



WHAT ACTUALLY HAPPENED AT MY MEETING WITH HUXLEY

Dr. Julian Huxley answered my first letter (Semantography Series No. 122) with a letter from Perth, acknowledging my "interesting letter" and saying "I hope it will be possible for me to see you and hear something of your work when I am in Sydney." He asked me to get in touch with him at the Australia Hotel in order to "arrange something." I left a letter at the Hotel saying that I shall approach him after his second lecture in the Assembly Hall.

I was a bit crestfallen when he informed me there that his time table is so crammed that he does not see any possibility to see me. As I had hoped for 8 long years for just this meeting, I gave him, somewhat desperately, a piece of my mind and told him of the difficulties which men of new ideas have in bringing them to the knowledge of the scholarly world. What I said then is contained in the first page of my foregoing NOTES (Semantography Series No. 123). He then consented to see me Friday the 13th at 4.45 at the Institute of International Affairs.

Throughout the following Tuesday and Wednesday I expected any minute a telephone call "Dr. Huxley regrets... I had to prepare for this emergency and I had to prepare myself for the meeting. I typed therefore my NOTES which I wanted to send him in case we do not meet. The work on these notes was hectic, I did something during my business hours, but the rest had to be done during the night preceding our meeting. When the hour arrived I hardly could keep my eyes open. I took benzidrine and went to meet Huxley.

At the rooms of the Institute I was told that Dr. Huxley will surely come, because there is a pile of letter to be signed by him. He was scheduled to arrive at 4.45. I enquired apprehensively about the next meeting on his program of his last day in Sydney. I was told that he is scheduled to appear at a reception in the Rural Bank building at 5.15. Goodness, this leaves him about 20 minutes for me and a pile of letters to sign. Confound those puerile palavers!

Frantically I crossed out in my mind all that of my Notes which I could not tell him in so short a time. Then, as it usually happens it occurred to me that I have forgotten to mention the most important item, the use of Semantography for an International Science Abstract which scientists of any nation could read in their own mother tongue. Huxley was very much instrumental in the Unesco Abstracts Committee to bring about some order in the Babel of scientific publications and abstracts of them. I took out the folder (Semantography Series No. 43), distributed at my lecture to the Students Geological Society of the University of Sydney and marked in red the part printed on this item. Then I placed it on top of my notes. I did the same in the file which I had prepared to give Huxley.

4.45 and no sign of Huxley. 4.50, 4.55, I crossed out more and more of my notes. 5 o'clock. The telephone rang. Now it comes "Dr. Huxley regrets..." Instead Huxley himself came through the door. Thank God, or rather (excuse me) thank Evolution and the rest. Our molecules have met.

In the following paragraphs I shall give an account of our meeting in the form of a dialogue. However, it was not much of a dialogue, rather a monologue. I didn't let him talk much, I HAD TO TALK AND TALK FAST. I had at the best perhaps 5 or 10 minutes to talk and I had to make him not forget my talk. With all the force of my talkative rhetoric (for which I am noted and feared) I had to grip his throat and shake him and his mind. I feared and my fear came true, that he will let me talk and he will read and sign his letters. And this is exactly what happened. I let him sign, but I did not let him read.

I had no tape recorder, so the words mentioned are not the actual words used by Huxley. This is an advantage because no copyright is involved. Moreover I cannot remember all he said. My mind was under high pressure. Typing this account down onto the wax stencil without a draft, I might remember something later on. If I find it relevant and of importance I shall add it at a later date. I had prepared a blackboard and was prepared to show him the symbols which I have shown in the foregoing Notes. But for this there was no time. I took out the green brochure (Semantography Series No. 62) the reprint of the article by W.A. HEANEY "SEMANTOGRAPHY One Writing for One World." which appeared in the Magazine of the New England University College of Armidale, N.S.W. The reader of these pages must put before him this brochure, as I described the symbols shown there.



The thoughts which crossed my mind during this meeting and our talk, thoughts of which I did not speak, are contained in the lines put into brackets.

Huxley: I am late Mr. Bliss. I apologize. Come right over and sit down next to me. I shall sign these letters and listen to your talk.

Bliss: Thank you, Professor. In 1945 I met in China Professor Joseph Needham of Cambridge on his way to the first General Conference of Unesco. He was very much taken with my work and he took my notes to Paris. He promised to do something about it. But I believe that he did nothing. He did not answer my questioning letters. Now at last 8 years have passed for the moment to come for which I longed. You the builder of Unesco ready at last to listen to me. And - astrologically speaking - today is Friday the 13th. Our planetary system is set for a most fateful meeting for Semantography. You know already what it is. You know too, that all attempts for an international language like Esperanto have failed, and I think you did right in banning any Unesco work on this. But symbols can be read in any mother tongues. And here are some of my symbols. ( I opened up brochure no. 62 and put page 5 before him).

Before you take a look I wish to say that I am no phantast. I do not think for a moment that people, scholars and laymen should start reading and writing in my symbols. But the idea of Semantography is already in use in the arrows on the motor highways of the world. This means a CURVE TO THE RIGHT in all languages of the world. Similary we can start using some of my symbols in some restricted fields.

Now look at these symbols. The first is the outline of a DOOR. The arrow marks then ENTRANCE and EXIT. The wavy line outlines a leaping flame, so this means FIRE EXIT. These symbols could be displayed throughout the world in every public building, school, cinema, theatre, etc. etc. The words in the native languages should always be put underneath the symbols, so that people would immediately grasp their meanings, even if they see them in a foreign city, foreign ship, airplane, etc.

Now here are symbols for an International Calendar. The SUN over the EARTH is a picture of what we mean by DAY. And the number 5 indicates the fifth day which is THURSDAY.

Huxley: What about those nations which do not use arabic numerals? The Chinese for instance.

Bliss: Oh Professor, don't say this. I spent 6 years in China. They have different numerical symbols, agreed, the first 3 being the Roman symbols pictured horizontally, the natural symbols as I call them: - = = But the other symbols are quite complex. Worse even, they have also CAPITAL NUMBERS, even more complex, which they display on their bank notes. But next to them they display the arabic numerals. And on their telephones and in their telephone books they have only the arabic symbols 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0. (Excuse me Professor, but the "arabic" symbols are Hindu Sanscrit letters).

Huxley: Good. Go ahead!

Bliss: Now here are a few symbols for use on seed packages for the illiterate peasants of Asia, Africa and elsewhere who speak in hundreds of languages and thousands of dialects. This is the outline of a KNIFE, a CUTTER. Combined with the symbol for EARTH it means a cutter of earth, a PLOUGH. These two bent lines picture grain stalks waving in the wind, so this means GRAIN. And this compound symbol of the KNIFE and the GRAIN means of course cutting the grain HARVEST. (Should I tell him about a recent happening? A well known Professor of Agriculture delivered a great oratory on the World Food Problem. Then Dr. Douglas N. Everingham my great friend and co-worker wrote to him and drew his attention to Semantography as a helpful tool in the drive for more food in the illiterate and ill-nourished countries of South East Asia. I then wrote a detailed letter explaining some of my symbols for peasants, but also their use for agricultural research reports for field workers speaking different languages. Then the professor answered Everingham denying the practicability of my symbols without having seen one of them. My long letter written, I asked the professor in a short note "Won't you even have a look at them?" But he did not answer. Other professors too refused to look. Incredible but true!

Huxley: Ah, and these are symbols for international postal communication !

Bliss: Yes, Professor, I am delighted that <sup>you</sup> recognize them with a short glance only. Yes, this is the outline of a LETTER, and with the lightning sign it means an elec-



tric letter. With the outline of wings (already used as a symbol for flying) it means an AIRLETTER. Of course telegram for instance is an international word already, and therefore this word can be used instead of the symbol. But telegram has no meaning for the peoples of Asia who know nothing of Latin and Greek words.

Huxley: Have you thought of a typewriter to type your symbols?

Bliss: Of course I have, and Underwood Typewriter Corporation of America has agreed to adjust an ordinary typewriter model for the typing of the symbols.

Huxley: An ordinary model ? How many types do you have on your typewriter?

Bliss: Just about 42. It is done by omitting the CAPITAL letters and having the symbol elements on their keys for the typing of the symbols. This leaves the typewriter with all the usual small letters of the alphabet for ordinary writing, for writing of names, for writing of scientific terms and international terms as for instance evolution and telegram. The trouble is only that Underwood wants me to pay for the conversion and I have no money for this.

Huxley: Very interesting. Proceed!

Bliss: The following symbols stand for the human male and female. In my memorandum I have pointed out that these symbols must not be treated as childlike drawings, but as scientific symbols for that biological entity, homo sapiens.

Huxley: Ah, and the number 1 indicates I and number 2 you.

Bliss: Correct. Now we are able to write a letter, or rather the sentence: "I write a letter to you". The inclined line indicates a PEN held in the usual inclined writing position...

Huxley: (Looking over the next line of symbols and noting that this symbol  $\wedge$  stands for physical ACTION) Ah, and the  $\wedge$  action symbol at the symbol for PEN means TO PEN, TO WRITE.

Bliss: Correct, Professor. Now let's jump right over to Semantography for scientific communication. (I turned to page 7 of the green brochure). This here is the outline of a retort, the age-old symbol for chemistry ( and I am sorry to say also used on the lapels of military units for chemical warfare). The retort symbol stands therefore for the meaning of CHEMICAL. Please observe the advantageous simplicity of these symbols compared with the phonetic symbols. The lines in C H E M I C A L are much more than the few lines outlining a retort. With the symbol for MAN we have then a CHEMIST, and the following is a complex symbol compound in which I use the ordinary mathematical sign for division + and my symbol for MATTER. I have chosen the beautiful simplicity of the square in order to indicate that MATTER is built up harmoniously and not chaotically. This  $\square$  is what we see in some crystals and molecular arrangements. The compound symbol then reads CHEMICAL DIVISION OF MATTER which is indeed what we do when we speak of CHEMICAL ANALYSIS.

We are now coming to the symbolization of PHYSICS. The first outline is displayed on every map. It is a scale, a ruler, a length divided in equal parts. With the  $\wedge$  action indicator on top it means then MEASURE. If we change over to the arrow which indicates a movement in a direction, the symbol outlines the division of this movement, the measurement of it, therefore MEASURING MOVEMENTS, and this is exactly what the PHYSICIST does.

Huxley: A physicist does not always measure movements.

Bliss: I think he does. Even if he experiments with motionless bodies, liquids, gases, static gravitational and electromagnetic fields he will observe instruments on which needles will be moved by pressure of molecules, atoms, electrons, etc. But as you criticise my pictorial symbol for Physicist, may I criticise your phonetic symbol P H Y S I C I S T. Do these lines suggest anything in connection with what a physicist does? And even if you explain it to someone, will he then grasp the meaning of PHYSICIAN and are these both men engaged in PHYSICAL EDUCATION and PHYSICAL CULTURE ?

Now the next line of symbols is again easy to grasp. The first, GRAVITATION showing a material body moving downward. The second symbol indicates PRESSURE.



The third symbol pictures what happens if we want to mix powders or liquids. We have to "intermix" (so to speak) the parts, which movement is indicated by the two "intermixing" arrows. If we put the Action indicator on top, it means the Action of mixing. If we put the matter indicator on top we have <sup>the</sup> thing mixed, the MIXTURE. The last symbol indicates a gas bubble (in a liquid) going upwards, a picture of GAS which otherwise cannot be pictured.

The next line of symbols shows first an arrow going into an enclosure, which pictures the meaning of ABSORPTION. The wavy line indicates WATER, and the following symbols indicate what we mean by DELIQUESCENCE and EFFLORESCENCE.

The next line shows some symbols for medicine. The first symbol is...

Huxley: The rod of Aesculapius.

Bliss: Correct. Then we have the medicineman, the DOCTOR. The next symbol shows that the Latin words in medicine (already used and known by doctors all over the world) can be used in conjunction with the symbols of Semantography. Thus the entering of the ileum into the colon can be shown instead of the difficult English word INTUSSUSCEPTION.

Huxley: And how are you proposing to use these symbols for scientific communication?

BLISS: I have been director of the patent department of a large European firm. I handled thousands of patent specifications of various countries, written in a variety of languages. I need not tell you about the great difficulties which scientists and doctors face, knowing that most important reports on research in their field are hidden away in scientific journals printed in languages they cannot read. Moreover, even the richest universities cannot buy all the scientific journals in all the languages (of little use to those who cannot read them). The first thing I propose is an international science abstract, printed on small filing cards, the size of a post card. These cards should contain the title indicating the subject, and the result of the research in say 100 words, also all necessary reference data and the filing number according to the Dewey library system, already in use in most libraries.

Anglo American Universities should issue abstracts written in English - and the symbols above each word. French Universities will write in French - and the symbols, etc.etc. Anyone who can read the language in which a report is written, need not to be bothered about the symbols. The others will read the symbols in their own language be it Hindustani or Danish or any other language.

These filing card should be interchanged between universities, but every doctor or engineer, or scientist, every hospital, industry, institute could subscribe to the cards for their special field only. They would receive every month the batch from the international distribution centre and thus would know immediately what's going on in their field in the whole world.

Huxley: It would be a good thing, no doubt.

Bliss: And imagine the additional advantage. Two doctors speaking different languages could write letters to each other. So can an engineer, corresponding with a firm in another country. Phantastic as this may seem, we must realize that today every larger commercial or industrial firm uses an international ideography, complicated, cumbersome, illogical to the extent of madness - THE TELEGRAPHIC CODES. Radio-photo cables in Semantography can be read in any language.

Huxley: And you have put all this down in these three large volumes?

Bliss: Yes. You and other people may think that the few examples I have given may be well selected. But I may have great difficulties in symbolising difficult meanings. For this reason, I have written large chapters for many sciences, industry, commerce, communication, etc, showing that every meaning can be symbolised. I shall place these 3 volumes at your disposal in London, and I hope that you will convince yourself that I have done a thorough job during 7 years of work.

Huxley: Now, so far you have symbolised the world of matter. But how about the world of the psyche?

Bliss: Yes, the world of the mind. For all meanings related to it, we must use first the symbol of the mind as pictured here on page 6 of the green brochure. I have simply



followed the outline of the upper skull, under which the brain is housed, thus  $\cap$  (turning to page 6 of the green brochure). Now we have the three divisions of mind activities, popularly called Emotion, Reason, Conscience. We can picture these meanings by placing the mind symbol  $\cap$  on three different levels. This would be awkward for writing on unlined paper, and therefore I have chosen three alternate symbols, the age-old symbol of the heart for EMOTION, the  $\cap$  symbol for REASON and a mind superimposed upon the mind of the individual  $\cap$  for CONSCIENCE. This is a direct picture of the meaning of Superego, the term used by Freud. The superimposed mind could be the mind of the father, mother or people in authority. If it is the mind of Hitler, or Stalin, or Savanarola, or Torquemada then the individuals influenced by those Super Minds will commit atrocities with a clear conscience, believing that what they do is good and right and that they are only eradicating bad and evil men.

Now here are my symbols for the meanings of good and bad with the rational mind symbol, and good and bad in the moral sense with the double mind symbol  $\cap$  standing for conscience.

These symbols simple as they may seem become however very disturbing if we operate them according to the operational rules of Semantography which are taken from biology. The first rule says that not two human beings are alike and therefore not two minds are alike, think alike and act alike. This is written in Semantography  $\cap_1 \neq \cap_2$ . Applied to the symbols for good and evil, their meaning will vary with various minds. What one mind may consider good, another mind may consider evil. What some Nazis considered good, Jews have considered evil. What orthodox Jews may consider good, orthodox Mahomedans may consider evil and the work of the devil, and so forth.

Now your colleague in the United Nations, the famous psychiatrist Dr. Brock Chisholm, Director General of the World Health Organisation has evolved a theory on the cause of human war and strife. He remarked that the concept of good and evil is at the root of every human strife.

Huxley: That was a very silly remark of him!

Bliss: (Oh no! You haven't grasped my symbolization shown before. Silly is a mind judgement and therefore the min $\cap$  symbol must be introduced. Then, what one mind considers silly, another mind may consider not silly at all) Oh well, Professor, in that case, I won't go further with Chisholm's theory. But I have all written down in this memorandum prepared for you. Please read it and then judge again, because of the second operational rule of Semantography namely, that a mind may change his mind (so to speak). What you consider silly today may not seem silly any more when you have read what I said and found. Professor Clyde Kluckhohn of Harvard University is very much on my side. Another anthropologist who thinks similarly is Professor Ashley Montagu of Rutgers University, with whom I have corresponded. Kluckhohn as associate editor of PSYCHIATRY has commissioned me to write an article on my findings for this journal. I shall be most interested to hear your opinion after you have read my memorandum.

Huxley: I shall read it.

Bliss: And now comes the inevitable.

Huxley: What is the inevitable?

Bliss: You see, when I have demonstrated a few of my symbols to a scholar and ask him to give me any meaning he can think of, Symbolization in Semantography he is already convinced that I can do this. And therefore he usually gives me a word the meaning of which has defied definition since man began to think. So the inevitable is now that I shall demonstrate to you, the modern ikonoclast, the Bilderstuermer, the idolsmasher, my symbol for...

Huxley: For what?

Bliss: For God, Creator of the Universe. It was exactly the question which Bertrand Russell put to me three years ago here in Sydney.

Huxley: (amused) Well! Go ahead! I am listening.



Bliss: I do not believe in a God with Halleluja and all paraphernalia. But neither do I believe that this universe of ours is the result of mere chaotic chance, atoms drifting aimlessly and forming complex organisations. On the contrary. Wherever we look into the macrocosmos and the microcosmos and especially into the living organism we cannot but being overwhelmed by an order and a purpose which is nothing short of being miraculous, or as you said in your lecture "almost miraculous."

How can we picture that purposive force working in the Universe, creating higher order out of lower order? It is all present, it is seen everywhere yet unseen. Surely the phonetic symbols of G-O-D, or G-O-T-T, or D-I-E-U or D-I-O do not tell us anything. If we want to picture the working of that force we can only picture a few of its manifestations. In order to be very simple I have chosen 2 manifestations, the one for not living matter, the other for living matter.

Now, I could use for instance my symbol for matter  $\square$  indicating that matter is built up harmoniously in a crystal. I could use the  $\min^{\circ}$  symbol as the highest manifestation of living matter on our planet. Indeed that bit of grey matter contained under our skull  $\cap$  has made us creators ourselves. We have been able to create apparatuses which are nothing short of miraculous and which may not be found on many celestial bodies.

But these 2 symbols  $\square$  and  $\cap$ , although they are manifestations of the working force of our universe are used in Semantography for every-day thought. I had to choose 2 other symbols. I have followed the Greeks of old who saw in the simplicity and harmony of geometrical configurations direct proof that this Universe contains harmonious order. Of all the geometrical configurations, the equal-sided triangle is the most simple and the most harmonious one. This symbol may therefore stay for Order in the world of Matter.

In searching for manifestations of living matter I found one which to me seems even more miraculous than the manifestation of the mind. How many stupid people populate this planet? How many cretins and lunatics overcrowd our asylums? But stupid or wise, demented or not, all human beings have something with which they can reach the furthest stars. But not only humans can reach the furthest stars. Every animal, every fish, every bird, every insect can do the same.

Having been an ardent photographer since my boyhood, and being the son of an optician, having played with lenses in my father's workshop since I started to crawl and being a practical factory engineer, I have no hesitation to say that for me the most miraculous living organ is the eye. There is the lens, the shutter the diaphragm, the projecting screen, the automatic adaptation and all the many miracles more. What are we debating what came first, the hen or the egg? Why does it not occur to us that within an egg the most miraculous instrument is formed, the eye?

Since I listened as a boy to my physics teacher I could never stomach the impertinence of the great physicist of the 19th century Helmholtz. He had the impunity and stupidity to say that if an optician would deliver him an optical instrument so faulty as the human eye, he would send it back.

And so I place the symbol of the eye within the symbol of the equal-sided triangle as it is seen on page 8 of this brochure (which I have before you) Now, once this symbol is formed it becomes a very familiar one. Indeed, it has been used for thousands of years, it has been displayed on temples, churches and synagogues and other places of worship to symbolize (nothing more than to symbolize) that mysterious force which we have called many names.

(I had spoken in great haste, because I realized that my time was up. I had swallowed half sentences and said in a few words what I have written here more elaborately. Some sentences only crossed my mind and remained unsaid. As I am sending this report to Huxley anyway, it will be of help to illustrate even more of what I want to say)

Now Professor, you know that this symbol for the creative force in our universe has been displayed in a variety of forms. You can find it even - of all the places - on the seal of the United States displayed on American dollar notes. And (probably because of that) some artists have depicted this symbol with a very angry eye against a thunderous background of clouds and flashes, indicating that God looks angrily at the worship of Mammon. As the symbol has thus become



the symbol for a personified heavenly father looking angrily with a stern stare at us, I have modified the symbol for those who do not believe in an personified Creator. I took the eye out, and the remaining enigmatic symbol of the equal-sided triangle may now stand for Mother Nature (whatever that may mean).

On page 596 of Volume III of SEMANTOGRAPHY I have symbolized a saying which I heard many years before. A Dutch biologist closed his lecture with a saying of a British philosopher: Nature has kindled a light, the human mind to disclose little by little her secrets. You have said something similar in your lectures. But if you look at the simple symbolization of this sentence in Semantography you may realize that it can be read by Believers and Unbelievers with equal awe.

Bertrand Russell was very much satisfied with these my explanations and he asked me then to symbolize the meaning of PHILOSOPHER. You will find the symbol on page 8, the rational mind of a human being contemplating Nature.

Huxley: (who listened very attentively) Well, how would you symbolize Evolution?

Bliss: Confound it ! I should have thought that you will ask me this very question. I am completely unprepared, and I would have to analyse and improvise a symbol for this meaning. But whatever I might show you, I am sure to catch l'esprit de l'escalier, the idea on the staircase or rather in the elevator going down. In any case, I shall write to you about my final symbol. But right now.... let me first define the meaning of Evolution, then I shall analyse its meaning elements and write down the symbols.

Now... Evolution, I would say, is a phenomenon in living organisms who display an urge to develop into organisms of a higher order.

Huxley: Don't say urge, let us say trend.

Bliss: Alright, trend it is (but if you want to express with this word an aimless drifting, some genes saying to each other: We are sick of the old game. Let's have a change. How about a mutation !...I am not going to follow you.)

Alright let us say trend, an upward trend.

Huxley: Not always upwards. Sometimes it gets stuck.

Bliss: O.K. not upwards (but I suggest that we shall compare notes one million years hence.) I suggest Professor that I get your and your definition only of the meaning of Evolution and then send you my symbolization to London.

Huxley: Good ! How would you symbolize Totem ?

Bliss: That should be easy. A totem is a thing or the symbol for a thing in mystic relationship with people. Now the symbol for a thing.... (At that moment the official of the Institute of International Affairs who had to bring Huxley to the reception, intervened. We had overstepped our time by nearly 20 minutes. The reception might become unreceptive.)

Huxley: I am sorry Mr. Bliss, but I must go. Now what do you want me to do?

Bliss: I shall be happy if you would kindly study my memorandum and then look into my books which will be in London when you come home. Then I shall be happy if you would tell me about your opinion in writing.

Huxley: What for ?

Bliss: Well, if you think highly of it, please say so. It won't help me with others. But it will give me some additional courage in the face of heavy odds.

Huxley: I have not much time. I shall be on travel for the next 4 months.

Bliss: Well, don't write the letter. Then the most important thing to do is to urge Evans, the present Director General of Unesco to do something for Semantography, either as a new medium for the illiterate billion of the world, or as a medium for scientific communication and the science abstract.



Huxley: But I have nothing to do with Unesco. I am out of it.

Bliss: But you are still the first Director General of Unesco. Your recommendation will still carry much weight.

Huxley: Why don't you approach Unesco yourself?

Bliss: I did year after year. I have piles of letters from Paris. But not only I made approaches. Prof. Lauwerys of the University of London approached Dr. Torres Bodet on my behalf. Professor Carleton Washburne approached Dr. John W. Taylor the next Director General, but the gist of all answers was that the Australian delegation must make a move for Semantography at the General Conference.

Huxley: And ?

Bliss: Allow me to be silent about the treatment meted out to me by the local Unesco officials. It is the old story again: Nemo propheta in sua patria honorem habet. But the trouble goes deeper. Even if the Australian Unesco Commissioners would be in favour of my work, even if they would not be afraid of promoting a picture writing from a crank down under, even if they were enthusiastic about my work - a majority vote must be found first until something gets going. Who of the other nations knows something about Semantography. I have printed this coloured leaflet (Semantography Series No. 15) for the General Conference in 1951, but it was not distributed. But you could have a talk with Evans. I think he is my friend. He was chairman of the Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Prof. O.L. Reiser of Pittsburgh spoke about my work. Shortly afterwards the Library of Congress Washington D.C. of which Evans is Chief Librarian gave Angus & Robertson of Sydney an order to collect all my writings including my future ones. Harvard University followed suit, and now other libraries in Australia have emulated Evans. It is good to know that your writing does not go to waste.

Huxley: And what should Evans do ?

Bliss: The Headquarters of Unesco can engage specialists without waiting for a majority vote. They don't ask for a majority vote when employing a cleaner, do they ? (Huxley laughed) They have a lot of employees - without a majority vote. I am the only person in the whole world in which mind this idea is well ordered. My mind, my knowledge, my work should not go to waste. I would hate to become an employee again, but I would do anything for Semantography.

Huxley: What are you doing now ?

Bliss: I renounced the idea of being a factory executive. It would take up all my mind. I rejected also the idea to get a teaching job in chemistry, physics, engineering, etc. I have a little business of my own, earn as much as a university lecturer and have most of the time for myself and Semantography.

Huxley: I cannot understand why you have difficulties in finding a publisher.

Bliss: This is easily explained. Firstly, this is today an outlandish idea and a bad risk for a publisher. Secondly, I am a factory man. I simply cannot go begging from one publisher to the other. I tried and found it below my dignity. I manufacture my own books. Thirdly, I have no impressive name and title. I have a university degree, thank you, but this is not enough. You know of Carlyle's Professor Teufelsdröckh of the University of Weissnichtwo, who has written a book on The Philosophy of Clothes. A few months ago I saw a great review about a new book The History of Underpants (or something). Such things are printed.

Huxley: Have you sought contact with the protagonists of an international language, with C.K. Ogden and the rest ?

Bliss: Haven't I ? Of course I have. I have approached them all. I said Semantography is not a competitor of your Esperanto, or Interlingua or Interglossa or Basic English. But it could be of mutual help. You should know what C.K. Ogden wrote, or the others, or the many scholars and professors I have approached. Everybody is too busy in promoting his own promotion. But I am undaunted. I shall succeed, in spite of everything. I shall succeed !

Huxley: Well, thank you for your most interesting demonstration and I shall see how I can help Semantography along. Yes, and here is the address of my brother Aldous in Los Angeles. You may send him the memorandum and your brochures. And now, Good bye,  
Mr. Bliss !