

from yeoman to beast: images of blackness in *caesar's column*

john patterson

In recent years, Ignatius Donnelly's novel *Caesar's Column* (1890) has attracted considerable attention from critics and historians. The book's central image—an immense column of human corpses which serves as a monument to a directionless revolution—has a ghastly fascination for readers in the post-Hiroshima world, while its popularity in Donnelly's own day—some 250,000 copies were sold in the 15 years after publication¹—makes it a tempting source for historians. The novel, which provided a vehicle for the ideas of a prominent Populist leader, has been scrutinized for its indications of nostalgia for a vanished agrarian past, has provided a text for an extensive debate over the roots of anti-Semitism in the United States, and has been offered as evidence that the utopian novelists of the late nineteenth century “are to be seen not as isolated and aground, but well out in the sweep of American literature.”² While this study of the novel's images of blacks, blackness and individual transformation is more limited in scope, it should help to clarify such larger questions as the place of prejudice in Donnelly's work, his feelings about the rapid changes which were taking place in his world and his position in a broader American literary tradition.

Donnelly's interest in the relationships between whites and blacks in America was particularly evident at the beginning and end of his lengthy and wide-ranging career. In the 1850's and 1860's he denounced slavery and rose rapidly through the ranks of the Republican party, serving first as Lieutenant Governor of Minnesota and then for three terms as a Radical Republican member of Congress. But the ambitious young politician's career stalled when he lost his seat in the House of Representatives in 1868, and he soon began to move away from the regular Republican party. In 1872 he reluctantly endorsed Horace Greeley, the Liberal Republican presidential candidate, and thereafter devoted his

political energy to the series of agrarian protests which culminated in the Populist revolt of the 1890's. It was then that his interest in bringing about a coalition of black and white farmers encouraged Donnelly to re-explore the racial situation in America. In his second novel, *Doctor Huguet* (1891), he tried to suggest some possibilities for black-white cooperation and to communicate a sense of "the dreadful burden of disqualification and disability borne by the colored people in America," by imagining the difficulties which would confront a white Southern doctor who was transformed into a black chicken thief.³

In *Caesar's Column*, on the other hand, Donnelly was not specifically concerned with "the Negro problem." No individual black characters appear in his analysis of a twentieth-century world in which the dangerous tendencies he perceived in his own society had reached the point of explosion. Rather, the book's narrator, Gabriel Weltstein, describes an urban situation in which ruthless adherence to the law of survival of the fittest has brought about immense technological achievements—"air-ships," "death-bombs," a multitude of electric gadgets, and so on—coupled with the division of society into a small ruling class of "cunning" "heartless men" (p. 15), and a mass of oppressed workers who are organized into a Brotherhood of Destruction with no purpose "except to burn, rob, destroy and murder" (p. 130). While Donnelly's subject was not the relationship between blacks and whites, his memories of the antislavery crusade did provide him with an appropriate metaphor for the dreadful future he envisaged. When plutocrats and "swarming masses" (p. 72) have alike rejected all appeals to reason, justice and love, the city is engulfed by revolution, and from among the ruins Gabriel Weltstein addresses a passionate apostrophe to the oppressors:

Your ancestors, more than two centuries ago, established and permitted Slavery. What was the cry of the bondman to them? What the sobs of the mother torn from her child—the wife from her husband—on the auction block? Who among them cared for the lacerated bodies, the shameful and hopeless lives? They were merry; they were merry; they sang and they danced; and they said "God sleeps."

But a day came when there was a corpse at every fireside. And not the corpse of the black stranger—the African—the slave;—but the corpses of fair, bright-faced men; their cultured, their manly, their noble, their best loved. And North and South, they sat, rocking themselves to and fro, in the midst of the shards and ashes of desolation, crying aloud for the lives that would come back to bless them never, nevermore.

God wipes out injustice with suffering; wrong with blood; sin with death. You can no more get beyond the reach of His hand than you can escape the planet (p. 260).

Donnelly's feelings still ran high on the subject of Negro slavery, but in *Caesar's Column* he was concerned with bondage in a different shape.

Distressed by what he took to be a serious erosion of Christian principles and rural virtues, Donnelly warned of a possible future polarization of American society into rich and poor, employer and employee, exploiter and exploited, city and country, plutocrat and farmer. He framed his indictment of the powerful in terms of his anti-slavery experiences: "They are like the slave-owners of 1860; they blindly and imperiously insist on their own destruction; they strike at the very hands that would save them" (p. 109). At the same time, theoretically at least, he had a good deal of sympathy for the workers. By the time of the uprising depicted in the novel, the Brotherhood of Destruction is presumed to be a tightly structured organization with more than one hundred million members, all of whom are workingmen of sober habits—since "the degraded" and "the vicious" have "nothing in their wretched natures on which you can build confidence or trust" (p. 36). Donnelly wanted to make it clear that it was the iniquities of a diseased system which needed to be reformed, the insatiable appetites of cunning men which had to be controlled, in order to give the farmers and workingmen who were the true backbone of America an opportunity to succeed.

Yet the fact of the matter was that his feelings about workingmen were not nearly so positive as he sometimes tried to suggest. As individuals, workingmen might be admirable, like Carl Jansen, "a Swede by birth, a blacksmith by trade, and a very honest, worthy man and good workman, but excessively poor" (p. 203); in groups they were terrifying. Donnelly insisted that only upright laborers could be members of the Brotherhood, yet again and again he described groups of workers in negative terms. In these descriptions he repeatedly employed images of blackness to make his point: the members of the Brotherhood wear black masks and dark cloaks at their subterranean meetings (p. 148); Gabriel Weltstein attends one of these gatherings and reports that "the hall was black with people" (p. 161); after becoming infuriated by the speech of a clergyman who urges them to bear their lot patiently, "A crowd of the more desperate—dark-faced, savage-looking workingmen" try to seize the offending speaker (p. 167). It would obviously be a mistake to make too much of these images. As Everett Carter has pointed out in connection with a similar pattern of color imagery in *The Breadwinners* (1883), John Hay's antilabor novel, with which Donnelly was no doubt familiar, in America such symbolism was as old as the Puritan divines' discussions of the struggle between good and evil—and of course it was by no means an American invention.⁴ Nevertheless, the cumulative effect of the images is considerable, and it should be clear that they are treacherous tools for a writer concerned with improving race relations in America. Once whiteness is accepted as a measure of cleanliness and virtue—and blackness as a sign of filth and degradation—it is difficult to describe any positive achievements by blacks except in terms of movement toward whiteness.

The negative suggestions of the images linking workers and darkness

are heightened, moreover, by the few specific references to blacks in the novel. The savagery, horror and ultimate futility of revolt are underlined for Donnelly's readers by the frequency with which they are associated with *black* insurrection. While white workers are said to constitute a large majority of the membership of the Brotherhood of Destruction, it is the black minority which serves to make the prospect of rebellion most terrifying. "The blacks of the South are members of it [the Brotherhood] to a man. Their former masters have kept them in a state of savagery, instead of elevating them: and the result is they are as barbarous and bloodthirsty as their ancestors were when brought from Africa, and fit subjects for such a terrible organization" (p. 142).⁵ Furthermore, Donnelly indicates that the past record of the black masses left no room to doubt their "barbarous and bloodthirsty" qualities. In addition to reminding his readers of the actual slave uprising which took place in Santo Domingo in 1791, he associates the leader of the Brotherhood with a more recent, fictional, black revolt: "Then the terrible negro insurrection broke out in the lower Mississippi Valley, which you all remember, and a white man, of gigantic stature, appeared as their leader, a man of great daring and enterprise. When that rebellion had been suppressed, after many battles, the white man disappeared . . ." (p. 127).

It is in his characterization of this remarkable white man, who reappears as the leader of the Brotherhood of Destruction, that the anxieties which were such a crucial element in Donnelly's attitude toward blacks, and their larger implications and connections emerge most clearly. Caesar Lomellini's name evokes memories of the end of the Roman Republic at the same time that it suggests Italian involvement with a future American revolt and hints at the tensions generated by immigration from Southern Europe. Donnelly's description of Caesar connects these suggestions with the fear of black revolt which had long haunted the American imagination. This is not to say that Caesar Lomellini is simply depicted throughout the novel as a monster, a fictional creation consciously designed to support arguments for immigration restriction or the repression of Southern blacks. Caesar is presented, rather, as an illustration of the ways in which the evil forces Donnelly observed in his society could mold personality and even transform physical appearance. It was to a blighted environment rather than to any innate deficiency of character that Donnelly looked when he sought to explain how Caesar became a monster.⁶ But his conception of what constituted monstrosity exposes with frightening clarity some powerful undercurrents in his own racial attitudes.

In his youth, as Gabriel Weltstein learns when he overhears the report of one of the plutocrats' spies, Caesar Lomellini was "a quiet, peaceable, industrious" farmer in the newly settled—and appropriately named—"State of Jefferson, on the upper waters of the Saskatchewan" (p. 126). But when his idyllic agrarian existence was threatened following a natural disaster, Caesar was forced to mortgage his farm and take a high-

interest loan. After this, in Donnelly's view, the remainder of the scenario could be filled in quickly. "The crops failed sometimes, and when they did not fail the combinations and trusts of one sort or another swept away Caesar's profits . . ." (p. 126). In spite of the fact that he "worked like a slave," Caesar eventually lost his home and shortly afterwards learned that his daughter had been seduced by the lawyer who was the money-lender's agent. Outraged at a system which had destroyed his happiness, Caesar devoted his talents first to organizing a band of outlaws who robbed from the rich and gave to the poor, then to leading "the terrible negro insurrection . . . in the lower Mississippi Valley," and finally to effecting the monstrous revolution of the Brotherhood of Destruction.

Caesar is emphatically identified as a white man and a farmer, and there is obviously real cause for his sense of outrage; as Frederic C. Jaher has remarked, Donnelly uses his story to provide a microcosmic view of the American past.⁷ But as the novel progresses Caesar increasingly takes on those terrifying qualities which Donnelly associates with dangerous and disorderly blacks. In his account of his first glimpse of the leader of the Brotherhood, at an underground meeting of the organization, Gabriel draws on many of these associations:

Such a man I had never seen before. He was, I should think, not less than six feet six inches high, and broad in proportion. His great arms hung down until the monstrous hands almost touched the knees. His skin was quite dark, almost negroid; and a thick close mat of curly black hair covered his huge head like a thatch. His face was muscular, ligamentous; with great bars, ridges and whelks of flesh, especially about the jaws and on the forehead. But the eyes fascinated me. They were the eyes of a wild beast, deep-set, sullen and glaring; they seemed to shine like those of the cat-tribe, with a luminosity of their own. This, then—I said to myself—must be Caesar, the commander of the dreaded Brotherhood (p. 149).

In his days as a yeoman farmer, Caesar was said to have had "considerable ability" (p. 126); as the leader of the Brotherhood he might more properly be described as a charismatic brute. The person actually responsible for devising the strategy of the Brotherhood, the man who is known as "the brains of the organization" (p. 127), is a crippled Russian Jew. Caesar now appears as a mindless leader, a powerful and ruthless killer. He has to be physically restrained from killing a spy before the man has been forced to reveal what he had discovered, and once the information has been obtained Caesar can be held back no longer:

In an instant the huge man, like some beast that had been long held back from its prey, gave a leap forward, his face revealing horrible ferocity; it was a tiger that glares, plunges and devours. I saw something shining, brilliant and instan-

taneous as an electric flash; then there was the sound of a heavy blow. The spy sprang clean out of the hands that were holding him, high up in the air; and fell close to me stone dead. He had been dead indeed, when he made that fearful leap. His heart was split in twain (p. 152).

The threat of brute aggression posed by the leader of the Brotherhood is intensified, in Donnelly's imagination, by its close association with the possibility of sexual assault. At the very height of the uprising depicted in *Caesar's Column*, Caesar is distracted from the work at hand when he notices "a prize worth pursuing," the favorite mistress of the leader of the plutocrats: "Caesar pursued her, crashing through the shrubbery like an enraged mammoth; and soon the cripple laughed one of his dreadful laughs—for he saw the giant returning, dragging the fair girl after him, by the hair of her head, as we have seen, in the pictures, ogres hauling off captured children to destruction" (p. 262). It is worth noting, incidentally, that Caesar's victim, who is described here as a "fair girl," is viewed in a fundamentally different way early in the novel when her appearance is contrasted with that of the book's heroine, Estella Washington. Then she is said to have "black hair and eyes" and a complexion which is distinctly darker than Estella's (p. 22). As her function in the novel changes from mistress to victim, from "fallen woman" to fairy tale heroine in the clutches of a monstrous ogre, so her appearance shifts from dark to light.

Incredible size and strength, mindless bestiality, outrageous and threatening sexuality—these are the qualities which Donnelly attributes to Caesar Lomellini. In the closing pages of the novel, as the Brotherhood's revolution whirls toward complete chaos, they are all brought together again—and once more specifically identified as "negro" characteristics—just before Caesar orders the construction of his hideous monument of corpses:

I found him in the council-chamber. You never saw such a sight. He was so black with dust and blood that he looked like a negro. He was hatless, and his mat of hair rose like a wild beast's mane. He had been drinking; his eyes were wild and rolling; the great sword he held in his right hand was caked with blood to the hilt. He was in a fearful state of excitement, and roared when he spoke. A king-devil, come fresh out of hell, could scarcely have looked more terrible. Behind him in one corner, crouching and crying together, were a bevy of young and handsome women. The Sultan had been collecting his harem (p. 272).

At the very moment when the revolution is passing beyond all control, Caesar, who now appears to be "a negro," "A king-devil, come fresh out of hell," can think only of his harem—" 'ain't they beauties,—all mine—every one of 'em' " (p. 273). Caesar Lomellini is seen at last as a drunken black rapist.

Donnelly was incapable of letting such monstrous conduct go unpunished, and as Gabriel Weltstein and his friends are about to make their escape in an airship from the tumultuous mob and the fire which is consuming the city, he provides a final panoramic view of the frightful scene and indicates the punishment he has reserved for the leader of the Brotherhood. Caesar's head appears, against a backdrop of flames, impaled on a stake and borne along by a triumphant mob: "It stood out as if it had been painted in grey characters by the light of the burning house upon that background of darkness. I could see the glazed and dusty eyes; the protruding tongue; the great lower jaw hanging down in hideous fashion; and from the thick, bull-like neck were suspended huge gouts of dried and blackened blood" (p. 289).

As his apocalyptic vision took shape, the leader of the rebellion was gradually transformed in Donnelly's mind from a white farmer into a black monster, into a creature whose sexual transgressions alone—particularly his attack upon the "fair girl" who had herself undergone a color transformation in the novel—seemed to justify the vicious final retribution which was meted out to him. Of course Caesar Lomellini's bloody end is first and most obviously that which Donnelly thought appropriate for the leader of a Brotherhood of *Destruction*. But in another sense Caesar's punishment—and he is the only one of the leaders of the revolution whose punishment is described in the novel—may be viewed as an effort to exorcise a terrifying black figure which was hidden in the recesses not only of Donnelly's imagination but also those of many other white Americans. In this sense it seems entirely appropriate that Caesar, who had been transformed from a Jeffersonian tiller of the soil into a black, lustful, urban rebel, should meet his fate at the hands of a lynch mob.

Caesar Lomellini is a relatively minor character in the book which bears his name, and no account which focuses exclusively on his role can adequately define the novel's intended meaning. *Caesar's Column* was designed to provide not a final prediction but a warning for Americans, and the novel's message was essentially the same as that which Donnelly sought to embody in all his fiction. As John R. Bovee puts it, "The theme of brotherhood between all people whether black or white, men or women, rich or poor, is not only found in each [of Donnelly's novels], it is the underlying theme of each book."⁸ Such was Donnelly's intention, no doubt, yet the fact remains that there was a crucial tension between his intended meaning and the torrent of wrath and violence which repeatedly threatened to engulf his message. It is just this tension which has made possible the substantial disagreements among modern critics over the meaning of his work.⁹ Donnelly celebrated brotherhood, but was most successful in depicting scenes of apocalyptic upheaval and conflict; he joined eloquent indictments of prejudice on one page with blatant capitulations to it on the next; he insisted, in *Doctor Huguet*, that "The negroes are the most patient and forbearing and gentle people in the

world,"¹⁰ yet his account of Caesar's transformation raises serious questions about his own real feelings on the subject.

The rapidity and comprehensiveness of Caesar Lomellini's transformation provides striking testimony to the anxieties which gripped Donnelly at the beginning of the 1890's. His portrait of the leader of the Brotherhood of Destruction seems even more noteworthy, moreover, when it is recalled that a year later he constructed his second novel around the experiences of a white Southern doctor who temporarily occupied the body of a disreputable Southern black. To be sure, there are enormous differences between these two white-black transformations: one involved a literal changing of skin while the other was employed as a metaphor for depravity (a metaphor freighted with meanings of which Donnelly can hardly have been fully aware); one was used to display the mechanism of prejudice and to enlist Southern blacks and whites in the Populist crusade while the other in some crucial respects can only have fostered prejudice; one transformation was ultimately reversed while the other culminated in ghastly crimes and grisly retribution. In spite of their differences, however, they both communicate a strong sense of Donnelly's concern about the essential fragility of human personality in the face of turmoil and baffling change.

While Robert Louis Stevenson's "Doctor Jekyll and Mr. Hyde" (1886), rather than any American tale, provides the most obvious literary source for transformations such as those described by Donnelly, it is also possible to see in them a link between his anxieties and the concerns of more prominent American writers of the 1890's. For example, the central character in Hamlin Garland's story "Up the Coulé" (1891), is so altered by his experience in the city that when he visits his family in Wisconsin after an absence of ten years his brother is unable to recognize him. This failure of recognition, moreover, appears to stem from alterations of condition rather than the mere lapse of time: Howard McLane has become an urban dandy, while his brother is a raggedly dressed and mud besplattered farmer.¹¹ Similarly, a brief exposure to the complexities and sophistication of late nineteenth-century science, religion and art is enough to cause substantial alterations in the appearance of the young Methodist minister who is the protagonist of Harold Frederic's novel *The Damnation of Theron Ware* (1896). "Only a half a year has gone by," Theron is informed near the end of the book, "and you have another face on you entirely. . . . If it seemed to me like the face of saint before, it is more like the face of a barkeeper now!"¹² In Stephen Crane's "The Monster" (1897), after Henry Johnson, a black handyman, receives disfiguring chemical burns in an experimental laboratory while rescuing a child from a fire, he is transformed in the eyes of most of his fellow townsmen from "the biggest dude in town" into a creature who is perceived as "a devil" who "*has no face in the front of his head, / In the place where his face ought to grow.*"¹³

None of these more or less abrupt character changes involves an alteration of the specific variety, or scale, described in Donnelly's fiction. Nevertheless, the transformations do reveal a shared sense of uneasiness—and a common mode of fictional response—about some of the forces which assailed the individual personality in the closing years of the century. The allurements and the perils associated with Darwinian thought and Higher Criticism, with scientific experiments and the encroachments of the city on rural America, all provided rude shocks to comfortable assumptions about order and continuity in personal growth and development. In exploring the effects of such pressures on individual characters, Garland, Frederic and Crane, like Ignatius Donnelly, pictured jagged discontinuities which were not merely internal, but which were vividly registered in external appearance as well.

These dramatic alterations of character provide one intriguing connection between Donnelly's fiction and the works of more serious American writers, but the precise nature of the transformation in *Caesar's Column* also links the novel to another and less attractive American literary tradition. The book's images of blackness and Donnelly's portrait of Caesar Lomellini closely resemble the nightmarish visions conjured up in the pages of late nineteenth-century popular magazines by writers who insisted that the numbers and potential for violence of Southern blacks necessitated unimpeded social control by Southern whites. In his discussion of America's economic difficulties, Gabriel Weltstein refers to an article from an 1889 issue of the *Forum*. It is not unreasonable to suppose, therefore, that Donnelly was familiar with another warning which appeared in the pages of the magazine in that year. In the South, Henry A. Scomp asserted, "A volcano mutters beneath the surface. Today the policeman who attempts to arrest a disorderly Negro in the Negro quarter of a Southern city is always in danger of provoking a Negro riot. Excited crowds will probably set upon him, even though they themselves may have summoned him to arrest the offender. . ."¹⁴ A year earlier, Senator James B. Eustis had insisted, also in the *Forum*, that it was only because of the firmness and vigilance of responsible Southerners that it had been possible to maintain a precarious calm in the region: "That there has been less violence and less bloodshed at the South is due to the fact that, at the outset of any trouble, the white people have been prompt and determined to teach the Negro that wanton desolation and destruction of property will not be tolerated by the white people of this country."¹⁵ A familiar strategy in such articles, of course, was to link a defense of white vigilante activity with a lurid warning about the presumed threat of black sexual aggression. This line of thought was given classic expression in W. Cabell Bruce's defense of Southern lynch law which appeared in the *North American Review* in 1892, and, in the following decade, in the Reverend Thomas Dixon's novels *The Leopard's Spots* and *The Clansman*. In the latter book, for example, Dixon heightened his picture of

white Southern heroism by setting it against a sketch of a savage black rapist:

Gus stepped closer, with an ugly leer, his flat nose dilated, his sinister bead-eyes wide apart gleaming ape-like, as he laughed:

“We ain’t atter money!”

The girl uttered a cry, long, tremulous, heart-rending, piteous.

A single tiger-spring, and the black claws of the beast sank into the soft white throat and she was still.¹⁶

Donnelly’s intentions can certainly not be equated with those of writers like Dixon, Scomp or Senator Eustis. While they were endorsing vigilante justice, lynch law and the disenfranchisement of blacks, Donnelly was exploring the possibilities of a coalition of Southern blacks and whites. Nevertheless, his images of black revolt and his description of the leader of the Brotherhood of Destruction—Caesar’s physical attributes and mental organization, the nature of his transgressions and the manner of his death—connect *Caesar’s Column* with the emotional appeals of late nineteenth-century Southern white supremacists and with the fictional world of *The Clansman*. In some crucial respects, then, the views of the Minnesota reformer and novelist appear to resemble those of a number of post-Reconstruction Southern leaders who, as Lawrence J. Friedman has recently suggested, were simultaneously attracted by images of docile Negroes and tormented by fantasies involving black savages.¹⁷ When Donnelly sought to depict the leader of a catastrophic twentieth-century revolt he created an image of a black beast, and the very ease with which he could envision the transformation of a white Jeffersonian farmer into such a monstrous figure provides a telling glimpse of the practical limitations inherent in his vision of a Populist alliance of blacks and whites.

The Capitol Campus
Pennsylvania State University

footnotes

1. Ignatius Donnelly, *Caesar’s Column: A Story of the Twentieth Century*, ed. Walter Rideout (Cambridge, 1960), xii. In *The Popular Book: A History of America’s Literary Taste* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1961), 172, James D. Hart observes that *Caesar’s Column* was easily the most popular of the works inspired by Edward Bellamy’s *Looking Backward*.

2. Alexander Saxton, “*Caesar’s Column: The Dialogue of Utopia and Catastrophe*,” *American Quarterly*, XIX (1967), 238. Anyone seriously interested in Donnelly’s career must begin with the excellent biography by Martin Ridge, *Ignatius Donnelly: Portrait of a Politician* (Chicago, 1962). For a recent overview of Donnelly’s literary career, see John R. Bovee, “Ignatius Donnelly as a Man of Letters,” unpublished PhD dissertation, Washington State University, 1968. Two important statements on anti-Semitism in Donnelly’s work are Oscar Handlin, “American Views of the Jew at the Opening of the Twentieth Century,” *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, XL (1951), 323-344, and Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R.* (New York, 1955), 67-81. The findings of these two studies are sharply criticized in a series of important articles by Norman Pollack: “Handlin on Anti-Semitism: A Critique of American Views of the Jews,” *Journal of American History*, LI (1964), 391-403; “The Myth of Populist Anti-Semitism,” *American Historical Review* LXVIII (1962), 76-80; and “Ignatius Donnelly on Human Rights: A Study of Two Novels,” *Mid-America*, XLVII (1965), 99-112; Pollack’s argument is also forcefully stated in his excellent

anthology *The Populist Mind* (Indianapolis and New York, 1967), esp. 469-496. The relationship of Donnelly and his fiction to late nineteenth-century American thought is imaginatively assessed in Frederic C. Jaher, *Doubtters and Dissenters: Cataclysmic Thought in America, 1885-1915* (New York, 1964), 95-123, and, more briefly, in Larzer Ziff, *The American 1890s: Life and Times of a Lost Generation* (New York, 1966), 82-85.

3. Ignatius Donnelly, *Doctor Huguet: A Novel* (Chicago, 1891), 163. For fuller discussions of this novel, see John R. Bovee, "Doctor Huguet: Donnelly on Being Black," *Minnesota History*, XLI (1969), 286-295, and John S. Patterson, "Alliance and Antipathy: Ignatius Donnelly's Ambivalent Vision in *Doctor Huguet*," *American Quarterly*, XXII (1970), 824-845.

4. Everett Carter, *Howells and the Age of Realism* (Hamden, Conn., 1966), 176. Rideout, p. xx, notes that Donnelly's decision to publish *Caesar's Column* under a pseudonym may have been prompted by his awareness that the circulation of Hay's novel had been increased because it was issued anonymously. Several of the essays in *Color and Race*, ed. John Hope Franklin (Boston, 1968) contain important statements on the history and significance of color symbolism. See especially, Roger Bastide, "Color, Racism, and Christianity," 34-49; Kenneth J. Gergen, "The Significance of Skin Color in Human Relations," 112-128; C. Eric Lincoln, "Color and Group Identify in the United States," 249-263; and Hiroshi Wagatsuma, "The Social Perception of Skin Color in Japan," 129-165.

5. As this passage suggests, Donnelly subscribed to the notion, widely held at the end of the nineteenth century, that the blacks had left behind in Africa no civilization worthy of the name. Ironically, Gabriel Weltstein comes from a white colony in Africa, and it is to this refuge where a utopian community can be established that he and his friends escape at the end of the novel. Here they barricade themselves against the rest of the world. As Gabriel puts it just before their departure from the United States, "if civilization utterly perishes in the rest of the world, there in the mountains of Africa, shut out from attack by rocks and ice-topped mountains, and the cordon of tropical barbarians yet surrounding us, we will wait until exhausted and prostrate mankind is ready to listen to us and will help us reconstruct society upon a wise and just basis" (p. 245). "Civilization," for Donnelly, can only be restored through the recovery of "mankind"; plainly it has nothing to do with "tropical barbarians".

6. It is true, however, that Donnelly's assumptions about "tropical barbarians" and some of the remarks on orientals which the novel contains appear to compromise his views about the shaping power of the environment. On his first tour of "The Under-World," for instance, Gabriel Weltstein notes that "the slant eyes of many, and their imperfect, Tartar-like features, reminded me that the laws made by the Republic, in the elder and better days, against the invasion of the Mongolian hordes, had long since become a dead letter" (p. 38).

7. Jaher, *Doubtters and Dissenters*, 115.

8. Bovee, "Ignatius Donnelly as a Man of Letters," 198-199.

9. Saxton perceptively describes the tension between utopian and dystopian elements in Donnelly's most successful book in "*Caesar's Column: The Dialogue of Utopia and Catastrophe*"; for other references to the conflicting views of Donnelly's fiction, see above, note two.

10. *Doctor Huguet*, 67.

11. Hamlin Garland, *Main-Travelled Roads*, with an introduction by Van Wyck Brooks (New York, 1961), 67.

12. Harold Frederic, *The Damnation of Theron Ware*, with an introduction by John Henry Raleigh (New York, 1960), 302.

13. Stephen Crane, *The Red Badge of Courage and Four Great Stories*, with an introduction by Ralph Ellison (New York, 1960), 247, 276, 280.

14. Henry A. Scomp, "Can the Race Problem Be Solved," *Forum*, VIII (1889), 368.

15. Senator James B. Eustis, "Race Antagonism in the South," *Forum*, VI (1888), 152.

16. Thomas Dixon, Jr., *The Clansman: An Historical Romance of the Ku Klux Klan* (New York, 1905), 304; W. Cabell Bruce, "Lynch Law at the South," *North American Review*, CLV (1892), 379-381. For a fuller discussion of the image of blacks in late nineteenth-century popular literature, see Rayford W. Logan, *The Betrayal of the Negro: From Rutherford B. Hayes to Woodrow Wilson* (New York, 1965), esp. chapters 10-13.

17. Lawrence J. Friedman, *The White Savage: Racial Fantasies in the Postbellum South* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1970).