

THE INSTITUTE FOR SEMANTOGRAPHY

A Non-Profit Educational Research Organisation.

Founder and Director: C. K. BLISS, B.Sc.

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



SEMANTOGRAPHY SERIES No. 125
Continuation

Page 41

Sydney 26th December 1953

MY ANSWER TO JULIAN HUXLEY

Continuation of my letter

THE SYMBOLS FOR EVOLUTION AND CREATION, FOR NATURAL AND SUPERNATURAL

See Semantography Series No. 122, 123, 124, and the first 40 pages of No. 125

Dear Reader,

The first part of this publication has been posted two days before Christmas to you. Meanwhile I have learned with regret that some of my friends have not received it on Christmas Eve, owing to the great mass of Christmas letters. Nevertheless, you will receive it during the following days, and I hope you will understand my difficulties, as described on the last pages, created by my desire to tell you as best as I could about the meanings under discussion, which are indeed mankind's ultimate meanings, and which influence our outlook and our future, our peace and, I regret to say, our wars.

Now, in the quiet of the Christmas holidays I continue, not knowing how many pages I am going to fill with the thoughts which cross my mind and which have been stimulated by your interest. In order to enliven chapters which may seem too long, I shall here below use a number of subtitles in the next and following chapters.

A U S T R A L I A ' S " G R E A T E S T " A N I M A L P I O N E E R O F E V O L U T I O N

We ended the last chapter in saying that we shall now turn to that mysterious creative process which has been termed "natural selection" in order to find out how those eternal mental ethical laws of the Universe manifest themselves in animals. These laws of the Universe have been formulated: "The Creation of Order out of Chaos by mutual help of individual atoms and molecules, of cells and organisms" and "The Creation of higher Order out of lower Order."

I have said that I know of no better specimen to demonstrate the second law than of a tiny Australian animal, which is a great pioneer of Evolution and which indeed suffers the fate of every true pioneer. It is almost unknown in its own country, unrecognized and unrewarded. The platypus and the kangaroo, the emu and koala bear have been feted and commemorated on millions of stamps and souvenirs, but not this one, of which I think that it is Australia's greatest animal. Let me tell you its story in true animal story fashion.

The Invention of New Words

When I was in highschool we had an illustrated zoology book and I remember even today the picture of the platypus with the name "Das australische Schnabeltier" - "The Australian Billanimal". To realize the significance in this German word, it is necessary to know that some German grammarians undertook vigorous campaigns for the "cleansing" of the German language from foreign words. Instead, German words were substituted the meaning of which was known to the common man. For instance, the word "Gravitation" is used in German, but often substituted by the word "Schwerkraft" which literally means "Force of Heaviness" not "Force of Gravity" as "Gravity" would again be a foreign word. Even in English such common words would be beneficial, as "Gravitation" has no or little meaning for the common man, whereas the "Force which causes Heaviness" is a good descriptive term. I am of the opinion that such common descriptive words should be invented and used correspondingly for every scientific highbrow term in English.

As shown before, those "Verdeutschung" (Germanisation) endeavours are beneficial in places, but they have their difficulties and dangers. Once a grammarian is out to find the etymology (word origin) of a word he should have no difficulty - if he is able to go far enough - to find that the word in question comes from a foreign language. I remember that those "Verdeutschung" grammarians wanted to ban the word "Nase" from the German language, because its meaning "Nose" stems from the Latin nasus. Now, this German word is so common that the replacement word proposed by the grammarians caused hilarity throughout the German orbit. They proposed the word "Gesichtserker" which literally translated means facebay or better facebalcony.

A new word for our Platypus.

In Book III, p. 423ff you will find an interesting chapter "The Future of Words" in which I try to show that Semantography may be helpful in the invention of new words which we need. At present such new words are invented on the whim of an official who happened to edit certain papers for general distribution. So we have "the returning officer" which causes endless questions by our new immigrants who have difficulty to understand that it means the officer to whom ballot papers in voting are returned. A much better word would be "the votecollector". Similarly we have a landed pilot and a landed gentry, or a grounded aircraft and a grounded coffee, etc. etc.

The word "platypus" is such a word which "misses the point." "Platy" means flat in Latin and "pous" means foot, in short "Flatfoot". But this description misses indeed the point, because the outstanding feature of the foot of a platypus is that it is webbed. It has a membran between the fingers like a duck and like other birds which swim on water and propel themselves by paddling with their webbed feet. A better term would therefore be "Webbfoot".

Now, we have a common name in English for the platypus and this is "Duckbill" which again misses the point, because every duck has a bill and can be called Duckbill or Billduck. What then is the outstanding feature of the platypus?

The German translators have done a good job in calling it "das australische Schnabeltier" - the Australian Billanimal. The amazing feature of the platypus is that it is a bird, it has webbed feet and it has a bill and the female lays an egg. But when the little platychick comes out of the egg, the mother suckles it at her breasts like an animal.

The Birdanimal

And here we have one manifestation of the mental law of the Universe, the Creation of higher order for the benefit and help of another individual. When chicks come out from their eggs they would starve if there were no food available. They would starve before the worried eyes of their mother who could not feed them by her own means. So, the "natural selector" or the "selective Nature" decided that this would be a risk in the bringing up of higher organisms - and somehow (Heaven only knows how) the mother was provided with an incredible apparatus: As soon as the "chick" hatches out of the platypus egg, Mama Platypus suddenly feels how her breasts are being filled with wholesome food for her young ones. The young cuddling up to mother soon finds out about the sweet milk and begins to drink - and live.

Why did I dwell so long on the study of words for our platypus? It is because that good German word "Schnabeltier" changed my religious and scientific outlook. Had I been forced to learn the Latin word platypus I would have forgotten it in no time. But that common description billanimal told me immediately of the paradox phenomenon, ^{though} birdanimal "Vogeltier" would have been even more to the point.

When I began to discard the story of Creation as told in the Bible, there was still a great gap to be bridged in the new story of Evolution. For me, the bridge from plant to fish was the coral, then the anemones, creatures which are fastened to the ground like plants. The bridge from the fish to the reptil was easy to find. Then we have the flying fish, obvious link between fish and bird. But there was one great and important gap - a tremendous step forward in the protection of the coming helpless generation - a step of highest ethics - the provision of food within the mother animal, so that the young will not die. This gap from bird to mammal was filled for me by the "Australische Schnabeltier". This little animal completed my atheistic outlook and changed my life. It is only fitting to say that this very animal reversed my outlook again when I came to Australia and read more about it.

Mama and Papa Platypus in their Burrow and Sorrow

Papa Platypus came home from his day's work. He did not forget to wipe his feet before entering the burrow. Suddenly he stopped. He heard a strange noise. He listened intently and knew what it was. His wife was crying. He rushed into the home and found her in tears, sobbing helplessly "My baby, my baby, I have lost my baby!"

"What happened dear?" he asked in alarm. Then he saw it. The egg was broken and the content spilled on the ground. A large stone obviously loosened from the ceiling must have fallen down and crushed it. There was nothing to do but comfort Mama. But what could he say? He knew that within her the eternal urge was to have a baby. It was the same eternal urge which brought them together and brought them so many sweet hours of love making.

"Now, now, my dear, don't cry," he said, "here, I have brought you one of your delicacies. Now, you must eat, and you must sleep too. Come!" He urged her gently into bed. Slowly, her crying became softer until it stopped.

But he could not find any sleep. And in the dark of the night he felt that his wife too was not asleep. She moved. "Why don't you sleep my dear?" he asked softly. "I have been thinking and thinking," Mama Platypus answered. "I am very unhappy about this egg procedure. It's too risky. Anything can happen. You lay your egg on the ground, but you cannot hover over it all the time. Sometimes you must go and be it for a few minutes only. Then the disaster may happen."

"But what could you do?" said Papa Platypus. You know we are helpless. All this egg business - you know we don't do it - IT does it somehow within ourselves. If I were a great scholar I would say "We don't live our lives. IT lives us. We are lived by unknown and uncontrollable forces!" I must have read it somewhere. I believe a man with the name of Freud said this."

"Yes, you are right", said Mama, "but I am thinking. Perhaps we can do something about it. After all, we have got a Mind, haven't we? And we use our Mind, don't we, in building a burrow, in hunting, in nursing our wounds, in defending our young ones. Why can't we use our mind in avoiding those risks to our offsprings, as the one which happened to-day?"

"Have you any definite idea in your Mind?" asked Papa, who knew that Mama was a very intelligent creature. "Yes, I have," said Mama, "yesterday I passed by the department store of David Jones, and I saw something in the window, something new, a "cuddleseat" they call it, and it is priced only at £ 2.15.6 - no, no, my dear, don't get alarmed. I know we can't afford it. And besides, we have no money. This is for the human mothers only who are too tired to carry their babes in arms. It's a kind of pouch which they hang before them just near to their breasts. I think I can make one myself. Imagine the advantages: I would lay my egg straight into that pouch and carry it around with me all the time. It would be protected all the time. It would be warm all the time. And when our little one hatches, why, it would be right on the spot where the milk flows. And it could stay there in its little cradle until it has grown strong enough to climb out by itself. What do you think of this idea?"

"Mama", said Papa Platypus in admiration, "the idea is grand. And if you really can do it, you would be the greatest genius on earth. Start on it Mama, right when the morning comes, and may the Creator bless you with his creative power."

And this is exactly what happened. Another manifestation of the creative power which I have symbolized with my Mind symbol M.

"Anthropomorphism" is the Word.

In the foregoing chapters I have used the word Creator, and God Father, and Mother Nature, and I have teased Huxley by resolving his "natural selection" into the agens or "agent" which does the selection, the "natural Selector" or the "selective Naturor". And now, I am going to the ludicrous length and let platypuses talk as if they were human beings. It should be enough to think of a God Father and a Mother Nature as if they were thinking and acting like human beings.

Indeed, the highbrow could "kill" all these references effectively with one word "Anthropomorphism". Anthropos means in Greek human being, and morphe means form. Together it means "of human form." In particular it means according to Webster

1. Ascription of human characteristics to things not human.
2. Representation or conception of God, or of a god under a human form, or with human attributes and affections.

Well, I have been guilty of Anthropomorphism. I have talked of a God Father and a Mother Nature and a natural Selector and have thus conceived the idea of a supernatural Being which thinks for us and which creates all things and directs all things. I apologize.

The fact is - as I have proved in foregoing chapters - that the cells of a plant, or a flower, or a fish, or bird, or animal, or the cells of a human being act in a most intelligent way, in most amazing co-operation, in almost miraculous mutual help if some of their fellow cells have met with an accident. They build new cells and they have found a method of creating new generations of organisms.

Consequently the cells themselves - and no outside supernatural Being - are responsible for the working of those mental ethical laws: the Creation of Order out of Chaos by mutual help, and the Creation of higher Order out of lower Order.

Then apparently they, the cells which form the body and brain of Mama Platypus have decided to carry out that plan originated in Mama Platypus and so much admired by Papa Platypus. They the cells added a pouch to later generations so that later generations of mothers could lay their egg into this "cuddleseat." They the cells provided a mammary gland within that pouch for the feeding of the young ones. But how did they do it? It's natural of course, but it is supernatural in every sense of the word. To assume a Supreme Intelligence, a Creator who does all the thinking and all the creating like we human do - this was quite "natural" for untold generations of man. But to assume that those little cells are doing these incredible deeds all by themselves is "supernatural" alright.

Incredible as it seems, this is the modern view, and it is necessary to dwell a little on the way how modern scholars came to fashion the new theory.

SCIENCE AND SEMANTICS

I have dwelt in foregoing chapters on words and their meanings. One aim of this publication is to impress upon you the importance of the study of Semantics. It is important for all of us to realize the disastrous consequences which are the result of the neglect of this scientific enquiry by the university authorities. The last century provides hundreds of examples. I do not hesitate to call the last 100 years the darkest age of scientific research and the darkest age of mankind. We may call it "the age of the mechanistic theory" and I have dwelt on this on p. 30 ff of this issue. I have shown the fallacy in the word "mechanistic", because a machine is a wonderful result of the creative spirit which dwells in the mind of man. I have called the theory with a better name "The Theory of Chaos." There is a direct link between the teachings of the mechanists (that is modern science) and the wholesale deportation, extermination and liquidation of races and other groups considered unreliable in the eyes of their tyrannical rulers. We have come from one tyranny into another, a much worse one.

The old tyranny was exerted by the churches who forbade scientific research which is contrary to the official teachings and especially contrary to the literal wording of the scriptures. The words in the Bible are the words of God and must be taken literally. Had Semantics been a university item for a number of centuries it would have occurred to many people that the various Bible students do not take the words of God literally. On the contrary. They invest each word with a different meaning and then quarrel and dissent about their different meanings. The result - the sorry result - is that we have today not one Christian Church, but hundreds of them - divided solely by Semantics. The result is that in the schools of the world we are taught on Monday, Wednesday and Friday not to believe what we are taught on Tuesday, Thursday and Sunday (especially Sunday). The result is that we human beings are growing up the perfect hypocrites. One aim of all my writing is to end this sorry state of affairs and to show that Science and Religion can be taught together - if we study Semantics, if

we start to realize that the hundreds of sects of believers and the hundreds of sects of unbelievers are mostly divided by different words and their different interpretations. In many cases it is the same word interpreted differently.

The churches of today have lost their power. Anyone who dares to doubt their teaching must not be afraid of life and limb. The new church of today - the one based solely on science (or so they say) is as dangerous as the old churches were in their time of power. This new church, of which Charles Darwin is saviour, saint and ~~saga~~ ^{is today} in Russia. On p. 13, I have cited Professor Ashby who told us what happens to scientists who dare to doubt the official tenets.

During the last centuries, scientists and researchers were enraged about the stubborn resistance by the official church, and as its power waned, they started to disprove one by one the tenets of the church - until they disproved the existence of a Supreme Intelligence of whom it is said that he dwells in the hated "Houses of God." But how to disprove the existence of that Supreme Intelligence? It is not easy. For everyone who has eyes to see, there are incredible happenings in the world around us, happenings which can only be explained by the existence of a force exerting a supreme intelligence, skill, wisdom and purpose.

Everyone of us realizes in his adolescence that he or she is drawn irresistibly and overwhelmingly to a being of the opposite sex. We see the same happen with all the creatures around us. And the final culmination of this "drawing-together" is rewarded by ^{the} sweetest of sensation which a human soul can endure. It is the act of Creation. In this act, a few clusters of cells come together. And by an incredible, but natural, magic more and more cells are build around the first ones, and slowly the most miraculous and wondrous engineering feats are built up: a pump - the heart, a camera - the eye, a microphon - the ear, a chemical laboratory - the stomach, a powerful crusher - the teeth, etc, etc, and above all, a mind to think up other human marvels, besides an apparatus to produce offsprings. Of course, God does not do these things. But who or what does it? Why, the cells themselves are doing all the thinking and constructing. But the cells have no brain and no design. They just can't help doing the things they do. So what does it? Well, the answer given is: IT does it! It just happens all by ITSELF. This is the answer which scholars have given and which most of "intelligent" mankind (believed to be advanced) has swallowed.

Of course, they didn't say this so simply. It would be too easy to understand. The falsehood would be too obvious. The scholars prefer to use long words in long sentences, which are almost impossible to disentangle by the common man - even if he uses a dictionary. Let's have a look at these sentences.

H A S D A R W I N D I S C O V E R E D E V O L U T I O N ?

In previous pages I have informed you that I have been director of the patent department of a large European firm. In many courtcases I had to trace the history and development of a new idea in science and technology. Invariably I found that the first men who promoted it went broke, bankrupt and worse. Others who came later got all the fame. One of my new aims in my forthcoming publication is to prevent such tragedies. Those pioneers are usually outsiders and have no means at their disposal to make their idea and their work known. I demand a court where they can go, "A Jury for the Pioneer" as the title of my new manuscript says. They should not fall into oblivion.

Legends persist not only in religious writings, but also in nonreligious ones. The "intelligent" reader spreads the legend, and it takes decades and centuries until the falsehood is properly exposed. Ask a number of your intelligent friends who "discovered" the working of Evolution. The answer will invariably be: "Why, Darwin of course!". And what is the main tenet of his discovery, you may ask. "Why, that man descended from the ape!" Well, it's all a lie.

The theory of Evolution, which Darwin repeated only, was proposed half a century before by the French naturalist Lamarck (1744 - 1829). We cannot even say that Darwin propounded it "independently" at the same time (as it sometimes happened with other discoveries). We cannot even say that Darwin was not aware of it. Charles Darwin (1809 - 1882) was the grandson of Erasmus Darwin, a contemporary of Lamarck. He was a physiologist. He worked in the same and similar fields. In short, it was in the family. Darwin knew of course of Lamarck's ideas.

Now, was Lamarck really the first man to propound the idea? I feel sure, he was not. Just give me a few months time and the money to go to France and to search in libraries, and you may be rest assured I shall find enough literature to prove that others have thought the same thoughts before. This is indeed what I have done in the past. My firm gave me the time and the money and sent me abroad to search in important libraries for men who have said the same thing before.

Of course, I can only find whatever has been printed, or - if handwritten - was considered important enough to be preserved in a library. But, as often as not, the men who thought those first thoughts had either not the time to write them down - and if they scribbled some notes, they had not the connections with important librarians. When those pioneers died, their families burned the rubbish. What I now demand in my "A Jury for the Pioneer" is that say 50 mimeographed copies of a pioneering work be preserved in 50 of the most important libraries in the world. Because those outsiders with outside ideas cannot find a publisher, who hopes to profit by printing.

Now, what is the essence of Lamarck's theory, called Lamarckism? Here I cite from the most concise (in my opinion) dictionary, Webster (1944):

Lamarckism, The theory of organic evolution proposed and maintained by the French naturalist Lamarck (1744-1829) that changes in environment cause changes in structure of animals and plants, esp. by inducing new or increased use of certain organs or parts, resulting in adaptive modification or greater development, and inducing also disuse and final atrophy of other organs; that such acquired characters are transmitted to offspring.

As you see, here we have a "natural explanation" with no reference to a supreme being, and with no admission of any ignorance. Now, where is the confidence trick? Which word does the trick? Read it again and think.

As it^{is} usually the case, a new idea needs some decades, half a century or so, until the scholarly authorities begin to wonder whether the old theories which they have maintained should be discarded. This process is then accelerated by young men who come up and in storming revolt adopt and adapt the newer theory. The man in this particular case was Charles Darwin. About his work Webster's dictionary says:

Darwinism, The theory maintains that organisms tend to produce offsprings varying slightly from their parents, and that the process of natural selection (which see) tends to favor the survival of individuals whose peculiarities render them best adapted to their environment; also, that, chiefly by the continued operation of these factors, new species not only have been and may still be produced, but organisms of widely differing groups may have arisen from common ancestors, hence popularly evolutionism.

Natural Selection, The natural process tending to cause "the survival of the fittest" (that is the survival of those forms of animals and plants best adjusted to the conditions under which they live) and extinction of poorly adapted forms. Darwin considered natural selection, operating by means of small fortuitous individual variations, as the most important factor in organic evolution. Later biologists do not generally regard it as of so great importance (relatively to other factors) in the origin of species and higher groups.

Now, you must realize that the editors of Webster's Dictionary are experts in their various fields, and that their main ability is to condense thousands upon thousands of words into a few sentences. They are doing a good job. Yet, for anyone, who is not accustomed to these long sentences, whose job is not to disentangle scientific word juggling - in short, for the common man and woman, such sentences are almost incomprehensible. Here are a variety of very different words - a veritable maze for the uninitiated.

Analysing such long sentences I am vividly reminded of my studenthood. At the highschool I was best in the natural sciences, and therefore the University of Technology was a "natural" for me. But when I attended lectures of professors I usually came out dumb-founded. In the beginning, I was despaired. Something must have happened to my mental powers. I could not understand what the lecturer was talking about. And these were my beloved subjects, the natural sciences.

In desperation I turned to the books. They too were written in highbrow scienceslang. But with a book I could pause and reread a sentence until I got the meaning of it. Then I could proceed to disentangle the next monstrous sentence. And then a terrible revelation dawned upon me. Everything said by a professor in incomprehensible terms can be told differently - in simple language. It can be told by using familiar words in short sentences. And here we have on of the epidemic "diseases" of the highbrow. He takes a devilish delight in entangling long words into long sentences - until the whole bally thing looks like deep wisdom and profound knowledge.

The result of my discovery at the university was that I stopped going to lectures. I studied from books. As I had to pay my way through the university I tutored other students, and telling them the things in simple language I had remarkable success. Later in industry, I went to evening classes, educational halls and lectured to common people, telling them of science in words they could understand. As you know, these pages are written directly onto the stencil as the thoughts come into my mind. If I have used a highbrow word, please excuse. I find it later, and am unhappy about it. But I cannot alter the printed page.

Can you find the main difference in the main theme of Lamarck's and Darwin's theory? Those statements look terribly different. But actually there is no difference. Darwin said the same thing. Let's take an example, say wild dogs. Let's use the words of the Lamarck theory and see whether they fit Darwin's explanation of the survival of the fittest by natural selection. Lamarck said:

Changes in environment cause...increased use of organs...resulting in adaptive modification or greater development...of organs

Food gets scarce

Dogs with better noses will find more food. They will produce offsprings with better noses, etc.

Climate gets colder

Dogs with thicker furs will survive, their offsprings will have thicker furs, etc, etc.

More enemies are around

Dogs with stronger legs will outrun their enemies and thus survive. Their offsprings, etc, etc.

So you see, Lamarck said the same thing which Darwin said, or rather Darwin just repeated Lamarck. But Darwin was luckier. Darwin had a good (see p. 9 of this brochure, containing S. Series No. 123, where I referred to a word from the Sydney Herald about Thomas Huxley) - a good "public relation officer", who was very good at whipping up controversies. The result is that millions upon millions of "enlightened" people believe that Darwin has discovered Evolution, that Natural Selection explains all the Creation, and that man descended from the ape. It is all a lie, of course, and many scientists admit it, but such legends die very hard.

These chapters are growing longer and longer to my consternation. I shall therefore not tell you about the haggings of the Neo-Lamarckists and the Neo-Darwinians, who haggle about the question of heredity, etc. Let us proceed to show that all of them are able to hide their profound ignorance of the basic question. But how do they do it?

WHERE IS THE VERBAL CONFIDENCE TRICK?

Which is the word in Lamarck's and Darwin's theory which covers up the main issue, which enables the professors not to admit their ignorance, and still make it look like expert knowledge? In the words of Lamarck's theory on p. 46 it is the word "new". It is innocent enough. Reread the sentence: "Changes in environment...induces) new organs or parts..." Now use the picture rule of Semantography and try to picture a real happening. When fish are left on dry land...what happens? They die. Why should they grow legs? Why should they grow wings? As I said on p. 9, a fish cannot grow a leg on his own free will. A fish cannot grow wings just by itself. Apparently the cells do something. But the cells are small clusters of molecules. To assume that they and they alone show an incredible skill, a purposeful design, that they alone are the greatest engineers - that such a theory could be propounded by modern science and swallowed by modern mankind will be incomprehensible to later generations. Just examine a fish scale, examine a skin, examine a fur, and examine the feathers of a bird. Realize the miraculous engineering feat in the production of these things. It's supernatural in every sense of the word.

Now read the exposition of Darwin's theory and try to find there the innocent word which does the confidence trick. Try to find it, then turn to the next page.

It is the word "fortuitous". "Darwin considered natural selection operating by means of small fortuitous individual variations, as the most important factor in organic evolution." On previous pages I have shown that the grammarians allow us to express any ambiguity and vagueness, even any nonsense, if only we express it "correctly", that is, in correct orthography, grammar, syntax, etc. In the above sentence we read that a Selection operates. It's anthropomorphism and worthy of the vaguest religious tract. (see p. 44).

The word "new" in Lamarck's theory is indeed a simple word. But "fortuitous" is surely a highbrow term. The common man does not use it. What does it mean? The word stems from the Latin *fortis*, meaning chance. We use the words *fortune*, *fortunate*, in short, *good luck*. And this indeed the meaning in the above sentence. Just lucky chance happenings, just by accident - and surely not by any intelligent force working actively and purposively in producing the changes in living creatures.

Once a highbrow word is used to "explain" an inexplicable happening, the word is exalted to the status of a doctrine, a theory. And so the highbrows formed an -ism: Fortuitism. About this -ism Webster says:

Fortuitism, The doctrine or belief that evolutionary adaptations and progress are chance results rather than determined consequences of natural law or ^{the} outcome of teleology.

Teleology? What's that? Let's look it up. Webster says:

Teleology, 1. The fact or the character of being directed towards an end or shaped by a purpose; - said esp. of natural processes, or of nature as a whole, conceived as determined by final causes, or by the design of a divine Providence, and opposed to purely mechanical determinism or causation exclusively by what is temporarily antecedent. 2. Sometimes the philosophical study of evidences of design in nature; more commonly, the doctrine or belief that ends are immanent in nature; esp. the vitalist doctrine that the processes of life are not exclusively determined by mechanical causes, but are directed to the realization of certain normal wholes or entelechies - opposed to mechanism.

Let us condense all this into a simple statement. *Telos*, *teleos* means in Greek end. And Teleology is the idea that whatever happens in nature, happens in accordance with an end, a design, a purpose.

I encountered this word Teleology for the first time in the highschool. We started to learn the natural sciences, and our teacher of religion knowing what's going to happen in our mind with regard to religious teachings, started to explain teleology. Water, he said, has the greatest density at 4 Centigrade above Zero. Consequently, this dense water will sink to the ground and will not freeze. Thus freezing will not commence from the ground but from the surface and consequently the fish will be able to go on living under the ice.

When we told our physics teacher about it, he smiled. This was enough for us. We didn't like religious teaching anyway. And I remember vividly that a strange coincidence made me dislike the word Teleology. As said before *telos* is a Greek word and means end, and *theos* means in Greek god. So we have Teleology and Theology. The fact that the doctrine of Teleology is constantly expounded by the theologians makes Teleology detested to those minds who detest the theologians or theologists or theologues. These words denote the men who proclaim that there is a God who directs all things towards a purpose and an end.

So Fortuitism as expounded by the Darwinians is contrary to Theologism. Consequently the Darwinians or the Fortuitists declare that only chance accidents have brought the higher organisms into being. In short, Chaos rules the world. In fairness to Darwin let us be reminded that he was a religious man, that he cited the Creator a number of times in his books and that he believed that after all, evolution is a creative process and not the outcome of chaotic chances. Then came Thomas Huxley and the others. But the rejection of teleology began with Descartes, 200 years before Darwin.

Now, who is right, the fortuitists and mechanists or the teleologists and theologists? Let's study two Australian animals which are not to be found anywhere else but in Australia: the platypus - and the other one of which I think that it is one of the "greatest" animals and pioneers of evolution.

THE MONOTREMATA (HOLE-IN-ONE) CLUB

Any father and mother will fully understand the miraculous happenings which I shall relate in the next paragraphs. However, every thinking man and woman, who ever stood before the cradle of a baby wondering how all this came about, will understand me too. Here it is, a tiny rosy piece of creation, complete with two wondering eyes, a little nose, two tiny ears, a sweet mouth, arms and legs and tiny nails and also fitted out with the apparatus which will enable it later on to create other babies and experience the sweetest of sensations in the act of Creation.

Look at the skin of a baby. Realize that no chemist in the whole world has been able to create a fabric of such incredible properties. It is smooth, it withstands many chemicals, including acids which would corrode any other material beyond repair. Instead, a skin has something which no professor has ever been able to explain. It can repair itself. It can patch up any damage and become smooth and healthy again. And this incredible process happens completely automatic. And it happens with the skin of any other creature.

But in some places, the skin gives way to holes in the body. And these holes lead into the body, which contains the most complex apparatuses ever found on earth. There is the hole of the mouth, the holes of the nose, the holes of the ears, partially closed by a microphone membrane. There are the holes filled by the eyes. There is the hole, now closed, through which mother fed her baby in her womb. And far below, there are two holes. These are our special concern.

All these holes are of a wonderful design and created for a special purpose. Some of the holes are designed to take into the body something vital for it. Some holes, like the mouth and the nostrils will take in oxygen and will give out the burnt products. And the two holes far below are used only to give out products. One hole gives out the liquid waste, the other the solid waste matter. The first hole however is also used to give out the tiny clusters of cells which create new human beings or other beings, the sperm and the egg. The sperm comes from the male, the egg from the female.

If we ought to believe the professors who tell us about evolution, then all these complexities, yet miraculous engineering devices, evolved from the most primitive of living beings, the family of the amoeba. This consist of one cell only. It has no exact hole, but cavities only through which it takes in food, excretes waste, respire and perspires, etc. In later organisms we find a definite hole leading into the body and used for taking in food and excrete waste matter. As higher and higher organisms developed, the cells (no one else) realized that the "machine" ought to have more holes, each for a distinct purpose. And so they went about their task creating these holes and lining them with the marvellous fabric, the skin. According to the "mechanistic" theory, all this happened just purposeless, just by the hit and miss chance.

And then a stage was reached where the cells had to make a decision about the hole down below. What really happened we don't know, but we here in Australia have the species which have only one hole. All the coming higher species have two. These Australians are the platypus and the echidna. They belong to the organic group of the monotremata, which simply means one hole (mono one and trema hole). Through this single hole, the female lays the egg and expels the liquid and solid waste matter. However, this one hole feature is of minor interest. Of major interest is another feature of the echidna - an incredible step forward in organic engineering design. How the professors can maintain their "mechanistic" theory of chaotic chance in the face of this feature - I cannot understand.

THE ECHIDNA - AUSTRALIAN PIONEER OF EVOLUTION

Of the platypus you have already heard in previous chapters. You have also seen many pictures in the papers and stories how some unfortunates were shipped to various zoos abroad. But I have found few people who know of the Echidnas. I have asked about them using their proper Australian names, the native porcupine or spiny anteater. Still there was much ignorance about. And even those who heard about this little animal could not tell me its outstanding feature. In short, it is a true pioneer, not recognized in its own country.

These two species, the platypus and the echidna, are the "lowest" mammals on earth. The word "low" implies some "low" quality. Therefore, let me hasten to say that we better call them the "first" mammals, because they represent a stage in evolution which is of the highest ethics: the provision of food for the young within the mother animal. In previous chapters I have told of the risk which every born creature (before the mammals) had to face: that there might not be food available. This is a great risk and so the cells did something about it: they provided mama platypus with an incredible apparatus. Please imagine the working of it. The platypus mama lays an egg and when the egg is hatched out, suddenly mama platypus feels her breast filled with sweet and wholesome food.

Now, some "mechanist", trying to explain this machine within a human mother or another mother in the animal world which bears living young, will assume that there must be some direct organic connection between the bearing mechanism and the feeding mechanism. As soon as the young one is to be expelled, the breasts fill with food. But this direct connection is absent with the platypus mama. The egg is there and not connected with any cord to mother. Yet, when the young comes out of the egg - mama's mammae (Latin breasts) fill with food. Who does it? What does it? The answer given by the professors is: IT does it. Of course, they say it in highbrow slang, but this is in fact their answer.

A few pages before, I have tried to tell a family tragedy in child-like fashion. Mama platypus lost an egg. And she got the idea of making herself a kind of "cuddleseat" which Australian mothers can buy in any department store. It is a pouch. As you know, the kangaroo has such a pouch. The platypus has it not. But the kangaroo has the pouch all the time. The female is born with it. It is there and she just can't help it. It is a wonderful idea. Since my early boyhood and since I knew about the pouch of the kangaroo, I looked for a happy family picture in every zoo I visited. In Sydney we have Taronga Zoo. But the many kangaroos there are a sorry and melancholy lot. They sit around. Never a real hop, never a real show of joy, and never could I see a little one jumping into mama's nice and warm pouch. It was only that film "Bitter Springs", in which a little kangaroo stole the whole show, which gave me that overwhelming thrill of seeing "nature" at work. The little one hopping around pursued by a little boy, and seeing that being with mama is best, just hopping into mama, turning around and then looking out snug, sweet and secure. What a sight!

Our "mechanist" may maintain that somehow by the hit and miss chance, the cells of the pouch family of creatures, the marsupials (from Latin marsupium, a pouch, bag, purse) just developed a pouch. There it was, and the young ones found it and used it. In short: the theory of chaotic chance can still be upheld. But it cannot be done any more when you know what the echidna is doing. As said before, few Australians know of the echidna, and as I shall prove soon even the Australian zoologists are very ignorant about it. People outside of Australia be they zoologists or laymen are even more ignorant (as I shall soon prove). There is the delightful story of the tennis star gorgeous Gussy Moran. A few years ago she came to Australia and hoped to see kangaroos hopping around. This is indeed the impression which foreigners get when they see the many Australian stamps depicting the kangaroo. But Gussy told us that Frank Sedgeman the Australian tennis star "pulled her leg" by telling her in America that in Australia every housewife is accompanied by a tame kangaroo which carries all the shopping in the bag.

I told you that it would be a good idea if a platypus had a pouch. Of course, it needed a pouch only at the time when her young one hatched from the egg. All the other time, the pouch might be a nuisance for a platypus. Sand and earth and water would get into it, the way platypusses live. But during those few days when she has a baby - just for this purpose only - it would be a great creative idea.

And this is exactly what happened. It is not the platypus which gets a pouch during baby time. It is mama echidna, the other species in the monotremata group, which develops a pouch when her young ones hatch from the egg. When the young has grown and can fend for itself, the pouch simply disappears.

Can you beat that? Can you explain this wonderful purposeful engineering feat with the theory of chaotic chance, with Fortuitism, with just good luck. Or are you going to admit that a purposeful working within the cells of a living being exists, and that all these incredible changes are made for an ethical purpose, for an end, namely to help the young ones have a better life than the creatures before, which had no pouch to crawl into?

HOW IGNORANT ARE ZOOLOGISTS REALLY?

This outrageous title may outrage many a reader and especially many a zoologist. However, any teenager who has learned the operations of the symbols of Semantography and knows of the symbol for "ignorant", will know that the word cannot be meant in the usual deprecatory sense. Call a man an ignorant and he will feel himself offended for any of his activities and skills. Today an "ignorant" means a man who is ignorant in anything and everything. But the pupil trained in Semantography knows that he must ask: "Ignorant? In what?"

Now, zoologists are surely not ignorant of the self-invented names they are calling the various species. Indeed there are so many of them, that the very same creature is called many synonymous names. Then we have the "Ignorance in the How and in the Why". Every honest zoologist will admit that he has not the slightest idea why there are so many varieties about, and why they act in so many ways. Indeed, man may perhaps never be able to answer the WHY.

Then we have the HOW. How do creatures come into the world? How do they hatch, how do they bring up their young, how do they behave, how do they live? Here we should be on safer ground. Indeed, one of the main tenets of Semantography is to realize which words refer to things in the outside world which can be observed and verified by various observers. We use the word "disgust". Some people are more disgusted than others, or so they say. But we are unable to measure the extent of "disgust", because it is a meaning which refers to something in a man's mind. However, the meaning in the words "the hatching of the echidna baby" refers to something outside of our minds, and therefore different observers could come to an agreement simply by observing.

Another fallacy known to the student trained in Semantography is to speak of "zoologists". It has a loose meaning, because it may include all zoologists. In Semantography, one of the main tenet is that not two humans are alike. Consequently, if we speak of zoologists, we must say: Mr. Soandso, and Mr. Othername, etc. Then we must state the instance with regard to which we consider each of them "ignorant".

As said before, to the student of Semantography, all these reservations are well known and need not be repeated. We shall now refer to a number of zoologists and to the particular item of their ignorance. What we are interested in, is the hatching of the echidna baby. However, just as an illustration, here is an incredible piece of ...call it what you may.

Before me is "The Children's New Illustrated Encyclopedia" edited by John R. Crossland and published by Collins Clear-Type Press, London and Glasgow 1948. Most of its contributors are Fellows of the Royal Society, the Zoological Society, etc., etc. On page 461 I found an article "Self-helpful animals" by L.R. Brightwell, F.Z.S. Before explaining the habits of strange animals he said: "Let us look at two animals everybody knows...the cat and the horse."

He proceeds now to tell us about how a cat gets its fur. "A new-born kitten is blind, naked and helpless." Then "For some months after it it is well furred..." I have underlined the statement that a kitten is born without hair and that "some months after" it gets a good fur. I have observed and sometimes assisted my various cats in Europe, Asia and Australia when they had their babies. I can testify that a kitten does never come out naked and without hair. On the contrary, it is already covered with hair all over, which is licked nice and dry within the first hour of its life. I am sure that anyone who has seen a kitten a few days old, or a few weeks old, will testify that it is nicely furred. How that Fellow of the Zoological Society can write such nonsense, you may not be able to understand. But it should fill us with grim forebodings.

Now to the matter in question: how does mama echidna handle her egg? How does the egg get into the pouch which develops only when there is a purpose for it, and which disappears when the purpose has disappeared. In a number of articles which I read during the last years here in Australia the writers say that the echidna mother takes the egg and puts it into her pouch. This clever act gave me a mighty thrill and this is the reason why I think that the echidna is one of Australia's greatest animals. Just imagine. The platypus mama lays an egg, and broods over it. The kangaroo does not lay an egg. The young one comes alive out of mother's womb and somehow climbs into the pouch. The pouch

of a kangaroo is there all the time. But with the echidna the pouch develops only during lactation time (Latin lactis milk). The mother feeling that she is going to have a baby sees the pouch developing and - gets the idea! When the egg comes out, she puts ^{it} into the pouch.

However, a few weeks ago, browsing through books in a Sydney bookshop I came upon a new book about animals. Naturally, I looked up the story of the echidna. And there, the writer admits his ignorance. He said that how the egg gets into the pouch is still a mystery. As this was quite different from what I read in other articles I started to look up whatever I could find at the moment. Here is the zoologist who handles Webster, and he says

Monotremata The lowest order of mamals, consisting of the only existing representatives of the subclass Prototheria, the duckbills and the echidna, belonging respectively to the families Ornithorhynchidae and Tachyglossidae, restricted to the Australian region. They lay large-yolked, thin-shelled eggs, similar to those of reptiles, and the young are nourished by a mamary gland having no nipple, and enclosed in a shallow pouch developed only during lactation..."

The echidna has a shallow pouch developed only during lactation. But the platypus never develops a pouch. It is not true. But after all, this is a strictly Australian business, and therefore he may be excused. But he could have consulted books of Australian zoologists. Look what he writes about the

Echidna A remarkable mammal of the order Monotremata found in Australia Tasmania and New Guinea; - called also porcupine anteater. It is somewhat larger than a hedgehog; the hair of the skin is mingled with spines on the upper part of the body....The egg, about seventeen by fifteen millimeter in size, is extruded from the cloaca directly into the brood pouch, etc.

According to his presentation, the little echidna does not grabb the egg as a squirrel grabs a nut to put it somewhere. The egg falls directly from the one hole (cloaca) into the pouch. It's fully automatic, like one of those selling machines. You put a nickel into the slot and from a hole the thing falls into the metal pouch underneath the hole.

But this procedure is impossible with the echidna, because the pouch is above the hole. Even if the echidna would stand on her head, the egg would not fall into the pouch, because the opening of the pouch is just on the other side away from the hole. There is only one explanation possible: that the echidna takes the egg and puts it into the pouch. Indeed, as I have seen many a time those kangaroos and wallabies and other marsupials are very clever with their hands. You give them a sandwich, and they will hold it with both hands and munch it just as human beings do.

There was only one thing to do. I must go to the experts of experts of the Australian fauna. I rang up the Australian museum. However such questions are difficult to discuss on the telephone. I could only make a dash during my lunch hour, and I know that the worst thing to do is to invade men during their lunch hour. Finding that their lunch commences at 1 p.m. I dashed down just 15 minutes before that time, enough for my enquiry.

It was a heartbreaking affair. I should have known; it is sacrileg to try to do business just before closing time, especially in this lucky country. In some offices they have even a notice: No Orders accepted after 4.45 - if 5 p.m. is the closing time. The expert found it therefore wiser not to invite me into his study but to do the business right on the staircase. I shall give herebelow a condensed account of our conversation.

"Sir, it's about the monotremata group. The echidna develops a pouch during lactation, the platypus does not develop a pouch. Correct?"

"Yes, but we don't call it the echidna."

"Ah yes, (I remembered my Webster) it's the porcupine anteater."

"No, it's the native porcupine or the spiny anteater."

"Alright (name calling, that's all they can), well, what I want to know is: how does the egg get into the pouch? Some writers say that the echidna (pardon me) puts it there. Correct?"

"No, not exactly. I am writing about this in an encyclopedia."

"Is the book out? Then I shall look it up."

"No, it's not out yet."

"Then you would have to tell me, I regret to say."

"I am sorry but (he looked nervously at his watch) I have an article to finish before 1 o'clock."

"Sir, you can get me out in half a sec. Just tell me, yes or no!"

"I told you, these matters are not simple."

"Alright, you don't know. Thank you, Good bye, Sir!" (at that he relented)

"Well, you see, I believe that the young one gets out of the egg and then crawls into the pouch."

"But you believe it only. You don't know for sure. Thank you, Sir!"

I went out, grinding my teeth in anger. Here is that man, an expert. He is paid the tax payer's money - in fact, my money. Here is a problem which can be easily solved, just by observing a couple of echidnas for say 4 weeks. And it is still a mystery, or rather, they still haggle about it. Some say that the egg hatches in the pouch. But he does not believe it. Others say that the egg falls directly into the pouch, which is a physical impossibility, because the pouch is above the hole. And some say that the echidna puts the egg into the pouch. And all of them are not sure, all of them don't know for sure.

Am I now right to ask: "How ignorant are zoologists really?"

Kindly see the importance of this question, as I see it. Here is a natural happening, which in the end may make millions turn away from the teaching of communism, a teaching which operates with the theory of chaos only, a chaos in which the fittest only (more divisions, more air-planes, more prisons, more concentration camps, etc. etc.) can survive. Here is a natural happening which can millions bring back into the churches, which teach the theory of love and co-operation. And this theory is happening before our very eyes in nature, in the acts of.... call it Nature or God or the Supreme Intelligence or the Life Force.

And here are those blasted experts who can easily refute the theory of chaos. And what do they do? Inventing names. And what do they teach young children and students? Just names. And what do they examine them sadistically? Just whether they have memorized names. I have my radio turned on in my business, and every afternoon there are the school broadcasts. And sometimes I listen to the teachings of zoologists. Their whole "knowledge" are self-invented names, and even these names are hotly contested by other zoologists. Let's have a look on another specimen of those experts on the working of Nature or God.

THE INSTINCT OF SIR ARTHUR E. SHIPLEY

Before me is another children's book "The Wonder Book of Science" published by Ward, Lock & Co. London and Melbourne. All articles on Zoology are written by Sir Arthus E. Shipley, G.B.E., Sc. D., Hon. LL.D., F.R.S. I shall quote from 2 articles only. The first is about "The Food of Animals".

One should think that if a zoological expert writes an article which children should read and understand, he would refrain from using those blasted Latin names which have no meaning for children. One should think that even if he cannot do so with his first draft, he could easily substitute the Latin names by common names. One should think that at least the editor of such a children's book will have the sense to substitute simple names in simple language for the Latin names. But no!

The article is full to the brim with Latin names, binary and ternary compounds, predatory organs, amphibians, marsupials, insectivora and carnivora, ungulates, and what not. For each one, a simple common word can be used. What maddens me in this article on the food of animals is the division into carnivorous, herbivorous and omnivorous animals. Why not tell children that these names mean meateaters, planteaters, and alleaters, that is animals which eat both meat and vegetable food.

Zoology and botany appears to me now one of the most fascinating sciences, but I remember how I hated them in my youth, because our teachers forced us to memorize and repeat words which simply had no meaning for us. Semantics again!

Let us turn to the real knowledge of Sir Arthur. A most fascinating problem is to^{be} solved. Who is more intelligent, mama echidna or baby echidna? Does mama put the egg into her temporary pouch, or does the baby go there for itself? That expert from the Australian museum won't admit any intelligence from either side, as I gathered from his talk. He thinks that the echidna baby cuddles up to mother, finds the pouch and crawls into it. He thinks that the kangaroo baby does the same - without any intelligence. Well, he is wrong in both cases. The fact is that the echidna baby comes out from the egg which is brooded in the pouch. How the egg gets into the pouch - some say that mama puts the egg into the pouch, others just don't know. But with regard to the kangaroo baby, the procedure has been observed. The baby (3/4 of an inch small) comes out alive from mother's womb and goes straight for the pouch. If for some reason (to which I shall refer later) the baby goes just a bit astray and just misses the entrance - it does not go further in the wrong direction. It stops. It hesitates. It turns around and makes straight for the entrance. How does it know? HOW DOES IT KNOW?

To this the zoologists have a ready answer - that is, they have a word, which does not explain a thing, but which seems an answer in itself. Instinct is the word. Instinct does it. A cat will run from any dog. But if she nurses helpless kitten, she will defy the biggest dog, nay she will attack him if he just blunders within 10 yards of her little ones.

What makes the cat so courageous in the face of mortal danger? Why, Instinct does it. So WHAT is Instinct? Sir Arthur explains this to the children readers. "Instinct", he says, "is an innate propensity in organized beings manifesting itself in acts which are performed without conscious design or intelligent adaptations of means to ends." Simple, isn't it? Any child should understand this. However, Sir Arthus adds a shorter explanation "inherited habit". Is this an explanation? Of course not. It opens up one of the greatest mysteries of our universe - that cells and clusters of cells do the most purposeful designs and the most intelligent adaptations of means to ends.

Sir Arthus tells us of the amazing working of bees and ants. He admits that ants "carry on agricultural operations of a highly developed kind." If you don't know this (and I have found many people who don't know it) - the ants have small plots under cultivation where they raise a green fungus which they eat. They employ tools, they raise livestock (little lice-like creatures which they milk for their sweet excretion), but, said Sir Arthur "they are not so intelligent as they seem." They are just "ruthlessly compelled by inherited habit." Now, you know.

Here we have the curse of our modern age. The belief by the professional experts that words in themselves are explanations. Apparently Sir Arthus does not know of latest researches into animal behaviour. Apparently he does not know what many a farmer and lover of animals know. In my chapter "The Thoughts of Mice and Men" I have told of a few amazing instances. I have told of the little mice which get the idea of a ladder mounted on wheels and push it underneath a morsel high up, then climb up and get it (see p. 16). I have told of the little fish, the cichlid and how it solves a difficult rational and ethical problem (see p. 18) and of other amazing proofs of animal intellect. Many times observers have reported that ants form a living bridge over which the others walk across an abyss in their path. However, the zoologist may all this "explain" by saying that all those creatures "are ruthlessly compelled by inherited habit." I must therefore point to happenings which many of my readers may have observed themselves.

Let us admit that creatures have, through millions of years, learned how to cope with certain difficulties. The word "learned" should indicate a mind and an even greater mystery, namely, that the knowledge is transmitted to the offspring by those few clusters of cells, the sperm and the egg. But how can animals, born in this technological age, adapt themselves intelligently to technological tools, which their parents may never have seen? It is a fact that many a cat can open a closed door. She jumps up and presses the handle with the fore-paws. But she learns soon that this is not enough. She must also push the door with her hindlegs, and she must do the handle and the pushing at the same time. In China, I had a knob (not a handle) on one door. Soon my cat got the idea and learned to turn it. Some of my other cats learned that doors can be either pushed or pulled. So they try both ways at each new door. I can cite many more such instances - and so can you or some of your friends. It cannot be "explained"

by the words "inherited habit".

Here is one last example of animal intellect. An investigator in America has constructed an apparatus which has a pushbar on one side and an opening on the other side. Each time the pushbar is pressed a morsel of meat falls out from the opening. Soon his cats learned to press the bar then walk to the other side to pick up the morsel. Then he put two cats together in the same enclosure with the apparatus. He found that some cats are lazy, but intelligent enough to let the other cats work for them. They just sat at the receiving end and let the other cat push the bar. When the working cat rushed around to get the morsel, it was gone, snatched away by that lazy fellow.

What to do in such a complex economical sociological technological situation? Our worker cat soon found a solution. She pressed the bar quickly a number of times in succession. Immediately one, two, three, four, or five morsels fell out. Our cat rushed around - and, of course, the other cat could not gobble up all the morsels. She was still at the first one and our intelligent cat had enough to eat for herself. If necessary, she just repeated the performance. Can you explain this with "inherited habit"? No, you can't.

Two alternatives are open to us. The first is to "explain" to ourselves that animals have a brain and (to convert Sir Arthur's saying) "are more intelligent than they seem." Then we are faced with the mystery of those cells contained in the gray matter of animal brains. Those cells can make most amazing "intelligent adaptations of means to ends" to quote again Sir Arthur.

The second alternative is even more mysterious. We must assume that a Supreme Intelligence is acting within the cells of living beings, "ruthlessly compelling" them to act in a rational and purposeful way, even more - to act in an highly ethical way for other creatures. It is this Supreme Intelligence which compels the cells of mama platypus to produce milk for her baby. It is this Supreme Intelligence which compels the cells of mama echidna to produce a temporary pouch for the protection of the egg. It is this Supreme Intelligence which compels the cells of mama kangaroo to make one of the greatest inventions of all times, of which we are going to hear in the next chapters.

Am I now right to call this our modern scientific age the darkest age of mankind? Later generations will not be able to understand how our scientists have been able to negate the existence of that Supreme Intelligence - with the result that the theory of purposeless chaos has brought chaos and mass extermination all over our planet and worse still to come.

For me, the explanation is simple. However, during the last few months when the first part of this publication has been in circulation, I had an opportunity to speak with a number of intelligent readers of my writings. And I have realized that no matter how often I have repeated myself, no matter how long winding my explanations have been, some of them are not yet convinced that a Supreme Intelligence exists. Least of all could I convince them that a universal ethics is at work within the cells of an organism, where all parts have to co-operate in order to achieve order and healthy working of the whole.

Those atheists still cling to the "mechanistic" theory. Many of them have a car. I pointed out to them that an automobile is again a manifestation of the creative power of our brain cells. Thanks to those cells, containing the force of supreme intelligence, man has been able to create organisms of his own. A car is a highly complex organism in which all parts are designed to work in their places for the healthy performance of the whole organism. In order to convert those "mechanistic" believers, I must refer to another miraculous happening which cannot be explained by words like "innate propensity" or "inherited habit" or any other word. The fact is that this dark age of science has been brought about by the idiocy of our scholars who have not learned of semantics and who believe that words in themselves are explanations.

R A D A R A N D T H E B A T

Here we have one of the most amazing disclosures of recent decades. This story of the bat should give our "mechanistic" unbelievers food for thought for the rest of their lives. The story itself opens up with another proof of the ignorance of many of our zoological experts. Before me is the book mentioned in previous pages "The Children's New Illustrated Encyclopedia"

Before me is the chapter "The Strange Ways of Bats" written by the zoological expert E. Crause. He tells children that bats can fly in pitch darkness, but he cannot explain how they avoid bumping into obstacles. He tells of experiments in which bats have been let loose in a pitch dark room which was "criss-crossed with rows of black cotton at various levels", but "the bats flew freely and never touched a thread." He relates that "other tests revealed that neither the sense of smell nor hearing was called into play." Well, he is wrong too, and here we have another instance of blatant ignorance of a zoologist. Because for the last 150 years it is known (or should be known) to every zoologist that it is the sense of hearing which enables the bat to fly in pitch darkness.

However, the How was only solved during the last decade. That children's book was published in 1948. At the same time, I wrote my 3 books on Semantography and (excuse me) you will find there the story of the bat on p. 589 in the chapter "Matter, Spirit, Creation and Creator" (Book III). Allow me to quote:

"For thousands of years men have wondered how bats can fly in pitch darkness without bumping into obstacles. About 150 years ago Spallanzani tried out some experiments. He stretched fine threads across a room which could be made completely light tight. Then he released in this pitch darkness a bat. But the bat did not hit the threads, nor did it bump into the wall or other things in the room. It flew around avoiding all obstacles. In assuming that the bat's eyes could penetrate the darkness, Spallanzani covered the eyes of the bat and let it loose blindfolded. But again the bat did not hit anything... Spallanzani then covered the ears, and now the bat did not want to fly at all. When thrown into the air, it bumped into the threads and into the walls. Spallanzani then concluded that bats can make their way in complete darkness, can avoid any obstacle with the use of their ears - but how they did it, this remained a complete mystery - until now."

"Now we have radar (radio echo) and sonar (sound underwater echos) and according to Cartridge, Griffin and Galambos the mystery of the bat is solved. The bat uses a kind of radar. With its tiny mouth it emits shorts squeaks. The frequency of these squeaks is above the 30,000 mark and therefore in the supersonic range, inaudible for ears of human beings. These tiny high frequency sound waves are emitted from the bat's transmitter, the mouth, travel forth and bounce back when they hit an obstacle. Coming back as echo, they are picked up by the receiver, the tiny ear. And so the bat flies in pitch darkness, and on the tiny "radar screen" in its brain, it somehow sees the radar picture of the trees, branches, walls, and other obstacles..."

"It is difficult to believe that this wonderful mechanism came about by mere chaotic chance. But the miracle is even greater. In our radar apparatus the short signals are emitted in intervals, and during the silent intervals the receiver picks up the echo. When the bat emits squeaks with its mouth, these squeaks would be immediately heard by the bat's ears. The bat might confuse the signal and its echo. To avoid this, a tiny muscle operates, which shuts off the ear during the squeak and opens it to receive the echo."

"But the miracle goes even further. In a cave filled with hundreds of bats there must be a terrific din of squeaks and a terrific mix-up of echos. But no - each bat has its own and personal frequency band, each bat transmits and receives on a different wavelength. But the miracle is not yet fully told. The bat, flying in the dark night, will easily avoid the trunk of a tree, or a branch, or a fence or a wire. But if an insect, a spider or a fly sits on that trunk, or branch, fence or wire, then the bat makes straight for it and grabs it. Apparently, the radar screen in its little brain is so perfect that it outlines in precision an insect against a trunk or a branch."

"It is difficult or even impossible to imagine that, according to our theories, a particular type of flying mice has been forced by circumstances to live in caves and to fly at night. And then, being forced by the alternative either to survive by evolving new faculties or to die out, they have evolved their own radar system. Surely the bats couldn't have done it themselves, so their molecules and cells must have done the thinking and constructing. If we deny an intellectual force at work, and assume

the hit and miss theory, then this species would have missed trillions of times the construction of a radar system and would have perished."

So we see, the bats have a wonderful mechanism. The philosopher Paley of the eighteenth century admired any mechanism. He looked into the wonderful mechanism of a watch and said that someone must have made it. It could not have made itself. Other great thinkers (Kant, see p. 31) said the same, yet in spite of all the miracles around us, the scholars of the eighteenth and nineteenth century evolved the theory of purposeless "mechanism", of chaotic chance happenings. We should not ask how ignorant zoologists are. We should ask ourselves how stupid, how idiotically stupid the majority of scholars were and still are, who will not deny the bankruptcy of their "mechanistic" theory.

THE GREAT INVENTION OF THE NIPPLE

If you don't know it, please be informed that the breast of mama platypus has no nipple (teat). The milk just oozes out all over her underbody, and the little baby has to munch around. However, much milk is wasted. It runs down the body onto the ground, it gets sour, it makes the fur filthy, etc. etc.

It is somewhat better with mama echidna. She develops a pouch during the time when she needs one, and the milk cannot flow to the ground. It remains in the pouch. But even there, it could get sour and make the pouch filthy.

And so, the cells of the following creature in evolution evolved a wonderful invention - a nipple. No waste any more. The milk stays clean and fresh and not a drop is lost to the baby. All it has to do is to suck.

And for those, who are still unconvinced, here is the final proof that the theory of "mechanistic" evolution without any outside working force of intelligence must be wrong. Even if we would assume that a mama platypus evolved herself a cuddleseat - we should find platypusses with pouches. Instead we find echidnas with pouches which are very, very different from platypusses. So, an outside force must have acted on the echidnas and given them a pouch to brood. If we now assume that mama echidna has evolved a nipple, we should find echidnas with nipples. Instead the kangaroo has one nipple in her pouch. And the outside force has gone a step further with the kangaroo. No more the risky egg-laying business. The egg stays within mama. A miraculous pipe is invented through which mama feeds the embryo within her womb. When the tiny kangaroo baby comes out of mama it makes straight for the pouch. There it finds a nipple and it starts sucking.

This intelligence of the tiny kangaroo baby (less than 1 inch in height) which makes straight for the pouch has been hotly debated in Australia. Usually the mother kangaroo sits on her hunches when the baby comes out. The pouch is above the vagina, so the baby must crawl upwards - against the force of gravitation. To this the zoologists have of course an explanation - that is, they have a word. I have forgotten it, but it sounds somehow like anti-gravitational. The instinct of the baby is ... see the word. Botanists know that various parts of a bulb or a seedling know exactly what to do. The cells which form the roots must go downwards, the stem must go upwards. Instinct does it but the botanists have another word for this miraculous phenomenon. I have no time to look it up.

However, instances have been observed where the mother kangaroo does not sit upright and the baby must go another way. Allow me to tell you about it in an unusual way.

A KANGAROO MOTHER AND A JEWISH MOTHER

During the last war incredible things have happened, things which will be incomprehensible to later generations. Millions of people, men, women, children and babies have been exterminated in gas chambers, because of crazy race theories of German scholars and pseudo-scholars. From 1941 to 1945 every day cattle trains went through Germany, carrying the human beings to be exterminated. Mothers went with their children huddled up to them in incredible fear.

I know that fear, because I have travelled in such a train myself. Fortunately I had no child with me, and I was secure in the knowledge that my mother, my family and my wife knew nothing of the terrible ordeal I went through.

Through a few miraculous happenings which have been reported, we have learned what must have happened in many cases, few of which became known. The terrified mother, knowing what is going to happen to her and her child, was filled with an overwhelming desire - to save her child from death sure to come. When the train slowed down at a bend, she pushed her child out of the lorry onto the earth, or into the snow. "Go my child, go! May God help you to find friendly people! Go!"

Nobody can imagine the torment of feelings which filled the minds of those mothers. We know of these happenings, because in a few miraculous cases, the mother survived and was even re-united with her child who found shelter with friendly people. But of the many cases, the thousands of cases, where the mother perished, we know nothing. "Go my child, go and live. I am going to my doom."

And this is exactly what the kangaroo mother is doing under the same circumstances. She is pursued by hunters and hounds. In wild leaps she tries to evade them. She carries her baby in her pouch, looking desperately for an escape. But when she sees that escape is hopeless, when her powers go from her limbs, she looks for a dense thicket, and in an evasive move which should mislead the hunters, she throws her baby into the thicket. "Go my baby, go and live. I am going to my doom!"

Sometimes friendly people find the baby kangaroo and feed it until it gets strong and big. Then they let it hop away into the bush and freedom. But other people, although friendly, do some stupid thing. They send it to a concentration camp for life. Here in New South Wales it is Taronga Zoo. There you can see the inmates, sitting around in lethargy and melancholy. The commander of this concentration camp has even a private concentration camp of his own. When you make an outing through Middle Harbour watch the shore near Northbridge Park and you will see the private concentration camp of Sir Hallstrom, the president of Taronga Zoo. With the melancholy kangaroos and emus and other creatures who are sitting around in cages near the water edge, no knowing what their lives are for. And realize that by a quirk of circumstance that bay is named Long Bay, the same name given to Sydney's Jail situated at another Long Bay.

People who lead their children into the zoo do not tell them of the tragedies they are watching. They have never been behind bars and they do not know. But subconsciously sadistic trends are developed in the children who enjoy their freedom knowing very well that the creatures behind bars cannot. Why do we not abolish zoos and animal circusses? Why do not the zoologists advocate the abolishment of those torture chambers? Why? Because they themselves are not lovers of animals. They make a living by them, and they themselves are sadists. They pester and torture their students with self-invented names in incomprehensible Latin. They could tell children quite a different story, a story which I am trying to tell in these chapters - that these creatures are living witnesses of a great Force in the Universe which has evolved all these complex organisms and which has instilled in them love and sacrifice for the coming generation.

This supernatural "mechanism" manifests itself in another way. If the kangaroo mother is heavy with child still in her womb and not born yet - and if the mother meets her death - what happens to the living creature in her womb? Then the mechanism of premature birth takes place. It has been observed many a times and reported in the press. The mother kangaroo is fatally shot. She lays on the ground sidewise or crumpled up. And the hunters observe how a tiny kangaroo (imagine, less than 1 inch in length) comes out of the womb and makes straight for the pouch. But the pouch is not as usual above the vagina. It would be miraculous enough if the tiny creature would go upward in search driven on by a mysterious force. But no, it goes sideways. No matter how the dying mother lays, the baby goes for the pouch wherever it is. When it misses the entrance by some inches, it stops, it hesitates, then it turns into the right direction, even if it has to go downwards. How does it know? HOW DOES IT KNOW? The zoologists know of course. Instinct does it. And Instinct is surely one of the most miraculous mechanisms in our world. We should sink down on our knees in awe and admiration. And we should then go up and chase the biologists out of their temples of learning.

They have deceived us and themselves with words and their utterly false theories. It is no chance coincidence that Charles Darwin's idea of the "Survival of the fittest" is elevated to a religion in Soviet Russia. All the Soviet rulers have to do is, to have the fittest divisions, tanks, bombers, the fittest blackguards and secret police agents, the fittest prisons. But it does not work.

S U R V I V A L O F T H E F I T T E S T - I N W H A T ?

If you know a bit of Semantography you could write the sentence above down in the symbols and analyse it accordingly. But if you don't know how to do this, just remember that according to the rules of Semantography all words of all languages fall in one or more of these 3 groups

- (1) material THINGS which can be touched, weighted, photographed, (symbolized □)
- (2) physical ACTIONS of material THINGS which can be observed and filmed, (symbolized △)
- (3) human EVALUATIONS of a human MIND (outline of skull ∩) symbolized V

Meanings referring to a ∩ cannot be touched, weighed, photographed or filmed, because they do not exist in nature outside of a human mind. And because every human mind differs from every other human mind, these words have different meanings in different minds. Even the same mind may evaluate the word differently to-morrow.

Survival means an observable Action of a material thing. It means that an individual (□) goes on living (∩). Fittest means here the fittest individual (□). But the meaning of fit (as such) cannot be touched, weighted or photographed. It is a ∩ mind evaluation. We must therefore write

Survival (∩) of the fittest (V) individual (□)

The disputable meaning is here "fit". It would take too long to explain and derive the symbol for fit, fitter and fittest. The symbols tell clearly the student of Semantography that it refers to some ability, but not which ability. And the symbol for ability is vague indeed. Whatever an individual is able to do today, he may not be able to do to-morrow or vice versa. These considerations seem plausible enough, until we realize that they have not been made by innumerable scholars and intellectuals. All (or nearly all of them) have mistakenly assumed that it refers to a physical ability - stronger legs, thicker furs, better noses etc. In the previous chapter "Has Darwin discovered Evolution" I have pointed out the fallacy in Darwin's and Lamarck's teachings, a fallacy camouflaged by a word "new" or "fortuitous". Granted that offsprings with stronger legs, thicker furs, better noses may have a good chance of survival, this theory does not explain the emergence of individuals with new organs, like a mamal gland, a pouch, a nipple, etc.

But even if we restrict the theory to existing species, it does not work. What the scholars have forgotten is that there are other than physical abilities. There are the abilities of cells which are concentrated in the gray matter underneath the skull, outlined thus ∩. Not the stronger legs and the thicker furs make survival possible only. It is the degree of intellect of the individual. A dog or a cat or another animal may be weaker in body, but more intelligent in the grasp of a difficult situation. From rational intellect we may proceed to conscious conscience. Those offsprings will survive whose mothers and fathers have cells in their mind which gives them a stronger desire for sacrifice for their young ones.

Once we realize that "fit" refers to a mental ability, and that in accordance with Freud and Semantography, we must refer to 3 levels of the mind - emotion, reason and conscience - we should not have any difficulty to find that those individuals will survive whose conscience for co-operation is strongest. Look at the many instances when groups of people have found themselves in difficult situations - in drifting boats, in deserts and wild country, on islands and on virgin land to be conquered. The men of strong physique usually murdered each other. Only those who were strong in mind, that is in the belief of the laws of nature - co-operation of individuals and organisms - only those could build new communities and survive the harshest physical conditions.

Think of your own experiences and you will find the same manifestation of the law. Here are two instances from my life. As a young boy scout I joined once a group of older boy scouts. We went on an endurance hike of 3 days. During the last 24 hours, we actually marched through nearly 23 hours with few minutes of rests between. I was one of the youngest, and any of the other could easily outdo me in wrestling or other physical tests. After 18 hours of marching, some of the biggest boys fell literally by the wayside, groaning and moaning. We had to scrape all the money we had together, and had almost to carry them to the railway station. They went home and we continued to march. As for me, I remember my terrible agonies during those weary marching eternities.

But I remember too my desperate desire not to become a burden to the others. I dragged myself mile after mile in agony. When I arrived at our home I almost fell into mother's arms. I slept two nights and one day, and afterwards was unable to rise for nearly a week. Mother had to massage my legs. But in the test of endurance it was my mind which won through.

And now another happening in my life, where men died every day around me. It was in the German concentration camps of Dachau and Buchenwald. Our daily deathroll was from 20 to 40 people. Some died by committing suicide. Others died because they wanted to die. They just gave up hope and the desire to go through a life of hell. I have seen young men, strong in physique and health, die like flies. And I have seen old men, weak and ill, men over 60 and 70 of age who lived through.

One day a commando of us were given a back-breaking task. Sacks of cement 80 lbs and more were loaded on our back and we were told to carry them to a distant building ground. We staggered like drunkards under the terrible load. But we all knew that dropping the load could mean death at the hands of our blackguards. There was an old and decrepit man. I have seen him a number of times naked - a skeleton. How he could carry those bags was a mystery to me.

In the evening I asked him about it. His explanation was simple. "I think of my children and of my wife and I pray for strength. I pray all the time I carry the load - and strength is given to me!" At that time I was a Darwinian, an unbeliever, an atheist. And I still do not believe in the stories the religious men are telling us about the beyond and the saints and the other unbelievable things. But I have realized that nature itself offers us incredible miracles - enough to believe in a force of purposeful design which drives all cells on to create higher order out of lower order, higher organisms out of lower organisms, higher societies out of lower ones and higher and higher co-operation between the cells and the individuals and the communities. It is the supreme Law of the Universe, and the supreme seat of this force is in those cells which are situated under the skulls of animals and men, thus $\cap$.

Now, these are nice words and you may have heard something similar before, a sermon or a well-meant lecture. As for me, I have not read something similar, that is an exposition as I am trying to give in these pages. It is the exposition of an engineer, who points out the incredible engineering feats which are happening again and again with every baby blossom, baby animal and baby human, and which cannot happen just by itself, as the professors say. I am trying to explain all this in simple language to simple people. Everyone of us was once a boy (or a girl) and liked to play with toys. But boys like to take toys apart to see what makes them run. Everyone of us like machines like a car, a typewriter, a washing machine, and everyone of us knows and admires the creative ingenuity which was necessary to create these machines. Now, I hope that every reader will realize the incredible semantic trick which has been put over us by naming a theory of chaos the "mechanistic" theory.

There is no other way out than to admit that a creative force is at work in this Universe of ours. Whatever you call this force: God, Creator, Life Principle, Presence, Nature etc. you must admit that a great Engineer is at work. The professors who probe the atom and find a simple harmony operating with whole numbers are now saying somewhat apologetically that "God is a Mathematician". However (as I shall show in later publications) mathematics can be used to prove and disprove anything. The great Helmholtz, the god of science in the 19th century proved by exact mathematics that machines heavier than air can never, never fly. The eminent physicist Babinet proved with mathematics that a cable between Europe and America is impossible. The physicist Pogendorff proved with mathematics that a telephone could never work. The professors of the Sorbonne proved mathematically that a smooth iron wheel can never get a grip on a smooth iron rail, and they did this at a time when Stephenson's locomotive puffed merrily in England, and so on.

Let us get away from mathematics and abstract language. Let us state something in simple language which anyone can observe in nature any day anywhere something which any child, and any boy and any girl and any man and any woman can see for himself or herself and understand, namely:

God (or Nature) is the greatest Engineer of this our great Universe.

THE GREATEST GUILT OF MODERN SCIENCE

In the foregoing page I have cited a few instances which prove that the professors are not the paladins of progress as they proclaim to be. On the contrary. They were and still are the greatest hindrance of any new idea. I have cited that professors proved mathematically and theoretically that the idea of an airplane, the idea of a submarine cable, the idea of a telephone and the idea of a locomotive is impossible and that it will never, never work. Being an engineer myself and having done library research with regard to inventions, I state frankly that I feel sure to be able to prove that professors at one time or another have disproved any new idea - until an outsider showed that the idea is possible. Alas, those outsiders paid with their lives for their battle with the professorial authorities.

For 300 years professors, logicians, linguists, mathematicians and others were convinced that the idea of a simple Algebra of Thought, a Symbolis Universalis, a simple pictorial writing which would also be a Logic for the People was wholly impracticable and impossible to realize. Now, that a few scholars have proclaimed that I have solved this problem, it was my belief that the other professors will admit it and that something will be done to start teaching it in school. I realize only very slowly what an optimist I have been.

The fact is that hundreds of years had to pass until a new idea becomes so respectable that it is taught in the schools and the universities. I am a chemist and I know that thousands of years had to pass until chemistry became a teaching item in the university. If you don't know, please be informed that even Einstein's teachings, although already half a century old, is still not taught to university students. Freud too is frowned upon and not yet taught. The other day I read in the Sydney Morning Herald that Hypnotism, although its healing value in medicine has been established for the last 200 years, is still not taught in the faculties of medicine.

Five years ago, a scholar said to me frankly:

"As for organising university committees to study your scheme, I can only wish you luck. There are no bodies, I think, harder to penetrate with a new idea than the universities...."

It is bad enough when when we realize that the professors are indeed the greatest obstacle of new ideas for the benefit of mankind. But it is worse in fact. I have tried to prove in this publication not only that the professors are the enemies of pioneers of new ideas, but that they themselves must be made responsible for the chaos we find ourselves in. In my forthcoming publication where I demand (according to the title) "A Jury for the Pioneer" I have devoted a number of small chapters to the professors and I quote 2 chapters:

THE GREATEST GUILT OF MODERN SCIENCE

Professors have deceived us and themselves by their cherished invention: highbrow language. They have invented names for phenomena and they examine their students as if these names are explanations. Why do stones fall? Why - because of "gravitation." Why does a mother animal defend her helpless young? Why - because of "instinct". Explained, isn't it?

And so they have "explained" everything. They have searched the heavens and the earth and have found no purposive force, no creative spirit, no possible existence of a supreme intelligence, no Creator - just Chaos, atoms drifting aimlessly, being attracted and repulsed without any visible force, without any sense - just by the "doctrine of statistical frequency occurrences."

But how do the professors explain the incredible feat of living cells? Cells repair themselves. Cells build a heart "pump", a "camera" eye and more. Cells produce in the mother milk for her young and defiance for their defence. How?

Why, cried the professors, "evolution" does the trick. When fish were left on dry land, they simply grew legs. Later they grew feathers and flew, and so on - it's easy. But fish can't do this by their own will. Darwin maintained that a Creator is at work in the miraculous and most purposeful working of living cells. But the Darwinians did away with any creative force. And so they have given us the new religion with the result that

(turn to next chapter)

THIS IS MANKIND'S DARKEST AGE

"Survival of the Fittest", the theory (already refuted) given us by the biologists have justified total warfare. Anthropologist's theories have justified extermination of "inferior races". Political scientists have divided mankind into warring camps and have justified liquidation of politically "unreliable" people. Chemists and physicists are building bigger and better bombs. Chaos reigns, thanks to the scholars who in their race for professorial salaries have developed into a world racket of "specialized experts" who know more and more about less and less. Now they know almost everything about almost nothing - and have lost sight of the obvious - the greatest Force in the Universe.

A child could see that cells are drawn together to form in harmonious co-operation the miracle of a flower, a bee, an animal, a child. If by accident a twig or our arm is hurt, then cells hasten to repair the tissue and restore life. They reproduce themselves and co-operate in the most purposeful way to form communities of a higher order, a rosebush, a beehive, a herd of deer. From the care, love and intellect of animals to the care, love and thoughts of humans we see a supreme and divine intelligence at work instilling in us the urge to build higher communities of harmonious co-operation.

This divine, natural and universal urge has been blocked in us by the muddled and miserable mediocrities in the temples of learning. They have given us the theory of chaos. They have led us into chaos. When will these changers of words be driven out of the temple?

In a number of pages I have told you of the crime of our language teachers who allow us to speak and write of "professors", "Americans", "Britons", using the plural in a vague and ambiguous way. "Professors" means all the professors, and even if we would say "with few exceptions" we are not told how many are few. I know of a number of professors who have been kind to me and who have thought similar thoughts as I. Consequently they answered my letters. One of them is Professor Ashley Montagu of Rutgers University, Brunswick N.J., U.S.A.

Once a man starts to think along those lines indicated above, he will start making experiments in order to see whether he can find proofs of that universal law of harmonious co-operation. Professor Ashley Montagu started such an experiment. He selected communities of a low type of organisms, a type of worm. He put single individuals on glass saucers and small communities and big communities on separate saucers. Then he exposed them all to Xrays, giving them a dosis which is deadly to a single individual. The lonely ones died, but the individuals which were together in a community lived through the ordeal.

Such an experiment should shake the world, and should send the biologists scurrying for more and more of such experiments. Nothing - nothing could convince more the people of this world that co-operation means survival, if we can prove that the same law works within the most primitive organisms who have no brain as such and have no language as we have.

But what happened? Nothing. Just nothing. Professor Montagu's experiments were ignored by the biologists, because he himself is not a biologist but an anthropologist (please keep to your department and leave biology alone!). As for me, I am not an anthropologist, yet I have made an anthropological discovery which has been acknowledged by Ashley Montagu. Professor Clyde Kluckhohn Anthropologist of Harvard University was so much impressed with my discovery that he asked me to write an article. He promised to try to have it published in the U.S.A. But he could not fulfil his promise. Editors and publishers of scientific journals must keep the standards of their papers "high" (whatever that may mean). To publish a discovery by a Mr. Bliss, who is not a professor of this or that, why - we might lose subscribers, might lose money. Heaven forbid this!

You will find notes on my discovery in the previous issues which are assembled in this publication, the notes which I prepared for the meeting with Huxley. I told Huxley that I have found the proof to a theory of the world-famous psychiatrist Dr. Brock Chisholm. And what did Huxley say when I told him of Chisholm's theory? "It's silly of Chisholm to say this!" Huxley said.

Professor of Anthropology at Sydney University, A.P. Elkin didn't go as far as Huxley. He ignored my letters and my pleas for a meeting. And he is a clergyman.

M I N D O V E R M A T T E R

You may find my disparaging remarks about the professors not "gentleman-like". Then you do not know how professors among themselves belittle and besmirch each other. I could tell stories. However, I have tried (much as I am embittered about them) to refer to instances which any intelligent reader can verify from his own experience.

In page 12 ff I have cited Huxley himself who spoke very disparagingly of "orthodox and organised science". He said that amazing properties of the mind over matter have been discovered and scientifically proved. Human beings are able to know what goes on at the very moment in some distant land. Human beings can communicate with other minds over thousands of miles away. Human beings can even sense future happenings and predict them accurately. In short, all those things, which the materialistic mechanists have discarded as old wives tales. Huxley said that further investigations should be carried out by "orthodox and organised science" which up till now frowns upon such ideas.

But these ideas are centuries old. In a previous page I told you that the power of the mind called Hypnotism is already known for about 2 centuries. It is known that this extraordinary power could help in the healing processes of an ailing body. But till this very day hypnotism is not studied and not taught in the faculties of medicine in the universities of the world. The field is left to the vaudeville performers, much in the same way as chemistry was left for centuries in the hands of charlatans and tonic sellers at country fairs (they still do it in the columns of the press).

Or take another inexplicable property of the human mind. Some humans can accurately sense the existence of water under their feet. Water diviners as they are called have been used with great success by governments and land surveyors, by farmers and people desperately in need of water. And they have found water. But "orthodox and organised science" still does not make extensive research into this amazing property of the human mind. The few researchers, even if they are professors of philosophy or any other orthodox science, who venture into the field of psychic phenomena are very much frowned upon by their colleagues who still believe in the materialistic mechanistic theory.

And I was their faithful pupil. I discarded all those old wives tales on psychic phenomena and I was especially scornful of those tales which came to us from India and the Far East. There, we were told, people can walk with bare feet over glowing coal and their soles do not get burned. People thrust needles, spikes and daggers through their body, cut vital organs and yet not a drop of blood comes out and they then go on living as the wounds heal miraculously.

As said, I did not believe a word of those tales - until I came to the Far East and saw these things with my very eyes - nay, I filmed them with my camera and I still have the film with me to convince myself that what I have seen is the truth and nothing but the truth. I have seen Chinese, many of them, boys and girls and grown-up men in a great religious procession. They had hooks in the flesh of their forearms on which were hung enormous weights. The flesh was drawn out to bursting length, two men had to support the hand and arm of the man who did the incredible feat, yet they smiled and were proud that I took their picture. But there were others who apparently were not strong in mind. Their face was torn in pain and blood trickled from their wounds.

You might have seen similar pictures. Many war correspondents came to India and the Far East during the last war. I have seen many pictures depicting similar feats of the power of the mind over matter. This thing is true. And you know for yourself what you can do when your mind wants desperately to do it. But we people of the Western world have apparently lost this faculty to make mind overcome matter. We lost it, because for centuries our scholars told us that it is all a swindle.

Again not all of them said so. There is one man Alexis Carrel, the famous physician and Nobel prize winner who wrote a remarkable book. I read this book in China, after I have seen what the human mind can do to bodily pain. The title of the book is "Man the Unknown" and you can get a cheap copy in the Pelican edition. I urge you strongly to read this book. It discloses that we do not know of the forces which work within our cells of body and mind.

With the permission of the publishers I have quoted a number of paragraphs in my third Book on Semantography, especially in the chapter on "Matter, Spirit, Creation and Creator." Allow me to quote from p. 580:

"In all countries, at all times, people have believed in the existence in the more or less healing of the sick at places of pilgrimage, at certain sanctuaries. But after the great impetus of science during the nineteenth century such belief completely disappeared. It was generally admitted, not only that miracles did not exist, but that they could not exist. As the laws of thermodynamics make perpetual motion impossible, physiological laws oppose miracles. Such is still the attitude of most physiologists and physicians. However, in view of the facts observed during the last fifty years this attitude cannot be sustained. The most important cases of miraculous healing have been recorded by the Medical Bureau of Lourdes. Our present conception of the influence of prayer upon pathological lesions is based upon the observation of patients who have been cured almost instantaneously of various affections, such as peritonal tuberculosis, cold abscesses, osteitis, suppurating wounds, lupus cancer, etc. The process of healing changes little from one individual to another. Often, an acute pain. Then a sudden sensation of being cured. In a few seconds, a few minutes, at the most a few hours, wounds are cicatrized, pathological symptoms disappear, appetite returns. Sometimes functional disorders vanish before the anatomical lesions are repaired..."

The miracle is chiefly characterized by an extreme acceleration of the processes of organic repair. There is no doubt that the rate of cicatrization of the anatomical defects is much greater than the normal one. The only condition indispensable to the occurrence of the phenomenon is prayer. But there is no need for the patient himself to pray, or even to have any religious faith. It is sufficient that some one around him be in a state of prayer. Such facts are of profound significance. They show the reality of certain relations, of still unknown nature, between psychological and organic processes. They prove the objective importance of the spiritual activities, which hygienists, physicians, educators, and sociologists have almost always neglected to study. They open to man a new world."

Well, do you believe this? Imagine a patient, who is an atheist, a rabid unbeliever, a hater of all religious faith laying in bed with a terribly large wound. And then someone kneels down in the same room. The mind of that other person is able to reach into spheres which are closed to the intellectual. "Prayer", said Carrel, "should be understood, not as a mere mechanical recitation...but as mystic elevation of consciousness in the contemplation of a principle both permeating and transcending our world." And then suddenly, the fluidum emanating from the mind of that person begins to act on the cells of the patient - and within minutes, within hours the large wound closes completely, and healthy cells cover the area. Do you believe this? I did not - until I saw what the human mind can do to matter, especially living matter.

And here is something even more phantastic. Something which I still do not believe, and which in a strange way is connected with the brother of Julian Huxley. The phenomenon of which Carrel writes is called "Levitation" which means a lifting up from the ground against the force of gravitation, in much the same way as a balloon ascends. Writes Carrel:

"Most of the great mystics have endured physiological and mental sufferings, at least during a part of their life. Moreover, contemplation may be accompanied by nervous phenomena resembling those of hysteria and clairvoyance. In the history of the saints one reads descriptions of ecstasies, thought transmission, visions of events happening at a distance, and even of levitations."

Before we proceed further, let us be reminded that Julian Huxley, the great unbeliever, has already publicly admitted (see p.12) that all the phenomena mentioned by Carrell as thought transmission, visions of events happening at a distance, clairvoyance, that is precognition, that is predicting happenings which are going to happen in the future, that all these incredible powers of the mind have been verified by scientific observation, that they exist. It remains therefore to elaborate on the last phenomenon mentioned above, namely "levitation". Writes Carrel:

"According to the testimony of the companions, several of the Christian

mystics have manifested this strange phenomenon. The subject, absorbed in his prayer, totally unconscious of the outside world, gently rises above the ground. But it has not been possible so far to bring these extraordinary facts into the field of scientific observation."

Now, do you believe this? That a human being in a state of mystic trance can be lifted up from the ground? Well, I do not. But read on. I give it to you for what it is worth. As for me, I have given up my faith of chaotic chance happenings. On the day when I contemplated the writing of the next pages of my third book on Semantography where I deal with Carrel's writing, I opened the Sydney Morning Herald, and what I read there, I put into a footnote in my page 580 underneath my quotation from Carrel's book "Man the Unknown". Here it is:

Footnote: Just yesterday (April 17, 1949) I found an article by W.R. Marr in the Sydney Morning Herald about Aldous Huxley (the brother of Julian) Gerard Heard and Christopher Isherwood, who "have gone Vedanta", a new religion, branch of Hinduism and practised in a temple in Los Angeles. In his introduction to "Vedanta for the Western World." Christopher Isherwood describes "samadhi":

"It is supposed to be a fourth kind of consciousness. It is beyond the states of waking, dreaming or dreamless sleep. Those who have witnessed it as an external phenomenon say the experiencer appeared to have fallen into a kind of trance. The hair of the head and body stood erect. The half-closed eyes become fixed. Some times there was an astonishing loss of weight and even levitation from the ground."

Now, this happened in Los Angeles and Christopher Isherwood has written all down "for the Western World" as the title of his book says. There are hordes of professional scientific researchers around Los Angeles. It would have been the easiest way for many of them to refute Isherwood and the whole nonsense. Why did they not do it? Because, so far, I have looked in vain for an official refutation of Isherwood's statement. The reasons are manifold. The old professors disdain any association with this kind of things. Moreover they would rather bite their tongue than admit that their theories are bankrupt. The young researchers have mostly one aim in mind: advancement, promotion and a professorial salary. The worst they can do is not to conform to conformity which is the law of the universities.

Be that as it may, the fact is that a scholar of world repute and a Nobel prize winner, Alexis Carrel points to the possibility of levitation and that others refer to it too - not in far-away India, but in American Los Angeles. Let us see what effect such considerations may have on our present theories of Gravitation.

M I N D, M A T T E R A N D E I N S T E I N

In previous pages I have announced that I shall soon have a go at Einstein. For thirty years I have lectured on the Relativity Theory and have tried to explain it to audiences and to myself - until I do not believe it any more. Since man began to think he invented cosmologies and discarded them one by one, Einstein has not the final word. Moreover, half a century has passed and still there is not the slightest experimental proof for Einstein's main contention (and I contest only this) that Space and Time form a sort of elastic mixture in which space shrinks and time slows down on moving bodies. We infer it only just as we inferred the existence of the devil, the phlogiston the ether and now a bunch of atomic particles already laughed into scorn and non-existence by the other physical party, the wave mechanics, who maintain that matter is a wave manifestation only - and they are slowly gaining the upper hand.

In my forthcoming attack on the relativity theory I shall not refer to the mysterious powers of the mind as told in the foregoing pages. I shall deal only with the theory itself as presented by Einstein himself. And I shall prove again what I believe to have proved in foregoing pages dealing with the zoologists, where I showed that they feel utterly content by inventing a word for a mysterious phenomenon, believing that the problem is somewhat solved. "Instinct" is just "inherited habit" and this is all there is to it.

As you know, Isaac Newton discovered the laws of Gravitation, and these laws helped other scientists (Adams and Leverrier, see p. 1 of the Notes)

to discover planets in our solar system of which our philosophy never dreamt of. Now, Newton has proved that the path of the planets around the sun is due to a pull exerted by the sun on the far-away planets. But something perturbed him and his contemporaries very much. It was the phenomenon of "Action at a Distance."

If you pull a wagon, your hand must be in contact with this wagon. If you push it, again you must be in direct contact with it. Surely you cannot pull or push a wagon with your hands when you stand 10 yards away from it. You can do it if you use a rope or a stick, something which again brings you in direct contact with the wagon. But there is nothing between the sun and the planets which can exert the force of pulling. It is action at a distance. Similarly if you hang on a horizontal bar and let loose, the earth pulls you down, but this again is action at a distance, something inexplicable.

But then there are other phenomena where action at a distance takes place. Every boy and girl knows about it - a magnet pulling nails from a distance. Again the old worry came up when Oersted, Faraday, Maxwell and the others found the relations between electricity and magnetism. How then to explain this incredible happening so much in contradiction to our every-day experiences of pulling and pushing? Why - a new word of course will do the trick.

The new word is "field", not a field as we know it, but a field which we can never see. It is the "field" of electro-magnetic force which does the trick. And with regard to gravitation, why - it is again a "field" which does it, this time the "gravitational field". And this is all there is to it.

Now, it takes about a century until men begin to realize that the new "explanation" with the new word does not explain a thing. Surely, juggling around with the words "gravitational field" does not explain the mysterious force we see and feel at work on our bodies and everything in nature. So - a new word has to be found. And Einstein found this new word "curved space". Now, let me tell you of his "explanation" in a kind of imaginary dialogue in which I use simple language.

"Please, Mr. Einstein, I am very much worried about the phenomenon of gravitation. You know, action at a distance. What about it?"

"Forget about it. There is no action at a distance. It's all nonsense."

"But, Mr. Einstein. The sun exerts a pull on our earth. And our earth exerts a pull on our bodies. If you deny action at a distance, what then makes the planet revolve around the sun?"

"Curved space, my friend, curved space does it."

"You mean curved space makes the planet rotate? But how Mr. Einstein? How?"

"The planets just can't help gliding around the sun. The sun just creates the gravitational field and thus curves the space and the planets just roll along in this curved space, just roll along."

"But Mr. Einstein. This is very mysterious. The planets describe curves. How do they do it?"

"The planets describe geodesics, that's all they do. No force at all."

"What is a geodesic, Mr. Einstein?"

"A geodesic is the shortest line between two points in a curved space. Like a meridian you know."

"Oh, Mr. Einstein, I know what a meridian is. It refers to our three-dimensional world. But where is the meridian in the solar system? Or do you think that the curved space consists of four space dimensions?"

"Yes and no. The fourth dimension is time."

"But Mr. Einstein, you don't want to say that time curves space?"

"Yes and no. Don't ask stupid questions. This can only be explained with higher mathematics, the Lorentz formulas you know, and others. Now, run along."

Alright - the Lorentz formulas. I shall prove that Lorentz had no justification to use abstract symbols for space and time in his formulas and that Einstein had no justification to apply Lorentz's formulas to gravitational fields. Lorentz evolved his formulas to suit electro-magnetic phenomena, especially light.

To this outrageous presentation the Einsteinian will tell me that Einstein predicted the bending of light rays near the sun. To this I would say that this bending of light rays follows already from Newton's equations and his theories. To this I would be told that the deviation according to Newton is smaller than the deviation according to Einstein. To this I would answer with joy that I am glad to hear that Newton too assumed the bending of light rays near the sun. And by the way, the solar eclipse of 1929 brought quite a different result.

And by the way, it is a well known fact that the very same phenomenon has been "explained" by various different scientists with various and different theories and all of those different scientists used mathematics with a variety of symbols all at variance with the other guy's formulas. And a mathematical formula, said Bertrand Russell, can be made to talk any nonsense. And Leibnitz, the great mathematician foresaw the dangers of abstract symbols and therefore he warned of such abstract symbols and demanded symbols which conform to reality in his idea of a "Symbolis Universalis". And as I am the first man who has solved Leibnitz's problem raised 300 years ago, I feel entitled to call the bluff on many a mathematical formula. In the many courtesies I fought in European patent courts I have refuted the theories of a number of professors. I shall go on doing so.

Now, please realize that in the foregoing deliberation about the phenomenon of gravitation on matter, I have adhered strictly to dead matter only, inanimate as it is called. I have not referred with one word to animate matter, that is living matter, which manifests itself in the highest form in the cells of that gray matter which is beneath the skull of an animal and especially man, symbolized thus $\cap$. What has Einstein to say about gravitation and animate matter?

Nothing. As far as I know - and I have laid my hands and eyes on anything I could find about Einstein's work, he has only referred to dead matter. But what about the "field" of that gray matter, the human mind? I have told you that organised science has still not probed into the mysterious manifestation of the mind to divine water at great depth in the ground. Here we have dead matter, water deep down into other dead matter earth, sand and rock and above we have just one man going over the ground. And in his skull $\cap$ he has a piece of living matter. And somehow the water in the ground is sensed by the mind of the man. How, oh great Einstein, how? There is no answer.

But now, Julian Huxley and others have admitted that action at a distance is a scientifically proved fact, namely action between two minds who may be thousands of miles away. Well, we can speak of a "mind field" or of "mind waves" would these words explain anything? They would not. In page 12 I have told of instances known to many Australians, namely that thought transference is practiced by Australian aborigines. One of my readers Mr. H. O. Busby of Cowra NSW has corresponded with me and has told me of incredible feats of water divining in Australia and of other inexplicable happenings between the human mind and inanimate matter thousands of miles away, a ship or a submarine or another mind.

And now we have a great scientist Carrel who told us of levitation - that a mystic can by the force of his transformed mind rise gently into the air. Unbelievable - yes. I do not believe it, although reported from Los Angeles.

What has Einstein to say to this? And as Huxley admits now that a human mind can see into time and foresee future movements of material bodies, what can Einstein say with his primitive, or obsolete, or call it what you may - conception of time. It will be laughed to scorn by later generations.

But all these miracles are nothing - just nothing, against the miracles which are here for everyone to see, and I shall cite Carrel again in the chapter below.

THE MIRACLE FOR EVERYONE TO SEE.

Mr. Busby (see above) communicated with me after he has read what I have said about Huxley's admission of psychic phenomena. But another man, also in New South Wales, wrote to me, even before he received the first part of this publication. He had received only one preliminary announcement, the sheet forming Semantography Series No. 126, in which I informed my subscribers that they will get the publication in the near future. I had to do this, because (I may as well reveal the method of my writing) when I advertised my publication it was not yet written. I had it only in my mind, and my mind was much occupied with everyday matters of making a living. To sit down and write a publication - I simply have not the time - unless I am forced to do so. And I put force on me by advertising something which I then HAVE to write - or else.

I started this second part just after Christmas, but was so much hampered with everyday work that I could not proceed. There was nothing else to do then to repeat the performance and so I advertised the second part in the A.B.C.

Weekly and received money from a number of subscribers. Now I had to write the second part or be accused of embezzlement. And so, here I am, Sunday the 14th of March 1954 typing away madly and hoping to finish the thing coming week - why? Because I intend to advertise coming Saturday another publication which is pestering my mind and demanding concrete form in writing.

Now, when the first part of this publication was not yet written, but only tormenting my mind, I received a letter from Mr. F.C. Stellway, a pastoralist of New South Wales (Oak Road Mail via Gosford). He did not know of what I intended to write. The advertisement said nothing and so did the preliminary letter - whether I am an atheist or whether I am a believer. I did not say also in what way I am going to attack those ultimate meanings of Nature and Creation, of Natural and Supernatural. My mind was in a torment then.

Well, I believe that Mr. Stellway somehow (take it for what it is worth) sensed my torment with his mind a hundred miles away. So he wrote me a letter and included some writings of his own about Life, and Creation and Religion. And in his writing he cited Carrel. He cited the same book I wanted to quote "Man the Unknown". The passage however was one which I had completely forgotten, and it was just this passage which I wanted so terribly to find, not the passage as such but an authoritative confirmation by a great scholar which should convince the reader that what I am saying in so many pages has been said much better by an established scientist. Mr. Stellway gave me that passage and my thanks are due to him.

However, Alexis Carrel is a scientist and a scientist cannot help writing in long sentences and cannot help using a lot of names and words which give just a headache to the common man and woman. Let me therefore give an introduction to that passage in simple language. Afterwards you will understand Carrel much better.

Imagine a brick. It is that well known and well defined piece of burned clay which we use to build houses. It is a piece of matter, having a definite shape and a definite weight. Is it possible that this piece of matter could suddenly begin to divide itself (just by itself) into two halves, and both halves, once they are separated would grow into two full bricks? It is possible? Of course not. But this is just what happens.

Ah, you might say, I know what you are driving at. You mean a brick of animate matter. Yes, a brick of animate matter can divide itself into two halves and these two halves can grow to two full length bricks. Let us say "cell" instead of "brick" and it becomes an everyday occurrence, something which every boy can observe with his student's microscope. One cell becomes two cells.

Now, imagine a mathematician who never heard of such things. To him, mathematics is the language of eternal truth and according to this eternal truth $1 = 1$ and $2 = 2$. But $1 = 2$ is a falsehood and contrary to the eternal truth. But then you let him have a look into your microscope and he will see within minutes that the mathematics of living matter is quite different from the mathematics of dead matter. In the world of life $1 = 2$, and these 2 bricks soon subdivide and grow to $2 = 4$ and so on. It's madness, but true.

Alright, you know now what I am driving at - a completely natural happening, the subdivision of cells which form thus more and more cells. Now let us revert to our bricks and let us assume that they are somehow filled with that agents of life. We can then imagine a building site completely empty except for one lonely brick laying there. And then, before our very eyes, that animate brick begins to subdivide into two halves and two full bricks, and they in turn begin to subdivide into two bricks and soon we have a hundred, a thousand and more bricks. But they do not just grow in a heap. No! They assemble themselves (just by themselves) into vertical walls, and partitions and by some mysterious process they leave room for the doors and the windows, and the pipes and the roof and the laundry, etc. etc. Miraculous enough. But now something utterly miraculous happens. The bricks do not subdivide into bricks only. They start to form lead pipes and iron pipes and chromium-plated bathroom fixtures and a bathtub and a sink and a stove and gas pipes and a hot-water system and roof-tiles and beams and gutters and a chimney - it is as if that very first brick had the building plan complete in his "mind" (excuse me) - but this is what really happens. And soon from one single brick a complete house with all rooms and fixtures and fittings and furniture stands before us. Do you believe this?

Now, you are ready to read the passage from Carrel's book:

"Isolated cells have the singular power of reproducing without direction or purpose, the edifices characterising each organ. If a few corpuscles, impelled by gravity, flow from a drop of blood placed in liquid plasma and form a tiny stream, banks are soon built up. Then, these banks cover themselves with filaments of fibrin, and the stream becomes a pipe through which the red cells glide just as in a blood-vessel. Next, leucocytes come, adhere to the surface of the pipe, and surround it with their undulating membrane. The blood-stream now assumes the appearance of a capillary vessel enveloped in a layer of contractile cells. Thus, isolated red and white corpuscles manage to construct a segment of circulatory apparatus, although there is neither heart, circulation, nor tissue to be irrigated,...."

"An organ builds itself by techniques very foreign to the human mind. It is not made of extraneous material, like a house. Neither is it a cellular construction, a mere assemblage of cells. It is, of course, composed of cells as a house is of bricks. But it is born from a cell, as if the house originated from one brick - a magic brick that would set about manufacturing other bricks. Those bricks, without waiting for the architect's drawings or the coming of the bricklayers would assemble themselves and form the walls. They would also meta-morphose into window-panes, roofing-slates, coal for heating, and water for the kitchen and the bathroom. An organ develops by means such as those attributed to fairies in the tales told to children in bygone times. It is engendered by cells which, to all appearances, have a knowledge of the future edifice, and syntetise from substances contained in blood plasma the building material and even the workers."

Mr. Stellway closes his quotation with these words: "Now, turn to your dictionary and find that the word "Religion" is derived from the Latin re-ligo - literally the making or renewing of an old, or original bond."

Indeed, the crux of the matter is in the words which I have underlined, that the cells "have a knowledge of the future edifice". The word "knowledge" (even if you do not know its symbol in Semantography) refers to a "mind" $\cap$. What mind? Apparently a mind which works in all cells in all parts of this our Universe. It is the world mind - the spiritual force of the Universe, of which we shall read more in the coming chapter.

For those who are atheistic mechanists Alexis Carrel seems to be the perfect "mechanist", because he has developed the so-called "mechanical heart". If I remember rightly, he planted a chicken heart in the correct solutions and joined necessary pipes for the bloodstream to go through and the heart went on pumping outside of the body. But it is a living heart. It contains the world mind, the spiritual force in the Universe.

THE SYMBOL FOR THE SPIRITUAL FORCE IN THE UNIVERSE

The philosopher Immanuel Kant said that there are two things which should fill us with awe: the starry sky above us and the ethical law within us. Each time I look up to the starry sky, filled with myriads of blazing suns far away, I think of Kant and try to find the unifying force between the world of inanimate matter which form the stars and the galaxies, and the world of animate matter which form the cells and the organisms of which we are one. Previously I have mentioned Sir James Jeans the great astronomer. He pondered about the creation of the wisps of nebulae which later draw together to form a brilliant star. He said that it may well be that the mysterious force which pulsates through our brain is the same force which creates the hydrogen atoms which create the nebulae, which create the stars, which create the galaxies, which create all other things. But the way he said it is again a glaring example of human conceit, a glaring indictment of modern science. I do not remember the exact words and I cannot find the book in the library any more. I believe it is "The Universe around us". I do remember however how I have been struck by the conceited tone of his assertion. He said that 'we may well cast humility aside' and believe that the force in our brain creates the Universe. In short, WE human beings are the masters of Creation. It is OUR brain which creates the stars. It is this gigantic guilt of modern science which has denied any greater intelligence than man in the world and which has brought about MAN the dictator, MAN the extermi-

nator, MAN the shaper of destinies of millions of people by using the tools of the deportation trains, the concentration camps, the liquidation trials. There is no outside Force to which MAN THE MASTER is answerable for his crimes, no eternal ethical law working within the Universe in which THE FITTEST IN FORCE survives only.

That this incredible and disastrous conceit is still displayed by our scientists can be proved a thousandfold. Just last week I listened to a B.B.C. science talk of a professor of Botany from Birmingham (I believe). He told us of the new plant genetics and the experiments made with plants of much greater yield, in which two sets of chromosomes are paired. He mentioned that similar products have been "accidentally" produced in Nature as some of our plants are just of this type and he added the incredible statement: "What Nature can do in her blundering way, we men surely can do better!"

All the many thousands of words which I have written down in the foregoing pages had only one aim: to expose this terrible and incredible thinking of the men who shape our destinies. They have led us into chaos, as I said. It should be obvious to a child when pointed out to him, that what the botanists can do only is to cross and pollinate varieties of plants. But they can do no more. Everything must then be done by the world mind which acts within the plant cells.

Let us then realize what is the obvious: that we ourselves are only the products of this world mind. Once we realize that this world mind shows us the way to higher evolution we should be able to reach that higher co-operation which we observe in the working-together of cells and organisms. This is the ethical law of the universe. A simple truth and a great religion.

Every night I go out of the house and look up to the starry sky. I think of what Kant said and my mind is filled with awe about the two things, the glowing of the firmament above me and the ethical law within me. But there is a third thing just in between, literally. When I look up to the stars the eyes of mine meet two other eyes looking down on me. It is Mutzi, one of my cats, perched high on the pergola. I look at her and wonder. Two eyes just like I have two. Two ears, one nose, one mouth, one tongue, four limbs and a skull, underneath which is that gray matter of the mind.

As soon as she sees me, she comes down immediately. It is the time of the lovers. I sit down and she draws near to me and speaks to me softly. It is not only the purr, it is a chirping sound which anyone who can speak with cats and dogs knows very well. In these sounds is love, and affection, and respect and an assurance of friendship and faith. If these expressions of the mind can manifest themselves on this tiny planet, they surely must be in existence on the myriads of other celestial bodies. Let us then draw my friends the symbol of the spiritual force in the Universe. It is all seen and yet not depictable, as it is within every cell of every flower, or fish, or bird, or animal or man. But at least, in the higher organism this Spirit has a house and we can draw its outline


 The symbol for the World Mind
 situated beneath the skull (outline) of the higher creatures

Throughout the ages man has made 3 distinctions when he spoke of three levels of the mind. These can be symbolized by placing the mind symbol on 3 levels


 emotion


 reason


 conscience

On page 32 I have explained that these 3 levels are not separated and that indeed our conscience is direct part of our subconscious, our emotions. Whatever feeling of ethics we have, it comes directly from the cells which form our subconscious. Only through our reasoning power and our articulate language are we able to become conscious of our ethical feelings and emotions. If you dear reader have not read the chapter "The Symbol for the Mind and the Theory of Chaos" beginning on page 27 of the first part, you are strongly urged to read it. I have

especially elaborated on the modern findings of psychologists and psychiatrists which are of direct concern to every man and woman. Read it again, as your well-being depends on the grasp of what I tried to tell you there.

On page 8 and 11 I have drawn a simple symbol for the meaning of Nature, the old symbol of the Greek philosophers, the equalsided triangle which depicts the harmony and simplicity in Nature. This is Nature which we observe with our senses. Then there is that World which we cannot grasp with the senses of our eyes, ears, hands, etc. It is the Nature superimposed on our physical world and yet real. Again this is simply depicted:



Nature
grasped with our senses



Super-Nature
beyond our few senses

If you, dear reader, have not read my detailed explanations of these symbols you are strongly urged to read the first 12 pages of this issue. I do not laugh when you use 6 sound letters to stand for all the phenomena of our Universe, namely N-A-T-U-R-E. You need not laugh when I substitute a simpler symbol of 3 lines which has the same meaning in all languages of our world.

And now let us bring our symbol for the mind ^o into close relationship with the meaning of Nature. What meanings do we get ?



The subconscious mind
in touch with Nature,
the feeling of Awe
religious emotions



the rational mind
contemplating Nature
Science, Philosophy



the conscientious mind
contemplating Nature
Morals, Ethics, etc.

Now, will you please realize that I have here depicted with 4 lines only, (3 straights and 1 curved line) meanings which are indeed the ultimate meanings of mankind. Will you please realize that these 4 lines have the same meanings in all languages. And will you please realize that these are not arbitrary symbols (like the alphabetical sound symbols are) but real pictures of natural realities. The curved line outlines the casing of the brain in all higher creatures. The equal-sided triangle is the most simple, the most harmonious space configuration, direct proof that there is harmony in space. Moreover, the outline is of profound significance. From a broad and secure basis, the horizontal line (which in Semantography depicts our earth) there rises a perfect peak striving majestically to a pinnacle of perfection - a vivid picture of what is indeed the ultimate meaning of natural Evolution - a striving to higher and higher organisms in which more and more cells and individuals and communities strive to higher and higher co-operation.

Before we now turn to the contemplation of our symbol for Super-Nature, a few words to the rabid unbelievers, that is the people who fervently believe (believe they must) that they believe nothing. They call themselves Rationalists, or Humanists, or Atheists and they will gladly swallow any rational theory presented by our rational scientists. They will fervently believe in the ether although the ether cannot be seen, grasped and proved. Now that the ether has been disproved and declared non-existent, they fervently cling to the curved space, although this too cannot be proved. They will believe in atomic particles although no one has seen one and we are told that we could never see one, because the very endeavour to direct light rays or electrons in an electron microscope against them would disturb them and distort the whole picture. Now we are told that there are no atomic particles but only manifestation of waves.

Let it then be known to you, you idiots, how I understand the meaning of my symbol for Super-Nature. I can address you lovingly as idiots because I was such a rationalist, atheist idiot myself for 30 years - until I began to analyse the meanings of the words which the professors have given me to swallow. I said above that the Super-Nature is that Nature which we cannot grasp with our few and very imperfect senses. In order to grasp the phenomena of the Supernatural we need apparatuses such as the microscope, the electron microscope, the spectro-scope, the volt and ammeter, and many other such devices. Hundred years ago,

no scholar suspected the discovery of realities of our supernatural world which are today an everyday experience, like Xrays, Radio, Television, etc. Now, slowly we begin to admit (and even Julian Huxley admits it) that the mind can exert supernatural powers - can influence other minds near by - or communicate with other minds thousands of miles away - or can see into the future. In previous pages I have told you of scientific observations proving that the power of a mind can speed up organic repair of diseased portions of the body of another person. Let's not call it prayer, although Carrel uses this word. It has not a good "semantics" because we are too easily reminded of the mumbling incantations we hear from professional prayerists (excuse me). Kindly excuse that I repeat again and again things which I have stated in previous pages, in previous publications, in my previously written books (which you can study in the libraries). I have found that, no matter how often I say things, people who do not want to believe them will go on not believing them. But in the end they might.

Now that I have explained the meaning of Super-Nature, let us bring our symbol in combination with the symbol for the mind.



The subconscious mind
experiencing feelings
known to poets, mystics
and deeply religious
people.

the rational mind
contemplating phenomena
named today Metaphysics,
Mystics, etc.

the state of mind
above and beyond ordinary
consciousness, mystic
trance and the like

What is the main advantage of these symbols? The main advantage is that these symbols could be accepted by adherents of any religion, and even by so-called atheists. The trouble with the explanatory words which are placed below the symbols is, that the words in themselves create a host of other meanings in different people, meanings which are strongly antagonistic to many minds. Utter the word "metaphysics" to a rabid atheist, and he will sneer. Utter the word "rationalism" to a man with mystic leanings and he will sneer too. But once we know that the two symbols above depict unknown realities, the Universe and our Mind - realities which we are just beginning slowly to explore and discover, then believers and unbelievers of any nation, of any religion and of any language may accept the symbols above as pictures of our searching mind trying to search the heavens and the mysteries in them.

Of course, it is necessary for all minds to admit that there are more things between heaven and earth of which our philosophy has never dreamt of (I am sure I have quoted incorrectly). A few pages before, I have said that even Einstein's revolutionary conception of time must be discarded as obsolete, because according to Julian Huxley, the human mind is capable to see into the future. I have also said that Einstein has no explanation for the action at a distance, the sensing of matter (water) deep down in the ground by the living matter of the mind of a water diviner. Consequently, his revolutionary conception of matter must be too discarded as obsolete. Yesterday evening I searched some books on Einstein to find his opinion about such borderline phenomena. I found him telling of his visit to a performance of a thought diviner, a person who can read other people's thoughts. The reality of such extraordinary perception has already been scientifically proved. But Einstein considered such performance a swindle. He also rejects hypnotic performances. When told that great professors refused to examine such phenomena he said that they were right.

THE SYMBOL FOR THE HOLY SPIRIT

About twenty years ago I walked with my wife through the Vienna woods, as we did every Sunday. We had left the train at Baden and wandered through the Helenental (Helensdale). We came to a small chapel. I am keenly interested in architecture and old things, so we went into it. And there in a dark corner I found an old painting, such as I have never seen before. There were three men sitting on clouds. One was obviously God Father, the other Jesus Christ, but there was a third man sitting with them, middle-aged and also bearded. Who is that man?, I asked myself. And of course - I had to find out. I searched in books on

"Oesterreichische Kunsttopography", books in which the Austrian art treasures are listed according to their geographical position. There I found the story of that mysterious painting. I cannot give exact dates from memory, but the story is that before the 12th century (I believe) painters of religious subjects were allowed to depict the Trinity of God Father, Son and the Holy Ghost as three persons in human form. Then a Council of the Church forbade that presentation and allowed only 2 human figures and at the most, the symbol of a dove for the Holy Ghost. All paintings with 3 persons on them were scrapped. The one in the Vienna woods was forgotten and escaped destruction.

Now, everyone of us has surely at one time or another wondered who or what that third party is, the Holy Ghost. If we should ask ten doctors of divinity for an explanation, the 10 doctors would give us 10 different explanations and each explanation would contain enough vague words to allow for at least 10 different interpretations each. We can't ask the early Christian mystics what they meant by it when they incorporated the Holy Ghost into the daily prayer. They are dead and their words have been interpreted and misinterpreted a thousand times. But it is a fair guess that they meant the Spirit which somehow fills all of us, no matter how lowly, no matter how simple of mind many of us may be. This spirit enables us to contemplate the mysteries and the wonders of the Universe around us, and enables us to communicate with the world spirit, the world mind. You know now the symbol for the Holy Spirit which dwells in all of us, in all creatures and in all living cells.

Seen from this point, that Council of Church made a wise move by forbidding to picture the Spirit as a human person. Unfortunately, Semantics has come into play and the meanings of the words have changed during the centuries. Today a Ghost means a frightful apparition. It would be wise to substitute "the Holy Spirit" for "the Holy Ghost". It is somehow different in German where "the Holy Ghost" is spoken of as "Der Heilige Geist". It is true that "Geist" means also an apparition, but the Germans have a definite word for apparition, namely "Gespenst" whereas the normal meaning of "Geist" means intellect, reason, (geistig) conscience, in short all attributes which lead to one source, the human MIND. In German sometimes the word "Zeitgeist" is used, and I have found that Anglo-American intellectuals and scholars use sometimes the German word because it has no counterpart in the English language. The "Zeitgeist" means (Zeit means Time) the mental attitude of a certain epoch, as for instance the "Zeitgeist der Reformation", which means the mental attitude of the minds of the people who lived during the time of the Reformation.

I often wonder what goes on in the minds of the little children who are told to pray the Lord's Prayer every day and who repeat every day the words of the "Holy Ghost". At the same time they learn that a Ghost is something frightful, something which gives them the creeps. How they can reconcile these two different meanings is a mystery to me, or rather I think that the result must be frightful. They could be told quite a different story, the story which I am trying to tell in these pages - that the "Holy Spirit" is that mysterious power which dwells in our minds [○] and in the minds of all the animals and birds and fish and even in the smallest cells of the smallest plants and flowers.

This symbol [○] gives quite a different interpretation to the words of the scriptures that the Creator created us according to his likeness. How misinterpreted these words are. The likeness can be symbolized by the outline of the casing [○] which houses that mysterious power and which has made us Creators ourselves. Look into the intricate mechanism of a living organism. Then look into the intricate mechanism of a machine, a motorcar, a radio set and realize that we ourselves have become Creators by using the Holy Spirit which dwells in our minds [○]. Then look into the intricate structure of a bird's nest, a beehive, a burrow and realize that these creatures too are filled with the Holy Spirit. What a story children to tell. Five hundred years ago, it would have been enough to bind me to the stake and to put fire to the faggots. Even today this interpretation means heresy, because it means nothing more and nothing less than the scrapping of all paintings which depicts God Father as a human being. Not that I advocate the destruction of those beautiful paintings. But I wish that they should be looked upon with the understanding which we have today with our knowledge of biology, psychology, physiology and all the other sciences, provided we realize that we know so little. The spirit of the Creator cannot be depicted, and the founders of the Jewish and Islamic religions strictly forbade the making of any picture which could only be false and misleading.

THE STRUCTURAL FORMULA FOR RELIGION

You might ask why I use the word "formula". Why not the "symbol" for religion? Well, I showed you already the symbol for that meaning in the chapter "The Symbol for the Spiritual Force in the Universe." It is symbolized by the thoughts which pass through our mind (subconscious or conscious) when we are confronted with the miracles of Nature.

But "religion" has more than that meaning. Indeed it has so many frightful meanings that we should not wonder why so many wars have been fought about it. The word "Religion" conjures up in our mind those terrible religious wars, those terrible injustices which have been committed in that name, and much more. The atheist will sneer cynically, and so will the simple mother who prayed desperately at the bedside of her little baby who cried in torment and then died a painful death.

On the foregoing page I have mentioned the epoch of the Reformation. It was the time when the protestants protested against the injustices of the only Church and clamored for reform. Then came the Counter-Reformation, the "Gegen-Reformation" as it is called in German, and millions began to massacre each other in the name of HIM. I spoke on the foregoing page of the "Zeitgeist der Reformation", the mental attitude of the Reformation and as the Reformation and Counter-Reformation was fought on German soil, I beg to give the essence of that mental attitude in a verse from that time. It runs in German:

"Willst du nicht mein Bruder sein,
Schlag ich dir den Schaedel ein."

which I shall translate literally and preserving the rhyme as

"Won't you be the brother mine,
Then I crack the skull of thine."

And they cracked each other skulls for the greater glory of God and Christ. Some of my acquaintances who immigrated to Australia from Austria, Germany, Czechoslovakia, etc. sneer at the "drabness" of Australia's little towns, and they compare them with the beautiful little towns in Central Europe which are so full with mediaval architecture. I however tell them of my impressions which I had when I hiked through those lands. In the marketplaces I saw the faggots burning for the heretics, and the gallows for the rebel reformers. The blue Danube (which is never blue) took on for me a red tinge, filled with the blood of those men, women and children who were massacred in the name of religion.

It is no wonder that a violent movement arouse in the minds of the men of the later centuries and - as the power of the Church declined (a power to persecute, prosecute and put to death) - the minds began to express themselves freely. Again I want to give you the impression of the "Zeitgeist" of that "Age of Enlightenment", by citing a few verses from a contemporary, Heinrich Heine. He was one of the greatest poets of the German language. But he did not restrict his verses to Liebe, Love and Lorelei. He castigated the religious rulers and the political rulers. The former had no power, but the latter had. So he had to flee and spend the rest of his embittered and tragic life as a political refugee in Paris.

There is one humorous poem which made a deep impression on me in my youth, because it showed to me, that debating about vague meanings in vague words lead nowhere - and this is indeed the moral of Semantography. I consider the foremost advantage of my Symbolis that it might make people realize just this. As religious teachings have led to many wars and still do (the Mau Mau movement is foremost anti-Christian, to cite one instance) as many martyrs have been crucified, burned, quartered and hanged in the name of religion - a tragedy beyond comprehension - let me follow my own prophet, the great mathematician Leibnitz who speculated, not only about a symbolism to unify mankind and make useless debates unnecessary, but he also speculated on means to unify the various Churches.

Heine's humorous poem is called "Der Wettstreit" - The Competition. I quote from memory and if I remember rightly the setting is the court of Spain in the reign of Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castil. To entertain his Queen the

King arranged a competition between a learned monk and a learned rabbi. They should hurl at each other their arguments and the loser must renounce his own religion and be converted to the faith of the victor.

Day after day the battle raged in front of the whole court. When the monk seem to be winning, his assistants busily brought forward the baptismal water and paraphernalia. When the rabbi scored in his favour, his assistants "wetzten schon die Vorhautmesser", were busily sharpening the circumcision knives to a keen edge. But there was no end in sight, and so the King turned to his Queen and asked her about her opinion. I shall try to translate her answer as given by Heine, as faithfully to word and rhyme as I can:

Heinrich Heine

Translation

Mir scheint es will mich gar beduenken
Dass der Rabbi und der Moench
Dass sie alle beide stinken.

It seems to me or so I think
That both the rabbi and the monk
They altogether stink.

This is not very nice to say but it will satisfy those who often have ground their teeth in anger listening to the vague palavers of many a rabbi or church man.

Now, we have here two great religions, the Christian and the Jewish and both are based on the same scriptures. The basic difference between both is, that the Christians say the Messiah has arrived nearly two thousand years ago, whereas the Jews say that with the arrival of the Messiah the Kingdom of God will commence and human massacres and miseries will come to an end. They point out that mankind is today much deeper in massacres and miseries than it ever was since the birth of Jesus of Nazareth - which is true, unfortunately.

Jews are divided by perhaps a dozen or so factions, but Christians are divided by hundreds of different denominations. This is something incomprehensible and most disturbing. What actually is the reason for this most unhappy affair? The reason is (apart from other factors) that - (now it comes and for this professors have accused me of promoting my Semantography as a panacea, an all-cure) all Christian denominations use the very same words of the scriptures but interpret them differently. In short - the knowledge of language, grammar, spelling, word order etc.etc. without the knowledge of semantics. We are told that the words in the scriptures are the words of God, but each word takes on a different meaning for different people, until a group of such people start a Church of their own interpretation and then start quarreling within their own church. At once, people who live in the same community and who may be good and co-operative neighbours are divided by the various churches to which they adhere. An artificial hatred is built up with most disastrous consequences. The eternal urge within us - to build higher communities of higher co-operation - is blocked by different interpretations of the same words. In my chapter "The structural formula for religion" Book III I say on page 566:

"Firstly, we must realize that the differences are differences in meaning, expressed by words. Consequently, we have to analyse these words and their meanings. Secondly, we have to realize that these words refer to very complex meanings. The word "religion" is a shorthand word for a great complexity of ideas. People do not realize this, and so they debate about this word, each one having a different idea in his mind."

"Now, let us apply the method of the chemist to a complex meaning. He builds up a structural formula. There might be a central group of molecules, around which are outer groups, which are interchangeable. In this way, the chemist is able to clear up the structure of a great many different things, and he finds that they are related to each other, that they are from the same "family", having the same or a very similar centre group and differing in their outer groups only, which gives them different or slightly different qualities."

"Similarly, we may assume that the various religions established on earth, belong to the same "family" of meanings and ideas. Somehow their centre meaning must be the same, and only their outer groups may differ.

Every boy and girl and every man and woman who has learned a bit of organic chemistry knows what I mean. Boys and girls in the highschools of the world have learned to draw up structural chemical formulas of complex organic chemicals. They know very well that it is utterly ridiculous to debate a complex meaning like "benzene compounds" which refers to thousands of different things. Instead, they have learned to discuss the groups which are similar and

the groups which are different. This new chemical symbolism has led to the manufacture of thousands of new substances which have saved millions of lives, and which have greatly improved the health of the whole human race. All the new amenities which mankind enjoys today in hygiene, medicine, electricity, transport, comforts and commodities in the home and elsewhere - all this is due only to a new reasoning working with a new symbolism - the chemical Semantography. It is only natural that I, a chemist, advocate the same reasoning with a similar symbolism to such an inflammable meaning complex like "religion". I continue to say in my third book on page 566:

"The reader may realize that on this basis, a whole book could be written showing the structural formulae for the various religions and discussing one by one the groups in the structure. What we can do in this chapter is only showing how such a structural formula may be drawn up. In other words, only a few hints are given. For the rabid religionist of one sect or another, every word may be wasted. This chapter is only written for those people, who believe that reconciliation is possible."

For further information, I advise the reader to look up my books in the libraries. In this chapter, I can only indicate the way we could go.

The centre group in our structural formula for religion would then be the symbols expressing all human beings on this planet whose minds are filled with awe and wonder when confronted with the mysteries of our world. I have elaborated the symbol for one mind in the previous chapter.

The outer groups which differ with different religions would contain the following groups:

Theories on Creator	Laws of Beliefs, Dogmas, etc.
Theories on Creation	Laws of Ethics
Theories on Causation	Laws of Worship
Theories on the Purpose of Man	Laws of Custom
Theories on Life after Death	Laws of Hygiene, Diet
Minor Hypothesis, Legends, etc.	Minor Superstitions, Taboos, etc.

Before we start to discuss the religions of Asia and Africa and try to accommodate them into our complex structural formula, we may as well make Order first in our Western World, and especially the Anglo-American World. Here we speak the same language. Once we apply Semantography to our reasoning and discussion we shall soon find which debates are hopeless, that is they cannot lead to an agreement because of our complete, abject and gross ignorance of the matter. For instance all discussions on Life after Death will lead nowhere. We don't know. We have not the slightest idea. So, this group will carry a big question mark in every religion and every religionists who starts putting over us his particular belief should be told to shut up - before he has divided people. Similarly, a big question mark should be put into the group of Theories on Creation. We have seen how within the last 50 years these theories have changed - and we know no more than before. However, whatever religion we adhere to, we can agree on the actual wonders we see around us, the creation of a plant, a butterfly, a blossom a bee, and a baby, and can agree that these wonders are full of purpose and design. This should give us the spur for further research into the purpose of man and his destiny. To such a standpoint even an atheist, a rationalist could agree, because he too believes that he is deeply religious.

Then we have one of the most important groups, the Laws of Ethics. Here, my Semantography could play a decisive part, because all these laws and all the commandments can be derived in a quasi-mathematical and physical way from the laws of Nature. On page 4 on the Notes (S. Series No. 123, which I prepared for Huxley, see first part) I have shown how we can derive from Newton's law of action and reaction, the law of Jesus "Whatsoever ye would that man should do unto you, do ye so unto them." You will find the simple symbol for this law of action and interaction between human beings on page 4 mentioned above. The great advantage of this new symbolism is that a new expression has been found for a law which we can find indeed in all the religions. It is in the Holy Books of the Islam, or Hinduism, or Shintoism, etc., etc., but it is said there in different words and in different languages and by different prophets. We have now a scientific formulation in a new scientific symbolisation for all these ethical advices given in all the religions. We know that scientists of all religions and of all languages have readily agreed to use the symbolism of science. Similarly, we have now in Semantography a new symbolism for the formulation of all ethical laws. I shall, in later publications elaborate on this. You may realize

what it could mean to the whole human race if we could teach the laws of ethics to children and students in the physics hour - not in the Sunday school where we are fed with ancient legends which have no or little bearings on our present way of life. It could mean a tremendous change in the minds of the whole human race.

Once we have found that the laws of Ethics are indeed somehow similar in many religions and once we have drawn up the international, interlingual and interreligious formulae for these laws of Ethics in the symbols of Semantography - we could then proceed to discuss the other groups and find the similarities and dissimilarities. Then, we would realize with horror what actually divides us into hatred groups. Now here are a few questions:

Has the prophet Eliah really departed in a carriage into heaven?

Has Daniel really been in the lions' den?

Has Jonah really lived in a whale?

Is the mother of Christ really capable of interceding with her son?

Is she only spiritually in heaven or even bodily?

Is St. Christopher really capable of protecting motorists?

And so on, and so on. Can such assertions ever be answered? Is it not better to admit our complete ignorance - before we are turned onto hating each other? What would then remain of all the religions and of all their dogmas if we could thus one by one take every assertion under discussion with the simple rules of Semantography? What would then remain?

Very much would remain. We would - just like the chemist - after removing all impurities find the real elements of religion which we find in all religions - the laws of Ethics - the realization that a great Intelligence is at work in Creation - that higher communities with higher co-operation of cells and organisms are the ultimate purpose of Creation, etc. etc. In short, what we would find then would be a Universal Ethics and Universal Religion for the whole human race, an Ethics and Religion to which every man and woman, every scientists and layman could adhere.

But what would then remain of the many, many people who now make a living by the catastrophic and disastrous division of mankind into many denominations?

THE REAL REASON OF RELIGIOUS DIVISION

As you know now, Semantography has been prophesied by the great mathematician and philosopher Leibnitz. He had a personal friend Baruch Spinoza, the author of the "Ethics". It is Baruch Spinoza whom I try to emulate - and alas, I realize that in doing so, my fate begins more and more to resemble the fate of Spinoza. He was a Jew, but the rabbinical authorities of Holland soon excommunicated him on account of his writing which was heresy. Then the papal authorities put his books on the Index. In order to make a living he ground lenses. Later, although university posts were offered to him, he declined, because he had realized the freedom which his independence gave him. He realized too that he is writing for the coming generations.

I started on the idea of Semantography in 1942 in China. During the following years I approached many a rabbi, and many a churchman, and many a professor and many an educator. The idea of Semantography seemed so good that I was sure everyone will take some interest in it. I was crestfallen every time when I found out that all those men, whose business it is to help mankind along, did not want to take the slightest interest. Indeed, many refused to have a look at it. During those years, I believed that the incompleteness of my work is the reason. In Australia I set down to work it out in detail. I used up my savings and worked for 3 years on my 3 books which I mimeographed in order to be able to send a number of copies abroad. Then I began to approach professors and educators, rabbis, and priests, and parsons in earnest. Slowly the thing became a nightmare. Nobody was interested. Nobody wanted even to see it (with a few blessed exceptions who could not evade my desperate oratory).

Today I have come to believe that the professors and educators, the rabbis and the monks are not interested in the promotion of a better future for mankind. What they are mostly interested in, is their own promotion, their own future, their own well-being. I completed my 3 books in 1949. You will not find in them a single word of resentment against the keepers of mankind. On the contrary. I appeal to them in many pages. But now 5 terrible years have passed,

I have approached hundreds of the keepers of mankind. I have spent hundreds of pounds for leaflets and brochures, for airletters and personal approaches to the dignataries of the United Nations, Unesco, Universities, Ministries of Education, and Church Authorities. The latest kick, received a few weeks ago, was from the World Council of Churches. I have not lost my belief in mankind, but I have lost my belief in the keepers of mankind. I have come to believe that they keep mankind divided with words and their different interpretations - and they do so for one reason only - an easy life for themselves, and may the devil take the hindmost. I have become a rebel and rebel I will.

Reverend Alan Walker of Sydney came back from the United States and told us that there are exactly 365 Christian denominations in the United States complete with churches, vicarages, bishops and a host of ministers. Why - for Heavens sake? Take for instance the denominations of the Baptists. What divides them from the other Christian denominations? Well, they claim that baptism must be done by immersion of the whole person in a tank. They therefore deny the validity of sprinkling with water. Is it understandable that on this flimsy pretext a religious division should occur between members who believe in the same God and the same Christ? And can you believe why these Baptists have among themselves split up in many different sects? Here is a list of the greater sects in the United States alone:

Baptists Denominations in the U.S.A

Northern Baptist Convention	Regular Baptists
Southern Baptist Convention	United Baptists
Negro Baptists (including other groups)	Duck River Baptists (and others)
General Six Principle Baptists	Primitive Baptists (ind. other groups)
Seventh Day Baptists	Colored Primitive Baptists
Freewill Baptists	Two-Seed in the Spirit Predestinarian Baptists
United American Freewill Baptists	Independent Baptist Church of America
Freewill Baptists (Bullockists)	American Baptists Association
General Baptists	Other Baptist groups not mentioned here (from Websters)
Separate Baptists	

What makes this dissension possible? Are really the different interpretations of the words of the scriptures at the root of the evil? No, but these different interpretations are only the pretext. And once we attack these different interpretations with Semantics - the real Reason for the disastrous Division of the Christian world will become obvious.

The fact is that much money and much easy money could be obtained - money to build splendid churches with comfortable vicarages with even more comfortable salaries and absolute and secure safety for the men who make a living by this. The fact is that rich people, feeling that their end is near, and that they cannot "take it with them" into the grave, are made to believe that by giving money to the church, they can get forgiveness and that therefore they will not go to hell, where they think they ought to go. The richer the men, the greater the guilt, the greater the donation, the greater the wealth of the church. A man in the U.S.A. who senses this gold mine, must have only one asset: He must be able to use language convincingly on people. Usually for the beginning one rich widow will be sufficient to build a chapel and a vicarage. Others will follow. Its easy, once you know how. If you are a Freewill Baptist and want to strike out of your own - just give another name to your new Denomination, say United American Freewill Baptists. This will enable you to draw away a number of people you know already. Then, of course, give the words of the scriptures a different interpretation - your interpretation. And then, of course, the rich widow, or at least the small donations to keep you in business.

Some years ago I read in Readers Digest the condensation of a book, written by an American who describes the life of his father. His father was a "depression pastor", one of the few churchmen who lived and worked and slaved for the well-being of their flock. And, of course, he could not help seeing how the other ministers went on with their easy lives. He therefore attacked them constantly and became a real pain in the neck to many of them, until a plot was designed to have him defrocked. It was a devilish plot. He was scheduled to give a sermon at the coming Annual Conference of his denomination. It was then decided to attack whatever he is going to say, and in applying a different interpretation, to accuse him of heresy. The expulsion would be easy as so many were against him. As said, it was a devilish plot. But fortunately that pastor had one friend, and that one friend devised an even more devilish plot.

At the Annual Meeting the stage was set for the "firing" of a modern heretic. The pastor rose and delivered his speech which he read from carefully prepared sheets. At once his adversaries rose and accused him of heresy on account of the ideas he has brought forward. They tore his statements apart. They demanded his expulsion. The Convention was in an uproar. His enemies saw the accused already defrocked, trying to make a living as a labourer or insurance agent. Soon they will be rid of him.

The accused sat dejected under the fire of the accusations. Then he drew a small book out of his pocket. He opened up a page where certain statements were underlined and showed the book to his neighbour. He took one look into it and one look at the cover and with a horrified look passed it on to his neighbour, who, equally horrified, gave it to the next man. Soon the clamour subsided and an oppressive silence descended upon the whole assembly, as the book passed from hand to hand until it reached the man who sat next to the speaker who went on with his accusations. "Stop it!" whispered the neighbour and showed him the book. The speaker opened his mouth and fell down on his seat.

Amidst the terrible silence only one man smiled, the man who presided the meeting. It was the Bishop of the Denomination, the highest authority. And that book was a collection of his, the Bishop's speeches. Our pastor has read one of the Bishop's speeches, with the consent of the Bishop. And the Bishop's own words have been attacked as being heresy.

This happened a few years ago in the United States. It could have happened anywhere in the world. What do you now think of Religion and Semantics?

A UNIVERSAL RELIGION

Words are used to describe the world around us. Consequently, according to Semantography all words refer to 3 groups only: matter, energy and mind. We know that we can quickly come to an agreement about material things (□) and physical Actions (Λ), because they exist outside of our brain in nature. However all words referring to religion are mind (○) words. They exist only within our mind. They are theories, hypotheses, assumptions, assertions, beliefs, etc. etc. As every human mind differs from every other mind, we must understand that we can never convince (○) an atheist that he should become a Roman-Catholic, or a Buddhist or an adherent of even another atheist sect. However, we know that a human may change his mind and he may do so under the impact of statements which refer to material things (□) and physical Actions (Λ) which he himself and indeed everybody, an adult or a youngster, can observe in nature. If these statements are simple enough, they might form the basis of a universal belief to which we could all agree - no matter what religion we adhere to - and which belief could give us a guidance for our future actions. I shall try to formulate these statements on the spur of the moment, as I type these lines down. You, dear reader are asked to condense and simplify them even more.

1. We do not know how the world and the creatures came into being, and we may never know. We can, however, observe all and try to find whether chaos reigns or whether supreme order exists in what appears to us to be chaos.
2. We see innumerable creative processes happening. From a few cells develop complex organisms with complex organs of amazing design - a plant, a flower, a tree, a fruit, a fish, a butterfly, a bee, a bird, an animal, a human being.
3. We see that creatures exist which have only one purpose: to give food year after year to other creatures to feed on. These food-givers are plants and trees.
4. We see that in the higher creatures the mother is filled with food for her young and with courage to defend them and with determination to sacrifice herself so that her young ones may continue to live.
5. We see that creatures of the same species do not kill each other. "Among the same species (except man) the highest ethics is supreme law," said Ashley Montagu. Lions don't kill lions, Elephants come to the rescue of their own. Wolves will roam the wintry forest howling mad of unbearable hunger - but no wolf will kill and eat a living fellow-brother wolf. Only man kills man. It is true that some creatures feed on the corpses of other creatures. But it is equally true that many creatures - the higher ones - live on the food which is

provided without suffering, without killing. We know that we human beings and other creatures can live on vegetable food and milk food provided in nature.

6. We see that the cells in all creatures and in our body co-operate harmoniously to make the working of the complex organs possible. We see also that the individual organisms co-operate among themselves to form higher communities of higher co-operation, a rosebush, a beehive, a herd of deer. We see that many insects form large communities where no one goes hungry, where everyone works for the common good - and if the common house is too small, then a number of individuals go out and form a new community of co-operation elsewhere.

7. The highest creature on earth is man. He has a unique advantage above all other creatures. He can form words in articulate language. He can write them down and read what others have written. But man kills man - although members of all other creaturespecies do not kill each other. Why does man only kill his fellow man - not to eat him - just for killing him only, why? Is it perhaps because of that unique advantage - articulate language? Yes, said Bröck Chisholm. Man has learned to form abstract meanings, and the most disastrous ones are good and bad, wrong, evil. Men will kill their fellowmen when they are told that it is the right thing to do, that the others are bad, wicked, evil. To this comes the fact that human communities in different parts of the world have developed different articulate languages. Understanding is thus blocked.

8. If human killing and human language are related to each other, then there must have been a time when man^{has} not yet learned to form abstract meanings. Then in those bygone times human warfare must have been absent. How old then is human warfare? Can we find proofs that man of bygone times did not kill his fellowman? Yes, Bliss found these proofs. He studied the history of writing, the writing of the Chinese, Egyptians, Babylonians etc. and found that writing was invented by the human mind less than 10,000 years ago. These ancient writings contain words with abstract meanings, and they contain also glorifying accounts of wars against other humans who are accused of being bad, wrong, evil, wicked. But Bliss went further into history and studied the cave paintings of paleolithic man who (according to archeological, geological, chemical and radioactive measurements) lived between 30,000 to 50,000 years ago. None of these cavepaintings contain any picture of humanshunting other humans. In contrast, the pictures of the last 10,000 years which we find in excavations and monuments are mostly about wars and warriors, victories about vanquished fellowmen. The paleolithic artist commemorated animals and men, but apparently the idea to hunt other men never entered the minds of paleolithic man. This is not a conjecture made by Bliss. We can go into the museums and the libraries and study the ancient pictures and the ancient writings and we would find for ourselves that 30,000 years ago the records on the cave walls do not contain any hint to man killing his fellowman. Apparently in those bygone times the law of nature - that members of the same species do not kill each other - was working also within the minds of men.

9. With his improved mind man discovered not only words and writings but also other phenomena like fire, electricity, magnetism, chemicals, metals, etc. Each of these discoveries contain certain dangers, but man with his reasoning power learned to harness these dangers for his own welfare. He learned to cope with them, and during the last 1000 years man has been able to create amazing apparatuses which work for the human welfare. It is now high time that we begin to overcome the dangers caused by articulate language, the abstract meanings which have so many different meanings in different languages and even in the same language. In doing so, we shall be able to invent a new reasoning for mankind which will enable all human beings to cope with the dangers of the concept of right and wrong, which, so far, has divided mankind into many religions and many warring factions.

10. With our resoning powers developed we begin to discover a new world - the world of the mind. Those cells concentrated within the skull of the higher creatures have mysterious powers. Minds can sense the thinking of other minds. Minds can sense water and minerals down below. Minds can communicate with other minds thousands of miles away. Minds can even see into the future. Minds can even heal miraculously diseased parts of another body. Minds can discover new phenomena. Minds can do this if they work in accordance with the mysterious force which we see at work in the world of ours - the urge to co-operate and build higher communities of cells, organisms and individuals of higher and higher

order and co-operation.

11. We can see and feel for ourselves, that working in accordance with the law of co-operation does us good. When we help a fellowman, we feel good. When we work for a cause for mankind, we feel good. When we do a good turn to someone in need, we feel good. Now the psychologists and physicians have discovered that ^{the} health of our body is directly connected with our ethical deeds, and that most of our bodily afflictions are caused by the cells in the subconscious part of our mind, which punish us with illness for the dastardly deeds we have done to our fellowmen.

12. Whatever name we give to that mysterious force which drives us on to help each other and to co-operate with each other, just as the cells in any creature do - whatever name we give to it, be it God, or Creator, or Life Force, or Supreme Intelligence, or Natural Selection, or any other name - this mysterious force exists and we see its working in every cell, in every plant, in every blossom and in every other creature. What we have to do is to follow its urge and its law. We must use our mind to overcome the physical and mental obstacles to higher and higher co-operation between all members of the human race. We are the highest creatures on this planet and we have been given a mind to be creators ourselves and to create communities with less and lesser suffering, and high and higher co-operation.

13. Once we realize that creative processes towards higher evolution go on all the time, we will become aware that new ideas to help this higher evolution along, spring up first in the minds of a few human beings. But these new ideas are in contrast to the old and established ideas. The keepers of the old and established ideas who make a living by them, are the last to admit that their ideas have become obsolete. In consequence, those men, who are paid to care for the spiritual welfare of the human race and for its betterment, are usually against the men with new ideas. The result is that those pioneers, who are mankind's best sons, are condemned to a life of bitter struggle against the injustices meted out to them by the keepers of the old ideas. Once we realize this injustice, we must work out methods to help those pioneers of mankind along, so that their ideas and their work shall continue for the betterment of mankind. We must realize that these pioneers of new ideas are themselves products of that great Supreme Intelligence working in the Universe, and that their minds has become the vessel for a new idea of higher co-operation and evolution. Thus we shall be able to reach a higher and a better life for us and for the generations to come.

HERE I STAND

In the foregoing pages I have managed to antagonize the professors of language, the professors of logic, the professors of biology, of zoology and of the other sciences and in the last pages I have surely deeply offended all men of the various religions. What chance could you give me that my work and my writings shall be accepted by the professorial and the other authorities? No chance whatever. You might think that I am of a quarrelsome nature, and that I quickly offend everybody. The opposite is true. Those who know me, will testify to this. Those who live in the Sydney area can have an opportunity to meet me and to form their own opinion about me. The truth is that I like, above all, to make everybody laugh, being a good jester and story teller. The truth is that I approach everyone with the utmost deference. The truth is that I am happy like a dog if you pat me with one good word only.

Another proof for you is to look through my 3 books on Semantography and my Semantography Series. A few important letters to important people are already incorporated in the Series and more of my correspondence will follow. You will not find a word against the professors. On the contrary, I appeal to them, I crouch before them, I beg to them like a beggar begs for a morsel. I have not asked for a job, I have not asked for a grant, I have not asked that my work should be taken up and taught. I have asked only for an opportunity to demonstrate it before a group of scholars who may examine it and may ask me questions. I could not get this hearing. I could not get a hearing at all. I was turned down every time. Most of my letters were not even answered.

I have approached governmental authorities in various lands, which could make use of Semantography for their people who are illiterate and speak many

languages. I have asked for the opportunity to demonstrate the practicability of my work. I was turned down every time. I have approached many a times dignitaries of the United Nations and Unesco, and have spent many pounds on airletters and printed material. It was all in vain. I have approached publishers and have even offered a guarantee against any loss from a publication on Semantography. I received in most cases no answer. I have approached scientific Foundations and have found that they are controlled by professors and care only for those scholars who make a living by their work. Thus, the last 5 years have gone by in great misery, dejection, and often abysmal despair. Most other men would have given up the struggle. Most other men would have realized that they have to be dead first in order to find recognition of their work.

And this is indeed the case with most pioneers of a new idea. In order to go on living, I have decided to fight. I am not out for money. On the contrary. Every penny I earn, apart for the barest necessities of life, goes into this work. But I have realized that there is a much greater job to do than Semantography alone, namely to make mankind realize the great injustices meted out by the keepers of mankind to mankind's best sons, the pioneers of new ideas. I intend to use the remaining days and years of my life to fight for the men of new ideas, for the outsiders, the parias, the men who have to be dead first, driven into death by the professorial authorities, before their work is recognized and taught. Professor Carleton Washburne of New York said:

"We Educators take easily to technical innovations, but we resist any change, we even pride ourselves with the antiquity of our educational innovations."

And he himself proved it for himself. He did nothing whatever for Semantography. Mankind is in a mess and we should start to blame the men (who educate our children) for the mess mankind finds itself in. I raise my voice and accuse the educators of mankind, the hierarchy of highbrows and I shall end these words with the words which another man used against another hierarchy:

"Here I stand. I cannot do otherwise. May God help me!"

MY PLEA TO YOU

My greatest handicap at present is that my publications are mimeographed. Their impact would be much greater if they were printed. Printing small publications is now possible with the aid of a varityper and a multilith machine. If I could acquire these two machines it would make a great difference. They cost about £A 800 (£st 640 or \$ 1800). If you, dear reader, are in a position to help me in acquiring these machines to be repaid to you at a later date, I ask you for your help. If you can advance only part of the money, I shall try to find the rest with other people. If you cannot advance me much, I beg you to consider to invest the sum of £ 5, or £ 10, or £ 15 for my past and future writings which will be forwarded to you. It is a small sum and anyone who has the welfare of mankind at heart could spend that much, realizing that you get publications which soon will have a bibliographic value much greater than your investment. Bertrand Russell wrote to me:

"Any man or men who will spend the money necessary to get your work printed will, in my opinion, be performing an important service to mankind."

I ask you, dear reader, to perform this important service and I tender to you my thanks in anticipation.

WHEN DID HUMAN WARFARE START?

My discovery, mentioned in previous pages and already acknowledged by a few scholars will be available in a separate edition. It will contain the issues

. "The gap in prehistoric history" (Semantography Series No. 25)

"A possible proof and tool to Chisholm's theory on the cause and prevention of human warfare." (Series No. 85)

"Psycho-semantics, adult emotion and war" by Dr. D.N. Everingham (Series No. 86)

"The concept of right and wrong in semantography" (new issue)

available for £A -.7.- or £st -.6.6 or \$ 0.80

Semantography Series Catalogue (84 issues) £A -.1.6 or £st -.1.3 or \$ 0.18 incl. Price of Books on Semantography, etc.