

ideology and utopia in the works of ignatius donnelly

allan m. axelrad

I

Ignatius Donnelly, known to his fellow Minnesotans as the Sage of Nininger, was a colorful and vibrant political figure for most of the second half of the nineteenth century. His public life stretched from his election as the Republican lieutenant governor of Minnesota in 1859 at the age of twenty-eight, to the year 1900 when he ran for the vice presidency of the United States on a ticket representing the steadfast remnant of the People's Party that refused merger with the Democrats. In addition to his long and often volatile political career, Donnelly was a popular and extremely controversial author of fiction, imaginative pseudo-scientific treatises and a voluminous tome on the authorship of Shakespeare.

During the final decade of the nineteenth century, Donnelly was one of the outstanding leaders of radical farmer protest. The Donnelly legacy has added importance to the student of Populism due to the excellence of the Ignatius Donnelly Papers housed by the Minnesota Historical Society, which are the premier source of data on Populism. Both Donnelly and the Populist movement have proved something of an enigma to the historian. On one hand Populism has been called the seed-bed of proto-fascism in America, and on the other it is thought the birthplace of the New Left of the 1960's. The ideological chasm separating these claims is vast. But, because Donnelly is identified with each side by historians arguing over the meaning of the Populist experience, a systematic analysis of his writings may provide a bridgework over this chasm, by disclosing the ideological principles which governed the outlook of at least one Populist. However, his inquiring but desultory intellectual conduct, combined with his animated imagination, attests to the fact that Donnelly was an unusual Minnesota farmer, and it is a mistake to think that his view of the world coincided exactly with that of midwestern Populism.

The structure of Donnelly's thought demonstrates an internally consistent cosmology, based upon his deeply felt ideological commitment to a utopian vision. Integral to Donnelly's utopian vision is his idea of history, because in his cosmos the historical process dictates the temporal and spatial relationship of the utopian possibility to contemporary society. There are, then, special historical epochs when utopia is realized, while during other periods utopia is geographically prescribed.

Two historians, Richard Hofstadter and Norman Pollack, stand out on either side of the division over how to interpret the Populist experience. In large part, their disagreement is reflected in their inability to agree upon the ideological nature of the Donnelly legacy.

In *The Age of Reform* (1955) Richard Hofstadter proposes an engaging thesis about the Populist mind. However, he does not challenge the legitimacy of the "progressive" position on farmer grievances put forth in John D. Hicks' standard work, *The Populist Revolt* (1931), which presents Populism as a realistic and forward-looking response of farmers to specific complaints against an economic and political order in which they were being victimized. The paradox accorded Populism by Hofstadter's analysis is that although on concrete issues it was innovative and future-oriented, nevertheless the rhetorical or literary style of Populism yielded a backward-looking and irrational side. This rhetorical style developed out of a curiously retrogressive world view infused with agrarian mythology, which argued the moral superiority of rural life and which produced a defensive and often paranoid interpretation of increasingly urban and industrial America. The farmer sensed a loss of status in a rapidly changing land and articulated this predicament as a conspiracy of monied interests, the press, the courts and the politicians to subvert democracy and enslave the farmer. Fear of conspiracy, according to Hofstadter, led farmers to outbursts of nativism and anti-semitism, and panaceas such as free silver, in an effort to fend off impending doom. An extreme revisionism in the 1950's levels charges of proto-fascism against Populism, which are not sanctioned by the Hofstadter thesis.

The counter-revisionism of the 1960's is led by Norman Pollack's *The Populist Response to Industrial America* (1962), and is immediately followed by Walter Nugent's *The Tolerant Populists* (1963). Nugent denies imputations of irrationality, nativism and a conspiratorial view of history, but admits that the rhetoric of farmer-politicians reacting to industrialism was often imbued with the garden myth. Nugent's study treats the popular mind, while Hofstadter's scope is limited to a small number of the most flamboyant and articulate leaders such as "Coin" Harvey, Mary E. Lease and Ignatius Donnelly. Nugent's findings suggest that Hofstadter errs methodologically in his willingness to elicit information from a handful of atypical personalities and infer this intelligence to an entire movement.¹

Norman Pollack has made a career of challenging the Hofstadter

thesis.² He begins by denying the centrality of the agrarian myth and proceeds to disavow all charges of emotionalism and irrationality in Populism or in any of its leaders. Pollack claims Populism as the progenitor of modern liberal humanitarian politics, in complete accord with urban-industrial reality, and vigorously denies all charges of racism and nativism. Ignatius Donnelly is central for both Hofstadter and Pollack to the perplexing question of how to correctly read Populist literature. Each claims Donnelly for his own camp.

Because of the polemical attitudes presented by Donnelly in his widely read anti-utopian novel *Caesar's Column* (1890), Hofstadter thinks Donnelly a doom-saying prophet of a forthcoming apocalypse, and writes: "Far more ominous, however, than any of the vivid and hideous predictions of the book is the sadistic and nihilistic spirit in which it was written."³ But in the very next sentence he calls *Caesar's Column* "childish," implying impish innocence, evidence of his uncertainty of attitude toward the novel. Donnelly's faults include xenophobia, anti-semitism, denying the workability of the two-party system and an irrational acclaim of the virtues of farm life. Hofstadter finds Donnelly fearful of a conspiracy in which wealthy plutocrats, motivated by greed, were seizing and corrupting the nation. This insidious conspiracy, in Donnelly's imagination, was crushing the yeoman farmer, turning once noble tillers of the soil into a "brutalized" and "bloodthirsty" peasantry.⁴

Pollack's view of Donnelly shares little common ground with Hofstadter's. At the heart of the disagreement is his certainty that Donnelly does not see the world through the blinders of an agrarian mythology. To the charge that Donnelly's model society lay in the past, Pollack replies, "Populism was running forward and not backward."⁵ He disputes Hofstadter's apocalyptic interpretation of *Caesar's Column*, arguing that the novel merely calls attention to ethical values in the face of industrialization, and believes the novel not even utopian because the "major portion" describes Donnelly's contemporary America (the novel is set in 1988 and refers only by innuendo to the author's own time). Pollack thinks the novel only an "extension of Donnelly's contemporary world" (this future society is ruled by Jews who have enslaved, degraded and dehumanized the Gentiles). He commends *Caesar's Column* for offering "concrete measures" to deal with social inequity.⁶ He considers Donnelly quite sensitive to the plight of minorities, and thinks his novel *Doctor Huguet* (1891) remarkable for its day in depicting the effect of prejudice upon black Americans. In *Doctor Huguet* the protagonist (Donnelly's persona) begins with a degree of bias, according to Pollack, which he outgrows as the story unfolds. Furthermore, Donnelly was not anti-semitic, as Hofstadter thinks, but anti-anti-semitic. In Donnelly's third novel, *The Golden Bottle* (1892), the son of a Kansas farmer (Donnelly's persona) leads the forces of liberation from America to Europe; this, says,

Pollack, is neither expansionist nor chauvanist, but simply demonstrates "what the Populist program could do for under-developed areas."⁷

In his refutation of the analysis of Populism in *The Age of Reform*, Pollacks isolates Hofstadter's five primary themes: "the idea of a golden age; the concept of natural harmonies [the inherent harmony of farmers and workers, the producing class]; the dualistic version of social struggle [producers versus non-producers]; the conspiracy theory of history; and the doctrine of the primacy of money."⁸ Pollack concludes that Hofstadter's five themes are inapplicable to Populism (which may be broadly correct); nevertheless, these five themes are excellent compartmentalizations of the political, social and economic thought reflected in Donnelly's prose.

Hofstadter and Pollack employ different analytical techniques for studying Populist literature. Hofstadter probes beneath the visible face in order to unmask irrational qualities. Pollack is only concerned with its progressive and humanitarian properties and does not try to expose idiosyncratic ideas. The remainder of this essay will look closely at Donnelly's writings and attempt to reconstruct his system of thought, which will be measured against Hofstadter's five themes. It will be shown that the utopian vision in Donnelly's writings is derived from a chiliastic idea of history, while the ideological basis is exacted from the ethical imperatives of the agrarian myth; the two combining to form his unusual cosmology.

II

The agrarian myth looked to a golden age in the idyllic past, to a pastoral landscape dotted with small farms worked by noble yeomen, with villages few and small and all goods handcrafted by virtuous, independent artisans. The economy was simple and there was abundance for all.⁹ Donnelly's garden had multiple existences; the Garden of Eden was the original, while the most recent was found in the United States in the early 1800's. Conventionally the myth of the garden is a nostalgic rhetorical device, but for Donnelly the myth pointed to the future as well as the past and was equated with a cyclical idea of history.

The role of the garden in the historical process is central to the theses espoused in Donnelly's two quasi-scientific treatises, *Atlantis: The Antediluvian World* (1881) and *Ragnarok: The Age Of Fire And Gravel* (1882). Donnelly believed that the fantastic ideas set forth in these two implausible works had great scientific merit; his continuing confidence in the theories is confirmed by their reappearance in his later writings. *Atlantis* was a best seller, which led Donnelly to conclude that his thesis was widely accepted. But when the scientists rejected his claim in *Ragnarok*, Donnelly complained, according to Martin Ridge, "that an outsider with an idea could not gain a fair hearing in American scientific circles."¹⁰

Atlantis was written by Donnelly to prove the historical existence of the legendary lost continent. Before its devastation by the Flood, he wrote, Atlantis was the flowering garden described in numerous creation myths: "it was the true Antediluvian world; the Garden of Eden; the Gardens of the Hesperides; the Elysian Fields; the Gardens of Alcinous; the Mesomphalos; the Loympos; the Asgard of the traditions of the ancient nations; representing a universal memory of a great land, where early mankind dwelt for ages in peace and happiness."¹¹ While a garden, Atlantis was true to the imperatives of the agrarian ethic. The people "despised everything but virtue, not caring for their present state of life, and thinking lightly of the possession of gold and other property, which seemed only a burden to them; neither were they intoxicated by luxury; nor did wealth deprive them of their self-control; but they were sober, and saw clearly that all goods are increased by virtuous friendship with one another" (*Atl*, 20). In short, Atlantis was the Garden of Eden, Donnelly's fanciful statement of the agrarian myth at the beginning of time.

Donnelly thought that the "temptation of Eve" was the Hebrew's synthesis of legends from Atlantis explaining the origin of the knowledge of sin (*Atl*, 199). The introduction of sin transformed Atlantis from a virtuous pastoral community into a voracious and immoral metropolitan society. When the citizens of Atlantis were overcome with "avarice" and the hunger for "power," when they no longer remained true to the ethical imperatives of life in the garden, the garden was destroyed by an irate god (*Atl*, 21). Donnelly's research showed that Atlantis was destroyed by a cataclysm which has been retained in the memory of man as legends of a great deluge. He thought this deluge the result of a catastrophic earthquake and the slipping of Atlantis beneath the sea.

Atlantis proved the existence of the original garden, told why it was destroyed and described the cataclysm which was the mechanism of its destruction. *Ragnarok* provided Donnelly with an explanation of the continuing dynamic of the historical process. According to this theory, the garden stage is always temporary; when life becomes too easy and the ethical imperatives forgotten, when large degenerate cities offer bacchanalian delights, then a great cataclysm is induced and life returns to a simple agrarian way, in ever repeating cycles. Donnelly insisted that the mythological Norse god Ragnarok caused what are thought to be glacial moraines, and is also the key to understanding the geological mystery behind tremendous cataclysmic changes that have occurred throughout earth's history. The pre-glacial world, he wrote, was "a garden, a paradise."¹² But according to the myth, when the world becomes infested with sin the fiery wrath of Ragnarok is felt: "The world has ripened for destruction; and 'Ragnarok' the darkness of the gods, or the rain of dust and ashes, comes to complete the work" (*Rag*, 142). Throughout ancient history he found examples of decadent societies, such as

Sodom and Gomorrah, razed by Ragnarok. Once Ragnarok's wrath is spent and the sinful purged, Arcadia is restored.

In the Donnelly system the key to the survival of Arcadia is its proximity to the ethical exhortations of the Populist ethic. It is a rural ethic; thus Atlantis was doomed when it became a metropolis, because the division of labor was no longer simple, with every man self-employed, and the wealthy ignored the commandment of frugality, living licentiously. An advanced stage of urbanization is pivotal to the cycle of history, foreshadowing the new cataclysm. Alexander Saxton misread *Caesar's Column* in thinking that Donnelly "believed . . . in rational Christian progress."¹³ Donnelly believed that history is cyclical and cataclysmic, and he rejected the evolutionist social darwinian notion of linear progress. Dramatic geological or social convulsions figure in most of his works. For his model of social and geological history, he evidently reached back to late eighteenth-century scientific orthodoxy which embraced catastrophism. Throughout Donnelly's writings there is talk of violent social convulsions brought on to redeem this corrupt world, and his language is accusing and vituperative, remindful of the Puritan jeremiad. His is an apocalyptic view of the human condition.

In *The American People's Money* (1895) Donnelly wrote that the fall of Rome presented "a striking panorama of the great battle now being fought in this country."¹⁴ Early Rome was an agrarian land peopled by yeomen farmers, but as time passed the small farms were "absorbed into vast estates, held by a few families and cultivated by slaves, while the old agricultural population was driven off the land and crowded into towns" and "the high society of Rome itself became a society of powerful animals with an enormous appetite for pleasure" (*Mon*, 9). Rome became an immoral metropolis when its citizens ceased to heed the commandments of the Populist ethic, and like Atlantis, Sodom and Gomorrah before it, Rome was on the brink of destruction. The cyclical character of the Roman experience is suggested in *Caesar's Column* by the revolutionary chief Caesar Lomellini, an Italian whose name recalls the ancient days of Rome. Caesar was once "a quiet, peaceable, industrious" yeoman farmer from the State of Jefferson, but when plutocracy drove him from his land he became the bestial revolutionary, leader of the brutalized masses in the cataclysmic destruction of western civilization in 1988--analogous to the barbarian invasion which ravaged ancient Rome.¹⁵

Donnelly argued, in *The American People's Money*, that the condition of the international money supply is instrumental to the historical process. Exhaustion of the money supply contributed to the fall of Rome; the "Dark Ages" were due to contracting currency and falling prices, while the Renaissance was prompted by an increase in international money (*Mon*, 44). Likewise, Caesar Lomellini's difficulties were precipi-

tated by high interest rates and a deflated standard, as were the American farmer's troubles in the 1880's and 1890's.

Sailing west across the Atlantic, from the decadent Old World to the New World's virgin shores, provided a temporary escape from the inevitable cycle of history. In America the regenerating muse of history also traveled west, leaving despoiled cities behind for frontier gardens. But Donnelly noted that the muse was finally being confronted by continental limitations: "Already the vanguard catches sight of the blue waters of the planet's greatest ocean; already, like buffaloes urged forward to the yawning precipice, they look back over their shoulders at the oncoming rush of the dispossessed millions, swarming behind them."¹⁶ Donnelly, like his contemporary Frederick Jackson Turner, saw the escape valve closing and Donnelly envisioned the frontier turning back upon itself, with the plight of the New World becoming indistinguishable from that of the Old World.

America in 1865 was still a garden: "What a charming picture of an earthly paradise is here presented? The People free from debt. Business on a cash basis. No land mortgages. No chattel mortgages. No one running to the banks to borrow money. Nobody being devoured by interest charges. The land smiling like a garden; the people happy" (*Mon*, 61). In *The American People's Money* Donnelly disclosed a villainous conspiracy which took place after the Civil War. During Grant's administration currency was contracted, silver de-monetized. It was a "deliberate" world-wide conspiracy of the money lenders. It was done "with malice, premeditation and aforethought." The contraction of currency sent America plunging downward in the cycle of history, causing "sin, death, crime; the bankruptcy of whole communities and unparalleled individual suffering." Afterward America was "no longer a Republic, governed by the people, but a Moneyed oligarchy" (*Mon*, 63, 88, 150-2). Donnelly predicted that this monied despotism will eventually fall in an apocalyptic battle of civilization, when the downtrodden masses finally arise against their oppressors on a forthcoming "day of wrath" (*Mon*, 184).

Caesar's Column opens in New York City in 1988. The city is anti-utopia, the completed inversion of the garden. The pre-conditions to this depraved city, the reader is informed, were obvious by the late nineteenth century, in political corruption, an impotent clergy, a conspiracy of the press and the courts, the liquor trade, starving workers, the new money-god, and various "isms," such as communism and single-taxism, sought by the desperate masses. In a foreword to the novel Donnelly pictured the condition of the nation in the 1880's, anticipating the ominous predictions of the story: "the old tender Christian love is gone; standing armies are formed on one side, and great communistic organizations on the other; society divides itself into two hostile camps; no white flags pass from the one to the other. They wait only for the drum-beat and the trumpet to summon them to armed conflict" (*CC*, 4). This

gloomy picture coincides with Hofstadter's theme of the dualistic nature of the social struggle; it prefigures open warfare between the producing and non-producing class, farmers and workers aligned against plutocracy.

New York City in 1988 sports a magnificent facade, giving testimony to the American faith in technological progress. Gabriel Weltstein, a visitor to the city from agricultural Uganda, is enchanted by what he sees until he discovers what lies beneath the glitter—the fate of those who service the city and serve the plutocrats: “What struck me most was their incalculable multitude and their silence. It seemed to me that I was witnessing the resurrection of the dead; and that these vast, streaming, endless swarms were the condemned, marching noiselessly as shades to unavoidable and everlasting misery. They seemed to me merely automata, in the hands of some ruthless and unrelenting destiny” (CC, 38). In this one of Donnelly's more powerful passages, he foretells of a truly frightening prospect in a future technological society. In anti-utopia the majority of humankind are an extension of and barely distinguishable from the machinery they service. Laissez faire capitalism reaches its ultimate expression, with the “iron law of wages” robotizing all but a privileged few (CC, 39). The immoral plutocrats dwell in ease and splendor, recalling the stereotype of the last days of Rome, while unnoticed the Brotherhood (the underground) prepares for revolution. When the revolution comes its psychic energy runs out of control causing “universal conflict, savagery, barbarism, chaos,” and wholesale starvation. It produces a “catastrophe” ending in “a holocaust of slaughter” (CC, 71). The survivors are few, and although they reflect “the law of the survival of the fittest,” most are reduced to a state of savagery (CC, 291). Gabriel and a few others escape to Uganda to plant the new garden.

The final chapter in *Caesar's Column*, “The Garden In The Mountains,” unveils the cycle of history begun anew. The mountain garden is modeled upon the Republic of Switzerland, because the Swiss were “not given to the luxuries and excesses that had wrecked the world, but were a primitive people, among whom labor had always remained honorable” (CC, 300). The political principles governing this new Eden anticipate the spirit of government sought by the National People's Party. One difference, however, is a conscious discouragement of technology written into the constitution. This discouragement of “labor-saving-inventions,” and also the isolation of Donnelly's utopia high in the midst of mountains, points to the necessity of avoiding social change, industrialization, urbanization and ultimately a new catastrophe (CC, 309). If Gabriel's republic is to remain “a garden of peace and beauty, musical with laughter,” it must thwart the forces of change and reside outside of the historical process (CC, 313).

III

The historical process revolves in analogous cycles, beginning with an unspoiled garden which is gradually transformed into a degenerate

megalopolis, the cycle forever repeating itself following the catastrophic destruction of the immoral old order. As the cycle of history turns away from the simple rural community, what replaces it is ideologically aberrant to the extent that it deviates from this ideal. In this manner the ideological manifestations of Donnelly's Populist ethic are sanctioned by his utopian vision.

The indictment of turn-of-the-century America in Jack London's anti-utopia *The Iron Heel* (1908) corresponds to *Caesar's Column* in most respects. However, there is one glaring ideological difference. London was wary of agrarians and warned would-be revolutionaries of them. Farmers, according to Ernest Everhard (London's persona), "are machine-breakers" who blame technology for their plight; they hope to regain their pre-industrial status by destroying "labor-saving machinery."¹⁷ Here is a vital difference between an agrarian and a Marxian radical; Donnelly rejected modern invention which he felt incompatible with the pastoral ideal, while London envisioned a blue collar utopia erected by technology. But, according to the doctrine of natural harmonies, Donnelly claimed an affinity of farmer and worker; together they are the creative social force, the producing class. The People's Party sought to collaborate with urban labor, but labor was suspicious of the proposed merger and its cooperation never assumed political significance. The Marxist Daniel De Leon saw in the Omaha Platform, which Donnelly wrote, "the promotion of the interests of the small farmer . . . by relieving him at the expense of the worker."¹⁸ Labor had a different stake in the world and a different program for changing it. The machine was central to the worker, but the bugbear of Donnelly's yeoman farmer. Pollack contends that Populism accepted the industrial state and argues the commonality of Populism and Marxism; but the centrality of the garden and the hostility to urban-industrial civilization are powerful ideological manifestations of Donnelly's thought which contradict this position.¹⁹

Donnelly felt that increasing concentration of economic power in a few hands, coupled with technological progress, would eventually produce the nightmarish megalopolis described in *Caesar's Column*. Fortunately, in accordance with the law of cyclical history, the reign of the plutocrats is short because they are unable to pass on their strength to their offspring. The Jews who rule the 1988 anti-utopia acquired power because they were the fittest. But, in a Veblenite fashion, Donnelly maintained that the idle rich weaken and degenerate. Only the morally fit survive the cataclysm, while the rich, who are morally impoverished, perish. Donnelly thought the implications of social darwinism law abhorrent. Although social darwinism might provide an accurate description of society, it is unacceptable moral philosophy (CC, 178-90). He suspected that there really are no immutable socio-economic laws; properly appropriated, "the resources of this planet are adequate to support in the highest degree of comfort fifty times the population that now inhabits it"

(*Mon*, 24-5). He envisioned intelligent planning freeing man from natural law and allowing him creative independence. Man had always been a pawn of nature because he had never mustered his mental and moral resources toward constructing a community impregnable to darwinian law, such as the garden in the mountains at the end of *Caesar's Column*. Although Donnelly was pessimistic over the prospect of ever building an urban-industrial utopia, he did explore the unlikely possibility in *The Golden Bottle*.

The Golden Bottle opens with Ephraim Benezet, the son of an impoverished Kansas farmer, delivering a soliloquy on the state of the nation: "I beheld the wretchedness of mankind, universal and overwhelming; as I saw vice triumphant and virtue trampled under foot . . . it was not God but the devil who was ruling this wicked world" (*Bot*, 10). In reply to Ephraim's despair "The Pity of God" visits him during the night and gives him a golden bottle which makes gold at its possessor's command. With the power of gold Ephraim becomes the most powerful man on earth. His armies conquer Europe, reviving Christianity, and a Universal Republic is proclaimed which includes the entire white Christian world. Paper money is issued to all citizens (Donnelly was not a free silverite; deflation ruined the farmer, thus paper money would promote inflation and economic well-being).²⁰ In the Universal Republic the industrial worker is regenerated by pleasant working conditions, shorter hours, higher pay, and soon equals the farmer in moral stature.

Only in *The Golden Bottle* did Donnelly seek a non-cataclysmic answer for the problems of urban-industrial America. The novel suggests that history is not inevitably cyclical; man can cope with natural forces by planning wisely. It does, however, require a Napoleonic figure with a magic supply of gold to accomplish this feat. By freeing the farmer and the worker from plutocracy with magic and precious metal, Donnelly's story anticipates the delightful parable of Populism which L. Frank Baum immortalized a few years later in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* (1900).²¹ Dorothy, in the *Oz* story, gets her magic silver shoes by killing the wicked Witch of the East (eastern plutocracy), and then sets off on a journey to the Emerald City (the nation's capital) upon the Yellow Brick Road (the gold standard). Helped by a precious metal, the Scarecrow (the farmer or hayseed) and the Tin Woodman (the urban worker or automaton) are freed from dehumanizing witchcraft. In both Baum's and Donnelly's fantasy the protagonist is from rural Kansas; both Dorothy and Ephraim leave home on a magical journey armed with a precious metal and bring freedom to victims of despotic rule, but in the end return to the same bleak farm and harsh reality. *The Golden Bottle* emphasizes the failure of the democratic process; democracy corresponds to the Wizard of Oz, whom Dorothy calls "The Great and Terrible Humbug."²² Ephraim recognizes the humbuggery of the democratic system and uses bribery to get elected President of the United States, because

that is how the system functions. As the story ends Ephraim awakens from his dream in the same dilapidated farm house on the day it is to be foreclosed by an English bank. He wanders out and meets a wise stranger wearing an ancient costume; but the stranger does not answer his parting question—"Will it end in a cosmical cataclysm?" (*Bot*, 312).

The dynamic of the tale in *The Golden Bottle* springs from Donnelly's awareness of the primacy of money. The novel's conclusion is not optimistic about the future of modern civilization, but Donnelly did experiment with the idea of allocating a portion of paradise to the city and the factory. Ephraim supervises the construction of Cooperation City, where factories are encircled by "parks or gardens, which insured fresh air and sunshine to the workers in the mills." Every worker is given his own home on an acre lot, in order that "each house" will "stand in the midst of a garden" (*Bot*, 166). Here the myth of the garden remains central, but it is given a constructive twist by planting a garden within the city, rather than razing the city to replant the garden, as the cycle of history dictates. When he was not writing about dreams, Donnelly always identified the city with evil and located its appearance on the nether edge of the historical cycle, anticipatory of cataclysmic renewal.

Rural America is identified with the original garden in Donnelly's system; the devil inhabits the city. C. Vann Woodward catches the historical irony of this juxtaposition, writing that the city symbolized community for the Puritans, but for Populism "it was just as naturally a symbol of anti-community."²³ The glamour and excitement of the city is enchanting but deceptive, analogous to viewing the Emerald City through tinted glasses; this Gabriel discovers when he penetrates beneath the bedazzling exterior of the 1988 anti-utopia. City life is luxurious and easy for the plutocrats, but it is hell for the rest who are "driven to shiver or swelter in some garret or tenement house, or to spread themselves, in hot weather, upon the roofs of houses, panting to catch a breath of the devitalized air, while their children perished in the foul atmosphere, like mice under the glass ball of an air pump" (*Bot*, 164). Juxtaposed to this description of city life is a dinner scene in the mountain village built by Gabriel after the revolution: "The merry, rosy faces of young and old; the cheerful converse; the plain and abundant food. Here are vegetables from their own garden, and fruit from the trees that line the wide streets" (*CC*, 311). The rural village blends harmoniously into the pastoral landscape, its innocence contrasting vividly with the fallen city. John Richard Bovee suggests that *Caesar's Column*—a monument to the revolution's victory erected out of the bodies of the vanquished—was intended as a symbolic tombstone "for all cities as it was for all 'modern civilizations,' because there would be no more cities in the utopia Donnelly envisioned."²⁴

The American People's Money is a soft-money tract, taking the form of a dialogue which takes place on a train going west between Hugh

Sanders, a midwestern farmer (Donnelly's persona), and James Hutchinson, a Chicago banker. It is swiftly apparent that the banker will not fare well in his battle of wits with the farmer, because he begrudgingly acknowledges the symbolic direction of the train: "the air seems to improve as we go west" (*Mon*, 25). Sanders, like most farmers, is a philosopher, because farmers are not distracted by the frivolous attractions of city living; instead they use their free time for study and contemplation. In the dialogue Hutchinson is overwhelmed by the articulate and knowledgeable farmer; to his surprise he finds that farmers even know more about financial matters than do bankers. Living close to the soil, then, is not only morally redeeming, it makes one wiser and sharpens the intellect.

A further variation of the juxtapositions, community to anti-community, rural to urban, west to east, appears in *Doctor Huguet*, with the comparison of south and north—the South pictured as the stalwart pillar of virtue and the agrarian way. In another work, recalling his Radical Republican days in Congress, Donnelly saluted the North for freeing the slaves, but then (unaware of the irony) used the argument of the famous antebellum mythologist George Fitzhugh to admonish the North for creating the industrial "white slave" of capitalism (*Mon*, 169). Donnelly's present day southern plantation fulfills every expectation of the antebellum myth: "'We raise corn to raise the hogs; we raise the hogs to raise the negroes; and we raise negroes to raise the corn.'" But the directing white intelligence reserves to itself a small percentage of the net profits, for the luxuries of life and the adornments of civilization, including books and newspapers; and thus . . . the whole great automatic machine is carrying out His purposes, and gradually lifting up mankind."²⁵ In a restatement of Fitzhugh, Donnelly suggested that the relationship of planter to his black field hand is mutually productive, but in the North the industrialist's employment of the white factory worker offers no reciprocating benefit. The southern plantation, as a variation of Arcadia, is an organic community in which everyone fulfills his calling.

Northern politics are described in *Doctor Huguet* as "an individual grab for profits; in the South" politics "are devotion to ideas and theories of statecraft." The typical evening is passed by planter and sons "upon the broad porch, smoking and discussing the affairs of the whole world." "The Porch" represents "the Southern academy" (*DH*, 38-40). The landed whites in *Doctor Huguet* are stereotypical southern gentlemen—wise, proud and honest. The exception is Lawyer Buryhill, a northern "shyster" engaged in purchasing plantation mortgages; he is described as having "rolling black eyes" which hold "a greedy, cruel look" (*DH*, 43).

A person's character or moral fiber, in Donnelly's works, is established by such determinants as the stage of the cycle of history, the economic base of the society and his relationship to the land; in other words, proximity to the garden. In Donnelly's America, farmers, westerners and southerners meet these prescriptions, but easterners, northerners and in-

habitants of cities do not. But the cycle of history was turning and soon no one would be near enough to the garden to be redeemed. In the Preamble to the 1892 National People's Party Platform, Donnelly assayed the quality of American life: the masses are "demoralized," the people "are rapidly degenerating into European conditions," while society has been polarized into two opposing forces, "tramps, and millionaires."²⁶ Donnelly was contemptuous of the captains of industry, but he had surprisingly little respect for the dispossessed, whom he likened to a herd of animals, because they too are corrupt, ready to do anything for money, and clearly lack the moral fiber requisite of access to the garden. Not long ago, he wrote, America was a land "where sturdy yeomanry once raised stalwart boys and girls, with the mettle of soldiers and heroines," but now "a cringing tenantry eats its bread in shame and submission" (*Bot*, 127). As a result of a vicious conspiracy, families are "separated; girls driven to lives of shame; men enforced to violence and crimes of suicide; millions compelled to become tramps, wretched half-fed nomads and barbarians; the whole peaceful, orderly and beautiful face of society changed to the scowling countenance of universal apprehension, distrust and danger!" (*Mon*, 68-9). From Donnelly's end-of-the-century vantage, man appeared good in the pre-Civil War garden, is presently degenerating and will be deprived in the future.

The revisionist historians accuse Donnelly of being a racist. He was, for example, fond of "Sambo" jokes and often used them in his speeches.²⁷ Likewise, it was not uncharacteristic of him to use the expression "jewed down" or refer to the "Chinaman" derogatively in his prose (*Bot*, 85; *Mon*, 14). But this brand of pejorative ethnic and racial usage was common to America of Donnelly's day, and is a better example of tastelessness than genuine racism. In order to explain Donnelly's prejudice it will be shown that he perceived members of ethnic and racial groups in stereotypes drawn from deeply ingrained preconceptions, based upon how well the stereotype matched the agrarian ideal.

Doctor Huguet is Donnelly's study of what it is like to be black in white America. Anticipating John Howard Griffin's trial in *Black Like Me*, the white-skinned Doctor Huguet, incredibly, swaps bodies with a black-skinned rogue named Sam Johnsing. Huguet discovers what a gruesome fate it is to be a Negro and develops a deep empathy for the plight of the black American, but Huguet (as Donnelly's persona) never abandons his certainty that blacks are socially and intellectually inferior to whites. Pollack finds that Huguet outgrows his racial prejudice as the story unfolds, but careful reading does not support his account.²⁸ *Doctor Huguet* was written at a time when Populist leaders were trying to forge an expedient coalition of white and black farmers. The novel argues for political equality of whites and blacks, but never wavers from the position that the Negro is inferior to the white; after all, political equality "does not imply social equality, or physical equality, or moral equality, or race

equality" (*DH*, 60). Donnelly supposed that the superior white species descended from the inferior black species; but he thought the Negro superior to the Indian, which he thought the most primitive and backward race. Living in the jungle, instead of the garden, impaired the Negro's physical and intellectual development; and it is quite clear that black is not beautiful: "Their black skins, their swollen faces, their depressed noses, represent their physical degradation of ages of such conditions, with the pressure of brutal ignorance and insufficient food" (*DH*, 57). It is apparent in *Doctor Huguet* that the Negro's relationship to the garden is as a tiller, not proprietor of the soil. The South is an organic agrarian community, consistent with the antebellum myth, in which a place is defined for all constituent elements: "As a Southerner once said: 'We raise corn to raise the hogs; we raise hogs to raise the negroes; and we raise negroes to raise the corn'" (*DH*, 39). As black Africa is not awarded a seat on the World Council in Ephraim's dream in *The Golden Bottle*, so the black in *Doctor Huguet* takes only a back seat in the garden of the South.

Except for the black, those excluded from paradise dwell nowhere near the regenerating soil and fit stereotypes of the exploitive or non-producing class. These sycophants are the wealthy conspirators who rule and reap, while the "producers of real wealth are crushed and degraded by the possessors of a couple of metals" (*Bot*, 129). The immediate culprit is the "shyster"—"a cadaverous, lengthy, black-jawed, hard-faced, wolfish-looking creature, with ten times a wolf's ferocity and appetite for spoil . . . the most merciless plunderer of the poor and distressed in the whole country" (*Bot*, 45). However, the lawyer is only an extension of his employers, the plutocrats, who are always either English or Jewish in Donnelly's prose. Their power emanates from control over the international supply of gold, which is the agency of their conspiracy to rule the world. Donnelly traced the English part in this conspiracy back to Benedict Arnold, who "believed in the American Revolution, but English gold was too much for him" (*Bot*, 27). The mortgage on Ephraim's father's farm, in *The Golden Bottle*, is held by an English firm. Sanders, in *The American People's Money*, is Irish, as was Donnelly, and they are both Anglo-phobes. Donnelly's attitude toward the English was probably an expression of an ancestral animus toward English absentee landlordship, which was not uncommon among Populists of Irish descent.²⁹ It is not enough to own property to be in the garden, one must live on the land and cultivate the soil. At the height of his imagination, Donnelly fancied this conspiracy a combination of John Bull and the Rothschilds (*Mon*, 94). For Donnelly the stereotype of the Jew as Shylock was as real as life, as was the threat of an international Jewish monied conspiracy.

The Great Cryptogram (1887) was Donnelly's mammoth treatise proving that Bacon wrote Shakespeare. After examining Bacon's and Shakespeare's character, Donnelly concluded that Shakespeare lacked the

moral qualities that the real writer of the plays possessed. Ridge thinks that Donnelly “could not accept the idea that the creator of Shylock was a moneylender as was Shakespeare and not a debtor as was Bacon.”³⁰ Shakespeare, according to Donnelly, “was a cold-blooded man, who had no instinct but to make money.”³¹ Bacon, on the other hand, “had no faculty to grasp money, especially from the poor and oppressed” (*Cr*, 61). Shakespeare, he wrote, could not have written Shakespeare, because “the man who described usurers as ‘Bawds between gold and want;’ who drew, for all time, the typical and dreadful character of Shylock,” could not have been an absentee landlord and moneylender as was Shakespeare (*Cr*, 50). Shakespeare did not measure up to the ethical imperatives of the garden; he was too much like his own character Shylock to have been a creative genius.

Donnelly’s fear of conspiracy produced its most florid articulation in his theory of the role of the Jew in western history, which culminated, in his imagination, in the 1988 anti-utopia. The iron-handed plutocrats that rule New York City in 1988 are Jewish. Another Jewish stereotype is used in *Caesar’s Column*—the conspiring Russian radical, a crafty Jewish intellectual, who steals a large sum of money entrusted to him by the revolutionaries and escapes to Palestine “with his vast wealth,” to “re-establish the glories of Solomon, and revive the ancient splendors of the Jewish race, in the midst of the ruins of the world” (*CC*, 283). *The Golden Bottle* also ends with Palestine restored to the Jews. The reason for this, says Ephraim, is that historically Jews “are a trading, not an agricultural, people; and so I told them to plant themselves in the ancient seats of commerce, at the head of the Mediterranean” (*Bot*, 280). Donnelly proposed a separate Zionist state because the Jew is a stranger to the garden. The Jew cannot enter the garden because he does not cultivate the soil. For Donnelly the Jew could never exist separately from his image as Shylock, and because he does not measure up to the imperatives of the Populist ethic, the Jew is excluded from paradise.

There is a sizable literature on the question of anti-semitism in Populism, and Donnelly’s prose is central to the debate. Hofstadter thinks Donnelly anti-semitic, but in “a somewhat self-conscious and apologetic” way. He sees Populist anti-semitism as “a rhetorical style, not a tactic or a program.”³² Yet there is a link, he contends, between the symbolic anti-semitism of Populists like Donnelly and a more vicious twentieth-century brand of American anti-semitism. Writing in 1962, Pollack admits that *Caesar’s Column* is anti-semitic, but he thinks Donnelly’s attitude complex because “he simultaneously blamed and defended Jews.” Two years later Pollack writes that in the broadest context Donnelly cannot be considered an anti-semite. And in 1965, he flatly states that “Donnelly cannot be regarded as an anti-semite.”³³ No doubt Hofstadter greatly over-estimates the amount of anti-semitism in Populism, but Pollack over-reacts in his campaign to clear all Populists of

charges of racial and ethnic prejudice. Woodward gets to the core of the problem: "The Populists' use of the Shylock symbol was not wholly innocent, but they used it as a folk stereotype, and little had happened in the Anglo-Saxon community between the time of Shakespeare and that of the Populists that burdened the latter with additional guilt in repeating the stereotype."³⁴ Donnelly's perception of the Jew as a "folk stereotype," combined with his agrarian views, produced a sort of ideological aberration: the Jew cannot fit comfortably in the garden, is on the wrong side of the social struggle, and as Shylock, is integral to the conspiracy theory of history.

IV

The apocalyptic predictions of the cyclical idea of history and the ideological importance of the garden, combine in Donnelly's works to form an agrarianist cosmology, which guided Donnelly's perception of his contemporary world. A number of extrapolations logically follow from Donnelly's cosmos, which suggest that Hofstadter's five themes are viable compartmentalizations of the ideological bias and utopian dream that pervades Donnelly's written work.

There was a golden age in the past, known as the garden, which will appear again in the future. Man's moral capacity is related to his environment; he is good in the garden and degenerates away from it; indeed, human nature is determined by the individual's proximity to the garden. Certain ethnic groups are strangers to the garden and are therefore damned. In Arcadia the division of labor is rudimentary; there is one economic class, the producing class. Everyone in the garden, with the exception of the Negro, is self-employed. The urban worker is hopelessly depraved because of his distance from the garden; thus the concept of natural harmony of producers is a political construct, not an ideological belief. Nevertheless, political exigencies argue for collaboration of farmers and workers against their common foe, plutocracy; hence the dualistic version of the social struggle. Life on the farm is pure and wholesome, with city life its dialectical opposite and the embodiment of evil. Technology is the insidious accomplice of urbanization because it is the agent of change, and any change that threatens the integrity of the garden is for the worse. Democracy can only function in the garden; once the garden has been displaced by urban-industrial society, democracy is doomed to ruinous corruption, because a polity can be no better than its citizenry, and man outside of the garden is corrupt. Finally, the doctrine of the primacy of money is central to the conspiracy theory of history; the two combine to subvert Arcadia, which eventuates a violent social catharsis and renewal of the garden.

There is a fantastic quality to the view of the world contained in Donnelly's works, which has prompted several historians to excessive recrimination. Hofstadter writes that *Caesar's Column* "is full of a kind

of suppressed lasciviousness.”³⁵ Frederic C. Jaher believes cataclysmic thinking at the end of the nineteenth century due to “maladjustment” and emphasizes the importance of revealing the inner biography of these misanthropes. This psychoanalytic method leads Jaher to conclude that the violent ending to *Caesar’s Column* demonstrates “a sort of perverted wish fulfillment,” because Donnelly “thirsted for violent revenge on those who had rejected his bid for power.”³⁶ However, this sort of virulent invective, at best, only obscures the real issues with which Donnelly was concerned. Pollack is perfectly correct to point out the humanitarian thrust which runs throughout Donnelly’s writings. Donnelly was deeply concerned about the farmer who was undergoing a severe depression, but also about human alienation produced by the factory system and found in the urban ghetto. Donnelly’s tone is pessimistic and obsessively moralistic, and indeed, he may have thought of himself as a lone voice in the wilderness. But, as with the abusively damning tone of the Puritan jeremiad, it is a routinized hyperbole, designed for creating an impact. A critical inspection of Donnelly’s writings reveals a standardized literary form, which is repeated over and over again, in which apocalyptic predictions take on a ritualized quality.³⁷ In Donnelly’s prose in the 1880’s and 1890’s, consternation over impending disaster becomes a recognizable formula for calling attention to the farmer’s plight, which was real enough.

Donnelly’s humanitarianism revealed a real feeling for the poor, the black and others alienated from affluent America. This facet of Donnelly’s thought, which Pollack chooses to emphasize, is not essentially ideological in nature. By recording his misgivings about western civilization moving toward anti-utopia, Donnelly stands at the beginning of what was to become an honorable twentieth-century literary tradition of forecasting technological wastelands. In this respect, the Sage of Nininger should not simply be dismissed as a crank and demented agrarian, as Hofstadter’s judgment might lead one to do. Nevertheless, the appraisal of Populism contained in *The Age of Reform* provides a revealing analysis of the ideological underpinnings which support Donnelly’s agrarianism. While there was much that was modern in his thought and positive in his reform proposals, Donnelly’s overriding cosmology was steeped in an agrarian mythology that could never be at peace with the unquestionable components of the twentieth century—the city, technology, the factory, the factory hand, the ethnic stranger, and above all the farmer’s loss of importance to a civilization ideologically removed from the land.

University of Pennsylvania

footnotes

1. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform, From Bryan To F.D.R.* (New York, 1955), 23-93; John D. Hicks, *The Populist, A History Of The Farmers’ Alliance And The People’s Party* (Minneapolis, 1931), 404-423; for a proto-fascist interpretation see Peter Viereck,

"The Revolt Against the Elite," Daniel Bell, ed., *The New American Right* (New York, 1955), 91-116; Walter Nugent, *The Tolerant Populists, Kansas Populism and Nativism* (Chicago, 1963). Several useful discussions of Populist historiography include C. Vann Woodward, "The Populist Heritage and the Intellectual," *The American Scholar*, 29 (1960), 55-72; Theodore Saloutos, "The Professors and the Populists," *Agricultural History*, 40 (1966), 235-254; Raymond J. Cunningham, ed., *The Populists in Historical Perspective* (Boston, 1968), v-viii; Karel D. Bicha, "A Further Reconsideration of American Populism," *Mid-America*, 53 (1971), 3-11. Supporters of the Hofstadter approach include Oscar Handlin, "Reconsidering the Populists," *Agricultural History*, 39 (1965), 68-74; Irwin Unger, "Critique of Norman Pollack's 'Fear of Man'," *Agricultural History*, 39 (1965), 75-80; Frederic C. Jaher, *Doubters And Dissenters, Cataclysmic Thought In America, 1885-1918* (London, 1964), 95-140.

2. Each of these studies reflects Pollack's quarrel with the Hofstadter thesis: Norman Pollack, "Myth of Populist Anti-Semitism," *American Historical Review*, 68 (1962), 76-80; Norman Pollack, *The Populist Response To Industrial America* (New York, 1962); Norman Pollack, "Handlin on Anti-Semitism: A Critique of 'American Views of the Jew,'" *Journal of American History*, 51 (1964), 391-403; Norman Pollack, "Fear of Man: Populism, Authoritarianism, and the Historian," *Agricultural History*, 39 (1965), 59-67; Norman Pollack, "Ignatius Donnelly on Human Rights: A Study of Two Novels," *Mid-America*, 47 (1965), 99-112; Norman Pollack, "Hofstadter on Populism: A Critique of 'The Age of Reform,'" in Raymond J. Cunningham, ed., *The Populists in Historical Perspective* (Boston, 1968), 39-51.

3. Hofstadter, 70.

4. *Ibid.*, 68.

5. Pollack, "Ignatius Donnelly," 110.

6. Pollack, "Hofstadter," 45-46.

7. Pollack, "Ignatius Donnelly," 111.

8. Pollack, "Hofstadter," 40.

9. The myth of the garden approaches the stature of a paradigm in American thought. See Hofstadter, 23-36; Henry Nash Smith, *The Virgin Land, The American West as Symbol and Myth* (Cambridge, 1950), 138-213; William Best Hesseltine, "Four American Traditions," *Journal of Southern History*, 27 (1961), 3-32; Leo Marx, *The Machine in the Garden, Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (New York, 1964), 73-144.

10. Martin Ridge, *Ignatius Donnelly: The Portrait of a Politician* (Chicago, 1962), 209.

11. Ignatius Donnelly, *Atlantis: The Antediluvian World* (New York, 1910), 1-2. Subsequent references to *Atl* are in parentheses.

12. Ignatius Donnelly, *Ragnarok: The Age Of Fire And Gravel* (New York, 1883), 43. Subsequent references to *Rag* are in parentheses.

13. Alexander Saxton, "Caesar's Column: The Dialogue of Utopia and Catastrophe," *American Quarterly*, 19 (1967), 230.

14. Ignatius Donnelly, *The American People's Money* (Chicago, 1895), III. Subsequent references to *Mon* are in parentheses.

15. Ignatius Donnelly, *Caesar's Column: A Story of the Twentieth Century*, edited with an introduction by Walter B. Rideout (Cambridge, 1960), 126. Subsequent references to *CC* are in parentheses.

16. Ignatius Donnelly, *The Golden Bottle Or The Story Of Ephraim Benezet Of Kansas* (New York, 1892), 127. Subsequent references to *Bot* are in parentheses.

17. Jack London, *The Iron Heel* (New York, 1917), 127.

18. Gerald N. Grob, "The Knights of Labor, Politics and Populism," *Mid-America*, 40 (1958), 20.

19. Pollack, *The Populist Response To Industrial America*, 11-12, 68-84.

20. Donnelly was consistent in his dislike of silver as well as gold, and was always quick to advocate paper money: *The Golden Bottle*, 248; *The American People's Money*, 130, 133; *Caesar's Column*, 307.

21. Henry M. Littlefield, "The Wizard of Oz: Parable on Populism," *American Quarterly*, 16 (1964), 47-58.

22. L. Frank Baum, *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, introduction by Martin Gardner (New York, 1960), 191.

23. C. Vann Woodward, "The Southern Ethic in a Puritan World," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 25 (1968), 352.

24. John Richard Bovee, *Ignatius Donnelly As A Man Of Letters*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Washington State University, Pullman, 1968, 79.

25. Edmund Boisgilbert, M.D. (Ignatius Donnelly), *Doctor Huguet: A Novel* (Chicago, 1891), 39. Subsequent references to *DH* are in parentheses.

26. Ignatius Donnelly, "Preamble To National People's Party Platform," of 1892, George B. Tindall, ed., *A Populist Reader* (New York, 1966), 90-91.

27. Martin Ridge, "The Humor of Ignatius Donnelly," *Minnesota History*, 33 (1952), 328.

28. Pollack, "Ignatius Donnelly on Human Rights," 106. Several recent studies of *Doctor Huguet* do not support Pollack's contention that Donnelly outgrows his racism during the

course of the novel; however, both agree that Donnelly was sympathetic toward the Negro: John R. Bovee, "Doctor Huguet: Donnelly on Being Black," *Minnesota History*, 41 (1969), 286-294; John S. Patterson, "Alliance and Antipathy: Ignatius Donnelly's Ambivalent Vision in *Doctor Huguet*," *American Quarterly*, 22 (1970), 824-845.

29. Ridge notes Donnelly's Irish enmity toward the English, "The Humor of Ignatius Donnelly," 328. For further discussion of Irish-American farmers' dislike of the English, see Roger Clement, "The Farmers' Attitude Toward British Investment In American Industry," *The Journal of Economic History*, 15 (1955), 151-159; also Nugent, 117.

30. Ridge, *Ignatius Donnelly*, 236.

31. Ignatius Donnelly, *The Great Cryptogram: Francis Bacon's Cipher in The So-Called Shakespeare Plays* (Chicago, 1888), 66. Subsequent references to *CR* are in parentheses.

32. Hofstadter, 79-81.

33. Pollack, "Myth of Populist Anti-Semitism," 77; "Handlin on Anti-Semitism," 391-403; "Ignatius Donnelly on Human Rights," 112.

34. Woodward, "The Populist Heritage and the Intellectual," 65. Donnelly is integral to numerous studies of anti-semitism in Populism. Handlin suggests that three stereotypes existed; the immigrant, the relationship to money, and an aura of mystery, in "American Views of the Jew At The Opening of The Twentieth Century," *Publications of the Jewish American Historical Society*, 40 (1951), 388. Handlin also sharply criticizes those historians who have attempted to clear Donnelly of anti-semitism, in "Reconsidering the Populists," 69. Unger sees the basis of Donnelly's anti-semitism in his position that Jews are parasitic non-producers, 77. John Higham, in "Anti-Semitism in the Gilded Age: A Reinterpretation," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 43 (1957), 565, states that Donnelly experienced an "inner conflict," regarding Jews as a once "noble race," perverted by Christian persecution. Nugent found that while Populists were not guilty of social discrimination toward Jews, there was a certain amount of ideological anti-semitism, and that Donnelly was both pro and anti-semitic, 110-114. Jaher clears most Populists of anti-semitism, but not Donnelly, 130-140. Peter Viereck's is the most extreme interpretation, placing Donnelly at the beginning of an American tradition combining anti-semitism and fascism.

35. Hofstadter, 69.

36. Jaher, 32, 94, 116, 122.

37. Donnelly's frequent entreaties to mankind to reform or suffer apocalyptic repercussions, assumes the standardized nature of a literary form, and is analogous to the Puritan divines' institutionalization of the jeremiad, as described by Perry Miller in his chapter "The Jeremiad," *The New England Mind, From Colony to Province* (Boston, 1961), 27-39.