

H.G. Wells and Eastern Europe

David C. Smith

It is virtually impossible during these times to work on a talk about H.G. Wells and eastern Europe without asking how he would view the events of the last weeks of August 1991. In fact, an eerie and unconscious echo of the events of today can be sensed as one reads his words. Wells's analysis and comments are often so clear that they become uncannily prophetic.

I think, however, that we can be quite sure of one or two things he would say if he were alive today - first, he would welcome the changes of the past three or four years, and he would say, as he did in 1917, at the time of the earlier Revolution, "We had not dared to hope it ... in the hearts of the four British nations, the Russian revolution burns like a fire."¹ Wells also drew other significant conclusions from the events in Russia, for, in the wake of the toppled tsarist regime, he called for the creation of a Republican society for Great Britain, implying that the days of royalty and aristocracy were no longer significant in this "war to end all wars."²

In a sense these two comments provide end-pieces for his views on eastern Europe. He welcomed the Russian Revolution, but he also understood that that event was not enough by itself. A stable world demanded fuller measures, measures which would deal with problems created by aristocracy, and monarchy, governmental structures which were fundamentally in conflict with the democratic demands of the populace.³

Wells was a very logical spokesman on Russian and east European affairs. Russia, and to a lesser extent, eastern Europe has always had considerable attraction for English travellers; a surprising number of English women were employed as nurses/governesses by the Russian aristocracy, and books on Russia and eastern Europe had had good sales in England for many years. Not many people had visited Russia, however, and few had much more than superficial knowledge of the huge state. Wells had visited Russia and had crossed through parts of eastern Europe on his way there.

In a newspaper report on his 1913-14 visit, he told his British readers that the two nations were not very similar. In one nation, England, the country was well established economically, but less so socially, while in the other nation, Russia, both aspects of life trailed in accomplishment. He was positive enough that a significant change in Russian life lay in the near future, however, to insist that the Russian language be made a subject for study at Oundle School, where his children were students. In addition, he provided special training for them at home. An important literary figure of the period, S.S. Koteliensky (Kot as he was always called), became a nominal part of that menage, helping with instruction and translation.⁴ In private correspondence of the time, Wells went further in his comments and he remarked that the Russia he met was just like a "stage Russia". He implied that like the stage, it could all be changed very radically and very quickly.⁵

In addition to his three major trips to Russia (1913-14, 1920 and 1934), Wells also visited eastern Europe several times. In both 1920 and 1934, parts of the trip were taken by airplane, and in the low altitude flying of that day this meant that he was able to observe carefully the massive spaces of eastern Europe. On the earliest trip he travelled by rail, and as he looked out the window of the slow-moving train, he noticed that each little city or village seemed to be separate from others, with large forests and fields lying between, almost as though they were not

connected with any larger entity.

Wells also spent part of the summer of 1921 flying about Europe, studying the distances and the probable traffic routes involved as he began to think about world control of aviation as a prelude to his post-nationalist dreams. In addition, he chaired the session of the international writers' organisation P.E.N. in 1933, at Ragusa and Zubrovnik, when the Nazi spokesmen walked out over the issue of free speech for writers and protection for Jews and other minorities.

Wells was especially familiar with Estonia. An earlier acquaintance from his second visit to Russia, Moura Budberg, attended the Dubrovnik meeting with him, and they enjoyed a brief holiday in Austria thereafter. Although they had met at Gorky's home in 1920, their connections were limited until they renewed acquaintance in 1929, where they met in Berlin when Wells arrived there to give a lecture. Budberg was part of the Gorky entourage and she followed the Russian writer after he left Russia, to Italy, and Berlin, although she also maintained a London flat as her children were educated in England.⁶ Moura Budberg retained control during the inter-war period of a family dacha at Kallijarv, near Tallinn. Wells spent several very pleasant weeks at that dacha after the Russian visit of 1934. In fact, he wrote the last lines of his autobiography at Kallijarv.⁷

Because of Wells's reputation, both as author of the *Outline of History*, and from his fiction and his essays on current affairs, he became a significant spokesman for world socialist ideas during the inter-war period. He met and became friends with several significant figures from eastern Europe. In addition to his personal knowledge of the land, he was also in touch with the ideas and hopes of the intelligentsia. Among those whom he met and knew well were Jan Masaryk, Edward Benes, Boris Chaliapin, Pieter Kapitza as well as Gorky. "Kot" remained close as well, translating both actual words but also ideas for Wells. Few English persons of this period were better versed on eastern Europe, Russia and the realities of life in this great shatter belt of language and customs, than H.G. Wells.

Although it might be assumed that Wells's published works would be translated into French, and even German, it is interesting to note that other nations were very interested in his ideas. Many volumes were issued in Swedish, Hungarian and Czech. Many were also translated into Polish, Russian and several others of the Slavic languages. Members of the intelligentsia were able to read Wells whenever they wished, and the extent of the translations suggest that his views on places like Eastern Europe were not just words written for Anglophones.⁸ In addition, virtually all his work, including the commentary volumes, appeared in the ubiquitous Tauchnitz editions, on sale in every railway kiosk on the continent.

When Wells commented on the subject of Russia or eastern Europe, especially when he offered conjecture on what might occur, readers and listeners in Europe, England and in America paid attention to his views. Some, as for example, Shaw and Churchill, attempted to offer alternative ideas, but Wells was usually able to shake these comments off, as he had the advantage of actual visits as well as his wide friendships with persons from the area.

Wells had given some thought to the various areas of the world which were experiencing nationalist tremors long before the Russian revolution. In his book *Anticipations*, written at the turn of the twentieth century, where he offered predictions as to the state of the world a century

later, he devoted an entire chapter to his thoughts about language in the new world he envisaged. This world was certainly one in which rapid communication and shortened distances were to be the paramount reality. However, as he remarked about his own thoughts,

So far, this has been a speculation upon the probable development of a civilized society in vacuo... We have ignored the boundaries of language that are flung athwart the great lines of modern communication Moreover, we have taken very little account of the fact, that, quite apart from nationality, each individual case of the new social order is developing within the form of a legal government based on conceptions of a society that has been superseded by the advent of mechanism. 9

The coming of the first world war provided an atmosphere in which generalised statements about nationalism and language barriers such as these no longer sufficed for Wells. In the first ten weeks of the war, H.G. frantically produced a series of articles written in an effort to understand the overall meaning of the conflict. In fact, by the time the conflict was only two weeks old, Wells wrote that he thought that the warring nations must adopt as the main purpose of the conflict the need for "A New Map of Europe". Looking into the foggy future of this new country or collection of countries, he called for a break-up of the remnants of the Austro-Hungarian empire, at the very least, asking his readers to contemplate, "What is to become of the non-German regions of Austria-Hungary? And what is to happen upon the Polish frontier of Russia?"¹⁰

He immediately answered his own questions by positing three new collections of entities. First, he suggested the possibility of a reunited Poland (under the Tsar of Russia as King of Poland), and, secondly, a looser confederation of states, based on Romania, (including Transylvania, and, one supposes, Moldavia) as well as a Servian federation, although he was well aware of and mentioned briefly the problems of language differences in western Bulgaria, Montenegro and Croatia.

Wells was under no illusions about his prescriptions in these matters, for he understood that others might have different borders in mind, but he did feel that the concept of Swiss-type federations was the best way to deal with the language/boundary problems lurking in any settlement of eastern Europe. He was also aware of worse problems. As he called for this restructuring of the European map, he knew that many English people would object to this or any interference in continental affairs. To these persons, however, he warned, if England and the U.S. (for he was also importuning the American cousins not to absent themselves from peace discussions) did not participate, "Left to herself, a victorious Russia is far more likely to help herself to East Prussia and set to work to Russianize its inhabitants than to risk an indigestion of more Poles"

In any case, said Wells, "things will not wait for reason and justice, if just and reasonable men have neither energy nor unity."¹¹ The first world war was only two weeks old, but Wells had

spotted the trouble areas, and, characteristically, he rushed in, and offered the germ of what would become the Versailles settlement in eastern Europe. However, again characteristically, he also pointed out the problems inherent in such a solution.

Elsewhere, at about the same time but to a somewhat different audience, Wells called for better understanding of the Russian position in eastern Europe, and urged teaching the Russian language in English public schools. He and others pointed out that the liberal fear of Russia was founded on very little evidence. In fact, he broke with his comrades in the Labour party, asking them to put aside their prejudice against the reactionary Russian government and to support the war effort, as he was convinced that the defeat of Prussianism and the opportunity to remake the European map should be the top priority of all thinking individuals. 12

Two weeks after his first venture into map-making, Wells returned to his ideas of Swiss-type federations, and he published a piece entitled, *Looking Ahead: Common Sense and the Balkans*. 13 In this article Wells provided significant factual material about the area he was discussing, while making the point to his readers that most previous barriers to discussion, such as the presence of the Hapsburg monarchy, were certain to be absent when the war was over. Wells went on to urge his readers to avoid recrimination about past acts, putting them in the same category as the Fenian raids, as annoying but not really significant. He was prepared to forget, if not forgive, in order to bring peace to this very difficult location.

As he remarked while urging tolerance, "Stifled nations, [and] outraged races, are the fortresses of resentful cruelty. This war is no cinematograph melodrama... It is not the business of statecraft to avenge the past, but [instead] to deal with the possibilities of the present and the hope of the future." In this vein he called for a revival and extension of the Balkan League, and substantial rectification of eastern European boundaries, with Bulgaria obtaining part of Macedonia, Greece to obtain Cyprus and the "natural expansion" of Romania and Servia into those areas which were linguistically connected.

Wells was aware of many petty dynastic claims, as well as potential economic problems in the area, so he pleaded for an open peace publically arrived at. Indeed, said he, "The nations themselves have to become the custodians of the common peace..... It is for the whole strength of western liberalism to throw itself upon the side of that movement, and in no direction can it make its strength so effective at the present time as in the open and energetic promotion of a new and greater Balkan League."

From these comments, one sees quickly that Wellsian ideas lay as the germ of the Peace of Versailles, the League of Nations and in the makeup of the post World War One world. Unfortunately, strong opposition to his ideas arose immediately, both in the Foreign Office, and even among his liberal friends, especially George Bernard Shaw.

In December of 1914, for instance, Wells and Gilbert Murray wrote an open letter to intellectuals in Russia urging them to work for a new map of Europe in which Russia could play a significant part. Shaw refused to sign the letter, although about thirty other members of the intelligentsia in England did. Instead, Shaw attacked Wells, especially after H.G. had written a second piece saying that the war could turn into a battle among Slavs and Germans for control of the world, unless other nations became involved in the development of the postwar world. 14

Wells naturally responded to the Shavian attack, and in his desire to respond to Shaw, lost some sight of his greater goals, which were under discussion in many other places. 15 The Foreign Office was a much more difficult target to hit than Shaw, but the amount of writing Wells produced on war and peace aims, as well as possible postwar settlements, is staggering, in his attempt to alter this obstacle to his ideas, especially in the last six months of 1918.

Wells and many other observers thought that, even though the war had become more or less a stalemate by the end of the year 1914, it might still be possible to create a negotiated peace. His writings at the end of that year, and through much of 1915, should be read primarily in terms of searching for a possible negotiated peace, but only if that peace would eliminate Prussianism and Kruppism from Germany. In addition, the peace must be one where the map of Europe more closely represented linguistic ties. This feeling was to remain present in most of his commentary until after the Battle of the Somme (which began on July 1, 1916).

After that horrific summer, Wells was so broken by the terrible toll of the war that following a brief religious epiphany, he seized upon and become almost fixated by the idea of a League of Nations and a complete rewriting of national boundaries from those before the war. These false boundaries now began to be symbolic for him of the economic and social disruption which had produced the war, fuelled by the Prussian military and Krupp industrial forces.

Even through the period of seeking a negotiated peace, however, he continued to think about eastern Europe. He spent his time thinking about how this area could be dealt with fairly while satisfying the significant interests which might appear at the time of settlement. For he knew very well that no matter the road to the peace settlement, the position of eastern Europe, the area from the Baltic to the Adriatic, now without a central government and bubbling with nationalism, must be the linchpin to a successful peace.

Wells wrote several thoughtful articles on this subject in the spring of 1916 at a time when the war was still a rational activity in his mind (although by this time he is already referring to a probable "war of exhaustion")¹⁶ In these pieces, he returned to his idea of a new map of Europe, and a greater Balkan League or federation. He remarked that it should be in the east of Germany that "map-drawing [should] become really animated". A proper and acceptable settlement would have to be accomplished in the areas inhabited by Poles, Bohemians, the Magyars, Slovaks, and, as he termed them, the Jugo-Serbs. He was concerned that perhaps Poland was not a really viable nation, as the various strains of patriotism among Poles were so great. In fact, Wells said, "Centuries of bloody rearrangement may lie before the East Central belt of Europe."

His hopes for a viable peace remained with a series of Swiss-like federations among like-minded people, but he felt that these would only work if the United States were to take a strong hand. Wells also thought Constantinople would best be ruled by the Russians, but he was not really sanguine about any of these possibilities. He finally fell back on the need to learn and teach Russian, to make that language a *lingua prolea* (if I may coin a phrase). In the long run, however, he knew (and one supposes that we instinctively know today) that "the gravitation of the West Slav state to either the Central European system or to Russia will, I think, be the only real measure of ultimate success and failure in this war."¹⁷

The war continued in its horror, however. Wells, and many others, revulsed by the slaughter,

now began to work toward a peace settlement with the purpose to bring an end to all such wars. They sought rational boundaries, and an international system of law, called for relinquishing much sovereignty to a central international government, beginning with international control of the post, the seas, money and tariffs. Such matters as the precise boundaries of eastern Europe would be worked out by this central organisation, according to these planners. Those individuals who believed in these ideas as a way of preventing future wars now began to exert substantial pressure on world leadership. 18

A loose coalition of like-minded trans-Atlantic acquaintances began to produce propaganda for their point of view. In Britain, the centre of these efforts was the original propaganda forces at Crewe House, under the auspices of Lord Northcliffe. In the United States, leadership came from persons close to the *New Republic*, and those who would eventually constitute the intellectual effort called "The Inquiry". There were strong ties between London, New York and Washington as many of these persons went back and forth under the auspices of diplomatic positions, or activities such as the Y.M.C.A. and the Red Cross.

Wells was very active in this effort. His liaisons with the U.S. tended to be through Walter Lippmann, whom Wells met as one of Graham Wallas's students. Lippmann was fairly close to Colonel House, a major advisor of Woodrow Wilson. And although House was going out of favour by this time, he still retained close ties to the President and the State Department. Wilson went far enough to appoint the commission of experts, "The Inquiry", with a mandate to propose terms of the world peace. 19 The Inquiry laboured long and several of its members were present at Versailles, but Wilson, by this time very tired and on the edge of a massive stroke, paid little or no attention to them or their ideas once the conference was underway. 20

President Woodrow Wilson electrified much of the world with a series of speeches in 1917 and early 1918 (the most significant coming at the beginning of 1918) in which he spelled out a fourteen-point plan on which the peace should be founded. These points included liberation of Belgium and the occupied areas of France, reunion of Trieste to Italy, a free Poland, liberation of Serbia, restoration of Romania, home rule for the Czechoslovakian people and a league of Nations. 21

Wilson's points were similar to many lists put forward by others, but the closest parallels were with several listings of goals suggested by H.G. Wells as basic material to be considered at the peace conference. In addition to his writing for the press, Wells also served on a quasi-official committee on war propaganda during this period, but the minutes of that body for 1917 are missing, so that actual development of the peace aims list is not well known. In his work on the Northcliffe committee, Wells concentrated his efforts on the development of war/peace aims for the Allies. What is known about the work in 1918 (the 1917 committee used unofficial persons like Wells who did not have a proper appointment, and this perhaps accounts for the paucity of materials) is that he circulated lists of goals for the peace conference which are remarkably similar to Wilsonian comment in his formal speeches. In Wells's most important official World War One work, he produced a "Memorandum on War Aims" for the propaganda bureau located in Crewe House. In the middle of general statements about peace aims, and the need for League of (Free) Nations, he remarked:

It is, however, of far less importance in the war aims of the Allies that this and that particular

*scrap of territory should change hands from the control of one group of combatants to that of the other, than that the present practical ascendancy of German Imperialism over the resources of the Polish, Russian, Ukrainian, Czech, Jugo-Slav, Finnish and Roumanian peoples should cease. The war aim of the Allies in eastern Europe is to create, in the place of the present Austro-Hungarian Empire, a larger synthesis of associated States, something in the order of an "East Central European League", within the League of Nations, a confederation that might possibly reach from Poland to the Black and Adriatic Seas, and have also access to, if not a port upon, the Baltic at Danzig. The Allies are necessarily obliged to wait upon the development of affairs in Russia, but the hopes and efforts of the Allies are towards a reconciliation of at least Great Russia, Siberia and Ukraina into a workable association within the League.*²²

In addition to this work at least once during this period, Wells attended a significant luncheon at Warwick Castle, hosted by the Countess of Warwick. Colonel House was also a guest at this luncheon, along with Ben Tillett (a labour leader), and George Lansbury (an English pacifist who was very interested in world peace). Finally, Wells also sent one extremely important letter to Bainbridge Colby, then a counsellor at the American Embassy, and later a high official in the state department, which dealt with such matters as the disposition of eastern Europe once the war was over. That letter contained the following remark,

*There is another area, an area beyond the scope of international controls, which remains an area of incalculable chances because no clear dominant idea has been imposed upon the world. This is eastern Europe from Poland to the Adriatic All liberal thought is agreed upon the desirability of a practically independent Poland, of a Hungary intact and self-respecting, of a liberated Bohemia, of a Yugo-Slav autonomous state.*²³

This letter was solicited from Wells by Colby according to Wells and to Philip Guedella, who carried it to Colby at the embassy. Wells, in his *Autobiography*, said he wrote the letter because he had been asked to do so, but he said he thought that Wilson had not read it, even though *it was handed to him* (my italics). Wells, by the time he wrote about the letter, however, had repudiated the fourteen points, the League of Nations, and had had severe second thoughts about his role in foreign affairs at the end of the war. He was not above dissembling on this issue at all by 1933, with Wilson dead and the League discredited.

Certainly many of Wells's friends and admirers thought he had much to do with the Fourteen Points address, and especially those portions which dealt with eastern Europe and the rights of self-determination. Wells could deny his role easily enough fifteen years afterwards, because his ideas had been truncated and partially ignored by those who solicited them. To some degree we can be grateful for his efforts, however, because it was at these same meetings in late 1917, and through 1918, where he decided to move in his search for world peace on an independent course. For it was at this time, and because of the failure of the Peace Conference at Versailles to deal with the causes of the war, that he reached, with his wife Jane, the decision to produce the *Outline of History* as a way of providing leadership to those who wished to really change the world and meet linguistic and historic realities.²⁴

Wells offered his views on eastern Europe freely to the world during the first World War period. Although he offered some commentary after the war, his views were clearly known and they changed very little for the remainder of his life. Wells realised that the shatter belt of eastern Europe would not be stable until a stable relationship with other governments took place. In the interwar period (and perhaps today and in the future) this meant that eastern Europe was caught between Russia and Germany.

Wells did not like Marxian Socialism which he felt was outdated and ill-adapted to the twentieth century.²⁵ However, he thought that the Nazi version of socialism was much more dangerous. Throughout the remainder of his life, although he often clearly stated his views with regard to Russian communism, he continued to hope for change, and he especially urged support of the Russian state in their battle against Hitler and his hopes for world power.²⁶

H.G. Wells's visits to Russia should be seen in terms of his desire to see the changes, but also as a way of providing some support for the Russians in their battle against the Germans for control of eastern Europe. He did not address any questions about eastern Europe to either Lenin or Stalin, as they were of no concern in the circumstances of the visits and interviews. Later when the Hitlerian invasion threatened the Russian state, Wells was quick to speak out about the dangers, but always in terms of his world state ideas, under which the Balkan and east European federations could exist easily, or so he thought.²⁷ Some of his comments were made to private citizens whom he felt could help in developing a new postwar world without these problems, but he also wrote pieces for the press as well.²⁸

Throughout the interwar period, Wells maintained a lively interest in the affairs of eastern Europe, and he was especially interested in Czechoslovakia. In 1923, he began a year-long stint of weekly articles in the *Westminster Gazette*. This outlet allowed him to comment on many matters, and especially the post-World War One settlement. In his very first article for the rather upscale newspaper, he reverted to his views on the stupidity of a world without a significant legislative body to adjudicate difficulties between nations, and the need for a confederation with power to prevent and punish nations for warlike activities.²⁹ In this piece Wells recalled the days of Versailles as "a false dawn", but, as he said, "it is easier to assemble crowds of enthusiastic people than to give them faithful leaders and capable Ministers."

In January, 1924, Wells focussed a weekly article on Czechoslovakia, describing it as "the revived and extended Bohemian Kingdom," while also terming it the "most orderly and successful of all the states created by the Treaty of Versailles." He remarked, "what is done in Prague is heard of in the world." Wells was welcoming a new treaty with France on this

occasion, pointing out that Poland had no power to live up to an agreement, and that Czechoslovakia had moved into Poland's place in central Europe. He thought that the new treaty marked the creation of a state which would act as mediator, perhaps even an honest broker, between the Slavic World and central and western Europe. Of course, Wells knew and remarked of, "the enormous disadvantages against which the imaginations of President Masaryk and Mr Benes and their colleagues are pitted."³⁰

Wells went on in this reflective article to recount his visits to Prague in 1920 and 1923 and he used his memories of the visits to suggest the terrible problems which the new treaty and its signatories would be likely to face. ³¹ In fact, he now thought that insofar as they had been tried, his earlier ideas of Swiss-type federations were not working, and only Cosmopolitanism could save the world, both in eastern Europe and elsewhere. Most of the remaining pieces in his year of journalism dealt with this need for a cosmopolitan state, with perhaps the most interesting to our time an article where he combined this call with a demand to use the world's resources in a democratic fashion, wisely and for the future. ³²

Wells continued his interest and affection for the Czechoslovakian experiment. He and Edward Benes conducted a fairly extensive correspondence toward the end of the '30s, after Benes assumed the presidency of the republic. After the Nazi take-over, Benes lived in London for a time. Wells, and others, nominated him for a Nobel peace prize, and provided speaking fora for him and his message on Czechoslovakia. Wells once termed Benes "a representative of world statesmanship to come," but these were rather empty words in a world facing the potential tyranny of the Nazis. ³³

Wells remained hopeful that an eastern Europe united in a desire for world peace could lead the world. In 1941, he published a book filled with short articles, almost as from a commonplace book. Among the places he chose for comment were, naturally enough, eastern Europe. In one of the short pieces in the book, with Poland as its subject, he ended the piece by writing,

*"Yet Poland is not all sentimentally patriotic. General Sikorski's recent exchanges with President Benes contain the promise of something far broader, wiser and more generous. These two statesmen are able to contemplate an eastern European Federation. I doubt if either of them will want to stop at that if Britain, America and Russia lead the way..."*³⁴

Of course, if Wells was right about the importance of eastern Europe to world peace, these last words, "if Britain, America and Russia lead the way," tell us about the failure of both diplomacy and military might to contemplate eastern Europe properly. Now, as the Russian world comes tumbling down, eastern Europe still waits - but observers may well ask, for what? Will crude nationalism continue to determine how the area is structured or will Wells's dream, a Swiss-type confederation, follow the turmoil? Steps toward settling the problems of eastern and central Europe, problems which have dogged the last century and more of European and indeed world history, still need to be taken. As with H.G. Wells in 1917, we can all welcome the new Russia, and say, with him, "We had not dared to hope it." But, just as the world of three-quarters a century ago had an agenda which focussed on eastern and central Europe, so must our world. H.G. Wells's ideas may still have some significance in this quest, but only if they are read

and thought about by those in conference, wherever those conferences may be held.

Notes

1. HGW *Daily Chronicle* (April 5, 1917), *Free Russia*. Others who welcomed the overturn of the Tsar included, in this issue of the paper, G.B.Shaw, T.P.O'Connor, Hall Caine, Marie Corelli and Arnold Bennett.
2. Letter to the *Times*, April 21, 1917; Letter to *Manchester Guardian*, April 27, 1917. These letters stirred considerable comment, not least in the United States where the *Times* letter was reprinted in the *New York Times*. Wells continued to monitor the progress of the first revolutionary government, analysing their efforts and calling on British Labour to support their attempts: *Manchester Guardian* (June 22 and July 9, 1917). This was the period, of course, when the west was concerned about what would happen to the Russian war effort, which held a large number of German divisions busy in the east. See George F. Kennan *Russia Leaves the War* (New York, 1956) for the best account of these days.
3. Probably Wells's clearest statements at this time (the summer and early autumn of 1917 when the situation in Europe was in greatest flux) appear in *Times* during April and May, 1917; repeated in *New York Times* for the same dates; *Daily Chronicle Republicanism in Great Britain* (April 27, 1917); and *Are we Sticking to the Point? My view of Our War Aims* (December 26, 1917). This latter article also appeared in part in his book *In the Fourth Year* (London, 1918). Here he remarked that the real issue of the war had become "freedom versus imperialism, the League of Nations versus that net of diplomatic roguery and of aristocratic, plutocratic and autocratic greed and conceit which has dragged us all into this vast welter of bloodshed and loss."
4. HGW *Russia and England: A study in Contrasts Daily News and Leader* February 21, 1914). This was repeated by them on February 21, 1917 so that readers could obtain greater perceptions of Russia as the Tsarist government began to fall apart. On Koteliansky (1882 - 1955) see John Carswe. *Lives and Letters: A.R. Orage, Katherine Mansfield, Beatrice Hastings, John Middleton Murry, S.S. Koteliansky, 1906-1957* (New York: New Directions, 1978). Marjorie Wells took care of "Kot" in the last months of his life, and was with him when he died. G.P.Wells mastered Russian sufficiently to act as his father's interpreter for the informal portions of both his 1920 and 1934 visits.
5. H.G.Wells to Amy Catherine Wells, January 24, 1914; to Frederick MacMillan, ? June, 1914. Also see Wells's introduction to Denis Garstin, *Friendly Russia* (London, 1915) in which he said that Russia was not "a mysteriously wicked tyranny."
6. An autobiography/biography of this fascinating woman has just been published in English translation. As with her life, however, it elides many matters which still interest those studying the twentieth century world of letters.
7. Tania Alexander has described this Wellsian visit, and includes some candid photographs in her *A Little of All These: An Estonian Childhood* (London, 1987), especially in chapter xi. The photographs occur between pps 124 and 125.
8. In my, as yet, unpublished Wells bibliography, I have an appendix of known translations into other languages of Wellsian materials. This list is based on my sightings, and the holdings in the U.S. Library of Congress. In this list there are 22 volumes in Swedish, about 10 in Polish, 24 books in Czech and 37 in Hungarian. In fact, an acquaintance of mine had read *William Clissold* in Hungarian, and then used the book as a crib to learn English when he emigrated to the United States early in the 1930s.

9. H.G.W. *Anticipations of the Reaction of Mechanical and Scientific Progress Upon Human Life and Thought* (London, 1902). I am using the 8th edition which has his widest footnote commentary on the original text, both in serial form and in the first printings. The quotation is from pp 144-5. Chapter VII is entitled *The Conflict of Languages*, and it appears from pp 215-244.
10. H.G.Wells, *Looking Ahead: The Need for a New Map of Europe* *Daily Chronicle*, (August 15, 1914), reprinted as Chapter VI of *The War That Will End War* (London and New York, 1914).
11. These quotations are from pp 55-9, chapter VI of *The War That Will End War*.
12. H.G.W *The Liberal Fear of Russia* *The Nation* (August 22, 1914), Chapter VIII of *The War That Will End War*. Other significant pieces at this time include a letter, jointly signed with C.Hagberg Wright, on misconceptions of Russia, *Daily Chronicle*, September 22, 1914; other letters from him on Russia appeared in *The Times*, September 22, 1914: His call for Russian in the schools appeared in *Times Educational Supplement*, October, 6, 1914. Virtually all of these pieces also were printed in the U.S.A., usually in the *New York Times*, occasionally trimmed, but offered nevertheless. Wells's views were widely noted, especially by Walter Lippmann, by this time one of the editors of *The New Republic* and an acquaintance of Woodrow Wilson.
13. *Daily Chronicle* (August 28, 1914) and Chapter 10 in *The War That Will End War*.
14. Reading this is one of the times that Wells's prescience is almost frightening.
15. H.G.W. *Looking Ahead: The Future of the North of Europe* *Daily Chronicle* (December 18, 1914); Shaw responded on December 23, and Wells answered on December 31, 1914. *Muddleheadedness and Russia with Some Mention of Mr Shaw* *Daily Chronicle*. Some of this had to do with Wells's efforts to get Ramsay MacDonald and parliamentary Labour members to forego their attacks on Russia as the real enemy was Germany and the real goal was the remaking of the map of Europe. See exchanges in *Manchester Guardian* and the *Labour Leader* for this period. Shaw was trouble-hunting, as usual.
16. H.G.W. *The United States, France, Britain and Russia* *Daily Chronicle* (April 15, 1916); *Looking Ahead: The Case for Languages* *Daily Chronicle* (May 13, 1916); *Tidying Up the Language Problem With Special Attention to Russian*. *Daily Chronicle* (May 16, 1916). These three together, actually rewritten entirely, form chapter X of *What is Coming?* (London 1916). Also see *The Kind of Peace That England Wants* *New York Times* (May 1, 1915) where, in addition to the freeing of Belgium and Alsace-Lorraine, Wells called for a stabilisation of the eastern borders of Germany.
17. Quotation are from *What is Coming?* Pp 203, 214.
18. The points stressed here tended to be the ones on which Wells focussed his attention. Other significant figures in the U.K. were Gilbert Murray, Bertrand Russell and dozens of others. In the U.S the leading figures were Walter Lippmann, Herbert Croly, Isaiah Bowman, S.D. Mezes and Edward M.House. None of these persons held public office.
19. The standard history of the Inquiry is by Lawrence E.Gelfand *The Inquiry: American Preparations for Peace, 1917-1919* (New Haven and London: Yale, 1963). However, this is an annoying book in that it presumes that there is little communication between the Allied forces on war/peace aims, and he does not use the papers of Walter Lippmann which are of some importance on this matter. See Walter Lippmann *The Political Scene: An Essay on the Victory of 1918*, (New York: Holt 1919) which consists of essays by Lippmann which appeared in *The New Republic* during 1918.
20. Perhaps the most interesting title of the period, by a member of the Inquiry, is Leon Dominian *The Frontiers of Language and Nationality in Europe* (New York: Holt, 1917). Other titles appear in Gelfand's bibliography, but like the League of Nations committee, their work was too little, too late, too abstruse and unread by the diplomats.
21. Wilson's major speech was delivered to Congress on January 8, 1918, but his speeches of January 22, 1917 and July 4, 1917, are very important. The final statement of the fourteen points appeared in a State Department paper in late October, 1918. It emanated from London and its authors were Lippmann, Frank Cobb (of the NY Sun) and Colonel House. The documentation is discussed by Gelfand, but he did not review every avenue of possibility.
22. The best place to read this, and in context, is in Sir Campbell Stuart, K.B.E. *Secrets of Crewe House: The Story of a Famous Campaign* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1920), pp 63-81, quotation from 75-6. This memorandum was written in June, 1918 and reflects among other things, the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Wells reprinted the memorandum in his *The Commonsense of War and Peace: World Revolution or War Unending* (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1940), slightly revised in the 1941 edition.
23. The letter, dated after November 14, 1917 but before the end of the month, was carried by Philip Guedella to Colby. It is reprinted in *Experiment in Autobiography* (London and New York, 1934) at 605-611 in the one volume edition.
24. More on this issue appears in my biography of Wells, in Chapter IX and especially in footnotes 43 and 44, pp 551-2. Other important documents are Countess of Warwick, *Afterthoughts* (London, 1931); Wells to Unknown Addressees, May 19, 1917 (this document was apparently delivered to several people for comment by S.S. Koteliansky); H.G.W. article on war aims in *Saturday Evening Post* (USA) late in 1916, early in 1917; H.G.W. *In The Fourth Year* (London, 1918); H.G.W. et al, *The Idea of A League of Nations* (Oxford and London, 1919); Walter Lippmann to H.G.Wells, January 29, May 14, 1919 (Yale) and Wells to Lippmann, at the end of May, 1919 (also at Yale). The standard literature on the founding of the League is remarkably slovenly in its research, offering only a court view of the history. The entire subject needs elucidation, both because the founding and the failure are now part of mythology, and reflect relatively little historical accuracy.
25. Wells made his ideas on Marxism socialism absolutely clear at a lecture given at the Fourth "Unity School" in August, 1920. These ideas were published along with the lectures given by F.S.Marvin, Arnold Toynbee, H.W.C. Davis, G.N.Clarke, G.P. Gooch, C.R.Beazley, Frederick Whelen and Eileen Power. They were republished in 1929. Wells called his talk "An Apology for A World Utopia". In this piece he called for a World State, and explicitly repudiated Marxist socialism, and with specific reference to the Russian experiment (pp 162-4). He dealt with border problems in eastern Europe in the postwar world on pp 169-170. See F.S.Marvin ed. *The Evolution of World Peace* (The Unity Series, IV) (London, 1921, 1929). Wells's essay appears from 159-178 and constitutes chapter X.
26. A sample of his support for Bolshevism, in this battle, was Wells's attendance at and support for a meeting at Earl's Court, November 6, 1938, to celebrate the twenty-first anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. Wells, along with twenty-six others, signed a statement calling for a common front with the Soviet Union for Peace and in opposition to Nazism. *Sovenir Programme* of Russia Today Society, meeting of November 6, 1938. (The copy I read is in Illinois). It will not escape readers that this occurred after Munich.
27. H.G.W. *Russia in the Shadows* (London, 1921): "The only possible Government that can save off such a final collapse of Russian now is the present Bolshevik Government, if it can be assisted by America and the Western powers. There is now no alternative to that Government possible....We have to make what we can, therefore, of the Bolshevik

Government, whether we like it or not." (pp 147-8, which did not appear in the newspaper articles on which this book was based). Also see the *Stalin-Wells Talk* (London, 1934). Other comments by Wells on Russia which are useful in this vein are his preface to the *Russian Horizon* (London, 1943); H.G.W. *The Outlook for the Small Nations* in *Frit Denmark* and republished in *Budou Cnost* and *Mazych Narod* which is an introduction to *The Rights of Man* in which he specifically asked for comments from readers of these languages; H.G.W. to editor *Daily Worker*, July 26, 1943; to Jan Masaryk, July 26, 1943; to Alexandra Kollantai, October 6, 1943; and to Chaim Weizmann, August 3, 1943 with the same requests. And especially to Ivan Maisky, June 15, 1943.

28. H.G.W. *Sunday Dispatch* *Russia and the Future* June 29, 1941. He told his readers that he could hardly hold from saying, "I told You So." H.G.W. *The Last of Hitler's Blood-soaked Convulsions* pp 93-4 of *In Defence of Civilisation Against Fascist Barbarians: Statements, Letters and Telegrams From Prominent People* (Moscow, 1941) *Idiot's Delight: Drawing the New Map of Europe* *Evening Standard* (January 6, 1943): Wells conducted a correspondence about the Rights of Man with Lev Upensky, a Russian aviation pioneer. The correspondence was published in the United States in 1944, *The New Rights of Man* (Girard, Kansas 1944) and parts of it in England, *Modern Russian and English Revolutionaries.....*(London, 1942).
29. *The Westminster Gazette* *The League of Nations and the Federation of Mankind* (September 22, 1923). These were collected, occasionally slightly revised, in *A Year of Prophesying* (London, 1925).
30. *The Westminster Gazette* *The Hub of Europe: Czechoslovakia and France*. (January 26, 1924). Of course, the treaty proved to be worthless when it was tested in 1938.
31. These problems are clearly stated in his article of March 8, 1924, *Reconstruction of the League of Nations: The Practical Problem*. It was, of course, failure to allow representation for many linguistic and ethnic groups while falsely creating others.
32. *The Westminster Gazette* (August 2, 1924), *The Impudence of Flags: Our Power Resources, and My Elephants, Whales and Gorillas*.
33. Wells's introduction to Edward Benes *Building a New Europe* (London, 1939) pp 5-9. The introduction was given first when Wells introduced Benes at a Foyle's literary luncheon in December, 1939. H.G.W. to Times, October 6, 1938 and many other newspapers. November 1, 1938, J.S.Huxley, J.M.Keynes and Gilbert Murray also signed some of these letters. Benes and Wells exchanged a half dozen letters in 1942. Wells bade him farewell when he returned to Prague at the end of the war. See H.G.Wells to Benes, February 27, 1945.
34. H.G.W. *Guide to the New World: A Handbook of Constructive World Revolution* (London, 1941) Chapter XXI *Poland* and Chapter XXII, *Map Dreams*.