



SEMANTOGRAPHY SERIES NO. 158

THE SWEDISH COOPERATIVA MOVEMENT AND SEMANTOGRAPHY

At the end of 1951 Prof. O. L. Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh addressed the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and I supplied him with pamphlet No. 52. He sent this to a number of friends and in turn he sent me their replies. Most of them were of the usual non-committal phrases, which indicated clearly enough that the recipients have not taken the time to study the material. But one man studied it and sent in a crushing negative opinion. As this lead in turn to an approach to the Swedish Cooperativa Movement, I shall quote first his letter to Prof. Reiser. It is interesting to see how experts foresee all kind of imaginary difficulties.

Oslo, Norway, March 22, 1952

Professor Oliver L. Reiser, Ph. D.,  
University of Pittsburgh,  
PITTSBURGH, Pa, U.S.A.

Dear Professor Reiser,

My first reactions to Semantography are as follows: It is constructed the same way as the chinish written language, in time it will become quite as intricate, hard to learn and impossible for one mind to master completely. It will be quite as difficult to learn as any real or constructed language, as the international mimical and sign-language of the deaf-mutes, or as the sign-language of the American Indians. Scholars and other educated people generally master two, three or more languages sufficiently, to communicate with other people. The sphere of interest of other people mostly doesn't reach beyond their own village, and never will if I understand anything at all of human nature. That is, not until the basic education of everyone everywhere is on a level with the college - education of to-day. Sooner or later there will be two or three official languages used and taught all over the earth, and then there will be no use of semantography. The teaching of semantography calls for teachers being available everywhere, to teach the ordinary man of the village, which cannot be until they are given a chair to teach from in every village. The political structure of the world of to-day doesn't permit this, and should it be permitted in the world of tomorrow, there are other teachers who will be invited first, for instance those who can teach the use of modern tools, agriculture, birth-control, health-aid, geography, world-history and politics. Semantography might have been of value if introduced by Marco Polo and Columbus, Vasco da Gama and the Jesuites who spread the Spanish culture in South-America - but to-day it's time has passed, like the time for the creation of the United States of Europe - But then, again I might be entirely wrong in all this.

Yours sincerely,  
Anders Clarin

In 1952 I found no time to reply to this letter. Three years later, I printed at last Prof. Reiser's lecture on UNIFIED SYMBOLISM FOR WORLD UNDERSTANDING IN SCIENCE (S. Series No. 150) and it occurred to me then to write to Mr. Clarin.

14th June, 1955

Mr. Anders Clarin,  
c/- Johsson,  
Storgaten 23, D/400,  
OSLO. NORWAY.

Dear Sir,

At the end of 1951 Professor Oliver L. Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh read a paper at the annual meeting of the American Association for the

Advancement of Science. The title of this paper was "Unified Symbolism for World Understanding in Science". He was kind enough to send you a leaflet on Semantography which he distributed to the listeners. And you have been kind enough to give him your "first reactions" to Semantography in a letter of March 22nd, which Professor Reiser communicated to me. Though your critical reactions were against Semantography, you stated at the end "you might be entirely wrong in this". I am the man who worked out Semantography, and naturally your criticism was of great interest to me. I think that criticism is better than no criticism at all and therefore I am indebted to you for having given my work considerations with regard to the difficulties of Semantography, difficulties of which I am well aware.

Unfortunately my personal situation deteriorated in 1952 and later on I could not find the time and the energy to write to you and to answer the various points of your criticism. Now I am out of the doldrums and one of my first steps was to make good my promise to publish the lecture of Professor Reiser. He enlarged his paper considerably including more about my work, and also the new science of Cybernetics. Enclosed you will find 2 prospectuses, one about the publication of Professor Reiser's paper, the other about my own publications. I shall be very happy if you would think it worth while to acquire Professor Reiser's writings for yourself or for your Institution, also if you would be instrumental in interesting the University in Oslo to subscribe to my books on Semantography and the Semantography Series.

I feel sure that after reading the deliberations of Professor Reiser about Semantography much of your misgivings would be dispelled, moreover you would learn of the second aspect of Semantography, namely the logic of Semantics which it incorporates and which can be taught even in the primary school.

Hoping that you will find the suggestion interesting enough to acquire one or more of these publications, I remain with thanks in anticipation.

Yours sincerely,

C. K. Bliss B.Sc.

I received from him the following reply.

Stockholm August 24 1955.

From: Anders Clarin,  
Box 58,  
Sundbyberg,  
SWEDEN.

C.K. Bliss, Esq.,  
Semantography Publishing Co.,  
5 Maroubra Bay Road,  
PAGEWOOD. SYDNEY. N.S.W.  
AUSTRALIA.

Dear Sir,

Being a roaming, free-lance journalist, I can't be expected to be found in a very long time in the same place. Hence, your letter to me of June 14th didn't reach me in Oslo, Norway, but at the above address. A suburb to Stockholm, Swedish Capital.

The best I could do for you so far, was to try animate the Publishing House of the Swedish Co-op, "Kooperativa Förbundet, Bokförlaget, here in Stockholm to investigate whether or not your offered literature on semantics, semantography and cybernetics would be something for them to offer the Swedish market, either in your prints or in translation.

The Swedish Co-operative organisation is a great and important factor in the Swedish economical life, also it is considered one of the best organized the world over. Their publishing company is more or less a non-profit organisation with a tremendous output of ambitious literature, scientific as well as popular and sociological works. No other publishing house or book-importer here could offer better salescoverage than this house.

They have kindly sent me a copy of their letter to you of Aug. 19th., and I

strongly recommend, that you let them have, not only the reading copy they ask for, but that you send them as informative and representative a package as possible. Their director, Herman Stolpe, incidentally, edited the first Swedish survey on world federalism. He is Doctor of Philosophy, is often quoted in the Press regarding various cultural aspects, and has a fine staff of academics at his disposal.

I hope, that the criticism in the form of "first reactions" which I offered Professor Reiser was not too negative for you. After all, the world of to-day is not a world where good intentions are prominent in international dealings. From the viewpoint of this European observer, we are more or less back to 1955 or thereabouts.

Hoping to hear soon from you again, I offer my best wishes and kindest regards to you and Professor Reiser, and remain,

Sincerely yours,

And. Clarin

and shortly afterwards I received a short letter from the Director of the Publishing House of the Cooperativa Movement Dr. Herman Stolpe. He asked for a reading copy of the Reiser brochure. I then sent off the following letter with much material.

Sydney 13th September 1955

Dr. Herman Stolpe,  
Bokfoerlaget,  
Kooperativa Forbundet,  
STOCKHOLM. SWEDEN.

Your letter HS-e/Kj of August 3 1955

Dear Dr. Stolpe,

In response to your request I have posted to you one copy of Professor Oliver L. Reiser's brochure UNIFIED SYMBOLISM FOR WORLD UNDERSTANDING IN SCIENCE. I am grateful to you for this request, and I am grateful to Mr. A. Clarin for drawing your attention to my work Semantography. My past experiences with publishing firms have been such that I have given up approaching them. The reason was that I could never penetrate to the head of the firm. My letter and material was scrutinised by some employee, whose main concern is to refrain from recommendations of something which could mean a financial flop and in turn a threat to his job and salary. Obviously, when looking superficially through my work, here is the work of a crank. There is no use in telling publishing houses that every new idea looked first a crank's idea. Publishers are here to make money or go out of business. Bertrand Russell realising my plight wrote: Any man or men who will spend the money necessary to get this work printed will, in my opinion, be performing an important service to mankind". This has not impressed any publisher. Most of them have found out that crime does pay and money invested in crime thrillers and the like will pay too.

But you are the head of a co-operativa publishing house. This is something completely different. You are guided by higher motifs, and therefore I take my time to write to you this elaborate letter. Moreover, Mr. Clarin has informed me that you have edited the first Swedish survey on world federalism. You know therefore more than anyone else of the obstacles to world federalism. But you may not know something which indeed only a few scholars who have been in China and have studied Chinese script know for certain, namely: How did it come that many different tribes and races speaking many languages have formed the largest nation on earth, the Chinese nation of more than 450,000,000 people? In Europe, we see a process acting throughout the centuries dividing and subdividing people simply because they speak a slightly different idiom. Thus we have the Slovaks, and the Slovenians, the Croats and the Serbs, the Flemes and the Dutch, and the many others, and all at loggerheads with each other, all anxious to establish their own and "independent" nation?

Every sinologist will give you the answer. They will say that the main unifying factor in East Asia, which has unified many races and tribes and many invaders, is the Chinese script, a character writing which every race and tribe and every invader could read in his own language, just as today  $1 + 2 = 3$  can be read in all languages.

Now let us assume a crazy idea for one moment. Let us assume that Europe had a character writing during the last 4,000 years, not a phonetic alphabetic writing. Then, all the great works in poetry, drama and arts, written by all the great European writers of the past would have been written in such a script. Then whatever an English writer wrote, or a Swedish writer, could have been read and understood by any other nation al no matter what language he speaks. It seems crazy to think that poetry, which is bound up with words could be written in a script independent/ because they do not depend on phonetic tones, of words, yet Chinese poems are the world's finest, but show directly in pictorial script "the bamboo leaves hanging over the still water and the silver moon rising over the mountains."

Imagine now a European script which anyone in Europe has learned to read and which at once would make it possible for him to read the great works of any other nation, to absorb its ideas and ideals, not only the ideas of the last centuries. No, the writings of great writers of many centuries past, which are today a dead loss without a translation could be read, just as in fact Chinese classics of more than 2500 years old are still readable in any of the languages spoken today in East Asia. We in Europe have difficulty to understand many passages in Shakespeare, and he wrote his words less than 300 years ago.

To sum up, let me quote the words of a great sinologist, which you will find in the additional material sent to you with the Reiser Brochure. Prof. Basil Hall Chamberlain prophesied "Ideographic writing will surely achieve the final victory over alphabetic writing." And he points out that ideographic writing wins through in everyday mathematics, in time tables and calendars, in technical use etc. etc. I point to the fact that the idea of Semantography is already in use in a field where mutual understanding across all languages is a matter of life and death. On the highways of the world warning signs written in the native languages are taken down and replaced by pictorial symbols. A bent arrow means a CURVE in all languages of the world. I have shown in my books that many of my symbols can find immediate application for fire prevention in public places, cinema, theatres, etc. I have shown in large chapters in my 3 books on Semantography the application of my work for all human activities, even for the most complex meanings of science.

Now, I enclose here a few leaflets which will give you an idea of the fascination of my symbols and may even tell you that a publication such as Professor Reiser's brochure may not only be "an important service to mankind", it may be a proud achievement of a pioneering body such as the Swedish co-operative is. I feel sure that Professor Reiser's brochure will pay, not only because of the idea of a script readable in all languages, but mainly because Semantography has another and even more important aspect: it has a new Logic for the people.

This cannot be explained in a letter, and I ask you to wait until the book is in your hands. Here I wish to mention only one obvious reason. It is clear that pictorial symbols can picture only picturable things. Vague and ambiguous words are not picturable, and consequently anyone who has a short training in Semantography can find out the fraud committed today by Demagogues and Dictators.

In connection with the treatment of abstract ideas in Semantography I have made a momentous discovery, one which will be acclaimed later, or sooner when I find an enlightened publisher. Professor Reiser and other American professors are on my side, but so far scientific articles written by men who are not professionals in the field are not accepted by editors of scientific journals. You will find details on my discovery in the pages dealing with my find in the records of paleolithic man, see p. 27ff.

Lastly I wish to draw your attention to the chapter on p. 30, which has a direct bearing on the Cooperative movement and leads directly to Professor Reiser's main work. In dealing with the symbolisation of every meaning known to man, I could not stop at symbols to express the highest meanings of mankind, and this in turn lead to thoughts about the purpose of man on earth. My mind symbol shows the outline of the human skull thus  and it indicates that mysterious power which we see at work in living matter and living organisms such as animals which have a brain too underneath their skull. We see in a living organism a conscientious force at work which drives on every cell in a living body to co-operate for the benefit of the whole community of cells. This force works also in organisms which have no outward sign of a brain, as for instance in plants. If a twig or a tree is injured then thousands of cells will come to

the rescue of the injured members of the community and will build up the broken tissues until all is well in the whole community.

This process has been obscured by the writings of biologists who have misunderstood and misinterpreted it. Instead, they have given us the idea of Survival of the Fittest, which has been interpreted as meaning the fittest in brute strength, bayonets, bombs and battalions. Instead, it should mean, the Fittest in Co-operative Work. Indeed we have seen that men thrown into terrible environments and relying only on brute strength, have usually murdered each other. Only those communities survived which co-operated and thus obeyed the great universal law, which we see in operation in every plant, every living organism, fish, bird, animal and man. The Swedish Co-operative is one of the main outcomes of this universal law, and therefore, I think that Professor Reiser's brochure would be an important factor in strengthening the moral and ethical basis of any co-operative movement. But Prof. Reiser goes even further.

Just as in fact millions of cells in our body are going places through the channels and highways of our body on their community errands of co-operative help, Prof. Reiser believes that evolution on our planet is now in that stage where the individual cells, which are individual human beings, are in the process of forming a greater organism, a planetary organism. Just as the cells which form and operate our heart, or our lungs, are organisms working for the common benefit of a larger organism, so the Swedish Co-operative movement works as an organism within the larger organism of the Swedish nation, which in turn is striving to work with-in the greater organism which we are now <sup>seeing</sup> in process of forming, the world organism, world federalism or whatever other name we want to give that organism.

I might have been able to say all this in better words, but I rely on you that you will read Professor Reiser's brochure, and that you will consider a cheap reprint. As you can see, all I can do is to publish these writings with my small means. But you as the head of a great organisation can do much, indeed you can begin with the printing of the primers for a world federalism, and thus you and your Movement and the Swedish nation can add another laurel to your great achievements. I do not think that the monetary outlay is great. Just a brochure. The part on Semantography will appeal to the layman and the part on Cybernetics will appeal to the learned man. The attached leaflets show you only the simplest aspect, but one which should appeal to a larger circle of readers, indeed to anyone. Hoping to hear from you (the brochure will arrive in about 4 weeks time). I am,

Yours sincerely,

Encl. Leaflet No. 1, 2, 16, 7, 43 and 52

C.K. Bliss, B.Sc.

The matter which accompanied this letter was :

|                    |                                        |
|--------------------|----------------------------------------|
| S. Series No. 150, | The Reiser Brochure                    |
| " " No. 1          | 100 Symbol Elements, the leaflet       |
| " " No. 5          | Metcalf's recommendation               |
| " " No. 6          | What Scientists Think of Semantography |
| " " No. 8          | Bertrand Russell's letter              |
| " " No. 16         | Colour Leaflet for Publishers          |
| " " No. 7          | Telegraph Article                      |
| " " No. 37         | Physical Society pamphlet              |
| " " No. 43         | Geological Society pamphlet            |
| " " No. 52         | Pamphlet for Reiser's Lecture          |

I also sent off the following letter to Mr. Clarin

Anders Clarin, Esq.,  
Box 58,  
Sundyberg,  
SWEDEN.

Sydney 13th September, 1955

Dear Mr. Clarin,

Many thanks for your kind letter of August 24, and for drawing the attention of Dr. Stolpe to the brochure of Professor Reiser. I enclose copy of my long letter to Dr. Stolpe. I have sent him a package of all good material I have, and I sincerely hope that he will consider printing Prof. Reiser's brochure. Now, here are a few words to you.

You are a free lance journalist. You are out for interesting articles, interesting ideas, interesting people. Well, here is one. I suggest that you take a look into the whole material when it has arrived at Dr. Stolpe's desk and then you consider an article on it, perhaps as a stimulus or aid for Dr. Stolpe's publication venture on this subject.

I am sending your letter on to Professor Reiser, together with a copy of this letter to you and a copy of my letter to Dr. Stolpe. If you are interested in my work, you could persuade Dr. Stolpe, or the University of Stockholm to purchase the 3 books and the Semantography Series and above all Professor Reiser's writings (of which you will find an account within the brochure).

Hoping to hear from you that you are interested in an article I am,

Yours sincerely,  
C.K. Bliss, B.Sc.

There was no answer.

A friend of mine and a Swede himself sent off a personal letter recommending me and my work. He is Mr. J. E. Nordling of Sydney. It is significant that Stolpe failed to send him a courteous reply. As I may judge Stolpe of being of a vindictive nature, I shall <sup>not</sup> quote his answer to me in full, in order not to invoke an attack on me on his copyright. I shall quote only the relevant passages from his letters.

On the 21st of November, 1955 Stolpe answered stating that he is very impressed by my enthusiasm in making propaganda for mideas and ideals, but "I am sorry to tell you that I am not convinced that you have found a method which will be accepted all over the world and I am quite sure that it is not wise to start a more intensive propaganda in Sweden, a small country in the corner of the world. If you really want to be successful - and of course you do - you have to convince prominent American and English scientists and have them as your collaborators."

I was, of course, bitterly disappointed. I sent off the following letter.

7th December, 1955

Dr. Herman Stolpe,  
Kooperativa Forbundet,  
Bokforlaget,  
STOCKHOLM. 3. SWEDEN.

Dear Dr. Stolpe,

Thank you for your letter of 21st November and for your comments and advice to which I shall take the liberty to refer in a separate letter sent by surface mail.

To-day I hasten only to ask you to be kind enough to post the brochure and all the material I have sent to you and which has no value for you, back to me. I am fighting a loan battle and I am spending most of my earnings for all my publications and therefore, I am asking you kindly to post the material back.

I thank you for having given them your time and consideration and remain.

Yours sincerely,  
C.K. Bliss

For weeks I harbored dark answers to Stolpe. They were even intensified when he replied saying that "the different pamphlets you have sent to me I have distributed among persons I think could have an interest in the subject and therefore it is impossible for me to send them back to you."

This I considered a polite pretext for not telling the truth, namely that the material went into the dustbin. He said in his letter that I should have informed him that I wanted the material back. This too is a pretext in my opinion. The simplest way is to write the rejecting letter and post it together with the material back to the author. This is the common procedure.

Instead, Stolpe wants me to imagine that he has gone to the length of writing a number of explanatory letters to a number of selected people and then sent different parts of my material to those people.

Months passed by, and now I found at last the time to write to him the following letter.

Sydney 15th April, 1956

Dr. Herman Stolpe,  
Kooperativa Förbundet,  
Bokförlaget,  
STOCKHOLM. 3, SWEDEN.

Dear Dr. Stolpe,

With your letter of November 21st you have declined my proposal that your publishing house should publish a brochure on my work. This was of course a great disappointment to me and it dashed all my hopes which I have set in a great and pioneering Institution as the Swedish Kooperativa movement. In my detailed letter of September 13th, I have told you why I believe that the Kooperativa could do a great pioneering work in spending a little money on a publication of my work.

Now, I would have taken your no in good grace were it not for the fact that you thought it wise to make some comments on my work and to give some advice. As you have done so you must at least allow me to answer to your comments and to your advice. I do so for two reasons. The first is to abreact my bitter disappointment and the second reason is to conclude this venture, my approach to the Swedish Kooperativa. I have spent quite a time in composing my long letter in which I approached the Swedish Kooperativa and I do not want that this should be labour lost. As great libraries are already collecting my writings, I intend to make my approach to the Kooperativa movement an issue of my Semantography Series. Sooner or later it will find its way into a Swedish library and the contemporary people, this or the next generation, may then decide whether or not it was wise for the Swedish Kooperativa and for you to answer as you did.

Your letter contains the following statements.

- (1) That you are not convinced that I have found a method which will be accepted all over the world.
- (2) That you are quite sure that it is not wise to start a propaganda in Sweden, a small country in a corner of the world.
- (3) You give me the advice that if I really want to be successful I have to convince prominent American and English scientists and have them as my collaborators.

Let us start first with argument 2. You do not think it wise to start a propaganda in Sweden, "a small country in a corner of the world". But why not? Look at the small countries in the world which have started something of great importance to humanity. Look at that even smaller country on the Greek peninsula. The Greek had started something 2500 years ago which has not even today been surpassed by any other country. Today as in the past we admire the examples set by the Greek classics in everything, be it art and architecture, poetry and drama, sport and citizenship and of course democracy.

Look at the example given by Switzerland. Seven hundred years ago they threw off the yokes of kings and emperors, or dictators and oppressor, and showed to the world that a country can govern itself by their own elected people. But Switzerland showed even more to the world. During the last seven hundred years and even before, the Germans the French and the Italians have fought wars with each other. But in Switzerland Germans and French and Italian and Latin people live together in peace. They adhere to the principle of an all embracing citizenship which has overcome the differences of linguistic and nationalistic barriers. What an example to the whole world, started in a small corner of the world!

I can give you more such examples. But let us look at Sweden a small country in a small corner of the world. It has started the cooperativa movement.

and has given a lead and an example and an inspiration to the whole world. The trouble is this that quite often great ideas are squashed by the bureaucrats who administer these ideas. And you are one of them Dr. Stolpe. You could have started something in your Sweden, something which would have been another inspiration to the whole world. Why have you declined to do so? I shall examine this later on.

Now to argument 3. I have to convince prominent American and English scientists and have them as my collaborators. Well, I have convinced them. Listen to this:

A Logician: BERTRAND RUSSELL (London) "I think very highly of it ... Any men who will spend the money necessary to get this work printed will, in my opinion, be performing an important service to mankind."

A Biologist: JULIAN HUXLEY (London) "Semantography provides something of real importance."

A Philosopher: Professor OLIVER L. REISER (Pittsburgh) "Bliss realized the ambition of the great mathematician Leibniz ... heroic work ... a powerful stimulus ... "

An Educationalist: Professor CARLETON WASHBURN (New York) "ingenious ... could be of great value."

A Scientist of varied fields: Professor LANCELOT HOGBEN (Birmingham) "interesting ... stimulating ... fascinating ... ingenious"

A Physicist: Professor V. A. BAILEY (Sydney) "deserves every encouragement by private and public means ... would be of great value to scientists."

A Psychologist: Professor G. PATRICK MEREDITH (Leeds) "sheer fascination ... such an important creative advance ... "

A Librarian: JOHN METCALFE (Sydney) "This book should be available in the larger public and university reference libraries throughout the world."

I can cite many more scientists, all in favour of my work. Why then has nothing been done? The first thing to do is to provide cheap books which can be acquired by every school and university and even by laymen who become interested. To do this, I have to approach publishers. There is no other way. They have the means and the machinery to print books. But they do not like risky ventures. They prefer crime stories, because with publishers, dear Dr. Stolpe, CRIME DOES PAY. As to the scientific books they publish you may perhaps know it, that many books are subsidized by universities and foundations who pay the printer and the publisher. But many more books are paid for secretly by the professors themselves. They need to show that they do some creative work, but as publishers do not like to risk money, they ask the professors to pay up and pay up they do. I know of quite a number of cases of this shameful procedure of printer-publishers fleecing the scholars. This answers also your advice about the collaborators. Professors have their own creative ideas which they want to have fostered. They want collaborators for their ideas. They are convinced that my work is good (see above) but they don't want to do anything about it.

This is the reason why I have put my hopes in you. You are a publisher. But you are a publisher with a mission. You are a publisher for new ideas. And moreover, you are a publisher who can risk a little money for a brochure which might not show a profit. Moreover, you write books yourself, you are an authority in Sweden. Now let us have a look at authorities in general and authorities in Sweden and Scandinavia and how they react towards new ideas.

The fact is that authorities are conservative. Consequently they consider unconservative ideas with distrust. They would have to unlearn. They would have to admit that their previous teachings is wrong. No authority would thus admit his own failure. And in consequence thereof the authorities in any country have been the greatest hindrance to any new idea. The pioneers had to go to other countries or more often had to die first.

To prove my point, let us have a look at two successful pioneers of Scandinavia. Let's take Fritjof Nansen. When he found a piece of driftwood off

Greenland and recognized it as wood from a tree which grows only in Eastern Siberia he concluded that there is no land at the pole and there is a drift from Eastern Siberia to the West over the pole. Hence his idea of having his ship being frozen in and drifting over the pole.

Now, who laughed this ideas to scorn? The men in the streets, or the men in the chairs of Scandinavian Universities. Only the scholarly authorities opposed his idea as utterly ridiculous. Only the authorities. Of course, afterwards, when he succeeded to prove his theory, he was feted. Had he died on his perilous journey the scholars of Scandinavia would have told each other: "I told you so. He was a crank!"

Or take John Ericsson, the Swedish engineer. It was an Ericsson who discovered Groenland and North America around 1000. I don't know what the Wiking authorities have said to his mad journeys. But I know what the authorities did to John Ericsson. He could not find any ear for his mad inventions with the Swedish authorities. He left his country and went to England. There he demonstrated his propeller screw for ships to the British admiralty. And the British brasshats in their conservative tradition turned the crank down. He had to go to America. There his ideas were recognized, and put into practice. He invented also the revolving turret for warships and thus helped the course of history of America, because his monitor ships proved decisive in the war against the slave states of the South. And he was only a man from a small country in a corner of the world, Sweden, which has turned him down and out.

And now to you Dr. Stolpe, and your argument 1 that you are not convinced about my work. Now you are not a pioneer. You are an authority in Sweden. In fact, you are an employee of a great movement, the co-operativa movement. And surely you do not want to lose your post, your esteem, your importance. Back in the back of your mind there must have been the thought of what would have happened if you had published a brochure of my work. Who would have laughed about it? Who would have scorned it? Who would have said that Dr. Stolpe has gone among the cranks? The men in the streets of Stockholm? Surely not. They are overawed by any publication which most of them cannot understand. If the Co-operativa would have published a brochure about Semantography, the common people of Sweden would have bought it and read it because Semantography is an interesting and fascinating idea. But it would have been laughed to scorn by the linguists of Sweden. And the directors of the Cooperativa, your bosses, might have heard some acid remarks about you: "What's gone into Dr. Stolpe lately? That crazy idea of whatsthenname Semiodiotagraphy. I wonder whether he is getting too old for his job!"

Yes, Dr. Stolpe. The thoughts which are at the back of the mind of every employee who has a position and a salary to lose, is what the bosses are going to say, and whether or not he will continue in office. Had you rejected my proposal with a simple No, and had you been a publisher with one aim only, namely to make money, I would have been quiet. But you are an employee of a great humanitarian organisation, and you have thought wise to give me advice. Only for these reasons did I feel it necessary to answer you.

One other point. It appears that you have looked only superficially into my work. It appears that you have completely overlooked the Semantics of Semantography, something which can be used with any thoughts in any language including the Swedish language. It appears also that you have overlooked the pages in which Prof. Reiser relates my great discovery with regard to the records of palcolithic man and the tremendous implications which his discovery holds for mankind. All you have seen is an oddity, a picture language.

When I received your letter, I asked you immediately by airmail to send back the brochure and the many pamphlets and other material. After all, you must have realized that I am a lone fighter for a new idea and that all this material cost me money. You should have sent it back, so that I could use the material for other persons.

But my letter came too late. You informed me that you have distributed them among persons "whom you think could have an interest in the subject". If you have gone to so great a trouble would you please send me the list of these persons. I want to get in touch with them. May be, they will help my idea along in Sweden. After all, this is what I am doing all the time, looking for people who have the vision to recognize the value of my idea. This is why I

wrote to you.

Please send me the list of the interested persons. If you do not do so, I shall have only one alternative conclusion to make: that my papers have gone into the dustbin.

Yours faithfully,

C.K. Bliss

I received then from him a postcard from Denmark. He was there on vacation and my long letter has been sent to him. Again I do not want to quote the letter in full, because I am afraid that he, a publisher, might wreak vengeance on me by using his copyright. However, I shall give a truthful account of the content of his postcard. He wrote that he well understands that I am a pioneer for a new idea. He is very glad to find that a lot of prominent people in the english-speaking countries highly appreciate my work. He added that he is very astonished that I with all these fine words in my hands can't find people willing to subsidize my work in America or in England where so much money is spent on new ideas of all kind. He very well understands that publishers working on a commercial basis don't find it possible to publish my book because of the risk of a loss. A book of this type has to be financed by a scientific institution or fund or by some wealthy person interested in the subject.

All this was of course terrific news for me. It was in fact nothing more than just filling in written lines, because he must know by now of the great efforts I had made to get my work published by a scientific foundation or a wealthy person. But now he comes to his business. As it is usually with a man who writes a letter in defence or to refute some charge, he will hang his arguments on anything. I explained in my previous letters why I put so much hope on his publishing business in contrast to other commercial publishers who prefer crime stories.

Stolpe now outlined his activities in the publishing field. He said that the book-publishing department of KF is specialised on literature, dealing with co-operative, economic, sociologic, educational and similar problems. "Crime stories," he writes, "we never published and we do not intend to do so." I appeal to the reader who has read all I wrote to Dr. Stolpe to judge for himself, whether or not I have stressed time and again the co-operative, economic, sociologic and educational aspects of my work. The following excuses Dr. Stolpe now makes must appear flimsy. He wrote that he has to publish books in the field which the house has to serve, and if "we publish books on other fields we must be sure that the costs will be covered." From this the reader learns that he publish books in other fields. Furthermore, he tells a deliberate lie by saying that a publisher must be sure that the costs will be covered. No publisher can ever be sure with any publication. Anything may turn out a flop and be a loss. Or does he hint that I the author should pay the publisher? This in fact is often the case.

Now he comes to the question of the material which I wanted back. In my letter I asked for the names of the persons to whom he sent my material. It would have been easy to name Prof. Soandso, etc. But he could not well name imaginary persons. So he wrote: "The collection of pamphlets and leaflets you have sent to me I regarded as general information and propaganda material and I never had the idea that you wanted it back. I distributed them to different persons and I am sorry to tell you that they didn't recommend publishing in Sweden."

This is a new slant. In his previous letter he did not say that he had submitted my material to other persons asking them of their opinion about a publishing venture. But all this is besides the point. All I wanted to know was the names of the persons. These he did not give, because he never gave the material to other people. He concluded his postcard asking me whether I have an article of an informative character on my idea. Perhaps he could find a possibility to introduce me in Sweden through an article in a review. This ruse I knew already very well, having fallen into this trap a number of times. When I wrote an article the editor regretted.....

I have fretted about his evasive answer for more than half a year. Now, re-reading my letters to him, and re-living all my hopes which I have put into a publisher who is not a commercial publisher, I simply feel that I cannot go on living and still fretting under the fact that he could evade my simple question in such a simple evasive way. And so I set to write to him again. My first draft was a bit rude. But then I altered it after calming down and here is my letter overleaf.

Dr. Herman Stolpe,  
Bokforlaget  
Kooperativa Forbundet  
STOCKHOLM 3 Sweden

Sydney 20th February 1957

Dear Dr. Stolpe

I regret having to comment on your postcard from Denmark, July 5. You, with your knowledge of psychology will understand that a man may feel slighted by the action or words of another man. In your and my case I feel (and I beg to forgive me saying so) that insult has been added to injury, or in German "der Schaden zum Spott." Kindly let me recapitulate.

Firstly, I have not approached you. You have approached me. I have sent you some papers, and it is common practice among publishers anywhere in the world that papers are returned to the author, or the publisher makes a suggestion to pass on the papers to another publisher or person with the author's permission. The fact is that these papers remain the author's property.

You have acted differently. You did not return the papers. Editors of journals who get sometimes unwanted manuscripts (which they have not asked for) do return them too. However, sometimes an editor believes that the author is an obvious crank, and a paper might go into the dustbin. I have put a stop to that early, though I know that many people may consider me a crank.

When I asked my papers back from you, you told me that you have distributed them. I then asked for the names of the persons, because they must be scholars and experts in that field and I want to get in touch with them. After all, only two or three men could have got my papers sent to you. However, in your postcard - though it might have been very easy for you to state the names of the scholars - you did not accede to my wish.

Since July 1956, since I received your postcard with the general words not saying what I wanted you to say, I have felt very bitter about you. Having spent so much time on my letters to you, having sent you papers which I had to print myself with my slender financial means, I felt that you have added insult to injury, that you have added "den Spott zum Schaden." Knowing your psychology you will understand that I simply cannot get over this.

Now, there is a way out. The papers were my property. You have disposed of them without my consent. But they can easily become your property and then your action will be correct. I include my invoice and ask you kindly to remit the small sum. This will give you the satisfaction that you have at least not added unhappiness to a pioneer of a new idea who has to suffer as all pioneers have. I am

Yours sincerely

Encl. invoice and catalog (25% reduction granted)

C.K. Bliss

The invoice amounted to 17 Australian shilling, surely a small sum. I have to conclude this issue for mimeographing and therefore I cannot tell the reader right now of the result of my letter which goes out today (I am writing this stencil). However, I shall add any further information later on to this sheet.