

## Unionism and Anglicizations: A Postcolonial Study of Joyce's *Ulysses*

Seokmoo Choi

### I

Class or racial division in colonial societies is attributed to the defense of the privileges of a certain category of people. Most of them are planters from the colonial center, whose settlement in a new territory drastically reinforces their domination of native people. Ireland has not been exceptional in this sense of colonial history. Before the foundation of the Irish Free State in 1922, Ireland and the Irish, as an aftermath of British colonial rule, had been divided into two parts: Protestant and Catholic communities. This division was not merely grounded in the distinction of religion, but that of the ruler and the ruled as well. The privileged class was called Anglo-Irish or the Protestant Ascendancy.

Unlike other colonized countries, however, settlers in Ireland were treated as Irish rather than British due to long colonial domination. And the penal law imposed on Catholics as a result of the Williamite defeat of James II and the subsequent Protestant Ascendancy over Catholics had been abrogated or debilitated throughout the nineteenth century. Firstly, the Catholic

Emancipation Act of 1829 enabled Catholics to become Members of Parliament at Westminster: Secondly, both the Tithe Commutation Act of 1838 and the Act of 1869 disestablishing and disendowing the Protestant church deprived the Church of Ireland of privileges: Thirdly, by the Land Act of 1881 Catholic tenants were granted with more stable conditions for land known as the three Fs: fair rents, free sale and fixity of tenure. Accordingly, Irish Catholics political and social positions had been improved, whereas Protestants had been deprived of their privileges as an inherited governing class. In Deleuze and Guattari's terms, the territory of the ruler and the ruled was deterritorialized with their boundaries blurred (Deleuze and Guattari, 16-27).

The last big blow to the Protestant planters was the introduction of the Irish Home Rule Bills in Westminster. The Bills were introduced and widely discussed first in 1886, then in 1893 and later in 1914, when the Bill was finally passed. The social turmoil caused by the introduction of the Irish Home Rule Bills had witnessed the division even within the Protestant community. One group, asserting their Irishness, fully participated in Irish cultural and political fields. The most prominent figures in this group included Yeats and other revivalists as well as Parnell and many Irish patriots. As Bloom broods about two Italian-Irishmen, Nannetti and Cuprani, in the Aeolus episode of *Ulysses*, they are more Irish than Irish (*U* 7.100). On the other hand, Irish Unionists and Ulster Unionists in particular were antagonistic against Irish home rule and their long identification with Irishness had been transformed into their identification as British. In the Nestor episode, Garrett Deasy, an Ulster Scot, represents this discourse. He faithfully follows his sense of Englishness, and he is anxious about what is happening in England. Even when he talks about Ireland, his discourse is constantly confined within colonialist concepts. Due to his identity as a settler, he cannot choose but to manipulate his discourse. Therefore, it can be asserted that Nestor embodies Deasy's Anglicized discourse of Unionism.

In this study, I intend to explore how much Deasy's Unionism is confined within the colonialist concept of domination and to what extent and why Ulster Unionism consistently mimics the English. Also Joyce's subversion of Deasy's historical discourses - through Stephen's straightforward rejection of Deasy's Anglicized world as well as through his interior monologue - will be scrutinized in the postcolonial perspective.

## II

Deasy asserts that we are a generous people but we must also be just (*U* 2.262-63). As Robert Spoo points out, we, in this sentence, are the English masters of a colonized nation, while Stephen's us is Catholic Irish (Spoo, 106). Like most other colonized countries, the "we" in Ireland had asserted their Irishness and had identified themselves with natives to justify their control over politics, economy, and culture. When Deasy writes an article about the foot and mouth disease, he insists on using the word "our" such as "our history, our cattle trade, and our old industries" (*U* 2.325). Though Deasy uses "our" to identify himself as Irish, Stephen refuses to accept Deasy's colonialist concept of the words "we" or "our" by appropriating Deasy's words themselves. Using "us," Stephen retorts to Deasy's "we" from whom he and his people are excluded: "I fear those big words . . . which make us so unhappy" (*U* 2.264). Stephen's response is subversive in that he reads Deasy's mind and his vocabulary and uses his "we" as an object of his phrase, thereby stressing the colonized situation of his Catholic Irish people. Here the mimicry which Anglicized Irish people plays an important role in Joyce's subversive strategies. Stephen's use of Deasy's vocabulary illustrates that what the colonized borrows from the colonizer might be adapted for the people's own creative appropriation.

In an earlier part of Nestor, Deasy's declaration of his Irishness can be detected, too. He claims his Irishness, firstly by stressing his position of a witness of long Irish history, and secondly by glorifying Protestants and indicting Catholic Irish for Ireland's historical situation

I saw three generations since O'Connell's time. I remember the famine in 46. Do you know that the orange lodges agitated for repeal of the union twenty years before O'Connell did or before the prelates of your communion denounced him as a demagogue? You fenians forget some things. (*U* 2.268-272)

Here dichotomy, the first principle of colonialism, is used by Deasy to assert that Unionists represent the Irish more than nationalists. His identification of Stephen with fenians distinguishes him from Stephen since this term had been used disparagingly by Unionists to describe nationalists (Kiberd, 955). Stephens consciousness eventually results in his search for the identity of the colonizer, especially Ulster Scots, in relation to both the atrocity of the invasion of Deasy's ancestors and their foreignness:

Glorious, pious and immortal memory. The lodge of Diamond in Armagh the splendid behung with corpses of papishes. Hoarse, masked and armed, the planters covenant. The black north and true blue bible. Croppies lie down. (*U* 2.273-76)

The planter's covenant was first administered to Scottish Presbyterians in Ulster early in 1644. The word "true blue" refers to a seventeenth-century Scottish Presbyterian or Covenanter (Gifford, 36), thus exposing Deasy's racial identity. The origin of the covenant may be traced back to the Covenant of 1641, when the Parliamentarians of England and Scotland were

bound together by a civil and religious treaty known as the Solemn League and Covenant, ratified in 1643. The Covenant pledged those who signed it to preserve the reformed religion; to try to extirpate Popery and Prelacy; and to maintain a balance between the right of Parliament and the King. It was again recurred during the Home Rule crisis in Ulster. The determination of Unionists was expressed on the September 28th, 1912 when over 200,000 men signed the Solemn League and Covenant against Home Rule, a covenant or pledge that they would use by all means necessary to defeat Home Rule.

In addition, in Proteus, when Stephen's associates shells with money, a thought which is influenced by the shells displayed in Deasy's study, Stephen thinks of Deasy and puts emphasis on his foreignness by using Scottish dialect: Dominie Deasy kens them a (*U* 3.19-20). This is Stephen's way of renouncing Deasy's colonialist concept of Irishness.

On the wall Deasy looks at the portrait of Albert Edward, King of the United Kingdom in 1904. Edward Said claims that fragile images [family photographs] often carried next to the heart, or placed by the side of the bed, are used to refer to that which historical time has no right to destroy (Said, 405). At the time when the Union with England was threatened, Deasy, an Ulster Unionist, naturally displays his monarchy on the wall so as to fortify his political position. It was also in Ulster that the king or queen was largely respected when he or she was often insulted by the public in the other parts of the United Kingdom. Significantly Edward VII endorsed Ulster Unionists. When he, as Prince of Wales, visited Ireland in 1886, his advice to the Irish nationalists was that if they followed the north's example their problems would be solved (Loughlin, 44).

Deasy's Unionism ultimately converges on a phrase: "We are Irish, all king's sons" (*U* 2.279-80). The phrase "all king's sons" originates from an Irish proverb - All Irishmen are king's sons -, but also can connote English

Kings, not least because the colonizer appropriates the culture of the colonized to adapt it for their own use. Therefore, with the phrase, Deasy declares Irish Unionism. Appropriately enough, Deasy announces his pride in being a descendant of Sir John Blackwood who voted for the union (*U* 2.279). But even in this moment his Unionism is vitiated by his confusion of J.C. Blackwood, a pro-Unionist, with his father, Sir Blackwood, an anti-Unionist. Deasy's Unionism has triggered an ironic response from Stephen because Deasy's "we" has excluded and dominated Stephen and his Catholic Irish in the political as well as economic domain; Deasy's ancestors riding to Dublin to vote for the Union brings a similar tunes of Irish ballad in Stephen's mind: Lal the ral the ra / The rocky road to Dublin (*U* 2.284-85). According to Gifford, this anonymous Irish ballad describes the adventures of a poor Catholic boy from Connacht as he travels through Dublin to Liverpool. . . . In Liverpool, when his country is insulted he answers with his shillelagh and is joined by Galway boys, [thus finally winning] respect in the rough world (Gifford, 37). Compared with public monuments, Luke Gibbons claims the importance of the street ballad to the colonized people:

Public monuments are expressions of official memory, and bear witness to the power of the state to legitimate its triumphant version of the past, and assert its authority over its citizens. By their imposing presence, and their control of public space, they stand in stark contrast to the memories of the vanquished which attach themselves to fugitive and endangered cultural forms such as the street ballad. . . . Unlike monuments, ballads were excluded from the public sphere, and hence carried on a clandestine existence in the margins between the personal and the political, charging a personal event or memory with the impact of a political catastrophe. (Gibbons, 369-70)

In their book *The Empire Writes Back*, Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin also claim the importance of oral culture in a colonized country. What the colonizer endeavors to oppress is not the domination of one language over another but of one form of communication over another, and specifically of writing over orality (Ashcroft, 81). Stephen's thought of the Irish ballad, therefore, has an underlying political implication, that is, the overt rejection of Unionism which has done more harm than good to Ireland and the Irish people.

Deasy's Unionist phrase also connects Deasy to the Revivalist's whose concepts of history had been Anglicized despite their pursuit of Irish identity through literature. Kiberd explains the phrase "all king's sons" in connection with the Revivalists. He says, The aristocratic fetishism of many Irish revivalists led them to claim their descent from ancient royal Irish families (Kiberd, 955). Revivalists counted on the heroic Irish past to claim their Irish heritage. Likewise, Deasy denies the coevalness of time in Ireland as shown in his collection of Stuart coins, a base treasure of a bog (*U* 2.201-2), apostle spoons and pictures of famous racehorses. A few lines earlier, Deasy's repetition of "What is it now?" (*U* 2.189; 195) in response to the students quarreling underlines his testy unwillingness to surrender to the present (Kiberd, 954). This is typical of the colonialist concept of time in their colony. Haines has come to Ireland to explore a dead culture and its language. For him Ireland is still in an allochronic existence from the imperial center, Britain, and thus it is an object for anthropological scrutiny. Like Haines, Deasy remains in the same psychological state of the colonizer, however he claims his Irishness and expresses his worries about Ireland in the ensuing discussion with Stephen.

Deasy's Ulster background, on the other hand, enables him to reflect upon Ulster's situation and uphold a different sort of Unionism from traditional

Irish Unionism. At the turn of the century, Ulster's Unionism differentiated itself from Irish Unionism, thus making way for the partition of Ireland. Unlike Southern Unionists, Ulster Unionist Deasy blames the English, claiming that he has rebel blood (*U* 2.278) against the English government. While it might be attributed to his flattering assertion of Irishness, this ironic expression might be historically traced back to the so-called contractarian theory of D.W. Miller:

. . . a civil contract existed between themselves and successive British governments, to the effect that, in return for colonizing and civilizing Ulster, their rights, especially the right not to be handed over to their enemies, had to be respected by the authorities in London. (cited in Loughlin 33)

Therefore, Ulster's relationship with British governments is a mutually dependent one. They are always loyal to the crown, but British governments are accepted so long as they respect their rights and privileges as British citizens. Otherwise, they are willing to break off the relationship with British governments and establish their own Protestant local government and parliament.

Historically the British government apparently responded only to the prospect of a violent and ungovernable Ireland (Jackson, 40). For instance, at the end of the eighteenth century, Ireland had achieved a Protestant parliamentary independence as a result of its volunteer's force. This history of violence has reminded Ulster Protestants that the tyrannical British government could and should be overthrown. This was further embodied in the Ulster Volunteers of the 1910s and, ironically, Irish Republicans. It is quite natural that Deasy's threatening military rhetoric should remind Stephen of the Protestant Ulster's anti-Catholic battle cry: "For Ulster will fight /

And Ulster will be right" (*U* 2.397-98). Their battle is not only against Irish Catholics but also against the British governments.

Deasy's use of Sir Blackwood's expression "*per vias rectas*" (*U* 2.282), by which the latter intended the opposite meaning, that is, an anti-Union sentiment, shows his bigotry and narrow-mindedness, which ultimately implies partition of Ireland, that is, a Catholic government in the South and a Protestant government in Ulster. His mentality is also shown in other matters. Using military terms, he deems his opinion about the foot and mouth disease as *the dictates of common sense* (*U* 2.294-95). The military terms expose his and Ulster Unionist's firm position: against home rule, they will fight. As he finishes typing an article about the disease, he says "Full stop." And the narrator's voice follows: "Mr Deasy bade his keys" (*U* 2.305). His emphasis on the dot, implying, as he has said, that there are no two opinions on the matter (*U* 2.322-23) which makes the narrator use military terms again.

Though the Home Rule Bills were rejected twice at the end of the nineteenth century, the political future for Ulster Protestants at the beginning of the twentieth century didn't look optimistic. They then were certain that partition, with the help of the British government, was inevitable lest they should be included in a United Ireland. As long as the British government kept its promise with their people in Ulster and preserved their privileges as loyal subjects, they were always loyal and ready to assert their nature as British citizens.

Paying Stephen's wage, Deasy asks Stephen what is the proudest boast of an Englishman. This question reminds Stephen of the sea's ruler (*U* 2.246), that is, Nelson, whom, in *Telemachus*, he has associated with Haines. And Stephen naturally answers in the perspective of colonized people. He says that "on his empire . . . the sun never sets" (*U* 2.248). In contrast, Deasy answers I paid my way, avoiding the overt political implications of

Stephen's response. He stresses his faith on the Englishman's boast by showing his savingsbox. This emphasis on the materialism to a colonial intellectual by a member of the ruling class might imply an underlying political intention. Fanon argues:

The native intellectual had learnt from his masters that the individual ought to express himself fully. Brother, sister, friend - these are words outlawed by the colonialist bourgeoisie, because for them my brother is my purse, my friend is part of my scheme for getting on. The native intellectual takes pride in the destruction of all his idols: egotism, recrimination that springs from pride and the childish stupidity of those who always want to have the last word. (*The Wretched of the Earth*, 36)

Deasy's essential definition of Englishness as materialism, which he suggests Stephen also should pursue, and his assertion of its superiority evince the colonizer's intention of preventing a native intellectual from arousing people into political uprising. In fact, Deasy, emphasizing individualism, is inculcating a hegemonic education upon Stephen.

Deasy asks Stephen if he can behave himself just like an Englishman. His response to this is simply "For the moment, no" (*U* 2.260), after pondering the long comic, realistic details, of debt and borrowing in his mind. Stephen knows what Deasy thinks about the Irish Celts since, in the eyes of an English man or an Ulster Protestant, the Irish have been treated as a spendthrift race, thus being much in debt. Stephen's remark implies that the present colonial economical and political situation is a significant impediment to the Irish economy, and it is ultimately responsible for his personal debt and poverty. Unlike Deasy, he is not attached to the past and is ready to scrutinize the present and create a different future.

Why then does Deasy assert the Englishman's boast? This can be construed in an historical perspective. During the Home Rule crisis, Unionists and Ulster Unionists in particular wanted to attach themselves more tightly than ever to the characteristics of Englishness. Ulster Scots claimed their Englishness and Anglo-Saxon racial characteristics which a common Protestantism allowed them to share with the English. In the perspective of the colonizer, Ashimead-Bartlett distinguishes Ulster Protestants from Irish Celts:

The lazy, lawless Celt, had never been an imperial or ruling race; however, in the east of Ulster where the descendant of . . . Saxon colonialists are the bulk of the population, the only really prosperous and law-abiding portion of Ireland [exists] . . . There, a race of British blood and of the Protestant faith are the mainstay of the British connection, as well as being the most progressive and civilizing element among the Irish population.  
(cited in Loughlin, 23)

Ulster Unionist's opposition to Irish Home Rule was mainly based on the ethnocentric logic that the industrious and peaceful part of Ireland couldn't be governed by a lazy and thriftless Catholic government. Deasy's mimicry of the English stresses his distance from the Catholic Stephen; his binarism within Ireland may be the origin of the partition of Ireland. When Joyce was writing *Ulysses*, partition of Ireland had progressed with the argument of how many counties in Ulster should be excluded from Southern Ireland, and it had finally been completed in 1920 despite fierce opposition from Irish nationalists.

Deasy's Unionism, which is based on an assumed English characteristic, materialism, is a much distorted version of the original Unionism of Lord

Clare, the founder of Irish Unionism. Lord Clare, as an Irish patriot in a different sense than Irish nationalists, defended the Union with Great Britain: I would advance her from the degraded post of a mercenary province to the proud station of an integral and governing member of the greatest empire in the world (cited in Donal McCartney, 19). He reproached Irish people for their immersion in materialism and claimed a firm Union with England for better participation in the Empire. Ironically his accusation applies more appropriately to Ulster Protestants as shown in the case of Deasy who claims Ulster Protestant's Britishness on the basis of materialism.

Claiming their English identity, Ulster Unionists acted according to what was happening in England and what Englishmen thought was equitable. Deasy, as a representative of history, mirrors Ulster Protestant's dilemma and their firm alliance to England. He blames the Jews for the death of old England. At the turn of the century, thousands of immigrants from central, eastern and southern Europe, many of them Jewish, settled in England caused a great threat to the English economy and the purity of the English blood. This imaginary threat to England made Ulster Protestants have substantial antagonism against the Jews. They thought that they were being attacked and threatened by Jewish immigrants. The fact that Deasy expresses his anti-Semitism against the Jews in England, not against those in Ireland is supported by Deasy's last, though incorrect, remark: she never let them in (*U* 2.442). Loughlin gives an example of how Ulster Protestants worried about the arrival of the European Jews in England as if it was their own problem:

Although the Jewish refugees congregated mainly in industrial areas such as Manchester, Leeds and, especially, the East End of London, the loyalist press - taking its cue from the hostile nativist reaction in Britain - reacts as if they had all suddenly arrived in Belfast. (Loughlin, 31-2)

Stephen's subsequent reaction to Deasy's anti-Semitism is subversive. Firstly, Stephen recalls Blake's poem "Auguries of Innocence" which, like Deasy's diagnosis, describes the dying situation of England and its causes. But unlike Deasy, Blake ascribes England's deterioration like that of whore and a gambler. Though they may not be the veritable causes for the plight of England, Stephen at least avoids Deasy's monocause. Secondly, for Deasy's universal imputation of the situation of England to the Jews, Stephen tells him that his universal definition of the word "merchant" can be applied to all merchants not only to the Jewish: "A merchant . . . is one who buys cheap and sells dear, jew or gentile, is he not?" (*U* 2.359-60). Deasy admires Englishmen for their materialism, which Stephen is suggested to comply with, and now he condemns the Jews for their materialism. Deasy's logic, therefore, results in self-contradiction, thereby demolishing the superiority of the imperial center. Stephen thinks about the Jews in Paris and secretly connects them to the Irish by the word "geese" (*U* 2.365). Like the exiled Irish patriots, wild geese, the Jews, in Stephen's consciousness, are disclosed as the oppressed rather than as the oppressor such as embodied in Deasy's remark:

On the steps of the Paris stock exchange the goldskinned men  
quoting prices on their gemmed fingers. Gabble of geese. . . .  
Not theirs: these clothes, this speech, these gestures. Their full  
slow eyes belied the words, the gestures eager and unoffending,  
but knew the rancours massed about them and knew their zeal  
was vain. . . . A hoard heaped by the roadside: plundered and  
passing on. Their eyes knew their years of wandering and,  
patient, knew the dishonours of their flesh. (*U* 2.367-372)

They are shown as people struggling for survival in hostile surroundings. At the turn of the century the Jew's social instability deteriorated because of

the Dreyfu's case. Stephen's defense of the Jews is also illustrated earlier in this chapter. When Stephen helps Sargent, a retarded student, to do sums, he sees numbers and meditates on the colored people who contributed to the improvement of the world:

Across the page the symbols moved in grave morrice, in the mummery of their letters, . . . imps of fancy of the Moors. Gone too from the world, Averroes and Moses Maimonides, dark men in mien and movement, flashing in their mocking mirrors the obscure soul of the world, a darkness shining in brightness which brightness could not comprehend. (*U* 2.157-60)

The Moors introduced algebra into Europe during the Renaissance. Averroes, a Spanish-Arabian, and Moses Maimonides, a Jewish Rabbi, had great influences on medieval Christian thought. The latter, according to Gifford, was called the light of the West (Gifford, 33). Even Jesus Christ, in Stephen's contemplation, appears to have dark eyes (*U* 2.86-7). In Cyclops, this is more fully embodied in Bloom's self-defense against the Citizen by mentioning Christ's Jewishness. Deasy associates the Jews with the darkness that sinned against the light (*U* 2.361). Significantly, by inverting phrases in the Bible, Stephen disparages the idealism of Western thought of Enlightenment with which the Western world colonized assumed primitive cultures to convey light and civilization to the natives. In the above passages, darkness is related closely with colored people. Western people associate darkness with sin, crime, or primitiveness just as Deasy has described Jewish sin through the perspective of light. Joyce deconstructs the Western concept of the word by twisting its meaning. As if Stephen anticipates what Deasy will say about Jews, he upholds the positive aspect to defend people who are in a historical dilemma. Furthermore, Stephen's defense of the Jews is extended to

that of his own people. To the racialized eyes of the English, the Irish have been treated as Black people, Oriental, or simian. Stephen appropriately wears a black suit while mourning his mother, there by connecting himself with darkness; Bloom who also wear a black suit at Dignam's funeral belongs to darkness, shining in brightness which brightness an not comprehend. They represent the colonized people in one way or another. Deasy, on the other hand, is described in the connection with brightness: "He stepped swiftly off, his eyes coming to blue life as they passed a broad sunbeam" (*U* 2.352-53); "His eyes open wide in vision stared sternly across the sunbeam in which he halted" (357-58); and "On his wise shoulders through the checkerwork of leaves the sun flung spangles coins" (*U* 2.448-49). Earlier Stephen said that the pride of England is that of her empire, the sun never sets, thus connecting brightness with colonial domination. Deasy's connection with the sun also implies his nature as a colonizer.

Astonished at Stephens unexpectedly strong repulse to his anti-Semitism, Deasy changes his topic into anti-feminism. Here the metaphor of Deasy's 'sun' is extended by its pun 'son,' thereby unmasking the masculine aspect of imperialists. His imputation of Ireland's first invasion by Anglo-Normans on a woman once again evinces a deficiency in his knowledge of history. Furthermore the fact that he is also a settler whose ancestors came to Ireland as a result of English colonization exposes the absurdity of his remark. He hurries up to connect historical incidents to achieve one goal, anti-feminism. In haste or lack of knowledge, he mentions MacMurrough's wife and O'Rourke, not MacMurrough and O'Rourke's wife-replacement owing to his psychological fixity on the purpose of debasing women. Even though Deasy talks about Irish history, his concern about the predicament of England is secretly implied as one of the reasons for his anti-feminism. This time his mentality is again focused on the colonial center. At the turn of the century,

the idea of female emancipation aroused deep fears among male members of the population, but demands for female suffrage were being resisted by the overwhelming majority of Conservative and Liberal M.P.s (Curtis, 61-2). Unlike in England, in Ireland, the movement for female emancipation was not so noticeable as the independence movement. Deasy's anti-feminism, therefore, is a reflection of the situation of England rather than that of Ireland.

The colonial hierarchy is strengthened as long as the patriarchal order within families is firmly maintained. Otherwise, the male should find out an outlet outside the family environment where he can assert his supremacy. Joachim Marcus claims that the strongest anti-Semitic persons belonged to the most conflictual family structures. Their anti-Semitism was a reaction to frustrations suffered inside the family environment (cited in Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, 158). In this context Deasy's anti-Semitism may be traced back to his family business. As it turned out in *Aeolus*, one of the reasons for Deasy's anti-feminism is also attributed to his disharmony with his wife.

The English had projected feminine weakness upon the Irish, and, as a result, the latter had been widely treated as a feminine race. Deasy's imputation of the invasion of Ireland on a woman logically concludes that Ireland's destiny depends on a woman just as Parnell, Deasy has claimed, was brought low by a woman. Therefore, the alleged feminine characteristics of Irish Catholic had precluded them from having self-government. Even in this case, Ulster Protestants connected themselves with the English. John Beddoe claims, "For ages . . . the Ulster men [have] . . . differed by their manly and vigorous character from their soft and treacherous countrymen in the south" (cited in Loughlin, 24).

The hallmark of the colonizer, Deasy's binarism, which sets the English against the Jews, and men against women, finally exposes its mask. Deasy contends "Many errors, many failures but not the one sin." He says, "I am a

struggler now at the end of my days. But I will fight for the right till the end" (*U* 2.394-96). And Stephen perceives the one sin through Ulster Protestant's anti-home Rule motto to be the relinquishment of the Union with England. Though Deasy identifies one sin as the Jews sin against the Light, Stephen, by finding Deasy's own words; "fight and right in a battle "... cry" against Catholics, recognizes Deasy's unquestionable sin. Here Deasy's binary division ultimately converges on a binarism: Ulster Unionism and Irish nationalism, or assumed Ulster Anglo-Saxon and Irish Celts.

Deasy's view of history is typical of the colonizer. Deasy claims that all human history moves towards one great goal, the manifestation of God (*U* 2.380-81). Deasy's history coincides with Hegel's concept of history-as-progress in which history is construed as an absolutist and homogeneous evolutionary march of the world spirit, unfolding and creating itself through the dialectical incorporation of otherness, culminating in a total or totalitarian self-realisation (Williams and Chrisman, 9). Gottfried Keller asserts that in that process the truth will never run away from us, implying that all of the colonizer's actions are executed on the basis of justice (cited in Benjamin, 255). The colonizer sees his history as progress, thus beautifying his history of invasion and occupation as his mission of civilization. Joyce himself equated the succession of the ages and history with the denial of reality and thus that which deceives the whole world (*The Critical Writings of James Joyce*, 81). In *Ulysses*, "those big words . . . which make us so unhappy" is Stephen's way of expressing the colonizer's historiography. In other words, the colonizer writes his history to arrange all events into one big goal, excluding what he think is inappropriate for their own purpose.

Deasy's school is characterized as a system which inculcates students with facts, there by deterring other possibilities obtained through imagination. Students ought to learn by rote in studying history as well as poetry, which

recalls Charles Dickens's *Hard Times* where Louisa and Tom are victimized by utilitarian education which puts emphasis upon fact and ruthlessly suppresses the imaginative sides of their nature. Naturally Stephen, who should defer to Deasy's education method, gets tired of his teaching. Stephen thinks that the history which he ought to teach in Deasy's school is fabled by the daughter of memory (*U* 2.7), thus excluding other possibilities for designated purposes. The subject of Stephen's history lesson, Pyrrhus, is no less a good example of a hegemonic education because students learn that the political uprising in Ireland, like Greek Pyrrhus, was destined to fail. Appropriately Irish people identify their historical destiny with Greece as claimed by MacHugh in *Aeolus*. As in Deasy's school, colonial education is inclined to teach the fundamental hierarchy between people. Stephen's subversion of this thought, on the other hand, takes place in his mind by dwelling on other possibilities:

Had Pyrrhus not fallen by a beldams hand in Argos or Julius Caesar not been knifed to death. They are not to be thought away. Time has branded them and fettered they are lodged in the room of the infinite possibilities they have ousted. But can those have been possible seeing that they never were? Or was that only possible which came to pass? Weave, weaver of the wind. (*U* 2.48-53)

Deasy's order for Sargent to copy is in keeping with Stephen's history and poetry lesson, a lesson that excludes imagination for fact. Stephen's response is short but to the point: futility (*U* 2.133). In *Proteus* he continues to ponder on Aristotle's philosophy about the possible and realizes that what we see or hear is just its sign, not its reality. In the world of a colonized country, its colonized people explore other plausible possibilities, thus avoiding the colonizer's egocentrism and monocause.

In response to Deasy's concept of history, Stephen claims that a shout in the street (*U* 2.386) is God. Outside Deasy's office, students are playing hockey, an English game, and, like Deasy, they are seeking a goal. According to Seamus Deane, the military element [of chivalric society] was converted by the Public School system into a sporting element; but that soon reverted to its military origins in times of war (Deane, 16-7). Appropriately enough, a little earlier Stephen heard military echos from the students' hockey play:

Again: a goal. I am among them, among their battling bodies in a medley, the joust of life . . . Joust, slush and uproar of battles, the frozen deathspew of the slain, a shout of spearspikes baited with mens bloodied guts. (*U* 2.314-18)

In Circe the word "joust" (*U* 15.4636) is used again by Biddy the Clap to describe the quarrel between Stephen and Private Carr, which is a symbolic confrontation between an Irish nationalist and the British Empire. Deasy's students enact a different version of jousting in their hockey play. Deasy's students are from the Anglo-Irish Ascendancy class, and their parents are naturally proud that their eldest son was in the navy (*U* 2.25). These students may also proudly serve in the British army in the future. In ordinary peace time it is through sports games that students from dominating classes control their aggression. Nandy claims that the English are preoccupied with the control of their own aggression, the avoidance of aggression from others, and the prevention of the emergence of aggressive behavior from their children (Nandy, 50). For example, Deasy is upset at the student's quarrel and he is preoccupied with controlling them and transforming their violence into sports games where violence is efficiently tackled by a certain rules.

Stephen recognizes the existence of a single goal of the British Empire even in the students' playing. According to Deasy's concept of history, the

British Empire is an institution which exists to achieve one goal. In connection with Ulster, Protestants Ascendancy over Catholics is one step progress. Therefore, Deasy proclaims he is fighting for one goal. Stephen repudiates this idea by exposing its identity in an instant. In this moment, time stops and the event shows the truth of the era and, further, the entire course of history. In Benjamin's sense, this moment is the sign of a Messianic cessation of happening, or, put differently, a revolutionary chance in the fight for the oppressed past (Benjamin, 262-63). This kind of history is also another version of Vico's history as repetition. With another whistle pointing to another goal, Stephen associates Deasy's history, and meditates on a putative attack: "What if that nightmare gave you a back kick?" (*U* 2.379). Stephen's resignation from Deasy's hegemonic school is a step toward liberation from the nightmare of history.

In the psychological drama of *Circe*, Deasy's concept of history is further parodied and mocked by Stephen and Bloom. Firstly, Deasy's apocalyptic history encounters THE END OF THE WORLD: (*with a Scotch accent*) "Whall dance the keel row, the keel row, the keel row?" (*U* 15.2180-82). Once again the Scots' dialects, recalling Deasy, expose his foreignness, and his concept of history is ridiculously mocked. The ensuing appearance of Elijah and his advice to the drunkard - "Bumboosers, save your stamps" (*U* 15.2207) - also remind the reader of Deasy and the absurdity of his concept of history. Secondly, the prostitutes, particularly Zoe, foretell Bloom's and Stephen's destiny through palmistry. Significantly Zoe is from England, thus connecting her action to a political significance. According to a fixed palmistry, Zoe wants to foreordain Stephen's and Bloom's destiny, blocking other possibilities, which is typical of the colonizers' concept of history. Stephen thus parodies Zoe the Englishwoman's teleological history, remembering Deasy's remark in *Nestor*:

STEPHEN

See? Moves to one great goal. I am twentytwo. Sixteen years ago he was twentytwo too. Sixteen years ago I twentytwo tumbled. Twentytwo years ago he sixteen fell off his hobbyhorse. (*he winces*) Hurt my hand somewhere. Must see a dentist. Money? (*U* 15.3717-21)

A little later Deasy is described further from the perspective of his nature as a colonizer. Deasy participates in an imaginary horse race:

*(A dark horse, riderless, bolts like a phantom past the winningpost, his mane moonfoaming, his eyeballs stars. . . . Skeleton horses, Sceptre, Maximum the Second, Zinfandel, the duke of Westminster's Shotover, Repulse, the duke of Beauforts Ceylon, prix de Paris. . . . Last in a drizzle of rain on a brokenwinded isabelle nag, Cock of the North, the favourite, honey cap, green jacket, orange sleeves, Garrett Deasy up, gripping the reins, a hockystick at the ready. . .)* (*U* 15.3974-82)

Except for the dark horse, all of the horses have imperial nuances - the first four horses actually participated in the Gold Cup Race on the 16th of June, 1904, while the next three horses are from the pictures on the walls in Deasy's study. Deasy appears as a rider of a horse called Cock of the North which, according to Gifford, was a nickname for the Scot George Gordon (1770-1836), whose Gordon Highlanders were instrumental in the suppression of the Catholic peasant insurrection in Wexford during the Rebellion of 1798 (Gifford, 515). Here Deasy's Scottishness and his nature as a colonizer is reemphasized. As in an actual race, a dark horse wins the race. In *Cyclops* Bloom is called a dark horse (*U* 12.1558) and, as I mentioned earlier, he has been associated with darkness. The fact that the Jewish Bloom

symbolically wins the race gives Deasy a further attack against his anti-Semitism. Deasy's green jacket with orange sleeves exposes his political identity in Ireland: a settler Unionist and, specifically, an Ulster Unionist. His hockeystick plays a hegemonic role, a joust in which students from the Anglo-Irish Ascendancy are cultivated into a colonialist type. In other words, Deasy's hockeystick implies an ideological war, a war which intends to attach Ireland more closely to England.

Because horses are Ascendancy's favorite creatures (Eagleton, 58), the horse race is charged with a political significance in the fading moments of the Ascendancy's political power. The Orange Lodges respond to Deasy's slow riding with a sneering not least because his losing the race might refer to a failure in the political sphere. As in Nestor, he uses Sir John Blackwood's anti-Union phrase "*Per vias rectas*" to express a pro-Union sentiment, thus once again exposing his ignorance. As in Nestor, Deasy is also associated with dancing coins (*U* 15.3991) which shows that he is faithful to the alleged Englishmen's pride. The greeting to Sir John appears again, but this time the people who greet him are named as the Green Lodges, who support Irish Home Rule. Therefore, their greeting to Sir John is genuine, highlighting their respect for his pro-Home rule policy.

### III

For Joyce, Unionism, whether of Ireland or of Ulster, is always confined within a colonialist concept and thus is dismantled through his literary refusal of Unionism as well as of the history of domination. Deasy's Unionism is couched in terms of continuous domination of an inferior race by a more superior race. His dichotomy - English / Irish, English / Jewish, and man / woman - foreshadows the partition of Ireland and exposes how much he is

irrevocably Anglicized. To declare their Englishness, Ulster Unionists mimic the English way of life and are anxious about the deteriorating condition of colonial center. In a sense, Deasy and Ulster Unionists are also the victims of colonial history in that their standard of judgment is on the other side of the Irish Sea. Significantly Joyce's subversive strategy is grounded in the mimicry of Deasy and Ulster Unionists by Stephen, but here the latter's words and way of thinking are appropriated for his own creative usage. Joyce's thorough scrutiny of Unionism in the discussion between Garrett Deasy and Stephen Dedalus not only acts to expose the clandestine imperial mode of subjugation and of efficient governing and but also to free Joyce from the nightmare of an oppressed history.

⟨The University College, Dublin, Ireland⟩

## Works Cited

- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations*, ed. and with an introduction by Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken, 1969.
- Curtis, L.P., Jr. *Anglo-Saxons and Celts: A Study of Anti-Irish Prejudice in Victorian England*. Connecticut: The University of Bridgeport, 1968.
- Deane, Seamus. "Masked with Matthew Arnold's Face: Joyce and Liberalism." In Morris Beja ed. *James Joyce: The Centennial Symposium*. 9-20.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Felix. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, trans. Dana Polan. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.
- Dickens, Charles. *Hard Times*. London: Hazell, Watson & Viney, Ltd., 1960.

- Eagleton, Terry. *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger*. London; New York: Verso, 1995.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Constance Farrington. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1967.
- . *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Charles Lam Markmann. London: Pluto Press, 1986.
- Gifford, Don & Seidman, Robert J. *Ulysses Annotated: Notes for James Joyce's Ulysses*. Berkeley and LA: University of California Press, 1988.
- Jackson, Alvin. "Irish Unionism 1905-21" In *Nationalism & Unionist: Conflict in Ireland 1885-1921*. The Queen's University of Belfast: The Institute of Irish Studies, 1994. 35-46.
- Joyce, James. *The Critical Writings of James Joyce*, eds. Ellsworth Mason and Richard Ellmann. New York: Viking, 1964.
- . *Ulysses*, eds. Hans Walter Gabler et al. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1986.
- Kiberd, Declan. *Ulysses: Annotated Students Edition*. London: Penguin Books, 1992.
- Loughlin, James. *Ulster Unionism and British National Identity since 1885*. London and New York: Pinter, 1995.
- McCartney, Donal. "The Quest for Irish Political Identity: the Image and the Illusion." In Maurice Harmon ed. *Anglo-Irish Literature & its Contexts*. Dublin: Wolfhound Press, 1979. 13-22.
- Nandy, Ashis. *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage, 1994.
- Spoo, Robert. *James Joyce and the Language of History: Dedalus Nightmare*. New York: Oxford UP, 1994.
- Williams, Patrick & Laura Chrisman eds. *Colonial Discourse and Post-colonial Theory*. Cambridge: Harvester Wheatsheat, 1993.