

even William Clissold. International governmental and non-governmental organizations wield formidable power and influence. So-called “rogue” nations like North Korea, Iraq and Serbia have been punished for their transgressions by internationally sanctioned “police actions.” A common electronic culture connects hundreds of millions of people the world over, via the Internet. In the Western and East Asian democracies a standard of living has been reached by the average working family that dwarfs anything known when Wells wrote *Anticipations*.

But there are just as many trends and facts that militate against these globalizing forces: no narrowing of the immense gap between the rich and poor nations, uncontrollably mounting demands on the biosphere by the insatiable progress of industry and technology, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the rapacious greed of multinational capital, and the stubborn survival, despite all the churning tides of so-called globalization, of the armed and sovereign nation-states. And then we have our religious friends. Are fundamentalist Christians in the American South, fiery-hot Muslims in the Middle East, intransigent Hindus on the Subcontinent, and all the others, Buddhists, Mormons, Sikhs, whatever, in any danger of losing their faiths and welcoming life under the benign umbrella of secular democratic planetary socialism? I think not!

So, we have a ding-dong battle ahead of us, one that H.G. in his prime – and H.G. was almost always in his prime! – would have relished. I will not venture any predictions. But I am sure of one thing: there are no conceivable segmental or local solutions to our problems. The allocation of human and natural resources, the priorities of economic development, the preservation of the environment, the maintenance of world peace, the achievement of liberty and equality and fraternity throughout the planet, cannot be left to this country, or that corporation, or whatever church or faith. It is a task for what Wells many times called the Mind of the Race, for the Open Conspiracy, for the conscience and will of all humankind.

Teru Hamano

H.G. Wells and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Being an outsider from the Far East, I felt much hesitation in writing this article, but have decided to take it on with my limited involvement with the works of H.G. Wells. I think it will be best to call it “H.G. Wells and I.”

Japan’s defeat in the Second World War had much to do with my starting to read H.G. Wells. I was then a high-school student living in Tokyo. On 7 August 1945 I heard on the radio of the “Hiroshima bombing by B29 bombers.” My instincts told me it was a uranium bomb that had exploded over the sky of Hiroshima, because my high-school chemistry teacher had earlier told us that a “match-box” size of uranium could be made into a fierce bomb that could blow up the whole of Mount Fuji. I immediately thought “Japan has lost the war!” or “would not be able to continue it!” Three days later, a bomb exploded very near to the dug out where we used to hide. The explosion was followed by pale lightning, tremendous shocks and strong smells. A standing tree split in seconds and started burning. I thought it was a uranium bomb. If it had been so, I would not have lived to read H.G. Wells and would not be writing this article.

On 14 August 1945, Japan accepted the Potsdam Declaration and surrendered to the Allied Powers. In February 1946, Japan was urged to accept a new Constitution by the Supreme Commander, Douglas MacArthur of the Allied Powers. I realized then that Japan really had lost the war, and was much shocked. The Emperor and the people of Japan turned into liberals and democrats overnight. But I could not change myself so quickly. I always looked at the new Constitution, the Emperor and the government out of the corner of my eye. I thought all the while that the Constitution was given by MacArthur and the Emperor should commit suicide, and the government follow MacArthur in all respects.

Then I began to think about the Western world. It is true that Japan had been under the influence of the West since Commodore Perry arrived in Japan in 1853. But now Japan was no longer under the influence, but came under total control, of the West. Without understanding the West, I thought it would not be possible to understand what was happening now. I then began to read the history of the Western world including that of England, France, Germany, Russia and the United States. One

day I stumbled upon a much different work of history, *The Outline of History* by H.G. Wells, and this history opened my eyes for understanding what was happening in Japan. The Second World War was the first modern war that Japan had fought and experienced as a nation. I think it was similar to what Europeans experienced in the First World War. It follows therefore that the post-Second World War period was similar for Japan as the 1920s and the 1930s was to Europe. This meant that I was reading the works of H.G. Wells in a similar situation as when Wells was discussing peace and war in the interwar period. If I had read his book in the prewar days, it could have been only a matter of education for me.

The second book by Wells that I read was *The Science of Life* in Japanese, after which I read *The Work, Wealth and Happiness of Mankind* in English. These turned out to be part of a series with *The Outline of History*. Upon having read *The Work, Wealth and Happiness of Mankind*, I thought it would be necessary to translate it into Japanese, and I completed the translation exactly one hundred years after the birth of Wells. In the period that followed, I have read his autobiography and critical essays, etc.

Speaking of the Constitution of Japan, the backbone of it is the renunciation of military power and the provision of basic human rights. The Emperor became the symbol of Japan and the Japanese people as a whole.

Article 9 of the Constitution, which stipulates the renunciation of military power, has drawn heated arguments from people who have tried to defend it. However, the article suffered damage with the arrival of the Cold War after Roosevelt, who had acted as buffer between Churchill and Stalin, died. In June 1950, with the outbreak of the Korean War, the Truman administration demanded that Japan rearm in violation of Article 9 of the Constitution which the USA had advocated as the gospel of peace four years earlier. This triggered the political confusion of postwar Japan. It led to the condemnation of the Communist leaders who had been liberated after the war and the revival of the *ancien regime*, and this led to the revival of old conservatism – rightist groups of reactionary tendency in various fields of society. The Constitution thus became hollow.

1952 The first H-bomb test was undertaken by the USA.

1953 The H-bomb was tested by the USSR.

1960s There were mounting arguments over what was the basis of the Constitution of Japan. On the one hand there were arguments that said the new Constitution was forced on Japan by MacArthur and the US; therefore it should be reviewed and revised by the Japanese people – a view supported by those representing the Old Order. On the other hand there were other people who were against amending the Constitution, saying that although it is true that the new Constitution was drafted and offered by the Americans, its content and spirit are based on modern human-rights ideals and the concept of world peace. However, the arguers did not know where the basic thoughts came from.

During this period, Japanese scholars and journalists visited the United States searching for the sources of thoughts which became the moral basis of Japan's Constitution. They dug into the files of the State Office, archives and libraries for official documents and literature, but brought home no significant papers.

At this period of time I continued to read the works of Wells and referenced papers, being aware that an international search was going on for the "origin" of Japan's Constitution. I took note of unusual similarities in Japan's Constitution and Wells's documents with reference to the description of human rights and the illegalization of arms.

Sometime in 1970, I noticed particular similarities in the Declaration of Human Rights in W. Warren Wagar's *H.G. Wells: Journalism and Prophecy 1893-1946* and in Japan's new Constitution, and considered the fact that the Declaration was issued very timely. I translated the Declaration into Japanese and produced a leaflet of it. But then I did not inquire why the Declaration was so similar to the human rights article of Japan's Constitution and the fact that the latter was promulgated only six years after the former.

Further, I came across the statement in *The Outlook for Homo Sapiens*, chapter 37, 'International Politics', which stated the following:

That the belligerent tradition may linger on in Germany for a generation or so is a risk the Atlantic Powers have to take. The world has a right to insist that not simply some German government but the people generally recognise,

unequivocally and repeatedly, the Rights of Man asserted in the Declaration, and it is reasonable to insist also that Germany remain entirely disarmed and that any aggressive plant, any war plane, warship, gun or arsenal that is discovered in the country shall be destroyed forthwith, brutally and completely. But that is a thing that should not be confined to Germany. Germany should not be singled out for that. Armament should be an illegality everywhere, and some sort of international force should patrol a treaty-bound world. Partial armament is one of those absurdities dear to moderate-minded "reasonable" men. Armament itself is making war; making a gun, pointing a gun and firing it, are all acts of the same order. It should be illegal to construct anywhere upon earth any mechanism for the specific purpose of killing men. When you see a gun it is reasonable to ask: "Whom is that intended to kill?"

Then something flashed across my mind. "Why not replace the words 'German' with 'Japanese' and 'Germany' with 'Japan'?" Then it became clear that the backbone of Japan's Constitution was there, the human rights and the renunciation of arms. I suddenly thought that it could be Wells who was the father of Japan's Constitution. I almost called myself a fool for not having thought earlier of such a possibility after having long been preoccupied with Wells, or I became crazy to think Wells was the father of Japan's Constitution, or was it that I had read too much of Wells?

Since then I have continued to read Wells's work keeping in mind the possibility of Wells being the originator of Japan's constitution. I read his critical essays, biography, etc., and began to understand his perspective of history. I realized that Japan's constitution was the result of the liberation of Japan's people from the traditional bonds of the nation and from the war. It was the creation that came out of the most violent waves that mankind had ever experienced in its history. Thus, I would hereinafter go into 'H.G. Wells and Japan's Constitution'.

#### **Discussion of H.G. Wells and Japan's Constitution**

In 1981 I read and translated the best of H.G. Wells – *The Croquet Player* and twelve short stories – and finally I summarized my views of the thoughts and personality of H.G. Wells, and timidly presented my view of H.G. Wells as the root of Japan's

constitution. Unexpectedly, I received a comment from a constitutional scholar, a well known student of Jeremy Bentham, which was quite encouraging to me.

I translated *The Outlook for Homo Sapiens* which appeared in 1983 in Japan, and wrote my remarks to the summary clearly stating my theory of H.G. Wells as the root of Japan's constitution. Following this incident I was asked by the publisher to write on 'MacArthur or Wells?' In 1985, I wrote on 'H.G. Wells and Japan's Constitution – from the Origin of the Species to Hiroshima'. But, my theory was then still based on circumstantial evidence only. I was not really convinced with my own theory. I wanted to hold material evidence to support it. I remembered then the sentences given by Francis Williams in 'A Voluminous Writer', *H.G. Wells: Interviews and Recollections* by J.R. Hammond, which goes, "But the Sankey Declaration is reflected very clearly in the Preamble of the Charter of the United Nations which Smuts wrote. It may even have had some influence on the Atlantic Charter and its Four Freedoms for Wells sent a personal copy to President Roosevelt." I naturally thought that there should be a Wells letter attached to the copy sent to Roosevelt, and that if I could get hold of the letter that should clear the matter. That is to say that such a letter would be the material evidence that I wanted. But where in this big world is the letter? Incidentally, I asked an American photographer, Mr Longford, who said that it could be found in the Roosevelt Memorial. "But is it really in the Roosevelt Memorial?" I was not sure. It is a long way to cross the Pacific Ocean to get to the Roosevelt Memorial. But after I wrote the postscript this matter had stuck in my mind. Then, I heard of the H.G. Wells archives located in the University of Illinois library, where I sent my inquiry. Then I received the reply with a London *Times* article which was a copy of Wells's declaration of human rights. That was not enough. I again wrote to the library of the University of Illinois asking them to inquire of the Roosevelt Memorial for the human rights declaration and Wells's letter to Roosevelt, asking them to send copies to me if they could get them. I received a good reply from the library saying they would. And in no time, I received a letter from the Roosevelt Memorial Library. Upon opening the envelope I was surprised to see not the Sankey Declaration which was expected but a draft of Wells's declaration of human rights which Wells had sent to the London *Times* attached with Wells's handwritten draft of a letter to the White House. The letter was dated 24 October 1939 with a White House stamp. I could imagine that Wells, first and foremost, sent his

personal copy to President Roosevelt. Naturally I thought there should be a letter from Roosevelt in reply to Wells. I inquired with the Wells archives of the University of Illinois who kindly replied and sent me the copy of the Roosevelt letter. I could feel between the lines that there was already a tacit understanding between the two of them. It should be noted that Wells met with Roosevelt in 1934, 1935 and 1937. It is known that Wells presented a copy of his *Experiment in Autobiography* (1934) to President Roosevelt which the president carefully read in 1935. It was indeed Roosevelt, the most outstanding US president, who first offered the opportunity of the historical encounter of the two of them.

The White House  
Washington

December 4, 1933

My Dear Wells

It is because I have read, with pleasure and profit, almost everything that you have written, that I want to send you this note to tell you that I like and appreciate your article in *Liberty Magazine*. You are right that "the days of one man leadership are at an end" but I am equally confident that a growing number are beginning to appreciate what you so well call "the needs of the case".

In any event, you are doing much to educate people everywhere, and for that I am grateful.

If you come over here again I do hope that we shall have the pleasure of seeing you.

Very sincerely yours

[Signed by Roosevelt]

H.G. Wells, Esq.,  
47 Chiltern Court,  
Clarence Gate,

London, N.W.1, England<sup>1</sup>

\*\*\*\*\*

April 14<sup>th</sup>, 1938

Dear Mr President

You wrote me a very pleasant note some months ago. These indiscretions carry their penalties. I am profoundly interested in the world situation and I want very much to have half an hour's conversation with you. I am coming to America early in May on the chance of being able to have that brief talk. If I could talk to you and to Mrs Roosevelt all sorts of things that are vague in my mind will become definite. I am more and more persuaded that you are in a key position in world affairs and extraordinarily right-minded and right-spirited. I have no intention of writing about any conversation we may have, but I shall probably be writing articles and talking on the air later, and I want to feel that I am as close to the personal reality of the situation as I can.

I shall probably come by the *Washington*, leaving here on April 26<sup>th</sup>, and I do not intend to stay in America for more than ten or twelve days. I've talked to Roosevelt I, Harding and Hoover at Washington and I shall be extremely grateful if you can give me an appointment.

Very sincerely yours

(Signed H.G. Wells)

I shall be on the *Washington* after April 26<sup>th</sup> and also any letters to me at the Chase National Bank, Park Avenue, New York will reach me.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Source: The H.G. Wells archives in the University of Illinois Library.

<sup>2</sup> Source: The H.G. Wells archive at the University of Illinois Library.

It is noted that when H.G. Wells and Roosevelt met in 1937, they had the same view that the world would be confronted with the danger of a world war and this danger would reach its most critical level around 1939 to 1940. Thus, it is natural to think there ought to have been an exchange of opinions on the upcoming war and some plans for the postwar world order. The Wells letter of 1939 could have been in relation to the discussions they had in 1937.

Thus, Roosevelt could be able to avail the views of the world brain in Wells. On the other hand, Wells had a great opportunity of offering proposals for the postwar world order to President Roosevelt. Wells earlier discussed in his *The War that will End War* that,

I could wish we had a government capable of something more articulate than "wait and see!" A government that dared confess a national intention to all the world. For what a government says is audible to all the world.

His ideas were shown in the letter that Wells wrote to President Wilson during the First World War advocating the formation of a strong League of Nations (the allied nations). Wells never met Wilson. But now Wells had a great opportunity with President Roosevelt of expressing his views for the reconstruction and promotion of the world based on human rights ideals as America's national interest.

13, Hanover Terrace, Regent's Park, N.W.1.

London, England.

Oct. 24, 39.

Dear Mr. President

Forgive my invading you with a question. It is an idea that has arisen in a group of people with whom I work and it seems to me so valuable, so full of possibilities [?] that I feel your attention ought to be called to it at the earliest possibility.

It arises from a consideration of the difficulties experienced by our present government in its attempt to meet the demand of our young people, and public opinion throughout the world for a statement of war aims. All that

it seems able to do is combine personal denunciation of Hitler with vague and unconvincing promises of a better order to come. There is nothing in that sort of thing to rally the creative forces in the world. But there is something better to be done for which there exists a number of precedents in the history of the "democracies" from Magna Carta onward and that is to make a clear restatement in modern terms in view of modern conditions of the natural Rights of Man. That would consolidate the real democratic and civilizing forces everywhere and lift the issue on to a new plane from the rather diffused, detailed and uncoordinated squabbly propaganda of the present time. And it is really and truly what most of us mean, deep within ourselves. But here it is, see for yourself. I am urging it upon people here by such means as I can, but any parallel utterance or action on your part would have an immense effect upon opinion here, and would be enormously helpful in carrying the declaration into neutral and enemy countries.

Always sincerely yours,

[signed H.G. Wells]<sup>3</sup>

I was surprised when I read the letter, because the letter described some phenomena which were extremely important when you consider the international political events if you focus on the international scene after the outbreak of the Second World War.

Firstly, if you look at the period following the end of the Second World War, the human rights ideals began to spread throughout the world and reached the corners of the world to an extent that had not been seen before. It can be said that the Wells proposal to President Roosevelt was responsible for this phenomenon. The human rights movement as we see it today is the result of the work of President Roosevelt, the most powerful political person in the world at that time, to promote the cause.

Secondly, those Wells associates who used to work together had an idea of updating all the human-rights-related ideals since Magna Carta into "a world constitution". Of course, this effort is attributed to H.G. Wells, who was an encyclopaedic thinker in the country of Magna Carta, and who tried to organise and update all human knowledge into a system he called the "world brain". These two

<sup>3</sup> Source: President Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Library.

remarkable phenomena are thought to be indicating the fact that Wells took efforts to clearly record the initiatives taken by himself and his associates for the cause of human rights as we see it today.

Thirdly, you must take note of the fact that Wells proposed to President Roosevelt that not only the Allied powers but both neutral states and adversaries should adopt the human rights declaration and fourth is the fact that Wells asked President Roosevelt to take any actions or make any statements in support of the human rights declaration.

The White House  
Washington

November 9, 1939

My Dear Mr Wells,

Thank you for sending me your proposed "Declaration of the Rights of Man", which I have read with great interest. It embodies many of the fundamental rights of the individual expressed in a form which cannot fail to meet with sympathetic consideration among the democratic people of the world.

Very sincerely yours,  
[Franklin D. Roosevelt]

[In his own handwriting] I hope to see you some of these days soon.<sup>4</sup>

President Roosevelt accepted the request of Wells, and thus "Wells and Japan's Constitution" becomes "Wells and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights".

1940: When President Roosevelt won re-election for his third term he implemented his promise to Wells.

6 January 1941: In response to Wells's request to make any statements in support of the human rights declaration, President Roosevelt declared his Four

<sup>4</sup> Source: The H.G. Wells Archive in the University of Illinois Library.

Freedoms – Freedom of Speech and Expression, Freedom of Worship, Freedom from Want, Freedom from Fear – as the basic freedoms of humanity.

10 August 1941: Acting in support of Wells's request, President Roosevelt met with Prime Minister Churchill in the Atlantic Ocean and signed the "Atlantic Charter".

7 December 1941: The Japanese navy attacked Pearl Harbor and Germany and Italy declared war on the United States.

On 10 January 1942, President Roosevelt invited the representatives of the Allied powers to Washington where they issued the Joint Declaration of the Allied Powers supporting the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms declaration. Roosevelt had done this in support of the earlier proposal by Wells.

Now the international political stage was ready for the signing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights with Roosevelt and Mrs A. Eleanor Roosevelt the promoters. The Four Freedoms of Roosevelt were adopted in Japan's constitution earlier than in the Universal Declaration.

The central issue for the Allied powers in the Second World War was Germany, the same as it was in the First World War. The issue was how to remove the militarism and the Krupp power from Germany. What was stated in Chapter 37, international politics, was the dosage for the German problem. Wells and Roosevelt believed the world had a right to impose human rights on Germany and to deprive Germany of arms. As a step the world leaders met in Yalta in February 1945 to declare the European liberation and to reconfirm the Atlantic Charter and the Joint Declaration of the Allied Powers. In order to impose on Germany human rights and the renunciation of military power, President Roosevelt followed the spirit of the message earlier given by Wells to the German people stating, in effect, that the purpose of the war was to end all wars. Following this spirit, the conditions for the surrender of Germany were written. Thus the declaration of Germany's surrender was prepared. The preparations were thus made for the world human rights declaration and the illegalisation of arms accompanied by the world security treaty and the creation of the world security forces.

Armament should be an illegality everywhere, and some sort of international force should patrol a treaty-bound world. Partial armament is one of those absurdities dear to moderate-minded 'reasonable' men. Armament itself is making war. Having a gun, pointing a gun and firing it are all sets of the same order. It should be illegal to construct anywhere upon earth any mechanism for the specific purpose of killing men. When you see a gun, it is reasonable to ask: 'Whom is that intended to kill?'

However, Germany should not be singled out for a ban on armament. Armament should be illegalised everywhere. It would be necessary to have a world security treaty and to have an international armed force organised and bound by the international treaty and the same world patrol over the specified areas of the world."<sup>5</sup>

Such was Wells's concept for the new world security to achieve the permanent peace on this earth. This was thought to be the final choice for mankind either to be able to survive or to perish from the surface of the earth.

The death of President Roosevelt on 12 April 1945 and the zonal occupation of Germany by the Allied powers, which meant a virtual disappearance of the German government, made it practically impossible for the Allied powers to proceed with the declaration of the conditions for German surrender.

Japan, an unexpected adversary in the Second World War, was about to collapse about this time but still had an undivided government. Besides, the Cold War was not as yet in an advanced stage. Therefore the declaration of the conditions for German surrender was applied to Japan's surrender, and the same became the Potsdam declaration on 26 July 1945. Japan accepted the Potsdam declaration. Thus, on 3 November 1946, the epoch-making constitution with human rights and illegalised military power was adopted by Japan as the new constitution – it would have been impossible for Japan to have this kind of constitution for a thousand years under the old imperial government. This therefore would have been the German constitution. This would be a miniature case of the future world constitution. However, consequent to the Declaration of Human Rights, the illegalisation of

<sup>5</sup> From H.G. Wells, *The Outlook for Homo Sapiens* (Readers Union and London: Secker & Warburg, 1942).

armament, the signing of a world security treaty and the establishment of world security forces should have occurred, but they failed to materialise because of the emergence of the Cold War.

This also caused Japan's constitution to stand still and is left in a haphazard state. Now, 24 October 1989, was just 50 years from the day Wells wrote to President Roosevelt regarding human rights. On that day I wrote to the H.G. Wells Society in Britain enclosing the personal letters exchanged between Wells and Roosevelt and a copy of Japan's constitution written in English. The reason I sent those papers was that I wondered if it were known by people in England and the USA that such letters existed. I also wished to draw to the attention of young people the connection of Japan's constitution with Wells's declaration of human rights.

3 December 1989: The meeting of President Gorbachev and President Bush in Malta led to the end of the Cold War.

After the turn of 1990 I had not heard from London and I decided to write to the two presidents. What should take place in world politics now that the Cold War had ended? I felt I could not wait any longer to write to both presidents of the USA and Russia. Which way should the world move after the end of the Cold War. Those measures proposed by Wells to President Roosevelt for the establishment of permanent peace in the world should be taken up again. In discussing this agenda I think we should reiterate the existence of the letters of Roosevelt and Wells and the significance of them. I am afraid the presidents of the United States and Russia may not know these facts or that they may have a mistaken belief that the human rights issue was originated in Washington and not in London. They may not know what role Roosevelt had in mind for human rights to play in postwar world politics. We should not lose the opportunity. I enclosed the copies of the Sankey Declaration together with the copies of Wells's and Roosevelt's letters in my letter (dated 17 March but posted in mid-June 1990). I also sent the same letters to the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times*, the *London Times*, the *Sun*, *Izvestia* and *Pravda*. I wrote to the H.G. Wells collection, Bromley Library, and sent copies of my letters to the H.G. Wells Society in Britain. I wrote, in effect, that I had written to the presidents of the United States and Russia, enclosing copies of my letters to the two presidents. I was very confident

about my papers, which would not be thrown into a waste basket by the clerks at the offices of the Kremlin or the White House.

In August 1990, I received a reply from Mr Draper of the H.G. Wells Society and in September received a letter from Mr Dilloway. I was very pleased by his straightforwardness and felt very much honoured that I was praised for having found the 'missing link' which would connect the Wells human rights and all the things that consequently occurred thereafter. Mr Dilloway said the Wells-Roosevelt letters would be, therefore, very helpful. I thought he is really a man of the country of evolutionary thought.

On the contrary, since the time of having found the Wells-Roosevelt letters up to the present, I have met some Japanese scholars of history and constitution, and have explained why I believe H.G. Wells to have been the father of Japan's constitution showing the material evidence, there have been none yet who have recognised verbally or in writing this fact. I only salute their rigidity, their authoritarian attitude and their insensitivity to the historical fact. I can decisively say that those scholars have rooted preoccupation on H.G. Wells, and that they think Wells was only a popular writer who wrote old-fashioned scientific romances. They do not know the fact that Wells was a major ecological thinker, a social scientist, an encyclopaedic thinker, and an human rights thinker. They also don't know that Wells was a man who aggressively met with the leaders of the world's great powers and tried to find ways to make his ideals come through. The constitutional scholars who are active in Japan belong to the old order group and are now studying the revision of the constitution, particularly article 9. Those scholars are now members of the council for investigation of the constitution in the house of parliament. Their views are limited. They are nothing superior to those expressed by minor government official.

On 1 June 1990, President Mikhail Gorbachev spoke in the White House at the signing of the agreement for the US-Soviet Strategic Nuclear Arms Reduction:

Half a century ago Franklin Roosevelt spoke of the Four Basic Freedoms, Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Worship, Freedom from Want, Freedom from Fear. This ideal has not been fully accomplished in any country of the world. We must make joint efforts for the construction of the new world.

At this time President Gorbachev was not aware that it was Wells who had requested Roosevelt to speak of the basic freedoms of man.

August 1990: President George Bush of the United States advocated the 'New World Order' as a vision of the post-Cold War world.

5 September 1991: President Mikhail Gorbachev moved to adopt in the People's Representative Congress of the Soviet Union the Declaration of Human Rights and Freedom.

By the way, on 9 November 1997, I sent copies of the Wells-Roosevelt letters and the Sankey Declaration to the Embassy of China through First Secretary Wu Jianki Hao because I learnt that Jiang Zemin, President of China, was going to meet with Premier Jean Chretien of Canada and would agree to hold a joint symposium on human rights in May 1998. I informed him that the origin of the ideal of human rights was in London because he may have a mistaken belief that human rights was originated in Washington. I wanted to convey to China that the correct understanding of the human rights problem would be absolutely important for the establishment of world peace.

But how unlucky! We lost Gorbachev on 15 December 1992 when he lost power to Yeltsin and we lost George Bush on 3 November 1992 when he lost elections for a second presidential term. It seems that those successors, Yeltsin, Bill Clinton, the current George Bush Jr. and Putin (frankly I don't feel very confident about these people) are not aware of the Roosevelt-Wells permanent peace proposal, the final choice left for mankind to take the course to the permanent peace. It seems that only Gorbachev is not oblivious to this cause.

But the question is what can we do now to promote this cause? As Mr Dilloway suggested, we may as well take action toward the United Nations to seek their understanding and recognition of the efforts and ideals of President Roosevelt and H.G. Wells as embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the exchanged letters.

We may have the last chance of promoting the realization of H.G. Wells's ideals of permanent peace through the United Nations, the only vehicle left for



humanity to keep burning the fire of hope, the United Nations where all races of people on earth meet and work together.

Tom Miller

W. Warren Wagar and *The Open Conspiracy*: A Rejoinder

The 2000 number of *The Wellsian* carried a defence of H.G. Wells's *The Open Conspiracy* by W. Warren Wagar. While entertaining great admiration for Professor Wagar's scholarship and humanity, the author doubts whether Wells's formula is significant, or applicable today.

Professor Wagar is right in assessing *The Open Conspiracy* as Wells's central political statement. It is possible to draw all sorts of conclusions from Wells's work, but Professor Wagar is correct in thinking that the novelist would have liked to be remembered by *The Open Conspiracy*.

To take an historical point, Professor Wagar is wrong to suggest that in 1931, when the revised version of the book was published, the world was not obviously in depression. Conditions later deteriorated, but 1931 was a bad year: for example, contemporaries witnessed the stock market disasters of September-November 1930 and August-October 1931; the currency crises of 1931 that destroyed *inter alia* the British Labour government; the Japanese attack on Manchuria, which Professor Wagar mentions; and the gains made by Hitler's Nazis in the German elections of September 1930.

Professor Wagar rightly says that not everything has changed since 1931. Britain's problem now, as it was then (though it was hard to see this in 1931), is to decide whether the country should be a satellite of Germany or the US; and the withdrawal of colonial rule in Africa was to a large degree a charade – it is plain that the IMF and the World Bank (institutions of which Wells would have approved) will have effectively to govern large areas of that continent for most of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

But is Wells now worth consideration as a political thinker? It is not enough to say that he was a great artist; comparable imaginative writers came up with all manner of nostrums, and their admirers are not obliged to share their heroes' conclusions.