English. If he sees the sign CURVE, it does not suggest to him a "bend in the road". He has first to translate it

in his brain into KROMME. Only this word suggests to him a "bend in the road". In other words, his communication of the idea "Bend in the road" has been slowed down. And in fact, foreigners in the traffic court have given this translation difficulty as their excuse.

But if a foreign driver is completely ignorant of the meaning of CURVE, then communication is completely blocked.

This situation which affects the lives of millions of peoples in all parts of the world, has lead to the adoption of ideograms by the former League of Nations, in the 1930ties. Consequently in most European countries, including Great Britain, a CURVE is written thus

But what an ambiguous sign this is. In fact, it hampers still communication of the idea. It suggests a "double bend in the road" (where there might not be a "double bend") and it furthermore suggests that the first turn goes to the right (where in fact, the volant might have to be turned to the left). Still the ideogram is better than the phonetic word, because it's meaning is the same in different languages.

Alterations have been proposed in Great Britain. As far as my studies go, the most advanced system has been established in Texas. But it has still many faults, and there is no possible signs to suggest clearly SLIPPERY ROAD or FRESHLY OILED, for instance. This, however, is easy with my system.

A few months ago, I saw in an American newspaper new signs to be proposed at the Conference on Road and Motor Transport of the United Nations scheduled for August 1949 in Geneva. I immediately sent them the chapter, dealing with motoring activities, of my manuscript. I got the answer, that I have to contact the Australian delegates, as this is an intergovernmental conference. I wrote to the Australian Federal Department for Transport, they immediately got the idea, and put me in touch with the delegates. But it was too late to take my work into consideration. May be next time.

Now, I have worked this idea of communication of thoughts and ideas for every human activity, and consequently my usual approach is to show in an one hour lecture the application for every practical communication not only in Traffic, but also in Commerce, Industry, Technology, Science, and I have worked it out for instance for agricultural adult education of illiterate peasants, and this has so much impressed the Official Secretary Mr. H. Dhanija, that the High Commissioner for India has forwarded a proposal to the Government of India.

There is practically no human activity in which my work cannot be applied, and I have proved this convincingly, and I am ready to answer the severest criticism, and the most rigorous tests. Most persons who have given me the time to demonstrate my work, have become ardent friends and supporters.

In a second lecture, which following discussion, I show how my system can be applied to the communication of every thought and idea, read in the paper or heard from the platform. What precisely is communicated to the minds of citizen when they see or hear the word "progressive" or "democratic", and why can demagogues confuse minds by hitching the word "new" to the word "democratic". Why do certain simple citizen believe that the "New Democracies" are "People's Democracies" of "freedom loving" peoples, whereas the "Old Democracies" are only "Warmongers". How is it possible that propagandists of theories, which have abolished the traditional freedoms of the West for almost half of the peoples of this planet, how can they effectively block communication of reasoned thought in the citizen's mind, by simply shouting one word: "Imperialist!"

The third world war can perhaps be averted, when this confusion of communication of thoughts and ideas can be effectively cleared up.

I am ready to prove, that my system is so simple, that it can be already taught in the kindergarten and gradually up to the university. If simplicity is a mark of ingenuity, then Prof. Washburne and Prof. Hogben are in so far right in declaring my work "ingenious", because it is simple in the extreme. But it is in advance of our time. The new approach is so unusual that it takes a little time to leave the accustomed grooves of traditional reading,

writing and thought, and to realize that, with my work, man has entered into a new evolutionary stage of the communication of thoughts and ideas. However, I can point out, that 300 years ago two great mathematicians and philosophers Descartes and Leibniz have prophesised that this will come one day about. I feel that I am only the tool of the evolutionary mind force in the Universe, and now my work ended, the cells of my mind crave for the evolutionary fulfillment of every bit of mind-matter: to attract, to pass on and to pass out.

What I want from you is to be given the opportunity, that I may present my work to young men and women in the world, so that they may take over, reform it, transform it, improve it, discard it, for a better system of their own - never mind, but GET ON WITH THE JOB, before it is too late. I am a retired research chemist. I want to retire at last.

Julian Huxley has distinguished 5 stages of man's evolution with regard to the communication of thoughts and ideas:

- (1) the invention of articulate speech
- (2) the invention of writing
- (3) the invention of printing
- (4) the invention of machine printing (single letters, linotype rotary press, etc.)
- (5) the invention of photography, telegraphy, phonograph, cinematography, radio, television, etc.

But we must realize that the inventions under (3), (4) and (5) are only multiplication machines of the inventions (1) speech and (2) writing.

If you give me your time and attention, I shall prove to you, that my invention comes right up after invention (2). In fact, it is a new evolutionary stage, the confusion of minds may come to an end, and with it, it may herald a new era; THE DOOM OF THE DEMAGOGUES.

In the course of my work, I have made a discovery of utmost importance, and this necessitates a third lecture, and following discussion. I am convinced that I can prove, that it may well cause a world sensation, if scientifically presented, and - I have furnished all scientific fundamentals.

A Practical Proposal

From your address, University of Melbourne, I guess, that you may have established headquarters in Melbourne for the investigation of Australian activities, which are "in advance of their time".

Now, the employee of Nuffield (Australia) Pty. Ltd. told me that you are coming back to Sydney in November. However, as the Government of India will hold a conference on Rural Adult Education in November, the improbable may happen, that I may get an invitation (in spite of the fact, that I have approached them so late, and government machinery is slow in this respect).

If I receive that invitation, and it would mean that I would miss you in Sydney, I would consider this a disaster. Therefore I make you the proposal to have me come over to Melbourne for 3 days.

And here is my proposal. If I cannot prove to you all the assertions I have made in this letter, then I shall pay my own fare and expenses. This proof I leave entirely to your discretion and I shall abide by your decision.

For seven years I have worked on this idea, and I have spent the greater part of my savings. Now I have started a world-wide correspondence, and my airmail budget is so great, that I have taken on a factory job to cope with my increased expenses. Therefore the above proposal.

Kindly excuse this long letter. What I pray for is nothing else than that you shall agree to put my idea to the severest test and most rigorous criticism. I feel sure, that then, and only then, you will become convinced that here is a work (to use your words from the newspaper report) "in advance of our time" and that it falls within the aims of the Lord Nuffield Foundation: the "promotion of the health and well-being of mankind".

Awaiting your answer and possible invitation, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

C.K. Bliss, B.Sc.

A few days later, I received a letter from the Government of India. Though it was non-committal, I felt that this is an angle which I should not miss to convey to Mr. Farrer Brown. I wrote then the following letter -

2nd November, 1949

L. Farrer-Brown, Esq.,
Secretary of the
Nuffield Foundation
c/o Maurice Brown, Esq.,
University of Melbourne.

Dear Mr. Farrer-Brown,

I hope you are in receipt of my double letter of October 20, and 24th and that you have given the content your attention. I trust that you are a man of broad vision and that you will have understanding for the difficulties of my approach and that you will not dismiss all this without hearing the evidence.

I write to you again to-day, because I have just received a letter from the Government of India. On page 3 of my foregoing letter, I have informed you that the High Commissioner of India in Australia has forwarded my proposal for rural adult education to the Government, after the official secretary Mr. J. N. Dhamija has been much impressed by my demonstration.

The Government of India has convened a Seminary on Rural Adult Education and has invited through UNESCO, representatives of 48 different countries, in which illiteracy is rampant. I have asked to be allowed to demonstrate my work before the delegates. However, I realised that the Government of India may be unable to allocate the money for my journey in such a short time, and therefore I made a practical suggestion.

Mr. Seth Ramkrishna Dalmia of New Delhi is India's greatest businessman and a famed philanthrop. If the Government of India agrees to my participation at the Seminary, Mr. Dalmia should defray the cost of my journey, which is about £500 sterling.

Now the Government has answered, and it appears that they do not object to my participation, and that they approve of my proposal. The passage runs:

"You may, therefore, contact Mr. Seth Ramkrishna Dalmia directly for necessary assistance in presenting your work before the UNESCO Seminary, which is going to be held at Mysore."

But so far, there is no answer from Mr. Dalmia. Mr. Bakshi, the Trade Commissioner for India told me to-day, that Mr. Dalmia may be abroad, as he goes frequently on travel.

Now here is a dramatic situation. A new nation is born within the British Commonwealth of Nations. Hundreds of millions of its people are illiterate. The farmers work their soil with outdated methods. The country lives on a starvation level. The Government realises that its most burning problem is rural adult education for agricultural advice and improvement. But the country and its people is divided by hundreds of different languages and dialects,

Now the Government has convened a Seminary on Rural Adult Education, which is held from November 2 (to-day) to December 14. There are delegates from 48 States present. They will grapple with the almost insurmountable problems involved.

And here am I, ready to present my seven years work, ready to show that a series of simple pictographic and ideographic signs can bridge all languages, in the same way as it is already done on the motor roads of the world. But I cannot go, because Mr. Dalmia is not in India.

Such an opportunity as the Seminary in the midst of an illiterate country does not come every day. My presentation there, may cause a great stir and may catalyze developments of far-reaching importance. On the other hand, if I cannot go, years may pass without a change.

Now, here is my proposal I have asked you to let me come to Melbourne to present my work to you. I asked for a visit of 3 days, because I know that a thorough examination requires this time. However, it may be accelerated.

I said, that if I cannot satisfy you with regard to my assertion of the simplicity and "ingenuity" (according to Prof. Washburne and Prof. Hogben) of my work, I shall pay all the expenses of the trip to Melbourne, and I leave the decision entirely to your discretion.

And here is my additional proposal, precipitated by the letter of the Government of India, and the fact, that the 6 weeks seminary has already begun. If I satisfy you about the practicability of my work, let me go to India and you watch the reaction of experts from 48 States. There is no better opportunity for a severe test than this.

I understand that the funds of the Nuffield Foundation are to be used for such purposes. £500 sterling is indeed a small sum for the Foundation.

Think it over, please. The factory would release me for the two weeks necessary. I rely on you, and close this letter in the hope of a speedy and favourable answer.

Yours sincerely,

C.K. Bliss, B.Sc.

A few days later I received a letter from the secretary of the Australian Advisory Committee for the Nuffield Foundation. It read:

31st October, 1949

Dear Mr. Bliss,

Mr. Farrer-Brown has asked me to reply to the letters you were good enough to write to him a few days ago.

The nature of your work lies outside the fields in which the Foundation has hitherto taken an interest. This does not of course mean that it is unimportant or of little value, but our present view is that the Foundation should concentrate on topics in which it has built up a body of information and experience.

In these circumstances Mr. Farrer-Brown does not feel that a detailed discussion would be helpful. He does, however, wish you well in your efforts to have your work recognised.

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd) Maurice Brown

Secretary, Nuffield Foundation
Australian Advisory Committee.

This letter threw me completely off balance. I was furious and terribly disappointed. Of course, I was a fool. I did not know anything of the working of foundations. I believed that I still could rectify matters. I tried to find out about the fields in which the foundation invests money and was told that it is the field of medicine. I then wrote the following letter.

6th November, 1949

∴ L. Farrer-Brown, Esq.,
Secretary
Nuffield Foundation
Melbourne.

This letter is for you
personally, the attached
copy for your London file.

Dear Mr. Farrer-Brown,

I beg you, kindly not to be annoyed by my continued correspondence. If you are, I assure you that I have been much annoyed by Mr. Brown's blank refusal to investigate my claim. This action is in direct contradiction of what you told the people of Australia through the press.

Mr. Brown could not, and has not, guessed the scope of my work, which is so unusual that I am always in fear of being misunderstood in any letter. Now that I have told him that it concerns also medical research I hope that he will give me the proper hearing.

I had in mind to approach the Nuffield Foundation sooner or later. Your coming to Australia has precipitated this. I beg you to study the attached letter, and revise your opinion and give me a hearing in Sydney.

You did the only correct thing when handing over my first letter to Mr. Brown, as he is the man to control proposals coming up in Australia. However, a general, although he relies on his officers who command certain territories, sometimes goes down into the trenches to meet the enemy with whom his men battle. Well, that's me.

World authorities have classified my work in the highest terms. Now having become a pioneer I suffer the usual fate. However, I shall not give in with a refusal or a dismissal. If the Australian Advisory Committee refuses to hear me properly or rejects my claim after hearing I shall go to the higher advisory body, the trustees, Lord Nuffield himself, and if all this fails I shall present the case Nuffield Foundation v. I to the scientists and the world, that is "mankind" (see above).

Now, you have a mandate and a duty to investigate proposals for "the promotion of the health and wellbeing of mankind". And I claim to have worked out an idea for "mankind" and consequently "mankind" has a mandate to take an active interest in our dealings. If you refuse to hear what's it all about, it would create the worst impression, here and abroad being in direct contradiction with your statement to the public.

I am completely independent. I have even my own small printing plant. And the world has still a liking for the underdog. But I hope that you will say: "Genius or madman, I will humour him and give him a hearing in Sydney."

Sincerely yours,

C.K. Bliss, B.Sc.

and attached another lengthy letter to the secretary of the Australian Advisory Board.

6th November, 1949

Maurice Brown, Esq.,
Secretary, Australian
Advisory Committee
Nuffield Foundation
University of Melbourne.

Please do not dismiss this letter on account of you having dismissed my first letters of Oct. 20 and 24. In a way it concerns you personally.

Dear Mr. Brown,

Kindly excuse the length of this letter. I was known for the brevity of my letters (as an industrial executive). However, when scientific matters were to be discussed, letters must be long of necessity, as there are ideas to put across to the other fellow scientist with many pros and cons to be argued. The correspondence of many scientists bear this out. They were very prolific in their correspondence.

Your answer of October 31st, was very polite but also "curt", and this word means not only brevity, but also that it was a kick. You do not want to have anything to do with me and my work.

In any case, you gave me your own medicine. If I have been cryptical

with regard to the scope of my work, you have been even more cryptical with regard to the scope of the Nuffield Foundation. In fact, you gave me no hint whatsoever.

So I repaired to the United Kingdom Information Office and together with the librarian we hunted up anything we could find under Nuffield. We found references to Lord Nuffield, to the Nuffield Institute for Medical Research, but search as we did, we found nothing about the Nuffield Foundation. In my despair I rang up Nuffield (Australia) Ltd., but the man who could best answer my enquiry did not know much himself. The best he could say was that the Nuffield Foundation is concerned "mainly with medical research".

If "mainly" means say 95%, what about the other 5% which fall not under "mainly"? I would be much obliged if you would kindly inform me where I could get hold of a copy of the charter, aims and progress already made with regard to the Foundation.

I attach here the report about Mr. L. Farrer-Brown's statement to the press, and wish to draw your attention to the expressive words:

"The men may be in any branch of science or medicine - the only qualification being that they must be leaders in their particular work."

Now, I wouldn't mind your kick, if it would have come after you have heard the evidence and if you would have acted on the advice of the father of modern science Francis Bacon. I have explicitly refused to disclose the full scope of my work for fear of being misunderstood. But I have made enough reference to the fact that it concerns Science (I underlined this in my letter of October 24) to warrant at least a question of curiosity from you.

In fact, your kick has been felt as an outrage by me, as a "slap in the face" (so to speak) of what Mr. Farrer-Brown said to the press. I appeal to your sense of justice and understanding, and I hope that the rational consideration of all I have to say will not be tainted by emotional feelings of aversion. If the Nuffield Foundation concerns itself with the help to "men in any branch of science" and if you are appointed to investigate anything which "unique men" claim to be "in advance of their time", and if your activities are defined as to concern men of Australia, then you have got to investigate my claim.

But I work myself up into a rage quite unnecessarily. I thought that Mr. Farrer-Brown comes from the motorcar industry and therefore I enlarged upon this field. Had I known that the Nuffield Foundation is "mainly concerned with medical research", I would have been jubilant.

In fact, one of my very first lectures about my work was before medical men, members of a medical society, and they were unanimous in the opinion that my work is of the greatest importance for medical research.

Now I am going to make some wild assumptions and assertions in the coming paragraphs, which would lead only to two conclusions: Either I am a madman or a genius. Two world authorities, Prof. Carleton Washburne and Prof. Lancelot Hogben favour the latter view. And I beg to draw your attention to the fact that Prof Hogben is head of the department for medical statistics, University of Birmingham.

I state therefore in all brazenness or modesty (which way one looks at it) that my work concerns itself directly with

M E D I C A L W O R K

(1) in the widest application of the term, namely

- (a) in the research field in the laboratory
- (b) in the therapeutic field in the hospital
- (c) in the preventive field in the health centre, etc.

(2) particularly in a special application for psychology and psychiatry.

- (3) a new approach to the problem relating to the relationship between "symptoms" and "diseases"
- (4) yes, there is a 4th point, and it may well turn out the most important point of all, in fact it may give medical research a new direction altogether.

But I am not going to write about it, even if you ask me to do so. I have behind me a lifetime of scientific work and I have argued many a case. If a new approach, a new idea has to be explained to another fellow, it can only be done by going step by step from one piece of observable evidence to the next.

The evidence is there and cannot be argued away, but the conclusion to be drawn is something about which learned men may differ very violently. If I start with evidence No. 1 and draw conclusion No. 1 from it, it is no use to go to evidence No. 2, if the hearer does not agree with conclusion No. 1. So discussion must go on about conclusion No. 1 and a certain agreement must be reached before going further.

Now if I write this in a letter, and draw conclusion No. 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. and the reader does already disagree with my conclusion No. 1, the letter will do more harm than good. In fact it may invoke disaster with regard to the idea itself.

But if the conclusions and the idea itself are so novel, so unusual so very much different from traditional thinking, or (to use some slang) if the idea seems outlandish, cranky, crackpottish, etc. etc. then the scientist who propounds it, is in for utter ridicule and even abuse.

And this has exactly happened with most great pioneering ideas and their unfortunate holders. In fact, in no other science than in the science of medicine has there been more abuse of pioneers.

We have seen that any hint of a new direction say in cancer research reverberates in all papers and magazines of the world. If I claim now that I have made a discovery of such great importance that it overshadows even research in cancer, I must armour myself with a thick hide and be prepared of the utter ridicule and abuse which is in store for me.

Who actually abuses the pioneer say in medical science? Is he attacked and vilified by the wheatfarmers, cattle drovers, water diviners or diesel-engineers? No, he is abused by his own colleagues, who work in the same field, and who actually should be best suited to recognize the great advance which the new idea could bring to medical science.

Well, such unfortunate men, the pioneers are - to use Mr. Farrer-Brown's own words "in advance of their time" and it seems that a pioneer must be at least 50 years safely in his coffin, so to be no threat to any authority or vanity of his contemporaries.

Sigmund Freud spoke only once before the medical society of Vienna but it was enough to make him never to set foot again in their building. The fact, that members of a medical society have applauded my work should make me apprehensive with regard to the pioneering qualities of my work.

However, I wish to add, that this lecture concerned itself solely with point 1 of my work (see list on page 2), and so far, their approval coincide with the approval by Prof. Washburne and Prof. Hogben and others.

I have not yet spoken to anyone about my work with regard to point 4. And I wish to add, that the discovery which I claim can only give medical research a new direction to be pursued by a host of researchers. At present I have only accumulated the evidence, and have unearthed some hints of foregoing researchers, and have rounded up my hypothesis.

When Wagner-Jauregg got the idea that fever might kill the spirochaeta and be a cure to the worst afflictions of syphilis the year was 1887. He looked up hints of foregoing researchers and published a report. You surely know how many, many years had to pass, until medical men stopped sneering at his idea.

I have spoken with Wagner-Jauregg a few times and got somehow the impression that in his opinion everyone of us has some mental defect in one way or the other. This made him unperturbed to the attacks of his colleagues.

But Wagner-Jauregg was an insider, he was one of the university clan. With a man and pioneer outside the university gates, the case is almost hopeless. He has the greatest difficulties to get a preliminary hearing. He is not sure whether his letters are fully and carefully read.

Now, you may ask me whether I am a doctor. The answer is no! But I am a chemist, not a drugstore chemist, but a scientific chemist, with a life long training not in pure science, but in applied science in industry, where you have got to get results, practical results, good results or else

And there are wonderful precedences. There is Louis Pasteur, who was a chemist only, and how was he attacked. There is Paul Ehrlich, and many others.

But it may be impertinence to refer to such great pioneers. So I may be allowed to vary slightly a saying of the great Bunsen: "A doctor, to be a good doctor, must be a good chemist!"

Consequently my hypothesis can only be appreciated by medical men who know their chemistry well. And I shall not relent until I get my case heard and debated to the fullest extent.

Now as I maintain that my work concerns itself with medical research, you have got to give me a hearing. And a personal hearing before you and at least 2 members of the advisory committee is a much quicker procedure than the spending of many hours of reading. I can answer counter-arguments on the spot, and (to use the words of the Farrer-Brown report) I am a "leader in my particular work".

I can pay my own fare and expenses, and I will do so, if you agree to give me a proper hearing before you and at least 2 other members. Two or three evenings, or mornings of discussion will be sufficient. Then there should be an interval of a few weeks, in which you and the members may contemplate the whole matter. Afterwards there should be a summing up of all counter-arguments, and I should be allowed to answer them point by point. Then you may make your final decision with regard to recommendation to the Foundation or refusal to do so.

This procedure with proper recording would be necessary, because should you refuse the hearing altogether, or should you grant it, but refuse recommendations, I will go to the "court of appeal", which I believe is in Great Britain. Should they refuse, I will go to Mr. William Richard Morris, the Lord Nuffield. He is an industrial man like me and I am sure he will recognise a practical idea when he sees one. And should he have no time for me or should he rely solely on his advisers, I shall present the whole case Nuffield Foundation v. I, before the scientists and the world in general.

The last war has shown that a few brains can turn the tide between disaster or survival. It has made the world science-conscious. I shall make it pioneer-conscious. Now having finished my work of 7 years of research, and finding that few great men honour it with the evaluation "ingenious", and on the other hand, many learned men refuse to hear about it, I shall show to the world that right now, pioneers are treated as they have been treated in the past. In fact, it can easily be proved that all progress of mankind has been initiated by a few hundred pioneers, who have changed human thoughts into new directions. I am going to write a book about pioneers and the treatment they have received in the past and right now, and my experiences will be recounted one by one, including this letter and its answer.

I have only finished my work 8 weeks ago, and I have already most favourable comments and reactions from great men. But I want to see it put into practice, before I can pass out, and I will fight for it. I have been a science lecturer for the last 25 years and I intend to tour Great Britain, Europe and America.

Together with all the other pioneers, I feel sure that my work is practi-

cal and good. And I feel equally sure that a future medical congress will do honour to me. And your name will be bound up with it, as I hope only for the better.

I hope you will excuse all this, realising that your first letter has been a great rebuke to me. And it may well be that your answer will be: "So you have something which concerns medical research? Splendid! Let's hear about it!"

In this case I shall do penance.

Yours sincerely,

C. K. Bliss

At that time, I did not feel that I should consider the whole venture a failure and I thought of what I could do to bring about a meeting with Farrer-Brown, in spite of his refusal to see me. I found out that Prof. Ward of the University of Sydney is a member of the Australian Advisory Board and I decided to go to him and to explain to him the application of my work for the science of medicine. However, I needed an introduction, and I found a man who knows Prof. Ward. He is Mr. Burgoyne Chapman, a man who worked for many years in China and who knows of the advantages of an ideographic writing. I had approached him some time before and he wrote the testimonial which appears in Semantography Series No. 6. I asked him to write a personal letter to Prof. Ward. It turned out that they were at school together. Chapman wrote the following letter:

My Dear Tuppy,

I wonder if you remember our schooldays together, since when you've risen to dizzy heights of fame and I have kicked round China and India and (this year) the Mediterranean for 30 years.

This my familiarity with Chinese picture language and its advantage in being readable all over China and Japan and Korea (though the noises the different folk make to represent the ideographs are quite different) has brought me into contact with Mr. Bliss.

I usually shun such giddy ideas like poison and I confess the idea of a few internationally usable ideographs seemed to me absurd for the first two or three minutes but on investigation I was greatly impressed.

It is because Mr. Farrer-Brown did not take the time to investigate that, I venture in the name of science and humanity to ask if you, as I understand an Adviser of the Nuffield Foundation, would suggest that he find the time to do so.

For instance, Australia is criticised abroad now for not educating Papua (a New Guinea fold, I always forget which) by UNO and other people, who don't know they have a hundred or so languages and that neighboring villages are mutually unintelligible.

By a small workable set of such ideographs they (and many districts in India that are intellectually starved and isolated by language variations) could be given directions and pamphlets on hygiene and indeed on general education and human progress. A typewriter would be easy.

In Israel amazingly advanced stuff in medicine, etc. is being written in Hebrew. If you don't happen to know this, well you can see possibilities there on a higher level, etc. etc.

Mr. Bliss is a skilled chemist and has an analytical mind.

Could you get Mr. Bliss's idea seriously investigated? I am convinced that he has no desire for personal gain. As an Austrian his English is not perfect but his logic and inventiveness seem to be excellent.

All pioneers, like Lister seem foolish cranks till investigated, and Ogden was at my alma mater Cambridge first laughed to scorn for his Basic English.

Cordially yours,
B. Burgoyne Chapman

I felt, however, that this was not enough as an introduction. Some time before, I met by chance Dr. MacDonald of the Senate of Sydney University. About my experiences with him I shall make a separate issue. I went to him and asked for an introductory letter to Prof. Roberts, Vice-Chancellor of Sydney University. To the secretary of the Vice Chancellor I explained that all I want is that Prof. Ward should be asked to hear my demonstration of my work. She did this, and a date was fixed when I should meet Prof. Ward. He is Professor of Bacteriology. I wrote a short letter to him, thanking him for the appointed interview etc,

* Our meeting was a complete failure. Herebelow is the note which I wrote immediately after it :

Meeting with Prof. H. K. Ward

21st November 1949

At last through Dr. MacDonald of the University Senate, and through his letter to the Vice Chancellor Prof. Roberts, I was to meet Prof. Ward of the New Medical School and member of the Australian Advisory Committee of the Nuffield Foundation, to get an introduction to Mr. Farrer-Brown, the Secretary of the Foundation.

The entrance of the New Medical School is flanked by two pillars bearing the busts of Pasteur and Harvey. These were two good points to start with. Pasteur was a chemist only and was attacked by the Professors of the Paris Sorbonne. Harvey was an eminent physician, but I found in the Encyclopedia Britannica the saying of one of his contemporaries, that "people would not pay threepence for his bills". In other words, another pioneer not recognised fully in his time.

But I had no opportunity to enlarge upon this subject. Prof. Ward, an old man in every respect, launched immediately upon a speech of his own. He has read my letter to Dr. MacDonald, the letter to Prof. Roberts, the letter of his schoolmate Mr. Burgoyne Chapman, and my letter to him (see my correspondence)

This interview was the longest, but also the worst I ever had about my work. The amazing fact was, that Prof. Ward never - throughout the one and a half hour of our meeting (there was vacation and he had time on his hand) never once wanted to see one of my symbols. A few times I tried to push a page of my book under his nose, but it was of no avail. He waved it away each time and kept on saying that the problem was not the bridging of the language barrier with regard to scientific literature, but the problem was how to cope with the problem of scientific literature even in one language, English, which is growing in volume every year. In fact, as he said, the problem is insoluble.

I said and repeated it often, that I did not come to tell him how to solve the problem of scientific literature with regard to volume, but my solution was of a different nature. But every time I pointed out all the known arguments from my book (about the doctor in Peru and the other doctor in Siam) he answered : "You have not solved my problem!"

There was no go at all. And he expressed not the least desire to have a look of my symbols, despite the fact, that I harangued him often to do so. He is a bacteriologist, and I was tempted to refer to the professors, who refused to look into the microscope, because "microbes" are just "nonsense".

The only advice he gave me to have patience. I answered that I shall be dead before anyone will take notice. He shrugged his shoulders.

In the end he telephoned to the Secretary of Prof. Roberts and to Mr. Butcher of the registry, but was careful to say on the telephone that he cannot recommend my work to Mr. Farrer-Brown.

When he found out that Mr. Farrer-Brown is leaving to-day, he was relieved from my presence. I said that the great praise that I received came from professors abroad, and the proverb might be true about the prophet in his own country but it made not the least impression on him.

The reader may ask about the formulation of the problem as presented by Prof. Ward, of which he said that my work does not solve the problem. He made the

following statement:

It is customary that every researcher in the field of medicine must make some literary contribution from time to time. This means that it is expected of him to have two or three articles on his medical research published each year. As the space of medical journals is extremely limited, and the number of researchers very great, and as any researcher could write an article about his current research and the results so far (positive or negative) it becomes clear that the editors of medical journals are simply deluged with manuscripts of articles. All authors clamour that their article be published. This, as Prof. Ward said, is a matter of utmost importance for every researcher. Indeed, his scientific reputation is at stake when he has not published anything during a year. This means that he may lose his livelihood, or that his advancement may be seriously impeded. Consequently there is a mad rush to medical journals. Year after year new medical journals appear, bigger and bigger in volume, but still they cannot keep up with the flood of pressing manuscript writers.

This is not the whole problem. The fact is that now a flood of medical journals is pouring into the university libraries. No one has time to browse even through a number of them. What is now needed, said Prof. Ward, are able abstracters who do nothing else than to read the journals and make abstracts, which then must be made available to the researchers (in the hope that they will find the time to read at least the abstracts). Then, of course, there is the problem of the journals printed in various languages. Able medical translators are urgently needed, besides the able abstracters. The whole problem of scientific publications in the medical field is unsolvable. Every year the flood of publications is larger and there is no way out.

I seized with eagerness on these statements and proceeded to evolve my plan of a science abstract written on small index cards, and written in the language of the university and the symbols of Semantography. Anyone who can read the language of the university (in which the research is carried out) need not bother about the symbols. Anyone else can read the abstract in his own language. The researcher could peruse the index cards (which universities would exchange between each other) and would look only into those cards which deal with his special field. A glance on the explanatory title could tell him immediately whether or not the research is of interest to him. As the index card would carry the name and address of the author, the enquiring researcher could easily obtain a copy of the full research report which would be mimeographed only, and sold or given away gratis by the respective universities.

This method would do away with all the medical journals which are issued in ever increasing number by voracious printers who sense the money available in universities and therefore bring out more and more medical journals all sold for atrociously high prices. In this respect, the hold and the bondage in which the researchers are held by printers and publishers and their editors would be broken, much money at present spent for those medical journals would be saved and every researcher would know within one month what is going on in his particular field anywhere in the world.

But as said in my note, Prof. Ward was not interested to hear my plan. Then he went to the telephone and said to the secretary of Prof. Roberts that he considers my work "not good". I was stark raving mad. He has refused to see anything of it.

In a mental uproar I left him. Coming home I wrote the note about our talk and later on followed it up with this letter:

22nd December 1949

Prof. H.K. Ward
New Medical School
Sydney University

Dear Prof. Ward,

I beg to thank you for granting me the interview, following a request of Dr. C.G. MacDonald of the University Senate and subsequently of the Vice-Chancellor Prof. Roberts.

In view of the fact that negotiations are already going on in London for the publication of my work, and that the discussion will be taken up at British and American Universities, I take the liberty to sum up our discussion, with the hope that it will be taken up again.

I regret to state truthfully the undeniable fact, that not once during the one and a half hour did you ask to see my work, not once did you make one voluntary look into these 3 volumes (707 pages) the work of 7 years of research.

I regret to say that I found you prejudiced from the outset. On the other hand, you could not deny the soundness of the idea. Medical men of all languages use the ideographs of mathematics, physics and chemistry. A complete system of ideographs to cover the whole range of language for abstracts, correspondence, case histories, medical advice, etc. using also the already international Latin terms, would be a good idea. Doctors the world over are busy people, and have no time to learn foreign languages (and even English is a very foreign language to those who can't speak it and so is Basic English, Esperanto and others).

But an abstract which doctors the world over could read in any of their mother tongues (just as they read $1 + 2 = 3$) would be a very novel, an almost sensational idea. The crux of the problem however is, whether I propose a difficult and complicated system of thousands of symbols or whether my system is a very simple one. And I claim that I use very few, very simple and almost self-explanatory symbols.

This must be seen to be believed - but you did not want to see it at all. Whenever I tried frantically to push my books before your eyes, you waved them away saying: "The inter-linguistic problem is not THE problem. THE problem is how to cope with the growing volume of scientific and medical literature, and this problem seems insoluble."

As I did not come to you to discuss that problem, I had to give up. But I did not believe my ears, when I heard you saying on the telephone: "I do not recommend the work of Mr. Bliss!" You haven't seen it at all.

Professor Lancelot Hogben, Head of the Department of Medical Statistics, Birmingham, has seen it, and he considers it "fascinating, stimulating, ingenious". He is the author of well-known books (Science for the Citizen, etc. etc.) and works at present at Queen Elizabeth Hospital, University of Birmingham.

A few months ago Prof. Carleton Washburne of New York, and James Hemming of London toured all principal cities of Australia and New Zealand, giving a series of lectures in each town.

Prof. Washburne has seen my work, and he wrote:

"A brief examination of the "100 Symbol Elements" idea of Mr. C.K. Bliss shows it to be ingenious"

He recommends "controlled examination", etc.

James Hemming spoke lastly in the Sydney Town Hall, under the chairmanship of Prof. Copland. He too has seen my work and he wrote, that:

"it should be developed as rapidly and as widely as possible"

I can refer to similar opinions of other learned men, all of whom have seen my work, and their praise contrasts strongly with your "non-recommendation" of a work, which you have not seen at all, and did not want to.

I hope that you will understand the deep bitterness which fills my mind after our fruitless discussion, and that you will judge rationally this letter, in which I state facts:

As said before, I did not come to you to discuss the problem of how to cope with the growing volume of scientific literature. But I have a life-long experience in scientific library research, and dare to say that the

solution is rather simple, once you get to the "root" of the problem, and here it is :

"Cut out the profit motif in scientific literature!" As long as printers (who make a living by printing) see that universities and hospitals are ready to spend the taxpayer's money in ever increasing amounts for costly publications - as long as this continues, they will continue to print more and more in logarithmic proportions. There is no end to this.

And the solution (to which I have devoted a large chapter in my book) is simple : All notes about any scientific research shall be typed on wax-stencils, and duplicates shall be made on the university duplicator for anyone requesting them, either free of charge or against payment of self-cost.

The result of the research shall be printed (or duplicated) on a small index filing card as short as possible (let us say about 100 words only) printed in 3 lines as follows :

First line: the abstract in symbols
Second line: English words beneath the symbols
Third line : Native words of researcher or university (Danish for instance) beneath the symbols.

Such an abstract could be read by all Danish speaking doctors and by all who understand English. And those doctors who cannot read English or Danish can read the symbols in their native tongue, be it French, or Malay or Urdu or Africans, or any other tongue.

These small abstract index filing cards should be of uniform size, classified according to the international Dewey library system, which would insure quick filing and finding, and should be exchanged between the universities, etc. in exactly the same way as patent specifications are now exchanged - without profit, and even free of charge - between the countries of the world.

For such an universal abstract index card my system of symbols is essential, as it enables the reading of the abstract in any language.

This new writing is bound to come. Already - as the world is fast getting smaller - warning signs on the highways of the countries, written in the native languages, are taken down and replaced by international symbols. And soon scientists will go the same way, simply because they have already found that international symbols in mathematics, chemistry, electronics, etc. do bridge all language differences.

I had no opportunity to speak to you about the semantic aspect of my work especially for medical thought, and I had even less opportunity to speak to you about a discovery which I have made during my work, and a theory, of which I am sure that it will reverberate throughout the scientific and medical world. It has nothing to do with the symbols, it came out only in pursuance of the study of the history of writing.

I am writing this letter to you, because I believe that you have that rare wisdom which can admit a wrong done to a man. I beg you therefore to reconsider your attitude, and enable me to present my work in a talk before your staff and your students. Let them fire as much criticism as they want at my work. Put the severest and harshest tests to it - and I shall win you over to the idea. I have done this already in the past, and I am a science lecturer of 25 years standing and repute.

Awaiting your reply, I remain.

Yours sincerely,

C.K. Bliss

I beg the reader to realize my terrible disappointment. This was my first encounter with scientific foundations. I believed that the advantages of my work are so obvious that I would not face any difficulty at all. Instead, I was not even

understood. To this came some bitter experiences at the hands of administrative officials of Sydney University. I went to see (before my meeting with Ward) Mr. Butcher of the registrar department. I was told that he could give me all information about any grants from any foundations and how to apply for them. The treatment meted out to me by Mr. Butcher left me speechless. When I told him that I want to apply for a publication grant, he could not help bursting into laughter. The request was apparently utterly ridiculous. And what necessity had he to maintain manners before an obvious obscurantist like me, obviously a crank with a crackpot idea.

But laughter and bad manners for me was general at the University as far as administrative officials are concerned. The secretary of the Vice Chancellor Prof. Roberts, to whom I expressed the wish to see Prof. Roberts, pointing to my introduction by the member of the Senate Dr. MacDonald, also burst into laughter. "No, you cannot see Prof. Roberts!" was all she could say amidst unsuppressed smiles and giggles. It was enough to make a beggar furious. I could not sleep. I could not work. And as Mr. Farrer-Brown was still in Sydney, I got the impossible idea of inserting a costly advertisement in the Herald. Of course the cost was prohibitive. But not knowing it yet, I drafted the following challenge. I reprint it her below in order to show my state of my mind, and also to make the reader realize the tribulations I had to go through. As said in the beginning I simply did not know how foundations operate. I shall refer to my present knowledge at the end of this issue.

C H A L L E N G E

to Mr. L. FARRER - BROWN,

Secretary of the Nuffield Foundation.

Upon your arrival in Australia, you informed the people of Australia about the purpose of your visit. You made a statement to the press (S.M.H. of Oct. 20, Reporter Peter Hollingshead) that you came here

"to look for "unique men or institutions in advance of their time" whom the Foundation may help. The men may be in any branch of science or medicine - the only qualification being that they must be leaders in their particular work."

I approached you by letter, informing you that my scientific work (a new and most unusual idea, "in advance of our time") has been hailed by world authorities, as for instance Prof. Carleton Washburne of New York (who toured Australia recently) as being "ingenious", by Prof. Lancelot Hogben of Birmingham (the famous author of "Science for the Citizen") who classified my work as "fascinating, ingenious", and others. I also informed you that a Federal Department, realising the importance of my work, has put me in touch with the Australian delegates to a United Nations Conference, that a famous American writer has put me in touch with the State Department Washington, Foreign Service Institute, etc. etc.

I asked you for a hearing. However, in my letter, I only indicated the vastness of the scope of my work (extending to any human activity and especially to any scientific activity including medicine,) but I reserved a full disclosure of my idea for a personal demonstration before you and your scientific advisers.

I received a curt refusal from your secretary. "Mr. Farrer-Brown does not feel that a detailed discussion would be helpful."

A few days later, I informed you that I have just received a letter from the Government of India (which has been favourably impressed by an exposition of my scientific work). The Gov^{orment} of India agreed in principle to my coming to a Conference at Mysore (attended by delegates of 48 states) to demonstrate my work before them.

I asked you to help me going to the Conference. There was no answer.

In my second letter, I informed you that I personally do not seek any sinecure or subsidy, but

"What I want from you is to be given the opportunity that I may present my work to young men and women in the world, so that they may take over, reform it, transform it, improve it, discard it, for a better system of their own - never mind, but GET ON WITH THE JOB, before it is too late. I am a retired research chemist. I want to retire at last."

There was again no answer from you.

You have refused to look into the matter, not even knowing fully, what's all about. Thus you have acted in direct contradiction to what you told the people of Australia through the press.

Here is a new fascinating and ingenious idea, developed on Australian soil, an idea, which could make Australia and the British Commonwealth leaders of the World in this particular field. I have just finished my 7 years work of research, and the few reactions from scientific sources indicate already that it will reverberate throughout the world, when becoming fully known. I am now preparing this disclosure for the papers and magazines of the world. It can't be said in a few words.

You must stand by your words. You must accord me a full hearing. What I want is a trial, harsh, rigorous, severe, but a scientific trial. Stand by your words, and by the mandate you have received from the Nuffield Foundation, "to look for unique men ... in any branch of science... whom the Foundation may help", the aim of which is (see report) "the promotion of the health and well-being of mankind".

You are still in Sydney.

C.K. Bliss, B.Sc.
5 Maroubra Bay Road,
Pagewood.

Of course, when the advertising department of the Herald told me of the price of the ad, I had to drop the idea. It was better that way. It would have had no effect what ever.

A few months later, the papers reported the arrival of Lord Nuffield in Sydney. A factory for the manufacture of Morris cars was being built here and he came out frequently to help. I tried to get his address by telephone, but could not get it. I wanted to see Mr. Lloyd, the man in charge of the Nuffield plant in Sydney. I saw Mr. Smith, the general manager. Actually I wanted only the address of Lord Nuffield. Mr. Smith could not help being fascinated by my symbols for road safety and he spent half an hour with me. I told him that all I wanted from Nuffield (now that my approaches to the Foundation had no result) was assistance in the publication of a brochure showing my symbols for road safety. This should be distributed to all officials and official bodies anywhere in the world who are working for the safety of the roads. I presented my testimonial which I got from the secretary of the National Roads and Motorist Association of N.S.W. (see Semantography Series No. 6). However, Mr. Smith, though he expressed interest, did not divulge the address of Mr. Nuffield. He had to, as other people too wanted to bother Lord Nuffield. I decided to play detective to find the lair of Nuffield. I went from one car shop to the other. Hours went by and no clue. At last, one man told me that he believes Lord Nuffield, whenever he is in Sydney, stays somewhere in MacLeay Street, Potts Point. Now I went from one house to the other in Potts Point until I came to an apartment house the caretaker of which acted strangely. He did not answer with a frank No. At last, I have found the house I thought. I went outside and there was a garage nearby. I asked the mechanic whether he knows that Lord Nuffield lives in this apartment house. Yes, he said, and this is his car, a Morris 10.

I had no time to wait for him to come out, but next day I was there early in the morning. The car was there, and I proceeded to wait in the true Sherlock Holmes manner. I had with me a selection of pages from my books, and some pamphlets which I stitched together with the following letter on top:

Sydney 2nd February, 1950

Dear Lord Nuffield,

These few pages stapled together are torn from their context in the complete work, amounting to 710 pages. This huge volume is explained by the

fact that I have devoted a chapter to most human activities.

These few pages show only the adoption for traffic and in particular motoring. A few additional pages are added to show that this new mode of writing can be used for any human activity.

Some of the symbols are so simple and almost self-explanatory that the reader believes, that he can read a text "right away". However everything must be learned. Only then can the simplicity of the whole scheme be appreciated.

The following items are found in the following pages

Opinions of learned Men about Semantography

Examples of Public Signs

Examples of International Symbols already in use p.57 ff

The Babel of Highway Signs now in use p.72 ff

A page from the chapter on Railway, Bus, etc. Traffic p.225 ff

Complete Set of Semantography Symbols for Highways p.357 ff

A sample of scientific correspondence in Semantography p.389 ff

A Bible Text in Semantography p.600 ff

Yours sincerely,

In addition I wrote the following accompanying letter :

Sydney 2nd February, 1950

Lord Nuffield

Sydney

Dear Lord Nuffield,

When the first inventors tinkered with a car, which could run on an explosive liquid, they could not find support from the existing industries and most of them died in embitterment and frustration. Now new ideas are born and their inventors face the same struggle.

The motorcar has made the world smaller. Countries are traversed in a few hours. Slowly a new writing has emerged : Geometrical symbols readable in all languages. And I have completed the task in $7\frac{1}{2}$ years of work : a complete system of geometrical writing for any purpose.

I am a factory man like you. I know when a thing is practicable and I feel sure that you will agree with me, once you devote a little time to the study of the few pages I submit to you.

More people die on the roads than in the wars. A Universal Symbol Writing for the Highways of the World is a matter of life or death.

What I want from you is a contribution to the publication of a booklet in English, French and Spanish, which should inform the motorist world that such a universal system exist. Then Unification will come.

What treatment will I get from your organisation and you? Will you help this idea along or not? Surely, a publication made possible by you, will only do honour to your name. And I shall give credit to you in my story : "Struggle of a New Idea" on which I am writing.

P.S. Please read the praise of famous professors about my work.

Yours sincerely,

With all this in my handbag I waited. And sure enough after 2 hours wait out he came, a small man in a school blazer. He went to his car where I intercepted him using the classic approach: "Lord Nuffield, I presume?" He was taken aback

He was taken aback by my sudden appearance and said "Yes!" Whereupon I asked him kindly to excuse my intrusion and kindly to take a look into my work for road safety. "What do you want from me?" he cried in anger. I said that I want that he should help me in the publication of this work. "I have given away 10 million pound sterling" he said, "and I am not giving another single penny." "I do not want an additional penny from you," I said, "all I want is that you should induce your Foundation to sponsor this work for international motoring." "All right, give it to me, whatever you have here", he said. I gave him the papers and my letters. He said Good-bye and this was the last I have seen of him and my papers. Nevertheless, I sent off the following letter to his address.

Please read this. It concerns also
your Nuffield Australia Pty.!

Dear Lord Nuffield,

You must still be angry with me for playing detective. You have not answered my letter and the letter of the National Roads and Motorist Association.

This newspaper report about Mr. Farrer-Brown will tell you why I tried to get in touch with you.

I appealed to him to give me a hearing, and referred to the opinions of world-famous professors about my work. He refused, not even knowing the full scope of my work.

Indeed I am not employed in a university. They usually get all the grants. I am only a factory researcher. But you are a factory man. You will recognise an original idea of a factory man, who does not seek any financial gains.

You do not need to spend a single penny. Just order Mr. Farrer-Brown to reserve the necessary sum for (1) printing a booklet "A NEW IDEA FOR WORLD UNIFICATION OF MOTORIST SIGNS" and for (2) Distribution to all motorists Organisations, Departments of Traffic in all countries of the World, as a Contribution of the Nuffield Organisation to the Safety of Motoring.

The publicity value of such a booklet for your organisation is obvious. Indeed the General Manager of the Nuffield Central Publicity Department might consider such a booklet as good advertisement, and cheap too.

As for me, I don't want a single penny for my labours. Here is a matter, which means life or death for many millions of motorists. And the motorists of Australia would have little understanding why you and the Nuffield Australia Pty. Ltd. have refused the idea, and why even the letter of the N.R.M.A. has been ignored. Don't let this happen!

Yours sincerely,

All this gave me much food for thought about the role of scientific foundations. I realized that they are constituted by a successful man or a company which does not want the profits snatched away by the taxation department. Instead a charitable foundation is constituted by which the man or the firm virtually remains in control of the money and can do what ever they like to do with it, provided it is within the limits prescribed by law. Scientific and charitable foundations are numerous in the U.S.A. and around this time I found an article published in Magazine Digest August 49. It deals with American foundations. I wish to state that I draw no inference as to the Nuffield foundation. However, as I intend to draw attention to the fact that pioneers of new ideas are virtually excluded from the benefits of the foundations, I conclude this issue with the reprint of the article from Magazine Digest

ARE CHARITY FOUNDATIONS ' FRAUDULENT?'

What is the actual purpose of charitable foundations?
Their number has grown so steadily since the inception of the Income Tax Law, that there is real cause to wonder. Sources: The Nation; Russell Sage Report, Washington Merry-Go-Round, Dun's Review.

Income-tax day, when most of us were trying to figure out how to eke out that last penny's worth of exemption, sharp-penned Drew Pearson, in his Washington Merry-Go-Round column, reported startling news - based on a Senate Banking Committee Investigation. If true, the columnist's report was as significant to a lot of Americans as it was shocking.

Pearson's report brands Textron, a New Hampshire textile company which built up a charity foundation allegedly to avoid paying taxes, as the largest of several trusts, created in reality to avoid taxes and provide risk capital for Textron.

No doubt the 81st Congress will carefully scrutinize the tax-exempt position of foundations and trusts organized on a non-profit financial basis. Over a year ago, the House Ways and Means Committee inquired into the activities of various college alumni foundations operating competitive business enterprises free from income tax. Senator Charles W. Tobey of New Hampshire charged that several trusts, organized directly or indirectly by the president of Textron Inc. had made phenomenal profits through intricate financial deals with that corporation and its subsidiaries. While claiming exemption from all Federal income taxes, Senator Tobey said, it donated only relatively small amounts to the charitable and educational organizations to which it was originally devoted.

Activities of the Textron trusts and of the college alumni foundations have been so foreign to the common concept of charitable trusts and educational foundations as to raise the question of whether they are rightfully entitled to full tax exemption.

The Nation questions the tax exempt status of a college or charity organization going into business. Should its profits be exempt from taxes? Present laws say yes, but a change has been demanded by the relatively sensational rise in the number of industrial and commercial enterprises owned by institutions, and because of "charitable" trusts used as devices to avoid paying taxes.

For a long time, these affairs were shrouded in silence, but in September when the Textron Company announced the closing of its mills in Nashua, N.H., and threw 7,000 textile workers out of jobs, the operations of foundations and trusts broke wide open.

Textile Workers Union of America demanded a Senate investigation and got it. It soon appeared that Textron's president, Royal S. Little was strongly addicted to "charitable trusts." The New York Times published a series of articles revealing the extent to which American Colleges and universities engage in business. The Times article and another factual report made by Fortune implied that some 50 million dollars a year in taxes were being avoided by such manipulations. But the Times only touched upon colleges. It ignored the more delicate problem, churches.

Textron is by no means the only foundation operating textile companies. The huge Callaway Mills, Atlanta Woollen Mills in Georgia and the Commander Mills in Oklahoma are also business ventures of so-called charitable "foundations."

Last March 25th, Senator Tobey introduced a bill into Congress to try to save the Government millions of dollars in taxes. Instead of ferreting out the little taxpayer who may unwittingly get away with a few pennies, he wants the government to go after the big time chiselers who hide their manipulations behind the law.

Senator Tobey's stormy sayings brought three important points to light: (1) Charitable trusts can be used for dynastic control of an industry; (2) they can be used for freedom of management from all responsibility, including freedom from the obligation to protect its own investment; (3) the purpose may also be the accumulation of risk capital without recourse to banks, the stock market, or a corporate reserve account and thus without questions from bankers, the Securities Exchange Commission

or dubious stock holders.

Kenneth Fiestar in the Nation describes the functioning of some foundations by showing how an industrialist can set up a trust under a state charter and make a nominal contribution of \$ 100 as initial capital. Then he appoints himself associate or trustee with unlimited powers. The beneficiary is also designated but there is no provision for enforcing payment of contributions. Absolute control remains with the trustee, who can use the foundation's money as he sees fit. Yet, profits from these speculations are tax-exempt.

The trust or foundation can repay the original loan but usually a large pool of money is left. The trustee may use this money to purchase a factory or to meet other financial obligations. Since he controls both ends of his transactions, he can show either a profit or a loss, depending upon which is convenient for him at the moment. He can liquidate his holdings at his own discretion without asking permission or paying profits on proceeds.

Many are the variations on procedures used, but the important factor is that the trust or foundation takes over where the tax payment to the government would be greatest. While the industrialist cannot pocket the money, he can use it for further transactions. He can use the fund to pay salaries to anyone he wishes. Members of his family may draw handsome "unearned" salaries as trustees.

The latest revelation by the Nation shows that universities have taken to manufacturing spaghetti (New York University owns the A.F. Mueller Company), and operating airports. (The University of Michigan owns the Willow Run Airfield). The educators excuse these enterprises by saying their normal investments no longer yield sufficient incomes.

Profits from such enterprises go directly to schools, churches and charities. But the beneficiaries of other foundations aren't as lucky. One of Royal Little's Textron trusts grew from \$500 to \$4,500,000 in 11 years, during which time it reportedly paid out only \$50,000 to the supposed beneficiary and more than \$200,000 in salaries to its trustees.

Foundations created by wealthy individuals in the form of private, non-profit organizations have been described as "largely an American invention." Canada has done something about it. The Ontario legislature recently passed the long-debated proposal to control charitable foundations. At the same time, it unanimously voted to tear up the will of the late newspaper owner, Joseph Atkinson, and ordered a different disposition of his estate, valued at many millions. At the time, Provincial Treasurer Frost told the Toronto Telegram that a profit-making business can no longer be regarded as a charitable institution. In 1900 only four or five such foundations were in existence, but as soon as the income tax was adopted in 1913, the number rapidly grew. A Russell Sage Foundation Report shows there are now some 5,000 "foundations," "funds" or "endowment." Of these, 505 are listed as "genuine."

The five organizations reporting the largest capital assets were the Rockefeller Foundation with more than 189 million; The Carnegie Corporation of N.Y. with 166 million; the Ford Foundation with 109 million; City Trusts of Philadelphia with over 88 million and the Hayden Foundation with 50 million. The Russell Sage survey reported that the endowment of all American foundations aggregated about \$1,818,000,000, and that their annual expenditures for direct operations and grants to other agencies amounted to 72 million.

Many of the other and better known foundations publish annual reports and make no effort to hide their activities from public notice. But too large a number have chosen to be known "only to God and the Collector of Internal Revenue."

"A disturbing number of foundations," comments the Russell Sage report, "appear to have no headquarters other than the office of a law firm, to be modest to the point of complete silence about any program for social or public welfare and indeed to be making no present contributions of any sort from their accumulated and accumulating wealth."

The survey goes on to suggest two initial corrective steps (1) Compulsory public reporting of financial and other operations of all tax-exempt foundations, and (2) limiting tax exemption contributions to organisations with an active program for the social welfare.

During the Senate hearings on the Textron case, as reported in the Nation, Mr. Little and his associates made the point, in their testimony before Senator Tobey, that what would hurt them would also hurt "Harvard University and the Catholic Church."

The suggestions made to remedy and correct the entire situations involving questionable foundations and trusts is merely in palliative form. The Nation wants to know what the reaction would be were the University of Chicago to acquire U.S. Steel and Notre Dame were to take over General Motors. The profits would, of course, be paid to the institutions but the tax collector would get no share and other taxpayers would be obliged to make up the difference.

Senator Tobey's report gave no solution to the problem except to suggest that trusts be made to pay 85 per cent of their annual gross income to the beneficiaries. To some trusts and foundations, this would be a body blow where it hurts - right in the coffers.

At later times I approached officials of the Rockefeller Foundation (see SS No. 84) the Carnegie Corporation and others. I have often wondered why I was invariably turned down. Today (1956, when writing this report) I believe to know the real reasons.

Employees of scientific foundations have wonderful posts. They are not salesmen who have to show sales. They are no managers who have to turn out products which sell. They are not businessmen who have to show a profit at the end of the year, or go out of business. Indeed, they have to show no success whatever. Moreover, they can draw a very good salary, because their salary need not be considered by the profit and loss account. Then they can make fine travels to distant countries in order to get personally acquainted with the people whom the foundation will favour with subsidies. Again in these travels they do not need to show any success whatever.

All they have to do is to see that their wonderful job is not endangered, that they should not commit anything which might bring them into discredit with the men who control the foundations. Consequently, they are determined to play safe - under all circumstances. To give away money to a University is absolutely safe, provided the university is a safe university, not one put up by Negroes, or Jews, or some religious organisation. There are dozens of such institutions in the U.S.A. which call themselves universities. A safe university is a state university, like London University, Sydney University. Furthermore, the professors to whom the grants go must have a respectable name, and this means that they must have published a lot in their field. (Later I found out that many of these publications are paid for by the professors themselves, who are mercilessly fleeced by printers, publishers and their henchmen the editors of scientific journals). In short, a grant given by the officers of a foundation to such a professor of such a university is a safe thing. The trustees of the foundation will never take to task an official who has advocated a grant to those safe institutions.

But a grant to an obscure man who is not on the staff of a university and who claims a work which looks like a crackpot idea? For Goodness sake, this could incur displeasure high up, and complaints by professors whose applications have been turned down. Nothing could be more dangerous to the safety of the job of a foundation official than to help a pioneer of a new idea, especially an outsider. But even a professor who is considered a bit on the cranky side with regard to his unusual ideas must be shunned like the devil.

And this is indeed all that matters with the officials of foundations. Their job and only their job is of paramount importance. Nothing else matters. I hope that I shall live to be able to launch a public campaign against these practises. I shall demand that outsiders should get a trial before a judge and a jury if their application by a foundation is rejected. At least, a pioneer should get the same treatment any criminal gets: a trial, a counsel for the

defence, a judge and a jury. And if they find that he has indeed committed a creative crime to his credit, then he should be sentenced to a number of years in an institution of monastic character. Like a criminal he should be relieved of his worries for the next meal, the next rent, the next pair of shoes. He should be given enough paper to write on, so that later generations may benefit by his work.

"Justice for the Genius" this is the title of a brochure which I want to write. I hope that the eternal force which works in the universe will give me the life and the power to start this work and to make mankind realize that mankind's best sons, the pioneers of new ideas for the betterment of mankind, are treated shamefully by the men who all the time profess to work for mankind, yet all the time are working only for themselves.

PS. Re-reading all this I see that I have forgotten to add that Farrell Brown, and Prof. Ward and Maurice Brown ignored of course my letters written to them. I wish to add also, that I handed over to Lord Nuffield a personal letter of the Secretary of the National Road and Motorist Association of N.S.W. It had, of course, no effect.