

A. B. MCKILLOP: THE SPINSTER AND THE PROPHET [2000]

(c) Raeto West 10 June 2009

INTRODUCTION

The subtitle is 'A tale of H. G. Wells, plagiarism and the history of the world' – presumably intended to lull the reader into thinking plagiarism is conclusively proved by McKillop's tale. In fact, as I'll show, McKillop's book is worthless as regards the main theme, namely whether Wells plagiarised Deeks.

For people who haven't seen McKillop's book, it's written in a reportage style though McKillop makes it fairly clear the Deeks detail is mostly speculation. Wells of course is far better documented. There's a huge amount of descriptive stuff – Toronto department stores, prices of fashionable articles, Toronto suburbs, clothes and manners, family life of the Deeks household; and publishers with unreliable staff, manuscripts; and less detailed courtroom accounts suggesting to me at least highly unmotivated legal teams on both sides wanting money and faced with unprepared case, confidential documents, secrecy, private and confidential letters, an anonymous supplier of money; and judges disinclined to pay much attention to the case.

McKillop supplies a lot on Wells's sex life - about 12 or 15 names. I'd heard of for example Amber Reeves, but hadn't known Rosamund Bland, daughter of E Nesbit was one conquest. He knew Margaret Sanger - I think in both senses. Fascinating about Hedwig Gatternigg, who seemed to be a sort of groupie of Wells – wearing almost nothing when Wells visited her, and later turning up suicidally at his flat. Interesting to know 'Rebecca West' (who had a child by him) wanted money from him, and also that she 'came to hate The Outline ... [and] wanted him to devote his imagination to more creative work.' (The intellectual level of groupies seems on the low side then as now). Many of Wells's novels have sex meditations and actions, too; McKillop presents all Wells's novels he mentions as full of sex, even The New Machiavelli.

I fear Florence, despite her advanced views, was less liberated than Wells in this respect. Interesting - but of course irrelevant to the plagiarism issue.

The dust jacket, at least in Aurum Press UK edition, says A B McKillop is 'one of Canada's leading historians of ideas. .. award-winning author of scholarly works on the history of religion and higher education.' What the 'award' is, is unstated. The book was funded by 'the Canada Council for the Arts'.

The Acknowledgements list archivists, friends, colleagues, editors - I counted about 70 people!

His sources listed near the end of the book are eight collections: Deeks's papers, Wells Collection at Illinois University, Macmillan archives in both Canada and Britain, Gilbert Murray at the Bodleian, Richard Gregory at Sussex; Laurence Burpee and Frank Underhill in Canada's National Archives. There's some other material, for example a large collection of feminist works, of complete irrelevance.

WELLS'S 'OUTLINE OF HISTORY'

Publication history of The Outline of History is unclear; the following is roughly correct for Britain, but don't treat this information as definitely accurate. Details for USA, Canada, translations, and so on are different:-

1919: approx: Monthly part-works come out, with gaudy covers with advertising, and illustrations.

1920: Outline of History published as two-volume hardbacks in (I think) Sept 1920

1921: Reprinted February

1923: January: Definitive Edition

1924: Feb: reprinted

1925: Revised edition 1925

1930: September: Popular edition – i.e. cheap, single volume hardback, no colour illustrations

McKillop says nothing about the different editions, and indeed there's no evidence that he even read any of them; his information is entirely made up of court testimony – there's not one single extract from any edition of *The Outline*.

Detailed account of Wells's (and Deeks's) activities around 1920

Apologies for the schematic layout. I've assembled the following sequence, partly from McK:-

- 1915: Wells publishes *The Research Magnificent*: An author travelling around the world, trying to draw conclusions. Supposed to include one of Wells's sketches of world history
- 1916: *Mr Britling Sees It Through* – very detailed patriotic wartime novel
- 1917: Wells publishes *God the Invisible King*
- 1918: Wells publishes a novel, *Joan and Peter*
- 1918: end of July: Florence Deeks's typescript handed over to MacMillan in Toronto. (McK. p.112). Partly to check whether she's entitled to lift parts of Green's *History*.
- 1918, August: Wells discussed a possible partwork with Sir Frank Newnes at the Reform Club – the meeting was mentioned in a subsequent letter (McK p.124)
- 1918, Oct 20: First letter re *Outline*: Wells to Brett (Canadian publisher) - 'there is an idea I have in hand..' (McK 23-4)
- 1918, November 11 – 'Great War' ends. Wells had worked in war propaganda, and in 1914 invented the phrase 'the war that will end war'; he helped bring Wilson of the USA into the 'Great War' in 1916. It's inconceivable that he would not have pondered such issues as who were the Hohenzollerns, and Hapsburgs (or Habsburgs), and endless related detail – navies, Bismarck, unification of Germany, British Empires, growth of the USA.
- 1918, c Nov 30: letter to Brett mentions only Breasted's *Ancient History* and J H Robinson's *Medieval and Modern Times*, suggesting Wells hadn't started. (McK)
- 1919: *The Undying Fire*: Well's *Autobiography* says this is an update of 'The Book of Job'; he thought it one of the best things he'd done. It contains a vignettted outline of history.
- 1919: February 5: 'Jane had produced 50,000 or 60,000 words.. Twenty days later, her husband had reached the 125,000 word mark - halfway [sic] through the projected book.' He had written between 75,000 and 80,000 words in under three weeks, researching along the way [sic]. (McK)
- 1919: Mid-August, 'Jane sent the first five polished chapters off to Newnes for serialization;' (McK)
- 1919 article (actual date unknown to me) 'History is One' in *Saturday Evening Post*, pointing out the absurdly fragmented bits of history presented to schoolchildren. Wells mentions a few titles (including Helmont's (sic) *Universal History*) but nowhere states he's writing a book. McK doesn't mention this article.
- 1919 or 20, I think - undated: Arnold Bennett's 3 vol. diaries show Wells's uncertainty - he told Bennett his 'boom' was over, and he was 'yesterday'. (before the 'Outline')
- 1919: Nov 22: Partworks are published from this date (McK) monthly, approx taking a year (Wells). Wells implies an earlier date – possibly McK is using Canadian dates? Each section must have taken say 40,000 words – unless the final book was larger; I have no information on the length of the partworks in aggregate. (McK p 160, and 216).
- 1920: *Russia in the Shadows*: a first-hand account of the devastation caused by the 'Russian revolution'
- 1920: September: 2 volume *Outline of History* published: one of my copies is Newnes, but Cassell and Macmillan at some stage got into the act. With self-confidence or audacity, or perhaps because of the author's fame, Wells's name didn't appear on the spine. It has 50 or

so lithographed colour plates in total and large numbers of line block drawings and maps, mostly by J. F. Horrabin, and half-tone photos, averaging at least one illustration per page – a very impressive example of then-modern printing techniques. I estimated 450,000 words in total. Remember this was all done with hot metal techniques, far more difficult to plan and alter than modern computerised layout.

There are also several chronologies in the text – bare lists of dates and events - from which Wells's selection principles and sources might be inferred. For example the chapter 'The Renaissance of Western Civilization' has about 60 column-inches from '650 Othman, the Third Caliph, is reigning in Medina ...' to '1683 Vienna besieged by the Turks for the last time...'. McKillop doesn't refer to these chronologies at all, despite their importance.

The final parts are 'The International Catastrophe of 1914' and 'The Possible Unification of the World.', an amazing contrast to the bitter anti-Germanism of the time. Despite this the book sold on a huge scale and re-made Wells's reputation.

- 1920: Dec 20th Florence Deeks buys 2 vol. hardback edition in Toronto's shopping area. (McK pp 6-7).
- 1921 'The New Teaching of History' pamphlet (more precise date not known to me) by Wells, replying to a few critics.

'For the better part of three years the writer of these notes has been occupied almost entirely on an intensely interesting enterprise. ... The Outline of History ... In volumes or in complete sets of parts it has already found over 200,000 purchasers; ... It was first issued in monthly parts whose covers brightened the bookstalls for a year. These parts [incidentally, with advertising, and some illustrations not chosen by Wells] were closely scrutinised by numerous readers, and a considerable amount of detail was amended and improved by their suggestions. Then it was completely re-set and issued in book form...'

Wells replied in this pamphlet to A W Gomme, a teacher of Greek classics, who relied on the first, unrevised part-work, and to two Catholics, Mr Belloc (in 'Some Errors of Mr Wells') and Dr Downey, who among other things were naturally exercised over the 'Historical Fall of Man', the Origin of Religion, and the Role of the Catholic Church in Restraining Knowledge. This may be relevant (see my conclusion) but we needn't examine these here, or the bulk of Wells's pamphlet – he concedes his climate chapters may be too heavy, and under-represents Abraham Lincoln and Mazzini – but note this comment on reviewers:-

'So far from sneering at the writer's brief year or so of special reading, it would rather become the teacher of history to realise how much better it is than anything that the teaching organisation ... deserved. It is not that the writer has stepped into the field of popular history teaching and done something roughly and impertinently that would otherwise have been done well; it is that he has ... done something urgently necessary that would not otherwise have been done at all.'

Wells ambitiously hoped his book might survive as an Outline – an introduction into which specialist detail could be inserted; and he hoped his approach to history might become common – something which of course has not yet happened.

- 1922: Deeks types out a list of similarities she found, or thought she'd found, between her The Web and Wells's first 2 vol. edition, resulting in about 80 pages of two column comparisons. This typescript is in Toronto reference library - referred to as "Comparison" in McK's endnotes. (Later, when Wells's MS/typescript was supplied, she added more, though not much more).
- 1925: Oct 15: two Toronto newspapers' headlines: '[Deeks] claims Outline of History contains part of unpublished work'. Deeks before this was assembling her case with witnesses and lawyers; financed by her brother, and, it seems, someone anonymous (McK p. 212). Wells wrote to say either it's a silly claim or blackmail based on fake MS.
- 1927: Sept 23: letter to Wells re Deeks vs Wells (McK)
- 1928: Oct 15: Florence Deeks' evidence began in Toronto. (McK p. 243)
- 1932: Deeks in London for her appeal

HOW DID WELLS RESEARCH AND WRITE THE OUTLINE?

Wells own rather vague overview

So Wells claims a 'brief year of special reading'; then a total of twelve monthly partworks, taking most of a year; publication starting in 1919, completed 1920; these partworks amended, taking into account readers' comments; then completely re-set and issued as 2 volumes in Sept 1920. All this he says took him 'the better part of three years', i.e. from about the start of 1918.

Obviously the later partworks would have had less time available for criticism and editing.

An approximate chronology gives 1918 – Wells reading, starting perhaps with the Encyclopedia Britannica and other reference works but with no definite purpose in mind; end of 1918 – end of war; then discussion with Newnes on partworks; reading; late 1919 – monthly partworks start being published; Wells receives feedback; some time in 1920 – typesetting and illustrating begins of two volumes; Sept 1920 'Outline' published in 2 vols. for '1 guinea = 21 shillings on approval on easy terms.'

Important evidence which McKillop suppresses

This seems an incredible achievement, and part of the pro-Deeks case is that Wells simply didn't have the time to do it without copying.

The original notes and manuscripts would help: but it's unclear whether Wells habitually kept these. (His near-contemporary Russell burnt the MS of Principia Mathematica – perhaps Wells habitually destroyed his early drafts too?) McKillop may have some idea – having looked at the H G Wells Collection in Chicago University - but if so, he doesn't say, despite the relevance here; he merely quotes comments from Deeks on the typescript/ manuscript as supplied by Wells. So we have no way to tell whether Wells might have gone out of his way to destroy the evidence.

It's undeniable that the Outline is an astonishing achievement. Or is it? -

Gilbert Murray (McK p 252) wrote to Wells – 'Her counsel "tried to make me say that you could not have written the book in the time unless you copied it from somewhere, and secondly that your scheme of history was so strikingly original that no two people could have thought of anything like it independently. I don't think he got any change out of me on either point, both being perfectly silly."' Unfortunately, McK doesn't present Murray's reasoning, as presumably recorded in the "Proceedings." I'm afraid I'm inclined to think this is because Murray made a good case.

One problem with the plagiarism idea is that her typescript was noticeably shorter than Wells's – I don't now how much, as McKillop doesn't say clearly; certainly less than half the length. (McK had an electronic copy 'prepared', presumably by scanning, then OCR, so he must know the word count. But neither Deeks' typescript nor the OCR version, nor Deeks's detailed comparison notes, are on Internet – although no doubt some of McK's 70 or so collaborators could have put it there).

Deeks never seems to have quite decided whether the plan of her book, or the textual detail, was the relevant thing; when people commented on the plan, she would be infuriated by what she saw as their refusal to examine textual details; but she seemed to think her plan was important, for example the fact that she began (according to McK) with an account of the solar system and hypotheses about its formation, as Wells did.

[McK gives extracts from the court testimony. Deeks's (McK p. 243-4) complaint was 'That portions of my book were used in the writing of The Outline of History. When asked: Do you suggest that Mr. Wells deliberately took that material out of your book? She replied, 'I never said that. ... I say that The Outline of History contains my book.' (1928). This is McKillop's description (p. 364): [In Whitehall, London, before the Privy Council, 1932]'.. Over three days.. she addressed the evidence against the Macmillan Company of Canada; the circumstances under which she believed H. G. Wells had reproduced her work; the irrelevance of "The Highway of History" to the case; the similar plans of "The Web" and The Outline; and of course the intrinsic evidence as set forward by her experts and dismissed by the justices.']

McK stresses the fact that (for example) Underhill appeared to have had little concern with textual minutiae, and yet he (McK) produces no textual evidence whatever – for example, of an alleged passage by Socrates, or seven passages supposedly copied by Deeks from J R Green, used in the same sequence by Wells. In view of the huge amount of inconsequential material – Deeks and her sister's cold London hotel room, and their going out to buy new gaiters and spats; there are immense amounts of trivia – it's difficult to see this as anything other than McKillop being aware of the slenderness of the claim by Deeks.

Not only does McKillop reproduce no textual passages, he also gives no indication of the scope of Deeks's work – even the table of contents is omitted.

Another aspect unexplored by McKillop is whether in fact, even if Wells had seen her typescript, he would have been liable; it's perfectly clear all Deeks's material was itself taken from library books, and the copyright infringement issue, as far as I know, then and now, deals with the actual form of words. The few cases in which there may have been copying are a tiny proportion of Wells's finished work. McKillop doesn't consider the question of whether copyright can subsist in a plan or design.

Detailed information on Wells's sources taken from his books and booklets

Wells' title-page gives prominence to Ernest Barker, H. H. Johnston, Ray Lankester, and Gilbert Murray – 'Written with the advice and editorial help of' all four, who gave 'much counsel and direction and editorial help.' (Barker – b. 1874; classics; Greek and English political thought; Johnston – b. 1858; explorer and administrator of tropical Africa; autobiography 1923, d. 1927; Lankester – b. 1847; worked in marine biology, Darwinism; directed the Natural History Museum etc; Murray – b. 1866; classical translator & writer on government policy, war and internationalism and women's emancipation. McK describes them on pp. 138-145).

These four, McKillop says, in fact did little work, apart from Barker, and were there to give the impression of a group effort; McKillop claims there's little evidence in these men's papers of correspondence with Wells. For example, Gilbert Murray testified, according to McKillop, having supplied nothing in addition to the work published in the Outline (viz. some descriptions of ancient Greece, and footnotes). Wells says that Barker did a great deal of checking and had an eagle eye for spellings and dates. However that may be, McKillop's entire investigation into sources stops with these four names, with almost incredible negligence. Now let's see what he missed out:-

Wells thanked J F Cox of the London Library, a private establishment, still in existence as far as I know, that doubtless provided Wells with his books, and Horrabin with sources for maps, and also his drawings of coins, axe heads, time lines, etc. It therefore seems very likely this library provided Wells's actual informational volumes.

Wells in his autobiography (much later – 1934) says he started 'with the Encyclopedia Britannica at my elbow'. McK perhaps doesn't know this. If Wells had copied Deeks, this remark could have course have been a bluff. There are however many references to this Encyclopedia in Wells.

McKillop refers a few times to this famous encyclopedia:- (i) a Dent plagiarism case (perhaps the Everyman encyclopedia?); (ii) one of Deeks' witnesses wrote the entry for 'psychology' for it; (iii) Brutus as a ringleader, rather than Cassius – Wells' testimony mentioned the Encyclopedia Britannica and Joseph Wells (and Shakespeare) as sources. (McK p314).

And also – wait for it - (iv) in a passage on Columbus, 'eighty per cent of Deeks's words had come from the Encyclopedia Britannica' (McK p 303).

McKillop has made no attempt to check the Britannica for the few passages the prosecution considered important. Could Wells have used the Britannica? McKillop hasn't checked, and neither will I, since the Deeks document is unavailable at present.

Wells explicitly mentions these other titles in his introduction to The Outline:-

- Breasted and J H Robinson

- Helmond's Universal History [also spelt 'Helmont'] in eight massive volumes is mentioned in 'History is One', and in introduction to the 2-volume set.
- F S Marvin's 'Living Past', 'an admirable summary of human progress.'
- F Ratzel 'History of Mankind'
- Ellen Churchill Semple's 'Influence of Geographical Environment'.

Wells explains why these, like Reade's Martyrdom of Man etc, and 18th Century multivolume sets with plans of Noah's Ark etc, aren't suitable for his purposes, and why his book is needed.

(Note that there is a well-known Universal History by von Ranke, which nobody in this saga mentions.)

Other names listed by Wells are: Richard Gregory, Prof J L Myres, Prof W S Culbertson of Harvard, Dr Singer of Oxford, Philip Guedalla, Mr L Cranmer-Byng, and Sir Denison Ross. Of these only Richard Gregory (a firm long-term friend of Wells) gets any mention whatever from McKillop!

Richard Gregory was editor of Nature, the well-known science publication (not to be confused with his modern namesake); J. L. Myres was professor of ancient history; W S Culbertson wrote on north American history; Charles Singer was an historian of science; Philip Guedalla was a Jewish barrister who wrote more or less Marxist popular histories; Cranmer-Byng wrote on China; Denison Ross was Director of the School of Oriental Studies (now SOAS). Their contributions appear shadowily here and there; for example a footnote on Napoleon is attributed to 'P.G.'

It can be inferred from this list of experts on science and non-British parts of the world that Wells was anxious to supplement his Britannica; for example, he was careful to include a map showing China and Rome both with empires, of about the same size, at about the same time. as a counter to the prevailing British Eurocentricity.

Footnotes and extracts include among many others: Winckler, Grote, Mommsen, Gibbon, Carlyle, Seeley, Suetonius, Thucydides, Voltaire, the Koran, Frazer, Keynes.

It's worth pointing out that Wells's collaborators were far more distinguished than the ones listed by McKillop. If we look at a specimen reference book roughly of the time, 'Concise Universal Biography', ed. J A Hammerton, (c. 1935), listing 20,000 names, all but one of Wells's names are listed, whereas only Bertram Windle ('English scientist.. a staunch roman catholic.. awarded, in 1919, the Gunning prize for his defence of religion in his book, The Church and Science, 1917.') and Robert Falconer ('President of Toronto University 1907-32.') appear, in addition to the well-known Harry Elmer Barnes and Ogden and Richards, who though involved in the case, were more or less neutral.

In short, McKillop repeatedly exaggerates the accomplishments of the witnesses called by Deeks.

Deeks apparently plagiarised or used Victor Duruy - General History of the World, translated from French, and published in English c 1901. Wells claimed never to have heard of him; possibly the London Library might be able to provide evidence one way or the other. She also used (McK p 162) Chambers Encyclopedia. 88ff lists e.g. Jane Johnstone Christie, The Advance of Woman from the Earliest Times to the Present; Green's Short History of the English People; G. Ferrero, The Women of the Caesars. ... As far as I can tell from McKillop, Deeks prepared no bibliography for 'The Web'.

Wells's Autobiography says he sent out chapters, and received them back covered with chastening comments, which he then incorporated (or, if he disagreed, left as initialled controversial footnotes). Presumably McKillop thinks this must be untrue, since he thinks Wells based his work on Deeks. (Wells's footnotes are one of the fascinating features of his book, making academic disagreements visible in a direct way most readers would never have encountered).

So far as I know, none of the men listed above wrote about their dealings, or non-dealings, with Wells – but I haven't checked. Nor has McKillop, despite the fact they are listed at the very beginning of the Outline.

Possibly relevant here is Julian Huxley's 'Memories' (1970), because Wells' 'The Science of Life' (1929) was a joint effort, and Huxley writes of Wells's pushy forcefulness and deadline-keeping, and many letters; and Huxley's surprise at the resulting work's sweep and comprehensiveness. Thus there is a clear example of Wells co-operating. Incidentally Wells's later 'Work, Wealth and Happiness of Mankind' set out as a collaborative venture, but Wells says he was entangled with unsuitable collaborators but 'managed to get every section of it "vetted" by authorities of the first rank.' Also Wells collaborated on a biology textbook - I have, or had, a copy.

It's worth making the point that a great deal of Wells's material was up-to-date and new. For example prehistoric lake villages had only recently been unearthed (if that's the word) by archaeologists. So had various types of hand axes (some now known to be fakes). The Hittite empire has only then been rediscovered. Piltdown Man is in – now of course known to have been a fraud. Wells included the First World War up to and including the Versailles Treaty.

LAYOUT of Wells's Outline; are there similarities in Deeks's?

Although part of the case for Deeks is that Wells lifted her plan, McKillop doesn't anywhere state what the plan of "The Web" was, how it was structured; and in what respect(s) if any Wells's resembled it. McK doesn't even list her chapter titles. After several readings, I'm unable to find in McKillop any evidence at all as to what Deeks's plan was, apart from the suggestion that it gives a broad sweep of history.

Her case, and those of her aides, rests entirely on single words and phrases, juggled in an unbelievably childish manner:-

Deeks: "I prepared a list (during most of 1921 – McK p 163) of hundreds of such verbal similarities.. phrases, clauses, and parts of sentences; whole sentences and paragraphs slightly changed or colourfully altered but containing the same details and original features of THE WEB, and mistakes. All of these... ran in the same sequence... About one hundred were identical in wording... Not one similarity ... was traceable to any one of the two hundred and fifty, or more, sources and authorities cited by Mr. Wells ... The cumulative effect became overwhelming."

For reference, I insert here the books and chapters of the earliest hardback Outline of History (I reluctantly omit the subheadings to save space):-

BOOK I THE MAKING OF OUR WORLD

I THE EARTH IN SPACE AND TIME / II THE RECORD OF THE ROCKS / III NATURAL SELECTION AND THE CHANGES OF SPECIES / IV THE INVASION OF THE DRY LAND BY LIFE / V CHANGES IN THE WORLD'S CLIMATE / VI THE AGE OF REPTILES / VII THE AGE OF MAMMALS

BOOK II THE MAKING OF MAN

VIII THE ANCESTRY OF MAN / IX THE NEANDERTHAL MEN, AN EXTINCT RACE / X THE LATER POSTGLACIAL PALAEO-LITHIC MEN, THE FIRST TRUE MEN / XI NEOLITHIC MAN IN EUROPE / XII EARLY THOUGHT / XIII THE RACES OF MANKIND / XIV THE LANGUAGES OF MANKIND

BOOK III THE DAWN OF HISTORY

XV THE ARYAN-SPEAKING PEOPLES IN PREHISTORIC TIMES / XVI THE FIRST CIVILIZATIONS / XVII SEA PEOPLES AND TRADING PEOPLES / XVIII WRITING / XIX GODS AND STARS, PRIESTS AND KINGS / XX SERFS, SLAVES, SOCIAL CLASSES, AND FREE INDIVIDUALS

BOOK IV JUDEA, GREECE AND INDIA

XXI THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES AND THE PROPHETS / XXII THE GREEKS AND THE PERSIANS / XXIII GREEK THOUGHT AND LITERATURE / XXIV THE CAREER OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT / XXV SCIENCE AND RELIGION AT ALEXANDRIA / XXVI THE RISE AND SPREAD OF BUDDHISM

BOOK V THE RISE AND COLLAPSE OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

XXVII THE TWO WESTERN REPUBLICS / XXVIII FROM TIBERIUS GRACCHUS TO THE GOD EMPEROR IN ROME / XXIX THE CAESARS BETWEEN THE SEA AND THE GREAT PLAINS OF THE OLD WORLD

BOOK VI CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM

XXX THE BEGINNINGS, THE RISE, AND THE DIVISIONS OF CHRISTIANITY / XXXI SEVEN CENTURIES IN ASIA (C 50 BC TO AD 650) / XXXII MUHAMMAD AND ISLAM / XXXIII CHRISTENDOM AND THE CRUSADES

BOOK VII THE MONGOL EMPIRES OF THE LAND WAYS AND THE NEW EMPIRES OF THE SEA WAYS / XXXIV THE GREAT EMPIRE OF JENGHIS KHAN AND HIS SUCCESSORS (THE AGE OF THE LAND WAYS) / XXXV THE RENASCENCE OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION (LAND WAYS GIVE PLACE TO SEA WAYS) / CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE 650 - 1683

BOOK VIII THE AGE OF THE GREAT POWERS

XXXVI PRINCES, PARLIAMENTS, AND POWERS / XXXVII THE NEW DEMOCRATIC REPUBLICS OF AMERICA AND FRANCE / XXXVIII THE CAREER OF NAPOLEON BONAPARTE / XXXIX THE REALITIES AND IMAGINATIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY / XL THE INTERNATIONAL CATASTROPHE OF 1914

BOOK IX THE NEXT STAGE IN HISTORY

XLI THE POSSIBLE UNIFICATION OF THE WORLD INTO ONE COMMUNITY OF KNOWLEDGE AND WILL / CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE 1563 - 1920

To give an idea of the detail in Wells, here are his subheadings for just one section from his Book VIII - The Age of Great Powers: -

XXXVI PRINCES, PARLIAMENTS, AND POWERS [1 Princes and Foreign Policy/ 2 The English Republic/ 3 The Dutch Republic/ 4 The Break-up and Disorders of Germany/ 5 The Splendours of Grand Monarchy in Europe/ 6 The Growth of the Idea of Great Powers/ 7 The Crowned Republic of Poland and its Fate/ 8 The First Scramble for Empire Overseas/ 9 Britain Dominates India/ 10 Russia's Ride to the Pacific/ 11 What Gibbon thought of the World/ 12 The Social Truce draws to an End]

At the risk of appearing statistically obsessed (real experts of course are innumerate) I estimate Wells's Outline of nine books, in forty or so chapters (listed above), amounts to 287 sections in total. These average about 1500 words. If he wrote one section a day, it would take him less than a year to complete the book, assuming his illustrators, photographers, compositors and so on could keep up. Much of the brilliance of course lies in designing the plan in the first place.

Note that Wells's sections aren't purely rehashes of then-conventional wisdom, but include concepts and attitudes and ideas – even when the factual basis is weakened by new discoveries his book retains considerable power.

IDEAS in Wells's Outline: would he have copied them from Deeks?

I took a few typical Wellsian ideas from his Outline. This list isn't intended to even begin to approach Wells's full breadth of material. McKillop nowhere comments on this sort of thing, and yet surely this perceptual stuff is part of the distinctive arrangement and style of Wells's the book?

- Tendency of English speaking races to promulgate statements - Magna Carta, U.S, Constitution, Wilson's fourteen points
- Severe criticism of the use of the word 'bourgeois' by Marxists to include a huge range of human types - Bacon, landowners etc
- Private enterprise after the Great War speculating in rents, not providing housing; insisting on closing state shipyards; buying up remunerative public enterprise after WW1
- The importance of print to the human mind and its bearing on the political future
- Distinction between race, nation, and language groups [discussing 'Aryan']
- Intellectual tangles due to the differences between Realism and Nominalism
- 'The Science of Thwarting the Common Man'
- Idea that not too severe conflict causes ideologies or philosophy: divided Greece, shattered and captive Jewry; disordered China - 'insecurity and uncertainty seemed to have quickened the better sort of mind.'
- Geology - slow changes with long spans of time; such as the Mediterranean flooding
- The vulgar error that the Roman Empire at the height of its power "united most of the known world."
- Could the Inquisition have been a debating society that took for its motto "Hear all sides"?
- Sea routes contrasted with land routes
- 'need of the transferable vote to prevent the "working" of elections'
- Various partitions of Poland
- Ridicule of the idea that early medieval Ireland was the main centre of culture in Europe
- Colonisation and e.g. reasons why eastern States of the U.S. are tiny compared with western

MISTAKES in Wells and Deeks?

A reliable indication of plagiarism would be repetition of errors; this is why telephone books are planted with fake names, and why A-Z maps of British towns include fake bits of road. A real-life example of plagiarism, which I was informed about, involved a teacher who copied out an entire maths textbook; even mistakes in the solutions were repeated. I recently read that Antonia Fraser included a spoof event in one of her books, as a tracer for plagiarists.

Reproducing mistakes therefore can be conclusively important evidentially. For this reason I must take some time here on 'mistakes'. McKillop refers a few times to Wells's 'mistakes', in passing, casually implying they exist, just as I might do when referring to McKillop's mistakes. However, this presumption doesn't prove they existed in Wells's case. He was in fact adamant that his work had been thoroughly checked:-

It was only to be expected that many reviewers would sneer a little at the idea of novelist-turned-historian, talk of superficiality, and hint of inaccuracies and errors they have neither the industry nor the ability to detect. They would have done that if the Outline had been absolutely faultless. As a matter of fact, and thanks very largely to the keen editorial eye of Mr Ernest Barker, for the writer himself is sometimes a very careless writer, the number of positive inaccuracies and errors that appeared even in the earliest issues of the Outline, was very small. Most of them were set right in a list of errata at the end of that edition, and there was another still closer pruning before the publication of the second, the book, edition. Among the cultivated gentlemen who "do" the book notices, in the provincial press more particularly, there was a disposition to qualify their approval by condescending reference to slips and mistakes which they imagined must be there. Within the limits set by law of libel, one can have no objection to this sort of thing, which gives the tone of leisured knowledge to the most hastily written review.

So let's turn to McKillop's list of 'mistakes'.

Deeks's 'The Web' and her testimony

244: '.. two publishers.. had already rejected "The Web" before she submitted it to Macmillan..'

-104: Deeks's MS content: '.. Lucrezie de Medici's influence on the education of her son Lorenzo. It was she who "really ruled Florence." Columbus had learned his map-making skills with the help of his wife, Philippa... Isabella of Aragon, the power behind the throne of late-fifteenth-century Spain; Marguerite de Roberval, who helped establish domestic life in sixteenth century new France; Marguerite Luther, .. instrumental in forming the character and beliefs of her son Martin. .. Vittoria Calonna, the marchioness of Pescara; Veronica Gambara, countess of Correggio; Constanza d'Avalos, duchess of Amalfi; ... And of course Elizabeth I, for whom Florence's admiration knew few bounds. .. "peace within her border .. her people became wildly ebullient with the joy of living, of union, of prosperity, of learning, and of liberty."

[4] All there is are some of Deeks's own comparisons – pages and pages but the total is unimpressive; for example P 164: Deeks: Woman "constructed ingenious stoves to cook the food, and as vessels were needed for cooking, she moulded the earth into shapes and dried and burnt them so pottery was produced." [Deeks seems to have imagined that the earth was first peopled, then a woman thought, oh, now we must invent cookery]

Wells: "They do not seem to have cooked their food ... they had no cooking implements ... they had no pottery." [McKillop doesn't reveal how much material was between the dots].

small extracts from the Phoenicians - e.g. silks from China/ silk ... from China/ the skill, especially of women, was responsible for rare productions./ Men had learner to weave fine linen and delicate fabrics of coloured wool they could then bleach and dye.

And e.g. spelling of Hatshepsut as Hatasu.

The idea is that cumulatively they are significant. Another example (McK p 275) is Columbus starting on a journey - 'little expedition' and 'beautiful weather' occur in both histories.

Another example – McK (p.276) says Deeks regarded it as a 'key passage' - is Deeks's claim that Wells copied a wrong date from her in a passage on Vasco da Gama. My early copy of Wells has "In 1498, Vasco da Gama sailed from Lisbon to Zanzibar, and thence, with an Arab pilot, he struck across the Indian Ocean to Calicut in India." My 1930 Popular Edition has "In 1497 Vasco da Gama sailed...etc" And the corresponding chronological tables have: "1498. Vasco da Gama sails round the Cape to India." 1930 Edition: "1498. Vasco da Gama sailed round the Cape to India." (McKillop - maybe following Deeks - irritatingly spells da Gama as de Gama at least half a dozen times). Deeks, says McK, had written 'Also in 1498 the Portuguese under Vasco de Gama sailed around the African continent and reached Calicut on the Malabar Coast.' She said she made a mistake putting the landing date first in her sentence. And Wells copied this, later correcting it. It's difficult to assess this without consulting e.g. the Encyclopaedia Britannica, to see how the date is represented. Wells's early work also has a map, by Horrabain, 'Chief Voyages of Exploration' (p 519 in my edition), clearly showing among other voyages V. da Gama, the part of his voyage before the Cape of Good Hope dated 1497, and the latter part to India, 1498. This map suggests Wells's wording was careless, choosing 1498 as the significant date rather than 1497; after all the date of da Gama's landfall was far more important than the departure date. However, I'm not able to disprove the possible link. But anyone contemplating the massive two volumes of Wells will I Imagine feel that Deeks would have to do a lot better than that.

Another pair of passages are paragraphs on the Greeks. There must be standard ones - Grote etc, E Britannica – probably with the same material on Greek unity of a sort - language, epics, trade, shrines, Amphictyonic councils [Deeks sp], Amphictyonies [Wells]

P 205 says Wells's human interest details of Pericles were the same as those in the Web. And that 'the special prominence afforded to Pericles in the Outline did not arise out of a consensus of scholarly opinion, but mimicked the same idiosyncrasy in The Web. Richards (of Ogden and Richards) said that..

Greece was re-interpreted during the 19th century as a 'democracy' and Pericles was regarded as a non-tyrannical ruler; this whole line of argument seemed odd to me. What is the truth? Well, J B Bury's 'Story of Greece' [1900 – presumably edited down from his multi-volume work] has about 12 chapters on Greece (excluding early Hellenic times, and later events – Carthage, Macedonia, Persia). Of these chapters, one is the Athenian empire under Pericles; another four chapters relate to the politics of Athens, the wars. And so on. This seems to me about the same balance as in Wells; where we find:

- A section ('The Greeks and the Persians') on Hellenic culture, Greeks, Persians, Sparta, Peloponnesian war, Thermopylae
- A section ('Greek Thought and Literature') – the detail being 1 the Athens of Pericles [and Plato] / 2 Socrates/ 3 common Athenians – whom Wells liked to compare to Cockneys, to Gilbert Murray's irritation / 4 theatre/ 5 Plato/ 6 Aristotle / 7 Cynics, Stoics, Epicureans, Zeno/ 8 quality and limitations of Greek thought
- A section on the career of Alexander the Great - [Philip, Macedonia, Darius, conquests]
- A section 'Science and Religion at Alexandria'

In short, Pericles is represented pretty much to the extent typical of historians of the time. The only way I can make sense of Richards' and/or Deeks' comment is to assume they made a mistake: rather as if someone complained that Queen Victoria was over-represented in writing about 'the Victorian age'. Pericles' thirty years gave the world the Parthenon, Socrates, Aristotle, Plato, Thucydides, the peak of the Athenian empire., numerous sculptors and artists.

As to human interest details, it's impossible to comment on Richards' claim without seeing Deeks typescript. On the face of it, the remark must be nonsense – as very little is known of Pericles.

Founding of Holy Roman Empire as 800 not a more usual later date despite apparently Bryce giving that date (though 162 says Bryce gave 962 - Holy Roman, not revived Roman Empire) 205 common 'misattribution of the founding of the Holy Roman Empire to Charlemagne instead of Otto the Great' – Henri Pirenne e.g. (1917) talks of the Frankish Empire, and Otto's dream of uniting the Papacy with the empire, and of attempting to restore the Carolingian tradition – this point seems vague. Wells does state the Empire of Rome 'rose again in 800 as the "Holy Roman Empire"', though Horrabrin's map gives 'Frontiers of Charlemagne's Empire' and after all he had been crowned 'Emperor'; and Tamurlane and Adam Smith. (This is partly true - it does seem odd there's a gap between Christianity and Islam and modern times - I'd assumed this was a sign of haste - it looks as though Wells did the first part, made it too long, and omitted quite a bit from the Middle Ages. (205 – the neglect of monasticism and feudalism, and absence of discussion of chivalry or the guild system); However the feudal system is mentioned with at least one map; Timurlane is mentioned – section 5D of 'The Great Empire of Jenghis Khan' even has a map; the Renaissance of Europe is rather strangely bundled in after the Mongol Empire - Wells comments, as Parkinson did later, that Europe had sunk to a low level). Much more on Florence than Venice. But since McKillop doesn't give the statistics within which these are embedded they amount to nothing.

P 163: 'In dealing with the Stuart period' in England: Deeks 'used seven passages from J R Green, four of them lengthy ones. The Outline contained the same four passages, word for word. .. All seven passages [were in] .. the Outline, and in precisely the same sequence.' McKillop doesn't provide any evidence for this. There is in fact no account specifically of the 'Stuart period' in the

Outline – unsurprisingly as it was chaos, including the gunpowder plot, civil war, regicide, commonwealth, restoration and revolution, and complications with Ireland, Holland, Spain, and France. However, I have a copy of Green (incidentally, there's also a much longer multi-volume version of Green). Wells's section (Chap XXXVI, section 2 'The English Republic' occupies about 6 pages, perhaps 4000 words. Green from 'THE FIRST OF THE STUARTS' to the end of 'THE SECOND STUART TYRANNY' – pages 474 & 672 in my copy – occupy roughly 100,000 words, and are correspondingly long drawn out. Wells says things like 'The English were drifting towards a situation new in the world's history, in which a monarch should be formally tried for treason to his people and condemned.' (p 543). He generalizes. His style is unlike Green's; I simply do not believe this short section of Wells could contain seven passages from Green, especially long ones, but in the absence of the actual typescript of *The Web*, it's impossible to be certain.

Richards also noticed a 'curious footnote' in *The Outline* that said: "This is not the same Simon de Montfort as the leader of the crusades against the Albigenses, but his son." Curious because.. "The Outline had not mentioned this Simon de Montfort in its account of the Albigensian Crusade. *The Web* mentioned him twice." It's not really curious at all, in fact. One or other de Montfort is one of these vaguely famous characters – 'the founder of parliament' - that many English people have heard of; there is for example a 'de Montfort Hall' in Leicester.

Deeks prepared a list [most of the year 1921; typed as Plagiarism? c 1930s says McKillop] of omissions from both books [159-160]: 1) the making of the earth; 2) any adequate account of the early civilizations of Egypt and Western Asia; 3) the great range of oriental civilization which had entered Rome; 4) Rome's contribution to modern civilization; 5) the social and agricultural organization of medieval Europe with its manors or villas and its lords and tenants; 6) the territorial organization of medieval Europe and the development of centralized authority; 7) any account of the United States of America from War of Independence 1776 to Monroe doctrine 1823. From 1823 to opening of Japan 1854. From civil war to end of century. .. many other cogent examples. [Of course since *The Web* isn't available it's impossible to say how just this is].

However McKillop seems not to have heard of Ranke – I presume his history was a universal one. McKillop doesn't seem to know reference books existed (cf. *L'Art de Verifier les Dates*). Nor does McKillop seem to know the standard by 1900 was bit of Biblical stuff/ Greeks/ Romans/ Middle Ages/ triumph of Europe. Wells could have slotted India and China and the US and prehistory into this in a way which coincided with Deeks; but McKillop gives no evidence.

WHAT DEEKS DID

From McKillop's account, it's impossible to be certain of Deeks's confidence in her own case. As we've seen she spent about a year comparing *The Web* with Wells's first hardback edition, and preparing her points of comparison. She seems determined. On the other hand, she was supported by her brother (financially) and sister (emotionally), and consulted about six men for their opinions, and their written 'reports', which suggests that she had some misgivings.

Unfortunately we can't assess the points of comparison, as McKillop supplies neither her table of similarities nor any facsimile page; nor does he supply any sustained extracts from *The Web*.

Let's however look at the reports she obtained; McK gives quite long extracts. These of course pre-date the trial – it's uncertain if she would have proceeded without them.

THREE REPORTS written for Deeks

Report 1: Laurence Burpee

This man was: ‘.. not a professional historian ... he was a former ... civil servant who ... worked for three .. ministers of justice.. and resigned to become librarian of Ottawa’s public library. ... [After 1912 he was] the first Canadian secretary of the International Joint Commission.’ He helped ‘bring into existence’ the Canadian Historical Association, and wrote books of exploration – ‘Sandford Fleming, Empire Builder’ (1915) for example. (McK p.193).

McKillop falsely presents Burpee as an impressive man of letters.

Burpee ‘agreed to examine’ the two works and two weeks later he sent an evasive report, which concluded that “‘.. ideas in the same sequence, ... in substantially the same form of words – the instances are far too numerous to even begin to present them here. ... it is the cumulative effect of very many similarities ... that compels one to the conclusion that some of those engaged in preparing.. ‘The Outline’ must have had access to .. ‘The Web’” McKillop adds: ‘Burpee had even appended his own five-page list of similar words, phrases, ideas, and mistakes.’

McKillop does not reproduce or quote any of these five pages; nor does he seem to think it odd that despite ‘innumerable’ similarities Burpee could only append five pages of them, presumably the best available. (Wells’s book remember had something approaching 500,000 words). In the absence of evidence - McKillop not having reproduced or quoted from any of these pages for us - something he surely would have done if they’d been convincing - the most likely interpretation is that Burpee was being polite, perhaps to collect his fee, and egged on poor Deeks with a report of the sort that unscrupulous writing colleges use to keep their aspirant writers paying – designed to look very encouraging at first sight, but on closer examination displaying little substance under the froth. The Deeks family had money - at least until her brother died – and poor Florence shelled out large sums including (McK p 219 - \$15,000 equivalent to about \$100,000 today) for Prof. W P Kennedy, a Catholic appointed by her one-time teacher, George Wrong, to edit/update her work . Burpee’s careless dealing may have propelled Deeks into disaster for a fee.

Report 2: Bertram Windle

The best-known man approached by Deeks was Sir Bertram Coghill Alan Windle, a surgeon and pathologist, and writer on medicine and anatomy and science, and on prehistory and Romans in Britain; he converted to Catholicism and wrote on miracles, suggesting that rational intelligence was not his strong point.

He could not find any “absolutely crushing and final piece of evidence” – even in nearly half a million words. He found ‘several’ examples of parallel passages, according to McKillop, who quotes some extracts from both books - paragraphs on Greece. (Pp. 198-199). But unfortunately, anyone summing up the Greeks would be likely to produce similar material: - nationalism as it was then, city states, the Med, gods in common, oracles, Olympics, slaves, Greek pottery.

Windle also says the fact that Wells said little about women was indirect evidence of plagiarism – he’d deliberately missed out every single example, making up the core of Deeks’s work, to hide his steps.

Windle added emphatically: ‘.. no man who had not made a prolonged study of the subject [history] could by any kind of possibility have drafted the scheme of the book. It is utterly impossible... he got that scheme somewhere. From a book? Let him produce it - I don’t know of one.’ - in other words Windle hasn’t heard of general histories. Also, absurdly, as Deeks hadn’t made a prolonged study of history, presumably she couldn’t have drafted her own book, either!

It’s not made clear if Windle was paid; there may be no evidence one way or the other. He offered to give evidence in court, and like Burpee may by his unintelligent support, have helped lure Deeks into destruction.

However ‘After the death of .. Windle, she had needed to find [another witness] ... towards the end of 1929 she had found a scholar [sic].. Professor .. Irwin..’

Report 3: Ogden and Richards & Harry Elmer Barnes

These are the once well-known Ogden & Richards ('The Meaning of Meaning') and the revisionist historian, Barnes.

Neither Ogden nor Richards seem to have had much grasp of history; they were involved with detail of the English language. Ogden thought it would take a month to study both documents sufficiently. Richards correctly stated that statistical analysis of some sort was needed. He vacillated in his report – 'instances.. have, by themselves, not the slightest evidential value.' He recommended against a court case. Barnes said 'their certainly seems to be an astonishing similarity' – but close reading of McKillop shows I think that Barnes was referring only to Deeks's 70 or so page list of supposed similarities; Barnes hadn't even seen *The Web*. It's unclear from McKillop whether Barnes ever saw her typescript; Barnes had lunch with Ogden and discussed the matter together; then six weeks later Barnes wrote to Deeks, withdrawing but suggesting 'an acquaintance' to examine the works.

The net effect of these various men, and others, including her lawyers – at least while the money flowed – was to propel Florence Deeks forward into legal battle.

THE LEGAL CASES

The factual basis in what follows is based entirely on McKillop:-

The reader may have noted McKillop's relentless one-sidedness, relying largely on imputing states of mind to Deeks. His one-sidedness is of course irrelevant to the actual truth or otherwise of the plagiarism issue. But let me give an illustrative example of his technique:

'At one stage, Lord Atkin asked: "Have you any idea how long it will take to present your argument?" The question, as put, seemed ominous. She tried to abridge her argument as she went along, but it struck her that the comment scarcely conformed to the ideal of British fair play.'

McKillop thinks it's unfair to ask how long someone expects to take to present evidence. But for all Atkin knew, Deeks might have photos of Wells with *The Web* open on his desk, surrounded by witnesses, plus scribbled notes all over her script saying 'Let's use this bit, Mr Barker – HGW' in Wells's handwriting. It seems entirely reasonable to ask for an estimate of time.

The judges were faced with concealment; one feels sorry for them, and can almost feel the lack of verve in both prosecutors and defence, and also the poor presentation of the plaintiff Deeks, who went through several changes of lawyers and had a stop-go policy depending on her money supply. The court record had Macmillan spelt McMillan throughout, suggesting considerable laxity in the stenographer(s).

- On Deeks's typescript: Macmillan had trouble with at least one staff member; moreover they had no security for their MSs – the so-called 'vault' in which they were stored was, says McKillop, just open shelves; any employee or visitor could see them.
- Deeks had wanted them to check whether her extracts from Green's History of England were acceptable to them - Macmillan held the copyright; it may have been sent for that reason. Page 177 (and photo of Macmillan's MS log) seem to show some irregularity over the MS.
- It doesn't help assessment of the evidence that Deeks on receiving her parcel back (she claimed this was April 1919 - p 277) didn't open it for a very long time, and only then discovered what she said was a dog-eared and generally well-thumbed condition.
- Deeks herself kept evidence to herself: 'She knew very well who the informant was [who told her the typescript went to Macmillan in England]. It was Sidney Watson of Thomas Nelson publishers, John Saul's golf partner. ... Saul.. The former Macmillan editor had said he had sent "The Web" to England. Under advice of counsel, she could not identify Watson by name since she had not been able to secure his presence as a witness.' [McK p 246. I'm not sure how McKillop knows this - perhaps because her then counsel, Smily, said he objected to the employee's name being revealed.]
- John Cameron Saul (experienced editor) ... I can't relocate what he did - left Macmillan? - as the indexing is mediocre

- Wise was dismissed from Macmillan Canada and may have gone into bookbinding or booze; and sold visas to Italians. Sir Richard Gregory denied knowing Wise - the President of the Canadian Macmillan - but they'd corresponded; and Nature was published by Macmillan & p 391 had its offices in Macmillan's building.
- Hugh Eayrs preferred no to say that Wise had been jailed in 1929. (p 122).

Wells's evidence was relayed from England (McK 311ff – no faxes or emails then): he said The Web may have come to England; he was vague as to his helpers; the plan 'must have occurred to thousands of people'; the coincidences or alleged coincidences were says McKillop, in effect, laughed off; never heard of Duruy; no original handwritten script; then timing of the number of words. McKillop leaves the impression that Norman Daynes, for the plaintiff, didn't do much of a job.

It does seem possible Wells saw the MS. He denied it. Whether it could have helped much, even if he did, apart perhaps from spurring him on such an enterprise, seems doubtful to me.

THREE 'EXPERTS' testifying for Deeks

[1] Prof William Andrew Irwin; student of Oriental Languages. Irwin studied Oriental Languages for about four years, did a masters on a topic unspecified by McKillop, was a Methodist and married the daughter of a dean of theology in the Old Testament department. By then aged 46 he had been an associate professor, and had 'just accepted a position as full professor at Chicago.' Incredibly, McK does not state was Irwin was a Professor of, possibly for good reasons. . (McK p 279).

[2] Lawrence Johnston Burpee: historian of NW America, FRS of Canada, president and member of some historical and author associations. 'Eminent historian and man of letters' says McKillop

[3] Prof George Sidney Brett - Oxford degree in history and philosophy; author of political and governmental works, and a three volume history of psychology 'to 1911'. McKillop says: 'he was perhaps the world's leading authority in his field' – by 'field' McKillop seems to imply 'the humanities or social sciences'; but presumably means the history of psychology. To be harsh, Brett's formal history was half his Oxford course, say two years, being generous; plus a study of politics and ethics taken purely from books, with no research work into actual legal systems; and a history of psychology – one can guess – Greeks, middle ages, the theory of association, Wilhelm Wundt, William James. His expertise in history was indeed tenuous.

Witness 1: Professor Irwin (and the 'Hatasu' issue)

It's discouraging to find that Irwin called Wells's book 'Outlines of History', (as did a lawyer); suggesting inefficient reading skills.

The 'Hatasu' issue.

This woman lived 3,700 years ago in Egypt – no wonder there were disputes about pronunciation and spelling. A Wells footnote compared the multiplicity of spellings to 'dazzle painting' – ship's camouflage. In those days the comparative study of hieroglyphics was fairly new. McKillop's treatment of Hatasa (or Hatshepsut) implies the spelling of her name is significant evidence that Wells plagiarized Deeks. As I'll show now, this is simply not true. Over to Irwin's trial testimony in 1932:

'... One particular Egyptian name.. was .. what had first twiggged him to the dependence of The Outline on "The Web" and had made him suspicious. It was the name "Hatasu." ... Irwin had worked in the field [ancient Near East] and had never seen or heard of it until he started the current investigation. It appeared in none of Wells's authorities, or in any other recent works. "Only by

special investigation did I discover it, ... and that in old histories of 1890 and earlier. Since that time the accepted form ... has been Hatshepsut.” [McK p 287]. (the date 1890 is repeated on p 344).

Pretty impressive, eh. Nobody uses the spelling (though one wonders in that case how Deeks had found it); if Irwin is right, this is serious. Thanks to the magic of Internet, we can easily check that Irwin, if possible, may be even more slapdash than McKillop.

Thus we find easily enough, without even attempting to be exhaustive, and without considering academic pay-only sites, or allowing for pre-computer material that nobody has scanned in, in chronological order:-

- 1881 ‘The Career of Queen Hatshepsut (Hatasu)’ - "Inscription of Queen Hatasu on the Base of the Great Obilisk [sic] of Karnak," being English Translations of the Assyrian and Egyptian Monuments, vol.12 (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons)
- 1881 Picturesque Palestine, Sinai and Egypt. 4 vols edited by Charles Wilson. Includes an account of Hatasu's obelisk at Karnak
- 1883 FLINDERS PETRIE (one of the most famous Egyptologists of the day) in 'The Pyramids and Temples of Gizeh' has details on monuments of Hatasu.
- 1886: ANCIENT EGYPT by GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A. 10th edition. London. Has an entire chapter on Hatasu: XI. Queen Hatasu and her Merchant Fleet. (Rawlinson was one of the best known ancient historians of the time and certainly mentioned by Wells and Winwood Reade.).
- 1889 Henry George Tomkins: ‘The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland’, Vol. 18 ‘...the commander of a corps d'elite in Queen Hatasu's service...’
- 1891 Pharaohs, Fellahs and Explorers. by Amelia Edwards. New York: Harper & Brothers: ‘QUEEN HATASU has been happily described as the Queen Elizabeth of Egyptian history; and she was undoubtedly one of the most extraordinary women in the annals of the ancient East. ... she inherited sovereign rights in virtue of her maternal descent from the old Twelfth Dynasty line. ...’ (I’m guessing the comparison with Queen Elizabeth appealed to Deeks).
- 1893 Matilda Joslyn Gage in 'Woman, Church and State' has material on Hatasu, along the lines of an Elizabeth I-style monarch (as generally understood).
- 1896 A work on 'cocoanuts' mentions Hatasu's expedition, sent in search of trees
- 1898 ‘The City of the Caliphs; a Popular Study of Cairo and its Environs and the Nile and its Antiquities’ by Eustace A. Reynolds-Ball. Details about Hatasu.
- 1904 ‘The Web of Indian Life’ by Margaret Noble. Mentions Hatasu!
- 1905 ‘To-day on the Nile’ Guidebook by Harry Westbrook Dunning. With an account of monuments by guess who.
- 1906 Prize winning sculptured panel: Queen Hatasu of Egypt by the English sculptor Countess Feodora Gleichen.
- 1908 The Illustrated History Of Free Masonry. ‘An Authentic History of the Institution etc etc’ By Moses W. Redding. Broadway. ‘Thotmes I erected two obelisks of large size before the sanctuary of the temple at Karnak. His daughter Hatasu erected two others before the second propyloeon.’
- 1910 G. A. E. Chapman Album 5: 489 photos, including Temple of Queen Hatasu & Rameses III
- 1914 ‘It Happened in Egypt’ by C. N. Williamson & A. M. Williamson; a thriller set in the area of Hatasu’s temple. (I expect – I haven’t read it).
- 1915 SHORT GUIDE TO THE CAIRO MUSEUM of Antiquities by E. S. Thomas, describes Hatasu's temple at Thebes, with Hatshepsu as an alternative spelling. Note that this guidebook is in English, and was for soldiers during the war who might be interested in exploring Egypt in between fighting ‘the Hun’.
- 1916 'Sax Rohmer' (pseudonym) short story - In the Valley of the Sorceress. Queen Hatasu reference. Remember Wells wrote short stories and paid attention to other peoples’.

- 1919 April 15: A 20 cents a copy educational periodical, 'The Mentor' on glass making says 'Many strange beads have been discovered; one that belongs to Queen Hatasu of the fifteenth dynasty (1450 B.C.) says in hieroglyphs that she was "beloved of the Goddess Hathor."'
- 1920 'The Fortieth Door' – by Mary Hastings Bradley; a story involving Hatasu's monuments, I think along Blood-and-sand lines with romantic Arabs (these spinsters, eh).
- 1921 Moss Steamship Company has a boat called 'Hatasu' (OK, blame Internet for that one).

'Only by special investigation did I discover' the name, said Irwin – a name in two of the best known authorities of about fifty years previously, who were well-known when he was studying in his youth; in guide books to Egypt, in academic works, in the principal museum in the whole of Egypt, and in popular fiction. And in particular, in books aimed at leisured feminist readership. Amelia Edwards (1891) or Matilda Gage (1893) seem probable source(s) of Deeks on Hatasu; I'd be willing to bet, sight unseen, that Deeks's 'The Web' would show suspicious signs of plagiarism from Edwards and/or Gage.

Another supposedly significant item was Wells on Egypt: Wells, and Deeks, 'completely ignored one of the most important periods of Egyptian social and intellectual development, that of the Middle Kingdom.' (McK p 287). This seems to represent Irwin's viewpoint rather than Wells's. I was surprised re-reading Wells to find how little space was given to Egypt. Wells was concerned with the whole historical and racial pattern of the middle east. His timeline diagram (untitled; p 111 in the early 2 volume set) has a time span of 6000 years from the Neolithic to the iron age, and diagrams western Europe, eastern Mediterranean, Russia, Judea, Arabia, Mesopotamia, India and China; Aryans, Semitic peoples, and Huns. Wells's chapters including Egypt are 'The First Civilizations', 'Gods and Stars, Priests and Kings' and 'Serfs, Social Classes and Free Individuals'. Wells was in generalizing mode and the social and intellectual achievements of Middle Kingdom Egypt, such as they were, presumably didn't fit.

Irwin criticised both works: they were 'sadly out of balance': '..treatment of ancient East was inadequate; disproportionate space to Greece, Macedonia, and Rome, they overlooked "Achaemenia Persia," and they neglected the Seleucid and Ptolemaic empires, of India and Syria and of Egypt, respectively. Their treatment of Israel and Juda [sic] was unsatisfactory but in similar ways; they gave only casual reference to the Ottoman Turks and neglected Tamerlane.'

Irwin also (McK 189-190) analysed Alexander, Macedonia, .. the Persians, India, China and Japan, and all central and eastern Asia..'. He seems to have left modern history most of Wells's second volume – untouched. McK gives no other example from Irwin's voluminous testimony; but presumably he selected the best ones for his book. Irwin comes across as one of the most wearying types of expert, or supposed expert, unable to focus on evidence, unwilling to admit lack of knowledge, and continually confusing fact with what McK calls senior common room gossip.

Witness 2: Lawrence Burpee

McKillop's account of Burpee's Court testimony (295ff.), if accurate, shows Burpee's testimony as poor, and his cross-examination as even worse. Burpee's main piece of evidence. The one example cited by McKillop is the date of the so-called Holy Roman Empire where the lawyer, Moorhead, himself made an unanswerable reply. The other thirty-two examples (p 296) aren't listed by McKillop, but presumably must be identical to, or resemble, those appearing passim throughout his book. They are therefore unimpressive. 'Many' of these seem to be the metaphor of a web; Moorhead pointed out that Wells's novel Joan and Peter had the same metaphor.

However Burpee raised another issue, in common of course with others, namely the sheer difficulty of researching into and writing up such a book. Burpee seemed not to realise that these objections applied to Deeks; the more difficult it was for Wells, the more so it would be with Deeks,

working solo as she did. [** McKillop produces no evidence whatever about the content of Deeks's book etc – OMIT??]

Witness 3: Prof George Sidney Brett

There's another Brett in the story... (Court testimony McK pp. 300ff). Brett, like Burpee, was impressed by the magnitude of Wells's book – 'anybody.. would organize a gang of workers'; later he said (p 304) it was 'Starting out from the blank ... absolutely impossible'.

Unfortunately Brett's collection of points of suspicion, which by my count are six, are desperately unimpressive; (1) Aspasia, 'wife' of Pericles, out of proportion; (2) A passage 'discussing Socrates on virtue and knowledge' seemed to have come from the Web – McK does not provide either passage and there is no such obvious passage in Wells anyway. I find; (3) Description of Sulla as "aristocratic" was in 'no other source'. Here, Wells wrote: 'Marius and an aristocratic general, Sulla, who had been with him in Africa etc.' Brett and others imply Wells described Sulla as an 'aristocrat', when Wells's usage looks like a simple description; 'aristocratic' in early 20th century English just meant someone from a wealthy or privileged background. (4) Columbus expedition was "a very good test passage"! (5) The Holy Roman Empire date again. (6) Both Deeks and Wells hadn't mentioned Adam Smith, a 'glaring omission'!

Brett, assuming McKillop's account is even approximately true, made no attempt to show similarity in the plans of Deeks's document and Wells's book.

Witness for the Defence: Frank Underhill

This was Frank Hawkins Underhill, Professor in Canadian history at Toronto. He's described (McK p 254) as a sort of understudy for Prof. Chester Martin, the head of the history department at Toronto. Martin didn't testify – the reason(s) appear unknown. Moreover Wells had explicitly said he didn't want an expert witness (McK p. 341). If I've understood McK (p 255) the trial was delayed from November to next March on Deeks's account. Underhill initially only had a few weeks' notice. McK make it clear Underhill was paid (p. 341 - \$750). McK p. 331ff describes Underhill's testimony, relying of course on the court transcript.

Underhill said '.. in their general spirit and tone there was not very much similarity... when you abstracted ... the feminism there was not much left in The Web except a succession of narratives and facts, which would ... be found in most elementary history books.' He also said he couldn't find any 'striking originalities' in the plan of The Web. ... the proportions given to different people and events .. were vastly different.'

Underhill also looked at the examples of supposed commonality, dismissively. Aspasia [and Pericles] was in Plutarch. Aristocratic Sulla was acceptable, Julius Caesar was in Plutarch, Holy Roman Empire was reasonable. And, presumably, so on.

He was not cross-examined on the structure of The Web, and took little interest in textual examination of the points Deeks had noted (her 80 pages). Since Underhill regarded the two works as having little in common, this of course is unsurprising.

Ontario Supreme Court: William Renwick Riddell

One of four justices; nearly 80, he was 'a well known legal historian' says McKillop, who discusses his 'lengthy opinion' – in effect, Riddell's written judgment – in one paragraph (p. 357). '.. the utter worthlessness of this kind of evidence.. nothing in any way conclusive as proof in any or all of the alleged common inclusions, common omissions, common errors, etc.'

=====

CONCLUSIONS: [1] - The evidence isn't firm as to whether Wells saw the typescript or not. Perhaps he did; if so, it seems unlikely it would have been much help to Wells. Even if Wells did use the MS, it's unclear what liability that would raise; I don't think McKillop considers this

[2] doesn't begin to make the case for plagiarism – McKillop simply hasn't even tried to do the work

[3] Deeks seems not to have been aware of psychological mechanisms: (i) Cp chap in the 1960s who took a photo framed by the lower part of the Eiffel tower. He seemed seriously to imagine he was the first person to do this, and wondered if he had copyright. (ii) Consider exam questions, where the examiners get driven to distraction by the imitativeness and similarities between the answer papers. Deeks seems seriously to imagine that, for example, saying Columbus started on his expedition of a fine day was an original feature of her work.

[4] I suspect her view of the world was a romanticised pioneer one, in which women did more basic work than in twentieth century suburban times, and which she imagined the women invented for themselves; at any rate this interpretation seems consistent with what little information McKillop gives about 'The Web'. Some support from this view is given by McK p. 180: 'Fragments of romantic novels, some co-authored with Mabel, have survived...'

[5] It's entirely possible Florence Deeks was exploited by lawyers at least for as long as she had money. (This was in pre-legal aid days; nowadays the preferred procedure in the UK is to find some patsy –if that's the right word - about whom both sets of lawyers make up some case and mutually share out the funding.)

[6] Why did McKillop write this book, while omitting everything which might enable Florence Deeks's claim to be checked? – My own best guess is that the whole thrust of this book is a religious, probably Roman Catholic, job, part of the modern-ish opposition to rationalism. As an example: McK p 223 has Chesterton's 'The Everlasting Man', which McK describes as his 'neglected classic' – neglected, certainly. Of Belloc and Wells' 'Mr Belloc Objects...' McKillop says 'The exchange [sic] of argument and insult did little to enhance Wells's reputation'. I haven't read any of this controversy; but compare e.g. Martin Gardner on 'Mr Belloc Objects...' – a 'little masterpiece of polemics'. McKillop flatly describes the Outline as 'a work hostile to the Christian religion' (p 160), implicitly appropriating all Christianity to Roman Catholicism. McKillop says (227) 'The two Roman Catholic scholars shared a deep disdain for Wells and all that he represented..' – these two being J F McCormick ('editor of the New York-based Catholic journal the Commonweal'; no other biographical information is provided) and Sir Bertram Windle (the English pathologist etc. and Catholic convert). The blurb on McKillop (including '...author of scholarly works on the history of religion...') suggests he's a Catholic though the only suggestive item on Internet I could find is that someone of the same surname wrote on 'Mother Teresa'. Kennedy, who ripped of Deeks, was Catholic. Robert Falconer was a Professor of Theology. William Irwin, of the absurd Hatasu nonsense, had religious entanglements – as above noted, McKillop omits to state his subject. Although no evidence is given, I would not be surprised if Leach, the editor of 'Forum', who referred Deeks to Falconer, aired religious subjects in his magazine of 'controversy'. The anonymous donation(s) suggest someone with a vested interest. I even wondered whether McKillop's complete unfamiliarity with Wells's books has a deeper basis – I imagine him shying away from them as being on the Index Expurgatorius.

In fact I wonder whether Florence Deeks wasn't used as a patsy by Catholics. Some of her list of omissions in common with Wells and her typescript may be Catholic influenced:- 1) The making of the earth; [creation?] 2).. Egypt and Western Asia [read: Palestine] 3) .. oriental civilization .. Rome [read: primitive superstition replaced by the wonder of Christianity]; 4) Rome's contribution to modern civilization; 5) the social and agricultural organization.. medieval Europe.. [what about the Church?] 6) centralized authority [read: growth and spread of Christianity].

274 McKillop thinks it difficult – 'taxing in the extreme' - to compare two passages – in Wells and in The Web. He made use of a computer program (McK p.410) developed in the US National Institutes of Health, by N. Feder and W. Stewart. It's not clear how effective their program(s) are; ideally they should look for synonyms, for example, and rephrased metaphors, and perhaps foreign language tags; and the underlying structures and approaches would be difficult to allow for. At any rate McKillop said no further examples came to light than Deeks and the others claimed.

CONCLUSION McKillop's book is virtually worthless as evidence-

[1] Not one single passage is quoted from Florence Deeks, perhaps because pp 409-410 '[it] is no longer a publishable work. Written in the elevated style of High Victorian Romanticism, its combination of evangelical enthusiasm and moral umbrage would sit well with few contemporary readers.' It's not on Internet (nor are images of the typescript pages) despite the fact that McKillop 'prepared a computerized transcription of the text of "The Web" to allow searches by keywords.' The only quotations are indirect, and about women, either relatively famous ones (e.g. Renaissance women, Queen Elizabeth) or women considered as women, supposedly inventing things like dyeing and building. And instituting medical science. And poetry. And clothes. (McK p 271)

McKillop appears to be concerned with the allegedly anti-feminist nature of the early-ish 20th century, and is sympathetic with Deeks's not being received well by the legal systems of Canada and Britain. However, he is unfair here. Many of the 'experts' she relied on were chivalrous to her – the paid 'experts' all said there was an overwhelming prima facie case; she was even praised for presenting her case well, in Britain (McK p 357), before they threw it out. They might have been more honest with her. Likewise McKillop paints a picture of Deeks in her old age as an impoverished genteel spinster (McK p 380 – 'strict economies..' barely able to make ends meet. The truth was (McK p 379, quoting William Deeks in 1998 to McK) that the total cost 'to the family' including presumably the modern day equivalent of \$120,000 to W P Kennedy was equivalent now to about \$750,000. McKillop doesn't comment on the anonymous donors – one wonders if they felt they'd had their money's worth; the cost to Wells was about £4000 (p 375) – today's value very roughly £30,000 using the same multiplier as W Deeks.

It's possible someone in Toronto might be interested sufficiently to digitally photograph Deeks's script and put it on Internet. Florence Deeks died in 1959 so that if Canadian copyright expires in fewer than about 50 years there should be no copyright problems. If anyone decides to do this, try to reproduce pencil marks, folded corners and so on. For that matter, such a person might copy her shorter 'Plagiarism?' notes in the Toronto Reference Library.

McKillop seems not to have read most of Wells's books; *The New Machiavelli* treated as based on sex, for example; *Anticipations* 'its emphasis on eugenics' (McK p.51); *Open Conspiracy* – 'benign alliance of bankers and industrialists who will rule the world by bypassing legislative democracy' (McK p 215).

Wells's Method of Writing

Wells on his Outline

McKillop gives some extracts from Wells's written evidence (pp. 312ff) as to his method of writing the Outline. 'as late as October 20 [1918] he was still only planning to write ... Much of the assistance .. had been provided by "word of mouth" ... "my helpers... merely.. vetted the book." ... Wells had made few notes, and even fewer abstracts from secondary sources. "I am afraid I have very little system in my work ... but if you want to know how the 'Outline' was written I should say that after these first few trials, the production of a manuscript, then most of it was typed at once by my wife, who was very much interested..." ... "All these books [sources in footnotes] were consulted ... I did not sit down and read a number of works through and then begin writing..." ...

“.. my manuscript... was very often written in pencil...” McKillop doesn’t make it clear that Wells, here, must presumably have been discussing his part-work; McKillop doesn’t mention the process of revising his partworks.

This is not very helpful, of course; the substructure of the book was the essential missing component. McKillop says Daynes, the cross-examiner, asked Wells about the plan for the Outline. Wells said it “must have occurred to thousands of people.” If McKillop is quoting fairly from the trial transcript, Daynes didn’t ask Wells to describe the way he devised his substructure; McK p. 313ff quotes Daynes as continuing with comparisons with The Web. Attempting to show commonality on the basis of the examples previously raised, though apparently the more general ones, such as the supposed glossing over of Mesopotamia, and neglect of Rome’s architecture and law.

Trying to piece together what Wells did is therefore not made easy by these rather incompetent lawyers.

The first thing to note is that Wells was a professional writer with no supplementary income; unlike McKillop, his income depended on the quality of his output. Wells worked to deadlines and specifically stated in his autobiography that ‘it was as natural as breathing’ in London of the late 19th century to be alert for money-making opportunities.

The second thing to note is the influences which he’d absorbed: his first love seems to have been science, particularly biology, with an evolutionary slant. Sociologically he was influenced greatly by Plato and the ‘releasing’ outlook of The Republic, with its suggestion that societies could be recast. Among minor influences were anthropological writers on such topics as race, primal law, and the origins of religion. He also read freethought publications which flourished at that period as a result of ‘taxes on knowledge’ being abolished. He read People like Grant Allen, whose piece on distances between towns struck him as the most seminal thing he’d ever read. His ‘Anticipations’ (1900 – though it’s often wrongly dated as 1902) included speculation on wide roads, larger cities, alternative middle class suburbs (in effect), the evolution of language as affected by technology – he thought accents would be fixed by sound recording, and that some languages, e.g. Italian, might die out. McK p.137 quotes G. P Wells: ‘He wanted to write history as “a picture of developing inter-communications”’. As regards economics: Wells disliked Marxists; at that time, the gold standard was universal; and Wells liked trade, since it can be an un-imperialist way of increasing wealth – he was lyrical about the Hanseatic League. ‘Democracy’ and its various caricatures and opponents was still a relatively new practice.

My guess is that this material was embedded firmly in his mind; the strands in The Outline would naturally include: (1) An account of the origin of life; (2) An account of the emergence of human beings; (3) An account of early beliefs, which he’d regard as primitive; (4) The effects of mobility – sea travel and roads in early empires; (5) The effects of languages, writing and reading on ideas, and the emergence of specialist castes to deal with them; (6) early synthesisers of ideas, notably Gautama (Buddha), Confucius, Lao Tse, Mani, and ‘Jesus’.

So far, so good. But then Wells became less abstract, following of course innumerable historians. (7) Greece, Rome, Islam in that sequence, with China and India inserted somewhere.. (8) The ‘Middle Ages’. (9) The previous (say) 400 years, including as a theme the partial emancipation of the masses.

Wells’s book is indeed somewhat bottom-heavy with the past, apart from closing chapters on the Great War, which of course he lived through and indeed contributed to.

I suspect that if Wells had been asked, he’d have said something like that. However lawyers are concerned to win cases, not find the truth, so one can’t be sure. Certainly, I can find no evidence in McKillop to suggest Deeks contributed anything whatever to any of this.

Let me add a few notes on omissions:-

Wells had the same difficulty as Russell did in his History of Western Philosophy, about thirty years later. Russell stated he had difficulty fitting modern science into his history-of-culture scheme. Ancient science is more easily subsumed under headings such as Bronze age, Iron age, etc.

Buckle's ideas & Comte are unmentioned; the Norman conquest gets just a sentence or two); Vico is unmentioned; heresies and sects are not described in great depth; the general universality of slavery is not dealt with; Wells omitted critical stuff on the impoverishment of India.

Wells seems to me to underdescribe geography – for example, deserts are barely mentioned at all – though this weakness is offset by Horrabin's brilliant maps, and of course Wells's occasional accounts of the effects of e.g. mountain ranges as barriers. Wells approved of van Loon's 'The Story of Mankind' (1921) which is written from a geographical viewpoint. Wells says nothing about H J Mackinder, despite (I'm pretty certain) knowing him personally.

Wells also is a little weak on military matters. He doesn't for instance examine the effect of gunpowder, or abstract considerations such as the balance, or unbalance, between attack and defence.

I list these items purely as a counterweight to some passages in McKillop, where one of Deeks's witnesses picks on some supposed weakness or omission without having any grasp of the sample space in question, namely the entire stretch of human history.

Well's Writing Method Generally

There are some scattered references in Wells's autobiography. He says he used a card index system, when he was in his short story/science fiction phase. If an idea struck him, he'd note it down in his card index; when he wanted a story, he'd look through and select one.

Bertrand Russell said a character in Tono-Bungay's dying words were based by Wells on his notes he made when George Gissing died.

I think it's reasonable to assume Wells made copious notes for much of his life later use. As an example, his novel *You Can't Be Too Careful* (1941) starts with characters living in a London boarding house; their language and mannerisms seem, to me at least, based on notes – I doubt he'd have memorised things in such detail.

Wells was aware of and cautious about plagiarism and the dangers of obsessiveness. In one of his novels, a lab technician retires to write a book describing the way progress in science depended on technicians. In life, Wells was faced with a man he'd once been in lodgings with who tried to sell a short story as Wells's; which 'I was unable to authenticate'. McKillop is anxious to imply Wells freely plagiarised, but personally I'd treat this claim with great caution. McK p. 396 quotes an author, Ingvald Racknem, who contributed a section to an edited book on Wells - '... borrowed, directly and indirectly, the words phrases and general outlines of a wide range of writers as diverse as Kipling, Sterne, Swift, de Maupassant, Poe, Flammarion, and Gourmont.' Of course any short story is likely to be influenced by other writers in the same genre. Incidentally Jules Verne, rather oddly, is not mentioned – the Webbs described him as a young man writing stories in the style of Verne. Wells's *Time Machine* may have been anticipated by Mark Twain. Flammarion presumably must be the encyclopaedic astronomy text book.]