

A Reply to "The Wold Newton Theory Alternative Universe"

By Win Eckert

(with contributions from Brad Mengel and Chuck Loridans)

I have reviewed the published version of Catherine D. Stewart's "The Wold Newton Theory Alternative Universe"¹ with some interest, especially after being privileged with a preview copy last year. Based on the preview copy, I had submitted to Ms. Stewart several suggestions in the nature of purely factual corrections, a few of which have been incorporated into the final copy verbatim, without citation or acknowledgement.

It is also gratifying that Ms. Stewart refers interested readers to my website for further information.² It is with some trepidation, therefore, that I must point out that many other factual errors were not corrected prior to publication. In my brief exchange with Ms. Stewart, she indicated that her article was a summary, intended only to introduce and educate readers about the Wold Newton concept. She stated that many of the factual corrections I offered would make the article too complex.

However, when one is faced with the options of presenting either simplistic incorrect information, or more complex but correct information, as a scholar one should select the latter option and trust that one's readers are intelligent enough to follow. Therefore, in fairness to Philip José Farmer, his theories, and interested readers of Ms. Stewart's article, I have prepared this "Reply."

Listed first are errors which have nothing to do with Farmer or his Wold Newton theories, but are errors pertaining to the history of American pulp fiction, which nevertheless begin to call into question the scholarly integrity of the entire article. These facts are easily checked, either by research on the Internet, or a trip to the local library for any one of several books on the history of American pulps.

Robert J. Hogan did not write The Shadow novels. They were written primarily by Walter Gibson, along with Theodore Tinsley and Bruce Elliott, under the publisher's house name of "Maxwell Grant."

Norvell Page did not write the G-8 novels. They were written by Robert J. Hogan and published under his own name.

¹ Published in two parts in *Thriller UK* No. 15, July 2003, and No. 16, October 2003. Ms. Stewart also purports to make the article available on her own website "The Cat's Whiskers: Fanfic and Family History," <http://www.cd.stewart.btinternet.co.uk/original_non_fiction.htm>; however, as of this writing (April 2004), the links are dead.

² "An Expansion of Philip José Farmer's Wold Newton Universe"
<<http://www.pjfarmer.com/woldnewton/Pulp2.htm>>

Walter Gibson did not write The Spider novels. The first few were written by R.T.M. Scott and then the series was continued by Norvell Page under the publisher's house name of "Grant Stockbridge."

Richard Wentworth was not G-8. G-8's real name was never given in the pulps. Per the original pulp novels, Richard Wentworth was The Spider.³

In only the very loosest sense of the word "derivative" can characters such as The Phantom, Tarzan, Fu Manchu, Wolf Larsen, Modesty Blaise, and Nellie "Grey" (sic)⁴ be characterized as derivative of Sherlock Holmes.

Moving on to errors specific to Farmer's Wold Newton theories....

Ms. Stewart refers to all of Tarzan's children, without bothering to cite the sources of the different theories which account for the different children. In so doing, she misleads the reader into thinking that Farmer, in his original family tree, proposed several daughters for Tarzan. This is not the case. Tarzan's daughters were proposed by a post-Farmer Wold Newton writer, Chuck Loidans, in his article "The Daughters of Tarzan." By failing to cite sources and by failing to adequately separate Farmer's theories from Loidans', Ms. Stewart does a disservice to both writers – and the readers of her article.⁵

In order to refute some of Ms. Stewart's most egregious errors, I am forced to quote liberally from her article:

[Western author J.T.] Edson used WNU to clear up one of Edgar Rice Burroughs' Tarzan discrepancies as well. In *The Beasts of Tarzan*, his and Jane's son is an infant, yet in *Son of Tarzan*, John is an adult married to Meriem. (*Thriller UK* No 16, p. 20, October 2003.)

³ In *Doc Savage: His Apocalyptic Life*, Farmer proposed that The Spider was a half-brother to full brothers G-8 and The Shadow. In his novel, *The Adventure of the Peerless Peer*, Farmer called the G-8 character "Wentworth" as a tip-off that he was The Spider's (Richard Wentworth) half-brother. However, Richard Wentworth was not G-8.

⁴ The character's name in *The Avenger* pulp novels was spelled Nellie Gray.

⁵ Ms. Stewart encourages similar confusion when she states that "Lord (sic) William's 1st illegitimate relationship made him father of the evil genius Fu Manchu (and grandfather of Fu Manchu's hero son, cop Charlie Chan of the 'Number One Son.'" (*Thriller UK* No 16, p. 22, October 2003.) The relationship between Sir William Clayton and Fu Manchu was established by Farmer. The relationship between Fu Manchu and Charlie Chan was established by Dennis Power in his article "Asian Detectives in the Wold Newton Universe." This type of confusion presents itself so often in Ms. Stewart's article that it would not be productive to enumerate each and every instance. Suffice to say that I suggested to her that she distinguish between Farmer's theories and theories presented by people other than Farmer, or as I like to call it, "post-Farmer" theories. Unfortunately, she rejected my suggestion. While I know that Phil Farmer is flattered by all of our collective post-Farmer speculation, he is first and foremost a scholar; I am sure he does not want someone else's theories attributed to him, or vice versa.

Edson was not the one who cleared up the Tarzan discrepancies. It was Philip José Farmer, and it was a major cornerstone of his Wold Newton "pseudo-biography" *Tarzan Alive*.⁶

Edson wrote two series about two great-grandsons of Mark Counter (his Floating Outfit hero): the "Rockabye County" set about Bradford Counter, and the "Bunduki" series about Brad's cousin James Allenvale Gunn. According to Edson, Tarzan and Jane had one son, John Paul Clayton, born in 1912, but, later that year, they adopted John Drummond. John Drummond was the youngest of seven children, the eldest being none other than Hugh "Bulldog" Drummond, but who was deeply involved in his work for the British Government and unable to assume guardianship of his suddenly orphaned siblings, including the youngest, John, aged only 14 (born 1898). These were then farmed out to various relatives amongst the mutated clan – John Drummond, the youngest, being taken in by Tarzan & Jane.

Edson uses the Bunduki books to "explain" that Tarzan's son "Korak the killer" was his adopted son, John Drummond-Clayton, not his real son, John Paul Clayton, feats John Drummond could accomplish because the Drummonds (see reproduction of Farmer's original Wold Newton family tree) had the same meteorite-mutated genes as the Greystokes. (*Thriller UK* No 16, pp. 20-21, October 2003.)

This is incorrect. All of the above was according to Farmer, not Edson. Edson merely adopted Farmer's theories⁷ and *repeated* them in his own books. Ms. Stewart does a major disservice to a writer, Philip José Farmer, whom she professes to greatly admire, by stating otherwise.

As a matter of fact, of Tarzan's 4 biological children, his eldest daughter and son have been woefully neglected in fiction, since as the genetic offspring of Tarzan, they would be able to accomplish a great deal more than John Drummond could ever dream of. (*Thriller UK* No 16, p. 21, October 2003.)

Farmer never concretely stated that Tarzan definitively had a daughter; the daughters of Tarzan are part of post-Farmer Wold Newton Universe (WNU) speculation, specifically "The Daughters of Tarzan" by Chuck Loridans.

In J T Edson's *Bunduki* series, Dawn Drummond-Clayton and James Allenvale Gunn have been raised in Africa by Tarzan and Jane after their

⁶ This is one of many errors which were pointed out to Ms. Stewart pre-publication, which went unheeded.

⁷ Farmer's theories as described above were first published in his article "The Great Korak-Time Discrepancy," *ERB-dom* No. 57, April 1972, and were later expanded in his *Tarzan Alive*. If Ms. Stewart read at least a portion of *Tarzan Alive*, she obviously did not read it from cover to cover.

4 parents were murdered in the Mau-Mau uprisings in the 1950s. Illegitimate, James' mother, Alison Counter, was the granddaughter of Mark Counter, and his father was the illegitimate grandson of H. Rider Haggard's hero Allan Quatermain (yet another irradiated cousin of Tarzan). (*Thriller UK* No 16, p. 21, October 2003.)

Where to begin? Only James Allenvale "Bunduki" Gunn's parents were killed; Dawn Drummond-Clayton's are still alive. Everyone lived on the Greystoke plantation and so they were raised together. Bunduki is not descended from Allan Quatermain, but from his friend and companion, Sir Henry Curtis. This is clearly stated in Edson's books, and so we are wondering if Ms. Stewart has failed to read these as well as Farmer's books. Alison "Tex" Counter was not illegitimate. Quatermain was not descended from those irradiated in 1795, although he is part of the larger family described by Farmer. In the Wold Newton Family (WNF), there is a distinction between the irradiated and their descendents, and non-irradiated characters who nevertheless are part of the Family. Allan Quatermain, Ned Land, and Wolf Larsen are examples of the latter. A quick reference to the genealogy in Farmer's other Wold Newton "pseudo-biography," *Doc Savage: His Apocalyptic Life*, reveals all of this.

James Bond's boss, "M," was never Mycroft Holmes, as Ms. Stewart asserts. As stated in Ian Fleming's novels, "M" was Admiral Sir Miles Messervy. Various pastiches and post-Farmerian speculations have it that Mycroft Holmes was a predecessor to Sir Miles. This would have been long before James Bond's time.⁸

Although I did theorize that the villain John Sunlight is the son of Doc Savage, I never postulated that Savage was married to Sunlight's mother, as Ms. Stewart states. A simple reading of Farmer's Doc Savage novel, *Escape From Loki*, and the correct recounting of my theory⁹ explains why.

Moving on, Ms. Stewart disparages the direction that post-Farmerian Wold Newton research has taken, citing my inclusion of the immortal Highlander as "unbelievable." Again, she does not burden her readers with direct citations; however, since I include *Highlander* in my Wold Newton chronology, I will take on the response to her criticism.

In *Tarzan Alive*, Farmer states repeatedly that Tarzan is effectively immortal. For example, the introduction in which Farmer describes his interview with Lord Greystoke portrays Greystoke as a young man, not a man of 87 years of age. Farmer goes on at great length about how Tarzan, as a young man, received an immortality treatment from a grateful African witch doctor. Later, Farmer describes the events of Edgar Rice Burroughs' novel *Tarzan's Quest*, in which Tarzan and Jane discover another source of

⁸ Later on, Ms. Stewart refers to James Bond as a character who has been added to the WNU in a post-Farmer expansion of the Wold Newton mutant family. (*Thriller UK* No 16, p. 23, October 2003.) In fact, Farmer himself included James Bond, as seen in *Doc Savage: His Apocalyptic Life*. Again, Ms. Stewart must not have read Farmer's book before preparing her article.

⁹ Available here: <<http://www.pjfarmer.com/woldnewton/Savage.htm>>

immortality, the Kavuru elixir, which they are able to share with their family and close confidantes.

In *Doc Savage*, Farmer describes how Tarzan sent the Kavuru elixir to his cousin Doc for analysis. Doc was able to synthesize the compound, and share the immortality pills among his family and his five loyal aides. Furthermore, in *Doc Savage*, Farmer includes Fu Manchu in the Wold Newton family tree. Sax Rohmer conferred immortality upon Fu Manchu in his novel *The Mask of Fu Manchu*. In fact Fu Manchu's "Elixir of Life" is a recurring component of Rohmer's novels.

Clearly, Philip José Farmer did not consider immortality to be off-limits in the context of his Wold Newton theories. It is specious of Ms. Stewart to criticize post-Farmerian contributors for including an immortal character such as the Highlander, when Farmer himself included several such characters. Given the fallacious nature of Ms. Stewart's "criticism," it becomes undeniable that she not read the two primary Wold Newton sources, *Tarzan Alive* and *Doc Savage: His Apocalyptic Life*, both by Philip José Farmer.

Obviously at this point whatever scholarly integrity Ms. Stewart's article might have had has been completely decimated. If only she had read Farmer's books and the post-Farmerian articles which she discusses and critiques.... Unfortunately, the errors continue.

Ms. Stewart criticizes Brad Mengel's article "The Incredible Raffles Clan," which reconciles Barry Perowne's pastiche version of A.J. Raffles with the original version of E.W. Hornung's classic character and builds a Raffles family tree (although she doesn't bother to name Mr. Mengel, or his article). Ms. Stewart claims that Mr. Mengel theorized that Raffles returned from the dead after the Boer War via the clichéd artifice of a twin brother. However, a clear reading of Mengel's article makes it plain that Raffles' brother was proposed by writer Jon L. Breen in his 1980 pastiche "Ruffles versus Ruffles." Mengel utilized this proposed brother solely to expand the Raffles family tree. Mengel's article never suggests that a second brother took over A.J. Raffles' identity after A.J.'s death in the Boer War, but rather that Hornung's Raffles (A.J.) wouldn't be above pretending to be Barry Perowne's (R.J.). A quick check of Mengel's article would have revealed this fact.¹⁰

Ms. Stewart continues to criticize the post-Farmerian treatment of Raffles thusly:

It was desired to create a closer relationship between Sherlock Holmes and A.J. Raffles, whose lives overlapped in the 1890s and who were already

¹⁰ Conversely, author Peter Tremayne resurrected the original Raffles in his pastiche novel *The Return of Raffles*. Tremayne's device for returning A.J. Raffles from the dead has nothing to do with Jon L. Breen's proposed brother. It is difficult to understand how Ms. Stewart could mix all this up. A charitable view of events would have it that she read Mengel's article years ago and then wrote her own article from a faulty memory. In any event, she has certainly not let the basic facts get in way of her own theses and "criticisms."

maternal first cousins in the WNU (Edignia's sister, Violet Rutherford, married Sherlock's father Siger Holmes; other mutual first cousins of Sherlock and Raffles included Professor Challenger; Melissa Rutherford [mother of Monk Mayfair]; Alice Rutherford [mother of Tarzan]). So, Raffles "acquired" a sister, Marjorie, only a couple of years his junior. Marjorie Raffles and Sherlock Holmes married in 1883, she dying in childbirth to their son Raffles Holmes later that year (despite Dr Watson, already Holmes' companion of two years, making absolutely no reference to any such occurrence). (*Thriller UK* No 16, p. 23, October 2003.)

Post-Farmer WNU theorists did not "desire" to create a closer relationship between Holmes and Raffles. The relationship is documented in the pastiche *R. Holmes and Co.*, by John Kendrick Bangs (published in 1906). Bangs said Marjorie was Raffles' daughter, but the dates did not work, and so WNU theorists converted her to a sister. Post-Farmer theorists decided to *use* the information presented by Bangs but it was not because of any "desire" to create a closer relationship between Holmes and Raffles. Dr. Watson, Holmes' companion, also makes no reference to Irene Adler as the mother of Holmes' illegitimate son, Nero Wolfe, and yet Ms. Stewart seems to wholeheartedly accept that theory.

Ms. Stewart continues:

But the silliness didn't stop there.¹¹

Just like Tarzan's elder two children Charlotte and John Paul Clayton, Raffles Holmes' rich fictional potential - stemming from his illustrious WNU heritage as a son of Holmes, nephew of Raffles, half-brother of Nero Wolfe, great-great-grandson of The Scarlet Pimpernel and cousin to a whole host of heroes such as The Saint, The Shadow and Tarzan - was never explored. He floated aimlessly around the cosmic ether of pulp fiction for a while before being ignominiously disposed of by succumbing to his father's one-time vice of cocaine addiction, overdosing shortly before 1920. (*Thriller UK* No 16, p. 24, October 2003.)

There is a text-based reference for this which Ms. Stewart is ignoring. Laurie King, in her series of Sherlock Holmes books, mentions several times Holmes' "lovely, lost son." The implication is that Holmes had a son who has died under some sort of tragedy. I have theorized that this was Raffles Holmes. Ms. Stewart implies that this theory is made up

¹¹ Readers of my "Reply" who feel I am unduly harsh with Ms. Stewart should be reminded of this and similar inflammatory language in her article. She uses the phrase "But the silliness didn't stop there" several times. She also utilizes the following language: "I kid you not. The ludicrousness of such an addition need hardly be explained." Given the outrageous number of factual errors and mistakes in her article, perhaps Ms. Stewart could have chosen her words with a bit more charity and selected a more respectful manner of expressing her disagreement. If one chooses to chastise others, one should be in a position of authority or knowledge to do so. Ms. Stewart has not demonstrated such authority, knowledge, or mastery over the Wold Newton topic.

out of whole cloth, without citing reference to the Laurie King texts (which I *do* cite when making my connection). Not only does this present an unbalanced viewpoint, but it is poor scholarship to fail to fully reference one's sources. Ms. Stewart is entitled to her opinion, but should fully cite her sources, as I have, in order to allow her readers to make up their own minds based on *complete* information.

Again, it is extremely unlikely that someone with the vigorous intellect of the Raffles/Holmes families plus their superlative physique would perish in such an ignoble manner. Incredibly, a while later, it was desired to have "Grandchildren of Sherlock" at which point, Lo! The late Raffles Holmes was found to have sired not only John Mannering (via a brief marriage in 1901), called The Baron in John Creasey's stories (The Americans inexplicably changed the character to the Blue Mask), but also an illegitimate son, Crighton (sic) Holmes, in 1913. (*Thriller UK* No 16, p. 24, October 2003.)

The addition of Creighton Holmes did not stem from any "desire" on the part of post-Farmer scholars to add grandchildren, but rather to fully document the wide range of Holmes' relatives who have been presented in various Holmesian pastiches over the years. In this case, the pastiche is *The Adventures of Creighton Homes*, an anthology of short stories by Ned Hubbell, published in 1979. Again, Ms. Stewart leaves this bit of information out in order to make her case appear more valid.

Ms. Stewart continues:

Even so, the "identical twin" cliché was yanked out of mothballs yet again with Sherlock Holmes, as his illegitimate son by Irene Adler, John Hamish Adler, a.k.a. Nero Wolfe, suddenly became a twin, the other being Scott Adler, a.k.a. Marko Vukcic. (*Thriller UK* No 16, p. 24, October 2003.)

Actually, Marko as Wolfe's twin brother predates Farmer, appearing, in William S. Baring-Gould's *Nero Wolfe of West 35th Street*, so it is not a new theory. Farmer himself adopted the idea of Marko being Nero's twin. Therefore, the "twin cliché" (they were never stated to be "identical," so this is Ms. Stewart's own twisting of the facts) was also adopted by Farmer himself. It is not an idea propounded in later, post-Farmer expansions of the WNU, as Ms. Stewart states.

Ms. Stewart goes on to claim that post-Farmerian writers have caused a "continuity cock up" in the history of the Wold Newton Universe, by including characters that come before the year 1795. Ms. Stewart cites as her example the inclusion of Highlander, stating:

Remember, the Wold Newton mutant family did not exist before 1795, so making Duncan McLeod et al, who had been around since 1592, a member of the mutant family, instantly creates a 203 year continuity cock up. (*Thriller UK* No 16, p. 26, October 2003.)

With this claim, Ms. Stewart has made yet another mistake, for no post-Farmer theorist has ever proposed that Duncan McLeod is a member of the WN mutant family. She continues to miss the point that characters are being added to a *universe* without necessarily being added to the WN mutant family. The distinction is between WN Family members and characters who co-exist in their universe (the WNU), but whom are not necessarily WN Family members.

Ms. Stewart's criticism of a "continuity cock up" is so baseless as to almost be laughable, were it not so pathetic. One of the defining moments of the WNU was when a radioactive meteorite fell in Wold Newton, England, in 1795, causing genetic mutations in those present. The descendants of those people had enhanced, strength, intelligence, and so on, and many became either great heroes or villains. Collectively, those people are called the "Wold Newton Family." However, the Wold Newton Universe did not *begin* in 1795, as Ms. Stewart seems to indicate. It has a history as long as our own, real universe. Certainly there were many characters inhabiting the WNU before 1795, and many of them were ancestors of those present at the meteor strike. Farmer himself refers to these characters as part of the "Wold Newton Family," despite the fact that they were not subject to the genetic mutations.

Furthermore, Farmer himself listed numerous pre-1795 characters in his Wold Newton Family trees. A five-minute research check of available online resources will reveal to anyone that Farmer included the following pre-1795 characters:

- Robert E. Howard's *Solomon Kane*
- Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's *Sir Nigel Loring*
- Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's *Micah Clarke*
- James Fenimore Cooper's *Natty Bumppo*
- Rafael Sabatini's *Captain Blood*
- Thomas More's *Rafael Hythloday*
- James Branch Cabell's *Manuel of Poictesme*
- Baroness Orczy's *Armand Chauvelin*
- Baroness Orczy's *The Scarlet Pimpernel*
- Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (via a reference to Van Helsing)
- Mary Shelly's *Frankenstein* (via a reference to Dr. Frankenstein's experiments)

Again, post-Farmerian scholars are merely following in Farmer's footsteps when they add pre-1795 characters to the Wold Newton Universe, whether or not the pre-1795 characters happen to be ancestors of post-1795 Wold Newton Family members. The "continuity cock up" criticism is spurious. If Farmer is allowed to include pre-1795 characters as ancestors of his Wold Newton Family, then why are we somehow precluded from including pre-1795 characters in an expansion of his WNU? The answer is: we are not. Certainly such a wonderful and varied continuity as the WNU is allowed to have a history and characters prior to 1795.

Speaking of *Dracula* and *Frankenstein*, which were included in the WNU by Farmer through references in his *Doc Savage: His Apocalyptic Life*, Ms. Stewart chides post-Farmerian speculators as violating Farmer's premise that the WNU is the real, believable world.¹² She ignores the fact that Farmer himself added the following non-real-world elements to the WNF and/or the WNU: an immortal Tarzan; an immortal Fu Manchu; the vampire Count Dracula; Frankenstein and his Creature; aliens as seen in Farmer's novel *The Other Log of Phileas Fogg*; a giant ape (Farmer's story "After King Kong Fell"); fantasy elements through Manuel of Poictesme; and horror elements through the Cthulhu Mythos of H. P. Lovecraft (Farmer's story "The Freshman" and his inclusion of Lovecraft's character Robert Blake as a WNF member). Once again, since Farmer himself went beyond the bounds of the "real world outside our window" in crafting his Wold Newton cycle of biographies, novels, and stories, so too are post-Farmerian Wold Newton contributors free to do the same.

There is another error that is perhaps the most pervasive, as it goes to the basic theme of Ms. Stewart's article: namely, the proposition that Farmer wrote his Wold Newton works with the goal of bringing order and organization to pulp continuities that were hopelessly convoluted and confused before he came along. Ms. Stewart seems to be drawing an unstated parallel between the state of American pulp fiction c. 1920s-1940s, and the utterly confused continuity that characterizes comic book universes of the modern era. She appears to cast Farmer in the same role as the creators of the DC Comics event *Crisis on Infinite Earths*, in which the convoluted DC Comics Universe was allegedly streamlined into a much simpler and more understandable continuity.

The problem with casting Farmer in this role is... It's completely false. Firstly, pulp continuities were not hopelessly convoluted, as so many comics continuities are today. As an example, Ms. Stewart states that Farmer solved many continuity problems by making G-8 and The Shadow half-brothers of The Spider. Certainly, in *Doc Savage*, Farmer proposed this fraternal relationship, but not to solve a (non-existent) continuity problem. In fact, The Shadow was published by a different company than G-8 and The Spider. Inter-company crossovers, so prevalent in comics today, just were not done in the pulp era, and so there could be no continuity conflicts between the characters.¹³

Ms. Stewart's further contention is that the continuity contradictions really arose out of all the different versions of characters that appeared in pulp fiction, comic books, stage plays, radio programs, newspaper strips, movies, and serials. While I grant her that point, it has nothing to do with Mr. Farmer. He confined himself to theorizing about the written pulp versions of characters, and did not deal with other versions from radio, comics, films, and so on. And as I've stated, the pulp fiction "universe," taken by itself and as a whole, was not subject to these continuity contradictions.

¹² This is an odd position for Ms. Stewart to take, given that she has entitled her article "The Wold Newton Theory *Alternative Universe*" (emphasis added).

¹³ In fact, *intra*-company crossovers were almost unheard of in American pulp fiction: the only ones that immediately come to mind are several crossovers between G-8 and the Red Falcon (both published by Popular Publications, Inc.).

Ms. Stewart also uses the different eras in which Hornung's and Perowne's versions of Raffles operate as an example of contradictions within pulp fiction. Again I grant her the contradiction. However, it is a contradiction which is internal to the Raffles stories.¹⁴ It has nothing to do with pulp fiction as a whole. While individual authors and their individual characters may have had internal contradictions, it is erroneous to extrapolate those individual contradictions to the whole of a pulp fiction "universe."

In other words, there were no contradictions between Holmes and Raffles, Tarzan and Holmes, The Spider and The Shadow, etc., that were somehow miraculously resolved by Farmer's unifying theory. In short, there were no hopelessly confusing continuity issues with pulp fiction for Farmer to solve.¹⁵ Ms. Stewart has presented a false dilemma, and again one questions whether she has actually read any of the source material.

The real reason Farmer set forth his Wold Newton theories was that he enjoyed the Sherlockian game of treating characters he loved as real. He connected as many of the best-loved characters of his youth as he could, because he wanted to imagine them interacting together in the same universe, indeed in the same family. It's that simple. Unfortunately, Ms. Stewart did not allow this simple fact to get in the way of her thesis.

Finally, on a note that pertains to one of my own theories: Ms. Stewart states that the character "Shrinking" Violet Holmes was inappropriately named. As a co-creator of the character, it is my province to name the character whatever I wish. The "Shrinking" nickname is properly described as "ironic," not "inappropriate."¹⁶

¹⁴ Furthermore, Mr. Farmer never addressed the differences between Hornung's and Perowne's versions of Raffles in his Wold Newton theories. He left that to later Wold Newton writers, such as the aforementioned Brad Mengel.

¹⁵ Certainly Farmer attempted to reconcile conflicting information wherever he encountered it, following in the footsteps of decades of Sherlockian studies of the contradictions in Doyle's writings. However it is wholly inaccurate to cast Farmer in the role of pulling "pulp fiction out of the mire it had carelessly meandered into." (*Thriller UK* No. 16, p. 19, October 2003.) If Ms. Stewart had actively searched for a real continuity contradiction that Farmer solved, she should have used as an example the chronological contradictions that resulted from Korak's miraculous aging between Edgar Rice Burroughs' *The Beasts of Tarzan* and *The Son of Tarzan*. (As noted earlier, she does mention this contradiction, but true to form, misattributes the solution to Western writer J.T. Edson, not Farmer.) However, even there, as with Doyle, the contradictions are internal to the author's own works and do not translate to the whole of pulp fiction. In any event, as it stands, Ms. Stewart's selection of G-8, The Spider, and The Shadow, as supporting examples for her case, is utterly inapplicable.

¹⁶ When Matthew Baugh and I created this character, we nicknamed her "Shrinking" in continuation of the tradition of naming women associated with James Bond odd or amusing names; Ms. Stewart appears to not get the joke. She also refers to Violet as "formidable lady of the British Secret Service who dated and dumped James Bond, becoming mother of his son Clive Reston Beauregard." (*Thriller UK* No 16, p. 26, October 2003.) Matthew Baugh and I never stated that Violet Holmes Beauregard was a British Secret Service agent; she may have been, but now Ms. Stewart is adding in her own speculation instead of objectively reporting on the WN speculation of others. Additionally, we never stated that Violet Holmes "dumped" Bond. In fact, we say that Violet was angry with Bond and would not reconcile with him, not

In conclusion, I did a quick review of Ms. Stewart's other available work and garnered this significant quote from her Edgar Wallace article, "The Mind of Edgar Wallace: Mr. J.G. Reeder & The Just Men".¹⁷

Today, people accept the reality that newspaper articles are often biased and contain what might, charitably, be called 'inaccuracies' even with regard to easily checked facts.

In the same vein, of course, Ms. Stewart should understand that my "Reply" is not made out of any ill-will, but rather a concern that the readers of her "Wold Newton" article in the pages of *Thriller UK* will accept her "inaccuracies" (using the word as charitably as she does) and promulgate them as facts.

That would be an unfortunate result, given that (1) Ms. Stewart's stated intent was to promote the WNU as the greatest of Phil Farmer's creations, and (2) the phenomenally large number of inaccuracies in her article were "easily checked facts," which were in fact not checked.

Philip José Farmer's Wold Newton Universe is a wonderful creation, and has brought his readers many hours of enjoyment. In some cases, it has introduced characters and writers to the attention of those who would have otherwise never heard of them. Ms. Stewart is to be lauded for bringing that message to the readers of *Thriller UK*. However, the readers of *Thriller UK* also deserve to be provided with accurate information.

The best starting places for readers interested in the correct information are, of course, Farmer's own "biographies," *Tarzan Alive* and *Doc Savage: His Apocalyptic Life*. Beyond those, a complete listing of Farmer's Wold Newton works resides at <http://www.pjfarmer.com/woldnewton/Pulp3.htm>.

Soon, another book will be added to this listing, with the publication of *Creative Mythography: An Expansion of Philip José Farmer's Wold Newton Universe*. This anthology is fully authorized by Philip José Farmer, and will be edited by Win Eckert, featuring contributions from Farmer, Eckert, and several other Wold Newton writers. The anthology will be published by MonkeyBrain Books <http://www.monkeybrainbooks.com> and will be available in 2005.

that she "dumped" him. Given Ms. Stewart's description of the James Bond character as a "sexist drunk," she seems to be inserting a bit of her own wish-fulfillment here.

¹⁷ Available at Ms. Stewart's website "The Cat's Whiskers: Fanfic and Family History," http://www.cd.stewart.btinternet.co.uk/original_non_fiction.htm