



Semantography Series No. 135

Sydney 21st Feb. 1954

A "BRIEF" ON THE SEMANTICS
OF SEMANTOGRAPHY

in app. 2500 words

(see the foregoing issue no. 134 : "Brief" on Semantography)

THE FOREGOING BRIEF

The reader is strongly urged to read the foregoing Brief first. There the history, scope, development and final solution of the problem, raised by the great mathematician Leibnitz, is discussed. The main issues, advantages, counterarguments are given and examples of Semantography are shown. Of the Semantics of Semantography (SG) only hints are given.

THE NECESSITY OF SYMBOLS

Leibnitz realized that only symbols could have the same meaning in all languages. They must be pictorial "for rendering our conceptions more real." They must be operatable in a simple "Algebra of Thought", simple enough for simple people. Such a "very popular" symbolism would "guide the mind as do the lines drawn in geometry, and the formulas in arithmetic," wrote Leibnitz 300 years ago.

THE MATHEMATICS FOR EVERYDAY THOUGHT

Inventing a picture writing is an easy matter. The early Egyptians, Babylonians, Chinese, American Indians, Eskimos, etc. had one. But a picture writing which comprises a simple Logic for the People is quite a different task. Here we have one of the main obstacles against the acceptance of Semantography. Professors and lay people, after one glance at the symbols of SG say: "Ah, a picture writing! (cranky idea)." They refuse to believe that those "childish" pictures could help us to clear up our personal, domestic, communal, political and world misunderstandings. But Bliss has proved in his books that SG can do just this. But to understand his work a new approach to language is necessary.

THE OLD APPROACH TO LANGUAGE

Bertrand Russell, Sigmund Freud and others have agreed that "we think in words". Vague thoughts are expressed in vague words and vague words create vague thoughts in other minds. But the teachers of language teach us only grammar rules. We can write any vagueness, provided we write it only "correctly." We can write of "spiritual materialism" or "materialistic spiritualism" and can get away with it. But to write of "spirritual matteralism" would horrify our language teachers. Many scholars have condemned conventional grammar as a useless torture inflicted on our children. The fact is that the 2000 million people of our planet go on babbling without the slightest bother whether they use a noun or a verb in whatever conjugation and mood. The fact is that most men and women who can speak and write correctly would fail miserably in any highschool examination on grammatical terms and rules.

BLISS versus GRAMMAR

Bliss, in his youth, was the delight of his teachers of math, geometry, physics and chemistry. The "Laws of Nature" came to him naturally. But he was the despair of his language teachers. He refused to learn the "Laws of Language" the illogical declensions and conjugations, the non-sensical irregularities and exemptions from the "Laws." Yet, his teachers could not dismiss him, because he delivered the best essays and the best recitations in all classes. Bliss gained his skill of words simply by voracious reading of adventure stories, notably Bufallo Bill, Sherlock Holmes etc. In foreign languages, being solely taught as grammatical constructions, Bliss was again a complete wash-out. It is understandable that Bliss, the Chemist, evolved a new Chemistry of Words to end conventional grammar in all languages.

BLISS' NEW APPROACH TO LANGUAGE

All words of all languages are used to describe the phenomena of our world. These phenomena are material (chemical, physical, biological) and spiritual (psychological). Bliss forms 2 simple rules from these sciences. He takes from

(1) Chemistry and Physics: Our world consists of material THINGS which perform physical ACTIONS.

(2) Biology and Psychology: Not two human beings are alike and think alike.

Human EVALUATIONS differ with different minds.

All words of all languages fall into these 3 groups: THINGS, ACTIONS and EVALUATIONS. Children and primitive people can easily find out. Here is how:

Material THINGS can be touched, weighed, counted and photographed. Such words are: stone, hammer, flower, animal, man, etc.

Physical ACTIONS are performed by material THINGS (see above). They can be observed or filmed. Such words are: falling, hammering, growing, etc.

Human EVALUATIONS cannot be touched, weighed, counted, photographed or filmed. They originate only within a human mind. They differ therefore with different minds. Even identical twins may quarrel. Such words are: reasonable, shocking, good, bad, ideal, etc.

A GADGET FOR HEATED DEBATES

In order to apply the 3 groups to all languages we must use a symbol for each group. These 3 symbols could be made into a poster to be hung in class rooms, or on a stand for conference tables, or office desks. In miniature they can hang from a woman's bracelet or a man's watch. The descriptive order is reversed. Matter at the basis. Mind at the top.



Mind (outline of skull) activities are thought (○), judgement (○), etc.

Evaluations (○) are symbolized by a V (Latin Valere, Value). They are expressed in such words as: beautiful, ugly, (V), tasty, abhorring (V), etc.

Actions are symbolized by a triangle (Latin Actus, Action), hammering (Δ), eating (Δ).

THINGS are composed of matter (molecules, crystals, etc. therefore □).

hammer (□), man (□), machine (□), etc. But some words fall into 2 or all 3 groups. A hammerer (□Δ) is a man (□) who hammers (Δ). A teacher (□Δ○) is a man (□) who writes (Δ) or speaks (Δ) using mostly his mind (○). What is important is whether a word contains a mind evaluation or not. These V belong together.

THE PICTURE RULE OF SEMANTOGRAPHY

If you want to recognize a disputed meaning, just ask: Can I make a picture of this meaning? Can I photograph it? You can picture a man (□), a machine (□), a horse (□). You can film their Actions of: going (Δ), running (Δ), galloping (Δ). But can you photograph the meaning of "new" as such. No, you can't. You can photograph a new (V) car (□). But it may be a re-conditioned (Δ) one (□). Can you photograph an idea (○)? No, you can't. Will different people easily agree that SG is a "new (Δ) idea (○)"? No! Some will say it is new (V). Others will say it is as old (V) as man's (□) first attempts (Δ) at writing (Δ).

HOW TO FIND AGREEMENT?

About meanings which contain mind (○) evaluations (V) different minds may forever disagree, because those meanings exists only within their different minds. In order to find agreement, the disputed statement must be re-formulated to contain only □ and Δ words. A new (V) car (□) is one (□) whose parts (□) were manufactured (Δ) and assembled (Δ) and the car (□) was then driven (Δ) only from the factory (□) to the showroom (□). Semantography is a new (V) idea (○) if no books (□) are to be found (Δ) which show SG. But the symbol for "if" and the future tense (of "to be found") carries in SG the question mark (?). There might be a Shangri-La monastery (□) which has just such a book (□). In SG "might" has also a (?). We must realize that we can quickly come to an agreement about the newness (V) of a material THING (□). But we may never come to an agreement about the newness (V) of something which is in a mind (○). It's idle to debate about it and we may part as enemies. But if we want to debate about it nevertheless, as soon as we find that our better formulated statements contain words which in the symbols of SG carries the question mark - then we better admit our mutual ignorance and part as friends.

SG SEMANTICS WITH OR WITHOUT SYMBOLS

From the foregoing paragraphs it becomes clear that we need not any symbols at all. The notions THING, ACTION, MIND and EVALUATION without reference to □ Δ ○ and V

are sufficient for us to be operated with the few simple rules of SG. Bliss maintains that any teenager could learn the Semantics of SG within a few hours training. The advanced student, however, will profit if he knows the symbols of SG, as pointed out in the foregoing paragraph. A few symbols will be shown.

FORMULATING BUSINESS AGREEMENTS

Bliss points out that business colleges offer courses for special jobs, machine accounting, shorthand, handling of telegraphic codes (a cumbersome ideography), etc. He maintains that any business college could offer a course on the Graphics of SG, and one on the Semantics of SG. A special clerk could use the graphics for corresponding with small countries where firms have no English correspondent, but can correspond with the whole world in SG. The graphics of SG can also be used for radio-photo cables which need no coding, decoding and translating. The Semantics of SG can be useful for every firm to eliminate disputable meanings in any contract. Such words often allow the defaulting party to escape his obligation and still be right in or out of court. Instead of writing that the ordered goods must be of good (V) quality (V), certain tests (A) should be agreed upon. To stipulate that the goods shall be delivered "as soon (V) as possible (V)" will allow the defaulting party to say that it was not possible (V). When the parties go to court, the relevant law may contain other evaluation words, like "reasonable (V) time" or "as the judge thinks (O) fit (V). Then only much money to buy the most persuasive barrister can help.

BLISS IS UP AGAINST IT

What means here "IT"? It may be a wall. Bliss may say that with regard to the acceptance of SG he "is up against a wall." It would be a lie. "Where is the wall?" would any teenager, trained in SG, ask. Ah, it's a metaphorical expression. But in SG a metaphor (Greek a transfer) is not allowed, because it is a lie. Certain THINGS (□) and ACTIONS (Λ) are transferred within a mind (O) and compared (O) and likened (O) with other quite different THINGS (□) and ACTIONS (Λ). Call a girl a goose and you may ruin her whole life. How do the symbols for comparison and likening look in SG? And what warning sign or symbol should we put up for any metaphor?

:	⊖	=	⊖	○	⊥	⊖
mathematical comparison comparison mark (mind)	equal sign	likening (in a mind)	mouth (speech)	person	"figure of speech" (metaphor)	

Now, this symbol for "metaphor" Bliss constructed as a sort of joke. The mouth topmost of a person should signify a highbrow talker, those who love the use of metaphors, comparisons, analogies, similes, etc. When hard pressed, they will say: "Well, it's not exactly a wall, and she is not exactly a goose." Then the proper answer should be: "Shut up!" That "figure of speech" symbol looks also like a roadwarning sign: ATTENTION, METAPHOR AHEAD, EXPECT ANY FALSEHOOD. The metaphor is extensively used in political speeches and slogans. The time-honoured American slogan "You can't change horses midstream" was used in every presidential campaign amidst a national crisis. The Republicans staged demonstrations along rivers to show that you can change horses midstream. Later generations won't need such foolery. They will know of SG and that horses are horses and presidents are presidents, and it is falsehood to liken (O) and compare (O) them. They will also know of the SG symbol for can and cannot being different for different minds. When Czechoslovakia was overwhelmed by the Communists just about when millions and millions of dollars were to come in as Marshall Aid - how to explain this to the needy people of Czechoslovakia? Why, a metaphor will do the trick "No dollar chains for Czechoslovakia."

But what actually is Bliss up against? He approached hundreds of professors whose job is to help any new idea for the betterment of mankind and also help the inventor (they are paid by mankind for just this). He asked only for the same treatment which any criminal gets: a hearing, a trial, a counsel for the defence and a judgement. It was denied to him. He did not dare to hope to get the same treatment which many a murderer gets. He is relieved of all earthly worries for the next rent, the next meal, the next pair of shoes, and he is even given free paper to write. Bliss approached hundreds of professors, publishers, scientific foundations, asking only for the opportunity to work out the primers for mankind, for the use of SG in any field of human activity. Here is

but one instance of what happened. A professor of a world famous university wrote about the possibility of finding Bliss a desk there, where to go on working on SG. This is what the professor wrote:

"I have canvassed the position here at and at and the nature of the institutional set-up in both institutions is such that there just isn't any possibility in the immediately foreseeable future. This may be irrational and indeed I would agree that there is much in the institutional code of most institutions of higher learning that is irrational. However, I am afraid this is the factual position."

Now, let's apply the picture rule of SG to the important word "irrational". It refers to a mind (○) evaluation (V). The contrary is rational (○) referring to reason and reasonable (○). It should stand to reason (○) that a man like Bliss who has worked out such an important work and who has presented 3 large volumes etc.etc. should be given the opportunity to go on and work out in detail the primers for primary, secondary and tertiary education in every field of human endeavour. But he is prevented from doing this through "irrationality". At the same time millions upon millions are spent on research. What does the word "irrational" really mean? What picture had that professor in mind when he wrote it. Bliss can only guess and here are some of his guesses.

The "irrationality" of the professorial minds may be traced to a real material THING, according to the picture rule of SG (see p. 2). It may be a piece of paper which can be photographed. Bliss has only a university degree in chemical engineering. He cannot produce a piece of paper (□) showing a degree in linguistics. He is supposed to work (Λ) in the building (□) for linguistics. In some countries only those pieces of paper (□) are recognized which are issued (Λ) in that country itself. Bliss's paper (□) was issued in another country (□). In other countries the first paper (□) for entering a university as member of the staff must be a birth certificate signed by a priest. In other countries it must be the Communist membership card. In some countries that piece of paper must show that Bliss's father was not a Jew or a Negro. It's all irrational, against any reason, it's crazy. It is as Goethe said: "It's all madness - yet, it has a method!" ("Ist es wohl Wahnsinn, hat es doch Methode!"). 'However, I am afraid this is the factual position,' wrote the professor.

But he restricted the "impossibility" for Bliss by saying that there "isn't any possibility in the immediately foreseeable future." The word "foreseeable" refers to the vision in a mind (○). Research work in universities is organised for many years ahead. All words referring to time like future and year are traced in SG again to □ and Λ, the movement (Λ) of the fingers (□) of a clock (□) or the movement (Λ) of the earth (□) around the sun (□). How many years must Bliss (now 57 of age) stay alive until the "irrationalities" will be removed?

For Bliss, the pioneer of a new idea, all those answers of the professors (who have a blasted duty to help him and his work) have a terrible semantics. All those negative answers mean for him that the professors say: "Into the grave my friend! Into the grave first, you pioneer of a new idea! Only when you are dead for good - then and then only shall we exhume you, extoll you and exploit you by making a living with your work. But you have to be dead first!"

Of course, it's all a lie. No professor said this. No such sound track could ever be produced on a film, because no one said it. But Bliss has now started to prove that the professors did the same thing to most pioneers of new ideas who were ridiculed and were driven into debt, despair and death. However, Bliss can translate his own words in his SG and he knows that they contain fallacies. You, dear reader may take this as a momentary outburst to show what's in Bliss's mind. It is not nice there.

Note to the first reader. Dear Friend, You have asked me to write a 2500 word Brief on the Graphics and one Brief on the Semantics of Semantography. It was easy to write about SG as a new script. It is a new idea, and every mind with a little interest and benevolence could visualize its working and its advantages. However, to write in 2500 words about the Semantics of SG is much more difficult because here it means to overcome all our ingrained thinking methods, inflicted upon us by our language teachers. As you know, I write without a draft and by trying to explain and explain the Semantics of SG I just think that more words are better than a few too few. Cut out the last one and a half pages, and cut out what I have already proved to your satisfaction, and you may arrive at less than 2500 words. 50 years hence, my teaching might be "self-evident". But not now.

CONVENTIONAL LOGIC AND SG

We learn the 3 R's and then we go on learning more R's and Arts. But the most important R is not taught in the primary and secondary schools of the world: The Art of Reasoning. The most important item to be taught to all students of a university (the future leading citizens of a nation) should be the Art of Reasoning. But only the few students who subscribe to philosophy are forced to listen to logicians. This is a silent admission by the university authorities of the whole world that conventional logic (condemned by many scholars) is useless, and downright misleading. In Logic - a statement can be factually true, but logically false, or logically true, but factually false. This utter nonsense is only possible because conventional logicians cling to the obsolete handling of words as taught by the conventional grammarians. One of the first formal statements to be learned in conventional Logic is: All S (subjects) are P (predicates). See how it develops:

All men are mortal	The men are mortal	Men are mortal	A man is mortal
All Jews are bad	The Jews are bad	Jews are bad	A Jew is bad
All Americans are capitalistic	The Americans are capitalistic	Americans are capitalistic	An American is capitalistic

The words mortal, bad and capitalistic are formally adjectives, so the form is the same in formal logic. This sort of thinking has made it possible that millions of people are convinced that the second statement is true, and million of Jews have been exterminated. The third statement is taught as true in all countries under Soviet rule. It will lead to an even greater mass destruction, and all nations are already spending a great part of their income in preparation. But we do not say usually All S are P. The grammarians have allowed us to use innocent words which mean the same: THE and A or nothing at all just: Americans are soandso. Open up any newspaper and you will find such utterances on every page. Children trained in SG will be able to trace quickly every word to a □ or A or a V. Mortal means to die (A). Bad is a mind (□) evaluation (V) about which different minds may differ violently. Capitalistic is an evaluation of a complex economical structure which Bliss, the chemist, explains in drawing a structural formula showing the groups and elements which compose this meaning. Boys and girls know already that you cannot say 'Benzene compounds are good or bad'. They will draw the structural formulas and discuss each group.

What about those little words, the particles like the, a, as, much, more, etc? Do they too fall into the 3 groups of □ A and V? Yes, they do. Here the knowledge of their symbols is necessary. Bliss calls these small words "shorthand words". They are used for meanings which are usually expressed in more words. THE is traced back to THIS and this is traced back to the index finger (□) of a person (□) pointing at something (□). Their symbols are derived from the picturegraph of a hand pointing. A is a deteriorated ONE ONLY symbolized by 1. AS used in the phrase: as bad as is a shorthand word for this (□) compared (□) with this (□). See the symbol for comparison on page 3 showing the mind (□), etc. Children trained in SG will soon know that when they say THE or THIS they have to attach it to ONE particular THING. When they say AS they may make statements which may cause disagreement with different minds. About much, more, etc. see next paragraph.

THE WAR OF WORDS

There is a War of Words going on within every family, every community, every nation and within the family of nations. We are told that primitive tribes know only of the meanings: One, Two, Three and Many. Consequently those primitives have been robbed and they have retaliated with murder. Today every housewife can quickly come to an agreement with every grocer, because both have learned in school the symbols for One, Two, Three, Four, etc and their operations. But we still are not taught the symbols for Many, Much, More, etc. and how to operate them. Now listen to this:

Wife: "I have so much to do, so many things to attend."

Husband: "No, There are not many things to attend and you have not much to do."

Wife: "Mr. Smith is much more attentive to his wife than you are."

Husband: "No. Mr. Smith cares less than I, and Mrs. Smith has more to do than you have."

Wife: "Mrs. Smith has little to do. But her husband loves her more than you love me."

Husband: "I love you more than you love me. But you are the most quarrelsome women in the world."

Wife: "And you are the least appreciative husband in the world." A A O O

Such vague words can start a chain reaction of explosions leading to estrangement, bitterness, the breaking up of families, violence and worse. But the same

vague little words are used daily in every office, workshop, and government department and cause the same and worse havoc. How do their symbols look?

$\times$	$\times$	$\times$	$\downarrow$	$\downarrow \times$	$\downarrow \times$	$\downarrow \times$
much many	more	most	opposite meaning	little few	less	least

Explanation: All these words express a multitude, therefore we use the multiplication mark $\times$. It's a vague meaning. How much? How many? Then we draw somewhere the horizontal "line of reference" and put the $\times$ symbol above the line, meaning more (than we mean below the line to be). But where do you draw the line? Then we draw the upper limit line to be reached by any multitude to mean the most. But again where is the upper limit drawn? Now we introduce the symbol for the opposite meaning pictured by two opposing arrowheads. Using this symbol we arrive at the opposite meanings: much - little, many - few, more - less, most - least. But again each mind ($\cap$) will draw the line somewhere differently. Utter vagueness is the result. Listen to these boys:

First boy: "My father has much money (or shirts, pairs of shoes, etc)"

Second boy: "But my father has more than your father has."

Third boy: "But my father has the most." That boy may become a politician.

Now, these boys have learned to count. Therefore, they would have to learn now that it is utterly futile to use these words. Either they can count the THINGS their fathers have, or stop such arguments. But with the adults it is even worse. The husband has not been told that "quarrelsome" is a mind ($\cap$) evaluation, something which cannot be counted at all; much quarrelsome, more and most; little appreciation, less appreciation and least appreciation ($\cap$). Where do different minds draw their lines (as shown in the symbols)? Now, realize that these little words are connected with all adjectives ($\cap$): silly, much and more silly (sillier) most silly (silliest) and all adjectival nouns ($\cap$): much, and more and most Badness, Evil, Stupidity, Thoughtlessness, etc. etc. Realize the misery of our own making.

HITLER'S METHOD OF THE BIGGEST LIE

According to Hitler, repeat and repeat the biggest lies and the people will believe it. Suppose he would have repeated: Jews have 2 heads ($\cap$), 3 eyes ($\cap$) and 4 legs ($\cap$). No German would have believed him. But use a mind ($\cap$) evaluation ($\cap$) and you can put over any lie. The Jews of Germany have contributed to German achievements in science, industry, commerce, etc., but Hitler repeated again and again: "The Jews are our misfortune" ($\cap$), something you cannot measure. In the end, they had to die.

YOU AND YOUR SEMANTIC QUANDARIES

Many parents, aunts, etc. tell young boys (and many wives tell their husbands and vice versa) that they are lazy ($\cap$), inattentive ($\cap$), forgetful ($\cap$), inefficient ($\cap$), unsuccessful ($\cap$), etc. etc. None has learned in school that these words are utterly vague and only mind ($\cap$) evaluations about which different minds ($\cap$) will differ. But most people believe that these words must have some truth, and when repeated again and again they will make hell for the boy who will start believing it and live a wretched life. How can a human being get out of these semantic quandaries?

THE SOLUTION

The first rule taken from biology and psychology we learned already on p. 2, namely. Not two human beings are alike and think alike. Human mind ($\cap$) evaluations ($\cap$) will differ with different minds. The second rule is: The cells of our minds change incessantly. To-morrow we may have changed our mind and our mind ($\cap$) evaluations. To-morrow we may think that you or he is not lazy, not inattentive, not forgetful, etc. These are changeable meanings. They exist only in a human mind. They have no reality in the outside world. Eventually, when you will know more of Semantography and its analysis you will find that many words relating to $\cap$ and Δ have an unseen evaluation attached either good or bad. You may call a group a society (good) a gang or racket (bad). You may call a painting a masterpiece (good) or trash (bad). Here are the symbols: Good means a positive attitude: yes +! Bad is negative, no: -! Put these symbols under the mind symbol and you have the symbols for good $\cap$! and bad $\cap$! If 2 minds cannot come to an agreement about their different $\cap$, they must realize that arguing about $\cap$ cannot bring any result. Then tolerance of the other guy's opinion ($\cap$) is necessary, and tolerance is symbolized (just like in engineering with plus minus $\pm$) thus $\pm$! The moral of SG: LET'S STOP ARGUING about $\cap$ LET'S START MEASURING the $\cap$ and Δ . (And let's study not this Brief only, but all the books and writings about Semantography)

C.K.Bliss,B.Sc.