



Semantography Series 337

BLISS AND A PROFESSOR OF ZOOLOGY

My cousin Mr. Karl Bittman has a friend from Vienna in the University of New England in Armidale in the Australian State of New South Wales. He is Professor of Zoology A. Stock. Karl has visited Stock a number of times and Karl told me sometimes of his meeting with Stock. I was pleased to hear that Stock knows of my work Semantography. I asked Karl what Stock thinks of Evolution and Karl told me that Stock thinks that the mechanism of evolution has been proved to be true, and that we can now be absolutely sure that this is the way how the creatures on earth "evolved". As this is contrary to what I think, I told Karl so, and on his visit to Armidale in 1970 Karl spoke to Stock about my ideas, and when he returned he urged me to write to Stock. I wrote the following letter to Stock on the 30th January 1971, and wrote a letter to the librarian which I asked Stock to convey and to urge the librarian to buy my book. I also included in my letter to Stock relevant pages of my book "The Invention and Discovery" which pages dealt with the problem of evolution.

Two and a half months passed by without an acknowledgement from Stock that he has received my letter. He could have sent me a short note at least. I then wrote the second letter on April 13, and indeed received a letter from Stock dated April 15 which follows further down.

Now when typing these stencils at the end of June 1971 there is still no answer from Stock, and I believe that he will do the usual trick: no answer at all. In this case I will contemplate further action. Meanwhile read my letters to him and his short reply.

Prof. A. Stock
Professor of Zoology
University College
Armidale NSW

Sydney 30 Jan 71

Dear Professor Stock,

My cousin Mr. Karl Bittman told me yesterday that he has seen you when recently in Armidale and that he has told you about my new book. He told me many years ago that you know about my work, because there was an article by Heaney (a student at Sydney University who attended one of my lectures there) in the yearly arts magazine Neuma of Armidale College (1952) on my work. In later years he informed me about your stand on the theory of Evolution. He asked you about this theory because I expressed serious doubts about its interpretation. Perhaps I shall speak about this right now because it has its bearing on what I want to tell you as a Professor of Zoology.

Hitler and Goebbels had made me a student of semantics, but also a student of zoology and biology. See page 104 of my new book "Bliss and the Beasts of Buchenwald" (attached to this letter). From this I resorted to a violent and vicious attack on the whole cast of zoologists and biologists. The basis of this attack is simple. If it is true, as the zoologists say, that there is continuous warfare in nature among animals, why, then continuous warfare among the human animals is only natural, and nobody can change nature or human nature. Therefore (as I saw it on the Vienna Kriegsministerium) "Si vis pacem para bellum". Prepare for war if you want peace. I make the zoologists responsible for this false and disastrous doctrine, and to this comes the false and disastrous doctrine of the "survival of the fittest". Who can use his elbows better will have a better chance of survival, and who has better battalions and better bombs will survive better. "Into the criminal courts with the zoologists and biologists!" I cry in my new book.

However, there are extenuating circumstances. The real culprits who have made zoologists their victims are the teachers and professors of language. So let's take the word "Evolution". It is the verbal noun of the verb "to evolve". But in my Semantography we must adhere to the natural sequence in any sentence describing a natural act. This sequence is "Agent acts on Object". As in say "Man kills fellowman". Well, who is the agent who does what the verb "to evolve" says? WHO or WHAT does the evolving of the species? If the answer is "Mutation", this is again another verbal noun. WHO or WHAT does mutate? The genes? WHO or WHAT makes the genes mutate? And so on.

Well, let's go to Julian Huxley. I had with him a spirited controversy and a spirited correspondence. But I could not change his mind.

Huxley's "explanation" has the simplicity of the mind of a child. He said in many of his utterances about Evolution: "The creatures were not created, they evolved. When the fish were left on dry land they grew legs and walked. Later they grew feathers and flew". It was just as simple as that.

I attach those pages of the References and Bibliography of my new book where I tell of that verbal fraud, and of another fraud committed by Huxley himself. He likes to quote the last paragraph of Darwin's "The Origin of the Species." In this last paragraph Darwin sums up the whole book. Alas, Huxley found it necessary to omit just 18 words from Darwin's summary, 18 words in which Darwin himself expresses his inability to explain how creatures really "evolve" except that they do evolve. But why and how? Darwin therefore does what most people did throughout the centuries, taking refuge in the existence of a Creator.

Naturally, Huxley does not want to talk about a "Creator" and I don't want to talk about HIM either. For me HE is a monster. He punishes innocent children for the crimes of their fathers. HE let us burn in hell for ever and ever if we do not repent and repay, etc. etc. I have dealt with this religious hocuspocus in the chapters "The meaning of God, and what they did with the word - and still do."

Now all these lamentations of mine must be old hat for you and for every zoologist. And surely you have your well-reasoned answer to what I said. I know the answers of the zoologists, because I searched through hundreds of their books. But my answer is a totally new hat, as it were - and it does not fit the heads of most zoologists, no matter how hard they try to discard it. This of course is a play with words and metaphors, but I want to introduce you to my own thinking and therefore I include the relevant chapters of my new book for you to read and keep. I don't want to send you the whole book because it deals with most of the ills of mankind. I want that you should concentrate on those pages which deal with the zoologists. And I want to say that there is only one answer to what I have to say. The answer could only be to go before your class, and tell them honestly that you and all other zoologists are victims of the keepers of our languages, and that the zoologists have befuddled themselves and all mankind by words and their false meanings.

Surely you cannot do this. You would endanger your own position. Moreover you have to adhere to a syllabus and to certain textbooks which contain the truth. You cannot tell your students and your chancellor that these books contain lies.

But there are some professors who can do this. One was the late Professor Clyde Kluckhohn, Harvard Professor of Anthropology whom I met in Sydney. He was much impressed by what I had to say, because he himself has voiced similar doubts in his book "Mirror of Man". He commissioned me to write an article, and he tried to get me a publication grant from the Carnegie Foundation. But they told me that their job is to give grants only to those who are on the payrolls of universities. Outsiders must stay outside.

Kluckhohn tried even to bring me into Harvard. He failed in this too, and in one of his letters to me he complained bitterly that the higher institutions of learning are (as he said) "governed by irrationalities". What a nice word, but what does it mean? Was my admission refused because I am a Jew, or because I am not a professional zoologist, biologist or anthropologist, or - and this may be what Kluckhohn wanted to tell me - was my entry refused because my teaching makes all zoologists, biologists and anthropologists look like fools, no worse than fools.

Well, perhaps you know what happened to Velikovski and his book "Worlds in Collision". I consider him an idiot, but what happened to him should be the concern of all of us. The astronomers of Harvard blackmailed MacMillan, who had Velikovski's bestseller, to drop it, as otherwise Harvard would refuse to accept any textbook published by MacMillan. The full story has been told in one of those Melbourne quarterlies (Minjean, or something similar) under "Velikovski in Collision" MacMillan had to give away the book to Doubleday.

Now this is an overlong letter. But "Wessen Herz voll ist, dem geht der Mund ueber". I am writing to you because I hold my cousin Mr. Bittman in high esteem because he is one of the very few people who take me seriously. For the others in our common Bekanntenkreis I am either a "gutmuetiger Tepp" or a crazy crank. So let us go back to Mr. Bittman with whom I started this letter.

Years ago Karl subscribed to the Wiener "Arbeiter Zeitung" and one day he saw there the title of an article which was the essence of what I have preached for many years, and what I have come upon in Buchenwald. The title "Tiere kennen keinen Brudermord." The author tells of the work of Konrad Lorenz who, as you know, lived for many years in Altenberg by Tulln. Well this title "Animals don't know of brothermurder" tells in a nutshell what I shall now try to tell you in the pages of my book. I have quoted there Lorenz in length, but I was in later

years dismayed to see that Lorenz had - perhaps because he is a professor and must not tell the world that his fellow professors of the same faculty are dangerous idiots - had found it wise for his paycheque to voice some of the idiocies of his colleagues.

For instance, I saw Lorenz explain on TV some of his experiments with his famous geese. There was a goose sitting on her eggs. Suddenly Lorenz made an egg roll out in front of that mother goose. She, believing that the egg rolled out from under her belly tried with her beak to push it back into the warmth of her body. Now Lorenz rolled out in front of her not an egg but a perfect spherical ball, white of course. Again, the goose pushed it back, though it was a golf ball. Now Lorenz rolled out in front of her a cube, white too. Again the goose pushed the cube into her warmth. Now Lorenz rolled out in front of her a monstrous oblong white box ten times larger than an egg. And again the goose tried but could not succeed, to get that object into and under her.

Said Lorenz that we have here two explanations for this behaviour. Either it is a highly ethical philosophical action, or it is only a mechanical reflex. And he preferred to call this a "mechanical reflex". Such utterances by an expert makes me cringe in white rage. Perhaps the goose has an eye which cannot discern geometrical differences? Perhaps the whiteness of that object is the main impression she gets. Or perhaps - hold onto your seat professor - the mother goose tried to save her baby, tries to save a life!!! This of course is silly, but throughout the centuries criers in the wilderness have said the silliest things and I am one of them.

Now one last item which will go straight into your own field; Australian Fauna. When I came to Australia my heart was filled with wonders about the unique animals. In my book "In search of a Logical God" I have a large chapter titled "Three Australian Pioneers of Evolution" and I explain why they are pioneers. They are the platypus, the echidna, and the kangaroo. Of them I hold the echidna the greatest pioneer of them all. And I have found that Australian zoologists are woefully ignorant about that wonderful little fellow who does not deserve the Greek word "monster". But perhaps he does. He proves the cast of zoologists and evolutionists utter fools. I had violent arguments with the zoologists of the Australian Museum in Sydney. Why? Here is why, and it goes back to Austria.

Our zoology teacher in Austria told us about "Das australische Schnabeltier" What's so freakish about it? Imagine it has a fur and a bird's beak. That was all we were told. Australian zoologists have given it an even sillier name "platypus" webbed flatfoot, again no indication of the wonder it contains. What is the wonder of the Platypus?

For the first time in the history of our earth something wonderful, something incredible happened. The mother animal provided food for her baby in her own body. Milk is oozing from her belly and her baby, after it had crawled out of the egg, cuddles up to mother and licks her milk. What's that? A purely mechanical reflex? Or a senseless mutation? Or a highly ethical act?

Now, evolutionists see no reason, no sense, no aim, and no purpose in the evolution of species, and indeed, the ~~waird creatures we see in aquariums~~ are very convincing. Hence, the milk of the platypus mother, or the pouch of the kangaroo mother evolved, they just happened, out of the sheer hit or miss chance. And once they are here, they prove its worth for the survival of the species. But there is that little monster, the echidna. The mother echidna is plagued by the same trouble as the platypus mother. The egg may break, the egg may be stolen when she forages for food. What to do to save the baby?

The kangaroo mother has it much easier. For the first time (in my opinion) in the history of the earth the egg does not come out as an egg. It remains in the mother womb all the time and the baby is hatched out there in perfect safety. How to make the echidna egg safe too? The echidna mother had a bright idea and went to it with a purpose - and "purpose" is the word Huxley and the others just don't want to hear. The echidna mother creates (no) evolves a pouch when she gets pregnant, and in this pouch she carries her egg, close to the warmth of her body and she can go foraging for food with the egg in perfect safety. Well the evolutionists may still not see a "purposeful action". But now watch what happens. When the baby crawls out of the egg and crawls out of the pouch - then the pouch has no purpose - and therefore purposefully disappears. It is the purpose, purpose, purpose all the way. But how does the egg get into the pouch which mysteriously appears in the abdomen of the echidna? THAT IS THE 64,000\$ question! And believe it or not, the zoologists have no answer to this. I told the zoologists in the Australian Museum; "You can get me out of here within the next minute. Just tell me how the egg gets into the echidna pouch!" But they wouldn't tell. They fumbled around with words, but couldn't say the simplest thing, namely (what I have said all the time) the echidna grabs the egg with her front paws and puts it into her newly created pouch - in much the same way as Lorenz!

goose puts the egg underneath her.

I often come to Angus & Robertson, because they get orders for my books from abroad. And every time I am there I head straight to the counter with the new books on Australian Animals. Hardly a month passes without a new such book. And every time I open up the page on the echidna, the author doesn't know, and some admit that much "research" must still be done. But cannot Australian zoologists observe a pregnant echidna for say 4 weeks and solve the riddle once and for all?

Now to my new book. I prefer to send you only the relevant chapters dealing with your field, and these cost you nothing. I have decided also not to make the book available in Australia. It is so full about my vicious attacks on the mental and moral teachers and preachers of all schools and universities, on all our leaders and misleaders in Moscow, Washington, London, and even Canberra, that I would be looking for much trouble when publishing the book in Australia. It goes straight to the U.S.A. and I hope that a paperback will be published there.

Now you do me a favour and I shall do you a favour. My favour to you is this: I have before me the galley proof of a lecture by Arthur Koestler which he gave at the 1969 Nobel Symposium in Stockholm. The title "The Urge to Self-Destruction". Koestler said the same thing as I say about animal and human behaviour. Furthermore I just received the last issue of "Der Spiegel" the best news magazine there is (it brought also the lecture of Koestler, and thus made me aware of it). In the last issue of Spiegel there is an article and picture of Professor Eigen the biochemiker who claims that he has now evolved the mathematical formulas for evolution - the idiot. I shall be happy to have xeroxcopies made of these two items and send them to you - if you could induce your librarian to order my large book "Semantography" which is already in most Australian Universities and hundreds of universities and colleges abroad. If you agree to this I shall send you the proper promotion papers for your librarian. Incidentally, there is a lot of what I said in this letter also in my large book. And so, dear Professor Stark thank you for having given me the opportunity to release some of my pent-up emotion devouring me. I am now in my 74th year.

Sincerely yours,
C.K. Bliss

And I attached a letter to the librarian of the university college as follows:

The Principal Librarian,
University College,
Armidale. NSW

Sydney 30 Jan 71

By courtesy of Professor A. Stark

Dear Sir/Madam,

Eighteen years ago, Noumea the Arts Magazine of Armidale College brought an article on my work Semantography. Since then the first edition of my work was sold out and in 1965 a second edition came out in one handy volume. This book is already in all University Libraries of Australia, and in hundreds of university, college and public libraries abroad.

Now that Prof. Stark has taken an interest in my work, may I suggest that you acquire the book for your library too. I am a lone worker, I have simply not the time to try to "sell" my work. I am now in my 74th year, and know that it will sell itself after my death, but perhaps Prof. Stark would like to see it, and other professors too. At least, your action would be for me a kind help as I am continuously broke, trying to do my scientific work and trying to propagate it. Here is but one instance that will show you the extent of my work.

I publish also the Semantography Series, of which over 300 issues have appeared. Years ago I was able to comply with the orders from a number of universities, for instance Harvard, Columbis and others, and was able to send them issues no. 1 to 163, but since then, though the libraries clamour for the next issues I am physically unable to do the work. I enclose the letter from the Australian National Library. The former principal librarian Mr. White found it worthwhile to order 2 copies and pay for the second one, and now Mr. Fleming wants to do the same. Other libraries have written similar letters. I shall now comply at least with Mr. Fleming's request. But I shall not ask you to subscribe to the Series, simply I would be unable to collect the issues, etc.

But my book is something different. It contains 882 pages and the reduced library price (15%) is \$ 9.20 including postage. I include a few sample pages from the book, and also an appeal to librarians which I printed many years ago. The explanations still hold true. Hoping you will kindly help the propagation of a book, of which it is being said abroad that the author is an Australian pioneer, I thank you for your kindness and remain,

Yours sincerely,
C.K. Bliss

2 $\frac{1}{2}$ months passed by and no answer from Prof. Stock.
I wrote again.

Page 5 S.S.No.337

Professor A. Stock,
Professor of Zoology,
University College,
ARMIDALE. NSW

Dear Professor Stock,

More than two months ago I did write to you a four page detailed letter, discussing some important aspects on theories concerning zoology, biology and paleontology.

It is of course possible that my registered letter never reached you, in which case I shall be glad to send you a copy as soon as I have your letter asking for it.

But it is also possible that you don't want to answer, or you don't care to answer. This is common procedure in the world of academe, though it is refusing the meanest courtesy to another scholar who has taken great pains to explain his ideas on four detailed pages.

Moreover, I did not want to bother you at all. Indeed, it was our common friend, my cousin Mr. Karl Bittman, who told me more than 10 years ago that he has discussed my work with you, and that you have told him that you know of my work, probably through the publication in Neuma (or a similar name) the Arts Magazine of the University College Armidale.

Now, Karl has asked me to write to you, and I think it would be an injustice and an injury to him should he hear that you have not accorded me the courtesy of an answer.

But you may be abroad, or incapacitated, or just too busy. The proper way in such a predicament, which is the way how other professors reacted to some of my letters (again not provoked by myself), that their secretary wrote me a short note acknowledging my letter, and then followed by a polite phrase, etc.etc.

If you are abroad, or incapacitated, or too busy, I expect therefore an answer from your deputy or secretary. So please oblige in the spirit of friendship to a common friend. I am,

Yours sincerely,
C.K. Bliss

At last the following answer came:

Dear Mr. Bliss,

Department of Zoology
April 15th, 1971

I received your registered letter this morning and I hasten to thank you for it and to acknowledge it. I also, as you pointed out, received about 2 months ago your previous letter. Unfortunately that came on the morning of a day when I left for a marine biology course and at the beginning of a very busy term. I have no excuse for not acknowledging it at the time and can only ask you to forgive me the discourtesy which, I assure you, was not intended.

I have, however, not yet had the time to do more than look at your first letter and the enclosures. This will have to wait until I have more time during vacations.

Many thanks, therefore, for your letters and I hope to communicate again in the not too distant future.

Sincerely yours,
Alex Stock.

When typing this stencil the time is 30th August and four months have passed without a letter from Prof. Stock. I don't expect any letter to come and therefore I close this sorry story. Should nevertheless a letter arrive I will print it here below.