

HUMANISM AND THE "DISCOVERY"
THAT WILL CHANGE OUR LIVES

An Address to Members of the Humanist Society (N.S.W.)
given by C.K.Bliss, B.Sc. on October 6, 1971 Sydney,
featuring an excerpt from his latest book titled
"The Invention and Discovery that will change our Lives."

Chairman: Mr. J. i m Thorburn

The chairman opened the session by introducing the speaker and mentioning that his book is of a very controversial nature, and hence it may prove to be an interesting subject. Unfortunately, I was unable to record the speech of Mr. Thorburn, and when I asked him to put it to paper, I found that he is a very busy man, and just could not find the time to do it. However, he provided me with an "afterthought" which I printed at the end of this paper.

I reserved this first page for Mr. Thorburn's address, and now that I cannot give it (except his afterthought at the end of the lecture) I must fill this page somehow. Kindly excuse this, and read the following story which may interest you.

The Story of the Book "The Invention and Discovery that will change our Lives.

In 1949, after 7 years of work I published it in 3 large volumes. I wrote it in the proper scholarly language, though I hate scholarly language. I love language which can be understood by the common people. Alas, to be popular in science is not popular with the scientists. Consequently, my large book is unreadable for the common man and woman.

Then my good wife Claire and I, we wrote thousands of letters to thousands of professors and educators all over the world. We included informative literature and asked for tests in the classrooms of the primary school, the highschool and the university. We never got a chance. Only a few scholars replied, but they were some of the greatest of our time, Bertrand Russell, Julian Huxley, Lancelot Hogben and others, especially Professor Oliver L. Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh who stood up in the American Association for the Advancement of Science and announced "Bliss heroic work...he realised the ambition of the great mathematician Leibniz," one of the greatest philosophers of all times.

This should have been tremendous news, but to our consternation the result was total apathy in the academic world. I lectured to students at the University of Sydney, and they were enthusiastic. But when I asked the professorial board to allow me to teach my work to students on a non-obligatory basis, my plea was rejected, and some professors told me, though in polite professorial language: "You must be dead first Mr. Bliss. A set of literature must be built up first around your work. Only then will the universities take an interest in your work. Hence, in the grave first Mr. Bliss. Only then will we exhume you, extol you and exploit you by teaching your work."

We were thrown in utter desolation. We both were idealists, and we believed that the Alma Mater is the "Fostering Mother" of all new ideas. Instead we found in consternation that it is only the fostering mother for those on her payroll. My good wife suffered her first attack just 18 years ago on the 2nd October 1953.

Having realised that I shall not win over the academicians, I decided to turn to the common people. In 1954 I began a new book written in popular language and with lots and lots of illustrations. It should be a "popular picture pocket book." My first manuscript was corrected and enlarged by suggestions from my good friend and humanist Dr. Douglas Nixon Everingham, now a Member of the House of Representatives, Parliament of Australia. It took me 16 years to complete and publish the book. My good wife died in 1961 and the following 3 years were a hell of desolation. But now the book has been published, and Mr. James Bennet, Australia's largest suppliers of books to libraries and his co-worker J.N.Wright advised me to show my book to Mr. Jim Thorburn of the Pocket Book Shop. He signed me immediately on to give this lecture to you, and here I begin: "Ladies and Gentlemen" (P.T.O.)

I wish to thank you very much for having come, because you haven't heard my name before, you don't know what I am going to talk about, and indeed you may be very apprehensive that this evening will be very disappointing for you, as I may turn out a crashing bore. Well, I shall do my best not to be a crashing bore.

And I wish to thank especially Mr. Thorburn because he may have got somehow the impression that I might deliver a good lecture. I will do my best to justify his faith.

But to give a good lecture a good audience is needed too. As you know, an entertainer and a lecturer cannot give his best when he stands before a dead microphone or a dead TV camera. He must have before him a live audience of people very much alive. He must feel a wave of sympathy and of goodwill coming to him, and only then will he be able to give his best. I ask you now to give me just this.

But I am sorry to say that this will be very difficult for you, because I am going to criticise you, to condemn you, to accuse you and even abuse you. I am going to tell you to forget whatever you have learned in school and in the university, and that you should stop believing whatever your professors have told you about the universe. Indeed, I am going to tell you something which you may have never, never heard before. And I shall not be surprised to find you in bitter opposition, because who wants to be told that he is a fool and that he has been felled by his professors in the university.

Now I must ask you to forgive me when I am speaking a bit too loud. Firstly I am in my 75th year and hard of hearing, and secondly I am always getting a bit hysterical. I am anticipating your opposition because what I am going to tell you may seem crazy and absurd to you. So let me remind you that every new idea looked crazy and absurd at first. And it takes more than a lifetime until the originator of the new, crazy, and absurd idea is at last recognised. At that time he is usually dead.

Now, what right have I to antagonise you? I was born in the last years of the 19th century, and I became a teenager in the first decade of the 20th century. At that time our teachers and professors told us that we are on the road of inevitable progress towards a better humanity and a better future for mankind. And I believed this too. And naturally I became a humanist, because at that time the meaning of humanism was still the same as when hundreds of years ago Erasmus of Rotterdam, Spinoza of Amsterdam and the others conceived the idea of humanism. Humanism meant then to give mankind a new faith, a new religion to supersede the murderous religions of the past, a new belief in a new humanity, and in our high destiny on this planet.

And then came the first world war and I became a soldier, and afterwards came Stalin and then Hitler and my whole world crashed down upon me when I found myself a prisoner in the extermination camps of Dachau and Buchenwald.

I was lucky. I came out alive, came to Australia after the war, and I began to contact humanists all over the world, because I had something to tell them. But I was very disappointed. I found that the old meaning of humanism is almost gone. I have before me here the book COSMIC HUMANISM by my good friend Professor Oliver L. Reiser. It is so highly philosophical, and scientific that even professors must have difficulty to understand it all. The meaning of humanism must be so clear and so simple that the common people must understand what it means. Or take this other book, written by another friend of mine Arthur E. Morgan a former president of the American Humanist Association, who abandons hope. The title SEARCH FOR PURPOSE. He searches for purpose in a purposeless chaotic universe and cannot find it.

But I cannot blame Reiser, I cannot blame Morgan, and I cannot blame all the humanist societies of the world that they have lost their faith in the meaning of humanism. I must blame however the professors of chemistry and physics, of biology and the other natural sciences because they have given us a new "faith", a new "religion" when they told us that this universe is the brute force of nature, in which there is no purpose, no design, no aim and no sense. There is only one law that govern this chaos of ours and this is the law of the survival of the fittest. Anyone who has the stronger elbows, the stronger bodyguards, the stronger battalions, the bigger bombs will succeed, and all others must go under, must go down to their doom. There is no God, and no mercy and no justice and no ethics in this world of ours. No wonder that the humanists all over the world gave up their hope that they will ever be able to give mankind a new and better religion to supersede the murderous religions of the past and the present.

Now, to criticise, and to condemn is very simple. But to give mankind something better, something constructive, something to restore the meaning of humanism to its old glory this is very difficult. Now you may be afraid that I am going to give you just another philosophical blabla, or a religious, or anti-religious blabla, or just an old humanist blabla. No, my friends! I am a chemical engineer and a factory man. I have learned to talk in simple language to factory girls, to workers and to customers and consumers. I had to explain to them the working

of electrons and protons and ions in the radio valves which they manufactured or bought and used. And what I am going to tell you today can be told to bright children of 7 years of age, and they will understand it. And this is what we need. The new idea of humanism I am going to give you must be so simple, so self-evident, that all the people in the world, even the illiterates of Asia and Africa, must understand it, and indeed become convinced that this is the truth, because we all can see it happen and can understand it, once it has been pointed out to us.

I am a graduate of the University of Technology of Vienna, and I know and we all know what our scientists are telling us, namely that THIS UNIVERSE PRESENTS ITSELF TO US IN TWO ASPECTS WHICH WE CALL MATTER AND ENERGY. We know today that matter can change into energy and vice versa. And MATTER AND ENERGY ARE GOVERNED BY TWO FORCES, THE FORCES OF GRAVITATION AND ELECTROMAGNETISM. These two forces work even in every atom of our body. All our cells are subjected to the force of gravitation and electrical currents are passing through our body all the time.

Now I am going to tell you something which perhaps no scientist has ever told you. It may seem crazy to you, but I am going to prove it to you right here and now. I am going to prove to you that THERE IS A THIRD FORCE ACTING IN OUR UNIVERSE, AND THIS IS THE FORCE OF UNIVERSAL ETHICS. We can see the force of gravitation when we let a stone fall. We can see the force of electromagnetism when we switch on the electric light. I am going to show you now the working of that third force, the force of natural ethics.

Now if there was one spot in the whole world where a man could come to believe that there is no God and no Mercy and no Justice and no Ethics, this was the extermination camp of Buchenwald. And it was exactly there when a new idea came into my mind.

There was a zoo in Buchenwald for the "enjoyment" of the Nazis. Often I stared in sorrow from my large cage which held over 20,000 human animals into the small cages of the other animals, they too innocent victims of Hitler and Nazi Germany. And then the strange thought flashed through my mind.

I could see every day human beings killing other human beings. But in the animal world, I realised suddenly, lions don't kill lions, tigers don't kill tigers, wolves don't kill wolves and so on and so on.

Now this may seem crazy to you, because we have seen cats fighting cats, and dogs fighting dogs, and even lions fighting lions, and so on. But these are not fights to the finish. The wrestlers have no intent to kill the other animal, least of all to eat it. These are mockfights, fought throughout the mating season over the favours of a female. And the most amazing thing about these fights is that the loser is his own referee. He counts himself out, but how? Does he run away? No, he prostrates himself before the victor, bows his head and offers his neck to be bitten to death. With one bite he could be killed. In other words, his is the gesture of submission, of begging for mercy. Throughout the many wars of mankind, the vanquished warriors have gone down on their knees, have bowed their heads and have begged for mercy. Alas, throughout the ages of mankind, millions of men, women and children have begged for mercy and have been ruthlessly and mercilessly slaughtered.

Apparently something is happening in the braincells of the victorious animal. We know that gravitation acts on his braincells, that electromagnetism is there, but apparently a third natural force acts on his braincells too, the natural ethical force which prevents him from killing his brother. Call it what you may, but it is a natural ethical force which works on his braincells.

At first, this thought seemed silly to me, but the more I thought about it the more evidence could I find in the animal world. There are trillions of the tiniest and the largest animals who act in a way which can be described by 4 words "THOU SHALT NOT KILL!" We in Australia have a sad opportunity to see that every year tens of thousands of sheep, of cattle, of kangaroos and other creatures are dying of starvation. How easy for a sheep or a kangaroo to catch a lizard, eat it, and stay alive. But no! These animals cannot kill. Apparently their braincells act under the influence of that ethical force which prevents the killing of another creature even of another species. These animals live on the food provided by the plants. And when there is no food, then they starve together and they die together as members of an ethical community to whom killing of creatures is simply abhorrent.

But how is it with the killer animals? They kill other species to stay alive. But when there are no creatures to kill, what do they do then? Wolves will roam the wintry forest howling mad of unbearable hunger. How easy for them to attack one of their own, kill him, eat him, and stay alive as an example of the survival of the fittest. But no! No wolf will kill another fellow brother wolf. Together they live, together they starve and together they die and this happens also with all the other killer animals.

But not with human animals. Men who find themselves in an open boat with starvation facing them, will kill one of their own, will drink his blood and eat

his flesh. It has happened in Russia quite recently in the last war as Krushchev told us of starvation in the Ukraine, and as Salisbury told us of the 900 days in beleaguered Leningrad. And it still happens in the jungles of Borneo, New Guinea and elsewhere. There however, the killings are even more horrible. There is no starvation. There is enough plant food and enough meat from the animals. And yet they kill men and eat them. They kill their "enemies" in battle and they eat their vanquished enemies, and their highpriests tell them that by doing this they will gain the power and the strength of the vanquished warriors.

Now the professors, the scientists, the moralists and the militarists have an answer to all the human cannibalism, and all the human warfare and all the killings of men by their own fellowmen. They say that incessant warfare is going on among the killer animals. This is biological warfare, and human warfare is just one aspect of biological warfare. But this is a blasted lie, and you will soon realise the lie.

Biological warfare is the hunt for food from other species.

Human warfare is the hunt for destruction of the same species.

The difference is tremendous. And what makes it so horrible is that the soldiers of both sides have no desire to kill the soldiers of the other side. All they want is to go home and continue their peaceful lives.

But - as I am talking of a natural ethical force working in the braincells of even the killer animals - the fact is that these killer animals do indeed kill - though not members of their own species, but members of other species. How can we explain away this unethical phenomenon?

Today we know the answer. Today we have read the book and have seen the film "Born free". Today we know that a lion baby when taken away from their killer parents before they can give it an education in murder, before they can give it a taste of blood and flesh of a lesser animal - then this baby, even when fully grown to a large lion, will be unable to kill. It will remain the best of pal with men and with other animals and will even eat with them out of the same trough. Here we face again the working of the ethical natural force in a killer animal.

Apparently, these killer animals must have gone through terrible times of starvation and death many millions of years ago. Somehow they killed lesser animals, and found the experience satisfying and so they went on to live by killing other animals, in much the same way as peaceful people in primitive tribes who practice cannibalism will continue to eat the flesh of killed enemies.

When I came to Australia in 1946 I could at last go into great libraries and read there books and books. I hoped I will find the same thoughts which I have told now. But I couldn't find one single book saying what I have said to you today. I could only find a few hints here and there by less than 5 scholars who somehow spoke of ethical behaviour among animals. It was for me to put these hints together and work out a - well, let's call it a theory, but I do believe that this can be told to children and they will understand.

I found for instance the saying of Professor Ashley Montagu an anthropologist of Rutgers University in New Jersey who said:

"Among the same species of animals the highest ethics is supreme law."

And I continued: "Only man kills his fellowman. Homo Sapiens is therefore ethically the lowliest creature on earth."

But how about cannibalism among animals? Apparently it is practiced - or so we are told to believe. Well, I am an engineer. And by developing an idea I must take into account all pros and cons. If I find only one valid argument against my idea, I must drop it. And consequently I began to study and to read up books about cannibalism among the animals. I had a row with zoologists of the Australian Museum. I had rows with everyone who told me with conviction that animals of the same species kill and eat their own kind. In all these encounters with other people I always asked the same embarrassing question. Have you seen this cannibalism with your own eyes? They always had to admit that they haven't. In other words it was just hearsay, readsay, and liesay.

But apparently some very rare incidents occurred of animal cannibalism. But in every report I studied I found, and found it even confirmed by zoologists, that an animal in his natural state will not attack his fellow animal. Somehow it must be "out of its mind" in a panic situation when it simply does not know what it is doing.

And here we come to a very important facet of animal behaviour, one which has been totally or conveniently overlooked by zoologists, animal psychologists, intellectuals, and of course the common people, and this important fact throws a new light on all the false or true stories of animal cannibalism. Now try to put yourself in the place of an animal which has been captured. You have been caught by hunters, be they political or guerrillas and they have put you in a cage. Suddenly you are deprived of all that means life to you. You cannot get in touch with your mate in marriage, your friends, your children. Indeed, it appears that you are going to be put to death. How would you react?

How would and should and does an animal react when it finds itself suddenly bound and gagged and pressed into a small cage which allows it only little movement? You and the animal too will get a terrible shock. You may go temporarily insane and so may the animal. In the end however, you will learn that rattling at the bars of your cage produce terrible results. You and the animal are whipped, are clubbed, are beaten into senselessness, and you and the animal are deprived of food and drink. Then you learn, and the animal learns too to become docile, to become stunted and submissive as otherwise there will be the whip, the club, and no food.

Assuming that now psychologists come to study you in your cage, asking you questions, try to break your sullenness, your occasional mad outcry, your rattling at the bars of your cage. And then your psychologists, and the animal behaviourists write their report, and do the fallacious thing: they evolve general behavioural symptoms for the whole species of homo sapiens, or the species of that incarcerated animal, not realising that they have deprived you and that animal of the basis of your lives: FREEDOM. You and the animal cannot act naturally. And if a number of animals, even of the same species, are suddenly captured and pressed into narrow cages, they may indeed go temporarily insane and attack their fellow brothers. And I have seen just this happen when we were transported in cattle cars to the extermination camp of Buchenwald. The cattle cars could hold not more than 40 men. But more than 100 were pressed into it. We all got frantic, got mad. A terrible stampede ensued. We all tried to get near the door or the little windows of the car, because the air began to suffocate us all. I was fortunate, having been pushed as one of the first to the farthest corner of the car and able to press my mouth against a slit in the wooden boards wall where I could suck in the clean air from outside. But for the others, there was utter madness. It was a wild stampede, by which soon old and sick people sank to the ground, to be trampled under and die. I shall not forget the terrible moment when the train halted at a siding before the camp and 5 dead people were thrown out and many wounded and unable to walk. Here you have the facet of men and animals attacking their own kind - out of sheer panic, out of sheer madness.

A few years ago a young zoologist wrote a book. He stopped studying animals in cages and instead went into the jungles of Africa to live with gorillas. He made camp in safe sight of them and lived there, until the whole tribe took him as part of their forest. We have read the many true stories how even ferocious killer animals who never have met a human being are utterly friendly and full of curiosity about the new animal. Our zoologist reported a wonderful tale of gorillas. They are friendly and docile and kind to their mate and to their children and to the members of the whole tribe. They don't kill other creatures for food, but live only on the food provided by the plants. What a different picture than that we expect when coming to a zoo and seeing a caged gorilla. When he roars in utter unhappiness, when he beats his breast, when he rattles at the bars of his cage, when he makes dangerous grimasses at the onlooker, we usually realise that he is the most dangerous ape there is. But the opposite is true, once we observe him in the freedom of his forest and his family.

I could cite and cite such instances, but let me recall only one "law" stipulated by the animal behaviourists, and "aped" by our sociologists. It is the celebrated "hen-peck theory". They say that hens in a chicken yard evolve a social order in which each hen pecks at the hen "below" her in the social scale. And here, so they say, do we have a true picture of human and animal behaviour.

I studied all I could about such experiments which zoologists made with hens and other creatures. They are all incarcerated, because a chickenyard is also an enclosure in which there are too many hens who cannot run out and away. Moreover, these hens feel that they are dependent on a warder who brings them their food, and who - how dreadful - takes away their most precious thing: their eggs which hold the coming babies. No wonder that they get frantic in this prison atmosphere, and no wonder that they peck at others, just as it happened in my cattle car. And I also found that some honest zoologists reported that this "social hen-peck order" is not rigid. Today hen No. 1 pecks at hen No. 2. Tomorrow it is the reverse.

Now take say six families in an Australian town or suburb where they all have their own cottage and their own garden. There will not be a hen-peck order. Now put the six women into a community flat in Moscow where they have only a "community kitchen" to cook their food and presto, see how the hen-peck order will emerge.

Enough of this, as I could go on and on, demolishing the celebrated theories of our zoologists and animal psychologists, as for instance their theory of the "territorial imperative" when they say that each animal has a "territory" and defends it ferociously. For instance a lion will take no notice of you when you are 100 feet away. But when you are within six feet he may attack you.

So, they postulate, a radius of 6 feet circumscribe the "territory" for a lion. The idiots! The lion is now afraid of you as you are so near him. Or take another instance which demolishes too the "territory theory". In the evening, birds are coming home to roost in the trees of the avenue where you live. If indeed every bird has his territory, then they should be dispersed as widely as possible in those trees. Instead, they are all sitting together in one tree only from which a deafening chatter of bird gossip emerges. Territory, my foot! Enough, enough of those academic idiots who tell us that men and animals are convulsed by one special law, and this is AGGRESSION TOWARDS OTHER CREATURES. A disastrous lie. In short, cannibalism among the animals is so rare and so contrary to the habits of animals in their natural environment that we can dismiss these unnatural cases as very rare. What is true and what we can see is that animals of the same species will not kill their fellow brothers, and planteating animals will not kill any other creature, will die of starvation but will not kill.

Why then does only the human animal kill his own kind in ever increasing massacres? Why does man kill his fellowman not because of hunger, but because of an urge to kill his fellowman and to destroy him?

In my search I came upon two lectures given by one of the greatest psychiatrists of our age Dr. Brock Chisholm, the first director general of the World Health Organisation of the United Nations. After the end of the second world war, the U.S. Government invited Chisholm to give two lectures on the most burning questions of the day:

1. Why do we go to war and kill each other?
2. What can we do to stop this disastrous trend?

Chisholm's answers caused a furore among the priest of all religions in the U.S.A. because he pointed his accusing finger at them. He said that good and honest and intelligent men will kill other good and honest men when their leaders tell them that the others are evil and their design is evil. In short, it is according to Chisholm the abstract concept of good and evil, which throughout the ages lead to religious and political wars.

I thought about Chisholm's theory and came upon a saying of Bertrand Russell. I had with him a spirited debate in Sydney and we corresponded. Russell said that it must have taken man many, many generations until he realised that two men and two tigers and two berries have something in common, namely the abstract notion of TWO. Similarly I thought that it must have taken men many generations until he realised that a brutal man, and a dangerous tiger, and a poisonous berry have something in common, namely the abstract notion of BAD.

What to do with the dangerous tiger? KILL IT! And what to do with the brutal man? KILL HIM TOO. From the killing of the tiger to the killing of the man there was only one step in abstract logical reasoning. But human warfare began with this step.

It was then simple for the medicineman of a tribe to accuse the other tribe across the river of being "evil". He exhorted to kill the evil men and to take their women and their possessions. The meaning of "evil" allowed men to kill their fellowmen with a clear conscience.

In short, said Chisholm, human warfare is a brain disease, an epidemic, a perversion of our braincells. And he demanded a "re-education of mankind" in order to make them immune of dangerous abstract meanings.

In our time, the abstract meanings which drive us into wars are nationalism, capitalism, communism, etc. We know too well that Hitler told the German nation that they are a "superior people destined to rule over inferior people" and even to kill them.

Alas, the uproar about Chisholm's theory subsided. Firstly, he could not prove that human warfare STARTED with the emergence of abstract dangerous meanings. And secondly, he could not propose any method how his "re-education of mankind" should be carried out. It was clear that this "re-education" must start in the primary school but how?

With all immodesty at my command I wish to say, my friends, that I have found the proof and I have found the method. The method is my Invention, and the proof is my Discovery and this is why I have given my latest book the title

"The Invention and Discovery that will change our Lives".

And I am going to tell you about this.

I began to ask myself WHEN did man begin to kill his fellowman? Consequently, I searched books and books written by anthropologists. To almost all of them, the question seemed meaningless, so much so that there is not a word in their books about any START OF HUMAN WARFARE. They all adhered to the belief that there is biological warfare among the animals and when man emerged from the animals he simply continued this disastrous trend. The idea that trillions of animals DON'T KILL, and that all animals, even the killer animals, do NOT KILL THEIR OWN KIND simply did not enter the minds of those anthropologists. Otherwise they would have written about it.

But here and there I found a hint which gave me some vindication of my thoughts. I began to think of that time some millions of years ago when slowly among the apes a creature evolved destined to be early man. At that time gorillas didn't kill gorillas, chimpansees didn't kill chimpansees, as they don't kill their own kind to this very day. Then naturally that ape destined to become early man did not kill his fellow-early man. UNTIL AT A MUCH LATER STAGE early man began to kill his fellowman.

Could I perhaps find some evidence of that disastrous event? Could I perhaps find out WHEN it happened? Idle thought. The books of anthropologists and archeologists could not give me an answer. But in a few books I found some hints which I followed up, and by combining these hints I could indeed build up a reasonable proof of which I am now going to speak.

I began to study the oldest writings of man, the Hebrew scriptures, the Egyptian writings, the Babylonian cuneiform records, the old Chinese records, but alas, they all told of human warfare, and they all told of the "righteous" kings who went out to war against the "evil" kings and their "evil" men who were slaughtered because they were "evil".

Now these oldest records of man go back not more than about 7000 years. Apparently writing was invented around 5000 BC. For older records, which could not be written records I had to examine the caves of stoneage man. We speak of old and new stoneage man. The difference is almost negligible. Old stoneage men used the flint stones as they found them. New stoneage men polished their flint stones for the arrows, axes and spears they needed. This difference meant nothing to me. I looked for something else and I found it in the kitchen refuse heaps within the caves. What do we find there?

We find animal bones of various animal species, and we find that these bones are broken to extract the marrow. But nowhere do we find human bones in the kitchen refuse heaps of old stoneage man. Human bones were only found in the graves of paleolithic man.

But a totally different and disastrous picture reveals itself when we examine the kitchen refuse heaps of new stoneage man. We find there animal AND HUMAN BONES intermingled and broken to extract the marrow. And I found the archeologist Graham Clark who said:

"No certain evidence is forthcoming for paleolithic time in Europe, but cannibalism seems to have been an established practice among some neolithic communities".

And another man, Harvard Professor of Anthropology Clyde Kluckhohn said in his book "Mirror of Man":

"A more scientific approach would be to discover whether in fact war has always and everywhere been part of the human scene. It is not certain that warfare existed during the old stoneage. The indications are that it was unknown during the earlier part of the new stoneage."

which means that in the later part of new stoneage cannibalism was an established practice. Please note that both scholars have not realised the implications of the tremendous difference, and have not asked themselves the pertinent question whether and why old stoneage man was NOT a killer of his fellowman. But for me this was enough to establish the link with the ethics in animals of which I spoke before.

I met Professor Clyde Kluckhohn in Sydney and he was fascinated with my conclusion. He commissioned me to write an article which I wrote under the title

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

This article is available as Issue No. 85 of my Semantography Series. My good friend Dr. Douglas Nixon Everingham, Member of the House of Representatives of the Parliament of Australia, who has at times used my method in the treatment of mentally disturbed patients in the mental hospitals of Gladesville and Kenmore in New South Wales, followed up my article with his own article titled

"PSYCHO-SEMANTICS, ADULT EMOTION AND WAR"

This article is contained in the Issue No. 86 of my Semantography Series. And Everingham followed up his article by a Letter to the Editor of the Australian Medical Journal under the haranguing title

"A MESSAGE TO MORTALS"

Semantography Series No. 87.

Kluckhohn made even strenuous efforts to bring me into Harvard. He did not succeed and he complained bitterly in his letters to me that the higher institutes of learning are governed by "irrationalities". What does this mean? It means that the established professors of biology, zoology, archeology and anthropology will not allow entry to a man who is only a qualified chemical engineer, but not a biologist, not a zoologist, not an archeologist and not an anthropologist. And they would not allow me to tell their students that they have been fed outdated and false theories.

Perhaps at a later date Kluckhohn might have succeeded of finding a place for me at Harvard, but alas, he died at the very young age of 54 and I lost the chance of my lifetime.

The kitchen refuse heaps of old and new stoneage man with the catastrophic difference as to the cannibalistic nature of new stoneage man was one clue for me. But I looked for another one and I found it.

When we examine the records of modern man from 5000 BC to our time, what do we find? Modern man has one overpowering item to record in stone and bronze, in paintings and on parchment ^{and} paper: the glorification of WAR, the glorious VICTORIES OVER HIS FELLOWMAN. The museums, the marketplaces, the monuments, the manuscripts are full of them.

And what do we find when we enter the hunting lodge of a hunters club or the drawing room of a hunter. We find again paintings and even the trophies of the heads of the slain animals. The walls are full with them. The walls of ex-soldiers clubs of our Western world show too paintings and trophies of war victories, though not the heads of the vanquished warriors. In cannibalistic communities we find the skulls of the heads of the vanquished and eaten men on sticks around the craals as trophies of the great victories. Now if we examine the caves of old stoneage man we find the walls covered with pictures of victories, but what victories? We find pictures of animals grazing or fleeing, hunted and killed by spears, axes, and arrows. Old stoneage man showed his records of his victories over animals.

BUT NOWHERE DO WE FIND IN THE CAVES OF OLD STONE AGE MAN HUNTERS BEING PURSUED BY HUNTERS. NOWHERE DO WE FIND A PICTURE PROVING THAT OLD STONE AGE MAN HUNTED AND KILLED HIS FELLOWMAN. Apparently, his braincells acted in much the same way as the braincells of animals. The idea to kill their own brothers of the same species simply does not enter their mind, as it apparently did not enter the minds of old stoneage man. Otherwise he would have depicted his victories not only over animals, but also over his enemies. Apparently, his fellowmen were not his "enemies".

And the same picture of animal hunts only we find in all the caves of old stone age man, not only in Europe, but also in Africa, Siberia, etc. This was for me the second clue and the second proof.

As soon as I realised that Chisholm is right, that indeed the emergence of abstract language meant also the emergence of human warfare and cannibalism, I began to think what can be done to stop this senseless slaughter, Or in other words, can I invent a tool which even children can learn to handle in the kindergarten and by which they can recognise and avoid abstract meanings which destroy the peace within the families and nations?

This new method, this new tool for the "re-education of mankind" as demanded by Chisholm, this what I call my "Invention" is the subject of a large book of mine which I published first in 1949, and here it is in its second edition published in 1965, under the title "Semantography-Blissymbolics". In this book of 882 pages there is almost all the space devoted to the Invention, whereas my Discovery of ethical behaviour among animals and my discovery of paleolithic man having lived in the blessed animal stage, takes up only about 50 pages. In order to promote the knowledge of my Discovery, and in order to give the common men and women, teenage boy and girl a pocketbook in popular language I then published in 1970 my last book "The Invention and Discovery that will change our Lives".

Now here is a short outline of the Invention. The story begins 300 years ago when the great English philosopher John Locke wrote his "Essay concerning human Understanding". In this book he attacked the professors of Oxford and Cambridge for their highfaluting language for creating in fact misunderstanding and even non-understanding. He also pointed out all the verbal tricks in abstract language which are used by the wordmongers to befuddle the minds of the unwary people.

We are now coming to the second man in this story. He was the German philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz who ^{was} so much taken with Locke's books that he wrote also a book under the same title "New Essays concerning human Understanding", a dialogue between Locke and Leibnitz. And in this book Leibnitz speculated about a new idea. It is not commonly known that many of our mathematical symbols have been introduced by Leibnitz. He was one of the greatest mathematicians who ever lived, and to be sure he was an "amateur" in mathematics. This means in the proper sense of the word an "amator" as the Romans called a man who for the love of knowledge (amator means lover) and not for a salary becomes proficient in a science and comes upon new ideas and methods.

Leibnitz realised the immense advantages of symbols, and he began to speculate about a system of symbols which would cover all meanings of all languages. Now this is a crazy idea, and indeed Leibnitz could not solve this problem nor any other scholar throughout the last 300 years. But in 1951 Professor Oliver L. Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh stood up in the American Association for the Advancement of Science and said these momentous words.

"Bliss realised the ambition of the great mathematician Leibnitz"

Now here is an introduction of what Leibnitz really meant with his universal symbols for all meanings of all languages. Let's take the statement $1 + 2 = 3$. We realise immediately that 5 meanings are symbolised here, the meaning of ONE, TWO, THREE, ADDITION AND EQUAL. And amazingly these symbols can be read in all languages of mankind without translation. But more than that. This idea contains also a symbolic logic. Today children realise the lie in the statement $1 + 2 = 4$. Moreover, the meanings of these symbols are not vague and not ambiguous. If we could symbolise also vague and ambiguous meanings we would immediately have a tool to recognise them and to avoid them. And indeed, Leibnitz demanded that these new symbols should be so simple that even children in the kindergarten and the ^{school} primary and even illiterates should be able to learn how to handle these symbols for - as Leibnitz said: "for giving us thoughts less absurd and verbal than we now have." AND "NOW" WAS THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. Leibnitz could not dream of our century where every day millions of lies are pouring forth from books, newspapers, radios and TVs and into the minds of many millions of mankind. In short, we need today more than ever such a method for recognising these lies. And as said before, I am the first man having developed and having realised Leibnitz speculation and dream.

When Professor Reiser announced my great feat in America, I hoped that it will cause a sensation. After all, it is sensational when a problem which has been considered "impossible to realise" turns out to be indeed "possible". Alas, I learned a new and bitter truth. When I gave my first lectures in Sydney University and when I was simply overwhelmed by the enthusiastic response of the students, I suggested to the University Board that my work be allowed as a non-obligatory subject to be taught only to those students who want to subscribe to it.

But the answer to this was - though in polite language: "Into the grave first, Mr. Bliss. You must be dead first before the university can take an interest in your work. A set of literature must be built up first about your work, only then will we exhume you, extol you and exploit you." Of course, all this was said in vague and scholarly language but the meaning of this my "death sentence" was clear. And indeed it was a real death sentence for my good wife. She suffered her first heart attack, and then more. For 8 years she helped me write thousands of letters to thousands of educators and professors in universities around the world. Then she dies in 1961 and left me in utter desolation.

But I am a fighter. It is said that new immigrants coming to Australia pick up first the vices of the Australians drinking, swearing and racing. I looked for the virtues, and I found the greatest virtue of the British character never to admit defeat, but to go on fighting, even if you fight with your back against the wall, even if your fight seems hopeless. And how many times have the British won hopeless and lost fights. And this indeed makes me now stand before you and makes me enlist you in continuing the fight for this new idea. It is here not the time, and indeed I would not have the time in this lecture to show you how these symbols work. (Note: However, as it turned out, the questions asked during the discussion gave me the opportunity to show the practicability and usefulness of my symbols for the solving of debatable issues, and I ask the reader of this paper to wait until I come to the questions asked during the discussion and my answers to them.)

I ask you to look into my books and brochures displayed here and to learn from them something about my symbol system.

What I want to impress on you in this lecture is the implications of my "Discovery" because I have not yet told you the most important parts which prove the existence of an ethical natural force governing our universe.

Now once a man stumbles into new territory he is bound to make some discoveries. As I was working on symbols for all meanings in our language and in other languages, I came upon meanings which gave me a real headache. How should I symbolise the meaning of "Humanism", the meaning of our "Universe" the meaning of "Life" etc. etc. It was exactly the meaning of "Life" which worried me much and I began to read books and books by biologists. But they could not give me a satisfying answer what life really is. They spoke about "biological this" and "biological that" but "bio-logos" means only "words about life". It does not tell us what Life really is.

Until I found one man who gave me the only honest answer. It was Harvard Professor of Paleontology (the science how life developed on earth) Professor Percy Raymond who said in his book "Early Life"

"What Life is no one knows".

It is a profound mystery. The physiologist Du-Bois Raymond was even more pessimistic. He said, safely in Latin

"Ignoramus, ignorabimus" We don't know, we shall not know".

And then I found another man who gave me a tiny little hint what Life really is. When I tell you about his answer, it should shake you to your core, because the

answer is breath-taking. So just wait a little bit until I develop slowly the idea, slowly I say, because what I am going to tell you is contrary to all you have learned in school and university.

John Locke induced Charles II to enact a law forbidding the dons of Oxford and Cambridge to "read papers". Oozing boredom to hapless students became a criminal offence. Well you know what happened. Today 300 years later, the highbrows still stalk the universities making a good living by twisting their tongue in a science slang which is so difficult to understand by young minds. I too hate professors who read their papers instead of speaking freely. A man can do this only if he is consumed by an idea. Now, I have written this last book "The Invention and Discovery" during 16 long years, and I developed a new method for book writing and book browsing. Every chapter contains an almost self-contained story. You can read page 50 or page 150 or page 398 and each time you will gain some new knowledge.

Writing such a book was a dismal affair. Some pages I wrote and re-wrote perhaps one hundred times, changing words and paragraphs until each word was like a hammer blow. It would be difficult for me to recite these few pages by heart. So allow me to read only a few of them to you. They are at the beginning of one part of this book, which part bears the title

"Is Ethics perhaps a natural Force like Electricity"

I shall prove to you that it IS. And this Discovery will surely change the minds of mankind. Now here are the first 4 pages from this part. Pages 96,97,98 and 99.

THE BALL, THE EGG, AND YOU

Take a golfball and an egg. Both look similar, both contain atoms. Now keep both warm for a few weeks and something incredible happens within the egg. By some mysterious magic, the atoms of the egg build a perfect aeroplane, called a bird, equipped with the most amazing mechanical, physical, chemical and electronic apparatuses.

This means only one thing: LIVING ATOMS THINK. They know what they are doing, and they do it better than the best human engineer. But the thinking of living atoms becomes unethical when their bird gets damaged. They rebuild the broken bone, the broken muscle, the broken feather until all is well again.

LOGICAL THOUGHT, CO-OPERATION, and MUTUAL AID, we find them in the atoms of an egg. But we cannot find them in many men of many communities. They DON'T think logically, they DON'T co-operate with each other, and they DON'T help each other. Instead, they destroy each other, first with words, then with weapons.

Now, let's take you. When you are injured, the cells in the central switchboard of your brain send out telegrams over the electric nerve network. Medicines are manufactured and shipped through the bloodstream to the scene of the accident. Ambulances, doctors and nurses arrive to help the injured brother cells. Then repair cells arrive and begin to rebuild the broken bone, the broken muscle, etc. etc. as they do in any damaged living fish, bird, animal, any creature which came out of an egg.

Come to think of it - you, too, came out of an egg. How did it happen?

ALEXIS CARREL TELLS THE MOST FANTASTIC FAIRY TALE

It's about you, and how you developed from your mother's egg. But who was Alexis Carrel?

One of the greatest medical biologists of our age and a Nobel prize winner. Many professors of biology and medicine disliked him, because he put their ignorance right into the title of his most famous book, MAN, THE UNKNOWN. And this is what he told in a fairy tale which even children can understand and marvel about. Alas, teachers and professors have failed to tell us the significance of this story.

Imagine, said Carrel, a brick laying on a building site. Then suddenly this brick multiplies into many bricks which form themselves into a foundation, and walls and rooms of a complex house. Other bricks change into timber for the floors, tiles for the roof, pipes for water and gas, wires for electricity, etc. etc. Other bricks change into lamps, radios, radiators, telephones and television sets. Other bricks change into windows and doors, bathtubs and basins, etc. etc. until the complex dwelling is complete - YOU.

But this is not the whole story. Suddenly one of your blood pipes springs a leak, an electric nerve wire breaks, your TV sets (eyes) get damaged, your telephones (ears) act up, your combustion heater (lungs) develops trouble, your pump (heart) gets into difficulties, etc. But magic upon magic, the pipe, the wire, the TV set, the telephone, the stove, the pump, REPAIR THEMSELVES.

But the most fantastic part of this tale is yet to be told in Carrel's own words:

"Cells act as though each of them understood mathematics, chemistry, and biology and unselfishly act for the interest of the entire community."

But what does this fantastic statement mean? Bliss will tell ^{you} on the next page.

BLISS TELLS THE GREATEST STORY EVER TOLD

No, it's not the Bible story about how God trapped Adam and Eve by inducing the serpent to tell a lie to Eve. How could poor Eve know that God had invented the lie?

Our greatest story begins a billion years ago, when torrential rain and terrific thunderstorms raged over the surface of our young planet. In the turbulent oceans, atoms and molecules, sand and pebbles were tossed about in wild and aimless chaos - until something happened - the greatest moment in the history of our earth.

We don't know how it happened and why. But we know that it did happen. Inspired by some mysterious force from the depth of space, a group of atoms began to act as if they had said to each other: "LET THERE BE MUTUAL AID AND CO-OPERATION. LET'S HELP EACH OTHER TO OVERCOME THE RIGOURS OF OUR HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT."

And so they formed themselves into an ethical co-operative in which each atom "acted unselfishly for the interest of the entire community" as Carrel would say a billion years later.

They built a Town Hall with various departments for food gathering, food processing, food distribution, waste disposal, oxygen renewal, transport vehicles, repair stations and ambulances should an accident happen to some brother molecules. And so the one cell amoeba came to light and life. Billions of it still sail the seven seas, as living proof of co-operation, mutual aid and natural ethics, for all to see - only our teachers failed to see it.

Their Town Hall is no Tammany Hall. There is no greed, grab, and graft. There are no bureaucrats and no aristocrats, no patricians and plebeians, no brahmins and untouchables, no demagogues and dictators, and no priests, rabbis, mullahs, monks and other men whose business it is to divide us by words. There is only one ethical principle at work: ONE FOR ALL AND ALL FOR ONE.

HELP! BILLIONS OF BABIES ARE DYING!

And as the millions of years went by, our ethical cells went on acting "as though they understood mathematics, chemistry, and biology" as Carrel said, only "a billion times more than all our professors of mathematics, chemistry and biology" as Bliss said. Our ethical cells built more and more complex organs and organisms with more and more ethical engineering wonders: a miraculous heart, eyes, ears, lungs, bones, brains, and the most fantastic chemical factories - for one ethical purpose only: that the cell communities of creatures should be able to survive the rigours of nature.

Here is but one example. There was abundance in the sea, but for the creatures on land there were often terrible times of starvation and death. Billions of babies must have died. And so our ethical cell engineers were again inspired by the ethical cosmic force. They began to build into the mother animals a complex processing plant with udders and nipples - and when the babies arrived - lo, there arrived also the most wholesome of food for them: milk.

For Western Scientists, however, Carrel's and Bliss' tales of ethical co-operation are nothing but blooming ballyhoo. "There is no sense nor ethics in the universe" they cry, "only chaos! All living beings were evolved by chaotic chance combinations and collisions, mutations and mutilations of atoms and molecules without any aim, sense, design, or purpose."

But every intelligent boy and girl can see (once it has been pointed out to them) that within the molecules which build a budding flower, a busy bee, a baby bird, a baby animal, a human baby, A POWER OF MIRACULOUS CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE ATOMS AND THEIR CELLS IS AT WORK, in which every cell "unselfishly acts for the interests of the entire community" as Alexis Carrel observed.

And now my friends I am giving now the lie to those professors and scientists who tell us that our living world is governed only by the brute law of the survival of the fittest. And I am going to show you that they themselves have befuddled themselves and us by their own words, by abstract language. Excuse me now that I am going to read to you again another page of my book, page 109 which I have titled

THE GIGANTIC GUILT OF MODERN SCIENCE

We have seen that a mysterious power of amazing intelligence, logical engineering, highest ethics, and miraculous creation is at work in every mother womb of every animal. Hence, in the light of Carrel's discovery, the supreme directing power in the universe is merciful creative co-operation, triumphing over merciless destructive competition.

"This is utter nonsense", our scientists cry. "Darwin has explained that creatures evolve through merciless selection by the survival of the fittest." But the Darwinians deceive themselves and us with words. In the first chapter of this book, we have learned to ask WHAT? Survival of the fittest - yes - but fittest in WHAT?

Imagine a pack of wolves in an ice age. Which wolves will survive? Those whose cells are fittest in co-operation to produce the warmest fur, the strongest limbs, the keenest eyesight, the greatest intelligence, stamina, and endurance.

Imagine helpless babies in a catastrophe which overtakes a herd. Which babies will survive? Those, whose parents have brain cells which are fittest in

ethical co-operation for producing the greatest love and intelligence, care, conscience, and courage. Bliss has cited in his books numerous instances of animal parents who sacrificed their lives so that their babies should survive.

Now take a cat. She will run from any dog. But when she nurses helpless kitten a chemical reaction takes place within her braincells. The reaction of fear and flight from the big dog completely disappears, and instead a new chemical reaction of fearless courage in the defence of her babies takes its place, and she will chase the largest dog - and he will run, knowing very well when he sees a mothercat though tiny but with her will to attack him and mutilate him. He retreats. How would you call this courageous attitude of the mothercat in defence of her helpless children? There is only one word which fits this attitude. It is ethics, it is ethical behaviour.

Or take incidents which happen every year here in Australia. Sometimes a bushfire sweeps with terrific speed just through the tops of the trees laden with eucalyptus oil. All birds will rise in the air to escape destruction and death, all - except the mother birds who have helpless babies in the nest. She will spread her wings over her children and when the fire sweeps over the nest the mother may be killed, but the babies underneath her wings may survive. Again, what word but Ethics fits this defiance of death for the helpless babies by the ethical cells of the mother.

Where then is survival of the fittest? Where then is the brute force of nature? Instead we see that those creatures who are unfittest to survive, they survive and their mother go to her death because her braincells are fittest in co-operation to produce the greatest love, care, conscience and courage.

Or take for instance a mother seal with her baby facing an attacking icebear. She does something cowardly. She abandons her baby and flees away. Why? Because the baby is white and blends with the snow, and becomes invisible for the icebear. The mother seal is black and is therefore pursued by the bear, is killed by him, but the baby survives. Again, this is ethical behaviour and nothing else.

Imagine a mother kangaroo which is hunted by hunters on horseback. She has her baby in her pouch and she realises that her situation is hopeless and that there remains only one thing to do, to save the baby. She hops desperately hither and thither until she comes to a thicket, and there, unobserved by the hunters, she throws her baby out of her pouch and into the undergrowth and apparently says to her "Good bye my baby. I hope you will survive. I am going to my death." And she hops away and is eventually killed. Ethical behaviour and nothing else, here you have it.

Or take a Jewish mother with her child in a cattle car on the way to the extermination camp. She knows that she is going to her death, but she thinks frantically how to save her child. And when the train slows down on a steep hill, she throws her child out into the forest and says to it. "Good bye my baby. Go and find good people who may care for you. I am going to my death." And such incidents have happened many times, and in some cases the mother survived the extermination camp and even found her child with good Christian peasants, Ukrainian, or Russian or Polish families who have brought it up as their own. What difference is then between a kangaroo mother, and a Jewish mother acting in much the same way to save their babies. No difference whatever. Only that the Jewish mother can think consciously, knowing what she is doing, whereas the mother kangaroo cannot probably think, and only can act as to the command of her ethical braincells who induce her to save the baby. Ethics, ethics, ethics, all the time. Or is this survival of the fittest in brute strength? No my friends. Let us then realise the catastrophic lies of our scientists and professors. Let us then realise that their catastrophic theory is responsible for the ever increasing violence, or the ever increasing crimes and the ever increasing wars among the human race.

Let me then read to you the last paragraph in this my page titled "The gigantic guilt of modern Science".

Thanks to our scientists, Darwin is revered like a God in despotic countries where the cruel rulers surround themselves with fitter bodyguards, fitter battalions, and fitter bombs - and to hell with mercy and democracy! "Because there is no design, and no purpose, no ethics, and no mercy in this universe" our scientists cry, "only chaos".

They refuse even to marvel about the miracle of their own baby creating "itself", and the miracle of their own body repairing "itself" when injured. And so they are leading us into the chaos of self-destruction. This is their gigantic guilt.

Now my friends, let us assume that one hundred years have passed by and my teachings have at last found recognition, and now every boy and girl in the primary school and highschool and university has learned to see an ethical power of mutual aid and co-operation and unselfishness working in every living atom of every living cell. What would happen then? Would the professionals of the old money making religions admit that I have found and founded the only universal

religion which teaches us to do what the living atoms in the cells of all creatures are doing? Will Christianity and Judaism, and Mohammedanism, and Hinduism and Shintoism and all the murderous religions of the past, will they have disappeared? No, my friends, let's give up this hope. They may thrive better than ever. And what are they going to say about my findings? This they will say "True enough, nobody has ever seen the God to whom we pray, but it was Bliss who showed us that Christ (or Jehovah, or Allah, or Brahma) reveals himself in every living atom of every living cell!" We of course will answer them "If this is true, if you believe in ONE CREATOR why in hell have you created hundreds of different religions and sects and denominations with all the devilish dogmas and doctrines which have enabled you by words and by words only to divide mankind into bickering sectarians who hate the other sects and religions and often go to war against each other and kill each other for the greater glory of your God!"

Will this condemnation make them go away and give up their money making business? Not at all. They have another trump card up their sleeves and this is a reaction of the brain cells of all creatures for saving the cell community of impending dangers. It is FEAR, FEAR, FEAR. They will say the same they say now: "If you come to our church, if you pray to our God, if you give to God what is due to God so that we may be able to carry on God's own work, then God will reward you with health and happiness in your family and will make your business prosper and in the end you will go to Heaven and sit with God in eternal bliss. BUT IF YOU DON'T COME TO CHURCH, IF YOU DON'T PRAY TO GOD, IF YOU DON'T GIVE US YOUR DONATION, THEN GOD WILL PUNISH YOU AND YOUR FAMILY WITH SICKNESS AND MISERY AND YOU WILL SUFFER ONE SETBACK AFTER ANOTHER IN YOUR BUSINESS, AND IN THE END YOU WILL GO TO ETERNAL DAMNATION AND YOU WILL BURN IN HELL FOR EVER AND EVER AMEN!"

And be sure that the billions of dollars and pounds and of all other currencies will flow as they do flow now into their coffers and make them what they are now, the richest landowners, the largest shareholders, the biggest property holders in all countries under their demoniac rule. WHAT CAN WE DO AGAINST THIS? HOW CAN WE HELP PEOPLE ESCAPE FROM THEIR DREADFUL CLUTCHES OF FEAR AND DAMNATION?

I have thought for many years about this the greatest handicap against a universal religion. And I have found a very satisfying answer. But it will not be easy for you to accept it, and I would not be surprised if some of you will jeer at me and call me all names. There are too many cynics around who will downgrade any idea, and any effort towards our common aim: a universal religion and peace and goodwill to all men. So, please give me all your goodwill and listen to me.

Now let me say that it is not a mere chance coincidence that I who is telling you all this, that I am a chemical engineer. I have built up, and organised, and conducted factories and I know how much ingenuity, how much intelligence, how much mutual aid and co-operation, even how much ethical behaviour is needed to keep a chemical factory going. Yes, even ethical behaviour. Because you must take an interest in the people you have hired to help you. You must take an interest in their families and in their troubles and in their need for help, because only then will they give their best and help you to make the product which you have planned to make.

Imagine now when I the chemical engineer realised with a flash that the most fantastic chemical factories are being built up from a single cell and are being operated in the most incredible way and even miraculous and magical way right in our own bodies and in the bodies of all creatures, the land animals, the birds, the reptiles, the fish and even the trees, and plants and flowers. And above all how the law of ethics of unselfish help for injured brother cells are governing all these fantastic chemical factories in our own bodies.

Now once you have realised my utter amazement, once you have agreed that these incredible magical factories are working in our own bodies, then you will be ready to agree that all our feelings of pain and joy and tiredness, and worry and despair that all these sensations of our own bodies are only the results of some chemical reactions. If you have pain the doctor prescribes a medicine. But what is a medicine? It is only a chemical compound and it reacts with the chemical factories in your body and makes the pain disappear. If you are worried and restless then you take a tranquiliser, again a chemical product, and if you are hungry and thirsty what chemicals are you giving your cells?

Well, you feel the sensation of hunger, which is induced by the cells of your body who are craving for food, craving for the calories they need to keep the whole cell community going - and this means YOU AND ONLY YOU. As a soldier in the first world war, and as a prisoner in the concentration camp I have felt ravenous hunger and I tell you that it is something dreadful. You cannot think of anything else but food and you will try anything which may seem eatable. And then suddenly food is given to you. You gulp it down, you eat and eat and slowly another chemical reaction takes place in your body, and you begin to feel wonderful. You are content because your belly is full and your cells of your body are busy at work to process the food and to distribute it to all other cells who need it.

You are overwhelmed with a feeling of intense contentment and you are satisfied with all the world which appears to you wonderful. All this is nothing but the result of chemical reactions.

Now take thirst, which is much worse than hunger. You are in a desert under a terrible sun. Your body has been dehydrated. The cells of your organism are choked with a salt content much too high for survival. And hence your cells crave for water, water, nothing but water. Indeed, you are almost mad for water, and when this liquid begins to run down your throat a wonderful happiness overwhelms you, because the cells reward you with this happiness which is their happiness, because they need this water for YOU AND ONLY FOR YOU.

Now suppose you don't feel hunger and you don't feel thirst, you don't feel pain and you have no worry. You are just living. And suddenly you do a good deed for somebody. You help somebody who is in need for help. Quite suddenly a happiness pervades the cells of your brain. What is this happiness? Nothing but another chemical reaction because you have helped a creature in need of help. Now this looks dreadfully like the sermon of a "do-gooder". But no, my friends. In order to make myself understood let me visualise a situation in which, I am sure, you have found yourself many times.

Your day has started very badly. You felt tired, experienced pain, and then there was your mate in marriage who gave you another headache, arguing with you about this or that. And then the children, one very sick, the other cheeky. Then your car didn't start, and you missed the bus. And in the office everything went haywire. Trouble with your boss and your underlings, trouble with your customers and suppliers. And then that dreadful headache, and your stomach pain too. At last, it's 5 o'clock and you go home, dead tired, in great pain, you almost cannot walk. You feel extremely unhappy, with you, with your life, with the whole world.

And then suddenly you are confronted with a tragedy about to happen: a child running out into the path of an oncoming car, a woman falling between the rails, a kitten about to drown. Suddenly, without thinking as to your own safety, you jump to help - and you save a creature from certain death. And equally suddenly something happened within the cells of your brain and body. Your tiredness has disappeared, your pains have disappeared, your unhappiness has disappeared. You are no more dissatisfied with the world and yourself. On the contrary. An amazing and wonderful joy pervades all the cells of your brain and body. You go home with springy steps as if you were treading on clouds.

What is all this happiness? Sure enough it is again a chemical reaction. But why has this new chemical reaction supersede the other one of tiredness, pain and unhappiness? Hold onto your seats my friends and realise that the cells of your brain and body are rewarding you because you have acted in accordance with the supreme law of ethical help which governs the cells of all creatures. You have saved another community of cells, another creature.

It works also the other way round. Suppose a man has done a dishonest thing to another man. He may feel remorse. He may not be able to sleep, not be able to eat, may even vomit and develop pain somewhere. What is this? Again a chemical reaction as the result of an unethical deed. There is only one way to overcome this. The man must go to the other man and must make good. Only then will the dismal chemical reaction disappear.

But if he does not do it, if he suppresses the thought of his unethical behaviour into his subconscious, then the cells of his body and brain will give him real hell. They will make him sick all over. Our doctors tell us that most of our bodily ills are mental in origin, and that half of all hospital beds in all countries are occupied by mentally sick people. Men who tyrannise other men, who tyrannise their wives and their children and their employees, they may go to their doctor who will prescribe some chemical called a medicine or a tranquiliser to offset the chemical reaction of bodily and mental pain, but it will be of no avail. No tranquilisers will help them, no medicine will help them, they will not feel health and happiness. Criminals and small-time criminals are living a dismal life, until their own braincells make them make the dreadful mistake which will land them in jail.

This my friend is the message of a chemical engineer. We do not need to hope for a Heaven after life, nor fear a Hell after life. Heaven and Hell are here with us, and they are all the chemical reactions of our cells who live by the ethical law of the Universe, and who drive us on to live by the same law in order to avoid hell on earth, and in order to gain heaven on earth and during our lifetime. This is the basis of a new universal religion based on what every child can see whose wounds are miraculously healed by a miraculous force of ethical help.

And now I want to read only one page of my book which I have written for the humanists of the world and for all people who think in terms of humanism. It is on page 310 and it is titled

WHAT HAVE WE GOT TO CONVINCE OTHERS THAT WE CAN MAKE A BETTER WORLD

"We have got a faith - not in a God nobody has ever seen, but in a "Universal Power of Unselfishness" which every child can see at work when it injures itself. This power works in all cell communities.

Furthermore, we can prove that most priests of all money-making religions have acted contrary to that power. They have divided us by words. We can also prove that most professors are even worse. They teach our children to believe in a Force of senseless chaotic destruction where only the fittest can survive. We have proved that "fittest" means "fittest in cell co-operation". Helpless animal babies survive when the brain cells of their parents are fittest in care and conscience, courage and self-sacrifice. We can prove that most of our professors have not realised this, and that they use highfaluting language to cover up their ignorant lies, and to saddle our children with useless stuff they never need in later life.

This book has taught us how to see through their verbal frauds, and how to recognise those words by which demagogues and dictators destroy our peace and drive us into mutual massacres. We have learned that only the human animal does this, but not all other species. We have heard of Dr. Chisholm who proved that human warfare is due to a brain epidemic caused by abstract and ambiguous words. We have learned that human beings only 30,000 years ago lived in peace. We have impressive proofs to impress people."

My friends I am at the end of my life. If I have impressed only one of you to go forth and tell the people of this earth about my findings then I shall be rewarded beyond my wildest hopes. And may be, the Humanist Society of N.S.W. will take up my story and my findings and bring it to the knowledge of others who want to regain some faith in the destiny of man on this planet, who want to be told that this world of violence and war is only due to the fact that our professors and scientists have not realised the existence of that ethical force, and that my tool for peace for the recognition of dangerous words will help mankind.

I thank you very much, and I invite now questions and counter arguments.
End of lecture.

The discussion was not recorded on tape, because the speakers were in different parts of the lecture room. I shall however, recall the gist of their questions and my answers.

Mr. D. Duffy: How can you prove that abstract language developed in neolithic time?

Bliss: This is a very pertinent question, and I am glad you asked me this, as I could not include this in my too long lecture. Yes, there is no direct proof available, because writing was invented 10,000 years later, and words are the most fleeting of events. We have no written record from the men of the New Stone Age, from the Bronze Age, and the Iron Age. We know only that neolithic man began to build huts over water and this can only be accomplished by teamwork and teamwork can only be accomplished by language. This goes also for the development of bronze and weapons of bronze, iron, etc.

Still, for teamwork dealing with things and actions without abstract meanings we don't need abstract language. But surely the men of 5000 B.C. who learned to write were already in full command of abstract language, as their records tell of the righteous kings who slew the evil kings and their evil men. There is therefore a chance that abstract meanings developed with neolithic man who became a killer and a cannibal.

But we have one good proof for this. And this is the ontogenetic biological law. It says that the whole development of a species over the millions of years is repeated with the development of every creature out of a single cell. A billion years have passed since the first one cell amoeba came to life. Hence a human being goes through these billion years in the 9 months the foetus develops in the mother womb until a complete human being has been formed. In the 4th month we see the development of gills in the embryo, a sign that it has reached now the fish stage. Later lungs develop and so on.

But the baby in the mother womb cannot talk. It starts to cry the moment it comes into the world, and its cries have two meanings only: pleasure and displeasure. Then the first word appears which means all pleasure, the munching of the baby at

mama's breasts: mamamamamamama... Hence mama is the first word in all languages, and mame in Latin means breasts, and hence all mammals breastfeed their young.

Now the word mama means nothing abstract. It means a very tangible reality. From now on it is Mama who teaches the baby language. The great linguist Jespersen describes beautifully how Mama teaches her baby the words which mean things and action of things according to the grammar of my semantography. The mother bathes her baby and talks baby talk as follows: "And now we are going to wash the little nose. And now we are going to wash the little mouth. And now we are going to wash the little ears. And now we are going to wash the little eyes." And so on.

It may take perhaps two years or more until the baby begins to learn the meanings of abstract words.

What does all this mean? It means that the ontogenetic law, the quick repetition of the slow evolutionary process in the mother womb continues also with regard to language within the first years of the baby. Surely a baby does not know what insincerity, or jealousy, or envy means. It learns these meanings only much later in life. And consequently, a little boy or girl will play happily with negro children, or Jewish children, or Chinese children without seeing anything wrong in it. It is only later, much later when it hears the adult abusing Negroes, Jews, Chinese and other people that it begins to dislike them and even hate them. This teaching is then continued under the general name of "enemies", and then the young boy is ready to go to war and kill the enemies.

We must therefore assume that the linguistic development of a baby is a short repetition of the development of language among human beings. Hence, the evidence that neolithic man became a killer and cannibal, and then the evidence that after him the oldest writings use abstract language for disastrous stories of wars and killings, all this is enough proof that abstract meanings developed with neolithic man.

Mr. Cunningham: I do not agree that abstract meanings are the cause of war. I think it is the craving for food. When animals and birds are being fed we see how the stronger animal or bird pushes the weaker ones away and fills its belly. The others must be content with what is left. And this craving for food is the cause of human warfare. (And then Mr. Cunningham went on to develop his theory for many minutes until the chairman Mr. Thurborn stopped him.)

Bliss: It is true that stronger animals will grab more and better food than the weaker ones. To this I say firstly that the feeding of animals by a warder or another human being is already something which does not occur with animals in freedom. There every animal goes in search for food alone. When the herd is contained within an enclosure then a disastrous change in animal behaviour comes about, as I have already told before.

So let us not forget that the mother animal feeds her baby first from her breast, and then teaches it how to tackle food which the mother animal brings to her baby. This is wonderfully shown in the feeding of little chicks in the nest of most bird species. Our little sparrow parents work themselves to death to feed their offsprings. Every bird fledgling eats its own weight in a day. Imagine how many times the father and the mother bird must fly out and bring home so much food for all their children.

And above all, members of the same species do not kill each other over food. But killer animals kill other species for food, this is true. However, once their hunger is satisfied, the gazelle will graze within a few yards of a lion herd and will be ignored by them. So it may be true that men in an utterly unethical way kill other men for food, either by eating their killed enemies, or by taking away their herds and their fields and their hoarded food.

Now let's take modern man. Let's remember the abstract meanings which have been used to bring the American people into the first world war. They were told that we must make the world "safe for democracy". Surely the American people were well fed. They did not go to war against the Kaiser because of food...

Mr. Cunningham (interrupting): "Ah, they went to war because of international trade and this means first food. And besides Mr. Bliss, you oversimplify a very complex problem.

Bliss: Well, now I have an opportunity to show you how my symbolic logic works. You say that I "oversimplify". And I say that I do not. Who is right and who is wrong? Let me therefore show you how children will learn to realise that the meaning of "oversimplification" is just a very vague ambiguous word which cannot bring agreement between debating people. On the contrary.

I spoke about the paleolithic man, and the little human baby who didn't yet learn to use abstract words. They used words for the concrete realities of our world, or in my grammatical terms for THINGS and their ACTIONS. THINGS I symbolize with a drawing of a square, which should stand for a crystal, as this is the basic geometrical form of MATTER, thus $\square$. And the meaning of action I symbolise with this outline of a volcano cone Δ indicating one of the first actions of our young earth. Hence the meanings of I ($\square$) or Mr. Cunningham ($\square$) is clear and to the point. There is no quarrel as to who is Bliss and who is Cunningham. Now we both speak, and this is an action (Δ) of our mouth ($\square$). Again there is no argument about this meaning. But Mr. Cunningham speaks of "simplification" and of "over-simplification". How do I symbolise these meanings? It is clear that the word "simplification" is an abstract meaning. It does not exist in our material world. The largest telescope and the most powerful microscope cannot detect the meaning of "simplification". It is in fact a meaning which DOES NOT EXIST in our outside world, that is outside of our brain. It exists only inside our brain. How do I symbolise "brain". By drawing the

outline of the upper skull seat of the brain thus $\cap$. Consequently, every abstract meaning must show first the symbol of our brain $\cap$. And children can quickly learn how to recognise an abstract meaning, simply by asking: "Can I see it, can I touch it, can I photograph it?" I can see touch and photograph Mr. Bliss $\cap$ and Mr. Cunningham $\cap$. I can see and touch and photograph their mouth $\cap$. These are the THINGS which perform some ACTIONS. But the meaning of "simplification" cannot be seen, touched and photographed. Hence it must be shown first with the brain symbol $\cap$.

However, the meaning of "over" and "under" can be seen! Yes, and here is how I symbolise them by drawing a horizontal line and a dot "over" it, thus $\overset{\cdot}{-}$ and when I put the dot "under" the line we have the meaning of "under", thus $\underset{\cdot}{-}$. But here again we must see somewhere that LINE I am drawing. Now suppose I and Mr. Cunningham stand on different rungs of the same ladder. Then each rung can be drawn by horizontal lines, and then we can state that Mr. Cunningham stands "over" Mr. Bliss or "under" Mr. Bliss.

But when we speak of "over" and "under" in connection with an abstract meaning where there is nowhere a LINE TO BE SEEN then the very first symbol for the brain $\cap$ must be put before the symbol for "over" or "under" thus: $\cap \overset{\cdot}{-}$ $\cap \underset{\cdot}{-}$. And now it becomes obvious even for children that the accusation of Mr. Cunningham, that I am "oversimplifying" the problem becomes very vague, and indeed we could quarrel until tomorrow, I denying that I am oversimplifying, and Mr. Cunningham maintaining that I do. And the moral of this is: Once we use words in a debate which are symbolised by my brain symbol, there is no possibility to resolve our argument. Indeed, it may even destroy our friendship. Now imagine a woman accusing her husband: "You are jealous, you are envious!" And he denying that he "IS NOT jealous and NOT envious". Bitter resentment is the result. Today husbands and wives do not argue whether $2 + 2 = 4$ or 5 ? They have learned the mathematical symbols in school and have learned how to operate them. Hence they would not quarrel. But they quarrel terribly about MIND MEANINGS $\cap$ as I call them by which they only destroy their love and their marriage.

Mr. Welsh: "On page 258 of your book 'The Invention and Discovery' you call Julian Huxley 'the pope of the atheists'. How could you do this? Has Huxley declared himself 'infallible'? Has Huxley instigated religious hatred? Has Huxley instigated religious wars and massacres?"

Bliss: Your argument is perfectly valid. I should not have called him "the pope of the atheists." And here again I wish to show you my symbol by which I myself condemn myself for this verbal fraud. What I have done is to compare Huxley to the pope. Now here is my symbol for "comparison". First I use the colon as a mathematical symbol for comparison as we used it in school as for instance $a : b$ which means a compared to b. Now comparison is a mind meaning. You cannot see it, touch it, or photograph it. Hence I must add the mind symbol $\cap$. And together we have the symbol for "comparison" $\cap$. Now once we have added the mind symbol we realise that what one mind may accept as valid (another mind meaning) another mind may reject, and there is no way to resolve the debate with mind meanings. My rule for such arguments is to resolve them, or as I say to "translate" them into THING $\square$ words and ACTION $\wedge$ words. Let us do now this.

Let us think of the many atheists around the world. They will buy $\cap$ Huxley's books $\square$ and read $\cap$ them. If they have before them other books of other atheists they will take to Huxley's books as the ultimate authority and they will follow his words. In this way I used the meaning of "pope". But I should not have done it. Being a comparison means that it carries the brain symbol, there is no wonder that you Mr. Walsh have been incensed by it. Imagine someone else being likewise incensed, and I am not with him to explain and excuse my saying. He may reject my whole book just because of this. Here again you have an example what mind meanings can do. They can destroy friendships.

But I am only a human being with all frailties of a human being. I am angry with Huxley. He came to Sydney in 1954 and we had a spirited controversy which I later put together in my book "Semantography and the ultimate Meanings of Mankind". Huxley liked my symbolism very much. He wrote that "it provides something of real importance". He even used his influence in the Unesco secretariat of which he was the first Director General. He asked Mr. Maheu who is the present Director General to bring my work to the notice of the scholarly world. So I should be grateful to him.

But I am still mad about him and his theories on evolution. He himself is a victim of words, and the word is "evolution". It is what grammarians call a verbal noun, and the verb is "to evolve". But in the grammar of Semantography I cannot use a verb which is an ACTION word without telling the reader WHO or WHAT THING does the ACTION OF EVOLVING, the action which we call "Evolution". The atheists including Huxley, and almost all biologists and zoologists say that "Evolution did it, the coming into the world of all creatures of this planet. But an ACTION itself cannot do it. WHO or WHAT THING does the evolving?"

Huxley get's mad every time someone speaks of the animals which were "created".

In his books he cries that they were not "created", they just "evolved", by the hit or miss chance.

When I mentioned to Huxley that apparently ethical actions are to be seen which may indicate some ethical power, and when I made the mistake to use the word "Life Force" for this ethical behaviour of living atoms in living cells, he got mad at me. There is no "Life Force" nor any intelligent Force acting on the atoms he said.

And the other biologists say the same. Every time I enter a bookshop I head for the counter with the new books on biology, and sure enough all the authors fail to see the ethical behaviour and are getting mad at the hint that perhaps some mysterious "Life Force" is at work. No wonder that I get mad at them, and I got mad at Huxley too. After all, I am a human being and somehow or other I may use some words to abreact my unhappiness. And in this mood I called Huxley "the pope of the atheists". I admit my mistake.

And so my friends, nearly two hours have gone by and I admire your patience, and nurture the hope that perhaps what I have told you has been interesting, and in this respect I sincerely hope that you the humanists of Sydney will go out and convince others of the fact that a mysterious and magical Force of Ethics pervades our Universe. This is my message, and it is a good message, as it gives us an idea to work and to live for so that we may be able to create a better world. I thank you very much.

Note: There was sustained applause and some in the audience came forth to browse through my displayed books and brochures and some even buying them through the Pocket Book Shop. This too filled me with great satisfaction.

The End.

An afterthought by Mr. Thorburn:

I met Mr. Thorburn a few weeks later, and asked him for the text of his introduction to my lecture. However, he is a very busy man, and was unable to put it to paper. He gave me however an afterthought which I print herebelow and on which I reflect. This is what Mr. Thorburn conveyed to me:

"Conflicts which result in death and destruction don't always spring from men being manipulated by men who instigate them to go to war. Such a position is a puerile point of view. It sees history as a conspiratorial development.

Conflicts leading to death and destruction must be solely seen as real conflicts between people, even though some people may be manipulated in such conflicts. Real conflicts are conflicts of interest. In other words, it is not a simple matter of sheep and goats, the sheep being the stupid ones, and the goats being the bad ones."

I have thought long about this saying of Mr. Thorburn, and I agree with him. There are many factors which lead to death and destruction between people of the human race. But I am glad that Mr. Thorburn does not question the basis of my exposition, namely that death and destruction is solely a phenomenon in the human world, and it is not to be found within the same species in the animal world, be they killer animals or plant eating animals. That a member of the same species can be killed and its "possession" can be taken away from it, this thought never enters the minds of animals. They, and be they even killer animals, will not kill their kind, even in starvation when the killing of one of them would keep the others alive by eating the killed brother. Men kills his fellowman and eats him sometimes.

I agree with Mr. Thorburn that real interests lead to real conflicts. For instance a powerhungry king will attack a neighbouring country, will take the population into slavery, and will force the remaining people to pay tribute to him and to slave for him. Naturally, here a real conflict of interests arises, and the subjugated people will think of nothing else than revenge, and be it even by murder.

Or take a people who are ruled by a aristocratic class which owns almost all the land, and which considers the population as virtual slaves who work for that class. This is the position in a number of countries of South America. Naturally, here again we have a real conflict, as a clash of interests, and the subjugated people will think of nothing else than to overthrow their rulers even by force.

Or take a man who is the most peaceful man there is. He is faced by a killer and robber who demands his money, and who shoots his child. That peaceful man will kill that murderer with a clear conscience. This is the law of "An eye for an eye." In my book "The Invention and Discovery" I show an interesting development of my symbols. I symbolise first the Law of ^{and I} Isaak Newton, which says that for every action there is an opposite reaction, / develop from this equation the Law of Jesus: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them." See page 103 titled "Physical Laws and Ethical Laws."

The End