

Spelling Progress Bulletin Fall 1980

Dedicated to finding the causes of difficulties in learning reading and spelling.

Publisht quarterly
Spring, Summer, Fall, Winter
Subscription \$ 4. 00 a year.
Volume XX, No. 3
Fall, 1980

Editor and General Manager,
Newell W. Tune,
5848 Alcove Ave,
No. Hollywood, Calif. 91607

Assistant Editor,
Helen Bonnema Bisgard,
13618 E – Bethany Pl,# 3 07
Aurora. CO, 80014

Editorial Board: Harvie Barnard. Emmett A. Betts, Helen Bisgard, Wilbur J. Kupfrian, William J. Reed, Ben D. Wood.

Table of Contents

1. Notices. SSS 3rd International Conference. [International Spelling Reform Day](#).
2. [Participants in the 1979 SSS Conference on Reading & Spelling](#), Fotos by Vic Paulsen.
3. [The Cultural Impediments of English Orthography](#), by Vic Paulsen.
4. [A Transitional Spelling Reform for Adults and Learners](#), by Valerie Yule.
5. [How to Implement Spelling Reform](#), by Valerie Yule.
6. [International Day for Spelling-Spotting](#), September 30th.
7. [Reading and Writing in English](#), by S. Bakowski.
8. [The Sensible Solution to Simplified Spelling](#): One Sound=One Symbol, by Hugh V. Jamieson.
9. [Ess Ess Ess /FONIK/](#), by S. S. Eustace.
10. [A Letter to Senator George McGovern](#), by Raymond H. Pierson.
11. [On Financing](#), by Leo Davis.
12. [The James International Alphabet](#).

The Simplified Spelling Society

Patron: H.R.H. The Duke of Edinburgh, K.G., K.T.

Founded in 1908 with William Archer, F. J. Furnivall, Israel Gollancz, A. W. Pollard *and* W. W. Skeat.

Former Presidents: Professor Daniel Jones, D.Phil., LL.D. M.A.:

Professor Gilbert Murray, O.M., D.C.L., D.Litt., F.B.A.;

Sir I. J. Pitman, K.B.E., M.A.;

Professor W. W. Skeat, Lit.D., LL.D., D.C.L., Ph.D.

President: Professor John Downing, Ph.D., A.B.Ps.S., B.A.

Vice-Presidents: The Rt. Hon, The Lord Maybray-King, P.C., MD,

Professor D. Abercrombie. B.A;

Sir E. Graham Savage. C.B., B.A.; H. S. Wilkinson, A.C.I.S.;

Honorary Secretary: S, S. Eustace, M.A.

Honorary Treasurer: Miss M. Cross.

Banker: Barclays, and Williams & Glyn's.

Late News

1. The Third International Conference on Reading and Spelling

Sponsored by the Simplified Spelling Society

Patron: H.R.H. The Duke of Edinburgh

to be held July 31, Aug. 3, 1981 at Pollack Hall, Edinburgh, Scotland.

Offers of papers to be presented and inquiries invited. Topics will, we hope, include recent research testing reform proposals, recent advances in spelling for speech-to-print electronic machines, comparative spelling in other languages and its effects on learning and fluent reading, improvements in teaching spelling, and progress in developing and implementing spelling reform.

Overseas visitors may attend the U.K.R.A. Conference immediately preceding, in Edinburgh, and the I.R.A. Conference immediately after, in Finland. Or they may have time to see a real bit of Scotland in the delightful summer.

Are you interested in coming? ()

If planning to present a paper, send provisional abstract ()

Can you help with assistance and/or publicity? ()

Write to Valerie Yule (Conference Organizer), Scotland.

September 30, International Spelling Reform Day

"Thirty days hath September – Spelling Reform to remember!"

On September 30 (or any day)!-

Get maximum publicity to improving English spelling.

Write letters to your local newspaper editor bringing up reasons for pupils dropping out of school, illiteracy, delinquency, etc.

with *Spelling Watching* – look around for misspelled signs, simplified spellings, in signs, trade marks, new products, pupil's writings, etc.

with *Spelling Problems* – note how many pupils have difficulty reading and writing English spelling. .

with *Spelling Improvement* – find out more about spelling reform – why not try SR-1 in writing friends (spell the short *e* sound with *e* as in: *hed, eny, frend, gess.*)

[See more in [Item 6](#)]

Notice

If you are not a subscriber to *S.P.B.*, do not think that this and other copies of *S.P.B.* were sent to you as an advertisement. It is being paid for by the Simplified Spelling Society of Britain as a service to enlighten its members about last summer's 2nd International Conference and the coming 3rd International Conference in Edinburgh in July 1981. We are grateful to Mr. Tune for publishing all of the lectures of that Conference and hope that our members now know about it.

2. Fotos by Vic Paulsen



1. Margaret Reed

2. (l. to r.)
Pia Wijk,
John Downing.



3. Katherine Betts.

4. (l. to r.)
D. G Scragg,
Alun Bye.



5. Emmett Betts.

6. Robert Baker.

7. (l. to r.)
John Beech,
Philip Smith.

8. (facing camera, l. to r.)
Fergus McBride, Helen Bisgard,
Sydney Rosenberg.

9. Mona Cross.

10. (l. to r.)
George O'Halloran, Will Reed.

11. (l. to r.)
Derek Thackray, Fergus McBride.

12. (l. to r.)
Christine Lord, Elsie Oakensen.

13. Abe Citron.

14. Valerie Yule.

15. (l. to r. facing camera)
Alun Bye, Mrs. Sydney Rosenberg,
Elsie Oakensen, Mona Cross,
Walter Gassner, Mrs Gassner.



[Spelling Reform ed Newell Tune t13.9pp193–196 in the printed version]
[Spelling Progress Bulletin Fall 1980 pp4–7 in the printed version]

3. The Cultural Impediments of English Orthography, by Vic Paulsen, San Francisco, Ca.

Communication amongst human beings involves at least two people: one who transmits the information, and another who receives it. *Written* communication involves a *third* element, which is interposed between the two human elements: a *writing system*, thru which the information is conveyed.

Writing systems are of two general kinds: (1) picture-writing, which uses ideographs, and (2) sound-writing, which uses syllabaries or alphabets.

Ideographs are simplified pictures with informational content. They have actual meaning. But syllabaries and alphabets are designed to represent speech-sounds only, and they are not intended to represent anything else. In China, for example, a common system of word-signs which is largely *ideographic* provides communication amongst people of different regions who cannot otherwise communicate because their spoken languages are different. But in the western world, where *alphabetic* writing is the custom, all three elements in the chain of communication must be geared to the *same language*. Both the writer and the reader must understand that spoken language, and the writing system must be designed for it. To the extent that any of the elements departs from these qualifications, communication fails.

The problem in the English-speaking world today is that altho the two *human* elements, the writer and the reader, both speak the same language, which is Modern English, the *third* element, the writing system, was not designed for that language. It has been shaped a bit, here and there, in the direction of Modern English, but the fact is that its spelling is based primarily on another language, Middle English, which hasn't been spoken in at least 400 years, and is no longer understood. So, we have a bottleneck in communication.

From the point of view of a technician, this problem is easily solved. All one needs to do is design a writing, system specifically for Modern English, so that all three elements in the chain of communication can function in harmony. We know very well that in those parts of the world where such systems operate, literacy is easily achieved. Learning to read in one day is not unheard of.

But the design of a new writing system is only a partial solution. The major obstacle that confronts the orthographic reformer is the existing system itself, which, with all its scandalous lack of utility, happens to be an *investiture* that seems to defy displacement.

During the last 30 years or so, literacy in the English-speaking world has been declining at an alarming rate. It's not hard to guess why. During the rapid development of electronics in the past 40 years, *speech*, for the first time in the entire course of history, *has become a mass medium*. The people, having discovered those electronic channels thru which they can receive information in their own language, are now circumventing the outdated writing system which has been the bottleneck in mass communication. And having alienated themselves from it, they have become less able and less willing to cope with its irrational complexities.

In an attempt to correct this situation, the Federal Government of the United States initiated its "Decade of the '70's" program, in which "The Right to Read" was to become a reality. [1] During that ten-year period, which is now ending, both State and Federal governments have poured massive sums into programs designed to eradicate illiteracy, not by re-designing the outdated writing system, but by attempting to shape the minds of human beings into conformity with the status quo. And what has this extravagant program achieved? Nothing! The drift to illiteracy continues as before, *except* that it now has reached the proportions of a crisis. For example, the United States Navy now complains that from 40 to 50% of today's recruits can't read the instruction manuals. The Navy is plainly worried about the future. [2] And they are not alone. But how do the educators explain all this? Their typical response is: "Well, this is a difficult problem! We must rise to meet the challenge, re-dedicate ourselves, learn to work together, involve the parents, etc." [3]

Now, before we start examining this peculiar human reluctance to do something about conventional spelling, let's just briefly review the origins and the nature of alphabetic writing, so we know exactly what we are talking about.

Alphabetic writing seems to have begun sometime prior to 1,000 B.C. in the eastern Mediterranean area. It was acquired and perfected by the Greeks, then adopted by the Romans, who spread it throught their civilizations. The principles were these: Each significant speech sound (phoneme) was represented by an individual symbol, and these symbols were written from left to right in the same sequence in which the sounds would be heard if the information were spoken. Diphthongs were represented *analytically*, that is, *each* of the *two phonemes* of which the diphthong was composed was represented by its own symbol, so that the phonetic constitution of the diphthong was clearly indicated; and those symbols were also written from left to right in the same sequence in which the sounds would be heard if the information were spoken. The *reader*, by scanning the line from left to right, "sounding" the symbols one by one, could reproduce, in speech, the information intended by the writer. That's what alphabetic writing is all about, and for its first thousand years or so in Europe it was done, for the most part, with capital letters and without any word-spacing. [4]

Along about the 7th Century a very important refinement was introduced. Groups of letters representing whole words were separated from each other by spaces, and this practice was combined with the use of letter styles, some of which had descenders or ascenders. [5] This gave a more or less characteristic outline to particular word-groups, making for easier whole-word recognition, and thus speeding up the decoding process.

It was not until *after* this development that vernacular writing evolved in Britain and in Europe, where the official language of record and of learning had been Latin. Vernacular writing was simply an adaptation of the Latin alphabet to the vernacular. But the new languages had some sounds that were not represented in the Latin alphabet, so the practice developed of using digraphs and other combinations of Latin letters to represent these sounds. But digraphs *don't scan*, and the only reason they could be used at all was that word-spacing had come into use. And so began a departure from alphabetic principles that fostered the strange notion that word-groups might be regarded as basic units, the spellings of which might be memorized if not scannable, or that might be identified more or less as logograms. Now, a few digraphs in the orthography of a language that has remained fairly stable is no great problem. But in the case of English, which has undergone enormous pronunciation changes which have not been accommodated in the spellings, the relationship between the speech and the writing has simply departed from the reality of alphabetic procedures.

The succession of influences that produced linguistic turmoil in England prior to the 18th Century and the subsequent orthographic chaos of which we are the inheritor, already has been documented ad infinitum, but let's just use one word as a sample of what happened: "knave." This is the Middle English word pronounced "knah-veh" (be sure to pronounce the "k" – that's what it's there for) . . .two open syllables, each containing one single vowel sound. And, as you can see, the spelling was a perfect specimen of classical alphabetic principles. Using symbols for the phonetic values for which they were intended, it scans from left to right, symbol by symbol, to reproduce the spoken word intended by the writer. But in *Modern English*, the language *we* speak, there is no knah-veh. That word has become one *closed syllable* containing a *diphthong*. But how would anybody know that? We are still spelling it k-n-a-v-e, which, in alphabetic terms, is a departure from reality. According to classical alphabetic procedure, which requires that diphthongs be represented analytically, the correct modern spelling would be: "neiv."

So how does a teacher explain the spelling k-n-a-v-e to a child? One way might be this: "Children, be sure to spell this word correctly. It begins with a "k", but this is a silent "k". It must be there, but we don't pronounce it. As we know, the letter "a" has many pronunciations, but we never know which one until we know what the other letters in the word are. In this case, the last letter is an "e". We don't pronounce this either, but be sure to include it in the spelling because this one is the *magic* "e" that tells us that the letter "a" is pronounced like the "a" in "able". Remember that rule, but remember too that rules have exceptions, and in this case, if the "kn" at the beginning of the word were replaced by an "h", this would tell us that the magic "e" wasn't magic anymore, and that the "a" would then be pronounced like the "a" in "hat". But above all, be sure to include the final "e" in the spelling, even if it is not magic, and even if it is not pronounced, because if you don't, the spelling won't be correct. Now is this clear to everyone?"

If the teacher were in a prophetic mood, the speech might continue like this: "Now I hope that all of you will try very hard, and that by the time you will have graduated, after eight years in this school, that most of you will have learned to read. . . a little. But some of you, even many of you, will have difficulties. Some of you will try, but just not be able to get it. Others will just sit and cry. Some will just stare out the window, and have a tight feeling in the stomach. But don't worry about it. The school psychologist will make a lot of tests, and ask you a lot of questions about your family, and might even interview your parents to find out what their problem is. The psychologist might discover that you have a learning disability, or perhaps a brain disfunction of some special kind, possibly dyslexia, or even that you are suffering from brain damage!

Some of you will become disciplinary problems. You will become hyperactive. You will run and jump and squirm and fight! Anything to avoid learning to read. For you, we have a little pill. Not a drug, really. . . just a pill. This will quiet you down and keep you from becoming a problem in the classroom. Of course, you might come back after dark and break all the windows, maybe even set the building on fire, in which case you will have to deal with the police. But this might not stop you. You might become incorrigible, and end up in a life of crime, which is what happens to many illiterates.

And there is something else I must tell you. Girls learn to read more easily than boys. You see there is quite a difference between boys and girls. But don't worry about it. We can send you to a Remedial Reading Clinic, where they will try to correct your problem.

"Finally, children, I would like to say that this task can be much easier for all of us if only you will try to remember that, after all, Reading is Fun!"

Conventional English spelling is commonly spoken of as "crazy" or "insane", but these are general terms that don't take us anywhere. A more particular and more useful description might be "*pathogenic*", that is, "disease causing"; "disease" in this case meaning mental disorder. The evidence, when viewed in proper perspective, seems to justify this one. Let's find out:

The tools a society shapes for its use are *reflexive* cultural entities. As the tools are used, the society that produced them is, in turn, shaped by them, may become dependent on them, even enslaved by them. Examples: television, automobiles, writing systems. The more widely used the tool, the more thoroughly it influences the society. And in the English-speaking world, where the writing system has – in alphabetic terms – become irrational, it has produced irrational mental processes in the society. Let's see how this has come about:

In the first place, the teaching of reading and writing in any society, whatever the language or the writing system, involves the enshrinement of the writing system as a standard of reference on which the teaching is based. This tends to identify the writing system with the particular language, as if the two were one and the same thing. This illusion has inspired a popular misuse of terms, some of which have found their way into dictionaries, thus reinforcing the illusion. For example: words such as "language", "vowel", "diphthong", "digraph", "English", "literacy", the terms "short vowel", "long vowel", and such statements as "Reading is Fundamental", and "Back to Basics"! All of these formerly had specific meanings based on the assumption that the writing represented the sounds of the language. But as the pronunciation of the language changed while the spellings remained the same, a distortion occurred in the meanings, some of the terms expanding to include multiple meanings. The result of this is that any discussion of the relationship between speech and writing tends to become futile because the terms mean different things to different people. Thus, any consideration of orthographic reform tends to be unappreciated.

Another peculiar psychological disability has come about with the phasing out of *acoustic* in favor of *visual* methods of decoding, namely: an actual incapacity to decode alphabetic writing acoustically. This has arisen from an accumulation of influences. Prior to the introduction of word-spacing, the custom seems clearly to have been that of reading aloud and listening to one's own voice to get the meaning. [6] After the introduction of word-spacing, secondary *visual* associations in the form of whole-word patterns came into being. The continuous contact with these secondary visual patterns that came about with the introduction of printing and the consequent proliferation of reading material, tended to cause a substitution of the visual for the acoustic. Also, certain non-alphabetic innovations such as the so-called etymological spellings contributed to the declining acoustic reliability. And in more recent times, the "look-and-say" method of teaching reading completed the job of producing a total dependence on visual word identification – to the extent that such identification is possible. Experience shows that people who have been conditioned to this visual process may be incapable of decoding a scannable alphabetic system, even if they have learned the phonetic values of the symbols and are capable of reconstituting the speech intended by the writer. Altho they may read the words aloud correctly, so that anyone within hearing distance can understand the message, they themselves are not listening to what they are saying because while they are saying it their attention is riveted to the visual image, which is where they expect to find the meaning.

Fortunately, this affliction is easily overcome, but the afflicted people don't know this, and when someone suggests a reform of English spelling that involves a restoration of alphabetic principles, they are seized with apprehension, and nothing gets thru to them. These are the people who say "making sounds is not reading" without realizing that they are only describing their own affliction.

But simple lack of knowledge concerning the nature of literacy does not adequately explain the single-

minded, unbudging tenacity with which the English-speaking world clings to its outdated writing system. This phenomenon resembles the behavior of an individual suffering from a neurosis, who defends himself against any suggestion that he might have a personal problem. Even knowledgeable analysts in the education field who have shown the writing system to be the main source of our reading difficulties, will then usually propose some special way of teaching it, but seem unable to perceive the possibility of changing it. Somehow, they will manage to find an explanation, an apology, or a rationale, to show that *change* is either unwise or impossible. [7]

This rigid, "blank-wall" attitude is pretty strong evidence that what we are dealing with here is a mental disorder. In psychiatry, behavior is considered normal when it is determined by processes that are predominately conscious, and therefore deliberative. But behavior is considered neurotic when the determining processes are *unconscious*, and therefore not subject to deliberation. [8] But a *collective* mental disorder involving a whole society is not readily identified. If an *individual* should become psychotic in an otherwise healthy society, his behavior is easily noticed because it is different. But if a whole society becomes psychotic, nobody notices it because it is the norm.

Another difficulty in recognizing collective mental disorders has to do with terminology. Individual mental disorders are dealt with clinically by psychiatrists, who have evolved clinical terms to describe them. But mental disorders of societal proportions are not treated clinically, and if they are described at all, it is by anthropologists or historians or sociologists. They may speak of "cultural tag", or perhaps "the decline and fall of," etc., but they don't identify the affliction for what it really is: a mental disorder of a particular kind.

But there is another – and perhaps the strongest – piece of evidence to identify as a mental disorder the fixation for an outdated writing system, and that is the way in which such fixations have commonly been dispersed. Of the instances of orthographic reform that have occurred in this century, those of the Portuguese, the Russian, the Turkish, and the Chinese, have followed in the wake of violent social upheaval. They are the collective counterparts of "abreaction", a psycho-therapeutic process by means of which the pathological complexes of individuals are dispersed. [9]

A certain amount of evidence has now been presented to show that we are dealing with an outdated orthography that has been enshrined as a standard, but which, in terms of alphabetic principles, has become irrational; and which, by virtue of its being a reflexive cultural entity, has produced in the society itself a pathological fixation which is interfering with the need of the society to be literate.

So, how do we get out of this mess?

It has been pointed out that individual mental disorders are dealt with clinically by psychiatrists, but that collective mental disorders are not. The cure of an afflicted *individual* can begin only when he himself reaches the conclusion that he has a problem that needs being solved. Until this attitude is taken nothing can be done for him. But in the case of a collective mental disorder, such as the fixation of the whole society for conventional English spelling, we are dealing with a collective psyche comprising many disparate elements and groups of elements in an organizational structure the *attitude* of which is a resolution of the complex vector relationships amongst the elements.

Since the orthographic reformer himself happens to be one of the elements of this structure, he can work from within, using appropriate strategy, to expedite the required change of attitude. The possibility of this is not unthinkable. A mood for change has been expressing itself in the western world since the end of World War II, and this iconoclastic dynamic is looking for targets. At the same time, the political and educational leaderships, having failed to produce literacy by the traditional methods they have espoused, are more vulnerable to criticism than even before.

But it doesn't make much sense to attempt to destroy an existing system without having first evolved some superior alternatives. What is needed, it seems to me, is some large-scale comprehensive tests of writing systems designed for Modern English. Some initiative in this direction was taken at the First International Conference in 1975, but it needs to be pursued more vigorously. And to encourage interest in this whole area, we might urge universities to institute courses in "Orthographies of the Western World". Something along these lines is being considered at a university in Canada.

It was mentioned earlier that many of the terms that would normally be used to discuss this situation have lost their specificity, so that communication has become ineffective. We must change this. For example: The word "orthography", from the Greek, meaning "correct writing", has come to mean any method of spelling, including conventional English spelling, and I have used it in that way in the writing of this paper. But the fact is that conventional English spelling is not correct at all. It has, in fact, become irrational and pathogenic. But we don't have any one specific word to describe this kind of writing. So, let's coin one. How about "pathography"? From the Greek. Literally, "sick writing". Defined as follows: 1. Any form of writing characterized by disorderly, non-alphabetic use of alphabetic symbols. 2. Conventional English spelling.

The use of the term "pathography" will not by itself exercise any immediate magic, but its continuous use, particularly in connection with legal initiatives, will emphasize the pathological nature of conventional spelling, and will gradually move into proper perspective a host of unreal concepts. For example:

1. "dyslexia", "reading disability", "minimal brain damage", "hyperactive" – are all concepts, the etiology of which has been sought *in the child*, his cultural heritage, his parents, his diet, his family environment, etc. But with pathography a factor to be considered, it might very well turn out that all these so-called afflictions are nothing more than normal human defenses against a pathological influence. And the way this can be determined is by comparative tests of writing systems.
2. "comparative reading scores". These are widely regarded as absolute determinants of the teaching and/or the learning of literacy. But since we know that the same identical pathography is built right into all the tests, the results may be nothing more than the aggregate reactions to a pathological influence.
3. "sex differences in reading". It is said among educators that boys have "more difficulty learning to read" than do girls. But this notion does not take pathography into account. Once we do consider it, our new perspective gives us an entirely different interpretation. We can see now that it is the boys who tend to rise up in rebellion against any attempt to condition them to an irrational, pathogenic pattern, while the girls are more likely to go along with it. In other words, what we actually have here is not a "difficulty in learning to read", but a normal, healthy, masculine outrage against the rape of reason. The attempt, by whatever means, to suppress or overcome the male reaction against pathography is clearly a case of sex discrimination.

During this era of social upheaval to which we all are witness, the courts have been busy overturning old concepts, but they haven't yet got around to considering pathography because, so far as I know, it hasn't yet been in any court proceeding. But the legislative process is gradually evolving the bases for this. In addition to the anti-trust laws which have been around for some time, we are witnessing an accelerating legislative interest in sex discrimination, environmental protection, consumer fraud, and public health. If, at this stage, pathography is not yet thought of as an evil monopoly existing in spite of the anti-trust laws, it certainly constitutes manmade environmental pollution, and it seems clearly to be an instrument of sex discrimination. And when its pathological nature is legally established, the propagation of it will certainly be subject to the laws that safeguard the public health and the riots of

the consumer.

So much for the attack on pathography. Assuming that by the time this has been carried out we have evolved a superior writing system, how then do we manage to establish it as the new standard, replacing the old? All of the strategies I have heard about are based on the assumption that people must be made to change life-long habits, either by persuasion or mandate, either gradually or all at once. But why should it be necessary to confront an obstacle, when one may just as easily circumvent it? It seems to me that, contemporaneous with the attack on pathography, demands should be made for the bi-literate presentation of all vital public information, with the old writing system and the new, side by side. This is not unreasonable, and is only one step beyond what we already do on a word-for-word basis in the dictionaries of the English-speaking world. This arrangement (1) makes the new system available to those who wish to use it, (2) compares the merits of the two systems, (3) provides instruction in the form of a cross-reference for those curious about the new system, and (4) continues the old for those who choose to live out their lives without changing their habits.

"In the end, the better system will survive. [\[10\]](#)

Pathography: n. (Gr. *pathos* + *graphein*. Literally, sick writing).

1. Any form of writing characterized by disorderly, non-alphabetic use of alphabetic symbols.
2. Conventional English spelling.

References

1. James E. Allen, Jr., U. S. Commissioner of Education, "Right to Read-Target of the '70's" Speech of 9/23/69 in Los Angeles, Ca. to the Ann. Convention of the Nat. Assoc. of State Boards of Educ. This well-publicized presentation was the precursor of the "Right-to-Read" program.
2. Vice-Admiral James D. Watkins: Talk given Jn 22, 1977 at the San Diego Chamber of Commerce. For full text, see *Spelling Progress Bulletin*, vol. XVII, no. 4, Winter, 1977, pp 14, 15, 20.
3. For a typical educator's perspective, see the article by former director of the Federal Government's "Right-to-Read" program, Ruth B. Love, in the publication, "Reporting on Reading", vol. 4, no. 6, Sept. 1978. This periodical is produced under contract with the U. S. Dept. of Education. Copies are available without charge from CEMREL, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.
4. Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th Edition, Cambridge, 1911, under the listing, "Palaeography."
5. Vic Paulsen, TORSKRIPT, LONDON, 75.1978. TORS KRIPT PUBLISHERS, San Francisco, Ca.
6. H. J. Chaytor, FROM SCRIPT TO PRINT, 1967, October House, Inc., New York.
7. I have chosen not to list examples of this, preferring to let the readers make their own judgments. Such a list would include scholars for whose accumulations of knowledge I have great respect. But knowledge and purpose are two different things, and if the purpose is determined by unconscious factors, the accumulated knowledge becomes subordinate to it. However, here are two references the readers may wish examine for themselves, to determine to what extent, if any, the writer's positions were influenced by subjective factors:
Rudolf Flesch, WHY JOHNNY CAN'T READ, 1955, Harper & Bros., New York. See page 24.
Robert A. Hall, Jr., SOUND AND SPELLING IN ENGLISH, 1961. Chilton Books, Philadelphia. See pages 59-60.
8. Lawrence S. Kubie. PRACTICAL AND THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF PSYCHOANALYSIS, 1975. International Universities Press, Inc., New York.
9. Vic Paulsen. IMPROVED ORTHOGRAPHY, 1971, TORSKRIPT PUB., San Francisco, Ca. See pages 41-44.
10. George Bernard Shaw: In his will he gave these words.

[Spelling Reform ed Newell Tune 16.8pp99–101 in the printed version]
[Spelling Progress Bulletin Fall 1980 pp.7–10 in the printed version]

4. A Transitional Spelling Reformed for Adults and Learners – using 12 rules to regularise present English spelling, by Valerie Yule, Aberdeen, Scotland. (SR-1 used)

Introduction

Although everyone assumes that 'spelling reforms means phonetic spelling, other features may also need investigation to produce the 'best fit' orthography that can meet the sometimes conflicting requirements of learners, machines, and fluent users of English, of the educated elite and the 'educationally handicapped', of native speakers and second language learners, of the changing English language and of maintained continuity with past and present English spelling.

This paper presents the type of reform that might meet those conditions, although the final form would need to be based on empirical research, not armchair theory and informal observation. Its details are set out in a form that can be used to describe other proposals too, so that schemes can be more easily compared in their rationale and details such as sound-symbol representation.

A. A Summary of Proposals

A highly regular 'transition' spelling can be used easily by both learners and fluent readers of present English spelling.

Learners start with a sound-symbol correspondence 'Learners' Spelling' following the lines of world English Spelling, and then modify it with 12 rules and 12 sight-words as soon as the basic principles of reading are comprehended.

Current print can modify present spelling in four stages, which unmodified by the 12 rules and 12 sight words, would lead directly to Learners' Spelling. With them, 80% of running text can remain unchanged – but the problem spellings are cleared up. As it is a reform by stages, anyone can begin now, with Harry Lindgren's SR-1, (short *e* always spelt with the single *e*), and later features can be modified according to research and experience.

Electronic machines can be programmed to write and speak using the 12 rules and 12 exceptions.

More effective techniques to teach reading and writing are included as proposals in the full scheme, once present 'unreliable' spelling no longer complicates 'the reading process.'

B. Assumptions

i) Research rather than dogmatic assertion is needed about the optimum spelling for different needs – reading and writing, learners and fluent users, English-speakers and the foreign-born, machines, 'average people' and handicapped learners.

Details of the issues that need to be settled are given in the paper following this one: "How to implement spelling reform."

ii) Continuity with present spelling is essential.

iii) A perfect reform is humanly impossible. The question is not to reject reforms that are not perfect, but to work for one that will work, and that the public can accept.

iv) Spelling reformers will never be unanimous in agreement on the kind or extent of reform, and all must be prepared to make some concessions from their own preferences.

C. Specific proposals.

Specific proposals can fit on one page, or, in example form, on a card for the pocket, as can be done with most major languages – except English, French and Chinese. The first two rules produce the phonemic-based *Lerners' Speling*:

1. *All consonants* have one sound each, broadly interpreted (e.g., no distinction between voiced and unvoiced *th*). Digraphs are: *ch, sh, th, wh, zh, ng, nk*.

2. *Vowels*:

a	e	i	o	u
ae	ee	ie	oe	ue
ar/aa	er	air	or/au	
ou	oi	uu	oo	

The next ten rules modify *Lerners' Speling* to produce *Transition Speling*. As the public gradually adjusts to the changes, these rules might be progressively dropped, starting from the last.

3. Standard formal speech is represented, as in dictionary pronunciation. Where there are regional differences, preference is for that closest to present spelling, e.g., *after, dog, remember, exampl*. Unclear vowels are written *e* or *er*, without distinction between stressed and unstressed schwa, unless there is a reason learners can be told, e.g., *metal-metalic, aebl-capabl*.

4. Represent diphthongs and triphthongs by digraphs only. Place in word affects pronunciation.

ae-maelstrom	ea-real, iedea	ia-dial, India	oa-oasis	ua-dual
ai-dais, plaing	ei-deity, seing	ii-tiing	oi-oil, going	ui-gluing
ao-caos	eo-peon, radeo	io-iota, Ohio		uo-duo
	eu-mueseum	iu-glorius		

5. Medial and final vowels:

Long vowels. Within polysyllables spelt with single letters, e.g., *inovation*. *-e* construction in final syllables without consonant blend endings, e.g., *hope, hopes*, (but *biend, fienal*).

Final vowels:

banana	--	hapy	--	--
way	me	hi-fi	no	nue
ar/a	er	air	or/saw	
cow		boy	thru	

A 'pocket card' setting out the vowel rules through examples could look like this:

banana	bet	pity	not	nut
saeling/sale/say	meeting/me	hieding/	noeting/	cute/cue
far/kraal/spa	her	hide/hi	note/no	
out/cow	boil/boy	air	taut/for/saw	
		muun/thru	took	

6. 12 *homonyms* shown to be confusable in real life are distinguished by spellings that are still arguably phonemic (legitimate), e.g., *too, tuw* (and sight-word *to*), *bi, biy, ther, thair, thay'r*.

7. 12 '*sight-words*' retained, with their related words: *to/ into/ towards/ together, of off, was what, who, put, -ful, I, you, -ion ending, one/ onse/ only. ?coud /shoud / woud?*

8. *Double consonants*. *rr* if possible confusion with *er/ar/or*, e.g., *carrot, erring*. Other possible uses, e.g., for stress distinctions, e.g., *comitty-comity, desert-dessert*.

9. *Verb endings* standardised *d/ed*, e.g., *lifted, jumpd, crepd*.

10. *s* for sounds *s/z* and all plurals, except for initial *z* and words like *buz, fiz, jaz*. Voiceless final *ce* replaced by *se*, e.g., *danse, silense*, or *ss*, e.g., *class, silenss?*

11. *c* for sound *k* except to close word-roots, e.g., *clok, basking, provoke*.

12. *qu* and *gu* for sounds *cw* and *gw*.

b) *Four stages* for changing the printed word, and for adult users to change their written spelling, each at his own individual pace:

1. *Spelling reform one*. (the Australian Harry Lindgren's SR-1) Spell *e* for the short *e* sound, as in: *bet, ded, sed, frend, meny, bery, gess*.

2. "*When in doubt (dout), cut it out.*" Simply omit unnecessary silent letters: *gess, led*.

3. *Use sensible consonants*, e.g., *folograty, jeneral, enuf*. For transition Speling, modify with rules 8-12.

4. *Use a consistent vowel system*. Lerner Speling vowels modified by rules 3-5.

For minimum disruption of the present appearance of English spelling, add the special spellings listed in rules 6-7, and use rule 3 for the standard of speech.

D. *Rationale*.

How many rules are needed for a reformed spelling? Answers range from: "only one rule: one-sound-one-symbol," to Dr. Wijk's Regularized English, which accepts almost any English spelling if a rule can be found to cover it, since the major problem is the 500 odd maverick words for which no rules are possible.

"12-rule spelling" tries to reconcile the needs and abilities of learners and fluent readers. The key is "Easy to remember," hence the arbitrary limit, the systematic setting-out, and catchy slogans. A stage at a time for adults means minimal disruption of the appearance of English text, gradual acclimatisation of users, and reform that can begin concurrently with research.

a) *Rationale of specific proposals*.

1. "Diaphonic" broad-band rather than precise phonetic sound-symbol correspondence, to minimise learners' difficulties in sound-discrimination and problems with regional differences. Spelling as

reasonable conventions to represent sounds – not "photographs."

2. *Vowels*. World English Spelling is the guide, except that unclear vowels are spelt with *e/er* rather than *u/ur* on the grounds that excess of the less familiar letters produces more affront in the present readers. *ue/uu/u* are the suggested pattern for *due/muun/tabu* rather than *ue/oo/oo*. To avoid the print disturbance of *puut* and *-ful* which 'look shocking', *put* and *-ful* are sight-words in Transition Spelling.

3. Children and foreigners learning to read English are often baffled in pronunciation of words when they do not follow the usual principle of stress on the first syllable. Written material for learners can therefore use *underlining* or *italics* to show how to read words with irregular stress.

Learners will naturally *begin* to write *according* to how they speak, but material for them to read will be as close as possible to standard formal speech. They may have reading books with large print Lerner Spelling and small print Transitional, later reversed, but Lerner Spelling remains for rendering pronunciation.

Everyone comprehends standard speech on the media and on tapes, whatever their own dialect English, and so it will be easy for children to learn to spell it as they become accustomed to transition reading and learn the reliable rules of transition spelling.

4. *Diphthongs and triphthongs*. Any spelling reform will still leave a few odd words difficult to manage, but they are no reason for abandoning a partial reform. The best solution may be ellipsis of letters rather than excessive clumsiness, e.g., *poetry*, *co-operation*, *dieresis*, *medieval*.

5. *Modifications to the basic vowel pattern* seek to preserve as much as possible of the appearance of English text by using the most common patterns applying to different positions in words and following modern trends to economy. However, experiment is needed about the value of frequency as a guide to retention of spelling forms – and if frequency, what sort? Of letters, of blends, of rhyming forms, or position in words?

Since learners' difficulty is known to increase with length of words, experiments may show that learners as well as fluent readers identify polysyllabic words more easily if medial long vowels are spelt with single letters, e.g., *education* rather than *educaetion*.

A word-count might also show that Chomskian principles of representing 'lexical structure' operated as much or more often in transitional spelling as it does so haphazardly in present English spelling: e.g., *fli-flies-fliet*, *apli-aplies-apliense-aplication*, *ferosity-feroshus-feerse*, (*fly-flies-flight*, *apply-applies-appliance-aplication*, *ferocity-ferocious-fierce*). Note also the economy of paper, time, and memory.

"Magic e". The *-e* construction for long vowels is a clumsy strategy and troubles learners. It should be dropped as soon as adult readers can be acclimatised to an improvement that does not affect letter sequence.

6. *Homographs*. Should any homographs, future or existing now, be distinguished to prevent possible confusion? (e.g. *letter*, or *reader* – the person and the book). Most suppositious confusions never occur in practice, e.g., you *cannot* say, "The sun's rays meet," and you *don't* say, "The sons raise meat," altho you *could* say, "The engine has a tender behind." The odds are a hundred to one that you have not noticed the homographs already on this page as typewritten. Even excluding verb-noun pairs and the multiple distinctions made by a good dictionary, there are 35 of them, from *standard*, *speech*, *spell*,

rules, can, will, to present, distinguished, book, practice, page, type, even, and only 18 of them are homophones threatened by reform, e.g., their, so, be, for, to, no, all, by.

7. *Sight-words*. A major barrier to spelling reform is that some very common and very irregular words would look very odd for a while. The interim solution is to leave a few 'sight-words' that occur very frequently in running text. An arbitrary number of 12 is easy to remember, and dull learners who at present cannot cope with 40 sight-words, let alone thousands, can confidently learn and remember merely 12. The *-ion* construction is included because it occurs continually in newspapers and textbooks, and is shared in similar forms by all modern languages with Western links, particularly in the international realm of science. Learners can be shown how our *shn, schn, zhn* pronunciations of *-tion, -stion, -sion* endings are slurrings from a more precise enunciation.

9. Some *grammatical markers* are retained pending research on the actual value for fluent reading and learner-ease. The latter point could be clarified by analysis of i.t.a. children's spelling, since they have the options of *-t* and *-d* for participles and a reversed *z* which looks like *s* for plurals and verbs. And how do they transfer to present spelling on these?

10. Experiments may support the observation that child and foreign learners who initially pronounce all *s* spellings of *z* sound as voiceless actually sound no worse than Welsh. But there is evidence that adult readers are affronted by the greater use of the relatively unfamiliar *z* in spelling reforms, and it may be expedient while first obtaining regularity to generalise more familiar letters except where the rarer letters are normally expected.

The expedient of using *-se* to indicate final voiceless *s* except in plurals, to avoid frequent confusions such as *peace* and *peas*, is a clumsy interim measure to make the best of the current alternatives English readers accept at present – *impasse, glass, rinse, dance, coalesce*. What would be better?

11. In any complete spelling reform, *k* will almost certainly be a significant letter, and so must be retained. However, at present it can affront, like *z*, since *c* is more familiar, so the attempt is to provide the most simple rule possible to govern maximum occurrence in a familiar position. *K* should be used, instead of *c*, before *e* and *i*, when sounded as *k*.

12. In the interim, the present invariable rule of spelling the sounds *cw* and *gw* with *qu* and *gu* are retained to maintain the present appearance of print. However, anomalies like *queue, lacquer* and *guess* are changed, altho *cue, racer* and *gess* will appear as minor oddities while they are still unfamiliar.

Summary.

This is a simple and economical reform, that requires popular support but not vast funds to be adopted gradually.

It maintains the basic appearance and continuity of English spelling while cutting out much of the unpredictability. The table below compares word changes in transliterated passages from:

- A. Running text from the introduction to *New Spelling*, in transition spelling.
- B. Running text from "the *worst* English spelling possible," collected in *The story of the Beautiful Princess* (Appendix 1), i.e., maximum change needed.
- C. *New Spelling* introduction, excluding repeated words, in transition spelling.
- D. The same in Dr. Wijk's *Regularized English* (Wijk, p.324).
- E. Transition spelling, excluding repeated words, 'The Beautiful Princess.'
- F. The same for the first three paragraphs of the Gettysburg Address.

	A	B	C	D	E	F
No change except omission of surplus letters	83%	81%	81%	79%	46%	71%
Total words shortened (including changed)	20%	22%	22%	10%	41%	30%
Total words lengthened	2%	3%	3%	5%	3%	2%
Total words with letter changes	15%	18%	18%	21%	52%	28%
Total words completely retained	66%	63%	63%	72%	30%	54%

Conclusion?

Transition spelling is designed to be easily read and learnt from both directions, by those just beginning from an initial Lerner's Spelling and by already fluent readers. It seeks to be as close to present spelling as possible with as few rules as possible. Twelve rules plus 12 sight-words can achieve close similarity to the appearance of the printed word today while cutting out the brambles and dead wood that, worldwide, hinder literacy in the English language.

Reform can begin now, by everyone, with Lindgren's *e* for the short *e* sound, as in *bet*, concurrent with action research on the next steps.

The scheme is set out in a form that could be a useful structure for the presentation and comparison of all schemes for spelling improvement.

Acknowledgements: This paper is the product of discussion and correspondence with many spelling reform colleagues, including those at the 1979 Conference, where Dr. John Beech, particularly, influenced my thinking.

Key background reading:

Chomsky, N. "Phonology and Reading" in Levin, H. and Williams, J.P. (Eds.) *Basic Studies on Reading*, N.Y.: Basic Books, 1970.

Chomsky, C. "Reading, Writing and Phonology" *Harvard Educational Review*, 1970, v. 40, pp. 287-310.

Lindgren, Harry, *Spelling Reform, a new Approach*. Alpha Books, Sydney, Australia, 1969.

Pitman, Sir James, and St. John, J. *Alphabets and Reading*, London: Pitman, 1969.

Wijk, Axel. *Regularized English*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1959.

Yule, Valerie. "Is there evidence for Chomsky's interpretation of English spelling?", *Spelling Progress Bulletin* v. 18, n. 4, 1978, pp. 10-12.

Appendix I

An example of Transition Spelling, showing an average degree of change in running text:

"The worst spelling possible," the story of the Beautiful Princess, is recommended for spelling reformers in fun or earnest, to see the maximum change that their reforms could produce. Here it is in transition spelling:

"Onse upon a time the buetiful dauter of a grate majition wonted more perls to put among her trezhers. 'Look thru the senter of the muun when it is blu,' sed her muther in anser to her question. 'Yu mite fiend yor hart's desier.' The prinsese lafd becos she douted these werds. Insted she used her imagination, muuud into the fotografy bisnese and took pictuers of the luuner sfere in culer. 'I perseve moest sertenly that it aulways aperes hoely white," she thaut. She aulso found that she coud ern enuf muny in ate munths to biy herself tuw luvly, huje, enormus nue juwels tuu."

[Spelling Reform ed Newell Tune t7.1 pp109–111 in the printed version]

Section 7

5. Ways of implementing Spelling Reform

Since it is equally as important to find out how simplified spelling may or should be put into use, this section is devoted to such planning.

[Spelling Progress Bulletin Fall 1980 pp10–12 in the printed version]

How to Implement Spelling Reform, by Valerie Yule

Spelling reformers must consider the needs, attitudes, and abilities of the people who are to use reformed spelling. A theoretically perfect phonemic spelling might prove impractical for general and technological use even if public resistance to its introduction were overcome.

This paper looks at aspects of 'the psychology of spelling' – practical criteria to consider in designing a more efficient orthography and planning its introduction, with techniques of consumer education and marketing.

Most of the ideas in this paper are not my own – they have come from many colleagues in spelling reform – Kingsley Read, William Reed, Sir James Pitman, Axel Wijk, Newell Tune, Helen Bisgard, Arnold Rupert, Reg. Deans, Vic Paulsen, Harry Lindgren – and none of them may agree with all of it. It also brings in concepts from my own discipline of psychology and its concern for human communication.

The time for spelling reform is now riper than it has been for hundreds of years. The old snob arguments are ridiculed and empty, while the mass illiteracy problem is increasingly serious. The audiovisual media which threaten to supplant print have their own advantages but cannot supply the dimension that reading and writing contribute to civilisation. The sacred cow of English spelling stands wobbling while all around the rest of the world is changing dramatically, faster and faster, and nowhere faster than in the field of communications. How can the drive for change, efficiency, economy, and logic be directed to spelling – this vital tool, – or idol?

How can the remaining impediments to spelling reform be tackled? The old arguments keep reappearing despite their continuing refutation, and reappear dressed in new words too, so that it would be worth while to devise one-page sheets that could be patiently, silently, handed out whenever someone glibly recites "Homophones!" or "Etymology" or "Dialects" or "Our English Heritage!" or "the beauty of funny spelling!" or "Chomsky!" or "Multi-Systematic Information Processing!" or "Finance!" or "Impossible!"

The basic argument behind these excuses is the vested interests against change of those who have learnt present spelling and imagine anything new would be just as tortuous as their original learning experiences. As people become less cultured, they either hang on to English spelling as the empty shell of their culture, or 'couldn't care less' for either maintenance or improvement of spelling. Yet the varying motives that impede reform could also in varying degrees be turned to its support, and the insights and techniques even if not the money, of commercial marketing can be directed towards the changing public's attitudes.

Public rejection of spelling reform has been helped by the public image for which spelling reformers have been responsible – a multitude of schemes which almost completely change the appearance of 'the word as we know it,' some seeming almost perverse in their determination to use the familiar in contrary ways. The immediate 'Ugh!' reaction prevents any further enquiry or attention. While the neat new script of i.t.a. probably attracted as well as repelled support, its special type has prevented i.t.a. spelling from percolating into the word beyond school.

Spelling reform can only be achieved by looking at what is practicable, not at dogmatic idealism about what would be perfect; arguments must deal in evidence rather than in opinion. Public participation is crucial for reform – unless we become so generally illiterate that literacy has to be brought in again like a new thing in the Dark Ages after the fall of the Roman Empire, or we are so socially disrupted that a dictatorship takes over, or big business discovers a spelling technology for its machines that will save millions. The latter is quite possible, in which case a sweeping change in the whole orthography could occur irrespective of human needs. Certainly no change in the alphabet itself has a chance unless it meets the needs of international electronic technology, and all spelling reformers interested in this area should develop communications expertise and the right contacts.

The need for facts and evidence

I think Harry Lindgren is right in saying, "Let's get on with Spelling Reform 1, short *e* spelt *e* as in *bet*, and not get bogged down with excuses for research." But while we are getting on with it, concurrently we should be finding out facts and promoting experiments to ensure that the next steps are not based on armchair philosophising so that time is wasted on doctrinaire argument or in finding out too late that what is ideal in theory is bugged in practice.

It has been assumed that an essential criterion for English spelling reform is accurate sound-symbol correspondence. Experiments in initial teaching media prove that this makes English easier to learn to read and to write. But what makes one system any better than another system? You can invent yourself in an afternoon a script that would be easier to learn to read and write than present spelling, e.g., Tolkien's Middle Earth script, which teenagers pick up quickly for their private communication. But what is a basis for comparison?

We need to find the reformed spelling that is the 'best fit' for a number of possibly competing requirements. We need re-analysis of the vast volumes on spelling research which have mostly focused on the problems of 'bad spellers' rather than the problems of 'bad spelling.' We should devise and publicise a list of 'research on spelling that needs to be done' not only in laboratories but in schools and the market-place, by teachers and the general public as well as by linguists, psychologists and educators. Every dogmatic statement by every expert needs to be tested, not quoted. To make English spelling an effective tool for human beings to use, we need to collate the evidence on the essential requirements for the following:

1. Easily mastered by the present literate population, and presented so well that they quickly discover how easy and beneficial it is. Without this, nothing can happen. This includes immediate 'face validity' and comprehension, rapid development of superior reading fluency, and easy stages to learn to write if necessary.
2. Easy to learn to read and write (not identical demands) by learners who are bright, dull, handicapped, adult failures, second language learners (again, not identical demands).

3. Useful for modern technology – for machines, their human operators and human users, easy, efficient and economical for machine-processing, typing, and handwriting.
4. Easy and cheap to get started, "saving millions and costing next to nothing," and demonstrably saving millions.
5. For the present at least, resembling present spelling as sufficiently closely, to keep books currently in print accessible as Medieval English in the future, with its greater changes.
6. A composite standard English spelling that crosses dialects, and enables children and foreigners to pronounce the new vocabulary learnt thru reading. Action research can teach and can change attitudes and provide feedback for further change, in the very process of testing and experimentation on how and what changes can be made.

Psychological research on human abilities may prove more relevant than linguistic research. The human capacity to switch set is a crucial area to resolve arguments about spelling transition – whether co-existing alternatives would confuse, about homographs in context, and dialectal variations in vowel representation, and the possibility of 'bi-literate' books in learning, and spelling conventions that can represent a common 'speech' across wide dialectal variations. We already know how we adapt without conscious effort to reading regardless of typeface, handwriting or letter-case, and how practised spelling reformers can switch from their own to conventional spelling, reading both with equal ease, and how children and adults can switch the languages they speak according to the situation.

We need to be well-informed on the 'natural trends' of spelling today, as shown in common spelling mistakes, experiments in free choice of spelling, and commercial and technological trends. Can this 'organic' change be accelerated constructively? (See Appendix I for some of the questions that require answers from practically-oriented research.)

I would like to see the proposals of spelling reformers set out in a standard form for easier comparability and investigation (See the previous paper, SPB Fall 1980 p.8).

Some ideas that have been popular with individual reformers may fail on the practicability account, however ingenious. It would be better to develop 'better' new letters than to divert existing letters to other strange purposes, which would make it fiendishly impossible even for scholars to read old books. Schemes start off handicapped if they require new keyboards or complicate writing and typing, and diacritics, etc. need research about what happens to visual scanning fluency.

Experience shows that you cannot assume that a thoroly reformed system adopted in schools will spread to the community around them as the children grow up. The children have to adapt to the world of print around them, not vice versa.

Stages in spelling reform

We are left with the example of other countries that have successfully reformed their spelling in stages. In the previous paper I describe the stages of a possible scheme and how it could operate from two directions – learning with a basically phonemic initial learning spelling in schools, and a first stage of reform that could be begun by anyone, everyone, anywhere at any time, consistently or more likely, inconsistently, causing no more disruption to the appearance of print than the usual misprints in your favorite daily newspaper. I have taken Harry Lindgren's SR-1 as the starting point: spell short *e* with as in *bet* – because it is a reform that has already made a start, it operates as a logical principle, not a

slippery list; it acclimatizes the public gently to the idea of change as a good thing and how easily it could operate, and it is likely to be a part of almost any eventual full reform. Even if it were not, switching the single spelling *e* would be easier with the cleaning up of the present tangle of *ai*, *ea*, *ei*, *ie*, *oe*, *e*, *ay*, and *eu*, *ue*.

My own hypothesis is that it is likely that learners will prove to have different needs than fluent users, as occurs in all fields of skill, from flying and motor-racing to sewing, and Learner Spelling will need to include steps that can be omitted and elided for greater fluency in skilled reading and writing.

Stages of spelling reform (e.g., the 4 stages I suggest) will inevitably be adopted unevenly through the community, as even the government-sponsored switch to metrication has to percolate, with some areas changing faster than others and the few intransigents who will never take to it. For every group there are different incentives for change as well as resistance, and this is the encouraging thing to guide present action in attitude-changing and starting actual change. These stages could be:

1. Good for you if you can get the support of politicians, big business, millionaires, publishers and public figures who can promote Stage 1 as house-rules on a large scale, and promote research and initial learning media.
2. Educators who do not actually teach children (or are such superb teachers it doesn't matter what they teach) are often vested interests against change, just as the horse trade opposed motorcars. Teachers who are nearer the nits and grits, faced with educationally disadvantaged children or even their own spelling or teaching problems, commonly sigh for rescue in a hopeless sort of way. If they could be shown how to teach the underlying structure of English, so that they and the children could distinguish it from the dead wood and brambles, both teachers and children will become aware of how easy spelling reform could be, and *how spelling* could be changed. (Most adults today have had present spelling conditioned into them, without understanding it, and have an unspoken fear, "Don't touch it, it might explode.") There would be the spin-off and incentive too, that children would be more confident in successful criticising of conventional spelling. "That word is sensible, that word is silly, but I'm not silly," is far better than so many children's present hopelessness, "I can't understand it, so I must be silly."

3. *Marketing spelling reform to the public*

On initial presentation of an innovation, habit strength operates against it, but the more people are able to actually try it out, i.e., act positively, the more chance that negative habit strength is reduced and alien feelings change to personal identification, particularly if a band-wagon effect can develop.

Other aims of marketing are to strengthen the mental reach and change the set idea that there is only one proper way to spell, while the freedom of choice prevents the trigger-reaction to any schemes with 'compulsion' whatever the public good may be. Public and expert contribution of ideas could be valuable when spelling reform is a fashionable subject for public discussion, play and even private experiment, instead of a sacred cow, paper tiger or taboo too horrible to touch. 'Bugs' in proposals can be weeded out. 'Democratic' spelling reform could become a painless *fait accompli*, that could be tidied up and ratified on an official basis or an improved system then introduced to a now more open-minded public.

Some marketing proposals

a. Promote *books* for libraries, e.g., Godfrey Dewey, Pitman & St. John, Harry Lindgren. Light-hearted books of 'Spelling Games' and Penguin-type books for the general on the Psychology of Spelling, and

Spelling and Society, are also desirable. A set of one-page Answers to Everything. A set of research topics for investigation, for tertiary institutions and students seeking useful topics.

b. *Articles* across as wide a spectrum of the media as possible, inviting public participation and comment-stimulating, amusing and informative, e.g.:

"Permissive spelling, how far would you go?"

"Your child and That Spelling"

"Your spellingscope".

"Shocking or Fascinating? Try your hand at spelling reform."

"Britain's Industrial Fossil." "Do you remember . . . ? Readers recall spelling incidents in their childhood.

"How YOU can help in bringing about spelling reform."

c. *TV documentary on Spelling*. Includes colorful history, scenes of past and present teaching, audience participation in demonstration of some of the astonishing facts about how we read and spell, a procession of current reading-teaching equipment, interviews with boffins, children, social workers, remedial readers, adult illiterates, delinquents, in flash-scenes from all over the country.

d. *Panel games* for radio and TV. A weekly five minutes on radio could also *follow the progress* of children and foreners learning to read conventional spelling and a consistent spelling.

e. *Radio playlets*, comic and satirical, in which one character speaks exactly what he reads, e.g., "Onky upon a timmy," "The miggrant whoe spelt likky an angle," "The miggrant's traggedye,"

f. *Word games* and other party games, including ways to use spelling reform in games alrely on the market, e.g., Scrabl; A book of Party and Family Games.

g. *Pop lyrics* for pop groups, e.g., "Break the Spell," "As difficult as ABC," "Reading turns you on." Comic verses, e.g., "I get my kicks when I try to spell."

h. *Cartoons and catchy cards* for sale.

i. *Materials, gifts, gajets and gimiks* for Christmas, birthdays and Spelling Day. An angle for "the person who has everything." New items appear to keep up interest. Souvenirs of Spelling Reform. A Spelender Calender. Magic Spell wrapping paper, Weirdo writing kits, T-shirts, badges, stickers, spelling kits, the conservation and energy-saving angle, contributions to Small Planet and Responsible Living groups. A mascot doll, a logo for spelling reform with a catchy title, how-to-do-it pocket cards, posters and friezes, desk-stuff.

j. *Stamps and stickers* for correspondence, letterheds, envelopes, etc.

k. Try to get *bi-literate reading books* on trial, and 'spelling cribs' for learners' reading books. Trial runs of modified spelling for social services information, regulations, parent education, etc. for semi-literate groups.

l. *Support by word and action* every sign you see of improved spelling, e.g., SR-1 in journals, mor sensible spelling in ads, trademarks, work-manuals, etc. Whatever your profession, encourage your trade journal and local media to try SR-1 (with or without publicity, to see if anyone notices/objects).

Write letters to newspapers. Be a lobbyist. Encourage organizations working for related issues, e.g., Better English, International Communication, etc. to make their English and communication better still. Bring spelling and spelling reform as a live issue into professional journals and conferences. Keep a supply of relevant literature yourself so you are 'always prepared,' with a handy publicity package and background facts. Keep your eyes open, in personal observation and personal experiments, and contribute your own findings to your spelling reform group records.

m. Obtain *sponsorship* for whatever you can.

n. *Spelling Day*, September 30. The idea of Australian Dr. Doug. Everingham, M.H.R., former Labor Government Minister for Health (sic) was for SR-1 Day, so that every year there can be another wave of publicity and promotion, with the ideas already suggested. Press releases can be sent out and notices put up on the lines of "Appendix 2."

(The ideas in this paper follow from previous articles in *Spelling Progress Bulletin*:
"Some causes of illiteracy and recommendations for action," v. xv, n. 4, 3-10, 1975.
"Spelling reform: arguments pro and con," v. xvi, n. 1, 11-20, 1976.
"Let us be practical about spelling reform," v. xix, n. 1, 7-9, 1979.

The third article contains some further essential detail not included here.)

Appendix 3: *Some recommendations for research*

So many researchers take trivial topics that at least we could publicise needed ones – experiments, surveys, questionnaires, observational analyses, for every relevant discipline in universities, teachers' colleges, etc. Background courses on orthographies at secondary level can enlighten Anglo-Saxons on what the rest of the world can do, and how it is done. Surveys can put ideas into the heads of participants, and make them think, if they did not before. (One such questionnaire by Barrie Smith appears in *Spelling Progress Bulletin*, v. xvi, n. 1, 19, 1976.)

The field is not just for linguists and reading academics, but requires working with communications engineers, teachers, publishers, psychologists, media boffins, learners, foreners.

What actual value in *using* spelling are semantic, morphemic, syntactic, lexical, etc. factors, above and beyond phonemic correspondences? Should English spelling be reformed to make at least consistent the benefits that linguistic supporters claim are reasons to maintain it as it is?

How many of the complex factors in 'the reading process' would be superfluous in a reliable, predictable spelling system? Are these factors those which most handicap poor learners at present? Are we handicapping the already handicapped for the sake of the verbally proficient who need additional help least?

How efficient a spelling would the trends of 'natural spelling change' develop anyway if custom slackened so that dictionaries caught up with current practices? Are people just a bit mystical about 'organic language change' when they call upon 'instinctive forces' rather than rational endeavour?

(And see the complementary paper preceding this which puts forward specific details which require more objective evaluation than personal judgements, e.g., re: accuracy of phonemic representation, usefulness of phonics in conventional spelling, the value of economy of space, etc.)

[Spelling Progress Bulletin Fall 1980 p13 in the printed version]

6. September 30 an international day for Spelling-Spotting

ON SPOT-A-SPELLING DAY – or any day give maximum publicity to improving English spelling

Conservatives look hard at every spelling they use. Is it any use to them or to anyone else?

Teachers and students at school explore English spelling. (Prepare Friday 28 Sept.)

Find the basic structure under the dead wood and barbed wire.

(This will help you to spell present spelling better too.)

Compare the spelling of other languages. Why are they so easy to learn?

Why are French and Chinese the only other major scripts still not reformed?

How did other countries manage to reform **their** spellings?

Write a page of a reading book with the spelling traps cleaned up and see if your slow learners can read it. Tell them, 'No traps'!

Everyone

Try Spelling Reform 1 for the day.

Spell the sound **e** plain **e** as in **bet**.

"Start with short **e** as in **sed**.

Redy, stedy, go ahead!"

Try "spelling how you would like to spell".

Invent your own spelling too, like Tolkien's Middle-Earth script.

It's sure to be easier than present English spelling to learn

Look around you.

How many silly spellings do you see today?

how many words with too many letters?

how many words with too few letters?

how many words can't be spoken just as they are written?

how many words can't be written just as they are spoken?

how many words are perfectly all right?

how many could be spelt with short e (SR-1 words?)

See how many spelling mistakes you see today.

how many are your own?

How many people do you see who cannot read or write English properly? who find it too hard?

September 30

A Day for Spelling Watching

A Day for Spelling Improvement A Day for Spelling Reform

"30 Days hath September

Spelling Reform to Remember – now add your own couplets ...

(and remember – Tomorrow's fashions always look crazy today.)

SOMETHING EASY YOU CAN DO FOR THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF THE CHILD

Help to start making English spelling easier NOW

7. Reading and Writing in English, by S. Bakowski.*

*Leicester, England.

Presented at the Second International SSS Conference on Reading and Spelling held July 1979 at Nene College, Northampton.

To begin with, I should explain why, being Polish, with limited knowledge of English, I got involved with a problem which might seem mainly the business of English-speaking people. I was always interested in the question of a so-called international language, that could be understood by the whole world. I would choose English as the most suitable. It has very simple grammar, no declensions and logical conjugation. The weak side of English is its extremely complicated orthography, or so-called spelling. Most other languages are 'phonetic' or nearly so. Letter *a* is pronounced as in 'art', *e* as in 'let', etc. But not so in English. The letter *a* is pronounced in 8 different ways, the letter *e* in 6 ways, the letter *i* in 5 ways, letter *o* in 9 ways, letter *u* in 8 ways, as in *quite*, *bury*, *busy*, *but*, *full*, *rule*, *turn*, *use*. This leads to many difficulties in reading and writing. The results of the difference between spelling and pronunciation can be illustrated by examination papers of students in a further education college, as described in the *Daily Telegraph* of 7.8.77, with spelling 'errors' such as *burch*, *crum*, *duct*, *enormus*, *slac*, *saiv*, *werst*, *awfull*, *rinckles*, *experteese*. The situation is explained as due to overcrowded classrooms, laziness of pupils and students, and lack of discipline. All this may be true, but I think the most important factor is complexity of English spelling. As you know, English was formed from a few completely different languages several centuries ago. At the beginning, it was probably more or less phonetic. Gradually with time both pronunciation and spelling were changing. There was a time when the word such was read and spelt differently in various parts of the country.

Eventually the spelling became stabilised but the speaking continued to change; so now we have two languages, one living and spoken, the other the old obsolete spelling.

How can we get out of this situation? Since we cannot change the spoken language itself, we can only reform the spelling.

My proposals are for a phonetic spelling, with a dictionary that should be checked by linguists and accepted by the Parliament. The following are my ideas, as someone who has had to learn English the hard way, not as his native tongue.

English contains 27 sounds which can be represented by the same number of letters. Most of them, like *b*, *d*, *f*, *k*, *m*, *n*, *p*, *s*, *t*, *v* and *z* retain their usual straightforward pronunciations. From the other sounds, *ch* is pronounced as in *church*, *g* as in *giv*, *e* as in *get*, *h* – with a slight blow, *i* as in *it*, *ng* and *nk* as at present; *r* is pronounced less distinctly or even totally omitted in the middle and particularly at the end of some words. Double consonants are written as single ones as they are not needed to show the short

vowels, and so are double vowels unless the difference is distinctly audible. The effect of so-called 'long vowels' is not taken into account.

The so-called 'silent letters' are omitted. If the proper pronunciation of the word is unknown, it can be found in one of the specialised dictionaries: Daniel Jones' *'Everyman's English Dictionary'* (1975), or J. Windsor Lewis' *'A Concise Pronouncing Dictionary of British and American English'* (1972).

Words can be compiled in the form of a special dictionary (see appendix). Each page is divided into 3 columns. On the left is the usual spelling, in the middle as they are pronounced or written using one possible spelling system (B), on the right using another system (Z), closer to usual spelling and which might be used as a transition to (B).

The disadvantage of system B is that it differs considerably from the present system to which people are accustomed. To make things easier, further symbols can be added: c=k as in cat, c=s as in cent, ch=k as in chemist, g=j as general.

y in place of i as in *sticky* or *boy*

x is sounded as ks in *six*, or gz as in *exam*. For *ph* use *f*.

Here are some examples using this spelling system Z with its compromises with the present system:

Numbers: wan, twu, thrii, foor, six, thertiin, foortiin, forty.

Drinks: woter, tii, coffi, shery, gin

Animals: cat, caw, shiip, giraf, eip

For comparision, here are some sentences written .in System B and System Z.

System B. Aur family konsists of for pipl, maiself, mai waif and tu children, Jorj and Airin. Jorj is sikstiin. Hi attends e ferder ediukeishn kolej. In de fiucher Jorj laiks to bikam e kemist. Airin pleis with adher gerls and bois in e plei-grup.

System Z. Aur family consists of foor pipl, mayself, may waif and twu children, George and Airin. George is sixtiin. Hi attends e ferdher ediuceishen college. In dhe fiucher hi laiks to bicam e chemist. Airin pleys with adher gerls and boys in e pley-grup.

Appendix

Phonetic Dictionary

<i>Present Spelling</i>	<i>Pronunciation Spelling B</i>	<i>Proposed Spelling Z</i>
I	ai	I (exception)
under	ander	ander
beautiful	biutiful	biutiful
change	cheinj	cheinge
cheque	chek	cheq
direction	direkshn	direcshen
photograph	fotograf	photograph
girl	gerl	gerl
here	hi e(r)	hier
hear	hi(r)	hir
electric	elektrik	electric
general	genral	genral
character	karakte(r)	character
queen	kwin	quin
minute (adj.)	mainiut	mainiut
minute (noun)	minit	minit
knight	nait >	(k)nait
all	ol	oll
always	olweis	olweys
people	pipl	pipl
write	rait >	(w)rait
true	tru	tru
weep	wip	wiip
water	wote(r)	woter
when	when	when
where	whe(r)	whey
why	whai	whay

Note: In parentheses= sometimes not pronounced.

Editorial comment: The lesson to be derived from this paper is that a foreigner with an imperfect command of English is so appalled by our inconsistent spelling that he wants to help us change it. And no wonder that he found it difficult!

We should be ashamed of our system of spelling and appreciate the fact that some foreigners want to do something about it to make it easier for them to learn English.

[Spelling Progress Bulletin Fall 1980 pp15,16 in the printed version]

8. The Sensible Solution to Simplified Spelling: One Sound-One Symbol, by Hugh V. Jamieson.*

*Dallas, Tx.

What is functional literacy? According to one modern dictionary, it is the ability to read well enough to function in a complex society. In Dallas the School Board has also included mathematics, citizenship, science, and health as part of a basic education.

A functional ability in mathematics, citizenship, science, and health has, by the very nature of things, to be accomplished by a functional use of reading and writing. However, the broad use of mis functional symbols to form words has been a tormenting handicap during the whole development of language.

A child is born with an amazing instinct for logic, starting with how he gets his first meal and lasting until he begins learning to write words he has just learned to speak. From then on he is forced to cultivate illogical reasoning by our present spelling system.

Students representing thirty North Texas Counties, for many years, have been attending the Dallas News Spelling Bee. They misspell an average of one out of fifteen words. For the thirty best out of one hundred thousand, that is not a very good indication of a high literacy average.

And there is one development occurring, as seen in magazine advertisements, on which educators should take prompt action. Before long printing machines will be turning out newspapers one completely spelled word at a time from a bank of prespelled words, all using the present illogical spelling system.

Believe it or not, by a thirty-thousand word 'one sound-one symbol' dictionary, I have shown that there are over sixty-thousand misuse of symbols in our present spelling system. That is why it takes from kindergarten through high school for the average child to become functional in reading and spelling. I have discovered that our alphabet has an even forty symbols that are each recognized universally for one particular sound. Unfortunately, they are misused so very often for other sounds in other words that our spelling has to be learned by rote and not by a system.

In this presentation, I will describe a workable 'one sound-one symbol' system for spelling the English language.

The first thing we require are symbols to exclusively represent the Long Vowel sounds. The capital letters A, E, I, O, and U (but don't say yU) are the best symbols for the long vowel sounds because they invariably are responded to with those sounds.

Here are some examples:

Long A

bA kr (baker), e ju kA shun (education), 47 stAts (47 states), dAn jr (danger), bAthh (bathe).

Long E

frE (free), siks tEn (sixteen), ab sun tE (Absentee), rEd ing (reading), prE am bul (preamble), u grEd (agreed).

Long I

be hind (behind), ek sIt ing (exciting), rIt ov lIf (right of life), tIm (time).

Long O

chOk (choke), sOl (soul), felQ (fellow), fOr un (foreign), wOr (wore), fOrs (force), Or_u tOri (oratory).

Long U

mUv munt (movement), trUthh (truth), sank chU eri, (sanctuary), kon stu tUshun (constitution), skU nr (schooner).

In our present spelling system, the vowel letters are used to represent a wide variety of different sounds. Using the capital letters to represent the *long vowel* sounds provides a unique and readily recognized symbol for pronunciation and spelling.

However, it is equally important that the lower case vowel letters also each have one unique sound represented by that symbol. Thus, we must learn to use the little *a* as in *at*, little *e* as in *end*, little *i* as in *it*, little *o* as in *on*, little *u* as in *up*. That is: *a(t)*, *e(nd)*, *i(t)*, *o(n)*, and *u(p)*.

Here are some examples:

short *a*

grat tu tUd (gratitude), alfu bet ik (alphabetic), plat fOrm, avu nU (avenue), fash un (fashion).

short *e*

reg_yu lAt (regulate), nev r (never), ben u fak tr (benefactor), sin seruti (sincerity), er (air).

short *i*

dam ij (damage), di rekt link (direct link), ri stOr (restore), yirz (years), hit (here), fir (fear).

short *o*

pol usi (policy), hord (hard), kom mun welth (commonwealth), kon grus (congress), porti (party).

short *u*

in nuf (enough), sug jes tid (suggested), sov run (sovereign), un dr (under), dek u dunt (decadent).

In our present spelling there is no way of telling whether a capital vowel letter at the beginning of a word or the beginning of a sentence is to be pronounced as a *long* or *short* vowel. In my phonetics this will be corrected by a singular quote mark after the capital letter meaning it is to be pronounced as a short vowel.

For example:

Hiz nAm iz A'nderson (His name is Anderson).

E'vrithing iz redE tU gO (Everything is ready to go).

So much for the long and short vowels. Now we come to the one letter in our alphabet that is never identified as a letter with the same sound it identifies in words. Whether you realize it or not, the response to 'r' is always the same as 'ur'. Therefore the 'r' symbol is always the sound with or without a preceding vowel such as *burn* or *bring*.

Here are some examples:

letter r

in k1Oz hr (enclosure), fig yrz (figures), wrk (work), ad vr t1z rz (advertisers), wrld (world).

The next symbol to examine is 'au'. The 'au' sound is a definite vowel sound, probably as well identified in the word *automobile* as any. Why does a dictionary use a confusing diacritic over a symbol that normally represents another sound, to represent identically the same sound in words like *walk*, *talk*, and *balk*?

Here are some examples of the 'au' sound:

au thhr (author), *aul* (all), *naut* (nought); *wauk* (walk), *lau* lus nus (lawlessness).

symbol 'oo'

The double-o symbol in our present spelling represents so many sounds in so many different words few people can think off-hand of a single definite sound for it. Well, it has one exemplified in the word 'book,' and another in 'boot.' The teaching of English has never included the teaching of individual parts of words. It should be done and is easy to do for the first time in 'one sound-one symbol' spelling.

Here are some uses of the oo-symbol:

stood (stood), *roorul* (rural), *sik yoor uti* (security), *poor* (poor), in *shoor* uns (insurance).

Now let's examine the digraph symbols. The 'ch', 'sh', 'th', 'thh' are digraph symbols that have been accepted in our language for over 500 years and their combined sound is different from the sound of any of the letters alone.

symbol 'ch'

vouch (vouch), *cher uti* (charity), *kwes chun* (question), *chal unjd* (challenged), *mon or ki* (monarchy).

symbol 'sh'

washing (washing), *shin* (shine), *ri tal EA shun* (retaliation), *shal* (shall), *shAv* (shave).

symbol 'th'

that (that), *then* (then), *ther* (there), *thOz* (those), *thEz* (these).

symbol 'thh'

helthh (health), *hundrethh* (hundredth), *brthhdA* (birthday), *grOthh* (growth), *strengthh* (strength).

The only difference between 'sh' and 'zh' is that 'zh' is voiced.

symbol 'zh'

kon fyU zhun (confusion), *du yr zhun* (diversion), *ri vizh un* (revision), *imr zhun* (immersion), *eks trU zhun* (extrusion).

For the symbol 'ng' you need no diacritic. Just use the plain 'ng.'

symbol 'ng'

gOing (going), yung (young), bangk (bank), bang (bang), swing (swing).

The dictionaries show the two symbols 'oi' and 'ou' in their pronunciation keys, so just listen to the sounds as spoken by men of unquestioned literacy.

symbol 'oi'

vois (voice), chois (choice), void (void), im broil (imbroil), soil (soil).

symbol 'ou'

u lou (allow), hou (how), u bout (about), hous (house), pour (power), dout (doubt).

Here are two more sounds using digraph symbols: symbol 'yU'

kon trib yUt (contribute), u byU zd (abused), fyU (few), byU ti (beauty), hyUj (huge).

symbol 'yu'

mil yun (million), man yu fork chr (manufacture), reg yu lAt (regulate).

In the last four symbols, 'oi', 'ou', 'yU', and 'yu', the individual letter sounds are recognizable, but are so blended in pronunciation they seem justified in being listed as separate sounds. If desired, the following digraphs might also be considered as separate sounds: 'er' for 'air', 'ir' for 'ear', 'Ir' in 'tire', 'or' for 'are', and 'Or' for 'ore'.

This presentation was made primarily to show and convince you that we do have a perfect sound-to-symbol relationship which would completely eliminate the confusing relationships in our present spelling.

If anyone thinks any English word cannot be spelled correctly using these symbols exclusively for the one sound herewith assigned to them, please send them with your pronunciation on tape and I will show you how with 'one sound-one symbol' it can be done.

Now ladies and gentlemen of the Second International Conference on Reading and Spelling you have the means to bring our spelling out of its 400 year old morass of confusion.

I will give you free distribution rights for use in England for all the material I have, if you recognize that 'one sound-one symbol' fonetic spelling is the only correct logical system for English. I strongly urge its adoption and use, beginning right away with the new spelling of all *two* letter words. After that gets a good start, introduce the *three* letter words. If that much catches on, future adoption of the whole system is assured. If it doesn't catch on, let them continue riding in the 16th century ox cart.

[Spelling Progress Bulletin Fall 1980 pp16,17 in the printed version]

9. Es Es Es /FONIK/, by S. S. Eustace.*

*London, England.

A paper presented at the 2nd Simplified Spelling Society Conference, Nene College, Northampton, July, 1979.

SSS /FONIK/ is a way of spelling standard British and other English phonemes with as much accuracy as is possible with a simple form of the International Phonetic Alphabet, but without using special types. (SSS /FONIK/ is *not* a spelling reform and is utterly unsuitable as such.) Its purpose is to permit accurate discussion of pronunciation privately and in dictionaries, etc., and so to spread phonological knowledge, a prerequisite for any spelling reform scheme. SSS /FONIK/ adapts a very ancient idea to the limitations of the ordinary, cheap typewriter.

For the innumerable symbolizations of a particular sound in English, the IPA and SSS /FONIK/ each have but one. For instance, the /Sh/ sound, written *sh*, etc., in conventional English spelling, *si* in Welsh, *ch* in French, *sch* in German, *sc* in Italian, *sz* in Polish, *sk*, *ski* in Swedish, and plain *s* in Hungarian, not to mention the untypable spellings of Czech, Croat or Russian, is spelt one way in the IPA, a symbol like an italic *f* with no crossbar. But in ordinary typescript this letter must be added by hand, which is slow, untidy and conducive to error. Now SSS /FONIK/ just has /Sh/, which has none of these drawbacks.

/Sh/ contains what you might call a postposed diacritical. The diacritical /h/ is a minuscule (or small) letter, so for this and other reasons, the letter being differenced must be majuscule (or capital). SSS /FONIK/ symbols, standing for phonemes, are placed between diagonals. Similarly the IPA letter of the voiced velar nasal, like an inverted G, as in *Sing*, could be written /Nh/. But since the minuscule *g* is not otherwise used in SSS /FONIK/, it might as well be /Ng/ not /Nh/. /h/ and /g/ are the only diacriticals used.

The consonants of SSS /FONIK/ are P, T, K, Q (the glottal stop or hamza), B, D, G, M, N, Ng, F, Th (*Thin*), S, Sh, H, V, Dh (*This*), Z, Zh (*Measure*), R, L, W, and Y (*Yet*).

There is no provision for syllabic consonants (or consonantal vowels, if you prefer). Structurally these are sequences of /3/ (explained here later) plus the consonant and are so written, as *Little* ('LIT3L). This incidentally corresponds with the speech of those, many now of school age, who have no syllabic consonants.

The vowels are more difficult. In English we have seven short-vowel sounds, as in *Pit*, *Put*, *Pet*, *Patrol* (shvaa), *Pot*, *Putt* and *Pat*, and only five letters, A, E, I, O, U.

The first three short vowels are *Pit* /I/, *Put* /U/ and *Pet* /E/.

As for the fourth vowel, the shvaa (Daniel Jones's English Vowel No. 12, EV12), the obvious choice is

capital yer, as in SSS Simplified English, which looks like a C backwards with a cross-bar. On typewriters without this letter, the best substitute is figure "3", as suggested by Mr. Leo G. Davis, California. Thus, Amid /3'MID/, Together /T3'GEDh3/.

You can say that /3/ is never fully stressed (a characteristic it shares with /I/ and /U/ not before a consonant). If there was a means of marking secondary stress, a symbol for /3/ might not be needed, because /3/ is arguably nothing more than /ʊ/ (explained later) with secondary stress. But what you gain on the swings you lose on the roundabouts, and risk making a mistake as well. For "secondary stress" is an awkward idea to entertain. It would save the necessary intellectual contortions to recognise that in East English; the third vowels in *Omnibus* and *Minibus* are quite different in vowel colour, forget about any stress difference, and write them /'OMNIB3S, 'MINIBʊS/.

The fifth vowel is EV12, as in *cut*. On the typewriter the symbol has to be built up, "U" plus "/"superimposed. In ordinary printing it is impossible to superimpose, so for once we must break with the principle of no diacritics in the second dimension (in the plane of the paper at right angles to the writing line) and use some kind of differenced "U", such as italic, grave or umlaut.

The sixth short vowel, as in *Cot*, is /O/.

The seventh is as in *Cat*, /A/.

The four long vowels which are never diphthongs, are shown with /h/, thus *Fee* /Ih/, *Fur* /3h/, *Four* /Oh/, *Far* /Ah/. (But "never" is a risky word. What about the variants *Thought* /ThOhUT/ or *Four* /FOh3/? However, these are unnecessary for say a foreigner to learn in order to speak correct English. The needs of the foreign student are a useful criterion of correctness.)

The long vowels which are sometimes diphthongs, may be so written, thus, *Too* /UW/. A Yorkshireman might prefer /Uh/ to the standard diphthong /UW/. /Ih/ might be written /IY/, but I prefer /Ih/ to /IY/ because, unlike /UW/, the simple vowel occurs more often than /IY/ in my speech. A theory might demand that /Ih/ and /Uh/ should be diphthonged symmetrically, to preserve the beauty of the diagram. But this theory does not accord with the fact. So much the worse for the theory. Speech is part of human behavior and humans do not always behave symmetrically. The Cockney long E, meaning /Ih/, could be /3I/. At this point I will ask those familiar with Cockney, /'S3I W3Q 3 'M31N?/ (See and Mean both have the rising intonation.)

The long vowels which are always (but see "never" above) diphthongs are:

- (1) Ending in /I/, *Bay* /EI/, *Buy* /AI/, *Boy* /OI/.
- (2) Ending in /3/, *Peer* /I3/, *Pair* /E3/, *Pure* /U3/.
- (3) Ending in /U=W/, *Who* /UW/, *Hoe* /3U/, *How* /AU/.

For Scotch and West English including American dialects, the diphthongs ending in /3/, (2) above, must be omitted.

The great and inconvenient complexity of the East English vowel system is a fact of nature and cannot be ignored. Please note: Firstly, this complexity is quite recent, say 1780 onwards. Secondly, as SSS member J. Windsor Lewis has pointed out, it is partly geographical. For nearby languages including Welsh, French, German, and Swedish also have exceptionally elaborate vowel systems, in contrast with more distant languages, seven vowel phonemes in Italian, five in Spanish, Greek and Russian, three, as you may say, in Classical Arabic. The system developed fully *after* the settling of North America but *before* that of Africa and Australasia, hence its absence in the former but its presence in the latter.

Stress can be marked in the same way as in IPA spelling, that is, with a vertical mark, the typewriter apostrophe before the stressed syllable, thus, /Dh3 'STREST 'SIL3BM/.

SSS /FONIK/ cannot show refinements such as secondary or other degrees of stress, or intonation.

Here are some propositions which can be discussed using SSS /FONIK/: Entirely is sometimes /IN'TAI3LI/ but more often /IN'TUHLI/. There are many who say People as /PIhPU/, Technical as /TEQNIKU/. Lightly and Likely are often sounded alike, /LAIQLI/. If Dr. Johnson's pronunciation of Contemplate had survived, we should now be saying /K3N'TEMPLEIT/ not /KONT3MPLEIT/. Part of the River Nene is /NIhN/, another part /NEN/. The variants of the word Controversy include /KONTR3V3SI, 'KONTR3V3hSI, K3N'TROV3SI, and K3N'TR3UV3SI/. While those who know the London borough of Southwark call it /SUDh3K/, others may say /SAUThWAhK/. Historically Birmingham is /BRUMIDZh3M/, and corruptly pronounced, in England /B3hMINg3M/ and in the USA /BURMINgHAM/.

The following examples are selected with a view to providing both enlightenment and moral uplift.
/WUN 'VAIS IZ 'MOhR 3k'SPENSIV Dh3N 'TEN 'V3hTShUWZ. DhEZ 'N3U 'RIhZ3NINg WIDh 3 'F3U, 'OhR 3 'MADM3N. F3 'WOTShUW K3N 'DUW YOhSELF 'D3UNQ DI'PEND ON 3'NUDh3. 'HIh HAZ 3 'GUD 'DZhUDZhM3NQ Dh3Q 'DUZ3NQ R3'LAI ON IZ '3UN./

Summary

/A/ Pat, /Ah/ Far, /AI/ Buy, /AU/ Bough, /Dh/ That, /EI/ Bay, /E3/ Pair, /I/ Pit, /Ih/ Feet, /I3/ Peer, /O/ Cot, /Oh/ Caught, /OI/ Boy, /Q/ glottal stop, /Sh/ She, /Th/ Thin, /U/ Put, /U3/ Poor, /U/ Cut, /X/ Loch, /Y/ Yet, /Zh/ Measure, /3/ About, /3h/ Fur, /3U/ So, /' placed before stressed syllable, /.../ enclose SSS /FONIK/.

Reference

Gleichen, Major-General Lord Edward. *Alphabets of Foreign Languages*, R.G.S. Technical Series: No. 2. 2nd. Ed. 1944, London: The Royal Geographical Society.

[Spelling Progress Bulletin Fall 1980 pp17-19,1 in the printed version]

10. A letter to Sen. George McGovern, by Raymond H, Pierson*

*San Diego, Ca.

(Written in SR-1-Spelling Reform, Step 1)
Senator George McGovern
Senate Office Bldg
Washington, D. C. 20580

Subject: Spelling Reform.
Reference: My letter of 3 Jan. 1980.
16 May 1980

Dear Senator McGovern:

Thank you very much for your **personal** response of 29 Jan. to my letter of 3 Jan. 1980 on the subject of spelling reform (regularization of our English orthography). I wrote to both you and Sen. Dole on 3 Jan., as well as to several other persons, including the newly appointed head of the Department of Education, Mrs. Shirley Hufstедler.

Both you and Sen. Dole were interested by my letter and responded **in person**. Mrs. Hufstедler (who probably did not come down far enough from her lofty perch even to glance at my letter) delegated the reply task to a subordinate whose response was less than gratifying. I wonder if (and hope that) Mrs. Hufstедler will take kindly to my proposal for spelling reform if you and Sen. Dole favor Congressional action on the subject!

Today I am writing you and Sen. Dole identical letters (except for minor differences) to provide you with some additional information which I hope will augment my plea for spelling reform.

A. *Adult Illiteracy in the United States*. First I must comment on a book, a report to the Ford Foundation entitled "Adult Illiteracy in the United States" by Hunter and Harman (Sept. 1979). I'm sure you are well aware of it and hope you may find some nuggets in it. I thought it mighty dull, repetitive and uninteresting, except for some details on the distribution of illiteracy by groups and localities.

Its main conclusions seem to be that: (1) about 50 to 60 million persons in the U.S.A. (about one fourth) who are over 15 years of age are "functionally illiterate" (a term the authors admit is hard to delineate exactly; as tho we didn't know that before they told us), and (2) that a great deal of money has been wasted trying to reduce adult illiteracy, because the ones who needed help most did not take advantage of the help offered (as tho we hadn't already known or sensed that!)

In my opinion, that study was largely a waste of money too. There is no word or hint (as far as I could see) as to why the adults happened to be so illiterate (maybe I missed something). Altho the last two of the book's 4 chapters bear the titles (III), "What is being done about adult illiteracy" and (IV), "What should be done, by whom, and how" – there is no mention anywhere in the book about the problem of our culpable orthography.

Their Appendix A "Summary of Recommendations" gives as their "Principal Conclusion: A major shift

in national educational policy is needed to serve the educational needs of disadvantaged adults." Less euphemistically they could have said "Efforts so far in adult education have been woefully unproductive and it is time for a DRASTIC CHANGE." And, they could go even farther and say that *some* of the change should begin in kindergarten plus grades 1, 2, and 3, with an improved orthography.

Please take a critical look at their principal recommendation and their 11 ("so-called") specific recommendations: Specific number 1 says, *in my words*, "Everybody and his brother, including legislators, etc. should be provided with a copy of our book." *They* say "this study" instead of "*our book*", of course. I think the "study" was a "boondoggle."

Were it not for danger to myself of a libel or copyright infringement suit, I would furnish for your convenience photocopies of pp. 133–35, the Summary of Recommendations, with copious comments thereon. To me, the recommendations seem to be "Cloud 9" vagaries (e.g., "increase public awareness" or *in my words*, "dispel public apathy" which is what we should like to *be able* to do about simplified spelling or even adoption of the metric system).

There are, of course, a number of factors that contribute to illiteracy, but I sincerely believe there is one outstanding and overriding factor, and that is our English orthography.

B. The History of Spelling Reform. There is a long history of spelling reform attempts and failures. Comprehensive reviews may be found in the references (encl. 5).

There are a host of reasons for the failures, for example:

- (1) Many attempts were schemes of individuals, each of whom believed his plan was the best possible solution. None of these schemes (alho some had good points) had any possibility of universal acceptance; many were "zany" ones with odd-looking characters.
- (2) Efforts by illustrious individuals (Benjamin Franklin, Andrew Carnegie, Theodore Roosevelt, etc.) failed mostly because the public had not been properly "sold" on the idea and the plans were not well conceived and planned, or were too extensive and radical for public acceptance in one gulp.
- (3) Even WES (World English Spelling, advocated by the Simpler Spelling Association – now called the Phonemic Spelling Council) which uses no new letters (only the 26 now in use) and no diacritical marks, failed to obtain Congressional support.
- (4) Over a period of time, many bills on spelling reform have been proposed in Congress but so far all have died. As far as I know, none of these suggested a Step-by Step plan.

Most of us have heard of the Chicago Tribune attempt to promote revised spellings, but the basics involved are not generally well-known or appreciated. In brief, the Tribune began in 1934 with a revised spelling list of 80 words. From time to time additions and deletions were made to this list. Then at various dates, reversion was made to T.O. (Traditional Orthography) and finally in 1975 (after 41 years of valiant effort) all the improved spellings were abandoned (including even "thru, tho, alho, and thoro") except for such words as "catalog" ending in "og" instead of "ogue," which were introduced by Webster's Dictionary. The experiment had failed simply because it had had a very *faulty* design and should never have been started with such a design in the first place. In the 80 words, there were 26 *types* of *change* and consequently thousands of contradictions! For example, "hearth" was changed to "harth" by elimination of the "e" but "heart" remained unchanged because it was not on the prescribed list. What a terrible waste of well-intentioned effort! What a pity it had not presented a good consistent plan such as SR-1, 2, 3, etc.! Such a plan might have gained wide acceptance and might have eventually obtained Congressional backing.

C. *The Step-by-Step Proposal, Step No. 1 (SR-1)*. First of all there should be Congressional action which would prepare the public for a gradual step-by-step manner of change *to begin* with SR-1. Otherwise there will be not only public apathy but probably rejection.

Then I suggest that the SR-1 be introduced by requiring all *Government* (both military and civil service) publications to use SR-1 (with due allowance for lapses into T.O. until an adequate period of adaptation had passed). Altho reading material written in SR-1 is very easy, writing it is a bit more difficult. Eventually everyone using SR-1 will see that words like "any" that are *not* spelled as "eny" do indeed look ODD! Then state offices and the public in general can follow the Federal lead.

This "preparation" of the public is very important. Even if such a thing as gas rationing becomes imperative, a little advance notice will tend to "soften the blow" to some extent and the more warning time, the better.

For each step of spelling reform, consideration must be given to such things as: (1) how will the changed words look in print as compared to T.O., (2) how difficult to read, (3) how difficult to write, (4) how many words would be affected, (5) how many homophones would be created, (6) how helpful would it be for children and for adults, especially those studying English as a second language, etc. (in other words, how much good will the change do in reducing illiteracy and in promoting English as a world language).

In the references provided in this letter, there are guidelines regarding proper steps for spelling reform and some pitfalls to be avoided. Let me call your attention to just a few specific items to emphasize this point. SR-1 is a good step because it changes in a very *simple* and *consistent* way about 250 *common* English words. Also it creates very few homophones and these are ones that are readily and instantly resolved by context. At the same time it eliminates some homographs. For example, "read" pronounced "red" is so written, and "lead" pronounced "led" is so written. And at the same time the new spelling "cures" the confusion in T.O. which pronounces the homographs "read" and "lead" in two ways.

D. *What about Steps SR-2, -3, etc.?* Steps beyond SR-1 must be well-planned and should represent a consensus of a group (committee or panel) of well-qualified experts (and I do mean experts, for there are many pitfalls; it is a complicated matter, not a simple one).

As for SR-2, changing all "ph" spellings to "f" where it is sounded as /f/ would probably be a very sound choice because few problems would be encountered (except for lexicographers!). In the Spanish language, our word "photograph" is written "fotografia," – no problem there as "ph" was never used for /f/. Then how about our "gh" or "ough"? That is a very different matter, and changing "gh" to "f" where the /f/ sound is intended, requires a variety of modifications and should be deferred to a step considerably further along in time than Step SR-3.

How about dropping all silent letters in one fell swoop. Heavens to Betsy, that would indeed open a can of worms! Changing words like "give, have, live" to "giv, hav and liv" (where the final "e" wrongly shows the preceding . vowel is long) could have an early priority. Step SR-1 will cure some silent and unnecessary "a"s (as in "head") but the silent "a" in "road", etc. would need modification in addition to the deletion.

How about the next silent letter after "a", namely "b"? That would be just fine for words like "debt" which would logically and desirably become "det" simply by deletion. And "lamb" would be O.K. as "lam", but how about "comb"? That would go just to "com" by deletion, and horror of horrors, what if

we wrote it logically as "come"? We already have *that* word which would certainly have to be changed to something like "cum". Another example of a "simple" change that should have deferred priority is changing the word "of" to "ov" (the way it is said); although this change represents consistency and the word occurs very frequently, it would "bother" the man in the street more than the change is worth – until change itself becomes commonplace.

Now these details have been presented to give you some idea of the need for an experienced group for the promulgation of a logical and *acceptable* sequence of changes.

E. *Enclosures and References.* These are intended to supplement those furnished in my letter of 3 Jan. 1980. At this time I realize that some of the references may *not* be readily available to you (although the Library of Congress can, I'm sure, go far beyond my sources). Hence I offer now to try to furnish you with originals or photocopies of those which may be of special interest to you. For example, it would be my pleasure as a civic duty in the interest of reducing illiteracy, to do what I can to get copies to you of articles from S.P.B. (*Spelling Progress Bulletin*, the quarterly edited by Mr. Tune, 1961 to 1980 inclusively) which you might like to see.

F. *My Plea Reiterated.* I realize your time and energy must be assiduously concentrated and regulated, but I beg of you to think seriously of the benefits which would accrue from a carefully planned and carried out series of Step-by-Step reforms of our English orthography. Think of where we could be by now (i.e., how many of our illogical and frustrating spellings could have been eliminated by now) if only we had started such a plan at the Federal level 25 years ago!

Sincerely yours, Raymond H. Pierson.

P.S. The matter of international cooperation with other English-speaking countries will, of course, come up and merits discussion by qualified persons. But I believe the U.S.A. can go ahead with the suggested step-by-step plan without any delay on this score. As a matter of fact, SR-1 is not a new U.S.A. invention; it is already in use to a considerable degree in Australia, where it has been advocated by Harry Lindgren since 1969. (cf. Item 3 on a Recommended Reading List in my letter of 3 Jan. 1980.)

P.S. 2. Senator McGovern, I sincerely believe that IF, through your efforts and those of Sen. Dole, SR-1 were to be initiated in this country, the end result could very well be a regularization of English orthography that would not only reduce illiteracy in the U.S.A., but also change the history of the U.S.A., other English-speaking nations and the WORLD! You and Senator Dole are, I think, in a position to put very large fetters in your caps!!

P.S. 3. Are we going to let the Russians get ahead of us in education and technology just because they have a phonetic alphabet and we are stuck with a difficult to learn and a wasteful alphabet?

-o0o-

[Spelling Progress Bulletin Fall 1980 pp16,17 in the printed version]

11. FINANCING THE SPB:-

Newell W. Tune,
Editor SPELLING PROGRESS BULLETIN:

Altho most "open forums" (letter to editors) are financed by advertizing in the parent periodical, that is not tru of crusading forums. Commercial advertizers ar "turned off" by the limited circulation of such a quarterly. Even at 4\$ pr yr, subscriptions dont even begin to pay publication costs of an effectiv number of such sheets. Such crusading forums must go to countless NON-subscribers (non-belevers) in order to acheve practical rezults. Thus, crusading forums must be financed ether by "grants" or by contributions from crusaders themselvs. However, not meny philanthropists ar aware of eny bona fide drive for spelling reform. Thus, until sum "Santa Claus" cums along, it seems up to wud-be reformers to finance ther own forum.. . How about notifying scribes that they are expected to subsidize publication of ther opinions (perhaps 25)¢ per typed line of 7-1/2 inches)???. Such a charge mite prompt scribes to condens their work to wher they wud be saying as much in one typed line as they hav been saying in 2 lines of your fine print. POINT:- If a professed crusader duznt think enuf of his own opinions to subsidize publication, thay ar probably not worth printing at eny prise, – or even worth reeding. . . And if eny grup wishes to anounce an up-coming convention, thay shud expect to pay for that anouncement:- likewize with eny subsequent report on that meeting. . . With this thot in mind, I am inclozing my check for \$9.25 to subsidise publication of this 37-line commentary. If uther scribes hav the sincerity to follo this leed, it mite for-stall "bankrupsy" in the imediate fyuchure.

Az I see it, – "scribe subsidys" wud hav a "chain reaction" for the better. It wud prompt scribes to cut out redundant commentary, – - and use more "4-letter" words, – - insted of jepordizing comprehension by violating the averaje reeders vocabulary with "big words" and/or technical terms. This wud attract more subscribers, – - sum of whom wud gladly subsidize publication of ther opinions.

"CAMERA-REDY" materials, – whether for 7-1/2 inch one-colum use, – or for reducing to your 2-colum fine print format, wud spare yu the task of re-tiping, – az well az responsibility for "tipos". – leving yu more time and enerjy for evaluating the material submitted, re; its baring on letter sequences. . . After all, my dictionary indicates that editors ar expected to "edit" articles, – rather than re-tipe them verbatim.

Yours for "riter subsidys"

Leo G. Davis, Palm Springs; Ca.

[Spelling Progress Bulletin Fall 1980 pp1,20 in the printed version]

These capital letters had 'rings' above, below, to right, to left or within them, to indicate pronunciation, e.g. a silent letter has a dot below it. The only ones available on the keyboard are Û Å

12. THE JAMES INTERNATIONAL ALPHABET

BULLETIN! C.LE ROY JAMES OF BEAUMONT • CALIFORNIA HAS INVENTED A LETTER-FOR-SOUND ALPHABET BY EXPANDING THE TWENTY-SIX LETTER ALPHABET TO SIXTY-TWO • INCLUDING 26 NOTATED SILENT LETTERS. READ MORE ABOUT IT ON BACK PAGE. ALL SPELLING PROGRESS BULLETIN SUBSCRIBERS ARE INVITED TO A DEMONSTRATION • OF THE JAMES INTERNATIONAL ALPHABET • AT THE RIVIERA • 10 AM • OCTOBER 11 • 1980 IN PALM SPRINGS • CALIFORNIA. A PRESS CONFERENCE FOR THE NEWS MEDIA • PRINT • TELEVISION • AND RADIO • WILL BE HELD IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING. (cont. p. 20)

BULLETIN! C.LE ROY JAMES OF BEAUMONT CALIFORNIA HAS INVENTED A LETTER-FOR-SOUND ALPHABET BY EXPANDING THE TWENTY-SIX LETTER ALPHABET TO SIXTY-TWO INCLUDING 26 NOTATED SILENT LETTERS. ALL SPELLING PROGRESS BULLETIN SUBSCRIBERS ARE INVITED TO A DEMONSTRATION OF THE JAMES INTERNATIONAL ALPHABET AT THE RIVIERA 10 AM OCTOBER 11 1980 IN PALM SPRINGS CALIFORNIA. A

PRESS CONFERENCE FOR THE NEWS MEDIA PRINT TELEVISION AND RADIO WILL BE HELD IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING

[See image on next page]

THE VERSATILITY OF THE JAMES INTERNATIONAL ALPHABET CAN BE DEMONSTRATED WITH THE FOLLOWING FOREIGN PHRASES BY REFERRING TO THE KEY BELOW.

ENGLISH o SPANISH

"HERE WE HAVE SOME FLOWERS o A ROSE o A TULIP o SOME VIOLETS o A CARNATION AND A PANSY."

"AQUI TENEMOS UNAS FLORES o UNA ROSA o UN TULIPAN o UNAS VIOLETAS o UN GLAVEL Y UN PENSAMIENTO."

ENGLISH o ITALIAN

"I THINK THERE IS A MISTAKE IN THE BILL."

"CREDO CHE CI SIA UNO SBAGLIO NEL cONTO."

ENGLISH o FRENCH

"YOU MUST CHANGE TRAINS."

"IL FAUT CHANGER DE TRAIN."

ENGLISH o PORTUGUESE

"PLEASE GALL ME A TAXI."

"CHAME ON TAXI o POR FAVOR."

ENGLISH o GERMAN

"CONGRATULATIONS!"

"HERZLIGHEN GLUCKUNSCH!"

ENGLISH O PIG LATIN

"THANK YOU."

"ANKTHA UYA."

THE VERSATILITY OF THE JAMES INTERNATIONAL ALPHABET CAN BE DEMONSTRATED WITH THE FOLLOWING FOREIGN PHRASES BY REFERRING TO THE KEY BELOW.

ENGLISH • SPANISH

"HERE WE HAVE SOME FLOWERS • A ROSE • A TULIP • SOME VIOLETS • A GARNATION AND A PANSY."

"AQUÍ TENEMOS UNAS FLORES • UNA ROSA • UN TULIPÁN • UNAS VIOLETAS • UN CLAVEL Y UN PENSAMIENTO."

ENGLISH • ITALIAN

"I THINK THERE IS A MISTAKE IN THE BILL."

"CREDO CHE CI SIA UNO SBAGLIO NEL CONTO."

ENGLISH • FRENCH

"YOU MUST CHANGE TRAINS."

"IL FAUT CHANGER DE TRAIN."

ENGLISH • GERMAN

"CONGRATULATIONS!"

"HERZLICHEN GLÜCKWUNSCH!"

ENGLISH • PORTUGUESE

"PLEASE CALL ME A TAXI."

"CHAME UM TAXI • POR FAVOR."

ENGLISH • PIG LATIN

"THANK YOU."

"ANKTHÁ UYÁ."

COMPARING ALPHABETS

NEW SYMBOL-FOR-SOUND ALPHABET!

THE UNDERLINED LETTER AND ITS SOUND IN THE 36 ANIMAL WORDS BELOW CAN BE MATCHED WITH THE SAME LETTER IN ANY UNKNOWN WORD TO REVEAL ITS PROPER PRONUNCIATION. THIS IS TRUE WITH MANY LANGUAGES.

APÉ ALBATROSS BEAR CENTIPEDÉ
GATERPILLAR DINOSAUR EEL ELEPHANT
FISH GIRAFFÉ GOPHER HORSE IBIS
JUANA JÁYBIRD KANGAROO LION
MOTH NANNY GOAT OPOSSUM OCTOPUS
PELICAN QUAIL RATTLESNÁKÉ SEAL
TOAD UNICORN UGLY DUCKLING
VULTURÉ WÉ WORM FOX
XERUS SQUIRREL FLY YELLOW JACKET
ZEBRA. A SILENT LETTER HAS DOT BELOW IT.

JAMES INTERNATIONAL ALPHABET
 TYPE FONT PAT. PEND. © 1967, 1980
 C. LE ROY JAMES

HERE IS SOME MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE JAMES INTERNATIONAL ALPHABET.

"RECOMMENDED BY THOUSANDS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS • AND USED THROUGHOUT THE WORLD BY OVER A MILLION PERSONS" -- SAYS PUBLISHER • BEACON ENTERPRISES.

"NON-TEACHERS READILY UNDERSTAND IT (AND) CHILDREN DO NOT EXPERIENCE FAILURE." --SAYS CALIFORNIA STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION-- 1972. (THIS REPORT MADE BY UNANIMOUS VOTE OF CALIF. LEGISLATURE).

"THE VIRTUE OF JAMES' ALPHABET IS ITS SIMPLICITY AND A FIRST GRADER UNDERSTANDS IT IN 20 MINUTES."--SAYS PALM DESERT POST-- MAY 25 • 1978.

RECOMMENDED FOR • "STUDENTS DEFICIENT IN WORD ANALYSIS SKILLS." "RECOMMENDED OVER THE 26 LETTER ALPHABET AND OVER THE 44 INITIAL TEACHING ALPHABET."--SAYS THE ESEA FEDERAL READING PROJECT • ORANGE COUNTY DEPT. OF EDUCATION • 1970.

ENDORSED BY G.A.G.S. • CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS.

"JAMES KNOWS THE ABC'S OF TEACHING READING AS FEW OTHERS DO."--SAYS THE ROTARIAN • SEPT. 1979.

"ALL NEWSPAPERS SHOULD BE PRINTED IN THE JAMES INTERNATIONAL ALPHABET • I'VE TAUGHT IT FOR YEARS • IT'S GREAT!"--SAYS A TEACHER FROM THE VALLEY CHRISTIAN KINDERGARTEN SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA.

"100 PERCENT SUCCESSFUL IN KINDERGARTEN." --SAYS THE BROTHERN SCHOOLS OF BEAUMONT IN CHERRY VALLEY.

RESOLUTIONS ENDORSING IT

CITY OF BEAUMONT • CALIFORNIA • USA
 CHAMBER OF COMMERCE • BEAUMONT, CA. • USA
 ROTARY CLUB OF BEAUMONT, CA. • USA
 AMERICAN AND MEXICAN INSTITUTE OF CULTURAL EXCHANGE
 SENATE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 DR. MAX RAFFERTY
 AMERICAN LANGUAGE INSTITUTE
 DR. S. I. HAYAKAWA --"YOUR SYSTEM IS UNUSUALLY INGENUOUS AND THOROUGH."

FOR MORE INFORMATION

C. L. JAMES
 P.O. BOX 305
 BEAUMONT, CALIFORNIA
 92223 (714)845-1330

COMPARING ALPHABETS

NEW SYMBOL-FOR-SOUND ALPHABET!

THE UNDERLINED LETTER AND ITS SOUND IN THE 36 ANIMAL WORDS ◦ BELOW ◦ CAN BE MATCHED WITH THE SAME LETTER IN ANY UNKNOWN WORD TO REVEAL ITS PROPER PRONUNCIATION. THIS IS TRUE WITH MANY LANGUAGES.

APE ALBATROSS BEAR CENTIPEDE CATERPILLAR DINOSAUR EEL ELEPHANT FISH
GIRAFFE GOPHER HORSE IBIS IGUANA JAYBIRD KANGAROO LION MOTH NANNY GOAT
OPOSSUM OCTOPUS PELICAN QUAIL RATTLESNAKE SEAL TOAD UNICORN UGLY
DUCKLING VULTURE EWE WORM FOX XERUS SQUIRREL FLY YELLOW JACKET ZEBRA.

A SILENT LETTER HAS DOT BELOW IT.

JAMES INTERNATIONAL ALPHABET TYPE FONT PAT. PEND.

© 1967, 1980 C. LE ROY JAMES

HERE IS SOME MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE JAMES INTERNATIONAL ALPHABET.

"RECOMMENDED BY THOUSANDS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS ◦ AND USED THROUGHOUT THE WORLD BY OVER A * MILLION PERSONS" -- SAYS PUBLISHER ◦ BEACON ENTERPRISES.

"NON-TEACHERS READILY UNDERSTAND IT (AND) CHILDREN DO NOT EXPERIENCE FAILURE." --SAYS CALIFORNIA STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION --1972: (THIS REPORT MADE BY UNANIMOUS VOTE OF CALIF. LEGISLATURE).

"THE VIRTUE OF JAMES' ALPHABET IS ITS SIMPLICITY AND A FIRST GRADER UNDERSTANDS IT IN 20 MINUTES." -- SAYS PALM DESERT POST – MAY 25 – 1978.

RECOMMENDED FOR ◦ "STUDENTS DEFICIENT IN WORD ANALYSIS SKILLS."
"RECOMMENDED OVER THE 26 LETTER ALPHABET AND OVER THE 44 ITA – INITIAL TEACHING ALPHABET." -- SAYS THE ESEA FEDERAL READING PROJECT ◦ ORANGE COUNTY DEPT. OF EDUCATION ◦ 1970.

ENDORSED BY G.A.G.S. ◦ CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS.

"JAMES KNOWS THE ABC'S OF TEACHING READING AS FEW OTHERS DO." -- SAYS THE ROTARIAN SEPT. 1979.

"ALL NEWSPAPERS SHOULD BE PRINTED IN THE JAMES INTERNATIONAL ALPHABET ◦ I'VE TAUGHT IT FOR YEARS ◦ IT'S GREAT:" -- SAYS A TEACHER FROM THE VALLEY CHRISTIAN KINDERGARTEN SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA.

"100 PERCENT SUCCESSFUL IN KINDERGARTEN." -- SAYS THE BRETHERN SCHOOLS OF BEAUMONT IN CHERRY VALLEY.

RESOLUTIONS ENDORSING IT

CITY OF BEAUMONT o CALIFORNIA o USA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE o BEAUMONT, GA.
o USA ROTARY GLOB OF BEAUMONT, GA. o USA

AMERICAN AND MEXICAN INSTITUTE OF CULTURAL EXCHANGE

SENATE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DR. MAX RAFFERTY

AMERICAN LANGUAGE INSTITUTE

DR. S. I. HAYAKAWA -- "YOUR SYSTEM IS UNUSUALLY INGENIOUS AND THOROUGH."

FOR MORE INFORMATION

C. L. JAMES BEAUMONT, CALIFORNIA.