



Semantography Series No. 347

SEMANTOGRAPHY AND THE NEW SCIENTIST AND
SCIENCE JOURNAL

Dr. Bernard Dixon,
Editor,
NEW SCIENTIST AND SCIENCE JOURNAL
New Science Publications,
123 Long Acre,
London WC 2 E 9 QH

Sydney 18 June 71

Dear Mr. Dixon,

The appearance of your Journal on the shelves of my newsagent was a wonderful surprise, as I had to feed on the staid and much too academic Scientific American. And the price of your journal was more than a surprise. It is a contribution to Australia and I am going to promote your journal among my friends. I myself am 74 years of age. Hence I cannot give you a subscription, because tomorrow I may be dead, and the money would be missing for my funeral expenses. But I am going to buy it as my newsagent is just around the corner. I am delighted about the controversial tone of some articles and therefore I hope you may be interested in my work over which controversy was raging for the last 300 years.

Three hundred years ago, the great Leibnitz prophesied that one day one man will invent a "Symbolis Universalis" in which pictorial symbols will be operated in a single logic and semantics. But for 300 years all philosophers, all mathematicians all linguists and all logicians have considered Leibnitz' speculation impossible to realise. Now I have done it. But my great handicap is that I am still alive and refuse to die so far, in spite of the many envious kicks I receive from professors and would-be plagiators of which there are some even in Great Britain.

I enclose Semantography Series No. 308 and propose to you that you bring this article in your esteemed journal. You don't need to pay me any author's fee. Instead, you can simply copy the article which fits exactly the size of your journal and print it by photo-offset. Just two pages. Why should you bring my article?

During the last few years a number of academic busybodies have looked ahead for new venues of making money without producing anything in return. The first to do, is to invent a new scientific name, and they invented "Futurology". Almost every science journal and many a magazine jumped on the futuristic bandwagon and came out with articles on futurology. Considering the fact that science fiction enjoys a terrific boom, why not put it on a sound money making academic basis?

About 67 years ago when I learned to read and write I was of course an avid science fiction fan. And now almost three quarters of a century later I find that the futurologists cannot predict anything now for the 21st century which was not science fiction old hat in my boyhood. Worse even, they are too shortsighted to see what is before their own eyes, and what they could have found in their university library, namely my books.

In my youth the question of bridging all languages was considered solved, as everybody thought. Esperanto was the answer. Today Esperanto is kept artificially alive by the Esperanto fans and societies. If you care to read my life story in the first column of the attached article you will see that I was fascinated with the symbols of mathematics, chemistry and electronics. Then I came to China. The rest is recent history, and I am sure that sooner or later my "One Writing for One World" will be taken up by mankind as a new medium that can be read in all languages. Read please the second column on page 2 and you will see how I tackle the difficult job of science abstracts in all sciences. If you would go to the trouble of looking up my large volumes in the School of Education Library University of London you will see how simple my symbols of science really are.

I have even a better idea for convincing you. My former secretary lives in London. She has my book 2nd edition (882 pages) and she can prove to you on the spot how she has taught her small brothers to write in my symbols and they have combined logically some of my symbol elements to new meanings. Her name is Mrs. Maureen Gibb and her address is 30 Woodberry Way, Finchley, London N 12.

And now one last suggestion. As you well know, a new idea in science comes up by cosmic intuition in more than one mind at the same time. I refer for instance

instance to the infinitesimal calculus conceived independently by Newton and Leibnitz. Or the periodic table of the elements by Mayer and Mendelejeff, etc. etc. Now here is such a double invention which could be a boon to students and scientists of organic chemistry. I refer to a new symbolism for complex organic chemical formulae invented by my good friend and co-worker Dr. Douglas Nixon Everingham who is now a member of the Federal Parliament of Australia. During his student days at Sydney University he realised the catastrophic difficulty for students who have to memorize very complex organic formulae., some stretching over half a page. He then conceived a new simple symbolism which goes as follows:

→ a line (vertical, horizontal or oblique) and a point at one end indicates a Hydrogen atom and its single valence. Two points at both ends indicate then H_2 thus: — One point with two valences indicate $\frac{1}{2}O$. Bend over the two valences until they reach the two points and you have O_2 thus: $\cap$ Consequently, then this means H_2O thus: — One point with 4 valences means C thus: $\div$ Consequently this means CH_4 thus: $\div$ And so on. I have rescued his little brochure titled "Chemical Short-hand for Organic Formulae" or "Carbograms" as he calls them, and have made it an issue No. 92 of my Semantography Series which is collected by great universities. Unfortunately Everingham's issue is already out of print. I have only one sheet (pages 3 to 6) which I include.

Now what happened when Everingham the student showed his booklet to his chemistry teacher? He was against it. And why? Because he said it would be too easy for students to memorize complex organic formulae. Do you believe this academic arrogance or should I ask Dr. Everingham for a statutory declaration? You can imagine how Everingham the young student was dashed in his hopes of having invented a new symbolism for chemistry. But then something happened again. He found that a professor of chemistry somewhere in California had invented almost the same symbolism in 1917. He even wrote a book about it. Everingham's little brochure (badly mimeographed) was published in 1943. One should think that the chemistry educators would grab Everingham's symbolism. They didn't. You know why.

Well, I suppose to you a two page article on this kind of symbolism. Everingham would submit to you a new and better text, and if he has your O.K. I am prepared to help you with the printing expenses by having set the text in typeset (according to the type you use in your journal) and the drawings made here in Sydney at my own expenses, and I would send it all to you ^{for} incorporating into your journal. You would need no further work than giving all to your offset printer. Everingham would refer of course to that professor who conceived it before. It may have some effect considering that nearly threequarter of a century have passed. It took some 200 years until Berzelius' symbolism was excepted, and even now there are exasperating differences as for instance in the lettersymbolism and names of the rare earth elements.

So, dear Dr. Dixon I hope that you will receive this letter in the spirit it has been written, though I have become something of a rebel in science, but I feel this is what you like, and in your issue of February 25 you give prominence to an "academic guerilla."

Hoping to hear from you soon, and wishing you all success with your journal I am with kind regards

PS I have decided to send this letter first to Dr. Everingham who may include a letter to you of his own. A copy goes also to my former secretary and she may ring you up.

Yours sincerely.

C.K.Bliss, B.Sc.

Dr. Everingham added his own letter and sent both letters to the editor. However, there was no reply, the usual "reply" by editors who reject a proposal for publishing. I was a fool to think he would be interested. This is

The End