

The Lie of the Land: Irish Modernism in a Nativist Ireland

Shahriyar Mansouri

Shahid Beheshti University (<s_mansouri@sbu.ac.ir>)

Abstract:

In *Waiting for Godot* (1953) Beckett draws upon a non-temporal stasis that has paralyzed the nation over the past decades, and demystifies such a paralysis by structuring the play around not only a fixed milieu and an unnamable saviour but also a widespread unwillingness in appreciating the urgency of this dominant spirit of stasis. I argue the roots of such severe pessimism, formlessness, and radical stasis as dominant elements in the works of Irish moderns can be found in a dichotomous perception of modernism and its emergence and development in post-independence Ireland. The rise of the State and their neoconservative politics of formation appear as internal forces that obstructed a proper appreciation of Irish modernism inside and outside Ireland. By exploring the roots of modernism in post-independence Ireland, and the conflict between modernism and the rise of a neo-colonial State, this essay examines a critical and ideological reticence within the nation which considers Irish modernism as a sub-category of the movement rather than an independent variety, precluding a reading of Irish moderns in at once a national and international context.

Keywords: Irish modernism, negative dialectic, postcolonial identity, Samuel Beckett, Yeatsian hero

In reading Samuel Beckett's barren depiction of humanity and modernism, scholars suggest that such "uproarious pessimism", formlessness, and radical stasis are rooted in an Irish perception of modernism and its emergence and development in a post-independence Ireland (*Waiting for Beckett*, 1993) (see Esslin 1986, 194; see also Moorjani, Veit 2004, 265). As Martin Esslin suggests, in *Waiting for Godot* (1953) Beckett draws upon a non-temporal stasis that has paralyzed the nation over the past decades, and demystifies

such a paralysis by structuring the play around not only a fixed milieu and an unnamable saviour, but also a widespread unwillingness in appreciating this dominant spirit of stasis. While *Waiting for* the nation to revisit and reflect on the duality of static nativism and modernism, non-conformist critics such as Flann O'Brien, especially in his *The Hard Life* and *An Béal Bocht*, and Beckett portrayed modernism as it was perceived by the Irish under the nationalist manifesto, namely, an inherent duality for the nationalists and the nativist State (see Boyce 1995, 325-330). Modernism in Ireland was being admired for the very same reason it was being detested, namely, a spirit of change and resistance. In other words, while modernism was at once disdained for its British roots, and an embedded spirit of resistance and defiance which, as Jonathan Bolton notes, could endanger the State's "politics of chastity", it was also admired by critics for its dialectics of self-criticism, allowing for the nation to not just relive but question the sacred domains of Irish life and Life in Ireland (2010, 165)¹.

Beckett's detailed, albeit drastically isolated, illustration of unfulfilled formations and unredeemed pessimisms, of an endemic silence caused by a "lingual 'block'"², and of incessant engagement with an unnecessary *wait* also invites a historical and political look back at an Irish reading of modernism in an 'anti-nativist' Ireland. The result is a nation-wide binary of modernism as a catalyst, radicalizing the ideological and political perception of Irish identity in the 1920s and onwards³, and the conflict between the inherently nativist oppositional movements that emerged in the 1920s, and especially the 1930s, as a response to the State's neocolonial politics of oppression⁴, confinement, and wide scale censorship of media and thought⁵.

According to Fredric Jameson, discussing modernism in Ireland in the postmodern era is clearly itself an exemplar of retrospection: engaging with a concept, the foundation of which is either regarded as miscalculation or discarded as antiquarian intellectualism (see Jameson 1990, 43-45). This essay explores the narrative of modernism and modern Irish identity in post-in-

¹ On Irish life and life in Ireland see Kiberd 1996, 32-55. See also Kiberd 1984, 11-25.

² Pozzo: "Have you not done tormenting me with your accursed time! It's abominable! When! When! One day, is that not enough for you, one day he went dumb, one day I went blind, one day we'll go deaf, one day we were born, one day we shall die, [...]" see Beckett 2006 [1956], 82.

³ On the emergence of this duality as a threat to Irish identity and culture concept see Peter Berresford Ellis 1989.

⁴ On the State's reinforcement of neocolonial structure of formation see Boyce 1995, 339-374. Also see Smith 2001, 111-130.

⁵ For instance, the Censorship of Publications Act 1929 under Éamon de Valera's administration at once crippled Irish novelists and a more inclusive distribution of modern Irish thought.

dependence Ireland by engaging with the connection between such a multifaceted binary of radicalism, rooted in Irish modernism and advocated by Irish moderns, and an anachronistic backwardness dominant in the nativist State's politics of formation.

As Brendan Kennelly argues, while Beckett and his like-minded contemporaries left Ireland, as it was becoming a place unappreciative of their thought and presence, they "took Ireland in [their] pocket" (*Waiting for Beckett*, 1993) or wrote on their heart, dedicating their writing to the motherland and its tribulations of the trilogy of revivalism, traditionalism and modernism⁶; and to critique an oppressive static nativism that resisted a proper and timely emergence of modern Irishness (*Waiting for Beckett*, 1993)⁷. For modern Irish writers modernism is defined only retrospectively, that is by reflecting on the history of the movement in an anti-modern Ireland, and on the history of their nation in flux, that is from colonial to anti-colonial to nationalist, and eventually to modern republicanism. Although modern Irish writers engage with Theodor Adorno's conception of identity, and thus think in contradiction simply to detach themselves from the social subjectivism imposed by the State's neocolonial architecture of containment, they externalize the thought in a fashion which resembles an internal sense of conservatism, if not hesitance (Adorno 1973, 145).

The divide, that is between a modern appreciation of Irish identity and an intra-community Otherness informed by the State's nativist norms⁸, obliges not just the author but also their characters to create a set of self-generated norms to protect the psychological border between the intruding societal norms and the individuals' state of selfhood and independence. The more supported and psychologically well-reasoned the border, that is by isolating and detaching themselves from becoming a part of society's politics of territorialisation and division, the stronger the chance for the character to understand the inner reality behind his society. The modern Irish protagonist, in this respect, needs to listen to a tape, as did *Krapp*, or should reflect on memories that had formed his life as in Beckett's "The Expelled", *Malone Dies*, *Murphy*, and in Seamus Deane's *Reading in the Dark* (1997). In these narratives, I argue, protagonists engage in an unconscious re-examination

⁶ Joyce's famous reference to Ireland: "When I die, Dublin will be written on my heart".

⁷ In his conclusion to *Modernism and the Celtic Revival*, Gregory Castle identifies notes revivalism as an actual milieu necessary for the emergence of Irish modernism. According to Castle, "to varying degrees, . . . revivalism contributed to the formation of Irish modernism by exploiting a specific relation between the traditional and the modern, a relation determined by the technologies of anthropology and ethnography coming to bear on the traditional folkways and texts of the Irish peasantry". See Castle 2001, 249.

⁸ On fascism and the emergence of a neocolonial Irish subject see Cronin 2004, 5-25. Also see Coackley and Gallagher 2010, 132-155.

of the past, struggling to synchronize an anachronistic sense of modernity against a backdrop of a predominantly conservative, nativist history via an idiosyncratic critical discourse that, as Gerry Smyth argues, is modern and rooted in “gender and individual subjectivity” (1997, 18)⁹. These characters either critique the significance of the nationalist ethos or denounce it all together, introducing it as an impasse. Declan Kiberd defines this intentional to and fro, and celebration of retrospective tendency imposed by a ruling State as “internal colonialism”, a force which is intrinsically at odds with a candid portrayal of developing modernism in a postcolonial nation (2005, 163).

Kiberd’s conception of ‘internal colonialism’, I suggest, can be read in light of Giorgio Agamben’s reading of power relations in a destituent State (see Agamben 2014). Agamben claims that the politics of power and control in a neocolonial State is informed by its interest in maintaining a purely vague and blurred line between anomy and anarchy on the one hand, and progression and retrospection, especially vis-à-vis its appreciation of modernism, on the other. The modern Irish narratives that emerged in the wake of independence, as Jameson notes, stand as “socio-symbolic messages” from a national unconscious that reject the postist State by providing a stark portrayal of a form of Irishness which is at once modern and critically resistant to nativist *telos* of formation (Jameson 1981, 141). The resulting narratives, I argue, discuss postcolonial visions that oscillate between a bygone colonial culture and thought, and a culture of stasis that delayed a timely utilization and maturation of modernism in a postist Ireland¹⁰.

Irish modernism has been perceived as a radical movement that is at once delayed and ambivalent in its nationalist context. For it has been misconstrued by scholars as a postist appreciation of the present that only lies in the past¹¹. In other words, the belated modernism in Ireland has triggered a neoconservative mentality that, as Jürgen Habermas suggests, defies the currency and progressiveness of modern thought, and translates the present as the past in prospect (see Habermas 1996, 38-55). Modernism, therefore, emerges as a temporal vagueness in the works of Irish moderns on a national scale: from George Moore’s confessional memoir that narrates how such a resistant nation-wide ambivalence made him leave Ireland for London and Paris, to Patrick McCabe’s *The Butcher Boy* (1992), illustrating a contradictoriness that has dominated the life of youths in a reformatory, semi-modernized, post-

⁹ In the Adornian definition, modernity and modernism are inseparable and interchangeable complementary concepts. See Adorno and Horkheimer 2002.

¹⁰ On understanding the superfluity of ‘recreation and despair’ in the post-colonial literature see Walcott 1995, 371.

¹¹ For instance see Declan Kiberd’s discussion of Irish moderns’ response to the Irish language movement in the 1960s as a delayed answer; and the 60s as a delayed answer to modernism in Ireland. See Kiberd 2005, 14-20.

independence Ireland¹². While Moore's *Confessions of a Young Man* is more informed by a Yeatsian search for a great man with outstanding features during Irish revivalism, McCabe's narrative represents the age of containment during de Valera's nativist vision of Ireland, in which political vagaries and socio-economic inconsistencies were regarded as political normality during decolonization¹³. As a revivalist vision of an Irish Ireland was altered by the State, the very values that defined Irishness too rapidly changed into what personified Francie in McCabe's *The Butcher Boy*: a rebel, perturbed by social inconsistencies and parochial abnormalities. Francie's actions, therefore, are labelled as erratic, and his perception of society as in the form of other boys vaguely represents a sense of unity demanded by conformist society. McCabe's subtle depiction of Ireland in the 1920s and 1930s, reflects a generation of idiosyncratic non-conformists whose most dominant objectives are not self-formation and social integration, but rather questioning the politics of confinement, and what lays the foundation of Irish nationalism, namely, Nation, Family, Church, and a belated recognition of modernity. This critical discourse emerged as a meta-critical discussion that later in the 1920s and onwards, not only enabled the moderns to voice their disgruntlement with the State's politics of *submission or marginalia* but started a backfire, especially on resistant voices, as critics such as Eimar O'Duffy (*The Wasted Island*, 1920; *The Lion and the Fox*, 1922; *King Goshawk and the Birds*, 1926) engaged in a fierce critique of revolutionaries and at once statist.

As Howard Booth and Nigel Rigby argue, the critical reticence to acknowledge the Irish moderns as modernist authors is rooted in the nation's immediate Deleuzian *desire* for labelling and then territorializing such literary figures as national or others¹⁴. By distancing not just their style but also their understanding of literature as a concept that stands beyond the limitations of national and individual consciousness, Irish moderns such as Beckett and Flann O'Brien emerged as some of the earliest examples who were regarded as both national and modern, the dialectical works of whom explored concepts such as narrativising the nation's plight of deformation induced by political abnormalities. In this respect, Irish modernism, a question of both chronological veracity and critical authenticity (see Booth, Rigby 2000), arises as a vaguely categorized "variety of Irish nationalis[m]" that plagued the nation before and well after the 1920s during socio-political struggles, becoming yet

¹² On the conflict between a resistant nativism and modern non-conformism see Mansouri 2013, 131-172.

¹³ On political inwardness, and socio-cultural politics of containment in the 1920s and 1930s see O'Driscoll 2008, 280-298. See also Nelson 2012, 231-250.

¹⁴ On the Deleuzian concept of territorialization and deterritorialization see Deleuze and Guattari 1977.

another misconstrued element of possession and discussion between Unionists, nationalists, and revivalists (Maley 1996, 34). In other words, as Irish nationalism has been seen as more of a “bundle of sentiments than a logical arrays of fact”, modernism would then emerge as an Adornian non-identarian form of expressing the same bundle of sentiments, rather than a radically dialectical discourse; moreover, the nativist government, as Boyce suggests, was doubted to have been “controlled by Unionist and Freemasons”, rather than the freedom-seeking Irish (1995, 342).

As Gregory Castle claims, Irish modernism has been perceived as a subcategory of an inherently European radical movement, follows it in every step and “shadows all features, and peculiarities”, and eventually incorporates an embedded equivocality in understanding the movement (2006, 120; see also 2001, 120-129). For in its Marxian specificity, as Marshall Berman suggests, “modernity [as a socio-historical experience] is either embraced with a blind and uncritical enthusiasm, or else condemned with a new-Olympian remoteness and contempt” (1982, 24); this is an undecided polarity that emerges as a notable quality of twenty first-century modernism¹⁵. However, I suggest that the multifacetedness and at once contradictoriness of concepts such as modernism, Irish nationalism and modern Irishness transcends the internationalism of modernism, which according to Booth and Rigby has been marginalizing the Irish moderns. I contend that such a labyrinthine nature of modernism in Ireland should be regarded as a dynamic impetus that introduces the roots of a belated form of Irish modernism to be not just in the Irish wars but an atavistic vision of the state.

According to Terry Eagleton, nationalism and modernism as non-identical twins emerge and mature in a nation that is politically conservative and socially traditionalist. It is modernism, however, that distinguishes its radically anti-bourgeois aesthetic, “anti-historicist consciousness”, and conventionally anti-traditionalist objectives from the State’s retrospectively progressive nativism, forming an irreconcilable dichotomy that is prevalent in both pre- and post- independence Ireland (1996, 308)¹⁶. In this regard, while British modernism initially emerges as an apolitical movement with most limited tendencies towards radical politics¹⁷, I argue, Irish modernism, albeit am-

¹⁵ While the twentieth-century modernism was received with mixed, ambivalent perceptions as either a destructive force or a path towards formation and economical florescence, the movement in nineteenth century carried a more positive tone leading towards an almost global excitement. See Berman 1982, 20-36.

¹⁶ According to George Boyce, nationalism is a modern, European form of identity that recently has become a cultural identity as well, affecting “members of a group who either have or have had a distinct or relatively autonomous existence, and who have shared a recognized common way of life”. See Boyce 1995, 18.

¹⁷ On modernism as an apolitical movement in Britain see Linehan 2012, 103-122.

biguously, clings to its political ethos of resistance and independence from its early stages of formation, manifesting itself in the form of anti-revivalist, anti-bourgeois Irish identity, and symbolizing a non-identarian Irishness that surfaces in the oeuvre of modern, non-conformist critics such as Synge, Joyce, Beckett, and Stuart¹⁸. This dichotomy can be understood by studying the history behind the movement and its materialization in a modernized yet still agrarian, pre-independence Ireland, where rural modernization precedes the neighbouring metropolitan nations.

According to Jameson, when discussing the rise of modernity in socio-historical form in Ireland and its later radical literary manifestations, we should look for a perpetual interplay of “contingency and theory”, otherwise the outcome will degrade to sheer hypothesis and inaccurate historical artifacts, tarnished with personal and subversive readings of political movements and history (2007, ix-x). With respect to modernity and Ireland, this theoretical interplay will eventually lead us back to a point crucial in the formation and emergence of a modern Ireland: the history of the land, the text(s) as well as the theory in question, namely, modernism, that itself was in the formation (see Jameson 2007, ix). In other words, this will be a history that is rife with colonial industrialization and intellectual alienation, an anachronistic history in a nation which at once is a pioneer in accepting modernity – if not a mature modern mentality – even before the onset of modernization in its European neighbours, and yet essentially traditionalist as it staunchly believes in its cultural heritage of Celts and Gaels. As Eagleton claims, modernity, and the concomitant radical mentality, emerges from within nations and cultures that are still inherently traditionalist, or when perception of traditionalism has been subsumed by an ultra-rightist consciousness under the guise of nativist Irishness or “modernist nationalism” (1996, 306). The result, I argue, is a form of a State-sponsored neo-conservative Irishness that emerges during and especially after the 1920s civil wars, which not only oppresses self-referential reformations, as realized by Kate O’Brien’s Helen Archer in *The Land of Spices* (1941) and the oppressive society in Patrick McCabe’s *The Butcher Boy* (1992), but also the actualization of modern Irishness.

Colonial Ireland, eclipsed by British Imperialism, rather involuntarily grasps the unceremonious incongruity of industrial modernization, and em-

¹⁸ As Castle, Eagleton and Lloyd pointed in their discussion of Irish modernism and its belligerence towards revivalism, Irish Revivalism is to be regarded as a non-avant-garde, non-modern movement, the sort which treats and introduces modernism in an Ibsenite fashion, crushing progressiveness and future through a limiting prism known as the past. In addition, the most radical literary figure it produced was Sean O’Casey whose plays, according to Williams, are a mere Irish interpretation of what Brecht had offered under the rubric of social Expressionism. See Williams 1987.

braces the related social and economic perturbations especially in the labour market. While the change towards British capitalist economy is revealed as constructive and beneficial to the majorly agrarian Ireland, it did not change the State's appreciation of modernity and modernization. Therefore, the result envisioned by the postist State remained intact: while an unhurried urbanization of the land was indirectly approved, an intellectual radicalization of the nation vis-à-vis perception of history and traditionalism stayed as impenetrable boundaries protected by the Constitution¹⁹. The result, I argue, emerges as a Beckettian treatment of stasis, a never-ending *wait* for a silence to break (Beckett 1958, 407), an unyielding "archaic avant-garde", as Eagleton suggests, which allows for modernism to be introduced and construed insofar as it is done through a nativist lens (1996, 282), forming "an ancient nation" trying to "meet the demands of modern life", as George Boyce claims (1995, 356),

The silence, speak of the silence before going into it, was I there already, I don't know, at every instant I'm there, listen to me speaking of it, I knew it would come, I emerge from it to speak of it, I stay in it to speak of it, if it's I who speak, and it's not, I act as if it were, sometimes I act as if it were, but at length, was I ever there at length, a long way. (Beckett 1958, 407)

This nativist definition of Irish modernism embraced Celtic culture and formed the consciousness that eventually emerged as the State's retrospective ethos, rather than modernism proper or at least a developing, progressive modernism. Therefore, the very contradictory national definition of modernism in Ireland emerges as what Jahan Ramazani describes as a "translocal" concept, namely, a notion which is neither locally rootless nor globally rooted (2009, xii-xiii). In other words, the conservative discourse of Irish nativism not only limits the externalization of modern aesthetics in literature and art by individuals, creating a Beckettian *vacuum* of silence and subservience, but emerges as a systematic "dialogic intersection" which detaches any form of modern Irish identity from the binary of nation-space, banishing it to non-national marginalia (2009, xiii). Irish modernism altered by the State's nativist vision of the nation appears as not just a belated, timeless and dichotomous form of modernism but an archaicizing variety, defying the ideological and

¹⁹ As Perry Anderson notes, modern self-development under capitalist manifesto reveals to be an equivocal form of becoming. For "capitalism-in Marx's unforgettable phrase of the Manifesto, tears down every ancestral confinement and feudal restriction, social immobility and clausal tradition, in an immense clearing operation of cultural and customary debris across the globe. To that process corresponds a tremendous emancipation of the possibility and sensibility of the individual self, now increasingly released from the fixed social status and rigid role-hierarchy of the pre-capitalist past, with its narrow morality and cramped imaginative range". See Anderson 1984.

socio-cultural changes necessary for proper cultivation of modern thought, as if they were sub-categories of a colonizing momentum.

The elements that originally marked the perception of modernism in Ireland as dichotomous and belated, I argue, can be found in nationalists' emphasis on forming a native Irish industrialism to "overcome the idiocy of rural life" and a colonial atavism that had dominated the nation on the one hand, and critiquing the Britishness embedded in the modern industrialism on the other; the latter being advocated by the revivalists' historical revolt against the British materialist and capitalist ethos (Cleary, Connolly 2005, 18)²⁰. The other influential element would be the conservatism of Irish revivalists in keeping their Celtic language as a national heritage. As Boyce suggests, "the language of Irish politics, and especially of Irish nationalist politics, was a conservative one, searching for precedents, seeking to find a justification for their political behavior in Ireland's past" (1995, 20)²¹. In fact, even Republican parties such as Fianna Fáil made it clear that they identify themselves with the historical principles of Celts and Gaels, and thus made tremendous efforts "to preserve the Irish language and make it again the spoken language of the people" (353). Such internal resistance against social legitimization of a modern hegemony, by sustaining the native language and culture, are symptomatic of a form of modernism that is at the threshold of brutal eruption in a traditionalist nation, which, according to Perry Anderson, regards its past as usable and classic, with "a still indeterminate technical present, and a still unpredictable political future" (1984, 105).

Such an anachronistic temporality of change in Ireland formed the very foundation of revolutionaries and political figures who were to decide on the fate of modernism in a nativist Ireland. The decisions, thus, were inherently

²⁰ "Many factors have been referred to as being the cause for the Irish to fight for national liberation and self-determination, but, in essence, as Connolly contended, the Irish fight for freedom is a fight against Capitalism, a fight for a more equal and prosperous society, namely Socialism. Thus in Ireland, Capitalism and its higher form, Imperialism, provokes the oppressed majority, namely the working class, to rebel and destroy the system which puts profit before people. Therefore, not only does Capitalism cause armed conflict between Capitalist countries, it also causes rebellion against itself, thus confirming our previous contention that within it, Capitalism contains the seed of its own destruction within a given society. This ultimately implies that Socialism defined as production for use and not for profit is the only assurance for an end to human conflict and the establishment of world peace". See the manifesto on The Irish Republican Socialist Movement website: <<http://irms.org/history/capitalism.html>> (04/2015).

²¹ Throughout the history of Irish nationalism, faces emerge and fade, trying to convince their doubting audience of non-nationalists or anti-nationalist using a politicized, convincing language, which appears as a blend of Hiberno-English and an intentional use of Celtic terminology. For instance, Henry Grattan's efforts in presenting the Irish protestants as the defenders of "the ancient liberties". See Boyce 1995, 20-22.

ativistic, or at least incongruous with the progressive temporality of modernism²². For Francis H. Stuart's character H in *Black List, Section H*, for instance, such an oppressive divide, be it to support independence from the empire or the separatist forces of within, appeals only to "mediocre minds" that can just survive in "restricted" societies, and "tight-knit communities" (1971, 72). Although it was the "enthusiasm for the Republican cause" that brought H and his wife Iseult closer and defined them as a family, H's negative dialectical perception of freedom would not allow him to support a war-oriented divide between the Irish, be they modern, nativist or postist (73).

Despite the State's and rebels' war-oriented conception of independence, unity and rejection of fascism, as H recounts, neither of the groups were aware of the fact that through ideological and political "subdivisions" they were facing the risk of losing not just the nation's confidence but also further splitting the Irish over their radical understanding of modernism and atavistic nativism (74). Such divisions provided non-conformist idealists such as H with "a climate in which [they] could breathe more easily", and "cast doubt on traditional values and judgments" (74). In other words, it was through the rise of modernism in Ireland and the concomitant conflict between the State and the masses that modern critics like H could distinguish between themselves and their ethos of formation and the other anti-colonial opposition groups such as revivalists, conservative Nationalists, and other minor political parties such as communists, socialists and Workers' Marxists²³.

If there arose heteronomous radical tendencies or movements that claimed rights beyond nativist Irishness, the state as in the form of the United Irishmen, Irish Volunteers, Free State or even Fianna Fáil would handle it at once by referring to their bygone Celtic heritage, and then by criticizing and isolating the conceptualization of such abstract non-Celtic, non-nationalist thought. In other words, as Boyce suggests, "nationalism in Ireland has been reared less on the rights of man than on historical wrongs" (1995, 20).

The nativist blend of Irish industrialism, language, and oppressive thought makes Irish modernism not only belated but also retrospective, for the nativist perception was to substitute the rapturous and unsettling nature of modernism with the static nativist agenda. The result will be producing a neoconservative modern thought with the tendency to replace anything

²² While both Anderson and Berman argue that such an anachronistic perception of modern temporality was the reason underlying the emergence of an agrarian, radical proletariat in the years between the chaos of the first world war and the beginning of the second, Sicari, in his reading of Kafka's *Metamorphosis*, sees "backward looking and anachronistic" nostalgia as forces that will lead individuals and nations towards finding their lost roots. See Anderson, 1984, 105-106; also see Berman 1982, 20-35. On modernist humanism, see Sicari 2011, 7-11.

²³ On political parties in Ireland, see Gallagher 1985.

modern with the spiritual conservatism of Irish nationalism, or as Eagleton suggests, “a political movement with modernizing base and a Janus-faced superstructure, ambiguously forward-looking and elegiac” (1996, 287). In other words, the rebelliousness of modernism was to be replaced with a nativist definition of liberation, promised by the Irish revolutionary mentality. Such unsteadiness in formation and liberation of a ‘new Ireland’, for instance, has produced protagonists who mature often too soon yet lack the essential experience and knowledge, individuals whose sense of adulthood would prevent them from apprenticeships and/or rites of passage. The sudden shift from childhood to maturity is often textually imperceptible, as was intended by the author, yet contextually quite poignant and sensible.

During his numerous and meticulous revisions, Stuart excised almost ninety pages, or five chapters of *Black List, Section H* that engaged with H’s formative years as a socially ignorant child growing up with his Unionist parents in County Meath²⁴. By removing these chapters, referred to as ‘Boyhood’ in the earlier drafts, Stuart shifts the emphasis from boyhood to H’s rebellious formation, introducing H as a child at an age known for critical vulnerabilities of dependence, sudden psychological shifts²⁵, and immature decisions. Writing a critical Pro-Home Rule letter to an Irish newspaper and critiquing his cousins, H began his narrative of resistance, placing his sudden rise to maturation as the sixth chapter in the draft and the first chapter in the actual published novel. By erasing H’s childhood, Stuart challenges the conventional dialectics of the Bildungsroman, and simultaneously redirects the focus of the narrative from being fixated on a traceable yet unreachable past, embodied by H’s ‘Boyhood’, to the radical currency of life in Ireland, a concept that can be planned, controlled and advised.

Childhood is a critical period during which the child either follows or defies the Deleuzian framework of “daddy-mommy, and me” set by his family, society and the State (Deleuze 1977, 111). For instance, it is this modern description of childhood, to defy and subvert the State’s architecture of repression, which informs Flann O’Brien’s characterization of Tracy in *At Swim-Two-Birds* (1939), a rebellious character whose creation, I argue, is a long due tribute to the marginalized ‘street children’ in the Post-Rising Ireland of 1916-1919. While Stuart authoritatively excises H’s childhood from his own narrative and presents him as a child with politically mature understanding of Irish identity, O’Brien’s Tracy, after suffering from various forms of psychosocial exile, finds a way to circumnavigate the nation’s intolerance vis-à-vis childhood and children’s rite of formation. In other words, while Stuart’s

²⁴ On revisions of *Black List, Section H*, see Kiely 2007.

²⁵ On children’s sudden psychological shifts [from absolute ‘love’ to absolute ‘hate’], see Freud 2005, 28-29.

H suddenly finds himself set on a pattern of psycho-social maturation and thus endeavours to act accordingly by finding interests in politics and cultural matters, O'Brien's Tracy tries to find a cure for childhood in Ireland by "chang[ing] the monotonous and unimaginative process by which children are born young"; as for Tracy, "many social problems of contemporary interest could be readily resolved if issue could be born already matured, teathed, reared, educated, and ready to essay those competitive plums which make the Civil Service and the Banks so attractive to the younger bread-winners of to-day" (O'Brien 1998, 54).

Tracy's subjective critique is directed at the State's intolerant politics of formation whereby children are marginalized as minors incapable of critical understanding, and at the same time at Irish children's botched rite of passage, resulting in minor characters whose mature understanding of Irish life counterbalances the conventional dialectics of the Bildungsroman in Ireland. Founded on the negative dialectics as externalized by characters such as Tracy and H, this critique highlights the failures of the State's politics of formation which, as Bolton notes, "hinges on the assumption that protagonists were blighted by their environment"; and identifies the (neo-) conservatism of the State and the 'pious' nationalist statesmen at the core of post-independence Irish society as the very source that "threatens to devour its young" (2010, 22).

The modern radicalism and rebelliousness inserted into the protagonist's *becoming* lacks a certain phase of maturation, as it emerges as an internally incomplete foundation decorated with a coarse façade just to survive the temporal dynamics of post-revolution and post-independence Ireland. What I am more interested in discussing here is to understand the relationship between such an anachronistic sense of maturation of modernism in an intrinsically nativist, insular history of Ireland, a "history", notes a character in William Trevor's *Beyond the Pale* which is "unfinished in this island, long since it has come to a stop in Surrey" (1983, 703). In other words, while the Eagletonian definition of Irish modernism focuses on a (post-) colonial reading of the movement, I wish to trace and assess notions of radical Irishness and belatedness in an inherently nativist Irish modernism by drawing on a Habermasian reading of Irish modernism. By marking these concepts as products of colonial deferment, both internal and external, and by reconsidering the broken chain of ongoingness in the interplay between contingency and theory, namely, Irish history on the one hand, and the nativist and modernist theorem on the other, the link between modernism and Irish nativism emerges as a broken continuum that according to Castle has led to an ambiguous perception and delayed emergence of modernism in postist Ireland (see Castle 2001, 172-207).

According to Joseph Cleary and Claire Connolly, the modern mentality can be "ascribed to an inventory of inaugural ruptures" that defies not only the nativist *chronocentric* perception of nationhood but also the subjective, society-oriented definition of an object (2005, 3). This is what Adorno and

Max Horkheimer introduce in *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1947) as one of the founding elements that subjectively demarcates the object and thus reduces it of its core features, namely, the ones that make *it*, say a nation or an individual, a unique entity in itself (see Adorno, Horkheimer 2002, xvi, 11). Modernism in Ireland, however, as a movement has been regarded as both an outsider and insider by a nation that thinks “outside [is] bad weather” while “inside [is] fire”, where the former demarcates the nation or the individual, and removes *it* from its core national values, and the latter limits the perception of the outside (Deane 1997, 19). In addition to such a dichotomy, I argue, modernism in Ireland has outlived another internal binary, being despised and celebrated by postist nationalists. On the one hand, modernism was critiqued by nationalists for being an un-Irish movement that came from ‘the outside’ by way of colonization or war, and led to termination of the constituents of Celtic Ireland; on the other, it emerged as the very same radical impetus that led the Irish to ‘think in contradiction’ and thus first revolt against the Empire and help shape the revivalist ethos, and then to stand against the very consciousness of revivalism, and shape and join the Joycean Anti-Irishness or Stuart’s *Faillandia*, namely, his “beloved and hated land” (Stuart 1985, 11).

My contention is that the belatedness inherent in the rise of modernism in Ireland, coincided with the socio-political ramifications of wars and an eventual neocolonial State, had transformed Irish modernism into a dialectical discourse that not only critiqued the external and colonial stimuli but provoked internal conflicts and socio-political divisions²⁶. For instance, in *Black List, Section H*, Stuart depicts such a dichotomous division through H as he recounts the divide that had appeared between the nativist, agrarian State and the Irish who have already experienced modernism in small towns and counties before being overshadowed and thus marginalized by the big cities²⁷. The latter group appears as rebels who adhere to the revolutionary merit of modernism find independent formation in non-identitarianism, and in challenging authority, and thus are in danger of containment or deletion from the national memory. As H’s narrative reveals, not only does the tension between the modern youth and the oppressive State further split the nation into various pro- and anti- groups, but it also provides the youth with a vague and biased definition of modern Irishness. The result, H reveals, is a political double standard which glorifies the past by commemorating the

²⁶ According to Thomas Sowell, modernism as an ego-centered movement rich with individuals’ will as its reservoir will be transformed into a group/class-led consciousness that interprets one’s will as an economic determiner. See Sowell 1963, 119-125.

²⁷ On the presence of modernism in small towns and counties in Ireland in 1920s see Cronin and O’Connor 1993. Also see Keown and Taaffe 2010, 103-107.

revolution, independence and international recognition on the one hand, and treats not just modernism but also modern critics as at once inseparable and redundant parts of the nation's present on the other:

Although he was still far from coming to understand the necessity for what had happened to them, he did begin to see the silence that he had entered as the deep divide between the past and what was still to come. Whatever it was that was at the other end there was no way of telling. It might be a howl of final despair or the profound silence might be broken by certain words that he didn't yet know how to listen for. (1971, 425)

Britain, as the nation's most influential neighbour, emerges as a force that has imbued Irishness with at once nationalism and modernism, the source behind internal conflicts as well as radicalization of an agrarian Ireland. It was also the Britishness of Irish modernism that triggered inherently oppositional nationalist responses, hence delaying the nation-wide acknowledgement of Irish modernism by flagging the movement as a variation of British mentality that would lead the nation towards a pampered bourgeoisie. In addition, historic instances as stark as the great famine and Ireland being regarded by the modern world as an anonymous metrocolony rather than a modern metropolitan nation, not only further damaged the nation's perception of anything modern and thus inherently British but also the general definition of modernism and modern Irish identity²⁸. "Uneven industrialization, sectarian division" worked in tandem with an apparent air of contradiction and separation amongst the opponents and proponents of an 'Irish-Ireland' and a modern Irishness, and led the nation to openly embrace the deferral of the concept of modernism proper (Boyce 1995, 120)²⁹. Nevertheless, this dominant air of ambivalence and contradiction supplied the necessary instability and negativity that became the very essence of resistance required for the formation or emergence of radical Irish modernism. This ambivalence in receiving nativist Irishness or shifting towards modern identity can be seen in Nuala O'Faolain's memoir, *Are You Somebody?* (1996), which recounts a gradual shift towards modern Irish identity: "whatever the people they came from had lived by just fell away in their generation. But they didn't have other

²⁸ As Proinsias MacAonghusa, Ireland's vice-chairman of Labour Party, claims, "The 'Irish, properly so called' were... trained from their infancy in a hereditary hatred and abhorrence of the English" name and culture (quoted in Boyce 1995, 128).

²⁹ According to Boyce, "Irish republicanism was an ideology riddled with contradictions: sectarian hatred existed beside the idea of the common name of Irishman; humanitarian philosophy had as its companion racial violence; social grievances and radical thinking were to be found along with notions of national independence" (*Nationalism in Ireland*, 131). Irish nationalism itself, in this regard, becomes a division which intends to re-unify the apparent religious and ideological schisms. See Boyce 1995, 120-155.

values to replace what they had lost” (13). The Irish, as depicted by O’Faolain, were to face a sudden wave of what I shall call *unbecoming*, that is to lose one’s appreciation of the present and experience their rite of passage only through retrospection, a condition most suitable for the neoconservative parties to exploit to advocate their backward ideology.

Irish modernism in its embryonic stage, exhibits a fundamental uniqueness that separates it from its European variants. My argument corresponds with Cleary’s and Connolly’s: Irish modernism did not follow the conventional path of becoming, namely, industrialization, intellectual radicalization and maturation. Rather, the Irish as a colonial sub-culture have already been familiarized with the concept of modernity in its colonial sense a while before industrialization could be established in agrarian Ireland. In other words, “modernization via colonization preceded modernization via industrialization” (Cleary, Connolly 2005, 7). The apparent anomaly in the sequence of modernization is what makes the crux of my second argument: Irish modernism, an incomplete project. While modernism, without doubt, has been an essence of radical Irishness and the revolutions of not only the 1920s but also of past centuries – starting from 1780 when the Irish Parliament claimed independence, a mature presence of modernism in Ireland appears as an incomplete Habermasian project, the sort which culminated its progressive manifestation up until the 1950s-60s, moving slowly towards a quasi-capitalist economy, becoming dependent on the “material structures” of modernity (Eagleton 1996, 284)³⁰. My contention is that, while modernism has conventionally been regarded as a movement that existed until the final years of the Second World War, I suggest it was during the very same period that nation’s perception of modernism and modern Irishness embraced the inevitability of development and maturation³¹.

What the nation experienced under the umbrella term of modern Irishness and modernity, remained the same, namely, extravagant poverty, gradual removal of Celtic culture and language, and a culture of stasis that lasted up until the late 1950s. Whereas to their far and immediate neighbours, mo-

³⁰ I understand that my argument sounds inherently Habermasian and thus debatable for Foucauldian scholars who perceive modernity as a process that cannot be “accumulated”, but rather as an “ethos” or a “philosophical life” that has revealed the limitations of modernism in its socio-cultural form. Yet, I still regard the process of modernization as well as continuation of modernism in Ireland, considering the flood of anti-nationalist critiques that surfaced in the late 1960s and the early 1970s, as Habermasian and ongoing. See Foucault 1997, 319.

³¹ Perry Anderson’s critique of Marshall Berman’s *All that is Solid Melts into Air* (1982) argues that modernist art “died” as an aftermath of the Second World War, during which notable figures in both literature and art emerged, albeit in a symbolic fashion that imitates the first three decades of the twentieth century. See Perry Anderson 1984, 107-108.

ernity meant progressive industrialization, “domestic innovation, national aggrandizement and even global pre-eminence” (Cleary, Connolly 2005, 9). In addition, before the economic breakthrough of the 1950s, for the Irish the only gift of modernity was a widespread socio-political mistrust and intellectual scepticism with respect to not only the inherent internationalism of modernism, which caused further isolation of the nation, but also the national and economic shrewdness of their nativist State. The result was a nation-wide divide, an epidemic sense of detachment from the nativist ethos of the State, and a silent shift towards Stirnerite dialectic of individualism, and a tendency to identify with the European standards that, as Joyce’s friend Thomas Kettle suggests, “if Ireland is to become a new Ireland she must first become European” (Kearney 1991, 77; see also Joyce 1969, 62-63).

In *A Star Called Henry* (2000), Roddy Doyle’s revisionist novel of national and individual formation, this divide is introduced as the duality of modern Irish identity and the nativist politics of formation, which further led the nation into the Kiberdian definition of internal colonization and othering. As the narrative unfolds, Henry’s prodigy, Ivan, and his fellow rebels are shown to have turned into a quasi-anarchic body of military force. Not only have they turned against their ex-comrades, such as Henry who symbolically mentored Ivan through his rite of formation, but they began a series of anti-national attacks against the Dáil, namely, the very cause that meant to unite revolutionaries and oppositional forces. Ivan’s self-referential radicalism, compared to Henry’s modern and critical upbringing, I suggest, can be read as an ironic critique of a sense of non-belonging and detachment which emerged in the wake of the Civil Wars, the conflict between the appreciation of modern Irish identity and a neoconservative State. Ivan’s radical non-belonging, I argue, embodies the very voice that in Doyle’s narrative tends to reveal a widespread, yet hidden anomalous pair, namely a psychological self-exile and the State’s fascination with political control, stasis, and their politics of chastity, where the latter became the reason behind Ireland’s archaic modernity³².

“Times have changed”, notes John Dillon in his speech, drawing the nationalist revolutionaries’ attention towards the fact that their effort towards an all *Éire-Ireland* is no longer uniquely uncontended; therefore, “the methods of carrying on the struggle for the liberty of Ireland must be changed in accordance with the times” (Boyce 1995, 263). This sudden Deleuzian turn in the nativists’ ambitions, reevaluating the relevance of historicizing the national heritage in a time of dire socio-cultural change³³, I suggest can be read

³² As Michael Hopkins explains, in the mid and late 1930s military radicals became the very force that not only betrayed the Dáil by calling Fenians as traitors, but also engaged in advocating socialism in an Ireland which was damaged from both within and without. See Hopkins 2004, 70-98.

³³ On Deleuze’s analysis of the relevance of the State see Deleuze 2004, 19-22.

as a rising horizon for a new appreciation of modern Irishness in Ireland. This, in other words, became the rising horizon for modernity in Ireland when neither the State nor the nation were interested in a Yeatsian Parnellite hero³⁴.

For while a Habermasian reading regards modernism as a “forward orientation” and anticipation of a “contingent future”, an indulgence in “contemporariness”, and a subjective recreation of the past, Yeatsian or even de Valerian nativism has revised the definition only to reflect a deformed perception of modernism (Habermas 1996, 40). This, in other words, is the shift that further distanced the youth and their modern perception of Irishness from the nativist ethos propagated by the nationalist opposition groups, even Sinn Féin³⁵.

According to Eagleton, the youth saw dominant nativist modernity as only a mere bourgeois abstraction of modern identity, a shift to an archaic, restrictive self-consciousness that seeks and defines Irish identity in national isolation and minimal approval of other cultures. Shrouded in an ingratiating discourse, the State’s neoconservatism redirected the national literature to alleviate and, as John Eglinton claims, “exalt an Irishman’s notion of the excellence and importance” by keeping the nation unaware of the significance of Irish nativism as a psycho-social colonial force (2000 [1906], 73)³⁶. As this sense of backwardness in the name of nationalism grew stronger during the 1920s, so did the process of maturing the nation’s perception of modern Irish identity and modernism, moving towards an anti-bourgeois, non-abstract appreciation of modern Irishness. In *Black List, Section H*, Stuart illustrates this radical socio-cultural awakening through H’s dialectical discourse. Stuart’s H finds “liv[ing] by established categories” normalized by the State as nothing but a “horrible” sub-reality, which forces critics like himself to either engage in self-cancellation, censoring their rebellious identity, or “make friends with those from whom [they] hadn’t to hide any part of [themselves]” simply to prevent a self-induced exile to marginalia (1971, 13-14). H’s non-conformism in defying the State’s structure of normalization, in this respect, can be read as a resistant Deleuzian minor literature, which criticizes the totalitarianism of not just an anomalous divide caused by rebels’ politics of division but the State’s politics of provincialism and marginalization, which tend to contain “anyone whose behaviour collides with the popular faith of the time and place” (100).

³⁴ On the Yeatsian ‘figure’ as a failed project see Boyce 1995, 339 and Kiberd 2005, 163.

³⁵ George A. Birmingham’s account of Sinn Fein radical introduces them as “wild creatures whom intelligent Englishmen have agreed to consider mad though undeniably clever”. See Birmingham 2000 [1907], 77.

³⁶ Non-conformists and radical intellectuals such as John Eglinton and George Birmingham regarded the Irish revivalist nationalism at one and the same time as a cure and a plague, imposed by the Anglo-Irish rather than the “hinterland Irishmen”, that emerged in the 1910s and the 1920s. See Eglinton 2000 [1906], 70-71.

According to Boyce, while Irish nationalism was revealed to be “paradoxical, self-contradictory”, guided by an “internal logic” of ambiguity, backwardness and traditionalism, modernism emerged as a concept, founded on individual’s sense of formation, albeit asocial and ego-centric (1995, 375). As both Eagleton and Boyce suggest, modernist and nationalist movements in Ireland are to be regarded as radical internal responses to colonization that rose from within and dominated the nation (see Boyce 1995, 375-377; see also Eagleton 1996, 338-340). In this regard, while nationalism rises as a pseudo-unifying military force, sworn to build an Irish Ireland and gain independence by shedding any trace of Britishness, modernism emerges as a catalyst that highlights inefficiencies of the former cause. Modernism, hence, emerges as the intellectual voice, though late in its awakening, that helps the Irish have a better understanding of their still colonial status quo in an independent Ireland. This is a voice that was about underlining the flaws of an internal, metropolitan-centered mode of colonization, the sort which caused an uneven and underdeveloped form of modernization throughout the nation; and the sort which was still profiting by hitting different territories and manipulating certain radical groups, that eventually led to further fragmentation and sectarian isolation than unification.

Stuart critiques such an ambivalent postist dichotomy in *Black List*, Section H as H is shown sympathizing with rebels in subverting not just the Empire but also the conservative State, while finding himself trapped in an ideological othering vis-à-vis rebel’s chaos-oriented politics of resistance. At the same time, however, H’s dialectical idealism, manifested in his non-traditionalism and anti-conservative principles of formation, separates him from the nationalist revolutionaries, thus leaving him in an ideological exile, if not oblivion, caused by the divide. For Stuart’s modern protagonist, these internal exiles and otherings resonate with a Kiberdian critique of Irish formation, namely, becoming “the nursery of nationality” by reversing the Irish subject’s perception of belonging to a nation (Kiberd 1996, 2). The result is the formation of a duality which Kiberd claims as “white-on-black negatives” whereby the subject finds himself at once othered by his fellow modern critics and the nativist State, the latter being the cause which meant to lead the subject to achieve his *telos* of self-formation in a liberated, postcolonial Ireland (3).

For critics like Stuart’s H, this dualistic division was “considered a rejection of [their] personal” modern world “by those who inhabited better, more imaginatively conceived ones of their own” (1971, 57). In other words, the socio-political divide between modern critics such as H and the nativist Free Staters not only displaced H and the like-minded non-conformists, further relocating them to socio-political marginalia, but transvalued the original ideals of forming a prosperous modern Ireland into ideological elements that partitioned the Irish from one another, forming parties such as the Irregulars, Pro-Treatyites, Unionists, conservative Nationalists, and moderns who were

banished to psychological and external exile. As H recounts, each side was so “deeply involved in outward areas of existence” and following their ideals that “they had no way of truly assessing [t]his kind of inward-turned attention”, namely, saving the nation from an impending internal divide (57-58).

My argument is that it was the dialectical, intrinsically critical discourse of modernism that allowed the nation to identify the reemergence of a structure of colonialism in Ireland, albeit this time it was scrupulously practiced by the State. Such revelatory efforts provoked a planned backlash from the other side in the binary of formation in Ireland, namely, the nativist State as they introduced modernism as a subordinate and inherently British intellectual parade originally initiated by the Anglo-Irish³⁷. As Deane argues in *Reading in the Dark*, highlighting a stasis that loomed over the nation during the 1940s up to the 1960s, the Habermasian Irish modernism reminded the ambitious Irish that “reformation” in its martial, communist or nativist variety is nothing but “history” revisited (1997, 99). Therefore, walking in the path of the IRA, Clann na Poblachta (The Republican Party), or even the reformist parties with conservative inclinations such as Fine Gael, not only would not help the nation to fulfill its socio-cultural demands in the twentieth century, but lead the Irish to “get caught between this world and the next”, namely, an inward-looking nativist Ireland and a modern Ireland (210). Such a politically confrontational treatment of the rise of modernism in Ireland, results in a socio-cultural paralysis that incessantly reappears in Beckett’s prose and dramatic works. Malone, an undefeated, cacophonous raconteur in *Malone Dies* (1956), for instance, is affected by the same duality of paralysis, namely, to yield to the quiet or to cultivate the inner urge and live “beyond the grave” by telling more stories and exiting the stasis (Beckett 1958, 236).

What modern characters have in common, nonetheless, is a psyche that is plagued by a culture of paralysis, which neither entices nor dispels progress. In this respect, the sense of modern Irishness as fully explored in the works of Irish moderns, emerges as a variation of Irishness that is still imbued with equivocation and doubt; it blames the State for its atavism and regards the very idea of nationalism as an impasse that has hampered Irish modernism proper. The result is a form of ‘I-ness’ that is “faced into the future looking backwards”, as O’Faolain claims in her memoir (1996, 108). This ambivalent geographical perception of modernism and time manifests itself in the form of “significant digression” in George Moore’s autobiographical works, and later becomes the essence of Beckettian characterization, or emerges as a figurative vagueness in perceiving the concept of time in Deane’s memories of the partitioned (North) Ireland (Schleifer 1980, 64). The modern Irish protagonist’s sense of selfhood,

³⁷ On the clash of modernism and the State see Miller 2008, 130-165.

in this regard, is shaped not only by a collective mistrust towards the State as fully expressed in Liam O’Flaherty’s *The Informer* (1925) but also by a radical understanding of modernism in Ireland, which introduces the movement as a vague and anachronistic frenzy of contradictory mentality.

Works Cited

- Adorno T.W. (1973 [1966]), *Negative Dialectics (Negative Dialektik)*, trans. by E.B. Ashton, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Horkheimer Max (2002 [1944, 1947]), *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Cultural Memory in the present* (Dialektik der Aufklärung), trans. by Robert Hullot-Kentor, Redwood City, Stanford UP.
- Agamben Giorgio (2014), “For a Theory of Destituent Power”, *XPONOΣ*, <<http://www.chronosmag.eu/index.php/g-agamben-for-a-theory-of-destituent-power.html>> (04/2015).
- Anderson Perry (1984), “Modernity and Revolution”, *New Left Review* 1, 144. <<http://newleftreview.org/I/144/perry-anderson-modernity-and-revolution>> (04/2015).
- Beckett Samuel (1956) *Waiting for Godot*, London, Faber and Faber.
- (1958), *Three Novels by Samuel Beckett: Molloy, Malone Dies and The Unnamable*, New York, Grove Press.
- (2010 [1934]), *More Pricks than Kicks*, London, Faber and Faber.
- Berman Marshall (1982), *All that is Solid Melts into Air*, London, Verso.
- Berresford Ellis Peter (1989), “Revisionism in Irish Historical Writing: The New Anti-Nationalist School of Historians”, *Irish Democrat*, <<http://www.irishdemocrat.co.uk/bookshop/publications/revisionism/>> (04/2015).
- Birmingham A.G. (2000 [1907]), “The Literary Movement in Ireland”, in David Pierce (ed.), *The Irish Writing in the Twentieth Century. A Reader*, Cork, Cork UP, 77-83.
- Bolton Jonathan (2010), *Blighted Beginnings: Coming of Age in Independent Ireland*, Lewisburg, Bucknell UP.
- Booth H.J., Rigby Nigel, eds (2000), *Modernism and Empire*, Manchester, Manchester UP.
- Boyce George (1995), *Nationalism in Ireland*, London, Routledge.
- Castle Gregory (2001), *Modernism and the Celtic Revival*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP.
- (2006), *Reading the Modernist Bildungsroman*, Tallahassee, University Press of Florida.
- Cleary Joe, Claire Connolly, eds (2005), *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Irish Culture*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP.
- Coackley John, Michael Gallagher (2010), *Politics in the Republic of Ireland*, 5th edition, New York, Routledge; Abingdon, PSI Press.
- Cronin Michael, O’Connor Barbara, eds (1993), *Tourism in Ireland: A Critical Analysis*, Cork, Cork UP.
- (2004), “The Blueshirts in the Irish Free State, 1932-1935: The Nature of Socialist Republican and Governmental Opposition”, in Tim Kirk, Anthony McElligott (eds), *Opposing Fascism: Community, Authority and Resistance in Europe*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 5-25.

- Deane Seamus (1997), *Reading in the Dark*, London, Vintage.
- Deleuze Gilles (2004 [2002]), "Instincts and Institutions" (*Instincts et Institutions*), in David Lapoujade (ed.), *Desert Islands and Other Texts 1953-1974*, trans. by Michael Taormina, New York, Semiotext(e), 19-22.
- Guattari Felix (1977 [1972]), *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia Vol. 1 (L'anti-Oedipe. Capitalism et Schizofrenie)*, trans. by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, H.R. Lane, London, Athlone Press.
- Doyle Roddy (2000), *A Star Called Henry*, London, Vintage.
- Eagleton Terry, Jameson Fredric, Said E.W. (1990), *Nationalism, Colonialism and Literature*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- (1996), *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger: Studies in Irish Culture*, New York, Verso.
- Eglinton John (2000 [1906]), "The De-Davisization of Irish Literature", in David Pierce (ed.), *The Irish Writing in the Twentieth Century. A Reader*, Cork, Cork UP, 70-71.
- Esslin Martin (1986), "The Theater of Stasis – Beckett's Late Plays", in P.A. McCarthy, ed., *Critical Essays on Samuel Beckett*, Boston, G.K. Hall, 192-198.
- Foster R.F. (1982), *Modern Ireland 1600-1972*, London, Penguin.
- Foucault Michel (1988 [1982]), *Technologies of the Self (Les Techniques de Soi)*, ed. by L.H. Martin, Huck Gutman, P.H. Hutton, Amherst, University of Massachusetts.
- (1997 [1994]), *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, in *The Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, Vol. 1 (Dits et écrits, 1954-1988)*, ed. by Paul Rabinow, trans. by Robert Hurley and others, London, The New Press.
- Freud Sigmund (2005 [1915]), *The Unconscious (Das Unbewußte)*, trans. by Graham Frankland, with an introduction by Mark Cousin, London, Penguin Modern Classics.
- Gallagher Michael (1985), *Political Parties in the Republic of Ireland*, Manchester, Manchester UP.
- Gonzalez G.A., Nelson E.S., eds (1997), *Modern Irish Writers: A Bio-Critical Sourcebook*, London, Aldwych.
- Habermas Jürgen (1974 [1971]), *Theory and Practice (Theorie und Praxis)*, trans. by John Viertel, London, Heinemann.
- (1981), "Modernity: An Unfinished Project", in Maurizio Passerin D'Entrevésand, Seyla Behhabib, eds (1996), *Habermas and the Unfinished Project of Modernity*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Hopkins Michael (2004), *Green Against Green – the Irish Civil War*, Dublin, Gill & MacMillan.
- Hyde Douglas (1892), "The Necessity for De-Anglicizing Ireland", in David Pierce, ed. (2000), *Irish Writing in the Twentieth Century. A Reader*, Cork, Cork UP, 2-12.
- Jameson Frederic (1981), *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*, Ithaca, Cornell UP.
- (1990), "Modernism and Imperialism", in Terry Eagleton, Fredric Jameson, E.W. Said, *Nationalism, Colonialism and Literature*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 43-66.
- (1998), *The Cultural Turn: Selected Writings on the Postmodern, 1983-1998*, London, Verso.

- (2002), *A Singular Modernity: Essay on the Ontology of Present*, London, Verso.
- (2007), *The Modernist Papers*, London, Verso.
- Joyce James (1969), *Dubliners: Text, Criticism, and Notes*, ed. by Robert Scholes, Arthur Walton Litz, New York, Viking.
- (2008 [1914]), *Dubliners*, Project Gutenberg, <<http://self.gutenberg.org/articles/Dubliners>>, (04/2015).
- Kearney Richard (1991), *Migration: The Irish at Home and Abroad*, Dublin, Wolfhound Press.
- (1997), *Postnationalist Ireland: Politics, Culture, Philosophy*, London, Routledge.
- Keogh Dermot (1995), *Twentieth Century Ireland: Nation and the State*, New York, St. Martin's Press.
- Keown Edwina, Carol Taafe, eds (2010), *Irish Modernism: Origins, Contexts, Publics*, Bern, Peter Lang.
- Kiberd Declan (1984), "Inventing Irelands", *The Crane Bag* 8, 1, 11-25.
- (1996), *Inventing Ireland: The Literature of the Modern Nation*, London, Jonathan Cape.
- (2005), *The Irish Writer and the World*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP.
- Kiely Kevin (2007), *Francis Stuart: Artist and Outcast*, Dublin, Liffey Press.
- Linehan Thomas (2012), *Modernism and British Socialism*, London, Palgrave MacMillan.
- Lloyd David (1992), *Nationalism and Minor Literature: James Clarence Mangan and the Emergence of Irish Cultural Nationalism*, Oakland, University of California Press.
- (1993), *Anomalous States. Irish Writing and the Post-Colonial Moment*, Durham, Duke UP.
- Maley Willy (1996), "Varieties of Nationalism: Post-revisionist Irish Studies", *Irish Studies Review* 4, 15, 33-37.
- Mansouri Shahriyar (2013), "Decolonizing Anarchic Formations and the State's Politics of Isolationism in Patrick McCabe's *The Butcher Boy*", *Journal of Irish and Scottish Studies* 7, 1, 131-172.
- McCourt Frank (1999), *Angela's Ashes*, London, Flamingo.
- Miller A.J. (2008), *Modernism and the Crisis of Sovereignty*, New York, Routledge.
- Moorjani Angela, Veit Carola, eds (2004 [2001]), *Samuel Beckett: Endlessness in the Year 2000 / Samuel Beckett: Fin sans fin en l'an 2000*, Amsterdam-New York, Rodopi.
- Nelson Bruce (2012), *Irish Nationalists and the Making of the Irish Race*, Princeton UP.
- O'Brien Flann (1998 [1939]), *At Swim-Two-Birds*, Dublin, Dalkey Archives.
- O'Driscoll Dennis (2008), *Stepping Stones: Interviews with Seamus Heaney*, London, Faber and Faber.
- O'Faolain Nuala (1996), *Are You Somebody? A Memoir*, Dublin, New Island.
- Pierce David, ed. (2000), *Irish Writing in the Twentieth Century. A Reader*, Cork, Cork UP.
- Potter Rachel, David Trotter (2004), "Low Modernism: Introduction", *Critical Quarterly* 46, 4, iii-iv.
- Ramazani Jahan (2009), *A Transnational Poetics*, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press.

- Schleifer Ronald (1980), *The Genres of the Irish Literary Revival*, Norman, Pilgrim Books.
- Sicari Stephen (2011), *Modernist Humanism and the Men of 1914: Joyce Lewis, Pound, and Eliot*, Columbia, University of South Carolina Press.
- Smith J.M. (2001), "Remembering Ireland's Architecture of Containment: 'Telling' Stories in *The Butcher Boy* and *States of Fear*", *Eire-Ireland: Journal of Irish Studies* 36, 3-4, 111-130.
- Smyth Gerry (1997), *The Novel and the Nation: Studies in the New Irish Fiction*, London, Pluto.
- Sowell Thomas (1963), "Karl Marx and the Freedom of the Individual", *Ethics* 73, 2, 119-125.
- Stirner Max (1995 [1844]), *The Ego and Its Own (Der Einzige und sein Eigentum)*, ed. by David Leopold, Cambridge, Cambridge UP.
- Stuart Francis (1971), *Black List, Section H*, Carbondale, Southern Illinois UP.
- (1982), "A Minority Report", *Irish University Review* 12, 1, 17-22.
- (1985), *Faillandia*, Finglas, Raven Art Press.
- Trevor William (1981), "Beyond the Pale", in Id. (1983), *The Stories of William Trevor*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 691-711.
- Wade Allen, ed. (1954), *The Letters of W.B. Yeats*, London, Rupert Hart-Davis.
- Waiting for Beckett: A Portrait of Samuel Beckett*, dir. and prod. by John Reilly, Melisa Shaw-Smith. Interviews with Edward Albee, Linda Ben-Zvi, John Calder, Martin Esslin, Raymond Federman, S.E. Gontarski, Israel Horovitz, Bill Irwin, Brendan Kennelly, Steve Martin, and Alan Schneider, DVD, Global Village, New York 1993.
- Walcott Derek (1974), "The Muse of History", in Bill Ashcroft *et al.*, eds (1995), *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, London, Routledge, 370-374.
- Williams Raymond (1987), *Drama from Ibsen to Brecht*, London, Hogarth Press.