

Re-membering the Rising: A Theoretical Reading of the Politics of Memory

EUGENE O'BRIEN

That the 1916 rising is a seminal point in the history of Ireland is beyond dispute; however, there are violent disputes about its ontological, epistemological, ethical and political importance, and the whole notion of how to celebrate (or the question as to whether we should, indeed, celebrate) this event has become an issue. There are similar issues as to how it is remembered. In this paper, I would like to offer a cultural theory perspective on remembering 1916, and specifically I would suggest that seeing it as a primal scene will allow us to have a more complete understanding of the complexity of the Easter Rising on the Irish psyche, and indeed, on the Irish body politic.

This term derives from the work of Sigmund Freud, and from the case of Sergei Pankejeff, whose father and sister had killed themselves, and who was suffering from depression himself. He had been having a repeated dream of wolves looking in his window and awakening him, and Freud traces the roots of this dream in his essay 'From the History of an Infantile Neurosis'. Briefly, as a child, Pankejeff awoke one afternoon and saw his parents having '*coitus a tergo*, three times repeated; he was able to see his mother's genitals as well as his father's organ; and he understood the process as well as its significance.¹ For Freud, the wolves looking at the child are the unconscious displacements of his own unwelcome viewing of his parents having sex (perhaps acting as symbols of the animalistic event that has so disturbed Pankejeff), though in a drawing, the wolves look more like dogs, and Freud goes on to explore this additional fact that the boy has been taken to watch sheep and has seen 'just such large white dogs and probably also observe them copulating'.² Freud suggests that this is,

possibly, where the initial primal scene came into being – in other words, he suggest that the primal scene is actually a primal ‘phantasy’.³ He contends that the relation between the memory and the actual event is one that is not linear, and one that is created by elements of dreamwork and resistance.

To apply Freudian psychoanalysis, which *de facto* is based on the individual, to a society or culture would seem to be breaking both disciplinary and methodological bounds. However, I would argue that there is intellectual warrant for such an application. Judith Butler, in her ground-breaking book *The Psychic Life of Power*, teases out an adequation between the psyche of individual and the psyche of a culture, making the point that in cases of national or societal trauma, the emergence of ‘collective institutions for grieving are thus crucial to survival, to reassembling community, to rearticulating kinship, to reweaving sustaining relations’.⁴ The collective and ideological memorialising of 1916, through the construction of a monological narrative of salvation, sacrifice and redemption (and the fact that the date stands in synecdoche for the complex series of activities before, during and after the rising underlines the created nature of this narrative), has been the norm in Irish culture. The problem arose when this narrative, which had been confined to an originary past in the case of the official organs of the state, was now being used as an ongoing performative moral and ethical warrant in terms of the Provisional IRA’s justification for their campaign of violence against the British army and unionist and loyalist groupings during the Troubles from 1969 to the Good Friday Agreement in 1998.

I would argue that looking at 1916 as a Freudian primal scene offers a chance for new understandings of the event, of its place in our culture, and of the confused and often contradictory emotions of pride and shame that is has aroused in people since its occurrence. Before exploring the relevance of this mode of reading the rising, it is necessary to trace the problematics attached to the 1916 rising itself, and to what might be seen as its effect on

succeeding generations. Moreover, it is on the contemporary effects of the rising that my paper focuses: while the past is significant, it is really only discursively available in the present and it is the mode of remembering the rising in contemporary Ireland that is at the core of my analysis.

The proclamation of the republic, which was read on the steps of the GPO on April 24, 1916 also foregrounded notions of remembrance, as the act of rebellion is located in the context of mythic remembrance: ‘Irishmen and Irishwomen: In the name of God and of the dead generations from which she receives her old tradition of nationhood, Ireland, through us, summons her children to her flag and strikes for her freedom’.⁵ Three things are significant here. One is that Pearse is accrediting a single monological memorial thrust to the past – in other words, there is no account taken of any Irishmen and Irishwomen who may not have been keen on calling the children of a personified Ireland to arms. The second point of significance is that this act of memory is very much a performative one: Ireland is personified; words are put into the mouths of dead generations who may or may not have agreed with the point being made; politics as a societal arena has been deftly transmuted into a familial discourse.

Instead of pointing out that the IRB, itself a secret subgroup of the Irish Volunteers (some 180,000 members in 1914), and never a majority organisation in an Irish context, had decided to disobey a direct order cancelling the rising and to attempt an abortive rebellion, the memory is explained differently. The passive voice is used and a personified and anthropomorphised female maternal Ireland is seen as calling her children, a term suggestive of lack of responsibility and maturity, to strike for her. This rhetorization of grammar is continued in the second paragraph where, again, memory is couched in a particular manner:

Having organised and trained her manhood through her secret revolutionary organisation, the Irish Republican Brotherhood, and through her open military organisations, the Irish Volunteers and the Irish Citizen Army, having patiently perfected her discipline, having resolutely waited for the right moment to reveal itself,

she now seizes that moment, and supported by her exiled children in America and by gallant allies in Europe, but relying in the first on her own strength, she strikes in full confidence of victory.⁶

Here the memory is again couched with Pearse and his colleagues as passive, seemingly enthralled to this personification of Ireland, but now the familial relationship is different. In the previous piece, the relationship between a feminised Ireland and the rebels in the GPO was that of a mother and her children, and this is possibly the context of Joyce's assertion that Ireland was 'the old sow that eats her farrow'.⁷ However, in this quotation, the relationship appears to have been somewhat sexualised as Ireland has been seen to have 'organised and trained her manhood', as opposed to her children, and the reference to 'exiled children' in America, and gallant allies in Europe would further complicate this narrative.

The point here is that Pearse, in his telling of the tale, is using some interesting familial metaphors and a feminising of nationhood, which can be seen as quasi-sexual, with a number of references to 'her children'. He speaks of how the Irish people, 'six times during the past three hundred years', have 'asserted it in arms'.⁸ This is a very partial perspective, as not all of the Irish people were involved in such assertion in arms, and this brings us to the third point of significance of the oration. All acts of memory, while they evoke the past and images of people and events which are no longer here, take place in the present, and that by definition, they are performative as opposed to constative. By using the passive voice, Pearse is very much attempting to elide the performativity and the agency of his words. As Jacques Derrida has noted, across the canon of his writing, memory is always an act, it is always something performed by a human subject in the present. It is 'the most living act of memory';⁹ he talks about a discourse of mastery as 'an act of memory', which allows for engagement with the past which permits the 'formalization in an economical manner of the maximum of things to be said and thought'.¹⁰ He also makes the telling point that an act of memory is necessarily partial, as it consists of 'betraying a certain order of capital in order to be faithful to the other heading and

to the other of the heading'.¹¹ Therefore, the proclamation itself, that which is part of the commemoration, is itself, a complex act of memory, which attempts to give life to the dead. In *The Politics of Friendship*, Derrida makes the very point that an act of memory in the present is the only way in which to give some form of life to the dead:

for at stake is an act of memory - this is what must engage memory in the present, *in the presence of the dead*, if that can be said; for however difficult this remains to say ... the dead live and the absent are present.¹²

It is in the present, and in the consciousness and writing that take place in that present, that the dead live through the act of memory, and in essence, this is what happens in the proclamation. The persistent use of the passive voice attempts to elide this process, but a careful reading makes it clear what is actually taking place here. Memory is, by definition, an active process that takes place in the present; the dead are passive and are remembered, 're-membered', in a different context to that in which they lived. It is as if they are ghostly presences, who are conjured up by those in the present, and because they are dead and voiceless, they are given face and voice by those who are performatively enacting their memory. The use of the passive voice in the proclamation attempts to elide this performativity, but when analysed it is clear that the people being called to arms are in fact calling themselves, and using rhetorical strategies to mask the fact that theirs is a profoundly undemocratic act, at the level of their country and at the level of their own public organisation.

Therefore, to take stock, when we speak of remembering the rising, in effect we are now looking at a second order of memory, a memorialisation of memory, a second derivative, which is a problematic process. Moreover, if we are remembering 1916, which is at the core of all the commemorative processes, then what exactly are we remembering? Is there a kernel of 1916-ness that we need to recall. What is there to remember? Historians, politicians and cultural commentators are all in debate and dispute about 1916.

Probably the hegemonic nationalist perspective on the rising is summarised by Eóin Ó Broin, when he notes that the year 1916 is ‘rightly viewed as a turning point in modern Irish history’,¹³ and he goes on to add that while undoubtedly a ‘military failure, the Easter Rising of 1916 acted as a turning point in the popular Irish nationalist imagination, fatally undermining the conservative Home Rule politics, and replacing it with a more militant separatism’.¹⁴ On the other hand, Conor Cruise O’Brien has termed Pearse ‘a maniac, mystic nationalist with a cult of blood sacrifice and a strong personal motivation towards death’.¹⁵ The main political parties in Ireland remember 1916 as a foundational act in the journey towards nationhood, though former Taoiseach John Bruton has raised some questions as to its validity in an interview on RTE on August 4, 2014, when he made the point that:

What they did when they occupied the GPO and other strong points in Dublin – and they said so in their proclamation – they were allying themselves with the Kaiser, the Kaiser’s Germany, with the Ottoman Empire and with the Austrian Empire Against the French republic, and against the United Kingdom, in whose armies many other Irish people – including perhaps brothers of those who were going out in 1916 – actually fought.¹⁶

Therefore, memories of the rising have been to say the least, sites of debate and discussion.

Specific anniversaries are what Jacques Lacan might term quilting point, or *points de capiton*, where sense and meaning are quilted together in a seemingly fixed relationship,¹⁷ of the memorialisation of the rising, the 50th and 75th anniversaries, again, the acts of memory were very different. The commemoration of 1966 saw a hagiographic series of acts of remembrance, with drams on RTE featuring messianic portraits of the rebels, and a national narrative that very much saw no ethical or political issues to cause any problems. Practically every school in the country had a framed copy of the proclamation; schoolchildren, certainly in Christian Brothers Schools, learned the text off by heart, and the poetry of Padraig Pearse

was a common refrain on television and radio. There was a national performativity involved with many plays, marches and tableaux of the rebellion being staged:

The centrepiece of the official commemoration was a military parade down O'Connell Street, watched by 600 veterans in the viewing stand and approximately 200,000 onlookers in the city centre. Pageants, religious services and art exhibitions were held, and RTE dedicated much of its schedule during the week to programmes related to the Rising.¹⁸

Along with this very clear sense of national pride, there was a concomitant focus on enculturating younger generations into the meanings of 1916, again through drama and action:

The state sponsored competitions in literature, music and art. Children were invited to write essays, in Irish or English, entitled 'An Easter Week veteran tells his story' or '1916-2016'. A pageant, '*Aiséirí – Glóir Réim na Cásca*', was staged in Croke Park, while the GAA commissioned their own pageant, '*Seachtar Fear, Seacht Lá*', both directed at youth. The 17th of April was named 'Lá na nÓg' and 20,000 students from 200 Dublin schools marched to Croke Park for a special performance of 'Aiséirí'. On 22 April the Proclamation was read in schools throughout the country. Special Masses were held for schoolchildren, which were preceded by a parade to the local church.¹⁹

The performativity of these forms of commemoration involved what we might now term a repetition complex, a repetition of the actions of the original event, as these events were preformed and re-enacted without any great degree of debate, discussion or critique. The use of the Irish language to describe some of these events is another rhetorical strategy used to mask the fact that any real form of renewal of the Irish language had not really taken place. To remember this was to also remember that Pearse's statement that the Ireland of the future needed to be 'not free merely, but Gaelic as well; not Gaelic merely, but free as well'.²⁰ Of course, in 1966, this was not the case, but in a manner paralleling the use of the passive voice in the proclamation, language here is used to glide over this state of affairs. The present is remembering the past as the past would have liked the present to be. This act of memory is a

sanitisation of the past through an ideologically driven mode of the present, and a repression of the facts that did not fit this sanitised ideal.

To remember was to remember uncritically, and also, to re-enact without comment. As Conor Cruise O'Brien put it, the event itself was one thing, but 'the way the event was imagined another thing, and more powerful'.²¹ I would both agree and disagree with Cruise-O'Brien here; I would agree that the imagined event is more powerful, taking us close to what Jacques Lacan might term the 'real' of the rising; however, I would disagree that there is an incongruity between the event and its imagining, as I think it is becoming clear that the lines between recalling an event and reimagining that event are very blurred indeed.

This sense of the imagined thing is the core of my paper. The rising itself was also imagined through memory as we have seen: the recursive embedding of the rising in a 300-year narrative, which was sweeping to a teleological goal. In 1966, it was imagined as a monological march of a nation to nationhood, with any awkwardness elided in the dramatic sweep of remembering through retelling and re-enacting the core events. It was less a political action than a symbolic and salvific one, its legacy and discursive context being more unconsciously mythic than political, and it is in this sense, as an event unconscious. In 1991, the occasion of the 75th anniversary of the rising, the commemorations were far more muted and the reason for this was simple. In 1969, violence exploded on the streets of Northern Ireland, and the provisional IRA, formed in December of that year, saw itself as a lineal descendent of the rebels of 1916, and they saw 'the proclamation of 1916' as 'its foundational document'.²² The organisation makes this explicit in its *Handbook for Volunteers of the Irish Republican Army*, known colloquially as *The Green Book*, where its 'moral position ... its right to engage in warfare', is based on:

- a) The right to resist foreign aggression
- b) The right to revolt against tyranny and oppression

c) The direct lineal succession with the Provisional Government of 1916, the first Dáil of 1919 and the second Dáil of 1921.²³

Here we are in very different territory from groups of children marching in Croke Park, or veterans telling their story, or choral readings of the proclamation. Here, the act of memory is a performative, which irrupts into actions of the present, and the rebellion of 1916 is now being used, along with the results of a subsequent election in 1918, to declare the state of Northern Ireland as illegitimate.

What made this even more problematic was that the Provisional movement also saw the republic of Ireland as being equally illegitimate, by refusing to ascribe the correct title to the country. According to this narrative:

In 1938 the seven surviving faithful Republican Deputies delegated executive powers to the Army Council of the I.R.A. as per the 1921 resolution. In 1969 the sole surviving Deputy, Joseph Clarke, reaffirmed publicly that the then Provisional Army Council and its successors were the inheritors of the first and second Dáil as a Provisional Government.²⁴

Here we see an act of memory that is monological and static; there are no contextual variants allowed, and democracy as a political mode of action has been frozen at the 1918 general election. According to this memorialisation, all subsequent elections, in both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland are illegitimate, and do not merit the obedience of the Provisional IRA. This is exemplified in the way in which post 1922 Ireland is addressed in the *Green Book*. In this text, there are three references to Ireland as a state, and keeping in mind that Ireland was declared a republic in 1948, the nomenclature is interesting. Speaking of the economic policy of attracting foreign multi-nationals as a means of providing employment, the book notes that ‘from 1958 on, the Free State abandoned all attempts to secure an independent economy’,²⁵ and goes on to decry the ‘economic imperialism’ that has become evident in an Ireland which is

defined as the ‘result of the Treaty sell-out by successive Free State Governments via mass media, R.T.E., and the press and through education’.²⁶

Given this threat to the existing Irish state, and given the violence that had been ongoing since 1969 in Northern Ireland, along with bombings in the UK and on military bases in Europe, it is no surprise that the 1991 commemorations were far more muted. The fact that this act of memory was animating a group whose existence was now inimical to the Republic of Ireland as a nation, meant that there was a natural reticence to make the connections between an undemocratic military uprising, which later gave rise to a democratic state, and an act of memory of that uprising which was deemed to sanction a threat to that state. The dispute here was not one of historical responsibility or accountability, but rather, one of the role of memory in the present. For the government and the state, the rising was to be remembered as a foundational act, which was a step on the road to independence from Britain and a 26 county republic, which was the logical outcome of the struggle by the men and women of 1916. For the Provisional and Sinn Féin, on the other hand, the rising is seen as warrant to overthrow both the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland, and their acts of memory foreground this. Since memory is the foundational ground for individual identity, ‘and cultural memory grounds community identity, these conflicts over belonging and laying claim to the past (and thus also the present), are tremors that threaten to fissure both of these foundations, thereby destabilising the social structure itself’.²⁷

This caused huge moral and ethical problems for those involved in reading this narrative, and these problems have persisted to the present time. On September 21, 2015, for example, in the wake of the PSNI maintaining that there had been Provisional IRA involvement in the murder of Kevin McGuigan, a claim that resulted in a breakdown in the power-sharing agreement in Stormont, *The Sunday Independent* published an editorial decrying Gerry Adams, leader of Sinn Féin. He had made connections, not for the first time, between the Easter Rising

and the Provisional IRA's campaign. The editorial encapsulates the problematic aspects of the competing narratives of public remembrance of the rising. It begins by noting that Adams had equated the 'IRA campaign over 30 years in the North to that of 1916', and that he had seen both eras as witnessing the 'same courage and sacrifice for Irish freedom'. The editorial continues:

One wonders what the men of 1916 would have made of the heroics of the unit that planted the bomb in Warrington on March 20, 1993. On that day, the lives of 12-year-old Tim Parry and three-year-old Johnathan Ball were lost forever to IRA terrorists.

One also wonders if the men of 1916 would have slept easily after blowing up 11 civilians in Enniskillen in 1987 at a Poppy Day ceremony.

The litany of atrocity and needless death is too long to chronicle; but for Mr Adams to equate what happened in Easter Week 1916 with the casual carnage perpetrated by the terrorists during the Troubles enters the very heart of darkness. Yet speaking of those three blood-soaked decades, he said: 'In terms of their unselfishness, in terms of their generosity and in terms of their commitment (to Irish freedom), yes, I do (see both in the same light)' Legitimacy was conferred on 1916 when Sinn Féin received its mandate in the 1918 general election. It was retrospective, but it was real. The election was the first democratic plebiscite to pass judgment on those events.²⁸

This editorial encapsulates the problems of public memory: the same problems that gave us hagiography in 1966 and a form of embarrassment in 1991. The writer clearly wants to separate 1916 from the campaign of the Provisionals, especially when, in the aftermath of the ceasefire, there have been so many allegations of criminality attributed to past and present members of the IRA.

Attempting to separate them based on atrocities committed is not easily done, as innocent civilians were killed and property was destroyed in 1916 as well. Similarly, the notion of retrospective validation is specious, as Sinn Féin have received strong electoral support in Northern Ireland in the wake of their bombing campaign, and indeed, have been in government since the Good Friday / Belfast Agreement, so the same point applies. From a deconstructive

perspective, the writer here offers a hostage to fortune in the use of the metaphor ‘enters the very heart of darkness’ to stress the horror at equating the two campaigns. The metaphor derives from the title of Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*, and is clearly intended to signify the complete incongruity of equating the two campaigns. Interestingly, though, the phrase is fictional, it is the title of a morally ambiguous tale of colonisation and descent into savagery of the fictional and mythical Mr Kurtz, a coloniser who has become more barbaric than the natives which he controls. His final words ‘The Horror! The Horror!’,²⁹ have become a classic in literary criticism, describing both a moment of recognition, what Marlowe, the narrator of the text, describes as expressing ‘some sort of belief’, before telling us that he was a ‘remarkable man’.³⁰

It is highly ironic that the very moral ambiguity that is at the heart of Conrad’s musings on the ethics and morality of the colonial venture, should be at the core of the phrase which is being used in the editorial to prove that there is a critical ethical difference between armed insurgency in 1916, retrospectively validated in 1918 by the election, and armed insurgency, retrospectively validated by power sharing from the Good Friday / Belfast agreement in 1998. In addition, as has been demonstrated, the Provisional IRA also sees the election of 1918 as a validating point of reference for their campaign of violence.

The problem for the writer, and I would suggest, for the official organs of the state, is that by attempting to remember collectively through a form of sanitised and mythopoeic narrative, there will always be such anomalies, and the commemoration will always give rise to a series of debates, revisions, discussions, and perhaps a structural failure that has been obvious through a number of symptoms in the Irish body politic. The difficulty here, I would contend, is that the mode of memorialisation has not been taken into account. Memory is driven both by ideological considerations and by the laws of the unconscious; while we have noted the agency of communal memory and group memory, there is also a whole dynamic of

repression and the return of the repressed at work in all considerations of memory. It is my contention that if we are ever to come to some understanding of the value of the 1916 Rising to who we are in contemporary Ireland, and to what we have become.

The sense of orchestrating a memory of the Easter Rising through pageants, parades and hagiographic literature can work up to a point in shaping some of the ideology of the collective Irish consciousness (or at least that of the 26 counties). The repetition of parades, wreath-laying ceremonies and ceremonial readings of the proclamation every Easter can serve to contemporise the memory and make it seem like an unquestioned and natural aspect of our history; however, where there is memory, there will be the unconscious; where there is the unconscious there will be repression; and where there is repression, there will be a ‘return of the repressed’.³¹

The unconscious has generally been seen as something that resides within the individual human being, but Freudian and psychoanalytic theory has always been keen to stress that the unconscious is also created by our cultural context: it is what Freud has called a sort of ‘internal foreign territory’,³² and what Jacques Lacan termed an *extimité* (extimacy): ‘the extimate is both what is closest to me and radically external to me, me and not me, *in me more than me*’.³³ For both of these thinkers, the unconscious is both an individual and a socio-cultural construct: ‘the unconscious is outside’,³⁴ Lacan notes, and he sees this outside as constitutive of the individual, who is dependent as an individual subject ‘on a pre-existing order, the symbolic’.³⁵

The unconscious, then is ‘*that aspect of me which I cannot know about myself, but which nevertheless makes me what I am*’ [*italics original*].³⁶ It is the notion of the inability to achieve full knowledge that is significant to my argument, as remembering will always be partial, and cultural remembering necessitates eliding or forgetting or repressing aspects of the original even that do not fit into the seamless narrative of remembering that had been the norm in Ireland until 1969, when the repressed appeared on the streets of Derry and Belfast and South

Armagh. I would suggest that it is only by looking at the rising in psychoanalytical terms, as a primal scene, that we can hope to come to a fuller understanding of its range of meanings, and more significantly, of its real and lasting effects on the contemporary Irish psyche.

To contextualise this reading, we can return to the *Sunday Independent* editorial. Here the mandate for the violence of the 1916 Rising is to be sought, retrospectively, in the Sinn Féin victory in the 1918 election. Thus, the Free State, later the republic of Ireland, came into being through an undemocratic act of violent rebellion, which is seen as lawful and legitimate due to a retrospective democratic validation two years later. Thus, the violence of 1916 is memorialised and narrated within this later democratic context. It has become a point of origin for the Irish state, and as such, needs to be within a democratic context. This argument allows 1916 to be remembered in a highly ideological manner, as a celebration of a leadership, which, in some mystical manner, knew the will of the Irish people before they knew it themselves. In this way, the Rising can be re-membered as a democratic and national surge towards independence, *avant la letter*, and the messianistic writings of Pearse and McDonagh feed into this perspective.

However, just as the primal scene can be a fantasy in the individual unconscious, so the *post factum* democratisation of the 1916 Rising is also a fantasy, but one which has seldom been put into question. The 1916 rebellion was the act of a minority group, the IRB, acting within a more open, but still minority group, the Irish Volunteers, which disobeyed its own leadership by staging the Rising when their Officer commanding, Eoin MacNeil had called it off. In this sense, it was an act of treason against the ruling British government in a time of war, as well as being an act of mutiny within its own militaristic society. To attempt to whitewash this by eliding a two-year gap and by suggesting that people would have supported the rising had they been given the chance is counterfactual and plain wrong, or it would be if we looked at memory in a purely historical context. But seen as a way of interpreting 1916 as

a primal scene in the growth and development of the country, this type of displacement becomes more understandable as a way of explaining the primal scene ‘found in neuroses as retrospective phantasies of a later date’.³⁷

Such retrospective fantasies are also to be found when the Provisional IRA offers its own reading, which suggests that just as the 1918 election offered a democratic mandate to the 1916 Rising, so it, and the subsequent Dáils that arose from it, offer the same form of democratic mandate to their own actions, as they speak of the ‘direct lineal succession with the Provisional Government of 1916, the first Dáil of 1919 and the second Dáil of 1921’.³⁸ Indeed, as has been noted, they trace a line of democratic succession which leads to their founding by recounting how the seven surviving members of that Dáil delegated ‘executive powers to the Army Council of the I.R.A. as per the 1921 resolution’, and then making the connection contemporary by noting that in 1969 the sole surviving Deputy, Joseph Clarke, reaffirmed publicly that the then Provisional Army Council and its successors were the inheritors of the first and second Dáil as a Provisional Government.³⁹

So, just as the 1918 election and the subsequent Dáil are used to justify the founding act of the Republic of Ireland, so the same two events are also used to justify a military and political movement whose aims include the overthrow of that republic. This dichotomy is at the core of the different pace of remembrance that we have seen in 1966 and 1991, as the memorial to the origin of a state became seen as something that could also be the origin of the destruction of that state. By looking at Easter 1916 as the Irish primal scene, the modes of memory and fantasy that are involved in this can be seen, and this is the first, necessary step, in their being understood.

NOTES

- ¹ Muriel Gardiner and Sigmund Freud, *The Wolf-Man and Sigmund Freud* (London: Karnac : Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1989), p. 200.
- ² Gardener and Freud, *The Wolf-Man and Sigmund Freud*, p. 221.
- ³ Gardener and Freud, *The Wolf-Man and Sigmund Freud*, p. 229.
- ⁴ Judith Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1977), p. 148.
- ⁵ Ruth Dudley Edwards, *Patrick Pearse: The Triumph of Failure* (London: Gollancz, 1977), p. 280.
- ⁶ Edwards, *Triumph of Failure*, p. 280.
- ⁷ James Joyce & Declan Kiberd, *Ulysses* (London: Penguin, 1992). p. 692.
- ⁸ Edwards, *Triumph of Failure*, p. 280.
- ⁹ Jacques Derrida, *Psyche: Inventions of the Other Volume 2* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2007). p. 94.
- ¹⁰ Jacques Derrida & Elisabeth Weber, E., *Points . . . : Interviews, 1974-1994* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1995). p. 145.
- ¹¹ Jacques Derrida, J. (1992). *The Other Heading: Reflections on Today's Europe* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992). p. 31.
- ¹² Jacques Derrida, *Politics of Friendship* (London: Verso, 1997), p. 95.
- ¹³ Eoin Ó Broin, *Sinn Féin and the Politics of Left Republicanism* (London: Pluto Press, 2009). P. 113.
- ¹⁴ Eoin Ó Broin, *Sinn Féin*, p. 92.
- ¹⁵ Diarmaid Ferriter, *The Transformation of Ireland 1900-2000* (London: Profile Books, 2004), p. 748.
- ¹⁶ John Bruton, *Interview with John Bruton/Interviewer: Keelan Shanley*, Today Programme, (Radio Teilifís Éireann, Dublin), August 5 2014.
- ¹⁷ Jacques Lacan, J. (2006). *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English*, translated by Bruce Fink in collaboration with Héloïse Fink and Russell Grigg (London: Norton, 2006, p.419.
- ¹⁸ Roisín Higgins, Carole Holohan and Catherine O'Donnell, '1966 and All That: The 50th Anniversary Commemorations', *History Ireland*, 14 (2) (March - April, 2006), pp.31-36, p. 32
- ¹⁹ Roisín Higgins, Carole Holohan and Catherine O'Donnell, *History Ireland*, pp.33-34

- ²⁰ Pádraig Pearse, *Collected Works of Padraic H. Pearse Political Writings and Speeches*, volume 1 (Dublin: Phoenix Publishing, 1917), p.135.
- ²¹ Conor Cruise-O'Brien, *States of Ireland* (London: Pantheon Books, 1972), p. 23.
- ²² Timothy Shanahan, *The Provisional Irish Republican Army and the Morality of Terrorism* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), p. 46.
- ²³ *Handbook for Volunteers of the Irish Republican Army: Notes on Guerrilla Warfare* (London: Paladin Press, 1966), p. 4.
- ²⁴ *Handbook for Volunteers*, p. 4.
- ²⁵ *Handbook for Volunteers*, p.3
- ²⁶ *Handbook for Volunteers*, p. 4.
- ²⁷ Emilie Pine, *The Politics of Irish Memory: Performing Remembrance in Contemporary Irish Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011). pp. 98-99.
- ²⁸ 'Editorial: Decommission your Tongue, Mr Adams.' *Irish Sunday Independent* (September 20, 2015). p17.
- ²⁹ Joseph Conrad & Paul B. Armstrong, P. B., *Heart of Darkness: Authoritative Text, Backgrounds and Contexts, Criticism*, 4th edition (New York: W.W. Norton, 2006), p. 90.
- ³⁰ Joseph Conrad, *Heart of Darkness*, p. 91.
- ³¹ Sigmund Freud, *Moses and monotheism* (London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1939), p. 129.
- ³² Sigmund Freud, *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, volume 22 (London: Hogarth Press, 1933), p. 57.
- ³³ Jacques Lacan, *Seminar 7 The Ethics of Psychoanalysis, 1959-1960*, translated by Jacques-Alain Miller (London: Tavistock/Routledge, 1992), p. 139.
- ³⁴ Jacques Lacan, J. (1977). *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-analysis, translated by A. Sheridan, Trans.*. London: Hogarth Press, 1977), p. 123.
- ³⁵ Anthony Easthope, *The Unconscious* (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 136.
- ³⁶ Tony Thwaites, *Reading Freud: Psychoanalysis as Cultural Theory* (Los Angeles: Sage, 2007), p. 6.
- ³⁷ Gardener and Freud, *The Wolf-Man and Sigmund Freud*, pp. 222-223.
- ³⁸ *Handbook for Volunteers*, p. 4.
- ³⁹ *Handbook for Volunteers*, p. 4.

Biographical Note:

Eugene O'Brien is Senior lecturer and Head of the Department of English Language and Literature, in Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick, Ireland, and the director of the Mary Immaculate Institute for Irish Studies. He is also the editor for the Oxford University Press Online Bibliography project in literary theory. His latest book, *Seamus Heaney as Aesthetic Thinker*, will be published by Syracuse University Press in 2016.