



The Irish: Effeminized and Effeminizing in Julia O’Faolain’s *No Country for Young Men*

Salwa A. EL-Shazli
English Department
College of linguistics and translation
Badr University, Cairo, Egypt.
Salwa.elshazli@buc.edu.eg

Received:11-12-2023 Revised:20-1-2023 Accepted: 19-2-2024
Published: 29-1-2024

DOI: 10.21608/jssa.2024.254749.1585
Volume 25 Issue 1 (2024) Pp.1-34

Abstract

This paper examines how Ireland has been a victim for both outside and inside forces. For England as an outside force, Ireland is a female country and the Irish are dirty people, a female race that must be rescued by marriage to the civilized male England. To affect this marriage, many measures and laws were to be taken mercilessly, hoping that such despotic measures would make Ireland and Irish people completely subjugated and effeminized. Oppression and effeminization were not just a British trade, they also hatched from inside. The higher circles of Irish society (Politicians and Church) were, if not more sinning like Lear, they were, at least, as sinning as sinned against. The poor Irish people were falling as victims between the ferocious fangs of colonial England and the fierce claws of politicians and the Irish authoritative institutions. This paper will count on O’Faolain’s *No Country for Young Men* to show the various techniques of both the internal and the external process of oppression and effeminization for Ireland. The focus will be on how the colonized Irish politicians and religious men, who lived the misery of colonialism, ironically turned to be worse than the British colonizer. Once in authority, the Irish politician O’Malley claims his responsibility as a protector of his own people and turns into another colonizer. The discussion will be extended from thematic analysis to technical analysis of O’Faolain’s writing techniques to explain how Ireland was effeminized. The analysis will be done through the lenses of postcolonialism.

Keywords: Ireland-effeminization-postcolonialism-oppression

Introduction:

Throughout the history of humanity, some races have always claimed their superiority over other races with a firm belief that this superiority is natural; a heavenly blessing endowed to them by God. Whites, in general, take it unquestionably that they are higher than Blacks: “I am as high over you as Mount Everest over the sea. White reigns supreme...I’m white, you can’t change that,” as Herman’s mother tells Julia in Alice Childress’s *Wedding Band*. In this two-act play, Childress, an African American playwright, shows us the American society as a real embodiment of human division at large: North and South, Whites and Blacks, Whites and Whites (Jewish–Americans and German- Americans). Northerners must be proud, “We’re from New Yorrrk” (30). Annabella puts a cardboard sign... printed with red, white, and blue crayon: “WE ARE AMERICAN CITIZENS,” but why? Because “somebody wrote across the side of our house in purple paint: ‘Kruats’... ‘Germans live here,’” Herman tells Julia (24).

Though I am very much concerned with the illusionary and unjustified human division at large, I am going to define myself to the British version of alleged superiority or let us say “virility” over the “female” Irish. England, the largest colonizing country of the modern world, has persistently claimed that it is a male country and as C.L. Innes tells us, in her *Woman and Nation in Irish Literature and Society 1880-1935---*, that “English men generally assumed their right as a ‘masculine and virile race’ to control feminine and childlike races such as Celts and Africans” (9). Walter Benjamin, in his “Thesis on the Philosophy of History,” confirms that history has always been written by “Victors” (448). And England has insistently exploited the two terms of gender and race to reinforce the colonial claims of “virility” and “superiority.” Being the writers of most of the world’s modern history, the British have kept reminding the world that “the countries of Europe [and by implication of the whole world] were either male or female, and the Celtic countries, along with Italy, comprised the female ones with ‘their soft, pleasing quality and charm of a woman, but no capacity for self-government’, [and that] it was necessary for male countries like England to take the female countries in hand” (Innes 9). As writers of history and assumers of the patriarchal role of “Father/

Husband,” the British, of course, have safely invented the idea of Irish woman’s frail morals which led to the English first coming here in 119” (O’Faolain 34). But can usurpers tell lies!

This paper aims first to discuss the British claim of masculinity and superiority, and second to display the transmission of certain colonial contagious values (effeminization, power, and hierarchy) to the colonial subjects, with special emphasis on Julia O’Faolain’s *No country for Young Men*.

Theoretical framework:

Among the negative effects of Colonialism is the hierarchal division between the superior (colonizer) and the inferior (colonized). Features of “laziness, aggression, violence, greed, sexual promiscuity, bestiality, primitivism, innocence and irrationality are attributed by the English, French, Dutch, Spanish and Portuguese colonists to Turks, Africans, Native Americans, Jews, Indians, the Irish, and others” (Loomba 107). These qualities provided “an ideological justification for different kinds of exploitation” (113). The exploitation of the colonizer takes various forms in colonized countries. Economically, it devoured the raw materials in some of these countries as in the case of Congo. To illustrate, B. Jewsiewicki in his article “The Great Depression and the Making of the Colonial Economic System in the Belgian Congo” speaks about how Congo was manipulated for its raw, natural materials (ivory, gold, rubber, and diamond) and how the colonial atrocities imposed aggressive restrictions on Congolese workers which, in turn, led to acute poverty, high death rate, armed violence and corruption (153-161). Another form of the colonizer’s exploitation extended linguistically to the imposition of the colonizer’s language on colonized nations. As Sophie Croisy highlights how “The colonization of Algeria by the French beginning in the 1830s led to the introduction (or rather imposition) of French and the integration or further integration of European languages such as Italian and Spanish as other settlers from Europe accompanied the French movement”. This led to the “imposition of French at all levels of Algerian society” (85). language affected the Algerian’s identity formation and raised challenges the colonized had to face with another, foreign culture.

Within the same context, Edward Said remarked in “Yeats and Decolonization” that “All of the subjugated peoples had it in common that they were considered to be naturally subservient to a superior, advanced, developed and...mature...whose role...was to instruct, legislate, develop, and at the proper times to discipline, war against, and occasionally exterminate” (72). The arrogant colonizer implemented his supremacy over the colonized nations, believing that it is the colonizer’s Godly, decided fate and destiny to control, civilize and discipline the backward countries. Kimbra L. Smith in her article “Telling Histories: Everyday Inequalities and the Construction of Authenticity” stressed the fact that “European colonizers from the early 1500s on developed discourses of race that clearly placed indigenous Americans (and, later, African slaves) into inferior categories within the Great Chain of Being” (33). For the colonizer, the colonized is positioned low in the hierarchy of creation and in need of enlightenment “colonial domination was indeed to convince the natives that colonialism came to lighten their darkness” (Fanon 210-211) Moreover, colonialism of a nation for a long-time span “created a population which acted as a strong base for colonial rule” (Loomba 110). For instance, the Irish nationalists in Ireland present such “base” which is “comparable or even worse forms of oppression than under colonial rule” (Young 25). O’Faolain’s *No Country for Young Men* explores how Irish nationalists, who once struggled to obtain independence from the British rule, became colonizers of their own people, where nationalists excluded voices and people. In such a case colonialism is no longer an outside threat, it flourished internally too. The various facets of “internal colonialism continue to operate” with various tactics of “exploitation” (Young 25). So, as Young mentioned, the concept of colonialism thrived and continued in previously colonized countries, even with the disappearance of the outside colonizer. To illustrate, the Irish politicians in O’Faolain’s *No Country for Young Men* are portrayed as fierce monopolizes as the British colonialists: two antagonistic predators devouring one prey; Ireland. It seems, as Deane asserts, that Irish male authority is nothing but “a copy of that by which it felt itself to be oppressed” (qtd. in Gandhi 116). The Irish nationalists developed their own agenda that has its pillar from the colonizers’ ideologies. As Leela Gandhi adds “anti-colonial nationalism remains trapped within the structure of thought from which it seeks to differentiate itself” (115). So, the colonized remains imprisoned within the ideology of the colonizer, that ideology

that the colonized assumed to escape from. But ironically, the colonized, turns into another colonizer of his own people.

To justify the invasion of other nations, the colonizer falsifies reasons to be excused by the international community. One of these reasons came under the allegation of civilizing and educating primitive, colonized countries, as Robert Van Krieken illustrates “Civilization was colonialism’s most central organizing concept” (299). To solidify such perspective Alice L. Conklin in her article “Colonialism and Human Rights, A Contradiction in Terms? The Case of France and West Africa, 1895-1914” stressed that “Europeans and Americans masked their baser motives for colonies-greed, national pride, the quest for power-in claims to civilize the "natives" beyond their borders” (421). So, civilization of the primitive was used as a coverage for the evil practices of the colonizer. The dominating colonizer acquired strength from feeding on the weakness of the dominated colonized. Power and strength are attributed to the masculinity of the colonizer, while submission and weakness are attributed to the effeminization of the colonized. The colonizer portrays himself as a virile male protector of a vulnerable female colonized country in an obligatory relation. Gandhi confirms that “Colonial masculinity defined itself with reference to the alleged effeminacy of Indian men...India is colonisable because it lacks real men” (99-100). The colonizer’s masculinity is recognized and obtained through the colonized’s femininity. As the previous quotation shows it is the assumed femininity of Indians by the British colonizer that creates the aggressive binary opposition between the male, virile British colonizer and the female Indian colonized. Ironically, “The discourse of colonial masculinity was thoroughly internalized by wide sections of the nationalist movement” (100). So, effeminization of the colonized turns out to be a contagious projection process from the colonizer to the colonized nationalists who, unconsciously, participate in the colonial discourse. As Edward Said explains: “Imperialism after all is a cooperative venture. Both the master and the slave participate in it, and both grew up in it, albeit unequally” (74).

This paper will use the tools of postcolonialism for analysis. Postcolonialism is a critical approach that “grew out of older elements to capture a seemingly unique moment in world history, a configuration of experiences and insights, hopes and

dreams arising from a hitherto silenced part of the world". Postcolonial approach helps to investigate the struggling experiences of Irish people to capture their unattainable dreams and hopes during the colonial situation. Through the lenses of postcolonialism we can penetrate the silence of Ireland under the tyrant hands of both the British colonizer on one hand and the Irish nationalists on the other hand. This in turn will expose "the discourses of the colonial era" to grasp a comprehensive view of such era and be able to "review the past and the future" (Mishra and Bob Hodge 378).

For Robert Young, postcolonialism "is not just a disciplinary field, nor is it a theory which has or has not come to an end. Rather, its objectives have always involved a wide-ranging political project—to reconstruct Western knowledge formations, reorient ethical norms, turn the power structures of the world upside down, refashion the world from below." (20) From such venue, I would agree with Young's idea of using postcolonialism as a tool to understand the power structure between the colonizer and the colonized and how the colonized Irish nationalists turn to be worse colonizers for his own people through using "Western Knowledge" and tactics. This will lead to violence and chaos; especially when the struggle divides the same society into sectors to "refashion" the power relation between the Irish people themselves as colonizers and colonized.

Shehla Burney in her article "Edward Said and Postcolonial Theory: Disjunctured Identities and the Subaltern Voice" confirms that Postcolonialism has a "methodology to research issues dealing with the nature of cultural identity, gender, race, social class, ethnicity, and nationality in postcolonial societies. Questions of language and power, of the subjectivity of the subaltern, are also key concerns". Postcolonial perspective will be used in this paper to pierce into the colonial relation in Ireland and how the colonized's "identity is politicized and how the postcolonial subject is created through hegemonic Western lenses" (Burney 42). The colonized's existence is seen through the political agenda of the colonizer. It is the agenda that seeks to keep the colonized in a marginalized inferior position as a subject for the colonizer's projected plans of superiority and dominance.

On the same line of thought Fanon in his most recognized critical book *Wretched of the Earth* speaks about how the natives are made into colonizers. This happens when “The European elite undertook to manufacture a native elite” (7). The choice of the verb “manufacture” conveys how a chosen group of colonized people are made into colonizers of their own people. What is worth mentioning here is that the Irish nationalists who were once colonized, developed what Homi Bhabha calls “Mimicry” of the colonizer, such attitude “coheres the dominant strategic function of colonial power” (86). The elite colonized Irish learned to mimic the colonizers’ tactics and tuned to be like the British colonizers; self-centered and racist. In her analysis of Fanon’s point of view, Burney refers to “the dubious role” played by the colonized people “who mimic and admire the colonizers and behave like the oppressors” (49). This is related to the inexplicable behaviors of the Irish nationalists who turned to imitate their British oppressors in the manipulative tactics of their own people. Fanon’s idea of how the elite colonized (the Irish nationalists) imitate the colonizer in oppressing their own people is a core issue of my discussion through the manipulation of O’Faolain’s *No country for Young Men*. To O’Malley (an Irish nationalist politician): “The Irish people will follow. They won’t initiate. And don’t tell me they’re tired. They’re always tired. They must be goaded for their own good.” He adds “The people have no self and no aspiration towards determining anything at all until we infuse it into them”. We are their virile soul, we are they” (312-313,314). The “virile soul”, he assumes, resonates the colonial “virility” that the British have always been claiming over the female Irish. On the same line of Fanon’s thoughts, we can see how the “native elite” project the concept of effeminization on their own people and portray them as helpless females who need control and guidance.

Likewise, Bill Ashcroft stressed that “anti-colonialism emphasizes the need to reject colonial power and restore local control”, but “Paradoxically, anti-colonialist movements often expressed themselves in the appropriation and subversion of forms borrowed from the institutions of the colonizer” (12). The nationalists became the same monsters they used to fight because they “had been educated to perceive themselves as potential heirs to European political systems and models of culture” (56). And that is exactly what happened in Ireland, a country that is moved from the

hands of the British colonizer to the hands of the Irish nationalists. From an outsider colonizer to an insider colonizer.

Through applying the ideas of oppression, effeminization and anti-colonial nationalists, this paper seeks to answer the following research questions: first, how did the British colonizer affirm England’s superiority and masculinity over Ireland? Did it happen randomly or was it planned? And why? Second, how did the newly acquired power offered to Irish politicians and religious men change them? Third, could colonialism concepts be contagious? How? Fourth, how did Julia O’Faolain’s writing techniques in *No Country for Young Men* help to answer the previous research questions?

The Irish: effeminized:

Eight centuries of occupation might require the British eight hundred excuses to save their face. However, the British have bluntly fabricated many justifications for their existence in Ireland. The major British claim is that Ireland is a female country in need of protection and that “Hibernia embodies the extreme of angelic femininity dreamed by Englishmen—beautiful, graceful, spiritualized and passive” (Innes 14). Therefore, Matthew Arnold, as one of the propagandists and perpetrators of the British colonial convictions, in his *On the Study of the Celtic Literature* states that “no doubt the sensibility of the Celtic nature, its nervous exaltation, have something feminine in them, and the Celt is thus peculiarly disposed to feel the spell of the feminine idiosyncrasy” (108) It is worth mentioning here that the same claim was also used by the British colonizers to justify their existence in Africa. In Caryl Churchill’s play *Cloud Nine*, Clive, the representative of British colonization, associates Mrs. Saunders, whom he approaches sexually, with Africa: “You are dark like this continent. Mysterious. Treacherous” (I, ii). As a colonizer, he celebrates his patriarchal position: “I’m a father of the natives here/ and a father to my family so dear” (1, 1). So, the relationship between England and her colonies, Ireland, and Africa, as females, as Edward Said described it, is “a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degree of a complex hegemony” (Orientalism 132). In the previous quotation Clive impersonates himself to be the father of the natives which in turn limits the colonized natives to the position of being children; immature and

reckless. The word father has the connotation of guidance and authority for someone who is intellectually inferior.

Though bearers of the same white skin of the British, the Irish were accused of being “racial undesirables” (D’ Arcy 7); “they are bestial, dirty...aggressive and ugly” (Innes 14). Benjamin Disraeli, British prime minister (1874-1880) and novelist, in a letter to the London Times in 1868, says that the Irish people “hate our orders, our civilization.” They are “wild, reckless, indolent, uncertain, and superstitious race [who] have no sympathy with the English character. Their fair ideal of human felicity is an alternation of clannish brawls and coarse idolatry. Their history describes an unbroken circle of bigotry and blood” (quoted in Innes14). I wonder what kind of “sympathy” Disraeli is asking for! “Bigotry and blood” were brought by the British troops, they are a British industry. Disraeli is of course, a colonist, product of colonial despotism which sees that “civilization, like the masculine sex, must be one,” that is, must be British (McGee 117).

Perhaps the best answer to Disraeli’s claims is found in some lines from Lady Gregory’s *Poets and Dreamers*, where she distastes the flagrant British atrocities all over the world:

For the people of India

(Pitiful is their case).

For the people of Africa

She has put to death.

For the people of Ireland,

Nailed to the cross.

Wage for each people

Her hand has destroyed. (Quoted in Knapp 291)

Still with the false claim about the inferior Irish race, Charles Kingsley, ironically an English clergyman and a novelist and poet (1819-1875) has a more degrading

viewpoint of the Irish. In a letter to his wife, Kingsley says that he is “haunted by the human chimpanzees I saw along those hundred miles of horrible country...to see white chimpanzees is dreadful, if they were black, one would not feel it so much, but their skin, except where tanned by exposure, are as white as ours.” (Kingsley III). With this violent colonial discourse Kingsley strips the Irish of their own full humanity and degrade them into the animal status. Again, what difference does it make for British colonialists whether the apes are white or black! Apes are apes. The difference is only with the British ethnocentric mentality which aims mainly at erasing the Irish identity at large.

Gerald Monsman, in his “Writing the Self on the Imperial Frontier: Olive Schreiner and the Stories of Africa” makes it clear that: “the frequent comparison of natives to animals in nineteenth century accounts is not simply an inconsequential rhetorical formula, but an indication of an ingrained way of looking at the natives—of a reading and a writing, resistant to more tolerant formulations, of the script of their subjugation (150). If the Irish are portrayed as “Chimpanzees” in Kingsley’s letter, the Africans, in Isak Dinesen’s *Out of Africa and Shadows on the Grass*, are portrayed as “bats, hyena, dogs, ticks, on a sheep, or elephants. The old dark clear-eyed Native of Africa, and the old dark clear-eyed Elephant, --they are alike; you see them standing on the ground, weighty with such impressions of the world around them as have been slowly gathered and heaped up in their dim minds” (362).

Ironic enough is that Kingsley feels dread not because of the abject conditions of the Irish, which the British created by their own usurping claws, but because the Irish, as inferior apes, carry the same color as the skin of the superior British. Seamus Deane resourcefully explains: “The definition of Otherness, the degree to which others can be persuasively shown to be discordant with the putative norm, provides a rationale for conquest. The Irish reluctance to yield to the caricature of themselves as barbarous or uncivilized exposed the nullity of the English rationale although it also aggravated the ferocity of the process of subjugation.” (12)

One more British colonial claim is that the Irish are “a not very improvable [who] cling to their rags, their faith and their filth with all the besottedness of perfect ignorance and stupidity” (D’Arcy 8), and, therefore, they need to be civilized. No

wonder then that Edmund Spenser, in his *A View of the Present State of Ireland* “defended the severity of the measures taken in Munster against the native population and advocated the complete extirpation of the Irish kinship and legal systems as a prelude to the civilizing of the degenerate and barbarous Irish” (Quoted in Collin Meissner 164). Reminiscent of both Kingsley’s and Spenser’s descriptions as “chimpanzees” and “degenerate”, is Olive Scheiner’s description of the native Africans in her *Thoughts on South Africa* as having an “ape-like body” whose simple minds cannot perform in the “mental operations necessary for the maintenance of life under civilized conditions” (51, 108). As “descended from, baboons...they will bear resentment for long years with the persistency of many wild animals” (109). Resonating the “Irish reluctance to yield to the caricature of themselves as barbarous or uncivilized” (Deane 12), the Africans’ “persistency of wild animals has also aggravated the ferocity of the process of subjugation.” As a matter of fact, what the British brought to Ireland was not civilization as they have claimed; rather they brought dissent, division, and degradation. Brendan Bradshaw states that with the transmission of Protestantism to Ireland, “Ireland emerged with an apartheid constitution in law and practice, a religion providing the criterion of discrimination” (502). In support of Bradshaw’s statement, Nicholas P. Canny also comments further on the division in Ireland because of the Reformation: “two communities appealing to different histories, having mutually incompatible senses of identity and claiming to speak for the whole of the island developed in Ireland after the Reformation” (quoted in Andrew Hadfield 70).

With the establishment of Protestantism as a new faith in England, the British colonizers started to perpetuate a new claim to justify their conquest of Ireland: “Ireland [is] too easily manipulated by Wily Roman Catholic clergy. Her salvation lies in her rescue and ‘marriage’ to her English Father/ husband, whose benevolent and patriarchal governance will allow her to fulfill her essential self” (Innes 15). England’s separation from the “Wily Roman Catholic” church was essentially initiated because of the sexual greed of Henry VIII, the British monarch. So, who manipulated whom? Maybe the Reformation came later to camouflage the shameful deed of the monarch. After colonizing Ireland, did the British “allow her to fulfill her essential self”? If we agree that Ireland’s essential self is Catholic not Protestant

or “feminine”? to add, anything in life can take place between people despite the existence of some discord –except for marriage, there must be full accord. On this basis, did the “female” Ireland agree to marry the “male” England? How can a bride marry the object of her hatred with his bestiality and blind claim of superiority? If we agree that Ireland has already married Catholicism, the first husband who came to Ireland, then, there is no room for Protestantism because Catholic creed never allows divorce.

In terms of love, both England and Ireland were sometimes portrayed as two lovers. this is a big lie, an appeasing formula. Therefore, William Trevor’s statement in his *Fools of Fortune*, through this character, Marianne, that “at the map Ireland and England seemed like lovers ‘Don’t you think so, Mr. Lanigan? Does the map remind you curiously of an embrace. “A most extraordinary embrace”” (162) is beyond credibility. The justification of Trevor’s statement is that: First the English Marianne at this moment is lying heavily under the influence of love to her Irish cousin, Willie, who is, at the same time, absent somewhere she doesn’t even know. Second, Trevor’s statement is not without some colonial implication, though unintentional, because such an embrace is also based on the belief that countries are viewed as “male” and “female.” If not, the embrace would then be seen as that between two homosexuals or two lesbians. Third, geography cannot solely fulfill an intimate relationship between two countries. The antagonistic distance between England and Ireland is as large as the distance between the absent Willie and his beloved Marianne. Though the latter is somehow ratified by Willie’s return, we don’t even know when the former relation could be yet narrowed. An accepted interpretation of Trevor’s statement is that the so-called embrace between England and Ireland be seen as between two compatible friends, two equal powers with two different identities, the characteristic which is, unfortunately absent, like Willie.

Having discussed some of the major British colonial claims which collectively aim at stamping the Irish with the degrading label of femininity and shown the failure of the appeasing formulas whether geographical or social, it is necessary to refer to some of the British laws and machinations used to engender effeminization and consequently, complete subjugation of the Irish, the Catholics, in particular.

Friedrich Engels, immediately after a journey to different places in Ireland, sent a letter to Karl Marx 1856:

How often have the Irish started to try and achieve something, and every time they have

been crushed, politically and industrially! through systematic oppression, they have come to

be a completely wretched nation and now, as everyone knows, they have the job of providing

England, America, Australia, etc., with whores, day labourers, *maquereaux*, pickpockets,

swindlers, beggars, and other wretches. (Engels 49)

Engels’s words, “systematic oppression” and “wretched nation,” imply that well-planned, merciless arbitrary measures and laws have been issued directly against the native Irish, the Catholic, of course, to turn them into a miserable nation. England, as Farrell reveals, “is noted in the history books for having perfected the technique of divide-and-rule” (130), a technique subtly used by all colonizers to keep sectarian and class differences ever intensely ignited. Also, Julia O’ Faolain refers to this British machination and its effects in her novel *No Country for Young Men*: “Divide and conquer was their old strategy and there were always bad eggs on our own side” (211). A prominent example of the British colonial and divisive laws is that of the Penal Laws whose major objective was to transfer the land of Ireland from Catholic to protestant hands, and, more equally, to undermine Roman Catholicism in Ireland. But, if England has greatly succeeded in usurping the Catholic land, it has equally failed in eradicating the Catholic creed. It seems that the more colonially oppressed, the more faithful the Irish have become to their Catholicism.

A widely acknowledged crafty colonial scheme has been the abolition of the language of the colonized. An obvious example is to be found in the Frenchification of Algeria where people hardly speak Arabic as their native tongue. As language means identity and self-determination, Collin Meissner points out that “the Irish

language question has been at the center of the Irish/English conflict from the start,” and that “between England and Ireland language has been a most powerful colonizing weapon” (165). Franz Fanon, in “Racism and Culture,” clarifies that in colonial encounters a “new system of values is imposed...by heavy weight of cannons and sabers” (quoted in Meissner 169), and as Meissner elaborates, “this initial demonstration of superiority is followed by a general condemnation of the conquered’s culture and forced assimilation” (169). Two outstanding examples of the “forced assimilation” are found in Henry VIII’s 1536 Act of Union decree and previously in the 1366 Statutes of Kilkenny which “ordained and established that every Englishman use the English language and follow the English custom or risk forfeiture of land and property (Meissner 165). To show the British persistent interest in abolishing the Irish tongue, Meissner also quotes Gerand O’Brien’s statement pointing out that it was “the Cromwellians, even more than the Elizabethans, who realized the incompleteness of any conquest that failed to take account of a day-to-day verbal communication” (165). In his discussion of Friel’s *Translations*, Meissner discreetly exposes the British colonial scheme:

In remapping Ireland, the Royal Engineers, acting on behalf of the British Crown,

make Ireland England and, in the authoritative position of colonizer, offer the colonized.

a place to live. ...The act of mapping and naming, the act of erasing the old and making

the new, is equivalent to an ideologizing act of plunder... removing Gaelic and

enforcing English as the only accepted verbal commerce, not only reenacts the master/

slave relationship but brings the hierarchical relationship to mind every time the newly.

instituted place name is articulated. This level of linguistic colonialism is what Cromwell

had in mind, and it follows Fanon’s notion of deculturation. What more complete

domination [and effeminization] of an individual, a community, a country can there be

than to remove the language in which the conquered’s identity is articulated and

strengthened anew with every utterance? (170,171)

Nevertheless, the Irish, described by Meissner as “resistant,” have always realized that “identity centers around language... and is barely available elsewhere. [To them] a choice of a language is a choice of identity” (During 43).

All that has been said is just one side of the coin: Ireland is a female country, the Irish are dirty people “beyond redemption,” (Hadfield 80), a female race that must be rescued by marriage to the civilized male England. To affect this marriage and keep it going, many measures and laws were to be taken mercilessly hoping that such despotic measures would make Ireland and the Irish people completely subjugated and effeminized. Such charges against the Irish, in essence, are detestable and refutable; however, Ireland was “despoiled,” “its people were driven off the land and out of the country, and the faith of its fathers was ruthlessly abhorred by the despoiling invaders who were also the professors of antagonistic religious creed” (Farrell 129). Eight centuries of colonization, to quote Said in *Yeats and Decolonization*, must have “affected the detail and not just the outlines of life” (71). “Sure, they colonized our thoughts and minds. Took over our heads! It’s hard to get free” (O’Faolain 186).

The Irish: effeminizing:

Oppression and effeminization, as it seems, were not just a British trade. They also hatched from the inside. By oppression I mean the unbalanced power structure

that privileged some people over the others, which leads to grudge and violence. And by effeminization I mean using feminine attributes with the purpose of inferiorating individuals, groups or even countries. The higher circles of Irish society (Politicians and Church) were, if not more sinning like Lear they were, at least, as sinning as sinned against. The poor Irishmen and women were falling between the merciless fangs of colonial England and the fierce claws of politicians and the Irish authoritative institutions. The discussion of the internal oppression and effeminization will count on Julia O’Faolain’s *No Country for Young Men*, where people “have given up their individual wills: the men to Ireland and to drink, the women to Ireland and to the men” (Moore 15). *No Country for Young Men* is a novel that speaks about the crisis of four generations of two Irish families, the O’Malleys and Clanceys, and their trials to compromise with the situation in their country after the Irish Civil War of the 1920s. Moreover, it handles the political, social, religious, and economic devastation of Ireland after colonization. O’Faolain cleverly connects the country’s trauma with the conditions of its own people through themes of madness, confusion, and loss.

If the British have arbitrarily usurped the will of Ireland and the Irish, Ireland, and the Irish, ironically, have surrendered their wills to their politicians. Those politicians in *No Country for Young Men* are portrayed to be as fierce monopolizes as the British colonialists: two antagonistic predators devouring one prey. Judith Clancy asks Owen O’Malley, her brother-in-law, a cabinet minister: “what happened to the money?” “There was a page full of cash brought over, do you remember?” Owen, who “looked impatient” answers her: “What do you suppose the party members lived on during the five years we were refusing to take our seats, Judith? There were no salaries and no jobs for us. The other crowd had the country in their pockets. We had a right to that money...it was donated to the Republican cause, and we were the only ones faithful to the cause” (O’Faolain 188,189).

like the British colonizers, Owen O’Malley falsifies facts about the reality of his actions. His first answer to Judith’s questioning about the money was different: “Nobody got the money. Not us and not the other crowd.” (O’Faolain188). Owen O’Malley, who is indifferent, or let us say, ethnocentric, to the well-being of others,

as the British colonizer, though he claims the opposite, fears that Judith might “throw off the veil” and tell the “old stories,” the thing which might threaten his own position: “old stories can come out. Be leaked. Especially now I’m in the government. Don’t imagine I’m better able to protect you now...quite the opposite. You never know who’s picked up rumors. Someone could use you to get at me, embarrass the party...I’m talking for your own sake, Judith, and for Kathleen’s of course and our children’s, not to mention, the country” (O’Faolain 188). If colonialism “is a process of radical dispossession” (Deane 10) then Owen O’Malley is also a colonizer as England assumed the role of the speaker for Ireland as a whole, O’Malley is assuming the same role for the Irish people, and if England considered Ireland as muted and passive, O’Malley has done the same: “people is an abstraction” (313). To him: “The Irish people will follow. They won’t initiate. And don’t tell me they’re tired. They’re always tired. They must be goaded for their own good.” He adds “The people have no self and no aspiration towards determining anything at all until we infuse it into them. We are their virile soul, we are they” (312-313,314). The extended metaphor of comparing O’Malley’s masculine soul to that of a horse where they share “virility” resonates and mimics the colonial “virility” that the British have always been claiming over the female Irish. O’Malley’s use of the verb “infuse” is not without a sexual connotation-an effeminizing one. He, the bearer of the “virile soul”, the god-like, is supposed to pour or to ingrain his liquid into the dead bodies of his people or, in other words, to dictate his orders and his own will upon the Irish exactly as the British have always been doing. He says to himself “I trust my own deep instincts,” (193). “My instincts” also bears an implicit heavy sexual connotation. Or why did he not say, “my talents,” “my experience,” “my mind,” or even “my insight!” instead of instincts. “Very fond of himself Owen” (191). Owen here is abolishing the remains of the Irish identity which the British have left. To both, the Irish are passive feminine recipients and mere spectators.

The effeminization of Ireland is not only exposed thematically but is also presented through Julia O’Faolain’s writing techniques. One of her techniques is the perceptive usage of metaphors. Ireland as a country is stigmatized with femininity and sexual vulnerability. This is manifested in Owen O’Malley’s narration of his memories about the Irish civil war with his description of Ireland not only as a female

country but also as a loose female “Ireland was a whore” (9). The word “whore” is used as a metaphor with a double connotation about Ireland, as a female country and as sexually vulnerable in an immoral, disgusting manner. For O’Malley Ireland was the “mother” who mercilessly abandoned her kids, the “whore” who sold her body on regular basis for any available buyer, the “tailor” who cooperated with enemies and the “madwoman” who lost her sanity and killed her kids through fossilization in the past fuels “she was a mother who had given birth to us all, but she had turned against us. She had become a whore who sold herself to anyone who would pay her price. She had become a tailor who collaborated with our enemies. She had become a madwoman who killed her own children” (144). The sequence of comparisons in the previous quotation shows how O’Faolain implicitly uses metaphors as a clever technique to intensify the portrayal of Ireland’s image as an effeminized country that goes through degradation from a mom to a whore. These metaphors add up to the ugly effeminized portrayal of Ireland in the eyes of its people. In addition, O’Malley uses the pronoun “she” repeatedly in his lines to intensify the persistence of the idea. Ireland, for him, is not only a negligent mother or a loose, infidel female but an insane woman who kills all the young generations by keeping them stuck in a static, suffocating surroundings of the past. Such figurative language highlights the amount of anger and resentment that the speaker carries against his country and how he sees it in a way that is worse than the original colonizer. Furthermore, O’Faolain uses the extended metaphors in her novel to create an analogy between Ireland on one hand and a weak, victimized, and submissive female on the other hand. This is exemplified when the narrator introduces Judith Clancy, a seventy-five-year-old nun who has dementia, as “she was a woman who had been raped, and raped again, and again. She was a woman who had been beaten, and starved, and humiliated” (3). Judith represents the current Ireland as an old-aged female who lives in dementia and suffers hallucination. Ireland here, as represented by Judith, is compared to an infertile female who lost its will and who had repeatedly been violated sexually. Moreover, the metaphor extended to describe Ireland as a defeated, manipulated female that is subject to humiliation because of its vulnerability and inability to control its fate.

As Edward Said remarked in “Yeats and Decolonization” that “All of the subjugated peoples had it in common that they were considered to be naturally subservient to a superior, advanced, developed and...mature...whose role...was to instruct, legislate, develop, and at the proper times to discipline, war against, and occasionally exterminate” (72). Did Owen O’Malley “discipline” or “exterminate”? The answer comes as follows: “There are young fellows still out in the wilderness, she [Judith] reminded him, because they believed what you told a few years back and are so unsupple that they still do –the new IRA. Your crowd goal them now”. (O’Faolain 193). Well, it’s politics, or better say it’s home colonialism. Owen stubbornly replies: “I know what is best for the country, I have purposes, duties, people who depend on me, and I never wanted anything for myself” (193). Judith tauntingly makes it clear: “Power?” True, it is power that propagates falsity. As Ralph Ellison put it in *The Invisible Man*: “power is confident, self-assuring, self-starting, and self-stopping, self-warning and self-justifying. When you have it, you know it” (142). Thus, to best describe Owen, let us change just one word from Judith’s question to him: “Do you distinguish what is good for Owen from what is good for Ireland?” (191), to become: Do you distinguish what is good for Owen from what is good for **England**?”. Since colonialism is contagious, then the problem of Owen is that “what he is charged with is what he inherited” (During 45). Owen practices what he internalized through the process of growing up under the thumb of a colonizer. As Said explains: “Imperialism after all is a cooperative venture. Both the master and the slave participate in it, and both grew up in it, albeit unequally” (74).

Owen O’Malley, who has supposedly spent the largest part of his “country’s best interest” (188), has now steered the wheel to the opposite direction: “Owen’s party, after swearing for five years that they could never take the oath of allegiance to England’s king which the Free State constitution of 1922 required of all members taking their seats in the Dail, had suddenly decided that they could and would take it. Various excuses had been put forward.” (187). Ironically these excuses are reminiscent of the British colonial excuses of controlling colonized nations. Owen justifies this upheaval by saying that” We couldn’t leave the country to rot. We had to be practical, get our hands on the helm and steer it out of the doldrums” (193).

The previous quote shows how O’Faolain uses symbolism as another technique to reinforce the thematic presentation of Ireland as a female, helpless country that always needs someone to lead its destiny. “Doldrums” is a symbol of Ireland’s lull, stagnation stage that necessitates the existence of a vital, male to “steer” it out of its loss. Again, O’Malley is lying. He is, like the typical colonizer, able to fabricate reasons for his party’s deeds. The actual reason is that “he and his party had suffered oblivion and poverty after losing the Civil War” (188), exactly like any colonial power which, after losing one colony, must look for another to compensate for its loss. Is Owen’s struggle for independence or for survival? Anyway, the “cute pet fox,” as Judith describes him (193), is cheating on the “white chimpanzees” as Kingsley has already described the Irish. Therefore, Owen’s party “called everyname: “pitiless idealists”, “turn-coats” (192).

Nonlinearity narration is another technique that O’Faolain employs to highlight a deeper dimension to the state of perplexity and disillusion Ireland suffers from, and by implication its people. The nonlinear narration deviates from a linear, chronological plot line. While “The linear narrative follows the events chronologically... the non-linear narratives start from the middle of the story and go back and forth using different mechanics of flashbacks and flash-forwards.” (Zecharias, abstract) In *No Country for Young men* events and information are presented in a nonlinear manner that matches the sense of disillusion and confusion both O’Malley and Judith suffer from. O’Malley used to compare his current situation as a cabinet minister with his past experiences as a freedom fighter. For instance, in a flashback he recalls his past involvement in the Irish civil war and the death of his brother-in-law while attending a cabinet meeting at the present. Such sway and confusion between the past and the present reflect how Ireland, through nonlinearity technique, is depicted as a perplexed and fatigued country “a poor, backward, divided country” (45). For O’Malley Ireland is “a country that had betrayed its ideals and its people. A country that has no future.” (45). Ireland is eternally immersed in confusion with no glimpses of future hopes. Likewise, O’Faolain presents Judith Clancy through the nonlinear technique of narration where she jumps around her present life as a nun and her past as a young female participating in the Irish war for freedom. “I was in love with him,. I was in love

with Robert. He was a soldier. He was an English soldier. He was my enemy. He was my lover. He was my child’s father. He was my brother-in-law’s victim. He was my sin. He was my salvation. He was my past. He was my present. He will be my future.” (176). In the previous quote Judith reveals her confused character where past interferes with present, and the pricks of guilt of betraying her country are tough to endure. She lives with the guilt of loving an enemy. Her flashbacks of the past shows Judith as a symbol of a divided, fragile Ireland. Judith, Ireland by implication, “did not know who she was...she was a blank, a void, a nothing.” (234).

The setting of O’Faolain’s novel in Dublin strongly corresponds to the portrayal of Ireland as a broken, vulnerable female (confused and fragile). While the novel follows the traumas of four generations, it recounts the Irish civil war (1920) and the inner political and religious divisions. During such a critical time Dublin suffers from corruption, division, and violence, it is disillusioned between memories of the past, confusion of the present and uncertainty of the future. Judith describes Dublin when she leaves the convent to her family as “a mess, a shambles, a disgrace. A no country for young men. Or old. A no country for anyone.” (9). For her, Dublin (stands for Ireland as a whole) is a place of failure and hopelessness where there is no hope for tomorrow. Judith as a symbol of Ireland itself can see that there is no hope, and everything is going to waste like her own life.

Julia O’Faolain, realizing how severe the church affects the Irish, skillfully associates Owen O’Malley’s image as a symbol of the clergy members: “His clothes had a clerical look. The long, lean, black coat reached to his calves” (191) and “his face had grown more ascetic with the years” (192). Describing his high ability of argument, Judith says: “He was Jesus and you, if you disagreed with him, were a Pharisee” (193). Feeling discomfort because of Judith’s repetitive enquiries, “Distaste was back on Owen’s face. He was the one who should have stayed in a monastery”. To him, “the convent...was a self-indulgent place in which he, if he had been free to follow his inclination, would have lived happily” (192,193). Seamus, in a discussion with Owen O’Malley, gets “shocked” at his “arrogance” and attacks his limitless power compared to that of priests:

You should have never left the seminary, Owen. You’re worse than a priest now. As a

priest you’d have known your authority was borrowed from heaven. This way there’s no

limit to it...Oh, I’d rather see shopkeepers run the country than lay priests, and I’ll tell

you another thing...I’d rather priests than lay priests: bloody, self-appointed heroes

like yourself. The anointed priest has all eternity to reach paradise and its perfection,

but you want it here and now. You learned the desire for it from the church, but you lost

the Church’s patience you’re dangerous. Mad. Like rabid dogs. (313)

To intensify the vulnerability of the female Ireland O’Faolain perceptively employs more symbols. The Catholic Church, England, Education system, and Irishmen are symbols of oppression and authoritative patriarchal domination over submissive women. The main common ground between Owen O’Malley and the priests (and Irishmen by implication) is their degrading view of women. Did this emanate from the authoritative Catholic Church or from the male colonial England? Or both? Part of the answer could be found in a statement by Innes describing James Joyce’s fiction in which “priests are aligned with natural fathers and with the English in their desire to be ‘men of the world’, in their suppression of rebellious thoughts.” (149). The other part of the answer is found in O’Faolain’s saying, through Therese, that “Irishmen were [and are] all priests” (15). Add to this the Irish system of education. Now, there are four sides (Church, England, Education system, and Irishmen)-a cross upon which Irish women have always been crucified. Whatever source there might be for the oppression, it is, by large, “The authority of the fathers” (Innes 54): Priests are fathers, English colonizers are fathers. Irishmen are fathers/husbands-all are oppressors, all are, in different ways, colonizers. The

woman in this society is religiously, sexually, and psychologically colonized. She is “a type of her race a batlike soul walking [like Ireland] to the consciousness of itself in darkness and secrecy and loneliness” (Joyce 160-161); she is the “desire” of the British, of her men, why not of the priests too! Being their “Desire [it] urges [them] to possess” (Joyce 179). If the British are sinners, “the church is cruel like all sinners” (Joyce 204) and so are the O’Malley’s. The O’Malley’s of *No Country for Young Men*, starting with Owen and ending with Cormac, all are in a sense patriarchal figure. The fourteen-year-old boy symbolically became a patriarchal figure: “in the last scene, Cormac assumes control of the family: he races to fetch his father in the Heraldry Commission: He gives Michael “a chance” to dissuade Grainne, then himself makes the final plea: “You can’t just leave us” (Moore 15). Like his elders, all are sinners, suppressors of “rebellious thoughts.” Who are those “rebellious thoughts! They are Judith, Kathleen and Grainne, the O’Malley’s possessions. A society based on “Jesus and Papa” (Joyce 214) has its own dictations for women. Women are “real targets of colonialist and nationalist discourses” (Loomba 222). Women in Ireland are molded within the Catholic frame. The following lines from Albert Memmi’s *The Colonizer and the Colonized* might, as referring to Catholicism, distinctly elaborate on this frame: “Formalism of which religious formality is only one aspect, is the cyst which colonial society shut itself and hardens, degrading its own life [and people] to save [them]. It is a spontaneous action of self-defense, a means of safeguarding the collective consciousness without which people quickly cease to exist.” (101-102). What does this “religious formality,” Catholicism, dictate on women? Women are “real targets of colonialist and nationalist discourses” (Loomba 222). Women are the symbols of weakness and fragility.

Catholicism, the core of the “androcentric Christian religion” according to Ann Weekes, (“Diarmuid” 93-94), dictates that women must be pure, holy, and virtuous and, as Innes explains: “The influence of the clergy” is represented in “teaching women to accept a position of social inferiority through insistence on “duty” (61). With her strong “resistance to and criticism of authoritative control” (Weekes, *Irish Women Writers* 175), Julia O’Faolain plainly reports this rigid Catholic view of women, through Judith’s memory:

My darling and beautiful and pure and innocent little girls,’ said the priest...’How can I

Ever tell you the joy it brings to my heart to see innocence abloom today in this ancient,

holy and sacred land of ours?’ Innocence, he confided, was a gift you could never.

appreciate until you had lost it and then you could never get it back.... [The priest]

turned to the dangers of desiring knowledge—Eve’s sin, and naming things. The girls

perceived that their own peculiar virtue was one which could only be preserved by

ignoring it. It was like a lamp held up to light other people but masked from holder.

(301,302)

These devastating effects of the patriarchal paradigm, “the authority of the fathers” (Innes 54) destroy women and by implication Ireland. This kind of oppression not only has had its great echo on Judith’s mind, but it has considerably contributed to the formation of her asexual personality as well. She condemns herself when she feels “numbed: astounded into submission by [Sparky’s] tongue sliding dementedly between her lips [and also because] her body was behaving wildly” (261). Ann Weeks argues that Judith’s “reaction to Sparky’s kiss does not confirm her own and other women’s sexuality but the ascetics’ lessons, and the experience of her body is discarded in favor of the fathers” (Irish women writers 185). As a seventeen-year-old- girl, “Judith never reached the stage of being vain since she never discovered whether she was plain or not. She had a suspicion that she might be about to blossom but put off the moment by slouching and wearing unbecoming clothes,” thereby, degrading herself (21). Contrary to her sister, Kathleen, who was “eager to marry”

(36), Judith “carefully kept herself from knowing about sappy things like love and courting” (232). As Weekes explains: “Judith, having adopted the asexual paradigm, sees her own reaction as a response to evil. So, when Sparky would interfere with Owen’s plans for war, Judith is in her own mind justified in killing the evil opponent of good” (Irish Women Writers 185). Judith is a symbol of Ireland’s submission to all the patriarchal dictates that will result in dementia and self-hatred.

O’Faolain employs situational ironies to strengthen her thematic focus about the effeminization of Ireland. What happens to Judith is against what is promised to any submissive female. Judith, who adopts the patriarchal paradigm, is ironically rewarded by confinement in the convent, by oblivion and by madness. So, obedience of the patriarchal figures is not salvation. When Judith expresses her fear of losing sanity in the convent, she receives two fatherly answers. The priest: Judith “was just a silly female. Imaginative.” Owen O’Malley: Perhaps “it’s sex” (189) Judith tragically remains “a young girl in an aged body” (182). Judith’s ironical life is an epitome of Ireland as a whole. When she submits she is living dead isolation as a nun. Unlike Judith, Kathleen revolts against the paradigm, but she is also rewarded by confinement at home—Owen’s own convent and by “deletion” which, according to Weekes, is “another kind of madness”. The Imagination Cruciband Kathleen gives us is an accurate image of her father/ husband, O’Malley, whom she sees as:

“Cold as ice.” A machine run on will-power. I can’t stand him now. He makes my flesh

Creep. I’m glad he doesn’t seem to care for me anymore...I don’t want a hero. I want a

man...I’d forgotten what men could be like. Maybe I never knew...[Owen] is arrogant,

abstract, he never changes his underwear... I am twenty-four. I’m losing my looks...my

hair is falling out...I’m trapped... I’m sick of being the woman of the house!
Alone! Everyone’s mother and nobody’s wife. Everyone depends on me and
who can I depend

on? The Da (323,324,325)

To extend the irony, it is the “Da” who is supposed to be dependable in Ireland, the father priest, the father O’Malley, or even the English father. O’Malley is her father: he even wears “The gold chain...which belonged to her father” (189). Ironically, Owen, to women, was never dependable. He kept Kathleen away. To him, like most of the Irishmen, “Women belonged in a domestic sphere” (190). “There is nothing here for a girl like Kathleen but marriage” (259), a “Repressive marriage” which, as Weekes explains, “even more than convent life effectively negates the independent woman, neutralizes her sense of self, her sensuality, and indeed, from a male perspective, effectively solves the problem of women’s disorder” (Irish Women Writers 186). Kathleen’s attempt to escape with Sparky is aborted as time is not yet ripe for liberation. Sparky is killed by Judith, the female agent of the manly paradigm, and Kathleen is contained. She has no freedom to choose. The only choice she has is to stay home, where she is supposed to be “useful” as a “mother of six children with another on the way” (193). The Irish father-husbands, Weekes argues, see women as “deviant. This deviancy asserts itself in action disruptive to the established, male pattern, hence must be repressed in the interest of order” (“Diarmuid” 99)

Discreetly viewing the highly fettering parental bond and also the influence of the Catholic church on Irishmen in their perception of women, Julia O’Faolain reaffirms, again, through Grainne, that “Men in this country had been educated by clerics [and that] Monastic tradition described woman as a bag of shit and it followed that sexual release into such a receptacle was a topic about as fit for sober discussion as a bowel movement” (155). Grainne, whose case culminates the case of Irish woman and of Ireland at large, is seen as conscious not only of the influence of the church on Irishmen but of her identity as well. Like Kathleen’s, Grainne’s husband, Michael O’Malley is “frigid” and “too drunk” (155), with a “wobbly ego” (204) as he describes himself. To Grainne, “sex has been of such minimal importance in her

marriage” because of Michael’s “lack of potency” (249); Michael who cannot discuss sex believes that “women are bred to masquerade, being ashamed of their essential function” and sees that “after years of marriage, you didn’t want [sex] that much”. “Women wanted it...because it confirmed their sense of themselves...basic creatures” (204,305). But, unlike Kathleen, Grainne is more independent as she leaves Michael for five months and then returns hoping that things might get better. As matters get worse, she turns to Owen Rowe “looking for more than sex, or more through sex” (147). Unlike Judith, Grainne got rid of Catholicism: “After an acute crisis of religiosity, she had given up the church,” and she mockingly and reluctantly resembles her “confessors” who “poked spiritual probes into her mind” to the “gynecologist who poked lubricated finger into her vagina to take a smear test” (98).

The impressive simile O’Faolain creates in the previous quotation between “confessors” and “gynecologists,” asserts the far degree of intrusion the Catholic Church has in Irish man’s life and in Irish woman’s privacy. The verb “Poked” shows implicitly that the role of the church is violent and no longer favored or liked. More powerful than Kathleen, Grainne becomes in a double relation including Owen Rowe and James Duffy, but she also challenges Rowe by keeping her love relation with James going. In a rough discussion with Rowe, the rebellious Grainne responds violently to his authoritative cupping of her breast, she bit his hand “until she felt her teeth pierce the skin. Blood flowed into her mouth, but she kept biting” (153). So, Grainne’s double relation with Rowe and James symbolically resonates Ireland’s double situation (Irish –Colonizers?). Moreover, Grainne’s violent response (her bloody biting of Rowe’s authoritative hand) is a symbol of Ireland’s wishful dream to stop the hands of her usurping men. Grainne’s dream of escape with James is aborted, like Kathleen’s, by the violent murder of James. But unlike Kathleen, who is restored into O’Malley’s home forever, Grainne stands outside home. Michael, mistakenly as usual, believes that “fatigue, habit [and] heritage, were stakes planted around [Grainne], holding her here, limiting her choices, “but poor Michael...how wrong he was she could go anytime she liked. Anytime at all” (327).

Grainne, as a matter of fact, stands as a symbol of the new Irish woman and of what Ireland should be. Grainne was not confined by the strict Catholic convention of women, nor beguiled by fake politicians—the home colonizers who enslave the

women, the land, and the people. Her sexual relationship with Rowe didn’t prevent her from having another with James. Rowe’s ferocity could not confine her. Grainne’s battle is more fierce, more tactful, and more fruitful than Judith’s: Judith sacrificed herself, Grainne sacrificed herself and her son, though in a different way. Judith is momentarily overcome by just a kiss from Sparky, Grainne is never overcome even by complete sexual relationship. Sex, to Grainne, is just a bridge, she needs more “through sex...she has been looking for more than sex” (147). Judith behaves spontaneously and is concerned in the convent, whereas Grainne behaves skillfully and never surrenders to the male’s dictations. Judith as a savior almost dies after her sacrifice, but Grainne stands stronger and more obstinate.

The comparison between Judith and Grainne, the two saviors (Kathleen is included by implication), might invite us to throw some more light on the 1970s home colonizer: Owen Rowe. Owen O’Malley, though for personal interest, surrenders to the will of the people by joining the cabinet and by deserting his IRA men, though temporarily; Owen Rowe, not different from his father but more ferocious, “funneled funds to the hard boys of the IRA and got them to break away from the other lot and from the Provos” (162), preparing for another civil war. Rowe resembles his father and himself to de Gaulle, but shyly attains a more forward position than his father’s: “A pantomime horse...takes two men to animate it. I aspire only to be the front legs. The rear, the past, the equivalent of de Gaulle’s resistance record, is provided by my illustrious Da” (61).

Within this repressive context, Judith remains asexual and mad with a bog-like memory-completely victimized. Grainne, on the other hand, despite her sexual affairs, is, like Ireland, “a snail with a tough shell” (210) who shows up just the outer layer to liberate the whole edifice. It is Grainne, now, and hopefully Ireland as a whole, who reverses the roles; it is she, with her “rough fingers” like “sandpapers” who touches the fluidly perfect” body of James (210), acting a manly role. Ireland, from such context, needs role reversal or at least equality. With the Irish remain as “some black men whose slave ancestor was given the slave-owner’s name” (O’Faolain 205). Or, as it comes through James to Grainne: “Well, it suits you to say that British hypocrisy—which they’ve shed, by the way—got dumped here as part

of their colonial cast-offs and you preen in their old cast-offs and think you’ve liberated yourselves” (229-230). We hope not.

To conclude, this paper reaches the following findings: first, the British colonizer affirms England’s superiority and masculinity through the intended and well-planned labelling of Ireland with femininity and inferiority. The female Ireland, consequently, will need the masculine England to protect and guide. Second, the colonized Irish politicians and religious men, who lived the misery of colonialism, ironically turned to be worse than the British colonizer. Third, the charm of authority changes people and brings the worst out of them. Once in authority, O’Malley claims his responsibility as a protector of his own people, but gradually turns to be another aggressive colonizer. Fourth, Julia O’Faolain’s writing techniques (using metaphors, symbols, ironies, and non-linearity narrative technique) help to intensify the main argument of this paper of how the concepts of colonialism are contagious from the outer colonizer to the inner colonizer. This paper rings a bell about nations that were under colonization, where the colonized may turn to be worse than the colonizer. It is a call to speculate more into the psychology of the colonized to understand how it is shaped through manipulation and oppression.

Works Cited

Arnold, Matthew. *On the Study of Celtic Literature*. London, Smith, Elder and Co., 1867 (digital book) / <http://books.google.com/>

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. Routledge, 2007.

Benjamin, Walter. “Theses on the Philosophy of History.” *Contemporary Literary Criticism: Literary and Cultural Studies*. Eds. Robert Con Davis and Ronald Schleifer. New York: Longman, 1994. 45-52

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994.

Bradshaw, Brendan. “Sword, Word and Strategy in the Reformation of Ireland.” *Historical Journal* 21 (1978): 475-502.

Journal of Scientific Research in Arts
(Language & Literature) volume 25 issue 1 (2024)

Burney, Shehla. “Edward Said and Postcolonial Theory: Disjunctured Identities and the Subaltern Voice.” *Counterpoints*, vol. 417, 2012, pp. 41–60. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42981699>. Accessed 28 Aug. 2023.

Canny, Nicholas P. “Identity Formation in Ireland: The Emergence of the Anglo Irish.” *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World*. Eds. Nicholas P. Canny and Anthony Pagden. New Haven: Yale UP, 1978. 159-212.

Childress, Alice. *Wedding Band*. New York: Samuel French, 1973.

Churchill, Caryl. *Cloud Nine*. London: Pluto Press, 1983.

Conklin, Alice L. “Colonialism and Human Rights, A Contradiction in Terms? The Case of France and West Africa, 1895-1914.” *The American Historical Review*, vol. 103, no. 2, 1998, pp. 419–42. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2649774>. Accessed 26 Sept. 2023.

Croisy, Sophie. “Algerian History, Algerian Literature, and Critical Theories: An Interdisciplinary Perspective on Linguistic Trauma and Identity Reformation in Postcolonial Algeria.” *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2008, pp. 84–106. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41210007>. Accessed 30 Sept. 2023.

D’ Arcy, Fergus. “St. Patrick’s Other Island: The Irish Invasion of Britain.” *Eire-Ireland: A Journal of Irish Studies* 28.2(Summer 1993)7-17.

Deane, Seamus. “Introduction.” *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature*. By Terry Eagleton, et.al. Minneapolis: U. of Minneapolis P, 1990. 3-19.

Dinesen, Isak. *Out of Africa and Shadows on the Grass*. New York: Vintage, 1989.

During, Simon. “Postmodernism or post-Colonialism Today.” *Textual Practice* 2.3 (Winter 1988) 32-47.

Ellison, Ralph. *Invisible Man*. New York: Vantage, 1969.

Engels, Friedrich. Marx-Engels Collected Works, Volume 40, p. 49. Abridged in *Der Briefwechsel zwischen F. Engels und K. Marx*, Stuttgart, 1913.

Fabian, Johannes. “Language, History and Anthropology” *philosophy of Social Sciences* 1(1): (1971)19-47.

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington, preface by Jean-Paul Sartre, Grove Press, 1963.

Farrell, James T. *On Irish Themes*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1982.

Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A critical introduction*. New York: Columbia UP. 1998.

Hadfield, Andrew. “English Colonialism and National Identity in Early Modern Ireland.” *Eire-Ireland: A Journal of Irish Studies* 28.1 (Spring 1993) 69-86.

Innes, C.L. *Women and Nation in Irish Literature and Society, 1880-1935*. Athens: The U of Georgia P, 1993.

Jewsiewicki, B. “The Great Depression and the Making of the Colonial Economic System in the Belgian Congo.” *African Economic History*, no. 4, 1977, pp. 153–76. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3601245>. Accessed 23 Sept. 2023

Joyce, James. *A portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Ed. R.B. Kershner. Boston: Bedford Books, 1993.

Kingsley, Frances E., ed. Charles Kingsley, *His Letters and Memories of His Life*. Vol. 3. London: Macmillan, 1901. Print

Knapp, James F. “Irish Primitivism and Imperial Discourse: Lady Gregory’s Peasantry.” *Macro Politics of Nineteenth-Century Literature: Nationalism, Exoticism, Imperialism*. Eds.

Jonathan Arc and Harriet Rivto. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1991.28 6-301.

Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/postcolonialism*. London: Routledg.1998.

McGee, Patrick. *Telling the Other. The Question of Value in Modern and Postcolonial Writing*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1992.

Meissner, Collin. “Words Between Worlds: The Irish Language, the English Army, and the Violence of Translation in Brain Friel’s Translations.” *Colby Quarterly* 28.3 (September 1992): 164-174.

Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. New York: The Orion, 1965.

Mishra, Vijay, and Bob Hodge. “What Was Postcolonialism?” *New Literary History*, vol. 36, no. 3, 2005, pp. 375–402. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20057902>. Accessed 27 Aug. 2023.

Monsman, Gerald. “Writing the Self on the Imperial Frontier: Olive Schreiner and the Stories of Africa.” *Black/ White Writing: Essays on South African Literature*. Ed. Pauline Flecher. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1993. 134-155.

Moore, Thomas. “Triangles and Entrapment: Julia O’Faolain’s *No Country for Young Men*.” *Colby Quarterly* 27.1 (March 1991): 9-16.

O’Faolain, Julia. *No Country for Young Men*. Bungay, Suffolk: Chaucer, 1980.

Said, Edward. “Yeats and Decolonization.” *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature*. By Terry Eagleton et al. Minneapolis: U of Minneapolis P, 1990. 69-95.

---“From Orientalism.” *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory. A Reader*. Eds. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman. New York: Columbia UP, 1994. 132-149.

Schreiner, Olive. *Thoughts on South Africa*. London: Unwin, 1923.

Smith, Kimbra L. “Telling Histories: Everyday Inequalities and the Construction of Authenticity.” *Practically Invisible: Coastal Ecuador, Tourism, and the Politics of Authenticity*, Vanderbilt University Press, 2015, pp. 29–63. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv16757c2.5>. Accessed 27 Sept. 2023.

Trevor, William. *Fools of Fortune*. London: Penguin, 1984.

Van Krieken, R. (1999) “The Barbarism of Civilization: Cultural Genocide and the ‘Stolen Generations’”, *British Journal of Sociology* 50(2): 297–313.

Weekes, Ann. *Irish Women Writers: An Uncharted Tradition*. Kentucky: The UP of Kentucky, 1990.

---“Diarmuid and Grainne Again: Julia O’Faolain’s No Country for Old Men.” *Eire-Ireland: A Journal of Irish Studies* 21.1 (Spring 1986): 89-102.

Young, Robert JC. “Postcolonial Remains.” *New Literary History*, vol. 43, no. 1, 2012, pp. 19–42. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23259359>. Accessed 24 May 2023.

Zeacharias, Justin
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355117301_An_Effective_Use_of_Non-linear_Narrative_Techniques_in_the_Selected_Contemporary_War_Novels.
Accessed 4 Nov.2023.

تأنيث الأيرلنديون في رواية جوليا أوفولين "لا يوجد وطن للشباب"

سلوى عبد السلام الشاذلي

قسم اللغة الانجليزية - جامعة بدر، القاهرة، جمهورية مصر العربية.

المستخلص:

تبحث هذه الورقة كيف كانت أيرلندا ضحية للقوى الخارجية والداخلية على حد سواء. بالنسبة لإنجلترا كقوة خارجية، تعتبر أيرلندا دولة أنثوية والأيرلنديون شعب قدر، جنس أنثوي يجب إنقاذه عن طريق الزواج من إنجلترا المتحضرة الذكورية. لإتمام هذا الزواج وإبقائه مستمراً، تم اتخاذ عدد كبير من التدابير والقوانين بلا رحمة، على أمل أن تؤدي مثل هذه الإجراءات الاستبدادية إلى إخضاع أيرلندا والشعب الأيرلندي ومحاولة تأنيثه بشكل كامل. لم يكن القمع ومحاولة التأنيث مجرد فكرة بريطانية، بل نشأت أيضاً من الداخل الأيرلندي. وان لم تكن الدوائر العليا في المجتمع الأيرلندي (الساسة والكنيسة)، أكثر خطيئة مثل لير، فإنها على الأقل أخطأت. ووقع الشعب الأيرلندي المسكين كضحية بين الأنبياب الشرسة لإنجلترا الاستعمارية والمخالب الشرسة للسياسيين والمؤسسات الأيرلندية السلطوية. ستعتمد هذه الورقة على رواية جوليا أوفولين "لا يوجد وطن للشباب" لإظهار التقنيات المختلفة لكل من عملية القمع والتأنيث الداخلية والخارجية في أيرلندا. وسيكون التركيز على كيفية تحول السياسيين ورجال الدين الأيرلنديون الذين عاشوا بؤس الاستعمار إلى أسوأ من المستعمر البريطاني. بمجرد وصوله إلى السلطة، يعلن السياسي الأيرلندي "أومالي" مسؤوليته كحامي لشعبه، ولكنه يتحول إلى مستعمر آخر. ستمتد مناقشة الرواية من التحليل الموضوعي إلى التحليل الفني لتقنيات الكتابة التي استخدمتها جوليا أوفولين لتوضيح كيفية تأنيث أيرلندا. سيتم التحليل من خلال تطبيق أفكار نظرية "ما بعد الاستعمار"

الكلمات المفتاحية: *ايرلندا- التأنيث- ما بعد الاستعمار- القمع*