

To you dear Brian
from Charles

SYDNEY March, 1978.

A DRAFT OF MY FORTHCOMING LECTURE ON MY WORK BEFORE THE STAFF AND STUDENTS OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS OF THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY IN CANBERRA 29TH
MARCH, 1978.

by Charles Bliss, Author of "Semantography", now called Blissymbolics.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,

First let me thank you dear Professor Dixon for having arranged this lecture. Let me also thank the Deputy Vice Chancellor Mr. Plowman for having asked you to take an interest in my work, and let me thank the man who started it all Mr. Allan Fleming, the former National Librarian of the National Library of Australia in Canberra who was and who is still fascinated by an idea that made the hearts of librarians all over the world beat faster, nothing less than a book that can be read in all languages - without translation.

The idea itself, the vision, the impossible vision, has filled the minds of wise men of centuries past. In this my book of 882 pages I have dealt with them and have quoted them and I have also shown the ways they went to achieve the impossible dream, and I have shown why they have failed. Two men are important in this quest, and here they are in enlarged posters.

Here is the English philosopher John Locke. He wrote his "Essay concerning human Understanding". He deplored the fact that people are using the same language and don't understand each other, and he pointed to the culprits, the dons of Oxford and Cambridge who are taking delight in using new highbrow words which their hapless students don't understand.

And here is another man Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz, a contemporary of Locke, but with a difference. Leibnitz never made the grade in the University of Leipzig. He remained an amateur and yet, he is today considered as one of the greatest men of all times, indeed in scholarly books he is praised as the greatest language planner who ever lived.

Leibnitz was fascinated by Locke's "Essay concerning human Understanding". And so he wrote his own book with the same title "New Essay concerning human Understanding" as a discourse between him and Locke and there he proposed his "Symbolis Universalis". I have no time to quote him extensively, but those of you who are interested will find my books and you will see that Leibnitz wrote very distinctly of using pictorial symbols. This would be "very popular" and for "easy communication with distant nations" and he even referred to illiterate peasants who use almanacs where the pictorial phases of the moon help them in their work in the fields when to plough and when to sow.

The first recognition of my work came from abroad, no lesser man than Bertrand Russell who has even written a book about Leibnitz. Then came Professor Oliver Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh who gave a lecture on my work to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in which he said the memorable words -

"Bliss realised the ambition of the great mathematician Leibnitz".

These credentials were enough for me to apply to the University of Sydney for permission to address the students. They were enthusiastic and said so in their student papers. But the professoriate remained apathetic. In later years I lectured to students in various universities of Australia with the same effect. Now, 27 years after my first lecture at the University of Sydney I am standing here before you at the Australian National University.

But this time, the situation is different. This time my work is recognised already. It is taught already in schools all over the world. Postgraduate scholars are writing their theses on my work. My term "Semantography" has been changed into "Blissymbolics" or "Blissymbols" or simply "Bliss" as the name of a new way of universal communication. The incredible has happened. I have achieved a measure of immortality in my life-time, one of the rarest things that can happen to a man. It happened to me because the many years of great unhappiness did not deter me in my determination to win through. But I am over 80 now.

Now I am standing before you. Will I also win with you? Will you prove that the Roman saying that prophets cannot find honour in their own country is not true with regard to the Australian National University? This will depend on you, but also on me. Will I be able to convince you of the value of my work? Will I be able to go even further and prove to you that I have far surpassed even Leibnitz' impossible dream. That will depend on my power of persuasion, and your power of reception and especially on your goodwill to appreciate an innovator of a new idea in linguistics.

John Locke described a number of influences which block human understanding, and his King Charles II followed up with two decisive measures. He made it a criminal offence of the dons to read papers in monotonous tones in words which their hapless students could not understand. Charles II inaugurated also the Royal Society for the Advancement of Science based on two demands. The members must be amateurs and they must adhere to a simple language, the language of countrymen, not the language of wits and scholars. We know all too well that Locke and Charles II failed miserably.

There is another influence that blocks human understanding and one of the greatest men in science in our times has described it. His name is Max Planck, the originator of the idea of the energy quantum. And he said that a new idea does not convince its opponents who are still teaching the old ideas. A new idea gains only ground when the opponents sink into the grave one by one and new and young minds take over. Max Planck lived up to 90 and he could indeed see his opponents die out and his new idea become accepted.

Forgive me when I refer now to my own person. Already in the primary school, and later in the high school and university my fellow students discovered that I have an unusual mind and an unusual ability. "Karl", they said to me, "you are a born teacher. You can explain a difficult theorem in such simple language that it is instantly understood." That was nice to hear and it helped me pay my way through the university. I tutored my fellow students with amazing results.

But my studies began when I was a baby in the cradle. I was born in the Babel of the old Austrian Empire where 20 different nationalities hated each other because they thought and spoke in different languages. I listened to my Mama who had to speak with the maid in Ukrainian, with the milkman in Polish, with the woodchopper in Roumanian, with the tradesman in Yiddish, but to me she spoke only in German, the language of culture and the language of the authorities.

Naturally, I developed an aversion against languages. Why should that wonderful liquid called wasser be also called water, eau, aqua, agua, voda and so on in the many languages? When I learned of the mathematical symbols 1 2 3 4 I was enraptured by the fact that $1 + 2 = 3$ can be understood in all languages without translation. I developed a love of the natural sciences and was fascinated to learn that H_2O tells of the real composition of water. And I developed an aversion to the science of languages - grammar. I refused to learn it and I was the despair of my language teachers. They even thought I was mentally retarded.

Only much later, when I began to formulate my semantography did I learn of other rebels and they were even professors of language. I learned of Professor Leon Guerard who said "Grammar, the torment of our childhood is an exploded fallacy". Another, Professor Brunot went even further. He said -

"Incomprehensible abstractions, pretentious, yet for the most part empty definitions, false rules, indigestible lists of forms, one has only to run over a few pages of any textbook to find variegated specimens of these sins against reason, truth, education. A profound pity overcomes one thinking of the hundreds of thousands of children compelled to undergo an education composed of such aberrations."

Now you all know of the distinction between pure science and applied science. The science of linguistics is a pure science, and I am enraptured by your theories as to how language works. Indeed, were I now a young man, I would enrol in all your courses. And I should say that every teacher of any language should have graduated first in linguistics.

But apparently somehow a breakdown in communication occurs here between pure science and applied science and the results are catastrophic. Not only in the teaching of foreign languages, but even in the teaching of the mother tongue. An incredible phenomenon has taken the universities in all countries by surprise. Some students who have graduated in the high school and have advanced to the university have been found to be almost illiterate. They were unable to write a coherent report in their own mother tongue. In Sydney, a professor of chemistry in the University of N.S.W. had to install courses in common English, and something similar happened in many other universities.

Something similar - a breakdown between pure science and applied science has occurred already in another field where it is even more catastrophic. I refer to the teaching of logic. Apparently, more important than any science and any teaching of anything, is the teaching of how to think logically. The children of today are the leaders of their nations tomorrow. They must be taught more than anything else how to think and speak logically. But only those students

who subscribe to the study of philosophy are obliged to learn logic, formal logic, symbolic logic and mathematical logic. Why not all other students? Is this not a silent admission of the university authorities that the science of pure logic cannot be applied to normal thinking and cannot be taught to all students in the universities, least of all to students in the high school and the primary school.

Now I maintain that I have invented a simple symbolic logic, so simple that it can even be taught to healthy children of say 3 years of age, and even to brain-damaged children. Indeed, some children who have been classified as being 'mentally retarded' have responded to my logical symbols and have been found not to be mentally retarded at all, only utterly bewildered by the illogic which governs the languages of mankind.

When I said and wrote all this many years before, it was rejected. But now it cannot be rejected any more. My logical symbols, my symbolic logic works with amazing results.

What chance do I have now, standing before you, and trying to convince you in the short span of an hour of the value of my work? Alas, there are other influences that block understanding and goodwill and I have experienced them all during the last 36 years. Some listeners may be annoyed by my atrocious foreign accent, a German accent. Others may not like my upbringing. Others may be opposed to new ideas, and others may resent that I try to overturn their own ideas.

Alas, there is another catastrophic influence that blocks human understanding and goodwill. It is envy, something I never thought of before. I still cannot understand it, but there it is. I make many wonderful friends, but I also make enemies. Now that my work has been found to be of great value, I make more enemies. But look at me. I am not an arrogant man who cannot suffer fools and those who refuse to understand my work. I am a goodhearted unselfish fellow. Everyone who meets me, who listens to my lectures, who has seen the film Mr. Symbol Man, who has read my books or who has corresponded with me is impressed with my sincere desire to help mankind without any personal gain for myself. Why then should I make enemies?

Here is my theory or call it what you may. I remember my youth as a teenager. I realised that the whole world is open to me, and I do believe that most teenagers dream of a great life. They dream of writing a great book, making a great discovery, achieving fame and wealth - and even a measure of immortality. Then comes cold reality, marriage, children and the need to make a living, to get a paid job - and the dream of a great book, a great discovery, fame and wealth sinks into hopelessness.

But suddenly they are confronted by a man like me. Charles Bliss, a man without a professional salary, without a grant to support his studies, without acclaim and without recognition who has done it, has written a great book, has made an important discovery and has achieved a measure of immortality in his own lifetime. This is very hard to bear by many.

So, I plead for your goodwill and for your sympathetic understanding. I will now proceed to tell you of my work, but I will be able in the short span of my lecture to touch only briefly on aspects of my work. I will however stand trial before you and will try to answer all your questions and all your counter arguments afterwards. I will therefore write on the blackboard the following items upon which I will elaborate but briefly. Here are the items:

1. immediate applications of my work
2. a new simple symbolic logic
3. a new approach to language
4. a new simple semantics
5. a new ethics
6. an incredible outcome of my strange thoughts.

As said before, I was determined from the start that my new work shall be so simple that little children of 3, and even brain-damaged children shall be able to understand and use my teaching. Please keep this in mind.

1. Immediate applications of my work

(a) I hoped that my pictorial symbols would find immediate acceptance in a field where understanding across all languages is a matter of life and death for millions who are using the motor roads of the world. There, many more people are killed and maimed than in all the wars ever fought by man. I approached therefore the road safety authorities in Australia and in other countries and lastly in the United Nations with the plea to examine my pictorial symbols for all

warnings needed on the dangerous motor roads of the world. I offered my symbols free for all mankind to use.

It was a hopeless undertaking and it got me more and more into desperation. I was told by the bureaucrats who are paid to administer to the killings on the roads- "You, Mr. Bliss, are not going to tell us how to run our business". Last year I was in Detroit and visited the man in the headquarters of Ford whose job is to interest all road safety authorities in a unified pictorial symbol system for all countries of the world. He himself is deeply unhappy and even desperate that he could not achieve anything. So, who or what is to be blamed?

(b) I have shown in my books that my logical symbols can help children and students to learn their mother tongue, and can help them to learn a foreign language. And I proved that Leibnitz had this in mind when he insisted that only pictorial symbols could help. Why this? Because Leibnitz realised that thousands of idiomatic expressions in the thousands of languages and dialects reveal their fallacious meanings when people try to picture their meanings. Let me show this only in a few examples:

To put down something has a logical meaning. But to put down also means to write it down and this can be symbolised with the pictorial symbol of the pen but to put down Charles Bliss means to reject his work. To put up something has a logical meaning. But to put up a man means to provide him with a bed for the night. To put off something means not to do it today. To do something has a logical meaning. But will you do me means will you paint a picture of me. But will you put me in means will you report me to my wife or the boss or the police for something I have said or done.

The mind boggles about all these idiomatic expressions, and the people do not realise that all languages of mankind have thousands of such idiotic idiomatic expressions. I have argued wildly with language teachers and even linguists that they have a duty, and they are paid for making languages logical and easy to learn. "No", they answered "our job is only to record and teach all the idiomatic and (as you say Mr. Bliss) all the idiotic uses of words".

(c) Nearly one hundred years ago, a doctor in Warsaw, Zemenhof by name, invented a logical language and he hoped it would help mankind to speak with one tongue. So, he signed his first book with the word of hope in his new language, Esperanto. Today thousands of books have been translated into Esperanto, and 14 million due paying Esperantists have pleaded with the educational authorities to make Esperanto an obligatory subject in all the schools of the world. It has not been done.

I say however, that we don't need an international language. We have one already. It is the mother tongue of hundreds of millions of people. It is the lingua franca in Asia and in Africa where hundreds of languages are spoken. It is the international language in commerce and in communication, in industry and in science. It is English. All we have to do is to make English logical and easy to learn, and my symbols are just the ideal medium to do it.

(d) More and more people migrate to other countries, including Australia, and their old folks and their children have great difficulty learning English. More and more they demand that their children should also be taught the ethnic languages of their own homeland, but it Italian, French, Spanish or Lebanese. In Toronto more than 50% of children speak a foreign language at home, because they are the children of immigrants. Maybe a similar figure is to be found in the great cities of Australia and elsewhere. But the translation and the teaching from one language into another is a hopeless task. But not with my symbols. Children can be taught my symbols and their meaning in English and their corresponding meaning in their own mother tongue spoken at home. Soon they will have learned a fair amount of words which have the same meaning in both languages.

I have been told that you Professor Dixon have developed an amount of such meanings which you call "nuclear" because they have the same "nuclear" meaning in other languages. Well, then my symbols are the proper medium for your "nuclear" words.

I know of more and more immediate applications for my logical symbol system, but I must make haste and turn now to other aspects of my symbols.

(e) A few days ago I read in the papers that industrial accidents cost Australia the incredible sum of 2000 million dollars in hospital and workers' compensation and other costs. Now we know that constructions workers in Australia are migrants, more than 50% and they don't understand English. I wrote my heart out

to the authorities year after year, proposing my warning symbols. I got nowhere.

2. A new Approach to Language

As far as I know, and I correspond with many people about all this, my new approach is not taught in any school, nor any university, and yet it is so simple that it can be taught to little children and here I say it within a few minutes.

No teacher of language is telling his pupils that we are living in two different worlds. The world outside ourselves, outside our brains AND the world inside ourselves, inside our brains. We have therefore words for meanings outside ourselves and we have words for meanings inside ourselves.

Outside ourselves we have the sun and the moon, and thousands of things which we can picture. We can picture a house, or a room, or a letter or a pen and thousands of other things. No one is so stupid as to think that the sun is actually the moon, or that a house is actually a letter. It is utter nonsense and little children can see the nonsense right away.

But as to the words which refer to meanings inside of our brain - we cannot picture them. We cannot picture the meanings of good and bad, right and wrong. We cannot picture wisdom or stupidity. We cannot picture sincerity or insincerity. We cannot picture jealousy and envy. And yet these are the words which cause so much trouble. How simple then to apply Leibnitz' idea by teaching children even in the pre-kindergarten stage to find out whether we can picture a word and its meaning.

But now, a new approach to language is needed. I have found that the old and venerable division into 7 "parts of speech" cannot be maintained. The first most important "parts of speech" are 1. the noun, 2. the verb, and 3. the adjective and adverb. But a noun can be any word to which a "the" can be hitched. Even "the ahs" and "the ohs" and "the bahs" and "the boohs" are nouns and they don't mean anything.

I assure you my friends that when I started to work on my symbols I wanted only to create an auxiliary writing which could be used where the language barrier had to be bridged. I had no desire to delve into logic, into semantics, and least of all into ethics, as you will soon hear, even into biology and religion. But somehow, by beginning to try to find symbols which explain more clearly the meanings of mankind, I stumbled into a new territory and made discoveries. I shall tell about this in my talk and during your questioning.

So, I had to abandon the noun. Instead I created the notion of the real material chemical THING for which I chose the symbol of a crystal cube  and here is how we can teach little children to recognise a real material chemical THING with 4 questions:

1. Can you see it?
2. Can you photograph it with a camera?
3. Can you touch it if you go near enough?
4. Can you put it on to a scale big enough?

Naturally, children will soon realise that you can't see, nor photograph, nor touch insincerity, stupidity, badness and other unpicturable meanings.

Now real THINGS perform real ACTIONS. A man walks, a dog barks, a bird flies. I have chosen this symbol, the eruption of a volcano cone  the first primeval action on our planet earth as my symbol for ACTION.

And now here is the first important rule of my semantography:

IN OUR REAL WORLD OUTSIDE OF OUR BRAIN THINGS PERFORM ACTIONS

And little children can learn to recognise words which mean real ACTIONS by these questions :

1. Can you see the THING which performs the ACTION?
2. Can you photograph the ACTION with a movie camera?

Suddenly I realised that I had found two meanings which are two of the most profound aspects of our real world MATTER and ENERGY. The noun and verb have disappeared.

But now we come to what I term MIND MEANINGS and which I symbolise with the outline of the upper skull  And what do we do with our minds? We judge, we evaluate THINGS and ACTIONS. We find them good or bad or right or wrong etc. I created a new term HUMAN EVALUATION and I chose a new symbol  which I shall later explain. And now we have a second postulate which reads :

IN THE WORLD INSIDE OUR BRAIN WE HAVE WORDS FOR THE ACTIONS OF OUR BRAIN AND THESE ACTIONS ARE MOSTLY USED TO JUDGE AND TO EVALUATE THE THINGS AND THE ACTIONS IN OUR OUTSIDE WORLD.

Suddenly the adjective and the adverb have disappeared and moral judgement has entered. And you may agree that the adjectives (evaluations of the THINGS) and the adverbs (evaluations of the ACTIONS OF THINGS) are mankind's main trouble makers.

You may then realise how new and how revolutionary my new approach to language is.

3. A New Symbolic Logic. Leibnitz said that we can draw the outlines of picturable things and this is exactly what I have done. But Leibnitz taught me also what to do with meanings which we cannot picture. Leibnitz said that in such a dilemma we can picture unpicturable meanings with those picturable things that accompany them. For instance we cannot picture time. So let us picture time with the picturable thing which we use to accompany the meaning of time, the picture of a clockdial. And how should we picture meanings inside our brain? By the outline of the brain, or rather, the dome of bone which protects the brain 

Now look how simple this can be. Apart from my basic pictorial meaning elements, not more than about 100, I also use about 30 international meanings as for instance the ten numbers 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 then the plus + and the minus -. Now look how a baby learns to differentiate between good and bad meanings. If it is with (plus) + Mum, plus + her breasts, plus + her food, plus + her milk, plus + her warmth, plus + her love it will utter a happy shriek.

But if the baby is minus (without) - Mum, minus - her breasts, minus - her food, minus - her milk, minus - her warmth, minus - her love, it will begin to cry in unhappiness.

Now let us realise a very sad truth. Today, in almost every home in all countries and in all languages millions of quarrels are occurring every day between father and son, mother and daughter, husband and wife. And I have the temerity to say that these millions of quarrels would not happen if my simple symbols were taught to children in the primary school. And look how simple it really is.

We do not quarrel about picturable things whether a house is a letter or a pen is a tree. We quarrel about those unpicturable meanings, which I call mind meanings. Now we can teach children that this symbol  expresses a favourable positive mental attitude, and this symbol  expresses an unfavourable negative mental attitude. And we can teach little children that the first symbol draws our heart together in friendship and in love, and the second symbol tears our hearts apart and destroys our friendships, marriages and lives. Today children learn only how to spell words, how to pronounce them, how to write them down in sentences. I believe that a day will come when little children in the kindergarten will be taught to recognise those words which must be avoided. They ruin our lives.

There is no time in this short lecture to dwell on the fallacies of logic teaching in the department of philosophy. I have already stated that university authorities all over the world have realised that the logic taught does not help the nations how to think logically. The nations are the common people, but also those who have university degrees, the doctors, the lawyers, the engineers, the judges and the others.

But my symbols do teach even children how to think logically. We all will recognise a simple truth, namely that no two human beings are alike, think alike and act alike. This can be expressed in a simple terse formula -

₁ ₂
my mind differs (not equal) from your mind

But we don't differ about picturable meanings, whether the sun is the moon etc. We differ about mind meanings. And I have proved in my writings and in my lectures that once we debate about some statement and we write it down and find that there is one word in it which is a mind meaning and must be symbolised with the mind there is no use going on with the debate. We may never be able to convince each other.

What to do in such a dilemma? I have shown what to do. We must TRANSLATE mind meanings into picturable meanings, and I have shown in my books in many examples how to do it. I shall explain this in the forthcoming discussion after my lecture.

4. A New Simple Semantics

In the foregoing paragraphs I have shown what MIND MEANINGS and their EVALUATIONS CAN DO. They can ruin our lives. And I have shown that we can teach children with simple questions how to differentiate between THINGS AND THEIR ACTIONS in our real world outside of our brains, AND MIND MEANINGS AND THEIR EVALUATIONS which refer to the world inside of our brain.

But now something incredible is happening with human evaluations. We have learned already a most important rule of my semantography my mind differs (not equal) from your mind because no two human beings are alike, think alike and act alike.

But surely my mind equals my mind or in a terse formula

$$\bigcap_1 = \bigcap_1$$

my mind equals my mind

Well, it's not true. Human beings can CHANGE THEIR MIND, usually overnight, but it can be done within a second. This we must express in a new formula by inserting the symbol for past and future, which I shall not show here to simplify things.

$$\bigcap_1 \neq \bigcap_1$$

my mind yesterday differs from my mind tomorrow

What does this incredible statement mean? Here is my new semantics which can change mankind now embroiled in millions of quarrels in all the families and in the families of nations. In our outside world, outside of our brain the THINGS and their ACTIONS will remain tomorrow as they are today. The sun will be the sun and not change into the moon. A chair will not change into a table, a pen will not change into a tree.

But what we evaluate today as bad may seem good to us tomorrow. You may realise what this means to the religions of mankind. You may realise that many of our wars we have fought and we are still fighting in Northern Ireland, in Lebanon and in Israel and in Africa and Asia are fights about the meanings of good and bad, right and wrong. Suddenly you will realise that many fights in the home are also based on these meanings. You may also realise that we can teach children how to recognise human EVALUATIONS how to recognise good and positive EVALUATIONS and the opposite which tear our lives apart. WE CAN CHANGE OUR MINDS AND WE CHANGE OUR EVALUATIONS. WE CAN GAIN PEACE.

Now you will understand my symbol for HUMAN EVALUATIONS. It is a cone standing on its top ∇ and this position is termed in physics and its wider meaning "labile, liable to topple over, liable to err". AND EVALUATIONS ARE JUST LIKE THIS.

What to do? How to change MIND EVALUATIONS which I symbolise thus ∇ into THINGS $\square$ ACTIONS $\wedge$ I have found a way by which children can be taught how to translate meanings inside of our brain into the world outside of our brain. I shall show this in our discussion.

5. A New Ethics

As you can see my symbols are going even further than Leibnitz imagined. My symbols can - if taught to children already in the kindergarten - change humanity for the better. And I assure you that I had no desire to be, what is called in German "ein Weltverbesserer" a man who wants to change our human world for the better. The idea of finding symbols which can explain better the words in all languages, simply forced me to the new idea and thus to a new ethics. And I claim that my new ethics, expressed in symbols which can be read in all languages of mankind can be accepted by mankind in all their religions and can be accepted even by atheists. If my symbols can really do this, then this would mean a revolution in human thought, a new humanity and a new future for our children.

Let me show you now with two examples how my symbols can change human thought.

My symbol for man $\wedge$ is a symbol for a biological entity. It means that animal can do what no monkey and no donkey can do. It can be taught to read and write. But alas, by having invented articulate language, human beings can be taught to hate. This is being done by attaching labels to human beings. Children hear their elders saying "That man is bad, because he is a Jew, or a Mohammedan, or a Roman Catholic, or a Capitalist or a Communist. Thus children learn to hate that man.

Can we teach children the fallacy in such thought. Yes we can, and here is how I teach it.

This is a man  He has a mind  and together man who thinks 

Now we can show this symbol combination


a thinker, bad

We see two minds here, but the second mind is another mind. Indeed, the first mind symbol may depict my mind and the second mind symbol may depict your mind, whoever you are. You may listen to my talk, you may find all I say strange, even absurd, in short negative and bad, and you may say so.

BUT TOMORROW YOU MAY HAVE CHANGED YOUR MIND. TOMORROW YOU MAY BECOME MY FRIEND.

But maybe not. Yet, something will come into your mind: DOUBT. You may waver as to whether you should evaluate me as negative or maybe positive. So let's draw up a new symbol and it means


TOLERANCE

And this symbol has a magic effect. It may tell you that maybe you are wrong and the other guy is right. It may dampen your self-righteousness. It may teach you tolerance. It may force you to think things over and if you have still a negative evaluation you must learn how to translate your MIND MEANING into THING and ACTION MEANINGS. This I shall show in our discussion.

6. An Incredible Outcome of my Strange Thoughts

When a man like me abandons only thinking in words and begins to think in symbols truer to nature, which means according to Leibnitz, in words that can be pictured, then he stumbles into a new territory and he cannot fail to make strange discoveries. You have seen already what happened to my thoughts when I found that I had to abandon the linguistic notions of 1. the noun, 2. the verb, and 3. the adjective and adverb. I ended up with moral judgements, I ended up with a new ethics that can be accepted by people of all religions, even by atheists.

Let me assure you my friends that I had no such strange desires when I began in Shanghai to develop a new modern symbol language. Indeed, I still have my notebooks from that Shanghai period and there is nothing in there of my new thoughts. They all came to me in Sydney. I had no desire to begin to meddle with physiology of the brain, with psychology, with moral philosophy and least of all with religion. And now let me tell you how my new quest led me to question the established theories of anthropologists, of archeologists, of zoologists and of biologists.

Albert Einstein called such a quest "Der noble Zweifel" - "The noble Doubt". This means the heretic thought that, maybe, the established theories are false and have to be either modified or discarded. You all know that mankind's history is one long story of discarded theories.

It all began when I started to think of mankind's dim past when he communicated only in gestures and grunts. Slowly he began to form words. Slowly he began to form abstract meanings like good and bad or worse evil. Then his highpriests told him to kill the evil people who believe in other gods and in other theories. I began to think about the origin of human warfare. I cannot go into all this here. I only want to tell you of Clyde Cluckhohn, Professor of Anthropology who was so impressed with my thoughts that he commissioned me to write a paper about it, that he tried to get me a publication grant, and that he tried even to get me into Harvard. Then suddenly he died, a young man of 54. How different it all would be, had he stayed alive and had he really brought me into Harvard.

In the Public Library of N.S.W. I began to read books on archeology and anthropology, zoology and biology, until I found statements here and there of a truth which I put together like a jigsaw puzzle. The writer themselves, dealing only with their own department and faculty of thought, did not see the total truth. My achievement is to put their findings together and to tell it in such a way which can even be explained to children.

But there is no time to go into all this here, and I believe I have already disturbed you enough, have given food for thought for many hours of discussion

and questioning. And should I go into all this now, and even hint at it, I would make myself very vulnerable and may lose all your goodwill.

So let me say that my strange thoughts can give mankind a fantastic hope of a new and wonderful future. And let me say that I have told all this in a way that can be taught to children in the kindergarten.

CONCLUSION

Now why am I here before you and why do I try to win you over to my new strange thoughts on language and more? The story began in 1972 six years ago. During these six years my work has been recognised and it is now spreading throughout the world. And the most pitiful of children, the brain-damaged and even mentally retarded children have been brought to a new life by my thoughts which I have developed to be so simple that little children can understand them. Six years ago the National Librarian Mr. Allan P. Fleming became fascinated with my ideas.

And what happened through those six years? Something terrible. Something I never thought of. And yet it happened, not only to me, but it happened in the past to all men who came forth with new ideas that can help mankind. And here is my story which I will elaborate in my lecture and in our discussion.

Straight from the University in 1922 I became factory manager in a firm making electric lamps. Later I became the chief of the patent department. And naturally my hero was one of the greatest inventors Thomas Alva Edison. His work and his sayings and his experiences helped me greatly in developing my symbol system. He said: "Ideas are two for a penny. Success depends on 2% inspiration and 98% perspiration - hard work". I worked very hard for many years - 30 years in fact. And then in 1972 success came to me, but something else came too.

When Edison perfected the electric lamp and patented it, hundreds of copiers, plagiators, and outright thieves began to manufacture electric lamps and made money. They used that money to defy Edison in court, belittling and negating his ideas and his patents. Edison had to fight over 600 patent litigations in American courts. But to do this much money is needed. Edison got the money because he had powerful backers who realised that they too would make money.

Something similar happened to me, but with a difference. A private charity of Toronto led on by an irrational egocentric and egomaniac woman got hold of my symbol system and were and still are able to attract public money in donation and taxation given for helping crippled children. Every year hundreds of thousands of dollars are given to that private charity. That woman gets \$34,000 per year for what? For misusing my symbols, for misteaching the crippled children and for misteaching other symbol teachers. But for me - she saw to it that I did not get one single cent for myself and she still sees to it. She ruined me financially, and physically (causing me my first heart attack and physical breakdowns) and mentally. Those 6 years of success of my work were the most unhappy years of all my life.

But why did she ruin me? Because I accuse her and her henchmen of being catastrophically ignorant of my work. At first she copied about 100 symbols from my books and they accounted for the great success with the children. But afterwards, she ruined my system, my logic, my semantics and my ethics. I had to fight her year after year and every year she had to abandon one false symbol after another. But in her ignorance she made more false symbols.

At last on the 9th June, 1977, I gave a rousing lecture in the University of Ottawa and proved the catastrophic falsehoods in all her symbols. I shall now show you some of the sheets which I demonstrated in Ottawa.

Why do I tell you all this? Because I need your help. I need the help of the Australian National University. I need the help of the Australian Government. I am at the end of my life. If that woman is allowed to ruin my work and to give it to mankind in a catastrophically perverted form, then all my labours will be lost. She gets all the money and she made me a pauper.

How the University and Government Authorities and all the People of Australia can help me, this I will tell you in our discussion. And so I close this draft in the desperate hope that you dear Professor Dixon and the staff and students of your faculty of Linguistics will stand up for me and will see to it that help be given to me.

Charles Bliss
Charles Bliss