

in England by a widespread reaction against positivism, which by this time had become something like the official ideology of the Victorian era. Positivism is a trivial systematizing doctrine which claimed to bridge the gulf between materialism and realism; in fact it did no more than substitute a superficial description of the laws of nature for a thoroughgoing study of them. By the 1890s it was rejected by all those who sought to comprehend the world. And the world needed to be comprehended anew. The era of free enterprise capitalism was coming to an end, the relations between social classes were changing, a new scientific revolution was beginning. In these circumstances positivism seemed the most glaring embodiment of mental inertia and bourgeois smugness.

It was this reaction against positivism which brought together such different people as Wells and the neo-romantics (a group to which Stevenson, Kipling and Conan Doyle belonged). Kipling set up the romance of empire in opposition to the dull course of bourgeois existence, and Conan Doyle a cleverly-planned and brilliantly exposed crime ("There's the scarlet thread of murder running through the colourless skein of life, and our duty is to unravel it, and isolate it, and expose every inch of it", declares Sherlock Holmes in *A Study in Scarlet*). To the same end Wells uses the romance of scientific discovery, both of the social and the physical world, man and the universe. Yes, he was quite close to the neo-romantics, but how unlike them he was!

He was aware of this himself and used to emphasize the difference. He for example very much disliked his story 'Pollock and the Porroh Man' — it was too nearly a work which could have been written by a neo-romantic. Furthermore, he regarded the neo-romantics with considerable suspicion. Were they not continually being drawn towards something called "art for art's sake"? He even suspected his friend Joseph Conrad of this. Of himself he said: "I never simply 'depicted life'. Even in the most apparently objective books I have written there is criticism of things as they are and a call for change." He demonstratively termed himself a "journalist" rather than an "artist". In actual fact he was a real artist — but of a special kind. (Every artist, if he is a real one, is special.) Moreover there was within Wells, both as man and as artist, something that gave birth to romantic motifs.

The young hero of "A Slip under the Microscope" now and again remembers William Morris's *News from Nowhere*. This book was one of the primary sources of Wells's socialist ideas. As a student he went to meetings that Morris used to organize in a sort of conservatory beside his house. Morris's socialism became firmly imprinted in Wells's soul. He was perfectly aware that Morris's ideas were utopian, that Morris dreamt of building a socialist society founded on closeness to nature, manual labour and the free association of artisans, but there was something unusually attractive in these ideas for him. The dreams of a completely different life, full of satisfaction, mutual understanding, beauty and tenderness, to which the boy from a Bromley crockery shop had once surrendered himself, assumed the shape of socialist doctrine now that he was a student of the natural sciences, sitting listening to William Morris or for the umpteenth time turning the pages of Morris's poetic book. It remained with him for ever. All the time there lived in his mind a Second World, so firm that it seemed to exist in reality somewhere alongside him. It was capable of adopting the quasi-scientific shape of a parallel (or

intersecting) universe, of taking the appearance of life on Mars ('The Crystal Egg'), or simply sounding like a nostalgic fairy-tale (as in 'The Door in the Wall' or 'Mr Skelmersdale in Fairyland'). The precise form that this Second World took is not important. Although changing in external appearance, this world never left Wells's side.

There was in all this no departure from the principle, proclaimed by Wells himself, of the involvement of art in society. It too was a call to change, and a loud call at that. After all, how unlike this humane, poetic Second World was the familiar world in which his characters actually lived.

Spade House Dialectic: Theme and Theory in 'Things to Come'

Leon Stover

...the prophetic soul
Of the wide world dreaming on things to come.
Shakespeare (sonnet CVII)

I

When in 1900 H.G. Wells built his first home, he called it Spade House. The architect wanted to put a heart-shaped letter plate on the front door, but Wells had him turn it upside down. In its new aspect it was a spade.¹

Used as a mark on playing cards the spade is a broad sword, from Latin *spatha* cognate with Greek *spathé*, a shovel for turning soil. The spade in its dual meaning is an apt heraldic device for a writer who termed himself a socialist "Radical", a word which "suggests going to the roots of things. It also suggests weeding and digging."² Sword and spade proper thus combine in one figure to represent radical socialism's action program, already nicely reduced in Proudhon's famous motto, *destruam et aedificabo* ("I will destroy and I will build up"). The front door of Spade House is emblazoned with a device of the destruction-construction dialectic, one that signifies both weapon and tool. The spade is a revolutionary instrument that at once clears the way for the Wellsian Utopia, a world socialist state, and founds it. Revolution means "death and birth, putting an end to old things and beginning with new things."³ Utopia does not come of itself. "Nothing comes of itself except weeds and confusion."⁴ Socialism can burgeon forth and be new only after the weeds of reaction have been eradicated; "the builder and maker with the first stroke of his foundation spade uses force and opens war against the anti-builder."⁵

Again, to invert the heart is itself a figurative act of revolution, a downing of the anti-builder whose emblem heart is. Turning it around raises the spade against all that heart stands for — exclusive love and sexual possession, ownership and private

property, family life and capitalism. For the taproot of private ownership in capitalist society is marriage. It is a "fellowship of two based on cohabitation and protected by jealousy."⁶ From this "partisanship for wife and family against the common welfare,"⁷ getting and keeping in everything else follows. "The fierce jealousy of men for women and women for men is the very heart of all our social jealousies."⁸

Heart, sword and building spade. In what I shall be calling the Spade House Dialectic, these elements "express the main forces in the world about us,"⁹ forever engaged in a triangular struggle. In accord with this dialectical movement, from heart's error to forceful correction and back again, the revolution makes "No Stable Utopia."¹⁰ The world state is no perfect society, and socialism is always in the process of becoming and being builded. For Wells, "Utopia must not be static but kinetic."¹¹ Its makers will prevail only so long as they master the dynamics of permanent revolution, too mindful of the errors of counter-revolution ever to settle. "Socialism must...build and guard what it builds with laws and with that sword which is behind all laws."¹² Sword must guard against heart's assertion of those "old obstinate real natural things...that make up class, partisan and nationalist passion." For the social jealousies are "as essential in human nature as lust." If mankind is to have social peace in a world garden of universal welfare, "these natural tendencies will have to be overridden."¹³ Again and again, heart must be slain. Man will have to be "socialized entirely against his natural disposition in the matter."¹⁴

II

This is a lot to read into one twist of a door plate. Yet I do no more than give my own name to the dialectical schemes of 'Things to Come'¹⁵ as Wells himself explained it in terms of Hindu theology to Alexander Korda and staff at the time this film was being produced. That exotic explanation we now have, with the discovery in the Wells Archive at the University of Illinois, Urbana, of an unpublished and heretofore uncited film treatment of 'Things to Come' the film production. Marked "Private & Confidential", it was printed for circulation among the production staff only, and bears the title, *Whither Mankind?*¹⁶

Under the by-line of H.G. Wells is the indication that the film is based on two of his works. One of them, as we all know, is the novel of 1933, *The Shape of Things to Come*. But the other is given as the last opus in the so-called "education trilogy" of his outline series. First came *The Outline of History* (1920). Then the *Science of Life* (1930), his outline of biology. Then finally his outline of economics, *The Work, Wealth and Happiness of Mankind* (1932). How make a film of *that*? Wells did, though this work source be sociological, not to say theoretical. How he did so is a puzzlement, if we had not a key to unriddle it, the Spade House Dialectic. To this I shall return, the question of theory, after I deal with the overt theme of 'Things to Come.'

Among the introductory notes to *Whither Mankind?* are those headed, "Theme of the Film." These give the familiar story line of 'Things to Come', the emergence of a new, one-world civilization from the ruins of a war that destroyed the old one divided by militant nationalism. That accounts for its narrative source in *The*

Shape of Things to Come. More, the introduction goes on to say the film gives a dramatization of "the Hindu vision of life", with its trio of gods, Vishnu the Possessor, Siva the Destroyer and Brahma the Creator. They symbolize the "cardinal forces" of the universe, whose reaction on each other is the explanation of everything. The film above and beyond its story line, is meant to "display these cardinal forces at work." That accounts for its dialectical theory, derived from *The Work, Wealth and Happiness of Mankind*, as we shall see. But for the moment we note that Vishnu is the one female deity in this triad, corresponding to sexual love (heart), and the rest is obvious in the following tabulation.

Spade House Dialectic

Heart	Sword	Spade
Vishnu	Siva	Brahma
Owning	Breaking	Making

III

If we count the published scenario of 'Things to Come' as a science-fiction romance, vis-à-vis the novel of realism, then it may be reckoned the most romantic (or fantastic) work in the entire library of Wellsian science fiction, which amounts to about one third of his total fictional output.¹⁷ It carries the logic of the romance to the last degree of the non-personal. Wells himself early on understood the difference between romance and novel, and in fact helped define the distinction during his writer's trial as a literary critic, in the latter half of the 1890s. In the course of his book reviewing at this time, he could say, for example, that "The romance form prohibits anything but the superficialities of self-expression; and sustained humour, subtle characterization, are impossible."¹⁸ Or again, putting it another way, he could say what the realistic novel was not. Its "people are not avatars of theories nor tendencies." They are rather "living, breathing personalities."¹⁹ In the romance, on the other hand, people *are* avatars; they are resonators of sociological theories and social tendencies.

The characters who people 'Things to Come' are nothing if not avatars of the Spade House Dialectic, in their Hindu guise of Vishnu, Siva and Brahma. The actors who play these parts carry it off with the proper classical passion, speaking like giants with superhuman force from behind the masks of their *personae*. They are professional actors who well understand the author's intention (it was explained to them in *Whither Mankind?*); and they read his lines with impeccable, high-flown diction, which give the film its enduring formalistic elegance.

Not that this has been much appreciated by the audience, then or now. The film never earned out. Now it is regularly shown on the double-digit channels of American television, amusedly on cheap horror shows or as amusing "camp" for the literati on cultural shows, broadcast on the public service network.²⁰ The humour of it in both cases is the easy ability to fault the film on thematic grounds alone, its pretence at prediction. The particulars of the future, forecast in 1936, look funny to us now, living in the days after yesterday's tomorrow. But such perils of doing "the fiction of prophecy" Wells was the first to admit, as he did in a radio address depreciating his life-long work in this field, not long after the film's release.²¹ Here as elsewhere in later life, he played down even the "philosophic quality" that Arnold Bennett saw in the early scientific romances,²² perhaps owing to the higher

prestige attaching to literary realism.²³ Yet that extra quality inheres in 'Things to Come', as in all Wellsian science fiction, which is a literature of ideas calling for more of an intellectual effort to understand than does the direct treatment of everyday contemporary life in realistic fiction. More than futuristic in theme, the film pushes a strong philosophic line, treating a theory of society and of the historical process itself. Always the "educationist"²⁴ Wells reduced his explanation of how the world works to the elementals of the Spade House Dialectic, as my sketchy overview may suggest.²⁵

The film's hero is John Cabal, played with immense dignity by Raymond Massey, as he must, because Cabal is not a living, breathing person but a cosmic persona, Brahma the Creator. He is also the avatar of John Calvin, for a family friend says to him, "You — you aren't eupeptic", which is to say he is splenitive, a reference to Calvin's famous liver condition, said to have made him the stern, dour Puritan he was. John Cabal is all that, and more. He is an aviation officer and engineer, and his name indicates his future role, leader of a revolutionary *cabal*, a private junta of professional men who turn against their national loyalties in the midst of a second world war and form the League of the Airmen. In the source novel, *The Shape of Things to Come*, the Airmen are known also as New Puritans, the self-elected "new saints" of world salvation. The Airmen, being typical Wells heroes of his one-world political religion, are both "makers and rebels."²⁶ That is to say they represent the creative force of Brahma in alliance with Siva the Destroyer; they *rebel* against the old order, putting it to the sword in the necessary dialectical process of *making* the new order. They both demodel and remodel the world. The League is a will organization comparable to the Communist Party, as explained in the novel, winning to global victory through airpower and the founding a world socialist state, headed by Oswald Cabal, President of the World Council of Direction. Oswald is John's grandson (played by the same actor and afflicted with the same tic in his right hand), now established in a hereditary line of philosopher kings, as with Plato's "king bee" in *The Republic*. The Wellsian world state is in fact a "New Republic"²⁷, and John Cabal's fellow partymen under his Air Dictatorship are its priggish New Republicans.

The war opens with a German air-raid on Everytown in Britain, and John Cabal is called to duty. He guns an enemy plane, follows it down, and comforts the dying pilot, saying "Why should we two be murdering each other? How did it come to this? Why did we let them set us killing each other?" This is not mawkish, pacifist talk. Far from it. The question is, why do not aviators have the sanity to league together in militant cooperation to make "war for peace"²⁸ against their nationalist war leaders? Professionals have more in common with each other's technical competence than they do with their respective political cultures. They have it in their power to wield "the sword of peace" in a war to end war, else modern war technology will end civilization.²⁹ Which it does, except for a saving remnant of Airmen who find in their engineering science "the unity of a common order and a common knowledge." They unite in one truth and one program, the ideals of technocracy. They are (in *Whither Mankind?*) "men of steel, men of knowledge, men of power." Says John Cabal: "We have ideas in common; the freemasonry of efficiency — the brotherhood of science." On this basis the Air Dictatorship arises with its headquarters at Basra, the port city of Bagdad in Iraq, once the capital of

the Abbasid caliphate and center of the Moslem conquest, "the most amazing story of conquest in the history of our race." Amazing because in the wake of the European Dark Ages it brought learning and enlightenment (from which we have our words for "algebra" and "chemistry") to "the whole world west of China."³⁰ Now a greater conquest is reaching out from Basra. There (as given in *Whither Mankind?*) fly banners and streamers inscribed with words of the technocratic credo; RESEARCH, INVENTION, WORLD PLANNING and SCIENTIFIC CONTROL. The Air Dictatorship then leads on to the World Council of a one-party state in the year 2036.

Before that happens, however, the Air League must settle with the remaining anti-builders of the world they have smashed. The war has gone on for decades, yet their nationalist passion is unabated, patriot chiefs who go on fighting over the merest shreds of territorial possession. One such is Rudolf the Victorious, Boss of Everytown's ruins, and played with a fine flair for the brag, blare and bluster of competing sovereignties by Sir Ralph Richardson. His is "a combatant state at war", his cavalry victorious over some nearby coal pits. His winning flag hoisted atop the bridgework of the taken colliery is a mockery of what sovereign independent states do for a living; their robber raids on each other. At his victory banquet he testifies that it is "A *man's* land we are making, a land for strength and for courage. None but the brave deserve the land; none but the brave deserve the fair." Here he reaches over to fondle one of his harem mistresses, to the botryoidal laughter of his horsemen. Another one, Roxana, leaves the room to visit and make a pass at John Cabal, held captive in the cellar following a lone scouting trip to the region in one of the League's new monoplanes.

Roxana, named after one of Alexander the Great's two wives, is played by Margaretta Scott, who dresses the part in proper, barbaric splendor. She is the avatar of Vishnu in this female deity's aspect of sexual possession, as Rudolf is in the aspect of territorial possession. The two aspects are related. Rudolf and Roxana want only love and glory. He the glory of bossing things and the glory of being loved; she the glory of being possessed by a strong man victorious in war. Sex is Vishnu's curse in everything possessed by the Natural Man. As Roxana says to Cabal (in *Whither Mankind?*), "Men and women are made for love making. All the rest — follows." Much to her dismay, Cabal argues the case for the New Man of party training, who puts "love on ice" for the sake of comradeship in a common purpose, as if there were only one sex in the world. In the Air League, as among Plato's Guardians, women fight *with* men and are not fought over and used *by* men. They have not the "common souls" of Natural Man: "The common man who cannot be trusted with duty and machinery and the common woman who cannot be trusted with men!" (*Whither Mankind?*)

Vishnu, then, is as much allied with Siva the Destroyer as is Brahma the Creator. The difference is that Siva's effect in siding with the Possessor is wasteful destruction; with Brahma it is creative destruction. Thus Rudolf makes war for self-glory, Cabal for social peace. The Airmen's terrible technical prowess in carrying out the war to end war is a virtue of their moral superiority. As Rudolf says of their values, revealing those of the unprogressive, reactionary anti-builder: "Science! — it's the enemy of everything that is natural in life." Yes. Natural Man is

driven by heart's lust for power, indulgence and sex. Rudolf is undisciplined, unprofessional. The New Puritans are privileged to govern and dispose of him as a mere brigand chief because they value scientific self-control. Who would govern others must first control himself. The discipline of machine technology makes the Airmen honest, dutiful and *rightly* powerful. Science and righteousness!

Rudolf and his robber gang of bawling patriots are quieted by a nerve gas, Pacificin (the "Gas of Peace"), dropped by the Airmen from invincible bombers when they come to rescue Cabal, himself saved by his gas mask. Like the tankmen in "The Land Ironclads", they are "calm and sensible men" who do their chastising of the naughty "open-country men" with "a certain qualified pity and a quite unqualified contempt."³¹ Airpersons (men and women alike booted and uniformed in black, as conceived but not shown) then parachute to the ground as the people of Everytown wake from the whiff of sanity given them, ready for re-education under the new order. All but unteachable Rudolf. Pacificin is a morally selective gas. John Cabal stands over his body and pronounces, "Dead and his world dead with him. And now for the rule of the Airmen, and a new life for mankind." The business of death and resurrection is what they do best.

This is followed by a rush series of technological marvels, in which Everytown is reconstructed, a sealed mechanized world built underground, the exterior landscape garden. It is a wonder city gleaming white and its directive élite are dressed in Brahma's white as well, no longer in Siva's black as were the Airmen. The upper garment of their costume is wide-shouldered, recalling the *Kata-ginu* or "shoulder cloth" belonging to the formal court dress of the Samurai nobility and still worn in Kabuki theater. The Samurai were the ruling class of Tokugawa Japan, sworn to a single-minded devotion to statecraft by the ascetic code of Bushido. From them Wells derived yet another name for his New Republicans in *A Modern Utopia*.

No sooner is the Utopia of 2036 achieved than Vishnu reappears in the form of a counter-revolution, led by Theotocopulos, played by Sir Cedric Hardwicke. He is a sculptor (named after the painter El Greco), and his artistic temperament rebels against "this great white world." He longs for the "natural life of man", he says of the self-disciplined party élite. "The servitude they put upon themselves today they will impose on the whole world tomorrow." He's right. The party is a model for the society it rules. The people are ignorant and unreliable and need the partymen to be their taskmasters, as are Plato's Guardians. For they rule by Science, the "power of the thing that is provably right", and opposition is treated as "purely evil, as a vice to be guarded against, as a trouble in the machinery."³²

As the mob heads out to destroy the space gun, Oswald Cabal calls upon his chief of security police ("Controller of Traffic and Order"), a man dressed in white with a black sash by the name of Morden Mitani, which might better be read as Morden[t] Mitani[n]i. The Mitanni were warrior heroes of an ancient Indo-European military chieftom, and a mordent is a melodic figure of music in which the principal tone is trilled with an auxiliary tone. So, too, does Brahma the Creator of the Wellsian world state alternate with Siva the destroyer. The sharp distinction between war and peace is undialectical, and the Samurai partymen of 2036 have both might and right on their side. The rebellion will be crushed with a musical grace note, Siva on

the side of Brahma, even though Morden Mitani has no "Gas of Peace" on hand.

The mob races toward the Space Gun, but Cabal and company get their first, to fire a manned projectile around the moon in a creative act of experimental science that now serves also to destroy the rebellion. The space gun is emphatically a gun, complete with gunsight pointing heavenward, its bold and steely barrel a church steeple of the world theocratic state and the very engine of its dialectical truth. It is truth proclaimed, truth punishable if denied. The gun slowly pulls down on its colossal shock absorbers as the mob reaches it, thousands of them clambering up ladders, girders and latticework, swarming over platforms, through passageways and in spaces below the gun. Cabal calls out to them, "Beware the concussion!" Three times he says "beware", before entering the concussion chamber. Then the gun, electrical, goes "thud" in a quiet killing way. The dissidents are extinguished. Advertisements for the film boasted a cast of 20,000 extras, all killed in the whirlwind of the concussion. Invincible truth comes out of the barrel of a moral gun with the power to smite wrongdoers dead in mass murder.

In *Whither Mankind?* Wells explains that the last part of his film of the future "brings the drama of creative effort versus the resistances of jealousy, indolence and sentimentality, a culmination." Once we have a unified world state, the dominant spirit of man will be different. "The aggressive maker in the human soul has emerged triumphant over instinct and tradition. Brahma the Creator asserts himself over Vishnu the Preserver after his previous subjugation by Siva the Destroyer. But as the struggle about the Space Gun shows, all three Powers are still eternally alive and at work in the world."

IV

This emphasis on the Hindu trinity of gods should not, however, lead us to suppose that Wells takes a special interest in the Eastern religion of the Indians. Rather, his display of the Hindu vision of life in "Things to Come" is a special use of his broader knowledge of Indo-European mythology in general. The author of *The Outline of History* was not unaware that Hindu mythology was but one instance of a like vision of life shared throughout the heroic societies of the ancient Indo-European cultural realm, from India to northern Europe. These societies were layered in terms of priests, warriors and peasant producers, and they invented departmental gods to express the social reality of these different strata, thus explaining society to itself and making it work. In ancient India, the god of the priests was Brahma, that of the warriors Siva, that of the producers Vishnu. In northern mythology they are Odin, Thor and Freya. In all cases they represent wisdom, force and wealth: — the instructive wisdom of the priests, the destructive force of the warriors, and the erotic fertility of wealth in possession of the peasant's plants and animals. Long after the chieftoms which gave rise to these gods disappeared as actual social structures, the myths remained as ideological formulations to clarify social ideals (as in the Medieval idea of the three estates, clerics, knights and people), but more as a means of analyzing and understanding the cosmos and its cardinal forces.³³

Heir to a long tradition, Wells undertook in *The Work, Wealth and Happiness of Mankind* to analyze and understand economic history in the very same terms, reducing the forces of the world to the interplay and transformations of three basic

"personas", those of priest, warrior and peasant.³⁴ In "Things to Come" these correspond to John Cabal, Rudolf and his peasant underlings and sexual dependents at a time when a war smash-up has thrown the world back in 1970 to a Medieval condition or earlier. The film takes these characters, among others, as a means to instruct the audience in the movement of the Spade House Dialectic. As in the past burghers rose out of peasants, the future will give rise to men of science and directive will out of the priestly caste, whose new wisdom and training shall allow them the "conquest of society", not alone the material "conquest of power" through technology, and the triumph of socialism for the common good (Brahma) over the disorderly use of force (Siva) and selfish ownership (Vishnu). Again, the model is Plato, whose ideal society brings these cosmic forces of Indo-European mythology into balance under a philosopher king. What he presides over and keeps aligned is a structure consisting, no less, of teachers, warriors (the Guardians) and workers.

Small wonder that 'Things to Come' is little understood. It was meant to both entertain and instruct. From the first, however, its theme of prophecy amused for the wrong reason (the coming of a second world war was laughable to the audience of 1936), and now it amuses for its failed prediction of later events. But its theory is as old as the ideology of our Indo-European ancestors, and this establishes it as a romantic work with intellectual deeps to be sounded. It is a work of profound social science fiction, and Platonic science fiction at that.

Notes

1. *Experiment in Autobiography* (New York: Macmillan, 1934), p.545.
2. *Travels of a Republican Radical in Search of Hot Water* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1939), p.74.
3. *The World of William Clissold*, 2 vols. (New York: George H. Doran, 1926), vol.1, p.185. On the world state, see W. Warren Wagar, *H.G. Wells and the World State* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961).
4. *Meanwhile* (London: Ernest Benn, 1927), p.258.
5. *First and Last Things* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1908), p.147. On the recurring imagery of gardening, see David Y. Hughes, "The Garden in Wells's Early Science Fiction." In Darko Suvin and Robert M. Philmus, eds., *H.G. Wells and Modern Science Fiction* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1977), pp.48-69.
6. *Autobiography*, op. cit., p.465.
7. *Social Forces in England and America* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1914), p.395.
8. *The Passionate Friends* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1913), p.96.
9. *William Clissold*, op. cit., vol.1, p.328. Here, to anticipate my argument, the Spade House Dialectic has its phrasing in terms of the major trio of Indian gods. The chapter from which this quotation is taken is in fact entitled, "Vishnu, Siva, and Brahma."
10. *The Open Conspiracy* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1928), p.51.

11. *A Modern Utopia* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1905), p.5.
12. *First and Last Things*, loc. cit.
13. "A Forecast of the World's Affairs." In *These Eventful Years*, 2 vols. (London: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1924), vol.2, pp.5 and 6.
14. *The Shape of Things to Come* (New York: Macmillan, 1933), p.428.
15. "Things to Come", a London Film Production, 1936. Produced by Alexander Korda, directed by William Cameron Menzies, with Raymond Massey, Margaretta Scott, Sir Ralph Richardson and Sir Cedric Hardwicke. All quotations are from the sound track, not from the published scenario, *Things to Come* (London: Cresset Press, 1935). The film differs from the book in that many scenes are eliminated, the dialogue is often modified in those which are filmed, and in others dialogue is added. New material includes two full speeches, one by Rudolf at his victory banquet, the other by John Cabal, spoken voice-over at the start of the rush series that show Everytown under reconstruction.
16. *Whither Mankind?/A Film of the Future/by/H.G. Wells./Based on his two books, "The Shape of Things to Come" and "The Work, Wealth and Happiness of Mankind."/TREATMENT.* Wells Collection, 822/W462w. Unpaginated and undated. *Whither Mankind?* probably was done in 1934, to judge from a note that gives it as covering future history for "the next hundred and twenty years", to A.D. 2054. 'Things to Come' (the film) ranges one hundred years to A.D. 2036, from date of production. *Things to Come* (the book) leaves the future date at 2054, as in *Whither Mankind?* (the film treatment). Wells in the book (p.11) says he did three descriptive treatments prior to the final scenario, and this agrees with Michael Korda, *Charmed Lives* (New York: Random House, 1979), p.122. Which one this is there is no indication, and I have found no others in the Wells Collection. I guess it to be the first on grounds of primitivity: — the number of unshootable scenes, the absence of Rowena, and the awkward plotting that has both Cabal and Gordon (not Gordon alone) flying from Everytown to Marseilles. On the other hand it gives, in the Appendix, two sets of notes on set design and on casting. One thing is certain, however, and that is Wells's attachment to its title. In the published scenario, he has the words "Whither Mankind?" flashed on the screen twice (pp. 19 and 20).
17. On this proportion, see Patrick Parrinder and Robert M. Philmus, eds., *H.G. Wells's Literary Criticism* (Brighton, Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1980), p.222.
18. *Ibid.*, p.101f.
19. *Ibid.*, p.68.
20. Here in Chicago, 'Things to Come' is shown twice a year on Channel 44, in mid-summer and every Christmas, the time the film's war breaks out. Channel 32 has it as a stock offering along with Japanese monster movies and other cheapo horror and science-fiction flicks, intercalated with risible remarks by the program's host during station breaks for commercial

advertising. Around Christmas time 1981, Channel 11 ran it as part of a series of like films, but from the vantage of a superior outlook, in which the offerings were classified as "camp", that is, films of trivial content done up in a high-handed or extravagant manner. Channel 11 is Chicago's TV outlet for the nation's Public Broadcasting System, run without commercials for the sake of high-toned Culture with a capital "C." The stance allows for laughing at uncultured things, and 'Things to Come' played in a series entitled, 'Summer Camp.' *Camp* is an American slang term for a homosexual brothel; and by extension applies to affected or ostentatious displays of behavior or vulgar art in which one is permitted to find amusing qualities of incongruity between form and content. In accord with this cultural policy, the station host pronounced 'Things to Come' in a mock homosexual voice "a film of no redeeming social value whatsoever." Hence fun to watch in complete safety, strictly for laughs.

21. 'Fiction about the Future' (1938). In Parrinder and Philmus, op. cit., pp.246-251. For another version, see 'Foretelling the Future.' In George Hay, ed., *Pulsar 1* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1978), pp.171-174.
22. *Ibid.*, p.225, but see pp.222-229 inclusively.
23. See Thomas D. Claeson, 'The Other Side of Realism'. In Claeson., ed., *SF: The Other Side of Realism* (Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1971), pp.1-28.
24. See F.H. Doughty, *H.G. Wells: Educationist* (New York, George H. Doran, 1927).
25. For a full reading of 'Things to Come', see my forthcoming *Socialism and the Science Fiction of H.G. Wells*.
26. *The New Machiavelli* (London: John Lane, 1911), p.522.
27. See *Anticipations* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1901) and *Mankind in the Making* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904).
28. *The War That Will End War* (London: Frank and Cecil Palmer, 1914), p.11.
29. *Ibid.*, p.14.
30. *A Short History of the World* (New York: Macmillan, 1922), pp.253,254,257.
31. 'The Land Ironclads' (1903). In *The Short Stories of H.G. Wells* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran and Co., 1929), pp.130 and 133.
32. *Anticipations*, op. cit., p.213; *The Shape of Things to Come*, op. cit., p.350.
33. Leon Stover and Bruce Kraig, *Stonehenge and the Origins of Western Culture* (London: Heinemann, 1978). In *America as Stonehenge and the Indo-European Heritage* (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1978). See also George Dumézil, *L'idéologie tripartite des Indo-Européens* (Brussels: Collection Latomus, 1958).
34. *The Work, Wealth and Happiness of Mankind* (London: William Heinemann, 1932), chap. 8.

From Puttenhanger to Polly: A Note on H.G. Wells's Comic Masterpiece

Christopher Rolfe

An author's choice of name for a fictional character is no less significant than that made by parents for their children. As parental choice is affected by, for example, family names, current trends, class considerations and aspirations, so an author's choice is coloured by what effect he is hoping to create with his character. The suitability of the name is a measure of its semiological effectiveness. A comparison of the holograph manuscript and typescript of H.G. Wells's *The History of Mr Polly*¹ reveals a fascinating metamorphosis of the book's title and the eponymous hero's name, providing an insight into this aspect of the creative process.

The first page of the manuscript has no heading other than the figure one. In the first sentence the protagonist's name appears as "Mr Puttenhanger". The sentence reads:

"Ole!" said Mr Puttenhanger. "Ole! Oh! Beastly Ole!"

And this is what the hero of Wells's most celebrated comic novel is called until p.26 of the (un-numbered) manuscript (p.32 of the first London edition; Nelson, 1910). Here, invited to go for a drink by his friend Parsons, the erstwhile Mr Puttenhanger's reply is written as:

"Short of sugar O'Man," said Mr Polly.²

The following is an attempt to trace the process whereby this change came about.

Wells passed the first sixteen pages of the manuscript to his wife Jane to type, with a note at the top of page one:

Three copies Please put quantity at end of every section

These first sixteen pages became numbers one to nine of the typescript and take the story to the end of section two of the published version. Wells obviously continued to write the novel using the name Puttenhanger (sometimes abbreviated to "Mr P."), until shortly before writing page twenty-six he received the first typed pages back from Jane for correction. In the approximately four inch space left at the top of the first page of the typescript, Wells penned in the book's provisional title, then "Chapter the First", and beneath this the title for the chapter. These lines are considerably emended and surrounded with working notes.

Initially, the book was to have been called *The Soul of Mr Puttenhanger*, and the first chapter was conceived of as the one which "Introduces the Soul". After writing this, Wells apparently went on to correct the text, deleting the first word "Ole!" and writing above it "Hole". Although the exclamation "Ole!" provides a striking beginning, and is certainly more in keeping with the character's speech patterns, Wells doubtless considered that an un-aspirated exclamation at the outset would confuse his readers. Any lessening of the impact of the book's shouted opening occasioned by this minor alteration is amply compensated for by Wells's alteration to the character's name. Here, at the fourth word, the emendations demonstrate his ultimately successful attempt to achieve a name that would signify the main