



SEMANTOGRAPHY SERIES NO. 143

JULIAN HUXLEY ANSWERS

When Huxley left Sydney he took with him a number of issues of my Semantography Series, and the Notes which I had prepared for our meeting. Later on, I sent him my further writing to London. In March he wrote from Delhi. I do not know whether he had received the material sent to London. In his letter, he told me that he had talked with the Director General of Unesco about my work. He advised me to ask for a publication grant from Unesco. This I did. However, the result was the same as that of previous approaches. This time, I knew that the refusal of the Unesco men to do anything for my work was final. I had put great hopes on my meeting with Huxley and my disappointment was profound. I cursed the whole set-up. I found it useless to debate anything with Huxley or with anyone else. The financial side of the whole brochure was another worry, and as my approach to Huxley had brought no result I was in no hurry to finish my writing on this subject. It was only the persistent request from some libraries for the Huxley brochure which forced me to finalise this writing. I therefore decided at last to answer to the critical remarks of Huxley and herebelow is my letter to him. I prefer to have the reader read my letter first in which I have cited every remark of Huxley and immediately my answer to it. The text of Huxley's letter then follows. I prefer this arrangement, because the reader might be interested to read only what Huxley said and might not be interested to read my answer. In 1951 a controversy was fought on my work in the Sydney Morning Herald (see Series No. 61). A letter from a retired professor of geography was printed by the Herald under the heading of PROFESSOR'S OPINION. That Professor was ignorant of my work, ignorant of its advantages, yet he was a professor and therefore his letter harmed my work. Fortunately the Herald brought another letter by Mr. David Donaldson a Sydney University student who had studied my work and written an article about it. He answered pointedly to the "Professor's Opinion.", but people are greatly influenced by the utterances of a professor "who ought to know". I prefer therefore to give my answer to every critical remark of Huxley, and after that I give the reader an opportunity to read the text of Huxley's letter. Should Huxley reply, I shall make it another issue of my series. But I have to finish the brochure for the libraries. This issue ends it.

Sydney 8th November, 1955

Professor Julian Huxley
31 Pond Street, Hampstead
LONDON. N.W.3.

Dear Professor Huxley,

Exactly two years have gone by since we met, and I sincerely hope that this letter will find you in the best of spirits and health. In my previous letters I have thanked you for the interest you have shown in my work and for the comment which you have made on my writings about our meeting which I sent to you. I have duly acknowledged the detailed letter of March 6, 1954 which you wrote in New Delhi, and I have thanked you for all the good words which you had for my work and for your endeavours to interest the Director General and his first assistant in my work. I promised to answer in detail to your critical statements which meant very much for me coming from, what I consider, the highest authority on some of the problems involved. I regret that one and a half years had to pass until I, at last, am writing the promised letter. The reason for my long silence will become obvious from the following paragraphs. As you have made a number of comments on different aspects of my work, comments which may have escaped your memory, I shall cite everyone of your comments and refer to it.

The Importance of Semantography.

You wrote: "I agree that your semantographic method provides something of real importance."

Many thanks for this praise. It has given me a tremendous uplift and has bolstered my courage in the face of heavy odds, of which I shall tell you in the next paragraphs.

Aid from Unesco.

You wrote: "I think that a full account of it ought certainly to be published, and I hope that you may receive some support from Unesco for this purpose.

I have spoken to Dr. Luther Evans when he was in Delhi about your work and gave your documents to his chief assistant, Mr. R. Maheu, as well as telling him about your work. I think if you write direct to Monsieur Maheu at Unesco, 19, Ave. Kleber, Paris 16^e, asking for support from Unesco for publication, this would be the best thing.

I felt elated at your message and thought that now, at last, my work has been put into the right hands with the right recommendation by the right man - you. My disappointment was cruel. The Unesco officials, including Dr. Evans wrote back, declining every assistance. In despair, I asked that at least, a short account of my work should be published in one of the issues of the Unesco Courier in order to inform educators in different parts of the world that such a system exists. Dr. Evans, in a personal letter declined even this small request.

A few months ago he visited Australia, I asked for an interview, but he ignored my letter. I cannot find words for expressing my disappointment and for condemning the attitude of the Unesco officials, an attitude which prevailed with Unesco since its inception, and since I offered my work to Unesco 6 years ago.

Now, that Unesco is 10 years old, it may be proper to assess its achievements. The fact is that this world-wide organisation commands the best educational and scientific brains of mankind, and the result is that now one single new idea has emerged from Unesco, or has been introduced by it. In the words of one of your colleagues Professor Lancelot Hogben, F.R.S. : Unesco has become a comic synonym for Fiasco.

This terrible disappointment is the real reason of my long silence. I have gone through similar disappointments with other scholars whom I approached, but in your case I hoped that the highest office in the world has at last been contacted by you with the strongest recommendation on your part. The result is Nil.

Studying the fate of the men who pioneered new ideas, I found that they met with similar disappointments - unless they had a powerful sponsor. Take Charles Darwin for instance. Last Saturday, the Sydney Morning Herald reviewed a new book, "Apes, Angels, and Victorians" by Professor William Irvine of Stanford University (publ. by Weidenfeld and Nichols, London). Irvine tells of the vexations which Darwin felt when he found out that Wallace had come to similar conclusions with regard to the theory of evolution. In all fairness to Wallace, every reference to this theory should be a reference to the Darwin-Wallace theory. Yet, Darwin was, and still is in every mouth. Wallace is forgotten. Why? Because Darwin had a powerful sponsor - your grandfather Thomas Huxley.

But this is not the whole story. The fact is that it takes more than a generation until a new idea proposed by a pioneer is not more considered as ridiculous to be treated with contempt by the authorities of the day. The Darwin-Wallace theory had become respectable for scientific circles, because nearly two generations ago, Lamarque had proposed the essence of the theory. And Lamarque was not an obscure outsider. He was a salaried scholar, who was paid for thinking these things up. And he had no trouble to get them published. Surely there were some men before him, some of them his contemporaries who had influenced him in discussions. I have made many scientific library researches in the course of my activities in the patent field, studying the

history of a number of new ideas. Just give me the money and the time to roam in the libraries, study the letters of Lamarque and the contemporary not published manuscripts of other writers, and I shall have no difficulties to find the names of others who have thought in similar lines as Lamarque.

In my case, another 50 years might have to pass, until salaried educators may begin to treat my idea seriously. When Braille was alive, the French Academy rejected his idea, his headmaster forbade him its teaching, his colleagues sneered at it. Today, all blind mankind writes in Braille, and Unesco officials of the various Braille committees are hopping around the world from one conference to the other.

50 years hence, or 500 years hence (educators are slow with innovations in new educational ideas) seeing mankind will write in Bliss and future Unesco (or any other name) officials will spend the taxpayers money in travelling from one conference to the other, promoting Semantography. It might not be Semantography. My initial work might be forgotten and some other teacher, a Mr. Teachkins may have proposed his Teachkinography. Or it may be a Monsieur Teachkineau, or a Herr Teachkinitzer, or Teachkinini, or Teachkinoff. Nowhere is theft of original ideas more rampant than in the realm of science, in spite of all the bibliographies which busybodies attach to their writings. Of course, of course, there were other men before them, but their ideas were "half-digested," "crude," "inconclusive" or other "human evaluations" (see below) readily at hand to diminish a pioneer's achievement.

As you see, one and a half year have not diminished my dismay and annoyance at the treatment meted out to me by the Unesco busybodies. And you may be dismayed and annoyed at this letter and may stop reading there and then. Well, I hope you will go on reading, and I hope too that you will understand that the only way open to me is to fight for my work. Already great libraries are collecting all my writings. I hope you will react nobly to this letter. I shall now refer to your statements one by one and give you the necessary information of what I have to say to them.

Semantography for practical purposes and for Ethics.

You wrote: "I feel it a great pity to mix up two very different things, as you do (a) the practical value of Semantography in certain definite spheres, and (b) a whole theory of ethics and semantics - this quite irrespective of the truth of the ethical or philosophical theories concerned."

Before I go into this, I remember the saying of the great physicist Boltzmann who said: Nothing is more practical than a good theory. Paraphrasing Boltzmann I might say that nothing would be more practical for mankind than a good working theory on Ethics, which people can readily apply and use to all their doings.

Now, why have I launched on theories of evolution, ethics, biology, etc. when I have told you about the aspects of Semantography? The reason is obvious. If you were an expert on fire prevention only, I would have discussed with you my simple safety symbols for fire prevention in public buildings, railway stations, cinemas, ships, ports, etc. etc. I wouldn't have thought of bothering you with theories on semantics and ethics. Similarly, if you were an expert on legal insurance proceedings, I would have told you about nothing else but the semantics of Semantography. I would have demonstrated to you how vague, and ambiguous words in insurance policies which lead to endless legal proceedings could be easily eliminated.

But you are one of the world's foremost biologists, more than that, the world's most advanced pioneer of a new ethics, derived from new biological theories. I simply had to show you these aspects of my work. Indeed, this was the reason of my approach to you.

It is interesting for me to see within you the same evolutionary trend in thought which occurred in my mind when I first contemplated the aspects of Semantography, as you have done when first confronted with my work. Indeed, I was firmly determined to evolve Semantography for only "certain definite spheres", namely for safety symbols on the highways and elsewhere. It did not enter my mind to indulge in questionable theories on ethics and semantics, which might indeed endanger my whole work.

I therefore started with the first symbols, showing a door, gate, portal, proceeded then logically to the symbols for entrance and exit.

Then I drew the outline of a wavy flame to mean fire. By combining two symbols, I came readily to the symbol for fire exit.

Then I thought of the symbolization of a warning sign found in every train all over the globe. It reads in a host of different languages: IN DANGER PULL CORD. A cord can easily be outlined, equally to pull in using the arrow downward. But how to outline the meaning of danger? It has no outline whatever.

This set me thinking. I found that the meaning of danger is utterly vague. Indeed what one person may consider to be a danger, another person may ward it off with a laugh, declaring that there is no danger at all. But a cord will be a cord for both. A door will be a door to both, fire will mean fire to both. Only with regard to the meaning of danger will these two persons vary. Indeed, many times people have pulled the cord, have brought the train to a standstill, had to pay a fine and had to listen to a severe admonition that there was no danger at all.

In trying to analyse the meaning elements (I am essentially a chemist who has learned to write chemical semantography) which constitutes the complex and compound meaning of danger, I found that the meaning danger contains the 3 meaning elements, namely (1) fear of (2) future (3) events. In my system these 3 (let us say) meaning molecules, can be further analyzed into their meaning atoms, (so to speak). I do not want to weary you with many symbols. I shall only indicate the analysis of these 3 meanings. An event is a physical action by a material body (and this means also a neuron in a material brain) in space and time. The meaning of future is symbolized by my time meaning thus: (which combination can easily be divided into past) showing the parabolical line stretching to the past words written, and future, showing the parabolical line towards the space on this paper where the future words will appear, thus (

Now to the meaning of fear. This is a biological mechanism implanted by that mysterious dame, Mother Nature into every creature from complex man to the one-cell amoeba. A kind of S.O.S. warning signal, which acts even in many plants. I interpret the morse signal of S O S in this case as meaning: Sense of Survival, or Sense Of Selfpreservation. We know now that the reaction is completely unconscious in man. His eyelid will flick when an object comes near to the eye, and it will do so even before the person has time to conjure up the meaning of danger in his mind. We also agree that all those natural reactions are co-ordinated in the brain cells. That lead me to put as the first symbol for fear the outline of a human upper skull, under which the brain is housed, thus $\cap$. Incidentally it outlines also the cranium of higher animals, and they too have evolved many words (cries, shouts, whistles, etc.) when feeling fear and danger.

As you see, I started off with simple symbols for a door and a flame and presto I was faced with difficult biological and psychological problems. It was a challenge, which I had to meet. There was no way out than to proceed. "Fear of future events" means fear of something which hadn't happened at all, but which some minds imagine that it might happen. Imagination again refers to a mysterious brain mechanism which enables man to see (virtually with closed or even open eyes) future events as they might happen. Consequently the symbol for imagination must carry as the first symbol element the mind symbol, thus imagination $\cap$, fear $\cap$ danger $\cap$, as well as other mind $\cap$ meanings like jealousy $\cap$, envy $\cap$, hate $\cap$, reason $\cap$, conscience $\cap$, etc. must carry this symbol $\cap$.

Having thus established the class of mind $\cap$ meanings, I had to realise that these meanings vary between different persons. One mind may fear $\cap$, the other not, though the physical phenomenon is exactly the same for both. One mind may hate $\cap$ a certain situation, another mind may not. Or in other words: two different minds may think differently. Expressed in a terse formula of Semantography we arrive at the first rule for mind $\cap$ meanings: $\cap 1 \neq \cap 2$ which means in every language: my mind is not equal to your mind.

The second and last rule for mind $\cap$ meanings followed easily. Mind $\cap$ meanings may change with even the very same mind at different times. A person may be gripped by fear $\cap$ when thinking of his financial difficulties

during the night. In the morning the fear $\cap$ may be gone though the difficulties are there just the same. In order to express this second rule in my symbols we must enter the time) (sign. We write $\cap 1) \neq \cap 1$ (or in words: My mind yesterday is not equal to my mind tomorrow. I shall think differently at different times about the very same thing.

As you see, starting with simple safety symbols, I had to arrive soon at the meaning for reason and reasoning. From here to the meaning of conscience was only a step. I dreaded this step more than anything else. I felt that it will bring me into conflict with all the churchmen and also with most of the scientists. Worse even, the lay people who have been told that conscience is the guiding principle in our ethics and religion, would be utterly repelled by my findings. But there was no way out. I had to go further ahead or abandon everything. Yes, I agree with your words that "it is a great pity to mix up two very different things - (a) the practical value of Semantography in certain definite spheres and (b) a whole theory of ethics and semantics." I hope that you will see from my explanations that there was no way out than to go forward in the search for symbols of a new medium for mankind. From the later paragraphs you will see that these symbols, when taught in school to human beings who grow up, must have great beneficial effects in bringing about a new understanding of man and his mind.

Freud's Ego and Superego.

You wrote: "Freud's Ego is not synonymous with reason and rational thought!"

In answer to this I have to cite Freud's own words from his book "The Ego and the Id" (Hogart Press, London). There he said: "The Ego represents what we call reason."

You wrote: "Conscience is not identical with what you call the supermind."

To this Freud said: "Consideration led us to assume the existing grade within the Ego, which may be called the Ego-Ideal or Super-Ego. Behind the Ego-Ideal there lies hidden the first and most important of all, the identification with the father... perhaps it may be safer to say with the parents. As a child grows up the office of father is carried on by others in authority ... their injunctions and prohibitions ... continue in the form of conscience, to exercise the censorship of morals."

In my search for a simple symbol for Conscience, I need not follow Freud. There was the simple realisation that a young mind is influenced by other minds in all matters of conduct. That other mind may be the mind of the mother, the father, the teacher, minister, in any case, to the child that influencing mind is superior. It was the simplest thing to do to put a higher mind symbol on, thus: $\cap$.

This simple symbol $\cap$ shows us vividly how it is possible that a good boy who has been influenced by his father (who has been influenced by his minister, who has been influenced by the teachings of Christ (though semantically differently interpreted by different denominations)) will be reared to be a good Roman-Catholic, or Protestant, or Anglican, and then another superior mind may take over, the mind of Hitler, or Lenin and presto the good Roman-Catholic boy will become a rabid Nazi or Commo and will kill with a clear conscience. But he may even kill his fellowman and remain a Catholic in faith. In all the religious wars and massacres human minds have been influenced by fanatical superminds and have killed with a clear conscience in the name of Christ, or Jehowah, or Allah.

Ethics, morals and conscience.

You wrote: "Ethics, morals and conscience are not identical."

At first thought, it may seem that these 3 meanings are entirely different. And here we encounter one of the most rampant semantic fallacies of human speech. Just because different words are spelled and pronounced differently in the very same language, we have been led by our language teachers to believe that these different words have different meanings. What is the difference between a fraternity and a brotherhood? What is the difference between Liberty and Freedom? Whole books and treatises have been written about this difference.

Compilers of books on Synonyms have been busy to point out those "differences" in spite of the fact that "synonym" means "same meaning". The trick is perpetrated by simply using different words to explain those imaginary differences. In the English language there is a Teutonic word for almost every Romance word, hence Liberty and Freedom, Fraternity and Brotherhood.

There is then one thing to do: open the big dictionaries and search for the differences in meaning for those different words: ethics, morals, and conscience. When we analyse the verbiage we find that one word is explained by the other and vice versa, though the trick is hidden by using a great many words. But in essence we find that Ethics means a set of moral principles, dictated by our conscience. Morals means a set of ethical principles dictated by our conscience, and Conscience is the set of moral principles dictated by our Ethics, and so on.

Recalling my simple symbol $\cap$ we can then easily realize that what one mind considers moral and ethical and conscientious, another mind may violently deny, and even the very same mind may differ. I know of course that such a teaching would have brought me to the stake in the dark middle ages and to the firing squad in the dark modern ages, but fortunately I live in Australia and not in Russia and can therefore question the teachings of all superminds including Lenin, Stalin and the other despots who have turned semantics into a new weapon. They have influenced their followers with new ethics, morals and conscience to gas, deport, destroy millions of people for "the liberation of mankind", just as previously mass killings have been taught for "the greater glory of God."

Semantography and complex ideas.

You wrote: "I fail to see how the method could be used for some of the more complex and subtle purposes for which language is required - unless the number of symbols combined to make one word, another number of symbol combinations, is so much increased as to remove a great deal of the methods' convenience, e.g. in my own subject evolution, development and transformation all have slightly different meanings. Again conscience is not identical with what you call the supermind; nor are ethics, morals and conscience identical; yet you have one symbol for all! Thus, while your system should be very valuable in regard to simple actions and concepts and accurately definable terms, I don't see how it could be readily extended to cover more complex ideas."

The length of this explanatory letter may be excused by my desire to show you how my system can be "extended to cover more complex ideas." Again, I wish to emphasize that it is not necessary as you fear to increase the number of symbols "as to remove a great deal of the method's convenience." Unbelievable as it seems, I operate with less than 100 symbols. If the beneficial effects of Semantography will be nothing more than to make mankind realize that the mass of verbiage used by the lowbrow and even more by the highbrow express similar meanings, only differently expressed in different words, I think that mankind would have made a great step forward to the improvement of human speech and understanding.

The first step is the realization that mind $\cap$ meanings have slightly different meanings in different minds or in the same mind at different times. This explains why you consider that Freud has a different conception with regard to the meaning of reason $\cap$ and conscience $\cap$. Hundreds of books have been written about the differences in the meanings of ethics $\cap$, morals $\cap$, and conscience $\cap$, and millions of debates are going on in millions of homes, classrooms and lecture halls about these meanings, with no opponent willing to give in. Mind $\cap$ meanings are just like that. We have no method to measure their extent, because they exist only in man's mind and have no counterpart in nature. Worse even, we are not sure whether some of them exist in a particular mind at a particular time. A woman may accuse her husband or lover of being envious $\cap$, jealous $\cap$, hateful $\cap$, revengeful $\cap$, cruel $\cap$, etc. etc. and the man may honestly deny these charges and say that those mind meanings simply have not entered his mind. But the worst is that the individual himself or herself is never sure what goes on in his or her mind. Many minds may believe $\cap$ that they are filled with the noblest desires $\cap$, motifs $\cap$, ethics $\cap$, morals $\cap$, and in reality they may be driven on by selfish gains.

Or a sensitive mind may accuse itself of sins $\cap$, passions $\cap$, low motifs $\cap$ not knowing that it is a victim of its conscience imposed upon it by a puritan father or minister.

Once we realize the terrific harm in human relationship which is inflicted with these words upon untold of minds, once we realize that such heated debates accusations and self-accusations lead nowhere, or rather lead to the breaking up of lives, marriages, friendships, etc. we may gain a glimpse of what semantography can do to the thinking of mankind.

Now to your meanings of evolution, development and transformation in your own field of biology. How do they look in symbols? You may be flabbergasted to learn that the meanings as such (without reference to a particular field) are expressed by one symbol only, the interational arrow symbol $\longrightarrow$. Firstly let us realize that we can speak of evolution, development and transformation of the means of transport or cinema entertainment, or crime publications or indeed anything. In all such cases, the arrow symbol is sufficient to express these meanings. In particular we would have to add to the arrow symbol the symbol for transport (a wheel), to cinema entertainment (eye, $\odot$ picture, wheel meaning movement), etc. all easily pictured with my symbols less than 100 in numbers. In the particular case of biology we would have to add the symbol for life to the symbol of the arrow (see later).

wheel



picture

Of course, the student of semantography would have to know how the arrow symbol has to be interpreted. This interpretation is simple. An arrow indicates a movement of a material body in space and time. Time itself has only one definite direction. Time goes on. Space however has infinite directions and we know that not one direction is more favoured than the other in an absolute sense. Directions in space are relative. The arrow as such $\longrightarrow$ means forward in ordinary speech. But forward may mean in any direction. We may say that mankind goes forward to a better life, or goes forward to ultimate destruction, or forward to the abolishment of all individual liberties, or to the erection of greater and greater slave labour camps, and so strong is the meaning of forward, progressive that adherents of totalitarian doctrines will interpret it as meaning their and their only particular creed, declaring all other beliefs of being utterly backward and regressive. Not only scientists feud with the same words having different meanings.

In your particular case of biological evolution, we speak of a development, evolution, transformation to higher and more complex organisms, but we know that evolution, development and transformation may take the opposite course and evolve, develop and transform into more primitive organisms. Of course, with you these meanings are "slightly different" as you say, simply because you attach to them slightly different meanings whereas other minds may take them as to mean the same thing, a movement of material bodies in space and time. You yourself may change your mind about the slight differences in these meanings. This is realized by the fact that the arrow expresses forward with regard to what one mind calls forward. This however is not necessary, because the student of semantography knows that any meaning as symbolized by the arrow is vague and relative and subject to the evaluation of what one mind declares to be forward or backward in relationship to his particular frame of reference. With this we arrive at the symbolization of human evaluations to which the meaning of forward belongs. This I shall explain in a later paragraph. I must explain in the following paragraph the symbolization of Life with reference to the following statement of yours.

The Meaning of Life in Semantography.

You wrote: "On page 7 of your letter you utilize the completely unscientific concept of a Life Force - while biologist have been busy analysing the various processes underlying development, evolution, etc. and finding scientific explanations (e.g. in Neo-Darwinian Natural Selection on a Mendelian basis as explanation of evolution."

I shall incur your greatest displeasure if I assert that you yourself are a victim of the magic of words, in as much as you take words for explanations. As a student I believed that the scientists have explained heaven and earth and all things around. Darwin and you figured highly in the belief - until I started to work on Semantography and tried to get at the real meaning of words. Then I came to the conclusion that nothing has been explained. We have only

found words for mysteries and in "explaining" one mystery we have used words which are used to express another mysterious phenomenon. Stones fall. Why? Because of gravitation. Gravitation in turn is that force which makes stone fall. Today we say that gravitation is due to the curved space-time continuum. Does this explain anything? Of course not. The mystery has grown greater. Mendel found how offsprings come off. But why do they do so? No one knows/ Why do genes mutate? No one knows.

In my search for a simple explanation of the meaning of Life I have searched through the books on biology which I could find. I was looking for an explanation of what Life really is. In many books I could find nothing of this, but only intricate descriptions of how life works in various organisms. At last I found the only honest answer in a book on prehistoric life by the Harvard paleontologist, Professor Raymond. In describing the evolution of Life on this planet he said quite in the beginning "What Life is no one knows". It is a mystery in every sense of the word, and we have not the slightest clue to it, in spite of the many theories.

I may weary you by referring to the old Paley question. What scientists are doing, confronted with an intricate mechanism built with amazing skill, purpose and wisdom as for instance a watch, is to describe (and above all name) the various axles, cogwheels, springs and how they interact in great grandfather clocks, smaller time pieces or minute wrist watches. As to why they act so purposefully and what or who has built them so cleverly, the scientists will not venture any theory, but neither will they admit their utter ignorance. How then is the trick performed, how is humanity made to believe that the biologists know? Why, by a mass of verbiage of course, by talking in highbrow terms and in scientific nomenclature which the lowbrow takes as coming from some sort of revelation.

Of course, I know that such deprecatory remarks are anything but "scientific" but I have seen scientists throwing deprecatory remarks at each other and not bothering about scientific concepts (see later). I think that it would be more fitting for the biologists to admit that they don't know what Life really is, as Professor Raymond had done. There is a force at work which operates purposefully and with amazing intelligence. Whether we call it the Life Force or any other name is irrelevant. Any name will do, if only we realize that names and words do not explain anything of this great mystery.

Realizing this, I thought that any symbol will be as good or rather as bad for something, the nature of which we don't know. In any case, my symbol chosen is better than the English symbol compound composed of 4 sound signs, namely L-I-F-E. I chose therefore the circle of the sun, without which no Life is possible, indicating with this symbol that warmth (whatever this may be) is necessary. To this I added a vertical line which should indicate an upright standing human being as the highest development of Life on earth thus:



Mind evaluations in Semantography

You wrote: "Granted that there is a great deal of subjectivism and relativism in regard to ethics and aesthetics, 'beautiful' and 'ugly', 'good' and 'bad' have also an objective component - at least I would strongly maintain so."

On the foregoing pages I have dealt with mind-meanings like reason ^o, conscience ^o, envy ^o, jealousy ^o, and other mind reactions. Now we come to a particular reaction of which I maintain that it causes terrific sorrow to the human race. This is the particular mind activity which we may call mind judgments ^o. Let us consider animals which have no articulate speech. Some animal may intensely dislike certain food, certain liquids, certain other animals or certain members of their own species. Some may growl or snarl, saying what they think. But only man has invented specific words by the thousands for his judgments of what he considers sympathetic or antipathic to him. 'Beautiful' and 'ugly', 'good' and 'bad' are some of them. We may consider hottentots as being extremely 'ugly'. They would think the same about us. But among hottentots, as well as white people, two different minds may judge the very same woman 'beautiful' and 'ugly'.

With the words 'good' and 'bad' it is even worse. I shall deal with them in the next paragraphs and at the end of this letter I shall show you that I agree with you that there may be "also an objective component." Of course, here we have another judgment ^o word, namely 'objective'. Its meaning is

purely fictional. Whatever we think is subjective to our thinking, to our upbringing, to the working of our mind. The linguist and philosopher have formed an adjective from the meaning of 'object', which is something which exists outside of our brain and independent of what we think about it. As the linguists have taught us how to write, spell and pronounce and combine words we have then at liberty combined them to form the most bewildering array of vague meanings and thoughts. We have been taught how to form adjectives from objects and how to use adjectives. But the linguists have not taught us that adjectives are deadly weapons which inflict untold misery. This recognition, I think, will be brought home by the use of my semantography. I shall then show in the following paragraphs how the adjectives 'good' and 'bad' or 'evil' have indeed brought (and still bring) untold misery upon the human race.

Chisholm's theory on the concept of Good and Evil.

You wrote: "Further, I entirely disagree with Chisholm (and with your acceptance of his views) about the bad effect of our use of words like good and evil, etc; the concept of good and evil is the cause of human strife. This appears to me just nonsense."

Before going into this, let us consider your utter frankness in using such a deprecatory remark about a fellow scientist. Or in the words of P. G. Wodehouse "let us drink in the sight": the former Director General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, Cultural Organisation, accusing the former Director General of the United Nations World Health Organisation of talking "nonsense".

For the layman this may be a wonder, a bewilderment, or a devilish delight, seeing scientists behaving like this. For the student of Semantography the solution is simple. You say that Chisholm talks nonsense. But Chisholm would hotly deny that he talks nonsense. Nonsense of course is a mind $\cap$ meaning. It does not refer to a door, a cord, a table. It does refer to a judgment $\cap$ of two different minds about mind reactions namely thoughts $\cap$ expressed in words. Furthermore, at the time you thought $\cap$ and wrote about what I told you of Chisholm's theory, you judged $\cap$ it as nonsense $\cap$. But to-day nearly 2 years older, you may think differently according to the second mind rule of semantography. May be you have changed your mind. May be you are about to change it. For this reason I am writing this long letter to you. I want to influence your mind. I want to change your thoughts about Semantography and Chisholm.

Let us then realise what Chisholm had in mind, the concept of Evil in religious strife and war. Granted that the witchdoctor, medicineman, pope, cardinal or bishop felt that their territory was threatened, and their livelihood too, what did they do to induce their adherents to take up arms and kill in cold blood and clear conscience fellowmen against which they had no grudge. There was one word in all languages which was used to judge $\cap$ the enemies. They are 'evil' and exterminating them, eliminating them from the face of the earth was 'good'. And thus Christians were told that Jews are evil, and Mohamedans were told that Christians are evil, and among Christians alone there were countless massacres, though all believed in the same God and the same Christ. It was only because the other sect was labelled 'evil'. This terrible word works even to-day. Exterminating Capitalists, or Communists or Fascists is good because they are 'evil' and their creed is 'evil'.

But it must not be bloodshed which is caused by these judgments. In every village of every country there are bony fingers pointing at other people declaring them bad and evil and in consequence many lives are ruined and much misery is caused in almost every family where quarrels are centering around the words "you are bad, that's what you are!"

I cannot understand how you can say that Chisholm's theory is nonsense. He is a psychiatrist. You deal with living creatures in general. He deals with human minds and what perverts their thinking. No one can deny the terrible influence of the concept of Good and Evil. Think about it and change your mind!

Chisholm's theory of War.

You wrote: "Chisholm's theory of war is pure speculation; organised war is doubtless a late product, but intergroup hostility was almost certainly prevalent from the outset."

Here I see that you are referring to Chisholm's theory together with my extension of his theory. I wish therefore to make a clear division as how far Chisholm went and from where I started to go further. Chisholm did nothing more than to refer to the fact that the concept of good and evil causes havoc in human relationship, and leads even to single and wholesale murder. He ventured no guess as when this tragedy started. He said that this goes back as far as "we know anything of the human race." Never did he even hint on what I found later.

I laboured for years on the concepts of conscience, of good and evil and all that. I found only that these meanings are utterly vague and what one mind may consider good, the other may judge bad and vice versa. Chisholm's lecture bolstered my courage and my conviction. I was then intrigued by Chisholm's remark that the tragedy goes back as far as we know anything of the human race. But surely, I thought, there was a time when those words were not yet invented, when human speech consisted only of inarticulate cries, which were slowly formed into specific meanings. I studied therefore books on the evolution of human speech. I was intrigued by a saying of Bertrand Russell who remarked that it must have taken untold generations of mankind until it was realised that two boars, and two girls and two turnips have something in common, namely the abstract meaning of "two" (2). Similarly I argued that it must have taken untold generations of mankind until it was realized that two bad snakes and two bad tigers and two bad smells have the abstract meaning of "bad" in common. After that the clever ones, the witchdoctor and medicineman found no difficulty to attach this abstract meaning to anything.

Having arrived at this juncture, I studied the oldest records of man. The records of the last 7000 years were full of wars and victories. The monuments and frieses of the antique show soldiers slaying each other. And the texts are full of the evil designs of the enemies. In contrast I found that the prehistoric cave paintings of paleolithic man (estimated of being 30,000 to 50,000 years old) show no sign of human war-fare. They show battles all right, but battles against animals only. This drastic difference must have significance. Apparently to kill his fellowman simply did not enter the mind of paleolithic man. Otherwise he would have glorified his victories as he did with his victories of animal hunts. Then I found that other archeologists came to the same conclusion, namely that human warfare was absent in paleolithic times. But they went no further, though they went further than Chisholm. It was I who went further than the archeologists.

We are all reared in the belief that war was, is and ever will be with the human race, that it is part of human nature, indeed part of Nature in general. And the best proof is that all the species are waging war against each other. But one archeologist Paterson said something which started me on a new trail. He said that "it may even be thought to be a sinister peculiarity of the human species that hordes should pursue hordes of the same kind with a persistent purpose of rapine and destruction."

"A sinister peculiarity of the human species?" How is it with other species? Then I found to my utter amazement that indeed warfare within the same species of animals is utterly absent. Lions don't kill lions, tigers don't kill tigers, wolves will roam the wintry forest howling mad of unbearable hunger, but no wolf will kill and devour a fellow-brother-wolf. Only man kills man.

Having arrived at this fact, the strange absence of pictures of human warfare in the 30,000 years old records of man took on a new significance. Perhaps at that time the abstract meanings which led to bloodshed on a large scale were not yet invented. Man lived and thought like the animals, that is they don't kill their own kind. May be "intergroup hostility was almost certainly prevalent from the outset" as you maintain. But this does not necessarily mean that hordes set on exterminating each other. Animals just don't do this.

Intraspecific killing among the animals.

You wrote: "Though cannibalism is rare in animals, it is by no means absent - and it is not the same as intra-specific killing which is not at all uncommon - e.g. in sexual fighting, fighting for territory, etc."

Cannibalism among the same species of animals is rare as you said. It happens sometimes in extraordinary circumstances. But sexual fighting does

not lead to the extermination and eating of the rival. On the contrary. The loser retreats without having been counted out by a referee. Death may occur only accidentally, as when antlers become entangled and both fighters die of starvation. Fighting for territory is rare again, and again it does not lead to extermination and killing.

In contrast to this, the newspapers, the documents, the speeches, the monuments are full with the talk of war against the bad people and the necessity to kill as many of them as possible.

As an afterthought you added "By the way, some ants also have organised warfare." This has caused me a great deal of reading. I have found that there are thousands of ant species, as different from each other as a mouse to an elephant (to speak of size only, but also of different features). Then the experimenters did some incredible thing. They put two herds of different species of ants in one sack, mixed them thoroughly and then poured the dazed creatures out on the ground. This does not happen in nature, where in most cases herds let other herds severely alone.

I will admit that I ventured on a ground where I am not an expert. But it has happened time and again that outsiders found a new trail by thinking in unorthodox lines. I am an outsider too as far as linguistics is concerned. It should have been the job of a linguist to conceive semantography. It should have been the job of a biologist to make us realize that mass killings among the same species simply does not occur in Nature, except in the human species.

Once we realize this, a new breathtaking hope opens up for humanity. Human warfare is not part of human nature, is not part of Nature at all. It is in the word of the great psychiatrist Chisholm a mind perversion, a disease, an epidemic which has engulfed the minds of man only recently, let us say during the last 10,000 years - "and we have learned to combat diseases and epidemics once we have found the cause" said Chisholm. I believe that I have found the proof for Chisholm's theory and also the tool for his proposed prophylactic treatment of mankind. The tool is Semantography which teaches us to recognize the vague meanings which differ in different minds.

Is there also an objective component in the meanings of 'beautiful' and 'good'?

You wrote: "I would strongly maintain so," and I agree with you. Let me then end this overlong letter with what I think. In order to find the objective component let us look at Nature and at the creatures which have no vague and ambiguous words, theories and similar verbiage. We find then that there are living creatures which are apparently on earth for the sheer expression of beauty and beautiful. I refer to the flowers. What I have not said in the previous pages is that two minds may readily agree to the same mind meaning having the same mind reaction in both minds. White men and hottentots and people of all other races may heartily agree that many flowers are 'beautiful', that their sight gives a sense of joy to our eye, that their smell gives a sense of joy to our nose, and their fruits give utter satisfaction and the meaning of 'good' to our bodies and well-being. And this brings us to the killings among different species. We can well imagine a planet where there is such an abundance of naturally produced food that there is simply no necessity for creatures to kill other creatures. Nature has provided an abundance of many fruits which are produced for the taking, leaving the creature, which gives the fruit, intact, and going on living. Imagine that Nature provides food within the mother animal, a wholesome food which constitutes a great part of the food which we human beings consume in the form of milk, butter, cheese, etc. Many species are herbivorous, and I can well imagine that a lion can be brought up on food prepared from naturally provided food, not carcasses of other animals.

You said somewhere that we human beings are now trustees of evolution and it is up to us to shape our destiny on earth. Can we then observe the "objective component" on earth which must be in the meaning of 'good' and 'bad'. Yes, I say, and we can do so by studying biology. The one-cell amoeba is composed by myriads of atoms and they all co-operate in order to keep life going within their society, the one-cell amoeba. Then in the course of evolution organisms grew more and more complex. A heart was formed in which myriads of cells co-operate, and the heart in turn co-operates with the organs of the lungs, composed of myriads of cells, and they in turn co-operate with other organs in the very same organism for the well-being of the whole society. This then is the natural meaning of 'good', co-operation among individual atoms,

molecules, cells, organs, organisms, and societies of individual organisms for the common good. Anything against this natural co-operation is 'bad' and this is killing of living creatures. Granted that a sudden abundance of grasshoppers or tigers will bring about great killing of plants and animals, because the urge to live is overwhelming and therefore the feeling of hunger in living creatures. But these are extraordinary circumstances like a devastating flood or fire. The usual trend in living creatures is clearly seen. Though there might be an occasional regression in evolution the natural trend is to higher and higher organisms in which co-operation is on a higher and higher scale.

The biologists have deceived themselves and us by looking at evolution as a happening of chaotic, though fortuitous chance. But here is another angle to look at. "Evolution means co-operation." This is my angle and it may seem utter "nonsense" to you and other biologists and millions of intellectuals who have been reared in your belief. But let us look at the happenings which occur when a living creature, a plant, a tree, an amoeba, a fish, a bird, an animal or a human being gets hurt. A portion of the body got injured, some cells are destroyed, others only partially and infectious foreign matter has entered the body. If no preventive measures are taken, the body will be ultimately destroyed. But in most cases this does not happen. An alarm is sounded throughout the whole body, thousands of cells are hurrying to the scene of the accident, others are manufacturing preventive medicines which are rushed to the injured fellow-cells. As soon as the body gets better, thousands of cells are busily building new bark, new bones, new scales, new skin, new hair, new feathers until through the co-operation of all cells the community which forms the plant, animal or man is well again. If this is not co-operation through community effort, than I don't know what the word 'co-operation' means.

In doing so the individual cells, built of individual atoms and molecules show an ingenuity and wisdom and skill and purposeful action much higher than the best human engineer can show. This is displayed most strikingly when a new organism is built from one single cell within the womb of the mother animal. The most complex engineering feats are accomplished in building a seeing eye, a hearing ear, a pumping heart, a breathing lung and many more most ingeniously constructed instruments, not to forget the device by which the new organism will ultimately be capable of bringing into the world other organisms. Here we have co-operation not only for repairing injured parts. This co-operation is creative in the highest sense, the building of new co-operative devices and bodies.

Let us compare this co-operative community effort with the co-operative actions by many human beings in building a larger organism, a human community. Somehow they imitate the wisdom displayed by living cells. They build a fire station and organise a fire brigade to combat inflammatory occurrences in the body communal. A hospital is built for similar purposes. A central brain, the town hall is organised to co-ordinate the community effort, etc. etc. In this comparison there is only one great difference between individual human beings and individual cells forming human beings or lower creatures. They have not evolved articulate language and abstract speech. Consequently they are free of the officials and super-officials who set themselves up above the others by means of vague language and thus hinder eventually the universal evolutionary trend of co-operation. Those kings, conquerors and commissars, those prelates, priests and atheist officials incite and hypnotize the others by means of vague language to kill other individuals, destroy their communities, wipe them off the face of the earth for the greater glories of Christianity, Judaism, Islamism, Buddhism, Fascism, Nazism, Communism and other theories composed with vague words. In this destructive process scientists have played an important part. There is no theory, no matter how destructive to the human race, which has not found some salaried scholars ready to uphold and justify it by means of a scientific theory. How did they do it? Why, by words and by words alone, words which were uncommon to the common people, words which surrounded them with the nimbus of the "experts" who know. There was nobody to tell the common people that the 'knowledge' of those 'experts' is no knowledge at all, but only new-fangled words to stand for unexplained mysteries. Those new words were made to be taken as "explanations."

But quite often, it was unnecessary to invent new words. It was sufficient when someone said something in common language, provided that someone is considered an 'expert' on that subject. Now, you are an expert. And thousands of time during your life you have said: "When the fish were left on dry land, they

they grew legs and learned to walk." It was as simple as that. But how Huxley how? Surely a fish cannot grow a leg on his own free will. Neither can you grow a feather and fly. Then there is no other 'explanation' than to realize that the myriads of atoms which formed the myriads of fish throughout myriades of years began to build legs in order to enable the organism to go on living when left on dry land. Then those clever cells went one better and built feathers, made the body lighter and induced the whole organism to become air-born. It is the most phantastic mystery of the universe.

Not satisfied with those amazing engineering feats, that mysterious and unexplained Life Force (or you may call it what you like) began to change things for nothing^{at all} but to create beauty for beauty's sake. The most gorgeous colours were manufactured by those individual atoms and cells which form the communities of some birds and fish, much in the same way as human communities create beauty and beautiful cities. Surely the bird and fish cannot make colours on their own free will. How then do they do it, how?

Are you at a loss for an 'explanation?' Surely not. No scientist is at a loss. It's so easy - words, just words, and lo the mystery is explained. You are chiding me in your letter with these words:

"You utilize the completely unscientific concept of a Life Force - while biologists have been busy analysing the various processes underlying development, evolution, etc. and finding scientific explanations (e.g. in Neo-Darwinian Natural Selection on a Mendelian basis as explanation of evolution)"

You are fooling yourself if you think that this is an explanation. And surely the layman not trained in semantics will be fooled too.

The biologists have deceived themselves and humanity by vague words. They have thrown upon us the slogan of 'Natural Selection through Survival of the Fittest'. In their ignorance of semantics and semantography they have not realized that fit, fitter, and fittest are in themselves utterly vague. The communists and fascists, and all the big and small dictators have taken their clue from the biologists (and Charles Darwin is a demi-god in Russia) that fittest means fittest in brute strength, that is the fittest bodyguards, bayonets, battalions, bombs and bombers. The opposite is true. It should be said that Survival in Life means survival by the fittest in community co-operation. Survival of the fittest animal in excruciating circumstances means survival of that animal in which the cells make the most strenuous community effort of co-operation. That completely unscientific concept of mine, that mysterious and unexplained Life Force, brings about a mysterious and miraculous co-operation of cells which make them invent, build and repair new organs in order that the individual creature may go on living and produce other creatures in ever widening higher co-operation of individuals and societies of individuals. We have seen time and again that a group of men thrown upon a deserted island and relying for survival on brute strength only, have usually murdered each other. Only those communities survived whose individuals co-operated with each other in order to survive and thus followed the natural phenomenon which evolution presents to us.

I am sorry, Sir to bother you with these many paragraphs which others may have written to you thousands of times. You know all about it. But the others who told you the same thing are displaying the evolutionary trend which makes human minds more and more advanced in their quest for truth. What I have said has been thought and said by others before me. In particular, the idea that humanity is now in the process of giving birth to a planetary organism is propounded by Professor Oliver L. Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh, who has deeply influenced my mind.

Ending this overlong letter, I recall that I started with simple safety symbols only, was soon forced to deal with abstract and vague meanings and had to end up with the study of the evolution of speech and the evolution of life on this planet. In the course of this study I believe I have made a breathtaking discovery. As all this concerns directly you, I had to bother you. Professor Clyde Kluckhohn, the eminent anthropologist of Harvard, commissioned me to write an article on my findings based on Chisholm's theory on the cause and prevention of human warfare. I attach this article. Perhaps you give this

letter and article to a young biologist so that he may follow the evolutionary trend and go forth where I have left off. Perhaps he will realize that human warfare is not part of 'biological warfare.' We MUST eliminate human warfare. WE MUST! We must realize that human warfare is a mental perversion caused by destructive words.

Yours sincerely,

C.K. Bliss, B.Sc.

Enclosure:

Semantography Series No. 85

"A possible proof and tool for Chisholm's theory on the cause and prevention of human warfare."

Having now conditioned the reader against the prejudice of a "Professor's Opinion", having said what I have to say to Huxley's remarks, I present herebelow Huxley's letter in full.

c/- Mr. T. Consalves,
Ministry of Natural Resources,
Government of India,
New Delhi.

March 6th, 1954.

Mr. C. K. Bliss,
5 Maroubra Bay Road,
Pagewood, Sydney.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

I have now at last a moment to write to you. I read your documents with interest, and agree with your Semantographic method provides something of real importance. I think that a full account of it ought certainly to be published, and I hope that you may receive some support from Unesco for this purpose. I have, however, various comments and criticisms.

(1) I fail to see how the method could be used for some of the more complex and subtle purposes for which language is required - unless the number of symbols combined to make one word, another number of symbol-combinations, is so much increased as to remove a great deal of the methods' convenience, e.g., in my own subject, evolution, development, and transformation all have slightly different meanings. Again conscience is not identical with what you call the supermind; nor are ethics, morals and conscience identical; yet you have one symbol for all! Thus, while your system should be very valuable in regard to simple actions and concepts and accurately definable terms, I don't see how it could be readily extended to cover more complex ideas.

(2) I feel it is a great pity to mix up two very different things, as you do - (a) the practical value of Semantography in certain definite spheres and (b) a whole theory of ethics and of semantics - this quite irrespective of the truth of the ethical or philosophical theories concerned.

(3) Further, I entirely disagree with Chisholm (and with your acceptance of his views) about the bad effect of our use of words like good and evil, etc; the concept of good and evil is the cause of human strife. This appears to me just nonsense.

(4) Freud's ego is not synonymous with reason or rational thought.

(5) On page 7 of your letter you utilize the completely unscientific concept of a Life Force - while biologists have been busy analysing the various processes underlying development, evolution, etc., and finding scientific explanations (e.g., in neo-Darwinian Natural Selection on a Mendelian basis as explanation of evolution).

(6) Granted that there is a great deal of subjectivism and relativism in regard to ethics and aesthetics, 'beautiful' and 'ugly', 'good' and 'bad' have also an objective component - at least I would strongly maintain so!

(7) Though cannibalism is rare in animals, it is by no means absent - and it is not the same as intra-specific killing, which is not at all uncommon - e.g. in sexual fightings, fighting for territory, etc.

(8) Chisholm's theory of war is pure speculation; organised war is doubtless a late product, but inter-group hostility was almost certainly prevalent from the outset. (By the way, some ants also have organised warfare).

I hope therefore in any future writings you will be careful to separate the practical and methodological importance of your Semantography from any general theories about ethics, social development, semantics, etc.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd) Julian Huxley
(Julian Huxley)

P.S.

I have spoken to Dr. Luthen Evans when he was in Delhi about your work, and gave your documents to his Chief Assistant, M:R. Mahau as well as telling him about your work. I think if you were to write direct to Monsieur Mahau at Unesco, 19 Avenue Kleber, Paris 16^e asking for support from Unesco for publication, this would be the best thing.