

NEW ADDRESS
'BLISS' INSTITUTE
2 Vicar St., Coogee
Sydney, N.S.W. Australia
T.L. FX 8140



SEMANTOGRAPHY
A CHRISTMAS PRESENT FOR PSYCHOLOGISTS

Sydney 5th November
1953

Dear Dr. and Mrs. Harvey Mindess,

Mrs. Ann-Maria Burchard of Long Beach California has taken an interest in my work and she decided to send you a Christmas present of some of my writings. It would have been so much easier to go into a bookshop and select an interesting looking book on Psychology, nicely printed and bound and with an impressive name as author. Instead she spent her money on some papers mostly mimeographed and from an author who is unknown. As psychologists you will realize what this means to that unknown author. This letter is the result.

This letter is about my work Semantography. Unknown as it is, (because publishers consider it too great a risk as a business venture) some enlightened librarians in the United States and elsewhere have realized that a lone free-lance scholar battles for a new idea and that his writings are worthy to be collected for future generations. They have bought my 3 mimeographed volumes on Semantography and they have given a standing order for all my writings, including my future ones. However, I have little time to write. Most of my waking hours are spent to make ends meet, spent in business and not in Semantography. I hit therefore on the idea to write down on stencils some letters which seem important for me. Letters which have stimulated my thoughts and which show some aspects and applications of Semantography and some aspects of my struggle for it. Some of these letters are included in my "Semantography Series" which comprise all my leaflets, pamphlets, brochures, correspondence courses, controversies and articles written by other people about my work. In later paragraphs I shall explain the reasons why I consider this letter worthy to go into my Series. However, as said before, I have little time to make drafts and corrections and therefore I write all directly unto the wax stencils. I beg therefore to excuse all my shortcomings in this and all my other writings.

Since the war ended I have written hundreds of letters to influential people and agencies up to U.N. and Unesco. I asked for nothing more than an examination of my work. Realizing that my letter will first reach a secretary I added a short letter for him or her and said: 'The fate of new ideas often depended on a secretary and I depend on you. Realize please the advantages of my work for mankind and get your chief interested in it. Thank you.'

Now, the job of a secretary is to sort the incoming letters into "important" letters and "unimportant" letters. The latter do not come to the chief. They go to the incinerator, especially if they contain such crazy ideas like a "picture writing" obviously the work of a crank. And in most cases, this is what happened. The very distinction between "important" and "unimportant" letters have brought to nought much of my work, time and money spent. It has added to my despair and despondency at times. As you are psychologists, I shall now show the application of Semantography to the meaning of "important" and "unimportant" and how this application could aid the psychologist,

Dr. Douglas N. Everingham, M.B., B.S., Division of Mental Hygiene, Department of Public Health, N.S.W. Australia is my closest collaborator. He has made most valuable contributions to Semantography. He uses the operational logic of Semantography in the treatment of his mental patients and he is presently working on a fully fledged system of Semantography as a Tool for Psychology. I have not the professional training which he has and therefore my explanations may seem to be not up to professional standards. But as I claim that Semantography can be grasped by simple people, my explanation must be simple.

Thinking in ordinary language, no explanation is necessary. Unimportant letters are unimportant - it's obvious. However, it looks different in Semantography. I am a chemist and we chemists have already our "meaningful writing." In chemical Semantography H_2O means not only water, wasser, eau, aqua, agua, voda, etc., etc., it shows the "meaning elements" of which water is composed. Boys and girls in the high school of the world have learned to operate the semantics of chemical symbols and their inherent logic. I claim that I have reduced the meanings of all words to their meaning elements, which are less than 100 in numbers. Each meaning could thus be written as a symbol formula in the symbols of Semantography. On the testimony of great scholars, I have thus realized the speculation of the great mathematician and philosopher Leibnitz. This speculation has been considered impossible to realize since Leibnitz wrote about it 300 years ago. He demanded pictorial symbols for those meanings which are picturable, that is, they stand for real things in our physical world.

The most important distinction in Semantography is between words which refer to things outside of our mind and words which refer to happenings inside of our brain. The meaning of the word water refers to some thing which exists in nature. But the largest telescope or microscope cannot discover the meaning of "important" on this or any other celestial body. It is a meaning which is created in a human brain. Consequently, the first symbol element in the symbol formula is this: $\cap$ This is the outline of the upper skull which houses the brain.

To the symbol for mind $\cap$ we add another symbol, the international exclamation mark: ! This symbol compound $\cap!$ stands for the meaning of "interest" If a person becomes interested in something, it is primarily the mind in which this interest is created and it is often accompanied by an exclamation. This pictograph, once explained, seems natural and convincing. Observe the minor advantages. It needs only 2 pressings of the typewriter key instead of 8 as in "interest" and it means "interest" in all languages of the world, including the ones yet to come. It pictures a biological happening, independent of any language.

To the symbol compound for "interest" $\cap!$ we add now the international plus + symbol which stands for positive, affirmative, etc. What I want to symbolize is "interest for a positive purpose" or we may say for an explanation "positive interest for a purpose". This coincides with the meaning of "important" If a secretary sees something which might interest her chief for the positive purpose of his work, she will consider it as "important" and will let him see it. The alternative is "interest with no purpose" which marks the "unimportant" letters which are addressed to the chief. No or negative would thus be symbolized by the international minus - mark. We have now so far $\cap+$ and $\cap-$.

Now for the symbol for "purpose" I have formed this difficult abstract meaning by using a symbol which teenagers are pestered with in mathematics. We learned to write $a > b$ and learned to interpret this symbol as a relation symbol, saying that "a in relation to b is....." This then $>$ is my symbol for "relation." Now Bon means "good" in French, and Bonbon means something specially good. Beri means "weak" in Singalese and Beriberi means something specially weak. So by repeating my relation symbol $>>$ I mean some special relation, some purposeful relation, not just a chance relation. I let this symbol compound $>>$ stand for "purpose."

We have now the complete symbol formulae for "important" $\cap+>>$ and for "unimportant" $\cap->>$. The typing advantage is obvious. They have the same meaning in all languages and can be read in all mother tongues. Moreover, the alphabetical symbols i, n, p, o, r, t, a, n, t each for itself, tell us nothing, whereas the semantographic symbols tell us "interest created in a mind for a positive purpose." This explanation involves 9 words with 41 symbols in phonetic symbolization.

So far, this looks desperately like an attempt for another "international language" like Esperanto. But it is the "opposite" (so to speak) of an international language. They have all proved a failure. But all foreign language teaching in school has proved a failure too (with few exceptions) The mother tongue is irresistible even in the most literate countries of the world. In your country Canada, settlers who came there centuries ago still speak only French, or Ukrainian, or a host of other languages. But all people who have learned to read $1 + 2 = 3$ can read it in any of their many mother tongues. Semantography is already in use on the highways of the world where mutual understanding in all languages means life or death. This pictograph $\curvearrowright$ means a "CURVE to the right" in all languages of the world.

However, the linguistic aspect of Semantography is only a minor advantage. Its main advantage is the operational logic and semantics. Mathematical symbols are operated according to a certain logic. Every boy and girl knows what to do, think and expect when he or she has to operate the symbols $+$ $-$ $\times$ $:$ $=$ etc. Similarly, the formulae for "important" and "unimportant" are of little use unless we know how to operate them, how to think about them and what to expect of them.

There are only two main operational rules in Semantography, and you will find them in Semantography Series No. 31 INTRODUCTION AND FIRST LESSON OF THE LOGIC AND SEMANTICS OF SEMANTOGRAPHY which you will receive by seemail. These rules can be explained to children. The first rule goes: Not two human beings are alike. Even identical twins think and act differently. Consequently not two human minds think alike. This is expressed in the terse symbols of Semantography thus

$$\cap_1 \neq \cap_2$$

The symbol for "equal" = crossed out by the oblique line / forms the symbol for "unequal, different" $\neq$. The number 1 is used in Semantography in combination with the symbol for human to denote I, the first case personal pronoun. The symbol 2 is used in combination to stand for you or the other. This formula expresses simply that my mind differs from any other mind.

The operational logic of this rule is obvious. Every meaning which contains the mind $\cap$ symbol may have a different meaning in different minds. I and the secretary and her chief will all agree about the meaning of "water". But we may disagree whether or not my work and my letter is "important". We may disagree even about the meaning of "important" and our definitions would differ.

The second operational rule is again very simple. It says: a person may change his or her mind. It may happen within a fraction of a second, enough for a new thought to come up. The difference is the time factor and here are my symbols for past, present and future. Time has no outline. It cannot be pictured. We must use a simple analogy. Imagine you are travelling on a road in forward direction (the arrow is the old international symbol). On your car are mounted 2 parabolic mirrors)(. The first mirror) reflects the part of the road where you have travelled in the past, just a minute ago. The other mirror (focuses your future way. This symbol)(means past. The other symbol (means future. The present)(is a fleeting glance between past and future.

The second operational rule means: the very same mind may think and act differently at different times, or in the symbols of Semantography:

$$\cap_1) \neq \cap_1($$

or even simpler: I may think differently to-morrow. This again is almost a platitude but we don't learn in school how to operate this platitude with regard to various meanings. In our present example it means nothing less than what we think to be. "important" may appear "unimportant" to-morrow, although the factual situation has not changed during the night. The chief who today waved aside as "unimportant" a suggestion of his secretary, may after a night's rest come into the office and say: "You are right. That idea of that man Bliss seems to me now "important" enough to warrant an examination of his work."

How can these symbols aid the psychologist? We are living in a world of worries. There is scarcely a person who is not in a neurotic condition about something which he or she considers important enough to be worried about. You can talk and talk to such a person not to take seriously this or that, but he or she will not be convinced. If she thinks her worry important enough she will go on worrying. The very word "important" will make it important. She has learned in school that water is water and important is important. Worse even if she has been to highschool and has learned some grammar. Water is a noun, and a noun is also called a substantive. "Importance" is a substantive too. Water is real, the importance of her worry is real too. Both have somehow "substance" as substantives. She has learned in school how to spell importance, how to write it, how to pronounce it and how to use it. But she has not learned that its meaning is nothing definite and of substance like water. Instead the meaning may change within a fraction of a second to the direct opposite.

It is different with her mathematical schooling. She has learned for a number of years the use of the mathematical symbols and their operational rules and no grocer will be able to make her believe that $2 + 2 = 5$. It would take only months to train children to learn the operational rules of Semantography. All

test with children have proved that they are "fascinated" even "thrilled" by the pictorial symbols of Semantography. You will find these symbols in the other number of the Semantography Series sent to you by seammall. Of course, in this letter, I went straight into abstract meanings, and these symbols may seem strange at first. But how strange may the following symbols look to someone who sees them for the first time: 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,0,a,b,c,d,e, etc.etc.?

I am now coming to an aspect of my work which I consider very important. The + symbol stands for positive, the minus - symbol for negative. When we add an exclamation mark they become the semantographic symbols for yes +! and no -! When we add the symbol of the mouth o we get a voiced yes or no, or in other words affirmation o+! and denial o-! When we want to express that our mind says yes to something we write it with the mindsymbol @! It means now good @! and its opposite bad @! If you are bewildered about the use of the symbol elements in various different positions to mean different things, think of the different meanings in different positions of 01 and 10 or 101. Or take the two marks, the dot and the comma, and see what we do with them in different positions: . : . , ; ' " ! They change the meanings of whole statements.

I have started this letter one and a half month ago. In the meantime, I had a long discussion with Julian Huxley, and the result is a publication JULIAN HUXLEY AND SEMANTOGRAPHY. I have not finished it. But I have decided to send you this instead of previous issues, except the ones which I attach with this in an air-letter to reach you before Christmas. It is an article about a theory of your famous countryman the psychiatrist Brock Chisholm. This article of mine was commissioned by Prof. Clyde Kluckhohn of Harvard University and he himself sent a copy to Chisholm, who acknowledged it in a letter to me. But this correspondence has only started. I told Huxley about Chisholm's theory, and what did Huxley say? "It's silly of Chisholm to say this." Wow! As I said, the correspondence has only started. What a row! What a beautiful row!

Now, why did I start with a woman secretary and whether or not she considers my letter to be important enough to show to her chief? Since my youth I was very much attached to my mother, and indeed all my love affairs or nearly all of them were with women whom I somewhat adored because of their intelligence, their music making, or just because they listened so wonderfully to what I have to say. My wife is older than I, and there is perfect harmony in our marriage. And so all the time since I started on Semantography 11 years ago, and throughout the years of work and worry, where my wife was my only comfort, I fervently hoped that one day an influential woman would come along and take my work in her motherly care. I hoped for the great chance that some creative men had, a Frau von Stein, a George Sands, a Rachel Verhagen. And every time I got a preliminary letter from a woman secretary in the U.N. or Unesco, etc. acknowledging officially the receipt of my material, I hastened to send a personal letter telling her of the great women of the past who helped creative men along. Alas, all was in vain - until I realized that another type of women has emerged. The great women of the past saw their career in helping creative men along. The new careerwomen want only to help their own career along. Man is for them the competitor.

I despaired of ever finding not a careerwomen who would take an interest in my work. And now, I have found her: Mrs. Ann-Maria Burchard of 3009 East Third Street, Long Beach 14 California. She has taken an interest in my work and has taken the few mimeographed copies of my work which I have in the U.S.A. in her motherly care. May be, she will find an American woman (and may be you will find a Canadian woman) with enough "influence" to pay the printer so that the words which Bertrand Russell wrote 3 years ago in vain will now be modified. Russell wrote: "Any man or men who will spend the money necessary to get your work printed will in my opinion be performing an important service to mankind."

As this my letter to you is going into some of the most important libraries in the United States and elsewhere, I wish that it should be considered as a Christmas present to Mrs. Burchard and given to her in gratitude. I shall also take the liberty to send it to other psychologists like you and shall be grateful if you too and friends of you in Canada would take an active interest in my work. With a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year from me and my wife, I am

Yours sincerely
C.K. Bliss
C.K. Bliss