

SUSAN-MARY GRANT

A Study in *Scarlett O'Hara*? The South in the Writings of Arthur Conan Doyle

*What shall we say who have knowledge
Carried to the heart? Shall we take the act
To the grave?*

(Allen Tate, "Ode to the Confederate Dead" 1928, 1937)

The hope for the future of South Africa is that they or their descendants may learn that that banner which has come to wave above Pretoria means no racial intolerance, no greed for gold, no paltering with injustice or corruption, but that it means one law for all and one freedom for all, as it does in every other continent in the whole broad earth. When that is learned it may happen that even they will come to date a happier life and a wider liberty from that 5th of June which saw the symbol of their nation pass for ever from among the ensigns of the world.
(Arthur Conan Doyle, *The Great Boer War* 1902)

Arthur Conan Doyle, creator of the most famous fictional detective ever to stalk the mean streets of London, is the most obvious weaver of the cultural ties that linked the American South to Britain, or even more specifically, Scotland, in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The first writer that would come to most minds, however, is Sir Walter Scott, whose (supposedly pernicious) influence upon the South was most famously described by Mark Twain in *Life on the Mississippi*. Scott, Twain charged, set "the world in love with dreams and phantoms; with decayed and swinish forms of religion; with decayed and degraded systems of government; with the sillinesses and emptinesses, sham grandeurs, sham gauds, and sham chivalries of a brainless, and worthless long-vanished society. He did measureless harm; more real and lasting harm, perhaps, than any other individual that ever wrote." Nowhere, according to Twain, suffered more from this harm than the American South. "But for the Sir Walter disease," he suggested, "the character of the Southerner – or Southron, according to Sir Walter's starchier way of phrasing it – would be wholly modern, in place of modern and mediæval mixed, and the South would be

fully a generation further advanced than it is.”¹ Twain, indeed, pretty much held Scott accountable for the American Civil War, stretching the life-imitating-art argument a little far. In any case, the extent to which Scott’s popularity was productive of the ends Twain described seems, at best, debatable. As Eugene Genovese and Elizabeth Fox-Genovese point out, since “Scott wrote for the modern world and read the Middle Ages through other than medieval eyes, and since his books sold more widely in New England than in the South, the verdict of Twain and every schoolboy appears questionable.”²

Nevertheless, as far as the South and Scotland is concerned, Andrew Hook has observed “a clearly visible line of descent from Scott and Scottish literary romanticism through *The Clansman* and *Birth of a Nation* down today to *Braveheart*.” Michael O’Brien cites Rollin Osterweis, whose *Romanticism and Nationalism in the Old South* positioned the South “as quasi-feudal, premodern and static,” and receptive only to the “most static and reactionary aspects of” Romanticism as this was imported from Europe, and of these the most influential comprised the medieval romances of Scott. “We do not have the research that will accurately tell us about the reception of Scott in the Old South,” O’Brien pointed out, adding that we do not have that much about Scotland and the South generally either, an observation as true now as it was twenty years ago when O’Brien made it. Nevertheless, he suggested, “there is reason to think that antebellum Southerners read Scott better than did Rollin Osterweis.” O’Brien has done more than many historians, to probe the lineaments of Southern thought, and he was – and remains – one of the few to acknowledge that there was and is such a country as Scotland that may have had an influence on, and been influenced by the American South.³

The purpose of this paper is to explore the intellectual traffic from the South, in terms of what the South had come to represent by the late-nineteenth century. This is where Conan Doyle comes in. As far as the historiography is concerned, there is a pretty large gap between Scott and *Birth of a Nation*. While historians of the Gilded Age probe the lineaments of American Anglo-Saxonism in this era, tracing the process of what Edward Blum calls “reforging the white republic,” their perspective is too parochial, too concerned to explore this process within the United States rather than place it in its broader international context.⁴ Conan Doyle was a best-seller in this crucial era of racial and national reconfiguration, not just in America, but in Europe and across the British Empire; his writing operates within and reflects

that broader context. Conan Doyle was a Scotsman (although frequently described as English) whose work complicates and offers a fresh perspective on the British response to America, to the Empire, and to race at the turn of the twentieth century.

Walter Scott's earlier fame and widespread resonance among the antebellum reading public across the Atlantic is not the sole reason for his eclipse of Conan Doyle when it comes to the South. Conan Doyle wrote virtually nothing about the South specifically, and the region forms the backdrop to only three of his stories. Indeed, as far as the South *qua* South is concerned, at first glance this appears to be a case of the dog that did not bark, as the popular shorthand for Sherlock Holmes's deductions in "The Silver Blaze" has it. This paper is not, however, going to argue – as Warren Roberts and Edward Said famously did for Jane Austen – that because Conan Doyle rarely mentions the South it therefore follows that it was a perennial preoccupation of his.⁵ In any case, and unlike Austen, Conan Doyle does address the subject of slavery and race – at some length in "J. Habakuk Jephson's Statement" (1884). The South is not the scene of action in this tale, nor is it the location of the two relevant Holmes mysteries to be discussed, but is nevertheless the clearly identified source of the problem in each case. Conan Doyle's response to the South can be situated within what Anne Windholz terms the "imperial masculinity" discourse that prevailed toward the end of the nineteenth century in Britain, but some further dissection is necessary in order to unpick the complexity of his perspective.⁶ Two linked but distinctive strains can be identified: one relating to the idea of the South; the other to the challenge of race. Finally, this paper proposes that these themes achieve a harmony, or at least a resolution of sorts in Conan Doyle's subsequent non-fiction work, specifically his account and defence of the conflict in which he briefly served as physician, *The Great Boer War* (1900, 1902).

Frontiers

Many British people take for granted a certain degree of knowledge about Arthur Conan Doyle's celebrated fictional creation, Sherlock Holmes. They also assume an even greater familiarity with the United States of America. In both cases, for the public at large, this familiarity is largely a media creation, representing at best a distorted image of both. Just as Holmes proved a wish-fulfilment figure capable of

imposing order on a chaotic world, so America fast became a wish-fulfilment nation offering a diluted version of the American Dream to those who lived far from its shores. For settlers and foreign observers alike, the American continent was, as Daniel Boorstin observed, “so fertile a repository of hopes because it was so attractive a locale for illusions. The map of America was full of blank spaces that had to be filled. Where solid facts were scarce, places were filled by myths – largely European in origin.”⁷ In the nineteenth-century, the physical map of the still United States became more fixed – although not in its present form – but what America was, what the American people represented, remained unclear to Europeans despite any number of travellers’ accounts of that nation flooding the bookshelves and magazine pages of Europe. The nation as a whole remained a geographical prop for some of the most famous literary productions of the day – a location from which characters could emerge and to which they could be banished as it suited the author – a conveniently distant shore that remained sufficiently obscure as to serve this purpose.

Even in the early period, the South was a region that attracted considerable interest, for a variety of reasons. When in the middle of the nineteenth century the republican experiment seemed about to implode, the general lack of understanding of what either the Union or the Confederacy was fighting for gave rise to further confusion, especially on the matter of slavery and race in the New World democracy. Arthur Conan Doyle was born on the eve of the American Civil War, and first visited America in 1894, when the conflict was long past. In the South, however, the war remained the focal point for a region increasingly defined by racial discord, a region already becoming fixed in the national psyche as ‘a problem’ for America as a whole. As the nation moved West the South remained caught, in many respects, in the time and place of the Civil War, abandoned to its fate. It was to the West that foreign writers, including Conan Doyle, increasingly turned; this was a West of the imagination, more malleable in form and function, it suited the purposes of fiction very well. Conan Doyle’s imagination had already headed into the West long before he travelled to America in person. Seven years before he arrived in America, the world had been introduced to Sherlock Holmes in “A Study in Scarlet” (1887), a strangely bifurcated work that described a mysterious continent in as much detail as it did the mysterious detective. The lengthy mid-section of “A Study in Scarlet,” devoted to the back-story set amongst the Mormon community in Utah, for early readers of the

novel must have seemed a brave new world indeed that had such people in it.

For some, Conan Doyle's description of the religious community in Utah may not have been wholly unfamiliar or unexpected. In assessing Conan Doyle's presentation of America, and specifically the South, one must consider the expectations of the British reading public. Space does not permit a detailed exploration of the magazine literature of the period, but a few themes can be identified that bear on Conan Doyle's writings. Several factors combined to bring American affairs to wider attention on the British side of the Atlantic: the growth of America and of American trade was a perennial topic of interest, and sometimes concern. Edinburgh's *Chambers's Journal* – the first magazine ever to publish Conan Doyle – appreciated all that America had to offer, yet was equally aware of the threat it posed. It waxed lyrical about the prospects for America, suggesting that “[n]ever since man attained to civilisation have so many favourable conditions co-existed for the growth and consolidation of a young nation . . . Besides every natural aid for multiplication,” the journal observed, “the United States have all the secondary aids for increase in almost greater profusion than in the most advanced states of Europe. Science is more widely cultivated, and bent to economic results; education is universal; political freedom is almost complete. To these must be added the eager desire for prosperity which permeates the whole people, and which has created an almost distinct type – the go-ahead Yankee.” Only three years later, however, the journal described the shift of “the labour and capital of the Old World” to the United States as one “of the greatest economic problems of our time.” On the whole, *Chambers's* did not dwell on the problems facing the United States, but one early opinion piece, penned by William Chambers himself, offered a glimpse of the confused and threatening world that Conan Doyle would describe over a decade later in “A Study in Scarlet.” An example of the Anglo-Saxon mindset at its hardest-bitten, the focus of Chambers's article perceived “American Troubles” to relate mainly to race, to Chinese immigration and to Mormonism.⁸

This theme of migration, race and religion as problematic belonged, by and large, to the immediate post-Civil War period, and its dissemination in British publications was far from objective. Some of the London journals provided a platform for the white South to make its voice heard at a time when attempting to recover economically and emotionally from the war, and seeking foreign investment. Edwin de

Leon, a Confederate propagandist during the war, made the post-war white South's case in *Fraser's Magazine*. "When an Englishman speaks of America and Americans, now-a-days," de Leon asserted, "he means the Northern States and the Northern people, with whom politically, socially, and commercially he has had to do since the subjugation – almost suppression – of the Southern States nine years ago," an assumption de Leon hoped to modify. Seeking to establish a rapport with his readers, de Leon pushed several familiar buttons regarding the "many points of similarity and congeniality" between the "Southern planter and the English landed gentleman." Southerners, he suggested, were essentially like the English, conservative in "habits and character, as well as religion and politics," and he seized the opportunity to take a familiar swipe at the North in his observation that "[a]ll the 'isms,' native or foreign – Radicalism, Mormonism, Spiritualism, Atheism, Free Love – all such fungi have sprung up and attained rank growth in Northern soil. They never have flourished nor even taken root in Southern soil." Yet de Leon was no fool, and well knew that his British audience had some notion of what the Civil War had been about and what its outcome had been. The thrust of his final article, a lengthy and fairly convoluted assurance that no race war was likely to break out in the South, was therefore designed to reinforce the theme of black-white harmony in the region post-emancipation, mainly as a means of persuading potential investors that their money would be safe in the South. "Now as during the war," de Leon promised, "the old ties are stronger than the new temptations, and the fidelity of the negro to his white confrère in all things not political is wonderful to contemplate, when the outside pressure on his passions and prejudices is taken into consideration." By glossing the reality of the Reconstruction South in this way, de Leon not only reiterated the long familiar defence of Southern race relations but told his British audience that in creating a secure economic footing based on a predominantly non-white, non-equal workforce, the American South and the British Empire had something in common.⁹

Whether de Leon's audience took his assurances at face value, however, is doubtful. Word had already reached British ears, long before Conan Doyle penned one of his most famous tales on the subject, "The Five Orange Pips" (*Strand*, November 1891), that the South was not the harmonious region that de Leon described. Although de Leon's essentially economic plea for the South found echoes in a wide variety of articles published in the late 1870s and 1880s, British audiences had

other evidence to consider. The relatively high number of articles appearing in British publications on the ‘poor whites of the South’ not only revealed much that de Leon would have preferred to keep out of the spotlight, but also addressed what was clearly one of the pressing concerns of Empire in the late-nineteenth century. The phrase alone – ‘poor whites’ – was used in both cases, in the context of Empire and in the context of the American South. The ‘poor white’ in a British colonial context not only threatened “to discredit the mythology of European racial supremacy,” Yumna Siddiqi notes, “but their ambiguous appearance also confused the boundary between European and native identity.” The Southern variant, too, was often described as “withered and yellow, as though vitality had been exhausted by chronic malaria and insufficiency of food.” The ‘poor whites’ of the South were, similarly, understood to blur the line between European immigrant and American native: they were frequently racially coded as non-white. One visitor to the South commented on a “cracker” female that “had she been copper-complexioned instead of the unhealthy yellow, I would have believed her an aboriginal inhabitant of Florida,” noting in general that the “retrogression of the high-bred, progressive Caucasian towards the inferior Red-man is very striking among the Crackers, who have sprung from two or three generations of degenerated whites.” In this case, the image of a degenerate but, crucially, non-African American underclass, threatened no colonial regime, and in a very real sense it did reinforce de Leon’s invocation of an essentially class as well as race-based Anglo-Southern kinship, though certainly not from the perspective he would have chosen.¹⁰

The threat of violence was also never far from the surface in British accounts of the South. One unusual mystery romance written and set in 1872, dealt with the activities of the Ku Klux Klan in South Carolina, and with the Federal response – South Carolina was still under military occupation at that point, with the second Enforcement Act (the Ku Klux Klan Act) passed the previous year. Neither Federal troops nor former Confederates came out of this *Chambers’s* tale very well, and the overall tone was one of disenchantment with American opportunities that, for the hapless protagonist, came at too high a price.¹¹ From the early 1870s, British audiences were presented with contradictory impressions of the United States in general and the South in particular. This in no way curbed their enthusiasm for the country: amongst the English-speaking nations by the 1890s around sixty percent of British emigrants chose the United States. This fact,

Windholz has observed, was met with ambivalence but also with alarm, an alarm that, by the time Conan Doyle was writing feared less that America was “a dangerous lure to British manhood” than the “industrial and military threat to Britain’s world dominance” that the United States posed. Such concerns were muted, Windholz argued, via “a discursive strategy that incorporated the United States into Britain’s imperial fold.” This rhetoric emerged in contemporary magazine descriptions of America, but especially the frontier West, “as an exotic, uncivilized, colonial hinterland,” and by the assumption of “racial and cultural kinship, most notably in references to Americans as ‘cousins’ and Britain as the ‘mother’ country; and by insisting on its essential Anglo-Saxonism in spite of the evident diversity of its immigrant population.” This clear attempt to annex “American successes as signs of the Anglo-Saxon initiative that made Britain into an empire,” Windholz suggests, positioned Anglo-Saxon manhood as “united against not only Native American, African, and Asian, but also Spaniard, Boer, and Hun on the frontiers of twentieth-century imperialism.”¹²

Windholz’s argument is persuasive, and certainly “A Study in Scarlet” can readily be accommodated by it, positing as the story does a clear division between the dangers of Utah and the civilizing forces represented by Holmes and, more subtly, by Dr Watson, famously identified immediately by the great detective as a man who had already suffered in the service of the Empire. As far as Conan Doyle is concerned, however, there are two problems with Windholz’s thesis. The first is that the threat in “The Five Orange Pips” does not originate on the American frontier, but in the South and, further, it is a story that harks back to an earlier theme, that of the Englishman corrupted by the New World. “The Five Orange Pips,” which appeared in *The Strand* in November, 1891, presents a rather different frontier on which civilization and barbarism clash, a frontier in which organized crime operates and from which a vague yet tangible aura of menace emerges “so ubiquitous,” as Michael Levine observes, “that it is everywhere and nowhere at once.” Indeed, the air of general foreboding in this tale foreshadows the work of Sax Rohmer, whose Fu-Manchu fiction, begun in 1913, invoked a world that, in Clive Bloom’s words, was “haunted by an international mafia with supernatural powers; powers which at once uphold and destabilize reality and whose presence is material yet invisible.” Holmes’s client, John Openshaw, begins his story. “My uncle Elias emigrated to America when he was

a young man, and became a planter in Florida, where he was reported to have done very well. At the time of the war he fought in Jackson's army, and afterwards under Hood, where he rose to a colonel." "When Lee laid down his arms my uncle returned to his plantation, where he remained for three or four years. About 1869 or 1870 he came back to Europe . . . He had made a very considerable fortune in the States, and his reason for leaving them was his aversion to the negroes, and his dislike of the Republican policy in extending the franchise to them."¹³

As far as it goes – “The Five Orange Pips” is one of Conan Doyle’s shorter stories – it is noteworthy that the back-story is presented in this way, and it does indicate a fair knowledge of the American Civil War and its aftermath. To anyone familiar with the war, John Openshaw’s account rings true; his uncle could have fought as described – it is also revealing that Conan Doyle assumes that his readership will recognise the names of Jackson and Lee – and Florida, a state relatively undamaged by the war was, thanks to its lumber trade, quick to recover afterwards. Uncle Elias’s plantation, if it provided wood, could well have proved profitable. Uncle Elias, we might also note, has opted to leave the South immediately prior to the passage of the Ku Klux Klan Act of 1871, at a time when Federal operations against the Klan were at their peak. Many Klan activists went West at this time, although Uncle Elias has chosen to return home. The choice of Florida as the scene of Uncle Elias’s fortunes and later misfortunes is also interesting. The state that comes to most historians’ minds at the mention of the Klan is South Carolina. Again, however, Conan Doyle’s selection of Florida reveals some knowledge, at least, of the extent and nature of Klan activity in the South at this time. As one former Klan member, law professor William Simkins, recalled, “Florida was more fortunately situated than other states to facilitate the operation of the Klan. The railroad from Tallahassee to Gainesville passed through the center of the black belt where we were most needed, and the conductors, engineers, and telegraph operators, being mostly Southern young men in hearty sympathy with us, never hesitated to carry out our orders when such services were needed, either for the dispatch of orders or the transportation of men . . . We controlled by mystery,” Simkins boasted; “there was our power.”¹⁴

Such mystery as real-life characters such as Simkins constructed proved no match for the fictional detective, but “The Five Orange Pips” remains an uncomfortable tale, in which Holmes solves the mys-

tery but singularly fails to save his client. It is, as Levine has argued, a text “in which nature and artifice, context and text, are repeatedly blended together.” It is also a text that posits civilization against barbarism: John Openshaw’s hapless father dismisses the threat posed by the five pips and the letters K.K.K. with the observation that “[w]e are in a civilized land here, and we can’t have tomfoolery of this kind.” His assumption that the murderous reach of the Klan could not stretch to the heart of England, however, proves fatally false. Herein lies both the significance of this particular tale and the second difficulty in applying Windholz’s thesis to Conan Doyle. Windholz’s argument – that the response to the threat posed by the United States “was a species of ideological colonization” – is entirely undermined by “The Five Orange Pips.” Certainly, the Anglo-Saxon brotherhood theme is evident in the character of Uncle Elias, who left the South because of his “aversion to the negroes,” but there is no comfort to be had from this transplanted Englishman’s sympathy for the white South in the resolution of what is, in effect, a national morality tale. The authority, in “The Five Orange Pips,” rests not on England’s side, and the initiative has passed even from Holmes’s hands: he can see what is happening, but is powerless to prevent it. It is, however, the character of Uncle Elias that provides the most unsettling aspect of the story. In this context, it is worth turning to the thesis proposed by Siddiqi in “The Cesspool of Empire,” that asserts, in brief, that in Conan Doyle’s fiction the image of the returning colonial – these men frequently have “an outlandish aspect” – betrays “certain recurrent anxieties about imperialism.” This, it seems clear, has a bearing on the character of Uncle Elias, although Siddiqi does not bring either America or “The Five Orange Pips” into the analysis.¹⁵

Siddiqi stresses Conan Doyle’s commitment to Empire, his belief in the opportunities it offered to counterbalance “the perceived degeneracy of turn-of-the-century English culture,” his friendships with men such as Rudyard Kipling and Robert Baden-Powell, and his membership in the Legion of Frontiersmen. All these elements combine to position Conan Doyle firmly within an elite imperial mindset that elevated “[c]lear-headed Anglo-Saxons” above all. Yet Siddiqi is surely on the right track in identifying more than a slight discrepancy between Conan Doyle’s apparently solid position on the subject of Empire and the rather more unsettling image of that empire that he presented in his detective fiction. The unwavering support for Britain’s position in South Africa that Conan Doyle offered in *The Great Boer*

War is undermined, Siddiqi notes, by the terrible reality of that conflict as presented in “The Adventure of the Blanched Soldier,” with its hideously disfigured protagonist. America, obviously, was no longer a British colony by the nineteenth century; yet the implications of the English experience in what Windholz describes as “the colony that got away” were not lost on Conan Doyle. “The return of disfigured and violent colonials,” Siddiqi argues, “points to a historical trauma that has been repressed – it signifies a return of the violence that is suppressed in celebratory accounts of the civilizing mission.” This may be indeed “be symptomatic of a troubled political unconscious,” a symbolic displacement of violence “onto the bodies of poor whites,” but in “The Five Orange Pips” the violence is not written on the body of Uncle Elias – except insofar as his hard drinking and bad temper are concerned, and he and his family do all meet a violent end – it is a more insidious violence within the mind. Uncle Elias, in effect a returning colonial, has brought some of the most troubling racial aspects of the Anglo-Saxon Empire adventure home with him, and these prove to be his downfall.¹⁶

The most troubling question about poor old Uncle Elias, however, concerns the extent to which he absorbed the racial mindset of extremists in the white South – in effect, went native – or whether this was already a fundamental aspect of his character as an Englishman abroad. Within the broader context of what Windholz has identified as “a kinship rhetoric that stressed . . . the essential Anglo-Saxonism of the United States” this question is significant. Southern propagandists like Edwin de Leon encouraged and reflected this notion of kinship across the ocean, and his arguments surely resonated within the British imperialist discourse, a discourse Conan Doyle was part of. Conan Doyle was, Siddiqi notes, no “critic of Empire,” and regarded “the influence of English culture abroad” as “unquestionably civilizing.” At the same time, “the shadowy figures of English colonials who have fallen through the cracks of the imperial economy and society haunt his stories. Their return to England and embroilment in misadventure or crime suggests that something is rotten in the state of Empire.” Uncle Elias hardly fell through the cracks – he was, we are assured, a success – but his homecoming was nevertheless the result of misadventure, of a crime that, as it turned out, followed him home, a crime that, in the tale of retribution that Conan Doyle weaves around him, situates the English gentleman abroad in a racial – and racist – discourse that stretched far beyond even the extremities of

Empire. In the American South, Conan Doyle was aware of a challenge to his belief in the civilizing mission of the Anglo-Saxon; his response in “The Five Orange Pips” was a disturbing portrayal both of the racialist foundations of Anglo-American kinship and the dire consequences when ‘kin’ fall out. Of “all our cases,” Holmes advises Watson, “we have had none more fantastic than this.” Yet as a murder mystery, it is hardly much more fantastic than many other Holmes’s tales, and a great deal more straightforward than most given that the victims are glimpsed but briefly, the perpetrators of the crime not at all. What was fantastic about the crime portrayed in “The Five Orange Pips” was that its origins and its implications caused the author himself concern: the American South had a lesson to teach, and Conan Doyle had begun, by the time this short story appeared, to realise what it was.¹⁷

For Conan Doyle, the South was real to him in a way that – prior to his visit in 1894 – the rest of America was not. This can be shown by even a brief juxtaposition of “A Study in Scarlet” with “The Five Orange Pips.” Where the latter is accurate in many respects, the former’s presentation of the frontier West is so completely off-beam that it has been described as “hilariously inaccurate about the terrain that it purports to be describing,” be that the West in general or the Mormons in particular. There was, Chris Redmond observes, “a sort of low-grade pornography of Mormonism” in print in the late-nineteenth century, and “whether or not Conan Doyle bought into it, he certainly took advantage of it.”¹⁸ Conan Doyle was sufficiently comfortable with the idea that his readers would have only limited information on Mormonism and even less knowledge of the topography of the American West – little enough, at least, not to spoil the story for them – whereas he felt comfortably assured of his readers’ expectations regarding the South as to rely on, essentially, the shorthand of Jackson and Lee’s names to invoke the cause of the Confederacy. He had grounds for this confidence. As Charles Shain noted, the traditional portrayal of “the brave little Confederacy” was a persistent theme in the English novel well into the late-nineteenth century. “For a novelist’s purposes,” he observed, “Southern defeat had, perhaps, advantages. An unlimited supply of tragedy and pathos was made available for an indefinite number of stories and, beyond this, a novelist could play with the resemblances between the loss of the tradition of the gentleman in America and his unstable fortunes at home.”¹⁹

Although late-nineteenth century British audiences would have been aware of the existence of ‘poor whites,’ and conscious of the

unsettling racial undercurrent that lay beneath the post-war propagandist portrayal of the South's fortunes, both elite and popular perspectives on the Confederacy remained, by the time Conan Doyle began to publish, essentially positive, especially as far as the Southern 'gentleman' was concerned. "The Five Orange Pips" sounded a discordant note, however, which was more than a simple complication of the traditional, romantic view of the Confederacy; it challenged, on a very basic level, the late-nineteenth century belief in "biologically or anthropologically grounded assertions that physiology and race are intimately linked to crime in a society," a belief that many critics have traced through the fiction of the 1880s onwards, including that by Conan Doyle. To focus on this, however, is to miss the point. Uncle Elias was living – or rather dying – proof that criminality could not be so readily foisted onto the 'other'; that, in fact, it resided within, not outwith, either the Empire or the Anglo-Saxon. It came down to knowledge. British global mastery, Seshagiri has argued, was "determined by the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge," while Caroline Reitz, in her analysis of detective fiction and imperialism argued that knowledge, in such fiction, "is more effective than violence in the acquisition and maintenance of authority."²⁰ Sherlock Holmes was the ultimate symbol of such knowledge, but his creator had a deeper knowledge even than his apparently omniscient creation; Conan Doyle perceived the racial flaw at the heart of Anglo-Saxon imperialism, and it was from the American South that this knowledge derived.

The Colour Line

In "The Five Orange Pips," Holmes's knowledge is, for all practical purposes, useless; it fails utterly to prevent the murder by the Klan of John Openshaw. The Confederacy's dark side could, and did, reach into the very heart of England, a nation that could no more escape or avoid the racial consequences of Empire than it could the murdering hand of the Klan. Holmes sees this, but the knowledge is to no avail. A more significant tale on this theme concerns the rare occasion when Holmes's knowledge itself fails, "The Yellow Face" (*Strand*, February 1893). A very great deal of critical ink has been expended on this tale, which is frequently required to carry a heavy burden in terms of its racial message and imperial implications: the full weight of the racial pathology of nationalism that is seen to constitute the heart of mo-

ernity's crisis in *fin de siècle* Britain is, apparently, contained in this single unsolved, at least by Holmes, mystery. This "seemingly innocuous short story," according to Jinny Huh, "symbolizes the height of the modernist anxiety of race detection because it depicts the intersection of both passing and detection where knowing/not knowing, seeing/mis-seeing, security/chaos collide to dismantle previous conceptions and expectations of racial knowledges." It is, in addition, "the first story . . . in which both the genres of detective fiction and the passing narrative unite to introduce a self-proclaimed professional detector of crime with the passing 'criminal.'" Not that Lucy Hebron is in any sense a criminal, but the need to keep her existence a secret from the English society in which her mother – another form of returning colonial – is situated serves to highlight a 'deeper crime,' one in which the British nation is implicated. This "deeper crime," Ronald Thomas argues, "is linked more indirectly to imperialism in general and to African conquest in particular. Here, the mask of suspected marital infidelity conceals the crime of racism."²¹

Most readings of "The Yellow Face" focus exclusively on the British imperial venture, and Conan Doyle's own experiences in Africa. The South, from whence Effie Hebron – now Munro – has returned, is rarely mentioned. Only Thomas acknowledges that there may be a link, when he argues that in the story "America, the lost colony of an earlier imperial moment, and Africa, the dark colony of the New Imperialism, return . . . to the safety of an English country home in the form of a black-skinned girl hiding behind a yellow face." Apart from that, the only other references to the South come from those critics whose determination to uncover the 'truth,' or the likely veracity of the story, leads them to question whether the Atlanta in the tale is actually Atlanta, Georgia – as is assumed by most readers – or whether, in fact, it is another Atlanta altogether. "The Yellow Face" is fiction, so it could as well be Atlanta, Mars, but here again, as in "The Five Orange Pips," Conan Doyle reveals a knowledge of the South that makes it likely that the Atlanta in question is, in fact, in Georgia. Yellow Fever was not, of course, confined to the South; New York – along with many other American cities – experienced periodic outbreaks of this killer infection throughout the nineteenth century, and in the decades after the Civil War. The most famous Yellow Fever epidemics, however, were associated with the South. Georgia experienced three major outbreaks in the nineteenth century: in 1820, 1854 and, the last and the worst, in which some 20,000 died, spread throughout the

South from New Orleans in 1878. All Holmes is told is that the fever had broken out 'badly.' In deciding to remove a character via the agency of a Yellow Fever epidemic, it does seem more plausible that Conan Doyle should have the South in mind, even if careful internal dating 'evidence' suggests that no such epidemic swept Georgia in exactly the period when the fictional John, Effie and Lucy Hebron are described as being there. The veracity, or not, of "The Yellow Face" is not the issue, however; a more important question than that concerning what carried poor John Hebron off and when was what his widow brought back, eventually, with her to England.²²

Literary critics are not fond of Effie Hebron, possibly with good reason. Despite the 'fact' that a deadly epidemic has just dispatched her husband, the woman decides to leave her daughter in the South – or in America, at least – for the sake of her health. This is surely a serious case of maternal dereliction, and a decidedly odd thing to do in the circumstances, but – without wishing to dismiss pages of literary analysis – it was necessary for the plot. The plot itself is unusual for a Sherlock Holmes mystery, involving as it does a case that totally flummoxes the famous detective, whose perceptive omnipotence is highlighted at the start of the story – when he correctly identifies a great deal about his client simply from a pipe left behind by the said Grant Munro – only to be thereafter completely undermined. After this initial piece of insight, Holmes's detective abilities abandon him entirely, and he concocts a fanciful tale of marital disharmony and blackmail from the evidence placed before him. The truth is simultaneously more straightforward and more complex than he, or the reader, supposes: Effie Munro is neither a bigamist nor a blackmail victim, even if she is a rather indifferent mother. The dread secret that she has sought to hide – for how long she anticipated doing so is anyone's guess – from her new husband consists of two startling facts: first, that her daughter did not die in Atlanta, as she had said, and second, that the said daughter, Lucy, is black, indeed, unmistakably so; she is not a mulatto, but 'coal-black.' The 'yellow face' that Grant Munro has seen at the window was, in fact, a mask, an attempt to disguise the irrefutable evidence that John Hebron, Effie's husband, was African American, and that Effie herself is therefore guilty of miscegenation. In Effie's own words: "I cut myself off from my race to wed him; but never once while he lived did I for one instant regret it." She nevertheless regards it as a "misfortune that our only child took after his people rather than mine," and there, of course, is the rub: why should

Effie regard this fact as a ‘misfortune,’ not just in America – indeed, apparently not at all in America – but in England, where no laws against miscegenation existed? Effie has committed no crime, except, of course, that in the context of the period, if her crime did not exist in the statute books, it certainly did in the hearts and minds at the heart of England. “The Yellow Face,” then, as Thomas has argued, begins as an apparent familial problem but ends by invoking far “larger national issues.” What Effie brought back home with her, her own issue, in fact, posed a fundamental challenge to the ‘Pax Britannica’ and all that it implied.²³

In this sense, Effie Munro, like Uncle Elias, is a returning colonial from “the lost colony of an earlier imperial moment” who brings dangerous knowledge home with her, knowledge that has the potential to unsettle the racial and moral certainties that justified Britain’s imperial activities. As Thomas charges – more than slightly unfairly – Effie’s confession “transforms the problem of race into an issue imported from America, a problem that the unscrupulous woman improperly projects upon English culture.” Uncle Elias might, in a similar vein, stand equally accused of importing a problematic American ‘issue’ into the heart of England, with rather direr consequences for his own family if not for the nation. Yet Elias and Effie are very different, although both, it should be noted, went to the South in their youth: the former is a white male whose racial antipathies are either matched or encouraged by the extremist element in the white South, and who is so averse to African Americans that he joins what is essentially a vigilante murder group in order to intimidate them; the latter a white female (although some critics have challenged that) whose racial views are so entirely at variance with Elias’s that she enters into an inter-racial union with, initially at least, no regrets. Elias and Effie could not be more different, yet both are forced to bring the results of their American sojourn back with them, and each faces up to their respective southern pasts only unwillingly. Both Elias and Effie initially attempt to deny their pasts by not divulging the facts to anyone, but their increasingly bizarre behaviour – the drinking, the temper, and the locking himself away are not signs of Elias’s guilty conscience but an attempt to avoid facing up to the inevitable, while Effie’s secrecy and increasing nervousness represent the same thing – prompts those around them to wish to solve what is evidently a mystery in each case, which is where Sherlock Holmes came in, in each case, entirely ineffectually; in the one, he sees but is

powerless to act; in the other, he does not see at all. This begs the question of why Conan Doyle made his normally omnipotent detective so helpless in both cases, and this question goes to the heart of his creator's own perspective on race.²⁴

"The idea of miscegenation never occurs to Holmes," Thomas suggests; "this is the crime that even he cannot (or will not) imagine, the crime of transgressing racial barriers. It violates the fundamental assumptions that he must share about racial difference and that form the basis of the criminal anthropology he practices." These fundamental assumptions relate to Conan Doyle's construction of Holmes as a detective whose abilities lie in the detail, in the ability not merely to observe, but to see, and to understand what he is seeing. Similarly, as Huh has argued, racial "science became the scientific schema of seeing and categorizing race, focusing on the visual detection of difference." Ultimately, this racial science "justified arguments for colonialism and slavery." Huh highlights Conan Doyle's writing on Africa as potentially significant in tracing the author's views on race, but it seems clear that Africa, *qua* Africa, was not where Conan Doyle's ideas on race, certainly as this played out in the context of British imperialism, derived. This is evident when one turns to a story that was conceived and appeared before the world had met Sherlock Holmes, a story that explored the complex subject of race in America: "J. Habakuk Jephson's Statement" (1884) published in *Cornhill* magazine was inspired, it is now generally accepted, by the meeting between Conan Doyle and Henry Highland Garnet, American Consul at Monrovia (Liberia), in 1882, while Conan Doyle was acting as ship's doctor aboard the African Steam Navigation Company's vessel, *Mayumba*. Garnet, a former slave, had been a radical abolitionist in the 1840s; in 1843, he made what became known as his "Call to Rebellion" speech in New York, where he declared: "Brethren, arise, arise! Strike for your lives and liberties. Now is the day and the hour. Let every slave throughout the land do this and the days of slavery are numbered. You cannot be more oppressed than you have been – you cannot suffer greater cruelties than you have already. *Rather die freemen than live to be slaves.*" Conan Doyle's meeting with Garnet has been described by Owen Dudley Edwards as "possibly the most momentous encounter he had yet sustained in the course of his life." Garnet, according to this analysis, "had done an extraordinary thing for Conan Doyle. He had given him his first authentic voice outside his own range of experience, and the voice was black." The voice, it might also be added, was Southern.²⁵

Garnet had been born in Maryland, although he had escaped to the North in 1824. Conan Doyle, in fact, made little of the meeting with Garnet in his memoirs – he never cited Garnet by name – but he nevertheless described Garnet as the “most intelligent and well read man on the Coast.” It was, Conan Doyle recalled, “wonderful to sit on deck discussing Bancroft and Motley, and then suddenly realize that you were talking to one who had possibly been a slave himself, and was certainly the son of slaves . . . This man did me good,” Conan Doyle concluded, “for a man’s brain is an organ for the formation of his own thoughts and also for the digestion of other people’s.” Much more has been made of this meeting since. According to Huh, “not only does Garnet’s existence forcefully confront Doyle with an epistemological paradox, dismantling his own secured position as a white, patriarchal, aspiring upper-class British professional, but Doyle may have also been confronted with the potential dangers behind this realization.” She goes on to argue, following Dudley Edwards, that the plot of “J. Habakuk Jephson’s Statement” makes it “safe to assume . . . that Doyle was aware of Garnet’s radical and revolutionary ideologies on race,” but that, obviously, is not the point of her argument, which concentrates on “The Yellow Face,” a story that, she proposes, was “a remembering” of Conan Doyle’s “experience with Garnet a decade earlier.” However, “The Yellow Face,” “The Five Orange Pips,” and “J. Habakuk Jephson’s Statement” should be read together in any exploration of Conan Doyle’s understanding of race, generally, and of the South in particular. In each case, knowledge – not necessarily detection, since detection fails to save anyone in all three cases – is the key to what these stories mean; knowledge of the South, and a recognition of what W.E.B. DuBois famously called ‘the color line.’²⁶

“J. Habakuk Jephson’s Statement” has, for obvious reasons, been more closely aligned with Herman Melville’s earlier story on a similar theme: “Benito Cereno.” There are, however, crucial differences that point to what Conan Doyle was seeking to say in his version of a ship that appears to be under the control of whites but is in fact steered by blacks. As Dudley Edwards has argued, “Melville’s effect is achieved by having some of the whites aware of what is happening while too terrorised to reveal it, while Conan Doyle’s depends on the maintenance of general white ignorance until the moment of revelation is declared by blacks . . . The difference,” he stresses, “lies in that Melville is playing with the ignorance but mental strength of the non-slave society as against the knowledge and mental sickness of the slavehold-

ing one, where Conan Doyle is concerned to show the utter agony that lies at the back of atrocious crimes in avenging slavery." In "J. Habakuk Jephson's Statement," the eponymous narrator is a doctor from New England – from Harvard, no less – a man of impeccable Puritan lineage and abolitionist credentials, who fought in the Civil War. Yet for all his learning, bravery and commitment, Jephson fails to understand what is happening aboard the *Marie Celeste* until the murderer, Septimius Goring, reveals all.²⁷

This tragic tale, as Dudley Edwards and others have suggested, represents the natural outgrowth of a conversation – or several conversations – aboard a sailing vessel in 1882, conversations in which Conan Doyle no doubt received a potted history of American, but especially Southern, race relations and, perhaps more crucially, heard the disillusionment of a man who had witnessed the "new birth of freedom" produced by the Civil War suffer a premature demise during Reconstruction and after. This, perhaps, was the core of his knowledge that Garnet conveyed to Conan Doyle, which led to the latter's incorporation of the problem of the colour line in his fiction: that to be truly 'colour blind' was, in the context of the late-nineteenth century struggle for nationalism, an impossibility; to assume that an individual, or a nation, is or could readily be such, was to invite disaster; and that even after a brutal internecine war costing some 600,000 lives, racial equality had not been achieved in the United States. Conan Doyle's understanding of race, and of the South, had less to do with the categorization of racial types, or with a subsumed fear of 'passing,' where it might become impossible to 'see' blackness, than it was about the delusions that sustained the imperial venture. The voice of Henry Highland Garnet, a black voice, a Southern voice from the colony that got away was the voice of experience, and its echo can be heard again in Conan Doyle's non-fiction work on the Boer War.

Conan Doyle's purpose in writing *The Great Boer War* was, it is generally acknowledged, to defend British actions against the vitriol of a hostile press. It is largely narrative in structure, detailed in its descriptions of the engagements of that conflict but, when placed in the context of Conan Doyle's earlier fictional tales, revealing about the warning that its author sought to convey to his country, even as he defended that country's actions. That Conan Doyle saw in the Boer War (the Second Boer War, for accuracy) parallels with the American Civil War has been noted by Thomas. It was a link made in his later detective fiction, not by Holmes – who nevertheless observes it – but

by Watson who, in “The Adventure of the Cardboard Box” (*Strand*, January 1892), contemplates the portraits of General Gordon and Henry Ward Beecher that hung in Holmes’s study. Watson, Holmes deduces, has been contemplating the “mission” that Beecher “undertook on behalf of the North at the time of the Civil War.” The reference is to “Beecher’s Bibles,” the arms shipments sent to Kansas for the use of free-soil supporters there. Although Holmes perceives that Watson acknowledges “the gallantry shown by both sides in that desperate struggle,” he understands, too, that for Watson it invoked that old wound from Afghanistan and “the sadness and horror and useless waste of life” of war in general. A similar link, Thomas points out, is made in *The Great Boer War*, when Conan Doyle draws “an analogy between British adventurism in Africa and America’s problems with ‘coloured people’ as it was manifested in the Civil War.” Certainly Conan Doyle observed that “[b]oth branches of the Anglo-Celtic race have grappled with the question, and in each it has led to trouble,” but it is by no means obvious that the ‘question’ in question was as straightforward as Thomas implies.²⁸

In the opening chapter of *The Great Boer War*, Conan Doyle set out the ‘problem’ very clearly, and it was this: how to effect the change from a slaveholding to a non-slaveholding society. This was where the parallel with the American Civil War really had an impact on Conan Doyle’s thinking. The problem, he realised, was not with the ‘coloured people’ except indirectly; the problem lay in the attempt on the part of the North to effect lasting change in the racial outlook of the South, a problem encountered in much the same degree by the British in relation to the Boer. To “change the habits of the most conservative of Teutonic races was a dangerous venture,” Conan Doyle realised, and the idea that “British justice, if not blind, should be at least colour-blind,” whilst “irreproachable in theory and incontestable in argument . . . is apt to be irritating when urged by a Boston moralist or a London philanthropist upon men whose whole society has been built upon the assumption that the black is the inferior race. Such a people like to find the higher morality for themselves, not to have it imposed upon them by those who live under entirely different conditions.” It would not be stretching a point too far to suggest that Conan Doyle had a figure very like the fictional J. Habakuk Jephson in mind when he described the rather narrow perspective on race relations produced from the “serenity of a well-ordered household in Beacon Street or Belgrave Square,” nor that the American South came to his mind when

he looked at South Africa. The British were victorious in the Boer War, but Conan Doyle had reason to suspect that, as far as race relations were concerned, the example of the American South – as described to him by Henry Highland Garnet – was both apposite and sobering.²⁹

Just as had been the case for the Confederacy, the Boers – in the Transvaal and the Orange Free State – had staked all in the deadly nineteenth-century game of nation making, and they had failed. Scholars of nationalism certainly have seen links between the ethnic construction of Afrikaner identity and that elusive phenomenon, Southern nationalism, but in establishing that link contemporaneously Conan Doyle was ahead of his time. Once the “God of battles had given the long withheld verdict” in each case, Conan Doyle contemplated the implications of the Boer War in terms equally applicable to the ending of the American Civil War from a liberal northern perspective: “They had fought and died for their ideal. We had fought and died for ours. The hope for the future of South Africa is that they or their descendants may learn that that banner which has come to wave above Pretoria means no racial intolerance . . . that it means one law for all and one freedom for all, as it does in every other continent in the whole broad earth. When that is learned it may happen that even they will come to date a happier life and a wider liberty from that 5th of June which saw the symbol of their nation pass for ever from among the ensigns of the world.”³⁰

The passing of the flag of the Confederacy from the ensigns of the world, however, ushered in a period of racial violence more extreme than anything witnessed on the Cape. Conan Doyle, of course, could not make that comparison: what he had learned from Garnet about the post-Reconstruction South, however, held out little hope for the future of a ‘wider liberty,’ either in South Africa or in the American South or, indeed, in the British Empire. By the late-nineteenth century America was becoming, Duncan Bell has argued, “a modern exemplar . . . a more apposite political structure on which to model Greater Britain.” Imperial thinkers, Bell suggests, did not simply ignore the example of ancient empires, “they actively dismissed them. Imaginatively leaping across both time and space, over 2,000 years and the vast breadth of the Atlantic Ocean, many of the advocates of Greater Britain instead sought authority in the image of America.” Yet in the image of the South, an imperial thinker such as Conan Doyle perceived an alternative authority, one that threatened to undermine the location of either America or the British Empire “in a

progressive narrative, open to the future not condemned by the past.” The Civil War was America’s past, but its repercussions resonated in the nation’s late-nineteenth-century present, and would do so in its future. The sectional divide in America had been, in theory at least, obliterated by the Civil War, but the colour-line remained. That was what Henry Highland Garnet showed Arthur Conan Doyle; that was the knowledge that Conan Doyle conveyed in his fiction, through characters such as Uncle Elias, whose complicity in the white Southern racial outlook proved his undoing; through Effie, who brought back to England a more positive message about the breaking down of racial barriers, but whose awareness of the racial mores of her homeland made her fearful of making the message public; and, above all, through J. Habakuk Jephson, whose tale is really a parable on the limitations of knowing or, as Sherlock Holmes himself put it, the universal human tendency to see, but not to observe.³¹

The author would like to thank Owen Dudley Edwards, whose work on Arthur Conan Doyle was the inspiration for this article, for his generosity with his quite voluminous knowledge of America, American and Scottish literature and, of course, Sherlock Holmes.

Notes

- ¹ Mark Twain, *Life on the Mississippi* (Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1883) 468-69, *Documenting the American South*, 10 September 2006 <<http://doc-south.unc.edu/twainlife/twain.html#twain465>>.
- ² Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, and Eugene D. Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Southern Slaveholders’ Worldview* (New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) 135.
- ³ Andrew Hook, *From Goosecreek to Ganderclough: Studies in Scottish-American Literary and Cultural History* (East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 1999) 210; Michael O’Brien, “The Lineaments of Antebellum Southern Romanticism,” *Journal of American Studies* 20.2 (August 1986): 165-88 (166, 179); Rollin G. Osterweis, *Romanticism and Nationalism in the Old South* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949).
- ⁴ Edward J. Blum, *Reforging the White Republic: Race, Religion, and American Nationalism, 1865-1898* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005).
- ⁵ The reference is to the thesis of Warren Roberts, *Jane Austen and the French Revolution* (London: St Martin’s Press, 1979), which proposed that Austen’s avoidance of any direct mention of the French Revolution indicated its pervasive influence in her thinking; the argument was transferred to Austen’s avoidance of any discussion of slavery in the West Indies by Edward Said in *Culture and Imperialism* (London: Vintage Books, 1994).

- ⁶ Anne M. Windholz, "An Emigrant and a Gentleman: Imperial Masculinity, British Magazines, and the Colony that Got Away," *Victorian Studies* 42.4 (Summer 1999/2000): 631-58.
- ⁷ Daniel Boorstin, *The Americans: The National Experience* (1965; Reprint. London: Penguin/Sphere Books, 1988) 223.
- ⁸ "Our Competing Cousins," *Chambers's Journal* 906 (May 7, 1881): 289-91 (289); "European Emigration to America," *Chambers's Journal* 41.1 (October 11, 1884): 641-42 (641); W.C., "American Troubles," *Chambers's Journal* 623 (December 4, 1875): 769-72.
- ⁹ Edwin de Leon, "The Southern States Since the War: Their Present Condition and Future Prospects," *Fraser's Magazine* 10.56 (August 1874): 153-63 (153); "Industrial and Financial Condition," 10.57 (September 1874): 344-66; and "The Conflict of Races," 10.59 (November 1874): 620-37 (620). On de Leon, see Edwin de Leon, *Secret History of Confederate Diplomacy Abroad*, ed. William C. Davis (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005).
- ¹⁰ Yumna Siddiqi, "The Cesspool of Empire: Sherlock Holmes and the Return of the Repressed," *Victorian Literature and Culture* 34 (2006): 233-47 (239); See, e.g., "The New Rebellion in America," *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country* 76.455 (November 1867): 622-37; E. D. Godkin, "The Southern States Since the War," *Contemporary Review* 44 (July/December 1883): 681-700; "Florida 'Crackers'," *Chambers's Journal of Popular Literature, Science and Arts* 20.1036 (November 1883): 689-92; and A.G. Bradley, "The 'Poor Whites' of the Southern States," *Macmillan's Magazine* 60 (May/October 1889): 141-50; Siddiqi, "The Cesspool of Empire" 239; "Florida 'Crackers'" 690, 691.
- ¹¹ "Belle's Black Coachman," *Chambers's Journal* 465 (November 1872): 744-47, 761-66.
- ¹² Windholz, "An Emigrant and a Gentleman" 632, 633-34.
- ¹³ Michael G. Levine, "The Vanishing Point: Sherlock Holmes and the Ends of Perspective," *Criticism* 39.2 (Spring 1997): 249-73 (260); Clive Bloom, *Cult Fiction: Popular Reading and Pulp Theory* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996) 191. In fact, Rohmer modelled his stories on Conan Doyle's work, so this similarity is likely deliberate, see Urmila Seshagiri, "Modernity's (Yellow) Perils: Dr. Fu-Manchu and English Race Paranoia," *Cultural Critique* 62 (Winter 2006): 162-94 (168); Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, "The Five Orange Pips," *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes* (London: Penguin, 1981) 103.
- ¹⁴ William Stewart Simkins, "Why the Ku Klux," *The Alcade* 4 (June 1916): 735-48 (741-2). Simkins was educated at the Citadel, and had served in the Civil War under Joseph E. Johnston. He and his brother organised the Klan in Florida after the war, and later Simkins became Professor of Law at the University of Texas between 1899 and 1929. This address, a Thanksgiving Day oration, can be accessed at <<http://www.law.du.edu/russell/lh/alh/docs/simkins.html>> (10 September 2006).
- ¹⁵ Levine, "The Vanishing Point" 264; Conan Doyle, "The Five Orange Pips" 107; Siddiqi, "The Cesspool of Empire" 233.
- ¹⁶ Siddiqi, "The Cesspool of Empire" 233-34, 242.
- ¹⁷ Windholz, "An Emigrant and a Gentleman" 651; Siddiqi, "The Cesspool of Empire" 245; Conan Doyle, "The Five Orange Pips" 111.

- ¹⁸ Chris Redmond, "A Study in Sin: Religious Hypocrisy and Fanaticism in (and out of) *A Study in Scarlet*," *Baker Street Journal* 54.1, 10 September 2006 <http://www.bakerstreetjournal.com/images/Redmond-Study_in_Sin.pdf>.
- ¹⁹ On elite attitudes toward the Confederacy, see Jay Luvas, *The Military Legacy of the Civil War: The European Inheritance* (1959; Reprint. Lawrence: The University Press of Kansas, 1988) and "G. F. R. Henderson and the American Civil War," *Military Affairs* 20.3 (Autumn 1956): 139-53; Charles E. Shain, "The English Novelists and the American Civil War," *American Quarterly* 14.3 (Autumn 1962): 399-421 (414); and John O. Waller, "Charles Kingsley and the American Civil War," *Studies in Philology* 60.3 (July 1963): 554-68.
- ²⁰ Seshagiri, "Modernity's (Yellow) Peril" 178, 187; Caroline Reitz, *Detecting the Nation: Fictions of Detection and the Imperial Venture* (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2004) 74.
- ²¹ Jinny Huh, "Whispers of Norbury: Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and the Modernist Crisis of Racial (Un)Detection," *Modern Fiction Studies* 49.3 (Fall 2003): 550-80 (554-5); Ronald R. Thomas, "The Fingerprint of the Foreigner: Colonizing the Criminal Body in 1890s Detective Fiction and Criminal Anthropology," *English Literary History* 61.3 (1994): 655-83 (676).
- ²² Thomas, "The Fingerprint of the Foreigner" 678.
- ²³ Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, "The Yellow Face," *The Memoirs of Sherlock Holmes* (London: Penguin Books, 1981) 35-54 (52-53); Thomas, "The Fingerprint of the Foreigner" 656-57.
- ²⁴ Thomas, "The Fingerprint of the Foreigner" 678.
- ²⁵ Thomas, "The Fingerprint of the Foreigner" 677; Huh, "Whispers of Norbury" 555; Owen Dudley Edwards, *The Quest for Sherlock Holmes: A Biographical Study of Arthur Conan Doyle* (Edinburgh: Mainstream Publishing, 1983) 255; Huh, "Whispers of Norbury" 550-54; the text of Henry Highland Garnet's 1843 address is available at <<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/aia/part4/4h2937t.html>> (10 September 2006); Edwards, *Quest for Sherlock Holmes* 255, 269.
- ²⁶ Conan Doyle quoted in Huh, "Whispers of Norbury" 550-51, 553, 566.
- ²⁷ Dudley Edwards, *Quest for Sherlock Holmes* 269; Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, "J. Habakuk Jephson's Statement," *The Conan Doyle Stories* (1929, 1956; Reprint. Leicester: Galley Press, n.d.) 386-422. It is interesting that the fictional Jephson is wounded at Antietam and carried from the battlefield very much in the manner of Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., who was wounded, and retrieved from the field at that battle.
- ²⁸ Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, "The Adventure of the Cardboard Box," *His Last Bow* (1917; Reprint. London: Penguin Books, 1997) 39-61 (41); Thomas, "The Fingerprint of the Foreigner" 676; Conan Doyle, *The Great Boer War* (London: Smith, Elder and Company, 1902) Chapter 1, 10 September 2006 <<http://pinetreeweb.com/conan-doyle-chapter-01.htm>>.
- ²⁹ Conan Doyle, *Great Boer War*, 10 September 2006 <<http://pinetreeweb.com/conan-doyle-chapter-01.htm>>.
- ³⁰ See, for example, Bruce Caughen, "The Myth of Divine Election and Afrikaner Ethnogenesis," *Myths and Nationhood*, ed. Geoffrey Hosking and George Schöpflin (London: Hurst and Company, 1997) 107-31; R. L. Watson, "Abolition, Violence, and Rape: Thoughts on the Post-Emancipation Experiences of the United States

and the Cape Colony,” *Safundi: The Journal of South African and American Studies* 22 (April 2006): Article Number 1, 19 September 2006 <<http://www.safundi.com/issues/22/watson.asp>>; Conan Doyle, *Great Boer War*, Chapter 25, 10 September 2006 <<http://pinetreeweb.com/conan-doyle-chapter-25.htm>>.

- ³¹ Duncan Bell, “From Ancient to Modern in Victorian Imperial Thought,” *The Historical Journal* 49.3 (2006): 735-59 (738, 758); the most famous Holmes pronouncement on this, of course, occurs in “A Scandal in Bohemia.”

Bibliography

- Bell, Duncan. “From Ancient to Modern in Victorian Imperial Thought.” *The Historical Journal* 49.3 (2006): 735-59.
- Bloom, Clive. *Cult Fiction: Popular Reading and Pulp Theory*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1996.
- Blum, Edward J. *Reforging the White Republic: Race, Religion, and American Nationalism, 1865-1898*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005.
- Boorstin, Daniel. *The Americans: The National Experience*. 1965. Reprint. London: Penguin/Sphere Books, 1988.
- Cauthen, Bruce. “The Myth of Divine Election and Afrikaner Ethnogenesis.” *Myths and Nationhood*. Ed. Geoffrey Hosking and George Schöpflin. London: Hurst and Company, 1997. 107-31.
- Conan Doyle, Arthur. *The Great Boer War*. London: Smith, Elder and Company, 1902.
- Dudley Edwards, Owen. *The Quest for Sherlock Holmes: A Biographical Study of Arthur Conan Doyle*. Edinburgh: Mainstream Publishing, 1983.
- Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth and Eugene D. Genovese. *The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Southern Slaveholders’ Worldview*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Hook, Andrew. *From Goosecreek to Gandercleugh: Studies in Scottish-American Literary and Cultural History*. East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 1999.
- Huh, Jinny. “Whispers of Norbury: Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and the Modernist Crisis of Racial (Un)Detection.” *Modern Fiction Studies* 49.3 (Fall 2003): 550-80.
- Leon, Edwin de. *Secret History of Confederate Diplomacy Abroad*. Ed. William C. Davis. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005.
- Levine, Michael G. “The Vanishing Point: Sherlock Holmes and the Ends of Perspective.” *Criticism* 39.2 (Spring 1997): 249-73.
- Luvás, Jay. *The Military Legacy of the Civil War: The European Inheritance*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1988.
- . “G. F. R. Henderson and the American Civil War.” *Military Affairs* 20.3 (Autumn 1956): 139-53.
- O’Brien, Michael. “The Lineaments of Antebellum Southern Romanticism.” *Journal of American Studies* 20.2 (August 1986): 165-88.
- Osterweis, Rolin G. *Romanticism and Nationalism in the Old South*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949.
- Redmond, Chris. “A Study in Sin: Religious Hypocrisy and Fanaticism in (and out of) *A Study in Scarlet*.” *Baker Street Journal* 54.1. 10 September 2006 <http://www.bakerstreetjournal.com/images/Redmond-Study_in_Sin.pdf>.

- Reitz, Caroline. *Detecting the Nation: Fictions of Detection and the Imperial Venture*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2004.
- Seshagiri, Urmila. "Modernity's (Yellow) Perils: Dr. Fu-Manchu and English Race Paranoia." *Cultural Critique* 62 (Winter 2006): 162-94.
- Shain, Charles E. "The English Novelists and the American Civil War." *American Quarterly* 14.3 (Autumn 1962): 399-421.
- Siddiqi, Yumna. "The Cesspool of Empire: Sherlock Holmes and the Return of the Repressed." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 34 (2006): 233-47.
- Thomas, Ronald R. "The Fingerprint of the Foreigner: Colonizing the Criminal Body in 1890s Detective Fiction and Criminal Anthropology." *English Literary History* 61.3 (1994): 655-83.
- Twain, Mark. *Life on the Mississippi*. Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1883.
- Waller, John O. "Charles Kingsley and the American Civil War." *Studies in Philology* 60.3 (July 1963): 554-68.
- Watson, R. L. "Abolition, Violence, and Rape: Thoughts on the Post-Emancipation Experiences of the United States and the Cape Colony." *Safundi: The Journal of South African and American Studies* 22 (April 2006). 19 September 2006 <<http://www.safundi.com/issues/22/watson.asp>>.
- Windholz, Anne M. "An Emigrant and a Gentleman: Imperial Masculinity, British Magazines, and the Colony that Got Away." *Victorian Studies* 42.4 (Summer 1999/2000): 631-58.