



SOME EXPONENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL
LANGUAGE MOVEMENT AND SEMANTOGRAPHY

In the introduction to Issue No. 99 I have told of my boyhood experiences with regard to Volapuk and Esperanto and of my hopes that the adherents of the idea of an international language will take an interest in my work.

Dr. Zamenhof, the inventor of Esperanto has found millions of persons in the whole world who took up his idea. Even to-day, more than 60 years later, and after the shattering experience of failure, Esperantists are still working all over the world for their ideal. It was my belief that they might now be ready to listen to someone who can explain why Esperanto has failed, why Ido has failed, and why even Basic English has failed. It was my belief that they might be inclined to examine Semantography, as a "forerunner" to their ideal, a spoken international language. In this my belief I was mistaken. In the following pages I shall show some of my experiences.

The student of my papers will find that I made few approaches before 1949. It took me 7 years; from 1942 to 1949 to work out Semantography and to write my 3 books. I felt that I must first finish the task, and only afterwards make the approaches. I am glad that I followed this plan. Had I made approaches to Esperantists, to linguists, to teachers and educators, to professors and directors of education before finishing my books, I would never have finished them. I would have been crushed by the shattering experiences through which I went since 1949, and which took me 7 years to overcome.

Looking through the piles of letters which I have written in vain, I find the following letter written to Sydney Esperantists. I saw the advertisement below in the Sydney Weekly of the Australian Broadcasting Commission, and as my first lecture at Sydney University was due, I took this opportunity to write to the Sydney Esperantists and to invite them to my lecture.

Here is the advertisement

CONVERT
Your Letter-Box
TO WORLD - RANGE
Correspond in
E S P E R A N T O

You can use this logical, flexible, euphonious WORLD-LANGUAGE from the first lesson. You can learn it fully in from one to two years, converse in a few weeks.

Esperanto promotes international friendship, understanding, peace. For particulars write the Hon. Sec.-retary, SYDNEY ESPERANTO SOCIETY, 12 ENNIS ROAD, MILSON'S POINT N.S.W.

and here my letter

Sydney, 21st April, 1950

The Secretary,
Sydney Esperanto Society,
12 Ennis Road,
MILSON'S POINT.

Dear Sir,

For years I wanted to approach you and your Society. I feel sure that

you will be interested in my present approach, in which I invite you and your members to my lecture at the Sydney University.

More than 60 years have passed since Zamenhof invented Esperanto in 1887, and we can now look back. I myself was an Esperantist, but realised that people will not learn a foreign language-if not forced to do so. Even parental and tutorial force is not enough-as the result of foreign language teaching shows. One reason for this is the different word order in the many languages.

But if people would be induced to a certain logical word order by some sort of mathematical symbol writing, like $1 + 2 = 3$ then it would be easier to teach them an international language. Therefore, my Semantography is not a competitor of Esperanto, but its forerunner. In view of the fact, that 60 years of Esperanto have not brought the results, hoped for by the early enthusiasts, would you and your Society be ready to examine Semantography?

Here is my proposal: I shall send you as many invitations as you have members, and you send them to your members. I am even ready to print an additional invitation according to your text coming from the Esperanto Society, and even supply the envelopes. I have a duplicating machine. Please let me know by return the number of invitations, etc. you need.

Yours sincerely,

Encl. Leaflet No. 1 and 7, Brochure No. 6
Order Form, Invitations to Lecture.

C.K. Bliss

Now, simple courtesy could have induced the secretary of the Sydney Esperanto Society to reply to my letter and to acknowledge the material sent. But, the secretary did what other linguists in the schools and the universities did. He ignored my letter. That was of course a bitter disappointment.

Studying books on the idea of an international language I came upon the name of Mrs. Dave Hennen Morris. Friends from overseas sent me newspaper articles with her picture, showing a friendly and intelligent person. They urged me to contact her. However, I hesitated. As said before, I wanted first to finish my books. Secondly, I realized that the persons who can put my Semantography to work are not the impotent idealists who advocate an international language, but the potent and powerful men who direct the schools and universities. Hence my approaches to eminent scholars from 1949 to 1951. When the Sydney University Extension Board granted me the privilege of a lecture to students and staff of Sydney University in 1951, I felt that success is within reach. I felt too that now adherents of other systems might now be willing to listen to me. I wrote therefore the letter to the Esperantists of Sydney (see before) and I wrote the letter to Mrs. Dave Hennen Morris, who is the founder of the I.A.L.A., the International Auxiliary Language Association. What I did not know was, that at the time of writing my letter, Mrs. Morris was not more among the living. To-day, I feel that, had she been alive, the result would have been much the same. I know now that Esperantists are strongly opposed to anything else but Esperanto. They are opposed to Ido, to Interlingua, and the other languages. Idists are opposed to Esperanto, and Interlingua-ists are opposed to Ido, etc. etc. Mrs. Morris advocated Interlingua. Here is my letter.

22nd March, 1951

Mrs. Dave Hennen Morris,
Honorary Secretary,
International Auxiliary Language Association,
420 Lexington Avenue,
NEW YORK CITY. U.S.A.

Dear Mrs. Morris,

For the last eight and a half years I had in mind to write to you knowing very well that you are one of the outstanding pioneers for an international language. However, I hesitated because I wanted to present to you a complete work. As the years went on and on I tore up manuscript after manuscript. Now at last I finished it. Reluctant to canvass such a vast manuscript which is not a profit making proposition for printers and publishers, I have become my own draughtsman, printer and publisher, and I am glad to say that my work is already of bibliographic value. I enclose some printed matter and an Order

Form and hope that you will acquire these three large volumes on SEMANTOGRAPHY.

I consider my work not as a competitor to your endeavours, but on the contrary, as the strongest tool ever devised to bring an international language into practical operation. The great obstacle barring the way of an international language is, among many other factors the different word order and sentence construction of the many and varied mothertongues to which the different races stick with determination, even in the United States. But the sentences written in mathematical symbols are the same for all languages, and so are the symbols of Semantography, which follow the natural physical word order. If different nationalities would start first with the use of this picture writing and would thus become acquainted with an exact word order, etc., then and then only would they be ready to substitute the sentences of this ideographic writing by the spoken words of an international language.

As you see from the contents of the enclosed papers, great men and educators have given praise to my work. Nearly all of them have seen me when visiting Australia, and it is only now that I am approaching the outer world. I have heard and read so much of your great endeavours that I feel sure of your interest, and I would be grateful if you, in turn, would send me some printed matter about the work of your beloved I.A.L.A.

Yours sincerely,

Encl. Leaflet 1, Brochure No. 6 Librarian
letter, Metcalfe recommendation, Order
Form, Children's Primer title page.

C.K. Bliss

I received the following answer by the executive director of the I.A.L.A.
Mary Bray :

INTERNATIONAL AUXILIARY LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION
I A L A

420 Lexington Avenue,
New York 17, N.Y.
Telephone: Lexington 2/2951

Institute of Interlinguistics
affiliated with Barnard
College,
Columbia University

Mary Bray, Executive Director

May 17, 1951

Mr. C. K. Bliss
The Institute for Semantography
5 Maroubra Bay Road,
Pagewood, Sydney N.S.W. Australia.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

Your letter addressed to Mrs. Dave H. Morris, which you wrote on March 22nd, reached me on May 3rd, and I am answering it at my first opportunity. I am sorry to have to tell you that Mrs. Morris, whose name is so well known to you for her work for an international language, died in August, 1950. Her leadership is a great loss to us but we are trying to carry on the work in her spirit of hope for a further international civilization. The language we have evolved by our research should be a practical help in hastening that era.

In the years of our study of all different concepts of an international medium we have of course taken into consideration the symbolic type of languages and those founded on "a priori" principles. We are therefore interested in knowing about your own work in this type of thinking. We thank you for sending us the circulars about it, although we do not wish to order the three volumes you refer to.

IALA'S concept of an international language is that it must be based upon the actual material familiar to national languages. We have just published our Inter-lingua-English Dictionary. I enclose circulars about this volume. I hope that you may be interested in knowing about our Dictionary. We are adding your name to our mailing list for future information about IALA.

With cordial regards,

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd) Mary Bray

Attached to it were some pamphlets exhorting the reader to buy the Interlingua English Dictionary. There was also an interesting short article by the interlinguistic director of the I.A.L.A. a Dr. Alexander Gode-von Aesch, under which direction the research staff of the I.A.L.A. prepared the Interlingua-English Dictionary. This article shows how Interlingua takes its words from Latin, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, French, English, German and Russian. To be sure, he chose one word only, the latin audire and this may indeed be the parade word of Interlingua, because derivations of this word are found in the above listed languages as for instance audience, auditor, audition, etc. etc. They are found there simply because the languages listed above with the exception of German and Russian are languages derivated from Latin.

Against such display the adherents of Basic English, and I, the adherent of Semantography say, that the majority of the peoples of this planet, the natives of Asia, South America, Africa and the Pacific, speak languages totally different from Latin and its modern counterparts.

I was interested to read in the pamphlets of the I.A.L.A. that there is a research staff, and a director and an executive director, etc. etc. Only later did I learn that Mrs. Morris was a wealthy person, and had devoted her income and funds to the fostering of Interlingua. This work is carried on to-day, and I suppose the executives will go on drawing salaries until the last penny and cent of Mrs. Morris funds will give out.

I do not remember other approaches I made to other adherents of an international language. As said before, the few shattering experiences were enough for me, and besides, I realized that these advocates of an international language are impotent. They could do nothing to help Semantography along. I abandoned therefore similar approaches.

However, no one can say of me, that I do not follow up any encouraging sign of interest in my work. And so, I relate herewith the story of the happenings of this year, a series of letters with adherents of an international language. The student of Semantography will be inclined to judge me harshly, because I was harsh in the end with these fine men. They have written wonderful letters to me, and I do not doubt for a moment their sincere intentions. Indeed, I print their letters below to show how gently they have treated me, and how "unreasonable"(?) I have been to them. I want to show that a pioneer of a new idea gets sometimes mad, even with his friends, simply because the strain of bitter disappointments is too much for him. I still think I didn't get a "fair deal" as the final letters show.

Here is the first letter from an Australian, Mr. John T. Higgins of Brisbane. I have not met him, but the reader will, no doubt, be captivated by his fine style of writing and the sincerity of his words.

69 Cochrane Street,
Red Hill, W.I.
Brisbane, Queensland.
January 18, 1956

Mr. C. K. Bliss,
5 Maroubra Bay Road,
PAGEWOOD. N.S.W.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

Through the courtesy of Mr. Sidney Baker of the Sydney Morning Herald I have learned that you are the inventor of a system of picture-writing called "Semantology".

This is of particular interest to me in view of another system I am at present following up. This is known as "Safo" and is the work of Prof. Dr. Andre Eckardt of Germany.

Dr. Safo's work is still wanting a dictionary before it can become practicable for use by English writers. I am informed this will soon be ready.

Your work "Semantology" seems to imply that you may be concerned in the general problem of an international language, and because of this I bring the following to your notice.

A good friend of Yugoslavia, Dr. Paul Mitrovich, who is author of several

books on international language, including "An Essay on Interlinguistics" and "Inter-sistemal", is anxious to discover anybody in Australia engaged in the study of international language. To date I have referred his inquiry to two people here - Mr. Metcalfe of the Public Library of New South Wales and Prof. Triebel of the University of Tasmania. I wish you would consent to get in touch with Dr. Mitrovich and explain to him the nature of your ideas on this great subject. His full address is : Sarajevo, Nemanjina 13, Yugoslavia.

Another matter of much importance which I think will greatly interest you is the fact that there is at present publishing in America an "International Language Review" devised in the ultimate to bring unity to IL ranks. The Review is a new one but already has a worldwide circulation. It embodies the principle of 'fair play' for all existing international language systems, and recognises no individual present system as pre-eminent. The status of the journal is scientific and analytical, and its purpose to record the knowledge and theories of authors and authorities throughout the world, whether wellknown or not so wellknown. Annual subscription is only 10/-d.

Further details on either of these matters I shall be happy to make available if you display an interest.

Meantime, could you advise me how I might obtain your "Semantology"? I would like to procure a copy, or perhaps more than one, as early as possible. Any additional information you might care to convey to me would be appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN T. HIGGINS

John T. Higgins

REPRESENTATIVE AT LARGE

"International Language Review"

"International Shorthand Review"

"La Revuo Universala"

I winced when reading the first paragraph. Sydney J. Baker, the author of "The Australian Language", is a writer on the staff of the Sydney Morning Herald. This paper has brought a series of articles and letters to the editor about Semantography. (See Semantography Series No. 61 and 83, also 99). Later he wrote a supplement to the "Australian Language" under the title of "Australia Speaks". In this book he devoted over 7 pages to the "Dictionary" of an ex-teacher, jailed for life in Sydney's Long Bay Jail. This dictionary comprises about 850 prison slang words. Baker gets enthusiastic about this dictionary. In previous years he had devoted a whole page of the Sunday Herald for the work of this prisoner, making a strenuous plea to Australian publishers to publish this dictionary. As to Semantography, Baker refused to write an article on Semantography in 1950. In his book "Australia speaks" he gives me less than half a page of derogatory criticism, and he calls my work "Semantology". It is interesting to note that he could have had within a few minutes all the articles from the Herald library in order to find out the correct name of my work, Semantography. But he was quite content to write that my work is called Semantology. Such is the accuracy of his linguistic studies. I shall deal with Sydney J. Baker and his work in a later issue.

I answered.

John T. Higgins, Esq.,
69 Cochrane Street, Red Hill, W.1
BRISBANE. Queensland.

Sydney 27th January, 1956

Dear Mr. Higgins,

Many thanks for your enquiry and your interesting letter. You are one of the few people in the world who come to me out of sheer interest. Therefore, I am writing to you on my old letterhead which I designed 7 years ago for writing to the teachers and professors of language. Alas, I was a great optimist believing that THEY will show some interest, because it is their blasted duty to take an interest in linguistic improvements. It took me 13 years of work to realize that they are the worst obstacles. They would not simplify language - Heaven forbid.

My second obstacle is that people think all I have done is constructing

a "picture language". Well, how would anyone "picture" every word of the following sentence: "THE PRICE OF FREEDOM IS ETERNAL VIGILANCE"? You can write this sentence in any existing language and in any international language, but you cannot write it in Semantography without realizing that it is utterly vague and its meaning can be twisted so that an American can say it, a Nazi, a Communist, or any other -ismist and everyone thinks of a different "freedom" and a different "vigilance".

The trouble is that nobody takes the time to study the semantics of Semantography (with the exception of a blessed few). I shall be happy if you would be one of them and if you wish I would be glad if you would write some articles for those international revues. I would ask for one condition only: that you submit your articles to me and allow me to add my version and explanation to whatever criticism you want to make. You may keep the money they might pay you for the articles. I enclose a few issues from my Semantography Series. Send me in return a few numbers of your revues which I would then return to you. Then I suggest that you acquire the brochure which Prof. Reiser wrote about my work (12/6, see prospectus). Can you induce the librarian of Queensland University to buy the brochure and my 3 books and subscribe to the Semantography Series (see prospectus). I suggest you write to Dr. Mitrovich. I am afraid to do so, because my work spells doom to demagogues and dictators be they Tito or any dominant father or cheeky son. Nothing more for today than my expression of hope that we may co-operate in the future.

Yours sincerely,
C.K. Bliss

Higgins answered (I.L. means International Language) :

Dear Mr. Bliss

February 12, 1956

I shall, as you suggest, write the Queensland University with a view to having your works received into their library. I shall write Prof. G. R. Cochrane, Lecturer in Phonetics, who recently sent a reply to a query by me relating to international language at the university. A copy of Prof. Cochrane's letter I enclose so that you may gauge what success might be expected when I write a second time. Interest generally in IL is dull, as you have observed better than I.

The reaction against your work seems scarcely credible. Sound opinion has lauded its evident merit, and I really thought that with such acknowledged authorities expressing warm approval of the plan it would have been accorded some measure of support. I am interested in Semantography because it might be the means of helping me to correspond with people in countries with whom I am able to converse at present only through translators. Any method which surmounted my present difficulty I would think was a tremendous triumph and something of astronomical importance; what then would its quantitative value be when the reaction of the thousands - the millions of others like me was taken!

I certainly shall try my hardest to understand the semantics of the system. Firstly, I would like to have Prof. Reiser's brochure, and I enclose the sum to pay for this. Then I shall invest in the complete series.

As the "International Language Review" is a new magazine I am able to send only a sample copy of one issue - the first. On the instant I received your letter I sent a letter off to editor Floyd Hardin in America requesting that you be forwarded the "International Shorthand Review". It is months ago that the latest number was issued, and I have now no 'spares' on hand. You may keep both the journals which come to you.

I have read over a second time tonight your two "Briefs" -- on SG and on the Semantics of SG. When I prepare an essay on your work for the International Reviews, I shall submit it to you for examination and alteration, if necessary. Incidentally, payment is not made for contributions to these Reviews which are conducted on a non-profit basis. To be even more truthful, Mr. Hardin is compelled to sustain a personal loss of considerable magnitude on his enterprises because of the impossibility of readers in certain countries to remit monies, due to serious currency restrictions.

Needless to say, I shall do whatever I can to bring news of Semantography

before a small number of friends who are interested in studies of this nature. The charge for the complete series of books, however, might unavoidably dampen their enthusiasm; therefore, I wish you would tell me whether the texts may be purchased separately or if the set can be obtained only as a whole.

Cordially,
John T. Higgins

I replied :

15th February, 1956

Dear Mr. Higgins,

I have received your kind letter of February 12th with happy feelings. I was not sure how you will take my attack on the linguists and indeed my attitude might have been the end of our co-operation if you had taken offence to my stand against the linguists. I am glad to see that this is not so and I sincerely hope that fruitful co-operation will come out of our communication.

Thank you very much for the 12/6d. for the Reiser brochure which I have despatched to-day. Seeing that you might have some difficulties with the Semantics of Semantography, I think that the introduction to it as given in Professor Reiser's brochure will be much better. In addition to this I am sending you three issues of my Semantography Series gratis. They comprise the Record of my appearance before the Committee enquiring into Secondary Education in New South Wales. You will get - (1) The Submission (2) The Draft of my speech and (3) the actual speech (as correction of the Official Record). These 3 items will give you an idea about the Semantics of Semantography and more.

I have been greatly touched by your willingness to invest money in my writings and I appreciate this gesture so much that I shall send you gratis whatever I can spare. The Semantography Series are available in single issues and I am now working on a new catalogue list of the 156 issues which have appeared so far. I might then suggest a few for your friends to arouse their interest.

I am awaiting the copies of the International Language Review and the International Shorthand Review and shall advise you with regard to the printing of the symbols as soon as I have seen in what manner these reviews are made out (mimeographed or offset or typeset). I have a number of blocks for typesetting which I would gladly give to you for your article. I suggest that you write the article from the inter-linguistic angle. You might indicate the Semantics and suggest that this will appear in a second article.

I am sending you also Semantography Issue No. 62, an article on Semantography written by Mr. Heaney. I have the blocks of the symbols shown there and you may work out an article by showing and discussing the symbols.

I beg you not to refer to Semantography as SG. This was done by an American Magazine writer for whom I wrote the two briefs. Since I have chosen the word Semantography many mistakes have occurred as the word is a real tongue twister. Sydney J. Baker refers to it in his book "Australia Speaks" as Semantology. Others have used other words and that American magazine writer has shortened it to SG (to my consternation). My friends have urged me to adopt the word Blissymbolics, saying that to-day blind mankind write in Braille, to-morrow seeing mankind may write in Bliss. After all engineers have named their product after their own name, as for instance, Ford, Buick, Chrysler, Daimler, etc. and I am an engineer. Moreover sooner or later competitive systems will come up and then the name Bliss or Blissymbolics will come in handy to distinguish it from the others.

As you might know there are over 50 different Esperanto systems available, all under the name of Esperanto. Surely if another man invents a new symbolics he cannot very well name it Blissymbolics.

When you read the Reiser brochure please skip the Foreword or if you read it do not be disheartened. It is highly philosophical and deals actually in the main with the second part of the brochure The Science of the Electronic Brain.

Thank you for the letter from Mr. Cochrane of the University of Queens-

land. I am glad that you judge him rightly. I would suggest that you should make a personal approach to the Librarian and to the teaching staff. You might be interested to know that the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Queensland became interested in Semantography when a friend of mine, Dr. Everingham praised its application for psychology and psychiatry in the Medical Journal of Australia. The dean (I believe it was Professor Myer) asked for more information and when Dr. Everingham gave him an explanation, he wrote back that he is "too old a dog to learn new tricks". In my opinion it is the duty of the Dean to learn of new tricks in his field. If he is too old a dog he should be retired to the doghouse. This is of course, a play with metaphors and in my logic in Semantic course I show how fallacious it is to speak in metaphors. To counter a metaphor it is best to lead it to absurdity as I did with the reference to the doghouse.

With regard to supplying Dr. Mitrovich with material in which he is so interested, I do not know what to do. Almost every issue of my writing contains a reference to demagogues and dictators and to the exposure of the fallacies of communism by Semantics. The Communist propagandists lose no time to denounce semantics and an article appeared in the Communist Review in which my work was denounced as "an obscurantist's invention" in Semantics and this is "the latest charlantly of philosophical idealism". As you know Esperantists and International linguists are highly suspicious in communist countries and if some local enemies of Dr. Mitrovich finds out that he corresponds with the West and gets papers from Australia, America etc. it might be disastrous for him. I suggest that we do in reverse what people do who are trapped in the communist countries but still have relatives in the West. They urge them to stop writing to them. And I think we should stop writing to Dr. Mitrovich.

In ending my letter let me thank you again for the great interest you take in my work. When you have written your article, I shall make it an issue of my Semantography Series and it will go into important libraries here in Australia, America and elsewhere.

Hoping to hear from you soon, I am.

Yours sincerely,

C.K. Bliss

A day later I wrote :

16th February, 1956

Dear Mr. Higgins,

Today when I wanted to post my letter of 15th Febr. the postman brought me the copy of the International Language Review, which I read with the greatest of interest. I have now to revise some of what I said in the foregoing letter.

Firstly, as the Review is printed in a very primitive duplicating way, the idea of using the blocks for typesetting, showing the symbols which you will find in the green brochure No. 62 is out of the question. Instead I would have to make the drawings myself, unless Floyd Hardin is good at making drawings on stencil (not easy). If he cannot do this, I suggest that you send me your article on Blissymbolics and I would type it on stencils exactly to size as shown in the Review and put the drawings onto the stencil. I use either a Gestetner or Roneo stencil. You must ask Hardin if he would take the stencils from me and make the duplicating in Denver.

Another idea is that I type and print your article exactly to the size of the Review, make say 300 copies or more and ship them to Denver. Hardin would have to tell you how many pages he can spare and what page numbers I would have to put on the pages. Then he would simply put the pages into his next review and stitch them together and this would be a great relief to Hardin, and you and I would be sure that the article and the drawings come out as we want them to come out. I may even spare a few hundred copies of Issue No. 52, the pamphlet on Prof. Reiser's lecture, and this would be bound into the review and would give the reader a true view as to how the symbols look like when nicely printed.

Another possibility is that I would write, type, print and draw the symbols for an article of my own, and you would write an introductory article on

it to be printed before my article. Then we would ship the printed pages to Denver to be incorporated into the Review. Frankly, I would like this idea best. I know what I want to say, how to say it and how to present my work. You, in your article would introduce a fellow Australian and fellow interlinguist and say something of your impressions about my work. You may also bring a short biography about me, much in the same way as Dr. Mitrovich.

Coming to Dr. Mitrovich I see that he is an old man of 70 and may therefore not be bothered by the communists in his country. Nevertheless I do not want to write to him directly. I had already some brushes with the Communists. I refused a set of my books to the Academy of Sciences in Leningrad. They got one nevertheless via the Berlin Library in East Germany, which put an order with a London bookseller. I learned later about it. So, if you like, I would put together a number of pamphlets which you would communicate to Dr. Mitrovich.

The article by James on Soviet linguistics is terrific. Prof. Mario Pei is a pro-communist no matter how much he denies it. Some years ago a friend sent me an article from an American magazine in which Pei swooned about the linguistic theories of a great expert, guess who - Joe Stalin!

Now that I have seen the review, I think that an article of my own, introduced by an article of yours would be best, and we would take all the work and worry from Hardin in the proposed way. If you like the idea, I would supply you with a few pamphlets to be sent to Hardin. I have now acquired an American varityper and can make now much better typeset looking mimeographed papers than the ones which you have from me. And now, you did not tell me of your own work, the Journal of Communication for the Orient. Please send me a copy. I am very much interested.

Yours sincerely,

C.K. Bliss

Higgins answered :

Dear Mr. Bliss

March, 18th 1956

I am writing Floyd immediately to get his rapid approval of your suggestion that you do the actual printing of your MSS for inclusion in the "International Language Review". I would like to see your article appear in the next issue, and as progress on this has already started no time should be lost at our end. This suggestion which you favour I favour also; and I believe Floyd will welcome and approve heartily of it as it will relieve him of a big and difficult job which would take much time in the preparation.

Would something along the lines of the article enclosed meet with your acceptance as an introduction to your contribution? Perhaps I have not yet been able to view or understand the full significance and import Semantography may have on the highly specialised fields of psychology, psychiatry etc. If, therefore, you consider the article suffers by want of this please point it out - and even work a section in which will satisfy the deficiency. Also, I feel it is better if you make out a biographical sketch; this could be appended to the introduction.

It is likely - and I am following the idea up - that your articles will be gladly accepted by "La Revue Universala", now under the directorship of Tom Lang of England.

I think it is very generous of you to offer to help me towards a closer familiarity with your work by supplying certain other of your writings, when they become available. Whatever you feel ready to offer in the way of literature for distribution among my colleagues will be gratefully and eagerly accepted.

Professor Cochrane has not yet answered my second letter concerning acceptance into the University library of the Semantography Series. But as you suggest I may make a personal approach to the librarian.

In what I hope will be very quick time I will acquaint you with the results of my communication to Floyd Hardin. Meantime, I hope that you will write your further views and continue always to keep me in close touch with your work.

Cordially and sincerely,
(Sgd) John T. Higgins

Here below is the article which Higgins wrote as a Preface to my proposed article for the International Language Review.

SEMANTOGRAPHY

(A Preface by John T. Higgins)

A literal encounter with the concepts of ancient civilisation is the earliest chapter in the theoretical framework of Semantography. Mr. C.K. Bliss, author of the revolutionary work, has traversed back three hundred years and brought to fulfillment the ideals expressed by the mathematical genius Leibnitz.

Semantography is not an efflux from any constructed stem, but represents the result of a profound exploration into but partially tamed wildernesses of notions and half-understood fantasies in the field of communication.

Semantography is a refined and sage judgment on the insufficiencies and vulnerabilities to fallacy of our normal language. The appeal is that the need for, not a reduction but an entire eradication of these serious imperfections with which every one of us are familiar, be admitted. This constitutes then, acceptance of the fact that a broad and complete revision is necessary; it means even an entire reallocation of values and their representative symbols.

The solution lies, Mr. Bliss says, in the application of simple universally-known formulae, processed and transmuted into grammatical functionaries. This offers the sole positive escape from the mingled mental-verbal maze in which we find ourselves to-day.

After years of research and wide travel in many parts of the world, Mr. Bliss, who is a scientist and engineer in Sydney, Australia, succeeded in compiling such a group of formulae and expounding an idea which has received the acclaim of many eminent scholars of international repute. Professor Julian Huxley wrote of Semantography: "Semantography provides something of real importance". Bertrand Russell went even so far as to say that those who would further the knowledge of Mr. Bliss's work would "be performing an important service to mankind." Other scholars spoke in similar vein.

The formulae -- simple signs derived from mathematics, traffic, punctuation, etc. which are common to all the peoples of the world -- e.g. $x \rightarrow \curvearrowright \rightarrow$ comprise the basic structure of the system. Alone, of course, they could not cope with all the exigencies of communication. They are elements in a wider and more important discipline imbibing relevant applications of teachings from Logic, Linguistics, Semantics, Psychology, etc. On account of this, Semantography deciphers and portrays meaning with strict accuracy, leaving no room for duality of meaning. The whole system forms a unique, ingenious and accurate structural symbolism formulated on pictographic foundations which everyone, regardless of nationality, can understand easily and instantly.

Semantography deserves your attention and it deserves mine. It deserves the immediate attention of all thinking men. Not alone because its merit has won the voluntary support of reputed scholars and humanists should we devote our own intelligence to it, but we should do this simply in feeling it our bounden duty to enlist our aid in whatever prescribes to a closer advance towards ultimate international understanding.

Bliss symbolics, a renaissance of thought tailored to the exact needs of the world's population to-day, promises perhaps the most optimistic and surest answer to the problem of finding a truly global policy to match and defeat linguistic misunderstandings and indeed illiteracy itself.

I wrote to him :

Sydney, 20th March, 1956

Dear Mr. Higgins,

Many thanks for your letter which I received just now. I feel rather overwhelmed by your wonderful article about my work. Throughout the years I felt often that I shall not be understood during my life time. When I met Bertrand Russell, Huxley and others and received praise, it was balm for the many disa-

ppointments I received with other people. So, your article gives me a fine up-lift and I thank you for it.

I am glad that you agree with my idea to write and print the article in the exact size and ship it to Floyd Hardin. However, as airmail is quite expensive, I think that we should not insist that it gets into the next issue. I shall write the article very quickly and do the printing, and if it comes in time for an issue I shall be glad. But surface mail to the U.S.A. takes sometimes 2 months and more.

Now you suggested another idea that the article be incorporated also in the journal of Tom Lang. Please send me a copy or at least one page in order to enable me to lay out the size of the printing in such a way that it fits both journals. Then there is your journal of Communication for the Orient, which you did not mention and did not send me a copy. As you know I got the idea of Semantography in China, and indeed China and Chinese writing is the proof not only that an ideographic writing can work and can work beautifully, but also that it has unified many different tribes into the largest nation on earth. Sinologists are of the opinion that a European nation would have been a reality centuries ago, if Europe had an ideographic writing in which Goethe, Shakespeare, Moliere and all the others would have written their immortal works which then could have been read and understood by all Europeans in all their different languages. In short, I could fashion the article in such a way that it would fit Hardin's, Lang's and your journal, having special regard to Communication in the Orient. I would give you also printed pamphlets to be bound within your copies of your journal. In latest 2 weeks time I shall have the first pamphlet ready to be sent to librarians and I shall send you one for use in Brisbane with the librarian there. Now, I am awaiting a copy of Lang's journal (or at least one page only) and a copy of your journal, in order to be able to plan the article as to size, layout and content.

My friend and co-worker Dr. Everingham has moved from Sydney to Rockhampton and he sent me a cable 2 weeks ago requesting your address. I cabled it back and hope that you are already in touch with him. He is a great idealist and a wonderful chap. Nothing more for to-day than my best regards.

Yours faithfully,
C. K. Bliss

and received a letter with letter of "Journal of Communication for the Orient":

JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION FOR THE ORIENT
Editor John T. Higgins,
69 Cochrane Street,
Red Hill, Brisbane, Queensland
Representative at large :
The International Shorthand Review
The International Language Review
La Revue Universala
March 24, 1956

Dear Mr. Bliss,

I am bringing to Floyd's immediate notice the subject matter of your inquiries concerning space available for the Semantography article so that they may be replied to as expeditiously as possible. It should be but a matter of days now before we have some indications as to the steps you should begin, following my former communication to Floyd. In writing him last, I left open the strong likelihood that further dissertations on Semantography may be offered by you at various future times.

By ordinary mail in this same post I am sending a "La Revue Universala" which, you will observe is exactly the same in every respect of design as the International review you already have. La Revue was also the property of Floyd until very recently when he requested Tom Lang to take it over to avoid the necessity for serious delays in its publication, due to the heavy burden of work at Floyd's end. Tom agreed. I understand that Tom has altered nothing in the general appearance of the magazine, and therefore we might expect, provided Tom is acceptable to publishing the Semantography articles (I am awaiting word from him), that the same conditions will apply here as in the case of the International Language Review. If Floyd finds your proposal in regard to the actual printing of the articles satisfactory, it is almost certain Tom will do likewise.

In respect to the "Journal of Communication for the Orient" I have to bring you your first disappointment. This journal is not yet in publication. The reasons are those not unusual, I suppose, to an over-animated enthusiasm. I allowed the announcement to be made before my ideas were properly formulated and without reflecting in advance on what time I would have to devote to the undertaking. However, it is a definite future prospect, and I feel extremely grateful in the understanding that your contributions will be available when I am able to use them.

It is, strangely enough, your advertence to the incident you experienced in China, and what followed as a result of it, which has probably secured my attention most. Without being able to attach to this question any merit or privileged comment because of my but partial acquaintance with and understanding of its consequences, I can enter fully into the feeling of the great importance surrounding it. Ideographic writing I feel positively has irrefutable claims to certain prominent and important aspects within the international language ideal.

I look forward to the printed pamphlets you will be sending within a couple of weeks. Is your work already in the Public Library in Queensland?

Also I am looking forward to having a letter soon from your friend and co-worker, Dr. Everingham.

All the very best,

Cordially,

(Sgd) John T. Higgins
John T. Higgins

At last Mr. Floyd Hardin joined the correspondence with the joint letter to me and Mr. Higgins.

Floyd Hardin
P.O. Box 393
Denver 1, Colorado

United States of America
Denver, Colorado, March 25th, 1956

A joint letter to
Dr. C. K. Bliss,
Institute of Semantography
5 Maroubra Bay Road,
Pagewood, Sydney, New South Wales

Mr. John T. Higgins,
69 Cochrane Street,
Red Hill, Brisbane,
Queensland, Australia

My dear Dr. Bliss and my dear John:

I received from you yesterday, dear John, your urgent letter in which you ask me to reserve certain pages in the forthcoming issue of the International Language Review for an exposition of the system perfected by Dr. Bliss, known as Semantography. (sorry for those mis-hits upon the keyboard!)

Within the recent letters received from you, John, you have sent me copies of your correspondence with Dr. Bliss and these copies of letters I have read with considerable excitement. And yet it is amazing to note that neither in your letters to Dr. Bliss, nor in his letters to you do you give me the faintest hint as to the nature of Semantography.

I can therefore make only certain wild guesses:

(1) It is my guess that Semantography discards all ethnic and international languages as mediums of communication and presents a series of signs and symbols, white, pure and clean -- to serve as a medium of communication between all men everywhere. Accordingly, my guess is that Dr. Bliss's Semantography comes within the field of picture-writing, and is in no way connected with languages, whether ethnic or international in their scope.

(2) My second guess is this: Not only does Semantology offer a series of signs and symbols in lieu of language for purposes of human communication, but

sets up certain safeguards and warnings against the indiscriminate use of words, so profoundly dedicated to the national ideologies and so tragically active in the destruction of all humanitarian values within the world.

If my guesses No. 1 and No. 2 are right, then I can promise you that I would go overboard to make known the unique merits of Semantography, not only in the International Language Review, but through my office as Chairman of the Committee for Study and Research in Intercultural Communication, the National Society for the study of Communication.

Speaking to you somewhat privately, I begin to despair that language can ever serve as an adequate means of communication among men. In this respect I distrust language because of its sectarian commitments and its innate prejudices, from which it can never quite hope to escape.

As a medium of communication among men I am inclined to discard language as a medium fit and decent to bear the great burden of an international and world-wide understanding.

And in this respect it is both my hope and my belief that in future some genius will appear upon the scene, to offer to the world a schemata of signs and symbols, altogether outside the field of language, and which by reason of their sheer purity and newness may offer to the world a methodology of communication altogether beyond reproach.

With this thought in mind, I ask you, Dr. Bliss, to answer this letter by air mail at the earliest moment, and to send me also by air mail an elementary exposition of your Semantology.

Cordially,
(Sgd) Floyd Hardin
Floyd Hardin

A few days later Floyd Hardin wrote the following letter to me.

March 29, 1956

Dear Dr. Bliss,

I was just on the point of writing you again by air mail, when there arrived by air from Australia copies of further correspondence between John and yourself. This latest correspondence has confirmed me in the suspicion that your whole outlook upon language as a medium of human communication has much in common with my own views. In short, while we espouse an international language as a means of resolving the conflict between the ethnic tongues with the resulting chaos, we begin to suspect that language itself, of whatever type, can never be an adequate means of communication among men; we believe this because language is so surcharged with national and racial commitments (to say nothing of its emotional connotations with resulting distortions) -- that we almost despair in our hope that it may fulfill the high dreams of human communication. We therefore look with expectancy and longing to the field of ideography and picture-writing to provide us with a system of signs and symbols, altogether neutral in their representations and competent to serve as unprejudiced tools for human communication.

My whole awakening in these matters harks back to the day when I first became acquainted with the movement of general semantics and became a member of The International Society for General Semantics. Perhaps you are also a member of this international organisation. Perhaps, like myself, you are a correspondent with the editor of its Quarterly Review: ETC, a Review of General Semantics -- Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, Language Arts Division, San Francisco State College, San Francisco 27, California. Perhaps you have read Dr. Hayakawa's book: "Language in Thought and Action", and the books of other leaders in this field: by Irving J. Lee (now deceased), Stuart Chase, Wendell Johnson and others. With all of them I have had most profitable correspondence.

Like many other students of general semantics, it was my next step to join the National Society for the Study of Communication. I have recently been appointed Chairman of its Committee for Study and Research in Intercultural Communication. In a former letter I have sent you certain particulars concerning the projected work of this committee.

I somehow feel that you should adhere to this Society (NSSC) and perhaps work along with me on this Committee. The membership fee is modest (\$5. per year) -- and this includes subscription to the Journal of Communication, official quarterly organ of this Society. This also entitles you to receive the Newsletter of the NSSC. Your membership remittance may be sent to John T. Higgins, who is a member of NSSC and also a member of my Committee. (I believe that in a former letter I sent you a folder of NSSC, setting forth its ideals and its objectives)

On my Committee there are now some 25 members, consisting, for the most part of members of NSSC who are of academic status (professors of Speech, Professors of Psychology, etc.). However, while my efforts within NSSC are acclaimed, I am not myself of academic status, but a simple layman, with a dream.)

While I await your reply in which I hope to learn more about your attitudes and interests in the field of communication, I am prompted to nominate you for membership in the NSSC, with the thought that you might be a most useful member of this organization and work with me on my Committee as it studies the problems of intercultural communication. On this Committee there will be a number of sub-committees, for example: Dr. Alexander Gode (author of Interlingua,) will be Chairman of the sub-committee on Language; John T. Higgins will be Chairman of the sub-committee on communication with the Orient; Tom Lang, of England, will be Chairman of the sub-committee on the Humanities; several other members of our Committee will head certain other sub-committees, studying the problems of race, archeological discoveries, and other topics.

I am telling you this, because I want you to know that I am looking for a man who will organize a sub-committee on signs and symbols, outside the field of language. (I suspect that you may be this man, and for this reason I am writing to-day to the Executive Secretary of NSSC, Dr. Donald E. Bird, Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri, U.S.A., and I am sponsoring you for membership in this Society.

Considering now some very practical and urgent matters: Issue No. 2 of the International Language Review will be mailed out in two parts: Part 1, dealing almost entirely with Esperanto, will be in the mails about two weeks from now. Part Two of this issue will be in the mails some six weeks later. It is therefore possible that your preliminary exposition of Semantography might appear in Part Two of this forthcoming issue.

I am altogether in accord with your suggestion that the first instalment of your "Semantography" should be printed by yourself and shipped to me (on pages 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 11 inches) for binding within the International Language Review. If your "Semantography" fulfills my expectations, I could reserve for you some 8 pages (4 sheets printed on front and back) -- together with introduction by John T. Higgins. I would ask you to make your first exposition quite elementary, such as might be readily understood by students within the 8th grade of elementary schools. In later instalments you could reach the ears of scholars.

Issue No. 5 and 6 of La Revuo Universala, contains a debate covering some 48 pages of the Review, in which some 15 interlinguists participated as they discussed the subject: The Logical vs. the Naturalistic languages. (Esperanto and Ido vs. Occidental and Interlingua). I am sending you by first class mail a complete copy of this issue of La Revuo Universala. From this issue, I have extracted certain pages which I enclose with this letter: the argument of Mag. A. Z. Remstedt, together with my somewhat inadequate reply.

Please be so kind as to write me at the earliest moment by air.

Cordially,
(Sgd) Floyd Hardin
Floyd Hardin

and a letter from Higgins shown below. This letter is interesting because Higgins mentions the approach to John Metcalfe, the Principal Librarian of the Public Library of New South Wales. He is interested in International Languages, especially Basic English and has encouraged me greatly.

"I have just lately received your letter, and so too I imagine has Mr. Bliss. It is almost certain he will be writing to you without delay. I am very pleased you thought to get in touch with him at the first instance.

My guess is that you will be filled with no ordinary degree of pleasure when Bliss reveals to you the nature of his work. I thought it preferable to let him relate to you in precise terms in what his work consisted. The one immediate recognition is that Semantography follows 'to the letter' the lines of your first 'wild guess' and refutes all ethnic and international 'derived' languages as effective instruments of communication. At the same time, it points the way out of darkness for us by showing a full manifestation of the miracles inherent within the citidels of "white, pure and clean" signs and symbols. All this is, of course, in conspicuous faith with our own ideals.

Mr. John Metcalfe, Principal Librarian at the Public Library of New South Wales, wrote to me in January: "Thank you for your letter of January 18. I would like to see a sample copy of the 'International Language Review', which we might then order for the Public Library." I was unable to send Mr. Metcalfe even a sample copy of the first issue of the review as my supply had exhausted itself, but I promised him I would endeavour to obtain for him a complete copy of the next number. Would you be able to manage this sometime, Floyd? The Queensland Library also will be pleased to scan one, as I mentioned the matter to them quite some time ago. From these indications, it is very safe to assume all other Public Libraries throughout Australia will welcome the opportunity of examining the Reviews with the idea of accepting them for use by the public."

I felt now that I could address Hardin with regard to those aspects of Semantography which are dear to my heart. I sent him by airmail the following Issues of the Semantography Series No. 1, 4, 7, 15, 62, 52 and the first part of the Reiser Brochure, (issue No. 150). By surface mail I sent him the catalogue from 1 - 84, the issues Nos. 5, 6, 8, 12, 23, 134, 135 (the Briefs on Semantography), 152, 153 and 154 (my Appearance before the Director General for Education of New South Wales). I wrote to him the following long letter and sent copies to Mr. Tom Long in England and Mr. Higgins in Brisbane.

Floyd Hardin, Esq.,
Editor,
International Language Review
Post Office Box 303
DENVER 1 Colorado U.S.A.

Sydney 4th April, 1956

Copy to Mr. Higgins and a separate
copy for Tom Lang.

Dear Mr. Floyd,

Many thanks for your kind and most interesting letter of March 25 and the attached material which I have studied with the greatest interest. I am grateful for your unprejudiced attitude towards my work. This comes as a happy surprise, because in the past, I have been shunned by Esperantists and others, and the way C.K. Ogden and even I.A. Richards treated me, including Stuart Chase and other semanticists, ah yes, Hayakawa too, are bitter memories. However, I shall come through.

The fact is that too many people take a glance at my work and dismiss it as a "picture language" (how odd). Consequently, I have been plagued by professional newspapermen who are interested in any "write-up" provided it is about something odd, like man bites dog. One day there will be news: Bliss bites hack-writer.

One thing which makes me mad is the reference to my work as a picture language. Now try to picture any of the following words: The price of freedom is eternal vigilance. Every word is unpicturable. Now, you can write these words in any language and also in Esperanto, Ido, Interlingua, Interlingue, etc. etc. but if you write it down in Semantography then you or any youngster trained in the Semantics of Semantography must realise the utter ambiguity and even falsehood contained in these words. Hitler could have used them, and Stalin or any other democrat, demagog, or dictator, and everyone of them would have understood a different freedom and a different vigilance.

Or take these words: The new democratic People's Republic of Communist China. Even this word cluster is not picturable. You cannot picture all the people of China and all of China. Neither can you picture the other words. And you can write these words again in Esperanto or any other international language. But if you try to write it down in Semantography it will become as nonsensical as $3 = 1$. THAT IS THE GREAT DIFFERENCE between my work and any other system of international communication.

NOTE: the following paragraph is not included in my letter to Hardin but is directed to the reader of this issue. I do hope that Hardin, Lang and Higgins would very much be startled by my assertion in the paragraph above in which I said that you cannot write in Semantography "New democratic People's Republic of Communist China" without realising that it is a lie. I expect^{ed} that Hardin, Lang and Higgins will answer immediately and say somehow : "Please Mr. Bliss write down "The New Democratic People's Republic of Communist China" in Semantography. But they just did not ask for it. They did not bother. I continue the letter in the following paragraph .

Consequently I maintain and eminent scholars have agreed upon this, that my work is the first solution of a 300 years old mathematical problem posed by the great mathematician Leibnitz (1646 - 1716) who dreamed of a simple "Algebra of Thought" in which symbols are employed for every meaning of every language, and which system enables anyone (including children and youngsters) to find out the unknown, the variables, the ambiguities, the demagogies, the falsehoods and the truth.

Now, mathematical symbols and their operations are taught in every primary school of the world, and incidentally these symbols have the same meaning in all languages. But to say of mathematics as being an "international language" would be besides the point. Of course it is an international language, but this is only a happy by-product, though already in practical use in timetables and price-lists which go out to many countries. But mathematics is mainly and foremost a logical discipline and this is Semantography too. I hope you will take the time and study the material which I have posted to you, partly by airmail and partly by surface mail (see list at the end of this letter). I hope that you will be able to say something about my work at the Conference sponsored by the Modern Language Association on the 14th April. Therefore this airletter and the airletter with the material.

From No. 7 of Revue Universala of Tom Lang, sent to me by John Higgins, I see that you have been a fighter already in 1917 and have suffered for it. So I assume that you too are of advanced age as I am (59) and I too have been imprisoned (by the Germans in Dachau and Buchenwald, and later by the Japanese in Shanghai (though that was only in a segregation area). I salute you therefore as a friend and co-fighter and I am happy to see that you have not given up hope and that you find it worthwhile to fight on. I hope that we will join forces, together with Tom Lang and John Higgins.

I was particularly touched by your despairing words in your letter: "Speaking to you somewhat privately, I begin to despair that language can ever serve as an adequate means of communication among men. In this respect I distrust language because of its sectarian commitments, and its innate prejudices, from which it can never quite hope to escape. As a medium of communication among men, I am inclined to discard language as a medium fit and decent to bear the great burden of an international and world-wide understanding. And in this respect it is both my hope and my belief that in future some genius will appear upon the scene to offer to the world a schemata of signs and symbols, altogether outside the field of language, and which by reason of their sheer purity and newness may offer to the world, a methodology of communication altogether beyond reproach."

To these your own words I have to say that I have in fact evolved a system of signs and symbols, and if "genius" can be defined as the capacity of taking infinite pains, well, I am a sort of genius, because for the last 14 years I have stormed the citadels of learnings, the universities - until I have seen the light and have realised that apart from fighting for a better mode of communication a more important fight must be started, and I have already started it, the fight against those who actually hinder human progress - the old men in the chairs of learning, the experts who have turned down every new idea until the pioneers went down the graves as cranks, only to be exhumed, extolled and exploited 50 years or 100 years later. They, the conservative educators and their worst examples the linguists have no interest to overthrow the present system. On the contrary.

Now that you went so far to realise the shortcomings of language as to despair about them, I can talk to you freely. I can tell you of aspects of my work of which I simply do not dare to speak to other people, simply because they take language as good and natural and they do not despair about it. Consequently, they would think I am a crank when revealing my own thoughts as I am going to do now to you.

If you despair about language my friend, be of good cheer, because I have good news for you. Here is my approach as evolved in my books.

Man is the most advanced living creature on earth. If we compare man and the higher animals we find striking similarities. The machinery of their bodies work on the same principles, heart, lungs, blood system, eyes, ears and even the working of the animal and the human brain. Because animals can show their emotion and they can even reason in a high degree as we see how clever they act in overcoming the obstacles in the search for food and in building nests, and avoiding enemies. But animals evidence also highest ethics and conscience. They will care for their young ones, they will defend them against overwhelming odds. They will even sacrifice themselves in order to help a helpless young one.

What then is the difference between man and animal? There is only one great difference. Man has evolved a system of articulate language, that is abstract words for abstract meanings. And men have found a way to put these words down in writing so that later generations can learn and can go forth. This and this only is the great achievement of mankind against the animals. From the study of the relevant chapters of my books you will learn that I place the emergence of abstract meanings and words not later than about 10,000 to 15,000 years ago (and probably not much earlier, so this is difficult to say). In short, language as a human tool is so terribly young, so crude, so inefficient. It is as if we just have discovered how to make fire. It is a great blessing, but we are playing with it and we can hurt ourselves very much.

Furthermore, if a good thing is found then the rulers, the exploiters get hold of it first. We see today as in the thousands of years of human history that rulers have held men in bondage by exhorting them with words, and the lackeys of the rulers, the subservient priests and teachers have done everything to keep out the knowledge of semantics, that is, in all the schools of all the generations of man the pupils and the people have not been taught how to recognise vague and ambiguous and fallacious words used by the rulers, the kings and the conquerors, the priests and the diplomats, the demagogue and the dictators. "Language is used for the concealment of thought" said the French diplomat Talleyrand. "With words we govern men" said British Prime Minister Disraeli. And in our times we witness the greatest fraud committed on trustful humanity. In Russia, the old Czarist despotism is still in rule only on a terrifying grand scale. Millions and millions of human beings are slaughtered, deported, left to die in slave labour camps, and yet, by vague words the despots of Russia could befuddle mankind in saying that they do all this for the liberation of mankind.

Now, let us go back to the animals and let us face an incredible fact obscured by the biologists. Animals of the same species do not kill each other. 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 attack and kill a fellow-brother-wolf. **ONLY MAN KILLS MAN.** How have the biologists obscured this fact? By inventing a word: Biological warfare.

True enough, organic beings can live only on organic food. Thousands of species live on food provided by plants. Others have found that organic food from other species taste good and consequently being hungry they prey on other species. But they do not attack and kill their own kind. They will go hungry together, they will starve together, they will die together. The thought of killing and eating one of their own simply does not enter their minds. Among the same species of animals "wrote Professor Ashley Montague (who agrees with my findings) "the highest ethics is supreme law!"

In short what the biologists call "biological warfare" (the preying on other species) is a totally different biological phenomenon than "human warfare" in which man attacks his own kind, and does so, not to kill and eat his fellowman, but for other reasons. What are the reasons of human warfare? Why did in the past Christians kill Moslems, and Moslems kill Christians, and Jews kill worshippers of other gods than Jehovah, and Christians killed Jews, and Catholic Christians killed Protestant Christians, and Nazis killed Jews and Germans killed Frenchmen, and Frenchmen killed Moslems, and in recent years Communist Koreans killed Capitalist Americans, and so on, and so on, throughout the bloody history of mankind. Why?

What now comes should amaze everyone and set him thinking. You may have heard of a famous psychiatrist Dr. Brock Chisholm. He was Canadian Minister of

Health during the War, then first Director General of the World Health Organisation. Well, after the end of the second world war Chisholm gave 2 lectures in Washington on nothing less than the cause of human warfare. And what he said was so incredible that no one believed him. He said that the prime cause of human warfare is a mind perversion, a disease, an epidemic, he said, and we medical men know how to fight epidemics. The first thing is to find the bacillus which causes that mind disease which makes man turn against his own kind. And Chisholm said that the cause of human warfare is linguistic in nature, or precisely, the use of abstract meanings notably Good and Evil, Man kills his fellowman when his Fuehrer tells him that it is good to kill the other man because he is evil and harbours evil designs. Precisely the same thing has been said by the Pharaohs, and the Kings of old, by the Tamerlanes and the Djenghis Kans, the Hitlers, and the Stalins.

Of course, no one believed Chisholm though he is a world authority. Firstly Chisholm could not offer any valid proof of his theory. Secondly he could not offer any new tool for his proposed treatment of mankind. With all immodesty on my command I say that I HAVE FOUND THE PROOF AND I HAVE FOUND THE TOOL. I have found the proof in the cave paintings of paleolithic man (who lived about 30,000 to 50,000 years ago). They show warfare alright, but only warfare against animals which primitive man needed for survival. BUT NO HERE

IN ALL THE CAVES FOUND DO WE SEE A PICTURE OF MEN FIGHTING OTHER MEN. In contrast most of the records engraved in stone of the old Egyptians, Babylonians and others going back about 7000 years, we see the overwhelming recording of men going into war against other men, fighting and killing them, and the words inscribed are telling us why this was done, because the enemies were evil and harboured evil designs. The archeologists and the anthropologists have overlooked this tremendous difference simply because they were used to think that human warfare is simply another manifestation of biological warfare which it is not.

I have found the tool, a new algebra of thought, Semantography, which is the very thing which Chisholm wanted for his reeducation of mankind. It is no wonder that one of my fervent supporters and coworkers is a young psychiatrist, Dr. Douglas N. Everingham. He spoke about my work at the recent Congress of medical men in Sydney. Prof. Kluckhohn of Harvard was much impressed with my findings and commissioned an article which I wrote (Semantography Series No. 85) followed by Everingham's addition (No. 86). Everingham has used my work in his treatment in mental hospitals in Australia, because many minds are in disorder through the falsehoods perpetrated by words. Tell a boy throughout the years that he is a "failure" and in the end he may begin to believe it and give in.

You see dear Mr. Hardin, that my work goes much further than any system of an international language. Perhaps you may think that you should send copies of this letter to some of your friends. Please do so. I have posted to you by air-mail the part of Professor Reiser's lecture to the American Association for the Advancement of Science in which you will find everything about my work. Perhaps some of your friends will order a copy (\$ 2.00 incl. postage). Now, as to the article for your paper. Give me 4 pages space. I shall print the article myself (preceded by Higgins introductory article) and ship to you as many copies as you need for your Revue, and you will bind them into your revue together with 2 printed leaflets which I shall send you too. And now, I must close. With the hopes of creative collaboration, I am,

Yours sincerely,
C.K. Bliss

After posting off this letter I found that I have written the last page too hastily and that a misunderstanding may occur. I therefore, wrote the following letter :

Sydney 7th April, 1956

Dear Mr. Hardin,

After posting off my 4 page letter of April 4, on my elaboration of Chisholm's theory of the linguistic cause of human warfare, I received your letter and material of March 29 and I hasten to answer for a number of reasons.

Firstly, I compressed in my 4th page too much, being afraid to start a 5th page (which I surely would have filled to the end of the 6th page). I missed therefore a few statements in the logical sequence. Now, seeing that you do send

copies of letters to your friends, and hoping that you might send copies of my letter with the startling theory of Chisholm to some of your friends, I would be much obliged if you would put in the following sentences in order to make the story complete; Please rewrite the paragraph beginning with :

"Of course, no one believed Chisholm, though he is a world authority. Firstly, Chisholm could not offer any valid proof for his theory. Secondly he could not offer any new tool for his proposed treatment of mankind. With all the immodesty at my command I say that I HAVE FOUND THE PROOF AND I HAVE FOUND THE TOOL.

If Chisholm's theory is correct, that is, if warfare among human beings started with the emergence of abstract meanings, notably good and evil, then THERE MUST HAVE BEEN A TIME IN THE PREHISTORY OF PRIMITIVE MAN WHERE THERE WAS NO WARFARE. With this exciting idea in mind I began to study the old records of man looking for signs of the absence of human warfare. I studied the records of the Egyptians, Babylonians, Chinese, etc. etc. They all go back not more than 5000 B.C. as apparently writing was invented around this time. And those records and pictures on the walls of Babylon and Ninive, Mephis and Thebes they all told of war against the human enemies. Of course they showed also hunting scenes, war against the animals.

When I went further down into history I arrived at the oldest records of man, the paleolithic cave painting. And here I found the proof. Those cavepainting estimated to be about 30,000 to 50,000 years old show only war against the animals, which paleolithic man needed for survival. NOWHERE IN THESE CAVE PAINTINGS DO WE SEE MAN FIGHTING HIS OWN KIND. Let us realize that primeval man like the hunter of modern times liked to glorify his victories. But apparently the idea to fight and kill his own kind and glorify the victories simply did not enter the man of primeval man. Otherwise he would have depicted it. Because in contrast TO THE COMPLETE ABSENCE OF HUMAN WARFARE 50,000 years ago, we find that the records of the last 7000 years are mostly about wars and victories over human enemies.

The archeologist and anthropologists when studying the records of old have overlooked this tremendous difference simply because they were used to think that human warfare is simply a manifestation of biological warfare WHICH IT IS NOT. The idea to kill its own kind does not enter the animals mind. And it did not enter the minds of paleolithic man (as otherwise he would have depicted it). There is no other conclusion possible that HUMAN WARFARE IS ONLY A RECENT DEVELOPMENT, NOT INHERENT IN NATURE AT ALL, IN WHICH THERE IS NO WARFARE WITHIN THE SAME SPECIES.

When this exciting find got hold of me I searched frantically the books of anthropologists and archeologists. Surely they must have found the absence of human warfare. And sure enough I found a few who said so, who pointed to the absence of war in prehistoric times. But they could not find any reason and they did not try to combine human language with this fact. This has been done by Chisholm and inspired by Chisholm's idea I started the search and found the proof."

Now, please continue with the paragraph in my previous letter which starts with the words "I have found the tool ... and ends with ... give in." You may then add:

"If you want to acquaint yourself with this my work, I recommend first the study of pages 27 - 30 of Prof. Reiser's brochure "Unified Symbolism for World Understanding in Science." Here I show also how I treat the symbols for Good and Evil and lead up to Chisholm.

Furthermore I refer to the article written by me and commissioned by Harvard anthropologist Prof. Clyde Kluckhohn. This article forms No. 85 of my Semantography Series and is titled "A possible Proof and Tool for Chisholm's Theory on the cause and Prevention of Human Warfare". A sequel to this has been added by Dr. D. N. Everingham "Psycho-Semantics-Adult Emotion, and War". Furthermore, I refer to Series No. 25, "The Gap in Prehistoric History" which brings more details. The whole theme has been dealt in detail in my book III on Semantography pages 611 - 663.

Now all this may seem too phantastic to you. It did so to a few people whom I took into my confidence. Therefore let me recapitulate:

1. The idea is not mine. The greatest authority on mental diseases Dr. Brock Chisholm has brought this forward, NOT I.
2. The fact that human warfare was absent in paleolithic times has been noted by a number of archeologists and anthropologists (I have named them in my other writings) I have simply found the same, but drawn the conclusion inspired by Chisholm.
3. My conclusion has been approved by anthropologist Prof. Ashley Montague of Rutgers University and by Prof. Kluckhohn of Harvard University.

So, there are great authorities involved and I believed therefore that my discovery which gives a breathtaking hope to humanity - the abolishment of the temporary mental "kill" disease, which is not inherent in human nature, - will cause a sensation when known. Well, an article in the Christian Science Monitor of Boston "Bliss and Semantography" said just this. But no one took notice. The idea is too novel and is too contrary to present teaching. Moreover, as I have found out, professors and scholars want to propagate their own discoveries, or at least discoveries of others who are safely dead. The discovery of a man who is not a professional anthropologist or archeologist has little chance to become known.

I have therefore told you all about this, because I hope that you will tell all this to your friends and the others who are intensely interested in making language a better tool for bringing mankind together. At present - as you yourself said despairingly - language brings mankind apart.

Yours sincerely,
C.K. Bliss

I added the following letter:

Sydney 8th April, 1956

Dear Mr. Hardin,

I started to answer your letter of March 29 in detail, but came only to a further elaboration of the theme of my letter of April 4th. It is Sunday night and I shall have no opportunity to continue the letter for at least a week as I have important work to do (to earn my livelihood, important enough).

I have therefore decided to post the 2 pages concluded so far, and to write to you again in a week's time. In the meantime, you may consider the phantastic elaboration of Chisholm's theory which I propounded in my two letters. Should you want to hear more of it, after reading the relevant pages in the Reiser Brochure sent to you by airmail (pages 27 - 30) I shall gladly send you the two other publications mentioned in my second letter enclosed. Meanwhile I am,

Yours sincerely,
C.K. Bliss

Then the first grim foreboding to the usual reaction to Semantography arrived in a letter from Mr. Tom Lang :

25 Oakwood Drive,
Leeds 8, England.
4th April, 1956.

Dear John and Floyd, and Dear Mr. Bliss,

I have been pleased and most interested to have from you, John and Floyd copies of recent correspondence with Mr. Bliss.

In your letter of 25th March to Mr. Bliss and John, you hazarded some "wild guesses" about the nature and purpose of Semantography, Floyd, I too, feel excited to hear of this new science of signs and symbols, and would be most grateful to Mr. Bliss if he could send me some information to enlighten me on Semantography. I hope that it will be found possible to include an article on this subject in the INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE REVIEW, and I know that Floyd will give this idea his very favorable consideration.

I have been studying the suggestion that the article to be printed might also be included in a forthcoming issue of the quarterly review LA REVUE UNIVERSALE,

which I now edit and publish. My difficulty is this : this review is intended primarily for readers of Ido, and is published in the international language Ido. The contents include articles on current topics, stories, poems, interesting news of the international language movement, and so on. It is my aim to keep the quality of contents at a good standard, so that the review will be of cultural value while being readable and of interest to a variety of readers. Mr. Bliss's article would not, unfortunately, fit into this general pattern, as you can no doubt see, and the article would also be written in English. I am anxious that the contents of LA REVUE UNIVERSALE should be in Ido, entirely or almost so, as I know that some of its readers do not know and cannot read English, but are well acquainted with Ido.

I feel sure that you will understand the position, Mr. Bliss. There seems little doubt that the INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE REVIEW is the more suitable medium for your article, and I have no doubt that Floyd Hardin will be writing you when he has more information about Semantography and will let you know whether he can put the article in I.L.R. I hope so.

Cordially,
(Sgdn) Tom Lang

I was of course bitterly disappointed and wrote in this mood the following letter :

4th May, 1956

Dear Mr. Hardin, Dear Mr. Lang and Dear Mr. Higgins,

I hope that you have received my long letter of April 4th in which I acquainted you with my work in connection with the theory of Dr. Brock Chisholm on the cause of human warfare. A few days later (April 7th) I sent an additional letter to round up the statements of the first letter. To-day one month later, I have no acknowledgement received. I may well be that my thoughts have been all too startling to be taken seriously by you.

In the meantime, I have received your letter of April 4th, Mr. Lang and in which you stated that you cannot accept my article for two reasons, the first is, as you wrote "it is my aim to keep the quality of contents at a good standard so that the review will be of cultural value while being readable and of interest to a variety of readers" and the second reason is that my article "would be written in English and not in Ido".

Well my friends, here you have in a nutshell the difficulties which beset my work. Here are you Mr. Lang, not a teacher of language and not (as most of them are) violently opposed to language planning in general and international language in particular. You are on the contrary, a man who has devoted himself to progress in language. You haven't seen anything yet of my work. You know only that it has something to do with symbols, but only this is enough for you to declare that my article "would not unfortunately fit into the general pattern" of your "LA REVUE UNIVERSALE".

Believe me, I am not disappointed. I have experienced the same attitude thousands of times with scholars and lay men. It was enough for them to know that my work has something to do with a kind of symbol language or even worse, picture language. They declined immediately to take any interest in it.

Now you have before you my long letters about my discovery in the cave paintings of paleolithic man in conjunction with Brock Chisholm's theory on the mental perversion by abstract meanings which make man a killer of his own kind. Now distrust towards my ideas and my work may be even far greater. These ideas go far beyond the idea of a symbol writing. The readers of the International Language Review may be indeed very reluctant to take an article on these thoughts seriously in spite of the fact that great authorities, as for instance Professor Kluckhohn of Harvard and Professor Ashley Montague of Rutgers University agree with my find. However, I have no intention to mention anything of these ideas in my proposed article for your Journal and I have revealed them to you only because you, dear Mr. Hardin, have found such fine words about your distrust of language as we know it, a tool of mankind not to unite but to divide mankind in strife and even war. Before I come to the content of my proposed article I wish to refer to your last letter dear Mr. Hardin, in which you did me a great honour in inviting me to join a Committee on Communication.

I thank you very much for your confidence in the scientific value of my work,

but I feel I shall not make good company with all the professional scholars who are united in this undertaking on communication. The fact is that I have approached most of the important people working in the field of semantics and communication and have found the attitude described above, namely refusal to take any interest in my work. This applies to Stuart Chase, Hayakawa and the others. I have approached thousands of teachers and professors and I enclose my Leaflet No. 157 which I have now prepared to be sent to over one thousand and fifty colleges and universities in the Anglo-American countries. For fourteen years I have made incessant approaches to the men whose duty is to take an interest in language planning, that is to the teachers and professors of language and linguistics. I have come to the conclusion that the greatest obstacle to the introduction of an international language are the teachers and professors of language themselves. In the past, men like Jespersen and Couturat were the exception. The rule was and still is that language teachers all over the world would not hear about an international language.

Just ask yourself the following question: Who are the men who can introduce the teaching of an international medium of communication in the schools? Are they the garbage men or the milkmen? Are they the men in the streets, or are they the men in the chairs of linguistics? If the teachers of language would be willing to come together and to create together an international language (taking the best from the existing proposals), it would be easy for them to introduce classes in all schools of the world. Only teachers, headmasters and educational authorities in linguistics can introduce such classes. They and they alone, not the milkmen, not the garbage men. As you very well know from the history of the international language movement during the last 70 years, the educational authorities have opposed any such idea. They are the greatest obstacle. They must be fought.

Now, I see from your papers that you have hopes in Unesco. I have approached Professors who are members of Unesco since the inception of Unesco in 1945. I have a big pile of letters from every Director-General of Unesco, beginning with Julian Huxley, Torres-Bodet up to Dr. Luther Evans. Julian Huxley told me that he had a serious talk with Luther Evans, the present Director General. He urged him that Unesco should help publication of my work. But Luther Evans refused, just as the others have refused in the past. When I asked Luther Evans to grant me at least some space in the Unesco Courier so that educators should learn that such a system exist - he refused even this, declaring that the Unesco Courier deals only with projects of Unesco.

You might know that the inventor of Interglossa, Professor Lancelot Hogben said in his book "From Cave Painting to Comic Strip", a study of the history of language and writing, that "Unesco has become a comic synonym for Fiasco". As for Semantography, Hogben wrote in a personal letter that my work is "fascinating" and "I think the views of Bliss are stimulating, ingenious and worthy of a wide public among interlinguists". This might refer to your Revue Universala, dear Mr. Lang. (By the way, I have received a copy of the Revue Universala with articles in English).

All those approaches made thousands of times through 14 long years have convinced me that there is only one thing to do, that is to fight the teachers of language as the real obstacle to any progress in human communication and fight I will, fight to the death, that is to my last breath. I feel sure that my fight will be taken up when I am not here any more.

I am preparing my own journal "Semantic Pioneer" which will have 4 aims:

- (1) To expose the greatest fraud put over trustful humanity - the fraud with words.
- (2) To expose the teachers of language who oppose any improvement in human communication.
- (3) To expose the educators in general who bring up mankind; who teach us how to lie, how to deceive, how to go to war and kill for the only true fatherland, religion or other sacred "principles"
- (4) To expose the shameful treatment meted out by the conservative experts to mankind's best sons, the pioneers of new ideas. They are driven into debt, despair and death, only to be afterwards exhumed, extolled and exploited by the next generation of teachers.

In short, dear Mr. Hardin, I am resolved to become a scholarly outlaw, a

man with whom no professional linguist would like to be linked up with. And this means that I am totally unfit to become a worthy member in any of the committees on communication.

Now to the proposed article for your International Language Review. I have given much thought to what I should write and I have feared that the reaction of your readers will be similar to the reaction of you dear Mr. Lang. As soon as they think they are going to see some curious symbols, they will turn the pages.

For this reason, and as I am very much interested to catch the interest of your readers, I want to make a completely different approach. I want to lead up the readers to the possibility of a new way of communication which could overcome the present difficulties, even in international languages. And I would like to show this in a way which is now much in vogue in the United States. It is the old method of Plutarch, namely to give information about a work by giving a biographical sketch of the inventor showing how his experiences in life and language lead him to create his novel idea.

Now the difference between me and you and many other people interested in the international language movement is this: whereas you love linguistics and language and are most interested in all this, I hate language. I hated it since my early boyhood. I was good in the natural sciences, but I was worst in language and linguistics. I loved the regular laws of nature and hated the irregular laws of language - grammar. Although I lived in a country where six different languages were spoken, I refused to acquire any other one except my mother tongue. I saw the misunderstandings caused by language, even when the bickering nagging and attacking was done in the same language. Later on I realised that language is used to pronounce lies and to do so against the better judgment of the liar. I saw how language is used to bring people apart and my hatred against language has deepened over the years. Only a man who abhors the abuses of language could have produced semantography.

My idea is, therefore, to write an article in which I would show my experiences in many a country (including China) and then lead the interlinguistic reader gently to the possibility of a completely different mode of communication which could overcome the obstacles which are inherent in the different languages, including international languages. I propose, therefore, to give my article the title "A Life against Language".

But now, after receiving your letter, dear Mr. Lang I am not sure whether you dear Mr. Hardin would like to bring my article at all. So let me know what you think about it all.

Meanwhile I am,

Yours sincerely,
C.K. Bliss

The reader's attention is drawn to the last paragraph of the above letter in which I put a direct question to Mr. Hardin whether he would like to bring an article on Semantography. In the following letter Mr. Hardin postponed the answer to this question and consoled me with the words that an article of mine will be included in a future issue. He did not say "near future" and a future issue might mean really an indefinite span of time. The incredible fact, however is that Hardin at the same time corresponded with Dr. Everingham who proposed to write an article about Semantography and Hardin accepted Everingham's proposal. Here is the letter which Hardin wrote.

May 12, 1956

Dear Mr. Bliss,

Your last letter has caused me concern and I therefore put aside much urgent correspondence to write you and assure you that it is our confident purpose to include your article on Semantography in a future issue of the International Language Review. As a matter of fact, I am profoundly interested in your studies; and when you write me and say that in the last analysis you hate language, then I am interested all the more.

I am far behind in my correspondence, and by this I mean that I consider my most important and urgent correspondence. My recent trip to New York City, of course, made my present situation even more difficult. Immediately upon my re-

turn, we have been working day and night to get out the current issue of the International Language Review. This we completed two days ago. I have sent you by first class mail a copy of this current issue (some 60 pages) and from this issue I have abstracted certain pages which give an account of the recent Conference on Constructed Languages in New York City, which I attended on April 14 and 15. These pages I include in this air mail letter.

Please take heart and please do not be discouraged. Entering into the very substance of my own personal idealism and devotion is the thought of men like you, ---more precious than gold.

Please believe in me and always think of me as one who has a sincere belief in your strivings.

Cordially,
(Sgd) Floyd Hardin

Hardin sent copies of his letter to me to Higgins and he himself was in close touch with Everingham. Following the letter of Hardin, Higgins wrote the following letter. I wish to draw again the attention of the reader to the fact that Higgins said that my discoveries are above his head. Hardin went one better and made no reference at all to the long letters in which I disclosed to him my ideas about Pre-Historic Man. Here is Higgins letter written as always in excellent English.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

May 23, 1956

It is an unfortunate circumstance that so many businesses should prevail at the time of receipt of your communications. I try to keep as true as possible to order, so I had to answer some other letters before yours. I am sorry for keeping you waiting.

Your fears in regard to being improperly understood on the question of your Semantography are quite natural in view of the unhappy experiences you have known over the years. I beg you, however, to accept my assurances on their full value that the implications contained in your discoveries have not escaped my comprehension because they in part are 'above my head'. Please bear in mind when reviewing Floyd's and my reactions that we have not the grounding capacitating us to bring more than a layman's acknowledgement of the truths that lie there. We must be given a chance; we must be taken and led to where we can see more clearly what it is all about.

But despite this the circumstance is not altered that the spirit in which we come to your work is one of perfect sincerity in complete compatibility with its startling revelations, which are made immediately evident by even a summarised exposition.

Speaking for myself, I am pleased - intensely pleased, that you have reposed your confidence in me, and I want to leave with you the guarantee that, if I can help it, this confidence will not be broken.

You bear witness already to the firm belief, you have in Floyd's good intention; and no doubt other communications have further strengthened this in the meantime.

The long letter of 4th May you sent to Hardin, Lang and myself I have scrutinised carefully, noting with a feeling of disappointment, - and I may say, a slight dismay - your statement on joining the National Society for the Study of Communication. I cannot entirely agree that this is for the best, though seeing clearly the origin of your decisions. Perhaps we may not altogether be deprived of your service, and shall have the benefit of your information as an external party to discussions.

Until time allows me a longer discussion with you on Semantography, I wish you every success.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd) John T. Higgins.

The least I hoped was that Hardin and Higgins (if not Lang) would take the time to study my long letters about Pre-historic Man and would comment on them

but though my letter was written on the 4th April and sent by airmail, the months passed and neither Higgins nor Hardin made any reference that they studied my theories. In disgust and dismay, I did not write to them. I received a copy of a letter which Mr. Higgins wrote on a Mr. ten Seldam of Cambridge, England in which he referred to my work as follows :

No, Safo was not in my mind in mentioning that word-picture language. There is a Mr. C. K. Bliss living in Sydney, Australia who has invented a system which promises possibilities, and which plumbs greater depths than Safo. "Bliss-symbolics", which is one name for this new language, is a blend of Semantics with the symbolic to form a foolproof communicative methodology. The larger share of his life Bliss has spent on this work, but a casual appraisal would not be sufficient to convince of its true worth. For indeed, it is a work of great consequence and genius, and should in my opinion be accorded an energetic study by all serious-thinking individuals who are intent upon factual representation of ideas and the overthrow of delusive idiom and falsified language 'twists'. A section of a future "International Language Review" (Floyd Hardin) will be devoted to an account of Blissymbolics, but if you wish I shall be glad to refer to you immediately further information concerning the discovery and its author, Mr. C. K. Bliss.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely,
John T. Higgins.

I had to answer somehow and so I wrote :

16th July, 1956

Dear Mr. Higgins,

To-day I give you only my thanks for the letters you have written. I am re-organising my business in order to have more time for Semantography and this at present leaves me no time at all to do anything about it.

Thank you for whatever you are doing for my work. I shall write to you and Mr. Hardin when I find the proper time.

Yours sincerely,
C. K. Bliss

Re-reading the above letter in the light of later disclosure, I realised that Higgins knew already that not my article on Semantography, but Everingham's article will be published. I referred the reader to the last lines of the above letter in which Hardin states that a section of a future International Review will be devoted to an account of Blissymbolics. He could have equally well written that Mr. Bliss will write this article. However, as said before, I was not aware of the goings on behind the scenes.

Then I received a copy of the World Literacy News Letter which is issued by the Committee of World Literacy and Christian Literature conducted by Dr. Laubach. I have contacted Dr. Laubach five years ago with dismal result (See Semantography Series No. 34). Higgins wrote :

July 21, 1956

Dear Mr. Bliss,

I could not help notice a similarity between the fundamental views of Dr. Frank Laubach and yourself. I have been reading about Dr. Laubach who has 50 million language pupils throughout the world.

He is an ageing educational missionary who has been travelling into the remotest regions for the greater part of his life, teaching the world's illiterates to read and write. To do it he has had help of course -- a specially-trained artist to draw 'special' alphabetical signs for use in changing circumstances (for instance, to me signs will be more suitable in the teaching of illiterates in some corner of Africa, while different ones would be more satisfactory if not essential in instructing illiterates of Arabia.)

I cannot explain much in this letter, but am sending a Newsletter posted to me regularly from Dr. Laubach's 'headquarters' in America. From that you will

be able to learn something more. A belief of Dr. Laubach's is :

"Since to-day's biggest conflict is a war of ideas, it is not enough merely to teach people to read. We must provide reading matter which will help them to help themselves and will increase their understanding of what freedom means."

Thank you for your July 16th letter. I have noted the contents and sent a copy to Floyd Hardin.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd) John T. Higgins

I was still smarting under the complete silence of Higgins and Hardin about my long letters of April and therefore did not answer. In the meantime I was busy because Everingham submitted to me an article for correction without telling me the name of the Journal to which he intends to have the article published. I could have thought of any of the millions of Journals but surely not of Hardin Review because it was I who told Hardin ^{that} I write an article. Yet it was exactly an article for Harding Review which Everingham wrote and submitted to me without telling me that it is for Hardin.

At last I answered Higgins and included in the following letter a copy of Semantography Series No. 34, my letter to Laubach. My letter to Higgins runs as follows :

Sydney 4 Sept. 1956

Dear Mr. Higgins,

At last my business leaves me the time to thank you for your letter with the reference to Dr. Laubach the famous missionary on literacy. In answer to your letter I include here my mimeographed letter which I wrote five years ago, at the occasion of Laubach visiting Sydney. I pleaded with him to grant me an interview. He refused. I hoped that he will acquire some of my writings. He refused. And the result was less than nil, a bitter feeling of frustration. Your letter has broken open an old wound.

Now, why did Laubach refuse to get interested in my work. And for that matter why did Tom Lang refuse to take an article on my work, and why did Floyd Hardin not answer to my offer that I shall write an article on how I came to invent Semantography, and why did the Esperantists of Sydney grant me the distinction of ignoring all my approaches to them by simply not answering my letters at all? Why indeed? By this time you must have convinced yourself that I am not rude in my letters, that I make submissive approaches and plead for my work. Why then the reaction of Laubach, Lang, Hardin and the rest? The answer is given in a German proverb which says: "es passt ihnen nicht in den Kran", which means "it fits not into their merchandise". And indeed Semantography does not fit into Laubach's efforts to give the natives thousands of alphabets for thousands of languages. It does not fit into Lang's efforts who want to support and foster Ido, and it does not fit into Hardin's effort, who wants to support an international language. Instead, Semantography is based on the fact that an international language will not come about, because people in different parts of the world (and this means also the different parts of Great Britain) just speak different dialects and languages.

If all the people in the world would suddenly start to speak Esperanto only, within 20 years we would have different dialects in Esperanto, different pronunciation and different spellings introduced by the linguists of various countries who want to do one better. Look what the Norwegians have done in deliberately changing their writing away from the Swedish, though they should think of some unification.

Semantography instead offers an interlinguistic medium which people can use in any of their many mothertongues. And because of this, it makes all the efforts of Laubach, Lang and Hardin obsolete, and because of that it simply does not fit into their merchandise. And because of that I have finished with Lang and I shall finish with Hardin in one last letter, which I am going to write. As to you, tell me about your work. Dr. Everingham wrote to me that you are working on a Brisbane paper. Is this true? As you know I want to come out with a magazine highly controversial "Semantic Pioneer". Maybe you would like to co-operate. Meanwhile I am,

Yours sincerely, C.K. Bliss

Then the bomb exploded. I received definite proof that Hardin has postponed my article and accepted Everingham's article instead. Before posting my letter shown above of September 4th, I received the following letter from Higgins. Higgins wrote :

September 3, 1956

Dear Mr. Bliss,

If you have heard from Floyd Hardin lately, this will probably be in part superfluous. If you have not, then I am very anxious that you should receive this.

Delays of one sort or another have been prevailing all round because of the immense amount to be done by the few of us. Delays in correspondence are most serious and they are presenting me, for one, with real difficulties. Some interlinguists, and others who are interested in the international Language Movement, I suspect, feel that they are being shabbily treated when long periods, without word from me intervene. Without exaggeration, this almost shatters me, and I am deeply saddened to think that it should be thus. Yet, there seems not a thing I can do about it.

But, instead of going further into that, which seems futile, let me make the declaration that I intended this letter for. Floyd Harding wrote as follows to Professor John R. TeWinkel, 4 Sanderson Avenue, Northampton, Mass, U.S.A. on July 27.

"Yes, I know Dr. C. K. Bliss and have recently been in correspondence with him. He has sent me much material about his system and I hold his views in high regard. John T. Higgins and Tom Lang also correspond with Dr. Bliss. Dr. Bliss is writing an article about Semantography for some future issue of the International Language Review. In the meantime, I have a splendid article on Semantography written by Dr. Douglas N. Everingham, P.O. Box 328, 21 East Street, Rockhampton Queensland, Australia"

In an advance sheet setting out articles which will appear in an issue of The International Language Review of the near future, is this : "The Semantography of Charles K. Bliss of Australia (article in English) by Dr. Douglas N. Everingham."

I thought this would please you, so wrote immediately in case you were unaware of the fact. All this information is sent to me, and I consider it rather important that you and others who are backing Floyd's efforts and exhibiting interest in the International Language Movement from Australia should be also fully informed, particularly in a case like this where you in particular are concerned.

I feel myself responsible for keeping the Australian IL-ists and supporters of Floyd's efforts up-to-date on events. Where this is not done, disappointments and even misunderstandings are sure to arise; and indeed, just recently we have had an experience of this.

I am hopeful tonight of being able to reproduce copies of an interesting circular and an "Urgent Message" which Floyd explains he is sending far-and-wide, among the world's interlinguists. No explanation of these is needed now, but again I am assuming that he has not directed either of these to you.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd) John T. Higgins

Enraged, I wrote to Higgins enclosing my letter of September 4th shown above.

Sydney 6th September, 1956

Dear Mr. Higgins,

Your letter of Sept. 3 just received in time to hold back the enclosed letter. On reading your letter I am sending you, however, the letter written before the arrival of yours. It seems to me a good example of what you describe in your letter; the shattering effect of the thoughts that interlinguists think they are shabbily treated by you and your friends.

However, it is different in my case. Believe me, I have no grudge against

you. I admire you and your brilliant style and think it should be diverted to a purpose where it would do more good to your cause. In short, I think that this intercorrespondence between interlinguists will not lead to the acceptance of an international language. This acceptance can only come about by the educational authorities. They must be attacked. They must be harangued. They must be exposed as the real obstacles. Instead you and Hardin and Lang are wasting their time with correspondence among impotent interlinguists who can do nothing.

Now to Hardin. I have written to him and have asked him whether or not he wants me to write an article A Life against Language, in which I would show to interlinguists that I had to go through Esperanto and pass over it, because it would not work, and why we must turn to an interlinguistic script like mine. Did Hardin say: "Go ahead, write the article, I shall print it out in my journal?" He did nothing of the sort. Lang refused outright to bring an article on Semantography. Hardin went one better. He just did not say anything, though he referred to my letter in a few "well-meant" phrases.

And now to my amazement I read that Hardin is going to bring out an article about my work by Dr. Everingham. Dr. Everingham is my friend and he wants to help me and has written a number of letters to editors and an article in The Rationalist. But why should I not write an article about my work? Who the devil is more competent?

Now here is an incredible phenomenon, one which I have fought over with journalists in Australia, America and elsewhere. Everyone wants to write an article about my work, but he does not want to let me write an article about my work. I do not want to write at length about this phenomenon. It happens to everyone who is food for a journalist. And I have found that any journalist who wrote an article about my work simply hasn't had the knowledge to write the article as it should be written in my opinion.

Dr. Everingham did not tell me that he is preparing an article for Hardin's journal. He did send me an article a few days ago, but he did not tell me for which paper it is for. If it is for the I.L.R. well, I say frankly that it is not good and will not fulfil its purpose. An article which interlinguists should read and be convinced must be written from quite a different angle than the one which Everingham assumes. In order to enable you to find out whether the article at hand is the one which Everingham sent to me, I inform you that Everingham deals at length with my symbol for poetry and metaphor, something which would be excellent material for the interlinguists to ridicule my whole effort.

Now, dear Mr. Higgins, I wish I could see you face to face and let you understand that I am a jolly good fellow, who above all, likes to tell laughable stories and jokes, and one who wants to live at peace with the whole world. But you are in Brisbane. You cannot see the mountain of work underneath which I am buried.

Rethinking the amount of work I have already put in writing letters to you and Hardin and Lang, I curse Sydney J. Baker for having drawn me into this. I have approached hundreds of linguists and interlinguists - it is of no use whatever. I have lost enough time and money and effort to realize that it will bring my work nowhere. And for this reason, I shall do what I said in my previous letter in the closed envelope: I shall write a last letter to Hardin. If Everingham, or you or any other man wants to write articles about my work, I shall be grateful for all such efforts, but I must keep the little time I have free for what I want to do.

And this is what I want to do. I have written already about this to you and Hardin. I want to come out with a highly controversial journal Semantic Pioneer, attacking the great and lofty words of all the great and lofty men, our educators, our teachers, preachers and leechers (whoever they are) and proving to the reader that they are the real obstacles to any improvement. Well, this is all highly dangerous, and as you are on a paper, you might be embarrassed by your connection with me. This is also the reason why I said to Hardin that my presence on any of his committees will embarrass him.

And now one last blast. You wrote with regard to my discoveries in paleolithic caves that all this is just "above your head". But Hardin did one better. He ignored it, and made no reference to all this. He did not write about it at all. What does it mean? It means that neither Hardin, nor you have read the 6 pages in which Prof. Reiser writes about my Semantics and my discovery. And

you had all this months before I wrote my special letter. Hardin did one better again. In his report of the session with the Modern Language Association he referred to my work under the name of Semantology. What does this mean? It means that Hardin has not taken the trouble to read the material I sent to him. Had he read only a few pages, he could never, never, never imagine that the name is Semantology. Indeed the word Semantography indicates clearly that it is only a script. And here is another proof. I did send to you and Hardin my latest leaflet No. 157 in which I said a few words especially with reference to Esperanto. I said there that you can write anything in Esperanto as for instance: "The New Democratic People's Republic of Communist China". But if you write it in Semantography it becomes as non-sensical as $1 = 3$. Now, either this statement is a lie and a shameful boast, or if it is true, it indicates the greatest achievement in language. In sending this leaflet to you I expected your incredulous query: "How Mr. Bliss? Please write that statement down in Semantography!" But neither you nor Hardin asked for any demonstration of that my incredible boast. It means only one thing. You and he has not read through my leaflet, 2 small pages only.

And so I beg you to understand the state of mind I am finding myself in. If I continue such futile correspondence with you with Hardin and other people I shall go to pieces. I want to go on with my work. I want to come out with my journal. Yesterday I entered into my sixtieth year. I have not much time left.

So, please be thanked for whatever you and Hardin send to me. I shall be extremely grateful. I shall be happy if Everingham or you or anyone else writes about my work. I shall be happy if Hardin prints it. I shall incorporate everything into my Semantography Series - BUT I CAN'T GO ON WITH CORRESPONDENCES WHICH WILL BRING NO RESULTS! There is only one way open for me: TO ATTACK THE KEEPERS OF LANGUAGES, TO ATTACK THE TEACHERS, THE PREACHERS AND THE LEECHERS. TO SHOW TO THE COMMON MAN THAT THE LEADERS OF MANKIND ARE MANKIND'S WORST OBSTACLE TO PROGRESS THAT THE PIONEERS OF EVERY NEW IDEA HAVE BEEN DRIVEN INTO DESPAIR AND INTO DEATH BY THE MEN WHO SUPPOSE TO CARE FOR PROGRESS, WHO ARE INDEED PAID THE PEOPLE'S MONEY TO FOSTER PIONEERING IDEAS. TO HELL WITH THEM. AND WE HAVE NO TIME TO LOSE. THE COMMUNISTS ARE USING VAGUE AND AMBIGUOUS LANGUAGE TO BEFUDDLE MANKIND! SOON THEY WILL ENGULF THE WHOLE EARTH.

This I want to do, and for this I want to live. Anything which hinders me in this endeavour makes me somehow frantic. I beg you to realize the state of mind in which I find myself in. I simply have no time for the international language review. I consider all this as futile efforts.

I wish I could see you personally, if I have hurt you, please accept my apology. I want that you should understand me.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd) C.K. Bliss

P.S. Please read the enclosed letter to Laubach carefully. Note the pleading tone of my words and realize that the contrast to the wild words used above have been brought about by many hundreds of similar approaches as that to Laubach. Approaches in which I include Hardin too.

A day later I wrote :

Sydney 7th September, 1956

Dear Mr. Higgins,

Another night has passed and I have again tossed the letters I wrote to you in my head. I am now sending this letter off by airmail hoping that it will reach you before the two others. I wish again to state that I did not mind the intervals of your writing. Here are my grievances :

1. Lang rejected the idea of an article even before he has seen it. That is enough for anyone to condemn him.
2. But Hardin did exactly the same. Worse even, he clad his disinterestedness in a few meaningless phrases. I like then Lang's frank rejection more than Hardin's subtle one.
3. I have sent you both Prof. Reiser's brochure on my work. There are only 6 pages in which Reiser speaks of my Semantics and my discovery. Easy to read, and moreover it contains the quintessence of the difference between all inter-

national languages and my work.

But you did not read these 6 pages, and Hardin did likewise. I waited for months for any sign that you have read these 6 pages.

4. When no sign came, I wrote a special long letter dealing exactly with my discovery. But more than 3 months passed without any comment. Then your comment came: "its above your head" which it cannot be, because it is simple and told in simple language - if only you would have taken the time to read it, and think about it. But you did not.

5. Neither did Hardin. He made no relevant reference to my long letter. He treated it as if it were the confused writing of a confused man. No need to study it, to think of it and to make any reference to it in his letter to me. The less said the better. Better say nothing at all.

6. And now comes the news that he is taking an article on my work by Everingham. And I know that Everingham cannot present my work as it should be presented to a circle of interlinguists.

Well, I suppose this is all and this is enough. Enough for me to stop hoping that any good will come out from the International Language Review. I have little time left. I may be dead to-morrow. I am in my sixtieth year. And I must avoid such disappointments and frustrations.

Just think about this all and think what you would have done. Read also the letter to Laubach, and realize that it is in the main the same pleading which I have put into my first letters to you, to Lang and to Hardin. Enough is enough.

I give you this advice: Get away from the I.L.R. Start something of your own. Correspondence with interlinguists will lead nowhere.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd) C.K. Bliss

Another day later I wrote :

8th September, 1956

Dear Mr. Higgins,

Another night gone, tossing around and thinking how much I must have annoyed and dismayed you, but I just could not help it. I hope that my violent letters will make you realize how much dismayed I have been by

Lang's explicit and Hardin's implicit refusal to take an article on my work written by me!

Your explicit and Hardin's implicit refusal to take the reading and thinking time to digest my letter about my discovery and the 6 pages in Prof. Reiser's brochure. You said that "it is above my head". It can't be. It's simple. Just a little time is needed.

I suppose the lid blew up when I read that Everingham has written an article for the I.L.R. without my knowledge and Hardin has accepted it without my knowledge.

I hope you will understand and forgive. Kindly excuse whatever annoyance I may have caused to you.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd) C.K. Bliss

I felt it then necessary to write to Everingham the following letter.

Sydney 10th September, 1956

Dear Douglas,

I feel it necessary to write to you. You know how much I appreciate all your work for Semantography, and how much happy I am seeing that you know so much about the system. Indeed, you are the only person in the whole world who knows about my system and its merits and demerits. A few years ago, when you stayed a few days in my home I told you that it is a wonderful feeling for me to know that at least one young man lives in this world who can carry on my work when I am gone. Because I have entered my sixtieth year and there is a

sense of urgency to put my house in order. I do not believe that I shall see any practical results during my life time. I am glad to know that you will carry on.

However, as you will remember, years ago I had not this feeling of resignation. On the contrary, I felt that if only I keep bothering the important people I shall see success in the end. And one of my other beliefs was that if only I could get as many articles into papers and journals informing the world about my work, attention will be drawn to it and success will come.

As you are one generation younger than I, it is only natural that you should still believe in the ultimate success through articles, and therefore it is only natural that you should go on writing such articles. It was very nice of you to send me your draft and to incorporate my suggestions. Why should I discourage you? Why should I tell you that your article in The Rationalist or your letter to the Medical Journal, or your letter to the Herald (you wrote a number of them) had no effect whatever. On the contrary, they caused me a lot of time, work and even money, answering letters of people who forgot to send any money, and did not send it at all, or to see how the Herald writer confused my symbols, or how the Rationalist editor ignored my letters, material, etc. Nevertheless, I took every opportunity and left no enquiry unanswered. When I told you about the ineffectiveness of all your efforts you said that it is a kind of "softening up" process and you admitted that it might take many years, until the public is softened up sufficiently. But who is the public?

The foregoing paragraph is written to offset your dismay when you read in my last letter that I do not want any advertisement in that journal for hospitals which carried an article on colour symbols. I also deprecated the effect of an ad in the international Language Review, because it will again lead nowhere, except to a lot of time for futile correspondence. The fact is that I am one step further than you, realizing that it is not the public which needs softening up, but the masters of the public, the educators. They can introduce Semantography into the schools tomorrow if only they want to introduce a new idea in education. But they do not want it. And they have stalled the introduction of new ideas for centuries and have driven the pioneers of new ideas into death. They closed down the private schools of Pestalozzi, they closed down the private kindergartens of Froebel, etc. etc.

For this reason, I have long ago realized that articles in papers will lead nowhere. I concentrated therefore on the educational authorities, Unesco and the others. Last year I demonstrated Semantography before the Committee set up by the Minister of Education and presided by the Director General of Education. The effect was again nil. They refused my small request to allow me a demonstration and discussion of my work before an experimental class of teachers (not children) in the Teachers College. They even refused to buy my books for their reference library.

Now, I concentrate my efforts to get as many books as possible into important libraries. Recently the University of Johannesburg bought the 3 books, following a propaganda campaign of mine. Now there are books in all 5 continents. 5 great libraries in Asia have my books and even the Russians (whom I did not want to send the books, and returned the order) have succeeded by a trick (ordering from East Germany through a London Bookseller, who informed me later that the books went to the Deutsche Austauschstelle in the Russian occupied zone (Deutsche Austauschstelle means German Exchangeoffice); well even the Russians have succeeded by this trick to get my books. At present Claire has again pasted 1250 addresses of the most important colleges and libraries onto envelopes and a new campaign will go out within a few weeks. Believe, me, I am busy all the time. At the same time, I am working on my idea of a controversial journal to "soften up" the public against their masters, the educators.

Nevertheless I leave no opportunity unused whenever it arises. And about half a year ago, Mr. Higgins of Brisbane learned of my work through the hack writer Sydney J. Baker, Author of the Australian Language. I say hackwriter, because I have learned so much of him to say that he is one of the kind of journalists whom we should despise. Well, in the course of the correspondence with Higgins and later with Hardin, the idea came up of me writing an article on Semantography for the International Language Review. I went even so far to suggest that I not only write the article but also print the relevant pages, and send them off to Denver where Floyd Hardin would have nothing else to do than to fold them into the other pages printed by him and stitch the issues together.

And now phantastic things began to happen.

Firstly, Tom Lang who by that time had not seen anything of Semantography wrote to me declining the idea for the Revue Internationale. Imagine - he hasn't seen anything of my work, he has not seen anything of my style of writing, and imagine him saying that he cannot lower the standard of his paper. Just that. I am sure you will understand my dismay, not about not writing an article, but dismissing something which you have not seen at all. However, it gave me an idea how fervent adherents of an international language would react towards the idea of an international script, which is based on the fact that the mother tongue is strong.

I then wrote to Hardin saying that I think it best to write an introductory article in which I want to "soften up" the fervent adherent of the different international languages to make them realize that after all, an international script would not be a bad idea, considering the fact that nearly 70 years of promotion of an international language has brought no result whatever. Mr. Higgins wrote an introduction to my article, and I waited for Hardin's saying: "Go ahead, write the article, send the printed pages off to me for say 200 copies, etc. etc."

But the incredible thing happened. Hardin kept mum. Not a word in his letter about my proposed article, not a word. The idea was apparently dead. That again was an even more bitter blow than the rejection by Lang. But I had to take it.

Up to a few days ago, I did not know that you are in touch with Higgins and Hardin. I got an incling however, when you suggested in your last letter that you would pay for an ad in the International Language Review. I told you to go ahead. I shall reimburse you from the proceeds, asked you to indicate that not less than 10 s. must be sent in for literature, etc. etc.

A few days later, I received a letter from Higgins from which I learned that Hardin has accepted an article from you. Apparently he must have seen the article already. I don't know. Apparently it is the article which you submitted to me a few weeks ago. Now you did not know of Lang and Hardin's rejection of me writing an article. Neither did I know for which journal the article is intended to, which you wrote. I did not ask you. I hope that you understand that I am quite upset and unhappy. Why Hardin treated me in this way (not to speak of Lang) I don't know. Maybe he thinks of me as a confused man. Hardin and Higgins received both the Reiser brochure, and there are, as you know, a few pages there about the implication of my symbols for good and evil, the theory of Chisholm, etc. etc. When Hardin did not write about it in any of his letters, I wrote a special letter to all three drawing attention to this special aspect of my work. Lang did not answer, Hardin made no mention whatever, and Higgins wrote that "it is above his head". I think they did not take the time to think about it.

Personally, I do not think that the article which you sent to me is adapted for the needs of Interlinguists. I feel that your dealing with my innocent flights of fancy, the symbols for poetry and birth will rather strengthen the interlinguists, against my idea. But I shall not restrain you to write articles, because as an American writer told me once, even an article which has a bad effect for a cause is publicity in the end. However, I have realized that the little time I have left would be wasted going on with the International Language Review. I wish I could convince you of my new work, my journal Semantic Pioneer. I must devote every minute I still have for this idea. And you, dear Douglas, write as many articles as you want. You know I am very grateful for this. But I feel I have to inform you of the turn of events in my relation to Hardin.

Yours sincerely,
Karl

Meanwhile Higgins got enraged about my letter and wrote :

September 11, 1956

Dear Mr. Bliss,

Thank you for being frank. I like frankness.

I have holidays, and I thought I'd like to come down and see you. But there might be a snag with the booking; I would come by train, and the Railways tell me they could give me no guarantee of a seat on such short notice.

Of course you have hurt me to a certain extent, but I don't mind that. It is my due. I read what you asked me to read; I read pages 27 to 30 of the Reiser Brochure. If I did not comment, too bad. There is such a thing as Time in my life too. Maybe I was rushed with some other job at the time; maybe my mind was half befogged with other thoughts - I don't remember. I could not be a Kluckhohn and grasp the significance of your Symbolism at once, while my attention was divided on so many subjects, and so many matters at the same time.

I submitted to you this -- That I felt a natural deep conviction in the importance of your invention. I referred to weaknesses in myself when I said that parts of the discovery were as yet 'above my head'. I held out my hand and I said "Here, I believe you; therefore, I want to put my faith in you. Consider my deficiencies and take me, confide in me and instruct me". I wanted to be understood, too.

As I still am, I was heavily committed to work for Hardin and Lang, but I was committed in other directions as well. My time was not my own, as there are matters of principle in these things. I had to apportion my time to be just to all parties. My action would not have been just had I sat down with the Reiser Brochure and Semantography Leaflets and proceeded at once upon the study with single purpose. Also like yourself, I have a living to earn and that requires some time.

In the beginning I wanted to help you and I thought we had the means to do so -- that has not changed one scrap. Floyd Hardin wanted to help you, and until I read from him how he has conducted himself up to this 'breaking point', I am afraid I must not, nor cannot, believe otherwise. I am yet to see his letter. Meanwhile, I am tempted to believe that there has been some huge but accidental misunderstanding somewhere along the line between you two. And perhaps this has its roots, once more, in the 'human subservience' within the field of communication, against which your Symbolism is warring.

Haven't you read what Floyd said before the Conference on Constructed Languages in New York -- "Language is a tool that man uses. Man, alas, is also a tool used by language - often ruthlessly so used. All history gives testimony to the fact that the tools of men tend to become his masters."?

Again, how can I believe otherwise of Floyd while this sticks out before my eyes in the first communication I ever received from him --

"It is evident that your enthusiasm has been captured by the magic and the promise which invites us all, in these perilous days, to devote ourselves to the study of the science of signs and symbols. Perhaps, like myself, you are not only intrigued by this study, but feel that it is of the utmost importance to the future fate of all mankind. Only as we sincerely devote ourselves to a study of the science of human communication, can we hope to contribute to an enduring peace for all men everywhere."?

So, Mr. Bliss, there it is, and there I stand. You know I am wanting to be scrupulously honest with you, and fair in every detail. I have told you how I feel about your work. I won't cover my eyes and go blindly or seek to appease myself with any cause which offends against principle. I have comfort, and there is pride for me in the knowledge that you have been able to house a feeling of trust in me. For that I am thankful.

If you think there would be a useful purpose served by my coming to Sydney tell me. In an hour of your time we might 'prove' a few things to mutual satisfaction. It is true I am in newspaper work -- a journalist in a Newsagency serving Queensland country papers. As to co-operation on "Semantic Pioneer", I think I can help you; but let's talk about it again.

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd) John T. Higgins

I wrote :

Sydney 19th September, 1956

Dear Mr. Higgins,

Thank you for your kind letter and for your offer to come to Sydney in order to help me. Unfortunately you can't help me, that is help my work. The only people in the world who could help me by helping my work along are the educational authorities. However, they would do this provided I am at least hundred years dead. They have treated similarly other pioneers in new educational ideas.

I must be content to share the fate of the other pioneers of being during my lifetime unread, misunderstood and unfollowed.

I am sorry seeing that I have hurt you. My grievances are directed primarily to Lang and Hardin.

Maybe, we shall meet some other time when you are in Sydney. You will find my telephone number in the book. I shall be most happy to have a talk with you. As to helping my Journal along, at least one year would have to pass until it hits the bookstalls. Let's talk about this some later time.

Yours sincerely,
C.K. Bliss

A day later I received a telegram from Mr. Higgins enquiring whether his letter has been received. I answered it in the affirmative and thanked him for his thoughtfulness. He sent me then the copy of his letter to Dr. Everingham which read :

September 24th, 1956

Dear Doug,

I am a bit anxious whether Mr. Bliss received my September 11 letter (enclosed) which I airmailed to him. There seems no reason why he should not, but still I have not had the reply I expected, so am wiring him reply-paid this morning.

Mr. Bliss has sent me copy of his letter to you dated September 10th.

I am gravely sorry at the turn of events which have been so worrying to Mr. Bliss. If I can contribute anything at all which will go any way to providing the right impetus for Blissymbolics, I shall do it willingly and with great pleasure. I am very pleased to see that you are standing behind Mr. Bliss and will recommend his invention at every opportunity. I will go no further, as I think I make myself clear in my letter to Mr. Bliss; I think there I have been strenuous enough in affirming my desire to help him in every way. Please write me with any suggestions.

Cordially,
John

A few days later I received an interesting memorandum from Hardin in which I found to my amazement the commencement of an article written by me. It appeared that Hardin has rejected my proposal for an article, has accepted Dr. Everingham's article instead and has concocted an article under my name which is composed of passages from my letters to Hardin. Hardin's memorandum reads as follows :

September, 16th 1956

Dear Dr. Bliss,

In the forthcoming issue of the International Language Review, (issue No. 4) to be mailed out some two weeks from today there will appear (1) An article by Dr. Everingham on "Bliss Symbols", occupying some three pages of our Review. (2) An article consisting of certain paragraphs drawn from your

your letters to me (occupying 4 pages, and which I have entitled: "The failure of Language in the Field of Human Communication". -- I trust that what I have done will meet with your approval.

Please continue to write me and give me the benefit of your wise advice.

Cordially,
(sgd.) Floyd Hardin

Issue No. Four of the International Language Review is now nearing completion and is scheduled for mailing on September 30.

This issue will contain some 65 to 70 pages.

Among the articles which will appear in this Issue is one by yourself Entitled: "The Failure of Language in the Field of Human Communication."

Your article occupies some 4 pages of Issue No. Four.
Also the article by Dr. Everingham, occupying 3 pages.

We appreciate your thoughtfulness in sending this article to us and believe that it will be enjoyed by our readers and provoke fruitful discussion.

Please let us hear from you frequently.

Cordially,
(sgd.) Floyd Hardin

I shall include in this issue the article written by Dr. Everingham and the article made by Hardin out of my letters.

Everingham too received the Hardin memorandum and believed that he is more than ever justified to write an article about Semantography because I myself have written one too according to Hardin's memorandum. Everingham wrote to me the following letter. At the same time he referred to the picture writing of Professor Eckhardt and Mr. Janson of Holland. I shall deal with these two systems at a later date. Here is Everingham's letter.

30/9/56

Dear Charles,

I have dropped the Karl again - well, it was only a whim of mine. It was the fascination of the foreign, and the urge to get you not to be ashamed of your past, but proud of it. That is why I think you should endorse your writings: Charles Bliss (and no K. if it means nothing), Dip. Ing. (Vienna) or Düsseldorf or wherever it is - not B.Sc. which carries no better distinction and no worse.

I have never forgotten, will never forget the first night in your home when I plied you with questions and you answered convincingly, unbelievably every one of my doubts in turn. I had tried with no shadow of success what you had accomplished, and every difficulty in the way had been bowled over, one after the other, in an hour or two. I have rarely been so delighted to find anything. It was like a new faculty, like radio, or writing for the first time. Yet it was some time later till I realized that you had also tackled with amazing success another hoped for project of mine - to make logic, semantics and thru them statistics and all sciences, readily accessible to the man in the street. You even gave me the lead which has resulted in a simple formulation of all the schools of psychodynamics into one, which I shall include in my Critique of Semantography.

I remember that if you die unrecognized you will leave all your writings and books and equipment and funds to be used, by me if possible for publishing your works and then to accept in payment only any profits that may resultall this assuming your wife must first have security if you should die before her.

Now I don't want to discourage your project, the Semantic Pioneer, for which you have still such a huge fund of enthusiasm that in my most youthful years I never had it, for anything unless it was my evangelical experiences for a few years due to the friendships I found for the first time in my life with the inter-school Christian Fellowship. I want to help this project, contribute to it just as I do when I write articles to journals about your work.

I can see that you hope to embarrass the educators into recognizing you

because you are outwitting them at their own game of enlightening the public and showing them as incompetents. This might give one of them who champions you the opportunity of swaying public and politicians to grant him time to do a study of the effects of teaching Blissymbolics to a bright class of children. (The "opportunity classes" for brighter children in N.S.W. always carry extra subjects in their syllabus). But I cannot see that, even if your paper outsells the Sunday Herald, anyone will ever be offering you a job and a cleaner's wages to sit in an institution and write things to be published over 12 months or so for educators only.

Now another complication has come up. I arranged with Higgins as you know to get the International Language Review and found there an advert. for SAFO, Dr. Eckhardt's world writing. As you can see by the book I bought thru John Higgins, the system is better than that of Bishop Wilkins, but not much better in some parts. Even if I had written a Critique of SAFO before hearing of your system, I could never have evolved such a semantically clear and trenchant system as yours. Yet, having seen yours I can make some improvements in it, just as you did to Basic English and General Semantics even though you might never have worked out those systems yourself.

A further complication is that a Dutch journalist now claims he evolved such a system in 1938 and has just published it. When you get the cutting you should write to him or ask me to write for you. I will also write to Dr. Eckhardt before I publish any criticism of his work.

Now you can see that your copy right is not so valuable. Perhaps behind the Iron Curtain there is another world writing in Russian instead of English, Dutch or German.

What should be done?

I think you have to merge your Institute for Semantography into the Institute for World Writing and make Eckhardt and the Dutchman members if they want to be. If they refuse or not it will bring only more notice and publicity to you, and at last the Australian Government or UNESCO committee might be stampeded into doing something to beat someone overseas. At the worst, you can have the satisfaction of knowing that you have made the first advances to the other two. At the best, you will have comrades to share your struggle and you will win.

You wrote one time about friends, supporters etc. of Semantog. just as they are for General Semantics etc. Why don't you give me some appointment like that? If it costs too much I might get a title of Associate Member of the Institute or something such. But it is no good making titles unless you have a responsible person or persons applying a set of rules as a test for admission to the Institute. Either they must pass an exam in two or three subjects (e.g. a recognised world language dictation test, or publication of a monograph like my chemogram or a shorthand system, etc. etc.) You can get the names of the officers printed on letterheads only after a proper constitution and rules are adopted and registered for election of officers. I would invite Bertrand Russell or Lancelot Hogben to be the patron - that is first step.

But all these things need the help of a modern specialist referred to recently by Mr. Casey when he addressed the United Nations Association in Sydney (as a member I got a summary of it). This new specialty is public relations - quite different from publicity. I never heard of it as being a specialty where you could consult someone but if you write Mr. Casey in Canberra, or the UN Association, it might help.

I think you must have got the wrong idea from Hardin and Lang. Firstly, I don't think your typing would fit in with page no. etc. and they may prefer to do their own stencils. Anyhow, it seems your article is accepted by the enclosed circular I got. Second, I don't think Tom Lang used a very happy phrase if he talked of lowering the standard of his paper. It is a paper rather too narrow to include your work I believe, devoted to one synthetic language only, unlike the ILR which accepts your article and mine. I agree that some adherents of an international language have this narrow outlook, but not all, for Hogben and TeWinkel admire your works, yet both are themselves inventors of languages. So I still want to have aversion of Bliss symbols printed in ILR, like the enclosed pamphlet on SAFO, spread over 3 or 4 issues. We have already started. My article is like the Preface of SAFO, your article is like the introduction, and we have done a better job than Eckhardt, even if you think it is bad publicity because I

draw attention to your sentimental touches. Remember that we are not in Europe now, and that is more like America, where nothing seels without sentiment. You say yourself that to arouse discussion you must make provocative statements. Cheer up, old friend with the youthful heart. Sorry I didn't have your letter in Sydney.

Kindest regards to you and yours,

Doug.

The letter above was typed on the stencil in October 1956, nearly two years ago. Meanwhile I had to work hard to secure my and my wife's livelihood. I had no time left for Semantography. Only now do I pick up the thread and try to finish this issue. I am aghast that this is already the 35th page. I was unaware of this, when I handed over one letter after the other to my typist. But now, in order to close the issue I shall only report about future happenings in brief and bring herebelow only three articles which appeared in the International Language Review.

Reviewing the aforementioned letters in the light of my experiences including the last years I see my difficulties in the following way: Everyone who comes into contact with my work tries to form an opinion what it is all about, and soon comes to the conclusion that it is a "picture language". This is a notion that everyone understands. And everyone simply refuses to think or try to think that I have found something much more than just a picture language. Even my best friends in this business as Dr. Everingham won't go any further, and any plea to recognise the semantics of my Semantography as the more important part is turned down. This is clearly shown in the article of Dr. Everingham about my work, printed below.

If people won't go further than acknowledging my work as a "picture language", they simply shy away from thinking that I have found something important with regard to man's prehistoric past. In vain did I cry in one of the aforementioned letters that what I have found, others (anthropologists and archeologists) have found before me, so it cannot be as hairbrained as it looks. But my cry does not help. Whatever I write in this particular vain (as I did in the aforementioned letters) is simply overlooked, not mentioned, not taken into consideration. Higgins when confronted says that it is "above his head" which it cannot be, if only he would try to take my findings seriously. Hence my crushing unhappiness.

The reader of the foregoing pages might have been puzzled about my unhappiness, and I, rereading the letters after a span of two years find that future researchers might not understand the shagrin which they ^{caused} me. Apart from the silence with which my letters on prehistory have been received, I was in consternation when Hardin turned down an article by me, but brought an article by Everingham about me instead. Everingham who must have had a bad conscience submitted his article to me not telling me that it is for the International Language Review. All my suggestions and all my corrections which I made to his draft were useless anyway because he submitted the text to Hardin beforehand and so it was printed. The article itself was made "in the best tradition of considering my work a picture language". It was all about a picture writing. I shall add my notes to the article within the text under the heading My Note:

A B R I E F B I O G R A P H Y

of Charles K. Bliss

Author of "Semantography"

with an explanation of Bliss Symbols

contributed by Dr. Douglas N. Everingham of

P.O.Box 328, Rockhampton, Queensland, Australia.

In a concentration camp in the 1940's a Viennese industrial chemist looked through wire barbs at birds and beasts held captive for the amusement of the Commandant. Around him stirred some of the skeletons draped in the hide which provided lampshades and book-binding later for the Commandant's wife.

One of these human wraiths was trundled into camp like a bird from an aboriginal emu-hunt. His limbs were trussed around a pole borne on the shoulders of two strapping SS men.

"Ha," greeted their Commandant, "another fowl recaptured? Back to the cage, wanderer. You other fowls should learn by watching him!"

This man, so ruthlessly handled, was Dr. Charles K. Bliss, the author of Semantography, who now lives at 5 Maroubra Bay Road, Pagewood, Sydney Australia.

My Note:

Everingham has read this story on page 19 Semantography Series No. 125 and has not re-written it properly. I pointed this out to him in my corrections but he had sent the text already to Hardin. The man whom they brought into the camp was dead, shot when trying to escape. The last paragraph "this man so ruthlessly handled..." might indicate the I was the man so ruthlessly handled. The time was 1939.

Now comes a paragraph in Everingham's article which made we wonder about the capacities of Hardin. What he did was nothing less than following up with the Biographical Note not of me but of Everingham. How could he have overlooked this is a mystery to me.

Continuation of article
Biographical Note

Born in New South Wales, June 25, 1923. Public Exhibitioner University of Sydney 1941. Wrote and published "Chemical Shorthand for Organic Formulae", 1943 Led Sydney delegation, National Union of Australian University Students 1944. Vice President, Sydney University Medical School, 1945. Graduated M.B., B.S., 1946. Resident M.O. general and mental hospitals, 1946-53. Hon Clinical Assistant in Psychiatry, Royal North Shore Hospital, 1950 and Royal Alexandra Hospital for Children 1955. General private practitioner, Sydney 1955 and Rockhampton Queensland 1956. Lecturer: Semantics and Psychiatry." Australian Medical Congress, 1955.

 The intervening years made him an electronic production manager in England, a photographer and cinema salesman in the Shanghai International Concession (under Jap "protection") and in Sydney a carfactory machinist, a drycleaning shopkeeper, and a boarding house proprietor. This strange change in work was dictated by an obsession with a world-shaking discovery which demanded more and more leisure time.

My Note: The reader may perhaps not understand why such "life stories" which I have encountered a number of times in articles written about me, just make me mad. Often I have tried to think of some way by which my work could be dissociated from my person. Often I thought that I would gladly forfeit all claims to my work if only I could see it taken up by humanity. Unfortunately when someone writes an article he must add some spice and sensation as "the world-shaking discovery" mentioned above. It does not shake the world, not the least.

Continuation of article

The noon of Nazism (or we might say the midnight of Nazism) taught Bliss the power of words to blight and blind the "Herrenvolk". In his extremity he brooded over a means of healing this morbid abuse of words leading to war of words, cold wars and hot wars. Finally he evolved a tool to light the way so that future young people need never again be deluded by fine phrases, fear of the unknown, or innocent misunderstandings.

My Note: I am sorry to say this is not true. In the German concentration camp and years later I never thought of a means to counteract word demagogy. In China I was fascinated about the advantages of an ideographic writing. Since my boyhood I wanted very much to make a contribution to human progress, and throughout the years of my adulthood I was inwardly very unhappy that I was unable to do so (the factory work took most of my time). So when I came to China, the idea of a modern ideography seemed to me the idea by which I could contribute to the progress of humanity. To be honest, I had no idea that this would eventually lead to Semantics. I am sorry about the phrases used by Everingham (see last lines) which overrates much my work and in fact are exaggerated boasts. This again is one reason why I hate others writing articles about me and my work.

Continuation of article

China taught him the power of an ideography to bridge dialects, races and ages. He found Mongol, Tartars, Pekinese, Cantonese, and many other speech groups in China plus Japs and Europeans who spoke only their mother tongues, trading with each other with no interpreter but with a pencil and paper. Surely this gives the lie direct to those who claim that English (Basic, Pidgin or what-have-you) will eventually unite those who now stubbornly resist absorption of foreign languages. He found that the "most cumbersome of alphabets" was actually a precision tool by which schoolboys read at once, in the words their mother taught them, the classics of their culture four times as ancient as Chaucer's English. He learned that ages of wisdom and epics of poetry can be condensed in one ideograph - that while learning pictographs was easier for toddlers of three than Western alphabets, the study of Chinese characters leads the learner on to an appreciation of Chinese philosophy and aesthetics which cements together the conglomeration which is China.

My Note: I pointed out to Everingham that the above lines are not in accordance with the fact. Chinese characters are not a "precision tool" and a schoolboy cannot read them "at once", etc.etc.

Continuation of article

In China he evolved Semantography which was hailed by the Chamber of Commerce as a new medium for world peace, embodying the wisdom of semantics and physical science rather than abstruse Confucianisms. Triumphant at last over his physical fate, Bliss set about giving thanks to the Providence that had preserved him. He decided to engineer a new chemistry - to conquer the scourge of all his fellows - the scourge that had led to his own miseries - the scourge of muddled thinking. Rich from American patronising his film shop, Bliss hastened to Sydney and invested his savings in years of research in the New South Wales Public Library. He mimeographed and bound his monumental three volumes of Semantography, which was refused by all publishers, but is now in the leading libraries of the English-speaking world.

My Note: The Chamber of Commerce mentioned above was the Rotary Club only, to whom I gave a lecture. It did not "hail, etc." On the contrary, the Rotarians in Shanghai and in Sydney and in America did nothing whatever to help me. They refused me even an invitation to a lecture about my work in Sydney. I resented very much the reference to "rich" and I said so to Everingham. Heavens knows what prompted him to write a lie like this. I had some small savings and I did what nobody in his senses might have done. I sat down to consume my savings and write my books. The high falutin' words in the foregoing paragraphs of the article must have made the reader curious and surely the symbols shown by Everingham and his criticism must come as an anticlimax.

Continuation of article.

Bliss symbols comprise 100 or more elements of meaning. These can be reproduced with a score or so of single-line characters and two extra spacing controls in lieu of redundant punctuations, fractions, etc., on a standard typewriter.

At times, Bliss allows himself flights of fancy like the Chinese, as when he produces a symbol for poetry, as follows:

poetry from flower wings metaphor this from mouth individual
and so representing high-flown, highbrow, high-sounding, stilted or flowery speech.

This he compares also with his symbol for

traffic notice. Both, he says, warns

against broken rules. A metaphor is a breach of rules of semantics and can be brutal, (as in the monologue of my opening paragraph), - or fatal, even catastrophic for nations and civilisations, like the "Master-Race" of the Third Reich.

Another flight of fancy by Bliss is birth from star under roof

More scientific or "semantic" definitions of birth and of poetry are possible in Semantography, but one can overdo the process if eliminating wonder and the miraculous in the name of "accuracy" which is often mere pompous assumption. Hence the departures of Bliss. However, in his zeal to support the aesthetic, I fear he may have overstepped the mark with his birth symbol which may perpetuate the evils of stories about storks and cabbages, rose bushes and hospital baby-sales departments.

My Note: I ask the reader to compare the high falutin' praise and boasts about Semantography and then the anticlimax of presenting two miserable symbols which have nothing to do with semantics, and criticising them. Is it any wonder why I am so unhappy when someone else starts to write about my work? But Everingham must have felt that he has not yet given the reader any demonstration of my system and so he starts doing this.

Continuation of article

On the whole, Bliss symbols are "ingenious...the logical analysis is good" as Bertrand Russell says. In the face of an official apathy that is shameful, Bliss deserves the support of interested readers. Literature explaining Semantography can be obtained from Dr. Bliss at cost, plus postage.

And now with his permission I reproduce a few more of his 100 "letters"

man pen sun sky earth fire brain heart eye tree past future

act from measure. And here are some "words" constructed from the "letters."

1. Superimposed: light shine day burn daylight curve

2. Adjoining: desire fireman lover

My Note: Here is an opportunity to indicate a phenomenon which must occur with most new ideas: the disciple trying to "improve" on the originator. I have said again and again that I like Douglas very much and that I am much indebted to him for all his interest in my work. But I have also said that trying to alter the symbols - without my consent - can only lead to a new Babel. Indeed, sometimes I feel happy that Semantography is still not yet an idea which has interested thousands. Otherwise we might already have thousands of different semantographic symbols, and I being very unhappy about it all.

I refer here to Everingham's desire to remove the indicators $\square$ $\wedge$ and $\vee$ from the upper line and place them along the other symbols. I have stated that this can be easily done, but at present it would only be bewildering for any student to find that symbols shown in the Series are different from those shown in the three books. Besides, such an idea of removing marks above the ordinary writing lines (as they are as diacritic marks in ordinary writing) has a purpose only if we want to avoid writing above the writing line. But a number of symbols of mine are above and below the writing lines, so there is no gain in removing the indicators from the top of symbols.

But here Everingham went even further. He alters my $\wedge$ action symbol and turns it around thus $\rangle$, and then uses it to symbolise shine (see foregoing page). But this turning around of the $\wedge$ action symbol should only be done when the active or passive verb form must be indicated (see Book II, page 188ff). What I could never understand is how he forms this altered symbol. He shows three symbols

$\rangle$ $\langle$ $\dashv$
 act from measure

The symbol for from as I invented it $\rangle$ is too altered, and without reason. My symbol from $\rangle$ is the shorthand symbol for departure (from) $\rangle$ and cannot be altered. What the symbol for measure has to do in this context I don't know.

And here is another example of what is in store when more people will take up my work and operate it not in the way I want it to be operated.

Everingham shows (on the foregoing page) the symbol for light (sun and eye) and then forms the meaning of shine by adding the (altered by him) action symbol. But shine in this context can be symbolised simpler by showing only the sun with the action indicator. Furthermore his combined symbol for daylight is redundant. It is not necessary to show the symbol for sun twice. The meaning for day contains the meaning for daylight.

Also the new classification into superimposed and adjoining symbol combinations is one which I see for the first time. It isn't in accordance with the facts. Burn as shown by Everingham shows no superimposed symbols but only adjoining ones.

Continuation of article

The main advantage of these "words" is that they can be learned more quickly than those of any foreign or constructed language (including for the bulk of humanity, if not all, Basic, Pidgin or what-have-you English).

Many of these characters are conventional and in increasing everyday use (for traffic signs, etc.) - e.g. numerals, punctuation. Others are pictographic and are related, as far as possible, to the spatial elements in the meanings expressed. Grammar is at a minimum, - its logical word-order conveying spatial relations, in many cases.

Philological variations (pronunciation changes from age to age and from district to district) cannot affect the sure interpretation of written records.

Finally there is a simple stencil design available (two sides at right angles, two obliques, and two semi-oval; three circular apertures of appropriate sizes).

Could it be that, in the course of time, ideography may supersede alphabetic writing, as it is already doing on the world's highways, where instant interpretation in spatial terms is demanded for human survival, by illiterates, strangers to a given language as well as those whose vision is dimmed by infirmity, drink or dirty wheather? (End of article)

My Note: I feel I have all reason to be dissatisfied with the article. The story of the concentration camp wholly unnecessary takes up much space, then the two wholly unimportant symbols for poetry and birth and their criticism are unnecessary too. So little space is left for the system itself that the few symbols shown cannot give the reader an adequate impression of my work. Furthermore, there is no indication whatever in what way these symbols should or could help "young people not to be deluded by fine phrases, fear of the unknown, or innocent misunderstanding." In short, Everingham has made no attempt to show how the semantics of Semantography works.

I believed therefore that the article did only harm to my work, and that Hardin should have given me the opportunity to write the article and not someone else.

Unfortunately more harm was done by Hardin by making an "article" from excerpts of the two letters which I wrote to him (see the foregoing pages). This "article"

is preceded by two Editor's Notes. The "article" itself shows that Hardin has completely failed to grasp the main implication of my two letters to him.

THE FAILURE OF LANGUAGE IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN COMMUNICATION

Language as the Prime Instigator of War.

The Need for a New Nomenclature of Signs and Symbols to adequately serve the purpose of human communication.

The Opinions and Judgements of Charles K. Bliss of Australia as set forth in his recent letters addressed to the Editor of the International Language Review.

Editor's Note: For some months past we have been in correspondence with Mr. Charles K. Bliss, of Australia, author of Semantography. In the pages which follow, we offer you his provocative opinions and judgements as set forth in certain paragraphs, taken from recent letters, addressed to us.

Second Editor's Note: We here give space to the opinions and judgements of Mr. Charles K. Bliss of Australia for reasons here enumerated: (1) because he challenges language itself as a prime instigator of war which bids fair to bring about the obliteration of all life upon this planet. (2) because he has courage to attack language itself as a communication tool altogether incompetent to serve the high purpose of human communication. (3) because he points out how language has effectuated a series of abstract generalisations, which have enslaved all men and wholly distorted the meaning and the invitation of life. (4) because he says that at the moment we do away with language we will do away with war and the slaughter of the innocents. (5) because he feels that language is loaded with sectarian and political commitments and also those philosophical debts which have small relations to the continued life of man upon the planet Earth. (6) because the views and judgements of Mr. Bliss, here set forth, may be provocative of fruitful discussion within the pages of the International Language Review. (FH)

My Note to (1) I do not challenge language itself as prime instigator of war, but refer only to certain words notably right and wrong, good and evil. (2) same comment as to (1); to (4) this is utter nonsense. How can we ever do away with language? Perhaps by sticking an adhesive tape over every mouth of every human being and ban all papers and books. to (5) this is too high for me. I don't understand what Hardin means and in any case I didn't say such things. to (6) the fruitful discussion which I hoped for never materialised. Not one letter came forth, not one. I attributed this to Everingham's disastrous article and to Hardin's disastrous mix-up of paragraphs of my letters. What Hardin failed to see and what is the main point is that I have found that primitive prehistoric man of say 50,000 years ago did not kill his own kind, as no animal does, and that only the evolution of the meanings of right and wrong brought war and human killing about. This latter theory is not mine, but Chisholm's. In my respective letters I said it that others have found the evidence before me, it was me only that put the parts of the theory together. I did this in order to give the findings more authority. But it was of no use. Hardin not only muddled my letters but failed to see the main point.

Commencement of the "article" (extracts from two letters shown in full on the pages 15 - 20 of this issue Hardin starts with parts of the second letter which makes no sense to anyone who hasn't read my first letter about Chisholm's theory. Dear Mr. Hardin, My Note)

After posting off my 4 page letter of April 4, on my elaboration of Chisholm's theory of the linguistic cause of human warfare, I received your letter and materials and hasten to answer.

Of course, no one believed Chisholm, though he is a world authority. Firstly, Chisholm could not offer any valid proof for his theory. Secondly, he could not offer any new tool for his proposed treatment of mankind. With all the immodesty at my command I say that I have found the proof and I have found the tool.

If Chisholm's theory is correct, that is, if warfare among human beings started with the emergence of abstract meanings, notably Good and Evil, then there must have been a time in the history of primitive man when there was no warfare. With this exciting idea in mind I began to study the old records of man, looking for signs of the absence of human warfare. I studied the records of the Egyptians, Babylonians, Chinese, etc. They all go back not more than 5000 B.C. - as apparently writing was invented about this time. And those records and pictures on the walls of Babylon and Ninive, Memphis and Thebes - they all told of war against

human enemies. Of course, they showed also hunting scenes - war against the animals.

When I went further down into history, I arrived at the oldest records of man, the paleolithic cave paintings. And here I found the proof. Those cave paintings, estimated to be about 30,000 to 50,000 years old, show only war against the animals, which paleolithic man needed for survival. Nowhere in these cave paintings do we see man fighting his own kind. Let us realize that primeval man, like the hunter of modern times, liked to glorify his victories. But apparently the idea to fight and kill his own kind and "glorify" these "victories" simply did not enter into the mind of primeval man. Otherwise, he would have depicted and recorded it...Because in contrast to the complete absence of human warfare 30,000 years ago, we find that the records of the last 7000 years are mostly about wars and victories over human enemies.

My Note: Now, instead of following up the paragraphs of my letter, suddenly Hardin switches to my discussion of symbols. Later on he starts again citing my paragraphs about man and the animals...a perfect muddle of my letters.

Continuation of article

...Now mathematical symbols and their operations are taught in every primary school of the world, and incidentally these symbols have the same meaning in all languages. But to say that mathematics is an "international language" would be besides the point. Of course, in a way, it is an international language, but this is only a happy by-product, though even now in practical use in time tables and price lists, which go out to many countries. But mathematics is mainly and foremost a logical discipline, and this also is Semantography. (And now again a switch to another paragraph in my letters, disconnected with the foregoing one. My Note.)

...I was particularly affected by the despairing words in your letter: "Speaking to you somewhat privately, I begin to despair that language can ever serve as an adequate means of communication among men. In this respect I distrust language because of its sectarian commitments and its innate prejudices, from which it can never quite hope to escape. As a medium of communication among men, I am inclined to discard language as a tool fit and decent to bear the great burden of an international and world-wide understanding. And in this respect, it is both my hope and my belief that in future some genius may appear upon the scene to offer the world a schemata of signs and symbols, altogether without the area of language, and which, by reason of their sheer purity and newness, may provide a methodology of human communication altogether beyond reproach." (And now again another paragraph not connected to the one just read. My Note)

...Now the most advanced living creature on earth is man. If we compare man and the higher animals, we find striking similarities. The machinery of their bodies works on the same principles: Hearts, lungs, bloodsystem, eyes, ears; - and even the working of the animal and the human brain. Because animals can show their emotions, and can, to some extent, even reason in their search for food and in the building of their nests, - and in avoiding enemies. But even in this area, animals also give evidence of a high ethics and conscience. They will care for their young ones; they will defend them against overwhelming odds. They will even sacrifice themselves in order to help a helpless young one.

What then is the difference between man and the animal? There is only one great difference: man has evolved a system of articulate language, comprising abstract words for abstract meanings. And men have found a way to put these words down in writing, so that later generation can learn and go forth. This, and this only, is the great achievement of mankind, compared with the animals. From the study of the relevant chapters of my books, you will learn that I place the emergence of abstract meanings and words not later than about 10,000 to 15,000 years ago (and probably not much earlier, so this is difficult to say). In short, language as a tool is so young, - so crude, so inefficient. It is as if we had just discovered how to make fire. It is a great blessing, but as we play with it, we must take care not to hurt ourselves too much.

Furthermore, if a good thing is found, then the rulers, the exploiters get hold of it first. We see today, as in the thousands of years of human history, that rulers have held men in bondage by exhorting them with words, and the lackeys of the rulers, the subservient priests and teachers have done everything to conceal and destroy general knowledge and appreciation of semantics: i.e. in all the schools of all the generations of man, the pupils and the people have not been taught how to recognize vague, ambiguous and fallacious words used by kings, conquerors, priests, diplomats, demagogues and dictators. "Language is used for the concealment of thought", said the French diplomat Talleyrand. "With words we govern men", said Prime Minister Disraeli.

Now let us go back to the animals and let us face an incredible fact, obscured by the biologists. Animals of the same species do not kill each other. Lions do not kill lions; tigers don't kill tigers; wolves will roam the wintry forest howling

mad of unbearable hunger - but no wolf will attack and kill a fellow-brother-wolf. Only man kills man. How have the biologists obscured this fact? By inventing a word "biological warfare."

True enough, organic beings can live only on organic food. Thousands of species live on food provided by plants. Others have found that organic food from other species tastes good, and consequently, being hungry, they prey on other species. But they do not attack and kill their own kind. They will go hungry together, they will starve together, they will die together, but they will not kill one of their own. The thought of killing and eating one of their own simply does not enter their minds. "Among the same species the highest ethics is supreme law," wrote Professor Ashley Montagu (who is in agreement with my findings).

In short, what the biologists call "biological warfare" (the preying on other species), is a totally different phenomenon than "human warfare" in which man attacks his own kind, and does not so not to kill and eat his fellowman, but for other reasons. What are the reasons for human warfare? Why, in the past, did Christians kill Moslems, and why did Moslems kill Christians and why did Jews kill worshippers of gods other than Jehovah, and Christians killed Jews, and Catholic Christians killed Protestant Christians, and Nazis killed Jews, and Germans killed Frenchmen, and Frenchmen killed Moslems, and in recent years Koreans killed Capitalist Americans - and so on, throughout the whole bloody history of mankind - WHY?

What now comes should amaze everyone and set him thinking. You may have heard of a famous psychiatrist, Dr. Brock Chisholm. He was Canadian Minister of Health then Major General during the war, then first Director General of the World Health Organisation. Well, after the end of second world war, Chisholm gave two lectures in Washington D.C. on nothing less than the cause of human warfare. And what he said was so incredible that no one believed him. He said that the prime cause of human warfare is a mind perversion, a disease, an epidemic; and we medical men, he said, know how to fight epidemics. The first is to find the bacillus which causes that mind disease which makes man turn against his own kind. And Chisholm concluded that the cause of human warfare is linguistic in nature, or precisely, the use of abstract meanings (notably Good and Evil). Man kills his fellowman when his Fuehrer tells him that it is good to kill the other man, because he is evil and harbours evils designs. Precisely the same thing was said by the Pharaohs and the kings of old, by the Tamerlans and Djengis Kans, the Hitlers and the Stalins.

Of course, no one believed Chisholm, even though he is a world authority. Firstly Chisholm could not offer any valid proof for his theory. Secondly, he could not offer any new tool for his proposed treatment of mankind. With whatever immodesty I have within my command, I may say that I have found the proof and I have found the tool.

I have found the proof in the cave paintings of paleolithic man, who lived about 30,000 to 50,000 years ago. These paintings show warfare, but only warfare against animals, which primitive man needed for survival. But nowhere in all the caves found, do we see a picture of men fighting other men. In contrast, on most of the records engraved in stone of the old Egyptians, Babylonians, and others going back about 7000 years, we see the recording of men going to war against other men, fighting and killing them; and the words inscribed tell us why this was ~~the~~ because the enemies were evil and harboured evil designs...The archeologists and anthropologists have overlooked this tremendous difference, simply because they were in the habit of thinking that human warfare is merely another manifestation of biological warfare - which most certainly it is not.

I believe that I have found the tool, - a new algebra of thought, Semantography, which is the very thing which Chisholm wanted for his re-education of mankind. It is no wonder that one of my fervent supporters is a young psychiatrist, Dr. Douglas N. Everingham. He spoke about this work at the recent congress of medical men in Sydney. Dr. Everingham has used Semantography in his treatment in mental hospitals in Australia, because many minds are in disorder through the falsehoods perpetrated by words.

Tell a boy, over a period of years, that he is a "failure"; then look and listen and see what happens. Finally, he will believe you and will enroll himself as one of the dying and the dead. (My Note: I can't find that I have ever written this last sentence. It must be Hardin's wording. And now he hops to another letter)

...I hate language and all language studies (This again is another falsification of Hardin. He quotes from my letter (see page 23, I wrote "I hate language" but I never wrote I hate "all language studies" This is utter nonsense. My Note)

...I am preparing my own journal "Semantic Pioneer", which will have four principal aims:

(1) To expose the greatest fraud ever put over on trustful humanity - the fraud with words.

(2) To expose the teachers of language who oppose any improvement in human

human communication.

(3) To expose the educators in general who teach us how to lie, how to deceive, how to go to war and to kill for the only true fatherland.

(4) To expose the shameful treatment meted out by the conservative experts, to mankind's best sons, - pioneers of new ideas. (End of article)

Well, it isn't an article which I had written, but in any case, here are some stimulating ideas brought forth, and I hoped therefore that some interesting letters from interested linguists will come forth. The incredible fact is that not one letter of interest came my way. The only communication I received was from a man in Mexico City who is an interlinguist himself. He offered me a handpainted horoscope for a few lousy dollars - dirt cheap.

This issue has been started in order to show that even the men in the field of international languages are opposed to a new idea in international communication. The readers of Hardin's International Language Review are adherents of Esperanto, or Ido, or Interlingua or other systems and they won't even listen to men who have evolved other ideas in the field of interlinguistics.

I shall therefore refrain from printing here the many other letters which I have exchanged and which all have ended in bitter disappointment for me. I shall only try to answer the question which has baffled and worried me: why has Hardin turned down an article about Semantography by me, the author, and why has he instead accepted an article on Semantography by Everingham. Why has he refused an article about my anthropological linguistic theory and discovery, and why has he published a muddle of excerpts from my letters. Slowly the picture has unfolded itself and the motives have become clear. They are of interest in so far as the very same thing happens everywhere with regard to men of new ideas. Even their friends create difficulties.

I haven't sent money to Hardin for his journal, simply because I said to him that he is getting my literature in exchange. Furthermore, I have not joined his intercultural committee, the yearly fee was \$ 5. On page 21 of this issue the reader will find that I have told Hardin that my joining the scholars of the intercultural committee would be a liability for him as I am determined to become a "scholarly outlaw" by attacking the whole cast of linguistic scholars. I assure the reader that never did it occur to me that I want to avoid paying a few dollars.

But exactly those few dollars mattered very much. Hardin found that I did not spend dollars on his journal and did not spend dollar on his intercultural committee. But Everingham spent the dollars on the journal and spent the dollars on the committee. Consequently Hardin printed Everingham's name on the journal's titlepage as a contributing scholar from Australia. But he refrained from mentioning my name in the list of contributing scholars and members of his journal, etc.

And because Everingham sent him dollars and I did not, he took Everingham's article about Semantography. Everingham himself must have had some misgivings because he sent me the manuscript (after he has submitted it to Hardin) without telling me that it is for Hardin's Review. Hardin himself must have had some misgivings too, and so he placated me by bringing excerpts from my letters, even altering the text. But he turned down my plea to bring an article which I had written. I haven't sent him money.

In order to prove this theory I offered Hardin the pay for one year, and the pay for a half-page advertisement about Semantography, provided that he brings an article by me. Whereas other authors of an international language system advertised frequently in his Review I had not done so. But now I offered him the dollars as a bait - and I hooked the fish. He took the article, but as it was an attack on the linguists from beginning to end, he foamed with anger and attacked me and accused me in a private letter - but he held on to the dollars and brought the article.

So far, I have proved what I wanted to prove. But I used the article for another proof too. I titled the article A CHALLENGE TO EVERY LINGUIST and invited in the advertisement everyone to ask for further information.

My other proof came through. Not one letter came my way. This again proves that the readers of Hardin's International Language Review - though being interlinguists - are not interested in any new idea and new thought in their own cherished field. This again is a further illustration of the difficulties which a man faces who brings forth an entirely new concept.

We must realise that the idea of an international language has been hammered into the minds of intellectuals for the last hundred years. In other words, the idea has become a conservative one. No one who advocates an international language must fear that he will be considered a crank. But an idea like mine is entirely contrary to conservative cherished ideas and hence the taint of crank is there.

With this, I close this issue (devoting the next issue to the article A CHALLENGE TO EVERY LINGUIST as an ^{Appendix} which can be supplied separately). I beg forgiveness to the reader for the overlong issue presented here. As I see it, only the researcher interested in studying the obstacles to a new idea in this field will take the time to read all this, and if his study will help future inventors in this field, I shall be happily rewarded for all the pains I took.

(see now next issue, no. 179)