FROM DIRECTOR TO COORDINATOR: THE IRISH STATE AND THE OFFICIAL COMMEMORATION OF THE EASTER RISING IN 1966 AND 2016

Vojtěch Halama

Introduction

Western commemorative practice changed significantly during the latter part of the twentieth century. French historian Pierre Nora has described the process as a disintegration of national metanarratives, the grand stories aiming to unify national experience and memory, and a turn towards more plural, diverse, subjectivist, and bottom-up commemoration. History gradually lost its status "as the myth underlying the destiny of the nation" and the relationship between national identity and history became "more elective than imperative" (Nora 614, 633).

Official commemoration of the 1916 Easter Rising constitutes a part of this process. For the two largest events of such kind, the fiftieth anniversary in 1966 and the centenary in 2016, the central organizers prepared extensive programmes. Yet, even though both conceptualized the Rising as a founding myth of the modern Irish state, they utilized it in very different ways. This is because commemoration, in order to be successful, must be consistent with contemporary sentiment in both its ritual engagement with the past and the meaning which emerges from it (West 11). While the state acted as an active central organizer on both occasions, its role was not the same, nor was the underlying message it wanted to communicate through the programme. Focusing on the instrumentality of official commemoration, this essay discusses a shift in these two aspects between 1966 and 2016, arguing that the Irish state became more of a coordinator rather than a director, and that the underlying message switched from promoting unity to embracing diversity.

The text deals specifically with commemoration organized by the state, in this case the Republic of Ireland. This does not necessarily mean that the official programme dominated the anniversary experiences, nor that the original intentions of the central organizers led to the desired outcomes. Indeed, the blowing-up of Nelson's Pillar by a renegade republican group in 1966 represented a particularly noteworthy event for many contemporaries and the memory of the anniversary was retrospectively moulded by the Troubles in Northern Ireland. Similarly, for some, the centenary has been associated more with the #WakingTheFeminists campaign against female underrepresentation in Irish theatre rather than with the state ceremonies. This essay lacks space to elaborate on the latter topic; however, a more detailed account can be found elsewhere in this volume.[1]

1 See the plenary conversation "Art-making, Activism, and Collaboration", chaired by Clare Wallace, with Lian Bell and Maeve Stone discussing their involvement in the

The choice of the 1966 and 2016 anniversaries may seem somewhat natural for a comparative analysis, as the former was often recalled during the preparation of the latter. Nevertheless, during most of the 1916 commemorations in the last century, the Irish state was a non-entrepreneurial actor, and the selected jubilees represented rather extraordinary cases of staging a large-scale commemoration. On both occasions, the Easter Rising was conceptualized as a founding myth and the state confirmed the claim to its revolutionary legacy. This should not be taken for granted. Taoiseach Seán Lemass was at first reluctant to stage a large-scale commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary and it was conducted due to pressure from Fianna Fáil backbenchers and veteran organizations (R. Higgins 3; Daly 22-23). Nor did the problematic beginnings of the *Ireland 2016* programme in 2014 suggest that the state would be keen to proudly claim its violent legacy: focusing solely on present achievements, the launch of the programme found little room for the Easter Rising itself. Both programmes eventually did revolve around the Rising, paid tribute to those who had fought and died for the Republic, staged military parades through Dublin, and certainly hoped to defuse anti-establishment republicans who claimed the same legacy. Both presented Ireland to the outside world as a modern European nation that has overcome past enmities. Finally, both strived to create a sense of mutuality, to overcome cleavages within society and to maximise public participation – each in its own specific way.

The Role of the State in Official Commemoration

In the 1960s, the Irish state was an active, interventionist actor. Influenced by the European welfare state model, the government of Seán Lemass turned towards economic planning, higher involvement in education, providing modern civil services and a more active foreign policy. The Ireland of that time was also a Fianna Fáil state. The party had held power almost exclusively since 1932 under the leadership of Éamon de Valera, a veteran of the Rising and now the president of the state. The government was enabled to act almost as a monolithic force. Hence, for the official commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary, the state assumed the position of a director, a sole leader determined to bring Irish nationalists together and pay proper tribute to the past.

Lemass desired neither to complicate the official narrative nor to open old wounds. In February 1965, he had set up the *Coiste Cuimhneachán*, “an informal committee, helping to advise upon the form of the ceremonies and celebrations”, stressing that the final arrangements would be made by the government. He chaired the committee himself and, as he proclaimed in the Dáil, he “invited a number of people to come together and asked them to suggest other people who, in their own knowledge, would be helpful and likely to be interested” (Dáil debate 215:7, 6 May 1965). This

#WakingTheFeminists campaign. The contribution also lists further sources on the topic.

rather ad-hoc formation resulted in the members being either Fianna Fáil politicians or civil servants. Opposition political parties and the public were omitted from the planning. Lemass had rejected calls to form a consultative all-party group, considering it neither necessary nor desirable, as it would, in his view, only duplicate the work of the organizational committee (Dáil debate 218:1, 20 Oct. 1965). The more radical republicans were likewise dismissed, most notably Kathleen Clarke, widow of the executed Rising leader Thomas Clarke, who had demanded to be put in charge of the planning (Ferriter, *A Nation and Not a Rabble* 358-59). The setting up of the programme was strongly controlled by the government and by the Taoiseach in particular.

During the two weeks of the official anniversary programme, most events took the form of centrally organized ceremonies. The principal event was the Easter Sunday parade in which marched not only current members of the Irish army but also representatives of various cultural and sporting organizations (R. Higgins 39-40). Even though the state organized some local ceremonies outside Dublin, these took form of local Easter Sunday parades featuring ministers or army representatives (Daly 19). More often, commemoration outside Dublin was left to independent initiatives and the broadening of the programme to the local level was largely limited to the television and newspaper coverage of the events in Dublin.

Turning to the centenary, Ireland of 2016 was an affluent, globalized country that had recently recovered from a devastating economic depression. The government of Enda Kenny (Fine Gael) replaced its Fianna Fáil predecessor in 2011 and set up a wider Decade of Centenaries programme of which the 1916 centenary represented the centrepiece. Determined to avoid the mistakes of the 1966 event that was seen as too triumphalist, two advisory committees overseeing the commemorations were established already in 2011. The first was the Expert Advisory Group on Commemorations, consisting of historians from every major Irish academic institution. It was set up to advise the government "on historical matters" and to "consult widely with academic, community and voluntary groups and members of the public to ensure that significant events are commemorated accurately, proportionately and appropriately in tone" (Ireland 2016, *Remember, Reflect, Reimagine*). Far from being a mere consulting group, the Expert Advisory Group set the basic principles for the commemorations and participated heavily in them. The second was the All Party Oireachtas Group on Commemorations, bringing together representatives of "all parties in the Oireachtas as well as independents", including Sinn Féin. The group met regularly to ensure that the commemorative events were "conducted on a non-partisan, inclusive basis" (Ireland 2016, *Remember, Reflect, Reimagine*). The early planning was marked by controversies, but the preparations gathered new momentum after introduction of new leading figures of the programme: Heather Humphreys, the Minister for Arts, Heritage, and the Gaeltacht, and John Concannon, the director of the National Tourism Development Authority in Ireland.

The state, through its platform *Ireland 2016*, provided a framework for widespread organizational engagement. The organizers claimed that the planning involved, apart from the state institutions and the relatives of the revolutionaries, "all local authorities, local community groups, schools and universities, teachers at all levels, the Diaspora, historians and historical societies, and a multitude of individuals and organisations from all strands of society" (*Centenary Programme* 13). This was partly enabled by extending the scope of what was considered to be a commemorative event. The programme comprised seven strands, some more traditional (State Ceremonial, Historical Reflection, An Teanga Bheo / The Living Language, Global and Diaspora), others based on active participation of other actors (Youth and Imagination, Cultural Expression, Community Participation), leaving space for local commemoration, cultural events, and even table quizzes. Local authorities received funds for community commemorative initiatives and were recommended to relocate them on the basis of alignment to key themes of the centenary and maximizing public engagement (Department of Culture). For example, County Monaghan organized a public workshop on preparation for the centenary, with over 100 people in attendance, and received forty-three applications for funds. The approved events included exhibitions and lectures, a summer camp, school competitions, workshops and discussions, musical and theatrical events as well as the placing of permanent reminders commemorating local history (Ireland 2016, *Monaghan*). Through special coordinators, each county then developed a local programme as part of the wider *Ireland 2016* framework. Thus, the state assumed the role of a coordinator rather than a director, providing an authorized platform rather than direct leadership.

Yet, of course, coordination also represents a form of control. The wider engagement with the public and the blurring of the line between the official and the community-based commemoration certainly facilitated at least basic widespread acceptance of the authorized discourse. Indeed, heritage scholar Laurajane Smith suggests that concerns with multi-vocality "too often tend to be assimilationist and top-down" and that the related discussion is often "framed in terms of how excluded groups may be recruited into existing practices, and how many non-traditional visitors be attracted" instead of challenging the power relations surrounding heritage (37-38). Not even the involvement of experts ensures proper interrogation of national myths. Dominic Bryan has warned historians against becoming the "high priests of commemoration", pointing out that academic engagement with the past can both disguise and legitimize the contemporary political context of commemorative practice (24-42). The instrumentality of official commemoration can take different shapes, but the state never remains neutral, and this should not come as a surprise.

The Underlying Messages

The fiftieth anniversary commemoration was first and foremost focused on paying proper tribute to those who fought for the Republic, many of whom were still alive in

1966. Given the previous low-key approach – which some called "a chronicle of embarrassment" – caused by the many cleavages resulting from the revolution, the coming of the anniversary had produced significant pressure for such recognition (Fitzpatrick 184-203; Daly 22-23). The participants of the Rising and the wider struggle for independence represented the centrepiece of the ceremonies. The veterans paraded on Easter Sunday, their dead comrades were commemorated at the wreath-laying ceremonies and at the opening of the Garden of Remembrance, a new permanent reminder of their sacrifice. The remaining veterans, nevertheless, were dying out, their first-hand memories fading away. Instilling "into our youth an appreciation of the value of their heritage and of the sacrifices made for it", as Lemass put it, become an important imperative (Lemass, *Cuimhneachán 1916*). The TV series *Insurrection*, prepared by the national broadcaster RTÉ, exemplified these combined requirements for recognition and revitalisation: its aim was to "underline the 'heroic drama' of the week for a younger audience while, notably, also giving space for the voices of the survivors" (Ferriter, *A Nation and Not a Rabble* 364).

The Rising was still heavily understood in political terms in 1966. *An Claidheamh Soluis*, a flaming sword signifying revolutionary struggle for political and cultural independence, was chosen as the central symbol of the programme. However, the symbol was chosen through a public competition; the organizers refused suggestions to use the Easter Lily, the traditional commemorative symbol associated with hard-line republicanism (P. Faulkner to S.F. Lemass, 25 May 1965). This may serve as a reminder that the 1966 event itself represented a recalibration of the national narrative, making it more conciliatory and rational, less militaristic and emotive. Indeed, the nation was encouraged to build on the Rising's legacy by other means: Lemass used the anniversary as an opportunity to unite the nation behind the flag of modernity and welfare in opposition to the unfulfilled geopolitical and cultural goals of the revolution. His concept of pragmatic patriotism assumed that the political differences of the past must be overcome in favour of economic improvement. "For the next fifty years", Lemass emphasized, "the symbol of patriotism is not the armed Irish Volunteer, but the student in the technical college, the planning officer, the busy executive of industry and trade union, the progressive farmer, the builders and workers on whose skills and enthusiasm the country's future depends" (*Irish Press* 22 Apr. 1966).

The organizers aimed to create a single unifying narrative that would replace the previous shattered discourse, promote unity among Irish nationalists and finally leave the past to rest. The programme of events prominently quoted the passage from the Proclamation about "the readiness of its children to sacrifice themselves for the common good [to] prove itself worthy of the august destiny to which it is called" (*Cuimhneachán* 1) and Lemass desired that the preparations appear as having been conducted in "the fullest harmony" (S.F. Lemass to S. Dowling, 17 May 1965). The pro-Fianna Fáil *Irish Press* editorialized that the "jubilee celebrations" would hopefully lead to "a better understanding between the sponsors of all forms of national endeavour and a clearer realisation that their various activities are part of, or could be

knit into, a universal pattern making for unity in national effort". In calling for "sinking selfish aims in a united effort for the national well-being", it made apparent that the programme aimed at reconciling the political cleavages within Irish nationalism (*Irish Press* 8 Apr. 1966). Other identities – cultural, social, gender or politically non-nationalist – were either incorporated, downplayed, or omitted, even though the programme notably included religious ceremonies by all denominations (*Cuimhneachán* 4-5).

Nor were unionists addressed. Lemass understood the North–South cooperation in pragmatic, economic terms, and was helpless as to how participation of any unionist representatives in a fundamentally political commemoration could have been secured (S.F. Lemass to L. O'Doherty, 26 Apr. 1965). Even though commemoration focused on twenty-six-county Ireland and generally avoided beating the anti-partitionist drum, some such comments were made, most notably by Éamon de Valera at the closing ceremony when he called for ending the partition of the island by "the uniting of all the people and the forgetting of past differences and dissensions" (*Irish Press* 18 Apr. 1966). Admittedly, little attention was paid to the possibly radicalizing effects of the commemoration on the relations with and within Northern Ireland; Lemass at least continued to avoid provocations, dodging calls in the Dáil for a greater involvement in commemorations in the North (*Irish Press* 4 Mar. 1966). Good relations with Britain, nevertheless, were actively promoted. The Rising was presented as "the basis of the excellent relations that now exist between Ireland and England" and of modern Ireland's active international position (P. Keating to F. Coffey, 17 Jan. 1966).

In 2016, on the other hand, the Rising was already in the distant past. The living memory of the revolution had long vanished and the political value of the Rising as the symbolic beginning of Irish independence had diminished. Ireland had become a globalized, wealthy Western state. The traditional pillars of society had fallen and the pre-1990s social conservatism had been gradually replaced by liberal values. For the most part, the centenary focused on the lived experience of communities, families, and individuals in 1916 regardless of their status or involvement in the national struggle. This time, the Proclamation passage highlighted by the programme was the one about the Republic guaranteeing "religious and civil liberty, equal rights and equal opportunities to all its citizens" (*Centenary Programme* 4).

The official centenary commemoration heavily implied that understanding the complexity of the past would lead to the support of inclusivity in the present. Army Chaplain Seamus Madigan's centenary prayer at the Easter Sunday wreath-laying at the General Post Office revolved around "singing a new song", different from the troubled past. This was to be "a song of compassion, inclusion and engagement, a song of listening, social justice and respect for all, a song of unity, diversity, equality and peace" (*Easter Sunday Commemoration 2016* 5-6). President Michael D. Higgins repeatedly called for generosity in embracing "the multitude of stories that comprise our past, in all their bewildering contradictions and differences", and that next to the leaders of the Rising, others are too worth the remembering, "all those

who suffered, so many who were too poor, too marginalised and too disenfranchised to be heard" (M. Higgins 2). The mantra, repeated in many official statements, proclaimed that "Ireland 2016 will belong to everyone on this island and to our friends and families overseas – regardless of political or family background, or personal interpretation of our modern history" (*Centenary Programme* 8). Again, it is debatable how the Republic's emphasis on the Easter Rising can attract Northern unionists, whose political parties declined invitations to participate in the ceremonies. Even though the state had included commemoration of the Battle of the Somme in the programme, the unionists' key event of the year, some commentators argued that commemorating the Rising was "fatally divisive" for "anyone unwilling or unable to honour the Rising as the defining act of Irishness" (Kennedy).

The concept of the "year for everyone" addressed not only traditional political divisions, but also the social cleavages of a globalized society. The official centenary video *Mise Éire // I Am Ireland* included statements from Irish citizens with many different backgrounds. "Mise Éire" was proudly pronounced by a red-haired schoolgirl as well as by Asian immigrants in their shop, by the young and the old, the urban and the rural, men and women, by the immigrants and their children as well as by the representatives of the diaspora. Similarly, RTÉ's TV series *Rebellion* revolved little around traditional national figures, as *Insurrection* had fifty years ago. Rather, under the slogan "Ordinary people. Extraordinary times", it focused on the experience of (fictional) women and men from various social backgrounds and affiliations. In general, the programme promoted embracing diversity and placed the variety of identities, narratives, experiences, interests, and opinions into a unique mosaic, creating mutuality without necessarily enforcing consensus. Thus, the very act of participation in any form became more important than adopting a specific narrative. As one commentator observed, the official commemoration "resonated with new audiences far beyond conservative traditionalists clinging to the past" (Ó Dochartaigh).

Within this mosaic, nevertheless, the official narrative retained a dominant position. The goal was indeed to "broaden sympathies, without having to abandon loyalties", allowing for a complexity of narratives under the central organizational umbrella but preventing complete disintegration into vagueness (*Centenary Programme* 62-64). "There is no doubt that the narrative of 1916 is an intrinsic part of our DNA as a State", proclaimed Taoiseach Enda Kenny at the launch of the programme. The attitude can be eloquently illustrated by two major events, the army parade and ceremonies on Easter Sunday and the public festival *Reflecting the Rising* on Easter Monday. John Concannon introduced them as being complementary to each other, presenting the former as "appropriate, respectful, dignified", with the latter a "family day" designed for public engagement and fulfilment of the idea that the centenary programme was "everybody's" (*RTÉ*, 24 Nov. 2015).

When Did the Shift Occur?

Official commemoration between the two anniversaries was largely shaped by the conflict in Northern Ireland. The Irish state was confronted by the Provisional IRA's re-interpretation of the Rising as unfinished business requiring further armed struggle (Regan 29-30). While many within the intellectual establishment responded with "anti-nationalist" revisionism, the state adopted a low-key stance, abandoning the annual military parade and largely avoiding any larger commemoration of the Rising. The anniversary ceremonies were not reintroduced until 2006, when Taoiseach Bertie Ahern decided to mark the ninetieth anniversary of the Rising. Given the ongoing peace process, the programme was now reconciliatory towards unionists, and an official state commemoration of the Battle of the Somme also took place that year.

The peace process, though, had not changed the fundamental understanding of the Rising, nor the means of commemoration. The revival aimed at recasting the Rising, as historian Mark McCarthy puts it, "in a new positive light and sanitising its legacy from all of the negative connotations associated with the actions of the Provisional IRA during the course of the Troubles" (362). The Troubles and the related "anti-nationalist" revisionism were implicitly side-lined as some sort of commemorative intermezzo, as Ahern once again linked the Rising to current peace and prosperity, and in many aspects continued where Lemass had ended in the 1960s. Indeed, Mary Daly has recognized remarkable similarities of message in Ahern's and Lemass's commemorative speeches (4). Most importantly, notwithstanding certain innovations, the programme again largely revolved around the army parade. Enda Kenny, who later became Taoiseach, remarked that the upcoming centenary needed to entail a broader range of events (McCarthy 382).

In fact, it was rather the discussion in the early 2010s, not the peace process nor the ninetieth anniversary, which initiated the transformation. The formation and the work of the all-party and the expert advisory groups represented a decisive turn that initiated fruitful discussion and at the same time courage to focus on national history in its troubling complexity. The chairman of the Expert Advisory Group, Maurice Manning, proclaimed that its goal was not to do the job of the peace process and that the group has a duty to prevent the hijacking of the centenary "by the government or anyone else" (Ferriter, "1916 in 2016" 165). This proved crucial especially after the troublesome beginnings of the centenary programme in late 2014 when it seemed that the revolutionary legacy would be sanitized. The launch was widely dismissed for its corporate tone and Sinn Féin, among others, dismissed it as a "bad joke", initiating its own commemorative programme which claimed to be truly "Ireland-wide [and] broad-based" (*An Phoblacht* 1 Dec. 2014).

The takeover failed to materialize and neither revisionism, disinterest, nor political hijacking characterized the centenary, partly due to the organizers' ability to learn from their own mistakes. Mark Daly, a member of the all-party group, has highlighted the renewed energies after Heather Humphreys and John Concannon got involved,

and their contribution to refocusing the programme towards its final form (History Hub). Broadly speaking, many more aspects contributed to this turn: the post-austerity context and the rise of public history, the level of affluence, relative peace in Northern Ireland, the stable but diverse political scene, the number of enriching counter-narratives, and the determination to avoid the retrospective failings of the fiftieth anniversary. A detailed analysis of the processes that led up to the last-minute refocusing lies beyond the scope of this essay and would require a separate study.

Conclusion

According to Pierre Nora, commemoration has become "less a matter of militant expression of the unity of a single group and more a matter of pluralistic unity of the many groups within conflicting agendas that constitute a democratic polity" (616). This essay has attempted to show that official commemoration of the Easter Rising has undergone similar transformation. Focusing on the instrumentality of commemoration during the anniversaries in 1966 and 2016, the essay has discussed the shift in the state's role as the central organizer and the changing "statement about the present" the programmes aimed to communicate.

The Irish state has ceased to act as a director and sole interpreter of the Rising's legacy. Instead, it has adopted a twofold role. Firstly, it has become more of a co-ordinator, providing an authorized platform rather than direct leadership. Secondly, it has claimed the revolutionary legacy but recognized that its narrative was only one of many. In 1966, the official programme was prepared by the central government represented by the Taoiseach, who chaired his own organizational committee, and others were merely invited to participate in what had been arranged. The planning of the centenary, apparently in direct opposition to this, was conducted in cooperation with an academic and an all-party advisory group. Furthermore, it included a variety of organizations and communities whose events were often funded by local authorities. Rather than focusing on the cultural centre and one unifying narrative, the state now allowed for a diverse programme under its organizational umbrella.

The underlying message changed accordingly. The fiftieth anniversary in 1966 saw many members of the revolutionary generation still alive and had to recognize their experience, but it also took place during the reorientation of the state from economic autarky towards international cooperation. Modernizing Irish nationalism for the post-revolutionary reality, the central organizers encouraged people to remember and respect the sacrifice of the founding fathers but to build on it by different, more pragmatic means. The nation, addressed as a rather singular body, was encouraged to overcome inner disputes and work in harmony towards prosperity. The 2016 centenary, on the other hand, suggested that understanding the complexity of the past would lead to embracing the diversity of the present. Even though the state paid homage to the founding myth and its actors, it extensively encouraged engagement of its citizens regardless of their social status, political affiliation, or compliance with

the official narrative. While both programmes promoted mutuality, the centenary did not enforce unity. Rather, it attempted to normalize a complex mosaic of experiences, interests, and opinions where – ideally – everyone could find a way to participate.

This essay has nevertheless argued that in the Irish case, the substantial shift in the state's role and the underlying message occurred only a few years prior to the centenary. The Troubles, in the long run, represented a commemorative intermezzo, and the ninetieth anniversary in 2006 largely reintroduced the pre-Troubles approach – with the important exception of a reconciliatory stance towards unionists. The conceptual shift apparently did not occur until the consolidation of the organizational framework in the early 2010s and the extensive refocusing with the advisory groups after the disastrous launch of the *Ireland 2016* programme in 2014. Reacting to enriching counter-narratives and learning from the state's own mistakes represented an important part of the process.

Works Cited

Bryan, Dominic. "Ritual, Identity and Nation: When the Historian Becomes the High Priest of Commemoration." *Remembering 1916: The Easter Rising, the Somme and the Politics of Memory in Ireland*. Ed. Richard S. Grayson and Fearghal McGarry. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2016. 24-42.

Cuimhneachán 1916: Tubhaile Órga Éirí Amach Sheachtain na Cásca, Clár 10 go 24 Aibreán 1966. Dublin: Hely Thom Limited, 1966.

Dáil Éireann Debate, 215:7, 6 May 1965.

Dáil Éireann Debate, 218:1, 20 Oct. 1965.

Daly, Mary E. "'Less a Commemoration of the Actual Achievements and More a Commemoration of the Hopes of the Men of 1916.'" *1916 in 1966: Commemorating the Easter Rising*. Ed. Mary E. Daly and Margaret O'Callaghan. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 2007. 18-85.

Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht. *Ireland 2016 Project Office and Commemorations*. 7 Apr. 2016. 10 Dec. 2021. <https://wayback.archive-it.org/org-1444/20171204192427/http:/www.chg.gov.ie/about/information-requests/freedom-of-information/foi-publications-scheme/services-provided-by-the-department/ireland- 2016-project-office-and-commemorations/>.

Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA). Letter from P. Keating to Frank Coffey, 17 Jan. 1966. DFA 2000/14/81. National Archive of Ireland, Dublin.

Department of the Taoiseach (DT). Letter from Pádraig Faulkner to Seán F. Lemass, 25 May 1965. DT 97/6/158. National Archive of Ireland, Dublin.

-----. Letter from Seán F. Lemass to Liam O'Doherty, 26 Apr. 1965. DT 97/6/157. National Archive of Ireland, Dublin.

-----. Letter from Seán F. Lemass to Seán Dowling, 17 May 1965. DT 97/6/158. National Archive of Ireland, Dublin.

-----. Lemass, Seán F. *Cuimhneachán 1916. A Message from the Government to the School Managers and Teachers of Ireland and to the Children under Their Care.* DT 2017/12/2. National Archive of Ireland, Dublin.

Ferriter, Diarmaid. *A Nation and Not a Rabble: The Irish Revolution 1913-1923*. London: Profile Books, 2015.

-----. "1916 in 2016: Personal Reflections of an Irish Historian." *Irish Historical Studies*, 42.161 (2018): 161-74.

Fitzpatrick, David. "Commemoration in the Irish Free State: A Chronicle of Embarrassment." *History and Memory in Modern Ireland*. Ed. Ian McBride. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 184-203.

Higgins, Michael D. "A Special Message from President Michael D Higgins." *Centenary Programme Guide*. *Irish Independent* 5 Mar. 2016.

Higgins, Roisín. *Transforming 1916: Meaning, Memory and the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Easter Rising*. Cork: Cork UP, 2012.

History Hub. "Mark Daly (1916 and Me – Full Interview)." *YouTube*. 21 Nov. 2016. 15 Sept. 2020. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_fV09v8GIdw>.

Ireland 2016 // Éire 2016 – Official Channel. *Mise Éire // I Am Ireland*. *YouTube.* 24 Dec. 2015. 20 Sept. 2020. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-xgodcJQAdM&t>.

Ireland 2016. *Centenary Programme. Monaghan.*

Ireland 2016. *Easter Sunday Commemoration 2016, 27.03.16.*

Ireland 2016. *Remember, Reflect, Reimagine.* 2016. 10 Mar. 2022. <https://www.ireland2016.gov.ie/>.

Kennedy, Daniel. "Pride in 'Inclusive' 1916 Commemoration Rings Hollow." *The Irish Times.* 7 Nov. 2016. 30 Sept. 2020. <https://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/pride-in-inclusive-1916-commemoration-rings-hollow-1.2856808>.

Kenny, Enda. "Speech by the Taoiseach at the Launch of Ireland 2016 Centenary Programme." 31 Mar. 2015. 15 Sept. 2020. <https://www.finegael.ie/speech-by-the-taoiseach-at-the-launch-of-ireland-2016-centenary-programme/>.

McCarthy, Mark. *Ireland's 1916 Rising. Explorations of History-Making, Commemorations & Heritage in Modern Times*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2012.

Nora, Pierre. “Era of Commemoration.” *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past, Vol. III – Symbols*. Ed. Pierre Nora and Lawrence Kritzman. New York: Columbia UP, 1998. 609-37.

Ó Dochartaigh, Niall. “Turning to the Past: Global Contexts for the 2016 Commemorations.” *Irish Historians in Britain*. 2016. 20 Dec. 2021. <https://irishhistoriansinbritain.org/?p=296>.

Regan, John M. *Myth and the Irish State: Historical Problems and Other Essays*. Sallins: Irish Academic Press, 2014.

RTÉ. “RTÉ News: ‘2016 Commemorations’ with Minister for Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht Heather Humphreys & John Concannon, Ireland 2016.” *RTÉ.* 24 Nov. 2015. 15 Nov. 2021. <https://www.rte.ie/news/player/2015/1124/20887094-2016-commemorations-with-minister-for-arts-heritage-and-the-gaeltacht-heather-hunphreys-john-concannon-ireland-2016/>.

“Sinn Féin Gets Ready for 1916 Commemorations.” *An Phoblacht.* 1 Dec. 2014. 1 Sept. 2020. <http://www.anphoblacht.com/contents/24594>.

Smith, Laurajane. *Uses of Heritage*. London/New York: Routledge, 2006.

The Irish Press.

West, Brad. *Re-enchanting Nationalisms: Rituals and Remembrances in a Post-modern Age*. New York: Springer, 2015.