

His 4815, Spring 2012, Newton Key

Write an essay (7-9 pages [graduate 12 pages], typed, double-spaced, 12 pt font, 20%: **due: Sunday, April 22 on WebCT**) focusing on one theme and revising either Doyle's *A Star Called Henry*, OR *Michael Collins*, dir. Neil Jordan (1992/96) OR *Wind that Shakes the Barley*, dir. Ken Loach (2006) based on use and analysis of primary sources (British Periodicals online, *The Times*, *New York Times*, Dáil Debates online, etc.) and the arguments of a couple relevant historians. Suggest one or two scenes to drop and one (or two) scenes to put in. The one additional scene should be based on (d) and historians. In your essay I want you

- (a) to pick one theme (and focus on one year between 1916 and 1923);
- (b) to suggest briefly what the movie director/novelist argues about that theme and give examples to show that this is his argument (see the movies, on Reserve, and Neil Jordan, *Michael Collins: screenplay and film diary*, New York, 1996, on Reserve, PN1997.M43683 J67 1996);
- (c) to show briefly the extent to which Senia Pašeta and Alan J. Ward agree or disagree with this argument; and
- (d) to use at least five articles or leading articles/editorials from contemporary newspapers to show the scenes you would like to add or modify to help prove or modify the director's argument (b) about the theme (a).

(But don't spend time writing a screenplay!) In other words, you are the historical advisor to the film and are suggesting adding a scene based on actual documents to reinforce one point that the film makers are already arguing.

April 5. Paper 2 **Pre-assignment due.** Find one relevant leading article (editorial) from *The Times*, 1920-1923, read and cite it, and write a paragraph noting how it relates to either *A Star Called Henry*, OR *Michael Collins*, OR *Wind that Shakes the Barley*. Submit image of the original article (include the title), the citation, and your paragraph. (Obviously if you find an editorial that is not relevant, you need to continue your search.)

"The Vital Treaty," *The Times* (May 25, 1922), 17.

THE VITAL TREATY.

The grave doubts and anxieties we have felt in regard to the Collins-de Valera agreement have in no way been relieved by the speeches at Tuesday's Ard Fheis. Even though we make every allowance for the circumstances that render co-operation against chaos desirable in the interests of Ireland, and for the tone of mutual conciliation that the protagonists have adopted, we find in their words more than enough to justify alarm. It might, perhaps, have been foolish to look for any recantation from MR DE VALERA ; but some of MR. COLLINS'S phrases seem plainly to indicate a hardening of the attitude of himself and, presumably, of his colleagues. He indicates, for instance, that he regards the restoration of stability in Ireland and the maintenance of the Treaty as distinct, if not wholly independent issues. The nation with whose Government he made the Treaty does not regard them in that light. He also refers to Northern Ireland in words that, despite their ambiguity, clearly suggest a departure from the spirit of the peace pact. We have no wish in a matter of such grave import to spring to conclusions.