



Semantography (Blissymbolics) Series No.192

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY AND BLISS

A Story in 4 Letters with the Subtitle

Which is the most desperately needed Science,
and what is Brandeis University doing about it?

by C.K.Bliss

Sydney, January 1964.

The American magazine TIME of April 13, 1962 brought an article on BLOSSOMING BRANDEIS. It told the story how Brandeis University came into being by generous gifts from American Jews. It is now a 24 million dollar complex of over 50 buildings at Waltham, Mass. near Boston. It has a 750,000 volume library, and three ultramodern chapels for Jews, Roman Catholics, and Protestants. Its president is historian Abram Leon Sachar. TIME mentions the following courses (which are apparently "desperately needed"): music, modern poetry, drama and American civilisation. Professors get "salaries as high as 16,000 dollars a year, and 39 endowed chairs are even better upholstered." Students are "anti-clerical", and as one senior said: "Most students feel that religion is - well somehow beneath them."

"In the intellectual sense" continues TIME, "Brandeis knows just what it is: 'the challenge habit of mind' makes its classrooms crackle. Delighted with his students' "seriousness," one former Princeton professor hardly misses "the elaborate military deference found at Princeton, where the men would address you as 'sir' with an undertone of contempt." Engagement with issues in turn makes the students eager for social action and dissent. In the 21-campus Boston area, it often seems that every peace march or civil rights rally is led by Brandeis students. The student paper, The Justice, is perhaps the most caustically anti-administration campus newspaper in the country. "It's hard not to censor them," sighs Sachar. "But we don't want to run the risk of closing their minds. We practice an affectionate kind of fratricide."

What Brandeis has in fact produced is a mirror of the liberal, learned humane tone of Justice Brandeis himself. For just this reason, it is likely to go on being a kettle of highly individualistic fish. Says Sachar: "You've heard about the two castaway Jews on a desert island? When they're rescued, they're asked why they built three temples. It's because every Jew must have one temple he wouldn't be caught dead in."

There was a time when I laughed about such Jewish jokes. But after graduating from Dachau and Buchenwald I found such jokes no laughing matter. Why must there be a temple for every Jew which he detests. Why must there be hundreds of sectarian Christian churches which are detested by the adherents of the one and only holy church (whichever that may be)? Why must there be dissension among Jews and Non-Jews about religious matters, and for that matter, in most other matters too? At present, the newspapers are full with the dissension among Cypriots which kill each other, though Cypriots lived together on that island for thousands of years? Why are there dissensions among human beings, which in the end lead only to passion, violence, murder, massacre and war? And what are the universities doing about it?

Is the study of music, poetry, drama, American civilization etc., so desperately needed by a desperate mankind? Is Brandeis University really out to help mankind with such "sciences"? Or are the sciences of chemistry, physics, and the others equally needed by a mankind threatened with annihilation by the very scientists whose upkeep in upholstered chairs they toil for? What then is the most desperately needed science for mankind?

Threehundred years ago, the philosophers John Locke and Wilhelm Leibniz asked the same question and gave the same answer in their books which bear the same title "ESSAY CONCERNING HUMAN UNDERSTANDING." Leibniz speculated on a new science

which could help mankind to overcome dissension and to find understanding. But he stipulated that in order to be of help to all humanity, this new science must be so simple that even children and illiterates could learn to operate it. This seemed ridiculous to the scholars of all universities, and for 300 years they considered Leibniz' idea a mere philosopher's speculation, impossible to realize.

Now, in our time, Professor Oliver L. Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh stood up in the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and said:

"Bliss realized the ambition of the great mathematician Leibniz"

This happened in 1950. But the universities took no notice. What has been declared impossible for 300 years was still impossible. And impossible is impossible. It cannot be possible too. As a law of logic says: A is either B or not B. It cannot be both.

Bliss is a professional research chemist. He remembered a similar linguistic and logical idiocy, which happened in the 19th century. The university men had declared that atoms cannot be split into smaller parts. They are indivisible, because the very word atomos means indivisible in Greek. And indivisible cannot be divisible. It's obvious.

But it wasn't so obvious for one man who was not on the payroll of a university. He wrote a thesis, but he had encountered already so much ridicule that he published it with his own money, but not under his own name. His real name was William Prout. He is the real "father" of atomic energy. He set the others on the trail, by declaring that impossible is possible and indivisible is divisible. The pioneer is not forgotten, but not forgiven either. A recent proposal to change the term proton into prouton was turned down. To confound the professional confounders in the universities is an unforgivable crime.

Something similar happened to Bliss. He had to learn the hard way what it means to be the originator of a new science, which was and still is considered impossible. He had to learn the bitter way that music, poetry, drama, American civilisation and other sciences are much more important. He was comforted by the thought that the few scholars who took the time and trouble to study his new science, found words of the highest praise for it. Fortunately, these men are eminent scholars, like Bertrand Russell, Julian Huxley, Oliver L. Reiser and others. Some of them said :

"Today blind mankind writes in Braille. A day will come when seeing mankind will think in Bliss."

He approached universities and foundations for a publication grant, and was turned down time after time, year after year. Money is given only to those who get already money from the universities. Bliss lectured to students at Sydney Universities, but he did this gratis. He was not on the payroll, and hence he was an outsider and must stay outside. One old scholar wrote to spare him more disappointments:

Dear Mr. Bliss,

As for organising university committees to study your work I can only wish you luck. There are no bodies, I think, harder to penetrate with a new idea than the universities.

Twentytwo years ago, when I started my work, I would not believe him. I believed in the meaning of the "Alma Mater", the "fostering Mother" of all ideas, the university. Today I have realized the truth in the words of that scholar.

And then I read of Brandeis University, built by generous Jews. Jews and Jewish scholars know what discrimination and persecution means. They will listen to me. They will help a new idea, and a new science into being, and thus enhance the name of Brandeis University. And so I wrote my first letter:

Sydney 4 March 1963

Please circulate this letter if you think it worthwhile. And thank you!

To the Trustees and Scholars of
BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY, Waltham, Mass.

Gentlemen,

The fascinating article on your University (TIME April 13, 1962) tempted me many a time to write to you. But each time I felt discouraged by previous efforts - not made by me, but by eminent scholars who approached universities

and foundations on behalf of my most unusual work.

Lord Bertrand Russell wrote that financing the printing of my work means "performing an important service to mankind."

Sir Julian Huxley wrote that it "provides something of real importance."

Professor O.L. Reiser (Pittsburgh) read a paper on my work to the AAAS and said: "Bliss realised the ambition of the great mathematician Leibniz"

an idea, which mathematicians, logicians, and linguists of the last 300 years considered impossible to realize: a simple mind mathematics for man, a new medium for mankind (see the attached leaflet).

The late Professor Clyde Kluckhohn of Harvard made strenuous efforts at Harvard and the Carnegie Foundation to get me a publication grant. He failed and told me in discouragement that universities and foundations are often guided by "irrationalities". I meant that he referred to the fact that I am a Jew.

True enough, I am a Jew, and per force a graduate of Dachau and Buchenwald and the Ghetto of Shanghai. Years ago, I approached Yeshiva University, but with the same result as Kluckhohn approached Harvard. There must be other "irrationalities."

At last, an officer of an American Foundation gave me the answer in Sydney. "Look Mr. Bliss," he said, "you deserve a publication grant more than many a scholar. I am particularly impressed by one application of your work: an inexpensive international, and interlinguistic science abstract on index cards, by which every researcher would be informed within one month what is going on all over the world in his particular research field. I have read your lecture about it which you gave at Sydney University. I know that many millions of dollars could be saved through such an abstract, also many duplications of research work, and many heartbreaks among researchers too. But you must realize that thousands of researchers are begging us for grants. We must turn away most of them, which makes many angry, even vengeful. If I get you a grant, I may get myself fired too.

For this reason, all officers of all foundations give grants only to staff members of universities who have the highest recommendations of their superiors. And this is the reason, why you, a true scholar, but not on the payroll of a university cannot get a grant. It is deplorable, and even disastrous, but it is real."

However, I felt not discouraged. I made 100 mimeographed copies of my 3 volumes and of my lectures, articles, courses, etc. and offered them to universities. I am glad to report that universities in all five continents took them up, and some even gave standing orders for all my future publications, even mimeographed only.

But 100 copies are not enough. My desire is that at least 1000 copies be distributed to the important universities and colleges throughout the world so that future researchers may continue where I left off. I am an old man now.

Can Brandeis University help, so that 1000 copies be donated in the name of your University to the Universities and Colleges of your choice?

If you are favourably inclined, and if you know of some way to help this work along, and if you want more information, please let me know. Meanwhile I have to thank you for reading this letter, and I remain with the hope of a favourable consideration.

Yours sincerely

C.K. Bliss.

I sent this letter off by airmail, and hoped to have an answer within a few weeks. But March, April, May, and June passed without news from Brandeis University. Then news came through TIME magazine (June 21, 1963) Brandeis University has awarded an H.L.D. to the dancer Martha Graham. No other honours to other persons were mentioned. And why to a dancer? Because as the citation says:

"Her craggy angular inventions mirror the liquid inner life of the American spirit."

This was for me bad news indeed. And indeed, 1963 went by, and I had to come to the conclusion that my letter won't be answered, because it has been burnt in the incinerator. Then in 1964, I decided to write again, this time directly to the President:

Sydney 8 Jan 64

To the President
of Brandeis University
Waltham, Mass. U.S.A.

Sir,

On the 4th of March 1963 I sent you a letter which I addressed "To the Trustees and Scholars of Brandeis University" not knowing clearly whom I should address, and who is going to deal with my letter. In this letter I drew your attention to the fact that I have done pioneering work in the field of linguistics and logic, and in particular that I have solved a problem which the great Leibniz posed 300 years ago. In 1950 Professor Oliver L. Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh read a paper to the AAAS about my work in which he said that I have at last solved this problem which was considered insoluble for 300 years. I attached also a leaflet to my letter which gives you a summary of the scope and applications of my work in a number of sciences.

I also pointed out that I am a retired industrial executive who lectured at Sydney University, and that I am also a Jew. Lastly I asked you to help my work along with a publication grant.

No answer came, and I assume that my letter got lost somewhere on a desk, due perhaps to my vague address. Now that nearly one year will soon go by without an answer from you, I would be much obliged if you would be kind enough to give me an answer one way or another. I am sure that you will have no difficulty to locate my letter. Should however this prove impossible, then I shall rewrite it and send it to you again.

I need your answer, because I am at present engaged in a study of how much or how little Jewish scholars of merit are helped along by Jewish institutions. Kindly help me in making it clear how you stand with regard to my work. In order not to cause you any actual expense, allow me to enclose the stamp for your airletter.

Thanking you in anticipation, I am

Yours sincerely
C.K. Bliss B.Sc.

This time I included a postage stamp for a reply. It came, informing me that my letter cannot be found. I was asked to send a copy of it. This I did, and realizing that my first letter was perhaps not good enough, I decided to write a long and detailed one, in order to impress the President and scholars concerned:

Sydney 13th February 1964

Professor Abe Sachar
President
Brandeis University
Waltham 54, Mass. U.S.A.

My letters of March 4, 1963
and January 8, 1964

Dear Professor Sachar,

This is first to express my sincere hope that you have returned from your trip healthy and happy about the success of your international scholarship program. I am sure that much work and many decisions are awaiting you, and therefore I shall be content to wait until you will find the time to study my 2 letters, the first written nearly one year ago, and the second last month.

This letter will be rather long, but only because I attach much importance to your person and to Brandeis University. I feel I have to deal with certain general problems which are facing creative men today, and which one way or another have to be solved. I am one of the unfortunate innovators whose work is ahead of their time, and who are fighting hopeless battles for help. I think that something must be done to help such men of vision. My approach to you is so elaborate because I believe that you are a man of vision. Moreover, after 21 years of approaches to professors and universities, philanthropes and foundations, this is my last approach. And this too explains the length and the content of this letter.

I am a Jew, a graduate of the University of Technology (chemistry) of Vienna, and also a graduate perforce of the concentration camps of Dachau and Buchenwald and the Japanese Ghetto of Shanghai. I went into industry, because I felt it will give me more scope, but in the evenings I was always a lecturer without pay, because I felt that much ignorance is in the world, and I wanted to do my share in lifting it. I was a good student at the university and graduated in 3 years instead of the prescribed 4, but I was also a good pain in the neck with my incessant questions about the prevailing scientific theories. I was full of what Einstein called "Der edle Zweifel" - the noble doubt. I doubted and questioned everything in science, and one of my recurring questions was this: which science is the most important one? Which science is most desperately needed by a desperate mankind, driven from one war into another, from one misery into another one - and the future looks bleaker than ever.

Is it chemistry and physics? It can't be. Man has lived for many thousands of years without the many gadgets of today, which forces even his wife into employment to pay for them all. Worse even, chemistry and physics have given man more and more elaborate weapons to destroy more and more men, women and children.

Is it medicine? Surely a great science for the help of suffering humanity? But what has medical science done to combat the ills of men brought upon himself, the sicknesses and diseases brought upon by alcohol and nicotine, by the spread of venereal diseases, and by the hundreds of millions of diasters which wreck almost every marriage - and caused by man's hopeless ignorance - and all caused by the utter failure of medical science to educate an ignorant mankind.

Is the study of history most important? It should be, because we have to learn from the mistakes of former generations. But, you as a great historian, you will surely agree with me, that many history teachers consider their task to be, to drubb young minds with the dreary dates of marriages, murders and massacres of self-elected kings and conquerors. It is said that history teaches us nothing, but only because the history teacher teaches us nothing about the dangers in dictators and demagogues to rule us. The terrible results are a Hitler and a Musselini, a Stalin and a Kruschew, a Mao and a Nasser, a Sokarno and all the other new potentates of Africa, who prepare feverishly the destruction of those men who follow other dictators and demagogues.

Is the money spent on archeology well spent? This science is a branch of the science of history. Millions of dollars are given away, and out of the taxpayers pockets, to dig up more and more rubble and rubbish of a criminal past, telling us of the sacking of cities and the slaying of citizens. Surely suffering mankind has nothing to learn from this science in our time, where the sacking of cities and the slaying of the citizens is done on a more grandiose scale than ever, thanks to the science of chemistry and physics.

As an aside, and with direct reference to my work, I have made an archeological discovery in the caves of paleolithic man, which is more important than all other archeological discoveries which tell us only that the potentates lived in splendor and the people in squalor. The late Professor Clyde Kluckhohn was so much impressed with it, that he commissioned me to write an artical about it, and he promised to place it in an Americal scientific journal. But he failed. Why? Simply because the editors of these journals were afraid of their own jobs in giving so much wanted space to a non-professional scholar, whose discovery overthrows all prevailing theories of the professional archeologist. I need not tell you of Schliemann and Sautuola and all the other amateur archeologists who loved to search (Latin amator lover) and who spent their own money, only to find that the professionals rejected their findings as fakes or falsehoods.

Whatever other science I studied, I found that man can do without them, and in fact about 2 billion people on this planet do not even know of the 3 R's, and yet they go on living and talking - and reasoning of some sort. But what reasoning? They are governed by words, spoken to them by their spiritual and secular rulers, and these words create havoc in their mind, and havoc in human relationship. Perhaps, there is one R which is more important than all the learning of all other R's and Arts - the Art of Reasoning. Yet, there is a science for this, the science of logic, taught at the universities only, and only to those few students who subscribe to the study of philosophy. But should not logic be taught to all students who will become the future leaders of their nations? They need more than any other skill the Art of Reasoning logically. Why is not logic made compulsory for all students? Why? Because the logic taught at universities is either a fossil

from scholastic days, or a jumble of hairraising symbol formulas which cannot help even the most intelligent intellectual to solve his everyday problems.

At last, I found the most important science of all, the science most desperately needed by a desperate mankind. I found it out, when the Gestapo arrested me and sent me through the hells of Dachau and Buchenwald. I found it out when the Japanese forced me and my wife and 16,000 other Jewish refugees in the Hongkew Ghetto of Shanghai. And why? Because of man's ignorance of this most important science of all, the science which can deal with all the man-made disasters brought upon mankind by men who use words to encite and enslave men.

In Dachau and Buchenwald I found what Aristotle had found 2300 years ago when he wrote his *Sophistici elenchi*. He had put his finger on the sorest spot of human weakness: the mind as being a victim of its words. In our time Sigmund Freud and Bertrand Russell put it in another way by saying: whatever we think, we think in words. And I have said in many of my writings: muddled thoughts are expressed in muddled meanings, and they in turn incite muddled thoughts in other minds. And the results? Hundreds of millions of people have died already and many more millions will die because of all the muddled meanings about religion, politics, nationality, socialism, communism, race, and other rabble-rousing meanings.

This danger was realized hundreds of years ago. John Locke wrote his "Essay concerning Human Understanding" and Wilhelm Leibniz followed this up with his "New Essays concerning Human Understanding". In this book he speculated about a simple "Algebra of Thought" so simple that even children and illiterates can learn to operate it. He prophesied that one day such a simple symbolic logic will be invented, a "Symbolis Universalis". But for 300 years, philosophers, logicians, mathematicians and linguists considered Leibniz' speculation impossible to realize.

Now in our time, an eminent American philosopher and logician, Professor Oliver L. Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh stood up in the American Association for the Advancement of Science, read a paper on my work and said:

"Bliss realized the ambition of the great mathematician Leibniz"

That was 13 years ago. I thought it will create a stir. But nothing happened. I had Reiser's paper printed, and wrote letters to every professor and lecturer of philosophy and logic on every American university and college - over 1250 of them - and promised to print whatever damnation they are prepared to mete out to my work. "Criticise it, condemn it, tear it to pieces," I wrote (in better words of course) "but say something." The result was silence, or what the Germans call "Totschweigen". As usual, this word is falsely translated in dictionaries with "conspiracy of silence." But not two professionals "conspired" to be silent about my work. "Tetschweigen" means literally "Death by Silence - Killing an idea and its innovator by being silent about it and him."

As told in my first letter, publishers told me that they cannot risk their money on a textbook which is not used in any school. True enough, there is no system of simple logic available which can be taught even to children, by which they can recognize the words which are vague and ambiguous, hurtful and destructive, and which words are used by demagogues and dictators to enslave mankind. All they are taught in school is how to pronounce such words and how to spell them, but not how to recognize their falsehoods and dangers. This is the most important science of all, and I am the only man who has fulfilled the prophecy of the great Leibniz. And I am condemned to death for this by the very professionals who are paid the taxpayers money to see to it that new ideas are taken up by the fostering mother of all sciences, the Alma Mater, and the men on her payroll.

You as an historian know very well that almost all the innovators of new ideas had to die first in desperation only to be exhumed, extolled - and exploited many years later. May I cite here one example out of hundreds. Comenius had to rot for over 200 years in his grave before they adopted his idea in his *Orbis Pictorum*, of pictures in school books. Recently Columbia University found out in a study that it takes 15 years until a new idea in education reaches 3% of all American schools, and 50 years until it reaches all American schools. How many hundreds of years will my bones rot until they will teach my simple symbolic logic in all schools of the world?

To this, one of the most famous of modern physicists gave the answer. Max Planck said (as retold by his friend Professor Frank) that a new idea does not gain ground by convincing its opponents. It gains ground as the opponents die out, one by one. Planck lived well over 90. He had an opportunity to see his opponents sinking into their graves and his idea rising in acceptance.

There is a counter-argument to this, by pointing at Einstein. But how many people, or how few, know that almost all ideas of Einstein's theory of relativity were pronounced by lone thinkers nearly one hundred years ago. Who knows today of Riemann and Lobachevsky who speculated about closed universes with more than 3 dimensions? Who knows of Riemann who said that a ray of light may follow the curvature of the universe? Who knows of Fitzgerald and Lorentz who speculated on the shortening of space and the lengthening of time on fast moving bodies? Who knows that Newton has predicted 300 years ago that a ray of light will be bent towards the sun - the very effect which made Einstein famous in 1919. And who knows of Friedrich Kotter of Vienna? Professor Frank who was also a friend of Einstein told the story of Einstein coming to Vienna, and meeting there Kotter who proved to him that he had reasoned out the very same theory of relativity before Einstein. Einstein had to admit it, but what did he do for Kotter? How nice if he had put him on the payroll of a university. But he let him rot in the obscurity of the payroll of the Kodak Company.

And all this in a time when hundreds of millions of dollars and pounds are made available as tax deduction for science and scientists. But what is done with these colossal sums? First, there are the international scholarship programs. In order to find out what they achieve, let us consider the effect of the most famous of these scholarship programs, the Rhodes Scholarship program. Since Cecil Rhodes died, over 12,000 of the best students of American and British universities were sent to Oxford. Some time ago I read an appraisal of a scholarly authority who said that the results are shocking. A few only had won distinction which they had won even without any scholarship. But with almost all of them, the only distinction they won was to be called a Rhodes Scholar. No discovery and no original work whatever. And why? Every teacher knows why. Because teachers best pupils are not best in later life, that's why. But they get the recommendations for scholarships and publication grants, and travelling grants, etc. etc. The true scholar, usually an outsider of universities, gets nothing.

I lectured gratis at Sydney Universities only to be told that my work is too new. It must gain first universal acceptance, before the universities can take an active interest in it. This means in blunt words: "Into the grave Mr. Bliss, into the grave first!" I wrote many letters to the director-generals and officers of Unesco and got many letters back. They are all in issues of my Semantography Series. And they prove what Professor Lancelot Hogben said some time ago: "Unesco is a comic synonym to Fiasco". All they can do is to hop around the world to conferences where they discuss the recommendation of former conferences to set up regional conference committees for the preparation of more conferences for the final adaption of proposals to the General Conference. Many millions of dollars are spent on such travelling - symposiums they call it - where the participants read a paper and then go on sight-seeing. Nothing is done, and in fact, Unesco, which has all the brains of all the universities at its disposal has not produced a single original work, a single creative achievement, except travelling on the pretext of helping suffering mankind through science and education.

But the worst abuses of those gigantic sums taken from the Internal Revenue Department for educational purposes, have been revealed by Professor Bazin of Columbia University who, in his book "The House of Intellect" cried out in shame about the shameless hand-outs given under the pretext of pseudo-scientific papers and "research" which no one needs and no one reads, and which are only a camouflage of rapacity in the name of science. The Ford Foundation is at least honest enough not to ask for a "paper" in return for a check. They give away many millions of dollars, simply to boost the salaries of teachers and professors.

I did not know of all this, when I approached for 21 years humbly with hat in hand universities and scholarly institutions and foundations. And all the time I cried that I don't want a post, not a job, not a position, not a penny for myself. All I want is only a publication grant, so that my work should not get lost and that it be found in libraries when I am gone, so that young minds can go on where I left off. But, as I explained in my first letter, I could not get a penny, and one official told me that if he gives me a publication grant, when thousands of professionals were crying for one, he would lose his job for sup-

-porting the application of a scholar who is not a professional, but who is only a creator and innovator, which apparently is not enough - or too much.

In desperation, I mimeographed 100 copies of my 3 books, and of my Semantography Series, which contains all lectures and all articles which I and others have given or written on my work, all controversies and all correspondences and approaches, which series now contains over 200 issues. I sold them all to great university libraries in all 5 continents, and some of them gave a standing order for all my future writings as contained in the series. Now, I have the pleasure to hear and to read the praise with which some scholars mention my work in their books. But with few exceptions, these commendable references are made as if I were dead already. I must depend on friends to be informed about them.

But I am not dead yet. All I want is that 1000 sets of all my books and writings be placed in 1000 important libraries of the world. And I know that you as the President of Brandeis University can help me to this. Even if all your money is tied up in grants of any sort, I am sure that you would know of some crazy Jew, ready to support a crazy original idea, or a rich Jewish widow, who would take an old darling pioneer to her heart, and have his books printed with her name as donor on the cover. You can do it, Professor Sachar, if only you want to help a Jewish scholar and enhance the name of Brandeis University. But if you too refuse me your help, allow me at least to repeat your words when I report about this last approach in my writings.

TIME (June 21, 1963) reported that you have made the dancer Marther Graham a H.L.D. because (as the citation says):

"Her craggy angular inventions mirror the liquid inner life of the American spirit."

If a dancer can get such honourable sentence, what do I deserve from Brandeis University? Do I deserve the death sentence as it has been pronounced by all the persons whom I have approached in the past? They killed my wife who saw me year after year sinking deeper and deeper into despondency and desperation.

This then is my last hope and my last approach. Will Brandeis University honour and help a great Jewish pioneer and innovator? Or will I be considered as just another great Jewish Chutzpahnik, another Jewish Oberchochem, Schnorrer and Kowetchapper with a new gimmick for getting money? It cannot be done, because the most eminent logician of our age Lord Bertrand Russell wrote 14 years ago:

"Any man or men who will spend the money necessary to get Bliss' work printed will, in my opinion, be performing an important service to mankind."

I attach Semantography Series No. 157 and want to draw your attention to one application of my work which is desperately needed in all fields of scientific research: an inexpensive international science abstract on index cards by which all researchers anywhere in the world can be quickly informed about the research going on in their own field. Many millions and many heartbreaks due to duplicity of work could be saved, and Brandeis University could become a real pioneer of science for all universities by promoting this idea. I am ready to send you my Semantography Series No. 37 and 38 containing my lecture given to the Physical Society of Sydney University, also the issues No. 43 and 44 containing the text of my lecture to the Geological Society of Sydney University, also the issues No. 40 and 41 containing the text of my lecture to the University of New South Wales, all dealing with this idea of an international science abstract.

BUT PLEASE do not ask for these papers in order to delay a decision of which you know already that it can only be negative - so sorry, and all that. I have written such a long and passionate letter because I hope to convince you that something can be done to help me with a publication grant, either through your university or through one of your rich Jewish friends, I know it can be done, but only if you want to do it, Hence tell me in a few words "Yes, my friend, we will help you!" This is all I want to hear.

I remain thanking you for giving me your valuable time to read this letter.

Yours sincerely
C.K. Bliss

Within two weeks I received a short answer from President Sachar. I cannot quote fully the letter, without infringing his copyright. But I can tell of its content. Prof. Sachar told me that my disappointment in relation to the publication of my writings should not be interpreted as a derogation of my work. Institutions and foundations must operate within their prescribed limitations. Brandeis University has no resources to publish the writings of even the most gifted scholars. The faculty members must seek out their own publishers. He expressed the hope that I will find a sponsor so that copies of my work may find their way into many libraries. Cordially Yours A.L. Sachar.

To this letter I answered as follows:

Sydney 11 March 1964

Professor A.L. Sachar,
President of Brandeis University
Waltham, Mass. U.S.A.

Your letter of February 28

Dear Professor Sachar,

You have reduced my passionate letter on the sorry state of science today to nothing more than a "begging for money." But you have treated me worse than a "begger". You gave me not even an "almon" of a few words of scholarly curiosity about my work, which solves a 300 years old "insoluble" problem, and brings a new science into being - nor a request for reprints of scientific papers, so that your faculty can learn about it - nor (Heaven forbid) an order of my books for your library. You are only hoping that copies of my work "may find their way into many libraries." I assure you that they will, together with a new issue of my Series (subscribed by universities) containing my letters to you, so that others shall read them. Apparently, you gave them only a cursory glance and thought. My first letter, sent one year ago, was not answered at all. I had to write a long letter in order to get a few phrases from you.

One of your phrases I shall use in my forthcoming book as a classic example of scholarly subterfuge. You said that:

"Institutions and Foundations must operate within their prescribed limitations." This looks like a "law of nature" immutable and unalterable. But boys and girls who have learned to operate my discipline (which Leibniz failed to work out) will know that "must" can easily be replaced by "must not", and that the men who "prescribe limitations" can "widen" them to suit their needs, as for instance to accomodate the cost of your travels in the name of science.

Suppose that by some quirk of fate my star of fame would suddenly burst into brilliance. Then suddenly all "prescribed limitations" would vanish, and you would go to any length (including persuading some rich Jews) to instal a Bliss chair and a Bliss Institute at Brandeis University. As it is, you have to make do with honorary degrees to dancers and the like.

You as a historian should know that the lone originators of new ideas were not recognized in their life-time by the very men of the universities. The professionals don't want even to hear of a new idea which is not their idea, as you yourself so admirably proved in this case. History has already pronounced judgement about my work in the words of Bertrand Russell, Julian Huxley, and others. History will pronounce also judgement about your treatment of me. And I wish you a long life to see it happen, and many more happy returns from many more travels in the name of science.

Travelling is today the most ardently followed vocation of most professional scholars, who can get easily within the "prescribed limitations". As to the originator of a new science: he can travel to hell!

Cordially yours

C.K. Bliss