Subject Support

Transition Year and Leaving Certificate

History

Teaching the period 1919-1923 in Irish history

Applying the lessons of research on teaching emotive and controversial history to develop senior cycle students’ ability to think critically

November 2017

Efforts have been made to trace and acknowledge copyright holders. In cases where a copyright has been inadvertently overlooked, the copyright holders are requested to contact info@pdst.ie

*Note:* Every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the historical data contained herein. Any inadvertent errors are regretted.
CONTENTS

PART I, SENIOR CYCLE HISTORY

Introduction ........................................... 4
The enquiry-focused approach ....................... 7
A multi-perspective approach ....................... 8
A short, preliminary enquiry on developments from 1914 to 1918 .......... 10

PART II, LEAVING CERTIFICATE HISTORY

Teaching the period 1919-1923 ..................... 20
Linking your teaching to the National Literacy and Numeracy Strategy ............ 20
The struggle for independence and its consequences: an overview .......... 21
Glossary of important terms: develop your historical literacy skills .......... 22
Biographical notes .................................. 28
Timeline of important developments ............... 34
Bibliography ......................................... 36
Useful websites and web links ....................... 37
Teaching the period 1919-1923: a possible line of enquiry ................. 38

Enquiry, Stage 1: To what extent were Sinn Féin and IRA members comrades during the War of Independence, 1919-1921? .......... 39

Enquiry, Stage 2: What tensions came to the surface as peace talks got underway between July and October 1921? .......... 44

Enquiry, Stage 3: Why did the outcome of the Treaty negotiations in London cause division in Dublin and across Ireland .......... 47

Enquiry, Stage 4: Why did disagreement over the Treaty eventually lead to the outbreak of civil war in June 1922? .......... 50

Enquiry, Stage 5: How serious was the degree of enmity between former comrades during the Civil War, 1922-1923? .......... 52

A critical skills exercise .......................... 57

Your conclusions on the enquiry .................. 61

© PDST, 2017
PART III, HISTORY IN TRANSITION YEAR

Introduction 62


Linking your teaching to the National Literacy and Numeracy Strategy 65

Pedagogical approaches 66

The ‘jigsaw’ approach 66

A multi-perspective approach 68

Combining approaches 68

The Anglo-Irish Treaty 1921 69

Some less well-known figures involved in the independence struggle 70

Formulating research tasks on the basis of topicality 71

Using photographs as a basis for investigation 73

Suggestions for working with material from the Bureau of Military History 74
Part I

Teaching the period 1919-1923 in Irish history: applying the lessons of research on teaching emotive and controversial history to develop senior cycle students’ ability to think critically

Introduction
At Leaving Certificate level, the teaching of the period 1919-1923 forms part of students’ study of the topic, “The pursuit of sovereignty and the impact of partition, 1912-1949”. In the context of the decade of centenaries, discussion of pivotal developments such as the Treaty and Civil War has the capacity to stir strong emotions and make more challenging the classroom implementation of a genuinely historical approach. Research on the teaching of emotive and controversial history can be helpful here, as can methodologies recommended in the Leaving Certificate History Guidelines for Teachers such as the enquiry approach and the multi-perspective approach.

For Transition Year students, a study of themes or episodes from the period using a variety of online resources has the capacity to promote understanding of how historical accounts are formulated and the questioning approaches that we need to adopt when we encounter different types of sources. It can also enhance students’ critical skills in dealing with online materials and give them a greater sense of the strengths and limitations of information technology. The use of a pedagogical approach such as the ‘jigsaw’ classroom can help students see the different perspectives that individuals may have on the same historical phenomenon as well as providing a powerful teaching and learning tool that improves motivation and helps all students to engage in meaningful classroom learning.

For all senior cycle students and teachers, the potential perspectives that might be considered in the classroom are many and complex. A reasonably comprehensive – though not exhaustive – list might include: the different perspectives within the ‘second’ Sinn Féin party, 1917-1921; the different views of IRA GHQ and IRA Volunteers at local level; the views of members of the Irish Parliamentary Party; the views of Ulster Unionists and Southern Unionists; the views of women participants in the independence struggle; the voices of unionist women; the voices of a range of British politicians, with varying attitudes to the ‘Irish Question’; and, from the Treaty on, the voices of the different ‘players’ in the Treaty debates and the Civil War. There are also the international perspectives, including Lenin and other Bolshevik voices.

While it may not be practical to draw on all of these perspectives, there is a need to draw on multiple perspectives if we are to help students develop a genuinely historical understanding. In doing so, the enquiry approach can help, as Christine Counsell has argued “to shape and limit an otherwise sprawling content”\(^1\). The ‘jigsaw’ approach can help students working in groups to see how individuals had their own unique perspective on events as well as a shared sense of mission with comrades. Both approaches are exemplified here: the enquiry approach for Leaving Certificate classes, the ‘jigsaw’ approach for TY classes.

Some pointers from the Executive Summary of the T.E.A.C.H. report 2007
T.E.A.C.H.: a report from the Historical Association on the challenges and opportunities for teaching emotive and controversial history 3-19

**Good** practice results when:

- There is a clarity of purpose and a rationale for the school that emphasises identity, values and diversity;

- History is taught both as a body and as a form of knowledge. The best practice places a high premium on planning, ensuring that the work has the right blend of content and hard thinking appropriate to the ages and ability;

- There is a strong emphasis on independent enquiry with its own procedures and conventions, ensuring that emotive and controversial issues are taught within a secure pedagogical and historic framework. The importance of good questioning is paramount;

- The planning and delivery builds in sufficient time and opportunities to reflect and to cover the different perspectives and beliefs involved. Where done fleetingly, learners failed to see what the historical problem was at all about an issue;

- The teaching matches clarity with a recognition of the complexity of emotive and controversial history;

- An emphasis on exploring multiple narratives and the past from different perspectives. The teaching of emotive and controversial history is seriously compromised if students do not see history as a subject that is open to debate and argument as they study different and competing views of the same events;

- Balance is heeded across a theme or topic and across a key stage.

- Learners are exposed to a rich variety of appropriate and stimulating resources, such as music, film and pictures. Quality resources can be a means of making personal engagement more likely.
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Questions for reflection with colleagues

1. Do we have a clarity of purpose in teaching the period 1919-1923?

2. At school level, is there a focus on identity, values and diversity?

3. Do we teach history as a form of knowledge as well as a body of knowledge?

4. In our planning, do we strive to ensure that there is an adequate balance of content and ‘hard thinking’ appropriate to the age level of our students?

5. Do we have a strong emphasis on enquiry to ensure that issues are taught within a secure pedagogical and historical framework?

6. Does our practice embed the principle that good questioning is paramount in the history classroom?

7. Do we plan to build in sufficient time to address the different perspectives and beliefs involved – so that the problematic nature of history emerges and students realise that there are no easy answers?

8. In planning for clarity, are we careful also to convey the complexity of the issues involved?

9. Are we committed to exploring with our students the multiple narratives and the different perspectives on the period 1919-1923?

10. Are we committed to the principle of balance in seeking to explore with students the various events and issues of the period?

11. Are we committed to exposing students to a wide variety of appropriate and stimulating resources such as music, film and still images as part of our strategy to ensure their personal engagement?

12. Are there other ways in which we can strive to ensure the personal engagement of our students in the matters under discussion?

Notes:
TEACHING THE PERIOD 1919-1923 IN IRISH HISTORY
Applying the lessons of research on teaching emotive and controversial history to develop senior cycle students’ ability to think critically

In exploring the history of the period 1919-1923, students are looking at a series of momentous and sometimes controversial events that led to the establishment of the state of which they are citizens and the origins of a number of political parties which continue to play prominent roles in Irish political life. In exploring these events, they must of necessity – if understanding is the aim - be concerned not merely with what happened but also with why it happened, and what its consequences were. In exploring issues of causation with students, we have a great opportunity to develop their ability to think critically, which is one of the stated objectives of the syllabus, and an increasingly cherished aim of senior cycle education.

At previous history in-service sessions, it has been argued that some of the best ways in which students’ critical thinking can be generated include:

- the use of the enquiry-focused approach
- the use of a multi-perspective approach
- the use of ‘critical skills’ exercises that involve group discussion and judgement-forming

All three approaches are drawn on in the pages that follow.

**The enquiry-focused approach**

The enquiry-focused approach involves organising a set of lessons around an enquiry question on which the teaching and learning activities are focused. It aims to give a clear focus to a series of lessons, to clarify for all concerned what the learning purposes are and to ensure that the sequence of lessons is leading to improved understanding on the part of the students.

In her book, *The Twentieth Century World* (The Historical Association, 1997), Christine Counsell outlines the rationale behind the approach. The following is an edited extract:

Choosing a sequence of interesting historical enquiries gives a clear focus to any scheme of work. This approach has a number of advantages:

(i) It prevents a superficial run through the content and leads pupils into deeper levels of historical understanding.
(ii) It allows students to engage in real historical debate. Historians usually begin with a question.
(iii) It motivates students by giving a clear focus to their work. Identifying key questions is a powerful way of ‘sharing clarity with learners’. Teachers are thus reinforcing that the whole point of a sequence of lessons or activities is to build towards some attempt at answering the question. Some teachers who use this approach will refer to such a question in every single lesson. Pupils are constantly reminded of what they are trying to do and why.
(iv) Key questions can shape and limit an otherwise sprawling content.
(v) It encourages pupils to produce more substantial and significant outcomes at the end of a section of work. (pp.30-31)
A multi-perspective approach

The benefits of adopting a multi-perspective approach are set out in the Leaving Certificate History Guidelines for Teachers as follows:

Rationale
A multi-perspective approach can help students to grasp some of the key points that underlie the syllabus objectives, e.g.

- that there is not necessarily one correct version of a particular historical event
- that the same historical event can be described and explained in different ways depending on the standpoint of (for example) the eye-witness or historian
- that the same piece of evidence may be interpreted differently by different historians
- that few historical sources of evidence can be deemed to be totally impartial, and that the context in which they were produced must always be taken into consideration.

The Guidelines go on to identify the following ‘teaching implications’ of the approach:

Teaching implications
Firstly, the teacher will need a range of texts or other sources that display different perspectives on the historical phenomena under investigation. Secondly, the teacher will need to direct students in identifying similarities and differences in the accounts. If students are to understand particular viewpoints on an historical episode, they will need to be provided with a context, i.e. where the holders of a particular viewpoint are ‘coming from’; what their political, economic, social or cultural circumstances are, and what are their specific objectives and priorities. Thirdly, the teacher will need to assist students in relating one perspective to another so that a more rounded and complete picture emerges. While the approach involves exposure to different perspectives, it also involves the development of analytical skills and a way of thinking historically that is always conscious of alternative viewpoints.

In his book, Teaching 20th-century European History (Council of Europe, 2001), Robert Stradling writes that

Multi-perspective, within the context of history and history teaching, aims to achieve three things:

- to gain a more comprehensive and broader understanding of historical events and developments by taking into account the similarities and differences in the accounts and the perspectives of all the parties involved;
- to gain a deeper understanding of the historical relationships between nations, or cross-border neighbours, or majorities and minorities within national borders;
- to gain a clearer picture of the dynamics of what happened through examining the interactions between the people and groups involved and their interdependence.

Discussion point: What is the relevance of each of the above bullet points to the study of the period 1919-1923 in Irish history?
A short, preliminary enquiry on developments from 1914 to 1918

Before engaging students in an enquiry based on the question, “Why did people who were comrades in the War of Independence, 1919-1921, become enemies in the Civil War, 1922-1923?” it may be helpful to look at the background and contextual factors that will assist students’ in understanding why there was armed conflict in Ireland during the years 1919 to 1923.

The relevant syllabus elements are as follows:

The impact of World War I; the 1916 Rising; the rise of the second Sinn Féin party; the 1918 election

A short, preliminary enquiry such as the following can help students to understand the series of developments from 1914 that undermined faith in constitutional nationalism and helped to sow the seeds for future conflict.

What impact did these developments have on the outbreak of armed conflict in 1919?

- World War I
- the 1916 Rising
- the rise of the second Sinn Féin party
- the 1918 election

For each development listed, some secondary source material is provided to help students work out their answers to the questions posed. The enquiry question as set out above can be used for assessment of learning purposes at the conclusion of the preliminary enquiry.

The impact of World War I

Significant data

Number of Irishmen who joined British armed forces: 210,000 approx.

Number of Irish soldiers who died between 1914 and 1918: Between 27,000 and 35,000. (Historians disagree on the precise figure.)

Potential leaders in a home rule parliament who were killed fighting in the war include: Thomas Kettle and Willie Redmond.
Secondary Source A

Men joined up for many reasons, but they came (in varying degrees) from all backgrounds …
Because the war reactivated Irish politics, different kinds of volunteer expressed the competing versions of nationality that came to a head in the conflict. The result, however, was to define and dramatise four varieties of statehood in Ireland: unionist, Ulster unionist, nationalist and republican. The war marked the definitive failure of unionism as a whole, and thus of that historic attempt to include Ireland in a British nation that had bedevilled Anglo-Irish relations since 1800 … …
The strength and density of Protestantism in the north-east, which had found expression in the 100,000 armed militia volunteers of the pre-war period, allowed a different option. Its volunteers, and especially those in the 36th division, fed a wartime culture of fortress unionism that anticipated partition and was reinforced in the second half of the war by the supposed ‘treason’ of the Easter Rising and Sinn Féin.

Home Rule nationalists, by contrast, invoked the model of the loyal dominion, such as Australia or Canada, achieving national status within the empire … Tom Kettle [believed] … that Britain owed Ireland ‘colonial Home Rule’ because of the ‘seal of the blood given in the last two years’ – a phrase used in a letter published after he died in September 1916, fighting with the 16th Division at the Somme.
Blood sacrifice of a different sort was the key to the Republic proclaimed by the insurrectionary Volunteers of Easter 1916 … For the minority that rejected Redmond’s crusade systematically inverted what we might call the war culture of Irish nationalism. The British Empire, not Germany, was the Empire … The nation had to mobilise, but for a war against Britain, which turned insurrection and collaboration with Germany into acts of patriotism.


Questions and points for discussion

1. Discuss what the writer means by “competing versions of nationality”.
2. The writer identifies four “varieties of nationhood” that he says were defined and dramatised by the war.
   (a) Which variety of nationhood experienced definitive failure as a result of the war, according to the writer?
   (b) How did the variety of nationhood popular with Protestants in the north-east draw strength from the experiences of the war years according to the writer?
   (c) According to the writer, what blood sacrifice did the Home Rule nationalists place their faith in during the war years?
   (d) Discuss what the writer means when he says, “… the minority that rejected Redmond’s crusade systematically inverted what we might call the war culture of Irish nationalism”.
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Secondary Source B (edited)

[World War I’s] most direct and immediate impact was the enlistment of large numbers of Irish nationalists and unionists in the British army. There are widely different estimates of the numbers killed, ranging from the official total of 49,000 to a more modest—but still grim—27,000.

The Home Rule Bill was enacted in 1914, although it never came into effect, and partly in gratitude for this victory John Redmond threw his weight behind the British war effort. But as the realities of life and death in the trenches became more widely known, and as the numbers of dead and wounded rose inexorably, the patchy enthusiasm for the war drained away. Redmond’s Irish Parliamentary Party was tainted by this shift in public opinion, and by the fact that home rule had still not been implemented. It became steadily less popular.

The war provided radical republicans with the possibility of foreign assistance and it encouraged them to view ‘England’s difficulty as Ireland’s opportunity’; they could stab the British in the back while they were distracted by their conflict with Germany. The Easter Week proclamation referred to support from ‘gallant allies in Europe’.

Another feature of the war was the fear of conscription, which was imposed in Britain in January 1916. Ireland’s exemption seemed anomalous and there were expectations that it would not endure. Finally in early 1918 the government decided to extend military service to Ireland. But the plan met with such widespread opposition—including hostility from all nationalist parties, from the trade union movement and from the Catholic Church—that it had to be abandoned. This victory over the British made a substantial contribution to the triumph of the radical Sinn Féin party over its home rule rival. It was not only the successor to the Easter rebels, it was also the ‘peace party’ that had saved Irishmen from the horrors of war.

Meanwhile, in July 1916 the unionists’ image in Britain was enhanced by the horrendous losses suffered by the Ulster division in the Battle of the Somme.


Questions and points for discussion

1. What was the most immediate impact of World War I on Ireland, according to the writer?
2. What reason does the writer give for John Redmond’s support for the war effort?
3. What reasons does the writer give for the decline in support for Redmond’s party during the war?
4. According to the writer, how did republicans view World War I?
5. How did the decision of the government to extend military service to Ireland in 1918 help to make Sinn Féin more popular, according to the writer?
6. How did the Battle of the Somme, 1916, affect the image of unionists in Britain, according to the writer?
The 1916 Rising

Significant data

Approximate number of participants in Rising: Dublin – 1,000 Volunteers + just over 200 members of Citizen army.

Number of members of IRB military council which organised the rising: Seven (Clarke, MacDermott, Pearse, Plunkett, MacDonagh, Ceannt, and Connolly who was admitted to the conspiracy in January 1916.)

Casualties: 64 insurgents, 132 crown forces and about 230 civilians.

Executions following the Rising: 15 participants + Sir Roger Casement.

Secondary Source C

Most Irish people were appalled by the death and destruction unleashed by the rebellion. The defeated rebels were jeered and attacked by some onlookers as they were led through the streets of Dublin.

But, as had occurred after earlier unsuccessful rebellions, Britain's response - including the execution of 15 of the leaders, the arrest of 3,430 men and 79 women (many of them entirely innocent) and the imposition of martial law throughout the entire country - provoked indignation and sympathy for the rebels.

Just as Pearse had fantasised, the sacrifice of the rebels converted previously unsympathetic nationalists to the republican cause.

In the general election of December 1918, nationalist Ireland decisively rejected the Irish Party in favour of the new Sinn Féin party which identified itself with the 1916 rebels.


Questions and points for discussion

1. What was the immediate reaction of most Irish people to the Easter Rising, according to the writer? What evidence does he mention in relation to this?
2. What factors brought about a change in people’s attitude towards the rebels, according to the writer?
3. Whose execution (the sixteenth following the Rising) is not mentioned by the writer?
4. How does the number of people arrested after the Rising compare with the number who actually took part?
5. What is meant by “martial law”?
6. What had Pearse fantasised that came to pass, according to the writer?
7. What was the significance of the 1918 election, according to the writer?
The rise of the second Sinn Féin party

Significant data

1905: First Sinn Féin party established by Arthur Griffith; advocated withdrawal from Westminster parliament and passive resistance to British administration in Ireland.

1905-1916: Term ‘Sinn Féin’ increasingly used to identify nationalists with radical or ‘advanced’ views.

1916: Though Griffith not involved in organising Rising, was among those arrested in aftermath, and many referred to Rising as ‘Sinn Féin Rebellion’.

1917, February: North Roscommon by-election won by Count Plunkett, father of 1916 leader, Joseph Plunkett, with support of many Sinn Féin members, including Griffith, and other nationalists opposed to Redmond’s party. Further by-election victories in Longford and east Clare increased momentum for new political movement.

1917, October: At Sinn Féin ard fheis, Griffith stepped down as president allowing de Valera to take on the role. Griffith was vice-president. Broader membership of ‘second’ Sinn Féin party was a coalition of radical republicans, many of whom had taken part in Easter Rising, and more moderate nationalists from the old Sinn Féin.

1918: Two developments, the Conscription Crisis and the ‘German plot’, increased support for Sinn Féin.

Questions to consider on some of the above data

1. Since Sinn Féin did not organise the Easter Rising of 1916, why did it become known to many as the ‘Sinn Féin rebellion’?
2. What developments in 1917 increased the momentum for a new political movement?
3. Were members of the second Sinn Féin party less likely or more likely to support the use of force to overthrow the British administration in Ireland? Explain the reasons for your answer.
Secondary Source D

In the first months of 1918 the [Sinn Féin] party suffered a number of reverses, and it lost three by-elections in succession, in South Armagh, Waterford City and East Tyrone. Many people wondered whether the tide might have turned against Sinn Féin.

Sinn Féin’s fortunes were restored by the conscription crisis in the spring of 1918. Finally in the spring of 1918, faced with the prospect of military defeat as the Germans broke through the allied positions on the Western Front, Lloyd George’s cabinet and the House of Commons decided at last to impose conscription on Ireland.

The Parliamentary Party MPs opposed the measure, and when they were outvoted by British members they returned to Ireland to carry on the fight at home. By doing this, of course, they put into effect the ideas which Griffith had advocated for the past twenty years: that Irish representatives should withdraw from Westminster and should meet instead in Dublin. But they did so reluctantly, and in circumstances which represented a humiliating defeat for their own policies.

Sinn Féin became the de facto leader of a nationalist coalition, and in the eyes of many cautious nationalists it acquired a new degree of respectability. This was enhanced by the cooperation between the nationalist leaders and the Catholic hierarchy which characterised the anti-conscription campaign.

Faced with unanimous opposition outside unionist north-east Ulster the British government backed down, and conscription was postponed.


Questions and points for discussion
1. Why did things seem to be turning against the new, ‘second’ Sinn Féin party in the early months of 1918?
2. What impact did the British government’s decision to introduce a conscription bill have on the Irish Parliamentary Party?
3. How did the campaign to stop conscription in Ireland benefit Sinn Féin?

https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Irish_Conscription_1918_John_Dillon_Roscommon_Rally.jpg
Secondary Source E
In May 1918 the government, having decided to postpone the implementation of conscription in Ireland, decided instead to focus on Sinn Féin and arrested 73 prominent members, on the pretext that a German agent had been arrested off the coast of County Clare, and that there was a necessity to stamp out ‘pro-German intrigues’ in Ireland. This also got rid of many of the moderates for some time (though Griffith in prison was elected in an East Cavan by-election), strengthening the hands of people like Harry Boland and Michael Collins, who had evaded arrest. While, officially, conscription had been postponed, in reality it had been abandoned.


Questions and points for discussion
1. What was the pretext for allegations of a ‘German plot’ that led to the arrests of many Sinn Féin leaders in May 1918?
2. Whose influence became greater as a result of the ‘German plot’ arrests? Discuss whether this made the use of violence more likely or less likely.

Michael Collins and Harry Boland at a hurling match in Croke Park, 1921.
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The 1918 election: what was Sinn Féin’s position on the issue of sovereignty?

Source A

1
Sinn Féin aims at securing the international recognition of Ireland as an independent Irish Republic. Having achieved that status the Irish people may by referendum choose their own form of government.  

Our position should be simply that we are insisting on only one right, and that is the right of the people of this country to determine for themselves how they should be governed.  

Points for discussion
1. In Source A1, does the form of words devised by de Valera commit Sinn Féin to a republic and nothing but a republic, or does it leave open the possibility of another form of government being chosen by the people? Support your answer by reference to the source.
2. In Source A2, written over four years later, is de Valera’s view similar to or different to that adopted by the Sinn Féin ard fheis in 1917? Support your answer by reference to the source.

https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Sinn_F%C3%A9in_election_poster_-_1918.jpg
Source B: the Sinn Féin manifesto for the 1918 election

Sinn Féin gives Ireland the opportunity of vindicating her honour and pursuing with renewed confidence the path of national salvation by rallying to the flag of the Irish Republic.

Sinn Féin aims at securing the establishment of that Republic.

1. By withdrawing the Irish Representation from the British Parliament and by denying the right and opposing the will of the British Government or any other foreign Government to legislate for Ireland.
2. By making use of any and every means available to render impotent the power of England to hold Ireland in subjection by military force or otherwise.
3. By the establishment of a constituent assembly comprising persons chosen by Irish constituencies as the supreme national authority to speak and act in the name of the Irish people, and to develop Ireland's social, political and industrial life, for the welfare of the whole people of Ireland.
4. By appealing to the Peace Conference for the establishment of Ireland as an Independent Nation.

See full manifesto at the CELT (Corpus of Electronic Texts) website of UCC History Department: http://celt.ucc.ie/published/E900009/index.html.

See also http://catalogue.nli.ie/Record/vtls000021469

Questions and points for discussion

1. (a) What is explicitly stated here as the main political aim of Sinn Féin? (b) Look at the rest of the document. What other form of words is used to describe the idea of an independent Ireland?
2. (a) What is the first strategy proposed to secure Sinn Féin’s political aim? (b) Which leader of Sinn Féin had been advocating this strategy for over fourteen years?
3. (a) Does the manifesto as quoted here commit Sinn Féin to a ‘war of independence’? Support your answer by reference to the document. (b) Which of the points leaves open the possibility that physical force may need to be used to secure independence?
4. What internal and external measures does the manifesto promise Sinn Fin will take to bring about the independence of Ireland?
The 1918 election: Sinn Féin’s links with the Easter Rising of 1916

Activity 1

http://www.ark.ac.uk/elections/h1918.htm

Study carefully at the above web link the list of candidates elected for Sinn Féin in the 1918 election. The following all had some involvement in the Easter Rising of 1916. Identify the constituency or constituencies for which they were elected. (Some, such as de Valera, were elected for more than one constituency.)

Éamon de Valera
Brian O’Higgins
Patrick O’Keeffe
Michael Collins
Diarmuid Lynch
Joseph O’Doherty
James Joseph Walsh
Joseph Aloysius Sweeney
Richard Mulcahy
Seán T. O’Kelly
Desmond Fitzgerald
Joseph McGrath
Michael Staines
Countess Markievicz
Pádraic Ó Máille
Liam Mellows
Frank Fahy
Piaras Béaslaí
Finian Lynch
Austin Stack
Daniel Buckley (Domhnall Ó Buachalla)
W.T. Cosgrave
Richard Hayes
Joseph McGuinness
William Sears
Edmund John (‘Éamonn’) Duggan
Seán MacEntee
Harry Boland
Cathal Brugha
Dr. James Ryan
Seán Etchingham

N.B. The above list is not definitive. Not included are people like David Kent – who spent Easter Week awaiting mobilisation orders – and John Joseph O’Kelly (‘Sceilg’), who was ill at the time of the Rising.
Activity 2: questions and points for investigation

1. Which of the thirty-one Sinn Féin TDs listed was the senior surviving commandant of the 1916 rising?
2. Which of the Sinn Féin TDs listed later served as head of an Irish government?
3. Which of the Sinn Féin TDs listed later served as President of Ireland?
4. Which of the Sinn Féin TDs listed was the father of a man who became Taoiseach in the 1970s?
5. Which of the Sinn Féin TDs listed was the father of a man who became Taoiseach in the 1980s?
6. Which of the Sinn Féin TDs listed had been a leader of the Stephen’s Green/Royal College of Surgeons garrison in 1916?
7. Which of the Sinn Féin TDs listed was the second-in-command at the South Dublin Union during the 1916 Rising and was severely wounded during Easter Week?
8. Which of the other Sinn Féin TDs listed also served in the South Dublin Union during the Rising?
9. Which of the Sinn Féin TDs listed was a leader of insurrectionary activity in Galway during the Easter Rising?
10. Which of the Sinn Féin TDs listed led a detachment from Maynooth, Co. Kildare, to fight in the GPO during the Easter Rising?

Activity 3: Point for discussion
Did the election of so many veterans of the 1916 Rising as Sinn Féin TDs make the use of violence to achieve independence more or less likely?

Research Study possibilities
Many of the lesser-known figures in the above list could be studied from a perspective such as their formation as political revolutionaries, what prompted them to become involved in the 1916 Rising and what their role in the rising was. A good starting point for research would be the Dictionary of Irish Biography (DIB) which is available online to schools via the Schools’ Broadband Network at http://dib.cambridge.org.

Part II

Leaving Certificate History: teaching the period 1919-1923

Turning now to the period 1919-1923, the following pages contain a range of reference and support material to enable students to gain the maximum benefit from their engagement in the enquiry that follows. While some primary source material is used in the enquiry, the bulk of the sources are secondary and include selected insights from a wide range of historians. As the splendid Atlas of the Irish Revolution was published as this booklet was nearing completion, it was not possible, except in a few instances, to draw on the many insights contained therein. The book, however, will be a tremendous resource for all teachers and students of this period of Irish history.
Linking your teaching to the National Literacy and Numeracy Strategy

The following quote comes from *Literacy and Numeracy for Learning and Life: The National Strategy to Improve Literacy and Numeracy among Children and Young People* (Department of Education and Skills, 2011, p.8)

Traditionally we have thought about literacy as the skills of reading and writing; but today our understanding of literacy encompasses much more than that. **Literacy includes the capacity to read, understand and critically appreciate various forms of communication including spoken language, printed text, broadcast media, and digital media.** Throughout this document, when we refer to “literacy” we mean this broader understanding of the skill, including speaking and listening, as well as communication using not only traditional writing and print but also digital media.

The student activities set down in this resource are designed to improve students’ “capacity to read, understand and critically appreciate various forms of communication including spoken language, printed text, broadcast media, and digital media.”

As the literacy strategy makes clear, a key element in developing literacy is promoting students’ listening, talking, reading and writing skills, as well as their ability to critically assess visual images and other broadcast material. Some of the ways in which material from this booklet can be used to achieve these objectives are as follows:

- The questions/points for discussion that follow the sources are intended to form the basis for purposeful discussion among students and educative interaction between teacher and students. As well as promoting literacy, the teaching and learning conversation which this type of interaction underlies is a key component of all strategies for promoting assessment for learning in the classroom.

- The enquiry approach exemplified in this resource is designed to keep the learning outcomes constantly in the forefront of students’ minds. This is important in all strategies to improve literacy and is a key component of strategies for assessment for learning.

- The critical skills exercise is a type of card sorting exercise which helps to develop students listening skills and oral skills, as well as their ability to think critically.

- The importance of consolidating learning through carefully-designed written tasks is fundamental to student learning. The enquiry approach exemplified here concludes with an activity for students: “Your conclusions on the enquiry”. Also, some of the “Questions and points for discussion” set down for each step of the enquiry can be used as the basis for written tasks as deemed appropriate by the teacher.

The elements of *Literacy and Numeracy for Learning and Life* relating to numeracy identify the need to enable young people “to think and communicate quantitatively, to make sense of data, to have a spatial awareness, to understand patterns and sequences, and to recognise situations where mathematical reasoning can be applied to solve problems.” All of these are relevant to the teaching of the 1919-1923 period e.g. in assessing the numbers of cabinet members and TDs supporting and opposing the Treaty; in identifying areas of most intensive conflict in War of Independence and Civil War; in identifying the sequence of events leading to Civil War; and in contrasting numbers of fatalities in Civil War with other conflicts.
The struggle for independence, 1919-1923, and its consequences: an overview

Following its success in the 1918 election, [27] Sinn Féin TDs met as Dáil Éireann on 21 January 1919 and began to implement their strategy of establishing an alternative administration to take over power from the British administration in Ireland. Independence was declared, a constitution of Dáil Éireann was approved, a programme known as the Democratic Programme was adopted and a ‘Message to the Free Nations of the World’ was read out. Following his escape from prison, Éamon de Valera presided as President at the second session on 1 April and the people he appointed as ministers included Michael Collins (Finance), Cathal Brugha (Defence) and Arthur Griffith (Home Affairs). The task of taking over power from Britain was pursued with varying degrees of success over the next couple of years in the face of British opposition and in the context of a developing armed struggle.

On the same day that Dáil Éireann first met, a group of local Volunteers ambushed and killed three RIC officers at Soloheadbeg, Co. Tipperary. A pattern of guerrilla warfare developed as local Volunteers attacked police barracks and other targets in various parts of the country, and ambushed squads of police and soldiers. The British government response included the recruitment of auxiliary policemen in Britain to supplement the ranks of a depleted RIC from which many officers resigned as the conflict developed. These recruits were known as ‘Black and Tans’ and ‘Auxiliaries’, and their arrival in Ireland from March 1920 marked a new and more bitter phase in the conflict. Reprisal killings were used to discourage civilians from supporting the Volunteers (who, from the summer of 1919 were officially designated the Army of the Irish Republic or Irish Republican Army). Michael Collins (in his role as IRA Director of Intelligence) built up an intelligence network to hamper the efforts of British spies to locate and arrest Dáil ministers and other important personnel.

The British government also responded to the situation in Ireland by implementing the Government of Ireland Act 1920 which partitioned the island. A home rule parliament was established in Belfast and Northern Ireland came into existence as a distinct political entity; a similar institution to be established in Dublin did not proceed as Sinn Féin kept up the struggle for complete independence.

Eventually – and for a variety of reasons – a truce was agreed in July 1921, and ‘talks about talks’ began, involving de Valera and the British prime minister, David Lloyd George. The subsequent ‘Treaty negotiations’ were conducted between October and December, with Griffith and Collins as leaders of the Sinn Féin delegation and Lloyd George leading the British delegates, with de Valera insisting that he remain in Dublin. On 6 December ‘Articles of Agreement for a Treaty’ were signed in London, a development that led to division in the Sinn Féin cabinet, the Dáil, the Sinn Féin party countrywide and the IRA. The successful adoption of the Anglo-Irish Treaty by Dáil Éireann in January 1922 led to the creation of the Irish Free State; but the depth of opposition to the Treaty from a significant minority of Sinn Féin members and their supporters in the ranks of the IRA (many of whose officers now became officers of the Free State army) was to result in civil war by the summer of 1922.

The seizure of the Four Courts by anti-Treaty forces in April 1922 led eventually to an attack by Free State forces in June 1922 and civil conflict ensued. Although relatively brief in duration (June 1922-May 1923), the Civil War was exceptionally bloody and bitter, deepening divisions which were long-lasting and destructive. It has been calculated that more Irish people were killed by fellow Irish people during the civil war than were killed by British forces during the entire two and a half years of the War of Independence². The Fine Gael and Fianna Fáil parties developed from the split in Sinn Féin at this time.

Articles of Agreement for a Treaty, 6 December 1921
The Treaty negotiations concluded in the early hours of the morning of 6 December 1921 when the British government and Sinn Féin delegations signed what were described as ‘Articles of Agreement’ for a Treaty. Before the terms of the Treaty could become effective they needed the approval of both the Dáil and the Westminster parliament. The Dáil voted in favour by 64 votes to 57 on 7 January 1922 and the Westminster parliament approved the terms in March. As a consequence, the Irish Free State came into existence on 6 December 1922, one year after the signing of the ‘Articles of Agreement’ in London.

Auxiliaries
As RIC officers came under attack during the War of Independence, mass resignations followed and there was difficulty in getting recruits in Ireland. Because he did not wish to acknowledge the existence of a state of war, the prime minister, Lloyd George, decided to open the ranks to recruits from Britain. The Auxiliaries were raised from among demobilised officers of the British army and, while nominally under RIC command, outside Dublin they operated independently. Divided into companies of about 100 men, they were heavily armed and operated mainly in trouble ‘blackspots’, mainly in the south and west of Ireland. Their reputation for indiscipline led to the resignation of their commander, Brigadier General Crozier in February 1921.

Black and Tans
Like the Auxiliaries, the Black and Tans were recruited in Britain to reinforce the ranks of the RIC. Most were former soldiers or sailors and, by November 1921, 9,5000 had been recruited. A shortage of RIC uniforms meant that they were issued with khaki army trousers and dark green police tunics: this prompted the nickname ‘Black and Tans’. They became notorious because of their many acts of reprisal carried out in response to IRA attacks.

Bloody Sunday, 1920
On Sunday, 21 November 1920, fourteen British officers were shot dead by members of the ‘Squad’, an assassination unit set up by Michael Collins. That afternoon, Black and Tans shot into the crowd at a football match in Croke Park killing twelve people. According to Brigadier-General Crozier (who coined the term ‘Bloody Sunday’ in this context), the Tans and Auxiliaries were there to search for arms. At Dublin Castle, two IRA members, Peadar Clancy and Richard McKee, along with a third man, Conor Clune, were shot and killed whilst allegedly trying to escape.
The Civil War, 1922-1923
The Civil War was fought between the anti-Treaty and pro-Treaty sections of Sinn Féin and the IRA, previously united under the leadership of Éamon de Valera. Whilst the Dáil voted to accept the Treaty and this was supported by a majority of the population, the Treaty was rejected by a significant minority of Sinn Féin and a majority of the IRA. The pro-Treaty side, led by Michael Collins and Arthur Griffith – and, after their deaths, by W.T. Cosgrave – set up a provisional government and a new national army which many pro-Treaty IRA men joined. In 1923 W.T.Cosgrave set up a new party, Cumann na nGaedheal. Politically, the anti-Treaty side retained the name Sinn Féin until it split in 1926 with the establishment of Fianna Fáil by Éamon de Valera. The anti-Treaty IRA were called ‘Irregulars’.

Matters came to a head when Rory O’Connor and other Irregulars seized the Four Courts building in Dublin in April 1922 and the deputy chief of staff of the new national army, J.J. (“Ginger”) O’Connell was kidnapped and lodged in the building in June. On 28 June, government forces attacked and the Civil War was well and truly underway.

In Dublin, the fighting was over in less than two weeks and government troops controlled all urban areas by the end of August. The Irregulars then resorted to the guerrilla tactics employed during the War of Independence. The government adopted strong measures to bring the fighting to an end, including internment and the introduction of the death penalty for carrying firearms. The fighting did not end until after the death of Liam Lynch in April 1923: the new chief of staff, Frank Aiken, called an end to hostilities on 24 May.

The depth of Civil War divisions had a lasting impact on the political scene. The Fianna Fáil party established by de Valera in 1926 and the Fine Gael party which succeeded the Cumann na nGaedheal party in 1933 have been dominant players in Irish electoral politics ever since.

Cumann na mBan
Cumann na mBan (The Women’s League) was established in 1914 and became the women’s auxiliary corps to the Irish Volunteers. Some members resented the apparently subordinate status to the male leaders of the Volunteers. The radicalism of Cumann na mBan was evident when the vast majority of its members supported the Irish Volunteers when the Volunteer movement split in 1914. The corps was active in the 1916 Rising as nurses, despatch-carriers and in other supporting roles, though not as combatants. Between 1916 and 1918, members played an important role in promoting a cult of the dead leaders of 1916 through commemorative events, as well as raising money for prisoners and their dependants, canvassing for the 1918 elections and opposing conscription. During the War of Independence they hid arms, provided safe houses and helped to run the Dáil courts. Most members opposed the Treaty; at least 400 members were imprisoned during the Civil War.
Dáil Éireann

‘Dáil Éireann’ was the name given to the assembly established in Dublin in 1919 by the elected Sinn Féin MPs who refused to take their seats in the Westminster parliament: henceforth, these members of parliament were known as Teachtaí Dála (Members of the assembly) or TDs. The assembly was unicameral i.e. it had only one chamber. (There was no upper house: no Senate or House of Lords.)

The first Dáil met between January 1919 and May 1921. Elections in May 1921 led to the establishment of a second Dáil which met between August 1921 and June 1922. Following adoption of the Treaty, the elections of June 1922 led to the convening of a new assembly which met between September and December 1922: this assembly, sometimes called the third Dáil was boycotted by republicans.

With the adoption of the constitution of the Irish Free State in December 1922, a bicameral (two chamber) system was adopted which persists to this day, with the Dáil as the more representative and more powerful of the two houses of the Oireachtas (legislature).

Democratic Programme

This was one of the key documents adopted at the first meeting of the first Dáil. It set out the social and economic objectives of the new Dáil assembly. Its socialistic elements were partly to reward the Labour party for its decisions to abstain from the 1918 election and partly to bolster the Irish case for self-determination at the International Socialist Conference in Berne in February 1919. (See http://catalogue.nli.ie/Record/vtls000075487.) Its principal author was Thomas Johnson of the Labour party but it was edited by Seán T. O’Kelly of Sinn Féin to make it more acceptable to Sinn Féin members.

Dominion status

The term was used to describe the degree of autonomy or self-determination granted to former colonies of the British Empire which retained allegiance to the British crown. The areas in question were areas of extensive white settlement. Prior to World War I, the following had attained this status: Canada (1867); Australia (1901); New Zealand (1907); and South Africa (1910). The term ‘dominion’ was applied to Canada and New Zealand; Australia preferred the term ‘Commonwealth’ and South Africa the term ‘Union’.

The conception of ‘dominion status’ was extended by the Anglo-Irish Treaty, in that the Irish Free State was granted full fiscal autonomy and the wording of the Oath of Allegiance placed the Constitution of the Irish Free State before the king. The 1930 Statute of Westminster recognised the right of the dominions to full control of their own domestic and foreign affairs.
Government of Ireland Act, 1920
Following on from the suspension of the Home Rule act of 1914, the Government of Ireland Act was Lloyd George's attempt to create a new structure for Ireland in a post-World War scenario. Two home rule parliaments were to be created, one in Dublin legislating for twenty-six counties, and one in Belfast legislating for six counties. While the Northern parliament came into existence and was officially opened by King George V in June 1921, Sinn Féin rejected the act as the struggle for independence raged, and the elections for a Southern parliament were used by Sinn Féin as elections for the second Dáil.

Guerrilla warfare
This is a form of irregular warfare involving ambushes, raids, ‘hit-and-run’ tactics and other strategies that are suited to a situation where a relatively small or relatively weak number of fighters takes on a more powerful and, usually, traditional military force. Guerrillas, as in the Irish War of Independence, frequently have the advantage of fighting on home territory against a force which is fighting on unfamiliar territory.

Irish Volunteers / Irish Republican Army (IRA)
The Irish Volunteers were founded at the Rotunda meeting rooms in Dublin in November 1913. In an article in the Gaelic League newspaper, An Claidheamh Soluis, under the headline, ‘The North began’, Eoin MacNeill had called on nationalists to arm themselves to defend home rule following the formation of the Ulster Volunteer Force which was committed to opposing home rule. From the beginning, members of the Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB) – the secret, oath-bound organisation committed to armed rebellion – were active in its ranks, particularly at officer level. In June 1914 John Redmond, leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party, won substantial control of the organisation. Following the outbreak of World War I, Redmond called on members to support the war effort and this led to a split in the organisation. The majority of the 160,000 Volunteers supported Redmond and now became the National Volunteers. Those who opposed Redmond’s call retained the name Irish Volunteers and Eoin MacNeill became their leader. Unknown to MacNeill, IRB members who held leadership roles in the organisation now began to plan a rebellion.

Reorganised after the 1916 Rising, the Irish Volunteers were closely aligned with the revitalised, ‘second’ Sinn Féin party, with Eamon de Valera assuming the leadership of both movements. Public drilling brought the Volunteers into conflict with the British authorities and strains developed between the political and military wings of the independence movement. Increasingly, violent action was taken on the initiative of local Volunteer leaders, even before the Soloheadbeg ambush of 21 January 1919 which is usually taken as the beginning of the War of Independence (also known as the Anglo-Irish War). From the summer of 1919, the Volunteers were generally known as the Irish Republican Army (IRA).

When the IRA split over the Treaty in 1922 many pro-Treaty IRA men joined the new national army, while those who actively opposed the Treaty in the Civil War became known as the Irregulars. To distinguish them from later incarnations of the IRA, the ones who fought in the War of Independence were subsequently referred to as the ‘Old IRA’.
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Partition
The creation of a political border in Ireland began with the Government of Ireland Act 1920. Despite the formation of the parliament of Northern Ireland in 1921, Sinn Féin and the IRA refused to recognise the new arrangements and remained active in some Northern counties. The Boundary Commission provisions in the Treaty persuaded many nationalists that substantial change would result from its deliberations and, as a consequence, partition was not a major issue in the Treaty debates of December 1921-January 1922. However, the Boundary Commission report proved unacceptable to nationalists and a tripartite agreement confirmed the existing border.

Restoration of Order in Ireland Act, 1920
To strengthen its hand in dealing with the guerrilla warfare of the IRA, the British government introduced this Act which became law on 9 August 1920. The commander of British forces in Ireland, General Sir Nevil Macready, was empowered to arrest and hold without trial anyone suspected of membership of Sinn Féin or the IRA. Suspects could be tried by secret court martial and military courts of inquiry were to replace coroners’ inquests.

Royal Irish Constabulary (RIC)
The Irish Constabulary, an armed police force, was formed in 1836 by Thomas Drummond, Under-Secretary for Ireland, 1835-1840. It gained the prefix ‘Royal’ for its role in suppressing the Fenian rising of 1867. Recruits came mainly from the tenant farmer class and constables were based in barracks in likely trouble spots. The RIC was unpopular in many areas because it assisted at evictions. In the early stages of the War of Independence, RIC constables were the main targets of the IRA.

Reprisals
A ‘reprisal’ is an act of retaliation. Frustrated at the ways in which IRA men ‘melted’ back into the civilian population, the Black and Tans retaliated by burning houses and other buildings, by shooting indiscriminately into crowds of suspected ‘sympathisers’ and by other acts of random terror. While such attacks were initially unofficial, from January 1921 they appeared to have official sanction as General Macready ordered that “punishments, including confiscations, fines, or, if necessary, the destruction of houses or property might be carried out against any person or persons who might be considered implicated in … outrages against the Crown forces….” (Sir N. Macready, Annals of an Active Life, Vol. 2, p.523)

Sinn Féin
Arthur Griffith founded the Sinn Féin party in 1905 as a radical nationalist party. With the help of Bulmer Hobson, it attracted a disparate group of supporters, including IRB men, disillusioned Irish Parliamentary Party supporters, feminists and pacifists. To achieve independence, including economic independence, Sinn Féin advocated passive resistance to British rule in Ireland. Griffith proposed that Irish MPs should withdraw from Westminster and form a national assembly in Ireland. Unsuccessful in political terms, Griffith’s writings were widely read and respected among all radical nationalist groups, including members of the Irish Volunteers who
fought in the 1916 Rising and who were sometimes referred to as ‘Sinn Féin’ Volunteers. Thus, Sinn Féin was widely held responsible for the 1916 Rising and Griffith was one of those arrested in its aftermath.

The executions and arrests that followed the Rising transformed public opinion, and Sinn Féin was re-constituted as a mass movement of militant nationalism determined to achieve national independence. Arthur Griffith stood down as president (becoming vice-president) and was replaced by Éamon de Valera. This party is sometimes referred to as the ‘second’ Sinn Féin’ party. It split in 1922 over the Treaty”. The pro-Treaty members subsequently established the Cumann na nGaedheal party in 1923 under W.T.Cosgrave’s leadership; in 1933, it merged with two other groups to form the Fine Gael party. The anti-Treaty members retained the name Sinn Féin under de Valera’s leadership; however, in 1926 de Valera enjoyed the support of a majority of members when he decided to found a new party, Fianna Fáil. Because of their origins in the disagreements over the Treaty and the Civil War that followed, Fine Gael and Fianna Fáil are sometimes referred to as the ‘Civil War parties.

**Sovereignty**

In a political context, the word refers to the power of a nation or national group to exercise full control over its own affairs. Thus, the ‘pursuit of sovereignty’ involves an attempt to achieve independence by wresting power away from an occupying power through negotiation and by constitutional means or by force of arms.

**The Treaty negotiations, October-December 1921**

Following agreement to a truce in July 1921, de Valera met Lloyd George for preliminary peace talks and this was followed, in August, by an exchange of correspondence, between the two men. They eventually agreed to a conference in London ‘to ascertain how the association of Ireland with the community of nations known as the British Empire might best be reconciled with Irish national aspirations’. The negotiations began on 11 October and concluded on 6 December. The Sinn Féin delegates were Arthur Griffith, Michael Collins, Robert Barton, George Gavan Duffy and Éamonn Duggan; representing the British government were David Lloyd George (the prime minister), Lord Birkenhead, Austen Chamberlain, Winston Churchill, Sir Hamar Greenwood, Sir Gordon Hewart and Sir Laming Worthington-Evans. For extensive coverage of the case study, see the relevant PDST booklet resource, currently available at [http://www.pdst.ie/sites/default/files/Treaty%20negotiations%20booklet%20FINAL%20%20.pdf](http://www.pdst.ie/sites/default/files/Treaty%20negotiations%20booklet%20FINAL%20%20.pdf).

**War of Independence, 1919-1921**

Also known as the Anglo-Irish War, the conflict resulted from the armed attacks on the constabulary by members of the Irish Volunteers (subsequently, the IRA). Conventionally dated from 21 January 1921, when the Soloheadbeg ambush occurred, it continued until 9 July 1921 when a truce was agreed, opening the way for peace negotiations.
Biographical notes

(Main sources: Dictionary of Irish Biography and Oxford Dictionary of National Biography)

Note: The notes on Collins, Craig, de Valera and Griffith were originally included in the PDST booklet on The Treaty Negotiations case study.

Richard Dawson Bates (1876-1949)  
Key personality

Northern Ireland minister of home affairs, 1921-1943. Born in Belfast, Bates qualified as a solicitor in 1900. As secretary of the Ulster Unionist Council (1906-1921) and joint secretary of the Unionist Associations of Ireland, he helped to organise the Ulster Covenant and the Ulster Volunteer Force. James Craig had a high regard for him and appointed him minister of home affairs in 1921, a post he held for nearly twenty-two years.

Bates became a leading architect of the Northern state for a number of reasons: the high esteem in which he was held by Craig and his resulting personal influence in government; his influence over central and local unionist organisations; and his ministry’s wide powers over security and local government. In the eyes of his fellow unionists, he ensured the state’s survival through the introduction of the Special Powers Act, 1922, which gave extensive powers to police to counteract terrorism and established the special constabulary.

To the nationalist community in Northern Ireland which he strongly distrusted, Bates was associated with inflexible security and discriminatory practices. In the 1920s he discontinued the use of proportional representation in elections and in the 1930s he was responsible for the gerrymandering practices that gave Derry city council a Unionist majority until the 1970s.

When World War II came, Bates was criticised for the shortcomings in civil defence revealed by the Belfast blitz and was dropped from the cabinet when Basil Brooke became prime minister in 1943. Bates was made a knight in 1921 and a baronet in 1927

Michael Collins (1890-1922)  
Key personality

Following his role as ADC to Joseph Plunkett during the 1916 rising and internment in Frongoch, North Wales, Collins was elected to the Sinn Féin executive in October 1917 and played a prominent role in the reorganised Volunteers. His intelligence network played a crucial role during the independence struggle, whilst his ‘Squad’ of gunmen (all members of the I.R.B. into which Collins was sworn in 1909) killed police agents and others who were seen as threats. As minister of finance in the Dáil government (from April 1919), director of intelligence in the IRA and a leading figure in the IRB, his dominant role was resented by some, notably Cathal Brugha (as Minister for Defence) and Austin Stack (as Minister for Home Affairs). His intelligence operation came under pressure in 1921 when Ned Broy and other informants were arrested and his offices were raided (in April). His acceptance of the truce in July 1921 was influenced by his assessment of the military situation.

Collins was not chosen to accompany de Valera to London in July for the early stages of negotiations. When selected in September as a delegate to the London conference, he suspected that he and Griffith had been ‘set up’ by de Valera to make a compromise that de Valera himself would not wish to make. He travelled to London on 9 October, a day after the other members of the delegation and stayed with his personal entourage at 15 Cadogan Gardens. Due to Griffith’s poor health, Collins was at times effectively head of the delegation. His decisions at this time appear to have been made on grounds of pragmatism: he signed the Treaty because it would bring about British military withdrawal from much of the
country and accepted the boundary commission proposals as a way of preventing the northern issue from blocking a settlement between the British and Irish governments.

As chairman of the provisional government (from 14 January, 1922), he tried to appease the republican opposition, drawing up a republican constitution and agreeing a pre-election pact with de Valera in May. When he and Griffith were summoned to London in late May, he reluctantly agreed to make the constitution conform to the terms of the Treaty. The rejection of the provisional government’s authority by an IRA convention on 26 March and Collins’ effective repudiation of the pact with de Valera (by calling on voters to support his views) deepened the developing fault lines between the pro- and anti-Treaty sides. When Sir Henry Wilson was killed in London on 22 June (a murder for which Collins himself may have given the orders), the British government blamed the anti-Treaty IRA forces who had been occupying the Four Courts in Dublin since 14 April and demanded that they be confronted. Reluctantly, Collins ordered the bombardment of the Four Courts on 28 June.

In the ensuing Civil War, Collins was commander-in-chief of the new Free State Army and gave up his chairmanship of the provisional government. By August, the anti-Treaty forces had been driven from almost all of their urban strongholds and Collins began a military inspection tour of Munster. On 22 August, he was killed during an ambush in the valley of Béal na mBláth, close to his birthplace.

William T. Cosgrave (1880-1965)  
Key personality

Born at James’s Street, Dublin, where his father had a public house, Cosgrave became one of the first members of the first Sinn Féin party when he attended a meeting at the Rotunda in Dublin in 1905. He was elected to the city corporation in 1908 and, in 1915, became chairman of the influential finance committee.

Although he declined a number of invitations to join the IRB, he did join the Irish Volunteers in 1913, becoming a lieutenant in the 4th battalion. Sentenced to death for his role in the 1916 Rising - where he served in the South Dublin Union, near his home – his sentence was commuted to life imprisonment and he was released from prison in 1917. Shortly afterwards he was elected as a Sinn Féin MP for Kilkenny in a by-election and was returned for Kilkenny North in the 1918 general election.

When Dáil Éireann met for the second time in April 1919, Cosgrave was appointed minister for local government and, along with his deputy, Kevin O’Higgins, succeeded in wresting power from the local government board and gaining the allegiance of a majority of county councils. When the Dáil cabinet split over whether to accept the ‘Articles of Agreement’ brought back from London in December 1921, Cosgrave’s vote was crucial in ensuring that the proposals were placed before the Dáil. He supported the Treaty as the best settlement that could be achieved. The deaths of Griffith and Collins in August 1922 saw Cosgrave become chairman of the provisional government and, from 6 December 1922, president of the executive council of the Irish Free State. Strong on security and financial stability, he remained as president until the 1932 election, when he was succeeded by Éamon de Valera.

James Craig (1871-1940)  
Key personality

1st Viscount Craigavon, first prime minister of Northern Ireland. Born in Co. Down. Was one of the founding members of the Belfast stock exchange. Fought the Boers in South Africa, 1900-1901, as an officer with the Royal Irish Rifles. On death of his father in 1900, he inherited a fortune. First elected as unionist M.P. in 1906 (for Down East). Helped Carson become Ulster Unionist leader in 1910, the two men dominating the campaign against the
Third Home Rule Bill of 1912. Stage-managed Carson’s public appearances including that on ‘Ulster Day’, 28 September, 1912. Actively involved in importation of guns. As advocate of six county exclusion from home rule, may be seen as architect of partition.

On outbreak of war in 1914, helped to create 36th (Ulster) Division, but resigned his commission in 1915 due to illness. In December 1916, on formation of second wartime coalition, given junior office as Treasurer of the Household and one of the government whips. Appointed Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Pensions in January 1919 and Financial Secretary to the Admiralty in April 1920. Was a significant influence on decision of cabinet committee drafting Government of Ireland bill to include a six county partition scheme.

In January 1919, accepted nomination as premier of Northern Ireland (after Carson declined the offer) and played the major role in shaping the new government and establishing security arrangements. Met de Valera on 5 May, 1921, at the behest of the British government, in an unproductive session. During the Treaty negotiations, resisted Lloyd George’s efforts to secure his agreement to an all-Ireland framework. Was angry about the boundary commission proposal but less worried about its terms than was Carson. Met Collins in January, February and March in an effort to defuse the I.R.A. campaign in Northern Ireland, but the ‘Craig-Collins pact’ of 29 March, 1922, quickly broke down. His handling of the Boundary Commission proposals in 1924-1925 is seen as assured.

Éamon de Valera (1882-1975)  Key personality

Born in New York, only child of Juan Vivian de Valera and Catherine (‘Kate’) Coll. Christened ‘Edward’. His father appears to have died in 1884. His mother’s employment in domestic service led to his return with his uncle, Edward Coll, to the family home at Bruere, Co. Limerick, in 1885. Went to school locally at first, but academic ability led to invitation to attend Blackrock College. In 1903-1904, accepted appointment as replacement of Mathematics and Physics in Rockwell College. Taught mathematics in the teacher-training college at Carysfort, Blackrock, 1906-1912. Joined the Gaelic League in 1908, subsequently marrying his Irish teacher, Sinéad Flanagan, in January 1910. In October 1912, appointed temporary lecturer and acting head of the Department of Mathematics and Mathematical Physics in St. Patrick’s College, Maynooth.

In November 1913, joined the Irish Volunteers at their inaugural meeting; his commitment led to his being appointed captain of the Donnybrook brigade. Involved in the Howth gun-running, July 1914 and sided with the minority who rejected John Redmond’s call to support the war effort in September. Appointed commandant of the 3rd Battalion in March 1915, became adjutant to Thomas McDonagh and was involved in discussions on a planned rising. His battalion occupied Boland’s Mill during the 1916 rising. Death sentence of 7 May was commuted to life imprisonment. His imprisonment, first in Mountjoy and then, in four English prisons, greatly enhanced his revolutionary credentials. On release of remaining convicted prisoners, led the group home to Ireland by boat from Holyhead in June 1917.

Following victory in East Clare by-election, he was elected president of Sinn Féin and president of the Irish Volunteers in October, 1917. At Sinn Féin ard fheis, as differences emerged between hardline republicans and those with more open minds, de Valera managed to secure unanimous backing for a compromise motion that, “Sinn Féin aims at securing the international recognition of Ireland as an independent Irish Republic. Having achieved that status the Irish people may by referendum choose their own form of government.” His role in the Conscription Crisis of 1918 enhanced his growing reputation. Was imprisoned following ‘German plot’ allegations in May 1918. Was in jail for eight months, a period which spanned the December 1918 election and the first meeting of Dáil Éireann in January 1919. Escape
from jail in February 1919 was organised by Michael Collins and Harry Boland. Elected president at meeting of Dáil Éireann on 1 April, 1919.

In June 1919, began his ‘American mission’ to secure recognition of Irish republic, dissuade US government from backing British policy on Ireland and to raise external loan. (Only the last was successful.) Returned to Ireland in December 1920. Met with James Craig on 5 May in an unproductive meeting. Supported attack on Custom House, 23 May, which led to arrests of over 80 IRA men. Following truce of 11 July, met Lloyd George four times in London between 14 and 21 July. Rejected an offer of dominion status with safeguards for British defence interests. Following a prickly correspondence between the two men, on 30 September accepted Lloyd George’s invitation to a conference in London.

His refusal to lead the delegation has been much criticised: reasons offered included that he needed to stay in Dublin so that delegates could justifiably delay signing any agreement until they had consulted with him. His ‘Document No. 2’, circulated during the Treaty debates, was an unsuccessful attempt to get unanimous backing for an alternative compromise. When Treaty was accepted on 7 January, he resigned as president but stood for re-election and was narrowly defeated. Tried to make a deal with Collins prior to June election to preserve unity, but ‘pact’ collapsed when Collins called on supporters to back Treaty. Electorate’s backing for Treaty candidates in June election disappointed de Valera who was further sidelined when the outbreak of civil war handed the initiative to the militarists. Re-joining his old battalion of the IRA, he did so as a private, an indication of his increasing powerlessness. After the Boundary Commission outcome in 1925, he resolved to offer a democratic alternative to Cumann na nGaedheal rule. Founded Fianna Fáil in 1926 and led the party into the Dáil in 1927, following the assassination of Kevin O'Higgins.

Arthur Griffith (1871-1922)

Key personality

Born into a working class Dublin family, Griffith followed in his father’s footsteps in becoming a printer. As a young man, he supported Parnell and developed radical nationalist views, being present at the first meeting of the Gaelic League. In South Africa (1897-1898), he began his involvement as a newspaper editor developing pro-Boer views that were critical of British policy in southern Africa. He returned to Ireland in autumn 1898 and launched the radical nationalist newspaper United Irishman with his friend Willie Rooney (d.1901). Publication ceased in 1908 when a libel action was brought against the paper, but another newspaper, Sinn Féin, soon appeared.

Griffith worked on a policy which he hoped would be supported by all nationalists from home rulers to republicans. The policy was set out in a series of articles in United Irishman from January to July, 1904, and re-printed in book form as The resurrection of Hungary. Griffith proposed a ‘dual monarchy’ (whereby an independent Ireland would accept the King of England as being also King of Ireland) as a means of securing the consent of unionists to Irish independence. In order to secure independence, he advocated that Irish M.P.s should withdraw from Westminster and establish a parliament in Dublin. This latter strategy was adopted by Sinn Féin in the 1918 election.

Support for some of Griffith’s policies among radical nationalists groups eventually led to the formation of a ‘Sinn Féin’ party (the phrase – already in use for his newspaper and associated with his policies – seeming to sum up very well the diverse aspirations of the various groups). Charles Dolan, M.P. for North Leitrim, resigned his seat and fought the resulting by-election as an abstentionist candidate. Following his defeat, Sinn Féin did not contest any more parliamentary seats and Griffith concentrated on his work as a journalist and proponent of radical action. He joined the Irish Volunteers on their formation in 1913 and the radical element in the new force became known as the ‘Sinn Féin’ volunteers (because the phrase had
become associated with radical nationalist policies). As a party, Sinn Féin had almost ceased to exist by 1914 though Griffith’s journalism kept him in the public eye.

Despite Griffith having no direct role in the 1916 rising, a number of factors spurred a modest recovery in the fortunes of his party after the rising: (1) the perception of a ‘Sinn Féin’ rebellion (due to the radical nationalist nature of the participants); (2) Griffith’s imprisonment following the rising; and (3) the sharp public reaction to the spate of executions and large-scale arrests. When Éamon de Valera was released from prison and elected as M.P. for Clare in 1917, Griffith stood down as president and was replaced by de Valera. The party now agreed to work towards a republic, but accepted that the people would choose their own form of government once independence had been won. At the party’s October ard fheis, Griffith was elected as vice-president and served de Valera as deputy over the next four years.

His leading role in opposing conscription in 1918, the withdrawal of Home Rule M.P.s from Westminster after the conscription bill was passed, and Griffith’s arrest in connection with the so-called ‘German plot’, all helped to ensure his election as M.P. for Cavan East. Following the Sinn Féin successes in the 1918 general election, his policy of withdrawal from Westminster was implemented and in the first Dáil government he was minister of home Affairs. When de Valera went to the US in June 1919, Griffith became acting president of the Dáil (until his own arrest at the end of 1920).

Following his release in June 1921, Griffith was one of those who accompanied de Valera to London for preliminary discussions with Lloyd George. Appointed minister for foreign affairs on 26 August, the following month, Griffith was chosen as chairman of the delegation for the conference in London. In November, Griffith privately agreed to a proposal for a boundary commission and agreed a written summary prepared by Tom Jones: this document was later (5 December) produced by Lloyd George to dissuade Griffith from breaking on the issue of Ulster. Lloyd. George’s late concession of the principal of fiscal autonomy was also designed to win Griffith’s support. Griffith was first to sign the Treaty, indicating that he would sign even if his colleagues would not.

In the Dáil debates, Griffith defended the Treaty as providing the best terms available and as part of a process rather than a final settlement. He was a frequent visitor to London in 1922 as the provisional government tried to adopt a constitution that would be republican in nature, frequently defending positions that he himself considered unreasonable. The June elections saw pro-Treaty candidates receive 78% of the first preference vote and strong personal support for Griffith in Cavan. However, his health broke down and he was in a nursing home in Leeson Street, Dublin, when he died suddenly from a cerebral haemorrhage on 12 August, 1922.

Countess Markievicz (1868-1927) Key personality

Born at Buckingham Gate, London, and named Constance, she was the eldest of three daughters of Sir Henry Gore-Booth of Lissadell, County Sligo. Educated at home, she made her formal début into ‘society’ when she was presented to Queen Victoria at Buckingham Palace in 1887. An aspiring artist, she went to the Slade School of Art in London in 1893.

Back in Sligo, in 1896, she presided over a meeting of the Sligo Women’s Suffrage Society. In 1898 she went to Paris to further her studies in art and, there, met Count Casimir Dunin-Markiewicz, a Pole whose family held land in the Ukraine. They married in 1900. On returning to Dublin in 1903, the couple were active in cultural and social circles, exhibiting their paintings, putting on plays and helping to establish the United Arts Club. However, the couple separated in 1909.
Her conversion to republicanism dates from around 1908 when she joined Sinn Féin and Inghinidhe na hÉireann (Daughters of Ireland), a women’s nationalist movement founded by Maud Gonne MacBride. In 1909 she founded Fianna Éireann, a republican youth movement. Increasingly interested in socialism and trade unionism, she was a strong supporter of the Irish Women Workers’ Union and organised soup kitchens for strikers during the 1913 lock-out. When the Citizen Army was established she became an active and zealous member, favouring armed rebellion against British rule. During the Easter Rising she was second-in-command to Michael Mallin at St. Stephen’s Green and the Royal College of Surgeons. Sentenced to death for her part in the Rising, this was commuted to life imprisonment, and she was released from Aylesbury prison in June 1917 as part of a general amnesty. Shortly after her return to Ireland she was received into the Catholic Church.

Elected to the executive board of Sinn Féin, Markiewicz was one of the leaders jailed in 1918 due to alleged involvement in a ‘German plot’. In the 1918 general election she was the first woman to be elected to the British parliament but, in keeping with Sinn Féin policy, she refused to take her seat. Appointed minister for labour in the first Dáil government, she spent much of the War of Independence on the run. A strong opponent of the Treaty settlement in 1921, she spent much of the Civil War in hiding, writing anti-Treaty articles and promoting republican ideals. Elected to the Dáil for Dublin South in 1923, she refused to take the oath of allegiance and, like the other anti-treaty TDs, did not take up her seat. She joined Fianna Fáil on its foundation in 1926 and stood successfully as a Fianna Fáil candidate for Dublin South at the June 1927 election. However, ill-health led to her admittance to Sir Patrick Dun’s Hospital, Dublin, where she died on 15 July 1927.
The struggle for independence, 1919-1923: timeline

A: January 1919 – March 1921

1919, 21 January  
First meeting of first Dáil, in Mansion House  
27 TDs in attendance.  
Declaration of independence + constitution of Dáil Éireann  
+ Democratic Programme + Message to the Free Nations of the World  
Soloheadbeg ambush on RIC officers by Tipperary Volunteers,  
following which attacks on Crown forces intensified.

1919, 1 April  
Second session of first Dáil. De Valera elected President.  
Ministers and Directors appointed.

1919, June  
De Valera began his ‘American mission’ to seek support for independence.

1919, 20 August  
On proposal of Cathal Brugha, minister for defence, it was agreed that every TD and member of the Volunteers should swear allegiance to the Dáil. Volunteers now recognised as Army of the Irish Republic or Irish Republican Army (IRA)

1919, 10 September  
Dáil declared dangerous association, meetings prohibited.  
Thereafter, meetings in secret.

1920, March  
Arrival of first ‘Black and Tans’ and Auxiliaries, recruits brought in from Britain to augment ranks of RIC following mass resignations.

1920, 9 August  
Restoration of Order in Ireland Act gave commander of British forces in Ireland the power to arrest and hold without trial anyone suspected of membership of Sinn Féin or the IRA. Led to increased activity by Auxiliaries and Black and Tans.

1920, 25 October  

1920, 21 November  
‘Bloody Sunday’: Fourteen British officers shot by Collins’s ‘Squad’. Twelve shot at Croke Park match that afternoon by Black and Tans. Two IRA men and civilian shot whilst allegedly trying to escape from Dublin Castle.

1920, 28 November  
Kilmichael Ambush, Eighteen auxiliaries killed.

1920, December  
De Valera returned from American trip.

1921, 19 March  
At Cross Barry, Co. Cork, one of biggest engagements of war, Tom Barry led 104 members of West Cork ‘flying column’ in battle against 1,000+ soldiers of the Essex and Hampshire regiments.
B: June 1921 – June 1923

1921, 22 June  
At opening of new parliament of Northern Ireland, King George V, made plea for peace.

1921, 8–11 July  
Arrangements for a truce agreed, following which de Valera had a number of meetings in London with Lloyd George. Following correspondence between the two men in August, agreement was reached on arrangements for peace talks in London.

1921, 11 October  
Beginning of Treaty negotiations in London.

1921, 6 December  
‘Articles of Agreement’ for a treaty signed in London.

1921, 8 December  
Dáil cabinet split, 4-3, in favour of putting proposals to Dáil

1921, 19 December  
Dáil began public meetings to debate the Treaty proposals

1922, 7 January  
Dáil vote on Treaty, 64-57 in favour

1922, 13 April  
Four Courts, Dublin, seized by anti-Treaty forces

1922, 26 June  
JJ (‘Ginger’) O’Connell, deputy chief of staff of the army of the Irish Free State was kidnapped and handed over to Four Courts garrison.

1922, 28 June  
Government forces attacked Four Courts

1922, 5 July  
Anti-treaty forces driven from Dublin, after which strongest resistance to new Free State government was located in Munster

1922, 9 August  
After sea-borne attack, government forces occupied Cork city

1922, 12 August  
Arthur Griffith, President of Dáil Éireann, died of cerebral haemorrhage

1922, 22 August  
Michael Collins, commander-in-chief of government forces and chairman of provisional government, killed in an ambush at Béal na mBláth. Two days later, his cabinet colleagues elected W.T. Cosgrave as head of the provisional government.

1922, 28 September  
Public Safety Bill passed by Dáil. Empowered military courts to impose the death penalty for carrying firearms.

1922, 6 December  
Irish Free State formally established, under terms of Treaty.

1923, 6-7 March  
Killing of five government soldiers in a booby-trap attack at Knocknagoshel, Co. Kerry, followed by controversial killing of nine anti-treaty IRA men at Ballyseedy Cross.

1923, 24 May  
Frank Aiken, commander-in-chief of the anti-Treaty forces, issued an order to cease fire and dump arms.
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http://www.nli.ie/WWI/

http://www.taoiseach.gov.ie/irish/Eolas_stairiúil/Comoradh_Stait/Irish_Soldiers_in_the_First_World_War/

http://www.militaryarchives.ie/en/home/

http://www.nli.ie/1916/

http://treaty.nationalarchives.ie


http://dib.cambridge.org
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http://www.myadoptedsoldier.com (Superb archive of research by Irish history students on World War I soldiers from every Irish county)
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https://www.irishgenealogy.ie/en/ (Can be used to search records of revolutionary figures)

Pedagogy
Teaching the period 1919-1923: a possible line of enquiry

If students are to understand the issues and events of this period, they will need a clear line of enquiry that gives coherence to an otherwise complex and sprawling mass of data. They will also need to explore a sufficient range of perspectives to get a reasonably clear grasp of some of the essential themes of the period. An enquiry question such as the following may be helpful in this regard:

**Why did people who were comrades in the War of Independence, 1919-1921, become enemies in the Civil War, 1922-1923?**

One way of approaching this enquiry is to focus first on the extent to which those involved in the struggle for independence were united in purpose and, then, to focus on the tensions and disagreements that developed from the time peace talks got under way in July 1921 to the outbreak of civil war in June 1922. A final stage might look at the degrees of enmity between former comrades during the Civil War. The following stages may be found helpful:

**Stage 1:** To what extent were Sinn Féin and IRA members ‘comrades’ during the War of Independence, 1919-1921?

**Stage 2:** What tensions came to the surface as peace talks got under way between July and October, 1921?

**Stage 3:** Why did the outcome of the Treaty negotiations in London lead to division in Dublin and across Ireland?

**Stage 4:** Why did disagreement over the Treaty eventually lead to the outbreak of civil war in June 1922?

**Stage 5:** How serious was the degree of enmity between former comrades during the Civil War, 1922-1923?

What are the potential benefits of using these questions to focus on the subject matter of the period in question?

In the pages that follow, for four stages of the enquiry a list of ‘factors identified in commentaries’ is followed by a selection of linked source extracts, mostly secondary but with some primary source extracts. For one stage – the fourth – a timeline is provided with questions and points to consider.

While most sources have undergone some degree of editing, teachers may decide to engage in further editing of some sources to facilitate use with their own classes. Also, the sources provided are intended to assist teachers in taking students through the various stages of the enquiry and may be used selectively at the discretion of the teacher. It is important that the line of enquiry be pursued in a way that students find engaging and helpful to understanding.
Stage 1: To what extent were Sinn Féin and IRA members comrades during the War of Independence, 1919-1921?

Suggested hook: https://www.flickr.com/photos/tg4/8178848402

Among the factors identified in commentaries are:

- The second Sinn Féin party was a disparate group with many shades of opinion, radicals and moderates, and this was reflected in many of its policies.
- Distrust existed between certain key leaders such as Griffith and Childers and Collins and Brugha.
- Attacks carried out by Volunteer/IRA leaders on their own initiative were common: the Dáil Department of Defence had less control over the actions of local Volunteer/IRA commanders than it would have liked.
- Some IRA men developed a disdain for ‘politicians’ and believed that their views mattered most when it came to peace talks.

Relevant sources

Secondary Source 1
In terms of its mass membership, its energy, its radicalism, and its military backbone, Sinn Féin in 1917 was a new party and not merely a continuation of Griffith’s old party …

[The] majority of … party members were recent converts to the ideas of Sinn Féin - to policies such as abstention from Westminster and the establishment of an independent Irish parliament. Until only a year or two earlier, most of those who now cheered and canvassed for Sinn Féin had been followers of Redmond and Home Rule. This rapid conversion of an already politicised electorate ensured that many of the new recruits brought into the new party their democratic assumptions and their old skills or habits; in this indirect manner the Parliamentary Party influenced its successful rival … [The] new party was broadly based and comprehensive, and its rank and file were less extreme in their opinions than were many of the leaders or most of the soldiers. Radical nationalists acquired a mass following which they had lacked before the Rising, but they had to pay a price: the movement in general and some of its leaders in particular, were reined back by the people’s moderation.

pp.21-22


Questions and points for discussion

1. In what ways, according to the writer, was the Sinn Féin of 1917 a ‘new’ party?
2. What two established policies of the Sinn Féin party does the writer identify?
3. (a) According to the writer, what was the common background of a majority of the new Sinn Féin party members?
   (b) According to the writer, how did this background affect the thinking of many of the new Sinn Féin recruits?
4. According to the writer, what price did the radical nationalists have to pay for acquiring a mass following after 1916?
Secondary Source 2
The rejuvenated Sinn Féin was more akin to a popular front resistance movement than to a parliamentary party. To preserve the unity of the fragile coalition, the leadership shelved potentially disruptive issues. This inevitably meant endorsement of the social and economic status quo. That made political sense. The Proclamation of the Republic, in which Pearse and Connolly, appeared, however vaguely, to commit the rebels to building a new society, promising equality of social and economic opportunity, would make little appeal to the established interests now shifting to the new Sinn Féin as the best guarantor of their inherited status.


Questions and points for discussion
1. Discuss what the writer means when he describes the Sinn Féin of 1917 as a ‘fragile coalition’?
2. According to the writer, what did the leadership of Sinn Féin do in order to preserve the unity of the party?
3. According to the writer, why did the leadership of Sinn Féin ‘shelve’ the Proclamation of the Republic?

Secondary Source 3 (edited)
Although Collins was, like Brugha, a cabinet member, he was also a Volunteer headquarters staff officer, serving as Director of Intelligence and, for most of the time, Adjutant-General, while also taking on many other duties unofficially. Brugha resented the power that Collins held within his (Brugha’s) department, while Collins let no one else have any authority in his own department. A complicating factor was that Collins was the head of the Irish Republican Brotherhood, an organisation that claimed supreme political power, and whose Supreme Council had, in fact, until very recently claimed to constitute the legitimate government of the Irish Republic. The position of the IRB within the Volunteers was bound to cause problems – as indeed it eventually did.


Questions and points for discussion
1. Find out: What cabinet position was held by Michael Collins in the first Dáil government? What position was held by Cathal Brugha?
2. What other leadership positions held by Collins does the writer mention?
3. What, in particular, did Brugha resent about Michael Collins?
Secondary Source 4

The following passage relates to the appointment of Erskine Childers as Head of the Dáil Propaganda Department (soon to be re-named the Publicity Department) as the replacement for Desmond FitzGerald who had been arrested in February 1921.

The appointment was not welcomed by everybody. Griffith viewed Childers as a valuable recruit to be employed in a subordinate position, but he opposed his appointment to a position of power, and specifically this position. He viewed Childers as an Englishman, and he did not believe that Englishmen should hold positions of standing in the organisation.


Questions and points for discussion

1. To what significant position in the Dáil government was Erskine Childers appointed in the Spring of 1921?
2. Discuss Griffith’s reason for being opposed to Childers’ appointment.

Secondary Source 5

In reality most brigades governed their areas with little direct oversight from GHQ [General Headquarters staff], leading to an uneven development and a lack of deference to central control. Decisions were collectively made at brigade or battalion councils, with officers usually elected to their positions by their subordinates, adding to the organisation’s egalitarianism. IRA members swore allegiance to Dáil Éireann, and the IRA chief of staff reported directly to the Dáil secretary for defence (Cathal Brugha). However, civilian control of the IRA remained nominal … p.392


Questions and points for discussion

1. How did most IRA local brigades operate, according to the writer?
2. What arrangements mentioned by the writer were meant to help ensure that there was ‘civilian control of the IRA’?
3. What does the writer mean by saying that ‘civilian control of the IRA remained nominal’?
Secondary Source 6

From April 1919 the Dáil government was headed by de Valera, with Cathal Brugha as Minister for Defence. The chief of staff, Richard Mulcahy, also a TD, reported to him. The evidence suggests that the two were on quite good terms, and that both sought to place the IRA unequivocally under the control of the Dáil as the legitimate parliament of the people. In reality, however, neither Minister for Defence or chief of staff had much say on what happened on the ground up to 1921. Local initiatives, such as the Soloheadbeg shootings, and the killing of a resident magistrate in Westport in March 1919, caused widespread revulsion and ran contrary to what IRA GHQ – or at any rate the chief of staff, Mulcahy - wanted. They also went against Sinn Féin’s political strategy, but the Dáil government could not disown such acts without abandoning its claim to speak for the whole independence movement and losing whatever influence it had on the IRA.


Questions and points for discussion

1. (a) What important positions were held between 1919 and 1921 by Cathal Brugha and Richard Mulcahy?
   (b) What did both men want the relationship between the Dáil and the IRA to be, according to the writer?
2. Discuss what the writer means when he talks about ‘local initiatives’ such as the Soloheadbeg shootings.
3. According to the writer, why did the Dáil government fail to disown acts of violence of which it disapproved?
Source 1

I regarded the Dáil as merely an adjunct of the IRA, a weapon to help make government impossible, a source of propaganda aimed at embarrassing the British abroad. I had no interest in the mode of government of the country. The Departments of the Dáil – Local Government, Home Affairs, Labour, Industries, Agriculture or even Defence – were to me mere ancillaries to the militant core of the Movement. My only aim was to break the connection with England. To do that I believed deeply that force was the only way.


Questions and points for discussion

1. As an active IRA Volunteer, what was the role of the Dáil government in the mind of C.S. Andrews?
2. Discuss what the writer means when he says, ‘I had no interest in the mode of government of the country’.
3. Was the writer’s belief that ‘force was the only way’ shared by all those who were involved in the independence struggle? Explain your answer.

C.S. Andrews in 1983
© RTÉ Archives
Stage 2: What tensions came to the surface as peace talks got under way between July and October 1921?

Among the factors identified in commentaries are:

- The tensions between those members of the Dáil cabinet willing to negotiate and those unwilling to do so
- The tensions created by de Valera’s refusal to lead the negotiating team
- The tensions between politicians and local IRA commanders
- Tensions between unionists and nationalists

**Relevant sources**

**Secondary Source 7**

The three members of the Cabinet who eventually opposed the Treaty, De Valera, Brugha and Stack, all had the chance of going, but all refused, De Valera for reasons that did not commend themselves to Griffith, Collins and Cosgrave. De Valera, Brugha and Stack must therefore bear some share of the responsibility for the actions of those they chose to represent them, above all, of Griffith and Collins, whom they chose as leaders.


**Questions and points to consider**

1. Which members of the Dáil cabinet refused to represent Sinn Féin at the peace talks in London?
2. Whose refusal to attend the peace talks in London was most controversial? Explain your answer.
3. Explain the writer’s view that certain named individuals must ‘bear some share of responsibility for the actions of those they chose to represent them’.

**Secondary Source 8**

Stack later declared: ‘It consoles me to feel that from the outset I instinctively and openly set my face against negotiations in London; so did Cathal.’ Here was a recipe for conflict: whatever terms – short of heaven and earth – Collins and company brought back, Stack and Brugha would not be able to resist the opportunity to attack their arch-rival.


**Questions and points to consider**

1. What was the attitude of Austin Stack towards the negotiations in London, according to the writer?
2. Why was Stack’s attitude ‘a recipe for conflict’, according to the writer?
De Valera’s position split the cabinet, and it was only by his casting vote that he remained at home. Griffith, Collins and Cosgrave were opposed. The matter was not allowed to rest there. At the Dáil session of 14 September Cosgrave declared that ‘They were leaving their ablest player in reserve. … The reserve would have to be used some time or other, and it struck him now was the time they were required.’ Gavan Duffy and Collins also urged de Valera to go.


**Questions and points to consider**

1. What ‘position’ of de Valera split the cabinet of which he was leader?
2. Explain W.T. Cosgrave’s view on de Valera’s decision as expressed in Dáil Éireann on 14 September 1921.
3. Who else publicly – in Dáil Éireann on 14 September – urged de Valera to attend the peace talks in London?
Source 2
Tom Barry describes meeting with Éamonn Duggan T.D. (and, later, one of the Treaty signatories) whom he was to accompany to a meeting with General Macready, commander in chief of the British forces in Ireland, during the Truce.

After I finished breakfast, I was having a smoke and in came Collins with this fellow called Ned Duggan. I’d never heard of him before. He was some kind of a bloody minister or something, and he was a lawyer. Collins introduced us; he said, ‘This is Ned Duggan. He’s the Chief Liaison Officer for all Ireland.’ We had no partition then.

So I looked at him anyway. He was dressed in a black coat, waxed moustache, black homburg hat, striped pants and spats. And he was supposed to be an IRA man. He was no more an IRA man than I was an atom bomber.


Note: Spats were made of cloth or felt material and buttoned around the ankle. Their purpose was to protect shoes and socks from mud or rain, but they also served as a feature of stylish dress in accordance with the fashions of the period (late 19th/early 20th century).

Questions and points to consider
1. What does the comment, ‘He was some kind of a bloody minister or something’, suggest about Barry’s attitude towards politicians and/or government ministers?
2. Both men, Duggan and Barry, were IRA liaison officers. Suggest a reason or reasons why Barry says, ‘He was no more an IRA man than I was an atom bomber’.

Secondary Source 10
The truce was greeted in Belfast with another spate of sectarian conflict which was renewed periodically throughout the autumn. As far as Northern Unionists were concerned, the truce was a victory for Irish nationalism. Eoin O’Duffy, as the IRA liaison officer for Ulster, set up headquarters in Belfast. The Northern units of the Volunteers were reorganised and the Republican Police were established in nationalist areas of Belfast. At a meeting on 12 August the Northern members of the Sinn Féin executive supported the continuation of the Belfast boycott. Several representatives supported both passive and active resistance to the Northern parliament.


Note: The Belfast boycott, 1920-1922, was a boycott of goods produced in and distributed from Belfast during the War of Independence. Talks between Michael Collins and James Craig, the Northern prime minister, in January and March 1922, eventually led to an ending of the boycott.

Questions and points to consider
1. What reason does the writer give for the outbreak of sectarian conflict in Belfast during the summer and autumn of 1921?
2. What decisions taken at a meeting of Northern members of the Sinn Féin executive were likely to anger Northern Unionists?
Stage 3: Why did the outcome of the Treaty negotiations in London lead to division in Dublin and across Ireland?

Among the factors identified in commentaries are:

- The negotiating team were accused of going against the instructions they received from de Valera.
- The terms contained in the ‘Articles of Agreement’ included an Oath of Allegiance which was unacceptable to some Dáil ministers and some TDs.
- The terms were completely unacceptable to doctrinaire republicans.
- A majority of IRA members would not accept the votes in favour of the Treaty by Dáil Éireann and by voters in the 1922 general election.

Relevant sources

Secondary 11
A torrent of recrimination immediately engulfed the signatories. Critics charged that the delegates had undertaken to sign no agreement without referring the terms to the cabinet in Dublin. Griffith had pledged as late as 3 December not to accept dominion status without referral back to the cabinet. Why had the delegates not even used the telephone to Dublin when faced with Lloyd George’s ultimatum? Supporters of the Treaty taunted de Valera with moral cowardice for staying in Ireland, and asked what better terms he could have delivered.


Questions and points to consider
1. Why were the men who signed the ‘Articles of Agreement’ – including Arthur Griffith – criticised, according to the writer?
2. (a) Who was criticised in response by those who supported the Treaty? (b) On what grounds was he criticised?

Secondary Source 12
But the confusion about the powers of the plenipotentiaries was partly a result of the conflicting signals being given by de Valera. His critics quite legitimately pointed to the inconsistency of his position; having prepared for compromise with Lloyd George ‘he had then rushed back to the rock of republicanism’ and seemed to be sending conflicting messages to the Irish negotiators. Another problem was that the Dáil had granted them plenipotentiary powers but, privately, they were issued with other, contradictory instructions by the Cabinet to the effect that before signing any agreement, they would have to refer it back to the Cabinet.


Note: ‘Plenipotentiary’ means ‘invested with full power’.

Questions and points to consider
1. Discuss what the writer means when he talks about ‘conflicting signals being given by de Valera’.
2. What was ‘contradictory’ about the instructions given to the Irish negotiators?
Secondary Source 13
The majority of the delegation accepted Lloyd George’s draft treaty as an objectionable but tolerable basis for future step-wise progress towards broader self-government; but de Valera and several ministers in Dublin repudiated the agreement on the grounds that Irish representatives should never express even ‘fidelity’ to a British monarch. In the bitter Dáil debate which followed de Valera tried unavailingly to table an alternative draft omitting the oath and altering nomenclature, but leaving virtually intact all specific restrictions upon Irish autonomy. On 7 January 1922 the Treaty was approved by a small majority of deputies. 


Questions and points to consider
1. Explain the writer’s view of how the majority of the Sinn Féin delegation regarded the draft treaty (i.e. the ‘Articles of Agreement’).
2. What reason does the writer give for de Valera’s repudiation (rejection) of the draft treaty?
3. The writer mentions ‘an alternative draft’ circulated by de Valera but rejected by TDs: this was known as ‘Document No. 2’. How did this document differ from the draft treaty, according to the writer? See if you can find out more about this.
4. On 7 January 1922, the Treaty was approved by Dáil Éireann by a small majority. What was the difference in numbers between the two sides?

Secondary Source 14
The republican women in the Dáil in particular asserted the right to speak in the name of their dead loved ones. The six women – five of them related to dead patriots – voted against its acceptance. Margaret Pearse insisted her son would not have accepted a treaty that included only part of the country, while Kathleen Clarke saw it as yet another chapter of England’s book of divide and conquer.


Notes
1. Margaret Pearse was the mother of Patrick Pearse, the 1916 leader, and his brother Willie.
2. Kathleen Clarke was the widow of Thomas Clarke, the 1916 leader.
3. The other four women TDs were Countess Markiewicz, Ada English, Mary MacSwiney (brother of Terence MacSwiney, who died on hunger strike) and Kate O’Callaghan (widow of the murdered Mayor of Limerick, Michael, killed 7 March 1921, probably by Black and Tans).

Questions and points to consider
1. What precisely does the writer mean in referring to the six women TDs as ‘republican women’?
2. On what grounds did Margaret Pearse and Kathleen Clarke oppose the Treaty, according to the writer?
The Treaty was supported by a majority of the army headquarters staff (nine for, four against), as well as the executive of the IRB. The principal argument that swayed both bodies was that the agreement could be worked for all it was worth and would be a stepping stone to the republican objective. Many commanders and ordinary Volunteers were not impressed by the staff’s endorsement. The men in the localities, having little political experience, preferred a clearly defined, simple position on the matter. Ringing reaffirmations of the Republic appealed to them. This was appropriate to their truce-time elevation as selfless and heroic soldiers; local opinion expected them to stand fast. Many of them, who had done no fighting before the truce or had joined afterwards, had to demonstrate that they were true to their oath to the Republic.


**Questions and points to consider**

1. (a) What two significant bodies backed the Treaty, according to the writer?
   (b) What was the main argument that swayed both bodies, according to the writer?
   (c) Do you know: With what political figure is that argument most strongly associated?

2. The Treaty was opposed by many local commanders and rank-and-file IRA men. What reasons for this are given by the writer?
Stage 4: Why did disagreement over the Treaty eventually lead to the outbreak of civil war in June 1922?

Timeline of critical developments

1921, 8 December  Dáil cabinet split, 4-3, in favour of putting proposals to Dáil.
1921, 19 December  Dáil began public meetings to debate the Treaty proposals,
1922, 7 January  Dáil vote on Treaty, 64-57 in favour. De Valera resigned as President, replaced by Griffith.
1922, 12 January  A group of IRA officers opposed to the Treaty (including Rory O’Connor, Liam Mellows, Oscar Traynor and Liam Lynch) demanded the holding of an Army Convention. Mulcahy, Minister for Defence, agreed this should be held within two months.
1922, 14 January  Parliament of Southern Ireland (as constituted under the Government of Ireland Act 1920), consisting of pro-Treaty TDs and four members from Dublin University, met and elected Collins Chairman of the Provisional Government, to which power was to be transferred.
1922, 16 January  Dublin Castle handed over to Collins.
1922, 15 March  De Valera set up new republican organisation, Cumann na Poblachta.
1922, 26 March  Army Convention held (not attended by most pro-Treaty IRA men). Allegiance to Dáil renounced and sixteen-man Executive formed. O’Connor’s reply to question as to whether they were going to have a military dictatorship: ‘You can take it that way if you like.’
1922, 13 April  Four Courts, Dublin, seized by anti-Treaty forces.
1922, 20 May  Collins-de Valera pact to fight election on joint panel of candidates. On eve of election, Collins asked voters to vote for candidates they considered best.
1922, 16 June  Results: 58 pro-Treaty TDs, 35 anti-Treaty TDs, 17 Labour TDs, 7 Farmers’ TDs, 4 Unionist TDs, 7 independents.
1922, 26 June  JJ (‘Ginger’) O’Connell, deputy chief of staff of the army of the Irish Free State, kidnapped and handed over to Four Courts garrison.
1922, 28 June  Government forces attacked Four Courts.
Questions and points to consider on timeline of critical developments

1. (a) Who were the cabinet ministers that voted for the Treaty proposals to be put to the Dáil?  
(b) Who were the three cabinet ministers that voted against?  
(c) Which cabinet members had been members of the Sinn Féin delegation to the London conference?  
(d) Which cabinet members had refused to be part of the Sinn Féin delegation to the London conference?  
2. Which item on the timetable is referred to as the ‘Treaty debates’?  
3. Before the vote on the Treaty took place on 7 January 1922, the Dáil had taken a Christmas break from 23 December to 2 January (inclusive). Discuss whether you think this is likely to have affected the eventual outcome of the vote.  
4. When the Dáil voted to accept the Treaty how close was the vote?  
5. Discussion point: What do you think was the reason behind the demand for an Army Convention that was made on 12 January? Look for evidence to support your view.  
6. (a) Since the British government did not officially recognise the Dáil, what alternative arrangement was put in place in order to establish a provisional government to take over power from the British?  
(b) Who was the leader of this provisional government?  
(c) One of the first duties of the chairman of the provisional government was carried out on 16 January? What did it involve?  
7. What political move did de Valera make on 15 March 1922?  
8. Discussion points: What was the nature of the ‘Army Convention’ held on 26 March? Who attended? Who did not attend? What attitude to the Dáil did the Convention adopt? Did this development make armed conflict with the provisional government more or less likely? Why?  
9. The seizure of the Four Courts by Rory O’Connor and other anti-Treaty IRA men on 13 April was a direct challenge to the provisional government. Why did Collins not order troops in to re-take the Four Courts without delay?  
10. The pact agreed by Collins and de Valera on 20 May was an attempt by both men to keep the arguments political and avoid armed conflict. See if you can find out why Collins effectively abandoned the pact on the eve of the June election.  
11. Look carefully at the results of the election of 16 June 1922. It could be said that the electorate sent a number of different messages to the provisional government.  
(a) What was the main message from the electorate in respect of the Treaty settlement and the impending creation of the Irish Free State?  
(b) What other messages may be gleaned from the results of the election?  
12. Sir Henry Wilson was security advisor to the Northern government. Why did his assassination in London on 22 June 1922 make armed conflict in Ireland more likely?  
13. Besides pressure from the British government, what other development prior to 28 June made an attempt by the provisional government to wrest back control of the Four Courts almost inevitable?
Stage 5: How serious was the degree of enmity between former comrades during the Civil War 1922-1923?

A photo taken in the early 1920s (possibly May 1922) of IRA comrades: Seán Mac Eoin, Seán Moylan, Eoin O’Duffy, Liam Lynch, Gearóid O’Sullivan and Liam Mellowes. MacEoin, O’Duffy and O’Sullivan backed the Treaty; Moylan, Lynch and Mellowes opposed it. See if you can find out what happened to (i) Liam Mellowes and (ii) Liam Lynch in the course of the Civil War. © RTÉ Archives

Among the factors identified in commentaries are:

- The provisional government believed the assertion of their authority was paramount if the Irish Free State was to survive and if the conflict was to be brought to a speedy conclusion. What followed from this was that harsh action was taken against former comrades to achieve those ends.
- The IRA’s chief of staff, Liam Lynch, declared TDs and others (including news reporters who were hostile) to be legitimate targets who could be shot on sight.
- Both sides accused the other of carrying out ‘atrocities’ and this deepened the degree of enmity between the two sides.
- Notwithstanding the previous point, after the Civil War ended, and over a period of time, many of those who were prominent on the anti-Treaty side moved towards a peaceful, political means of resolving their political disputes with former comrades. A degree of enmity, however, persisted and was sometimes evident in the political campaigns of the two main descendants of the ‘second’ Sinn Féin party, Fine Gael and Fianna Fáil, who dominated politics in Ireland for much of the post-independence period.
Relevant sources

**Secondary Source 16**

After abortive peace moves in September, the government, reinforced by episcopal denunciation of the Irregulars in October, was granted special powers by the Dáil to impose the death penalty for a variety of offences after the expiry of an amnesty offer. Seventy-seven anti-Treaty prisoners were executed between November 1922 and May 1923. The execution of Erskine Childers in November provoked Liam Lynch, the anti-Treaty leader, into adopting a retaliatory policy of assassination against prominent Free State supporters.


Questions and points to consider

1. **Moves to bring about peace in September 1922 were ‘abortive’. What does that mean?**

2. **In 1922 the Catholic bishops condemned the actions of the ‘Irregulars’ (the anti-Treaty IRA). Check the link below and identify one or two of the reasons they gave for so doing. (You can zoom in on the document by clicking the plus sign.)**

   http://catalogue.nli.ie/Record/vtls000514373#page/5/mode/1up

3. **What special powers did the Dáil grant to the government in September 1922?**

4. **The Special Powers Act of September 1922 led to a large number of executions of anti-Treaty IRA men: how many in total?**

5. **Whose execution by the new Free State government prompted Liam Lynch, the anti-Treaty IRA leader, to introduce a policy of assassination of prominent Free State supporters?**

Two key players in the security policy of the government in 1922: Kevin O’Higgins, Minister for Home Affairs, and Eoin O’Duffy, Garda Commissioner

© RTÉ Archives
Secondary Source 17 (edited)
The most celebrated victim of what became a notoriously harsh policy was Erskine Childers. Childers was found in possession of a gun – a tiny, pearl-handled .22 pistol given him as a souvenir by Michael Collins – when he was captured in his cousin’s house in Annamoe. He was duly found guilty by a military court and died before a firing squad on 24 November.

Worse soon followed. On 27 November the IRA’s chief of staff, Liam Lynch, wrote to the speaker of the Dáil threatening to adopt ‘very drastic measures’ against all who had voted for the special-powers resolution. On 30 November orders were issued to all IRA units that listed deputies and thirteen other categories (ranging from British army veterans who had joined the national forces to the hostile press) were to be shot on sight. On 7 December Deputy Seán Hales was shot dead and the deputy-speaker, Pádraic Ó Máille, badly wounded when on their way to a meeting of the Dáil.

Questions and points to consider
1. Why did the execution of Erskine Childers arouse considerable controversy?
2. What was the response of Liam Lynch, anti-Treaty IRA leader, to the passing of the Special Powers Act and the execution of Erskine Childers?
3. The shooting of Seán Hales was widely condemned. Discuss the reason for this.

Source 3
We captured Charlie Daly, who was OC of the Republicans up in my area in Donegal, and I remember there wasn’t a shot fired in this operation. We heard that his column was up near Muckish Pass in some houses up there and we got them just as they were going to bed.
The terrible thing was that Daly had to be executed. We had received word from Dublin that anyone captured carrying arms was to be court-martialled and sentenced to death. I had to do the job myself, to order a firing party for the execution, and it was particularly difficult because Daly and I had been very friendly when we were students, and it is an awful thing to kill a man you know in cold blood, if you’re on level terms with him. …
… It’s very hard to describe a war among brothers. It was fierce and it was atrocious. You had family against family and brother against brother, and I’ve tried to wipe it out of my mind as much as possible because it is not pleasant to think about.


Questions and points to consider
1. One difficulty faced by Republicans or anti-Treaty IRA fighters during the Civil War is evident in the first paragraph of Source 3. Can you identify that difficulty?
2. Why was it that ‘Daly had to be executed’?
3. Why did Sweeney find it difficult to carry out the order to execute Daly?
4. What insight into the nature of civil war does Sweeney offer in the last paragraph above?
Secondary Source 18
In Kerry, little quarter was given on either side. At Knocknagoshel, a woman inveigled some Free State troops to investigate a field where she said there was a Republican arms dump. Three officers and two men were killed by a trap mine. On March 7th fearful reprisals were taken. The worst of these was at Ballyseedy where nine men were roped to a log and a mine exploded. The remains were distributed among nine coffins but one man had been blown some distance into a wood and lived.

Questions and points to consider
1. What does the writer mean when he says, ‘little quarter was given on either side’?
2. How were Free State forces led into a trap at Knocknagoshel, according to the writer?
3. The writer says that ‘fearful reprisals’ were taken as a consequence. What is meant by ‘reprisals’?
4. The action taken by Free State forces at Ballyseedy was highly controversial. Suggest reasons for this based on the writer’s description. (See http://www.irishtimes.com/culture/heritage/stories-of-the-revolution-ballyseedy-and-the-civil-war-s-worst-atrocity-1.2462070 for the later perspective of the survivor’s son.)

Secondary Source 19
Perhaps nowhere in Ireland was the Civil War fought as bitterly as in County Kerry. While the Kerry IRA had been reasonably active and well organised during the War of Independence, it waged an even more aggressive and lethal guerrilla war in 1922-23. Kerry republicans sustained determined armed resistance, inflicting heavy casualties on the National Army, and retained control of large swathes of the county for much of the conflict. Frustrated by their inability to crush the republicans, National Army officers took extreme measures against the IRA. The Free State forces in Kerry included the ‘Dublin Guard’, comprised of IRA veterans from Dublin. Many of its officers were closely associated with Michael Collins, including the intelligence officer David Neligan and Major-General Paddy O’Daly, the commander of Free State forces in Kerry. Republicans accused both men of killing and brutalising republican prisoners. The toxic environment culminated in several unofficial reprisal executions carried out by the National Army in March 1923, including the notorious ‘Ballyseedy Massacre’.

Questions and points to consider
1. How do the authors characterise the fighting in Kerry during the Civil War?
2. According to the authors, why did National Army officers take extreme measures against the IRA in Kerry?
3. Who did republicans blame for these extreme measures, according to the authors?
4. Discuss what the authors mean by ‘unofficial reprisal executions’.
Secondary Source 20 (edited)

The [1937] constitution was carried by a roughly 55 to 45-per-cent vote, largely following party lines, but de Valera had done enough to capture the floating vote. Above all, the debate was relatively civilised and it was a far cry from the circumstances in which the constitution of the Free State in 1922 had been imposed. For that, and despite their considerable mutual antipathy, Cosgrave and de Valera can both claim a fair share of the credit. Few states in Europe could claim to have steered into such relatively calm constitutional waters from such contested origins over the same period.


Questions and points to consider

1. How does the writer contrast the circumstances in which the 1937 constitution was introduced in 1937 with the circumstances in which the 1922 constitution was introduced in 1922?
2. For what do Cosgrave and de Valera both deserve credit, according to the writer?
3. Discuss the point the writer is making in the last sentence of the passage.

Secondary Source 21

After 1923 commemoration was war by other means. Fianna Fáil, Cumann na nGaedheal and Fine Gael had repeatedly gone to the polls with more than a glorified encore of the Treaty debates, but in Leinster House civil war and revolution were the reliable retorts in their limited repertoires. Although they knew that in time ‘some 200,000 people are on the register who never saw a Tan, never lived under the Cosgrave regime and who don’t care one damn about where anyone was in ’16, ’22 or ‘39’*, they preferred not to heed it. They could bait each other at convenience’s command with the vehemence of 1922 and the massacres of men many never even knew.

* Phrase used in Fianna Fáil Head Office correspondence, CAI, PR/6/521.


Questions and points to consider

1. Read the passage carefully. What do you think the writer means when she says, ‘After 1923 commemoration was war by other means’?
2. According to the writer, did voters (people ‘on the register’’) share the Civil War obsessions of some Fianna Fáil and Fine Gael TDs?
3. Discuss what the writer means when (writing of some Fianna Fáil and Fine Gael politicians of the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s) she says, ‘They could bait each other at convenience’s command’.
A critical skills exercise
Documents-based study
▼
Development of critical skills
▼
Documents-based question

The Leaving Certificate History syllabus states that the documents-based study is “the primary means of developing [students’] skills in working with evidence”. (p.5)
The syllabus also states that, in the examination, the documents-based question “will test candidates’ ability to interrogate, correlate and evaluate a particular body of evidence”. (p.15)

Rationale for card sorts
In a card sort, cards with text (single words, phrases, sentences) are grouped or ranked according to particular criteria. Card sorts are good in helping students to make connections and form judgements. By having the text on cards, students can move them around, group them and, when necessary, change their minds. This approach promotes discussion and collaborative learning.

The intention of the critical skills exercise on the pages that follow is to illustrate in a practical and active manner the type of critical skills that the documents-based study is designed to develop. Essentially, the purpose of the exercise is to encourage students to THINK by discussing snippets of evidence and making judgements on their import by deciding whether they support or oppose the given proposition. The PLAY element is important and the exercise should be an engaging one for students. The intention is not to come up with answers that are either ‘right’ or ‘wrong’: much of the value of the exercise is in the process itself. That said, it should be possible to reach consensus in most cases and to clarify misunderstandings – where these arise – in the process.

In literacy development, such approaches can play a pivotal role as students engage together in purposeful reading and discussion of text and are active participants in the learning process.

What is involved in the critical skills exercise
Each group of 4-5 students is given an A4 sheet with the proposition at the top of the page and two columns headed: Agrees and Disagrees. Each group is also given an envelope containing 8 short documentary extracts – each on its own small strip of paper or cardboard – and the task is to discuss with each other the appropriate column in which to place each extract. When each group has reached its conclusions, the outcome of the exercise is discussed in a whole group setting.

Note: Since some of the sources are primary and others secondary, it may also be helpful to invite students to distinguish between the two types.
**Proposition:** The provisional government and Free State government’s strategies to end the civil war were too harsh.

Place each of the secondary source extracts in the appropriate column, depending on whether you think it agrees or disagrees with the above proposition. If the group cannot agree on whether a particular extract agrees or disagrees with the proposition, place it along the dividing line in the middle and wait to hear what other groups have to say about the extract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agrees</th>
<th>Disagrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Source E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimately all government is based on force, must meet force with greater force if it is to survive.</td>
<td>I [W.T.Cosgrave] know fully well there is a diabolical conspiracy afoot … there is only one way to meet it and that is to crush it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Source B</strong></th>
<th><strong>Source F</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To have to face the uncertainty of execution if captured in some gun fight or even if I stumbled into a cordon of soldiers while carrying a gun was a terrifying prospect.</td>
<td>In the eleven-month period that spanned the Irish Civil War, more Irishmen were killed at the hands of their fellow countrymen than were Volunteers lost to the British forces during the entire two and a half years of the Anglo-Irish War.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Source C</strong></th>
<th><strong>Source G</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collins’s death led to a toughening on the Free State side, and some bitter army reprisals occurred despite Mulcahy’s plea for restraint.</td>
<td>Of the many acts of violence employed to suppress the Republic in 1922 the judicial murder of Erskine Childers was, perhaps, the least defensible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Source D</strong></th>
<th><strong>Source H</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Fourth Congress of the Communist International vigorously protests against the executions by the Irish Free State of the five national revolutionaries. It draws the attention of all the workers and peasants of the world to this savage culmination of a widespread and ferocious terror …</td>
<td>The ill-treatment of women prisoners reached an infamous climax during what became known as the North Dublin Union riots, when women received such vicious beatings at the hands of Free State soldiers and guards …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>W.T. Cosgrave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Kevin O’Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>C.S. Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>M.J. McManus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Helen Litton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Margaret Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Your conclusions on the enquiry

Our enquiry has explored why people who were comrades in the War of Independence, 1919-1921, become enemies in the Civil War, 1922-1923?

Based on the evidence you have encountered in the course of the enquiry, identify key points on each of the following:

(a) Tensions within Sinn Féin prior to the War of Independence
(b) Friction that arose between apparent comrades during the War of Independence, 1919-1921
(c) Differences over the Treaty negotiations and the eventual terms of the Treaty
(d) Why Civil War broke out
(e) How former comrades became enemies in the Civil War

Make your case in a written report, devoting at least one paragraph to each of the headings above. In a concluding paragraph, give your judgement – based on the evidence you have studied – in relation to the question: Why did people who were comrades in the War of Independence become enemies in the Civil War?

OR

Now that we have looked at a wide range of evidence on why men who fought as comrades between 1919 and 1921 became enemies in 1922

- Give two reasons why there was disagreement during the War of Independence between Michael Collins and Cathal Brugha.
- Give two reasons why there was disagreement over who should represent Sinn Féin at the talks in London in October 1922.
- Give one reason why some TDs voted for the Treaty in 1922 and one reason why other TDs voted against.
- Give two reasons why Civil War broke out in 1922.
- Give two reasons why former friends became enemies during the Civil War.
- For each of the reasons you give, back up your reason with evidence from the primary sources and secondary sources that we have studied.
Part III

Teaching aspects of the period 1919-1923 in Transition Year or as Transition Units in a ‘teaching emotive and controversial history’ framework

Introduction

The period 1919-1923 in Irish history is a challenging period to teach. In the context of the decade of centenaries, discussion of pivotal developments such as the Treaty and Civil War has the capacity to stir strong emotions and make more challenging the classroom implementation of a genuinely historical approach. Research on the teaching of emotive and controversial history can be helpful here, as can methodologies recommended in the Leaving Certificate History Guidelines for Teachers such as the multi-perspective approach.

For Transition Year students, a study of themes or episodes from the period using a variety of online resources has the capacity to promote understanding of how historical accounts are formulated and the questioning approaches that we need to adopt when we encounter different types of sources. It can also enhance their critical skills in dealing with online materials and give them a greater sense of the strengths and limitations of information technology. The use of a pedagogical approach such as the ‘jigsaw’ classroom can help students see the different perspectives that individuals may have on the same historical phenomenon as well as providing a powerful teaching and learning tool that improves motivation and helps all students to engage in meaningful classroom learning.

For all senior cycle students and teachers, the potential perspectives that might be considered in the classroom are many and complex. A reasonably comprehensive – though not exhaustive – list might include: the different perspectives within the ‘second’ Sinn Féin party, 1917-1921; the different views of IRA GHQ and IRA Volunteers at local level; the views of members of the Irish Parliamentary Party; the views of Ulster Unionists and Southern Unionists; the views of women participants in the independence struggle; the voices of unionist women; the voices of a range of British politicians, with varying attitudes to the ‘Irish Question’; and, from the Treaty on, the voices of the different ‘players’ in the Treaty debates and the Civil War. There are also the international perspectives, including Lenin and other Bolshevik voices.

While it may not be practical to draw on all of these perspectives, there is a need to draw on multiple perspectives if we are to help students develop a genuinely historical understanding. The ‘jigsaw’ approach can help students working in groups to see how individuals had their own unique perspective on events as well as a shared sense of mission with comrades. In the pages that follow, the two approaches are discussed and some ways in which the approaches can be deployed in the classroom are exemplified.
Some pointers from the Executive Summary of the T.E.A.C.H. report 2007
T.E.A.C.H.: a report from the Historical Association on the challenges and opportunities for teaching emotive and controversial history 3-19

**Good** practice results when:

• There is a clarity of purpose and a rationale for the school that emphasises identity, values and diversity;

• History is taught both as a body and as a form of knowledge. The best practice places a high premium on planning, ensuring that the work has the right blend of content and hard thinking appropriate to the ages and ability;

• There is a strong emphasis on independent enquiry with its own procedures and conventions, ensuring that emotive and controversial issues are taught within a secure pedagogical and historic framework. The importance of good questioning is paramount;

• The planning and delivery builds in sufficient time and opportunities to reflect and to cover the different perspectives and beliefs involved. Where done fleetingly, learners failed to see what the historical problem was at all about an issue;

• The teaching matches clarity with a recognition of the complexity of emotive and controversial history;

• An emphasis on exploring multiple narratives and the past from different perspectives. The teaching of emotive and controversial history is seriously compromised if students do not see history as a subject that is open to debate and argument as they study different and competing views of the same events;

• Balance is heeded across a theme or topic and across a key stage.

• Learners are exposed to a rich variety of appropriate and stimulating resources, such as music, film and pictures. Quality resources can be a means of making personal engagement more likely.

Questions for reflection with colleagues

13. Do we have a clarity of purpose in teaching the period 1919-1923?

14. At school level, is there a focus on identity, values and diversity?

15. Do we teach history as a form of knowledge as well as a body of knowledge?

16. In our planning, do we strive to ensure that there is an adequate balance of content and ‘hard thinking’ appropriate to the age level of our students?

17. Do we have a strong emphasis on enquiry to ensure that issues are taught within a secure pedagogical and historical framework?

18. Does our practice embed the principle that good questioning is paramount in the history classroom?

19. Do we plan to build in sufficient time to address the different perspectives and beliefs involved – so that the problematic nature of history emerges and students realise that there are no easy answers?

20. In planning for clarity, are we careful also to convey the complexity of the issues involved?

21. Are we committed to exploring with our students the multiple narratives and the different perspectives on the period 1919-1923?

22. Are we committed to the principle of balance in seeking to explore with students the various events and issues of the period?

23. Are we committed to exposing students to a wide variety of appropriate and stimulating resources such as music, film and still images as part of our strategy to ensure their personal engagement?

24. Are there other ways in which we can strive to ensure the personal engagement of our students in the matters under discussion?

Notes:
Linking your teaching to the National Literacy and Numeracy Strategy

The following quote comes from *Literacy and Numeracy for Learning and Life: The National Strategy to Improve Literacy and Numeracy among Children and Young People* (Department of Education and Skills, 2011, p.8)

Traditionally we have thought about literacy as the skills of reading and writing; but today our understanding of literacy encompasses much more than that. **Literacy includes the capacity to read, understand and critically appreciate various forms of communication including spoken language, printed text, broadcast media, and digital media.** Throughout this document, when we refer to “literacy” we mean this broader understanding of the skill, including speaking and listening, as well as communication using not only traditional writing and print but also digital media.

The student activities set down in this resource are designed to improve students’ “capacity to read, understand and critically appreciate various forms of communication including spoken language, printed text, broadcast media, and digital media.”

As the literacy strategy makes clear, a key element in developing literacy is promoting students’ listening, talking, reading and writing skills, as well as their ability to critically assess visual images and other broadcast material. Some of the ways in which material from this booklet can be used to achieve these objectives are as follows:

- The ‘jigsaw’ method is designed to maximise the participation of all students in the classroom through group-work, cooperative structures that improve their ‘capacity to read, understand and critically appreciate various forms of communication’. The interactive elements that that characterise the ‘jigsaw’ classroom are recognised as being key to improving literacy.

- The strong focus here on using various websites for historical research purposes can help to develop students’ capacity to engage productively with digital media.

- The focus here on visual images has a key role to play in developing students’ visual literacy in a historical context

- The importance of consolidating learning through carefully designed written tasks is fundamental to student learning. Here, the various ‘frameworks’ provided are intended to assist students in communicating research findings in a structured format.

The elements of *Literacy and Numeracy for Learning and Life* relating to numeracy identify the need to enable young people “to think and communicate quantitatively, to make sense of data, to have a spatial awareness, to understand patterns and sequences, and to recognise situations where mathematical reasoning can be applied to solve problems.” All of these are relevant to the teaching of the 1919-1923 period e.g. in considering the numbers in support of and opposed to the Treaty; in identifying areas of most intensive conflict in War of Independence and Civil War; in identifying the sequence of events leading to individuals’ involvement in the War of Independence and the Civil War; and in employing the ‘jigsaw’ approach to maximise the learning of all students in respect of the period in question.
Pedagogical approaches

1. The ‘Jigsaw’ approach

Introduction
One approach that can be used very effectively in Transition year is the ‘Jigsaw’ approach, originally developed in the United States but now used in many countries across the globe. See https://www.jigsaw.org.

The jigsaw approach is a research-based cooperative learning technique invented and developed in the early 1970s by Elliot Aronson and his students at the University of Texas and the University of California. Since 1971, thousands of classrooms have used Jigsaw with great success.

As the ‘Jigsaw’ website notes, “The jigsaw classroom has a four-decade track record of successfully reducing racial conflict and increasing positive educational outcomes such as improved test performance, reduced absenteeism, and greater liking for school”, and many practitioners who have successfully adopted the approach will corroborate this. (See, for example, http://www.teachhub.com/jigsaw-method-teaching-strategy)

The term ‘Jigsaw’ is used because, just like in a jigsaw puzzle, each piece – the part played by each student – is essential to the completion and full understanding of the final learning outcomes.

The ten steps
For the teacher, there are ten steps to follow in carrying out the approach:

1. Divide class into groups of 5-6 students.
   Groups should be diverse in terms of gender, ethnicity, ability
2. Appoint one student from each group as leader.
3. Divide the day’s lesson into 5-6 segments.
   e.g. In lesson on Michael Collins: his early life; his early revolutionary involvement;
   his role as IRA Director of Intelligence, 1919-1921; his role in peace talks; civil war.
4. Assign each student to learn one segment.
   Ensure students have access only to their own segment.
5. Give students time to read over their segment at least twice and become familiar with it. They do not need to memorise it.
6. Form temporary ‘expert groups’ by having one student from each jigsaw group join other students assigned to the same segment.
   Give students time to discuss main points and what they will present to their group.
7. Bring the students back into their jigsaw groups.
8. Ask each student to present his/her segment to the group.
   Encourage others in the group to ask questions for clarification.
9. Float from group to group observing the process.
   If any group is having trouble (e.g. disruption) make an appropriate intervention.
   Long term, aim for leaders to do this. (Help by whispering instructions, advice.)
10. At the end of the session, ask questions to identify the key points learned.

The approach as outlined may be adapted for research tasks and this is the approach used in the pages that follow.
Points to consider when using this approach

- Expert groups work best when students have a clear understanding of the parameters of the task that they are set. It is advisable, therefore, to give students a framework or set of questions to guide their work. A number of examples relating to the period will be found in the pages that follow.

- In some cases it may be helpful for expert groups to lay out key points in graphic form, using mind maps or graphic organisers. For example, the ‘Fish Bone’ technique is often used to identify the various factors associated with a complex topic and to show how they inter-relate. The technique is described in the PDST booklet, Graphic Organisers and other Literacy, Numeracy and AfL Strategies in Teaching and Learning, pages 21-23, currently available at http://www.pdst.ie/sites/default/files/PDST%20GRAPHIC%20ORGANISER%20ENG%20FINAL.pdf

- In allocating students to their groups, in some contexts it may be appropriate to do this randomly. In other contexts (e.g. where there is a clear need to ensure that students with additional learning needs have adequate support), the teacher may need to ensure that there is a good balance within each group – taking into account such factors as strengths, interests and needs.

- Teachers may find it helpful to rotate the position of ‘leader’ who guides the discussion, so that all students or, at least, those who are interested in taking on the position, feel that they are getting a ‘fair crack of the whip’.

- Leaders need to be helped to understand that their job is to spread participation as evenly as possible so that nobody feels ‘left out’. Generally, students come to realise very quickly that the group functions better if each person is allowed to present his or her material before comments or questions are taken.

- The work of the ‘expert groups’ is of key importance. Before presenting their report to the members of the jigsaw group, individual students have the opportunity to discuss their report with members of the expert group who have prepared a report on the same topic. They can modify their report in the light of comments or suggestions made by fellow members of the expert group.

- The jigsaw approach gives all students the opportunity to become a ‘leader of learning’ and this can be a powerful motivational force for all students, including the brighter ones. If brighter students are encouraged to take on the mind-set of ‘teacher’, this can transform an ordinary everyday task into an exciting challenge. Furthermore, it is likely to facilitate more thorough learning of the topic in question.

- Further guidance on the Jigsaw approach may be found in the PDST booklet Active Learning: An Integrated Approach to Learning, Teaching & Assessment, pp.77-79, currently available at http://www.pdst.ie/sites/default/files/Integrated%20Approach_0.pdf. The entire section on cooperative learning, beginning on p.57, contains much helpful advice.
2. A multi-perspective approach

The benefits of adopting a multi-perspective approach as set out in the Leaving Certificate History Guidelines for Teachers are also relevant to TY students. These are:

A multi-perspective approach can help students to grasp some of the key points that underlie the syllabus objectives, e.g.

- that there is not necessarily one correct version of a particular historical event
- that the same historical event can be described and explained in different ways depending on the standpoint of (for example) the eye-witness or historian
- that the same piece of evidence may be interpreted differently by different historians
- that few historical sources of evidence can be deemed to be totally impartial, and that the context in which they were produced must always be taken into consideration.

In his book, *Teaching 20th-century European History* (Council of Europe, 2001), Robert Stradling writes that

Multiperspectivity, within the context of history and history teaching, aims to achieve three things:

- to gain a more comprehensive and broader understanding of historical events and developments by taking into account the similarities and differences in the accounts and the perspectives of all the parties involved;
- to gain a deeper understanding of the historical relationships between nations, or cross-border neighbours, or majorities and minorities within national borders;
- to gain a clearer picture of the dynamics of what happened through examining the interactions between the people and groups involved and their interdependence.

**Combining approaches:** In dealing with aspects of the period 1919-1923 in Irish history, the ‘jigsaw’ approach and the multi-perspective approach can be combined effectively in ways that draw on the great wealth of material available online. Some of the ways in which this might be done are set out in the following pages.
The Anglo-Irish Treaty 1921

The Republic of Ireland of which we are citizens developed from the Irish Free State which came into existence on 6 December 1922. The Irish Free State was set up as a consequence of the Anglo-Irish Treaty 1921 which followed the War of Independence, 1919-1921, (also known as the Anglo-Irish War). The National Archives has an online Treaty exhibition which can be used by students to research a number of different aspects of the period 1919-1921 and to set those aspects in a wider chronological context.

http://treaty.nationalarchives.ie

The exhibition has biographical profiles of the five Sinn Féin delegates to the Treaty negotiations (Robert Barton, Michael Collins, Éamonn Duggan, George Gavan Duffy, Arthur Griffith) as well as the four secretaries who supported them in their work (John Chartres, Erskine Childers, Fionán Lynch, Diarmuid O’Hegarty).

‘Jigsaw’ groups of five could be set the task of drawing up their own profiles of the five delegates using a framework such as the following:

- What involvement, if any, did this person have in the struggle for independence before 1919? (e.g. role in 1916, role in first Sinn Féin party or other nationalist organisation). If the answer is ‘none’, what sort of role(s) did the person have before 1919?

- What was the person’s involvement in the independence struggle between 1919 and 1921? (e.g. was the person a member of the Dáil government? Was the person active in the military struggle?)

- How and/or why did the person come to play a part in the Treaty negotiations?

- How did the person vote when it came to the vote on the Treaty, 7 January 1922? (If students need to research this further, they may wish to consult the Treaty debates available online at https://celt.ucc.ie/published/E900003-001/index.html. By entering the name of the person they are researching, they will be able to see what that person said during the debates.)

- Did the person take any part in the Civil War, 1922-1923? If so, what role did he play? Did he survive the Civil War? If so, what did he do afterwards? If not, how did he die during the Civil War?

Each person in the ‘jigsaw’ group prepares a series of key points as an initial draft of the presentation they will make to the group. They then join the expert group of students who are researching the same person as they are. The discussion in the expert group and the suggestions made will help each individual to refine her/his presentation prior to making the presentation to the group. The exercise could be continued with jigsaw groups of four dealing with the four secretaries to the delegation and using a similar framework.
Some less well-known figures involved in the independence struggle

Many people who played a significant role in some aspect or aspects of the independence struggle may be unfamiliar to students. A good exercise would be to get students to research the role of some of these figures, preferably adopting the jigsaw approach and using a framework similar to that on the previous page. An invaluable resource for students in this regard would be the Dictionary of Irish Biography published by the Royal Irish Academy and available to all schools through the Schools’ Broadband Network.

http://dib.cambridge.org.ucd.idm.oclc.org

In choosing the figures to be researched, teachers may wish to bear in mind local considerations – possibly including figures who are commemorated in some way in the locality but are not very well-known nationally. In line with the multi-perspective approach it is recommended that a range of figures be identified reflecting the different positions taken on the Anglo-Irish Treaty and the different positions adopted during the Civil War. The following list is given as an example of the range of people that might be researched: Piaras Béaslaí (1881-1965), Charlotte Despard (1844-1939), Máire Comerford (1893-1982), Darrell Figgis (1882-1925), Noel Lemass (1897-1923), Liam Ó Briain (1888-1974).

Taking the above list as an example, ‘Jigsaw’ groups of six could be set the task of drawing up their own profiles of the six figures using a framework such as the following:

- What involvement, if any, did this person have in the struggle for independence before 1919? (e.g. role in 1916, role in first Sinn Féin party or other nationalist organisation). If the answer is ‘none’, what sort of role(s) did the person have before 1919?

- What was the person’s involvement in the independence struggle between 1919 and 1921? (e.g. was the person a member of the Dáil? Was the person active in the military struggle?)

- What position did the person take on the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921? Do we know why the person took that position? If so, what were the reasons?

- Did the person take any part in the Civil War, 1922-1923? If so, what role did he/she play? Did he/she survive the Civil War? If so, what did he/she do afterwards? If not, how did he/she die during the Civil War?

Each person in the ‘jigsaw’ group prepares a series of key points as an initial draft of the presentation they will make to the group. They then join the expert group of students who are researching the same person as they are. The discussion in the expert group and the suggestions made will help each individual to refine her/his presentation prior to making the presentation to the group.
Formulating research tasks on the basis of topicality

During the current decade of centenaries, there is an opportunity for history teachers in Transition Year to focus attention on events the hundredth anniversary of which is being commemorated in any of the given years – from now, 2017, up to 2023. Two very useful websites for this purpose are http://www.decadeofcentenaries.com and http://www.rte.ie/centuryireland/

For the current year (2017), examples of events featured include:

- The election of W.T. Cosgrave as Sinn Féin MP for Kilkenny in August 1917 (See http://www.rte.ie/centuryireland/index.php/articles/w.t.-cosgrave-elected-as-sinn-fein-td-for-kilkenny-city)

A wide range of research tasks could be given to students based on the above events. Some examples are set out on the next page.
1. Using the ‘jigsaw’ approach, one could set up jigsaw groups of five students to investigate the significance of the impact of each of the following:

- The election of Count Plunkett
- The election of Joe McGuinness
- The election of Éamon de Valera
- The election of W.T. Cosgrave
- The death and funeral of Thomas Ashe

Avenues of investigation might include:

- What role or connection with the 1916 Rising did the person have?
- What period of imprisonment did the person serve following the Rising?
- What impact did the event have at the time?

Besides the ‘decadeofcentenaries’ and ‘centuryireland’ websites, other useful online resources here would be the online Dictionary of Irish Biography (See p.70) and The Irish Times Digital Archive (also available via the Schools’ Broadband Network).

2. In 1914 a majority of Irish nationalists supported the Irish Parliamentary Party led by John Redmond. Many answered his call to join the British war effort in defence of Belgian neutrality. By 1918 a big shift in the political allegiance of nationalists had taken place as the general election showed.

There is an opportunity here for students to investigate the effects the European war had on Irish soldiers in 1917 – through the lens of the Battle of Messines and the Third Battle of Ypres - and the motivation behind, and fortunes of, the Irish Convention of 1917.

Once again, the jigsaw method could be used to look in greater detail at some of the key figures involved in these events such as Major William Redmond, Fr. William Doyle, Lt. Col. John Patrick Hunt and John Redmond.

Avenues of investigation might include:

- Their life and career prior to 1914
- Their involvement in, or support for, the war effort

A local approach could also be used using the ‘My adopted soldier’ website to research soldiers from the students’ county.

3. Classroom/online displays, where the results of the investigations undertaken by individuals - and expanded and refined through their interaction with fellow members of their expert groups - are put on show for all to see, can provide splendid opportunities for all to develop more rounded perspectives on the events of 1917 and the people who were prominent in these events.

4. Investigation could focus on groups or individuals not mentioned in accounts of the above events e.g. the activities of Cumann na mBan members. See http://catalogue.nli.ie/Collection/vtls000648663
Using photographs as a focus for investigation

There are a large number of images relating to the 1919-1923 period on the RTÉ Stills Library website at https://stillslibrary.rte.ie. Many of these images can be used to provoke students’ curiosity and open up lines of investigation. As a first step, students might use the RTÉ Stills website to begin their investigation of the episode, person, movement or incident to which the images relate. Follow-up research using the ‘centuryireland’ and other websites mentioned in these pages is recommended.

The images below are provided as examples of ones that might be used.

Civic Guards enter Dublin Castle, 1922
© RTÉ Archives

The sack of Balbriggan, September 1920
© RTÉ Archives

The funeral of Michael Collins
© RTÉ Archives

Máire Comerford and Cumann na mBan
© RTÉ Archives

There are lots of research questions to which the above images might give rise e.g.

- Who were the Civic Guards? Why were they entering Dublin Castle in 1922?
- What was the reaction to the death of Michael Collins at the time?
- What happened in the ‘sack of Balbriggan’? Why was it controversial?
- Who was Máire Comerford? What role did she play in Cumann na mBan?
Suggestions for working with materials from The Bureau of Military History (1913-1921) at http://www.bureauofmilitaryhistory.ie/

**Note:** These suggestions were originally provided in the PDST booklet, *Approaches to teaching History in Transition Year* (March 2013).

The Bureau of Military History has made 36,000 pages of witness statements relating to the struggle for Irish independence, 1913 -1921, available online in PDF format. Enter the name of a person or place to search the collection:

Adopt a local approach. Get students to conduct searches for local areas or known individuals. It is possible that some students will be able to locate family connections in these archives. Some accounts are very long, and teachers may wish to direct their students to concentrate on a particular section of an account. Some accounts are in Irish.

If you can...
find a military operation that happened in proximity to your school get the students to plot the incident on a map and/or to explore the route on foot to identify the exact locations of each stage of the ambush/attack/escape, etc. Ordnance Survey maps can be examined at https://maps.scoilnet.ie/Gallery/Eng/

It is possible that students could re-enact an engagement and photograph or film themselves at work. They should be able to justify their locations/poses by reference to the account.

Another approach would be to identify and study accounts from different points-of-view. Can students identify facts/opinions, bias, etc? Can they think of ways they would double-check the veracity of these accounts (e.g. by checking local newspapers, etc.)?

- A member of the Irish Volunteers gives his account of activities in and around Ennis, 1916-1921:
  http://www.bureauofmilitaryhistory.ie/reels/bmh/BMH.WS1135.pdf#page=1

- Harry Boland’s sister, Kathleen, gives an account of the activities of her three brothers:
  http://www.bureauofmilitaryhistory.ie/reels/bmh/BMH.WS0586.pdf#page=1

- Molly Reynolds’ account of being in Cumann na mBan and First Aid duty in the GPO during the 1916 Rising:
  http://www.bureauofmilitaryhistory.ie/reels/bmh/BMH.WS0195.pdf#page=1

- Cuntas Sheamus Ó Néill ar ghníomhaíocht Chomplacht Chluain Meala, d’Óglaigh na hÉireann, 1913-1921:
  http://www.bureauofmilitaryhistory.ie/reels/bmh/BMH.WS1557.pdf#page=13

- Ernest J. Jordison, an English-born Dublin businessman gives an account of events in Dublin, 1914-1921:
  http://www.bureauofmilitaryhistory.ie/reels/bmh/BMH.WS1691.pdf#page=1