



Semantography Series No. 348

BLISS AND THE TRUMAN PEACE RESEARCH
CENTRE OF JERUSALEM

The following article appeared in the Jerusalem Post Magazine on December 26, 1969

A LAB FOR PEACE

The building which will house the Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace is nearing completion on Mount Scopus. It will be dedicated on May 24. ABRAHAM RABINOVICH reports on the Center's aims and how it will go about achieving them.

A new building sheathed in pink Galilee marble atop Mount Scopus overlooks the Judean Desert into whose caves ancient prophets retreated to contemplate the failings of man. From air-conditioned cubicles on the third floor, modern-day prophets will soon come to gaze out at the same unyielding landscape and to contemplate the same failings. It will be their role to offer suggestions for salvation.

The building is the Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace. It was born of an idea offered by Mr. Truman himself during a visit to his home in Independence, Missouri late in 1965 by a delegation of American Jews who wanted to honour the former President's contribution to Israel in some concrete fashion. Would he permit a center for American students to be created in his name at Hebrew University, they asked. Mr. Truman - the only American President to serve as Commander-in Chief in two major wars, the only man ever to order the atom bomb dropped - said he would prefer lending his name to a peace research center. The delegation, headed by Mr. Sam Rothberg of Peoria, Ill., obtained the quick approval of the University's Board of Governors for the concept.

In a world where almost every civilized country boasts of a war college, the idea of a peace center with its ambitious title is vaguely disquieting. In the former, at least, there is a functional trade to be learned, however horrible. But what do you learn in a peace center? And what good does it do?

World Research

It took two years to work out the answers for the Truman Center. According to an U.N. survey in 1966, there were already 67 organizations in the world engaged in peace research. Most were either involved in scholarly research into the origin of conflict or were attempting to promote peace through some particular scheme, such as world government. It was decided that the Truman Center would for the most part avoid such a cosmic approach, applying itself to problem solving in two areas where Israel has acquired practical experience. While the Center would support some "classical" research into conflict resolution, it would concentrate on the problems of the undeveloped countries and the Middle East.

The formidable Israel success in meeting its own development problems has over the past 10 years been adapted to other nations through the country's foreign aid programmes. The Truman Center will make use of this expertise as some of its first projects, listed below, indicate.

Prof. Dan Goldberg will attempt to apply the trickle irrigation system successfully developed in Israel's Arava to the Sonora Desert of northern Mexico. The system, which feeds water directly to plant roots, conserves water and gives promise of considerably higher yields.

Prof. Ariel Brosh will survey the vast Savanna regions of eastern Africa, whose characteristics are similar to those of the northern Negev. If the enormous agricultural possibilities of the area are exploited, they could go far to easing the hunger pangs of Africa.

Research into the optimal allocation of land in developing countries under the direction of Prof. David Amiran.

Laboratory research aimed at eliminating the tsetse fly which plagues Africa with sleeping sickness. The research will be centered on sterilization of the male fly.

What such research has to do with peace was explained by the academic director of the Center, Prof. Julius Stone, during his inaugural address to the Board of Trustees in July, 1968. "Possibly decisive factors in the building up of tensions

tensions towards violence are seen in the suffering, resentment and frustrations arising from backwardness, deprivation, misery and misfortune," said the professor one of the worlds leading authorities in international law. The efforts of the Truman Center, he said, should be to help close the gap between the haves and the have-nots and to reduce tension by helping meet the basic needs of the poorer countries.

Catalyst

At the same meeting, Hebrew University President Avraham Harman noted that the Center could not hope to carry out vast development programmes but that it could serve as an effective catalyst. "We should try to produce enough basic scientific justification for putting issues like this (the African Savanna development programme) on the world agenda," he said. President Truman himself has strongly urged that the Center's programme take this direction which parallels the programme he instituted for aid to developing countries.

Other projects include an investigation of inter-tribal rivalry in East Africa, a study of the balance of payment deficits of developing countries, and an evaluation of the effect of Gandhi's ideas on the politics, society and religious development of modern India.

The Center is a research, not a teaching institution. It has a \$5 million endowment and will expend 1L500,000 yearly on research projects. To date, about 40 project suggestions from scholars have been received and 10 approved, most from Hebrew University professors. Projects will generally last for three years, according to administrative director Harry Zinder, the scholars preparing their project in the first year, going out into the field second year and analyzing their findings in the final year. The Center is an autonomous institution with its own budget but a Hebrew University faculty delegation has a controlling voice in choosing its research programmes.

Research at the Center will be able to draw on what promises to be the world's leading documentation center on developing countries. At a push of a button, they will be able to learn the salinity of the soil in central Peru, the strength of the carpenter's union in Malaysia, the dollar reserves in Uganda's central bank the number of pharmacologists in British Honduras and the kind of crops best suited to the barren northeast provinces of Brazil.

A parallel documentation centre is being developed on the Arab-Israel dispute. Original source material from the Arab nations has been assembled under the direction of Yehoshafat Harkabi, former head of Israeli military intelligence and now a research fellow in international relations at the Hebrew University.

Science Background

A similar background steeped in the hush-hush side of the military is shared by one of the leading forces in the peace center, Prof. E.D. Bergmann, Deputy Chairman of the Board of Directors. (Chairman is former U.S. Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg.) Prof. Bergmann was for 18 years chief scientific adviser to the Israel Defence Forces and for 14 years chairman of the country's Atomic Energy Commission. A professor of chemistry at the Hebrew University, he urged support by the Center of laboratory research such as the tsetse fly experiments against the opposition of some trustees who felt that such efforts were remote from the aims of a peace institute.

The \$1m. building on Mt. Scopus is currently in the final stages of construction. It was originally designed for the Givat Ram campus and slightly modified when the decision was made following the Six Day War to shift the building site to Scopus. It will be officially dedicated on May 24, two weeks after Mr. Truman's 85th birthday. The ex-President is not expected to be able to attend. The four-storey building will contain an auditorium and seminar rooms where the public will be able to attend lectures. On the third floor are the think tanks, 20 cubicles, each 12 square metres where the researchers will be able to sit in sound-proof isolation and gaze out of the window at the last line of trees on the slopes below and the desert stretching out to the horizon.

End of article

My younger brother Henry prepared for a visit to Israel in the spring of 1971. About the same time I found the article above, and decided to approach Professor Julius Stone of Sydney the academic director of the Peace Centre with the request that he give my brother a letter of introduction to the scholars of the Peace Centre, so that my brother would find a willing ear among them as to my elaboration of Chisholm's idea on the cause of human warfare and my subsequent archeological discovery (see Semantography Series No. 85). I wrote therefore the following letter.

Sydney 25 March 71

Professor Julius Stone
University of Sydney

Please read this letter as it will reduce the time of our meeting (which I desire) to a few minutes only for showing my credentials to you

Dear Professor Stone,

I am a scholar, recognised abroad, and sought after by young students who

write to me for help with their master thesis, Ph.D. etc. because they have heard of my pioneering work, and where can they get my books, etc. In Sydney, apart from some lectures at the university some years ago, I have ceased all academic contacts because Nemo propheta in sua patria honorem habet - though the Department of Foreign Affairs, after having received a favourable estimation of my work, has recommended me to the United Nations, a futile effort from the start. I am 74, I wish I were 20 years younger, as I would have gone to Israel long ago. I have a degree in chemistry from the University of Technology in Vienna, but alas I am also a graduate of Dachau, Buchenwald, and the Ghetto of Shanghai.

I need nothing. I want to see ^{you} because a group of Jewish scholars of whom you are the leader need me and my work. I refer to you as the President of the Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace. I learned only the other day that you are the President, and I am writing to you because my good brother Henry is leaving for Israel in 10 days time on the 5th April, and he will present an outline of my work to whom? Most probably only to the caretaker who may even tell him to post it on. After that it may disappear in a pigeonhole in some office. Hence my letter to you and my request for a short visit, because, as said before, you and your co-workers of the Centre need me and my work - almost desperately (if you forgive me this word) but I will prove it to you in the next lines.

I can prove to you that Truman had some special peace research in mind when he suggested the idea of a peace research institute in Israel. May be, he an old man, has forgotten it, but I have not. It was Truman who as president in 1945 initiated a new kind of peace research through his undersecretary for the interior Abe Fortas. I shall soon relate the details. Here I want to say that I know of the controversy and the somewhat desperate search for "peace projects" proposed for the Center. These projects are all orthodox university projects, remote from peace. Indeed, as the events have proved time and again, to help the under-developed and underfed people has usually resulted in developing them into well-fed soldiers and warriors who used the higher income for better weapons to wage better wars.

Now in 1945 Truman invited one of the world's foremost psychiatrists, the minister of health of the Government of Canada, and later the first Director General of the United Nations World Health Organisation, Prof. Dr. Brock Chisholm to lecture on the most burning question of the day:

Why does man go to war and kills his fellowman?

What can we do to stop this catastrophic habit?

Chisholm's lectures delivered in Washington and New York caused a furore among the moral teachers and preachers of the world because he accused them openly for being responsible for man's urge for self-destruction. But the furore subsided quickly, because Chisholm could not offer any scientific proof for his theory, nor could he propose any method for his demanded "re-education of mankind."

I have found the scientific proof, and I have found the method which can be taught to children in the schools of the world, the future warriors of their nation. As a result, Chisholm and I have been nominated to one of the highest awards in peace research. The proof for this I want to show you. Alas, Chisholm died a few months ago, and just today I received a letter from his widow.

The late Professor Clyde Kluckhohn, Harvard professor of anthropology was so fascinated by my work that he wanted me to join Harvard. Alas, he died, and I lost the chance of my life-time. I want to present the scholarly paper, which he commissioned me to write on my discovery, to you, but I did not want to subject you to spend your time to read it. In a personal meeting I could outline the idea in the fewest words, and can answer on the spot all your counter arguments. Hence my plea for this meeting.

Now, it would be the easiest thing for you to decline my request by pointing out that you are a professor of law, not of psychiatry, not of anthropology, etc. Therefore let me show that we are both somewhat "brothers-in-law." I was for years chief of the legal department of a large electronic firm in Vienna, and have employed dozens of lawyers and have conducted most successful patent litigations in European countries, up ^{to} the highest courts, as for instance the Reichsgericht in Leipzig. I won my cases, and by doing this I won entry into Dachau and Buchenwald. I rescued two Jewish judges of the patent court in Berlin Dr. Peter Behrendt and Dr. Kurt Michaelis by employing them for years as patent researchers even when Behrendt went to the U.S.A. and made a living there by being my researcher in Washington. I lectured on patent law in Sydney. I took a whole Australian industry to the High Court of Australia and won as they quickly settled. Proof of all this I shall submit to you if necessary.

A few years ago, there was an international conference of judges, jurists and professors of law in Italy. Professor Klug advocated the re-writing of the law books and the cleaning up of the verbal mess of law proceedings by employing an idea suggested 300 years ago by the great mathematician, philosopher and language planner Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz. The assembly was not told that some years ago Professor Oliver L. Reiser told the American Association for the Advancement of

of Science that I have solved the problem posed by Leibnitz. The trouble with me is that I am not on the payroll of a university, and hence the coveted columns of scientific journals are not open to me. However, it takes time for the truth to come out and I am alive to see it happen.

All in all, I am your "brother-in-law" and hence I deserve your consideration, the more so as it would help tremendously the peace centre under your guidance. Hence

I don't want any money from Jerusalem

I don't want any post there

I don't want any personal fame

I want only that Israel be credited with this my Tool for Peace, that it should go out from Israel into the world.

Hence, I want a letter of introduction for my brother to make sure that my submitted papers are being given the consideration they deserve. And in putting my request to you, allow me to show a devastating parallel from recent Israeli history. When the Syrian Metropolitan bought the scrolls from the dead sea from Arab traders he peddled them to every scientific institution (Jewish and otherwise) in the Holy Land. Nobody wanted to see what he has to offer. He had to go to the U.S.A. and there the truth came out and the Israeli Government bought the scrolls from him for some \$ 150,000. He would have sold them for a few thousand dollars in Israel. But nobody wanted to listen to him.

I don't want to share this fate, and hence my request to you for a few minutes of your time, and if you have satisfied yourself of the truth of all my assertions I want your active interest as president of the peace research centre in Jerusalem. My brother leaves in a few days. Please tell your secretary to ring me up 665 5140 I shall come anytime anywhere. And I thank you for having read this letter. I am

Sincerely yours

C.K. Bliss

His answer made me mad. I believe that he is just an ornamental figurehead of the Peace Center, and that the professors of the Center and the Hebrew University would not allow him to meddle in their affairs, namely what they want to do with the money. He told me:

Dear Mr. Bliss,

26th March, 1971

I appreciated very much your writing me the explanatory letter of March 25, 1971.

Knowing something of the situation in Israel I can assure you that I will not be decisive as to how your ideas are received, whether they are carried by your brother's hand or sent later through the airmail.

This being so some of my colleagues and I would be glad if you could send us a typed copy of the paper concerning peace which you have in mind, so that we can study it, and assess its importance at leisure. There is no other need of credentials, I am sure.

From the contacts you have had in so many parts of the world you should already take considerable satisfaction in your intellectual achievements.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,
Julius Stone.

I lost no time to answer him in a very bad mood.

Dear Professor Stone,

21st April, 1971

In accordance with your wish expressed in your letter I submit to you the paper titled

A POSSIBLE PROOF AND TOOL FOR CHISHOLM'S THEORY
ON THE CAUSE AND PREVENTION OF HUMAN WARFARE

which paper was commissioned by Professor Dr. Clyde Kluckhohn of Harvard. As you can see he harbours similar views as shown in the leading quotation from his book "Mirror of Man". But he has not found any proof. I did.

However, please forgive me if I do not comply with your request to send copies also to "your colleagues" by which I believe you refer to the men of the Peace Centre in Jerusalem, and for the following reasons.

I was disappointed by your refusal to meet me. I am trying to understand your reasons. Maybe you have no time, but then you are willing apparently to spend the time to read my paper. In a personal meeting, not more than 5 minutes would have been necessary to acquaint yourself with the basic idea and my proof. Maybe then, there is another reason. Maybe, you don't want to get personally involved in a work of another Sydney scholar, because somehow that "peace research" to be done at the Peace Centre has met with sharp criticism, saying that Truman's dream has been converted and perverted into a travesty, and has degenerated into a sinecure for a few who will sit, and sit, and sit, and Klaer and Klaer, and Klaer to the tune of half a million dollars annually.

The yiddish word "klären" stems from the German "erklären" and the English word "to clarify". It is used in hundreds of Jewish jokes about the Jewish talmud

scholar who sits, and sits, and klaers, and klaers, waiting for lunch to come around. This jocular picture has been conjured-up by the Jerusalem Post when it described what the scholars at the Peace Centre are going to do, and deploring - in spite of the hopeful words at the inaugural address which you delivered as president, - that the "sham research" about the tsetse fly, the arid desert, the Dollar exchange, and other matters of the underdeveloped countries has nothing, just nothing to do with research into actual promotion of peace. As I pointed out in my first letter, the underdeveloped countries of the world are ~~using the~~ foreign aid to develop into well-fed warriors who wage wars of extermination against the tribe next door. The Spiegel just arrived in Sydney brings a devastating headlined "Waffen statt Brot" (weapons instead of bread) illustrating just this catastrophic perversion of "helping the under-developed countries".

In other words, the Peace Centre is already spiritually bankrupt. You as president have to take a stand, as otherwise your own reputation will be tarnished. Should I send copies of the article to the men in Jerusalem who hold the purse strings, they would ask "Who is that man Bliss in Sydney who wants our money?" They might write to you, and you would have to take a stand.

Now, the submitted paper deals only with the scientific basis of Chisholm's theory. He was unable to provide any proof of it, and he was unable to name any method too. But I am not going to subject you to the reading of my books and the many papers I have written and which are collected by great university libraries. I wanted a personal meeting to save your time. I wanted to show you practical demonstrations of my work not only for peace but also for international law as well. I wanted to prove to you that any bright highschool boy or girl could point out (after having received a short explanation of my work) in any law book those vague words which could be interpreted differently by judges and juries, by solicitors and barristers, leading to the catastrophic fact that the courts are in many cases not dealing with the dispensation of justice, but with the haggling of interpretation of this or that word of law. But you have refused me a meeting.

Now an opportunity is opening up for you to get an inkling of my work. You may know of the progress articles in all fields of science which appear regularly for many years in the Sun Herald as a contribution to the enlightenment of the intelligent reader, and sponsored by Manufacturers Mutual. The article on March 14 carried the promising title.

"A Science of Peace"

It deals with the "work" of the International Peace Research Association. But as usual, the researchers are doing nothing else but Klaeren, and getting good money for Klaeren. They have produced nothing, just nothing so far.

Now two sequels to this article on "A Science for Peace" will appear, and both dealing with my work. The first article will be published next Sunday April 25, the second on May 2. I commend these articles to your attention. But please realise that, that though these articles are written by an accomplished all-round scientist, they have to cater for the average newspaper reader who must be carefully led into a new idea which may seem absurd to him.

Now having written my heart out to you, it all depends on the question "Who in hell is Bliss?" Is he a professor of this or that? The fact is that I could fill a dozen teaching jobs in the natural sciences at any university, but I have refused to be regimented into the rigid orthodoxy of a university with all the dreadful duties that go with it. I am an independent man and a publisher. I earn good money and I can do whatever I like. I can go to Truman and show him the travesty of his dream, and I can go to the trustees of the Peace Centre. Ultimately it all will end up on your desk. So, (if you do not intend to resign your post as president in the near future) you will have to deal with me, and I hope that we will eventually meet, the more so as I have stated emphatically that I don't want a penny nor a post from Jerusalem. I want only that my work should go out from Israel into the world, and thus should enhance the name of Israel. As this is also your aim, I hope we will meet. In this hope I am,

Yours sincerely,

C.K. Bliss

At last he did some explaining with regard to the Peace Centre when he wrote to me:

Dear Mr. Bliss,

22nd April, 1971

Thank you for your paper on "A Possible Proof and Tool for Chisholm's Theory of the Cause and Prevention of Human Welfare". Unfortunately this arrived after the meeting of the Australian Society of Legal Philosophy, at which I had hoped you might introduce us to the body of ideas which you have developed.

I was interested to read the above paper and have passed it on to my

colleagues in international law and jurisprudence, Dr. I. Tammelo and Mr. U. Baxi, who are also officers of the above Society.

I am afraid that you seem to have a quarrel with a body called the Truman Peace Centre in Jerusalem which ceased to exist about a year ago. There is now only a Truman Research Institute in Jerusalem which has no special mandate in relation to your peace and war theories. The budget of the Truman Research Institute is not drawn from "Truman funds," which are, I believe, being used by a separate Truman Peace Foundation in the United States in which I hold no office: ^{but} I know no details of its work or personnel.

You have no basis for thinking that you have a quarrel with me, nor, certainly, do I have any interest in quarreling with you.

Please feel free, as your letter suggests, "to go to Truman" or to "The Trustees" to show them anything you wish. You can also feel free to try and send out your message from Jerusalem, but I am not in a position to place the Truman Research Institute at your disposal for this purpose. The Truman Research Institute has no specific mission of this kind.

Let me say that I admire the verve with which you press your intellectual concerns, and I have no wish to obstruct them. My tasks in Sydney are concerned with the teaching of International Law and Jurisprudence at the University of Sydney. And considering that I am still convalescing from a serious illness, I must refuse to be conscripted by you into an intellectual commitment which you feel and I do not feel.

For this reason I courteously responded to your approach to me by asking for sight of an MS. which my Sydney colleagues and myself could consider for our Society of Legal Philosophy proceedings. I did not feel then, nor do I feel now, that our assessment of your thesis should be affected by questions of personality.

I cannot in all these circumstances, regard the tone of your covering letter of April 21, 1971 as in any way appropriate. Any future communications from you containing threats such as those on page 2 will accordingly not have my attention. Please be assured that I am serious in this statement.

Yours sincerely,
Julius Stone

As usual, when I get a kind word, I topple over and apologise all over. I wrote:
Dear Professor Stone,

25 April, 1971

I hasten to apologise for any unhappy thought I have caused you, now that I know that you are recovering from a serious illness. No hurt was intended, believe me. My belligerence has other causes explained below.

I hasten also to thank you for giving me your valuable time, writing to me so detailed and kindly, for reading my paper on Chisholm's Theory and for passing it on to your colleagues Dr. Tammelo and Mr. Baxi. Unfortunately, little in this paper indicates the application of my work to the lawbooks of the world. Hence I am sending you, for passing it on, a detailed letter I wrote to an admirer of my work and a professor of law at Cleveland State University, Professor Kevin Sheard. Chisholm is mentioned in the 4th page, and if your colleagues request further reading, I am prepared to send them the treatise on my work written by Professor Oliver L. Reiser, Professor of Philosophy and Logic at the University of Pittsburgh, titled "Unified Symbolism for World Understanding in Science". I refer also to today's article on page 104 in the Sun-Herald, and continued in next week's issue. These are written by William de Vere an accomplished science writer, but naturally adapted to the average newspaper reader.

I thank you also for having cleared up the realities behind the Truman Peace Research Center. Believe me I would not have bothered you, had I not read in the Jerusalem post some time ago that you were the president. As to my belligerent words, for which I apologise again, there is a ready explanation: desperation.

Look at this outrageous letterhead, explaining "the greatest social innovation of modern times". Outrageous and ridiculous, isn't it? Yet I devised it and had it printed just a few months ago after 29 years of desperation when thousands of educators refused even to know the scope of my work.

Look at this outrageous term "Blissymbolics". Also an act of desperation when I discovered that academic would-be plagiarists turned the term of my work "semantography" into a general term for all the "Semantographies - yet to come" implying that they should be better.

The trouble with me and my late wife was that we were idealists believing that the Alma Mater is the fostering mother of new ideas and their originators. Consequently, when I ended my first lecture in the Wallace Theatre to an "enthusiastic" (Honi Soit) audience of students, I cried out "Alma Mater Sydney-ensis Vivat, Crescat, Floreat". But when I applied to be allowed to lecture to students, or to extension board lectures at social clubs, and the like

I was turned down. The explanation (though in polite words): "Into the grave first Mr. Bliss! The University can take a professional interest into a new idea only when a "set of literature" has been built up, and this takes time. Apparently they didn't know that "a set of literature" has been built up on this idea for the last 300 years, since the greatest planner of all: Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz made the prophecy that one day one man will invent just this what I have done (on the testimony of great scholars).

My good wife sent out thousands of letters and informative literature to thousands of educators. When only a few answered with some meaningless phrases, she broke down and died in desperation. Now I try to "abreact" (Freud's term) in belligerent words, not against a particular professor, but against the catastrophic trend in academe that a man must be dead first before his new and apparently absurd idea has been taken seriously. Living pioneers of new ideas are apparently and obviously cranks and crackpots, especially if they are not part and parcel of the payroll of a university.

But you dear Professor Stone have taken me seriously, right from the start and for this I am grateful. I am still an admirer of you, and in previous years I never missed your radio talks ("Hello Everybody!" if I remember rightly). They were clear concise and understandable to everyone.

So this is my last bother, and it remains for me to wish you a long and healthy life, complete recovery from your illness, and prosperity and creativity. May you live till 120, the old Jewish wish, to see my work becoming fully recognised, and taught in the schools and law schools of the world.

Thanks for everything Professor, and God Bless you and your Family!

Yours sincerely,
C.K. Bliss.

And as he advised me to see Dr. Tammelo and Mr. Baxi I wrote to them:
Dear Dr. I. Tammelo & Mr. U. Baxi, May 7 71

I hope that Professor Stone has been able to hand over to you my paper on "A Possible Proof and Tool for Chisholm's Theory of the Cause and Prevention of Human Welfare", also my four page letter on the application of my semantography to Law addressed to Dr. Kevin Sheard, Professor of Law at the Cleveland State University, Ohio, and furthermore the short popular article on my Semantics which appeared in the Sun-Herald of April 25.

I address this letter directly to you because I promised Professor Stone that my letter to him is my "last bother" (I have bothered him already much too much). When he informed me that he wanted my paper for "his colleagues" I thought he meant his colleagues abroad. I did not realise that he was so kind to want to present my paper at the recent Meeting of the Australian Society of Legal Philosophy.

When I realised my mistake it was too late for this meeting, and I hastened the therefore to send him the letter to Professor Sheard and the cut from the Sun-Herald April 25.

Now the second article has appeared in last Sundays Sun-Herald and I'm sending it to you herewith. Both these articles have been written by Mr. William de Vere a noted popular Science Writer, and naturally his explanations had to fit the average level of the average newspaper reader. In order to show you more about the implications of my symbols for "good and bad" I enclose herewith pages 165 to 170 of my last book (definitely last, I am 74) which has not been published yet. I hope these explanations will suffice in order to show you my "tool" for the "Re-education of Mankind" as demanded by Dr. Chisholm.

All this may seem outlandish to many people. Indeed some years ago I had a controversy with a Professor of English of Newcastle University College who did not see any need for the "Science of Semantics". He said to me "when I want to know the meaning of a word I just look up the dictionary". And all this after Hitler and Goebbels had demonstrated to the world that vague words can drive a sane and intelligent nation like the Germans into running amok. In contrast, I received yesterday a telephone call from a Sydney man who had read the articles in the Sun-Herald and who bought my book right away because, as he said, he had become painfully aware what semantics is about. He was witness in a libel case and the counsel for the plaintiff asked him whether the defendant has said this and that. "Yes", said my man but he realised crestfallen later that the words of the counsel were not the exact words the defendant had said, but only "very similar in meaning". He was forced to retract his statement which was very embarrassing to him. This may give you an indication how semantics and especially my own symbol-semantics can be of use in the dispensation of justice. I refer again to my four page letter to Professor Sheard.

You may tell Professor Stone that I wrote to you and why, and if he wants to see my letter please give it to him. Tell him also that I am most thankful to him and to you for taking my work seriously. I am with kind regards,

Sincerely yours,
C.K. Bliss, B.Sc.

P.S. I enclose also three copies of one of my articles "Semantography One Writing for One World" which appeared already in two American and one Australian Magazine and is scheduled to appear in other magazines. I draw your attention to the last column which deals with the meaning of "good and bad". At the end I mention a paper about my work written by Professor O.L. Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh. If you really want to go on studying my work I shall be pleased to send you a copy of this paper.

End of letter.

In due course I met both gentlemen and it turned out that Dr. Tammelo is a scholar specialising in symbolic logic. He showed me some books he had written on symbolic logic as applied to law. I gave him my letter on the application of semantography to law, which letter I had written to Professor Sheard. Tammelo knew also of Leibnitz, but he would not agree with me 100% that Leibnitz wanted a pictorial symbolism, though I showed him Leibnitz' own words, as reprinted in my S.S. 6. Naturally he did not agree, simply because he himself is of the opinion that he is a true disciple of Leibnitz, and that his abstract logic symbols (which do not have any pictorial content, and are the same as used by most scholars on symbolic logic) are representing the "Universal Symbolism" as demanded by Leibnitz.

In short, we both thought that each one of us has realised Leibnitz' dream. In the end he gave way to my proof of Leibnitz' own words, and he said that Leibnitz idea of a "Symbolis Universalis" can be divided into two different approaches, first his approach, and then mine. I did not want to argue with him and so I showed him that my pictorial symbols can indeed express any meaning wanted, and that my simple symbolic logic can be applied by children to their problems which are usually caused by words.

In due course I was made a member of the Australian Society of Legal Philosophy. Dr. Tammelo wanted that I should present my paper on Chisholm's Theory to the next annual meeting of the Society. Then he called Professor Stone to come into his office to meet me. We shook hands and exchanged kind and happy words and parted as friends.

But as to my approach to the Truman Peace Research Center in Jerusalem not a word was said, and I realised that all my letters to Professor Stone had ended in failure.

The End.

P.S. In my original correspondence there are a lot of letters exchanged between me and Dr. Tammelo about Leibnitz and my Semantography. There are also two articles written by Tammelo which appeared in the Sydney Morning Herald. As this correspondence has nothing to do with the original issue about the Truman Peace Center, I refrain from quoting them. I direct my future researcher to look them up in the National Library of Australia.