

SCHOLARS AND SEMANTOGRAPHY

Ten years ago I started my Semantography under the subtitle The Story of the Struggle for Semantography. It's time now to end the series, and therefore I shall deal in this issue cursorily with the correspondence between a number of scholars and my-self. In previous issues I printed my letters to scholars and academics institutions, because some of my best friends believed that I did not approach the professors with the necessary deference, submission, humility and humbleness. In order to prove that I did so I had to reprint my letters. In this issue it should not be necessary. I shall only reprint part of my letters dealing with some special aspects. Some letters are not mentioned at all. The researcher will find the whole correspondence in my files.

I wish to say however, that the scholars mentioned in this issue have gone out of their way to listen to my pleading letters and answering them. For this I am grateful, because many other linguists and scholars who received my papers have ignored them.

The correspondence reprinted herebelow is in alphabetical order. The first scholar is my old Professor from Vienna, Professor Emil Abel. I am extremely grateful to him because he referred to me the writing of Professor Ashley Montagu.

Only excerpts from some of our letters are printed below and on the next page.

Dear Professor Abel,

27th December, 1949.

Your letter full of sincerest friendliness came to me, when I felt at the bottom of an emotional wave and it carried me upwards to the crest of a new wave of hope. I am happy that we have established contact, and that I can count on you as a friend. I am writing in English, as you asked for an exposition of my work, and as I want that you should acquaint friends with it.

Firstly, let me express my deepest sorrow at the death of your dear wife. I have lost my mother, who having escaped death at the hand of the Nazis, was happy in the thought of coming out to me, permit and ship ticket in hand, and then slumbered away peacefully in the arms of her younger son, my brother who is now here in Australia with me.

Turning to a living, I am happy about your wonderful news, about your happiness with your children and grandchildren, and especially that you have settled in Great Britain and that you are feeling well in your work.

You remembered in your letter the first time you met me in 1939 in London. But I have met you much earlier, already in 1919. I was an ex-Serviceman studying chemistry at the Technische Hochschule. Determined to make the degree within 3 years only (using benefits for ex-Servicemen) I did not attend any lecture but I studied at home. But one lecture series I did attend, Physikalische Chemie although I was not compelled to go through an examination. The lecturer, was you and since you have been my example of a science lecturer who is absorbed and can make his hearers be absorbed in science. As a science lecturer myself, I have followed you since 1919. And I am glad to feel that I have a personal friend in <sup>then</sup>

I said in the beginning that your letter came to me when I was very much down. I had just received a letter from one UNESCO bureaucrat, and together with others received before, it makes me feel that over the entrance of the scientific Unesco institution should be the words of Dante: "Voi ch'entrate! Lasciate ogni Speranza" ("You who enter, leave all hopes behind,") And I think that this inscription should be over the doors of some educational authorities too.

As you might have guessed already my downheartedness refers to my scientific work. For seven years I worked on the crest of a wave of creative bliss. Four months ago I finished it. I should not complain because it is a short time, and during this I have collected the most flattering comments, Prof. Lancelot Hogben (Author of Science for the Citizen,) of Birmingham; Henning of London ("should be developed as widely and as rapidly as possible") and others (see enclosed leaflet).

But there are other professors, who would not hear about it, who are so prejudiced right from the start, that it is useless to talk to them. And then are those in authority who can do something about it, but they won't budge an inch.

I believed naively that the times, where pioneers of a new idea have been driven into despair, are past. Nowadays, there are institutions like UNESCO where men of science are paid for looking for pioneers of new ideas.



I have not yet recovered from the shock, realising that a pioneer must even today be at least 60 years safely in his coffin as to be to the authorities no threat and also to vanity, to have his work recognised and put into practice.

It might be arrogance to consider myself a pioneer, but so far, anyone who has given me half an hour's time and listened to me without prejudice has become convinced that mine is a pioneering idea, and that it will be one day put into practice. I feel sure that you too will be convinced about the value of my work and herebelow I shall tell you about it."

I then asked Prof. Abel to write a few words about my work (in much the same way as Bertrand Russell and others did.) I asked him to write too, a letter to the Director General of UNESCO, urging him to take an interest in my work. I made the same requests to other scholars and some of them responded, others not.

He answered in German which I translate herewith. Dear Colleague Bliss, "Your last letters containing also papers, etc. have been of great interest to me, and I am strongly impressed about the width and depth of your fields of interest. You do not indicate in your letters what chemical work you are doing at present, but it is remarkable that you are able, apart from your daily work, to find time for such deep going research which leads you into fields and history of the study which would occupy the whole time of a man. Your versatility is enormous. I myself knew little of what your letters and papers revealed to me. I knew that the Japanese, who speak a different language from the Chinese, are nevertheless able to read their writing, thanks to their ideographic script. But have they not some thousands of signs, many of which in suitable combinations, whereas your proposal refers to a few hundred only? Is it really possible to write with so few signs, say a philosophical treatise with its many terms, and read it? This should not express any doubt, only that I am following your intentions with critical curiosity.

The famous book the Loom of Language is one of the few books I like best at hand, like the Oxford Dictionary. I haven't occupied myself with archeological problems but also in this respect, your thoughts are like a catalysator, making it desirable for me to study what I have neglected so far. With me, it is my profession which has made it impossible to pursue other studies, and I am grateful to you that you have made me take an interest in these fields. Old age, it is said, does not protect one against foolishness, but surely, also not against the thirst for knowledge, and you have, dear colleague Bliss, judged me rightly, when you told me about your research. I am most grateful to you about this. Yours sincerely,

Emil Abel.

This letter was a disappointment, because he made no mention of my request for a few words about my work and for a letter to the Director General of UNESCO. When he drew my attention to an article by Ashley Montague "Social Instincts" in another letter I wrote to him.

Dear Professor Abel,

13th October, 1950.

Many thanks for your letter of May 29th, which arrived in August. Please excuse that I am answering it only today, and not in German. I was very happy to receive from you the hint as to the article in "Scientific America". I haven't yet had the time to look it up in the library. I would be glad if the author takes the view of a chemist as I do. I maintain that a sufficient portion of  $C_2H_5.OH$  can make a killer out of a gentle person and break down all mental barriers. Marihuana (the formula of which I am blissfully ignorant) and other new drugs, can do the strangest things to the cells of our brain. And as you know, I maintain that something must have happened between 15,000 and 30,000 B.C. if we assume that a sufficient portion of  $N_2O$  (say a few percent) has been formed in the air by strong electric discharges, radiation, or Heaven knows what - then this must have an effect on the human brain. Of course, I don't know what happened, but the reference to  $N_2O$  was only made to show you that a theory can easily be built up.

Your reference to this publication in your letter does not indicate that the author takes the chemists point of view, but I hope he does. In any case, many thanks for your suggestion.

As to the second part of your letter, I shall be greatly interested to read your present publications on Physical Chemistry. The reason why I did not ask for it before, is something which troubled me, and which I shall get off my chest. You remember that I told you that you were the only professor on the Technische Hochschule whose lectures I attended, although as an ex-servicemen I needed not to go for an examination in Physikalische Chemie.

When I got your letter after 10 years (since 1940) when we met in London, I was very happy. I sent you pages of my work and asked you: would you be kind enough to make similar statement as to those made by Professor Lancelot Hogben, and Professor Carleton Washburne. In addition I sent you a long letter about my fantastic hypothesis about early Man. Your answer of February 21st, was a bad shock for me. I realise that you did not want to give me the desired statement, not to fulfill my wish and write the few lines to the Director General of UNESCO. But you did not go into my hypothesis from a chemist's point of view.



I had to overcome this disappointment somehow. Enclosed, you will find my brochure no. 6, containing the most favourable statement of Lord Russell and other men of learning, and I hope that you will understand my deep disappointment. I was sure that the line of names in this brochure would run Bertrand Russell, Emil Abel, Lancelot Hogben etc. etc. Es hat nicht sollen sein.

Well, I got it off my chest, and I hope that you will understand, and will not be angry with me. I find that this disappointment is actually the reason why I did not ask for your present publication. But now - I hope that you will forgive me for my frankness, and you will send me your work, which I will study with the greatest interest.

In a later <sup>letter</sup> he told me that a friend of his had seen an article about my work published in a French paper L'Intransigeant. He attached the cut (see S.S. no.

The next scholar is professor Arnold from the M.I.T. Mass. U.S.A. Prof. Reiser sent me a cut from LIFE and I wrote,

Prof. E. Arnold,  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

CAMBRIDGE MASS. U.S.A.

22nd June, 1955.

Dear Prof. Arnold

Prof. Oliver L. Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh sent me a cut from LIFE (?) which deals with your thoughts, and reads :-

"The machinery by which we put our thoughts into writing is likewise in need of an overhaul, he feels. Human beings think at the rate that Arnold roughly estimates at between 600, and 1,200 words per minute, yet even only a superb typist can put only a 10<sup>th</sup> that much on paper. To make writing as fast as speech will call for a whole new set of symbols and then a new way of communicating them. Arnold has not tried to work out any actual devices himself, but he perfectly certain that some would be thought up."

Reading this I feel sure that you will be interested in my Semantography and for this reason I enclose two prospectuses hoping that you might be interested to acquire the paper of Professor Reiser. My three books on Semantography are in the M.I.T. Library as well as at Harvard. Harvard has however, my semantography series and has given a standing order for future issues. I wonder whether you could persuade the M.I.T. Librarian to put in an order similar to Harvard's for the semantography series.

With regard to the above reference, I wish to say that my symbols are surely grasped much quicker than any phonetic script. Their main advantage, however, is that they can be read in any language. Recently a researcher found my three books in the Library Of Congress and he wrote to me "It seems to good to be true that someone has thought this up." This coincides with your own thoughts and therefore I hope that you will take an active interest in my work.

Yours sincerely,  
C.K. Bliss.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

September 21, 1955.

Due to the extreme rush of special work this summer, and trying to get some vacation, I have not had a chance to answer your letter of the 22nd of June, which, however, did not arrive until August 15th. I appreciate very much your reference to the paper by Professor Reiser, and your books on semantography that are available at M.I.T. and Harvard Libraries. I have not had a chance to look these up yet, but certainly will do so in the near future. The work you are doing sounds extremely interesting, and I would like to know more about it. I am sure it would add considerably to my work in Creative Engineering.

Sincerely yours,  
J. E. Arnold,  
Associate Professor of  
Mechanical Engineering.

I wrote another letter to him, begged again that the M.I.T. should order the series, and heard nothing more.

One man who was one of my greatest hopes was Dr. Beeby Director of Education of New Zealand. He was a big man at Unesco and he also was a member of the New Educational Fellowship (see S.S. No. 181). When my approach to Unesco was in danger of floundering I wrote to him, and asked for help. I also included enough material about semantography. Nevertheless, he found nice words for not doing anything.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

20th October, 1955.

I was interested to learn from your letter of the 5th October that you have written to Unesco, bringing to their notice the system of semantography which you have developed. The idea is an attractive one, but I am afraid that you have not given me enough information to warrant my writing officially to Dr. Torres F backing your scheme. If as I presume you have sent them all your material, I should imagine that they would be very interested in it, since it helps the problem of communication between peoples of different languages which are the biggest to have to face.

Yours faithfully, E. Beeby. Director of Education.



I despatched another long letter and sent him even the 3 books, so that he can see all there is to see. That was in November 1950. 5 months later, and still no answer and no acknowledgement of the books, I wrote again, asking forgiveness and all that...and again waited for another half year without an answer from Beeby. In Sept. I wrote again, asked for forgiveness again, etc. At last an apology came back, but no assurance whatsoever that he is going to do anything for my work. On the contrary, he feigned ignorance, claimed that he is a layman only, etc. Dear Mr. Bliss,

My delay was due in the first place to my action in referring your work to several people in New Zealand more capable of making a judgement on it than I am, and then finding the time in an overcrowded life to give your volumes the personal attention they merit and to write to you about them.

I have also had some difficulty in thinking what I could say to you about your work that would be useful and would be something <sup>more</sup> than the mere superficial praise of a layman that could really mean nothing to you. In the first place I shall say that everyone here <sup>to whom</sup> I have shown the volumes has been deeply impressed by the breadth of the whole conception, by the ingenuity of the means you have adopted to achieve your ends, and by the vast amount of labour that has obviously been involved.

On the technical side I can as a layman say nothing in the way of either praise or criticism that would be of much significance. My main criticism of your work is that it is too complete, that it goes too far, that it proves too much. It would, I am convinced, have more chance of being accepted if it could offer the beginner a simple method of expressing himself quite elementary ideas to a person who did not know a word of his language. To offer him from the beginning a system that would enable him to express the most abstruse ideas of the specialist and the scholar may impress him but will at the same time frighten him off.

I realise of course, that what you want to do is to show that semantography is something more than a child's toy or a parlour game. You are in something of a dilemma. If you put forward a simple and sketchy scheme, serious people may dismiss it as trivial.

I was interested seeing from your later leaflet that you are publishing a simple manual for children. If children of different languages could learn to correspond through an international sign language it might do more than anything else to make their busier and more sceptical elders interested in the system. It would be quite within the bound to get a few schools, youths clubs, and Junior Red Cross Groups, international clubs and the like to experiment with the idea if a simple manual existed.

C. E. Beeby.

The letter ends up with the usual generalities about the needs of communication, etc etc. Another great hope went down the sink. Beeby did not order an investigation and test.

In 1952 Professor John E. Burchard from the M.I.T. came to Australia. He lectured also over the radio and an article by him The Modern Tower of Babel appeared in the official Radio Journal. I wrote him a long letter, and was happy when I received an answer.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

December 26th, 1951.

I have just returned from New Zealand where I was when your letter of November 2, reached here.

I will borrow the work on semantography from Harvard and have a look <sup>to</sup> see if it is too specialised for our purposes, and if not we will want to order it. So after I have an opportunity to examine it, you will hear from us again.

Sincerely, yours,

John E. Burchard  
Dean of Humanities  
and Social Studies.

I wrote a long letter explaining the logic and semantics of semantography and received the following letter.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

February 19, 1952.

Following your letter of the 7th January I have borrowed your work and discussed it with Professor Bodmer, who is on our faculty.

We will buy the work for the M.I.T. Library and we will make it available for the student.

Obviously if we thought it trivial we would not buy it; on the other hand our purchase can naturally not be construed as an endorsement of its principles and conclusions. So you should not use this information. I have given you in your reasonable efforts to attract others attention.

Sincerely,

John E. Burchard,  
Dean of Humanities and Social Studies.

He bought the books alright, but he was too much afraid to say a few words about my work, though I sent him S.S. No. 6 with all the good words of other scholars.

When one scholar after the other refused to answer I nurtured the forlorn hope that a Jewish University in America might help a fellow Jew.



And so I wrote to Professor Ginsburg, Professor of Mathematics on New York's Jeshiva University. I explained in a long letter that Leibnitz's idea has been fulfilled; I told him of Reiser's paper about my work, of Bertrand Russell and the others, I sent him a lot of material, I appealed to him to help a fellow Jew, a victim of the Nazis, a victim of the Japanese, and now a victim of orthodoxy in the universities. I begged him to be instrumental in helping my work along in his university. This was his answer.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

December 9th, 1953.

Please forgive for the long delay in acknowledging the receipt of the interesting material you sent me some time ago. It came during my absence on a vacation and was put under a pile of printed matter which I had the opportunity to examine only recently.

Your idea about a new kind of writing is a very interesting one and its realisation would be a genuine service to humanity. But, like other forward ideas, it is not likely that you will find many individuals or organisations that would be willing to make a substantial effort towards the realisation of this worthy project. Simplification of writing is not new on the "agenda" of humanity.

It is possible (but not probable) that some large universities in this country or in Europe would be amenable to a suggestion that the idea be tested by members of the faculty, but you would have already contacted some great institutions and are familiar with their reaction to this idea.

I exceedingly regret my inability to be of greater assistance to you in this matter.

Sincerely,

Jekuthiel Ginsburg

Editor of Scripta Mathematica.

Now we come to an interesting man, Professor Hajakawa, a co-worker of Korzybski, editor of the journal of General Semantics ETC, and leader for the Society of General Semantics. ETC is called after a "semantic device" of Korzybski, who said that we can never say all that there is to say about something. Therefore we should add the abbreviation "etc" to any descriptions we make, indicating thus that there is more to say and we shouldn't forget it.

From various publications I learned that apparently Hajakawa was at loggerheads with Korzybski. Indeed, Hajakawa's book "Language in Action" is written on the lines of Korzybski's work, but he is hardly mentioned there. In fact, some devices of Korzybski are deliberately distorted as for instance his Structural Differential. (See Semantography Book III p. 471). Furthermore Korzybski uses his formula of "man<sub>1</sub> is not man<sub>2</sub> is not man<sub>3</sub>" in order to indicate that three different men evaluate things differently. Hajakawa takes Korzybski's device and transforms it so "cow<sub>1</sub> is not cow<sub>2</sub> is not cow<sub>3</sub>". But cows have no abstract language. Cows do not make evaluations and express them in words. In short, I realised that Hajakawa plays a game which leaves much to be desired. See same issue later pages from my correspondence with Miss Kendig, Korzybski's secretary and director of the Institute of General Semantics after Korzybski's death, I learned that my assumption is right. It is only natural that the slightest hint that cows are not men must have made Hajakawa go mad. And this is indeed what happened.

But Korzybski, though his teachings helped me greatly, went too far in some respect and especially his attack on Aristotelian logic seems unfounded to me. Korzybski developed the dictum "Whatever you say it is, it is not." So is Korzybski a man or is he not? I asked. This would have driven Korzybski mad had I written to him when he was alive. The reader interested in all this will find my exposition in semantography series No. 74 (Introduction to the Semantics of Semantography) which is actually a letter directed to Hajakawa.

It all began when Professor Reiser asked Hajakawa to review my work in his ETC journal. Hajakawa invited me to send it to him.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

September 1st, 1951.

Professor Oliver L. Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh has urged strongly that we review in ETC your work Semantography. We should be happy to do so. Will you kindly send a review copy of your book on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

S.I. Hajakawa.

Dear Mr. Hajakawa

11th September, 1951

Your letter of Sept. 1st. has been a most pleasant surprise and I am grateful to you for your interest to review my work, and I am also grateful to Professor Reiser for his suggestion.

I am not a new-comer to General Semantics, and I was very happy to discover in your magazine Winter 1948 Vol., No. 2 page 155 a note which you or someone else had found for inclusion, namely that I gave a lecture on the subject "A New Method to bring General Semantics into Primary School Education." You have also been kind enough to grant me in a personal letter permission to quote some of your writing, and of some contributors to ETC, for instance Rapoport.

I should have approached you much earlier, and indeed, it was on my mind to approach you with regard to a correspondence I am starting.



The reason for my silence is that I have somewhat a bad conscience, and here is why. Three years ago, I studied Lee's LANGUAGE HABITS IN HUMAN AFFAIRS and wrote a letter to Professor Lee with observations and suggestions. I got a very nice letter, indeed a letter so nice that I sat down and wrote a 13 page closely written letter, containing all observations which I had made in the Sydney Chapter of the Society of GS. We read there SCIENCE AND SANITY and I had many times to go up and explain the mathematical, geometrical and physical implications, which were "dark" to the audience. When I read my long letter again, I was flabbergasted. It contained actually a critic of GS, or rather observations of how the "highbrow" language of S & S reacts on the minds of common man and woman.

As said before, I didn't like to criticise Korzybski, and therefore I didn't send the letter to Professor Lee. I am now going to repent. I want to show that I was studying hard to think up a "Method to bring General Semantics into Primary School Education" and Semantography is this method.

Professor G. Patrick Meredith at the University of Leeds wrote about my work "Semantography is such an important creative advance in language design, that the strategy of its presentation to the world merits as much care as the author has devoted to the system itself." Now, Sir you are for me a very important slice of the world and I am anxious that Semantography should find your approval. For this reason I choose my "strategy" carefully." (end of excerpt)

Dear Professor Hajakawa, 7th January, 1952.

This letter accompanies the six page sheet INTRODUCTION TO THE SEMANTICS OF SEMANTOGRAPHY, a special exposee written for you in appreciation of your work. I shall send copies of this also to Professor Rapoport, to Professor Reiser, to the Institute of General Semantics, and to a number of other semanticists.

With hope but also with apprehension I do look forward to your review. And I beg for your understanding when I ask for one favour from you. Should you have some criticism to offer <sup>write</sup> to me and hear my argument. After that, you may proceed with your criticism. I have found that people who have voiced some criticism realised their mistake, when I explained the matter to them. But your criticism may be of a fundamental nature. Even then, you should know my answer, before putting it into print. The damage will be done, because many people just rely on a review of a work. At present, I feel like tending for a (surely premature) baby which can be "killed" by any criticism. Unfortunately, this is not a metaphor only. The distressing and frustrating experiences I have had, seeing people rejecting a new idea, just because it looks unusual, have brought me to brink of disaster, materially and mentally. My few friends have drawn up a leaflet which Professor Reiser distributed at the AAAS meeting. The fourth page tells of my plight. I hope that a correspondence course will bring me out of my difficulties financially.

Lastly, one more request. Should you care to show some symbols in your review, please let me draw them for you. I have found that newspaper and magazine draughtsmen drew them as they like with unpleasing results. And when you show some symbols let it be accompanied by my explanation, as follows "Bliss describes the meanings of the symbols as being....." At present there is a controversy going on in the largest Sydney daily, started by a letter to the editor, in which the writer criticises a symbol <sup>because</sup> simply the newspaper man described it not in the way I told him. I have shown in the leaflet for the Reiser lecture, that I can describe my symbols in the shortest of terms.

All this may make a not pleasing impression on you. I rely therefore on your magnanimity and your generosity that you will recognise the desperate struggle of a man for a new idea and that you will help him along.

The attached exposition, S.S. No. 74 and as I feared, it made him mad. But I could not help it. The very basis of Semantics of Semantography is a refutation of Korzybski's "Whatever you say it is, it is not." I showed that it is unacceptable to THINGS AND ACTIONS (Korzybski is a man, Korzybski is writing a book, etc.) Korzybski's dictum is only applicable to human EVALUATIONS. (Korzybski's book is good or bad, his theories are right or wrong, etc) Again I had to show that Hajakawa <sup>owns</sup> are innocent things which cannot make human EVALUATIONS in words. In short, I went in my criticism to the very roots of Korzybski's and Hajakawa's teachings. I expected a learned controversy. But I did not expect a flight and a refusal to study my semantics. But this is what I got.

Dear Mr. Bliss, March 25th, 1952.

I have received your book on Semantography and have finally had time to examine it in this past week. I am sorry to say that I do not find it suitable for notice in ETC., hence I am returning it to you by parcel post.

Yours very truly,

S.I. Hajakawa.

P. S. I should be pleased if you would refrain from any further use of my name in connection with your mimeographed communication, "Introduction to the Semantics of Semantography," dated January 1952.

In order to show that I have correctly guessed Hajakawa's attitude to Korzybski's work and mine, I shall quote from my correspondence with Miss Kandig, who carries on Korzybski's work,



She is the Director of the Institute of Semantics, and has no direct influence on the Society of General Semantics which Hajakawa dominated even during the last years of Korzybski's life.

Dear Miss Kendig,

21st February, 1956.

You have put me on your mailing list some years ago, and from time to time I have received your cards inviting me to a summer course on General Semantics. I wish I had the money to come, but I haven't. I cannot even contribute with money to your work, because I myself am in a life and death struggle trying to keep my work on Semantics alive. So the only thing I can do is to admire your work in keeping Alfred Korzybski's work alive, and to accompany your work with all my best wishes.

I wanted to say this to you for a long time, but my time for writing letters is very short, as I have to make a living in other spheres. You can count on some thousand of supporters in the United States and elsewhere. I have only a few and they do not contribute money to my work, only sympathy. So, at last I am writing to you today, because I have one question to ask.

Some time ago a pamphlet came into my hand from the Society of General Semantics, which I believe is conducted by Hajakawa. What perplexed me in this pamphlet was that the way and manner in which the discipline of Semantics was treated there, was Korzybski's teaching. Yet, there was not the slightest hint in the whole pamphlet which said so. There was no reference to Korzybski at all. Also in "Language in Action" the reference to Korzybski is so slight that I cannot help feeling that here is a distinct trend to suppress the origin of all the teachings on General Semantics. Now, I have experienced something similar, as some of my disciples have tried to twist my work to suit their ambitions. I wonder whether there is a similar trend here. This I consider one of the greatest handicaps in the development of a new idea, the fact that disciples soon deny the teacher and proceed to put up something of their own. I don't know whether you are willing to answer my query frankly. I shall be grateful. In order to give you the full facts, I wish to inform you that some years ago Professor Oliver L. Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh (who was an unselfish helper of Korzybski and an unselfish helper of my work) approached Hajakawa asking him to review my work in ETC. Thereupon I sent Hajakawa something of my work. However, as the Semantics of Semantography is not worked out distinctly because Semantography has been devised as an interlinguistic medium, I wrote and mimeographed a special pamphlet "Introduction to the Semantics of Semantography". In this I tried to show that I have studied General Semantics, and have in the true spirit of time-binding started where Korzybski has left off. I have attended here a course where we read Science and Sanity, and I have experienced the perplexity of some of the members about some aspects of General Semantics. I believe that I have overcome these perplexities, and I showed Hajakawa how. Now one of Korzybski's main points is:  $man_1$  is not  $man_2$  is not  $man_3$  etc. This I have taken over acknowledging always Korzybski's pioneering work. In "Language and Action" Hajakawa gave this teaching a twist by asking the reader always to think that  $cow_1$  is not  $cow_2$  and is not  $cow_3$ . Now believing that Hajakawa will be able to stand a little critic, I showed that cows are perfectly harmless objects. They have no language and they do not express whatever they think in words which may have different meanings with different people. We must therefore return to the original teachings:  $man_1$  is not  $man_2$  etc. However, Hajakawa did not take my article in good grace, got mad and refused a review, sending back all my papers. This is the story of Hajakawa and my work, and I told you this in order to show you why I wanted to know something of the relations of H. to the people who uphold Korzybski's work, but if you don't want to go into this, it is alright with me. I have accepted my fate to go alone knowing that my work will be appreciated and used by later generations. My three books on Semantography are bought by important libraries in the U.S.A. and elsewhere. I have sent you the Synopsis some years ago, but I only received a card acknowledging the receipt of the book which will be incorporated in your library. This was a disappointment, but I do not mind. I realise now the great struggle you are facing, and again wish you all success.

Yours sincerely,

C. K. Bliss.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

22nd May, 1956.

You have practically hit the nail on the head in connection with Hajakawa's work in general semantics and the very scant acknowledgements he makes to Korzybski's work. He has also "twisted" the discipline considerably, and this was a great sorrow to Korzybski during his later years. He cared much more about the fact that the discipline was being misinterpreted than he did about not getting "credit". Some time when I am able I shall send you the carbon copy of a critique I have just written on another book which involves saying something about Hajakawa's work with general semantics. We particularly disapprove of his adaptation of Structural Differential.



Under separate cover I am sending you a reprint of an article by Dr. F.S.C. Northrop of Yale which I think, you will see agrees with you on the cow<sub>1</sub>, cow<sub>2</sub> business.

Additionally you should know that the Society of General Semantics was originally founded to support the institute but later gave <sup>this</sup> up. Then we started our own membership program. At least half of our budget comes from memberships of ten dollars, a few people give us more. We operate together on a budget of about twelve thousand dollars. This has to support four or more people over the year and pay for our considerable promotion work.

Thank you again for your letter. You have my warm best wishes for yourself and for your work. I am sorry that I am not able to pay more attention to it, and if ever I am able to retire you can be sure that I will look into it more thoroughly than I have been able to do.

Yours cordially,

M. Kendig.

Director.

Dear Miss Kendig,

2nd July, 1956.

I am glad to see from your letter that I have judged Hajakawa correctly. I wish to have, during my lifetime, an opportunity to tell him the truth and to make others known the truth. Your kind promise to send me a copy of a critique about Hajakawa's work will be greatly appreciated. The article from Professor Northrop has not yet arrived. I am looking forward to it.

I include a mimeographed letter to Hajakawa in which I have been critical on some aspects on General Semantics. As I told in my first letter, it was the critique which has made him mad. Now will you kindly study this critique carefully, I am afraid that it might make you mad too, because I am <sup>criticising</sup> not Hajakawa but some aspects of Korzybski's work. I am doing this for I have for a number of years been connected with the Sydney Chapter of the Society for General Semantics and have found that the people have some <sup>of the</sup> criticised notions about general semantics.

Korzybski spoke of "time-binding" and I understand that he meant with this the possibility that one generation can start off where the foregoing generation left off. This in fact has been made possible by the spoken, written and printed word. I took Korzybski's word of time-binding literally and started where Korzybski left off. However, I have learnt in the meantime that adherents of a certain item or ism, or a certain-ology, do not like to hear criticism of their idea or its originator. There was a time when I believed that the adherents of General Semantics will take kindly to my work. However, my hope has come to naught. Not because of opposition but because of (as said before) adherents do not want to hear or read about any critique of their pet idea.

Yours sincerely,

C. K. Bliss.

As I had predicted Miss Kendig did not take the trouble to answer my criticism of Korzybski's work. Neither did she respond to my previous pleas to bring something of Semantography in her bulletin. I have learned my lesson that the originator of a new idea not only has to face ignorance and antagonism of professional scholars, he has also to face the opposition in ranks of adherents of similar ideas. Consequently the adherents of Esperanto, and other constructed languages did not want to hear about my work, though I always tried to prove to them that my symbols cannot be spoken, are no competition to their language, but could be the forerunner of an auxiliary spoken language.

Now for a change, let's not look at a professional scholar, but a professional educational administrator. Mr. Heffron was for many years Minister for Education for the State of New South Wales. At present (July 1960) he is Premier of the Government of this State. His constituency is the suburb of Maroubra where I too lived for more than 10 years. As his constituent I should have ready access to him, but from other instances I learned that ministers or members of parliament always turn over any request made to them to the public servants of the respective government departments. My brother who lives in the constituency of Bondi then approached his member of Parliament Landa. Mr. Landa is a Jew and has been and still is a Minister for the Government. The Jewish minority of Sydney (concentrated in the Bondi electorate) looks to him for support. In turn they vote for him faithfully through all elections. Years ago, I approached him but without result. It was my brother Henry who urged me to go to Landa to reconsider the matter. So, I wrote to Landa.

Dear Mr. Landa,

40th October, 1953.

I regret that this letter might add to your overheavy burden of working for the community. Yet, I believe that here is a worthy cause, which should interest you as a representative, as a member of the senate of Sydney University, and as a member of the Jewish community. I have spoken to you some time ago, and found you a ready listener to my work, a great educational idea which has found support by great scholars in Great Britain and the United States. Yet, here in Australia, despite lectures before the students of Sydney University, I experienced the recurring



truth in the old proverb : Nemo propheta in sua patria honorem habet.

What I want from you is an introduction to the Minister for Education, Mr. Heffron. Without support and introduction, I feel that he will delegate my case to some official and this might be the end of it. What I want is the opportunity to give a personal demonstration in a talk to the Minister and some of his higher officials.

Here is the gist of my work. We learn the three R's in the primary school and then we go on learning more R's and Arts. But the most important R is not taught in the primary and secondary schools of the world - the Art of Reasoning. At the University a number of students take the course in Logic, but you know that the textbooks on Logic are out of reach mentally for the common man. There is no simple method available for teaching man and women, children and adolescents how to reason, how to come to logical conclusions, and how to avoid the fallacies in thought. 300 years ago, the great mathematician Leibnitz prophesised that one day a simple "Algebra of Thought" will be invented. Now that scholars abroad have agreed that I am the first man who has realised Leibnitz's idea, I find myself forced into oblivion simply because new ideas are not readily accepted, and the educational authorities might be reluctant to listen to a man who is a professional teacher.

I ask you therefore to be kind enough to bring the Minister of Education to agree that I shall demonstrate to him and some of his officers in a personal talk my work, which has found great acclaim abroad. If you would like to hear about it and if you would agree to have a personal demonstration given to you one evening in your home before you and some of your friends, I shall be delighted to fulfill such a request. Thanking you in anticipation, I am

Yours sincerely,  
C. K. Bliss.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

October 13th, 1952.

Your letter of October 10th, to hand.

I will speak to the Minister for Education and see if it is possible for him to arrange an appointment to meet you and discuss your subject. I will let you know as soon as I hear from Mr. Heffron.

Sincerely,  
Mr. Landa.  
Member for Bondi.

And then what I feared did happen.

Dear Mr. Landa,

5 November, 1952.

Perhaps in the first instance Bliss would care to discuss his work with a senior officer of the Department -- I have forwarded the contents of your presentations to the Director General with this end in view and I have asked him to communicate with Mr. Bliss direct.

Yours faithfully,  
R. J. Heffron.  
Minister for Education.

Dear Mr. Heffron,

24th November, 1952.

For over 6 years, I am living in the Maroubra area, and many times I have felt the temptation to walk up to your house and tell you about my work. Each time, however, I hesitated. I realised that I had to go a long way. I feared that you, a minister, overburdened with many duties would relegate my work to an official and I was unknown in the educational profession. I had to seek recognition abroad first.

Now, I have been informed that Douglass N. Everingham M. B., B.Sc., Division of Mental Hygiene, Department of Public Health, N.S.W. has written a personal letter to you on behalf of my work. He and a number of educational authorities in Great Britain and the United States have praised in eulogistic terms the value of my work for children and adult education. Tests have been made in Great Britain. Endeavours are made in the U.S.A. to bring me on a lecture tour. The Library of Congress in Washington, and other Institutions have given standing orders to Angus and Robertson to buy anything I have written or should write about my work. This is surely an honorable recognition not accorded as far as I know to many Australians, that whatever they write and be it a typewritten sheet only is bought by great American institutions.

There is therefore no doubt that one day I will receive a call to go and teach at an American institution, or in Great Britain or elsewhere. But I do not want to go away. I want to stay here and want that this great educational idea should spread from New South Wales into the world. Yet despite some lectures which I have given to the Students of Sydney University and the University of Technology - I have waited in vain for an invitation to demonstrate my work to the educational authorities here. I approached therefore Mr. Landa and asked him to introduce me to you and to support my plea for a personal demonstration before you and a group of your officials.

You have been kind enough to respond to Mr. Landa's presentation, but you have relegated the study of my work to an official. A new educational discipline involving even some mathematics, cannot be explained by a petitioner sitting at a desk.



Moreover, the official may find the new idea strange - as all new ideas are. If his report is in the negative - this is the end of it. This is the reason why I plead for a demonstration to a group of educators. If all of them <sup>hear</sup> the counter-argument and my answers, then at least I would have the benefit of a divided audience.

I ask you therefore, kindly to revise your decision. Give me an opportunity to present in your home my work of which has been said: "an important service to Mankind" (Bertrand Russell,) "should be developed as rapidly as possible" (James Henning) "great value" (Prof. C. Washburne) and many other of such statements.

Yours sincerely,

C. K. Bliss

Now at last Heffron knew what it is all about. I want a job. And his secretary knows perfectly how to handle the thousands of letters from constituents all asking for jobs.

Dear Mr. Landa,

18th May, 1953.

I am in receipt of your personal representations on behalf of Mr. Henry Bliss, wherein you advised me of the desire of his brother Mr. C. K. Bliss of 5 Maroubra Bay Road Pagewood, to be considered for appointment to the Research Division of the Department of Education, the University of Technology or the Sydney University.

The matter of appointment to the Sydney University would be one for consideration by the University Authorities.

I will be pleased to ask the Public Service Board to give consideration to Mr. Bliss' request for a position in the Education Department or the University of Technology.

Yours sincerely,

R. J. Heffron

Acting Premier

And the Public Service Board too had a time-honored formula how to answer to such requests.

The Hon R. J. Heffron, M.L.A

Acting Premier and Colonial Treasurer

SYDNEY.

Dear Sir,

27th May, 1953.

I refer to your personal representations on behalf of Mr. C. K. Bliss of 5 Maroubra Bay Road Pagewood, who is interested in employment in the Department of Education or the N. S. W. University of Technology.

For the present no suitable vacancies are available in the Department of Education or in the N.S.W. University of Technology in which Mr. Bliss could be employed. From time to time as additional staff is required, details of vacant positions are advertised in the Sydney Morning Herald and should future vacancies be of interest to Mr. Bliss, any application he may desire to lodge with the Public Service Board will receive full consideration with those of other applicants.

Yours sincerely,

H. W. Dickinson

Secretary

As the reader can see, the subject of semantography has completely vanished. No one knows what it is, and no one cares. They have all done their democratic duty to deal with a job hunter.

From Heffron to Harvard. In 1950 Bertrand Russell came to Australia as the Dyason lecturer of the Australian Institute of International Affairs. In 1951 it was Spanish diplomat and writer Madariaga (see next pages) and in 1952 it was a distinguished Harvard professor of Anthropology Clyde Kluckhohn. From my correspondence with Reiser I knew they were friends. I sought an interview, and wrote to him.

Dear Professor Kluckhohn,

30th August, 1952.

We have a common friend, Professor Oliver L. Reiser of Pittsburgh. He sent me a mailing list with your name and address on it (24 Dudley Hall, Dunster Street, Cambridge Mass.) and requested me to send you a copy (when published) of his address UNIFIED SYMBOLISM FOR WORLD UNDERSTANDING IN SCIENCE, which he gave at the last meeting of the AAAS in Philadelphia. I am negotiating the publication, because Professor Reiser spoke prominently about my work and used such words as "Bliss heroic work".... "a powerful stimulus and aid".... "Bliss realised the ambition of the great mathematician Leibnitz," etc.

My books have been acquired by Professor A.I. Richards of Harvard, by Professor Burchard of the M.I.T. and by other scholars and universities in the United States. I have even a Cambridge scholar among the students of my correspondence course. Moves are under way for lecture tour through the United States. I attach an editorial article from the Christian Science Monitor which contains a passage which will interest you, and this is the reason why I write to you.

The President of the Australian Institute for International Affairs in N.S.W. Senior Lecturer H.D. Black is a great supporter of my work, and he has at last years visit to Harvard interested Professor Willard Quine in it. Moreover, I have been introduced to the Dyason lecturers of 1951 and 1952 Bertrand Russell and Salvador de Madariaga. Earl Russell wrote afterwards that support of my work "means performing an important service for mankind."



I do not want to bother the officers of the Institute for a personal introduction. I am writing to you therefore, because you <sup>are</sup> an anthropologist, and I have made an anthropological discovery (as a "by-product" of my work, which has the backing of a colleague of yours, Professor Ashley Montagu of Rutgers University).

My work itself, which is of no importance as far as this letter is concerned, refers to the speculation of Leibnitz, considered impossible to realise

for 300 years, his Symbolis Universalis, a pictorial symbolism, which in its simplest form constitutes a new interlinguistic medium for illiterate mankind; on its next higher level it is a medium for interlinguistic communication in industry, commerce and even science. Furthermore, the symbols of my Semantography work in a simple "Algebra of Thought" as Leibnitz prophesied it. In the course of my study of <sup>the</sup> writings of old (Chinese, Egyptian, Babylonian etc.,) I made my anthropological discovery.

Although I have lectured a number of times on semantography at Sydney University, I am - as it is often the case, not much recognised here, partially also because I work in industry and am not a professional teacher. As to my anthropological discovery, I have been unable to interest anyone here. Not that my theory has been rejected. I wasn't given any opportunity to speak about it. Apparently people don't believe that an amateur (Latin Lover) in anthropology can make a discovery. I enclose a short extract, and shall be happy to come to you in order to give you more details should you find a personal meeting interesting enough.

The interest which Professor Reiser showed in my work has greatly changed my life. I am writing to you, hoping that you, a friend of Reiser, will act in his spirit. What I have found is so phantastic, that it seems unbelievable. It can indeed change our conception of homo sapiens. I want to get rid of this idea, which torments my mind. I am writing to you hoping that you will help me in making this idea known. As for me, I am already 55 years of age, and want to pass it on before I pass out.

Awaiting your letter or phone call, I remain

Yours sincerely,  
C. K. Bliss.

We met and I lost no time to introduce him to my anthropological theories on the origin of human warfare. It turned out that he was a personal friend of Chisholm who was at that time Director General of the World Health Organisation. Kluckhohn was also an associate editor of the journal Psychiatry. And he was much interested in my work. He commissioned me to write an article and he promised to do everything to get it into the journal Psychiatry or another journal. In addition, he said that he would do everything to get me a publication grant from the Carnegie Foundation, and he will do everything to get me to Harvard. It all seemed too good to be true.

It took me four months to perfect my article A POSSIBLE PROOF AND TOOL FOR CHISHOLM'S THEORY ON THE CAUSE AND PREVENTION OF HUMAN WARFARE (See S.S. No. 85) In addition Everingham wrote his PSYCHOSEMATICS, ADULT EMOTION AND WAR (see S.S. 86) and his MESSAGE TO MORTALS in the Medical Journal Of Australia. (S.S. No. 87) I sent it all to Kluckhohn with the accompanying letter. I termed it my last personal appeal after 11 years of going a-begging to scholars, universities, foundations and institutions.

Dear Professor Kluckhohn,

5th February, 1953

Kindly excuse this long letter, it might well be that this is the only opportunity to write to you, and as an anthropologist you will surely be interested to know what goes on in the mind of a man whose work is ahead of his time. I sincerely hope that this letter will find you in the best of health and spirit and I beg to renew my thanks for the inspiration you have given to me in asking me to write an article which you will try to place in PSYCHIATRY. The draft of this article together with other matters are enclosed in a separate letter. And here are some important details.

1. When the article was drafted I felt that you must have expressed similar views and a search in the library made me find your book MIRROR OF MAN. There I found the gist of my article expressed by you in a few sentences and I put your words at the head of my article. Furthermore, I dedicated it to you, and I beg you to kindly accept my dedication.
2. Kindly excuse the closely written <sup>and on</sup> both pages mimeographed article; the reasons for this procedure are explained below. In any case you and/or the editor of PSYCHIATRY want to make some alterations or suggestions, kindly use interleaved blank paper and number your suggestions to corresponding paragraphs in the article. As soon as I have these suggestions, I shall rewrite the article properly spaced and on one side of the paper and submit it to the editor of PSYCHIATRY. What I have sent to you is a DRAFT only.
3. The reasons for mimeographing my draft are manifold. Firstly, you may be interested to send some of the copies to some of your friends. Tell me how many you want. Secondly you will probably send one copy to the editor with your suggestions, one copy to be retained by him, and a third copy to be retained by you.



Please receive three copies. Thirdly, I have no financial support whatever and in fact have great difficulties to earn enough money for my extravaganzas semantography. Every saving in paper, duplicating, mailing, etc. counts. Fourthly (see my next paragraph).

4. I know of the great difficulties which professional teachers, professors and researchers have in getting their articles placed in scientific journals. If you succeed in placing my article, I would consider this a miracle. However, if <sup>you</sup> do not succeed, then my labours are not wasted. I have put my thoughts down and the article, dedicated to you, becomes an issue of <sup>my</sup> Semantography series, which is a collection of all my brochures and leaflets, articles and lectures written or given by me or any other people, as well as other writings illuminating a special application of semantography or a particular endeavour for it.

5. My struggle during the last 11 years has resulted in a few encouraging and rewarding events. One is your kind interest. Another is a standing order given by the LIBRARY OF CONGRESS Washington D.C. to a prominent Sydney bookshop to acquire and collect all <sup>my</sup> and other people's writing on semantography, the semantography series. Now I am happy to inform you that HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY has joined THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS and given a second standing order. It may be you, or Prof. Richards, or Prof. Qine, or the Librarian of Harvard or someone else. But I believe that <sup>another</sup> set of my three books has been delivered to Harvard. There are now three sets in Cambridge, one at Harvard, one at the M.I.T. (bought by Prof. Burchard and Prof. Bodmer) and one bought by Professor A.I. Richards. My deepfelt thanks to all.

6. When we met in Sydney, I realised how little time you could give me, I concentrated only on the aspect of the absence of pictures of human warfare in paleolithic cave paintings as a possible PROOF FOR CHISHOLM'S THEORY ON THE CAUSE OF HUMAN WARFARE. As you know, according to Chisholm, human warfare, the killings of members of the same species (almost absent in animal species) is due to the evolution of abstract language, the emergence and the application of the concept of good and evil to everything, including the people across any real or fictitious borderline. War became imminent. Considering the fact that only animal hunts, but not man hunts are pictured in paleolithic caves paintings, it is likely that the concept of good and evil <sup>was</sup> evolved at a later date, say at the end of the neolithic period.

7. But what I had no time to tell you in Sydney is the fact that semantography (being according to a number of scholars the first practical realisation of Leibniz's idea of a simple and logical "Algebra of Thought") is a POSSIBLE TOOL FOR CHISHOLM'S THEORY ON THE PREVENTION OF HUMAN WARFARE. Chisholm wants a re-education of mankind making all peoples realise the ambiguities and fallacies of the concept of good and evil. Semantography is that simple symbolic Logic and Semantics which even children can grasp, as it has been proved in Great Britain and Australia.

8. For the above mentioned reasons I have tentatively titled my article A POSSIBLE PROOF AND TOOL FOR CHISHOLM'S THEORY ON THE CAUSE AND PREVENTION OF HUMAN WARFARE. However, cramming the first aspect (the proof in paleolithic man) and the second aspect (the symbolic logic of semantography) in one article would endanger its acceptance. I shall be happy to have the first article be followed by a second one, showing semantography as a tool for carrying out Chisholm's prevention treatment.

9. As a proof that semantography can be a tool for the psychiatrist I beg to inform you that a young man and brilliant psychiatrist Douglas N. Everingham a graduate of Sydney University and now with the State Mental Hospitals of New South Wales has become an active and enthusiastic co-worker. He has applied the simple symbols and logic of semantography in his treatment of patients and he has - after reading my draft article - written his comments in a supporting article, and has written a small article to the Editor of <sup>the</sup> Medical Journal (encl.)

10. So far I have referred to the submitted article and to semantography. Allow me to refer to myself. For a number of years I have been Director of the Patent Department of a large Electric Firm. During my researches with regard to the priority of inventions, I have found that, with few exceptions, the originators of new ideas met <sup>an</sup> untimely death, bogged down by handicaps, difficulties, misery and bankruptcy. They got indeed a rough deal, but not because of the apathy of the masses or the resistance of the "man in the street" who were not aware of the inventor. The originator of <sup>a</sup> new idea approached the important men in this field the men who indeed could help his work and himself along. They had the means they had even the duty to recognise the value of the ideas in their fields. It was their job to give the originator, that inventor, that pioneer a fair deal.

11. I am being what is called an "idealist" not a cynic and not a fool. Only an idealist could spend most of his time, his earnings, his thoughts on a new idea by which mankind could benefit. And I believed that those bitter times for men with new ideas are gone for good. To-day in this enlightened age for science all that is necessary <sup>is</sup> to make a scientific contribution and the men of science will recognise it, no matter whether it comes from a professional or from one who worked on it without pay. In this my belief I have been most cruelly disappointed.



As told to you, in most cases, the receipt of my letters, brochures, books have not been acknowledged although<sup>a</sup> line written by a secretary could have alleviated the burning pain of shame and injury.

12. You are a man of Harvard University, one of the greatest, if not the greatest seat of learning in the world. Your kind response to my request for a personal talk has opened up hope in my heart. Moreover, you are head of the department which deals with various aspects of Communism on the minds of people, especially people in the Western World. We see the incredible happen that millions of intelligent people in the Western world are still captivated by the Communist's slogans and fallacies, in spite of the fact that Soviet Russia every possible abomination is perpetrated. These fellow travellers in America, Great Britain believe that they are sincere in their belief yet they constitute a very great danger. WHAT WE NEED IS A SIMPLE SEMANTICS AND LOGIC WHICH EVERYONE CAN GRASP AND BY WHICH THE SLOGANS OF THE COMMUNIST DICTATORS CAN BE EASILY DEMASKED. Semantography is this new tool, and all I ask at present is that I shall be allowed to prove it.

13. If a man commits a hideous crime he is given a fair trial, a judge and a counsel for the defence, and even a lay jury. He can appeal to the higher court. But if a man commits the "crime" of evolving a new and unorthodox idea, he has no court where his doings can be tried and judged, no counsel for the defence, no lay jury. He is condemned without a hearing, without a trial. He has to go the bitter road of oblivion and desperation. Only when he is dead is the value of his work realised. But what could he have done in his field if he could have got a little encouragement, a little help?

14. If I am allowed to sink into deeper bitterness and desolation, I shall have no other recourse to keep alive mentally and physically then to devote all my energy to a book in which I am going to show that, with few exceptions mankind's best sons are condemned without a trial and without a hearing - a virtual death sentence.

15. What do I ask for the inventor, the pioneer of a new idea? I ask for him the very same thing which the criminal gets: for a number of years his worry about his next meal, the next rent, the next pair of shoes are taken off his mind. He is given a cell, he is given seclusion, is given a free mind to think about what he cares to think about. If he wants paper to write on, he is given it free of charge. Indeed, many great works have been brought to paper in the merciful seclusion of a prison cell. The lunatics are better off than criminals. They are housed, fed, cared for by the best hospitals, set in wonderful parks. But the geniuses, the pioneers of new ideas are allowed to die in poverty. What should be instituted is a Trial for the Pioneer A Jury for the Genius.

16. Please look through my three books in Harvard Library. See my large chapters, my symbols for interlinuistic scientific communication in chemistry, physics, medicine, agriculture etc., for technology and industry, for commerce and communication, for the three quarters of this world's population who are illiterate and divided by thousands of languages. Give me a trial with regard to the application of semantography for demasking the slogans of Communism HERE IS A NEW IDEA "ONE WRITING FOR ONE WORLD", A SIMPLE LOGIC AND SEMANTICS FOR THE PEOPLE OF THIS PLANET.

17. I APPEAL TO YOU AND ALL THE MEN OF HARVARD AND THE M.I.T. ALL I ASK FOR MY WIFE AND I ARE THE MEANEST WAGES FOR THE LOWLIEST WORKER, INDEED NOT MORE THAN TO KEEP THE BODY AND SOUL TOGETHER OF MY WIFE AND ME. WE CAN DISPENSE WITH ALL AMENITIES. ALL I WANT TO DO IS TO WORK SIXTEEN HOURS A DAY IN PREPARING THE PRIMERS FOR THE NEXT GENERATION OF SCIENTISTS, TECHNICIANS, AND WORKERS IN ALL FIELDS.

This is my last appeal personally. For 11 years I have gone-abe-gging to scholars and universities, foundations and institutions. The fate of a new and great idea, the fate of its inventor is in your hands and through you in the hands of the men who direct two of the greatest sets of learning. May your decision be such as to stand the judgement of later generations. Kindly understand my situation and be thanked for everything.

Yours sincerely,  
C. K. Bliss.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

Thank you for your letter of February 5th and the separate packages of materials which I have just received. I have transmitted your article to PSYCHIATRY. The only suggestion I have is the one I made to you in Sydney - namely that it is by no means proven as you say on page nine that warfare among the human species existed only after 5000 B.C. There are evidences of Cannibalism in Choukoutien and at Krapina at vastly earlier periods and there are some indications of warfare at periods earlier than 5000 B.C. though perhaps not earlier than 10,000 B.C. These have been summarised and discussed by V. Gordon Childe in various books and papers. I still think that you have



a worthwhile point, though I believe before publication you should protect yourself against factual criticism of your somewhat dogmatic statement on page nine.

I have discussed your work at some length with the officers of the British Dominion Fund of the Carnegie Corporation and shown them materials relating to you institute. I think there is a chance that they might be willing to give you some aid. It would be worthwhile to write to Mr. Stephen Stackpole, British Dominions Funds, Carnegie Corporation of New York, 522 Fifth Avenue New York City, making a request for a specific grant-in-aid. I suggest that your initial request should be modest. American Foundations usually proceed as follows: they make small grants for "pilot studies" by persons who, in their opinion, may have great potentialities. If the pilot phase of work is to their satisfaction they will then in the favourable case provide support.

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

I am very grateful to you for dedicating to me this very interesting article.

With kind personal regards and good wishes for the success of your work in spite of the difficulties.

Yours sincerely,

Clyde Kluckhohn.

Dear Professor Kluckhohn,

6th May, 1953.

My gratitude for your kind letter and all your efforts, I shall alter the article as suggested by you, as soon as I have the acceptance of the Editor of PSYCHIATRY. Many thanks for your additional comments which I shall incorporate.

Many thanks for your approach to the Carnegie Foundation. A year ago they informed me that their grant-in-aid are restricted to allocations for travel only. I have drawn up a letter following your advice, and I beg you to send it off, with a few words of recommendation. It's better when it comes from you.

My last request and perhaps my last hope is Chisholm himself. Maybe, he could find a place for me to work with the Health Organisation, either with regard to his work or for the dealing of the organisation with the illiterate peoples in the backward areas. Attached is a short letter to him and again I beg to send it off with a few words of recommendation. Many thanks,

Yours sincerely,

C. K. Bliss.

Receiving no answer (the matter was apparently closed) I used an occasion to write to him again. The occasion was an order of my work by the Academy of Leningrad. The letterhead on which Kluckhohn wrote to me was headed Harvard University Russian Research Centre. That my work should interest Soviet scientists should interest Kluckhohn I thought.

Dear Professor Kluckhohn,

21st July, 1953.

Harvard College Library, has ordered a second set of my three mimeographed books on semantography. This proves that a number of persons at Harvard show such interest that the first set alone must be insufficient. The order is dated July 10, and approved by Mr. Edwin E. Williams. You have been kind enough to investigate the possibility of Harvard taking up my work. An enquiry at the Library may lead you to the right persons. Please follow up this encouraging sign and be thanked.

Another sign, less encouraging (I find it disturbing) is that the Soviet Academy of Leningrad has also ordered a set of my three books. I attach the order of a Sydney Book Company to deliver the books to Biblioteka Akademii Nauk SSSR Brigevaia linia 1, Leningrad 164, USSR. A year<sup>ago</sup> a Communist review "Organ of the Communist Part of Australia" attacked me, semantography, semantics, and "bourgeois logic" in general (April 1952, p. 118 ff) It is true that in a number of chapters in my book analysed Soviet statements with semantography demasking their ambiguities and vagueness and not sparing with scathing criticism.

I have (under pretext 'out of print') not sent my books to Soviet Russia. I should be most unhappy if development of my work - a pictorial script for bridging and unifying the thousands of languages spoken by the backward peoples of the world - would come from the communists. They would surely exploit this new tool of inter-linguistic communication to the utmost. They could hide from their pupils the semantographic analysis of abstract and ambiguous meanings and could invent a number of symbols imbuing<sup>them</sup> with the communists ideology and meaning.

Nevertheless my books are available in a number of libraries (even those where one can take the books home then declaring that they are lost and offering payment). The fact that Soviet Russia is interested in my work should make responsible American men aware that the United States should give to the world a unifying script for science, industry, commerce and communication. Moreover there is the undeniable fact that millions of Americans are taken in by Soviet propaganda, and in their minds all the da stardly cruelties committed in the soviet countries are right and good and not wrong and evil.



This brings me to Chisholm's theory and your kind help in forwarding my article to PSYCHIATRY. The managing editor Miss Helen Swick Perry has informed me that she has submitted my article to the editorial board. Even if the article is printed it will not be enough. I have hinted that Semantography, the Leibnitzian "Algebra of Thought" is the answer to the dangerous conception of right and wrong. So far, I have not been able to prove before the men of science the practicability of my work for the fight against Communist slogans. You are the Director of Russian Research Centre. Maybe, you can further this aspect of my work.

All I want is the removal of my present handicap under which I must use up most of my time for making a living only. I want to work 16 hours a day on the primers (even if they will be printed years hence). I am 56 years of age and surely the many disappointments have not enlarged my life prospects. Should my mind in which this idea is well ordered be wasted?

You have been kind enough to speak with officers of the Carnegie Corporation. I informed you then that this foundation, as well as others have already rejected my application. For this reason, I asked you to forward my second application. Should it be possible to get financial assistance from a scholarly institution or foundation would you kindly consider this last approach.

I have approached the largest American typewriter company with the plan for an adjusted typewriter of ordinary size with which special typists after a training could work in export departments of firms, corresponding in Semantography with non-English countries. At present the most cumbersome ideographic scripts are in use in exports firms, the telegraphic codes. Radiophoto cables in Semantography need no coding, decoding and translating. I approached the IBM Remington, Smith, Underwood and others. All declined except Underwood which offered to adjust an ordinary typewriter for the typing of the symbol elements - if I pay for the conversion. This proves that the idea is sound but financial assistance is needed.

Those companies especially IBM are spending millions of pounds for research to make business machines just a fraction of a second faster. If the interested men at Harvard would suggest to IBM that employing me (here in Sydney or the USA) would be a worthwhile thing to do, all difficulties would be solved. At the Harvard College Library you will find the Semantography Series and No. 3 shows 9 different designs for a typewriter keyboard which are self-explanatory. All these designs and different ones are copyrighted in Washington, and this should give assurance to the company that their labours will be returned in revenue and royalties. Please follow up this idea which would make me most grateful.

All these letters make me a terrific nuisance, but I hope that you won't mind. For 11 years I have approached men of the universities one after another until I realised that nothing will be done for me. But now, you and Harvard and America are giving me so much new hope, that I keep on writing to you. It is a good change from my present work which is a study of the lives of man of new ideas, showing that they received no help during their life-time, showing that the responsible men of their time did not help them. It is my hope that your active support will help me to abandon my manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

C. K. Bliss.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

August 3rd 1953.

Thank you for your letter July 21. I think that I did have something to do with the library's ordering of your second set of book. It is interesting that they have been ordered in the USSR.

I think that I have done everything that I can with the Carnegie Corporation. I made a very strong case of giving you support of some kind, and I advised them to have your work reviewed by competent specialists.

I have no personal contacts with IBM but I shall scout around when the opportunity affords.

With good wishes, Yours sincerely,  
Clyde Kluckhohn.

This was the last letter. The sorry story of my approach to the Carnegie Foundation introduced by Kluckhohn is told in S.S. No. 174. The story of my article which Kluckhohn introduced to the editor of PSYCHIATRY is told in S.S. No. 194. And the story of his approach to Chisholm is told herebelow.

When I studied Chisholm's lectures, and developed my theory on the origin of human warfare, and even found my theory proved in the cavepaintings of paleolithic man, I was elated. I considered the discovery - that human warfare is not innate to human nature - of far greater importance than my Semantography. I believed that everyone will stop to think about my discovery when he has grasped the truth which everyone knows to be true, namely that among the same species of animal there is no killing. Lions don't kill lions, cats don't kill cats etc. Only man kills man. I believed that my discovery would cause a sensation. However, my failures with scholars have made me apprehensive to approach the man



who might be most interested in<sup>a</sup> proof for his theory - Chisholm himself. I wrote to him, and to the president of the psychiatric foundation and the editor of the American journal Psychiatry where Chisholm's lectures appeared. My letters to them and their answers, including the answer after Kluckhohn urged acceptance of my article is reprinted in S.S. No. 194. The reader can guess what they did. They rejected my article. Herebelow is my letter to Chisholm.

Major General G.B. Chisholm, C.B.E., M.D.  
c/o The William Alanson White Foundation  
Washington D. C.

11th January, 1951.

Dear Sir,

The slip below carrying the favourable comment of Bertrand Russell, is a safeguard to have my writing taken seriously. This is necessary, because my findings are so startling and semantography is such a novel idea, that I need the goodwill and benevolence of the reader not to dismiss my work. Bertrand Russell, Lancelot Hogben, Carleton Washburne, and others have much praise for my work.

Semantography is a modern picto-ideography, and you can imagine that I had great difficulties with regard to the symbolisation of the meanings of "good" and "evil". Somehow I found a way, which I felt would surely antagonise many a churchman. Then I came across your lectures in 1945 and was thunderstruck.

Moreover, my studies of the oldest records make me believe that I have proof of your theories. I enclose my pamphlet No. 25 and beg to read it carefully. I feel sure, that if you will take the time and an unprejudiced attitude you should be thrilled and delighted by my findings. I cannot think of any better way to spread your theory, as in a special publication. The idea is so startling and breathtaking that no newspaper will afford to miss it. There will be controversy of course, but this will only add to the publicity.

I have two copies already sent to the editor of Psychiatry and to Ross McClure Chapman, and proposed a publication. If you favour the idea, please convey it to them. In any case, I ask your permission to quote from your lectures. Expecting your favourable answer, I remain

Yours faithfully,  
C. K. Bliss.

And what did he answer? Nothing of course. My letter was ignored, even by his secretary. This was a bitter blow.

But two years later when Kluckhohn promised to convey my letter to Chisholm I hoped again and wrote.

Dr. Brock Chisholm  
Director General  
World Health Organisation  
United Nations Organisation

6th May, 1953.

Dear Sir,

Professor Clyde Kluckhohn has earned my gratitude by becoming interested in an aspect of my work which deals with your theory on the cause and prevention of human warfare, based on the concept of good and evil. I attach the article inspired by Prof. Kluckhohn, also some comments by the psychiatrist Dr. Douglas N. Everingham who applies already semantography in the treatment of mental patients in an Australian state hospital.

Another aspect of my work could be a great help to the world health organisation and its dealings with the illiterate peoples in the backward areas. I shall submit all details as soon as your request is forthcoming.

Yours sincerely,  
C. K. Bliss.

And the unbelievable happened. Chisholm answered. But it became clear to me from his words that he had not taken the time to read my article really. The words are banal generalities which anyone can write about anything concerning human relationship.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

20th July, 1953.

Your letter of May 6th arrived just on the eve of my departure to retirement to Canada and I have read it with interest.

I am sure that every attempt to understand more of the peculiarities of the human is valuable and particularly any knowledge that can lead to a reduction of inter-human tensions should be used in every possible way.

With all good wishes for the success of your work.

Yours sincerely,  
Brock Chisholm.

Director General World Health Organisation, United Nations, Geneva.

Surely, Chisholm hasn't read my article. Otherwise he would have realised that I have found the very proof for his theory, and what's more the very tool for his re-education of humanity, as to the proper handling of the concept of good and evil. The article itself did not contain anything about Semantography. It did not show the symbols for good and evil and how to operate them. Anyone who glanced at the article and became interested would ask to see how semantography can be applied to



Chisholm's proposed prophylactic re-education of mankind. But Chisholm did not read the article and did not ask to see anything of semantography. This was another bitter blow for me.

One of my early hopes was Professor Lauwerys, Director of the Institute of Education University of London, and a fellow of the New Education Fellowship. He visited Australia in 1946 (the year I arrived) for lectures and I approached him then. He took my papers, and that was the last I heard of him.

In 1951 I approached Dr. Peggy Volkov, editor of the London educational journal the new era (see s.s. no. 181) and she promised to help me at Unesco headquarters in Paris. She knew Lauwerys of course, and she and I approached him. I was only too happy when I received a letter from him in which he told me that he had indeed written to the Director General of Unesco Dr. Torres Bodet. At the same time he gave me little hope, and urged me again to approach the Australian Unesco Authorities. This I had done already a number of times, and with dismal result (See s.s. no. 167). It was my hope that the top Unesco men would realise the great potential of my work, and would urge the Australian committees to make a move at the next General Assembly of Unesco. My dear Mr. Bliss,

When I got your letter I held on a little while to see whether anything was happening in Unesco, but I imagine that your view is probably correct. In fact, of course, it is by no means clear to me that Unesco itself can possibly do to help ideas. They would be precluded by their constitution from adopting any particular scheme, no matter how good, and I still believe that your best plan would be to press your ideas on the Australian National Commission for Unesco. Apart from that, simply proceed as before, since I feel in my bones that comparatively little is to be done or hoped for which is at all unorthodox from official governmental agencies.

With best wishes,

Yours very sincerely,  
Joseph Lauwerys.

P.S.

I have written the letter you asked me to write to Bodet.

I conceived that scientific experiments might convince the top men, and therefore I begged Lauwerys that such experiments be carried out. He, as Director of the Institute of Education, would have no difficulty to arrange for a few hours experiments. And so I wrote.

Dear Professor Lauwerys,

7th February, 1951.

Thank you very much for your letter of January 19, and for your letter to Dr. Torres Bodet. I knew you would help me.

I realise that there is the interminable approach through the National Unesco Commissions, but Miss Luffman, of the Educational Department wrote to me, that "in 1951 we shall be making some studies on language problems." Unfortunately, she decided to pass it on to the Education Clearing House, and Mr. Akrawi lost no time to pass it on to Mass Education. And here the thing has fizzled out. This department failed to communicate with me, and even Mr. William Farr did not answer my two letters.

What I want from Unesco is very little. It can be done within one week, and at practically no expense. For one week one children's class in Paris and one class in London shall receive instructions in the writing of semantography. Then the English children should write letters to the French children and vice versa. If they can make themselves understood, in spite of the different word order etc, of Romance and Teutonic linguistic structure - well, then it will be proved that semantography works, and with such a statement from Unesco I shall go ahead and find the enthusiastic children among boyscouts, girlguides, stamp collectors, who will spread semantography.

This test has been made in a little way. The children of Mrs. Volkov (twins aged 12 I.Q. 136) have been able to read a symbol <sup>letter</sup> from me and in answering it they made practically no mistake.

It just occurred to me. It may well be, that among your students, there might be one, interested to take the test mentioned above.

Yours sincerely,  
C. K. Bliss.

Now here was a plea, not to Unesco men who have their actions bound by constitutional procedures, but to Lauwerys himself. He surely could arrange for the tests. But he did not want it - and so he wrote

My dear Mr. Bliss,

1st May, 1951

I hope that all goes well with you and that all is progressing in a satisfactory manner.

Regarding the Unesco programme, when they say they are making studies in language problems, what they have chiefly in mind is the writings of documents at meetings. In reality they have no direct method of getting experiments started in schools or with children. They have to rely on persuading someone else to do it. For example, it would be quite impossible for them to directly persuade French or English teachers to give instructions in Semantography.



That could only be done through the Agency of the French Commission and of the English National Commission. For the best way of getting experiments started is to do the job oneself and directly - that is to make contact with other French or English teachers, and get them to try out the experiments. In the case of the French teachers, you would probably have to find either teachers in private schools like the Ecole de Roches or in catholic schools. Schools coming under public authority have their syllabuses and methods of teaching very carefully laid down by the Ministry and it is very difficult for any teacher to step outside the limits laid down for them. As regards getting English teachers, one possible mechanism might be to write a brief little article and ask Mrs. Volkov whether she would print it in the NEW ERA. Teachers reading it would then communicate with you, and you might be able to get something going. I do strongly urge approaches of this sort rather than relying on major organisations which are slow to move.

Yours very sincerely,

C. K. Bliss.

But Volkov did not want to print an article showing symbols etc., and the readers of her journal had shown no response when Prof. Meredith reviewed of semantography appeared. (see S.S. Nos. 49 and 181)

We exchanged some letters concerning my approach to Unesco, but nothing happened. Lauwerys made no move to introduce my work to interested students at his institute. My disappointment was great, because Lauwerys was actively interested in international languages. He even wrote a forward to a book by Jacob "On Choice of a Common Language," which book, published by Pitman, appeared under the auspices of the New Education Fellowship. Apparently they had thought nothing of my work. When I had lost all hope in Lauwerys I asked him to do me one last favour; to induce his librarian to buy my three books and my semantography series. Only the three books were ordered, but not the series. Some result - though dismal.

Another great disappointment was the literacy missionary Laubach. This man made a good living by travelling the world over and devising alphabets for illiterate tribes. When he came to Sydney and was appropriately feted, I wrote to him a letter (reprinted in S.S. No. 34) sent him the Telegraph article. (S.S. No. 7) and others. It was of course Love's labour lost, but what maddened me in his reply were his stupid counter arguments. When I can face my opponent and explain to him how his counter arguments are taken care of, well and good. But getting it in a letter with the obvious purpose of declining an active interest, is bitter. I shall reprint the letter then answer to his counter-arguments.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

July 17th, 1951.

I was interested in your ingenious method of building up a picture alphabet. If you ever develop a dictionary with the English word and your ideograph beside each word, I think that our office would like a copy. You do not indicate how you would construct a dictionary with your ideographs. This would be necessary. The Chinese have a radical showing the classification of each word.

It would be absurd of course, for me at my age to attempt to introduce this article to the world. I am now in over my head, and sixty six years old. Besides I sense limitless difficulties over the work as you try to picture the thousands of shades of meaning in the English language, and still further refinements of meaning the American Indians Language. Your word "translator" shows how words may grow in length for you in spite of your efforts to keep them simple and short. Still keep us posted as you progress.

Sincerely,

Frank C. Laubach.

He tells me that he would buy a dictionary, if I ever develop it. I told him in my letter that I have published three books, why did he not order the three books? A dictionary is easily constructed for my symbols, because it is easier than the Chinese symbols dictionary and the Chinese telephone book with their many complicated signs, which I nevertheless learned to handle quickly. As to the counter argument that he is too old, that is absurd too. He has a big office with many young missionaries. They could become interested in semantography. He sees limitless difficulties when depicting the shades of meaning in the various languages. But this is just the great advantage of semantography. In fact there are only two principle shades of meaning in which a speaker expresses himself: whether he likes or dislikes something. In all languages the speaker has a lot of vague words which may mean approval or disapproval at the same time. In other words, in ordinary languages you can shilly shally around without committing yourself in one way or another. But in semantography these demagogic devices are blocked.

Lastly Laubach points that my symbols grow in length and he points to the longest symbol combination in the Telegraph article. (S.S. No. 7) TRANSLATOR. But what he does not realise is that I have drawn the symbols three times larger than the alphabetical letters. Actually it should be printed thus  $\Lambda \phi \wedge$  TRANSLATOR. Then the alphabetical word is more than twice as long. And all the other symbols, as for instance  $\phi$  to speak (or)  $\wedge$  to write, are many times shorter than the words.

I was so disgusted by his reply, that I did not take the trouble to write him again.



The reader should realise that every such setback made me unhappy for a long time. I realise that I shall not convince a man who has found already subterfuges to decline any interested action. So I gave <sup>up</sup> and started hope on another man. And other <sup>come along</sup> men who give me hope at first.

One of them was the Dyason lecturer after Bertrand Russell, Salvador de Madariaga, one time President of the League of Nations, a refugee from Franco-Spain and a distinguished writer. I asked for an interview and it was granted; he was very much interested in my work or pretended to do so. Anyway here is his answer.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

December 28th, 1951.

Though I have not written since I had the pleasure of meeting you, I was busy on your behalf. As I had promised you, I wrote to Sir Stanley Unwin, and I found that he already knew your work, but he was good enough to write that in view of my recommendation he would look into the matter again. He came, unfortunately, to the conclusion that in the present state of the publishing business in this country, he was not in the position to undertake your work, interested though he was in it.

I began a letter to the Director General of Unesco, but discovered that Unesco has already considered the matter. In the circumstances the only one idea that occurs to me is that you should form a dossier with the favourable opinions of those who have expressed them to you, such as Bertrand Russell, and that you should put the matter with one of the American Foundations, say Rockefeller. I believe that there would be many people who would back you. I certainly should my self.

Wishing you best success,

I remain yours sincerely,

S. Madariaga.

Going alphabetically through the correspondence of my selected scholars I come upon Professor A.H. MacDonald, professor of ancient history at Sydney University. He was the only professor of Sydney University who accepted my invitation to my first lecture at the University. Seeing that he is an expert in ancient history I sent him my "Gap in Prehistoric History." (S.S. 25) and asked him for his comment.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

3rd September, 1951.

Thankyou very much for your good wishes! I am looking forward to returning to Cambridge - though it will be a wrench leaving Sydney.

Yes, I read your pamphlet and the "Gap in Prehistory" with interest - but I have no comment to offer. I think that there are too many gaps in <sup>our</sup> archaeological evidence so far to draw any general conclusions.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

A. H. MacDonald.

This was no comfort at all. But at least he answered. When Mrs. Margaret Mead an American Anthropologist <sup>was coming</sup> to Australia to lecture for the New Education Fellowship I wrote to her New York address two subsequent letters attaching all material. She found it not worthwhile to answer. My letters were polite and submissive as usual. When she arrived in Australia half a year later I wrote her the following letter.

Dear Dr. Mead,

24th August, 1951

May I be allowed to add my voice to the many other voices, and say "Welcome to Australia". May your stay here be a most pleasant and fruitful one.

More than half a year ago, I wrote to you twice about my work, but did not even get an acknowledgement, and I assumed that you were very busy, but I feel sure that you will understand the feeling of humiliation, caused by your silence. Other scholars, like Washburne, Hogben, etc., treated me very differently. Bertrand Russell even wrote to me that assistance to my work means performing an important service to mankind. All this refers to semantography. But I wrote to you about something else too - namely, an anthropological find, which I have made in the study of cave paintings of paleolithic man.

Now here is what happened. I wrote about this discovery to two anthropologists in the United States, Doctor Margaret Mead, and Professor Ashley Montagu. Montagu answered immediately, and wrote that after studying my material he agrees with me, in fact he favours the same idea.

Now, my theory is a very startling one. But, I have based it on expert opinions of other scientists working in this field. My contribution however, is that I have found the proof: the pictures of paleolithic man show animal hunts - not man hunts. Wars of destruction must have been <sup>un</sup>known about 30,000 years ago within the species of man, just as wars of destruction are unknown among the <sup>same</sup> species of animals. Only later - neolithic man became a cannibal and man hunts started.

Apparently, we have made the grave mistake of identifying the hunt for food (from other species) in the animal world, with the hunt for destruction (of the same species) in the animal world.



I have advanced meanwhile and have now the theory of a great psychiatrist to back my theory. But I would like very much to hear your opinion.

I know that you have a very busy programme, but when you return you may find half an hour for me. After all, I have something to show you which you cannot find anywhere else. Semantography itself is fascinating. The anthropologist McCarthy of the Australian Museum wrote that it "...will help tremendously"... Professor Oliver L. Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh has sent me his paper for the American Association for the Advancement of Science. In describing the advantages of semantography he wrote "Bliss heroic work...a powerful stimulus and aid to President Truman's Four Point Programme"...

Will you grant me an interview? Or will you grant me at the most a few polite words - this would be equivalent to a negation.

I wish you a most pleasant trip through Australia and the greatest success of your lecture tour. I am ready to come anywhere, any time.

Yours sincerely,

C. K. Bliss.

And how does a distinguished anthropologist (who studies human beings and should understand the hurt feeling of a human being) react to a fellow scholar? How does she react to a new and startling theory which is acknowledged by other American anthropologists. Here is her answer.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

4th October, 1951.

At the time that you wrote me your letter of January 6th, 1950, you wrote on the back of a second page of mimeographed material, the following message "You will receive the following nine pages with my next letter." I then asked my secretary to file your letter under the heading of my Australian visit to await the additional material, which never arrived.

I planned to contact you when I reached Sydney but after receiving your second letter it hardly seemed necessary.

Sincerely Yours,

Margaret Mead.

So she has a secretary. Why could she not tell her to write a line of acknowledgement half a year ago? Why could she not ask her to ask for a second letter or a copy of it when it failed to arrive? Why could she not bring herself to say just one word about my theory, say the word "interesting", if nothing else. But suppose my letterhead would bear the additional data say C.K. Bliss President of the Anthropological Foundation of Australia. Would she also not acknowledge my letter? Would she also write me such a shameful letter of discourtesy and of contempt? Just because I am a bloody nobody, because I am not a professor or a president of this or that, the lady of anthropology thinks that she can kick me. I wish fervently that my journal should come alive. One of my targets would be scholars like her. One day I hope to get even with her. I do not deserve to be treated in this shameful manner.

Next in line is the Director of Research of the Korlak Laboratories Dr. Mees, When he came to Australia I sought an interview and wrote to him a letter of which I quote a few paragraphs.

Dear Dr. Mees,

9th January, 1952.

I received a letter a few years ago, signed (if I remember rightly) by yourself giving me permission to quote from your book THE PATH OF SCIENCE. This quotation I put at the beginning of the first chapter of my book. It runs:

"Almost everything appears to be absurd. Absurdity is associated primarily with the unusual. And the story of ridicule excited by the first umbrella should warn us against the appearance of absurdity as having any relation to value."

In the meantime, I have experienced the truth about your words in full measure although a number of great scholars have found words of great praise for my work.

I attach a few leaflets which will give you an idea.

Here is the idea for the application of my work to Kodak products. They are sold all over the world, and although some mathematical terms are already displayed on the lenses, shutters, etc., of all cameras, some other pictorial symbols should be displayed on the film, cameras, projectors, etc.,. In fact Siemens produced before the war a home movie projector, carrying a few pictorial symbols concerning the operation of the resistance, lamp brightness, speed, etc., etc. In my book I have shown a number of pictorial symbols for photography.

I certainly hope that you will find this interesting enough to warrant a talk. My problem is this: No one considers my work as absurd. But I still have to find men who have vision enough to put it into operation in their field. Hoping to hear from you, I remain

Yours sincerely,

C. K. Bliss.

He answered that he has not time for an interview. As to the proposal that Kodak should put this idea into operation on their products, he was completely silent. Why, this would have involved work, wouldn't it, and work which was for someone else to gain the credit. Better be silent about my proposal.



The next scholar is Mr. John Metcalfe, Principal Librarian of the Public Library of New South Wales, now (1960) of the University Library of New South Wales. I heard that he is interested in Basic English and when I came to him with my three volumes he was much impressed. Without me asking for anything he immediately dictated a letter to all Public Universities Libraries in which he recommended the purchase of my books. Before that, I thought that it is utterly impossible to sell books which are mimeographed only. I learned from Metcalfe that many scholarly treatises and articles are mimeographed only, and go in this form into the libraries. Realising the great amount of work I put into the books, he approved a price of £5 and so said in his letter. This letter forms Semantography Series No. 5 and went into thousands of libraries, but was heeded only by a few librarians who bought my books. Metcalfe of course was the first to buy them. I was delighted. Throughout the years Metcalfe has been my real friend. Although we lived and still live in the same town he nevertheless found the time to write to me long letters advising me how to try to break <sup>into</sup> Unesco, how to launch promotion campaigns, especially how to face reality and realise that I cannot expect to see results in my lifetime. All these letters are in my files and if any later researcher would like to delve into them, I am sure that he would realise the magnanimity of Mr. Metcalfe in helping a fellow scholar in a most difficult task. It is therefore not necessary here to print any letter of our correspondence. Metcalfe, Reiser, Dodd, Paget, Bertran Russell and a few others <sup>are the</sup> blessed exceptions from the many scholars who cared nothing about my work and even found it in order to ignore my letters.

The next scholar is Professor Ashley Montagu a noted anthropologist of Rutgers university. I owe him a saying which I repeated time and time again in my writings and in my discussions - without finding any belief by the people I addressed. Montagu said: "Among the same species of animal<sup>s</sup> the highest ethics is supreme law." I think therefore that our correspondence should be reprinted here.

Professor Ashley Montagu  
Professor of Anthropology  
Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, New Jersey, U.S.A.,  
Dear Sir,

7th January, 1951.

Professor Emil Abel of London has been kind enough to draw attention to your article "Social Instincts" in Scientific American. He did this, because he saw a connection with my findings and therefore I am sending you a short extract which I hope you will find interesting.

I beg to inform you that this extract has little to do with what I call Semantography which is a modern picto-ideography. Semantography has already found praise by high authorities like Bertrand Russell, Professor Carleton Washburne of Brooklyn College, Professor Lancelot Hogben of Birmingham, Professor Patrick Meredith of Leeds and a number of other scientists. Semantography can be understood in all languages of the world. I shall send you some information about it, if you are interested.

What I have enclosed in this letter is a short account of a hypothesis, which I came across when studying the ideographs of the Babylonians, Egyptians, Chinese, down to the cave paintings of Cro-Magnon men. The conclusions drawn are phantastic, but the facts are undeniable. I beg you sir, to examine them carefully.

Your article was a revelation to me, and it was "quite up my line". I was interested to hear that there is a Foundation for Integrated Education, founded by scholars and business men. You might be so kind as to send me the address of this Foundation - if you would like what I have found - would you say a few words in my favour. Thinking that these scholars and business men would also be interested in Semantography as a new means of understanding I ask this favour. Expecting a reply at your earliest convenience, I remain

Yours sincerely,  
C. K. Bliss.

Dear Sir,

17th March, 1951.

Thank you for your letter and your pamphlet THE GAP IN PREHISTORIC HISTORY. I have read both with much interest. All the ideas that you set out in the pamphlet have been dealt with by myself and I have done it in two books MAN'S MOST DANGEROUS MYTH: THE FALLACY OF RACE, Columbia University Press, 2nd Edition 1948 and in my recent book ON BEING HUMAN, Henry Shuman Inc., New York, N.Y. 1950.

I should be interested to learn more about semantography.

The address of the Foundation of Integrated Education is 220, East 42nd Street, Room 1605, New York 17 N.Y.

Sincerely yours,  
MF Ashley Montagu.

But search as I did I still couldn't find the statement by Montagu that pre-lithic man was still in the peaceful animal state, and that human warfare is



only a recent perversion and due to perverted thoughts of abstract notions notably good and evil. I wrote therefore

Dear Professor Montagu,

7th April, 1951.

Many thanks for your kind reply, and especially for your agreement with my views. I have immediately secured your book MAN'S MOST DANGEROUS MYTH : THE FALLACY OF RACE from the library and I have read it with ravishing interest. Especially your chapter "Race and War," has become a revelation to me and the accumulated material there is a real mine for me. It is a pity that emotional prejudices are still so strong. A book like yours which in its title tells the whole story should deal a devastating blow to all the people who still think in terms of Race, and you have made it quite clear that scholars and even anthropologists are to be found among them.

I believe that my discovery in the pictures of paleolithic man (that man hunts were absent then) could be of tremendous help to carry your theories forward. I have not found any mention in your book as to that distinct difference in the records of paleolithic man and modern man, except the quotation of Childes book Man makes Himself (page 174 in your book) referring to the Magdalenian Age, in which settling took place. This coincides beautifully with other quotations, according to which the cave paintings of paleolithic man disappear with the beginning of the Magdalenian Age (Swindler).

Your other book ON BEING HUMAN, I am afraid I could not secure it, as we have great difficulties to get the necessary American dollars to buy American books. I shall try hard, and I should be glad to find there the same discovery mentioned along the following lines: "Up till now all speculation with regard to human warfare, were only mere speculations. But now we have the definite proof. The pictures of paleolithic man show animal hunts, never man hunts, much the contrary to the records of modern man. Now everyone has to believe, that human warfare is only a recent perversion." Please consider such a statement, made in an appropriate way.

I am sending you a title page for a Children's Primer which I want to publish. You will find there a few samples of my symbols. The grammar is a few simple rules taken from Physics, Chemistry, Biology, and Psychology and you can see right away the grammar rule concerning Anthropology. The symbol for human being is the same, no matter what tribe, nation, country, etc. I hope to engage the active help of the Foundation for Integrated Education (many thanks for the address) and other Foundations with regard to the publishing of my children's primer.

Bertrand Russell wrote that money given to my work means performing an important service to mankind. However, I want to give something in return, and I offer my extensive work. If you cannot secure it, would you be kind enough to persuade your librarian to do it. I enclose an order form. By ordinary mail I am sending you a few other pamphlets which however give you a few hints only. I hope that you will soon have an opportunity to see my whole work.

I shall send you some more printed material, as I get it from the printer. Meanwhile my many thanks. I am terrifically busy, because the University of Sydney has given me a chance to expound my work before an audience of Professors and Students in the largest hall of the University. I am now preparing for a good lecture. I hope to have your agreement to mention your name and your books in connection with the picture writing of paleolithic man.

Yours sincerely,  
C.K. BLISS.

But no answer came my way. This was a terrible disappointment, because I hoped that Montagu would advance my ideas, which are in advance of his. But perhaps because of this, he did not do it. Nine years later I bought a book by him "MAN, his first million years." But there was no mention whatever of paleolithic man living like animals do (among the same species the highest ethics is supreme law); there was no mention that human warfare is utterly different from biological warfare, that human warfare is due to a mind perversion as Chisholm pointed out; and no mention of paleolithic man that in his cave paintings he proved that his mind was free of the idea of killing his fellow man.

In short, Montagu has disregarded all these points of so much importance. Why? Could he not advance this theory, and be it only for its curiosity value, or for the implications it carries? Or did he not dare to challenge his colleagues with a theory which everyone could have found had he only compared the records of paleolithic and modern man? Whatever his motifs, his silence was a bitter blow for me.

The next scholar whose name wakes bitter memories is the president of the American Humanist Association. My old friend from Vienna Fritz Truier lives in Yellow Springs where is also the Headquarters of the American Humanist Association and their journal the Humanist. Fritz was actually employed there. When I contacted Professor Reiser and showed him my letter (Semantography Series No. 27) that my symbols could indeed advance the ideas of scientific humanism, my hopes went high that the A.H.A. would take an active interest in the promotion of my work. But all Fritz could achieve was a reduced price in the Humanist for an advertisement, adver-



vertising my correspondence course on the Logic and Semantics of Semantography. One man who responded was Mr. Felix H. Frank. As it turned out, he was from Vienna, and was a prominent official in the Viennese Ethical Society. He informed me that the A.H.A. is actually looking for symbols for the promotion of Humanism. I was delighted when I heard that an international congress is planned in Amsterdam. I approached the A.H.A. with a definite proposal. It forms S.S. No. 81. The result was utter disaster. They refused to examine my symbols. They rejected my work without seeing it. And all this by an organisation and by men who are in contact with my friend Treuer. And so I thought that I should write a personal letter to the president knowing that he is a personal friend of Reiser.

Lloyd Morain, 8 Willard Street  
Cambridge Mass.

2nd September, 1952.

Dear Mr. Morain,

I am writing to you because Fritz Treuer told me that you are my friend. I am writing to you because Mr. Kelso informed me that my case will be discussed at the forthcoming meeting of the Board of Directors of the A.H.A. So far from the communications received my hopes have dwindled. Therefore this letter to you.

My case started without me. In March, Dreikurs and Morley demanded at the Chicago conference that "our next task shall be the discovery of symbols suitable for the extension of Humanism." Whereupon Felix H. Frank wrote to Dr. Wilson that the symbols are already discovered. Nothing happened then, but later I learned that in August an International Congress for Humanism and Ethical Culture will be held in Amsterdam.

The threat of a third world war is with us. Another International Congress may not come about for a decade or more. I myself am of advanced age, and I realise that this may well be my first and last chance in my lifetime to bring my symbols for Humanism and Ethics to the knowledge of the Humanists of many countries. I decided then to approach directly the Board of Directors in the hope that my work will be made known in one way or another, at the congress. I believe that you have surely received my pamphlet which was written by a Humanist to Humanists, stressing the meaning of "humane".

During my ten years of work and struggle for a new idea I have met many high-minded people, whose reaction to my work can be divided into two groups. The first group of people realise the importance of my work, and they realise too that a man with a creative mind, and with a creative work to his credit must be measured differently. He thinks differently, he writes differently and he acts differently from many other people. Only his work counts. Those men found the highest praise for it. I am writing to you, because from Fritz's report I believe that you belong to this group of people.

The other group react quite differently. They did not want to take the time to examine my work, although it could be done in a couple of hours or less. Instead they found all kinds of arguments - not against my work, but against my implicit suggestion to do something about it. I hope that you will realise the many hours of anguish, of bitterness, of distress, which such an attitude causes.

I am now writing to you hoping that you will use your voice and your influence at the forthcoming discussion, because I realise that my approach and my work will end in failure as far as the A.H.A. is concerned, unless you come to my aid.

Dr. Dreikurs told me that the proper way is to write an article for a journal then and then only will he examine it. Such an answer was very distressing because from my pamphlet it should be clear that there are books and articles already written on the subject, and that my work has even been presented to the AAAS by Professor Reiser. Mr. Wilson wrote that what I suggest is that the A.H.A. should affiliate itself with the Movement, Organisation, or Group, (all words used by Mr. Wilson) of semantography. He then cited a number of instances when the A.H.A. has decided not to affiliate with movements, groups or organisations. Neither Dr. Dreikurs nor Mr. Wilson found one word of satisfaction about the fact, vouched for by Professor Reiser and Felix H. Frank, that the symbols for Humanism are discovered. Neither of them found one word that the International Congress should be informed about this fact. And neither of them wrote to Frank or to Treuer or to me: "Give me that pamphlet Bliss mentions 'Scientific Humanism and Semantography'". It takes less than half an hour to read through it, and to see for oneself whether or not the symbols are such as Professor Reiser and Frank said they were.

From Dr. Dreikurs and Mr. Wilson's letters I must conclude that they are not keen on fostering my symbols of Semantography. I wish therefore to stress a few points in order to forestall a decision by the A.H.A. which would be based on a mistaken assumption. Will you kindly stress these points.



(1) My work - Semantography - is neither a movement, nor a group nor an organisation. Never did I ask or contemplate that the A.H.A. should affiliate itself with my work. My work has a number of aspects, for science, industry commerce and communication, education, logic, semantics, etc, etc, which are of no concern to the A.H.A.

(2) I want only that the A.H.A. should examine my symbols for Humanism and Ethics and should bring them to the notice of other humanists.

Such an acceptance of my symbols or a rejection of them, cannot - in my opinion - be done in camera, in a closed session of Directors. If judgement is to be passed on this section of my work, it must be done in a democratic way, that is in full view of the public interest, and I must be not only given the opportunity to explain my symbols but also to defend them against counter-arguments. In short, such an open forum is the HUMANIST, and I think that judgement should be passed after I have discussed my case with the principal persons interested and by correspondents in the pages of the HUMANIST.

My books are available in Cambridge in the Library of the MIT and at Harvard (Prof. Richards), in Chicago at the Teachers College and with Fritz. I hope that he has sent to you the editorial article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on May 27. A number of important libraries, including the library of Congress are already collecting all my writings. More and more articles are appearing in different parts of the world. I sincerely hope that the responsible men of the A.H.A. will realise the importance of my work and do it justice. With thanks in anticipation I remain,

Yours sincerely

C. K. Bliss.

The A.H.A. stresses the idea of humanism against the sectarian attitude of the various churches. Surely the least one can expect from the president of the American Humanist Association <sup>he will</sup> be human enough to accord me a few lines (no matter how meaningless) as an answer to my detailed letter. Moreover I am a friend of Treuer and a friend of Reiser. But Morain acted not as a friend, not as a humanist, not even as a man with common decency. He ignored my letter. Three years later, Reiser sent him the paper Unified Symbolism (S.S. No. 150) which carries an enlarged version of my symbols, including a special chapter on how my symbols represent the idea of humanism. And what did Morain do? Here is his letter to Reiser, which Reiser sent to me.

Howdy Reiser, August 18th, 1955.

Your wonderful gift arrived yesterday and last evening was spent studying it. It certainly is good to have these papers together, and I fully expect to have further that goes with them, or it.

Bliss does seem to oversimplify, to fail to take into account the vast complexities within the individual. The kinds of statements which we <sup>can</sup> ordinarily give good sign or other representation to are not those which we ~~get~~ <sup>get</sup> into difficulties over. I suppose however that any kind of translation of statement has some value in freeing the individual from former feeling tones associated with the words involved, and so to me Bliss' ideal seems naive. (Note Morain's atrocious English, apart from the nonsense)

For a welcome change here is the story of my approach to Sir Richard Paget. He is the author of Babel (from which I quoted S.S. No. 6 and other writings) and he is the inventor of a sign language for the born deaf and dumb. Moreover, he is the author of a most fascinating theory as to how human speech developed. He maintains that primeval man acted first by signs with his hands. Of course, he also uttered sounds of joy and grief, or pain and anger, but not yet words of an articulate language. What did he do when he had no hands free to make any sign to his fellowman? Paget thinks that he tried to make a similar gesture with his tongue. By uttering a sound at the same time to attract attention, out came a word which later stood for that meaning. If we say "up" our tongue goes up within our mouth. Now, this is quite an interesting theory, but the proof? Well, Paget delivered the most amazing proof at Oxford University. I have told about it in S.S. No. 55. The professor of ancient Chinese uttered certain words of ancient Chinese and Paget tried to get the meaning by analysing the movement of the tongue and lips. And a number of times he guessed correctly, in fact, his correct guesses were far too numerous with regard to the law of probability. His theory has some truth. But the professional linguists would not hear of a new theory by one who is only an amateur. And so they ignored him.

Our correspondence was a happy one. He even bought my books. The researcher will find all letters in my files. There is no need to record here the utterances of a man who was full of sincere interest for my work. Perhaps he too could not find any acceptance for his theory and system of sign language for the born deaf and dumb.

Now we come to a man whose name is in the paper nowadays when we all talk about spacetravel: Professor of Astronomy in Harvard Harlow Shapley. Professor Reiser sent me a letter of Professor Hoagland a biologist who interested two other scholars in my symbols: Prof. Lynnman Bryson who has written and lectured of symbolism and Prof. Harlow Shapley. Hoagland said that both scholars wanted to purchase a copy of Unified Symbolism.