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Abstract

The Shawlies: A Study of Early Neoliberal ‘Gender-ification’—The Street Trading Act, 1926, Modern Gender-ification, and the Implications for Cork’s Women Street Traders

For centuries Cork’s Shawlies, working-class women, survived by trading on public streets. My study explores how the first Irish Free State government, and Cork’s local authority, limited the rights of poor women to earn by subsistence trading with The Street Trading Act, 1926. The government insisted this would regulate street trading. In practice it further marginalised the women economically and socially, containing them outside the privileged, commercial city centre.

In Cork the legislation facilitated the gradual disappearance of the Shawlies amid entrenched social processes and relations, contingencies that allowed for the abuse of their rights in the service of amalgamated business interests. This study address the role of discourses in deepening this marginalisation.

My theoretical framework is designed to demonstrate how a seemingly innocuous piece of legislation would, in practice, do this. I set out the concepts of ‘Thriving State’, ‘Prosperous State’, and state of ‘Best Intentions’ that uses gentrification to meet these goals. The existing knowledge on women in trade is then examined, highlighting the gaps in what is known about the Shawlies. Chapter 3 details the theory behind my genealogical method. The legislation, debate, and other data produced at the national level is then examined, before moving to the local data. Chapter 6 is devoted to the Shawlies, setting their stories in the larger context of the debates. An examination of studies of contemporary women street traders in poor nations follows, along with a brief history of the decline of street trading in New York city under gentrification. Points of convergence between that process and the one in Cork are identified, along with convergences between contemporary traders and the Shawlies. The conclusion sets out my methodological, theoretical and substantive discoveries, and comments on current nostalgic renderings of the Shawlies in Cork’s newly gentrified Corn Market Street.
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INTRODUCTION

The Shawlies had imploring faces, hoping to entice someone to buy...
These formidable ladies were intent on selling, making it difficult not to buy.

Before entering the research question, a brief explanation of the term ‘Shawlie’ is needed. It might have been easier to replace Shawlie with ‘street trader’ to make the title and this research question more accessible to readers and researchers from outside of Cork. However, using the more generic ‘street trader’ would be the reader’s loss. The term is particular to Cork city’s lexicon, and has found its way into accounts of local history (Verdon, 1993; Lenihan, 2012). It was assigned to the working-class women who wore the traditional shawl on Cork’s streets into the last half of the twentieth century. Therefore, it does not simply describe a woman street trader, however both the shawl and the term are synonymous with the poor and working-class women who traded in Corn Market Street.

An entire chapter in Michael Lenihan’s (2012) Pure Cork is devoted to the Shawlies, showcasing images of women trading on Corn Market Street, the neighbouring streets, at the quay walls on the river, and elsewhere on the city’s streets. The shawl is one thing they all have in common across locations and time. In June 2012, the Cork City Council completed a regeneration scheme on Corn Market Street in an attempt to revive a fledgling urban street market to its former glory. A sculpture by the late Seamus Murphy of Cork was unveiled as a public memorial to the Shawlies, recognition that they had once dominated the vibrant street trade there. Lenihan (2012) records the death of Cork’s last Shawlie in 2010. At first glance, then, it is hard to understand why it is that the Coal Quay, the Shawlies, and street trading have disappeared.

Petty traders like the Shawlies were not regulated in Ireland prior to 1926, but the first government of the Irish Free State moved to do so only four years after the country had gained independence from Great Britain and only two years after the Irish Civil War. One question comes to mind immediately: why did the government of the new state

---

1 The street and its markets are known locally, to this day, as the Coal Quay (Beecher, 2007; Lenihan, 2012). Both Coal Quay and Corn Market Street will be used to designate Corn Market Street.
move on this particular issue so quickly? Furthermore, the question of why street trading was on the political agenda at all looms considering the timing of this legislation: both the war for independence and the civil war had resulted in tremendous damage to the country’s infrastructure, and the Irish Free State itself was contentious. And yet the regulations introduced to manage street trading were sweeping and comprehensive.

Answers first emerge from the data gathered at the national level where it is revealed, through the discourse in and surrounding the legislation, that poor women selling on the streets in Dublin, the capital of the new state, were an eyesore to the middle-class men who dominated Ireland’s parliament and its firm-based economy. Their position as poor women in Irish society and political life also made them easy to erase from Dublin’s streetscape. In Cork, complaints against the Shawlies were, in comparison, muted. However, this historic source of subsistence income for poor women was still targeted for regulation in 1928. The data gathered locally reveals how structures of governance, the work of the various power brokers jostling to have their agenda become the agenda of the new state, gentrification, and the power of property deepened the marginalisation of the Shawlies. And so, the meta-question that prompted this research project is:

What role did The Street Trading Act, 1926 have in the disappearance of the Shawlies from Cork City's street-based markets? The question that is prompted, in turn, is: can the workings of The Street Trading Act, 1926 be conceptualised socially as extensions of the conditions that marginalised poor women in Irish society? The consequent questions that prompt a review of theories that interpret power and power relations in society—those which flow from legislation, policy or regulation, and capital—are:

- who were the Shawlies who traded on Cork’s streets?
- how did this legislation and the practices flowing from it change their lives?
- what were the implications for Irish society if their livelihoods disappeared?
- was The Street Trading Act, 1926 a municipal regulation that, in practice, was a policy that re-articulated market spaces in the public sphere?
- was The Street Trading Act, 1926 an act of governance that had greater implications for poor women in Cork?
INTRODUCTION

• was that legislation, and the debates surrounding it, the start of a modernist, gentrification effort?
• how do regulatory actions directed at women street traders in contemporary poor counties compare to those used by the Irish Free State government and the local authority in Cork following the introduction of The Street Trading Act, 1926?
• what do the challenges of women trading in the global south in the early 21st century reveal about women trading in Cork in the early 20th century?

Background to the Question

Corn Market Street was subject to a regeneration scheme that was completed in 2012. Renovations commenced in the latter years of the Celtic Tiger building boom; initially a grand re-development scheme was planned that included a luxury hotel. This would have meant the demolition of two historic buildings, Bazaar and St. Peter’s, markets for stall traders built by the Cork Corporation in the 1840s to bring affordable food to the poor of the neighbourhood. Both are visible on the left of the photograph of Corn Market Street that precedes this Introduction. Under the final regeneration scheme, Corn Market Street became home to luxury apartments, and multinational retailer T.K.Maxx. A small area opposite, on the east side, was assigned for licensed “casual” street traders. The memorial to the Shawlies, a statue by Seamus Murphy called The Onion Seller, also stands on the east side.

As can be seen from the photographs of the Onion Seller, Murphy immortalised an aged, tired-looking woman, head covered and body wrapped in her shawl. This Shawlie, identified as Mary Anne\(^2\), was created in 1937 just prior to Cork legally implementing The Street Trading Act, 1926. She holds out to passersby two handfuls of onions from the folds of the shawl. The unveiling of this memorial on Corn Market Street was a stroke of historical irony: these same women were blamed by the local authority for the declining fortunes of the public markets. She faces the refurbished facade of what was once a large, wholesale grocery built in the 1920s. When it was built its owners, Musgrave Brothers, Ltd., pressured the local authority in Cork to ban

street trading, and forced the removal of the Shawlies to where Mary Anne now stands. A second Mary Anne is on display in Cork. Ironically, she stands in Bishop Lucey Park facing the ‘English’ Market, where women were also targeted for prosecution when caught selling onions (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011).

It was these ironies that forced me to pursue the question further. What had happened to make these women and their public marketplace disappear considering both are now rife with nostalgia and are publicly embraced and celebrated in Cork?

As I began a review of the existing knowledge on women in trade, I returned to a story I had read several years earlier, that of a young Irish woman who had supported herself through trade in the last decade of the nineteenth century. I have since concluded that, while the focus of this work is her murder and not her trading life, her story is the most revealing story available of a poor woman trading. Even more relevant to the study at hand, her story allows me to peel back the sentimentality that surrounds the Shawlies and the Coal Quay, because it highlights how the intersection of class and gender permeated Ireland’s commercial sector. Thus, it serves as an insightful entry point for an examination of women street traders like the Shawlie named Mary Anne.

Bridget Cleary was a poor woman who turned to trade to survive and it allowed her to do so independently (Bourke, 2006). Thriving as a subsistence entrepreneur, she avoided the lot of many poor and working-class women forced to depend upon sweated labour, a spouse, or charity. According to Cronin (2010, p. 110), “there existed in Irish towns and cities small but thriving female-run businesses” in the nineteenth century that are “difficult to categorise in class terms”. Bridget’s story illustrates this difficulty. She prospered financially before and after marriage, and transcended the material boundaries of class (Bourke, 2006). Bridget’s contributions to the family economy she shared with her cooper husband, Michael Cleary, and the financial support she gave her parents, illustrate the need and importance for poor or working-class women to earn.

---

3 The significance of the Grand Parade and Princes Street markets, adjoining covered markets owned by the local authority in Cork, will be described in Chapter 2. They have come to be known locally and collectively as the English Market. The Grand Parade market and Princes Street market will be used in the dissertation to distinguish between the two as needed. However, they will be referred to collectively as the English Market.
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The alternatives available for survival, particularly for those who were alone, with or without dependents, were bleak: begging, the workhouse, convent industries, domestic labour, sweated labour, prostitution, or immigration loomed. This juxtaposition highlights a vital reality: trading represented resistance of a sort to the abysmal status quo offered by the Irish economy and society.

Bridget earned by selling her skills as a milliner and the eggs produced by the hens she reared. According to Bourke (2006, p. 44), Irish society was one “which allocated most work by gender”, and it appears this was no less true within a sector such as retail: all her earnings came from food and clothing—the ‘woman’s domain’ in retail from the eighteenth century onwards (Cox, 2000). Finding a way to survive and thrive when gender narrowed one’s options became more important when class was considered, because the Irish economy offered few opportunities for even basic social mobility. Under colonialism Irish men and women were typically employees rather than employers (Clear, 2007). Likewise, education policy at this time was tied to the macro-economic imperatives of the British Empire (Martin, 2011). Accordingly, the priorities of state-led education were not geared to improving the lot of those labouring in the micro-economy (Martin, 2011). Schooling was domesticating rather than emancipating, emphasising basic employment skills for ‘useful’ workers rather than educating students to move on to further education after a young age (Martin, 2011), or to create their own niche in the economy.

For girls this meant that basic literacy and numeracy skills, alongside needlework and other domestic skills, were central to the curriculum (Luddy, 1995a; Bourke, 2006). Bridget Cleary received this education, however she made it work to her ends. She did this at a time when the number of women recorded as unemployed or negligibly employed increased with each census between 1881 and 1891 and onwards (Rhodes, 1992). But after leaving school Bridget apprenticed as a dressmaker, a good investment that would see a return for her poor parents: at the trial of her husband for her murder, Bridget’s father cried out that “she was a fine milliner, and able to give us a bit of money” (quoted Bourke, 2006, p. 41). According to Bourke (2006, p. 41), his standard of living had “improved out of all recognition” and Bridget was the reason.
The emphasis on her profession as that of “milliner” points to a significant demarcation line within the category of ‘working-class’ (Bourke, 2006; Cronin, 2010). Bourke (2006, p. 42) observes that this positioned Bridget higher than others classed as working-class because it characterised her as a woman who was “much more likely to be literate than a ‘shirtmaker-seamstress’”. However, it also served to blur her class position: according to Bourke (2006) the title signified that she was a ‘modern’ woman, and her material success and independence meant that Bridget did not conform to the expectations of the larger Irish society.

According to Clear (2007) her non-conformity was both visible and public: dressing as a successful, modern woman, meant her earning power was socially visible. These factors served to make her vulnerable within her class of origin: Bridget now stood apart from her working-class peers. She was said to have been “looked on with suspicion by her neighbours” because, as a working-class woman, she was expected to wear a shawl and, instead, opted for a hat and jacket (Bourke, 2006 cited by Clear, 2007, p. 155), both of which were typically the dress of middle-class women (Clear, 2007; Cronin, 2010). Visible, too, was the fact that she was, potentially, independent of the control of her husband, the man later convicted of her murder (Bourke, 2006).

A woman without the power and influence of class behind her, married to a man without the power and influence of class behind him, Bridget still managed to avoid economic vulnerability. However, prevailing social factors complicated her situation: she was vulnerable as a woman transcending traditional norms of what was expected of a woman in Irish society while she began to ascend, at least materially, social class. Bridget's story provides a glimpse into how precarious economic survival was for poor and working-class Irish women, single or married, without training or skills and highlights how their attempts at survival were limited by the rigidity of the expectations held for women.

However, her story also illustrates the rigidity and potential sway of the expectations women held for each other, and the influence of class that complicated matters further. It is notable that at the formation of the Irish Women Workers’ Union in the opening decades of the twentieth century, “major problems of status between women
workers” (Jones, 1988, p. 7) were encountered. Organisers observed a classed ‘pecking order’ among women workers: Jones (1988) reports that typists put themselves above those in trades, those in trades were positioned above the factory workers. Street traders were, evidently, at the bottom of the power chain as women factory workers did not “associate” with women ‘hawkers’ (Jones, 1988, p. 7). The impact of these conditions would have been felt keenly amongst the Shawlies: they would have been recognised as women ‘hawkers’ because their workplace was the street and the footpath. Furthermore, by not adopting ‘modern’ dress like Bridget Clearly, the shawl created a visual demarcation line recognised by all of Cork’s social classes.

Considering their work meant they were exposed to the elements for countless hours, women street traders in Cork may have embraced this emblem of working-class identity for other reasons. The reality is that the hooded cloaks and shawls from which they would take the name ‘Shawlie’ were very practical. Covering the head and much of the body, they provided relief from the rain and the cold when walking or working outside and, in the home of the impoverished, these doubled as blankets (Dunlevy, 1989; Verdon, 1993). The excess fabric could be used to carry both goods for sale (Lenihan, 2012) and babies (Verdon, 1993; Clear, 2007; Lenihan, 2012) in the absence of a childminder. Anecdotally, I have been told that the shawl could be lifted to cover the head as a woman entered a Catholic church to attend mass.

A closer look at the phenomenon of the ubiquitous black shawl on Cork’s streets also reveals the cruelties of class in daily life. According to Dunlevy (1989, pp. 168-169), the shawl became more popular than the cloak—a black shawl with a hood—when “disciplinarians” of the mid-nineteenth century disapproved of a ‘coverall’ that both concealed dirty clothing and was used as a bed covering. With this reputation the cloak went into decline across Ireland; however, Dunlevy (1989) reports, both it and the shawl survived in Cork into the 1980s. Perhaps the stalwart nature of these coverings in Cork so late into the twentieth century prompted the local term Shawlie. It is probable that women trading on the streets embraced the woollen black shawl for another significant reason: according to Clear (2007), a shawl covering a woman’s head and body when she was on the street set her apart from prostitutes who were known to work in the community surrounding Corn Market Street during the mid-nineteenth century.
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The daily presence of the Shawlies on the streets in significant numbers working and earning, for hours at a time, stood to make them more vulnerable socially and politically for several reasons. The fact that they were, simply, women who stepped into the public sphere to work and earn independently cannot be ignored. Ironically, as history advanced across the twentieth century, it has been demonstrated that Ireland pushed women further into the private sphere. According to Luddy (2007, p. 197), the “appearance and presence” of women “in public life was deemed to have upset the moral order or had the potential” to continue upsetting that order after independence. The antidote: in the Irish Free State domesticity came to be associated with virtue, and a woman’s place was ascribed to the domestic sphere of the home (Luddy, 2007).

These were the years in which *The Street Trading Act, 1926* was passed, however there are no immediate references to what is commonly known as a ‘woman’s place’ in the debates or other public statements that were made about women street traders in the 1920s and 1930s. That said, their visibility in the public sphere would have been problematic for the political leaders of the day because of what their numbers and their work revealed about the structures of governance. I have come to conclude that thinking of the old photographs of Corn Market Street as simply visual representations of a once vibrant street market is wrong. These are, instead, visual representations of hundreds of poor women in Cork selling in the streets to survive because the Irish economy failed to produce opportunities for them to earn, Irish society refused to recognise the need for poor women to earn independently, and Irish politicians refused to meet the needs of both women and the poor.

That there are so many photographs of a teeming Corn Market Street, and of women selling elsewhere in Cork across time is telling. These photographs, then, are also visual representations of the very public failure of the social and political powers at work in Cork to create alternatives for women who were marginalised socially, politically, and economically to survive and support their families across time.

*Constructing The Street Trading Act, 1926 in Social Terms*

Luddy and Murphy (1992, p. 3) highlight the claim that “writing the history of women is necessarily limited by a lack of sources”; however, sources that are accessible may be
used in “an imaginative way”. This is true of the Shawlies. Compiling their story and that of the legislation are complicated because theirs is not a history of what Luddy and Murphy (1992, p. 2) refer to as “a minority of women”, or those who “did have a history”. I have instead focused on women who were rendered invisible, silenced, and objectified in the public debates and private debates surrounding the legislation.

This examination of The Street Trading Act, 1926, then, provides a lens through which to view competing visions of a new Irish state and society, although the competition presented by the Shawlies and their sisters in Dublin was actively muted by those who held social, political, and economic power. They, like other populations of poor Irish women, had “previously received little or no attention from Irish historians” (Luddy and Murphy 1992, p. 1). However, their adaptation to and exploitations of their situations are actions which, Luddy and Murphy (1992, p. 1) assert, make poor women “active agents in the historical process”. These same actions have made the Shawlies active agents in Irish history, although their place in recorded history is, at present, a void.

Gender history will, according to Luddy and Murphy (1992, p. 6) attempt to “unify the workings of political and economic forces stressing the interrelationships of men’s and women’s lives”. However, women “do not form a homogenous, undifferentiated mass”, Luddy and Murphy (1992, pp. 5-6) offer, “groups and individuals must be studied separately” within the larger population. With these goals in mind, I broaden the social and political context of the Act to that which surrounded the legislation and the debates to demonstrate that the story of the Shawlies is one not only of gender, but one of gendered poverty in a society seeking to contain them rather than help them. Through constructing the stories of the Shawlies themselves, their role as active agents is articulated: their stories reveal how they created subsistence employment opportunities for themselves when the larger economy failed to do so, and that they created markets where the urban poor could afford to purchase the necessities of life. However, their stories in the context of The Street Trading Act, 1926 deepen an understanding of the workings of hegemonic power in Irish social history at the foundation of the state.

Their stories also illustrate how critical the policy implications were when the first Irish Free State government created two classes of trader: those who were propertied and
traded from ‘bricks and mortar’ premises⁴, and those who were not but exercised what had been for centuries their ‘market right’ to trade in the open in public space.

Examining the legislation, the debates, and newspaper accounts demonstrates exactly how *The Street Trading Act, 1926* had more than just the potential to push the Shawlies further into the margins of the economy and society, and eventually out of the public sphere. The power of this seemingly innocuous legislation was galvanised through a re-articulation of their trading activity by male, middle-class vested interests. In the process their means of survival was demonised as potentially fraudulent, a potential public health concern, a potential threat to ratepayers, and a drain on public resources in a time of austerity because they were an ongoing source of litter and dirt on public thoroughfares.

Repetition of these statements by politically and socially powerful men transformed this discourse into what Foucault (1980a) conceptualises as ‘truth’ spoken by power, that which draws on ‘knowledge’ to underpin ‘right’—the legal apparatus reflecting that ‘truth’. In the process, access by the Shawlies to the marketplace that provided them with subsistence incomes was compromised and then blocked. Furthermore, the ‘market’ or price mechanism for food, clothing, and other of life’s necessities fell under the control of large private retail interests and smaller ‘bricks-and-mortar’ traders because the local authority curtailed the availability of publicly-owned and regulated markets. The focus of this research, then, is the social impact of street trading regulations that worked in the service of the goals of private business interests, on the women who once dominated Cork’s street-based markets.

In the process I locate the potential of a seemingly insignificant piece of legislation—one that, on the surface, appears to be justified and working for the general good—and the debates surrounding it to further marginalise poor women in Cork’s inner city. The Shawlies did not have a voice in the drafting of the regulations directed at their trading, the debate that followed, or in the planning processes that were, contemporaneously,

---

⁴ This is the term I use to designate small, independent traders who trade from rented or owned shops, from the petty traders who would work in the open on the streets, or from stalls rented in public markets such as St. Peter’s.
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poised to reconfigure their markets and their communities in the service of a firm-based economy. This project demonstrates that a failure to recognise the importance of the need for poor women to trade in urban street markets deepened the marginalisation of the Shawlies and their sisters in Dublin within the ethos and life of a newly independent Ireland. Ultimately, their agency as citizens was erased, both directly and indirectly.

Grey areas in Ireland’s existing legislation had allowed women to trade on the streets in Ireland legally for centuries. This study, then, allows for an examination of the historical reconfiguration of street trading from ‘formal’ to ‘informal’. This action, I contend, aligns with Milgram’s (2011, p. 263) characterisation of current efforts by local authorities and national governments to limit “informal urban livelihoods” such as street trading through a “government agenda” that privileges work deemed ‘formal’ as work that achieves a “city’s vision of progress and development”. By bridging time and space, this analysis thereby deepens the understanding of Milgram’s (2011) theory of the present through a ‘backward glance’. By moving back to the past, her theory deepens the understanding of how these processes worked in the lives of the Shawlies as Cork’s urban landscape was reimagined and reconfigured in the 1920s and onwards.

The presence of street traders is known to increase in the wake of the neoliberal economic changes that make life tenuous for the poor under globalisation (Agadjanian, 2002; Companion, 2010; Milgram, 2011). For this reason I have triangulated the data collected in this study of The Street Trading Act, 1926, its implementation, and the Shawlies, with that which has recently been collected and compiled by others. A consideration of the work of the Shawlies via what is known about women street traders from contemporary research, makes it easier to articulate the challenges to their democratic agency. What moves to the fore is the importance of trading in the lives of poor women attempting to earn a living in a poor country by means that are legal or ‘semi-legal’, to avoid the bleak alternatives Irish women had that, sadly, still wait for so many of the world’s women who live in poverty.

The Street Trading Act, 1926 and The Shawlies—Theoretical Considerations
The notion of ‘semi-legal’ in relation to street trading puts the work of the Shawlies into the realm of ‘informality’ or the ‘informal economy’. The terms ‘formal’ and
‘informal’, when used in connection with work or sectors are, according to Milgram (2011) essentialist categories that appropriate uses of space as well as legality and illegality. As such, informality is a contested term (Cross, 2000; Milgram, 2011). Considering informality has come to be associated with illegality (Cross, 2000; Tokman, 2001; Milgram, 2011) or a ‘shadow economy’ (Tokman, 2001), I initially rejected the use of the term to describe the work of the Shawlies. Their trade, no matter where it was carried out, was legal under the framework that existed in Ireland prior to independence.

However, the United Nations (2010) definition of informal workers in the informal economy succinctly describes the work of the Shawlies and their assistants in early twentieth century Cork. They were self-employed in their own informal enterprise, employees of an informal enterprise, or employers in an informal enterprise, or “contributing family workers working in informal sector enterprises”, or “members of informal producers’ cooperatives” (United Nations, 2010, p. 88). However, the comprehensive legal sweep of The Street Trading Act, 1926, rendered them informal according to the conventional definition offered by Portes, et al. (1989): informal economic activity “uses illegal means to produce legal products” (cited Cross 2000, p. 31). This distinction is critical because it is one that separates the activity of street traders from that of the drug dealer. That said, it will be learned, the first government of the Irish Free State, Commissioner Phillip Monahan and, later, the Cork Corporation, found it easy to conflate the trading of the Shawlies and their sisters in Dublin with the criminally deviant activities.

In the discipline of sociology, tangible markets such as street markets are conceptualised as open spaces that offer insight into social relations at that location or in the community where they exist. In political economy, a street market is a place where goods, services, and currencies are exchanged; like the abstract location known currently as ‘the market’, a street market is a price mechanism that establishes the prices of commodities and services. However, across the twentieth century the market access

---

5 The large agricultural resources surrounding Cork and its harbour made street trading of produce, fish, dairy products, and meat part of an informal distribution network. This is considered more closely later in the literature review.
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rights of street traders were limited rather than protected by governments globally. According to Cross (2000), this trend in developing countries\(^6\) followed the disappearance of street traders in the affluent ‘West’ because street markets were constructed as ‘anti-modern’ or ‘counter-modern’. As such they are said to embody disorganisation, and interfere with the flow of goods, people, and cars (Bluestone, 1997; Cross 2000). They are also characterised as ‘dirty’ or unhygienic, and a source of litter (Cross, 2000; Cross and Morales, 2007).

Ireland did not exclude itself from this trend, despite the fact that so many of its urban poor continued to struggle under what have been described by many as the economic fits and starts that followed independence (Lee, 1989; O’Hearn, 2001; Garvin, 2004). Prior to the hyper-regulation of street markets in Europe and North America, it was widely known that the poor regularly took to the streets in numbers to sell, because this was the most accessible, legal means of supporting themselves (Stansall, 1986; Bluestone, 1997; Cross, 2000; Taylor, et al 2000). A late-century reemergence of street-based markets is noted in affluent countries and, once again, Ireland is no exception. This reemergence has, however, followed two trends: the hippie-style flea market of the 1970s (Bluestone, 1997; Cross, 2000), and the yuppie-style farmers’ markets of the 1990s (Cross, 2000). These stand in contrast to their developing world counterparts that continue to be unregulated or defy regulation as the urban poor, typically poor women, take to the streets to sell in order to meet the immediate need to support themselves and their families (Fahey, 1998; Agadjanian, 2002; Lincoln, 2008; Companion, 2010; Milgram, 2011).

It will be demonstrated that not only the Coal Quay but also the streets of Dublin’s city centre that were, according to accounts of the day, crowded with women street traders, were market spaces that provide insights into the social relations of the larger community. Like street markets across history and locations, they do so because of the variety of direct and indirect encounters they facilitate. The list of encounters is long.

---

\(^6\) Gimenez (2004) insists that using geographical qualifiers such as ‘the global south’ or economic qualifiers such as ‘developing countries’ conceals their reality which is that they are poor countries and debtor nations. Thus, she uses ‘poor’ or ‘debtor’ (Gimenez, 2004) to signify the condition of countries such as those in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. I have opted to follow suit in my writing. It must also be remembered that, while developed, Ireland and many Irish citizens were struggling economically in the years immediately following independence (Lee, 1989; Garvin, 2004).
INTRODUCTION

There are the face-to-face interactions between buyers and sellers, and those that occur within their groups that make the price mechanism\(^7\) transparent in a street market, as opposed to that which is obscured in the contemporary abstract ‘market’\(^8\).

In Cork there were also encounters in the street based market between individuals and their government, and between individuals and the interests that sought to control those spaces as the government privileged ‘bricks and mortar’ traders, and those associated with ‘the market’. The data reveals that the first government of the Irish Free State, the Dublin Corporation, and the Cork Corporation were content to allow the abstract to prevail in setting the prices of life’s necessities such as food and clothing, despite protests by some elected officials that the poor could not afford to pay the prices set by shopkeepers. As spaces subject to policy and regulation, the Coal Quay reveals a governing body’s goals for that space in the public sphere and, ultimately the individuals who moved through it. Paramount in the decision making are power and the power relations of class and gender that were privileged and operated in and around Ireland’s street markets.

Key to this study of women street traders in early twentieth-century Cork is Foucault’s (1980c) concept of power in its multiple forms. Power, as such, does not have a binary structure: there are no places where fundamental freedom or liberty can thrive or exist because power is “co-extensive with the social body” and its “relations are interwoven with other relations” that exist such as production (p. 142). Power is typically conceptualised as hierarchical with an apex, however my analysis shows that it is, instead, part of an apparatus that, as a whole, reproduces ‘power’ and “distributes individuals” (Foucault, 1995, p.177). Particular to this study of Cork’s historic street-based markets and the Shawlies is Hunt and Wickham’s (1994, p. 45) proviso that Foucauldian power in the modern era carries an “enigma” that is “epitomised in the visibility of political power and the often veiled reality of economic power”.

---

7 The price mechanism transmits information, provides incentives for producers and consumers (Gilpin and Gilpin, 2001; Aldridge, 2005), and—more controversially—distributes income (Aldridge 2005). There are always externalities—third parties outside an exchange who may be impacted negatively by that exchange—via the interconnectedness of a market (Aldridge, 2005) whether tangible or abstract.

8 The abstract market is defined as “an intellectual construct” (Gilpin and Gilpin, 2001); an "ideal, or a vision, or an ideology" that located in space, opaque, mediated, and unregulated (Aldridge, 2005) in contrast to the tangible market such as a street market or a covered market with stalls.
In their interrogation of the pragmatic qualities that gave late-twentieth century capitalism its messianic and millennial characterisation, Comaroff and Comaroff (2000, pp. 292 - 293) asked if this characterisation was connected “by cause or correlation or copresence” to the other “more mundane features of the contemporary historical moment”. The meta-question of this study prompts the opposite. This is, instead, an interrogation of the mundane—The Street Trading Act, 1926—and its connection to the pragmatic, millennial, or the messianic in the historical moments that marked the early years of Irish independence. The condition of the Irish state in 1926 necessitates this approach. A young state and a post-colonial state, Ireland was anxious to shed a past of domination and cement its independence by thriving and prospering in all areas under self-governance.

It is difficult to conceive that urban, female poverty—signified by prolific numbers of women selling on footpaths for meagre earnings—was welcome in the public sphere when political and economic stability were the overarching goals of the public agenda. It will be demonstrated that pragmatism, the messianic, and the millennial were embraced by political and business leaders in the newly independent Ireland as a pancea. Poor women trading publicly and in large numbers on the streets of the new state’s major cities could only compromise the new state’s self-conception as a visionary liberator and leader working to move the masses toward stability, strength, and prosperity. Furthermore, these women were problematised by a power base that worked actively to keep the first Free State government, led by William Cosgrave, in power.

**Organisation of the Dissertation**

Following this introduction, Chapter 1 details the research question and consequent questions, and the theoretical framework assembled for this study out of theories of power, class, gender, governance, modernity, gentrification, and contemporary neoliberalism. I show how theories that articulate the foundations of neoliberal constructions of society merge with those that articulate a ‘modern’ city embodying progress, prosperity, and propriety. The role of gentrification in propagating that vision is also considered. The implications for women are explored. Thus, this framework of
INTRODUCTION

concepts was constructed to explicate how the historical intersection of class and gender bridges neoliberalism, modernity, and gentrification and, ultimately, the role of each in the disappearance of the Shawlies from Cork’s streets.

Chapter 2 is a review of the existing knowledge of women in trade in Ireland and Cork. It begins with a look at ‘bricks and mortar’ trading which was, historically, open to women who were born or married into middle-class families. The literature on women and street trade in Ireland is very limited and so a variety of texts—general histories, the visual arts, radio broadcasts—were consulted. These are considered in the general context of the opportunities that were or were not available to poor women in the mainstream economy. This literature review shows the classed and gendered nature of street trading, and the deeper marginalisation that resulted: when women street traders were written about, they are typically portrayed as poor at best, and law breakers or threats to public health and safety at worst.

The methodology chapter then addresses why a genealogical approach to understanding women and street-based commerce in Ireland was selected. The theory behind the methods, and the methods of data collection are discussed, as well as the genesis of the study at hand. While the shortcomings of archival data and questions surrounding validity are addressed, it is demonstrated that the knowledge of those who have been subjugated can be emancipated to challenge that which is presented as ‘truth’ by those in power. Furthermore, creating a genealogy of the larger context of the advent of the legislation, has filled gaps that would have weakened the analysis had only the documents available on street trading been considered in isolation from the historical social context in which they were created.

Three data chapters follow. The first details and provides an analysis of official documentation at the national level, including newspaper accounts. The larger political context is also explored to establish that The Street Trading Act, 1926 was part of a larger attack on poor women in Ireland. The impetus for the Act was, initially, construed as addressing street traders only in Dublin’s city centre, and so the data available at the national level is linked primarily to conditions in that city. The data explored is substantial considering this is a study of the Shawlies in Cork. However, the
unified discourses against street trading that constructs women street traders as a source of ‘contagion’ commenced in Dublin and is later used in Cork by powers aligned with those at the national level. These details illustrate the foundation of the larger historical contingencies that would, directly and indirectly, work against the Shawlies.

The next chapter details and provides an analysis of the official documentation—private and public—related to the implementation of the Act in Cork. This is explored in conjunction with the larger vision for the city’s economic development voiced by amalgamated business interests. Unlike the preceding chapter, a ‘behind-the-scenes’ glimpse is provided by correspondence located at the Cork City and County Archives between Civic Commissioner Phillip Monahan and various parties. What is revealed is the simplicity with which the Act was used and, ultimately, abused, for ‘containment’ of the Shawlies. It is also revealed how gentrification through the ‘science’ of town planning worked contemporaneously with the Act to erase street markets for poor traders and consumers.

The third data chapter is devoted to the Shawlies. Their stories are compiled as completely as possible from census data and a registry of street traders that was compiled in Cork in 1928. The chapter concludes with a glimpse into the decline of the Coal Quay across the decades that followed. This chapter sheds light on the realities of the lives of women street traders that were ignored in the Free State government’s and the local authority’s regulation of their work. Furthermore, the data illustrates the importance of trading to the fundamental survival of the Shawlies and, in many cases, their families across generations when alternatives were absent or bleak.

In Chapter 7 the larger global context of the convergence of street traders, modernity, and gentrification is examined. This chapter serves to provide information that fills in the gaps and addresses ‘hunches’ that remain about the Shawlies. New York’s

---

9 The concepts of ‘contagion’ and ‘containment’ are used by Luddy (2007) to describe the Irish government’s response to prostitution. These terms have been adapted here because they are useful in understanding the Irish government’s response to women street traders. The ‘contagion’ they presented was not only as a source of disease (i.e., improper food handling; disease spread by used clothing). It will be demonstrated in Chapters 4 and 5 that theirs was also constructed as a growing trend that had to be curtailed because of the threat to the flow of pedestrians and vehicles. The response, in short, was ‘containment’. 
obliteration of its street markets demonstrates the power and influence of class in mediating public space in a global economic power. Contemporary case studies of street traders in Mozambique, Bolivia, Vietnam, and the Philippines are then explored. A richer picture then emerges as to why Ireland may have rushed to regulate, and how Cork may have used regulation to pursue a modern vision of the city. Also provided are some answers as to why the Shawlies turned to street trading, and continued to trade well into old age.

In the Conclusion I reflect on the methodological, theoretical, and substantive discoveries made across the study. The notion of ‘genderfication’ is explored in light of the findings presented. Before moving on to Closing Thoughts, a section entitled ‘Next Steps’ addresses the substantive and theoretical gaps that remain. Included here are avenues of future research to address those gaps and new questions generated by the work at hand.
Chapter 1 - Conceptualising the Power Relations that Governed the Shawlies and Cork’s Street Markets

…it would certainly be very unwise...at the embarking of a new State, where you must depend on the good will and hard work of all sections to make a success of that State, to embody in the Constitution what certainly looks very much like Communist doctrine.

—Kevin O’Higgins, Minister for Home Affairs (qtd. Powell 1992, p. 159)10

1.1 Introduction

This study draws on theoretical paradigms that explore the relationships among capital, privilege, and governance. These, in turn, illuminate how governance in the new Irish state evolved to regulate the trading lives of women like the Shawlies—those who numbered among the new state’s urban poor—and how the vision the state and key power brokers had for city centres as commercial hubs were then grafted onto social relations. Using these concepts I demonstrate how a new state, in order to strengthen its hold on power, must at least appear to ‘Thrive’ and ‘Prosper’ to, vicariously, cement its power socially. In motion this strengthening means that order and what is visible in the public sphere are critical, particularly when neoliberal constructions of efficiency and ‘success’ shape the public agenda designed to reach these goals.

To narrow the focus to the micro social and political processes at work within these larger efforts by the state prompts an exploration of the relevant theories that position modernity as a collection of well-intentioned processes where progress and prosperity fuel change, promote commerce and, ultimately, urban renewal. Modernity carries with it the notion of ‘progress’ as a ubiquitous and politically neutral force, and yet it is, largely, a bourgeois force. Progress, in the guise of gentrification, is deemed inevitable even if undesirable in the short term; in the long term, it promises to act as a social leveller that will create communities with sustainable flows of people, capital, and security. Modernity, in its positive and progressive guise, creates the image of a state working to thrive.

---

10 The “Communist doctrine” O’Higgins refers to was the Democratic Programme of 1919 passed by the first Dáil Éireann. The Programme was intended, according to Powell (1992, p. 158) as a “radical statement of national objectives” that was “designed to attract the support of the working-class in the struggle for nationhood”. Kevin O’Higgins went on to become the Minister of Justice, and in 1926 he introduced the Act. See list of Key Public Personages.
This conceptualisation of modernity raises the question of what implications that process had for the Shawlies trading in a working-class neighbourhood in Cork: the intersection with their class positions is clear, however the fact that street trade in Cork was largely the domain of women raises new questions about how gender intersects with the process of gentrification. According to Wajcman (1991, p. 28), when it is understood that gender construction is “an ongoing ideological and cultural process” then the means to understanding the resulting constructions is through an analysis of the social practices involved in governance that create new sites of power and domination.

The sections that follow address the theories that explore state formation, the positioning of the economy, modernity, and gentrification as well-intentioned processes that serve a state seeking to thrive and prosper. How it is that consequent notions of propriety, prosperity, and progress intersect with gender is also explored. The first sets out the process I followed to construct the conceptual framework.

1.2 Constructing a Conceptual Framework

There is no single conspirator in the disappearance of the Shawlies. The data shows that The Street Trading Act, 1926 was not overtly directed at eliminating livelihoods, the government did not overtly target women, nor did the Act overtly privilege larger business interests. Thus, a theoretical framework was needed to understand how multiform power—social, economic, and political—worked with historical events to create contingencies that virtually erased a historical use of public space, and eliminated a historical source of subsistence income for poor women in Cork. It was out of theories of power, governance, policy development, and neoliberal capitalism, that a framework of concepts was constructed to bridge data on women street traders across historical periods and continents to understand who the Shawlies were, why their marketplaces disappeared, and what role bourgeois gentrification and town planning had in that process.

The core research questions that have guided this study are repeated here along with the conceptual observations they generate in order to illustrate how theories about power, policy, and capital have been merged to answer the questions and understand the data. The meta-question that prompted this research project is: What role did The Street
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*Trading Act, 1926* have in the disappearance of the Shawlies from Cork City's street-based markets? The question that is prompted, in turn, is: can the workings of The Street Trading Act, 1926 be conceptualised in social terms, as extensions of the conditions that marginalised poor women in Irish society?

These questions prompt three conceptual observations that are specific to this study, but are generic to studies of the regulation of street traders, and the impact of progress narratives such as ‘globalisation’ on the disenfranchised. Three thematic links then emerged: government regulation directed, specifically, at the street trading sector, and series of social outcomes that seem disparate in scope. These are:

1. government regulation of street trade and the reconstitution of ‘valid’ trade;
2. government intervention in street trading and contemporaneous gentrification;
3. government intervention in street trade and the privileging of large, private interests in the public sphere or, what I term, privatisation ‘creep’.

These processes are best understand via the work of Michel Foucault, specifically that which falls under the broader umbrella concept of ‘governmentality’. Governmentality provides the means to understanding how power emanating from a government’s attempts to govern has a ripple effect far from the centre of power, to shape activity beyond the actual target of legislation, policies, or practices in other sectors of society, and the behaviour and attitudes of individuals (Burchell et al, 1991; Foucault, 1991; 1995; Hunt and Wickham, 1994).

Hunt and Wickham (1994, p. 76) describe the process of governmentality as “the dramatic expansion in the scope of government” that includes “an increase in the number and size of government calculation mechanisms”. This process, they believe, commenced around the middle of the eighteenth century, and continued as they were writing in 1994 (Hunt and Wickham, 1994). The characteristics and processes that make governmentality readily identifiable include the reason of the state, the problem of population, “the birth of modern political economy”, and “the emergence of the human sciences as new mechanisms of calculation” (Hunt and Wickham, 1994, p. 76).

These events, as part of a conceptualisation of power and its proliferation, are naturally suited to understanding how a seemingly innocuous piece of municipal regulation can
re-articulate the lives of poor women trading in historic street markets. Across time, it will be shown, proliferations of power gained momentum to transform the material and social relations that accompany trade and characterise life at the street level in neighbourhood marketplaces. Material relations, Giroux (2000) asserts, can transform public life in a democracy. This study asserts that this was the case in Cork: *The Street Trading Act, 1926* was legislation that emerged from the material relations that existed in Ireland, and it further compromised the already frail democratic agency of a population of Irish women.

The section that follows provides a lexicon of the key concepts and subconcepts, in isolation, needed to deconstruct the regulation of street trade, allowing for the fundamentals of each to be highlighted.

**1.3 Lexicon of Key Concepts and Subconcepts**

Social power and state technologies of power drive this study of women and street trade in Cork. The key concepts that have emerged from Foucault's (1988a; 2010a) work in these areas are defined here, and are used in the study to bring the processes that deepened the marginalisation of the Shawlies into focus.

- **Polizei** or ‘police’—This political rationality is central to the development of the ‘political technology of individuals’ and is marked by an intervention into the behaviour of individuals (Foucault 1988a). Here the term ‘police’ and its role in governance closely approximate what is regarded as policy—public or social. ‘Police’ has since its early modern origins, according to Foucault (1988a, pp. 154-156), served as “a dream” or utopian vision of society where the object is life. In motion, *polizei* is the administrative means by which individuals become useful to the state and its goals as “working, trading, living beings” (Foucault, 1988a, pp. 154 -156).

- **Gesellschaftspolitik** or ‘policy of society’—Foucault (2010b) asserts that this is the goal of neoliberal governments, it is not conventional social policy, the latter being forms of governmental action that are problematised by the neoliberal. This political rationality is marked by the state's practices that intervene in the social world with the goal of making the market possible (Foucault, 2010b). The regulatory principle of society is dynamic competition but this is not, Foucault stressed (2010b, p. 147), what
is known as a market society; instead, this ‘policy of society’ creates an “enterprise society” where individuals are not defined by exchange or consumption, but by their “enterprise and production”.

- **Rechtsstat** or ‘Rule of Law’—The application of law, institutionally, to the economy is a political rationality that frames the actions of public authorities in law (Foucault, 2010c). The state becomes one in which acts in law and of governance “are distinguished in their principle, effects, and validity” (Foucault, 2010c, p. 169).

- **raison d'Etat** or ‘reason of the state’—This is the political rationality by which the state's preservation, expansion, and it's “felicity” are prioritised and actively pursued by the state itself (Foucault, 1988a, p. 148). The ‘reason of the state’ follows rules that are not shaped by customs or traditions, but by rational knowledge (Foucault, 1988a). The state reinforces its existence by political knowledge that “deals not with the rights of people or with human or divine laws but with the nature of the state which has to be governed” (Foucault,1988a, p. 151). Ultimately, the state’s strength and capacity are defined in relation to other states (Foucault, 1988a).

- **discipline**—In the Foucauldian sense, discipline refers to “non-sovereign power” and is an invention of bourgeois society (Foucault, 1980c, p. 105). According to Smart (2002, p. 90), Foucauldian discipline proliferates through micro-powers that are not egalitarian, but represent instead “the reality of the functioning of power”. Disciplines are, according to Smart (2002), the foundation upon which the formal juridical structure is built.

The next three sections explore the role of regulation under three concepts that demonstrate how the foundation or reimagining of a state as thriving, prosperous and, ultimately, modern, could eliminate street trading. These concepts I term ‘A Thriving State’, ‘A Prosperous State’, and ‘A State of Best Intentions’.

### 1.4 ‘A Thriving State’

How does a state project an image of success? What responsibility do individuals have to help the state to thrive? Answers are found in political rationalities that make individuals and their activities ‘useful’ to the state, while strengthening the state. The usefulness of individuals is governed by the first political rationality outlined in the lexicon, *polizei* or ‘police’. According to Pasquino (1991, p. 112) the ‘police’ as a
technology of governance was conceptualised as “partly a political project, and partly a kind of utopia” as early as the start of the seventeenth century.

In order to realise the ‘utopia’ of a thriving, successful state with a thriving, successful populace, I contend that state-led action is required in the form of practices or rules for both the new state and the individuals who are its citizens. The birth of a new state or the reimagining of an established state prompts the creation of a new agenda with these goals and priorities. However, a new or reimagined state is always established on the foundation of an old society with established priorities, customs, and traditions that are historical. Likewise, the individuals who make up that society have priorities, customs, and traditions. What if the immediate goals of the state and individuals differ?

One answer is found in Foucault’s (1988a, p. 146) studies of the creation and evolution of asylums and prisons that demonstrate how humans have “indirectly constituted themselves through the exclusion of others.” I will use this idea to demonstrate that exclusion, by its very nature, constitutes subjects by validating some and invalidating others and, ultimately, constructs them as compliant insiders, and non-complaint outsiders to be targeted for correction. To establish a state, then, according to the ‘dream’ requires government regulation that articulates legitimate actions that promise to reduce harm to society and its individuals. What is ‘valid’ and represents the ‘dream’ then articulates the sites, practices, and behaviours where the likelihood of harm is perceived as being reduced or non-existent.

Across the eighteenth century society became, according to Pasquino (1991, p. 108-109), the “object of knowledge” and a “target of political intervention” via ‘police’ to promote happiness through governance. This, I will demonstrate, marries with Foucault’s (1988a) ‘political technology of the individual’—the term he gives to the government’s intervention into the behaviour of individuals to make them useful in working towards the state’s ‘dream’; this employs a “marginalistic integration” of individuals “into the state's utility” (Foucault, 1988a, p. 156). According to Foucault (1995) the body is useful to power only if it is productive and subjected simultaneously.
Productive and subjected in what way? It will be shown that through the ‘political technology of the individual’, individuals may be integrated into the state’s ‘dream’ or progressive ethos, while it may, simultaneously, force individuals and activities further into the margins. The demarcation line signifies ‘useful’ on one side, proximate to the centre of power, and detrimental on the other. Producing as an insider, thereby, means following the rules, practices, and ‘the dream’. Producing as an outsider, then, means producing but without following the rules, practices, or producing in the service of the progressive ethos. The ‘political technology of individuals’ now has the potential to shape the formation of an individual’s identity as a producer—insider or outsider—via state administration and policy. To govern happiness into being through legitimating production and subjection thereby serves to limit the power of the dangerous ‘outsider’ as individuals seek or engage in work that is prescribed as ‘useful’.

According to Pasquino (1991, p. 111), as the early modern state attempted to control its population, it created what became known as “society”. Society was perceived as “an open space traversed by men and things” with “critical points in the territory” identified for control by ‘police’; these points included public spaces such as squares and markets (Pasquino, 1991). Thus, across time, ‘police’ sought to regulate the irregular, that which lacked “order or form” (Pasquino, 1991, p. 111). With time these efforts surfaced in policies and regulations geared to a prosperous state with order assured (Gordon, 1991). The population then became the priority of government because government was concerned with guaranteeing “the health, wealth, happiness” of the population (Hunt and Wickham, 1994, p. 76).

In my analysis I will use this idea to show that exclusion is the result of the state’s construction of ‘valid’ insider, and the ‘norm’ is constructed through a policy of government that regulates the safety and security of the population. This subjugation integrates individuals into what Foucault (1988a, p.160) calls ‘a totality’ or a community where individuals willing to contribute to a community are then charged with making decisions about the common good with their conduct. In his reading of Foucault's work, Gordon (1991, p. 12) asserts that in “early modern political culture” a deep connection was forged between “the principles of political action and those of personal conduct”. A sense of involvement in the social order, loyalty to a system of
governance, and even a sense of agency are then forged, it will be shown, when the connection between political and social order and personal conduct is made.

The connection between the governing of conduct and a thriving state, according to Gordon (1991, p. 27), is inevitable: in a liberal capitalist state, economic order and public order are considered interdependent, and create a “coherent general policy of order”. The ‘police’ style of government is one that, according to Gordon (1991, p. 12), characterises itself as a government ‘of all and of each’; in turn, this government assigns individuals “to an economically useful life”. With this assignment, I contend, an individual who is not contributing to the strength of the state, is producing by a means now constructed as economically deviant or outside the ‘norm’. It follows, then, that an economically useful life is one that serves the realisation of the state’s larger progressive ethos when that ‘economically useful’ activity does not interfere with established profitable enterprises.

To what ends are economically useful ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ of value to the state in its quest to thrive? The *raison d'Etat* or ‘reason of the state’, according to Foucault (1988a), governs the conduct of individuals by regulations rather than simply ‘norming’ them into compliance. According to Foucault (1988a), this rationality shapes its rules according to rational knowledge rather than customs and traditions, all with the goal of strengthening the state. Rational knowledge in shaping these decisions and practices thereby excludes customs and traditions (Foucault 1988a), or what is referred to elsewhere (Foucault 1995) as the ‘genealogies’ that shaped centuries of life in those communities. Accordingly, it will be shown, the application of rational knowledge with this sweep and scope into the activities of individuals in the economy serves to strengthen the state via an active role in the day-to-day lives of individuals. Critically, these rules are shaped by rational knowledge related to state designated and constructed social needs—economic, law and order, health and welfare—that become the foundation of a ‘Thriving State’.

This action is further deepened by what Foucault (1988a, p. 151) calls the state’s political knowledge, knowledge prescribed by “the nature of the state that has to be governed”, as opposed to legal or juridical knowledge that is concerned with the rights
of groups or individuals, human or divine laws. The privileging of the state over the rights of groups or individuals, established man-made or divine laws, and the history of the community, serve what Foucault (1988a) designates as the second ‘reason of the state’: self-strengthening. The state, according to Foucault (1988a), must strengthen its political forces because each state is permanently in competition with other states or countries. Under the perpetual pressure of inter-state competition, governments do not need to concern themselves with individual rights, and they only need to be concerned where individuals are “relevant” for the state to strengthen itself (Foucault, 1988b, p. 152).

To disconnect individuals from their genealogies—their rights, history, customs and traditions, or their ancestors—I argue, means that the state has, in the process of securing itself, deepened the individualisation of responsibility for the state’s strengthening. Furthermore, the ability of state power to proliferate by micromanaging anonymously is facilitated by this reach into individual lives and identities; thus, as the population becomes more individualised, the individuals become isolated in relation to power rather than thought of as a population with needs and goals. What is considered the ‘norm’ then becomes the reference point for individuals to comply with the state rather than comply with their established rights, history, and customs (Foucault, 1995, p. 193). This could be understood as the power in seemingly small acts of governance that will re-articulate individual lives and shape communities, acts of governance that establish and emphasise the ‘norm’ to serve the ‘reason of the state’ rather than established historical rights and practices.

To what ‘norm’, then, must the state adhere in order to strengthen in competition with other states and thrive domestically and internationally? To what ‘norm’ must individuals adhere in order to limit the marginalisation bred of the increasing subjectivity and individualisation that mark the state’s strengthening? The answers surface in the means by which Foucault (1988a) asserts a political rationality must work in order for state power to subjugate individuals: it cannot work in isolation and so it must be linked with other rationalities that are the business of state administration and policy.
These rationalities he refers to as ‘sciences’ and include economics and society (Foucault, 1988b). Here Comaroff and Comaroff’s (2000, p. 292) proviso that capitalism’s positioning as ‘saviour’ for states at the close of the twentieth century was the result of political and social binaries, including that of hyper-rationalisation with “the exuberant spread of prosperity gospels” proves helpful in understanding the ‘norm’ that separates ‘insiders’ from ‘outsiders’. If rationalisation is understood as the state’s application of a set of rules to govern behaviour or conduct based on principles of logic or guidelines geared to efficiency, then hyper-rationalisation refers to the extension or deepening of that form of control or governance. Thus, the “exuberant spread of prosperity gospels” (Comaroff and Comaroff, 2000, p. 292) conceptualises prosperity as the subject of a truth mantra, spread with excitement and even anticipation. Following the logic of this binary, the prosperity mantra justifies the extension of logic into the lives and conduct of individuals, and may shape the rules that govern behaviour or conduct.

This binary, then, is shaping a technology that links an embrace of prescribed guidelines for conduct with the promise that prosperity will result if the guidelines are followed. Prosperity in work and in trade are generally conceived as reaching beyond subsistence to accumulate wealth, or prosperity is manifest in the growth of one’s enterprise. I contend in my analysis that, to insure prosperity according to the binary proposed (Comaroff and Comaroff, 2000) when the polizei is the means of hyper-rationalisation in the states’s attempts to insure a population that thrives and prospers through trade, it does so by limiting harm in trade. According to Pasquino (1991, p. 113) a “state of prosperity” becomes the “rallying cry of all discourses and practices” that are associated with ‘police’.

The source of the gospels of prosperity that may emanate first from the state to individuals, directly or indirectly, in the state’s quest to thrive are explored in the next section.

1.5 ‘A Prosperous State’

What role does economic security play in a state’s ability to thrive? How does it appear to thrive economically if it isn’t already? Understanding how a state appears to act in
the best interests of its population via the economy to ensure the security, welfare, and prosperity of that population necessitates an understanding of how a state conceptualises society and the economy as interdependent, with the economy serving a social welfare function.

As discussed in the previous section, the phenomenon of the Polizei deepens productivity and connects the economy to the state’s strengthening. Deepening the individual’s role in this strengthening via the economy and their ability to produce in it and be useful to the state (Foucault, 1988a) allows the state to thrive and continue to strengthen. As the state attempts to strengthen through the shaping of individuals as “working, trading, living beings” (Foucault 1988a, p. 154-156), it follows that if the state is going to prosper, this ongoing policing will involve what Hunt and Wickham (1994, p. 27) refer to as “a much wider range of social interventions”. Social interventions by the state promote the ongoing effectiveness of the productive individual. In motion these social interventions have the productive individual embellishing the “stature of the state” (Hunt and Wickham (1994, p. 27) within what has become what Foucault (2010a) terms the ‘enterprise society’.

In his commentary on Foucault’s disciplines, Smart (2002) highlights how social interventions with the goal of ‘utility’ emerged alongside three broader historical processes. The first, relevant to the state’s attempts to prosper, is production; the second and third—juridical and political structures, and the sciences—are developed in the section that follows. I will use this idea in my analysis to show how production emerges as the key discipline geared to building a prosperous state under neoliberal individualisation and the regulation of public space. The goal of this discipline, according to Smart (2002, p. 90), is to maximise the body of the individual as a “useful force” and the body becomes regulated as a “political force” (Smart, 2002, p. 90).

The political nature of the body as a useful commodity that strengthens the state as it strives for prosperity is, I argue, the means by which individuals become responsible through their economic and social activities for multiple areas of state building, including social welfare. Foucault (2010b; 2010c) explored the process by which responsibility for social welfare is shifted from the state to both the individual and the
economy in his discussion of the ‘policy of society’. It was noted in the lexicon that
_Gesellschaftspolitik_, or ‘policy of society’, is not what is commonly called social
policy\(^1\). According to Foucault (2010b), the policy of society, within the neoliberal
vision, dictates that the government must not work to counter the impact of economic
processes on society. Instead the government must intervene to ensure that competitive
mechanisms regulate society to nullify “the possible anti-competitive mechanisms of
society” (Foucault, 2010b, p. 160).

According to Foucault (2010b, p. 160) this ‘enterprise society’ is not modelled on the
price mechanism, but on the notion of enterprise and only makes the price mechanism
possible. If an ‘enterprise society’ is one that takes this form, then it is, I argue, founded
on economic activity that is entrepreneurial in nature. Accordingly, this society is
shaped by individuals doing their best to help the state prosper through economic
activity that is classified as enterprising. This is, then, a society characterised by
individuals engaged in economic activity that Rose (1998) conceptualises as
competitive, strong, vigorous, bold, and driven by the goal of success. This is also a
society founded on activity marked by what Aldridge (2005, p. 20) asserts is “the
‘creative destruction’ of old forms”. The objective of the policy of society, according to
Foucault (2010b, p. 145), is that society is generally “regulated by the market” in “every
moment and every point in society”.

I will use this idea to illustrate a similar, significant effect upon the street-based
economy and the transactions within it. The term ‘market’ is typically associated with
the abstract market that regulates competition in the macroeconomy, but Foucault
(2010b) only used the term market. However, this concept does, I contend, extend to
tangible markets and the activities of individuals in those sites. In the enterprise society
individuals are defined as economic beings not in relation to exchange or consumption,
but in relation to enterprise and production (Foucault, 2010b), factors that are suited to
both microeconomic and macroeconomic activities. It follows, then, that all

---

1. Foucault (2010b, p. 142) defines social policy as “a policy with the objective of everybody having
relatively equal access to consumer goods”, serving as a “counterpoint to economic processes” that may
have a negative impact on individuals. A social policy that is generous is a result of growth in the larger
economy and serves as “a kind of reward and compensation” for harms that come about as a result of that
growth (Foucault, 2010b, p. 142).
individuals, even those earning a subsistence income, are classed as enterprises and producers, and are defined according to their level of enterprise and production.

Foucault (2010b, p. 148) argued further than when the “formative power of society” is the market, competition is intensified as enterprise is multiplied; as a result the opportunities for “friction” between and among enterprises is multiplied. This, in turn, prompts governmental action through legal arbitration that allows them to continue to operate (Foucault, 2010b). And so a society shaped by enterprise is one that is also framed by a “multiplicity of juridical institutions” (Foucault, 2010b, p. 150). This is where the law and enterprise meet. When a state’s policy toward society follows Foucault’s (2010b) ‘policy of society’ then, it will be shown, it socially privileges the ‘entrepreneur’ engaged in entrepreneurial activity that produces beyond a subsistence level. Furthermore, following Foucault's (2010b) prescription for legal intervention, the law is then used to protect the productive entrepreneur and thereby ensure the survival of an entrepreneurial society.

The principle adopted towards economic regulation, according to Foucault (2010c), maximises legal intervention while minimising economic intervention. This means that the judiciary articulates property rights in the enterprise society, and the law shapes the economy (Foucault, 2010c). In its state of constant evolution capitalism has, Foucault (2010c, p. 164) offers, relied on the ongoing interaction of “economic processes and [an] institutional framework”. Foucault (2010c) stipulates that the laws he refers to do not touch the market, but regulate the market and the practices in it and, ultimately, the society in which that market operates.

These principles, it will be shown, signify that the law is regulating social relations among individuals in a society that embraces capitalism, and thereby shapes their identities as ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ in relation to each other and the market.

According to Foucault (2010c) the source of the rules governing this ‘enterprise society’ and its economy may have a social impetus. I will use this paradigm to show that in creating its market via the ‘policy of society’, it follows that the state will call on society to help make rules. Thus, the power structure of that society serves as a ‘metropolitan
centre’ of sorts, crafting the rules governing conduct in the ‘enterprise society’, and it is guided by the needs of power—political, social, or economic.

What is the connection between a state’s mission to thrive through the governance of its population and its intervention in the social to create a market and an ‘enterprise society’? How can it thrive if it promises prosperity for some and not for others?

It is simple to connect the notion of prosperity for some with the ‘enterprise society’ when taking into consideration Foucault’s (2010c) identification of the ‘policy of society’ as a goal of neoliberalism. Neoliberal social discourse, at its most basic, pledges that capital accumulation is the common sense path to common wealth globally when facilitated through the individualised pursuit of wealth in ‘free’ markets. Yet, many observe, the individuals and states that profit or realise continued prosperity are those situated as centres of wealth, and the power that comes of wealth (Comaroff and Comaroff, 2000; Gimenez, 2004; Giroux, 2006). Furthermore, capitalism offers what Medovoi (2002, p. 66) calls a “future-tense narrative of inevitability”, like a promise that creates a snare when prosperity is connected to “a time and place in the offing” rather than meeting survival needs that are immediate (Martin, 2012, p. 272).

To characterise the ‘policy of society’ as neoliberal is particularly appropriate when considered alongside more recent definitions of neoliberalism. According to Foucault (2010b) neoliberalism is a governing technique with macroeconomic principles running through it. According to Soederberg (2005, p. 329) it is a “steadfast belief” that solving social and political problems is achieved “primarily through market-based mechanisms” rather than through state intervention. The implications for governance are, I contend, that the state allocates much of the task of governing in a range of policy areas to the abstract, intangible ‘market’. In the lives of individuals this means that neoliberal doctrine encourages the shaping of lives to achieve material success in whatever economic circumstances the ‘market’ shapes at the time because earnings and employment are now ‘naturally’ tenuous in an evolving marketplace.

The contention that a state’s political attempts to strengthen itself by promising to thrive economically using a neoliberal anticipation of prosperity for both the state and
individuals, is underpinned by Foucault’s (2010b) conceptualisation of neoliberalism as a technique of government instead of the view that it is simply an economic paradigm. According to Foucault (2010b, pp. 131-132), it does not revolve around “freeing an empty space” in the abstract market, and it should not be “identified with laissez-faire”. Instead, neoliberalism refers to what he characterised as “permanent vigilance, activity, and intervention” on the part of government (2010a, p. 132) in the form of “regulatory actions” and “organising actions” (2010b, p. 138). A minimal level of economic intervention and a maximal level of legal intervention (Foucault 2010c) materialises, according to Foucault (2010b, p. 141), as “light” on economic processes, but “heavy” when “social factors” become, increasingly, the “object of governmental intervention”. My analysis will show that it is through an intervention aimed at a public, street-based economy, and the lives of the individuals operating in that economy, that these lives are, in turn, shaped by regulations or a policy that privileges larger business interests. Furthermore, this prioritising of macroeconomic factors over the social factors around economic activity and the lives of individuals does not have to be direct in terms of its operations: through legal means the street-based economy and the lives of its economic actors were re-articulated. The distribution of wealth under this paradigm, I contend, is left to chance even after the implementation of regulations that do not overtly seek to regulate that distribution through planned economic structures or social policies. The economy in motion, then, like the state in its mission to strengthen, has the power to marginalise.

In my analysis I will use the idea of regulating the economy in this ‘enterprise society’ to show how the state has the power to create economic and social ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ by using the law to regulate economic processes. As noted earlier, in the ‘enterprise society’ friction is multiplied and these frictions generate “environmental effects” (Foucault, 2010c, p. 175). Some of the effects come to bear on the individuals themselves and how they act and react in this arrangement: according to Foucault (2010c, p. 175), as economic subjects are freed and allowed to act, they become detached “from their status as virtual functionaries of a plan” and become inevitable judges of the plan. The question that remains, then, is who has the power to judge and shape the design, workings and effectiveness of the state’s plan?
This phenomenon and the role of arbitration play critical roles in the state’s strengthening mission via prosperity: if the state seeks to maintain its credibility as it thrives and prospers, it must be seen to act with good intentions in the spirit of ‘fair play’. How the state acts with what are framed as ‘best intentions’ when governing—trying to incorporate fairness into its actions, trying to guarantee fairness amongst its subjects—and creates social casualties, is explored in the next section.

1.6 A State of ‘Best Intentions’

How is it that the state may say that it is acting with the best intentions, but still damage the individuals and communities it governs? It will be shown that the legal regulation of a population through the creation of laws and policies directed at security, welfare, and even urban planning, are the means by which a state acts with ‘Best Intentions’ to protect all individuals, but makes casualties of others.

In a paradigm where security and welfare are at the heart of the law or regulation, I will demonstrate that the state’s ‘Best Intentions’ must appear to be directed at the common good and the prohibition of harm, stipulating what individuals must do to maintain the common good. I will use Foucault’s (1980c) proviso that power is located in the law itself and is not simply prohibitive to show that oppressive power is found in diverse sites including statements and claims to ‘truth’ that articulate the law or policy, and thereby regulate individuals and activity. Oppression also exists, then, in the exclusion of particular individuals at those multiple sites, in the prescribed tasks, and in the limitation or negation of their agency in strategies of governance.

Foucault (2010c) stipulates that capitalism was formed through an economic-institutional ensemble. The institutional or judicial phenomenon that makes and shapes the economy and its processes is the Rechtsstat or ‘rule of law’—the application of law to the economy within an institutional framework that includes legislation (Foucault, 2010c). To this end, Foucault (2010c, p. 171) notes, the ‘rule of law’ is a liberal “attempt at defining a way to renew capitalism”. In working to this end, he adds, the role of the judiciary is political: its work on and in the economy makes capitalism possible (Foucault, 2010c). I contend that the ‘rule of law’ serves a function in both the
state’s ability to thrive and the appearance of prospering, regulations providing a scaffold between the state as a governing body and the market it makes possible.

The ‘rule of law’ is the state’s legal intervention “in the economic order” through “the introduction of formal principles” (Foucault 2010c, p. 171). In this sense the economy is likened by Foucault (2010c, p. 173) to a game with rules set down by the government, but the players are “individuals” or “enterprises”. The “formal principles” that govern the economic order are defined by Foucault (2010c) according to principles framed by Hayek in *The Constitution of Liberty*. In short, a framework of economic rules allows “economic agents” to “freely make their decisions, inasmuch as...every agent knows that the legal framework is fixed in its actions and will not change”, nor will corrections be devised to compensate for outcomes. People are told what they must and must not do as economic actors and the state, for its part, must remain “blind to economic processes”. The state is bound by this framework as others are bound by it (p. 172-173). In an ‘enterprise society’ this rational framework allows individuals to engage in economic activity according to their individual plans as opposed to a larger, collective vision (Foucault, 2010c).

By this definition, the creation of the legal framework according to the formal principles cited appears to abide by notions of ‘fair play’ or ‘Best Intentions’: there are rules and, presumably, individuals are aware of their limits and their freedoms. The state, too, must abide by the same framework as its citizens while remaining blind to the processes and, seemingly, ambivalent to the outcomes in keeping with, say, political or social goals within the state. In the larger schema of the ‘rule of law’, the intention of fairness on the part of the state is evident in the notion Foucault (2010c) identified as judicial arbitration between individuals and the public authorities.

According to Foucault (2010c, p.170), in the context of English law at the end of the nineteenth century, the ‘rule of law’ was a state in which citizens could appeal “to ordinary justice against the public authorities”. Across the twentieth century and into the neoliberal capitalist era it came to regulate the economy (Foucault 2010c). As such,
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12 Hayek and *The Constitution of Liberty* embodied the principles of neoliberalism embraced by British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, and United States President Ronald Reagan.
regulation approaches policy in the Foucauldian (1988a) concept of the *polizei*. The ‘rule of law’, it will be shown, allows the market to continue to regulate society in its operations after it is created under the ‘policy of society’. Regulation, in the realm of ‘Best Intentions’, becomes a means of soft governance that shapes individuals, communities, and social relations based on knowledge of individuals, communities, and social relations as well as rational claims to ‘truth’.

According to Foucault (cited Smart, 2002, p. 114), a juridical framework operating as egalitarian and guaranteeing, at least in principle, “an egalitarian system of rights”, was cancelled by the rise of the bourgeoisie—the “politically dominant social class”. Foucault (cited Smart 2002, p. 91) put forward that this class privileging in the juridical and political realm came about through the network of disciplines operating beneath the juridical structure. These disciplines expropriated “juridical limitations on the exercise of power” while insuring the submission of both “forces and bodies”, a process that is, according to Foucault, the “foundation of the legal and political structures of modern society” (cited Smart 2002, p. 114). A modern society in the Foucauldian sense is not, according to Smart (2002, p. 91), a disciplined or ordered society, however it does diffuse “disciplinary mechanisms throughout the social body”.

I use this idea to show that when regulations and policies act as disciplines and sources of disciplinary power, they act as mechanisms that move through the social body, shaping interactions among individuals, and perceptions about individuals and activities. At this juncture the notion of ‘Best Intentions’ becomes a measure of value according to who is compliant and seen to work with the regulation, assuming that the regulation is working towards the common good. The situation is complicated further by the notion that the juridical framework promises to be egalitarian, yet in a society dominated by the middle-classes, egalitarian principles do not flow into practice. One social and political group is shaping or influencing the shape of regulations intended to better society, and work in the best intentions of that society.

If a class-based system of laws and regulations is deciding what are the ‘Best Intentions’, how are those ‘Best Intentions’ defined? How are they delivered in order to appear to work in for the common good?
The answer to both, I contend, is found in the final process that Foucault (cited Smart 2002, p. 91) described as emerging alongside disciplinary power: ‘scientific’ power characterised as the “inter-relationship” between “the exercise of power and the formation of knowledge”. As a result, knowledge was acquired and accumulated and then used as an instrument of domination (cited Smart 2002, 91). I will use this idea to show that policy and legislation, and the governing agencies responsible for specific knowledge in areas such as the economy, welfare, and urban management, are instruments of domination and that the opportunity to privilege particular ways of thinking and acting at those each of those locations is considerable. Furthermore, a hierarchy is created around the idea of who knows best what the ‘best intentions’ are, based on who owns and hones the knowledge used to shape the institutions.

The possibility of a state acting with ‘Best Intentions’ in developing policies that have a detrimental effect is best conceptualised as the ‘policy paradox’ by Stone (2002). According to Stone (2002) a policy can be developed with the best social intentions (i.e., safety and security of citizens, equity), yet in practice ambiguities will create social harm or inequities. This happens, Stone (2002, p. 2) asserts, because “even the clearest, simplest, most unambiguous policies [can] be ambiguous” in practice. I will use this idea to show that ambiguities in the practices that flow from policies create a policy-practice divide in outcomes that are fundamental to understanding how the ‘Best Intentions’ become oppressive. For example, a regulatory mechanism may be designed to ensure fairness among competing parties, yet in practice the regulations favour one group over another.

I will use this in my analysis to demonstrate that it is simple to conceive of the suppression of activity as the outcome of ‘Best Intentions’ when a state passes laws and policies, because the state insists those actions are directed at creating a ‘fair’ market, and at controlling forms of deviance and harmful behaviours that threaten the security and welfare of citizens. Indeed, how else is it possible that a state is seen to ‘Thrive’ if the security and welfare of its citizens is not guaranteed? Certainly acts on the part of the state to limit harm appear well intentioned, however this suppression of deviance is different from oppression in both action and intention. Thus, I will use Foucault’s (1988c) proviso and its emphasis on “oppression” to show that the state’s actions, no
matter how well intentioned in programme design or implementation, may pose an abuse of power that subjugates individuals or communities when put in motion, particularly if the negative impact is ignored.

The next section defines the parameters of how class and gender work together to construct social categories of propriety, prosperity, and progress that, in turn, shape identities defined by one’s property and one’s occupation. Cronin (2010) writes that class in post-Famine Ireland was frequently a factor of occupation and property ownership. For Irish women these became intertwined with socially constructed notions of ‘respectable’ and ‘non-respectable, labels that were, in turn, tied to what was “visible in living and working conditions” (Cronin, 2010, pp. 118-119). The focus of the theoretical framework is, therefore, narrowed to the intersection of women and class to highlight the merger of the moral and the economic to further subjugate poor women under notions of progress and prosperity.

1.7 Gender and Constructed Notions of Propriety, Prosperity, and Progress

Power, in relation to both class and gender, is realised in political and economic terms, and particular social conditions allow for its creation and perpetuation. Class ‘in action’ also creates social conditions that allow for its perpetuation, resulting marginalisation, and the deepening of its impact on the lived experiences of those it codifies and shapes. Skeggs (2013) describes class as being in continuous production, and is always constructed by those with access to power; simultaneously, it works in the interests of those same power brokers. To further conceptualise class in “genderic terms”, Lane (2010, p. 3) cites the importance of Lerner’s (1997) insistence that class also describes “multilayered locations relations and experiences” based on identities (i.e., race, nationality, gender) that have, historically, been different for men and women.

In conceptual terms it is fundamental to address in this section the emergence of what Lane (2010, p. 4) refers to as “understandings of ‘respectability’” among Ireland's middle-classes in post-Famine Ireland. These complications are not unique to Ireland, and they continue to complicate the lives of poor women who try to earn a subsistence living by trading on streets elsewhere. They must be addressed, however, because the moral complications and notions of respectability that Skeggs (2013; 2005) and others
(Nicholas, 2009; Cronin, 2010; Lane, 2010; Parkins, 2010) have identified as being connected to class, and to class and modernity (Nicholas, 2009; Parkins, 2010), are synonymous with the historical and contemporary constructions of street trading as deviant. Ireland, it will be shown, was no exception.

Historically class has, as a bourgeois construct, had a moral component that created a demarcation line from the decadent class above and the unwashed masses below. According to Skeggs (2013) this distance created moral legitimacy for the middle-classes that is evident in the hygiene movements of the nineteenth century. The working-classes, thereby, were coded with terms such as dirt, contagion, disorder, danger, and degeneracy (Skeggs, 2013). With time middle-class constructions of the value or liability of the working-classes would extend beyond the moral threat to an economic one, and with moral judgements attached to economic utility.

Class produces subjects through moral, economic, and/or political exchanges (Skeggs, 2013). Categories can then be struck within the larger categories of working, middle, and upper classes, to further modify subjects as, say, ‘respectable’ or ‘idle’ or ‘enterprising’ within their larger class grouping. Class categories, in light of the codification and judgements made, have real effects for those who carry the weight of the associations of these categories (Skeggs, 2013). Hence class also has the potential to shape relationships among the members of a classed group, among individuals interacting across class boundaries, and to shape individual identities based on class ‘assignments’ and the associations inherent within that assignment.

Skeggs (2013) writes of exchange creating the economic domain which, in turn, shapes or re-shapes the individual to work in the interests of wealth accumulation for one’s self; this self is then enabled or disabled by the existing exchange mechanisms at work in that society. Economic responsibility then becomes the responsibility of the individual. Historically, when combined with the knowledge the state has of its citizens, working-class women and other social groups came to have a value ascribed to them according to their potential as producers, thereby binding moral classification to one’s labour (Skeggs, 2013). Working-class women, Skeggs (2005; 2013) asserts, have been characterised as pathological and, frequently, irresponsible in the care of themselves and
their dependents; economically this irresponsibility may also extend to their relationship to the state.

As such the working-class woman becomes a social threat that produces a “national sin” (Skeggs, 2005, p. 967) and, it will be shown, a threat—both economic and moral—that, ultimately, threatens the health of both society and the economy. According to Skeggs (2013) the poor and working-classes come to represent a liability for the state and society by presenting limits to modernisation. The middle-classes, then, are positioned as the ‘vanguard of the modern’ (Skeggs 2013). She is not alone in this finding. Nicholas (2009) examined how gender and modernity conjoined in representations of progress and a vision of the future in 1927 when Canada celebrated its golden jubilee as a dominion. In the materials produced for the celebration class, gender, and race were foregrounded: white, middle-class men were characterised as visionary and “natural leaders” in the country's future (p. 249), and as “agents of progress” (p.260).

Ultimately these portrayals, she argued, created gendered notions of citizenship and nation (Nicholas, 2009, p. 266). Similarly, Parkins (2010) found gendered and classed notions of progress in the English-speaking West across the twentieth century excluded all women and working-class men. For women in particular, she argues, they were relegated to a place “outside of history” and “anterior to modernity” (Parkins, 2010, p. 102). Taking the notion of civic involvement in progress forward, Parkins (2010, p. 103) offers that conceptions of “the new and the avant-garde created categories of persons with different relationships to an idealized ‘public sphere’”. Women weren't suited for public life, therefore they did not have “full agentic participation”; subsequently, they were relegated to the private sphere (Parkins 2010, p. 103). Modernity, she offers, carries an ethos of rationality which has, historically, ensured the exclusion of women from participation in public life (Parkins 2010).

The conceptions of progress and propriety that flow from the narratives of bourgeois modernity appear to meet at this juncture and have particular consequences for women street traders: rationality not only applies to science, knowledge, and business, but to propriety when health concerns are tabled, along with the social privileging of earning an income that reaches beyond subsistence. The role of political rhetoric in rendering
Ordinarily defined as the art of persuasion, Skeggs (2013) offers that rhetoric will persuade people to believe and to accept what appears likely to be true. Among the goals of political rhetoric is the quest for legitimacy of particular discourses and power (Skeggs, 2013). This is clear, in the example given above, of the legitimacy granted to white, middle-class men in the Canadian government’s Jubilee celebrations (Nicholas, 2009). Hence political rhetoric, according to Skeggs (2013), is also a vehicle for class struggle and a means of identifying that struggle. This concept is extended further in Chapters 4, 5, and 6 when the data including statements surrounding The Street Trading Act, 1926, its implementation in Cork, and the Shawlies is examined.

The neoliberal concepts of ‘enterprise’ and the ‘enterprising individual’ at work in Foucault’s (2010b) ‘enterprise society’ demonstrate how political rhetoric deepens the historically classed categories of responsible and irresponsible, moral and immoral, in making economic and moral choices. Fairclough (1991, p. 39) has identified three meanings for the word enterprise as it came to be used in Thatcherite Britain: enterprise signifies “activity” or an undertaking, a personal characteristic or “quality”, and business as in ‘free’ enterprise. Rose (1998, p. 157) describes the “ethics of enterprise” as signifying “competitiveness, strength, vigour, boldness, outwardness, and the urge to succeed”. I will use these ideas to show that enterprise serves as a rationality employed by government that extends particular forms of conduct outside the economic sphere, and that the neoliberal concept ‘enterprise’ will, as Skeggs (2013) alleges political rhetoric does, prompt and make visible class struggle.

Enterprise narratives become equally synonymous with modernity if, as Aldridge (2005, p. 20) asserts, enterprise is also a hallmark of “the ‘creative destruction’ of old forms”. It is a core premise of this study that Cork and Ireland’s regulation of street-based markets was shaped by a bourgeois modernism that is characteristically ‘upwardly mobile’, and that this was so from the foundation of the state. This potential is explored in the section that follows on how modernity and gentrification work in tandem and
then in practice in the uses of power and political rhetoric to regulate and reshape cities, and articulate city life.

1.8 Modernity, Gentrification, and Gender: Bourgeois Progress, Prosperity, Propriety, and Street-based Markets

Theories and debates over what constitutes modernity are vast and cross disciplines. Much like the terms modern, modernism, or modernisation, modernity frequently refers to a process observed in such seemingly disparate disciplines as literature studies, fine art history, sociology, economics, politics, and history. Nicholas (2009, p. 251) calls it a “knot” that includes “capitalism, consumer culture, urban life, new disciplinary techniques, an overarching belief in scientific and technological progress”.

The addition to these definitions of the claim by Parkins (2010, p. 104) that modernity was built on “social exclusions” provides an early understanding of how modernity impacts on the lives of poor women. Progress and political rationality, working as handmaidens to modernity, unite the political, the economic, and the social. It is proposed here that in the lives of poor women who support themselves as street traders in urban centres, the political action that seeks to regulate their work socially and economically, marks an encounter between their work and modernity. Gentrification, I contend, is an institutionalised form of modernity, and the process through which progress, prosperity, and propriety transform urban centres and re-articulate particular forms of trade as ‘valid’. By articulating the appropriate uses for public spaces where the Shawlies and their sisters at other locations across time and space could trade, gentrification is transformed into ‘genderfication’.

The term modernity has a nebulous quality. That said modernity does, despite it’s nebulous ‘feel’, describe tangible social and political processes in the lived experiences of individuals. Bermen (1988) invokes Marx in his encapsulation of modernity as the condition where “all that is solid melts into air”, when “all that is holy is profaned” (qtd. Berman, 1988, p. 21). Berman (1988, p. 313) depicts the modern economy as one with “an infinite capacity for redevelopment and self-transformation”, an element that lends modernity its bourgeois characteristics. However, according to Berman (1988, p. 93), despite the potential of “the marvellous modes of activity” the bourgeoisie opened up
across history, the cornerstone of bourgeois activity is “making money, accumulating capital, piling up surplus value”. It will be shown that this prompts the capitalist impulse within modernity that privileges particular narratives of success in shaping both individuals and cities.

The difficulty of working with the term modernity is, as Foucault (1997, p. 309) writes, that it is typically thought of as an epoch. Instead he envisioned it as a “task”, “an attitude”, and “a voluntary choice made by some people”. To these ends, modernity is ageless and transient: it is a way of viewing the present and identifying its possibilities for growth, and a choice to advocate for the unfolding of those possibilities. The state of being modern, according to Berman (1988, p. 15), is to be in “an environment that promises us adventure, power, joy, growth, transformation of ourselves and the world”. However, he adds, modernity will, simultaneously threaten to “destroy everything we have, everything we know, everything we are” (1988, p. 15). Cross (2000) asserts that the planning and order inherent in modernism do not guarantee that everyone is equally privileged.

Destruction in the pursuit of growth is important to this study when considered with Foucault's (1997) stipulation that modernity might also reveal itself as a struggle with what is presented as counter-modernity. To be counter-modern, it follows, means working in the pursuit of something other than power, growth, and transformation. This term then lends itself easily to arguments that particular forms of economic activity are not conducive to survival and economic growth, or are anachronistic. Here is where the problem of the pursuit of ‘modern’ connects to governing with ‘Best Intentions’ to create a state that thrives and prospers: the narratives of progress and modernisation that emanate from sites of power have the authority to constitute what is counter-modern. I will use this idea to show that when prevailing narratives seek to transform streets and communities in the name of modernisation to prompt the health, wealth, and prosperity of its citizenry, those who resist or cling to their established practices are accused not only of holding back progress, but of blocking attempts to ensure public health and economic growth.
Berman (1988) wrote extensively of the modern development of his native New York City and its transformation into an ‘expressway world’ that carved through historic neighbourhoods with no concern for the lives that existed there, justified solely by the emphasis on the movement of goods and people. Having watched and lived with modernity unfolding across the last half of the twentieth century, he described the “developers and devotees of the expressway world” such as its creator, the renowned planner Robert Moses, as having presented their vision of the modern world as “the only possible modern world” (p. 313). To oppose modernity, according to Berman (1988), is to “fight history and progress, to be Luddite, and…afraid of…change and growth” (p. 313). It follows, then, that those who “oppose them and oppose their words” oppose modernity (Berman, 1988, p. 313). The individuals in opposition are then vulnerable to the characterisation of being ‘counter-modern’ at best, discredited, silenced, or rendered invisible, I contend, at worst.

What makes modernity particularly bourgeois at the location of gentrification is the disconnect with the past in terms of a larger history or geneology. As noted earlier, Foucault (1988b) stipulated that the state’s strengthening project involves shaking off a geneology. Similarly Bermen (1988, p. 93-94) wrote of the bourgeoisie building their rule as a class on an authority founded not on ancestry, but “on what they themselves actually do” which, in turn, produces “vivid new images and paradigms of the good life as a life of action”. He identified the bourgeoisie as the ruling class that liberated “the human capacity and drive for development…permanent change…perpetual upheaval and renewal in every mode of personal and social life” (1988, p. 94). Bourgeois society at its most intense will “eventually turn on” that society because it limits growth; this results in a fight against that society “in the name of the new life it has forced them to seek” (Berman, 1988, p. 97). Gentrification, I argue, is a form of institutionalised modernity as a process that typically incorporates bourgeois notions of what constitutes the ‘good life’.

The appearance of bourgeois propriety, prosperity, and progress are constructed by the state via policies, planning, and activities such as property development and regeneration schemes with the stated intention of improving life in cities (Martin, 2014). Zukin (1993, Ch. 7, paragraph 23) defines gentrification as a “profound spatial
restructuring”, and indicative of the social transformation of a city’s centre “in terms of an international market culture”. The events and decisions that comprise this spatial restructuring is fed, according to Zukin (1993), by a larger process of social transformation. This social transformation is, according to Zukin (1993), classed. A commonality of gentrification efforts across locations and eras is, she insists, the “collective effort” to appropriate the city centre for “elements of a new urban middle-class” (Zukin, 1993, Ch. 7, para. 24). To justify, at least ideologically, the appropriation of the city centre by the middle-class, she notes that the ‘gentrifiers’ are typically thought of as ‘urban pioneers’ (Zukin, 1993, Ch. 7, para. 25), a notion that perpetuates the idea that gentrification is neutral and a sign of progress. In his characterisation of a central figure in gentrification, ‘the developer’, Berman (1988, p. 40) asserts that there is an “affinity between the cultural ideal of self-development and the real social movement toward economic development”.

Citing the provisos of the renowned modern architect, Le Corbusier, Berman (1988) and Cross (2000) characterise the modern city as one that must be planned to avoid disorder. Cross (2000) adds that modern planning was also viewed by Le Corbusier as preventing shapelessness, wilfulness, and poverty. This trio provides insight into why street trading is not classed as a modern activity. Cross (2000) asserts that street trading is considered pre-modern and, accordingly, it is associated with disorder and inefficiency, two characteristics that are anathema to modernity (Berman, 1988; Zukin, 1993; Nicholas, 2009; Parkins, 2010). As for poverty, street trading was the domain of poor women in Ireland, and it remains the domain of poor women today in poor nations (Fahey, 1998; Agadjanian, 2002; Lincoln, 2008; Companion, 2010; Milgram, 2011). The problem in both a state articulating itself and its economy as modern and progressive, and in city centres under gentrification, street traders mean that shapelessness, wilfulness, and poverty are visible and are not contained. Furthermore, their continued trade and proliferation represent a ‘contagion’ of sorts as others among the urban poor join their ranks and the market spreads through public space. They also stand in stark contrast and competition to what Cross and Morales (2007, p. 8) call “larger hygienic commercial establishments”.
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Consequently street trading is seen to exist on the “fringes of modern society” and has been subject to “crackdowns” because of “ideals of public order and state control” (Cross, 2000, p. 29). In keeping with the need for an ordered society, sanctions on street trading in modern societies was, according to Cross (2000), part of creating more efficient and productive individuals by controlling social relations among individuals across time. According to Cross and Morales (2007) street trading was labelled ‘pre-modern’, and it was once believed that it would eventually be absorbed by the advance of capitalism, and its surplus labour would also be absorbed. However, they add, “modernity’s economic successes and subsequent inequalities” created conditions for street traders to seek out ways to continue their trade into the early twenty-first century despite repeated attempts by governments to regulate them (Cross and Morales, 2007, p. 8). Under the strain of a modernising economy, one where what is termed the ‘formal sector’ is not providing sufficient work for an increasing urban population, Milgram (2011, p. 262) asserts that people will seek to capture “in-between spaces in which to establish viable livelihoods”.

The structural changes to a city under modern gentrification that Berman (1988) and Zukin (1993) describe resonate for urban street markets. Cross (2000, p. 34) asserts that this is the case because the “need to manufacture a ‘modern’ society is best expressed in its ideal version” through modernist architecture and urban redevelopment schemes. These attempts to “put the modernist vision at the service of the masses” create, instead, “new forms of ghettos” that cannot “control local space earlier enjoyed by the neglected poor” (Cross, 2000, p. 35). Likewise, he insists of modernity that those left out of the “dream” do not benefit from it nor do they ever “fully escape its effects” (p. 35). One example he cites is the creation of the supermarket, the “quintessence of modernist retailing”, and yet it thrives only when “presented with a mass consumer market able to pay” the ‘formal’ costs that result from its infrastructure (Cross, 2000, p. 38). Under such cases, Cross (2000, p. 28) notes, “street markets and informal producers can step in” and pass on savings to poor consumers because of their flexibility.

However, there exists a dialectic, according to Berman (1988, p. 48), under which modern developers must operate in order to move forward: destroy all of what exists to “pave the way for more creation”, the same ethos that envelopes and moves “the
modern economy, state and society as a whole”. Similarly, Zukin (1993, Ch. 7, para. 25) alleges that gentrification clears a city centre of the existing populations and transforms the economy at that location to one where “finance, entertainment, tourism, communications, and their business suppliers” are concentrated (Zukin, 1993, Ch. 7, para. 25). This would also become the point at which the gendered nature of gentrification via the planning process is made visible. According to Flanagan (2009, p. 221), the cities that are part of the ‘Anglo-Atlantic world’, cities in North America, the United Kingdom, and Ireland, became gendered when the separation of the “productive and reproductive spaces of life” led to the “specific differentiated effects on the uses of, and access to, public space, urban resources and institutions for women and men”. Men, she asserts, “wanted cities shaped to promote their economic desires and social privileges” and so “gendered ideals became powerful tools” through which they are constructed” (Flanagan, 2009, p. 222).

In addition to shifting existing populations and designating the use of space in a city centre, Zukin (1993, Ch. 7) claims that gentrification also marks the loss and rearticulation of what she terms “vernacular landmarks” (para. 54). These locations once had cultural value attached to them in their community but, with time and the transformation of the economy of the city centre, become “socially obsolete” (para. 59). Here is where the neoliberal nature of gentrification becomes apparent. According to Brenner and Theodore (2002) neoliberal destruction includes social artefacts such as public space, and even policies that involve wealth redistribution, to create new practices that, in turn, deepen neoliberalism (cited Hackworth, 2007). Neoliberal gentrification then becomes a social justice issue, according to Prince (2014, p. 26), because it draws on essentialist “notions of who does or does not belong” in a city.

Vernacular landmarks designated as not belonging, it will be shown, include both open street markets, publicly-owned markets for petty traders renting stalls, and the bodies of the Shawlies and their sisters in Dublin exercising their ‘market right’. Cross (2000, p. 40) offers that “street vending came under savage attack in the modernist era”: large retailers such as supermarkets made use of the modern state’s regulatory mechanism to use the “police system” by over-regulating, banning, or “redesigning urban spaces in which” street traders “could no longer exist” (p. 41). The data examined in chapters 4
and 5 demonstrate that this was the case in both Dublin and Cork of the 1920s and 1930s.

According to Cross (2000, p. 39) the “presence of large street markets was the clearest sign of ‘disorder’ and ‘wilfulness’ of the informal economy that needed to be stamped out” in the modern city. The modernist vision of development, Cross (2000, pp. 39-40) asserts, viewed street markets as “backward, inefficient and detrimental to national development schemes”; furthermore, they posed a threat to a firm-based economy and a drain on national development by presenting a satellite economy. It follows, then, that what Cross (2000, p. 39) terms “Third World elites” came to equate ‘modernisation’ with something approximating “the western modernist ideal”. It is also likely that a gendered ‘modernist ideal’ emanating from the west, also emanated from the planned cities in the Anglo-American world of the early twentieth century. Flanagan (2009, p. 231) cites an essay published in 1922 in the professional journal American City that drew an analogy between the unplanned city that did not incorporate zoning to designate sanctioned activities to a drawing of a “dishevelled and slovenly” woman.

Invoking the spirit of both the ‘westward glance’ described by Cross (2000) and what Zukin (1993) describes as the judgement of social obsolesce, Berman (1988, p. 43) offers that an identification of ‘underdeveloped’ exists in countries that are designated as being in need of social, economic, and political development. He likens this label to one that invokes shame before it works with the country’s sense of pride, becoming a “volatile” mix that prompts an inner anguish and feeds the development impulse (1988, p. 43). In the United States, an inner anguish of sorts prompted the modernisation trends Berman (1988) alleges gained momentum during the Great Depression. The trends Berman (1988, p. 309) refers to included building highways and homes in suburban areas, while simultaneously characterising cities as “obstructions to the flow of traffic…junkyards of substandard housing and decaying neighbourhoods” that Americans needed to escape.

There was also a need to escape another hazard of city life and the persistent risk of poverty that existed there. According to Flanagan (2009) town planning in the ‘Anglo-American world’ addressed the threat of female independence that came of poor and
working-class women being forced out of the home to work, or to take in boarders, in order to bolster the family economy. This independence upset what Flanagan (2009, p. 227) terms the “established patriarchal order”. This resulted in the designation of city centres for production, and the suburban, residential settings were designated appropriate for reproduction (Flanagan, 2009). In order to create a successful city, Flanagan (2009) cites four common principles that dominated the planning activities in three countries—the United States, Canada, and Ireland—in the early twentieth century: capitalism, democracy, legalism, and patriarchy. I will draw on these principles to elucidate the process at work in shaping both the Cork Corporation, and the city centre.

Ultimately, Flanagan (2009, p. 221) asserts, the city is then gendered because it is “shaped by the interests of its politics, economy, and “familial systems” that are also gendered. So to, I contend, was the Coal Quay along with other public spaces where the Shawlies earned in Cork.

1.9 Conclusions

As the state tries to strengthen and ‘Thrive’ by appearing to ‘Prosper’, its priorities are the state’s felicity and building an enterprise society respectively. An ordered economy makes for an orderly life in a variety of economic sectors and in other areas of life, giving the impression of stability and sustainability. At each juncture in the state’s mission to strengthen, prosper, and act in the interests of its citizens, the focus of the process was the state itself and the individuals within its population, rather than addressing a ‘collectivity’ or the preexisting genealogy. It follows, then, that the articulation of ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ is acceptable in the state’s pursuit of stability and prosperity through the implementation of well-intentioned policies and regulations in the name of the common good. It is apparent how the addition of ‘enterprising’ to economic choices has the potential to deepen the moral impact: choices with added ‘vigour’ or the ‘urge to succeed’ have as their opposites ‘lethargy’ and the ‘urge to fail’.

If the nature of work, as a class signifier, may be further classified as respectable, the attention shifts to behaviour. In the case of women street traders, this shift in focus transforms their trade into the embrace of an economic activity that produces meagre earnings, or to one that has been rendered deviant through statements and regulation, as
if they had made a choice. This means the reasons why their earnings are meagre and why street trading is one of the few options available to them remain unexamined. Additional challenges to their presence in public spaces are presented by the re-articulation of the purpose or appropriate use of city space along bourgeoisie-modernist lines once the appropriate social and economic uses of that city space are re-articulated.

Gentrification then marks the demise of both old or established structures and the social and economic relations attached to those spaces and landmarks, including street-based markets. According to Roces (1998, p. 313), inserting ‘woman’ into questions about modernity unsettles the term. It is demonstrated across the chapters that follow that, by taking an intersectional glimpse into how class and gender work to subjugate under modernist gentrification, it is clear that ‘gender-fication’ has implications for poor women who earn a subsistence living as street traders in city centres.
Chapter 2 - Women in Trade in Ireland: A Classed and Gendered Economy

The plight of Irish working-class women in the first decades of the [twentieth] century was grim. Connolly, who characterised the Irish working-class woman as a ‘slave for life’, observed, ‘her life is darkened from the outset by poverty, and the drudger to which poverty is born’...

—Fred Powell (1992, p. 129)

2.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the existing knowledge of women street traders in Ireland. The focus then turns to Cork, the ‘Merchant City’, and the Shawlies. Comprehensive histories of women trading in Cork or anywhere in Ireland are nonexistent; likewise, texts that provide insights into the lives of street traders and stall holders in Cork or Ireland have not been written. Thus, for the purposes of this study, a review of a variety of sources including general historical texts on Irish women, Irish women and work, and general social histories were used to compile the first section on women trading from ‘bricks and mortar’ retail premises.

2.2 Women and ‘Bricks-and-Mortar’ Trade In Ireland

Women were visible at all levels of commercial trade in the Irish economy for centuries, however their positions were a function of class or their relationships to men. That said, the existing knowledge is both general and brief.

In sixteenth and seventeenth century Ireland, women born into trading families were expected to be active in the family’s business, and a woman working in partnership with a trading spouse often handled the administration of the business (O’Dowd, 2005). By the opening of the eighteenth century it was common for a family-owned shop to be passed on to a surviving wife or to be divided equally between a daughter and a son (O’Dowd, 2005). A woman with financial means could also maintain a small business as a sole proprietor or in co-operation with a daughter or sister (O’Dowd, 2005).

In Dublin, Cox (2000) reports that a survey of business directories reveals a significant proportion of businesswomen and traders. Between 1791 and 1810 women represented “an average of 7 percent of the merchants and traders listed in the Dublin trade
directories” involved in the small ‘luxury’ trades such as wine and tobacco, or trading as silversmiths and goldsmiths (Cox, 2000, pp. 34-35). However, by the late eighteenth century a gender boundary became apparent: the majority of women proprietors of small firms in the ‘luxury’ trades were forced out by large trade organisations dominated by men (Cox, 2000). O’Dowd (2005, p. 122) observes that it was in this same era that women were gradually clustered into trading “food or cloth. So it is that, according to Cox (2000), businesses classified as ‘female’ in trade directories are typically associated with food and clothing.

Further out in the periphery of retail trade, women operated a variety of small retail premises. Some were listed in the eighteenth century as “tallow chandlers, proprietors of book, printing and paper businesses” (O’Dowd, 2005, p. 122). In Dublin, some women were self-employed as “tea-dealers”, vintners and cheese mongers (Cox, 2000, p. 37). In the retail food sector most women were proprietors of shops designated as a “grocery” according to O’Dowd (2005, p. 122). However, the majority of women who opened food shops were so small that they did not advertise in trade directories (O’Dowd, 2005). Counted among these traders would be widows: such women in need of an income frequently turned to trade for survival, selling the personal effects of a spouse from “the downstairs room of a house” (O’Dowd, 2005, p. 122). The ubiquity of these small shops is evidenced by the observation of one travel writer who noted the prevalence of Ireland’s “petty shopkeepers” who were, according to O’Dowd (2005, p. 122), women “who could start an enterprise with a small “capital outlay”.

According to Barnard (2003, p. 26), “shopkeepers with sizeable assets” rather than the petty shopkeepers or street traders, typically left “some retrievable traces”, an indication of the power of property ownership as social and political power. The role of property ownership is more clearly delineated in the story of women and trade in Cork. This is also evidence of Foucault’s (2010b, p. 149) ‘policy of society’ at work: women in trade are distinguished not only according to their “enterprise”, but according to their production. Furthermore ‘police’, what Foucault (1988a) designates as active and productive humans, designates whose voice was heard in a history of trading in Ireland.
Thus, general histories of women and social histories had to be consulted to supplement what is known of ‘bricks and mortar’ traders, along with gleaning what may be learned from photographs, public art, poetry, and media accounts to provide a thorough representation of what is the existing knowledge of the lives of women street traders in Ireland. What follows is a history of women street traders in Ireland based on the disparate references available.

2.3 Women and ‘Footpath’ Trade In Ireland

According to O’Dowd (2005), for centuries through to the start of the nineteenth century many poor women across Ireland sold dairy products, and fruit and vegetables door-to-door. Women also produced linen and yarn at home for sale in local markets (O’Dowd, 2005). The presence of women trading on the streets of Dublin in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is noted by O’Dowd (2005), primarily by the response of the local authority: she reports that women street traders were visible in large numbers at opening of the 1700s despite having raised the ire of the Dublin Corporation in the previous century. Cox (2000, p. 34) indicates that women street traders were ubiquitous in Dublin across the eighteenth century, however, despite this notoriety “little record of the nature of their employment survives”. In eighteenth century Dublin a ‘market district’ was established that became significant for women street traders into the present day: the Moore Street district was home to shops, but also to stalls, and mobile traders (Kennerk, 2013).

The ubiquity of women trading in Dublin’s streets is evident in the fact that poetry and a famous song tell of their trade and something of their lives. Jonathan Swift penned six poems under the banner “Verses Made for the Women Who Cry Apples, etc.”, the collection is frequently referred to as the “Market Women’s Cries”\textsuperscript{13}. Swift was living in Dublin when they were first published in 1746 (Degategno and Stubblefield, 2006). Each poem is a woman’s market cry advertising the virtues of the single item she has for sale: fruits, asparagus, onion, oysters, herrings, and oranges.

\textsuperscript{13} The poems are attached as Appendix 1.
Swift gave two traders an opportunity to say why they trade on the street, and the story told is grim. The fruit seller advises that she is supporting seven children with no support from a husband she describes as “a sot, With his pipe and his pot”. The oyster seller trades “to get me some bread, Or, like my own herrings, I soon shall be dead”. The lyrics to the song *Molly Malone* tell the story of a young woman who sells fish from a pushcart. Her trade was intergenerational. At the close of the song she is reported to have died of fever, but her ghost continues to walk the streets pushing her cart.

The *Cries of Dublin*, drawings of street traders in the eighteenth century by Hugh Douglas Hamilton, offers an extensive visual record of those who made “their livings” on Dublin’s thoroughfares (Shergrees, 2003, p. 41) selling “the articles wanted for daily living” (Barnard, 2003, p. 26). The majority of the traders captured by Hamilton are women, typically mobile traders carrying goods in baskets, on their backs in a satchel, or on small carts. The goods for sale include fish, milk, eggs, tripe, fruit, herbs, vegetables, and prepared food including blood puddings, pickled fish, hot pies, and ginger bread. They also sold used clothing, shoes, and rags for paper making, and offered services such as mending and wig making (Barnard and Laffan, 2003).

The story that emerges is one that is grim and makes clear the desperation of women who turned to street trading. One sketch portrays two women with their children; they are sifting through a refuse heap searching for things to sell to “eke out a living” (Barnard and Laffan, 2003, p. 167). The analysis accompanying the sketches provides some insight into the lives of the traders based on the scene at hand and historical accounts of the era. One woman is repairing stockings for customers yet, the commentary offers, her toddler’s legs are bare (Barnard and Laffan, 2003, p. 88). The goods on offer indicate that these were also marketplaces catering to the poor: in addition to the items listed earlier, birch brooms and hand woven bed mats were also sold (Barnard and Laffan, 2003). Many of the women are wearing shoes particular to the upper classes, but excessive wear suggests these were passed on or purchased used (Barnard and Laffan, 2003).
Much of the used clothing would have been obtained from domestics to whom clothing was often passed by an employer (Barnard and Laffan, 2003). However, despite the market they had among poor consumers, these women had little recourse when their trade was visible to ‘bricks and mortar’ traders. According to the commentary, used clothing dealers were “sometimes physically attacked, by professional tailors and weavers” who believed their livelihoods were threatened (Barnard and Laffan, 2003, p. 150). Pressure from tailors led, in 1774, to an act of the Irish Parliament compelling dealers in used clothing “to register and buy a license” (Barnard and Laffan, 2003, p. 150).

Economic vulnerability and finding a means to survive in the Irish economy remained a concern particular to women into the nineteenth century: if she counted among the poor, as the majority of Irish women did (Cullen, 1990), she needed to earn whether she was sole-supporting or part of a family (Cullen, 1990; Luddy, 1995b). According to Rhodes (1992) women were likely to seek out any form of subsistence income in Ireland’s pre-Famine economy. One direct reference to street traders exists from this era: visiting Limerick in 1842, William Makepeace Thackeray estimated that “thousands” of women were “clustering upon bridges, squatting down in doorways, and vacant sheds for temporary markets” and “crying their sour goods” (quoted by Ó Gráda, 1994, p. 265).

Women’s contributions to the family economy included small efforts at producing and trading that were critical to help bolster the family economy of a labourer (Cullen, 1990; Luddy, 1995b). Witnesses addressing His Majesty’s Commission for Inquiring into the Condition of the Poorer Classes in Ireland (1835) recalled “golden days” when women produced and sold wool and cloth from home which meant the family could pay the rent (Cullen 1990, p. 98). Cullen (1990) believes that many of these opportunities for women in that era were eliminated through advances in large-scale production and international trade.

According to Luddy (1995b, p. 158) “social class determined the necessity” of a woman to seek out work. Across the sweep of the period 1880 to 1918, Luddy (1995b, p. 157) observes that “Women’s work was concentrated in three broad areas”: agriculture,
domestic service, and “textile work”. It could also be said that it was confined to those areas. The post-Famine Irish economy produced few opportunities for women to contribute to the household economy (Rhodes, 1992). According to Rhodes (1992, p. 126), the census records compiled in Ireland between 1881 and 1911 reveal that during this period the number of women employed in domestic service declined by approximately 13%, while there was also a decline of 4% in industry. This indicates that the formal economy was producing few employment opportunities for poor and working-class women. More significantly, a traditional source of employment, domestic service, was producing significantly fewer opportunities for women to find work and support themselves and their families.

During this era the types of activities and one’s earnings came to redefine what constituted ‘work’. According to Clear (2007) in official accounts work is described as ‘gainful’ employment rather than efforts geared to a subsistence living including petty trading. This is an early indication of the deepening of Foucault’s (2010b) ‘policy of society’ that designates individuals as economic beings and defines them according to their production, and an Irish society moving closer to Foucault’s (2010b) ‘enterprise society’. Furthermore, the constitution of ‘work’ according to capital accumulation by the state indicates that the Ireland under an ethos of what I term a ‘Prosperous State’—‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ being designated officially and institutionally in the economy—was in play early in the nineteenth century to designate women street traders as ‘outsiders’ in an ‘enterprise society’.

Rhodes (1992, p. 126) observes that the number of women classified as negligibly employed or unemployed increased in every census in Ireland between 1881 and 1911. This statistic, along with the emergence of economic ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’, would have social implications for women street traders: with a net increase of approximately 17% of women classed as unemployed over that 30-year period (Rhodes, 1992, p. 126), more destitute women would be turning to work that was now officially devalued. It

---

14 The important connection between domestic service and street trading is explored more closely in the analysis and triangulation of the data in Chapter 7.

15 The important connection between a woman’s likelihood of turning to street trading when unemployed is explored more closely in the analysis and triangulation of the data in Chapter 7.
isn’t surprising then, as Curtin (2001) reports, the number of women living in Irish workhouses outnumbered males across each census recorded from 1871 to 1901 and, according to Luddy (1995a), women vastly outnumbered men as the residents of charitable homes across the nineteenth century. Nor is it surprising that, as Curtin (2001, p. 31) observes, homeless women who ‘took to the bag’\textsuperscript{16} were “a common and accepted feature of everyday life” in nineteenth and early twentieth century Ireland. The need to earn to survive does not go away and, Curtin (2001) reports, various local records show that in early twentieth century Galway significant numbers of poor women turned to street trading. It is clear that without the direct or consistent support of a partner or family, a poor woman in Ireland required what Curtin (2001, p. 17) refers to as a means of “survival” stemming from her “initiative, experience, and education”. Selling eggs, milk, potatoes, fruit, tin-ware, flowers, turf, and fish gave them some financial independence although they were not accumulating capital (Curtin, 2001).

However, Curtin’s (2001) study demonstrates the deepened social consequences for women who were ‘outsiders’ in the Irish economy: she observes that women who listed their profession as dealer were as likely to serve a jail sentence as women who listed their occupations as prostitute. Similarly, Clear (2007, p. 137) offers that there was often a fine line between unemployment or irregular employment and prostitution, calling regular work “the strongest insurance against prostitution” for Irish women in this period. In her study of prostitution in Ireland in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Luddy (2007) indicates that it was rare that prostitution was regarded as a means to supplement meagre earnings despite the limited employment opportunities Irish women had, but that it has since been established as a means of earning for women who were economically vulnerable. Furthermore, she concludes, a woman’s earnings as a street trader or huxter were “precarious” and gave them that vulnerability (Luddy, 2007, p. 46).

The personal stories of many women in these unfortunate circumstances demonstrate clearly the importance of access to the marketplace found on footpaths. For Maggie M. dealing fruit on the streets of Galway provided an alternative to prostitution and petty

\textsuperscript{16} A reference to the homeless who become transient.
crime (Curtin, 2001). In 1892 the Governor of Galway jail observed that she was known “for over 20 years to be a prostitute of the lowest type” but had “apparently reformed” and stayed out of prison for three years because she survived by selling fruit from a basket (quoted by Curtin, 2001, p. 92). According to the Galway R.I.C. Inspector, Maggie began drinking and returned to prostitution (Curtin 2001). After serving a sentence for larceny in 1892, Maggie asked for ten shillings so that she could resume trading (Curtin 2001). Other charges for which prostitutes were frequently in court were also levelled at women street traders, including disorderly conduct, obstruction, and obscenity (Curtin 2001). Kate C., occupation “vegetable seller”, was jailed approximately 105 times for “various offences” prior to being imprisoned “for obstructing the public thoroughfare” in 1881 (Curtin, 2001, pp.69-71).

Curtin’s (2001) study indicates that poor women trading in Galway’s streets were vulnerable socially to abuse and harassment that constructed them as deviant. A newspaper account of the trial of a group of women demonstrates that media accounts could marginalise them further. The women were tried for obstruction in 1881 after they set up tables on the public thoroughfare to sell fruit and wares, and the correspondent depicted them as “the tin-ware ladies, from the notorious Shell-lane” (quoted by Curtin, 2001, p. 27), referring to Galway’s inner city. After being convicted and fined, one of the accused appealed to the magistrate alleging that she had been assaulted by the arresting officer; she was immediately convicted on a charge of contempt of court (Curtin, 2001).

Their visibility also rendered women street traders expendable when in direct or even indirect competition with established businesses; here the law was used to protect merchants (Curtin, 2001). A woman selling fowl on the street stood as both complainant and defendant in two cases that were connected (Curtin, 2001, p.82). In the first, she charged a butcher with assault after accusing him of arranging her eviction from a rooming house; she was later charged by the butcher with causing a disturbance when drunk (Curtin, 2001, p. 82). It is apparent that living in the margins of the economy not only made these poor women vulnerable to abuse, but also limited their voice and political agency.
Furthermore, this and the story of the women from Shell Lane provide an example of how Foucault’s (2010c) ‘rule of law’ was coming to be applied institutionally to the Irish economy: it was not illegal for women to sell in the streets, however the law was brought to bear directly on them—indirectly on the economy through indirect regulation of the market—when their presence obstructed the business of ‘bricks and mortar’ establishments. Thus, it isn’t surprising that sympathetic accounts of women street traders are rare. According to Clear (2007, p.132) there are some nostalgic accounts in the nineteenth century of “old women selling holy pictures” on streets around the country, but these women are remembered “with affection”.

Kennerk (2013) provides some insights into the difficult lives of poor women trying to eke out a living as stall or mobile traders in Dublin’s Moore Street, in the north inner city, into the twentieth century. In the 1950s and 1960s, Cullen (2001) assisted both his mother and his maternal grandmother with their stalls in Moore Street and, by his account, this is where he acquired the business acumen for success in the Irish macroeconomy prior to the late twentieth century phenomenon known as the Celtic Tiger. Insight into the persecution of street traders detailed in the other sources consulted does not dominate Cullen’s (2001) account; however, he does forefront the economic and social challenges that motivated women, widowed or married, to trade in order to help the family survive.

Cullen’s maternal grandmother was orphaned in childhood, and street trade offered release from domestic service in the early twentieth century; she sold year round into her sixties (Cullen, 2001). In the years following the Second World War, Cullen’s (2001) mother took up street trading. She continued to borrow her mother’s licence to sell a farmer’s surplus vegetables when her husband was unemployed to keep the “family alive” (Cullen, 2001, p. 53). In her early years of trading the family was given the opportunity to move to a newly built public housing estate located far from the city’s centre in a Dublin suburb (Cullen, 2001). His mother refused because her family could not afford for her to stop trading; this decision angered Cullen’s father, but he relented when reminded that sales from her stall payed the rent, the gas bill, and kept the family clothed (Cullen, 2001).
According to Kennerk (2013, p. 11) accounts of the history of Moore Street and Dublin’s open markets are “disparate”. Kennerk (2013, p. 23) offers that women have historically had a “strong role” in the life of this market district. In the Forward to this history, RTE radio presenter, Joe Duffy, describes Moore Street of the 1960s and 70s as a “world where men worked for women, hauling fruit and veg by horse and cart to the makeshift stalls which the females controlled” (Kennerk, 2013, p. 10). Kennerk (2013) provides insights into all aspects of trading life on the street, including the ‘bricks and mortar’ premises, and the street’s role in the history of Ireland; thus, it does not focus specifically on the women who were stall or mobile traders in the district, or The Street Trading Act, 1926 that would shape both their lives and those of the Shawlies in Cork.

That said, a picture emerges of economic and social ‘outsiders’ and ‘insiders’ in both a city and a country positioning themselves as ‘Prosperous’ and acting in the ‘Best Intentions’ of progress and prosperity, along with a spacial restructuring geared to a social transformation (Zukin, 1991). Furthermore, Kenner (2013) provides a clear account of the impact of urban gentrification in and around Moore Street that threatens one of Dublin’s ‘vernacular landmarks’ (Zukin, 1991).

Kennerk (2013, p. 11) asserts that the 1950s onwards marked “the complete dissolution of the market community”. He and his contributors describe in detail attempts by various power brokers—amalgamated business interests, developers, and politicians—to erase this marketplace from Dublin’s city scape. At a 1968 hearing into plans to redevelop the district, Mrs. Margaret Keogh gave evidence that she had been a trader there for thirty years, and that she was one in a line of traders that dated back eighty years (Kennerk, 2013). If forced to move, she said that she would not be able to afford to continue her business because of higher rents, a cost of doing business that would have to be passed on to her customers (Kennerk, 2013). In her words: “We cater for ordinary working-class people, for the women with young children, for the woman who has to keep five or six children on a working man’s wages” (quoted Kennerk, 2012, p. 139). In 1981 the ILAC shopping centre opened in the neighbourhood, a structure that
resulted in the destruction of homes, small ‘bricks and mortar’ establishments, and displaced and disrupted women street traders.\(^\text{17}\)

According to community worker, Seanie Lambe, the 1980s marked the start of “pressure” exerted by Dublin’s City Centre Business Association and directed at women selling “bananas, flowers, chocolate or jewellery” from prams (quoted Kennerk, 2013, p. 181). These efforts of the Association provide an insight into how business interests can easily conscript the resources of the Irish state and the courts to regulate the market: according to Lambe, the Association was able to instigate police action that included arrests and the seizure of their goods; some women served time (Kennerk, 2013). In 1984 there were 600 prosecutions under the existing street trading legislation (Kennerk 2013). According to Kennerk (2013, p 29), “For a woman trying to feed a family, the prospect of an entire day spent in a cell, coupled with the confiscation of her goods was a difficult cross to bear”. Even if only held for a few hours to process the charges, many women found that their goods had spoiled and could not be sold once when they retrieved them after they themselves were released (Kennerk, 2013).

The persecution of women street traders in 1980s Dublin was revisited early in 2012 when Raidió Teilifís Éireann aired a segment on the radio programme *Drivetime* about a photo exhibition entitled “Dublin's Working Prams” (Heussaff 2012 February 24). The reporter interviewed women who supported their families through the sale of fruit and vegetables from prams. One woman described in the report had supported herself for approximately seventy years by selling fish from a pram. Another said that trading made her feel “great going home at night with money” in her pocket (Heussaff 2012 February 24). Another recalled that the pram was how she “earned a living” and supported her children when no government supports were available for poor families (Heussaff 2012 February 24). Finally, one trader recalled that the mobility of the pram was important because if “you weren't able to move you were put in the back of the A poignant account of the impact of the building of the ILAC, along with other attempts to gentrify Moore Street and the surrounding neighbourhoods is found in the documentary *Alive Alive O - A Requiem for Dublin* by Sé Merry Doyle. The relevant excerpt is found on YouTube found at [www.youtube.com/watch?v=7zm5SuWfOgU#t=12](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7zm5SuWfOgU#t=12). Additional footage is available at Irish Film Online [www.ireland.onlinefilm.org/en_EN/film/57861](http://www.ireland.onlinefilm.org/en_EN/film/57861).
van” (Heussaff 2012 February 24), meaning that she would have been arrested for trading.

The story behind this statement is explored in a later episode of Drivetime; there Brian Lally’s interviews with the women traders were used in a report on the work of the late TD Tony Gregory (Heussaff 2012 March 16). The women detail the discrimination, harassment, and state violence they were subjected to in the early 1980s by Gardaí and the government. Gregory is referred to as the “voice” of the traders who needed his assistance to secure licenses and stalls, both of which had become difficult to obtain (Heussaff 2012 March 16). One woman alleges that the area where she traded was prime space for dealing heroin, yet police resources were devoted to “chasing women selling fruit” from prams (Heussaff 2012 March 16). When traders staged a peaceful demonstration against this harassment in O’Connell Street, Gardaí “baton charged” them; the women were “battered” and arrested (Heussaff 2012 March 16). For the women street traders sent to Mountjoy prison during this period, Gregory came to their assistance when elected officials would not (Heussaff 2012 March 16).

Both Tony Gregory and community activist Christy Burke served time in prison in 1986 in support of street traders, angered that these women were “being prevented from making a living when more pressing social problems seemed to go unchecked” (Kennerk, 2013, p. 29). Gregory said publicly at the time that the traders had “a constitutional right to earn a living” (quoted Kennerk, 2013, p. 30). The documentary Alive Alive O - A Requiem for Dublin by Sé Merry Doyle (2001) provides a vivid visual juxtaposition of the women who continued to trade amid crews using heavy construction equipment to demolish buildings immediately behind them; evidently the trading lives of women who were established stall traders were also made difficult. In an excerpt available on YouTube, Gregory asserts that legislation developed in Ireland in the 1980s also targeted the licensed traders who had a legally established right to trade on Moore Street as part of a larger plan by big business and the state to erase communities in Dublin’s city centre.

According to Kennerk, 2013, p. 30), the protest resulted over the crackdown: “the embarrassment it caused” led to the restoration of pitches in the district for mobile
traders. Ironically, two years later, a bronze statue portraying Molly Mallone pushing her cart was erected in Dublin’s Grafton Street in 1988 as part of the city’s millennium celebrations. However, Seanie Lambe describes a later attempt by the Irish government to regulate street trading that would, once again, threaten women traders. In 1994, Lamb accompanied a group of women street traders to the Office of the Minister of the Department of Enterprise and Employment when legislation was about to be passed that would levy a fine of £6,600 “for women trying to earn an honest living” (quoted Kennerk, 2013, p. 182). The fine, according to Lambe, was more than a woman street trader’s annual earnings, however “the government insisted on completing the legislation—no doubt at the behest of the City Centre Business Association” (quoted Kennerk, 2013, p. 183). In Lambe’s words: “They had as much sympathy for these women as they had the man on the moon. They were technocrats and didn’t want to know about our problems” (quoted Kennerk, 2013, p. 183).

Interviewed in 1997 during the opening years of the Celtic Tiger, and on the brink of the property boom that resulted, Tony Gregory asserted that the women in Moore Street were still under threat because plans were continuing to build upscale shops, apartments, and a luxury hotel in the vicinity (Alive, Alive O- A Requiem for Dublin). In the radio report in 2012 on the photo exhibition entitled “Dublin's Working Prams” that aired on RTE’s Drivetime, photographer Susan Weir observed that she became intent on documenting the existence of these women during the Celtic Tiger out of concern that the building boom and renewed gentrification of Dublin’s city centre had created a new threat and would lead, once and for all, to their disappearance despite being an institution on Dublin’s streets (Heussaff 2012 February 24). When Weir’s book, Dublin’s Working Prams was launched in January 2013, the Lord Mayor of Dublin and several politicians were there for the launch. Another historical irony: the photo exhibit was featured as part of Dublin’s Social Inclusion Week in April 2013 as “Selling goods from prams has a long tradition in Dublin”18.

CHAPTER 2

The next section explores the existing knowledge on trade in Cork’s city centre, and the core and periphery that has existed there for economic and social ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’.

2.4 The ‘Merchant City’ and the Shawlies

A review of a variety of sources including histories of Cork’s St. Patrick’s Street and the Corporation-owned Grand Parade and Princes Street Markets—the English Market—were consulted along with general and social histories of the city, the websites of the Cork City and County Archives, and the Cork City Council. These sources were supplemented with what may be learned from photographs, public art, and local lore. The history of ‘bricks and mortar’ traders and the Shawlies is intricately interwoven, along with the shifting cores and peripheries of the two key retail neighbourhoods in that city’s centre. Thus, the lives of the Shawlies and developments in trade in Cork are considered in unison.

A port city with a strong agricultural economy on its outskirts, eighteenth century Cork is depicted as “a wealthy trading post on the Western European/North American highway” (O’Callaghan, 2010, p. 55), and is known as the ‘Merchant City’ because of the ‘merchant princes’ who developed the city into a wealthy trading post. The city’s port served as a “rendezvous” for commodities exported to and imported from the Caribbean and the east coast of America (O’Callaghan, 2010, p. 55). From the middle of the seventeenth century through the late-nineteenth century butter was a “principal source of wealth” for Cork merchants, and it was exported throughout the world (O’Callaghan, 2010, p. 55).

In the centuries leading up to the 1800s, the sale of food items was under the control of the Corporation, and goods were available in regulated, open markets throughout the city. Cork was home to so many small, open-air markets that it was called a “city of markets” (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 7). Spaces were rented to vendors with rents controlled by the Cork Corporation; activity was also regulated through inspections that included the calibrating of scales (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011).

---

19 Cork’s reputation as the ‘Merchant City’ is developed by the Cork City and County Archives at www.corkarchives.ie/merchantcity/home/merchantprinces.
While open markets were available wherever there was a concentration of people living, a great many of the city’s original open markets and shambles\textsuperscript{20} operated in the lanes off North Main Street and Corn Market Street in what had been the city centre from the medieval era (Johnson et al, 2002; Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). Many of these, such as Fishamble Lane, were named for the commodities sold there (Johnson et al, 2002). Across the seventeenth century these markets were, according to Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil (2011, p. 29) a “significant source of income for the Corporation” despite the emergence of privately owned shops in that century.

Despite the concentration of wealth in the merchant class, and the income from its open public markets, trading at street level was permitted by the Corporation in Cork in the eighteenth century. According to Petit (1977, pp. 58-59) the Corporation Minutes of 16th November 1756 record that a trader could pitch a stall and sell from that place for thirty minutes without paying “petty customs” to the corporation. He records that the goods had to be carried or pulled for sale through the public thoroughfare, and must be for the use of the citizens of Cork; finally, the trader must not create an obstruction (Petit, 1977). These same minutes list a variety of conventional and humble goods sold for daily life: fuel, fowl, straw, skins, wool, brooms, twigs, oysters, and oats (Petit, 1977).

The Corporation introduced an overt form of Foucault’s (1988a) ‘police’ to ensure the health and welfare of its citizens in the late eighteenth century. Many of the publicly-owned markets were in poor condition and concerns were raised regarding the associated health risks (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). In 1786 the Corporation wanted to address both the problem of substandard hygiene and to formally regulate street trading through the creation of a Market Jury (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). The discourse surrounding this move positioned women street traders as sources of danger against whom Cork’s citizens needed protection. One of the stated goals was to prevent obstructions and the blocking of public thoroughfares by traders identified in the Corporation Minutes as “Fruit Women” and “Green women” selling in the meat

\textsuperscript{20} An ancient term referring to an open slaughterhouse and meat market.
market and on bridges because they were “very great Nuisances and Obstructions” (quoted Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 45).

In this same period, large-scale ‘bricks and mortar’ merchants amalgamated to create a Committee of Merchants which, according to O'Callaghan (2010, p. 34), was an indication of the “increasing commerciality” of Cork. The group also crossed the religious border of Catholic and Protestant (O’Callaghan, 2010)—an indicator of the rise of the Catholic middle-class, and that any potential political influence would not be focused within the historical religious-social cohort. According to Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil (2011, p. 50) the power shift in Cork could be characterised as “Catholic/liberal/nationalist”. The political power of merchants remained evident into the first half of the nineteenth century (Fahey, 1986; Murphy, 1986). The power of the collective voice of established merchants, however, had been established before the close of the eighteenth century as indicated in the influence they had with the Corporation to prompt important changes in the landscape of Cork city.

As the city's wealth grew, according to O’Callaghan (2010, p. 23) the “politically dominant merchant class” demanded the investment of public funds to reconfigure the social and economic landscape of the city and, as a result, marshland was reclaimed and the docklands were developed. The Corporation complied in what marks a clear ‘policy of society’ (Foucault, 2010b), as it interfered in society to make the market possible. In the 1780s, the Corporation allocated funds to establish a new city centre east of the medieval city centre. This represents the start of a spacial restructuring by the local authority to socially transform the ‘vernacular landmark’ that was the city’s historic retail core (O’Callaghan, 2010, p. 35).

According to Fahey (1986, p. 45) that historic retail centre now came to be “dominated by craft and non-specialized retail activities” and the clientele that frequented the area was drawn chiefly from the city’s poor. As was noted earlier, this was home to many of the city’s original open markets and shambles operating in the lane ways off North Main Street and Corn Market Street (Johnson et al, 2002; Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). These included an “open-air breeches market” for the sale of second-hand clothes (Johnson, 2002, p. 36), herbs and root vegetables in Cockpit Lane, and potatoes on Kyle
Street; Kyle Street was also home to the milk market (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011) and, later a meal market (Johnson, 2002). These continued to exist as the marketplace for the poor, casualties of the Corporation’s ‘Best Intentions’ for the dominant class that focused public resources on a new city centre. In 1783 the spacial restructuring commenced with the filling in of the river channel that ran through the city to create St. Patrick’s Street (O’Callaghan, 2010, p. 28), the main street in the new commercial centre.

Additional funds were devoted to widening adjoining streets and passages, and to purchasing buildings that obstructed the new street (O’Callaghan, 2010, p. 35). A bridge was also constructed to allow people and goods to cross the Lee River at the start of St. Patrick’s Street, facilitating travel to and through this retail centre without detours (O’Callaghan, 2010). Construction on the street ended in 1789. This public project illustrates a vision that Cork had for the city centre it wanted and, what Foucault (2010d; 1988a) would term ‘its felicity’, was now a priority. According to O’Callaghan (2010, p. 43), many middle-class merchants then relocated to St. Patrick’s Street to trade in luxurious premises and reside “in high-status residences”. Fahey (1986, p. 45) observes that this neighbourhood “took on the role of both residence and workplace for a substantial portion of the merchant and professional groups”.

The popularity and growth of St. Patrick’s Street prompted concerns about where food could be purchased by its middle and upper middle-class residents and patrons (O’Callaghan 2010) who did not, evidently, want to purchase food in the established markets. The Corporation responded with plans for a “purpose-built, conjoined covered food market at the core of the new city centre” (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 43). This decision marked the founding of the Grand Parade covered market. The inspiration to move from “open or semi-covered shambles to...modern covered markets” came from English cities; the hope was that the new “flagship” public markets would signal a “prosperous and expanding city” (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 43).

The local authority in Cork was clearly, from the late eighteenth century, intent on creating a ‘Prosperous State’. The presence of economic and social ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ was also articulated: the location, according to observers, made it clear that
the authorities intended for this market to cater to a privileged population (O’Callaghan, 2010; Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). Likewise, according to Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil (2011, p. 51), the location was both “significant and symbolic”. This new, vibrant commercial centre was the space where the “affluent merchant and professional elite lived, worked and shopped”; it offered variety in “specialisation and luxury” that set it apart from the old medieval city area (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 51). For example, the majority of the pawn shops were located in the latter, but the majority of the city’s perfumers, jewellers, wine merchants, and “upmarket outfitters” were located on St. Patrick’s Street or the streets that bordered it (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 51). The modern, covered market at the Grand Parade opened in August 1788.

In the years that followed the opening of the Grand Parade Market, many of the smaller open public markets dotted around the city were removed to that location (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). Only steps away the historic, established markets of the medieval city continued to cater to the poor and working-classes (O’Callaghan, 2010) in open publicly-owned markets and shambles. Many, in the lane ways off North Main Street and Corn Market Street, remained in poor condition (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). Many small-scale traders also sold cloth and provided services such as boot and shoe-making (Johnson et al, 2002). In the 1820s the Fishamble Lane was renowned for cooked food sold by women (Johnson et al, 2002). Like St. Patrick’s Street, this neighbourhood also had a residential population. After the earlier eastward move of wealthier tenants, residential housing in the district was dominated by tenements, also in poor condition (Johnson et al, 2002). The neighbourhood was also home to a great number of unlicensed pubs and was renowned for disorderly behaviour (Johnson et al, 2002).

One area where Irish women figured prominently in independent small-scale production in the food sector was poultry-keeping\(^\text{21}\), and the eggs produced often found their way into the markets of Cork. Poor women were also a part of the independent, small-scale production of eggs. According to Bourke (2006, p. 43) poultry keeping and the sale of eggs was “a major occupation of women in rural Ireland, and often a significant source of family income” for poor and working-class families.

---

\(^{21}\) According to Bourke (2006, p. 43) poultry keeping and the sale of eggs was “a major occupation of women in rural Ireland, and often a significant source of family income” for poor and working-class families.
distribution chain that moved food to the urban marketplace from the countryside. Luddy (1995b, p. 169) carries an account from the Report from His Majesty’s Commissioners for Inquiring into the Condition of the Poorer Classes in Ireland 1836 that describes the journeys of the young women who carried eggs to Cork from West County Cork. Described as “young women of blameless morals and great industry”, they traveled “bare-footed” with approximately 300 eggs in baskets on their backs (quoted p. 169).

The journey of approximately 50 miles would take about a week to complete. The eggs would be sold to traders at the English Market, they would return with “as heavy a load back”, and completed “ten or a dozen such journeys every year”; endeavouring “to make out a livelihood”, the Commissioners said their profits were “inconsiderable, perhaps £3 in the year” (quoted Luddy, 1995b, p. 169). What they carried upon returning to the countryside was not stipulated, but it is possible they returned with commodities unavailable outside the city. According to O’Dowd (2005) women shopkeepers in cities often wholesaled nonperishable commodities to women shopkeepers in rural towns. These young women may have been means of transportation for these goods.

The year 1840 saw a shift in governance at the Corporation to the city’s “Catholic ‘Irish’ majority” (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 7). This era marked a transformation in the earlier Market Jury: it became to the Tolls and Markets Committee (“TMC”) (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011), and with it a commitment by the Corporation to building covered markets in the North Main Street. In 1842 the Corporation designated funds to build two new, covered markets on North Main Street (backing on to Corn Market Street), and to the renovation of the exiting open markets in that same neighbourhood; funds allocated for the project were £5,000 (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, pp. 65-66), approximately £220, 500 in 2005 currency values. Following completion of the works the people had, in the Committee’s words, “commodious and well-sheltered Potato Markets, as well as convenient Fish, Milk,

---

22 The currency converter at the National Archives (UK) was, unless otherwise noted, used for all conversions. Unfortunately the service only converts historical values to the approximate value in 2005 and not 2014 values. The converter is found at http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency/ default0.asp#mid .
Flesh and, Vegetable Markets…improvements which they could hardly have anticipated” (qtd. Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 66).

St. Peter’s market on North Main Street (backing on to Cork Market Street) was opened in 1843. Approximately a half acre in size, it was “modelled on St. John’s Market in Liverpool” and became the covered market for the sale of food including meat, fish, and vegetables (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 67). The Bazaar market, the covered market for the sale of wares, iron work, and clothing, was completed in the 1850s. According to Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil (2011, p. 67) these developments were efforts by the local authority to “regulate dealing and minimise street selling”, as the Corporation explicitly wanted to bring in dealers who were trading on Corn Market Street.

The rents for stalls and the prices were lower than those at the Grand Parade Market and, according to Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil (2011, p. 68), so was the quality of the food. Locally the high-end Grand Parade market became known as ‘the English Market’ (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011), while St. Peter’s and the Bazaar became known colloquially as ‘Paddy’s Market’23, the ‘poor man’s market’ or the ‘Irish Market’ (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011) although all were owned by the Corporation. These new covered markets and the renovations on the existing shambles allowed the Corporation, according to Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil (2011, p. 67), to “distinguish itself from its predecessors by providing facilities for the majority working-class population” who, they claimed, “had been ill served in the past”.

As was noted, a great deal of public funds were devoted to the building of St. Patrick’s Street and the surrounding neighbourhood served the middle and upper classes; however, 75% of Cork’s population was classified as pauperised in the years leading up to the Famine that commenced in 1845 (O’Mahony, 2005). According to Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil (2011) a legacy of the Corporation’s previous regime was the neglect of the city’s markets with the exception of the English Market. It appears, however, that the need to create a marketplace where food was affordable to the poor and working-

---

23 Paddy’s Market is used in references to these markets on Corn Market Street in both Bulfin (1981) and at the Cork Council’s historical site [www.corkpastandpresent.ie](http://www.corkpastandpresent.ie).
classes was not missed. An article in the *Cork Examiner* of 8 May 1844, reported that the new Lord Mayor said at the opening of the Harpur’s Lane market that the TMC was “anxious to do what they could to cheapen provisions for the people”; accordingly, no one buying potatoes in that Corporation-owned market would be permitted to sell them “at a higher price to the poor” (quoted Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, pp. 67-68).

During the years of the Famine, Cork experienced a downturn in trade (O’Callaghan, 2010; Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011), and the demarcation line of class, as well as ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’, became even more evident in the privileged commercial core. Many of the hungry from the surrounding countryside flooded into the city seeking relief: in 1847 alone approximately “30,000 beggars” were on the streets of Cork and corpses “were found on the streets every morning” (O’Callaghan, 2010, p. 90). The power of the merchants in dealing with the poor and the starving is indicated in the official response to these desperate migrants. The Royal Irish Constabulary and security men patrolling the English Market worked to prevent what Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil (2011, p. 80) refer to as a “disruption from the hungry”. One Cork magistrate noted in court that he was doing his “best to get rid of this abomination” of beggars on the streets, and offered his sympathy to the merchants conducting business under these conditions (quoted by Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 80).

The figures for workhouse admissions during the Famine demonstrate that a gender line existed among the urban poor as women consistently outnumbered men in the number of admissions (O’Mahony, 2005). In 1846 alone, women made up 74% of the Cork union workhouse population (O’Mahony, 2005, p. 41). That women still made up a clear majority of inhabitants in the workhouse in the years after the Famine demonstrate what O’Mahony refers to as the sociological impact of the Famine and poverty on families and women. Furthermore, in addition to abandoned and orphaned children, abandoned women with their children continued to rely on the workhouse (O’Mahony, 2005). These numbers are particularly important considering poverty typically dictated if a woman would enter street trading for her economic survival and that of her family.

The percentage of able-bodied female inmates in the years immediately following the Famine years remained consistent with the levels during the Famine. According to
O’Mahony (2005, p. 64), able-bodied women needed the workhouse as “a surrogate spouse, supporting and ameliorating their destitution while feeding and educating their children”. This is significant considering what was learned about the women street traders in Galway in the nineteenth century, and the women trading from prams in Dublin in the late twentieth century: Irish women in need of a subsistence income would turn to street trading, and this appears to have been the case in Cork. According to Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil (2011, p. 83), in locations across the city, women dominated temporary “standings” in the mid-nineteenth century selling as “tripe, butter, pudding, lemon or roasting pig women”, indicators of what they sold.

A gender line of ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ also emerges in the privileged core of Cork’s retail and commercial economy, in addition to the class line that was noted earlier. Within the Grand Parade Market itself, the power of the collective voice of the male-dominated butcher’s trade union dictated much of the market’s life from its inception through the mid-twentieth century (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). Women began trading in the market as butchers across the nineteenth century, however they were, typically, widows assuming the business after the death of a spouse; those who were not widows were relatives, women with a family connection to a man who had held the butcher's stall (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). Other women renting stalls did not have the bargaining power of the butchers: they traded fish, vegetables, poultry, butter, eggs, and offal (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 78), all commodities that carried little overhead, required less equipment, and were cheaper to purchase and sell.

Yet, it is noted that there were usually no more than a half dozen stalls in this large market being run by women at any one time (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 78). This was part of a larger trend in the commercial core. O’Callaghan (2010, p. 75) notes that on St. Patrick's Street, middle and upper middle-class women were evident as customers, but census returns that list ownership of retail premises and residences also reveal that “the place of women on the street was inferior to men”. According to the trade directories consulted, O’Callaghan (2010, p.105) draws the conclusion that women have, into the late twentieth century, fallen “far short of men in positions of significance on the street”. In trade terms, women “were the drapers’ assistants, not the
Thus, it is apparent why, according to Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil (2011), a significant population of Cork women earned their living through street sales across the nineteenth century. According to Murphy (1986, pp.233-234) census returns reveal that women frequently outnumbered men in identifying themselves as ‘dealers’\textsuperscript{24} in Cork. These figures are compiled in Table 2.1.

### 2.1 Dealers in Cork City in Nineteenth Century By Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Year</th>
<th>Percentage of Women Dealers (as a % of female population)</th>
<th>Percentage of Men Dealers (as a % of male population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>13.68%</td>
<td>10.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>16.23%</td>
<td>10.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>17.75%</td>
<td>9.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>14.85%</td>
<td>10.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>11.85%</td>
<td>11.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Maura Murphy, *Cork Commercial Society 1850-1899: Politics and Problems*)

According to the numbers compiled by Murphy (1986), in all years women appear to have dominated dealing. According to these figures the number of women employed as dealers increased significantly of and immediately following the Famine to 16.23%, while the number of men employed as dealers increased negligibly (.22%) across the same period. Over the next decade the number of women continued to increase to 17.75% while the percentage of men dealing decreased by 1.2%. By 1881, the number of men had increased slightly from the number recorded in 1861, while the number of women decreased to 11.85% by 1881. In all years women outnumbered men in the street-based economy.

Many of these women may have been trading in the Princes Street Market. While located at the north entrance to the high-end Grade Parade or ‘English Market’, appearances put it a world away in this era. The Corporation created an open market there in the early 1790s for the sale of poultry and vegetables, and women dominated

\textsuperscript{24} The term ‘dealer’ is frequently used to describe street traders or petty dealers who may have operated from stalls or small shops. Typically a dealer trades in one commodity.
what was described as its “chaos of standings, sittings and stalls” (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 54). This was in stark contrast to the conditions in the adjoining covered market where the rents were much higher (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011).

The Princes Street market was open to the elements from its opening until the 1860s. Pressure for improvements to the vegetable and poultry market began late in 1861, but nothing materialised for another year (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011).

Women also dominated trade on the street outside the entrance to the Princes Street market (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). Like their foremothers of the previous century, they were regarded as a nuisance and a hazard, representative of the disorder that comes of the pre-modern (Cross, 2000) or counter-modern (Berman, 1988). An article in the Cork Constitution in 1858 described the street at that entrance as having been “converted into a market for the sale of fruit” and other produce; the traders were accused of blocking the “footpaths at both sides from Patrick street to the market gate” making the thoroughfare “wholly impassable” (quoted Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p.137). Deviance as well as disorder was also implied by the correspondent in the added observation that “the fruit sellers, all women” aided pickpockets who were attracted by the crowds (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p.137). This allegation serves to generate a construction of working-class women not unlike that which Skeggs (2005; 2013) describes in the present day as ‘pathological’.

The previously shelved plans to renovate the Princes Street Market were revived in 1862 after an article appeared in the Cork Constitution that described the stalls as being placed in a “confined and confused way” on a floor full of “mud and slush on wet days” (qtd. Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 89). Then, a letter of complaint published in the Cork Examiner prompted a visit by the Lord Mayor (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 88). The author of the letter described a setting without gaslight which made it difficult to conduct business at night, yet the main Grand Parade market remained lit and open until late at night (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 88). The author described the Princes Street market as “an injustice to the parties doing business there”, recognising those women as “contributors to the public revenues of the city” (quoted Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 88).
Renovating the market meant relocating these women and, in the short term, conditions did not improve. Those selling vegetables were moved to the lanes adjoining the English Market, yet the corporation insisted on charging them the same rent they had paid on standings and stalls in the market (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). They protested to the Corporation’s Improvement Department complaining that they were now forced to do business in the cold and an even more uncomfortable setting that they likened to “purgatory”; they requested and obtained a rent exemption until the market was completed (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, pp. 89-90). The women selling poultry were left to their own devices on the city’s streets, and the Corporation agreed to overlook their sales on the streets adjoining the main markets until the renovations were complete (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). The new market opened in December 1862, and the official, ceremonial opening was recorded in the Cork Examiner.

The correspondent described the “fish, fowl and vegetable women” sympathetically as the “legitimate lords of the soil”, those “most interested” in an improved market. Their joy at what must have appeared to be luxurious surroundings—in contrast to those suffered since the market’s inception—was duly noted. The correspondent reported the “most favourite mode of giving vent to their emotions was by performing a wild dance around some prominent corporate officials” (quoted Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 91). This conduct appears to have been outside the ‘norm’ or what was socially acceptable: it was reported to have “contributed very much to the awkwardness and timidity of the gentlemen” (quoted Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 91). Disorder and disharmony, according to officialdom, continued in this market: conflicts were blamed on competition, congestion, and alcohol; between 1869 and 1900, the “55 instances of disorderly conduct” recorded by the TMC involved 37 women (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 137). Again, a construction of working-class women in line with that which Skeggs (2005; 2013) describes as ‘pathological’ was underway.

2.5 Twentieth Century Trade in Cork: The Shawlies and the ‘Smaller Men’

Observers (Fahey, 1986; Murphy, 1986) indicate that a shift in the power structure of both the Corporation and the city’s ‘merchant princes’ occurred in Cork as the twentieth century approached. Murphy (1986, p. 242) observes that the dominance of that group in the running of the city, so marked in the eighteenth century, shifted in the period
between 1850 and 1899 as the “mercantile politics” of the historic large-scale general 
merchants and butter merchants saw their hold on power in the running of the city 
decoming (Murphy 1986). A new and growing male commercial sector, labelled 
‘smaller men’ by Murphy (1986, p.234)—small grocers, victuallers, and vintners—were 
becoming as powerful as their wealthier forefathers.

The attentions of these ‘smaller men’ then turned to the political life of Cork (Murphy, 
1986). This shift in power came about even though this group was of “relatively little 
consequence” in terms of accumulated wealth (Murphy, 1986, p.238). Murphy (1986, 
p. 238) reports that their power was not always direct but was, instead, “more unified 
and purposeful” than that of their “social superiors”: the ‘smaller men’ worked 
collectively to form associations, ‘watch-dogs’ on “the proceedings of the merchant-
dominated corporation”. Thus, the political power and influence of men at all levels of 
trade and the broader political life in Cork entering the twentieth century was great.

On the cusp of the twentieth century street trading remained a significant occupation for 
women and girls. By 1891, 14.14% of women in Cork were dealing, an increase of 
2.29% from the 11.85% recorded in the 1881 census. In 1892 “girls” described as 
“casual onion sellers” persisted in trading on the periphery of the Grand Parade and 
Princes Street markets and became the focus of the market’s security men; the inspector 
reported that they refused “to keep out” when told (qtd. Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 
2011, p. 148). The corporation’s TMC ordered them to be prosecuted after warnings did 
not serve as a deterrent (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil 2011), generating on several 
levels, a deepening of the construction of poor women as ‘pathological’ (Skeggs, 2005; 
2013). Certainly that conceptualisation was easily and freely ascribed to the Shawlies.

In the first census of the twentieth century, 1901, the percentage of women dealing out 
of the total female population reached its highest proportion from the figures recorded 
on all census returns from 1841: 19.01% of the city’s female population were now 
identified as dealers while 11.47% of the male population were so employed (Murphy, 

---

25 The photographs available in Lenihan (2012) and those from the City Council found on 
www.corkpastandpresent.ie are included in this dissertation. See List of Illustrations.
on the website of Cork City Council, indicate that a significant number of these women were probably dealing in the Corn Market Street at the rear of the Corporation-owned markets. A photograph located on a wall in the English Market in 2013\textsuperscript{26} appears—judging by the clothing of passersby—to have been taken near the turn of the twentieth century. It establishes that women were selling from stalls and baskets, along with an itinerant onion seller, on Paul Street, outside what is now a Tesco grocery store.

At the turn of the twentieth century the annual income of the Grand Parade market nearly doubled that of the St. Peter's and the Bazaar combined; street traders were frequently blamed for the declining fortunes of the two markets (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). In yet another construction of these women as ‘deviant’ and ‘pathological’ (Skeggs, 2005; 2013), the significant number of vacant stalls in both “was directly related to traders abandoning them” to sell on the street (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 154) where they were not charged rents. There is no indication if this abandonment took place out of a desire to avoid rents, or was due to a decline in the greater economy which meant that the traders could not afford the stalls.

Despite the Corporation’s concern with the bottom line, a hallmark of later neoliberal governance, and the reputation of the more ‘upscale’ St. Patrick’s Street, Corn Market Street developed a reputation as one of a vibrant trading space that flourished in a dense residential area, and it was regarded with some affection. In 1870 a tribute appeared in the \textit{Cork Examiner} entitled “Chant of the Quay called Coal” (reprinted in Beecher, 2005). The enthusiasm of the author for the neighbourhood is evident: he notes that “for all wonders of convivial grandeurs, There is no galaxy like this bright shore” (reprinted in Beecher 2005). The Coal Quay is portrayed as a ‘social leveller’ where all are welcome and street life offers an ethnic mix (reprinted in Beecher, 2005). It also celebrates a rowdy and sometimes ribald life for both men and women (reprinted in Beecher, 2005), contrary to middle-class notions of respectability and conduct.

In 1907 William Bulfin (1981) visited Corn Market Street, referring to it as both the ‘Coal Quay’ and ‘Paddy’s Market’. His account confirms an affection for the

\textsuperscript{26} A photograph of this photograph is in Chapter 5.
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marketplace by citizens of Cork that appears to have crossed class boundaries: Bulfin first learned of the street from “an exiled Corkonian” years earlier during a conversation “over a boulevard coffee table under the shade of tropical vegetation in a city far away” (Bulfin, 1981, p. 260). Describing the “wonders” of the city, the “commercial importance” of “the permanent fair held near the Coal Quay” was raised (Bulfin, 1981, p. 260). Bulfin’s companion described it as “unique” and “the only place that I know of in the world where your handkerchief can be stolen from you as you pass in one gate, and sold back to you as you pass out the other” (quoted Bulfin, 1981, p. 260). When Bulfin (1981, p. 260) admonished his companion for the negative depiction, the reply provided another indication of a pervasive affection for the Coal Quay: his companion said, was permitted to joke about the city, but those from outside are not allowed that privilege. Thus, Bulfin was cautioned, “if ever you write anything about Paddy’s Market bear my words in mind” (quoted Bulfin, 1981, p. 260).

Bulfin (1981, p. 260) confirms that the traders in this street market were women, and one with whom he spoke was described as “cross-shawled”; many were seen to be knitting while they worked, and chanted “the praises of their socks and cradles and onions and fruit”. He provides an extensive list of what was sold there, including necessities of life that were affordable for poor consumers: “old books, old furniture, new and old clothes, fruit, vegetables, baskets” in addition to “cradles, crutch pots and pans and tinware, stockings, sweets, cakes…lace, rosaries, pictures” and “a hundred and one things that you would never think of” (Bulfin, 1981, p. 260). He adds that “anything one of those Cork women will fail to sell may be sent to the scrap-heap as a hopeless case” (Bulfin, 1981, p. 260). Of the women themselves who traded there, Bulfin (1981, p. 261) wrote, “there was no unkindliness in any of them”, but “Still I would be very slow to provoke them”.

In addition to the covered markets and the Shawlies, the street was also home to “jobbers”, “shopkeepers and eating-house proprietors” (Beecher, 2007, p.106). Lenihan (2012) reports that at the turn of the twentieth century the street housed approximately eleven public houses and nine refreshment rooms; his collected photographs indicate dense, regular street trade from the late nineteenth century through the 1930s (Lenihan, 2012). The majority of traders on the street, based on these photographs, are women
selling various foods, wares, and used clothing from piles heaped on blankets on the footpath (Lenihan, 2012). According to Bulfin (1981, p. 259) the shops throughout “the Irish market” catered “more for the market as a whole”, an indication that it is likely that what the Shawlies were selling in this “open-air institution” posed no threat to the ‘bricks and mortar’ establishments.

A significant gap in specifics concerning the Shawlies is evident after independence. It must be noted, however, that a key event in the political life of Cork, would have an indirect impact on women street traders that was profound: late in 1924 the Cork Corporation was dissolved by the government of the Irish Free State\(^{27}\), and Phillip Monahan was appointed City Commissioner\(^{28}\). This is notable because Monahan filled the role of what Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil (2011, p. 165) term “a no-nonsense administrator”, epitomising the new government's “policy of fiscal rectitude and administrative ruthlessness”, and an indication of strategies of early neoliberal governance. The Free State government believed that Cork’s markets were a drain on public funds, and insisted on austerity measures which Monahan echoed when he took over the running of the markets (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011).

St. Peter’s, the covered food market on Corn Market Street, was first leased to private interests in 1916\(^{29}\), and never resumed its life as a market, a move which displaced the traders with stalls in the market (Johnson et al, 2002; Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). In 1928, while Monahan was still Commissioner, a registry of street traders was compiled in Cork city for the first time. Approximately 200 names were recorded and all were women; the majority were working in and around the North Main Street and Corn Market Street\(^{30}\). The ‘bottom line’ approach that Monahan took to administering

\(^{27}\) The Dublin Corporation was also dissolved in 1924; that event and its significance for women street traders will be explored in detail in Chapter 5.

\(^{28}\) The impact of the pre-dissolution inquiry and Monahan’s role in implementing The Street Trading Act, 1926 is explored in detail in Chapter 6. See also Key Public Personages.

\(^{29}\) The market was first leased to the British Military for use as a munitions factory. How it fell into private hands is explored further in Chapter 5.

\(^{30}\) The registry available at www.corkarchives.ie/merchantcity/home/ forms a part of the data collected on the Shawlies and is explored in detail in Chapter 7.
CHAPTER 2

the markets continued after the Corporation was restored in 1929 and he was appointed City Manager for life (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011).

This is critical for the Shawlies because Monahan was noted to have expressed a low regard for Corn Market Street publicly. In the 1940s, when the English Market had fallen into decline, he was asked about the possibility of lowering the rents on the stalls; Monahan replied that this would “reduce” the English Market “to the level of that of Corn Market Street” (quoted Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p. 169). Monahan also noted that new regulations from the Minister of Health “probably spelt the end of the street trading of food” (quoted Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011, p.170). Persistently cited as fiscal liabilities, the Bazaar and St. Peter’s markets closed completely in the 1950s; the remaining stall holders from St. Peter’s were given the opportunity to move to the English Market (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). Both markets were targeted for demolition and redevelopment under proposed regeneration schemes that included the conversion of St. Peter’s into a fire station or a basketball stadium (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011).

These proposals fell through and both markets were leased; a portion of the Bazaar accommodated second-hand clothing dealers into the 1970s (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). Thus, the neglect of the neighbourhood noted a century earlier by Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil (2011), had resumed after independence. In the early 1970s, according to Beecher (2007, p. 107), a wholesale supermarket occupied much of the former Bazaar market, and shared it with some traders selling used clothing and “junk”. However, Beecher (2007) notes, stall leases were not being reissued as they expired, and the supermarket took over the entire building; these conditions existed despite his assertion that Corn Market Street was, historically, an important marketplace for many of Cork’s residents, including “market gardeners” who could offer their produce for sale (Beecher, 2007, pp. 106-107). He notes the intergenerational importance of trade, as most traders had passed their custom from one generation to the next (Beecher, 2007). Also worthy of note, he observed a marked “loyalty” among stall holders “against outside interests” that he characterises as “so called progress” and “the dreadful rush to uniformity and ‘respectability’” (Beecher, 2007, p. 107).
2.6 Conclusions

This review of the literature available on the history of women in trade in Ireland and Cork was undertaken to determine if the research questions at hand could be answered by the existing knowledge, and to build a synoptic outline of the challenges presented to the livelihoods of the Shawlies by the intersection of class and gender. It is evident that women street traders have had a strong yet largely unrecorded history in Ireland and Cork; this pathway to a living was likely prompted by poverty, and the lack of alternatives available to poor women, to support themselves and their families. In Cork, the power of the merchants over the municipal government was evident from the eighteenth century. It continued into the twentieth century but there was a shift in the power base held by the merchants themselves towards ‘smaller men’. Both the old and the new power bases were dominated by men. Across time, women had little impact at the privileged core of the retail economy—St. Patrick’s Street and the corporation-owned English Market.

Typically, the Shawlies dominated trade in substandard conditions in the corporation-owned Princes Street market, or on the streets. Subjected to criticism or prosecution they were often characterised as deviant or a hazard. They also dominated trade in the neglected medieval city centre in and around the North Main Street that had fallen into decline and neglect following the establishment of St. Patrick’s Street as the upscale retail core, and designation as the city’s new centre. That said, they and their marketplace figured prominently in local lore and both were regarded with affection by some citizens, enough so that both received a detailed mention in Bulfin’s travelogue of Ireland, and one Shawlie, ‘The Onion Seller’, was captured in bronze. However, the neglect of their neighbourhood and markets by the Corporation continued through the opening decades of independence. A regeneration scheme at mid-century was known to have been launched, but was later abandoned.

It is evident that any impact that The Street Trading Act, 1926 would have had on the Shawlies has not been the subject of research, and the Act is not mentioned in any of the resources available. This represents a significant gap in the existing knowledge on that legislation and its aftermath. However, a clear picture of the potential vulnerability of the Shawlis to regulation does emerge. There is also clear evidence that there are
connections to the conceptual framework, and that it will provide a scaffolding to the strategies of governance used to control the Shawlies, to create a privileged retail core in Cork, and the further social and economic marginalisation of women street traders throughout Ireland.
Chapter 3 - Research Focus and Methodology: A Genealogy of the Shawlies in Cork

...the recent conjuncture of neoliberal economic policies with unprecedented urban growth...makes nuanced analyses of street vendors even more important to policy makers and social scientists investigating workers’ rights with transformations in the politics and economy of urban public space.

— Lynn Milgram (2011, p. 263)

3.1 Introduction
This historical case study of the Shawlies and their world is important for what the past can tell us about Cork’s social history, and how strategies of governance including regulation, policy, and urban planning deepened the marginalisation of women who were already socially and economically marginalised. It is also important for the light it sheds on the present plight of contemporary women street traders in the cities of poor countries.

This chapter explains the methods used to collect data, the theory behind those methods, the inspiration for and the evolution of the questions that drove the study, issues of validity, and the limitations of the study.

3.2 Evolution of the Question and the Study
Initially in October 2010, I embarked on a study of the policies surrounding Ireland’s ‘smart economy’ when that policy document was offered by political and business interests as a panacea for the country’s financial ills following the collapse of the property bubble, and the bailout deal that was struck with the International Monetary Fund and the European Central Bank. I was particularly concerned with the ‘promise’ of jobs and the ‘promise’ of prosperity that the Irish people were persistently asked to believe in; on a regular basis, we were reminded that ‘the market’ demanded that we be competitive and this was the way to compete in the world’s economy. What troubled me specifically about these narratives is that results were imminent not immediate, and imminent was not a certainty.

This led me to question how poor and working-class women in Ireland see themselves in relation to these constructed meta-narratives that privilege the macroeconomy. I then
set out to develop the concept of a ‘market identity’ and to try and develop a study that would answer the foregoing question. In the meantime, I had to figure out what, exactly, was this entity called ‘the market’. Admittedly, by the summer of 2011, I was, like so many people, weary of the daily news reports that told us whether ‘the market’ was happy, disappointed, or unresponsive to the actions of mortals.

I decided to try and figure out what was meant by ‘the market’ by examining a market that I could actually enter and observe—Cork’s English Market. I took several trips to that location where I recorded what I saw and heard. As I tried to pull these findings together into a comprehensive definition, I discovered some significant findings for both earners and consumers. The first was that a large number of women were operating small businesses there and had for generations. As a consumer, I realised that this market offers an interesting forum for competition that affects prices, a condition that does not happen within a larger grocery store. For those selling, I reasoned, this also offered options to raise and lower prices according to what the competition was doing, a freedom the manager of a large grocery store would not necessarily have.

My next step was to investigate the history of women in the English Market. As I read Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil’s (2011) history of the English Market, focusing on the role of women, I became intrigued by the women who traded in the periphery, on the streets. I then walked to Corn Market Street on a Saturday morning and recorded my observations during the weekly farmers’ market. What I observed was a marketplace regulated via signs and markings on the street that said who could trade where, when, and for how long. Street trading was also called “casual trading”. Where the people were concerned, I observed an environment that offered entertainment, social chitchat, and small producers brought their produce, products, and services to market.

Over the next few months I focused my reading on the ‘market’ as a price mechanism in sociological and political economy texts. During this time I heard the segments on Drivetime about Dublin’s working prams, and accounts of the persecution and prosecution of those women. That marked the start of my literature review as I continued to engage with theory and develop my conceptual framework.
Several personal factors drove this study to completion. One was a long-held frustration with the ‘future tense’ nature of capitalism that I had watched evolve across my adult years. This was deepened along with my concerns for Ireland’s future and the preoccupation with the ‘smart economy’. This led me to question why there was a persistent emphasis on the macroeconomy when, as I had observed in Cork’s markets, there existed a contemporary vibrant micro-economy. The primary factor that pushed me forward as I continued to gather the data, was the fact that the Shawlies were largely invisible in the official record despite their historical ubiquity: they existed in photographs, bronze statues, on the websites of the City Council and the local archives, and figured prominently in local lore. Furthermore, as the data continued to grow, I could not fathom how certain official accounts held them in such contempt. I wanted to discover and tell their story.

Finally, this story is personal for a reason that is much closer to my heart. My grandmother was born on the north side of Cork in 1898—her father was a labourer and her mother was a domestic before the marriage. Nana was delivered by her maternal grandmother who signed the birth certificate with an X. When my grandmother and her family emigrated to Canada she was fifteen years of age; she and her older sister were both domestics. In 1918, while working in a munitions factory in Toronto, she was injured in an accident and lost the sight in one eye.

In a Freedom of Information search, I obtained a copy of her compensation file from the Ontario government while compiling a family history. In the file is a letter her father wrote to the Chairman of the agency that awarded the claim. He was indignant at the negligible monthly pension she would receive, and insisted that she be given compensation in full because she would, no doubt, have difficulty securing employment. If she were given a payout, he reasoned, she would be able to open a small shop and support herself. I had learned this information five years before I began compiling my literature review, however it resonated for me then and has continued to resonate through to the completion of the study.
3.3.1 Understanding the Past Through Qualitative Research

Qualitative research is defined by Denizen and Lincoln (2005, p. 3) as “a situated activity that locates the observer in the world” to perform “a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible”. The ease with which this may be performed by a researcher seeking to understand the present or the not-so-distant past is obvious. That said, my goal was to situate myself as much as possible in the world of the Shawlies and so I sought to recreate as much of that world as I could. According to Denizen and Lincoln (2005, p. 3), qualitative research in practice involves the “studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials” such as artefacts, cultural texts and productions, historical texts, and visual texts “that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals’ lives.” In order to describe problematic moments in the lives of women who were, figuratively, invisible in relation to the power structures that shaped their lives meant drawing on the artefacts or documents, historical texts, and the visual texts alluded to in the introduction to this chapter.

When the “description of the making of social situations” is the goal of qualitative research, Flick, Kardoff and Steinke (2002, p. 19) use documents as data, and the analysis of both the discourse therein and the documents themselves as a means of interpretation. This approach serves to reconstruct the “routines of everyday life” as well as “the making of social reality” (Flick 2002, p. 9). Documents from official sources can allow the researcher to “see the workings that led to particular policies or practices” (Gidley 2004, p. 252); likewise, newspaper accounts can provide the context or social climate of the time (Gidley 2004). From a social constructivist standpoint, texts in an archive are viewed as “topic rather than resource—as realities in themselves rather than a way of assessing some other reality” (Gidley, 2004, p. 254). Furthermore, according to Gidley (2004, p. 250), a document is “interesting to social researchers because of what it reveals about the way that the account was produced”. Thus, according to Palys (2003, p. 249) “researchers must always be critically aware of the processes and perspectives embodied in their sources and of the contexts in which those accounts were produced”.

Historical research using primary documentary sources can help the researcher to create a genealogy of ideas (Gildey, 2004) such as those constituting what is considered
employment, legitimate business, and deviance. According to Cronin (2010, p. 109) documentary sources, “despite their limitations” can be used to find words and statements that “obliquely articulate class identity”. Research of this kind can also generate a genealogy of institutions (Gidley, 2004) such as government bodies, legislation, amalgamated business interests, and policies. To these ends an archive can, ultimately, provide access to marginalised voices (Gidley, 2004). Archival and documentary research do have weaknesses and these are addressed in the final section of this chapter.

In order to understand why qualitative research with these particular goals is used in this study, revisiting the meta-question and consequent questions provided in the Introduction is necessary. The meta-question that prompted this research project is:

**What role did The Street Trading Act, 1926 have in the disappearance of the Shawlies from Cork City’s street-based markets?** The question that is prompted, in turn, is: can the workings of *The Street Trading Act, 1926* be conceptualised in social terms, as extensions of the conditions that marginalised poor women in Irish society? The consequent questions that prompt a review of theories that interpret power and power relations in society—those which flow from legislation, policy or regulation, and capital—are:

- who were the Shawlies who traded on Cork’s streets?
- how did this legislation and the practices flowing from it change their lives?
- what were the implications for Irish society if their livelihoods disappeared?
- was *The Street Trading Act, 1926* a municipal regulation that, in practice, re-articulated market spaces in the public sphere?
- was *The Street Trading Act, 1926* an act of governance that had greater implications for poor women in Cork?
- was that legislation, and the debates surrounding it, the start of a modernist, gentrification effort?
- how do regulatory actions directed at women street traders in contemporary poor counties compare to those used by the Irish Free State government and the local authority in Cork following the introduction of *The Street Trading Act, 1926*?
- what do the challenges of women trading in the global south in the early 21st century reveal about women trading in Cork in the early 20th century?
According to Hunt and Wickham (1994, p. 33) “if history is to show how we have become what we are...then it is about the ‘small’ happenings, not themselves part of any master plan or subject to any grand design”. Instead, forms of knowledge and particular practices meet and “it is possible to identify the existence of a strategy”: strategies, they offer, exist without there being any ‘strategists’ per se (Hunt and Wickham, 1994, p. 30). For the purposes of this project particular ‘truths’, narratives from sites of privilege, and practices come together to isolate multiple strategies that intersect. The intrinsic ‘strategists’ are many and include, but are not limited to, the workings of social class, public figures, institutional apparatuses, and the power of Cork’s amalgamated business interests. Furthermore, these intersect with larger historical events and practices that do not appear, at least on the surface, to be directly implicated in the marginalisation of the Shawlies but did, nonetheless, have a hand in deepening that process.

Using the statements of the powerful to create a ‘history of the present’, and addressing the power behind those statements, is the method Foucault (1980a) conceptualised as genealogy—giving life to subjected narratives, voices, or knowledges, belonging, frequently, to the subjugated. A genealogy serves to uncover the origins of a phenomenon that were previously hidden, and will also address problems about the present (Kendall and Wickham, 1999). Statements are described as “an ongoing process, rather than as a snapshot of the web of discourses” at a particular moment or moments (Kendall and Wickham, 1999, p. 34). As such a genealogy is critical to comprehending the impact of statements made by various power brokers in Ireland and Cork in the years following Irish independence, and the consequent impact unfolding political, economic, and social events had on institutional practices and the public positions of the Shawlies. Finally, this genealogy also serves to address contemporary, global concerns about women street traders in the urban centres of poor countries under gentrification.

3.3.2 Michel Foucault's Use of History

The key works of Michel Foucault were compiled using archival research; his major study of the prison, Discipline and Punish was, according to Gidley (2004, p. 261) collected “fragments from prison archives”. Foucault claimed to want to give “a chance to ‘these absolutely undistinguished people to emerge from their place amid the dead
multitudes, to gesticulate again” (quoted Gidley, 2004, p. 261). When asked directly why he undertook the study of the prison, Foucault was also asked if he was inclined to “overstate the importance of the prison in penal history” (1991, p. 73). However, Foucault (1991) believed that the prison of the nineteenth century was not what reformers of the eighteenth century had expected and he wanted to know why. First, he believed the prison had been neglected in analyses that were sociological and focused on the criminal population, and in those that were juridical and focused on the penal system (Foucault, 1991). Instead he wanted to focus on “imprisonment as a general punitive practice” in society (Foucault, 1991, p. 74).

Foucault had a second rationale for undertaking his study of the prison, one he called a ‘genealogy of morals’—a project that traced “the lines of transformation of what one might call ‘moral technologies’” (1991, p. 74). Genealogy, in addition to giving voices to the marginalised (Foucault, 1980a), allows for the study of the history of a problem and the swirl of power around and in the problem (Hunt and Wickham, 1998). In Foucault’s (1980a, p. 85) words, genealogy is an “attempt to emancipate historical knowledges” or to “reactivate local knowledges” from subjection. They then become voices opposed to the coercion of those of the privileged and powerful; as Foucault (1980a, p. 85) wrote, local knowledges are rendered “capable of opposition” against the coercive impact of “a theoretical, unitary, formal and scientific discourse”.

To this end he sought to gain knowledge of what is punished and why by asking “how does one punish” in the same way he had, in his studies of madness, asked how divisions such as sane or insane are “operated” (1991, p. 74). For Foucault (1991, p. 75) the target of analysis was a ‘regime of practices’: not institutions, theories, or ideology, but the “places where what is said and what is done, rules imposed and reasons given, the planned and the taken for granted meet and interconnect” in order to grasp the conditions that make these practices acceptable at a particular moment. This initial analysis generated a subsequent analysis of “programmes of conduct” that prescribe action to address a particular problem or phenomenon, and “codifying effects” that prescribe what is known about that particular problem or phenomenon (Foucault, 1991, p. 75).
The role of ‘programs of conduct’—or the use of knowledge and action—in producing or deepening subjugation are further explored under what Foucault (1991) terms ‘eventalization’. This he defines as “rediscovering the connections, encounters, supports, blockages, plays of forces, strategies” that will “establish what subsequently counts as being self-evident, universal and necessary” (Foucault, 1991, p. 76). The event may then be analysed as a process, with ‘eventalization’ having lightened concern or preoccupation with causality (Foucault 1991). To this end, ‘eventalization’ serves both a theoretical and political purpose because it calls into question actions and knowledges that have been constituted in a society as “self-evident, universal, and necessary” (Foucault, 1991, p. 76) to the exclusion of other knowledges and actions (Foucault, 1991). ‘Eventalization’ then serves a theoretical-political function because it disrupts what has been held to be self-evident in a society (Foucault, 1991).

A “breach of self-evidence” then initiates what Foucault (1991, p. 76) called a “multiplication or pluralisation of causes”. Foucault (1991) was then able to draw connections between seemingly dissimilar events, practices, and situations such as the formation of professional armies and penal practices. The implication of privilege in the phenomenon of ‘self-evidences’ is clear: Foucault (1991, p. 76) conceptualised ‘self-evidences’ as the notions upon which a society’s “knowledges, acquiescences, and practices rest”. The role of the researcher who breaches what a society holds to be knowledge that, in turn, provides consent for its actions reveals, in Foucault’s (1991) words, that particular actions were not as necessary as they were believed to be at the time.

Kendall and Wickham (1999) describe several goals of Foucault’s work with statements, three of which are critical to the use of statements to subjugate the Shawlies and women street traders in Dublin. Firstly, by addressing the ways particular statements came to be repeated Foucault shifted attention onto the procedures used by power, rather than focusing on the feasibility of the statements. Secondly, by analysing the positions established between the subject and the statements, Foucault demonstrated how statements produce subject positions. Finally, he used statements to reveal ‘surfaces of emergence’ or “places within which objects are designated and acted upon” (Kendall and Wickham, 1999, pp. 26-27).
A method principle of Hunt and Wickham’s (1998) sociology of the law as governance relevant to this study is the compilation of “social facts” in the genealogical manner of Foucault. ‘Social facts’ they define according to Durkheim’s definition as “things which happen through actors interacting socially” (Hunt and Wickham, 1998, p. 118). The genealogy of social facts is compiled to demonstrate that the present is simply “a collection of contingencies” some that are unique to their time and place, and some that are like those of other eras (1998, p. 119). Addressing a collection of contingencies (Hunt and Wickham, 1998) also allows the researcher to look beyond a notion of a comprehensive strategy (Hunt and Wickham, 1998), a point alluded to at the end of the previous section. The compilation of social facts will help to answer two sides of a core question: “how are these social facts possible?” and “what are their conditions of possibility?” (Hunt and Wickham 1998, p. 119). This requires that the researcher investigate the actors involved and their involvement as contingencies (Hunt and Wickham, 1998, p. 119).

A clear goal of Foucault’s (1980a, p. 82) genealogy, stated at the outset, was to bring to life what he called ‘subjugated knowledge’ or “knowledges that have been disqualified as inadequate to their task or insufficiently elaborated” and “located low down on the hierarchy”. This requires moving beyond a class-based notion of hierarchy. The hierarchy of knowledges proposed is one where those above the subjugated are characterised as qualified, scientific, or have knowledges that emanate from a body of theory (Foucault, 1980a; 1980b). The knowledge of the subjugated is further characterised by Foucault (1980a, p. 82) as “local knowledge”—knowledge that he emphasises is harshly “opposed by everything surrounding it”. ‘Local knowledge’ is reconstructed through genealogy, Foucault (1980a, p. 83) maintains, by a “union of erudite knowledge and local memories” that allow the researcher to bring subjected knowledges forward to develop “a historical knowledge of struggles” that help to explain struggles in the present.

Foucault (1980a; 1980b) believed that power develops and maintains its domination by using two vehicles: ‘right’ or a legal apparatus, and ‘truth’ or knowledge as a technology. What he termed “the rules of right” give those who exercise power the right to de-limit that power (1980a, p. 93). ‘Right’, Foucault (1980a, p. 95) asserts, is...
found not just in the law but the combined operation of “apparatuses, institutions and regulations” that apply the law. In applying the law, Foucault (1980a) maintains, ‘right’ initiates relations of domination through multiple techniques that subjugate (Foucault, 1980a). Working in concert with ‘right’, what is designated and produced by power always subjugates those who do not speak or act on that same truth; the pursuit of ‘truth’ is, ultimately, rewarded by power (Foucault, 1980a). This hegemonic use of power is only exercised through the production of ‘truth’ which is institutionalised, professionalised and legalised as ‘right’ (Foucault, 1980a). Under this paradigm Foucault (1980a) envisioned a triangle of power-truth-right working in concert, and the “effects of truth” that are produced and transmitted by power serve to reproduce this same power (1980a, p. 93).

3.3.3 My Use of Foucault’s Historical Methods to Understand the World of the Shawlies

My overarching goal is to tell a new truth about old events: that of the Shawlies trading against a multiplicity of hegemonic ‘truths’ about street trading and women street traders. Across my journey with the Shawlies I felt, on several occasions, that I was being asked similar questions to those Foucault (1991) was asked about his study of the prison. In my experience the question was equally direct: was I overly concerned about women street traders in Cork? At the earliest stages the answer was a firm “no”, even if I could not readily articulate a tidy answer to satisfy others. At first glance I knew that those who passed The Street Trading Act, 1926 insisted that it was not intended to abolish street trading, and yet the Shawlies disappeared from Corn Market Street.

Reflecting upon why I place such importance on street trading, my response aligns with the two reasons Foucault gave when the question was posed. Firstly, my literature review revealed that for the period in question there were many general studies of Irish women’s history, the challenges of poor women, prostitution, and the work of women in the movement for independence. However, there is no comprehensive study of women and trade, and very little is known about women who engaged in subsistence trade to survive. Even less of the story has been told from their perspectives. Similarly, the intermittent appearances of the Shawlies in histories of Cork and its ‘merchant city’ past prompted this study. As noted in section one, photographs, statues, and folklore tell a richer story, and one which has pointed to a sentimentalised memorialisation.
Furthermore, I believed that a comprehensive picture of the social conditions that pushed these women into street trading needed to be compiled.

Secondly, the attempts to regulate their work had not been explored, and yet frequently the designation of these women as ‘deviant’ was highlighted. Like Foucault (1991), I wanted to focus on how they came to be constructed as deviant and why they were frequently held in contempt by the local authorities. Likewise, in the very early stages, I questioned why some forms of trade were considered deviant while others were not, why some forms of self-employment were classified as entrepreneurial over others, and how the marketplace and the price mechanisms for essential items such as food and clothing were considered safe in the private hands of large-scale retail outlets but not in those of street traders. To this end I wanted to unseat ‘truth’ and turn to the Shawlies themselves to reactivate what Foucault (1980, p. 85) conceptualised as “local knowledges” under subjugation.

During the preliminary research it was readily apparent that a straight-line between the implementation of the Act and the disappearance of the Shawlies could not be readily identified. Furthermore, the Irish Free State government, and later Commissioner Monahan, both insisted that the intention in passing the Act was to regulate street trade and create a climate of fairness. The initial reading of the Act seemed to support that proviso. I suspected I was dealing with something like the historical contingencies described in the previous section, not unlike Foucault’s ‘regime of practices’.

As I moved deeper into the debates, newspaper accounts, and business and municipal plans, I realised these had to become part of the data collected to understand what made these practices—passing the Act, seeking to implement it in Cork at two junctures—acceptable at a particular moment. From this I hoped to learn the potential effects of the action needed (Foucault, 1991)—the regulation of street trade—and the effects of the codifying that took place through both the regulation and the meta-narratives emanating from privileged corners about who the Shawlies were, how their trade was constructed, and their impact on ‘legitimate business’. In short, my goal was to shake up what the meta-narrative appeared to have constructed as Foucauldian “self-evident” in terms of action and knowledge.
During the preliminary research it also became clear that multiple ‘plays of forces’, ‘strategies’, and ‘connections’ (Foucault, 1991) had come to impact upon the street-based marketplace, although they were not overtly targeting it. In particular, the austerity impulse of the Cosgrave government, the implementation of the Act in 1926, and its implementation in Cork in 1928 under the Commissioner appointed by the Free State government following the dissolution of the Cork Corporation, all had a hand in the outcome. Furthermore, the indirect impact of larger historical practices, conceptualised in Chapter 1, could not be denied: the precarious condition of the Irish Free State, the rise of ‘home-grown’ middle-class business interests lobbying for power in a new state, and the efforts of public figures to work to promote progress and produce modern communities that were thriving economically.

Thus, a study of the Shawlies as a group being governed by law meant an investigation of the government as regulator, the police as enforcers, the business community as the voice of the economy, and the women as traders and contributors to a working-class family income—all ‘social facts’ (Hunt and Wickham 1998)—as all were actors who interacted directly or indirectly. The political debates, planning documents, and newspaper accounts—taking into account events that were not covered in the newspapers, and voices that were absent from the political debates and planning documents—provide insight into the subject positions of the Shawlies and their trade. The repetition of statements regarding the ‘fair’ regulation of trade along with those about concerns over public safety (i.e., fraud, health and welfare, and obstruction) forced a focus on both procedures and subject positions.

The sweep of this study as a genealogy is critical to understanding how the law came to govern this group of women and had the potential to re-articulate their lives. The narrative the Shawlies might have provided as part of the public debate about their lives and their trade represents what Foucault (1980a) terms a ‘subjugated knowledge’. The knowledge expressed by the Shawlies about the role of street trade in their lives as both earners and consumers is one that would be further characterised by Foucault (1980a, p. 82) as a “local knowledge”. Through genealogy, as Foucault (1980a, p. 83) stipulated, local or subjected knowledges are brought “into play” to “establish a historical knowledge of struggles” and “to make use of this knowledge” in the present. This
interrogates what the meta-narratives of the day positioned as ‘truth’ (i.e., street traders were deviant; trading from ‘bricks and mortar’ premises constituted ‘valid’ trade) to learn what connections current studies of women trading on urban streets in the world’s poor countries tell us about the Shawlies.

The initial findings generated a subsequent analysis of ‘programmes of conduct’ (Foucault, 1991) having both the action prescribed to address the problem, and the effects of the knowledge used. The utility of these concepts to this study became clear as both complaints expressing concern for the welfare of women street traders, and those which characterised them as a public blight, were debated in Dublin and in Cork by public figures. With time various speculations came to be accepted as ‘truth’ about the ethics of traders, the threats they posed to ‘legitimate’ trade and to public health, as well as their potential criminal deviance.

Foucault (1991) characterised the political power that exists both inside and outside the operations of governing bodies as contemporaneous power—social and political. This concept is critical to understanding the forces that came to shape the regulation of street trade in Cork, and articulate what is and what is not the legitimate use of public space and public funds in the Coal Quay. A search beyond the legislation was prompted, as well as beyond the accompanying documents, and the newspaper articles that directly addressed the debate. The study now had to address the vision the amalgamated business interests in Cork had for the city centre.

Throughout the early stages of discovery it became clear that this law would impact on, exclusively, a population of poor and working-class women, and the public space where they lived and traded through ‘right’ using ‘truth’ (Foucault, 1980a) that was generated from a site of privilege. However, ‘right’ (Foucault, 1980a) was not being used to address the needs of poor and working-class consumers, or a significant population of women who needed to support themselves, their dependents, or to contribute to a working-class family economy.
3.4.1 Triangulation and Multiple Methods

Referred to as “boundary crossing” by Green and Preston (2005, pp. 170-171) multiple methods, is encouraged when the fundamental purpose of empirical research is to theorise by providing, to cite one purpose, “viable representations of what is real”. As a means to triangulating the data, Denizen and Lincoln (2005, p. 5) insist that the use of multiple methods “reflects an attempt to secure an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in question”, adding that combining “empirical materials, perspectives, and observers in a single study” will add “rigor, breadth, complexity, richness, and depth to any inquiry”. According to Flick (2002), combining “different theoretical approaches” provides a means of the triangulation of data just as combining qualitative and quantitative methods will triangulate data (Flick, 2002; Denizen and Lincoln, 2005) to build confidence in the findings.

Flick (2002, pp. 17-18) asserts that “beyond methodological discussions” linking qualitative and quantitative approaches is “useful for pragmatic reasons”, as a means of “making procedures in the field and the foundation of results transparent and plausible to recipients”. The concerns of pragmatism and transparency extending to the subjects of this study was also my concern. Similarly, Flick (2002, p. 18) asks: "How can qualitative researchers do justice in their writing to the life-worlds they study and to the subjective perspectives they meet there?" The following sets out the means by which I sought to do justice to the range of perspectives in the life-world of the Shawlies in Cork in the first half of the twentieth century.

According to Tonkiss (2004, p. 88), statistics taken alone do not necessarily address “the wider social context in which statistics are produced” and how the knowledge they generate is used. For example, demographic variables collected in a census are also known as “political arithmetic” (Tonkiss 2004, p. 86): a form of compiling social demographics by which a population becomes known to its government, and then is governed by its government. Tonkiss (2004, p. 88) asserts that statistics alone are problematic because they are tied to the concerns of government but do not “suggest the most appropriate ways to initiate social and economic reforms”. When used with social surveys—supplemental interviews with members of the population under study—these early sociological works in Britain provided more direction for reforms (Tonkiss, 2004).
In a similar vein, Brannan (2005, p. 178) posits that the method of “attaching a qualitative subsample to statistically derived samples” will also furnish the “meanings of underlying statistical associations”. For these essential reasons I employed qualitative research with some ‘counting’ to achieve the goal stated at the opening of this section.

On the surface, insights into what the Shawlies thought of the Act appear sporadically in the public narrative, given voice by representatives such as solicitors and sympathetic politicians. When they actually speak for themselves, they are answering questions put to them by a census collector or a police officer. Thus, a deeper understanding of their social and economic positions could only be developed by compiling demographic and statistical profiles of the Shawlies using information on the 1901 and 1911 census forms, and the 1928 registry, along with accounts of events recorded at the time. The counting conducted in this study was done to create these profiles, and in a review of a report on trade and commerce in Cork to establish the degree to which businesses in the neighbourhood in question had a voice in shaping the future of Cork city’s centre.

As for the official record, qualitative data was collected from the debates in Dáil Éireann, newspaper coverage of the debate surrounding street trading in Dublin and Cork, and the various legislative documents governing street trade and public markets. The business plan of 1918, the planning documents of 1926 and 1941, and the correspondence of Philip Monahan and others were used to develop a genealogy of the larger social context within which the legislation was passed in Cork, and the larger social context in which the Shawlies lived and worked.

The registry of street traders compiled in 1928 provides an overview of the trading lives of these women and its importance, but does not demonstrate the social need for allowing them to continue earning a subsistence wage, and the social need for a marketplace where the urban poor have more control over the price mechanism, and can access affordable goods. It is in the tradition of the social surveys and interviews cited earlier (Tonkis, 2004), that the statistical picture of the Shawlies from the 1928 registry is supplemented with narratives of the lives of individuals based on the data culled from the 1901 and 1911 censuses.
3.4.2 Data Collection Methods
At the start of my fieldwork, the only documentary evidence of basic personal and trading information available about the Shawlies available was the 1928 registry. This document, initially, provided the spark to develop the study further, however the insight provided is limited by its purpose. It lists the names of the Shawlies who registered, their addresses, their ages, commodities sold, the materials used to construct the stalls (if used), trading location, if an assistant was employed, frequency of trading (i.e., daily), and the length of time these women had been trading. This generated statistics and percentages but did not answer questions that would lead to a richer picture of their personal lives (i.e., marital or family status; education level) or the power relations that put them through the exercise of registering.

Fortunately, the review of the 1928 registry of women conducting their trade in the city centre did reveal that approximately 47% of the women were residing on twelve streets and lanes, all clustered in the blocks surrounding the market place of Corn Market Street and North Main Street. These twelve streets and lanes were used to narrow the subsequent samples culled from the numbers of women recorded in the 1901 and 1911 censuses who were dealers. A small sample of close matches between the registry and the census data collected seventeen and twenty-seven years earlier was generated, and I prepared a narrative from the data on those lives. Further, random samples of women dealers/vendors was generated from census data using the search terms “onion” and “clothes” in the occupational field of the digitised 1901 and 1911 census records. This allowed me to create a demographic profile of the samples and narratives of the lives of these women.

Possible points of convergence with the women in the 1928 registry were also identified, making it possible to make some generalisations from the smaller samples of 1901 and 1911 to the larger sample of 1928 to provide answers as to what role trade played in their survival, and in the survival of families who were among the working poor. The data collected to learn more about the Shawlies was not limited to that which was gathered from them directly. In order to contextualise and historicise their lives and their trade and the impact The Street Trading Act, 1926 would have on both, that piece of legislation along with what came before it became part of the data collected.
While this produced a significant amount of data, there were some gaps in the public debates. This led me to search for newspaper accounts to determine how the Act was perceived, and how street trading was regarded publicly. The database of digitised copies of *The Irish Times*—Ireland’s newspaper of public record—was used to search for articles using the terms “street trading”, “street traders”, and the name of the Act. This search yielded several articles that helped me to reconstruct the public narrative in Dublin, and to determine how street trading was construed as a problem across the opening years of the century.

The situation in Cork was not detailed in the debates at the national level. In the absence of this information I could not determine why Commissioner Monahan sought to implement it in Cork, considering it was intended to deal with street trading in Dublin and was optional elsewhere. Staff of the Cork City and County Archives were consulted. A search of the indices by the Chief Archivist revealed the existence of a file of documents, mainly correspondence, connected to the development of by-laws governing street trading in Cork. This became the central documentary source of information for this study—the file that held correspondence and memoranda relating to the design and implementation and the passing of *The Street Trading Act, 1926* in Cork city between 1928 and 1941.

As the minutes of the TMC\(^{31}\) of the Cork Corporation had served as the central resource for the study of Cork’s English Market by Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil (2011), I turned to these next. However, few references to street traders were made, and yet this committee’s purpose was to regulate and manage the business and activity of the corporation-owned covered markets and the open public markets in lane ways surrounding Corn Market Street. The stated purposes of the various committees revealed that street obstruction was dealt with by the HCC\(^{32}\) and so I reviewed the index of minutes, and there some complaints against traders were located. When complaints were referred from the TMC or other committees, or the Council were mentioned, the minutes of those specific meetings were consulted.

---

31 See List of Abbreviations.

32 See List of Abbreviations.
At times there appeared to be gaps in the meta-narrative generated by the Council and Committee minutes and so the *Cork Examiner* — Cork’s newspaper of public record — was consulted. The back issues of the newspaper for the period in question are only available on microfilm and so a digital search using particular search terms is not possible. In this instance, issues of the newspaper immediately preceding and following all the council and committee meetings where street trading was on the agenda were consulted; *The Irish Times* digital collection was searched using the terms “street trading+Cork”, “street trader+Cork”, “Coal Quay+Cork”, and “Corn Market Street +Cork”. The *Evening Echo*, considered to be Cork’s ‘working-class newspaper’, was not part of the review as back issues for the period in question are not available. Issues of the *Cork Weekly News* were available for 1922 and 1923; the debate surrounding street trading in Cork was not covered by that publication.

3.5 Validity

As a socio-historical study of a small population of women at a particular time and place in Ireland’s history, this study does not claim to produce findings that can be generalised. The criteria against which its validity may be established include: the triangulation of the data through the use of multiple methods and methodologies; the triangulation of both qualitative and quantitative data available from contemporary studies of women street traders in poor countries; the logic of the research design and breadth of data collection; the quality of the data recording and documentation; and, the logic of the data interpretation. The foregoing sections have detailed these processes and described the general logic running through the research process.

I continuously weighed all data against my reading on street trade, modernity, and studies of women street traders in poor and debtor countries to weigh the findings of contemporary research on poor women against the story of the Shawlies as it was emerging from the data; points of convergence were part of those discussions. As new questions developed about the history of Irish women at work generally, or specifics about the political and social context in which they traded when *The Street Trading Act, 1926* was passed, additional readings were suggested by my supervisors. The

---

33 Now the *Irish Examiner*. 
significance and relevance of supplementary findings were then weighed against the
story emerging from the documentary evidence. Throughout the process the meta-
question and consequent questions, and the conceptual framework were subject to
review in consultation with my supervisors, other graduate students, and staff in UCC.

Foucault (1991, p. 86) said that he set out to investigate the history of the
‘objectification’ of particular “elements” considered to be “objectively given”, and to
find the “effects the question produced within historical knowledge”. With regard to
this expectation for using history in social research, I believe my objectives have been
fulfilled.

3.6 Limitations of the Study
According to Palys (2003, p. 252-253), “sins arise when one begins to assume that the
available data are necessarily the most important data”, without questioning “the
meaning of the data” or “the organizational, cultural, and/or methodological context in
which they were produced”. I had to draw on this proviso throughout the study. If I
only took the data that was readily available as the most important data, I could not
compile a study that would truthfully tell the stories of these women. Thus, by
questioning the context in which that data was produced, I sought to overcome the core
limitations of archival and documentary research that I was aware of from the outset.

Critics of archival research cite problems with using documents as sources: the
information may have been incorrectly recorded, omissions may occur in the
information provided, as well as general inconsistencies across time. These problems
can apply to official sources or personal papers. Newspapers in particular are cited for
bias in their accounts of events. The data gathered, aside from the legislation, is drawn
from documents that fall under these potentially problematic categories, and resulted in
some omissions in the final study.

The first concern involves the documents held at the Cork City and Country Archives.
In some instances books of council meeting minutes were missing. Perennial questions
also arise about the accuracy of record keeping in the case of correspondence; however,
the sequence of the letters and notes in the file appear to indicate that there are no
glaring omissions. As for the council minutes and committee minutes that were available, detailed accounts of the discussions about street traders and the complaints surrounding them were frequently absent, or were recorded simply as “a discussion took place”. In other instances it is obvious that when the discussions were described, they were abridged in the minutes because the corresponding newspaper accounts were more lengthy. Furthermore, when Philip Monahan was the Commissioner of Cork, he alone acted as the Council and Committees, and so there was no discussion that could be recorded. Finally, the whereabouts of letters of complaint about street traders that were read at Council Meetings is unknown.

A second concern surrounds the use of newspapers. Certainly the mainstream media has, historically, had a class and gender bias. There are also universal concerns about the accuracy of reporting and editing aside from those of bias. Those general concerns aside, there are significant lapses in the coverage of this issue. A larger local concern exists in the use of the *Cork Examiner*. According to Quinlivan (2006), the *Examiner* was a very sympathetic correspondent when reporting on the efforts of the Cork Progressive Association to have the Cork Corporation dissolved. Unfortunately other newspapers were not available to consult. That said, as will be learned in Chapter 5, the debate surrounding the legislation in Cork was not as markedly controversial as its implementation in Dublin, nor had the complaints in Cork reached the crescendo that they appear to have reached in Dublin. Thus, it is difficult to say if the issue would have gathered much notice and, thereby, received additional press coverage.

A third concern is one of accuracy in how information was recorded by census takers and An Gardaí. Throughout the study I was aware that human error may have crept into the recording of information. An additional concern exists around the reporting of information by the women themselves to authority figures. In the case of the registry, concerns over threats to their livelihoods may have impacted on the collection of information. Cronin (2010) and Luddy (1995b) caution about the challenges of using census data in studies of Irish women, particularly in regard to occupation. According to Cronin (2010, p. 110), many small-scale businesses women “remain hidden in the census behind the term ‘housewife’ or ‘unoccupied’”. I noted that in the censes the use of the term “vendor” does not make it clear if the women had stalls in the markets that
were rented from the Corporation, if they had stalls on the streets, or if they were itinerant traders.

Finally, I hoped to learn the potential effects of ‘jurisdiction’ or regulation of street trade, and the effects of ‘verification’ or the codifying that took place through both the regulation and the meta-narratives emanating from privileged corners about who the Shawlies were, how their trade was constructed, and their impact on ‘legitimate business’. The limits on the voices of the traders telling their own stories in the press or at council and committee meetings means that only the official voices remain to tell their tale. Even when they spoke, they were answering questions rather than asking them, and when their concerns were raised, they were raised by representatives speaking for them. That said, the accounts compiled in this study, when set in the context of the meta-narratives and political processes revealed, serve to fill a significant hole in the available knowledge of women street traders in Cork and in Ireland.
Chapter 4 - Governing Women Street Trading in an Independent Ireland: The Public Debate

People reared in workhouses, as you are aware, are no great acquisition to the community and they have no ideas whatever of civic responsibilities. As a rule their highest aim is to live at the expense of the rate payers. Consequently, it would be a decided gain if they all took it into their heads to emigrate. When they go abroad they are thrown on their own responsibilities and have to work whether they like it or not.

—William Cosgrave, Minister of Local Government in Dáil Éireann from 1919-1922 (quoted Ferriter, 2001, p. 111)

4.1 Introduction

William Cosgrave went on to become President of the Executive Council in the government of the Irish Free State following its inception in 1922. These sentiments expressed prior to becoming An Taoiseach, suggest that the leader of the new Irish state characterised Ireland’s poor as parasitic, and he was unsympathetic to their plight. Was The Street Trading Act, 1926 part of a larger attack by that first government on the poor within a larger bourgeois, business-friendly and ratepayer-friendly agenda? Were women street traders in Dublin and Cork casualties of a Foucauldian (1988a; 2010d) ‘reason of the state’—of both the state’s vision of Ireland’s future, and of the prioritisation of the state’s “felicity” (Foucault, 1988a, p. 148) in the pursuit of that vision?

Seemingly, the configuration of Dublin as the capital city put that city’s women street traders at a particular disadvantage. This was the capital of the new Irish Free State and, according to Flanagan (2009, p. 228), Dublin was trying to transform itself “into a worthy capital city” while trying to confront its “massive poverty and housing issues”. Earlier, in 1914, a Town Plan had pushed for the privileging of business and industrial interests in the city centre, a move which would have resulted in the displacement of approximately 60,000 people from their homes to “extra-urban land”, while those residential properties were reallocated for commercial purposes (Flanagan, 2009, p. 229). Clearly, there was no room for the urban poor to live in Ireland’s capital city. The implementation of this plan was postponed by the Great War, the Anglo-Irish War, and then the Irish Civil War.

34 This role is now that of An Taoiseach or Prime Minister.
This chapter reviews the legislation and debates surrounding street trading at the national level in Ireland prior to the passing of the Act, before turning to the Act itself and the first regulations made for its implementation in Dublin. An exploration of the neoliberal nature of that government sets the context for the legislation, and the debate that followed the implementation of the Act. All are supplemented by newspaper accounts to expand on the debates in the Oireachtas to assess how these women and their work was constructed in the public narrative. The chapter is organised chronologically to facilitate an analysis of the progression of what Foucault (1980a) terms the ‘effects of truth’—those exercised by contemporaneous social and political powers to reproduce and delimit their powers.

4.2 Legislation Relevant to ‘Street’ Traders in Ireland Prior to 1926

The term ‘street trader’ came into existence as the official descriptor of the Shawlies in the 1920s. Prior to that their work was actually that of the ‘pedlar’. Although street traders are frequently referred to as ‘hawkers’ this term is not legally applicable: hawkers, under the relevant legislation, used a vehicle or beast of burden to move their goods and services around a town or from door-to-door. The legislation which governed their trade until 1926, The Pedlars Act 1871, originated in Westminster.

Section 3 of The Pedlars Act 1871 stipulated that a pedlar was a person who traded on foot. A pedlar could move from town-to-town or door-to-door to trade, but had to do so on foot. A pedlar might provide services (i.e., repair work), sell goods, or could take orders for the sale of goods to be delivered soon thereafter. Thus, based on what was revealed in the literature reviewed in Chapter 2, the Shawlies traded as pedlars. Under this legislation, a pedlar required a certificate to do so legally. There were exemptions, however, and most of these applied to the Shawlies, giving their work a grey existence in law.

Under Section 23, “Exemptions”, those selling “vegetables, fish, fruit, or victuals” were not required to have a certificate. Furthermore, a trader who was not travelling from town-to-town or selling door-to-door was not classified as a pedlar and, as such, did not

35 The Hawkers’ Act, 1888.
require a certificate, and would not be subject to a penalty under the provisions of *The Pedlars Act 1871*. These two exemptions were critical to the Shawlies. According to this legislation, they were permitted to sell the items described on the street without a certificate: there was no legislation prohibiting them from doing so, and their work did not fall under the remit of any statute. As the literature review revealed, the Shawlies dominated sales of the food items listed in the exemptions on the streets of Cork.

What of those, however, who did not sell food but sold used clothing or small wares? A third exemption, also found in Section 23, extended an exemption to those exposing goods for sale if they did so “in any public mart, market, or fair legally established”. This was, in short, an individuals ‘market right’. Thus, those selling clothing and wares would also be exempted if selling in the aforementioned areas. Furthermore, the review of the existing knowledge indicates that lane ways in Cork had, historically, been designated for the sale of particular commodities for centuries by the Corporation.

The *Royal Commission on Market Rights and Tolls, 1891*, provided a thorough treatment of the term. According to this report a market, in the strictly legal sense of the word, “may be defined as an authorised public concourse of buyers and sellers of commodities meeting at a place, more or less strictly limited or defined, at an appropriate time” (p. 2). The report assigned a market three essential elements: “an authority conceded, a place more or less defined, and a time specified” (p. 2). In the review of the literature it was learned that a great number of public markets were open, particularly in Cork’s historic medieval city centre. Furthermore, to trade on the footpaths of Corn Market Street or North Main Street meant they were trading on a concourse outside a public building, if trading outside the Bazaar or St. Peter’s. Thus, they were legally trading at these locations and were, largely, exempted from legislation regulating street trading prior to and in the very early years of independence.

---

36 The term “concourse” is defined in the *Oxford English Dictionary* as “a large open area inside or in front of a public building”.
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4.3 Constructions of Street Trading Prior to *The Street Trading Act, 1926*

A search of the debates of Dáil Éireann back to 1919 reveals that, prior to 1924, there were no references to street trading in general. Those that do appear are specific to truancy concerns about school-aged children trading on the streets rather than attending school. The same is true of the newspaper coverage of the issue: a review of the database of the *Irish Times* produced very few references to street trading as a public problem excepting those concerned with child employment and truancy. When statements about street trading as a public blight do begin to appear in the press, the power of what Kendall and Wickham (1999) define as ‘ongoing discourses’, as opposed to isolated moments when a single statement is made, become apparent.

On 6 October 1921 an article appeared in the *Irish Times* under a title that clearly implies deviance: “Street Trading Evils”. Subtitled, “Dublin Citizens’ Protest”, the correspondent reported on a meeting of the Executive Committee of a group that called itself the Dublin Citizens’ Association (“DCA”). However, despite the emphasis on citizenship, the DCA was, according to a representative quoted in the article, comprised of “substantial ratepayers” from “incorporated firms” who believed they had a right to “criticise and investigate any rate or any action of the Corporation that they thought should be questioned”. The DCA declared that a recent increase in “the growing practice of street trading” was compromising “the common law rights of the citizens”, and presented “specific unfairness to the taxpaying traders”. Street trading, the article continued, was contributing to the unsanitary conditions “prevailing” in Dublin’s streets.

The next reference to street trading in the *Irish Times* did not appear until 1923; it was an opinion-editorial piece that ran on 4 June entitled “Street Trading in Dublin”, subtitled “A Nuisance and a Blot on the City”. The correspondent reported that street trading in Dublin had seen a marked increase in recent years, resulting in cluttered streets. Attempts by the police and the courts to curb the trend were described as futile. To make the streets more passable, it was suggested that the traders move to the Iveagh

---

37 In January 1919, during the Anglo-Irish War, Dáil Éireann was established as the governing body of the Irish Republic. Following the establishment of the Irish Free State government, Dáil Éireann became the lower house of a new legislature called the Oireachtas.
Market—a covered market built to accommodate street traders earlier in the century\textsuperscript{38}. However, it was reported that the traders were not using the market because it was not frequented by consumers. The correspondent concluded that if they moved into the market, street traders would provide “a whole-somer, cleaner service”, one preferable to that provided from their current location identified as “the gutter”. Street traders were also requested to keep the streets sanitary, tidy, free of the litter and free of “all sorts of fumes”. The allegations of deviance then move from the issue of hygiene. The correspondent suggested that street traders could continue but needed to respect “the rights of the citizens in the thoroughfares”, the rights of shopkeepers with whom they compete at cut prices”, in addition to other expenses. Evidently the street traders abused rights but did not have rights, nor were they identified as citizens. Furthermore ‘bricks and mortar’ traders were construed as the economically vulnerable.

However, the correspondent’s tone became more sympathetic when attention turned to the observation that most street traders were “women and girls” attempting to “earn their living honestly”, and by “worthy means”. The unworthy alternative is not named, but the correspondent predicted “a disastrous state of affairs” would follow not only if their livelihoods as street traders were taken away, but the same folly was predicted if trading was “curtailed”. However, despite recognising their vulnerability, the correspondent suggested that “all would wish success to their enterprise” if the traders observed “the rules of fair play and cleanliness”. Clearly, despite their vulnerability, they were, ultimately, construed as ‘outsiders’, and they were requested to conduct themselves like ‘insiders’.

Not all reports that followed that year were sympathetic. A few weeks later, on 29 June 1923 an article under the title “Street Trading Evil” described the statements of a magistrate upon fining several traders. He blamed the street traders for Dublin’s “untidy” streets, and said this condition gave “a bad impression of the city”. He then used this opportunity to request that the Corporation ban street trading, but said he

\textsuperscript{38} According to http://www.excavations.ie/Pages/Details.php?Year=&County=Dublin&id=4536 the market was built on Francis Street in Dublin to accommodate established traders who had previously had pitches on the street. They were moved indoors to accommodate development in the area at the end of the nineteenth century.
anticipated that complaints about threatened livelihoods would follow that move. The
magistrate then recalled having predicted that what he termed this “evil” would “spread
over the city” before noting that his prediction had come true.

In an *Irish Times* opinion-editorial on 22 August 1923, a correspondent suggested
compensating street traders’ lost earnings if a ban were implemented. Sympathetically,
it was noted, Dubliners “may be sorry for our street-traders and may appreciate their
individual hardships”. However, the correspondent noted, reforms were needed.
Dublin was then described as “a greater thing than any of its citizens”, invoking a
notion of citizenship as secondary to the needs, vision, or functioning of the city. In
closing, it was suggested that “civic government must make every effort to mitigate the
loss of those whom it is forced to hamper or disturb”. On 5 October 1923 a letter to the
editor on the issue appeared that, again, highlighted deviance, and blamed the traders for
chaos and the loss of business. The letter was signed “Disgusted”.

This was the last reference to street trading in the *Irish Times* prior to calls for
legislation in Dáil Éireann the following year. However, the ‘problem’ had been
identified and constructed as one affecting public health and safety, and the rights of
those trading from ‘bricks and mortar’ premises. The call to create what Foucault
(1991) terms a ‘programme of conduct’, one that addressed the ‘problem’ as constructed
through the use of knowledge and action, had been made. On one occasion the
connection between trade and subsistence earning for women was made in the *Irish
Times*, however gendered poverty was never addressed as the real problem that required
a ‘programme of conduct’. It is the former ‘problem’ rather than the reality that
prevailed in the statements and actions of elected representatives to reveal the
contemporaneous power that, according to Foucault (1980a), exists inside and outside
governing bodies. In this instance, that which combined the social power of men in
Dublin’s business community with the men holding political power in the new state: elected officials in Dáil Éireann, and the Civic Commissioners.  

4.4 The Debate Moves from Dublin’s Streets to Dáil Éireann

In Dáil Éireann on 25 June 1924 TD Bryan Cooper asked if the Minister for Justice, Kevin O'Higgins, would issue “new regulations” to control street trading in Dublin. Responding on behalf of O’Higgins, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Desmond Fitzgerald, said that there was no existing power in statute to make the regulations, therefore legislation was necessary. He indicated that the Minister intended to introduce a bill that would create regulations to control street trading in Dublin, and “in such large centres of population as might from time to time require such control”. The fluidity implied by “time to time” in relation to control of street trading is never mentioned again.

On 3 November 1924 a letter to the editor appeared in The Irish Times under the title “Street Trading”. Signed “Mere Citizen”, the letter highlighted “a blot on our civic administration”. The author used “women” exclusively when referring to the traders, and complained that they “are allowed to pester people in main thoroughfares”, trying to sell “bits of heather and bunches of faded flowers”. In addition to women traders being a “blot”, the author then implied deviance, alleging that many of the women were carrying “borrowed babies”. Presumably these “borrowed babies” were intended to curry sympathy with passersby, as the author alleged they followed those identified as “a lady or gentleman” for some distance while “begging in a most provoking and disgraceful manner”. Now trading had been conflated with begging.

---

39 In March 1924, an inquiry was opened into the administration of the Dublin Corporation under Section 12 of the Local Government (Temporary Provisions) Act, 1923. This section allowed for an inquiry into mismanagement or corruption, allowing the Minister for Local Government to dissolve any local authority considered “negligent, insubordinate or corrupt” (O’Callaghan 2000, p. 58). One of the groups alleging that the Dublin Corporation was not operating efficiently, and that the rates charged for services received were too high was the DCA. The Corporation was dissolved by the Free State government following the inquiry and three commissioners were appointed and assumed control, acting as the local authority. The same was done in Cork and is detailed in the next chapter.

40 See list of Key Public Personages.

41 See list of Key Public Personages.
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The next month, on 17 December, during questions on another matter, TD Cooper again raised the issue with the Minister for Justice. He suggested that legislation regulating traffic and street trading in Dublin was needed. Again, on 3 February 1925, during another debate, Cooper highlighted the unique traffic problems in Dublin and cited those posed by street trading. He was told by Minister O’Higgins that regulations would be drafted. However, the issue was not raised in Dáil Éireann again for a full year.

On 23 September 1925 an opinion-editorial under the title “Street Trading” appeared in the *Irish Times*. The author expressed “a natural reluctance to take any action” that would encourage “harshness towards” what he/she termed “humble citizens”. However, it was added, “sympathy and charity” must not negate the needs of “the ratepaying shopkeeper” or the “health and well-being of a considerable area of the city”. The correspondent reported that street trading was on the rise and was complicating increased vehicular traffic in Dublin. It was then observed simply that street trade was regulated in major cities on the European continent and in London, leaving the impression that Dublin needed to position itself among Europe’s major urban centres.

On 29 October 1925 a story appeared in the *Irish Times* under the headline “A Dublin Street Trading Bill”. According to the article, at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the DCA, an announcement was made that “a Street Trading Bill” would be introduced in Dáil Éireann. The news of the legislation in advance of its introduction came to the DCA in a letter from the Commissioner of Police. Following the announcement the correspondent reported that the Executive Committee of the DCA “expressed much satisfaction” with this preview, along with the “unanimous opinion… that all street trading in the city streets should be abolished”. Clearly the push was on for an outright ban which would, in turn, put the emphasis on what Cross (2000) terms a ‘firm-based’ economy. On 17 December 1925, the Minister of Justice, Kevin O’Higgins, introduced *The Street Trading Bill, 1925* in Dáil Éireann stating that he did not want to “arouse any fears”: the bill was “not proposed to abolish street trading” but would “regulate it”.
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On 6 January 1926 the *Irish Times* printed a “summary” of the proposed legislation. Despite the assurances of Minister O’Higgins that the legislation was geared to regulation, the article concluded that “We should be sorry to see the abolition of the Dublin street trader”. In a statement that evokes both modernity and sentimentality, the traders were described as a “picturesque survival of ancient times”. However, the correspondent concluded, without regulations street trading was “a civic evil”, one that the government would now control. In the *Irish Times* on 9 January 1926 an article indicated that the legislation gave “drastic powers to the Civic Guard to deal with infringements of the law” before detailing the restrictions on traders, the fines for violations, the powers of the police to seize goods, and the power to arrest without warrant. However, the discussion of the “drastic powers” given to the An Gardaí were not questioned further.

On 19 January 1926 the Bill reached the second stage where the Minister spoke to it at length. He emphasised, once again, that the legislation was not intended to abolish street trading. He then provided a synopsis of the events that, according to O’Higgins, prompted the creation of the legislation—complaints from the police and “merchants and shopkeepers” located in “certain streets” in Dublin. This is a clear indication of what Foucault (1980a) conceptualises as ‘contemporaneous power’—that which is social and political and works both inside and outside governing bodies. The police and selected ‘bricks and mortar’ businesses in particular districts had the ear of the government, but the women street traders did not.

In motion, this contemporaneous power generated the coercion Foucault (1980a) asserts will come of a ‘unified discourse’—one that is formal, draws on theory and science, and is used against the population outside that power. The observations and allegations made in the press to this point had indicated that the discourse surrounding the women was predominantly one of deviance. It was this discourse and these sources that O’Higgins drew upon to develop a discourse of what is ‘fair’ in an urban economy, and what is ‘safe’ for an urban population. In short, ‘Best Intentions’. This discourse then fuelled, ultimately, those that would paint the appearance of both a ‘Thriving State’ and a ‘Prosperous State’.
Minister O’Higgins said there had been a marked increase in the number of street traders over the previous year or two; furthermore, they were trading on streets where, historically, street traders had not been trading. According to O’Higgins, the police claimed that existing legislation was “inadequate” to control the traders, while merchants complained that “paths outside their premises were blocked by street traders” and customers could not access shops. He reported that the government had investigated the complaints and concluded that the situation was as described, and new legislation was needed. The details of the investigation were not given.

O’Higgins had, by his account, responded to the statements of the police and selected merchants to design what Foucault (1980a) terms a ‘programme of conduct’: he addressed a problem through the use of knowledge and action, knowledge that was, apparently, self-evident or taken for granted as ‘truth’. Acting as ‘police’ (Foucault, 1988a), O’Higgins insisted he was acting to regulate the marketplace operating in public space, and address complaints of public safety and fairness. Under ‘police’ the state classifies its citizens as ‘active’ and ‘productive’ human beings in its mission to strengthen (Foucault, 1988a). In Dublin in 1926, ‘active’ and ‘productive’ was conflated, through the privileging of particular voices in creating the Act, with ‘bricks and mortar’ trading, a firm-based economy, and a larger gentrified vision of the city centre, to construct women street traders as expendable in the state’s mission to strengthen.

O’Higgins indicated that the police in Dublin had used their powers under the *Dublin Police Act, 1842* and the *Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1851* to try to control the traders. Those statutes made it “an offence to obstruct the public in their use of a highway”; however, he added, “actual obstruction by some one or more individuals” had to be proved and this had been difficult to establish in the courts. He pointed out that district justices had reported that the “comparatively recent growth” of street trading could not be dealt with under the existing legislation. He noted that the question of traders losing of “their means of livelihood” if convicted had been raised, and added that district justices had been “impressed with that argument”. The use of “argument” calls into question both the validity of the argument that traders would lose their livelihoods, and
if ‘loss of livelihood’ was a valid reason to exercise care when using the law to control street trading.

O’Higgins categorised street traders into three “classes”: pedlars covered by the Pedlar’s Act, 1871, hawkers covered by the Hawker’s Act, 1888, and “persons selling vegetables or coal” who were exempted from those two pieces of legislation. He indicated that it was this group, those selling vegetables or fuel that the government sought to control. He did not elaborate upon the threat posed by vegetable and fuel sellers—other than the competition alleged by ratepayers, or the safe passage of vehicles and pedestrians detailed earlier. He described street traders as residents of Dublin who “sell their wares on the street, carrying their wares in their hands or in small receptacles”. He identified them as residents, yet O’Higgins did not explain why they were not consulted in the preparation of this legislation.

O’Higgins provided an overview of how they would be regulated. He described the proposed procedure for certification, stipulating that all fees would offset the costs of implementing and enforcing the Act, a hallmark of late-twentieth century neoliberal governance. His overview also revealed how the statements that construed street traders as threats to public health, had turned this legislation into what Foucault (1991) termed a ‘moral technology’, and necessitated well-intentioned government action. He stressed the need for cleanliness in the handling of food for human consumption, thereby ascribing to the legislation a sense of public security as one ‘Best Intention’.

He advised that the Bill created a new power to prohibit stall trading “removing any undue interference with traffic through the streets”. This statement touched on security, but through an action that facilitates the free-flow of people, goods, and vehicles, a vision in keeping with what has been conceptualised as the bourgeois vision of the ‘modern’ city (Berman, 1988; Bluestone, 1997). Finally, he indicated, the Bill was introduced to address the situation in the City of Dublin, but he left an opening for its implementation elsewhere: “it is thought wise to leave it open to any Corporation or Council with a population over 5,000”. The reason why it was designed for Dublin but was left “open” to other local authorities with populations over 5,000 was not explained.
Parliamentary Labour Party leader and TD Thomas Johnson expressed several concerns. First, he believed the legislation marked a move towards the centralisation of power by the Free State government as they were “legislating in respect to Dublin”. With respect to the traders themselves, he highlighted that powers of arrest as “too drastic”. Johnson noted that “to give power to a policeman to arrest a person for a breach of a by-law” gave the police too much power considering the by-law “may be quite trifling in its incidence”. It is noteworthy that O’Higgins had not included the powers of arrest or the penalties in his overview of the legislation. His response demonstrated the government’s privileging of the business community over the street traders. He replied that an obstruction and refusal to move from a pitch must be dealt with, and the provision was made for arrest to deal with what were public nuisances. He predicted that arrest would be used conservatively.

Johnson then asked O’Higgins if he would speculate about whether the Dublin Corporation would use the Act to eliminate street trading entirely considering the legislation gave the local authority the power to prohibit trading in particular streets. O’Higgins indicated that prohibition was limited to “specified” streets; Johnson responded: “They may specify all the streets”. O’Higgins replied: “I do not think they will. I think that in fact what they will do is confine them to particular streets where [street traders] will not occasion very much obstruction to traffic…They would have to do it by the process of blocking the streets by name”. Johnson qualified blocked streets when he replied, “All the useful streets.” The qualifier “useful” was not expanded upon in the debate. The prophetic significance of “useful” became clear in the months that followed.

On 27 January 1926 the Bill moved to third stage. O’Higgins moved through the Bill section by section and TDs suggested amendments where appropriate. Under Section 6—that which gave the Corporation the power to make by-laws—TD Bryan Cooper, the first TD to request legislation, put forward an amendment at the request of a “certain number of traders” in Dublin who were anxious for “a fixed and stable policy”. He then made it clear that he was not speaking on behalf of street traders. He proposed that

42 See list of Key Public Personages.
when trading was prohibited in a particular street, the prohibition should not be reversed without “the consent of two-thirds of the rate payers residing or carrying on business in the street”. This is a clear indication of the degree to which the ‘bricks and mortar’ traders who had consulted him, as well as Cooper himself, privileged the role of the ratepayer in shaping the law and the marketplace. As a rationale he said that in the past if “interested parties” appeared before the Corporation, by-laws were changed based on those representations. He then said that the Bill was intended to protect those who carried on “a certain class of business” against the “unfair competition of street traders”. He specified “certain class” as those who paid “rates and taxes and rent”. His amendment, he added, would give those businesses “greater protection”. The amendment did not pass.

In the course of the debate, O’Higgins repeated that the legislation was intended “simply to banish” at which point TD Thomas Johnson interrupted and inserted, “opposition, competition”. O’Higgins then said the intention was to banish “Competition in the open to the local traders” without questioning if street traders actually presented competition, or acknowledging that they, too, were local. It is clear, however, that street traders were not “traders”. Furthermore, the emphasis was on banishing what the women were doing to earn a subsistence income, rather than addressing the conditions that prompted street trading.

Johnson then spoke at length about the possibility of the legislation damaging a price mechanism that acted in “the public interest”. Through reduced competition, he reasoned, prices would then be controlled by shopkeepers. He cautioned that shopkeepers might also comprise the local power base if they were also representatives in the local authorities. Johnson then highlighted the “danger” of shopkeepers having “the power to prohibit...the fish hawker, or the fruit seller...and any other types of street traders”. The alternative, he suggested, was the creation of public markets to allow street traders to continue to trade with “a check upon the unbridled appetites of the small shopkeepers”.
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TD Johnson’s comments highlight that the Bill, as proposed, was constructing what Foucault (2010b) conceptualised as a ‘policy of society’—the creation of an ‘enterprise society’ where individuals are defined by ‘enterprise’ and what they ‘produce’, a policy that shapes and articulates the market through government interference. Not only had the work of street traders been identified as anterior to ‘enterprise’ and ‘production’, but the legislation is evidence of state interference to narrow the market and the uses of public space for buying and selling, thereby narrowing the options to buy and sell from ‘bricks and mortar’ shops. These conditions, in turn, make visible the ‘Thriving’ and ‘Prospering’ missions of the new Irish state via an ‘enterprise’ economy and, ultimately, the uses of public streets and the construction of valid trade. His suggestion of creating a public market did not receive a response from the Minister.

In the course of proposed amendments, an additional statement was made in the service of public safety that, vicariously, further demonised street trade. A concern was raised over the spread of disease through the sale of used clothing on 4 February 1926. A lengthy discussion followed, and an amendment tabled to include a guarantee that the “cleanliness of and freedom from contagious disease” spread by the sale of second-hand clothing be included in the Bill. This was withdrawn.

However, on that same day Sir James Craig43 TD, revisited the issue of used clothing, but within the context of the concern raised by TD Johnson previously about a truly competitive market. He asked Minister O’Higgins if it “would be right for us to prevent poor people getting the clothing at a cheap rate”. This allegation highlights how the ‘policy of society’ or ‘enterprise society’ (Foucault, 2010b) in motion may narrow the market for both poor buyers and poor traders, putting both at a further disadvantage. O’Higgins did not address this observation directly. While speaking to the list of suggested amendments, he repeated that the Bill was not intended to eliminate competition. Again he insisted, it was intended to keep footpaths and streets “reasonably clear”, to avoid interference with traffic. Now, he added, it was intended

---

43 According to the Dáil Éireann Members Database, Sir. James Craig’s occupation was Professor of Medicine for the constituency of Dublin University after 1922. Prior to the end of the Anglo-Irish War he was listed as a member of the Dáil for 1919-1920 and his profession was Lieutenant-Colonel.
“to secure cleanliness” of food sold by the street traders”, evoking, once again, a ‘moral technology’ (Foucault, 1991) in motion, and one embodied in the Act.

The issue of what constituted a public marketplace was raised when O’Higgins defined a “lawful public market” as “a concourse of buyers and sellers”. He suggested that “every person is entitled to go into a market and expose his goods for sale, subject to the payment of certain tolls or stallage [sic] fees to the owner of the market rights”. This definition was not explored further, and O’Higgins was not asked to define a public market in more detail. On this point, however, TD Thomas Johnson again raised the concern that if merchants dominated the local authority, they could use the legislation to limit market and fair days and, ultimately, eliminate street trading. This concern was never addressed.

TD Bryan Cooper did raise an amendment to the provisions of the Bill related to fines and punishments set for violations. A £5 fine was proposed in the Bill for a first offence, however Cooper wanted a more severe punishment: he asked for the option of a fine or “imprisonment for not more than seven days”. His rationale revealed a keen, blatant social bias towards these women, and one he felt secure expressing publicly in Dáil Éireann. He suggested that imprisonment as an alternative was needed because “the street trader, particularly a street trader on a small scale, is not a very easy person to levy a fine from”. He described them as “evasive”, and would prove difficult to catch because “in some respects they resemble fleas” that “hop about from one street to another”.

Extending the metaphor of the parasite, the deviant characterisation had now deepened. Cooper stated: “when you do catch them, it is difficult to get them to disgorge their ill-gotten gains”. He went on to say that the government was “not dealing with a person in an established business” or with those “who pays rents and rates” and has goods to be seized. The street trader, he said, “may have no real legal existence” and “may live in a tenement” or be a lodger. His rationale reveals that he was aware that these traders were women living in poverty, and that he prioritised ‘bricks and mortar’ trading as a form of legitimate trading. He did not clarify if housing status was connected to the likelihood
that one would not be able to pay a fine or was not willing to pay a fine. In either case, he believed that these conditions meant a street trader was likely to default on a fine. No one raised an objection to Cooper’s statements. Cooper then took the discussion of street trading from one of regulation to one of criminal deviance: he characterised street trading as “not a serious crime”, but insisted that it was still a crime and his proposed penalty of imprisonment, therefore, was moderate.

When O’Higgins spoke next, he did not speak out against Cooper’s characterisation of street traders, or the language he used. He simply rejected the amendment, believing the discretion of the courts should be trusted to levy an appropriate penalty. He made an observation, however, that demonstrates that he shared Cooper’s sentiments about the transient nature of a street trader’s life. He added: “the resources of civilisation and the resources of the police will prove adequate to meet the elusiveness which Deputy Cooper ascribes to street traders as a class”. The influence of the resources of “civilisation” hints at the opposite presented by street trading, namely the disorder implicit in the modernist characterisation of street markets and traders (Bluestone, 1997; Cross, 2000; Cross and Morales, 2007) as something other than civilised. The amendment was then withdrawn.

At the Third Stage, in Seanad Éireann, it was moved to have the Bill extended to smaller towns where traders travelled “with stands and lorries” and created competition to established traders. In response, O’Higgins asserted that the Bill did not try to define “what form of competition is or is not legitimate with the traders of a town”, nor did he want to speculate if “the shop of the future is going to be a stationary shop or a movable shop”. He said that he did not want to eliminate street traders and reiterated that the government was trying to keep “the streets and pathways of the towns and cities reasonably free from obstruction”. Here is an indication of the state’s ‘Best Intentions’. This also indicates that the legislation was, according to the Free State government’s rationale, a Foucauldian (1980a) ‘truth’ and one that underpinned the ‘right’ or legal apparatus of the Bill.
In this final statement he conceptualised street traders as “a rather harmless class of people” who lived by the sale of “small wares”, but had not “attained the prosperity which would enable them to have premises on which they would pay rates”. Thus, the Free State government knew of their poverty but was not prepared to address it. Instead the state was fully prepared to move forward with a regulatory mechanism that had the potential to limit their respective abilities to earn. Instead, he had allowed the street traders to be the ‘problem’ that the Act, as a Foucauldian (1991) ‘programme of conduct’, was designed to address. On 13 April 1926 The Street Trading Act, 1926, “An Act To Regulate Street-Trading in the County Borough of Dublin and Also in Such Other County Boroughs and Urban County Districts as May Adopt the Act”, was passed.

4.5 The Street Trading Act, 1926

The Minister of Justice was clear in both his introduction of the Bill, and in response to questions about the possibility that street trading would be eliminated, that the Act was intended to regulate the trading activities of women street traders. However, it is clear from the opening of the Act that, despite O’Higgins’s stated ‘Best Intention’, this was an overt effort to rationalise urban space: the Act severely limited street traders’ access to public space, the ways in which they could trade. In short, the Shawlies would go from no regulation to hyper-regulation. Minister O’Higgins codified a historic source of subsistence income for poor women in creating a Foucauldian (1991) ‘programme of conduct’. In the process the Act delimited the power of the government and the police to interfere with the potential for poor women to earn. The result was, as Foucault (1991) asserts, the domination of those who did not speak this same ‘truth’.

In Section 1, Definitions, the “street” is established as a “highway, whether thoroughfare or not”, and is extended in the definition to include the adjoining footpath. The provision was added that any references to a street included “references to any part of a street”. This scope eliminated any opening for interpretation: the street was a highway of any description and it, along with the footpaths and “any part of a street”, were subject to these regulations. The term “street-trading” was a broad-based activity defined as “selling of goods by retail in a street to passersby”; not only did it include
offering and exposing, but simply by carrying goods a person was now engaged in street trading. “Goods” included wares and merchandise with the added catch all “and other articles of any kind whatsoever”. This eliminated the exemptions for food under the previous legislation, would now include used goods, and even the “bits of heather and bunches of faded flowers” referred to in the letter to the editor of the Irish Times 3 November 1924.

These broad definitions would, conceivably, make it easier to regulate every level of petty trading in public space. The prohibition was equally broad. According to the second section, it was now against the law in any street in the City of Dublin for anyone “to sell or offer, expose, or carry for sale any good of any description” without a street-trader's certificate, or “to engage in any form of stall-trading” without a street-trader's stall licence. This meant that women who had previously sold goods on a footpath, street, or lane, whether from their hands, a basket, their shawls, or a barrel, could no longer do so without a certificate; in the case of the barrel, she would need a stall-trader’s licence. This would have consequences for the women who, say, traded occasionally based on financial circumstances, and those at the lower end of petty trade who were walking a fine line between trading and begging by offering “faded flowers” for sale.

Another consideration for poor women was the fee of five shillings needed to apply for a certificate, and the additional five shillings payable by those who wanted to obtain a stall traders licence after the street traders certificate had been obtained (S. 3). According to section three, the fees for a street traders certificate would go to the Exchequer. Those paid at the time of application for a stall trader’s licence were to be “paid into the fund applicable to the purposes of the Public Health Act” (S. 4). Thus, as part of their regulation, they were also made to cover the costs of the administration of the Act, an early neoliberal provision.
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44 Twenty shillings made up £1 in 1926. Five shilling would then be valued at 1/4 of £1. This would put the value of the street traders certificate in 2005 currency values at approximately £7.
There were new procedures in the Act that complicated the process of getting a certificate. After paying the fee along with the application to An Garda Síochána, the power to approve or deny a certificate was held by the Commissioner, or the Chief Superintendent of a particular district: he could grant a certificate if he alone was satisfied that a “person” was “fit and proper…to have a street-trader’s certificate” (S. 3.1). Under *The Pedlar’s Act, 1871*, the procedure was the same. However, if the pedlar’s certificate was denied at application, an appeal mechanism was in place: the applicant could get a hearing in court and, potentially, obtain the license. Under *The Street Trading Act, 1926*, the appeal mechanism was removed. Who was successful and who was not was at the discretion of the Commissioner or Chief Superintendent only, and his decision was final. The stall-trader's licence could only be obtained once a street-trader's certificate had been obtained; the power to grant a stall-trader's licence was at the discretion of the Corporation (S. 4), without recourse to an appeal if denied.

As a further measure of observation, a registry of all certificates and stall licences granted was to be kept by both the Commissioner and the Corporation.

Control over the certificates and licenses, down to the ways in which trading was carried out, was hyper-regulated. Not only were street traders prohibited from engaging in stall trading (S. 2.3), but stall traders were prohibited from engaging in street trading as set out in the Act after the stall-trader's licence had been obtained, despite holding a street-trader’s certificate (S. 2.3). The manner in which trade could be carried out was clearly articulated. A certified street trader had to “actually” carry the goods directly in hand, “or by means of a tray, bag, basket, or other like receptacle”; limits would be prescribed in the regulations (S. 3.2). Critically, it was illegal for a street trader to trade in a manner other than that prescribed.

Stall-traders licences were of two types. The first allowed the trader to sell, expose, or carry from “a wheeled and moveable stall, barrow, cart or other vehicle”; the licence would indicate if the trader could operate in any street in the City of Dublin subject to the list of prohibited streets (S. 4.2.a). The second authorised the sale, exposure, or conveyance on a “stall, booth, or other stand”; the licence would specify in which street and “in any part of such street or in a particular part thereof” or at a “particular place
therein” (S. 4.2.b). In either case the goods available would be stipulated on the licence, creating problems for women who sold a variety of goods, depending upon the available supply. Critically, it was illegal for a stall trader to trade in a manner other than that prescribed: thus, trading illegally, did not simply apply to those who traded without a certificate or licence.

An Garda Síochána were given powers to enforce the Act under Section 9. Gardaí could demand to review the certificate of any person “observed to be engaged in street trading other than stall-trading”. A stall trader was compelled to produce his certificate, stall licence and, if he or she employed assistants, disclose the number of assistants and their names and addresses. If the stall trader failed or refused to produce the permit, or refused to allow Gardaí to “read and examine same”, the trader was guilty of an offence. Further, Gardaí could demand that a licensed stall trader in a street, at a particular time, or selling a particular type of goods prohibited under by-laws or regulations to remove himself/herself and the goods in question “from that particular street or from the streets generally”. Failing to comply with any of the foregoing could result in the person being arrested without warrant along with the seizure of all goods.

In the debate on 19 January 1926, TD Thomas Johnson had expressed concern about the powers of arrest being too drastic. Under the Act Gardaí had the power to arrest anyone failing or refusing to comply with these demands to produce a certificate, licence, or the information stipulated, along with anyone selling, offering or exposing goods for sale who did not have a certificate or a licence. They could also seize goods without warrant, a penalty that had particular consequence for poor women traders. The seizure of “goods” included all goods for sale along with “the receptacle, vehicle, or stand” for carrying or exposing goods. This included an animal, if used, to pull the stall/vehicle, and even “utensils, boxes and other articles”. Money was included in the definition of “goods”, and therefore whatever they had earned or cash they were carrying with them could be seized.

Provision was made for the disposal of goods seized under Section 11. Within three days of seizing goods, and within twelve hours of seizing perishables, Gardaí could sell
the goods, with the proceeds of the sale appropriated to “defray all expenses incurred in
the seizure, removal storage, and sale of the goods”. In short, sale was made to defray
the costs of enforcing the Act, in addition to the defrayal of costs for administering the
Act. Any surplus funds from the sale would be given to the person who owned the
goods at the time of seizure. However, the goods would be returned to the owner if the
owner satisfied the Commissioner that he/she was the owner, and then paid the
Commissioner the costs of the “seizure, removal, storage, and any intended or attempted
sale of the goods”. Again, an early neoliberal defrayal of costs. If food or drink was
seized and was, in the opinion of the Commissioner, unfit for human consumption, it
would be ordered to be destroyed. No doubt the promise of seizure to this degree would
be a threat to a poor woman. Furthermore, the disposal and sale of goods marks a
punishment that is meted out by the police, and not by the courts.

Under Section 2, anyone found guilty of an offence pursuant to the Act was found guilty
of a criminal summary conviction offence. The fines were substantial for the day,
particularly when the population they would affect is considered: first offence, up to £5
— valued at approximately £150 in 2005—and on the second or any subsequent offence
up to £10. Further penalties for convictions would threaten a trader’s ability to earn in
the future. In the case of a certified trader convicted of an offence pursuant to any
section, regulation, or bye-law under the Act, the courts could revoke the certificate as
part of the sentence. Furthermore, if a certified street trader were convicted “of any
crime or other offence which in the opinion of the Court renders such holder unfit to
continue to hold such certificate”, the court could revoke the certificate at sentencing.
The types of crimes or offences were not stipulated, but were left to the discretion of the
court. Furthermore, the revocation of a certificate compelled the “register, clerk, or
other principal officer of the court” to notify the Commissioner of An Garda Síochána
and the Corporation, and all revocations were to be recorded in a register.

The powers granted to the local authority also focused attention on public health and
safety. Provision was made in the Act for by-laws to be made that ensured the
cleanliness of vehicles, stands, receptacles, and utensils when food and drink were for
sale; likewise, the seller was prohibited from carrying or handling food “without a
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protective container or wrapper” on goods. Specific sections of the *Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1878* applied to by-laws made in this regard. Expenses incurred by the local authority when implementing the Act would be “defrayed out of the rate or fund applicable to the purposes of the *Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1878*”. The funds collected with applications made for certificates and licenses to supplement that “rate or fund”, an early neoliberal proviso that made street traders responsible for the cost of implementing the Act.

The Minister of Local Government and Public Health shared some responsibility for the Act with the Minister of Justice as street trading laws were, ultimately, to be adopted by the local authority. It was noted in the Act that while the City of Dublin was cited as the municipality where the Act would be adopted, *The Street Trading Act, 1926* was open to any council of any county borough or urban county district in Ireland. The powers of a municipality to make bye-laws pursuant to the Act focused primarily on the activities of stall traders and included: the prohibition of stall trading in particular streets, the times when it could be carried out in particular streets generally or for the sale of “any specified description of goods”, and “limiting the size and character of vehicles and stands used” in specific streets and for specific goods. Specific provisions such as tray dimensions could also be defined by the municipality. However the Minister of Justice could, specifically, prescribe the “size of the receptacles” certified street traders used to carry goods, and The Minister of Justice could also prohibit street trading, a particular “class” of street trading, “or any particular class of stall-trading” in specified streets.

4.6 The Regulations Made 22 July 1926

The first set of regulations was ordered on 22 July 1926 by Minister of Justice O’Higgins. These are notable for two critical reasons. Firstly, they demonstrate that the government shared both the negative stereotypes of the street traders voiced by men such as TD Bryan Cooper. Secondly, the concern for prohibiting street trading from what TD Thomas Johnson characterised as “useful” streets is very apparent.

The allegation had been raised by Cooper during the readings of the Bill that street traders were transient and elusive. The provision was made in the regulations for a
trader to notify the Commissioner of an address change. The Street Trader’s Certificate also carried a written description of the certificate holder including: age, height, complexion, hair, eyes, and “Any peculiarity of features, etc.”, an inclusion that would eliminate the potential for a certified street trader to loan a certificate to someone who was uncertified.

The list of streets O’Higgins designated as prohibited for street trading were: Grafton Street, Nassau Street, Dawson Street, Suffolk Street, Wicklow Street, Exchequer Street, South Great George's Street, College Green, College Street, Dame Street, Westmoreland Street, O'Connell Street, North Earl Street, Parliament Street, and “that portion of Talbot Street between Gardiner Street and Marlboro Street”. These streets were listed on the back of the Street Trader’s Certificate, a persistent warning to the street trader not to trade on those streets.

O’Higgins had not named specific streets, districts, businesses, or residential areas when he specified that there had been complaints, nor was he specific when asked where trading would be prohibited, indicating only “certain streets”. Following this designation, TD Johnson replied: “useful streets”, a more appropriate designation in light of those listed. The prohibition had been placed on streets comprising Dublin’s commercial centre, Trinity College, and governmental centres including Dublin’s city hall. More importantly these streets formed the core or abutted Dublin’s major upscale retail streets.

A significant event on Grafton Street in 1926 provides some indication of why this particular street was designated. That was the year of when the construction of the landmark Bewley’s Cafe was underway. Completed in 1927, the cafe cost £60,000, what is estimated in currency values of 2005 to be approximately £1,798,200. Bewley’s had existing cafes on two other streets targeted under the Act—Westmoreland Street and Georges Street. Of particular significance, the company currently uses the words “grandeur” and “ambition” to describe the building that would become its cafe on

---

45 The information on Bewley’s cafes is taken from the company history provided by the Bewley’s at http://bewleys.com/bewleys-grafton-street-cafe/our-heritage.
Grafton Street. This was, evidently, critical to the configuration of the new state and its
capital: the company’s website records 1926 as one when this building was critical, and
the Grafton Street cafe is reputed to have represented “a huge vote of confidence in a
city and a country that had endured great turbulence”. Bewley’s, then, represents one of
what Nicholas (2009, p. 260) conceptualises as modernity’s “agents of progress”. The
post-independence gentrification of Dublin was underway, and women street traders
were clearly not welcome in the city centre.

4.7 The Early Neoliberal Context For Regulation
As was noted in Chapter 2, complaints against street traders formed the bulk of what is
the existing knowledge about them and their work in Ireland. In Cork those complaints
frequently implied deviance: blocked footpaths, competition to stall traders in the
covered markets, and hygiene. These complaints in and of themselves converge with
neoliberal notions of efficiency, enterprise, and security respectively. The idea of
neoliberal individualisation and self-reliance emanated from the Cumman na Gaedheal
leaders of the day, including William Cosgrave, in the sentiments cited at the opening of
this chapter. Furthermore, the provisions of the Act indicate an early neoliberal
emphasis on fiscal austerity in public services in the regulation of street traders where
fees and fines are earmarked to offset the costs of administering the Act.

Garvin (2004, p. 26) characterises the leaders in the government of the newly
independent Ireland as “a conservative, if democratic nationalist elite”. It has been
observed that the Minister of Justice who introduced the Act, Kevin O’Higgins, was
pleased to characterise the outcome of the Anglo-Irish War as a conservative revolution
(Lee, 1989; Garvin, 2004). According to Powell (1992, p. 165) the leaders in the new
government were “committed nationalists with little time for social reform”. Ó Gráda
(1997, p. 91) alleges that the fiscal and economic policies of the first Government “are
likely to have increased the gap between rich and poor” in the new Irish state. Powell
(1992, p. 166) cites a reduction in public expenditure between 1923 and 1927 of nearly
£10,000,000, and a concurrent reduction in income tax from 5s to 3s as evidence of that
government’s unwavering “allegiance to the promotion of the interests of the native
bourgeoisie”. Furthermore, Jones (1988, p. 77) offers that the “demands of employers
dominated the industrial scene” over those of workers in the opening years of Irish independence.

According to Garvin (2004, p. 29), those who were disenfranchised in Irish society were those “whose interests were not addressed, either because they did not suit the interests of elites or because they represented modes of living and ways of earning a living that were obsolescent or declared to be anti-social”. Among those he cites as being at a disadvantage and “commonly discouraged, or even prevented…from plying their trades and earning their living” were “small grocers, booksellers…sweetshop proprietors…and women workers” (p. 29). Street traders were not listed, but they would have fallen lower on the social ladder than small grocers, booksellers, and sweetshop proprietors; they definitely fell under the larger catch-all “women workers”. Jones (1988, p. 87) credits the absence of an agenda for women workers to the “absence of women from mainstream political movements” in Ireland at the time.

The austerity measures of the Free State government’s fiscal agenda point to a larger attack on the poor which did, I will show, create a climate of ease for the implementation of the *The Street Trading Act, 1926*. The first government in the newly independent Ireland was noted to have stressed low rates of taxation (Ó Gráda, 1994; Considine and Dukelow, 2009) in addition to the pursuit of an “outward-looking commercial policy” that focused on the macroeconomy as a panacea for Ireland’s economic troubles (Ó Gráda, 1994, p. 385). According to Considine and Dukelow (2009, p. 26), the new state had “little industrial infrastructure and few resources” to help develop industrially. No doubt this further complicated the ability of women and men to find work in the formal economy. Jones (1988) notes that when women in the labour movement identified sectors that, if encouraged, would increase employment for women in industry, these lobbying attempts were ignored.

According to Haughton (1995, p. 14), the years 1921 to 1932 were characterised by the ‘treasury view’ with priorities established for “free trade, low taxes and government spending, and modest direct state intervention in industry and agriculture”, provisions that would, later in the century, be hallmarks of neoliberal globalisation. Futhermore,
Haughton (1995, p. 16) compares the economic policy of the first Free State government to policies prescribed by “the World Bank to less developed countries in the 1980s”, those characterised by neoliberal economic imperatives such as reduced budget deficits, reduced government intervention in the economy, and “a conservative monetary policy”. In October 1922 when the Minister for Industry and Commerce, Joseph McGrath, was asked what actions would be taken to intervene in the economy to create work for the growing numbers of unemployed his replied that there were no plans, followed two months later by “there is no money, the Government cannot do anything” (quoted Powell, 1992, p. 166).

The Free State government was limited by a lack of capital (Meehan, 2010), and the substantial reconstruction debt that followed the Anglo-Irish War and the Irish Civil War stymied the government for many years (Garvin, 2004; Considine and Dukelow, 2009). However, in response to the daunting expense of reconstruction, William Cosgrave, as the government’s Minister for Finance, introduced the Local Authorities Destructive Bill which downloaded fiscal responsibility for reconstruction from the Free State government onto county councils and corporations (Meehan, 2010), a move that would simultaneously, create a need for local authorities to raise funds via fees, fines, and taxes. For ratepayers this would have meant a greater strain on their resources, and for the local authority this would have created a need to raise revenues through fees and fines through vehicles such as The Street Trading Act, 1926.

After the cost of repairing the infrastructure, one of the new state's most significant expenditures was pensions (Considine and Dukelow, 2009; Meehan, 2010). Ernest Blythe⁴⁶, the first Minister of Finance made significant cuts to the old age pension in 1924 by limiting both the payout and the entitlement (Ó Gráda 1997; Considine and Dukelow 2009). This put women at a disadvantage because 67,000 of the 114,000, approximately 58% of the persons receiving the old age pension, were women (Lee 1989, p. 126). Minister of Local Government, Seamus Burke⁴⁷ justified the cut by citing “one of the most serious defects of the Irish character” as “dependence”,

⁴⁶ See list of Key Public Personages.
⁴⁷ See list of Key Public Personages.
indicating that an increased number of Irish citizens were leading “a parasitic existence” in relation to those “striving to make an honest living” (quoted Ó Gráda, 1997, p. 91). Burke was the Minister of Local Government when The Street Trading Act, 1926 was created, and he confirmed the first by-laws submitted by the Civic Commissioners in Dublin. In addition to this cut, the pension for the blind was reduced and the criteria for receiving that pension was tightened (Lee, 1989).

However, the Free State’s budget carried a reduction in income tax equivalent to the decrease in the Old Age Pension which led to allegations that Blythe favoured the wealthy in Irish society (Meehan, 2010). These moves, according to Meehan (2010, p. 32), “compounded the perception that Cumann na nGaedheal was the party of the middle-classes and big business”. Ó Gráda (1994, p. 386) observed that much of Cumann na Gaedheal’s core of support came from the urban middle-class and “the more substantial farmers”; Considine and Dukelow (2009) refer to middle-class farmers as having more influence in Ireland than the collective voice of labour. This led to what has been referred to as a rural-over-urban bias that led to the neglect of urban concerns such as housing (O’Connell, 2007), and the development of an agricultural agenda for the economy (Considine and Dukelow, 2009).

Unemployment rose rapidly in Ireland after 1920 as the postwar boom halted (Lee, 1989). In October 1924, during debate in Dáil Éireann about the unemployment problem in the state, the Minister for Industry and Commerce, Patrick McGilligan48, announced that “people may have to die in this country and die of starvation” (quoted Ó Gráda 1997, p. 91). Later that same year Cumann na nGaedheal eliminated unemployment insurance, only to reintroduce it with new legislation in 1926. By 1926 the unemployment rate was approximately 12% (Lee, 1989, p. 126). In this same era, working women were viewed, increasingly, as threats to employed men (Jones, 1988). The political agenda of the day, according to Jones (1988, p. 87), had no place for “the question of the employment of women”.

48 See list of Key Public Personages.
More significant for poor women, the unemployment rate among those who were classified as domestics and those who were or had husbands employed as agricultural labourers, the unemployment rate in those two sectors was 17%; they were also excluded from receiving unemployment insurance available to workers in other sectors (Lee 1989, p. 126). According to Powell (1992, p. 172), in 1926, 60% of Irish women who were working were employed in those two sectors. It is likely, then, that poor women who were disproportionately affected by these trends would turn to street trading to survive. Pressure also emanated from other sectors where women were not dominant in the opening years of the Free State: unemployment among women previously employed in factories and trades was prevalent and further “aggravated by the displacement of workers following the introduction of new machinery” (Jones, 1988, p. 66).

Considine and Dukelow (2009, p. 25) observe that the government of the Irish Free State inherited from colonial rule “a suspicion of welfare and its effect on character”. The Local Government (Temporary Provisions) Act, 1923 closed the workhouses that had been available to the destitute, and replaced them with relief payments that were allocated locally via a means test. Payments were available for one month at a time, making it necessary to apply monthly (Considine and Dukelow, 2009). Relief was, according to Considine and Dukelow (2009, p. 27), “highly stigmatising” and women were disproportionately affected: they note that more women applied then men “for themselves and their children”. Their numbers included widows, deserted wives, and unmarried mothers (Considine and Dukelow, 2009). In this arena, women were further stigmatised as the decade progressed. While they may have been disproportionately affected by unemployment and the need to access relief, in 1927 William Cosgrave “refused to appoint a woman to the Relief of Unemployment Committee” (Jones, 1988 p. 87). The report of that Committee, released in February 1928, did not even mention women (Jones, 1988).

According to Lee (1989) men in the newly independent Ireland were encountering problems finding work; the demobilisation of soldiers from the Free State Army following the ceasefire in the Irish Civil War added their numbers to the ranks of the
unemployed (Powell, 1992). Many men also lost work in the local authorities amid fiscal cutbacks in areas such as road work (Powell, 1992). According to Powell (1992), government employment schemes during this period paid very little. Thus, even married women who numbered among the poor and working-classes may have turned to trade to supplement the family income if relief was not available, if they were too ashamed to collect it, or if the sum received was inadequate.

According to Powell (1992, p. 172), Irish women remained “generally economically and socially dependent upon men”; however, even women “who achieved a modicum of independence through joining the workforce found themselves in a largely subordinate state” witnessed by the numbers employed as domestics and agricultural labourers. Presumably, too, witnessed by the numbers who found themselves self-employed as street traders. Whether economically advantaged or disadvantaged, women were at a larger social disadvantage in the new Ireland, an indication that the needs of poor women were not likely to be foregrounded on the government’s agenda.

According to Considine and Dukelow (2009), Minister of Justice Kevin O’Higgins, when introducing the *Juries Bill* in 1927, revealed a sexist bias. Amid protests that women were excluded from serving as jurors O’Higgins provided the rationale that “a few words in a Constitution do not wipe out the differences between the sexes, either physical or mental or temperamental or emotional” (quoted Considine and Dukelow, 2009, p. 28). This, Considine and Dukelow (2009, p. 28) assert, illustrates legislators’ view of women as “fundamentally different to men in a way that did not warrant equality with men”. According to Jones (1988, p. 87), working women in 1920s Ireland were particularly problematic, and were “deemed a transient” minority group, with employment classified as “a less desirable status than marriage and motherhood” for Irish women.

Perhaps most significant to women street traders in this regard is the link between the beliefs cited earlier about women in the public sphere that were identified by Luddy (2007). This aligns with the emphasis on social control that Considine and Dukelow (2009, p. 28) allege extended to women through an emphasis on traditional roles for
women in marriage and the home, and yet they “were subordinate partners” in marriage. According to Considine and Dukelow (2009, p. 28), this was viewed as “central to social order and social control”, and a need for order “was heightened in the early decades of independence” as the new state was redefining itself after colonisation. This need for order—a modernist view that typically extends to street-based marketplaces according to Cross (2000)—posed a clear threat to women trading in the public sphere.

However, despite fiscal austerity in the area of social welfare, and the deepened threats to the livelihoods of those who numbered among the poor, the Shannon Electricity Scheme was completed in 1929 at a cost of approximately £8 million (Meehan, 2010). The legislation that created the project was passed in 1925, just prior to the introduction of the bill that would create The Street Trading Act, 1926. The Shannon Scheme was considered “a symbol of the government's investment in the future”, significant in the “concept of nation-building”, and a “symbol of modernity and progress for the fledgling state” (Meehan, 2010, pp. 58-60). It created 4,000 jobs for men, however they earned “pitifully inadequate wages”, some earning “less than £1 per week” (Powell, 1992, p. 168).

A poignant example of the disregard had by the Cosgrave government for the urban poor occurred in 1923. Seanad Éireann passed a resolution to withhold £400,000 in funds from the Dublin Corporation that were allocated to replace the substandard housing in which so many of the city’s poor lived (Flanagan, 2009). The funds were withheld because the Dublin Corporation was paying partial support to several families of Corporation employees who were jailed for fighting on the anti-Treaty49 side during the Irish civil war (Flanagan, 2009). On 7 February 1923, Senator Thomas Farren50 proposed to have the resolution withdrawn and questioned if it was fair to visit the sins of so few” on the unfortunate people who are rotting in the filthy slums of the city?” (quoted Flanagan, 2009, p. 225). An Taoiseach Cosgrave’s reply is indicative of contempt for the poor and, according to Flanagan (2009), a patriarchal attitude in his

49 Those who were anti-Treaty were those who opposed the Anglo-Irish Treaty that formed the Irish Free State. They fought against the Free State during the Irish Civil War.

50 According to the Dictionary of Irish Biography, Farren was a trade unionist from Dublin and a member of the Labour Party.
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approach to governance. In response to the question, Cosgrave said that “The time comes when fathers, as well as Governments, have got to correct any delinquencies of their children, or subjects, or citizens” (Flanagan, 2009, p. 225).

4.8 The Debate In The Aftermath

According to the database of debates in the Oireachtas, the issue was not raised again in 1926. The Act was not implemented in Dublin until later in the year. According to the 9 October 1926 edition of the *Irish Times*, the delay was due to the need for the City Commissioners to write and enact the by-laws, and provisions that needed to be drafted by the Department of Justice; the regulations were said to encourage a more “orderly” type of street trading.

On 5 October 1926 an opinion-editorial ran in the *Irish Times* announcing that the Act would soon come into force. The correspondent alleged that Dublin’s streets had been “disfigured” by street trading, including the “best business thoroughfares in the Free State capital”, emphasising the appearance of what constitutes a worthy capital. It was further alleged that street trading created losses for “respectable” traders and “ratepayers in general”. The scene on Dublin’s footpaths was depicted as a “camping ground” with “shouting basket holders” filling the air with “tumult” while assailing the public with “importunate appeals”. The correspondent went on to describe the scene as more “noisy and unpleasant” that what one would find in an “Oriental bazaar” or a “continental ghetto”, an implication that street trading was not suited to a modern, bourgeois capital. “Moral and economic evils” were said to “flow from this evil state of affairs”.

The street traders themselves were characterised as “Kerb-trading apple women” forming a “gauntlet”, which pedestrians were reluctant to run in order to reach the shops they had once frequented. Their poverty was, evidently known, as they were said to reap only a “petty harvest” from street trading. Street traders were also alleged to encourage deviance in the form of “shiftless and tricky habits”, a result of not being answerable to an authority. The correspondent urged the Commissioners to keep moving with this effort and urged citizens not to buy from street traders. On the issue of
legal pitches, it was suggested that only “respectable” people should be allowed to trade publicly at a limited number of venues.

On 4 December 1926 the *Irish Times* published the by-laws and an appendix of prohibited streets prepared by the Commissioners, one that well exceeded those named in the regulations published by O’Higgins the previous July. This bears out TD Johnson’s concern that local authorities would seize the opportunity to wipe out trading altogether. Questions about the large discrepancy between what the Minister of Justice considered an adequate number of streets to prohibit, and the number the Commissioners actually prohibited, it appears, were never raised. On 22 January 1927, an expanded list of prohibited streets totalling approximately 250 streets was published. The Commissioners also announced that trading in Dublin would be confined to Moore Street “and a few other thoroughfares” that were not specified. Clearly, the ‘rule of law’ where the law is applied institutionally to the economy in “principle, effects, and validity” (Foucault, 2010c, p. 169), was in motion under the guise of regulating the traders. As a result, the economy was being reconfigured for buyers and sellers, and the economy at the level of the street was being contained and isolated.

Here is it evident that ‘rule of law’ (Foucault, 2010c) worked tidily with bourgeois and modern gentrification (Berman, 1988; Zukin, 1991) to configure a ‘Prosperous State’ by implementing a policy of ‘Best Intentions’. According to the Commissioner interviewed, the prohibition was extended to what he labelled Dublin’s “major show streets” to wipe away “the tawdriness of Dublin”, make it more like other major cities, and fulfil their “municipal duty of street cleansing”. Again, the emphasis was on the problem created by the appearance and presence of street traders, rather than on addressing their poverty. He went on to say that they wanted to make Dublin a “clean, hygienic, and beautiful city”. He characterised street trading as an “abuse”, one that had become more prolific in recent years. He made it clear they were acting with ‘Best Intentions’: he said he “regretted” moving people from their established pitches, but insisted this was for the “general good”. Evidently alleviating gendered poverty was not for the ‘general good’.
In the *Irish Times* on 12 February 1927 an article ran under the title “Street Trading in Dublin”, subtitled “Ensuring Tidiness and Cleanliness”. The article advised that the Act was coming into force at the start of the following week, and went on to list the requirements for being able to trade on the street legally. It was noted that “some objection” was made to the “new regulations”, but was not elaborated upon. It was noted that many applications had been received but, according to the article, there was a delay determining “the suitability of the pitches”. Thus, it was anticipated there would be a delay by the traders in moving “from their old haunts into the streets now set aside for trading”. There was a caution that the City Commissioners had no intention of allowing the Act to “become a dead letter”, however there was no indication of what would happen to the street traders livelihoods in the meantime.

Concerns regarding persecution surrounding the Act’s implementation were raised almost immediately in Dail Éireann during oral questions on 16 February. Thomas Nagle⁵¹, TD for Cork North in Cork city, asked the Minister of Local Government and Public Health, Seamus Burke, to use his powers under *The Street Trading Act, 1926* to hold an inquiry. The large number of prohibited streets, he said, had led to “widespread dissatisfaction amongst” the street traders. This did not move Burke. He replied that because the by-laws had been published in advance of the enactment, and the Civic Commissioners had reported no objections to the new regulations, no inquiry would be held. He added that an inquiry must be done prior to confirmation of the by-laws and not afterwards, and these regulations had been confirmed on 18 January. For this reason, Burke replied, he had “no power to rescind the by-laws”.

On 19 February the *Irish Times* reported that “another big batch” of applications for stall traders licenses had been received at the Dublin Corporation; the article revealed the local authority would limit the number issued to approximately 200. To that point, it was reported, 80 applications had been received. The article stated that the Corporation intended to be “rigorous” in its enforcement, again a suggestion of deviance and the anticipated need to deal with it. The article went on to describe a demonstration by a “considerable body of the recalcitrant traders” who marched with “a band at their head”

⁵¹ See list of Key Public Personages.
to the Commissioners’ offices in protest. They were reported to have “declared they would never surrender their rights”. Newspaper coverage of this demonstration in the *Irish Times* was not located in the digital database.

On 31 March 1927 during oral questions Nagle again raised the issue of an inquiry, to which Burke referred him to the previous answer: no inquiry. Nagle asked Burke how many prosecutions under the Act were underway in Dublin; Burke replied that he did not know. Nagle asked if the Minister was “aware that street traders generally” were not in the habit of reading the statutory notices placed in the *Irish Times* and *The Independent*, the two newspapers where the government had placed notices, and an indication that Nagle knew or believed that street traders were likely working-class or poor and, possibly, that many among their number could not read. The result, he informed Burke, was that the street traders were not aware of the regulations until they were charged with violations. He advised Burke that on several occasions he and other deputies had tried to speak with the City Commissioners to place “the views of the street traders before them”, but their attempts were “in vain”. He then asked Burke to “take these facts into consideration” and hold an inquiry to allow street traders to air their grievances.

Burke did not comment on the lack of proper notice of the Act’s implementation that Nagle alleged. From Nagle’s questioning, it is clear that Burke would not hold an inquiry despite the allegations that the traders had not been adequately notified of changes in the regulations on Dublin’s streets. It is also evident that the police were charging traders and a number of prosecutions would go forward despite this allegation. The fact that Nagle and others had tried and did not gain access to the Commissioners speaks to the limited voice of street traders, even when elected officials were trying to speak on their behalf. After questioning Burke, Nagle reiterated the hardship wrought of failing to properly advise the street traders, advising they had “been put off the street without having an opportunity of knowing anything about the matter until the notice was slung at them”. Burke simply said that an inquiry would not go forward, and told Nagle to take his representations directly to the Commissioners. He then added that in
view of what had been said, he would take the matter up with the Commissioners himself.

TD Alfred Byrne\(^{52}\) then asked the Minister to recommend to the Commissioners that prosecutions cease pending an inquiry into the allocation of “reasonable sites” to traders who have been “deprived of their means of livelihood”. Burke repeated that he had no power to hold an inquiry, and that there would be no inquiry, and did not address the concern raised over prosecutions. Byrne then asked again if Burke would recommend that prosecutions cease until after he met with the Commissioners; Burke replied that he could not do that. Byrne advised that traders were suffering “great hardships” from “being hunted from pillar to post”. He then said he would ask Cosgrave “to interest himself in their cases, and see that the prosecutions would cease.” There was no further comment from Burke. TD Bryan Cooper was recorded as questioning if the grievance here was “that people have been hunted from the Pillar to the Post Office?”, an observation that implies the problem was that street traders were now forced to pay fees in order to trade legally, an allegation that further renders them as ‘outsiders’.

On 24 May 1927 in the *Irish Times* an article ran under the title “Street Trading: A Fresh Batch of Prosecutions”. According to the correspondent a “large” number of cases against traders charged with trading without licenses were before the courts. According to the Magistrate, the traders had complained that the alternative, Longford Street, offered to those who had been trading from stalls in South Great George’s Street was not suitable for stalls and the space was insufficient to accommodate all those who had been displaced. The Magistrate also stated that street traders “were discharging a public service, and an essential one”; he asked the defendants to move to the streets allocated, take out certificates, and he believed their custom would follow. In terms of sentencing, those appearing for the first time were given probation, those previously fined were now fined 20s, and those not appearing were fined 40s.

On 18 June 1927 an article appeared in the *Irish Times* under the title “Defiant Street Traders: Sympathisers Assemble Outside Court”. Eleven women and one man, were

\(^{52}\) See list of Key Public Personages.
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charged with having traded on South Great George’s Street “contrary to the regulations”. The Inspector testified that they had been selling fruits and vegetables from stalls without licenses and had declared “their intention to continue to trade there”. The solicitor representing the traders was out of town, and so an adjournment was requested until the following week when he would appear. The application was denied and the traders were convicted: each was fined 20s. The correspondent wrote that sympathisers had been kept in the streets by the police, and “the gate leading to the courtyard” had been locked to keep them out.

On 30 June in the Dail, TD Alfred Byrne asked Richard Mulcahy53, the new Minister of Local Government and Public Health, if he would recommend to the local authority that suitable sites be found for Dublin’s street traders. Evidently there had been no movement on that issue since it was first raised with Minister Burke in March, despite what is known about the numbers of prosecutions that occurred in the interim. He asked if Mulcahy was aware that a suitable site had been located, and that street traders were prepared “to pay a reasonable rent for allotted spaces” if the Dublin Corporation acquired it and made it “suitable”. He also advised the Minister that the addition of a new road in the city centre had meant that vehicular traffic in a prohibited area, one where traders had worked previously, was now reduced significantly. He then proposed that “in view of this reduction” the Minister should consider leaving street traders in that district undisturbed.

Mulcahy did not address the final part of the question. As for the new site, he indicated that he had been assured that the local authority was giving the site “the fullest possible consideration”, but that he had “no function in the matter”. Byrne then asked: “Has the Minister for Local Government no power to recommend to the City Commissioners, who are really responsible to his Department, the advisability of taking over this site” in order to “end the legal proceedings against, and the persecution of, these unfortunate traders?” Mulcahy replied that the matter should be left to the Commissioners. Clearly Minister Mulcahy and the government did not care to remedy the situation as it stood.

53 See list of Key Public Personages.
Furthermore, they were content to allow appointed administrators, the Civic Commissioners, to make significant changes to the life of Dublin’s streets unchecked.

On 18 November 1927 an article was published in the *Irish Times* under the title “Street Trading Order: Question of Title Raised”. According to the correspondent, the trial of fourteen women accused of selling fruit, fish, and vegetables in prohibited streets resumed. The women claimed they had been trading in South Great George’s street from “baskets and boards” for “periods as long as forty-six years”. In this case the prosecution cited the *Dublin South City Market Act, 1876* that “prohibited any person, except an auctioneer, from selling on certain streets, one of which was South Great George’s street”\(^{54}\); furthermore, that legislation “made it impossible to claim a prescriptive right to trade on that street”, in addition to the prohibition made by *The Street Trading Act, 1926* itself. The solicitor appearing on behalf of the traders insisted a “bona fide question of title” was involved—meaning that street traders had established a legal right of access to trade on that street. He went on to say that this, in turn, meant that the magistrate had no jurisdiction, and the case should be heard in another court. The magistrate concurred and, reserving judgement, adjourned the case for one week.

On 24 November TD Alfred Byrne asked the Minister of Justice, James Fitzgerald-Kenney\(^{55}\), to consider withdrawing prosecutions because of “the introduction of legislation to deal with the Greater Dublin Commission’s proposals”\(^{56}\) which would reinstate a reformed Council and Corporation, thereby removing the Commissioners who had implemented the Act. Fitzgerald-Kenney said he would not. Byrne then asked if what he characterised as “raids on street traders” would stop during the Christmas

---

\(^{54}\) The Dublin South City Market is currently known as the George’s Street Arcade. According to the official website [http://www.georgesstreetarcade.ie/history.php](http://www.georgesstreetarcade.ie/history.php), the Market was the first “purpose built Victorian shopping centre” in Dublin. The legislation passed in 1876 was specially passed to create the company that would acquire the land and build the market; provision was also made for improvements in the area, including widening streets. It was “promoted by wealthy families with extensive property interests in the city”.

\(^{55}\) See list of Key Public Personages.

\(^{56}\) Late in 1926, the Commission had proposed the new local authority structure to replace the old corporation and create a system of city management. Adopting the proposals would also mean elections of a new council, and would bring to an end governance by the Commissioners who had implemented the Act in Dublin. The city management system would first be adopted in Cork in 1929, and is described in the next chapter.
adjournment of the Dáil. Fitzgerald-Kenney replied that “The law exists, and the law must be carried out whether the Dáil is sitting or not”, thereby placing an emphasis on the law as Foucauldian (1980a) ‘right’, firmly putting the women street traders in the wrong. Byrne then asked if there was a need to “persecute” traders “during the Christmas season”, advising this was “the only time they have an opportunity of making a living”. Fitzgerald-Kenney reasserted the government’s position that “no one [is] being persecuted”, adding simply that “The law is there, and certain regulations have been made which it is the duty of the Executive to see carried out”.

The next day the *Irish Times* reported on the resumption of the trial in which the question of title had been introduced. According to the correspondent “A large number of female street traders occupied the dock”. The magistrate addressed the claim, citing similar cases where the High Court had held “that forty years use was sufficient evidence” to infer “a limited dedication of the street” for the use of the street traders. He insisted he was not “deciding anything”, but that he must hold that he did not have jurisdiction because evidence had been given from which “a certain inference might be drawn”. The prosecution declared that he was satisfied that “the order applied to all cases” and that the issue of jurisdiction “would be decided elsewhere”.

On 19 December, the same women appeared in court again. According to the *Irish Times* article on 20 December, one trader, Ellen Coleman, was charged with having assaulted a Garda, allegedly having struck him “on the head with a bread board”. She denied the charge, a denial “supported by others of the defendants”. According to their solicitor, the traders had applied for licences but had been refused. Furthermore, the alternative site on Longford street was not, as noted in the previous case, a suitable alternative site. The magistrate found that as the women had been trading for some considerable time the case had “extenuating circumstances”. He applied the Probation Act and dismissed all the cases. The correspondent reported that “The defendants left the Court in the best of humour”, and invoked a blessing on the magistrate.
The South Great George’s Street’s women traders appear in the Irish Times next on 6 March 1928. This time TD Robert Briscoe57 intervened to have their fines remitted, following allegations of “disorderly scenes in South Great George’s Street” the previous Saturday. Sixteen women traders were alleged to have breached the Act and assaulted a Garda. They were also charged with disorderly conduct. The women “entered into a bail bond to keep the peace for twelve months, and not to trade in South Great George’s Street”. Briscoe gave a surety in each case. According to their solicitor, Briscoe planned to raise the matter in Dáil Éireann with a view to raising a compensation fund for these women.

Briscoe was reported to have defended the street traders, calling them “decent, honest women” who been “forced by circumstances to make a living in this way”. On the consumers’ side, he added, their trade was “feeding a poor section of the community who could not afford to pay shop prices”. He said that forty women insisted they had a “vested interest” in trading where they were, but would move to Longford Street if they received financial compensation. The fines were then remitted, and the Magistrate told the defendants he was doing so because of Briscoe’s intervention, and his promise that they had agreed “not to trade again in South Great George’s Street”. He cautioned them: “If you break your word this time, not alone are you committing a breach of the law, but you are severely penalising Mr. Briscoe, and putting him in a very false position”. A search of the debates digital database of the Oireachtas did not produce an entry for Briscoe on behalf on the street traders, or on the topic of the Act.

On 16 March an article in the Irish Times appeared under the title “Street Traders Again: Moore Street A Public Market”. These street traders had been summoned for “throwing vegetable rubbish on the roadway” and others for trading without stall licenses. Critical in this case was that the Magistrate proclaimed Moore Street to be a public market “established from time immemorial”. He declared that the new legislation “could not ‘do away with’ the existing right of the people to do business there”. He went on to say that “in no other street in Dublin was there that right to trade in a public open market” and Moore Street was “a public market established by custom” where people could

57 See list of Key Public Personages.
exercise their right to trade. However, he added, they did not have the right to litter. He dismissed the charges of trading without a licence, but imposed fines for littering.

On 20 April the *Irish Times* reported on “More Trouble Over Street Traders: Justice and a Mistaken Idea”. Nine women were charged with trading in Lower Camden Street without certificates or stall licenses. In the testimony of one defendant, Christina Butler, she said that the “shopkeepers in the street did not object to the traders outside their doors”. The Magistrate said he found it “curious” that the shopkeepers like that street traders “bring business to the street”, adding “The idea that all shopkeepers are opposed to the street traders is a mistake”. The prosecution said that the opposite was true, to which the magistrate made a statement that points to the absence of consultation with the women street traders. He said: “I do not know why some attempt was not made to negotiate with [the street traders].” The prosecutor replied that, “a genuine effort had been made to accommodate these people”, but these efforts were “met with open defiance of the regulations”. This further constructs the women as deviant in light of what he characterised as legitimate attempts to accommodate them. This “defiance” identified by the prosecutor stands in marked contrast to the low-key response of elected members of the national government.

The coverage of the trials then moved to South Great George’s Street. The Magistrate said that the “trouble” there had been addressed by TD Briscoe with “tact and diplomacy”. He characterised Briscoe as “a public-spirited member of the legislature” who had “stepped in and found a solution”. At this juncture, “Some women” in the court identifying themselves as George’s street traders “shouted” that they had not yet been compensated as promised. The Magistrate then suggested an adjournment so that negotiations could be opened with the Civic Commissioners. The prosecutor then asked the Magistrate “to warn the defendants that in the interval they should not repeat the offence, and should keep out of Lower Camden Street”. The women accused were said to have shouted from the prisoner’s dock that “they would be back there in the morning”. The Magistrate then proceeded to order an adjournment for one month and “declined to warn the defendants as suggested” by the prosecutor. The prosecutor then issued a warning himself, saying “that if they went back to the prohibited street they
would find themselves in serious trouble”, a clear threat he felt he had the agency to make.

On 19 May 1928 the *Irish Times* reported on what was termed “Another phase in the Camden street trading crux”. Six women had been arrested and charged with trading without certificates. One woman had been stall trading and was fined £2; the others who were “selling vegetables, fruit and flowers from heavy baskets” were fined 10s. The solicitor representing the women indicated the women would take out certificates; the Magistrate decided that if they did so within three weeks the fines would be withdrawn. The same solicitor then appeared on behalf of eighteen women charged with trading in Parnell Street. He explained that TD Alfred Byrne58 “had been interesting himself in these cases, and was trying to make arrangements for them to move into a street adjacent to Parnell Street”. The solicitor asked for the fines to be mitigated if his clients agreed to take out certificates, and not to trade from stalls on Parnell Street. The Magistrate agreed to do so.

On 30 May 1928, in Dáil Éireann, TD Alfred Byrne asked the Minister of Local Government and Public Health “whether, notwithstanding any previous inquiry” the Minister would now hold an inquiry to review the by-laws in Dublin. He added that the by-laws now completely prohibited stall trading in streets where “formerly and customarily” stall trading had been carried on “for upwards of 30 years”. An inquiry would allow, he said, “the views of the street traders and any interested parties be adequately heard”, and a case for “the alteration and repeal of the existing bye-laws properly presented”. Minister Mulcahy replied that he had “no power to alter or rescind bye-laws made by local authorities and duly confirmed”, and referred Byrne “to the replies given on the 16th February and 31st March, 1927” as to why.

Byrne then asked: “In view of the fact that these people's means of living are practically threatened, and that they failed to attend the first inquiry, because the opportunity was allowed to slip, simply because no one realised the seriousness of it,

---

58 It was noted earlier in the section that Byrne had been lobbying for the creation of a dedicated market. It was at this particular location.
would the Minister not consider the advisability of having an inquiry?” The Minister did not reply. Foucauldian (1980a) ‘right’ is not simply the law, but its application, regulations, and the combined operation of the institutions that administer it, and those who do not speak its ‘truth’ are dominated. Clearly, the silence of the government stands as a form of domination in its deference to the Commissioners, and its refusal to correct what many identified as a wrong in the events that unfolded in the wake of the Act.

On 15 September the *Irish Times* carried a story under the title “Stern Words to Street Traders”. Two women appeared before the courts charged with trading vegetables from stalls in Lower Dorset Street; a third was charged with assaulting a Garda. She was alleged to have been left in charge of the stall owned by a co-accused and, when the Garda tried to arrest her “she resisted violently and bit his finger”. According to the Garda, “the defendants had been cautioned and summoned time after time”, adding that the women “persisted in keeping their stalls in Dorset Street instead of Eccles Place” which had been appointed for stall trading. The Magistrate remarked, “The last time I had street traders before me I had an exhibition in this court such as I do not want to see again.”

He fined the women £5 each, stipulating that the alternative was one month in jail, in line with the punishment TD Cooper had insisted on when the Act was still at the bill stage. This was clearly an attempt at coercion through the use of the law or ‘right’ (Foucault, 1980a) to dominate those who were not speaking the ‘truth’ (Foucault, 1980a) as he added, “This humbug must be stopped, and the law must be obeyed”. The two women charged were described as “elder prisoners” by the correspondent. The women asked for another chance, promising “that they would not go into Dorset Street again.” The Garda Sergeant told the Magistrate “he did not wish to press any of the charges further” other than to “ensure that the trading in Dorset Street would stop”. The Magistrate decided to adjourn the cases for three weeks, fined the third woman 5s for assault, and told them all that if “they again went to Dorset Street, even once, “he would impose the maximum fine” of £10, again using the law as a threat and source of discipline and domination.
On 20 September 1928 the *Irish Times* reported on another set of prosecutions against what was characterised as “Another batch of women”. These women traders were brought before the courts after their arrests for stall-trading in Parnell Street. Some were fined 40s, while others who agreed not to sell again in Parnell Street were not. One of the defendants applied to have the fine removed, but she had a previous unpaid fine. She was told to “approach the Minister of Justice with an undertaking not to trade in a prohibited street”. Such undertakings being ignored, the Magistrate said, “was a state of things that he would not tolerate”.

On 3 November 1928 the *Irish Times* ran an article under the title “Women Street Traders Again”. The accused had been trading in Moore Street from stalls without licences. The police witness reported that the women had street trading certificates but had been selling from a stall which required licenses. The women gave evidence that they had been “trading in rabbits in Moore Street for periods varying from ten to thirty years”. It was reported that, when questioned, they admitted to having been prosecuted and fined for street trading and littering on previous occasions. Their solicitor argued that “a fair and market right” was established in Moore Street as street trading had been established there for more than twenty years. Therefore, he argued, these women “had a prescriptive right to trade there”.

His next submission to the magistrate delineates Foucault’s (1988a) *raison d'Etat* or ‘reason of the state’, the technology that strengthened the state by ignoring or erasing established historical rights and customs, was at work in the implementation of the Act. He told the magistrate that “before ancient rights and customs were to be lightly swept away the matter should receive grave and careful consideration”. The magistrate expressed sympathy for the women, but held with the new law. He said he was “satisfied that there had not been a public right to sell in Moore Street uninterruptedly for a period of twenty years”, but did not elaborate on a how he had drawn this conclusion. He said that if the women would take out licenses he would not impose fines. He applied the Probation Act which, effectively, dismissed the charges.
The next entry in the debates database appears on 13 March 1929 when TD Eamonn Cooney\textsuperscript{59} posed a question for the Minister of Justice about a specific trader. Cooney indicated that the goods of a woman trader in Dublin had not been returned despite having been fined. Fitzgerald-Kenney replied that the goods seized were perishable, and that the trader could have secured “the return of the goods by paying the cost of the removal, 3/-, but she refused”. He advised that the police had sold the goods pursuant to their powers to do so, and the sum raised was credited to a Gardaí fund, therefore it was no longer possible to issue a refund to the trader, Mrs. McCarthy.

This is the last entry in the debates database following the implementation of \textit{The Street Trading Act, 1926}.

4.9 Conclusions

It is clear that a ‘unified discourse’ (Foucault, 1980a) developed over the years leading up to the design and implementation of the Act. It is clear that statements from business interests including those of ‘bricks and mortar’ traders, larger firms speaking through the voice of the DCA, and the press, including the \textit{Irish Times}, completed what Foucault (1980a) conceptualised as a ‘harmonisation’. These were, in turn, harmonised with those of elected officials and the Civic Commissioners. Ultimately, then, \textit{The Street Trading Act, 1926}, was what Foucault (1980a) termed ‘coercion’ via a harmonised ‘unified discourse’.

Foucault (1980a) offered that the ‘unified discourse’ used against those who spoke ‘local knowledge’—the subjected—was formal, and spoken as if it drew on theories. In this instance, formal arguments about street trading were developed that theorised what is fair in an urban economy, and were constructed as if scientific, telling the Irish public what is safe for an urban population. Accordingly, rhetoric was used as Skeggs (2013) proposes, to persuade, justify, and make believable, what ‘appeared’ likely to be true—that the Act was necessary to correct a legal grey area that allowed for the continued rise of street trading in Dublin, rather than eliminate it. Later, after implementation and

\textsuperscript{59} According to the Dáil Éireann Members Database, Eamonn Cooney was TD for Dublin North. His profession is listed as grocer’s assistant and commercial traveller.
enforcement, it was used to construct the street trader as a ‘law breaker’ when she struggled to exercise her historic right to trade in public space. In this genealogy, *The Street Trading Act, 1926*, the statements that preceded it, and those that followed served, as Skeggs (2013) suggests rhetoric will, a vehicle to identify class struggle, and a vehicle for class struggle.

Ultimately, it is very clear the degree to which the presence of poor women selling on the streets of Dublin’s city centre—the business and political core of the capital of the new state—was contrary to the appearance of a ‘Thriving’ and ‘Prosperous’ modern state. This new state seeking to ‘Thrive’ and ‘Prosper’ constructed the Act with ‘Best Intentions’ but, ultimately, rendered its women street traders ‘outsiders’. They traded outside the particular forms of trade constructed as ‘legitimate’—that of the ‘bricks and mortar’ traders—by these same discourses. In a ‘modern’ capital they were, as Parkins (2010) asserts women have been, ‘anterior’ to the modern. On only one occasion, in an article in the *Irish Times*, were the street traders were depicted as anachronisms of a by-gone era. However, they were more ‘anterior’ to the modern in the multiple statements that depicted them as dirtying the streets, blocking footpaths, and their obvious poverty.

According to Parkins (2010, p. 104), modernity was “built on social exclusions”. The ‘modern city’ is one that is clean, efficient, prosperous, and allows for the free movement of traffic and pedestrians (Berman, 1988; Bluestone, 1997). Dublin was envisioned and constructed in statements as a modern city, and that characterisation was one that excluded its women street traders. As with street traders who would, across the century, be excluded from firm-based economies (Cross, 2000), Dublin’s city centre had been earmarked earlier as a business centre (Flanagan, 2009), and poor women had no place there as residents seeking subsistence earnings, a move that further limited even a small redistribution of wealth in the newly independent Ireland.
This section is taken from Bartholomew’s Map of Cork City dated 1903. “Market Street” is Corn Market Street. St. Patrick’s Street, the Grand Parade, and the English Market are on the lower right.
This map gives a view of the laneways leading west and east from North Main Street. This map is based on maps that pre-date the creation of Corn Market Street.
ABOVE: Corn Market Street at the rear of the Bazaar Market. The date is unknown. (Source: Cork Past and Present).

BELOW: Corn Market Street at the rear of St. Peter’s Market, operating then as the Lee Clothing Factory. Date unknown (Source: http://listowelconnection.blogspot.ie).
Chapter 5 - Street Trading in the ‘Merchant City’: Public and Private Regulation

*I have never been a philanthropist and am inclined to be very sceptical of the social value of unemployment grants, etc….my views are at present shared by many who have laboured in the different charitable organisations of the city.*

5.1 Introduction

Philip Monahan was the appointed Commissioner of Cork following the dissolution of the Corporation\(^\text{60}\) in 1924, and went on to be that city’s and Ireland’s first City Manager. He had a critical role in the life of the Shawlies through, what I have learned, was both the official and the unofficial regulation of street trading in Cork. This chapter reviews the available discourse, including public and private statements, made by Monahan, elected officials, and amalgamated business interests about the Shawlies and street trading.

The documents reviewed to gather data are held at the Cork City and County Archives. These include Council Minutes, minutes of relevant Corporation committees, and documents in a file containing correspondence and memos related to the passing of the Act and its regulations. These are supplemented, where available, by accounts in the *Cork Examiner*. The vision for ‘modern’ Cork and its city centre was developed in three key planning documents; these are also considered to determine the place of the urban poor in those plans, and to further the understanding of the context in which the Shawlies lived and traded.

5.2 Trading in Cork’s Streets 1901 to 1918—The Public Narrative

Complaints against street traders in the public record were sporadic and did not receive a lot of attention from the Corporation until 1922. The Hackney Carriages Committee (“HCC”) employed street inspectors to investigate obstructions, thus the minutes of this Committee were reviewed from October 1902 through November 1929 for complaints about street traders. Typically, cases of obstruction that were investigated involved large-scale obstructions caused by larger businesses referred to as “firms”, rather than

\(^{60}\) An organisational chart of the Corporation—before and after 1929—is found in the appendices.
those obstructions posed by the Shawlies. The Tolls and Markets Committee\(^\text{61}\) ("TMC") minutes were also reviewed from October 1903 through November 1929 for references to street traders working in the vicinity of the Corporation-owned covered markets.

On 27 October 1902 the HCC exempted Corn Market Street from "the general order to the Constabulary regarding the prevention of street obstructions". This made it possible for traders and businesses to use Corn Market Street at the loading area at the rear of St. Peter’s and Bazaar Markets for the sale or display of goods. The North Main Street, the major retail thoroughfare in this working-class neighbourhood, and the street from which customers could enter the St. Peter’s and Bazaar Markets, was not subject to this exemption (CP/CO/HC/M/2).

On 23 November 1903 a complaint was heard at the HCC of clothes for sale on North Main Street, but no further action was taken until 8 February 1904 when the Street Inspector was asked to report on the matter. On 9 May 1904 a complaint was forwarded from the TMC to the HCC about unspecified "goods" exposed on North Main Street for sale while stalls in the two Corporation-owned markets were vacant. The HCC moved that the street must be kept clear, however two councillors added an amendment that no action be taken against the traders. A rationale was not provided. The complaint against "old clothes" for sale on North Main Street registered in November 1903 resumed on 24 May 1904, and the Street Inspector was ordered to do his duty with regard to obstructions (CP/CO/HC/M/3).

On 27 June 1904 another complaint against the sale of used clothing on North Main Street was made at the HCC by the stall holders who rented space in the Bazaar Market. On 8 August 1904 the traders on North Main Street, identified as "women", were heard when a letter prepared on their behalf by a solicitor was read at the HCC. He identified his clients as "poor women" and asked that they be allowed to trade on North Main Street near to the Bazaar Market as their goods were not selling in the market. The Committee decided that the Corporation could not sanction trading on North Main

\(^{61}\) Details of the founding of the TMC and its role were provided in Chapter 2.
Street because the thoroughfare would be obstructed. On 26 September 1904 a recommendation from Council was read at the HCC meeting requesting that they “reconsider” all complaints of obstruction in North Main Street and recommended prosecutions. However, the HCC was asked to consider the “class” of trader when doing so. “Class” was not defined and, unfortunately, these Council minutes are contained in a missing volume. The HCC then decided to prosecute all who cause an obstruction “save the vendors of apples” (CP/CO/HC/M/3).

On 1 May 1905, a solicitor appeared before the HCC on behalf of “women” who had been charged with obstruction on Corn Market Street by selling fish, fruit and vegetables; he requested that the proceedings be withdrawn. The HCC appears to have been somewhat sympathetic to the street traders when it deferred consideration for three months “in the hope” that “some arrangements” might be made for the women elsewhere. The nature of the proposed arrangement is not detailed; the matter does not appear in the minutes of the TMC, nor was it raised again at the HCC. On 9 October 1905, a councillor resurrected the complaint on behalf of the “shopkeepers in North Main Street”, the present-day Washington Street, and Liberty Street, against those selling “milk, butter, and eggs” from carts, alleging this trade was detrimental to shopkeepers. It was noted that the Constabulary had been ordered to “prevent this practice” but had not been successful; as a result the Street Inspector was ordered to “take steps to put a stop to it” (CP/CO/HC/M/3).

The issue of street trading was not raised again until 1907 when, on 26 February, a solicitor representing residents and shopkeepers in North Main Street appeared before the HCC and complained of obstructions by traders described as “poor persons” selling second hand clothing and bedding, etc. He alleged they deterred people from coming to North Main Street because they shook “their old commodities…scattering offensive and possibly infectious dust about”. Statements about both the appearance of the street and public health had now entered the discourse. Prosecutions were ordered, and then adjourned on 7 April (CP/CO/HC/M/3).

On 23 April 1907 the HCC heard deputations on behalf of these “offenders”, and again on behalf of the shopkeepers. The minutes note that a lengthy discussion took place,
following which it was agreed, on the Lord Mayor’s suggestion, that further action be
defferred for two months. What was to be done in the meantime was not stipulated but,
at the end the deferral, it was noted, that the Chairman of the HCC would “report
whether any further action was necessary”. The story does not appear again in the
official record (CP/CO/HC/M/3). The aftermath was recorded in the Irish Times on 26
July 1909. According to the correspondent the shopkeepers alleged that the Corporation
had “at first resolved to prosecute the defendants” but the resolution “was rescinded”.
The reason was not given.

On 9 June 1908 the issue of street trading on Corn Market Street was raised again at the
HCC. At this meeting a reference from the TMC was read requesting that the HCC
“consider” carrying out a recommendation from the TMC to remove all persons found
selling goods on Corn Market Street; they also recommended a one month notice be
issued prior to the removal of street traders. A councillor reminded the HCC of the
exemption of 1902, calling it “an order of Council” and the matter was dropped (CP/
CO/HC/M/3). It would be four years before another complaint against women trading
in the streets would be registered: on 28 May 1912, at a HCC meeting, a councillor
complained of obstruction to “vehicular” traffic by “women” depositing old clothes on
Corn Market Street. The Street Inspector was simply told to warn the offenders (CP/
CO/HC/M/3).

On 6 July 1916 the TMC resolved to deal with the issue of vacant stalls in St. Peter’s
and the Bazaar by preparing a scheme that would combine in one area of each market
the stalls that were tenanted. The remaining space could then be “be utilised for such
purposes as might be most advantageously devised, with the sanction of council”. What
is meant by “such purposes…advantageously devised” is not explained. What is clear
from the scheme that did follow was that the consideration of stall holders rights, or the
needs of poor women street traders who could have relocated to the market through a
scheme to lower rents, were not considered. Instead an emphasis on the ‘bottom line’
was maintained by the Corporation. On 5 April 1916, the TMC elected to divide St.
Peter’s into two equal parts: stall holders on the Market’s south side would be given
stalls in the vacant portions of the Market’s north side. The City Engineer was to design
a dividing wall; the south side would then be “let for such purposes as the Corporation may decide” (CP/CO/TM/M/8).

The first lessee appeared later that month. On 18 April 1916, at a special meeting of the TMC, the Lord Mayor announced that the government of Great Britain had allocated a shell factory to Cork. After meeting with representatives of the military, the Minister of Munitions (Ireland), and “other citizens”, the group visited various locations in the city. The Lord Mayor reported that St. Peter’s was selected having received the military’s “thorough satisfaction as to the suitability of the market for such a factory”. He stressed the “urgent and important character” of “handing over the Market to the Minister of Munitions”; accordingly, he invited “representatives of both Trade and Labour Councils in the city to attend and give their views”. The stall traders were not consulted. The proposal “was unanimously agreed to”. Instead of the partitioning originally proposed, the entire market was expropriated. Provision was to be made in the Bazaar Market for the displaced stallholders from St. Peter’s (CP/CO/TM/M/8). The order was confirmed by Council on 22 April 1916.

Later that year the first complaint against street traders was made in more than four years, but this complaint was over litter left behind by traders. On 18 December 1916 the Street Inspector reported to the HCC on obstructions caused on North Main Street and Corn Market Street when cabbages were placed on the footpath for sale, and cabbage leaves were left on the footpaths. The Inspector was instructed to issue warnings about littering the footpaths with cabbage leaves, but not to remove the traders or their goods (CP/CO/HC/M/4).

A complaint is next heard the following year, but against street traders outside the city centre. On 15 October 1917, a solicitor appeared before the HCC on behalf of a photography studio on Coburg Street, on the north side of the city, complaining of women selling apples and causing an obstruction that resulted in lost business. In hearing this complaint the HCC took the traders’ into consideration: the HCC deferred its decision to give the vendors the opportunity to move their stands to a less busy place.

---

62 This is during the Great War, 1914-1918.
section of the footpath. The vendors appeared at the HCC meeting on 5 November; the Committee agreed that to defer action altogether as the “season for the sale of apples in the streets” was nearly over (CP/CO/HC/M/4).

There are no further references to street traders in the minutes of the HCC or in that of the TMC after Irish independence. From the complaints made between 1901 and 1917, it is clear that complaints were sporadic, and the response of the Corporation was not rigorous. On some occasions it was conciliatory.

In the final year of the Great War, the vision that larger and amalgamated business interests had for Cork’s city centre began to emerge, just as a vision had in Dublin in the planning document of 1914. As Flanagan (2009, p. 224) notes, in the ‘Anglo-Atlantic world’ planning proponents “were investigating, proposing, and sharing urban reform plans for cities in the United States, Canada, England and Ireland” at this time. Their plans had a common goal: to relieve cities of impoverished conditions, but through the development of the “economic prospects of cities” (Flanagan, 2009, p. 224). This was no less true in Cork. However, as was noted in Chapter 1, such plans were, typically, classed and gendered.

They were also the result of four shared principles (Flanagan, 2009). Flanagan (2009, p. 222) notes that while individual cities demonstrate differences, the ‘Anglo-American world’ prioritised a “capitalist economic system” to guarantee the “accumulation of capital and property”, governance by democracy, “envisioning the city as a legal and financial corporation”, and a city that exerts “patriarchal control”. Events in Cork that would unfold over the next twenty years echo distinctly these four principals that Flanagan (2009) identifies in her study of Chicago, Toronto, and Dublin.

The ‘formal’ approach and the ‘science’ (Foucault, 1980a) of comprehensive town planning that favours uses over citizens commenced in Cork at the start of the 1917-1918 school year. D. J. Coakley63, Principal of the Cork Municipal School of Commerce, delivered a lecture called the “General Principles of Housing and Town

---

63 See list of Key Public Personages.
Planning”. A series of public lectures followed in 1918 to explore what were termed “the different aspects of the problem as applied to Cork”; these lectures were given by Coakley, Joseph Delaney, the City Engineer, and John J. Horgan. Out of these lectures, *Cork - Its Trade and Commerce 1918* was published by the Cork Incorporated Chamber of Commerce and Shipping (“CICCS”) to promote and protect the industrial, trading and shipping interests of Cork, promote Irish self-government within the Empire, and to secure “adequate representation of business and trading interests” in an Ireland-based legislature (p. 35). It is clear the CICCS viewed the future of the country’s governance as the ‘felicity’ of the business community.

It was authored by D. J. Coakley, but presented the CICCS’s vision of Cork. That organisation’s 251 members listed in this document included 16 elected officials and 3 representatives from the British Military; John J. Horgan was also a member, so was Musgrave Brothers, Ltd., and the Musgrave brothers themselves. Despite the plight and magnitude of Cork’s urban poor that was common knowledge, the CICCS wrote that the city was at its most “promising than at any period within living memory” (p. 35). With the projected expansion of the city and its economy, they proposed that “the sphere of usefulness of the Chamber should also expand” (p. 35), but “usefulness” is not explained. The organisation cited Ireland’s low taxation rate in comparison to that of Great Britain as a key to potential industrial growth (p. 175). The promise for Cork’s future was also highlighted: agriculture, the harbour and waterways, its history as a commercial centre, and proximity to the marketplace of Great Britain. Clearly their focus for economic success was on the macroeconomy and an ‘enterprise society’, not unlike Foucault’s (2010b) ‘policy of society’.

Accordingly this vision for the future of Cork had very little to say about the working-class, the poor, or women. The working-class as a whole made a brief appearance in the mention of the Corporation’s expenditure on over 60,000 working-class dwellings “in various parts of the city” (p. 81). Labouring men in Cork were extolled as simply an industrial advantage. The poor were merely hinted at in a one-sentence entry under the heading “Poor Law”—the last entry under the two-page description of the organisation.

---

64 See list of Key Public Personages.
of the local authority (p. 78). Women do not exist in the document’s overview of the city’s history, its population, and its workforce. A check of its membership list shows that women were not represented in the leadership or membership of the CICCS.

Of further significance is the limited voice of the working-class neighbourhood in which the Shawlies lived and traded. St. Peter’s and the Bazaar receive a perfunctory mention under the heading “Markets” among the entries on Public Services (p. 80). Approximately 60 full and half-page advertisements appear in the guide; only two were from businesses located on North Main Street, and only one from a business on Corn Market Street appeared—it was owned by the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd., who advertised a warehouse there. Of the organisation’s 251 members, 232 represented business interests; the number of members listed on North Main Street, South Main Street, and Corn Market Street totalled 6, or less than 3% of the membership. Clearly even the ‘bricks and mortar’ traders in the marketplace of North Main Street and Corn Market Street did not comprise a significant voice among the business interests that were associated with the CICCS.

The Musgrave Brothers, Ltd., however, were the exception. They now had warehouses located on Corn Market Street, but they had had humbler beginnings in that neighbourhood in the 1870s. Their main retail outlet was now based in the upscale shopping district of the Grand Parade at the foot of St. Patrick’s Street, steps away from the North Main Street, but much farther away in terms of the type and scale of business they now operated. A direct link between the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd., and the Shawlies is not evident, other than this geographical connection. However, their impact on the Shawlies in Cork’s history from this point forward was significant.

Who were the Musgraves? According to an authorised company history compiled by White (2001), the Musgraves fit Murphy’s (1986) depiction of the ‘smaller men’ who would rise to prominence and inherit power from the historic ‘merchant princes’ to influence the governance of Cork city as it entered the twentieth century. Their beginnings were at 103 North Main Street where two brothers, Thomas and Stuart, opened a grocery in 1876 at 103 North Main Street, just north of St. Peter’s Market. Eleven years later, in 1887, they opened a second shop on the more prestigious Grand
Parade at number 15. At that stage the brothers had accumulated over £10,000 in capital (White, 2001).

Seven years on they formed Musgrave Brothers as a limited partnership. By 1894 they had left North Main Street, had opened extensive and what are depicted as luxurious premises at 84 Grand Parade, next to the equally luxurious Queen’s Old Castle department store at Grand Parade and Daunt’s Square (White, 2001). In 1899, Musgrave Brothers recorded profits of £67,000, the equivalent of 8.5 million euros in 2001 (White, 2001). Into the opening decades of the twentieth century, they expanded their business interests to include hotels when they opened the upscale Metropole Hotel on King Street. They had now become wholesale suppliers to grocers and small retailers of both commodities and store fixtures (White, 2001). During the years of the Great War, the Musgraves doubled their net profits resulting in remarkable growth for the company (White, 2001). No doubt this also added to their significant social capital.

On 30 December 1919, the Annual General Meeting of the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd. was held. In the course of the meeting, a sum of £50,000, approximately £1,498,500 in 2005 currency values, was approved by the shareholders for the purchase of additional buildings on Corn Market Street to house Ireland’s first grocery wholesaler (White, 2001, p. 31). The trade directories for Cork, *Guy’s City and County Almanac and Directory*, from 1917 through 1919 were checked to determine what holdings the Musgrave’s had on Corn Market Street. During that time the premises at numbers 17 through 24 were held by small dealers including vintners, a furniture dealer, fish and provision stores, grocers, and refreshment rooms. In 1920 and 1921, Musgrave Brothers took over numbers 22 and 23 as warehouses.

As the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd. planned their building on Corn Market Street, John J. Horgan turned his attention to what he considered an efficient, business-style model for the management of Cork, evoking a neoliberal approach to public policy. He had also embarked on what would become a Foucauldian (1980a) ‘programme of conduct’ to address a problem through the use of knowledge and action. The great interest in town
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planning generated by *Cork—Its Trade and Commerce*, continued during this era, but that interest now turned to town planning within the context of a new style of municipal management.

If the 1918 planning document had focused on the capitalist economic system that Flanagan (2009) asserts was one principal of urban planning, the ‘science’ of planning from this point forward was now married openly with two additional principals. Flanagan (2009) positions governance by democracy, and the vision of the city as a legal and financial corporation among the four principals at the core of urban planning in the Anglo-American world, and Cork was no exception. In 1920, in an article in the journal *Studies* Horgan wrote—in language that has a distinct neoliberal resonance—that managing a city is really a “business undertaking”, and that democracy does not negate a need for efficiency (quoted Quinlivan, 2006, p. 93). He had made a study of particular American cities and concluded that Irish cities would be better served by a system that employed a city manager in a power-sharing relationship with fewer elected representatives (Quinlivan, 2006). Foucauldian (1980a) ‘truth’ had come into play, and what Foucault (1980a, p. 93) termed the “effects of truth” would demonstrate how power would reproduce power in Cork.

In 1922, the year Ireland gained independence, the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd. secured an overdraft totalling £19,200 with the Bank of Ireland using company shares as collateral (White, 2001, p. 31). According to the trade directory, Musgrave Brothers, Ltd., now controlled the premises from numbers 17 through 24 on Corn Market Street. However, further progress on the facility was delayed: the company believed it was not prudent to proceed considering the “unsettled state of the country” (White, 2001, p. 31). During this time, Horgan continued to speak and publish on the topic of ‘efficient’ and cost-effective municipal management.

5.3 Post-Independence: Cork’s “Principal Citizens”, The ‘Smaller Men’, and the Shawlies

A marked shift in the nature and noise of the complaints against the Shawlies in Cork begins in 1922, and culminates in a call for a ban on street trading. The notions that street trading posed a threat to public health and safety, and that it represented a threat to
ratepayers including ‘bricks and mortar’ traders now entered the discourse. What appears as a campaign against the Shawlies began at the HCC meeting on 21 March 1922 when a letter from a group called The Cork Traders’ Protective Association (“CTPA”) was read. They alleged that interference to businesses was caused by obstructed foot paths on North Main Street and also on Castle Street. Additional details are not in the minutes, therefore it is not known if street traders were named as the cause of the obstruction. The matter was deferred (CP/CO/HC/M/4).

In the Council Minutes of 22 September, a letter from the CTPA was read. They alleged “serious injury” to the shopkeepers in the North Main Street and Castle Street by street traders, and called for an immediate ban. The matter was referred back to the HCC, and on 17 October the letter was read. The Street Inspector was told to “compel street traders to keep their wares off the footpaths” in the streets named in the letter, but there is no indication that they would be banned. The efforts by the CTPA resumed at the Council Meeting on 27 November 1922. A letter from William Mockler, the group’s solicitor, was read that painted an extreme picture of the situation in the North Main Street. Street traders were accused of causing “serious interference to the business of shopkeepers” by trading on the footpaths and on the street. The CTPA referred to other “localities” that protected the trading of shopkeepers and asked that the same be done in Cork (CP/CO/M/14).

Despite the severity of the situation as depicted, the complaint was simply referred to the HCC, and there was no coverage in the *Cork Examiner*. It would appear the concerns of the CPTA over the situation may not have been shared by the HCC or the local press. On 16 January 1923 the HCC heard letters from several unnamed businesses on North Main Street that referenced the obstructions complained of at “a previous meeting”. These letters were considered by the HCC along with complaints of obstructions made outside the premises of large firms; this factor makes it difficult to determine if the obstructions referred to here were in fact made by the larger firms or the street traders. A special meeting was called to “consider the question of street obstructions as a whole”. That meeting took place on 23 January (CP/CO/HC/M/4). Again no action was taken, nor did the *Cork Examiner* cover the discussion of street trading at either meeting.
On 22 February the HCC was asked by the TMC to consider a complaint of obstructions by street traders to the entrance of the Princes Street Market. Consideration was deferred to a special meeting where the Street Inspector reported that he had issued warnings to the street traders to no avail. The HCC decided that the traders must be told that continuing to trade at that location would result in legal proceedings against them. At the HCC meeting on 20 March, a councillor drew attention to an obstruction caused by street traders in Sheares Street, west of North Main Street, and the Street Inspector was ordered to issue warnings. Another councillor then drew attention to an obstruction on the foot path in Daunt’s Square by stalls. This was also referred to the street inspector (CP/CO/HC/M/4). Still the issue did not appear in the *Cork Examiner* in their coverage of Corporation business.

On 27 April 1923 the Council Minutes record that another letter from Mockler, again on behalf of the CTPA, was read complaining of what was now described as the “constant obstruction of the thoroughfares” in North Main Street and in Castle Street. The complaints now named Daunt’s Square and Princes Street off St. Patrick’s Street at the north end of the English Market. These obstructions were categorised as “a serious menace” to shopkeepers, the nature of which was not detailed. The CTPA threatened legal action if the obstructions continued. The target of that threat was not specified in the minutes (CP/CO/M/14).

That meeting was covered in the *Cork Examiner* and yet, despite the scope and volume of the complaint, there was no coverage of this portion of the meeting. The matter was referred to the HCC again, and the letter was read at the HCC meeting on 15 May. Despite the repetition of the complaint and the threat of legal action, the complaint was simply referred to the Street Inspector “for attention” and he was given permission to use an assistant if help was needed (CP/CO/HC/M/4). A report of that meeting was read at Council on 8 June 1923 and there was no further discussion on the matter (CP/CO/M/14), nor was it covered in the *Cork Examiner*. There were no further discussions on the matter of street trading for more than a year. Events in the years 1923 and 1924 would, over time, be significant in the trading lives of the Shawlies.
In 1923, John J. Horgan founded the Cork Progressive Association ("CPA") to plan and lobby for an American-style or ‘business model’ of municipal management to be instituted in Cork. Described as a “highly organised” group of 450 local businessmen and “disgruntled citizens” by Quinlivan (2006, p. 59), the membership of the CPA was drawn largely from the city’s Chamber of Commerce and the CICCS. Just as the DCA in Dublin had conflated citizenship with the rights of businessmen and ratepayers, the CPA conflated ‘progressive’ and ‘democracy’ with the protection and promotion of a capitalist economy. Furthermore, this group was not politically neutral: according to Quinlivan (2006, p. 59) they had entered an “election pact” with the government of William Cosgrave.

According to correspondence that originated with the CPA in 1923 their goal was to “conserve the Taxpayers’ and Ratepayers’ interests” while securing “adequate representation for Commerce in the Oireachtas and other public bodies”. According to a letter soliciting memberships, the CPA was expressly concerned over the potential outcomes of upcoming national and local elections because they believed there existed “a grave danger” described as “almost certain”. That “grave danger”, they wrote, was the prospect “that the interests of the Commercial and Industrial classes will be seriously imperilled unless they are looked after with energy and promptitude”. Clearly the CPA’s agenda included a new style of municipal government operating within a firm-based economy.

They were also prepared to work in a Foucauldian (1980a) triad of power-right-truth, where hegemonic power produces ‘truth’ to underpin ‘right’. ‘Right’ in the Foucauldian (1980a) sense is used by power to delimit their power. It is important to note that while ‘right’ is a legal apparatus, it is not simply the law (Foucault, 1980a). It is also the application of the law and the combined operations of institutions and regulations and, in turn, dominate those who do not speak the ‘truth’ (Foucault, 1980a). In this case the
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67 Copies of these documents, obtained from the National Archives, appear as appendices in O’Shea (1995), pp. 126-128.
CPA turned to legislation to reconfigure the local authority according to their ‘truth’, while deepening the control of the business community over governance in Cork.

In December 1923 the CPA called upon the Department of Local Government and Public Health to hold an inquiry under the *The Local Government (Temporary Provisions) Act, 1923*, an inquiry like that which had led to the dissolution of the Dublin Corporation alluded to in the previous chapter. In Cork, the CPA alleged excessive rates and the “wasteful” administration of the Cork Corporation as the reason for the inquiry (Quinlivan, 2006, p. 59). According to Quinlivan (2006), the *Cork Examiner* provided a supportive public forum for the CPA and Horgan as he began the campaign for the public inquiry early in 1924. The campaign gained momentum after the inquiry began into the Dublin Corporation in March 1924 (Quinlivan, 2006).

In April 1924, at the Annual General Meeting of the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd., it was announced that construction on the Corn Market Street facility would begin, and the company hoped to have it completed by the end of the year (White, 2001). On 9 July 1924, complaints against street traders resumed. At a meeting of the Law and Finance Committee, a councillor raised the matter of the obstruction on Corn Market Street by the sale of vegetables. During the discussion, the suggestion was made that indoor space be provided for street traders on Angelsea Street in the Corn Market building. The matter was then referred to the HCC “to have the bye-laws (sic) regarding” obstruction enforced (CP/CO/LF/M/16). In the minutes of the HCC meeting on 15 July 1924, this was mentioned but not in detail, and consideration was deferred (CP/CO/HC/M/4). There would be no further action on this suggestion to relocate the Shawlies.

Complaints about street trading are absent from the public record until August 1924 when the inquiry into the administrative affairs of the Corporation commenced at the request of the Minister of Local Government and Public Health, Seamus Burke. Although the inquiry was to deal with larger allegations of corruption, nepotism, and ineptitude on the part of the Corporation, street trading was raised to illustrate the alleged ineffectiveness of the local authority by the CTPA. On 6 September 1924 the *Irish Times* ran an article under the headline “Street Trading Nuisance: Complaints at Cork Inquiry”. The newspaper reported that the CTPA had told the inquiry of “the
obstruction and inconvenience caused by street traders and the failure of the Corporation to take action”. They alleged that a “continuous line of stalls for 150 yards” were operating on the North Main Street, and that some had “two or three attendants”.

These echoed the complaints submitted to Council earlier, and included their earlier allegation that Castle Street, Daunt’s Square and Prince Street were obstructed by street traders. However Corn Market Street, the location of the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd. facility scheduled to open at the end of the year, now appeared on the list of streets where street trading was now a nuisance and hazard. The inquiry closed following that sitting. Castle Street and Daunt’s Square are access points to Corn Market Street from St. Patrick’s Street. Prince Street, off St. Patrick’s Street, is the north access point for the English Market.

On Tuesday 16 September 1924 the Street Inspector provided the HCC with a list of those causing obstructions in North Main Street, Washington Street, and Shandon Street; the list included both street traders and shop keepers. At that same meeting a solicitor spoke on behalf of “4 to 500 traders in North Main Street”. He told the HCC the street traders would experience a “great hardship” and would be “deprived of their livelihood” if action were taken against them. He advised that many were “compelled” to trade in the street because the continued lease of St. Peter’s Market to private interests had meant they lost their stalls in the market (CP/CO/HC/M/4).

According to a report in the Cork Examiner, the street traders’ solicitor also said that some of the displaced traders had been trading “for 30 or 40 years”, and had not been permitted to resume trading in St. Peter’s after the munitions factory was closed. Furthermore, he estimated that a ban on street trading would “pauperise” approximately “400 or 500 people including relatives and family”. He asked that the Corporation create a market for them. After a discussion the HCC decided “that some alternative method” to allow those trading on the street to continue was needed, but that the solution should not interfere further with the “shop owners in the streets referred to”.
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The Lord Mayor, Sean French, was in attendance. He suggested a special meeting of the HCC be scheduled to consider “the whole question of street trading”. In the interim, he advised, no action would be taken against the traders. That meeting took place on 23 September 1924. According to the minutes, the purpose was to “consider the question of ‘street trading’ generally” and, in particular, the Street Inspector’s report on street traders and shopkeepers creating obstructions in the North Main, Washington, Shandon, and Parliament streets. William Mockler, the solicitor who had represented the CTPA, was also in attendance at that meeting. However he was now representing the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd. (CP/CO/HC/M/4). This meeting would put the company at the centre of power in deciding the future of the Shawlies. A platform had now been granted to a private interest to exercise their ‘felicity’ in governance. This allowed Musgraves, through their representative, to make statements about the Shawlies, and to articulate both ‘legitimate’ trade and the ‘legitimate’ use of public space.

The account of Mockler’s appearance on 23 September 1924 before the HCC in the minutes is very brief. He told the HCC that Musgraves had recently built “extensive premises” on the east side of Corn Market Street at a cost of £20,000. In light of this sum, Mockler requested that, in “fairness” to Musgraves, street trading be confined to the west side of Corn Market Street. He then said that the street traders were interfering with what he termed “legitimate trading” conducted by Musgraves who, he added, were “large ratepayers”, again invoking the privilege that comes with that status. He then asked that “some steps” also be taken “to remedy” street trading in Daunts Square, and offered his legal firm’s assistance to the Corporation to “correct” the situation. Following a discussion the meeting was adjourned on a motion by the Lord Mayor, Sean French (CP/CO/HC/M/4).

A more detailed picture was provided in the Cork Examiner on 25 September. In this account discussion of the issue started among the committee’s members, beginning with Councillor Gamble, the elected representative for the Corn Market Street area. He reminded the HCC that two markets, St. Peter’s and the Bazaar, had previously been
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available for petty traders in the North Main Street. He added that one was lost when a private interest “secured influence in the Corporation”, resulting in the market being “taken away from the poor people”\textsuperscript{70}. The power and influence of the Musgrave Brothers Ltd. in the Corporation’s handling of the Shawlies was quickly apparent in the response of the Chair of the HCC and that of Lord Mayor Sean French to Mockler’s presence at the meeting.

At this point, a councillor was reported to have recognised a deputation representing Musgraves, and asked on a point of order if a deputation should be present during the discussion. Gamble took exception to this presence, noted that the deputation was not on the agenda, and insisted the Committee was compelled to follow the agenda. The account then described a dispute among the HCC members over the presence of Mockler and his right to address the meeting. The Chair, Councillor M. J. O’Riordan\textsuperscript{71}, advised Gamble that he would “exercise his privilege” on the issue, and that it was usual to hear deputations. Gamble responded by telling O’Riordan that he would confine him to the agenda. O’Riordan replied simply: “We are here as public representatives attending a public meeting, and the public are entitled to come here and state their grievances”. Gamble then observed that Cork’s poor were not part of this “public meeting”.

Lord Mayor Sean French then intervened and asked for Mockler’s assistance in “arranging the question of street trading” because he felt that Musgraves “had a very legitimate objection”: street traders on the footpath “outside a premis” would not be “conducive to improved business”. He then cautioned that an immediate ban would, however, “inflict a terrible hardship” on traders he identified collectively as “women”. This is evidence that he was referring to the Shawlies, and that he knew the importance of trade in their lives: some, he noted, had “been trading in the street for over 30 years”. However, clearly, in the sense of the early twentieth century ‘modern’, Musgraves were what Nicholas (2009, p. 260) terms “agents of progress”.

\textsuperscript{70} According to a review of Goad Plans and trade directories, the St. Peter’s Market had continued to be leased by the Corporation to private interests following the closure of the munitions factory.

\textsuperscript{71} According to the trade directories, in addition to serving as a city councillor, O’Riordan was also employed as a commercial traveller.
French then expressed concern not for the Shawlies, but that “the situation would worsen” if action was not taken. He then added that the HCC “should try to lessen” and “if possible, clear it away”—“it” presumably was the large, open market that had existed there for some time. However, he then added, the HCC should provide for an “alternative means of livelihood for those poor people”. Finally, he said the issue “should not be left long”, but that Musgraves “should not press for any drastic action”.

Councillor Hennessy then seconded the motion to hear the deputation. Gamble requested a legal opinion, stating that “Until such time as it appeared on the agenda, the committee could not hear the deputation”. The deputation proceeded amid this protest. Mockler then addressed the HCC at length, and addressed the subject of street trading not simply on Corn Market Street but in the vicinity, before recommending how the Corporation should tackle what he saw as a problem.

He began by saying that French’s opinion “differed practically not at all from that of his clients”, but it was quickly apparent that it did. He said the building on Corn Market Street would house a “large retail trade” that would be “adversely affected” by street obstructions, and so Musgraves “had a very distinct interest in having order kept in the street”. Here he echoed what has been identified as the equation of order with a ‘modern’ city (Berman, 1988; Bluestone, 1997), a condition anathema to street trading (Cross, 2000). He also echoed the chaos or what Cross (2000) characterises as ‘willfulness’ that was implicit in the complaints against street trading presented by business interests in Dublin. Mockler insisted that Musgraves did not want to eliminate street trading. He asked instead that it be permitted on one-third of the west side of Corn Market Street “where it was formerly carried on”, reserving the middle of the road and the east side for what he termed “ordinary business people”. He called this allocation “Ample”, and the street traders would be able to maintain their custom.

Mockler then addressed an allegation made elsewhere that, he insisted, was false. The source of the allegation was not indicated, nor has evidence of it been located elsewhere. He said that the allegation had been made that clients had arranged the eviction of a woman, a furniture dealer, from her business premises. It was alleged that since her eviction she had been “forced to commence street trading”. As Mockler told the story, this woman had “left of her own free will, and owing rent, and established a
business on the street between Castle Street and Corn Market Street”. The search of the trade directories for Corn Market Street cited earlier indicate that a furniture dealer had been located in the premises purchased by Musgraves after 1922. The dealer is not named, nor was the woman in this article named.

Now his complaint shifted from Corn Market Street, and Mockler implied that she and others street trading on adjoining streets were disrupting the business of Musgraves. At her location on Castle Street, he pointed out, the woman who was allegedly evicted was now interfering with “people coming up from Patrick Street” to the warehouse. He complained that at the same location “people from the country brought in eggs, fowl, etc.” to sell. He now insisted that street trading on Castle Street be prohibited. His attention then turned to Daunt’s Square, where he said that “Women selling onions” were obstructing the footpath. He then said that he believed the HCC would “agree that proper access should be allowed to Corn Market Street”. This call for access echoes the insistence on the free flow of pedestrians and vehicular traffic in the ‘modern’ city (Berman, 1988; Bluestone, 1997), a connection that is endemic in the complaints against street traders in modern and modernising cities across the twentieth century.

Mockler advised that, “In other cities special regulations governing street trading were enforced, and prosecutions followed any breaches”, underlining not only that the law must be applied, but it must be punitive. An allegation, then, was also made implicit that street traders were likely to break the law. He then said that Musgraves were pleased the Corporation had called this special meeting on the issue, and they believed that street trading must now be addressed “and the necessary regulations made and enforced”. According to Mockler, previous administrations had made by-laws but these were no longer enforced. He concluded with an additional rationale for administrative action that implied further deviance and safety risks: street trading, he said, results in litter, “vegetable matter, decayed fruit, etc.”, which makes it “very hard on people paying high rates to carry on business” in what he termed “the ordinary way”.
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According to the newspaper account, Gamble then reminded the HCC that at previous meetings the objections had been to street trading in the North Main Street, but now he highlighted Corn Market Street had become the focus. Gamble said that, as the representative for the area, he had frequently called attention to the condition of Corn Market Street and its footpaths. He then observed that Musgraves “factory” on Corn Market Street was a wholesale business, and said he could not understand how the street traders would threaten that business. Mockler replied that Musgraves business on Corn Market Street was a retail business.

Gamble then highlighted both the threat to the Shawlies posed by this proposition, and the economic vulnerability of the Shawlies. He observed that the HCC had been persistent in trying to get street traders to move from Daunt’s Square to the end of Corn Market Street however, he added, “they were now asked to wipe them off the map altogether”. He said he sympathised because the company was creating a lot of employment, but he “could not support anything that would injure these poor people”. He concluded that he would “fight their battle” by “strongly” opposing the application presented by Mockler. French then called for an adjournment, and noted that Mockler had provided “a very fair summary of the situation” and that the HCC could, he thought, “meet Mr. Mockler in the same spirit”. The meeting was adjourned and resumed two days later.

Mockler had insisted the premises were for retail sales when Gamble questioned the interference street traders would pose to a wholesale grocer. According to an *Irish Times* article of 11 October 2006, the premises at Corn Market Street were significant in the history of both the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd., and Ireland. This was Ireland’s “first large, purpose-built grocery warehouse”, and it housed more than “a million cubic feet of warehouse and office space”. The Musgrave Brothers, Ltd. became the premier supplier to grocers and provisions stores in Cork and, with time, other cities and towns in Ireland. Clearly, in 1924, an articulation of Corn Market Street and its public spaces according to the agenda of private, large-scale business interests was underway.
This is section from the Goad Plan showing the east side of Corn Market St in 1909 prior to the arrival of Musgrave Brothers, Ltd. This section is comprised of small commercial establishments and tenements.
This section from the Goad Plan shows the east side of Corn Market St in 1938. The transformation of the street by Musgraves is evident.
When the HCC met next on 25 September 1924, a solicitor appeared on behalf of street traders in Corn Market Street, another represented those in Daunt’s Square, and Mockler returned on behalf of Musgraves. However, according to the minutes there was just a discussion on a “proposition of the Lord Mayor” before it was “unanimously agreed” that street traders would be “confined” to the west side of Corn Market Street. The street inspector was “authorised to prosecute any traders or persons found obstructing the eastern side of Corn Market Street”. For the first time, mention of licensing street traders was announced. These would be issued “at a nominal fee” in order to have “control over the present traders”. However, no new licenses would be issued “for a period to be specified” without a rationale being provided. As for the Shawlies trading outside the Princes Street Market, they were to be given accommodation within the English Market (CP/CO/HC/M/4). There was no coverage of this meeting in the *Cork Examiner*.

On 7 October 1924, at a meeting of the TMC, Sean French picked up the cause of the Shawlies, when he asked that estimates be made for “the cost of providing a suitable open shelter on a suitable site on Lavitt’s Quay” for the sale of produce. This motion was seconded by Councillor Hennessy and passed. However, this and his earlier recommendation that accommodation be found within the Princes Street Market for traders working on the adjacent street would end here (CP/CO/TM/M/10).

On October 30 the verdict following the inquiry into the administration of the Cork Corporation was released: Seamus Burke, the Minister of Local Government and Public Health, dissolved the local authority in Cork. According to the Minister “an understanding of modern developments in city management” was necessary (quoted Quinlivan, 2006, p. 66). Street trading had a brief mention in the report of the Department’s Inspector who had presided over the inquiry. According to O’Shea (1995, p. 31) he wrote that the TMC was “found wanting” where “dealing with the difficult problem of street trading” was concerned. It is clear from the foregoing review of the HCC meeting, that Council had not made a decision to end street trading in the main, however the inspector wrote that Council had decided to ban trading (O’Shea, 1995). Of that decision he wrote that “Good intentions seldom benefit ratepayers” (quoted O’Shea, 1995, p. 31).
On 31 October 1924, Mr. Philip Monahan delivered the order of dissolution to a meeting of Council in Cork. The former Mayor of Drogheda, and more recently the County Commissioner in Kerry, Monahan was appointed the City Commissioner for Cork by Minister Seamus Burke, and took up the post on 11 November 1924.

5.5 Philip Monahan and the Shawlies—Public and Private Regulation

Commissioner, Monahan became the municipal government in Cork—the city’s council, mayor, and its committees. Thus, when a committee was meeting, Monahan heard reports and made decisions alone. What had been council meetings now became a “Special Sitting” of the Commissioner where, again, he made decisions alone. All were held in his office at Fitzgerald’s Park, a municipal museum located west of the city’s centre, making it difficult for members of the public to attend as they might in a larger and more accessible venue. The minutes of all meetings typically indicate that the meeting was attended by Monahan, the Town Clerk and, on occasion, a member of the administrative staff, such as the City Engineer.

A review of the minutes of the TMC and HCC for the period when Monahan was the Commissioner indicate a neoliberal style of cost administration. In administering the corporation-owned markets, for example, contracts for repairs were given to the lowest bidder, and leases for stalls were given to the highest bidder (CP/CO/HC/M/4; CP/CO/TM/M/10). A neoliberal inclination was also found in his early request to Cosgrave’s government, one that was sanctioned, to “lay off superfluous staff and reduce wages” of Corporation employees in order to make the local authority solvent (Quinlivan, 2006, p. 76). In his direct dealings with the poor this inclination was evident when he allocated new houses in a public housing scheme to those who could pay a £50 deposit (Quinlivan, 2006), approximately £1,498 in 2005 currency values. According to Monahan, he wanted “to give houses to people who had proved their ability to save a few pounds and who had a real desire for a house” (cited Quinlivan, 2006, p. 88).

On 18 November 1924 Monahan presided for the first time over the TMC. The minutes record that the Market Inspector’s report showed that, after looking for accommodation in the Market for women street traders working outside the Princes Street Market, he had found no accommodation there. Monahan ordered that the
traders be removed from the street and the search for accommodation ceased (CP/CO/TM/M/10). On 7 January 1925 Monahan was read a report at the HCC from the Street Inspector. In the report, three women and one man were reported to have been found street trading. Monahan ordered prosecutions (CP/CO/HC/M/4). On 15 January 1926, the Inspector reported that he had carried out Monahan’s instructions to clear the footpath in Corn Market Street and had “warned a number of traders against depositing refuse on the streets”. Monahan deemed the report satisfactory (CP/CO/HC/M/4). There are no further references to street traders in the minutes of either committee.

In 1926 *Cork—A Civic Survey* was published by the Cork Town Planning Association. This group formed in 1922 at a conference of what they termed Cork’s “principal citizens” (p. iii) invoking, once again, the notion of citizenship and who holds it. These included John J. Horgan, founder of the CPA, the Executive Committee of the Cork Town Planning Association, members of the Cork Chamber of Commerce, and the CICCS. In the Forward, gratitude was extended to Commissioner Philip Monahan who would be given the Survey “with a view to the preparation of a Town Plan for Cork” (p. iii). Funding for the publication was made by “City Firms” (p. iii) who had, evidently, adopted the role of civic planners, delimiting their power in the Foucauldian (1980a) sense to govern in Cork. Certainly the document was presented as ‘truth’ (Foucault, 1980a).

The Introduction reiterates Horgan’s earlier position that a town is much like a business, the success of which will depend upon “forethought and foresight in anticipating and preparing for eventualities” (p. v). Cork’s ‘eventualities’, they wrote, were the work of “a multitude of smaller forces” and the result had “not been progressive in the recent past”, but a “steady growth in future years” was possible “if rightly directed” (p. v). The authors allege that the city’s strengths had left a “characteristic impression, but without orderliness” (p. v), adding to the ‘unified discourse’ now underway of the equation of ‘modern’ with order (Berman, 1988; Bluestone, 1997; Cross, 2000). Cork, they argued, was of a city that had “schools where there should be warehouses”, “dwellings where there should be factories”, and “fields where there should be houses” (p. 5). This plan is clearly in line with the trend towards planning in the Anglo-
American world (Flanagan, 2009) that delineates sites for business and for people at work, and home as a place outside the urban.

At the time of the Survey, Cork was in an “economic and social depression” that included “large-scale unemployment”, a condition complicated by the city’s isolation due to the damage to transportation infrastructure during both the Anglo-Irish and the Irish Civil wars (Quinlivan, 2006). However, depression and unemployment are not mentioned in the plan. The focus instead was on the prosperity that would come of a planned future. By the end of the document it is clear that the city centre was to be made available to business interests, and to those performing public and private administrative functions. There would be limited public interests excepting higher education and cultural pursuits, those to which the middle and upper classes had access. This trend is in line with Flanagan’s (2009) observations of Chicago, Toronto, and Dublin, at the turn of the twentieth century, and Zukin’s (1991) observations of gentrification goals in late-twentieth century American cities.

Like the vision offered in 1918, there is no direct mention of the urban poor or women despite the Association’s insistence on the need in Cork for a “greater Civic self-consciousness” (p. 5). Knowledge, they argued, was needed of the city’s “blemishes” to remedy them via “a proper town plan” (p. vi). They identified Cork’s slums as “the perennial housing problem” and “the breeding ground of disease” (p. vi). “Disease” was qualified as physical, but also as “political”—the latter identified as “a source of danger and expense to any community” (p. vi). At the time of the survey, approximately 1/9th of the population of Cork lived in tenements (p. 14); the number of persons residing in houses considered substandard or unsuitable, when added to those of tenement dwellers, put approximately 1 900 persons (p. 15) or 23.5% of the population of Cork resident in perilous conditions. The solution proposed was not to build better houses on the current sites because the Association did not want to create what it called “heritage slums” (p. vi). A Town Plan, they argued, was “the prescriptive remedy” (p. vi).

The working-class neighbourhood at the heart of this study was quietly configured under the larger plans for the city centre and Cork’s macroeconomy. Those living there
were relegated to the outlying areas under the goal of creating better and healthier housing conditions. Plans for a city centre reserved for commercial purposes, and the ‘extra-urban’ land being offered as housing for the inner city poor, meet what Flanagan (2009, p. 225) refers to as the proposal by “male planners, politicians and businessmen”. What makes it evidence of the “patriarchal control” (Flanagan, 2009, p. 222), the fourth principal of the modern town plan, is the pastoral approach and its relegation of work and men to city centres in the Survey. Flanagan (2009, p. 225) observes that the reordering and control of urban growth is simply tackled by “embedding the separation of the public world of the city…from the private world of the home” on extra-urban or suburban land within this “new vision” of the urban environment.

_Cork—A Civic Survey_ (1926) described the DEDs where the Shawlies lived\(^73\) as being among those identified as having the highest mortality rate in the city (p. 12). Causes of death included typhus, typhoid, and pulmonary tuberculosis, with scarlet fever and diphtheria among the most common causes of death (p. 13). Referred to as the “north western corner of the island”, the neighbourhood known locally to this day as ‘the Marsh’\(^74\), was described as one of three “dilapidated housing areas of Cork”, and “should certainly be cleared out at the earliest moment” (p. 14). The authors were firm that after clearance was completed there should be no new housing there, as the space was “required for shopping and business purposes” (p. 14). Furthermore, the clearance of Henry Street and Grattan Street to the west of Main Street would not result in new homes because there was “ample better land available” elsewhere in a new extension of the city (p. 14).

The urgency of the housing situation in these years is evidenced in a decision Commissioner Monahan took immediately after his appointment. Cork had been without a City Hall since the burning of Cork in 1920\(^75\). In December 1924, Monahan
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\(^73\) The DEDs used for the collection of the Shawlie sample are detailed in the next chapter.

\(^74\) The rectangle bounded by Liberty and Sheares Streets on the south, North Main Street on the east, Bachelor’s Quay on the north, and Moore Street and Grenville Place on the west.

\(^75\) On 11 December 1920, much of Cork’s city centre including St. Patrick’s Street and municipal buildings, were destroyed by fires set by British auxiliary forces. According to White and O’Shea (2006, p. 190), this event was “the single largest reprisal conducted by crown forces in Ireland” during the Anglo-Irish War.
turned down a sum of £58,000 allocated by the Free State government to rebuild City Hall and municipal offices (Quinlivan, 2006). Monahan wrote to the then Local Government Minister, and advised that the offices he was using at Fitzgerald’s Park were sufficient. Instead, he suggested, the funds would be more appropriately spent if used to build houses for the working-classes (Quinlivan, 2006). His request was granted (Quinlivan, 2006).

A full chapter of the Survey is devoted to something called “Natural Zoning”: planning based on what the Association conceptualised as “the natural tendencies of development” (p. 16). They insisted natural zoning would eliminate uses “contrary to the main object of a district”, while encouraging “those for which the area appears most suited” (p. 16). Evidently the neighbourhood where the Shawlies lived and worked was an ‘unnatural’ tendency of development because it was simply identified as one which “must be cleared” (p. 16). The question posed next was not of the displaced residents and traders, but rather if the land should be used for industrial or business uses (p. 16). The authors proposed whimsically that “it might be thought desirable to emphasise the business zone aspect of the island” (p. 16). Ultimately, they concluded, extensive clearances were not necessary “to create a dignified centre”, as one already existed that required “some touches here and there” (p. 25). St. Patrick’s Street was, however, designated the “principal shopping street” (p. 25).

On a page of photographs entitled “Street Views”, only three visual representations of Cork’s streets were selected: St. Patrick’s Street, Grand Parade, and the South Mall—home to Cork’s upscale retail sector, banking sector, financial and legal services. While addressing the architectural richness of Cork, Corn Market Street and North Main Street were approached but avoided. The Art Gallery (now the Crawford Gallery), and the Opera House in Emmet Place, two blocks east of Corn Market Street, were said to be best approached by walking west from St. Patrick’s Street via Academy Street. Mention is made of North and South Main Streets as being on the “original scale” from the mediaeval period, but one that was not in keeping with the architectural “worthiness” of other thoroughfares (p. 24). St. Peter’s, the Bazaar, and the English Market do not receive significant attention: they are not listed as “Existing Municipal Services” (pp.
The push for an American, business-model of local government continued. In that same year Horgan, on behalf of the CPA, sent a proposal for a reformed municipal government in Cork to the Secretary of the Department of Local Government and Public Health (Quinlivan, 2006). In this correspondence he indicated that the CPA was prepared to table a private members’ bill to bring their proposal for a city management system into effect. This bill would also propose the appointment of Monahan as the first City Manager of Cork, and a reduced number of elected councillors to govern the city (Quinlivan, 2006). In November the Department of Local Government and Public Health drafted the legislation based on the CPA’s proposal. According to Quinlivan (2006), both Horgan and Monahan received copies of the draft legislation. Clearly the state’s ‘felicity’ in its mission to strengthen (Foucault, 1988b) drew on the ‘felicity’ of Cork’s middle and upper class business community.

In January 1928, the new Minister of Local Government and Public Health, Richard Mulcahy, met with Horgan and “others” at Cork’s Metropole Hotel, after announcing that “he was willing to talk to interested parties in Cork who had ideas as to how the city should be run” (Quinlivan, 2006, p. 95). Original documents in O’Shea (1995) reveal that the “others” included 14 members of the Chamber of Commerce and 19 members of the local Cumann na nGaedheal. The Minister was also given petitions carrying approximately 100 signatures, expressing the approval of “the undersigned Ratepayers of Cork” for the Bill. The petitions indicate that the Bill was approved by both the Cork Chamber of Commerce and the CICCS. It is important to note that most signatures on the petitions appear above a company stamp. In June 1928, Mulcahy drafted the legislation that would become The Cork City Management Act. This

---

76 When the legislation was being debated in the Dail, TD Richard Anthony from Cork characterised the CPA as the most reactionary class in Cork” unlikely to ever “under any circumstances, get elected to a public body” (quoted Quinlivan, 2006, p. 98). Clearly members of the CPA did not have to get elected in order to govern. TD Anthony appears briefly in the next section when he comes to the defence of Cork’s street traders.

77 Copies of these documents, obtained from the National Archives, appear as appendices in O’Shea (1995), pp. 133-138.
CHAPTER 5

legislation proposed that when Monahan was removed as Commissioner that he be appointed City Manager for life.

That same month, with Monahan’s unilateral hold on power drawing to a close, The Street Trading Act, 1926 arrived in Cork78. There is no mention of the Act in the minutes of the HCC, TMC, (CP/CO/HC/M/4; CP/CO/TM/M/10) or in the minutes of Monahan’s sittings as the Commissioner, held in place of what had been the meetings of Council (CP/CO/M/15). However, on 23 June 1928 an article ran in the Irish Times under the title “Street Trading in Cork: New Regulations”. According to the article, Monahan said he had “decided to follow the example set by Dublin, and restrict the activity of street traders” under powers that the Act gave him to implement it.

He specified what he termed the “market in North Main Street”, which had been “an object of interest in the city for centuries”, much the way Moore Street was characterised in the previous chapter. He said he would abolish it out of necessity as vehicular traffic had become heavier. He also advised that shopkeepers would be prohibited from displaying goods outside their shops because this obstructed “the free passage of pedestrians”. Monahan was, clearly, construing Cork as a modern city where the movement of pedestrians and vehicles must be facilitated (Berman, 1988; Bluestone, 1997), and one where street trading was now an anachronism (Cross, 2000; Cross and Morales, 2007). His construction of street trading then approached the deviant when he called it “a source of danger”. According to Monahan, street trading had resulted in several accidents, but he did not elaborate further. He then promised to find accommodation for the displaced street traders.

Weeks later it became clear that Monahan was using his unilateral power to regulate street trading outside of a democratic process, using what Foucault (1980a) conceptualises as hegemonic power producing ‘truth’ to underpin a legal apparatus or ‘right’. There are no references to street trading in committee minutes CP/CO/HC/M/4; CP/CO/TM/M/10, those of the sitting of the Commissioner (CP/CO/M/15), nor is there correspondence during this time in the by-law file (CP/FILES/41). However, on 16 July

78 Likewise, as noted in the previous chapter, the Act was passed in Dublin while it was under the stewardship of three commissioners.
1928 the *Irish Times* reported on a “Street Traders’ Period of Grace” in Cork. The article indicates that *The Street Trading Act, 1926* had become “operative” in Cork, but would not be enforced until the end of 1928.

The article stated that representatives of street traders had met with Monahan, and had “undertaken to voluntarily leave North Main Street” if they could continue to trade in the interim before the deadline. Monahan was reported to be “most reluctant to grant” this request because, once again, vehicular traffic on North Main Street was “on the upgrade”. He said he felt obliged “to go to the limit of concession” in order to reach “a peaceable settlement of this old-standing problem”. The article closed with the observation that street trading on North Main Street had “been in existence for centuries” but had grown to “formidable proportions of recent years”. A rationale for the increase was not given.

It is clear, however, that the design and implementation of a law governing street trading in Cork was ambiguous. Furthermore, Monahan was comfortable in the unilateral power he exercised to construe and constrain the Shawlies without a challenge that would change the situation. That article published in July had reported that *The Street Trading Act, 1926* was operative in Cork, that Monahan was reluctant to offer a period of grace for the displacement of the traders, and that he was following the example of Dublin. However, according to correspondence held at the Cork City and County Archives, it wasn’t until 7 August 1928 that Monahan wrote to the Town Clerk in Dublin to request a copy of Dublin’s by-laws governing street trading. Furthermore, on 23 August 1928, the Town Clerk (Cork) issued a notice to be published in the *Cork Examiner* and the *Evening Echo* indicating that the Act would take effect in Cork from 1 January 1929 (CP/FILES/41).

Clearly Monahan had used Foucauldian (1980a) ‘right’ to delimit his power. Foucault (1980a) conceptualises ‘right’ as permitting this delimiting through the application of the law, and the combined operation of institutions and regulations to dominate those who did not speak his ‘truth’. The ‘truth’ about street trading, according to Monahan, was that it was problematic in Cork on several counts and, furthermore, he presented the regulation of street trading in Cork as ‘truth’. It was not until 22 October that the Town
Clerk (Cork) wrote to both the Department of Local Government and Public Health, and the Department of Justice, to advise that Monahan had resolved to adopt the Act at the sitting of the Commissioner in September. There is no account in the official record of this resolution. On 7 November the Department of Local Government and Public Health wrote and acknowledged that the Act would come into operation in Cork on the 1st January 1929 (CP/FILES/41). According to Council Minutes, at a sitting of the Commissioner on 9 November, this letter was read and Monahan stated the Act would come into effect 1 January 1929 (CP/CO/M/15). There was no coverage of any of these events in the Cork Examiner.

In the interim, according to correspondence from An Garda Síochána (Cork) dated 31 December 1928, Monahan had ordered a registry be compiled of street traders, and they had done so in “October/November 1928”. The criteria for registration was “all persons exposing goods for sale in the City who would come under the term of ‘Street Trader’”. The Chief Superintendent noted that there was a significant number of traders, and that it was “likely” there would “be a number of new applicants for licences when the time arrives for enforcement”. He then added that he understood Monahan intended “to limit as far as possible the licences to those already engaged in such occupation”. Without naming prohibited streets, he suggested that Monahan keep in mind the future of the city’s centre. Using terms that construe a modern vision of Cork, he suggested that “regard should be had to the necessity at some future date...for reserving certain wide streets for parking omnibuses and motor cars”. This vision was also middle-class, as he added that these same wide streets should not be allocated to “street traders” and “motor parks”, referring to what are now known as taxi stands (CP/FILES/41).

On that same day, the Town Clerk issued a notice that the Commissioner would “hold a Special Sitting at this office” on 4 January 1929 to “consider and, if approved, to adopt the Bye-Laws under the Street Trading Act, 1926” (CP/FILES/41). The Council minutes of 4 January record that a letter from the Secretary of the Department of Local Government and Public Health was read, and it advised that the Minister approved of Monahan’s proposed bye-laws “and they may be adopted”. A list of prohibited streets was requested as soon as possible. The minutes note that the Commissioner made a statement to the press about the intentions behind the by-laws, along with the locations
where street trading was prohibited (CP/CO/M/15). There was no explanation as to the discrepancy between what was reported in July 1928 about street trading regulations in Cork, nor was this discrepancy reported on in the press coverage of the meeting.

Monahan’s statement to the press was all that was given coverage in the Cork Examiner on 5 January. The title indicated that, in relation to “New Regulations Enforced In Cork”, there was a “Commissioner’s Warning”. The by-laws were purported to provide “better regulation of street trading in Cork City”. Contrary to how Justice Minister O’Higgins had created prohibitions, by naming prohibited streets, Monahan said a prohibition would “apply to all streets, except those mentioned as exemptions”. A number of regulations were detailed. Hours for trading were set at 0900 to 2300 hours, dimensions for stalls or pushcarts were set, and prohibitions were placed on cleaning fish, plucking fowl, and vegetables carrying dirt or soil could not be exposed for sale. Stall holders had to carry a container for refuse, and “cleanliness” in the handling of food was provided for. Just as it had in Dublin, the regulation of street trading in Cork had become what Foucault (1991) terms a ‘moral technology’, and the discourses surrounding it were now part of the larger, national ‘unified discourse’.

When he spoke to the press, Monahan insisted that the by-laws would not abolish street trading, but would regulate it to eliminate obstructions to both traffic and the “ordinary business of other traders”. He said it was “well-known that the provisions of The Street Trading Act, 1926” had been adopted, and the Corporation had the power to “prohibit street trading in any particular street”. He described street traders as a “class”, a “hard-working, decent body of people, who deserve a good deal of public sympathy” and insisted he was “anxious to cause them as little trouble as possible”. However, he then continued to problematise them as a problem for which a Foucauldian (1991) ‘programme of conduct’ was needed, one that drew on knowledge and action. He described “conditions” in North Main Street, Daunt’s Square, and the North Gate Bridge as intolerable, calling street traders “a serious obstruction to traffic”. He expressed concern that both traders as well as pedestrians were in danger when forced to

---

79 Daunt’s Square appeared in the complaint of the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd., detailed in Mockler’s deputation to Council in 1924. It does not connect to North Main Street, but it is located at the junction of St. Patrick’s Street and the Grand Parade.
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walk on the roadway. As was the case in Dublin, he also criminalised trading when he issued the warning that Gardaí had the right to seize goods from traders working in prohibited streets.

The geographical limits he set indicate that he intended to contain the Shawlies in the working-class neighbourhood at the heart of this study, and off footpaths in front of businesses. He allowed them to trade on Kyle Street and Corn Market Street, but only “beside existing traders”. They were permitted to trade on selected quays, however they were only allowed to pitch in the limited space on the river side. Lavitt’s Quay was permitted “from Corn Market Street to Half-Moon street”, which kept the Shawlies from the approach to St. Patrick’s Street and landmarks such as the Opera House. They were permitted on the riverside of Pope’s Quay, but only at “a distance of 100 yards from a point fifty yards east of North Gate Bridge”, which contained them on the approach to North Main Street. Monahan said those who vacated North Main Street, North Gate Bridge, and Daunt’s Square could to pitch a stall “or use barrows” in the authorised locations. If they did so, he added, it was “likely” they would not meet with “further interference”. However, if they did not, Monahan promised “reluctantly” to “make use of all the powers” provided by the Act.

Several cautions about prosecution were made that hinted at the potential deviance of the Shawlies. When the requirements for certification, licensing, and the fees attached were detailed, Monahan said that the street traders themselves would “decide to what expense and what trouble they shall be put”. He made reference to the threat of prosecution and fines if the regulations were not followed. He then noted that he had “extended to them every possible consideration, and now expected them to carry out the undertaking given them by themselves and by Deputy Anthony on their behalf”. He cautioned them to “carry out their undertaking” or, in the following month, “the full rigour of the law” would be enforced. A notice appeared in the Cork Examiner on 7 January 1929, and on 8 January the Town Clerk wrote to the Secretary of the Minister of Local Government and Public Health confirming the adoption of the Act.

80 See list of Key Public Personages.
As was the case in Dublin, Monahan then extended the list of prohibited streets in the weeks that followed. According to the newspaper coverage, he had prohibited street trading in all streets in Cork and then named exceptions where trading could take place. However, according to a letter dated 15 February 1929, the Town Clerk (Cork) wrote to the Department of Local Government and Public Health that at the Commissioner’s sitting on 8 February 1929, he had added Parnell Place, Beasley Street, Garranabraher Street, and Penrose Quay to the list of prohibited streets. Another ambiguity also arises: Monahan had said in January that he had prohibited street trading in Daunt’s Square, however this letter from the Clerk indicates that Daunt’s Square was added to the list of prohibited streets in February. The minutes of 8 February, and those of the next sitting, do not mention the changes or even the Act.

Street trading did appear in the Council Minutes on 15 March 1929, Monahan’s last sitting as Commissioner. At that time he resolved, according to correspondence, “That application be made to the Minister of Local Government and Public Health for the confirmation of the Byelaws with respect to Stall Trading” made on 4 January 1929 by the Commissioner, and “alterations made thereto by the said Commissioner on the 8th day of February 1929” (CP/FILES/41). Evidently he knew that the by-laws were not in place, and yet this did not prevent him from making statements and threats that prohibitions were in place and prosecutions were possible from July 1928. Again, the minutes of 8 February do not mention street trading or stall trading. Furthermore, the next piece of correspondence that appears in the by-law file held at the Cork City and County Archives indicates that, at Monahan’s request, the Act never passed into law in Cork (CP/FILES/41).

This information was revealed in a letter sent on 14 June 1929 from the Secretary to the Minister of Justice to his counterpart at the Department of Local Government and Public Health, a copy of which is in the correspondence file at the Cork City and County Archives. In that letter the Minister of Justice reports that Monahan “now holds

81 In February 1929 The Cork City Management Act, 1929 came into law. An election of a new council followed in March. The Act eliminated the HCC and the TMC in November of that year. According to the website of the Cork City and County Archives, Monahan continued to attend committee meetings without councillors present as City Manager from March through November. TD Anthony referred to Monahan’s appointment during debates in the Dail as undemocratic (Quinlivan, 2006).
the view that it is not necessary at present to have the Act enforced”. The letter goes on
to state that Monahan had said his goal was to have “street traders removed from three
streets” considered “unsuited for such purpose”; as that goal had been met, Monahan
was described as “satisfied with the present position” and had “suggested that the matter
should be allowed to rest”. The Secretary concluded that, “it would not appear to be
necessary to take any further steps to bring the provisions of the Act into operation.” In
a letter dated 1 July, the Secretary to the Minister of Local Government and Public
Health advised the Secretary to the Minister of Justice that Minister Mulcahy would not
proceed further with the by-laws (CP/FILES/41).

Copies of these letters were forwarded to the Town Clerk (Cork) on 1 July 1929 (CP/
FILES/41). The reality, then, of the passing of The Street Trading Act, 1926 in Cork is
that due process had been abused by Philip Monahan, with the complicity of the
government of the Irish Free State. The “effects of truth” (Foucault, 1980a, p. 93)
—‘truth’ delivered by the government, elected officials, the Commissioners in Dublin,
and Commissioner Monahan—had, as Foucault (1980a) offers they will, reproduced
power as power-truth-right working in concert. Monahan had used what amounted to a
threat to implement the Act to remove the Shawlies from streets where they were
identified as a problem by business interests, and then said that street trading was
legally regulated in Cork to continue to keep them out. He did this with the consent of
both the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Local Government and Public Health.
Evidently none of these men considered the Shawlies worthy of due process, nor did
they believe more consideration of the matter was required beyond the bidding of the
business community and ratepayers.

Clearly these men in power did not fear that their actions would be questioned or
scrutinised, were confident to do as they pleased outside the democratic process, and did
not anticipate opposition that would prevent them from doing so. Evidently they were
protected by gender and class to disable the agency of the Shawlies, as Skeggs (2013)
asserts that the working-class women will be disabled by the existing exchange
mechanisms or wealth accumulation that are at work in a society. They used ‘unified
discourse’ (Foucault, 1980a) to coerce the Shawlies out of their trade under the guise of
‘Best Intentions’. There is no evidence that TD Anthony or anyone else took the side of
the Shawlies after his initial intervention. As was the case in Dublin, efforts to defend women street traders and their livelihoods were not sustained.

The next entry in the by-laws file where correspondence concerning *The Street Trading Act, 1926*, is made in 1938 in relation to Corn Market Street specifically. The Chief Superintendent of An Garda Síochána (Cork) wrote to Monahan on behalf of the Commissioner 82 about street trading in Corn Market Street and the “adjoining thoroughfares” (CP/FILES/41). The Musgrave Brothers, Ltd. are not mentioned in the complaint, however, it is known that by the end of the 1930s they did, according to an *Irish Times* article published in 2006, have “the edge on competitors” because of this facility. According to the article, Musgraves were now wholesaling to grocers and retailers outside of Cork—throughout the province of Munster, and as far away as Galway and Kilkenny.

The complaint is made in a letter dated 9 April 1938. The Chief Superintendent (Cork) wrote that “my Authorities have come to the conclusion that the most appropriate way to deal with the situation is for the Corporation to adopt the Street Trading Act, 1926”. As an incentive he indicated that, as the Corporation would be issuing licences, implementing the Act would generate revenue (CP/FILES/41), an incentive in keeping with the early neoliberal provisions of the Act itself. It is evident from this request that street trading had continued in the wake of Monahan’s ‘adoption’ of the Act in 1928, and indicates that Gardaí had not been prosecuting street traders because they had now asked for its implementation.

Monahan replied on 13 April. He insisted that the Act was adopted in September 1928 and came into force the following January, specifically to target street trading in the North Main Street. He then indicated that the “adoption of the Act” had been “sufficient to deal with the difficulty which then existed in that street”, and no further action was taken. He advised he would contact the City Solicitor to determine what needed to be done to bring the Act into “force” (CP/FILES/41). It is clear, then, that not only had the Act not been given further thought, there had been no consideration as to how street

82 In the power structure of an Garda Síochána, the Commissioner is at the head of the police service and oversees its operations from Dublin.
trading would be regulated. The Shawlies had simply been moved off the streets where they were identified as a nuisance, contained and away from sites of privilege in Cork’s centre.

Then on April 20 he again wrote to the Chief Superintendent advising he would contact the Minister of Justice to obtain copies of regulations made elsewhere in the country, another indication that regulations had never been formally made. He asked for advice from the Chief Superintendent about the need to make by-laws under Section 6, despite having detailed regulations in the *Cork Examiner* in January 1929. Section 6 gave power to the Corporation to make by-laws to prohibit stall-trading, “or any particular class of stall-trading” in specified streets, prescribing the times when it may be carried out, and “in regard to any specified description of goods”, limits on “the size” and “character of the vehicles and stands” used, and regulations related to litter and hygiene (CP/FILES/41).

On 25 April 1938, the Minister of Justice forwarded the street trading regulations made in Bray in 1935. The following day Monahan forwarded those to the City Solicitor with a letter that said, “The Chief Superintendent of the Guards desires to enforce the Street Trading Act of 1926 in Cork”. He then wrote, “We appear to have adopted the Act without taking steps to bring it into force”. On 27 April the Chief Superintendent replied, and advised Monahan if the street trading “problems” were to be dealt with “effectively”, the Corporation needed to to make by-laws pursuant to Section 6 of the Act (CP/FILES/41).

On 28 April 1938 the City Solicitor wrote to Monahan and advised that regulations needed to be made by the Minister because the city’s only control over street traders was “limited to bringing prosecutions for Obstruction” (CP/FILES/41). Thus, despite Monhan’s warnings to potential law breakers and threats of prosecution published in the *Cork Examiner* in 1929, in 1938 the only means of prosecuting the Shawlies in Cork remained obstruction, the charge the Free State government had insisted was insufficient in 1926. In his reply he City Solicitor added what Minister of Justice O’Higgins had indicated ten years earlier: “actual obstruction” was difficult to prove. However, despite this difficulty, the sway of power must have been sufficient to register
convictions because, he added: “The Justice always holds with us, but I have a certain amount of doubt in the matter” (CP/FILES/41).

The City Solicitor wrote again to Monahan on 4 May 1938, in reference to by-laws in Bray. He advised that nominating streets where stall trading is allowed, as Monahan had done in 1929, was insufficient: by-laws that prohibited stall trading in specific streets was needed. On this subject the City Solicitor then expressed, again, his doubt about prosecutions under existing law: he observed that the approach to prohibiting streets “seems to bear out the view which I have often expressed, that, as the Law has stood hitherto, we had not right to prohibit Stall trading”. The exception, he wrote, was what he termed “the very often fictitious ground of obstruction to traffic”. It appears that the matter was then allowed to drop: the next item in the file is dated one year later (CP/FILES/41).

A memo from the Town Clerk (Cork) to Monahan, dated 3 May 1939, provides a chronology of the Act’s progress in Cork from 1928 through January 1929, with “no further entry on the Minutes” after that date. He added that, “a list of our Bye-laws, dated May 1929, records that the Confirmation of the above by the Minister has been deferred”. On 6 May 1939, Monahan wrote to the City Solicitor and asked that the Bray by-laws be returned because he was “going into the matter of street trading here again”. Monahan then wrote to the Town Clerk on 9 May and asked if he could “trace a letter from the Department of Local Government approving the form of Bye-laws to be made under the Act”, and if there was “any correspondence with the Department dealing with them”. The same day the Town Clerk wrote to Monahan and advised that the file of papers from the sitting in January 1929 when the Act was adopted was missing, and that he believed the correspondence from the Minister of Justice and the by-laws would be in the missing file (CP/FILES/41).

It appears that this renewed activity on the issue may have been the result, again, of pressure from Gardaí to have street trading regulated. On 18 May when Monahan wrote to the Chief Superintendent in Cork he referenced “previous correspondence” from the Chief Superintendent and “a visit here some time ago by one of your Sergeants”. He then wrote: “I desire to say that the provisions of the Street Trading Act, 1926 were
adopted by me acting on behalf of the Cork Corporation on the 28th September 1929” revealing, again, the inconsistency with what was reported in July 1928. He added that “the resolution passed at that time declared the Act to be in force in the County Borough of Cork as from the 1st January 1929”. He advised that if the Act was going to be “effectively administered”, it was necessary for the Minister of Justice to make regulations under Section 13 of the Act, and that the Corporation then needed to make by-laws related to stall trading. The next day he wrote to the Chief Superintendent, enclosed the by-laws he proposed be made by the Corporation, and asked for the Chief Superintendent’s opinion on their suitability (CP/FILES/41).

On 1 June 1939 the Chief Superintendent replied and proposed several changes. He asked for a firm definition of a stall trader’s assistant as any ambiguity might allow for “a trader's husband, wife, or child...to transact business” outside of hours specified for stall trading. He asked that penalties with regard to continuing offences should include “a further penalty of 40/- for each day on which an offence is committed after service of a written notice”. He then proposed that the schedule of streets where trading is prohibited needed to be extended to reflect growth within the City Borough evidenced since 1929. Monahan forwarded the letter to the City Solicitor on 2 June 1939 requesting that the City Solicitor revise the draft by-laws but added, “You may leave the drawing of the list of streets to us” (CP/FILES/41).

On 27 June 1939 the Council Minutes record that Monahan urged council to pass the by-laws. This submission was made in concert with by-laws on littering and spitting on the street (CP/CO/M/17). In keeping with constructions of street trading as disorderly, unhygienic, and working counter to the workings of a ‘modern’ city (Bluestone, 1997; Cross, 2000; Cross and Morales, 2007), Monahan told Council “a good deal of litter arises from the manner in which Street Trading is at present carried out” (CP/CO/M/17). The Cork Examiner covered this event in the 29 June edition under a heading implying criminal deviance—“Illegal Trading”. The headline implies that a law was in place because, despite knowing that there were no laws governing street trading, Monahan was quoted as saying that street trading was illegal. He was careful, however, to qualify that it was not illegal under any existing laws against street trading, but was “illegal under existing laws as causing obstruction in the streets”.
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He referred to the events of 1929, the year when he had insisted the Act had come to
govern street trading, as the year when “there seemed to be some kind of unofficial
arrangement come to with certain traders that they should clear out of certain streets and
congregate on the Coal Quay”. He then added that they were trading on the Corn
Market Street at present, however they were doing so, “without any legal right to do
so”. He made this allegation despite the fact that the Corn Market Street was on the list
of streets where he had approved street trading in 1929. He added that the “Corporation
could either abolish such trading, or,” referring to the current situation, “wink the eye
altogether to it”.

At Council on 27 July 1939 it was recommended that the draft by-laws be adopted but,
according to the minutes, confirmation was adjourned as an alderman wanted to put
forward proposed amendments at a later date (CP/CO/M/17). A handwritten note
appears next in the file. Unsigned and undated, it is on the letterhead of the City
Manager and is situated between correspondence dated October 1939 and December
1939. It advises that complaints were received from “certain shopkeepers regarding the
type of structure now used for street trading at Corn Market Street”. The structures are
described as “fairly…regarded as shops upon which rates are not payable”. The author
goes on to say that “the continued tolerances of the use of such structures for trading
purposes constitutes a legitimate cause of complaint by shopkeepers”; it goes on to say
that, without by-laws under the Act, “this abuse cannot be adequately dealt with”. The
author closes by suggesting “respectfully that the Corporation” reconsider the by-laws
submitted at the meeting on 25 July 1939 (CP/FILES/41).

The role of business interests in regulating street trading in Cork, and their influence
with Monahan on this matter, are directly indicated by the two pieces of correspondence
that directly follow. The first is a letter from Monahan dated 9 December 1939
addressed to C. P. McCarthy, Incorporated Accountant. It begins by referring to “our
conversation of a couple of days ago”, and he writes that he has enclosed “for your
information” a copy of a report in advance of his presentation of the same report to the
Corporation at the next meeting of Council. On 12 December C. P. McCarthy, writing
as “The Secretary, The Cork Master Bakers’ Association” replied to Monahan:
I am very much obliged for your letter of the 9th inst. enclosing copy of item 4 of the Agenda for Tuesday night’s meeting of the Corporation. I have since inspected the particular property on the Coal Quay and it appears to me to be somewhat of a fixture, and I cannot say finally how far it contravenes your Bye-Laws.

He closed the letter by writing, “I am very much obliged and several of my members desire me to express to you their best thanks for the efficient manner in which you have dealt with my enquiry” (CP/FILES/41).

At the Council Meeting on 12 December 1939, Monahan reported that “complaints have been received on behalf of certain shopkeepers regarding the type of structure now used for street trading at Corn Market Street”. He urged Council to reconsider the street trading by-laws presented at the meeting on 25 July. At the Council Meeting on 27 February 1940, the draft by-laws were approved. Corn Market Street was not on the list of prohibited streets, however the lanes adjoining Corn Market Street were, along with all remaining streets in the city centre (CP/CO/M/17).

On 16 April 1940 Monahan wrote to the Department of Local Government and Public Health. He summarised events related to The Street Trading Act, 1926, in Cork as follows: it was adopted in Cork on 28 September 1928; on 4 January 1929 draft by-laws were adopted; these were approved by the Minister for Local Government and Public Health in a letter dated 8 January 1929. He then addressed the fact that while by-laws were “formally made and submitted to the Minister for approval” a confirmation was not issued because “circumstances at the time were not favourable to the enforcement of the Act generally”. He then requested ministerial approval for the new by-laws (CP/FILES/41). There is no further correspondence on the issue.

This resurrection of the Act in Cork took place amid the writing and publication of the first officially commissioned town planning report, delivered in 1941. The language of this document echoed the language of modern efficiency evident in the earlier documents of 1918 and 1926, the discourse emanating from the CPA, and the early neoliberal management style of Cork city after 1924. Furthermore, it embodies the patriarchal and classed goals of town planning identified by Flanagan (2009).
construct “impossibly grandiose conceptions”; instead it was described as a means of ensuring civic development on “common sense lines” (p. 5).

The author, planning expert Robertson Manning, proposed that without planning “overcrowding, lack of open spaces for health…ugliness, inconvenience” and “useless expense” in “compensation and services” (pp. 5-6) is the result. Manning offered that planning “does not cost anything at all because it only aims at doing works which would, if things were properly organised, be done in any case” (p. 6) invoking the language of organisation, efficiency, and order that directed urban modernity (Berman, 1988; Bluestone, 1997; Cross, 2000). Furthermore, he wrote, there is nothing “in town planning to alarm the ratepayer” (p. 7), putting the ratepayer in the position of privilege over the ‘citizen’ as the DCA and CPA had previously done. The concern for what may be termed an early neoliberal ‘bottom line’ is put forward as a valid reason for removing the slums in the city’s centre. According to Manning, “humanitarian considerations” aside, it was “bad business to allow unhealthy conditions” because these result in “immense cost in hospitals” (p. 7).

As with the report of 1926, and the observations made by Flanagan (2009) of the principles of city planning in the Anglo-American world, it is clear throughout this document that Manning has reserved the city centre for purposes other than housing: he wrote that the “decayed core” required “a policy of thinning out” to give it “sun, light, and air” (p. 20). Manning echoed the concern of the Survey of 1926, and emphasised “rigorously” that there should be no rehousing in ‘the Marsh’. Given special mention as “derelict” he offered that, instead, the area would be better served by a “public park, playgrounds, warehousing, market, etc.” (p. 22). The plan for “clearing the central areas” was to demarcate sections and “demolish” them one at a time, rebuilding in places considered “appropriate” according to a “completely planned scheme” to alleviate what Manning termed “the danger” of families moving into the city centre and squatting in the “condemned houses” (p. 21).

In describing the process of rehousing, Manning never wrote of people or families living in the city centre: those human terms were replaced by “section” or “inhabitants”. The “first section” were to be “rehoused entirely in the outskirts”, and
the “inhabitants from the second section” were to be “transferred partly to the houses in the first section and partly outside” (p. 21). This was Manning’s solution for “the central problem” so that the Corporation would “achieve the utmost economy in development charges” by rehousing on half the usable city centre, leaving what remained for open public spaces (p. 21). Relocation of the urban poor to suburban housing, Manning stipulated, would provide for “a lavish setting” (p. 21). He proposed that these housing schemes must be “subordinate to main traffic routes”, and not the reverse (p. 22).

Manning proposed the reconfiguration of the streets in the city’s core so that the Grand Parade would extend “to its full width as far as Paul Street”, which would make for easier vehicular access to the proposed central bus station. This he planned to build on the site of the Bazaar Market and St. Peter’s Market (p. 20), both of which were still being used by stall traders at that time. The displacement of stall holders, or a new site for the sale of used clothing and cheap food and wares, is not included in the overall plan. As for businesses in that area, Manning clearly took a modernist’s view that even the older, established ‘bricks and mortar’ traders in the neighbourhood needed to be cleared. He wrote that although they might be prospering in the area, businesses on the quays and North Main Street “are near the end of their useful lives and are ripe for rebuilding” (p. 22).

Manning also proposed the continuation of Academy Street from St. Patrick’s Street to Lavitt’s Quay. In order to provide a clear vista of St. Mary’s Church on the north side of the river from St. Patrick’s Street, he further proposed the demolition of buildings on Half Moon Street and designated that site for a car park “to serve this section of town” (p. 15), one that would accommodate 70 cars (p. 19). On this topic he wrote that car parks were “of fundamental importance” so that streets were not blocked and traffic could move freely (p. 19). Invoking, again, an early neoliberal ‘bottom-line’: at the right location and properly managed, car parks could, he added, be “self-supporting” (p. 19). In the Marsh where many of the Shawlies lived, he proposed the building of a car park on Sheares Street for 160 cars (p. 19), clearly envisioning the car as the way of Cork’s future, bringing people from suburbs to the city’s centre. Manning, as the Cork Town Planning Association had earlier, created what Berman (1988) conceptualises as
the modernist developer’s ‘expressway’ world, one where the car articulated the private use of a city’s public spaces.

The emphasis on the bottom line and pleasing the ratepayers noted in the workings of the CPA and other amalgamated business interests in Cork resonates in this document. So, too, the analogies drawn between municipal management and a business model of management. The centrality of the car in the privileging of roads and the building of car parks is indicative of a privileging of the needs of the middle-class and the wealthy—those who could afford to own cars and did not live in the existing slums of the city centre. Then again, the city centre, in this vision, was not a location where people would be living: there they would be working and shopping. Like the report of 1918 and the Survey of 1926, the absent stakeholders in the issue of planning the city and its economy are the poor, the working-class, and women.

*The Street Trading Act, 1926* appears next in the public record the year after this report, on 24 November 1942. According to Council Minutes an alderman tabled a motion to “request the Minister of Local Government and Public Health to revoke the bye-laws of the Cork County Borough made under the Street Trading Act, 1926”. He alleged that “unnecessary hardship” had been created for Cork’s street traders. He said that their trade was intergenerational and continuous “for over one hundred and fifty years”. In that time, he said, their business had not been “a hindrance or obstruction to traffic”. The motion was seconded, and the minutes simply record that a discussion followed before the motion was withdrawn (CP/CO/M/17). This event was not covered in the *Cork Examiner*, and there are no further entries in the by-law file. *The Street Trading Act, 1926* or street traders do not appear again in the index of the Council Minutes.

The ambitious, modern future Manning envisioned for North Main Street and the Corporation-owned markets would not come to fruition. In an *Irish Times* article dated 15 June 1946, Lord Mayor Michael Sheehan, cited the report by Manning and stated that “the war brought to a standstill the Corporation’s projects for the improvement of the city”, but added that the plan was to continue with Manning’s recommendations.
5.5 Conclusions

The data indicates that in Cork the discourse was fragmented in the opening decades of the twentieth century, but found momentum immediately following Irish independence, and again when Monahan’s role as Civic Commissioner was drawing to a close. As was the case in Dublin, a unified discourse emanating from sites of power (Foucault, 1980a), was created through ‘statements’ that generated ‘social facts’ (Kendall and Wickham, 1998) about street traders and street trading. It did not, however, approach the level of demonisation and moralising that subjugated the women trading on Dublin’s streets. It appears that the Shawlies were subjected to a ‘quieter’ form of coercion through discourse.

Their ‘local knowledge’ (Foucault, 1980a) of life in Cork and trading on the streets of the ‘Merchant City’ was still, as Foucault (1980a, p. 83) put it “harshly opposed by everything surrounding it”, even if this harsh opposition did tread softly as it wove its way through their lives and their street-based marketplace. The rhetoric used in Cork did, more clearly than that developed in Dublin, provide a glimpse into how street trading was construed as ‘counter modern’ in the complaints made by both William Mockler on behalf of Musgrave Brothers, Ltd., and Philip Monahan. Likewise both, along with the planning documents of 1918, 1926, and 1941, brought into focus what Cross (2000, p. 40) calls the “savage attack” of the modern, as large retailers made use of the modern state’s regulatory mechanism to use the “police system” to regulate or redesign “urban spaces” where street traders “could no longer exist”. In Cork those interests were not only those of Musgraves, but also those of the English Market and surroundings, and ‘bricks and mortar’ traders on North Main Street.

The Shawlies were, however, allowed to continue while contained outside the retail core, and off the doorstep of Musgrave Brothers, Ltd. The reasons for Monahan and the Corporation largely ignoring the Shawlies in the years following 1929, followed by the sporadic attention received in the late 1930s, indicate that they and their trade were not an overwhelming concern to the political and social powers in Cork once they were confined to their working-class neighbourhood, and they were not trading on the doorstep of the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd. They may not have been a pressing concern because of the era in which their trading was called into question: power struggles and
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controversy grounded in the implementation of the *Cork City Management Act, 1929*, and Monahan’s appointment in the contested role of City Manager for life (Quinlivan, 2006) were likely to have had a role in he and elected officials ignoring the Shawlies until the implementation of the Act was pressed for by business interests and the Gardaí Commissioner in the 1930s.

It is clear that the ‘unified discourse’ (Foucault, 1980a) developed over the years leading up to the design and implementation of the Act in Dublin, was adopted and made local by Monahan. Those from business interests such as Musgraves, and those of ‘bricks and mortar’ traders, ‘harmonised’ (Foucault, 1980a) with those of the CPA, and the Cork Town Planning Association about what constituted an efficient, modern, democratic, and ‘Prosperous’ Cork. This ‘harmonisation’ materialised in the work of Philip Monahan both as City Commissioner and later as City Manager. The result was what Foucault (1980a) termed ‘coercion’ in the form of his insistence that *The Street Trading Act, 1926*, was the law in Cork, and later through his insistence that this implementation simply needed to be formalised through the adoption of by-laws.

As was the case in Dublin, formal arguments about street trading were developed that theorised what is fair in an urban economy, and were constructed as if scientific, articulating what is safe, clean, and current for an urban population. Rhetoric was used, as Skeggs (2013) proposes, to persuade, justify, and make believable, what ‘appeared’ likely to be true. As was the case in Dublin, the statements about safety and security ‘appeared’ to be true and necessary in Cork. Likewise, Monahan’s rhetoric about the implementation of the Act in Cork in 1929 did not have to work hard in order to be believed by the Shawlies: they moved off the thoroughfares identified as problematic and were contained. Furthermore, the rhetoric he used as City Manager to conceal this abuse of power committed while City Commissioner was never called into question by observers.

In this genealogy, *The Street Trading Act, 1926*, the statements of Mockler and those of Monahan served, as Skeggs (2013) suggests rhetoric will, as a vehicle to identify class struggle and a vehicle for class struggle. With Monahan working comfortably outside of the democratic process while purporting to further the democratic process, this
genealogy reveals how rhetoric also serves to identify political subjugation. Through the rhetoric and statements of the CICCS, the Cork Chamber of Commerce, the Cork Town Planning Association, and the CPA, it is very clear the degree to which the presence of the Shawlies in Cork’s city centre would counter the appearance of a ‘modern’ city that is ‘Thriving’ and ‘Prosperous’. In that city Monahan, as Commissioner, constructed the implementation of the Act with ‘Best Intentions’ for the city and for the Shawlies, promising they could trade as long as they complied. However, ultimately, their ‘outsider’ status meant that they were easily corralled and contained. Furthermore, he had the power in the form of compliant Gardaí, to abolish trading by ordering that no new licenses be issued.

The potential role of the Cumann na nGaedheal government of William Cosgrave in Monahan’s “adoption” of the Act in 1928 cannot be negated. Monahan said nothing publicly about street traders in the first four years of his reign as City Commissioner outside the prosecutions noted, and his decision not to find alternative space for them in the English Market. This included the years during which it was implemented in Dublin. However, as the issue died in Dublin, and the Irish Free State government prepared to implement the legislation that would restore the Council in 1929, Monahan rigorously turned to the Shawlies and their work. There is no direct evidence available that the timing of this was due to any urgency to clear away women street traders in Cork prior to Monahan’s removal as Civic Commissioner, however local business interests in Cork were, as demonstrated in the documents included in O’Shea (1995), aligned with Cumann na nGaedheal, and they had expressed a desire for a ban on trading. They were also controlling the legislation that would see Monahan appointed City Manager for life.

As did their sisters in Dublin, the Shawlies traded outside the particular forms of trade condoned by the Cumann na nGaedheal government, those constructed as ‘legitimate’ by the discourses of the ‘bricks and mortar’ traders, and those of amalgamated business interests that had the ear of that government. In the ‘Merchant City’ as it continued to ‘modernise’, the Shawlies were, as Parkins (2010) asserts women have been, ‘anterior’ to the modern. They were anachronisms of what Cork’s ‘Principal Citizens’ construed as a by-gone era in Cork’s city centre: they were poor and working in an impoverished
neighbourhood slated for demolition and gentrification. Unlike their sisters in Dublin, rigour was not needed to render them ‘anterior’ to the modern in multiple statements depicting them as dirtying the streets, blocking footpaths, and anterior in their obvious poverty, although these were made, oftentimes subtly by Monahan, less so by Mockler. That said, they were ‘anterior’ to the modern primarily in their interference with the car, the transportation mode of Cork’s future as articulated by Monahan, an Gardaí, and Manning.

According to Parkins (2010, p. 104), modernity was “built on social exclusions”. The ‘modern city’ is one that is clean, efficient, prosperous, and allows for the free movement of traffic and pedestrians (Berman, 1988; Bluestone, 1997). Cork was envisioned and constructed in statements as a modern city, and that characterisation prompted the need to contain the Shawlies. In the process their social exclusion, evidenced in the abuse of the process by Monahan and the silence on the issue that followed this abuse, is evidence of their social and political exclusion. Their absence in the planning documents that articulated an expanded business core for Cork, and in the public debate, is evidence of their social, political, and economic exclusion. As with street traders who would, across the century, be excluded from firm-based economies (Cross, 2000), Cork’s city centre had been earmarked earlier as a business centre, and the Shawlies seeking subsistence earnings in what had been, for centuries, their marketplace, had no claim to public space.
ABOVE: This is a photograph taken of a photograph that hangs in the English Market. It shows women selling from stalls on Paul Street south of Half Moon Street. They are close to where the Paul Street Shopping Centre is now, at the rear of the Musgrave Buildings. Date unknown. (Source: Susan Marie Martin)

BELOW: This is a detail of the woman on the right of the photograph above. This is the only photograph I have located of an onion seller.
Chapter 6 - The Shawlies

...photographs from the early twentieth century suggest that participation in [religious] confraternity processions was the preserve of the wearers of hats and coats—in the Cork context, at least, the outward sign of middle- or upper working-class status. The wearers of shawls stood on the sidewalk to watch the procession pass.
—Maura Cronin (2010, p. 121)

6.1 Introduction

Who were the Shawlies? This chapter uses the census data of 1901 and 1911, and the registry of street traders compiled in 1928, to reveal the precariousness of the lives of the Shawlies. Foucault (1991) proposed that ‘eventalization’ will call into question actions and knowledges constituted as self-evident or obvious. In this chapter, the statements constituted as self-evident or obvious about street traders and street trading by various powers in Dublin and Cork, along with those that proffered that regulation was a ‘Best Intention’ for the Shawlies are called into question through qualitative and quantitative data that tell us who the Shawlies were and, ultimately, why they turned to street trading to survive. This marks what Foucault (1980a) terms the emancipation of historical knowledge from beneath the discourses that silenced them. The silenced discourses Foucault (1980a, p. 83) conceptualises as ‘local knowledge’—the knowledge of the subjected who, like women street traders in Ireland, were “harshly opposed by everything” that surrounded them.

The samples drawn from census data were selected by choosing those categories of women who were frequently cited as problematic—the onion sellers and clothes dealers. As described in Chapter 3, my intention is to complete what Foucault (1980a) conceptualises as the emancipation of ‘historical knowledge’. This means unleashing the voices of those who stood opposite the coercion of a ‘moral technology’ such as The Street Trading Act, 1926. Foucault (1980a, p. 83) insists that creating a genealogy reconstructs ‘local knowledge’, that of the subjected, that which is “harshly opposed by everything” that surrounds it. Having reconstructed that harsh opposition in the previous chapters, I continue the genealogy in this chapter by giving life to the women behind the numbers.
6.2 Who Were the Onion Sellers? What the 1901 Census Reveals

It was noted in Chapter 2 that girls selling onions outside the English Market were frequently the target of warnings and even prosecution from the Market’s security men. William Mockler, speaking on behalf of the Musgrave Brothers, pointed to the women who were onion sellers as causing a “great obstruction” in Daunt’s Square in September 1924 and, potentially, blocking access to Corn Market Street and the “legitimate” business the Musgraves had established there. Who were these girls and women who sold onions on the streets of Cork, these threats to “legitimate” business?

A search of the digitised census returns for 1901 was queried with only the term “onion” in the occupation field; the gender and county fields were left blank. The same search was conducted of the 1911 census records, however there were no returns. The results from the 1901 census reveal that the ‘onion seller’ was, potentially, a phenomenon unique to Cork: in that census 23 citizens declared their occupation to be “onion vendor”, all lived in Cork city and all were women. This also suggests it was an urban trade. More importantly, all were women, making onion selling a gendered means of earning. They all lived in four lanes running off Corn Market Street—Curtis Lane, Albert Row, Fitzgerald’s Alley, and Harpur’s Lane—in District Electoral Division (“DED”) Cork No. 2. In some homes more than one woman was an onion seller. The oldest was 70 years of age, and the youngest was aged 13 years.

The demographics culled from the census for this group of women are contained in Tables 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3.
6.1 Onion Sellers: Marital Status and Household Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Onion Sellers</th>
<th>Percentage of Total (23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married and Not Living with Spouse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married and Living with Spouse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Household</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Household w/ Dependents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to Family Economy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residing in a Family Home with a Male Head of Household</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residing In a Home w/ Female Head of Household</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from these numbers that a significant number of women were supporting themselves and others by selling onions to passersby. Clearly, onion selling was a critical means of earning to survive and contributed to the family economy among the urban poor, even if a male was earning as head of household. For three women, it was their sole means of support.

6.2 Onion Sellers: Personal Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Onion Sellers</th>
<th>Percentage of Total (23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age: Under 20 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 20 - 25 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 30 - 40 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 60 - 70 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Literacy Skills</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Roman Catholic</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Cork city</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering basic literacy skills will typically increase one’s chances of finding gainful employment, selling onions to passersby to earn a living would have been significant to 70% of the onion sellers who did not have basic literary skills. It was particularly
significant to young women: approximately 83% were under the age of twenty-five. The scattering of the remaining four women across age groups, and the gaps in age after 25-years suggest that onion selling was a tenuous form of street trading, particularly when considered alongside the information on marital status and the number of onion sellers who were head of household. This may have been work that way taken on when women could not access other forms of street trading.

6.3 Onion Sellers: Residence, Housing Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Onion Sellers</th>
<th>Percentage of Total (23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence: Curtis Lane</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence: Albert Row</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence: Fitzgerald’s Alley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence: Harpur’s Lane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency Status: Lodger</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residing in Tenement Classed as First Class</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residing in Tenement Classed as Second Class</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers on housing status\textsuperscript{83} indicate that onion selling was a means of survival for the economically marginalised as evidenced by the fact that all resided in tenements, and a significant number resided in tenements considered unfit for human habitation. This phenomenon, combined with information culled from the statistics in Tables 6.1 and 6.2, speak to the need of poor women to be able to trade on the streets in order to house themselves and their families. This also illustrates the dependence of poor families upon street trading at a very basic level, even when a male earner was the head of household. It is clear, too, that onion selling was both classed and gendered, particular to Cork, and a means of income for women who counted among the urban poor. Many were illiterate, and lived in substandard or even dangerous housing conditions in the neighbourhood surrounding the marketplace of North Main Street and Corn Market Street.

\textsuperscript{83} The classifications that designate the condition of their housing follows that developed by Dublin Housing and used in the preparation of the \textit{Cork Civic Survey} of 1926 (p. 14). First Class Tenements “appear to be structurally sound” but “may not be in good repair, but are capable of being put into good repair”. Second Class Tenements “are so decayed or so badly constructed as to be on, or fast approaching, the border-line of being unfit for human habitation”.

218
The following narrative provides a closer look at the home lives of the twenty-three onion sellers based on the census data.

For widows with or without dependents, onion selling was a vital source of income. Julia Barry, 60, was a widow living with her three adult children. She and her son, 19, a labourer, were literate. However, her 15-year daughter, a scholar, could not read, nor could her 22-year old daughter, a domestic servant. They lived in two rooms. Annie Eyers, 40, was also a widow. Her daughter Margaret, 16, was also an onion seller. They resided with Annie’s other daughter, 13 years of age and attending school, and a female lodger, 18, a domestic servant. Both Annie and the lodger were illiterate, but Margaret and her sister were literate. They lived in two rooms. Ellen Spillane, 30, was also widowed. Both she and her daughter Ellen, 15, were onion sellers. They were both illiterate. They lived in one room. Mary Barry, 70, was a widow who lived alone. She was illiterate.

Onion sellers also supported their widowed mothers. Mary Ellen Murray, 17, and her half-sister, Maggie Barry, 13, were both onion sellers. Both were illiterate. Their mother, 43, was also illiterate and worked as a rag picker. She also had a 5-year old son. They lived in two rooms. Mary Costello, 18, was the sole earner in a family of seven. Her mother, 42 and widowed, was raising Mary and her five siblings, aged 14 down to 3-years of age; Mary’s siblings were in school. Mary’s mother was illiterate; Mary and all but her two youngest siblings could read only. They lived in one room. Julia Cotter, 15, was literate; she resided with her mother, 46 and widowed, an older sister, and a female lodger. Her mother did not work outside the home; her sister was employed as a tobacco spinner. The lodger was a rag picker. Julia and her sister were literate; her mother and the lodger were not. They lived in one room. Mary O’Brien, 23, and Catherine O’Brien, 19, were supporting themselves and their widowed mother 48, who did not work outside the home. All were illiterate. They lived in two rooms.

In one case, two onion sellers played a vital role in a family economy where a married woman was the head of a household, but her spouse was not in the home. Margaret Walsh, 23, and her sister Hannah Cleary lived with their 46-year old mother who did not work outside the home. Like her mother, Margaret was married, but was not residing
with her spouse. Margaret and Hannah also helped support three younger siblings. Their two brothers, 12 and 10, were employed as news vendors. They also had an 8-year old sister who was in school. All were illiterate. These six people lived in two rooms.

Onion sellers played an important role in the family economy even when a male was the head of household. Kathleen Sweeney, 20, was married but lived with her parents and siblings. Her father, a foreman, and her mother who did not work outside the home, were both illiterate. Kathleen’s brothers, 14 and 10, were news vendors. Her youngest brother, 8, was not in school and was illiterate. Kathleen and her two working brothers were literate. They lived in three rooms. Margaret O’Brien, 18, lived with her father, a labourer, her mother, and six siblings. Her mother did not work outside the home; her older brother was a labourer. Only Margaret and three of her siblings were literate. This family of nine lived in two rooms. Margaret Daly, 19, was literate. She lived with her father who was employed—the occupation is illegible—and her mother. Margaret’s younger sister, 11, was in school. Mary O’Neill, 18, lodged with the family. She, too, was an onion seller. All were literate. They lived in two rooms.

For single women like Mary O’Neill, or married women not living with their spouses, onion selling was their sole means of support. Like Mary, Margaret Barry, 19, was a lodger residing with a fisherman and his wife. Unlike Mary, she was illiterate. These three adults lived in one room. Julia Field, 22, was married but lived alone in two rooms. She could not read. Ellen Broaderick, 20, was married but lived alone. She was illiterate. Mary Carlton, 18, was the head of a household. She lived with two younger siblings and a female lodger. Her sister, 16, was a domestic servant, as was the lodger, aged 17. Her brother, 12, was a news vendor. All were illiterate. They lived in two rooms. Ellen Crowley, 21, and her sister, Kate Crowley, 18, were both illiterate. They lived alone in three rooms.

6.3 Who Were the Women Clothes Dealers? What the 1901 and 1911 Censuses Reveal

The following sample of women traders was selected from those who named their occupation as a dealer in “clothes”, “old clothes”, or “second-hand clothes”. This sample was selected because, as reported in the previous chapter, these women were the
target of scorn from businesses in North Main Street and stall holders in the Bazaar Market in the opening years of the twentieth century. In addition to obstruction, these women were accused of cutting into the profits of ‘bricks and mortar’ traders because customers were turned away by offensive odours from their goods, the dust and dirt they scattered, and the potential for the spread of infectious diseases.

Who were these women who presented threats to business and to public health? A search of the digitised census returns for 1901 and 1911 were queried with the search terms “clothes” in the occupation field and Cork in the County field; the gender was left at “both”. In the 1901 census, 78 names were returned for County Cork, and 75 were in Cork city; of this 75, 4 persons were eliminated because they were involved in the commercial sale of clothing, or another profession involving clothes (i.e., dyer), leaving 71 clothes dealers. In the 1911 census, 44 names were returned, and only 2 did not live in Cork city. This data suggests that clothes dealers were common, perhaps based on the needs of the urban poor in Cork.

More importantly, it was also a classed and gendered profession across both census returns. Of the 71 clothes dealers recorded in 1901, only 9 were men, suggesting that being clothes dealer was a gendered profession. Of the 71 dealers, 46 or 65% lived in the DEDs that were selected for the collection of a random sample. Only 1 of the 9 men returned lived in the relevant DEDs—he was eliminated from the statistics—for a total sample of 45 women. The presence of only one man in the relevant DEDs suggests that clothes dealing was, significantly, a gendered profession among Cork’s urban poor.

Of the 42 clothes dealers recorded in 1911, all were women, suggesting that ‘clothes dealer’ may have become even more gendered as a profession across the previous decade. Of the 42 women recorded in 1911, 33 or 79% resided in those same DEDs, suggesting once again that this profession was both classed and gendered.

Unfortunately across both samples it is difficult to determine if these women worked in

85. The dealers were selected if they resided on streets listed in the 1911 census as DEDs Cork No. 2, Cork No. 7, Cork No. 7 Urban, and Cork No. 7 Urban (Part of). These streets in these DEDs were targeted because the review of the 1928 registry revealed that this is where the majority of registered traders resided. The list of streets is provided in the Appendices.
the Bazaar Market or on the street. In some cases, recorded in 1901, “in the market” was recorded following clothes dealer or old clothes dealer. However, in 1911, this was not the case, and the occupation was listed simply as “clothes dealer”.

Regardless of their status as stall holders or street traders, profiles and commonalities do emerge. In the deputation to the HCC on 8 August 1904, they were described by their representative as “poor”, and this was typically the case. However, the data that follows also suggests clothes dealers contributed to family economies, and had the potential to help some to move above the precarious living standards experienced by others of their trade. Certainly, being a clothes dealer granted a woman clothes dealer more stability than the onion sellers experienced. Across the two samples, the oldest clothes dealer was aged 75-years, and the youngest was aged 14-years. The demographics are compiled in Tables 6.4, 6.5, and 6.6.

### 6.4 Clothes Dealers: Marital Status and Household Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1901 # of Clothes Dealers</th>
<th>% of Sample (45)</th>
<th>1911 # of Clothes Dealers</th>
<th>% of Sample (33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married and Not Living with Spouse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married and Living with Spouse</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Household</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Household w/ Dependents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residing in a Family Home with a Male Head of Household</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residing in a Family Home with a Female Head of Household</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to a Family Economy</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like the onion sellers, a significant number of clothes dealers in both 1901 and 1911 were contributing to a family economy. Unlike the onion sellers, a clothes dealer was more likely to be residing in a family with a male head of household; among those who
were married, a clothes dealer was more likely to be residing with her spouse. The onion sellers were more likely to be unmarried. In 1901 the clothes dealer and the onion sellers were as likely to be the head of a household; however, that number dropped among the clothes dealers on the 1911 census. The onion sellers were far more likely than the clothes dealers of either cohort to be living in a home with a female head of household.

6.5 Clothes Dealers: Personal Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1901 # of Clothes Dealers</th>
<th>1901 % of Sample (45)</th>
<th>1911 # of Clothes Dealers</th>
<th>1911 % of Sample (33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age: Under 21 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 21 - 30 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 31 - 40 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 41 - 50 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 51 - 60 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: Over 60 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Literacy Skills</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Roman Catholic</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Cork City</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The clothes dealers in both cohorts were much more likely to be literate than the onion sellers. The clothes dealers of 1911 were more likely to be literate than their peers in 1901. Onion sellers were more likely to be very young; however, age data for the 1901 clothes dealers is more evenly distributed across age groups than is that of the onion sellers, an indication that this was a source of employment for women across age groups and, possibly, a source of subsistence income with more stability. Between the 1901 and 1911 cohorts of clothes dealers, the number of traders over 60 years, as a percentage, is consistent. Likewise that of those aged 20-years and under, and those aged 21-30 years; however, there is a marked variation in terms of the percentages of the cohort for those in the middle, ages 31-60 years.
Like the onion sellers, the clothes dealers were more likely to be living in the city centre, in the area surrounding the marketplace of North Main Street and Corn Market Street; and, like the onion sellers, they were likely to be living in substandard housing classified as “second class”. Unlike the onion sellers, however, they were not always tenement dwellers: typically, the clothes dealer was more likely to be living in a private house, over a shop, or in a flat in a large, private house divided into several flats.

Despite variations in demographics, however, it is clear that the Shawlies who comprise the three cohorts were drawn from the working poor of Cork’s city centre.

The following narrative provides a closer look at the home lives of the forty-six clothes dealers appearing in the census of 1901, and the thirty-three clothes dealers appearing in the census of 1911.

For widows with or without dependents, selling clothes was a vital source of income. In 1901 Bridget Coleman, 35, was a widow raising three children, aged 13, 10, and 8 years, all attending school. They lived in two rooms. Bridget was illiterate. In the 1911 census Bridget Coleman, 45, was living with her son, daughter, son-in-law, and two grandchildren. Her son-in-law was a labourer, her son was a butcher’s porter, and her daughter was not working outside the home. They lived in three rooms.

Also among the widows raising children in 1901 was Bridget O’Callaghan, 43; her daughter Mary, 28, was also a clothes dealer. Her son, 18, was a grocer’s porter.

Bridget was also raising three children who were enrolled in school. They lived in five
rooms. Margaret Browne, 44, was also raising children: her son, 29-years, was a labourer; her 14-year old daughter was in school. They lived in one room. Margaret Curtin, 43, was raising four children ages 10, 8, 4, and 1; her school-aged children were attending school. They lived in two rooms. Margaret Howard, a widow at 30-years, was raising two daughters, ages 10 and 2; the 10-year old was attending school. They lived in a 2-room house. In the 1911 census Mary Foley, 45, was widowed and raising her 9-year old daughter. They lived in one room. Likewise Jane McCarthy, 31, was widowed and raising her 9-year old son. They also lived in one room. Julia Sullivan, 45, was widowed and raising a 6-year old son. They, too, lived in one room. Kate Sullivan, 46, was widowed; she and her daughter Ellie, 17, both sold clothes. They lived in three rooms.

In 1901 there were also widows who continued to contribute to a larger family economy. Mary Murphy, 60, was literate, however her two daughters who were also clothes dealers—Hannah age 20, and Lizzie age 17—were recorded as illiterate. She also had a 15-year old son who was an unemployed messenger. These four people lived in two rooms. Mary O’Leary, 66, was living with her son, a store clerk, and had taken in a boarder who was a labourer. They lived in a 3-room house. Mary Hall, 65, lived with her daughter, 32, who was a domestic. They lived in one room.

The sale of clothes on the streets or in the markets also provided a means of support for widows supporting themselves. In 1901 Sara Mullaney, 50, was, like Mary Gready, 44, widowed and living alone in two rooms. Mary Murphy was 50 and a widow in 1901, and living in one room. Likewise, Hannah O’Brien, 62, and Margaret Ryan, 60, were widowed, and each was living alone in one room. In 1901 Hannah Donovan, 63, was living in a flat of two rooms and, in 1911 at 75, she was still trading clothing and living alone in two rooms.

Clothes dealers also supported widows and other dependents, or contributed to the family economy of a home where a widow was the head of household. In 1901 Annie Carey, 21, was living with her widowed mother and two sisters, both of whom were working. They had also taken in two lodgers. These six people lived in 5 rooms. In 1901 Elizabeth Anne Downey, 21, and Catherine Downey, 16, were living with their
widowed mother who was a shopkeeper, their brother who was a tinsmith, and a younger brother who was still in school. All were literate and lived in a six-room house. In 1911, Kate Woods, 26, sold clothes to support herself, her 76-year old widowed aunt and a 76-year old female lodger. They lived in two rooms. Hanna O’Brien, 18, was helping to support her widowed mother, along with her 15-year old brother who worked in a factory; they had two younger siblings still in school. These five people lived in two rooms. Mary Buckley, 44, was supporting her widowed mother and her 29-year old sister. They lived in four rooms.

Several of the clothes dealers had daughters who had taken up the trade, indicating that the sale of clothing may have been viewed as a sustainable enterprise for a woman. In 1901 Ellen Kettle, 51, was married to a labourer. Their daughter Ellen, 28, was a clothes dealer. They lived in five rooms. Similarly, Julia Hegarty, 36, was married to a labourer; she and her daughter Julia, 17, were contributing to the family economy as clothes dealers. Mary Murphy, 40, was married to a blacksmith; both their daughters, Nora 17 and Margaret 15, had entered the trade. These five people lived in two rooms. Helena Mintern, 58, was married to a fisherman. Their daughter Nora, 27, was in the trade, but her two adult sisters were housekeepers. Julia O’Mahoney, 58 and widowed, was living with her two daughters, Agnes 20, and Mary 19, both clothes dealers. The number of rooms they lived in was missing from the census data. In 1911 Kate Caulfield, 47, was married to a dock labourer. They had four children two of whom were clothes dealers: Mary, 18, and Kate, 14. The two youngest, both boys, were in school. These six people lived in three rooms.

The aforementioned families illustrate that the sale of clothing provided important contributions to the family economy of labouring men. In addition to the aforementioned women were married to labourers, in 1901 Hanoria Murray, 75, was a clothes dealer married to a clothes dealer. They lived in four rooms with their widowed daughter, 48, who was a housekeeper, and their 21-year old grandson who was a tailor. Agnes O’Connell, 29, was married to a labourer. They had two children in school; they lived in two rooms. Nora Walsh, 40 was married to a cork maker. Their 15-year old son was employed as a boot maker, and they had a younger son in school. These four people lived in one room. Mary Hayes, 18, was not married; her father was a labourer.
and her mother wasn’t working. She had two brothers working as shops’ porters, and a younger brother who was in school. These six people lived in two rooms.

Similar financial needs among families of the working poor were evident in the 1911 findings. Ellen Webb, 24, was living with her father, a 60-year old blacksmith and a widower. She was also living with three siblings; one, a sister, was unemployed. These five people lived in three rooms. Mary Ellen Quilligan, 17, lived with her parents and four siblings all under the age of thirteen; her father’s sister-in-law and her young daughter also lived with them. She and her father, a chimney sweep, were the only members of the household who were working. Julia Mahoney, 24, resided with her mother, step-father, and two brothers. Julia’s mother did not work outside the home; her step-father and two brothers were carpenters. Annie Riordan, 21, lived with her father, a dock labourer, and her mother, also a dealer, but what she sold is not specified. Her younger brother was a tailor’s apprentice, her younger sister a housekeeper. They lived in four rooms.

Clothes dealing also assisted financially at the start of a married couple’s life together. In 1901, Bridget Downing, 29, was married to the man in that sample who was also a clothes dealer. They shared two rooms. Mary Duggan, 23, was married to a labourer; they had a daughter aged 1. They lived with Mary’s mother, a housekeeper, and Mary’s younger sister. All were illiterate. They lived in three rooms. In 1911 Ellie McCarthy, 23, was married to a dock labourer. They shared two rooms. Hannah McCarthy, 34, was married to a bread truck driver. They were supporting two children aged 5-years and 8-months. They lived in four rooms. Mary Fulignati, 29, was married to a 35-year old cabinet maker from Italy. They had two sons aged 4-years and 3-years. They employed a female domestic. These five people lived in three rooms. Mary Sheppard, 62, was married to a tinsmith. They lived with three adult children: two sons were employed as tinsmiths, the daughter was unemployed. These five people lived in three rooms.

Clothes trading was also the domain of women who were married but did not have a spouse in the home. In 1901 Annie Leahy, 48, was married and Head of Household. Her 18-year old son was a porter in a shop; Annie had four children aged 4-12 years.
They lived in two rooms. Another Annie Leahy, 46, was Head of Household on the night of the 1911 census. Her daughter Annie McCarthy, 22, lived with her and also sold clothes; she was married but not living with her spouse. They also lived with Annie Leahy’s 30-year old step-son, a labourer and army reservist, Annie’s 13-year old son, and daughter, 17, were unemployed. These five people lived in three rooms. Eliza Hart, 30, was married but her spouse did not live with her; she was supporting a 1-month old daughter. She lived with her brother, a general labourer, and two sisters—one a hairdresser and one a domestic. Margaret Mahoney, 22, lived with her father, a quay labourer, her mother, and nine siblings. Only Margaret, her father, and her 20-year old brother, a soap factory hand, were employed. These twelve people lived in two rooms. Ellen O’Connell, 30, was married but her spouse was not in the home. She was supporting five children aged 10-years to 10-months. They lived in two rooms.

Other single women supported themselves, and sometimes others in a family economy through the sale of clothes. Hester Hearde, 62, was single in 1901, and lived in a 3-room house with her niece, also single, a 20-year old seamstress. Bridget Harris, 40, was a widow who boarded with a baker, the baker’s wife, and their three children. The number of rooms in their home was not indicated on the census. In 1911 Mary Twohig, 55, was single; she was the head of a household that included a 19-year old niece, a tobacco spinner, and a 21-year old nephew, a labourer. They lived in one room. Mary Ellen Sullivan, 18, lived with her father, mother, an older brother and a younger brother. Only Mary Ellen and her father, a labourer, were employed. These five people lived in three rooms.

Several women were part of homes where the family appeared positioned to transcend the precarious economic circumstances apparent in the lives of many of their peers, and the lives of the onion sellers. In 1901, Margaret Murphy, 60, was the head of a household shared with her working adult children. Her daughter Helena, 22, was also a clothes dealer. Margaret also had a daughter who was a dressmaker, one who was a milliner, and a son who was a frame maker. She was supporting her 12-year old nephew who was in school. They lived in four rooms classified as over a shop off the Grand Parade. In 1911, Margaret Carroll, 63, was married to a tinplate worker. Their son, 26, was an undergraduate. They lived in five rooms. Catherine Rice, 42, was
married to a harness merchant, and they operated a lodging house. They resided with their two children, aged 14-years and 11-years and still in school. They had eleven lodgers. All lived in sixteen rooms in a private dwelling.

For at least one family, clothes dealing appeared to be sustainable across generations and both censuses. In 1901, Mary Ellen Stark was married to a plumber; they had five children—four in school, and one aged six months. Mary Ellen’s widowed mother, Eliza O’Neill, 64, was also a clothes dealer and lived with them. The information on their housing conditions was not available. In 1911 Mary Ellen Stark, 45, was still married but her husband was now a waterworks superintendent. They lived with five of their children, one of whom was working: Eliza, 22 and the oldest, was her mother’s assistant. Eliza O’Neill, 74, Mary’s widowed mother, was still living with them and she was still selling clothes. They lived in six rooms.

Just as selling onions was a gendered trade, it is clear that selling clothes was also gendered. In County Cork, this trade was largely urban and concentrated in Cork city. It was also a classed profession. Although there appears to have been more breadth in the income and prospects of the clothes dealers—in particular for those who were married and lived with a working spouse—this was still very much a profession for poor and working-class women.

6.4 What the 1928 Registry Reveals About the Shawlies

As noted in the previous chapter, Commissioner Philip Monahan ordered Gardaí to compile a registry of all the street traders in Cork in advance of his ‘adoption’ of the Act. This activity was carried out in the city centre, and a commercial district in a working-class neighbourhood on the city’s north side. Of the 199 traders listed in the registry, all were women.

The registry lists the names, ages and addresses of these women traders, and professional particulars (i.e., commodities sold, length of time trading, location of pitch). A small number were itinerant, and most traded from a pitch, with or without a stall (i.e., a blanket on the pavement with goods displayed). The materials that constituted a stall were, evidently, moveable (i.e., boxes and boards). Of the total
number of women street traders, 161 or 81% were trading in the city centre, and it is these Shawlies for whom demographic profiles have been compiled. Analysis in this section is guided not only by the conceptual framework and the methodology, but by the information detailed in the previous chapter.

The information requested of the women who described their trade as ‘itinerant’ and working in Cork’s city centre when reporting to An Garda Síochána was limited to their age, address, the locale where they traded, and the commodities sold. This data is compiled in Table 6.7.

6.7 Demographics of 1928 Itinerant Street Traders (city centre)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF ITINERANT TRADERS</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 38 years</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 - 59 years</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years and older</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading Area: Corn Market St., N. Main St., and Coal Quay</td>
<td>12 (86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading Area: Corn Market St. and N. Main St.</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading Area: Corn Market St. and Coal Quay</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities: Old Clothes/Articles of Clothing</td>
<td>9 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities: Produce (fruit/vegetables, fruit &amp; vegetables/any of the above in combination with another commodity</td>
<td>3 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities: Other (Sundry)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data reveals that a significant number of itinerant traders were older than 39 years; the youngest itinerant trader registered in the city centre was 17, and the oldest was 60. All worked on Corn Market Street as part of their rounds, and all but one worked on both Corn Market Street and North Main Street combined. A significant number, 69%, lived in the DEDs where so many of the onion sellers and clothes dealers lived. That only 14 women were itinerant—street traders by definition under the Act—means that an overwhelming majority of women were now, technically, ‘stall traders’, and had established a fixed location from which to trade.
CHAPTER 6

The 147 women designated as stall traders working in Cork’s city centre provided An Garda Síochána with their age, address, length of time trading, type of stall, and the commodities sold. The data related to their stall locations and commodities sold is compiled in Table 6.8.

### 6.8 Stall Traders 1928 (city centre): Trading Area & Commodities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF STALL TRADERS</th>
<th>147</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stall on Corn Market Street</td>
<td>69 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stall on North Main Street</td>
<td>68 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stall on Kyle Street (N. of St. Peter’s Market)</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Trading Area (North Gate Bridge or Grand Parade)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities: Old Clothes/Article of Clothing</td>
<td>58 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities: Produce (fruit/vegetables, fruit and vegetables/any of the above in combination with another commodity)</td>
<td>62 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities: Other Food (i.e., meat, fish only)</td>
<td>9 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities: Other (i.e., chandlery, wares, used books, etc.)</td>
<td>18 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost half of the women were selling food, however the number selling clothing was also significant. The number of women trading on the street in the market district immediately surrounding St. Peter's Market and the Bazaar numbered 144; approximately half were trading on Corn Market Street, and half on North Main Street.

From these numbers it is clear that displacement of the traders on North Main Street, in conjunction with the ban placed on the east side of Corn Market Street, that these displacements would have a dramatic impact on the Shawlies due to significant crowding on Corn Market Street. Furthermore, Monhan’s concession of allowing these women to trade on the quays but only on the river side, would have put many of them out of the easy reach of customers. Finally, the Corporation was still not prepared to make more space available in St. Peter’s Market and, presumably, many of these women were among those displaced when the space was leased to private interests. Therefore, the implementation of the Act would, under these circumstances, have significantly compromised the earning potential of all 144 women both in terms of guaranteeing a space to trade from, and increased competition. The Act also meant increased costs.
Clearly the Corporation had little regard for assisting 144 women who were financially responsible for supporting themselves and, in many cases, dependents.

The typical stall was constructed of “boxes and boards” while others reported using tables, barrels, boxes; for some others their goods were simply laid on the street or footpath and, pursuant to the definition set out in the Act, these were not stall traders. As for the frequency of trading a significant number, 124 (84%) of respondents reported trading daily, an indication that this was a source of full-time employment. Only 22 (15%) reported trading on Saturdays only, and 1 (less than 1%) traded on Fridays and Saturdays only. This information indicates that, as noted earlier, the vast majority of women trading on the streets were stall traders. They were also trading from an established location daily, an indication that the disruption to their trading and earning caused by displacement would have been detrimental. Only 4 (3%) employed an assistant, an indication that perhaps very few could afford to hire an assistant, or were not trading at a rate that justified having an assistant.

The age distribution of the traders is displayed in Table 6.9, along with the approximate age at which these women started trading.

### 6.9 Stall Traders 1928: Age & Age When Commenced Trading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Age of Trader when Registered/ Number of Traders/% of Total (147)</th>
<th>Age When Commenced Trading (approx.)/Number of Traders/% of Total (147)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 yrs.</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>52 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 39 yrs.</td>
<td>63 (43%)</td>
<td>90 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 59 yrs.</td>
<td>54 (37%)</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 yrs. and older</td>
<td>27 (18%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average age when a woman started trading across all 147 traders is 20 years; the youngest began trading at 11-years, and the oldest at 55-years. The average age, when considered with the significant numbers who started between the ages of 11 and 39, indicates that trading may have been the only work these women had ever done. This condition means a threat to trading and earning might have put them at a further disadvantage of finding employment that would replace lost earnings.
This information is particularly poignant considering the length of time many women had been trading; the length of time all 147 women had been trading was recorded in the registry. The trader with the least experience had only been trading 2 months when the registry was compiled; the trader with the most experience had been trading 50 years. That length of time trading for the entire sample is compiled in the Table 6.10.

6.10 Stall Traders 1928: Length of Time Trading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Long Trading?</th>
<th>Number of Traders/ % of Total (147)</th>
<th>Era When Commenced Trading (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less</td>
<td>21 (14%)</td>
<td>1923-1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>23 (16%)</td>
<td>1918-1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20 years</td>
<td>42 (29%)</td>
<td>1908-1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30 years</td>
<td>28 (19%)</td>
<td>1898-1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40 years</td>
<td>19 (13%)</td>
<td>1888-1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 years or more</td>
<td>14 (9%)</td>
<td>1887 and earlier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To put these numbers into historical perspective, 14% of the women trading started trading in the period 1923 - 1928—the period that coincides with the foundation of the state, the passing of The Street Trading Act in 1926, and its passage in Cork in 1928. In the period 1918 - 1922, 16% of the sample started trading—the period that coincides with the Anglo-Irish War, the Irish Civil War, and an increased momentum in calls by business interests to have street trading banned. Thus, 30% of the women began trading during the period when war, displacement, uncertainty, national economic challenges, and cuts to social welfare presented survival challenges to poor Irish women.

The information provided by the Shawlies indicates that the period 1898 through to 1917 was when a significant number of these women commenced trading, figures that appear to be in line with the trend noted in Chapter 2. It is significant that 103 women had been trading for more than 11 years: that means that 70% of the women registered in 1928 had been trading for more than a decade to support themselves, or themselves and her dependents, or were contributing to the economy of a poor or working-class

85 “In 1901, the percentage of women dealing out of the total female population reached its highest proportion from the figures recorded on all census returns from 1841: 19.01% of the city’s female population were now identified as dealers while 11.47% of the male population were so employed (Murphy, 1986, pp. 233-234)”.
family. Some had done so for as many as five decades, starting in 1878. The vast majority had started trading under the Pedlars’ Act, when to do so was not illegal nor was it regulated. Furthermore, they had been trading on the streets when a market was defined as a public space.

In Chapter 4, the newspaper accounts of the controversy following the implementation of the Act in Dublin demonstrated that the question of an established public market, and the right of access to that market, was raised in the instance of Moore Street. Consideration was also given to the length of time women had been trading. Was there concern by Monahan and Cosgrave’s ministers that these issues were valid and would be raised in Cork? This may explain why the registry detailed where the women traded, the composition of their stalls, and the length of time they had been trading. ‘Lessons’ from Dublin may also explain why the Garda Chief Superintendent (Cork) noted that the number of traders was significant, and that it was likely many applications would be received for licenses. Finally, as detailed in Chapter 5, the Corporation had, two decades earlier, exempted Corn Market Street from charges of obstruction to facilitate trading. Approximately 61 or 42% of these women would have started trading when that exemption was established.

The address of each woman was recorded. The residence information for these women is compiled in Table 6.11 according to the DED information available on the 1911 census. Four of the addresses could not be located in trade directories, maps, or in the 1911 census. These four traders were removed from the sample for this analysis.

### 6.11 1928 Stall Traders: Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cork DED</th>
<th>Number of Traders Residing in DED/% of Sample (143)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cork No. 1 Urban, No. 3 Urban, No. 4</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork No. 4 Urban</td>
<td>12 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork No. 5 Urban</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork No. 2</td>
<td>30 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork No. 7</td>
<td>35 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork No. 7 Urban</td>
<td>43 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork No. 7 Urban (part of)</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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According to the address information provided, 117 or 82% lived in the DEDs where the onion sellers and significant numbers of the clothes dealers lived: Cork No. 2, Cork No. 7, Cork No. 7 Urban, and Cork No. 7 Urban (part of). While the specifics of the housing conditions they lived in in 1928 are not known, their residence in these areas where the onion sellers and clothes dealers lived provides some indication. We do know that these women, like their predecessors, numbered among Cork’s urban poor looking to earn a subsistence living. Unfortunately, not only were their livelihoods threatened, but so too were those of the women who would be their successors. As noted in the previous chapter, correspondence from the Garda Chief Superintendent (Cork), dated 31 December 1928, indicated that Monahan intended “to limit as far as possible the licences to those already engaged in such occupation”.

Unfortunately, additional information is not available to know more about the lives of these women. Dates of birth were not provided which makes precise information about their ages difficult to assess in order to retrieve more information about these particular women from the 1911 and 1901 census returns. Taking into consideration other factors—name change, transience—makes it is difficult to pinpoint women from this registry in the census returns compiled 17 and 27-years earlier. That said, close matches for 9 of the 147 women emerge from the 1911 census and, out of the 1901 census, close matches for 4 of the 147 women emerge. The following narrative traces the lives of these women.

Bridget Coleman was a mother and a widow who earned a living as a clothes dealer according to both the 1901 and 1911 censuses; her story appears in the narrative in the previous section. In 1901 it was learned that Bridget was illiterate; her three children were in school. In 1911 she was residing with her son, daughter, son-in-law and two grandchildren. In 1928 Bridget Coleman, 64, was living in the Corporation Buildings and was selling fish and fruit on Corn Market Street from a stall made of boxes and boards. She declared that she had been a trader for 45-years, making her approximately 17-years of age when she started.

In 1901, Mary Costello, age 32, was a vegetable vendor, and husband Patrick was a coal porter; they lived at 9 Coach Street. In 1911, Mary Costello, age 40 was living at 18
Portney’s Lane, and was selling fish. At that time she was living with her husband of 20-years, Patrick, a general labourer; they lived with two cousins—one a general labourer and one unemployed—and her aunt, a widow aged 50-years, also a fish dealer. In 1928, Mary Costello, aged 60, was still living at 18 Portney’s Lane, and was selling vegetables and fish on Corn Market Street from a stall made of boxes and boards. She reported that she had been a trader for 40-years, making her approximately 20-years of age when she started.

In 1911 only one woman named May Desmond appears in the census returns from Cork. At that time she was aged 22 years, and living in an apartment with two single aunts, aged 60 and 56 years who were not working. May was a machinist. She was born in Dublin city. In 1928 May Desmond, age 40, lived at 20 James Street. She was selling boots and old clothes on Corn Market Street from a stall made of boxes and boards. She had been a trader for 18-years making her approximately 22-years of age when she started trading.

In 1901 Margaret Hurley, age 31 lived at 22 Cockpit Lane with three daughters, all in school. She recorded her occupation as charwoman. In 1911 a woman named Margaret Hurley, age 44, was living at 22 Cockpit Lane. A widow, she was the head of the household and recorded her occupation as charwoman; she was illiterate. She resided with two daughters; one employed as a weaver, and the other as a factory hand. In 1928 Margaret Hurley, aged 62, lived at 23 Cockpit Lane and was selling fruit and fish on Corn Market Street from a stall made of boxes and boards. She had been a trader for 30-years, making her approximately 32 years of age when she started trading.

In 1901 Mary Kickham, age 24, was married but did not live with her spouse. She was the head of the family and her profession was listed as housekeeper. She lived at 19 Harpur’s Lane with her 2-year old son and her mother. Mary and her mother were illiterate. In 1911 a woman named Mary Kickham, age 32, lived at 14 Grattan Street. She was a widow and a mother of four children. A profession is not listed for Mary; she could read and write. In 1928 Mary Kickham, aged 50, lived around the corner from Grattan Street at 11 Henry Street, and she was selling old clothes in North Main Street.
from boards on the street. She had been a trader for 25-years, making her approximately 25 years of age when she started trading.

In 1911 a woman named Catherine McCarthy, age 34, was a dealer in wool. She was married to Michael, an upholsterer, and they lived with four children. Catherine had given birth to nine children who were living at birth, thus five of her children did not survive childhood. They lived at 24 Corporation Buildings at the top of Corn Market Street. In 1928 Catherine McCarthy, age 50, lived at 18 Cockpit Lane and was selling fish and vegetables on Corn Market Street from a stall made of boxes and boards. She had been trading for 25-years, making her approximately 25-years of age when she started trading. A match approximating Catherine McCarthy does not appear in the 1901 census.

In 1911 Jane Sullivan, age 36, was living at 8 Harpur’s Lane with her husband, a fisherman; she declared her profession to be dealer. Her 17-year old daughter, Ellen, was also a dealer. Jane and Ellen could read but could not write. She had two younger children in school; Jane had given birth to four children who were living at birth, thus one did not survive childhood. In 1928 Jane Sullivan, age 50, was living at 22 Paul Street and was selling vegetables on Corn Market Street from a stall made of boxes and boards. She had been trading for 30-years making her approximately 20-years of age when she started trading. A match approximating Jane Sullivan does not appear in the 1901 census.

In 1936, approximately nine years after the registry was completed, and the year before talk of The Street Trading Act, 1926 would resume in Cork, Seamus Murphy carved the onion seller “Mary Anne”. There is only one onion seller in the 1928 registry, but she was not itinerant like the woman Murphy had sculpted, and the woman observed in the photograph hanging in the English Market. She was Nellie Carlton, age 23. She lived at 15 Brown Street and sold onions on Grand Parade from a stall made of boxes and boards. She had been trading for 5-years, making her approximately 18-years of age when she started trading. Only one Mary Anne appears in the 1928 registry. Mary Anne O’Sullivan, 70, was living at 22 Kyle Street and sold fish on Corn Market Street.
from a stall made of boxes and boards. She had been trading 50-years making her
approximately 20-years of age when she started earning on the streets.

There are no additional registries available at the Cork City and County Archives. It is
not likely, however, that additional ones were compiled until after 1938 considering it
was the Chief Superintendent of an Garda Síochána (Cork) who wrote to Monahan that
year to suggest that street trading be regulated in Cork. The next section provides a
brief post-script to this era to understand how street trading on the Coal Quay was
constructed and re-constructed over the decades that followed.

6.5 The Shawlies and the Coal Quay Post-1942
At the close of the previous chapter it was learned that Lord Mayor Michael Sheehan
blamed World War 2 for stalling improvements to the city. That statement was made in
an article that appeared in *The Irish Times* on 15 June 1946. Entitled “Strolling Round
Cork”, the piece is a photo essay of Cork’s landmarks and its power brokers, including
Sheehan and Monahan.

Two photos appear side-by-side of the city’s two major retail promenades—St. Patrick’s
Street and Corn Market Street. This juxtaposition makes it clear that the emphasis on
‘the modern’, order, and hygiene continued. The caption described St. Patrick’s Street
as “fashionable” and “orderly” with its “modern shops”, and Corn Market Street as a
location marked by “disorder, and the dirt that remains after each day's trading and
bargaining”. The caption concludes: “At Cornmarket [sic] you may pick up bargains,
but you will spend a more tiring day there than you would in orderly Patrick street”. As
noted in Chapter 2, during this decade Monahan, speaking about troubled times for the
English Market, hinted that it might be reduced in stature to that of Corn Market Street
if the Corporation followed through on plans to reduce the rent on stalls (Ó Drisceoil
and Ó Drisceoil, 2011).

In contrast, eight years later, the *Irish Times* ran an article on 2 October 1954 that
described Corn Market Street as a world-renowned “nostalgic spot”, the “subject of
photographers looking for the quaint and the picturesque”, and the “object of curiosity
for visitors”. Nostalgia was settling in as Corn Market Street was on the decline: the
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The title of the article, “Do You Remember the Coal Quay?”, hinted at what the article implied in the main, namely that this marketplace was possibly “out of place in our new world of post-war mass-produced shiny things”? The traders interviewed said this was the case, suggesting that the glut of cheap goods available had compromised the second-hand trade. They stated that the Bazaar market was most lucrative when at its busiest, through the years of World War 1. The article questioned the market’s future in strictly economic terms, observing the Bazaar’s “present value as a commercial proposition” to traders or the Corporation could not guarantee “its continued existence”. As noted in Chapter 2, this was the same decade St. Peter’s and the Bazaar markets were set to be demolished under a regeneration scheme that would see either a fire station or a basketball arena being built on that site (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011).

It was made clear throughout the article that trading in these markets was intergenerational. Both the intergenerational nature of women trading on Corn Market Street, and the decline in trade at that location, were explored again in an article in the *Irish Times*, dated 3 May 1985, entitled “The Market Women of Cork”. A connection between the two phenomena was also noted. The author reports that the few women still trading in the Coal Quay in 1985 claimed that their daughters and granddaughters now refused “to stand in the cold, week after week, selling vegetables or second hand clothes”. At the time of the report, trading was taking place on the east side of Corn Market Street, largely from stalls, from Tuesday to Saturday.

This article, however, stands out from the others for the sweep of the information provided: it offers some insight into the history of the Coal Quay, and uses the voices of the women trading there to provide first-hand insights into the history of trading in the lives of their families. One long-time trader reported that in the past the only women who sold on the street were women who lived in the area; however, she reported that “Now there’s all kinds of tricky ones after coming along”. According to the reporter, she was referring to traders from outside Cork with stalls described as “brash”, selling “cheap digital watches, electric drills, bits of brass, and half-price toolboxes”. These traders were labelled as “casual” by the reporter. In contrast, the trader he spoke to—described as one of the “real women of the Coal Quay”—sold sewing notions including ribbons, lace, and buttons.
Two women selling clothes claimed to have been “nearly born” on the street, and were fourth generation traders. Another, still selling fruit in her seventies, reported that she was part of a family of Shawlies who had traded there for approximately 150 years, a legacy that included her mother and her grandmother. In her words, “The fruit was always our thing. It was passed on, like, that we’d sell the fruit. We never bothered with anything else”. She remembered meat being sold in St. Peter’s Market, and recalled that as a child she would swing from the meat scales. A trader selling second-hand clothes reported that she was “born and reared on the Coal Quay. We’re here all our lives”. She described a street market where the stalls had once been “four deep”, with one side of the street consigned to the sale of eggs and poultry. She added that “All the women wore shawls at that time”. According to the article, St. Peter’s market was now used to store used clothing for the traders out of hours. This is much closer to the Corn Market Street of the old photographs: a vital marketplace and the ubiquitous presence of women covered in shawls. The article goes on to describe the depiction of “Paddy's Market” in Bulfin’s 1907 Rambles in Eirinn, detailed in Chapter 2.

The article describes a code among the women used when sizing up a customer: “H.B.” stood for “heart breaker”—someone of means haggling for the sake of haggling to bring down the return to the trader. It was noted, too, that the traders would, typically, reduce prices for someone who was genuinely poor. Despite the openness of this price mechanism, one customer claimed that tastes had now changed so that people had become “right fussy”, and wanted “their clothes to look like they come out of Dunnes Stores”. She had been coming to buy in Corn Market Street since the age of two, a weekly visit that continued into her later years. The article alluded to changes in buying habits, calling the used clothing market a “Hippie paradise” in the 1960s and 70s. Both observations aside, the author noted that a market for used clothing still existed: on Saturday mornings women would push prams stacked with used clothing to Kyle Street and sell from the prams, or pile the clothing on the street.

Much of the information in this article aligns with the data collected from the censuses and the registry. It is clear that trading was a full-time means of earning and living for women, and for many it was the only work they or their foremothers knew. It confirms that women specialised in particular commodities, and established custom in particular
locations. Building on that data, it confirms that street trading was difficult work for little return, and earnings were vulnerable to changes in the larger economy and in Irish life. Thus, street trading was a very real means of earning for these women and not a life-style choice to earn ‘pocket money’, or a means of accumulating wealth outside of paying taxes or rates, despite what the negative meta-narratives surrounding street trading have dictated.

It is noted that the correspondent used the word “casual” to describe particular traders. The term had come into use earlier in the 1980s when the Irish government re-articulated street trading as ‘casual’ trading, as if it were a life-style choice, or one made outside of ‘regular’ work. Whatever the connotations, this change and its aftermath makes a statement that de-legitimates further the work of these women and the value of trade in their lives. The Casual Trading Act, 1980 replaced The Street Trading Act, 1926, and redefined street trading as casual trading, or “selling goods by retail at a place (including a public road) to which the public have access of right or at any other place that is a casual trading area” (S. 2). Exemptions were made for particular commodities. A casual trading site could only be designated by the local authority. The regulation of street trade now fell to the Minister of Industry, Commerce, and Tourism.

According to an Irish Times article published on 22 July 1985, The Casual Trading Act was implemented in 1983 and was intended to sort out the “anomalies” of the 1926 legislation. It is interesting that the state needed nearly sixty years to address the confusion noted in the data collected in Chapters 4 and 5. The article went on to describe the situation, noted in Chapter 3, in the interviews with Dublin’s pram women and the resistance to the new legislation that followed. The article suggests that street trading was on the increase because of the recession; there was speculation that the dispute would continue in Dublin’s city centre for some time. The May 1985 article about the women trading in the Coal Quay does not describe similar problems with the implementation of the new legislation in Cork.

86 The era when The Casual Trading Act came to replace The Street Trading Act, 1926 is the era detailed in Chapter 2 when women street traders in Dublin were subjected to arrest and even imprisonment.
A search of the Oireachtas debates database for the 1980s indicates that there was little debate surrounding the new legislation, and little attention was given in the Oireachtas to the arrests and the dispute ongoing in Dublin. This suggests that the plight of women street traders under state regulation received even less attention from Ireland’s elected officials in the 1980s than it did in the 1920s and 1930s. The two exceptions were TD Tony Gregory and Dublin City Councillor Christy Burke, both of whom served 14-day sentences in Mountjoy Prison for demonstrating in support of the Moore Street traders.

Little appears to have changed more than a decade later: on 28 March 1997 an article appeared in the *Irish Times* under the headline “Expert Warns on Street Traders’ Demise”. The expert was the European Union’s General Secretary for Market Traders. He said it was “unbelievable that in these modern times street traders are looked on as criminals”, and described Dublin’s Moore Street as “something from the Middle Ages” with the “police chasing street traders with their prams”.

He observed that the greatest threat to street markets in any of the the countries in the European Market was in Ireland. In the same article a representative of the Cork Corporation reviewed the history of the “Coal Quay market”. He said that the “traditional market location” had “gone downhill”, and was now a weekend market that operated seven days a week during the Christmas season. He said that the Coal Quay had recently been redeveloped by the Cork Corporation with financial assistance from the European Union (“EU”), and that the Coal Quay was becoming a successful market again. However, he said that he doubted if the market would operate seven days a week as it had in the past. He predicted that as a “vibrant Friday and Saturday market”, the Coal Quay “would be a valuable asset in the City”.

Ironically, more than sixty years after the Cork Corporation began coercing and containing the Shawlies, he also proclaimed that a market like the Coal Quay was as much a part of Irish life as “dancing, hurling or traditional butter-making”.

6.6 Conclusions

This turn in Cork’s official position on street markets aligns with a shift in official thinking that occurred in the wealthy nations after poor street traders were regulated off the streets of their cities (Bluestone, 1997; Cross, 2000). A distinction must be made
between this representation by the Corporation’s representative in the late twentieth century of the Coal Quay as a “valuable asset”, and the problematisation of the Coal Quay in earlier in the twentieth century. It is clear from the data explored in this chapter, and the previous two chapters, that street trading was not viewed as a “valuable asset” by the large-scale business interests, the local authority in Cork, or the Irish state.

According to Hunt and Wickham (1998), ‘statements’ generate ‘social facts’, and the discourses about the Shawlies, their sisters in Dublin, and street trading in Ireland in general, rendered all deviant, counter-modern, and a public nuisance and hazard. In this chapter, their ‘local knowledge’ (Foucault, 1980a) has been constructed, and confirms that the ‘social facts’ emerging from the dominant discourses obscured the reality of these women. The data in the censuses and the registry reveal that the Shawlies struggled across generations to support themselves. In many cases they struggled to support families amid poverty, and opportunities for social and economic mobility that were limited by a lack of education. The length of time so many traded, and traded across generations, is a further indication that a Shawlie’s social mobility was limited with or without an education.

Kendall and Wickham (1999) offer that analysis of ‘statements’ makes it possible to shift attention onto the procedures used by power rather than tackling the feasibility of the statements. The information gathered about the Shawlies in this chapter provides an analysis of the implications of the procedures—negative statements, allegations of deviance and health risks, the Act itself—used by various powers in Dublin and Cork in the design and implementation of the Act rather than investigating the credibility or feasibility of the logic used to support the Act. In the process, this has allowed for an analysis of what Kendall and Wickham (1999) describe as the positions established between the subject and the statement which will, in turn, reveal how statements produce subject positions. In this study what was revealed was how statements deepened the subject positions of poor women in Cork, so that they had no agency when their livelihoods were threatened.

The data in this chapter has, however, confirmed the statements detailed in Chapter 5 that were made by those speaking on behalf of the Shawlies: they were poor, and street
trading was the means by which hundreds of women had earned a subsistence living for
centuries on streets in Cork’s working-class neighbourhood. Based on the information
set out in the previous chapter it is clear, too, that they were poor women snared by what
Nicholas (2009, p. 251) calls the “knot” of modernity, formed by “capitalism, consumer
culture, urban life”, that was tightened by a regulatory snare. Unlike their sisters in
Dublin, they were able to do so close to the city’s centre, but only if they were out of
sight of those who worked, lived, and shopped in Cork’s privileged retail and
commercial core.
Above: A sense of community in the Coal Quay. This plaque still hangs on the exterior wall of a business on Corn Market Street where it meets Portney’s Lane. August 2013 (Source: Susan Marie Martin)

Below: A mural that appeared at a building site on Shandon Street, August 2013. (Source: Susan Marie Martin)
Chapter 7 - The Shawlies and Women Street Traders in Contemporary Poor Nations

*It [Moore Street] features on all the tourist brochures welcoming tourists to the city. Yet behind that facade the state was actually moving to destroy them.*
—Dublin TD Tony Gregory

7.1 Introduction

In the conceptual framework I explored why a new state, or one working to re-position itself economically and politically on the world’s stage, must strengthen its hold on power or ‘Thrive’ by conscripting its citizens as economic actors. In turn, all take the steps believed necessary to ‘Prosper’, or to appear to ‘Prosper’. The state then continues in this mission to prosper and strengthen, simultaneously, by protecting this economic paradigm, and acting under at least the pretence of having the ‘Best Intentions’ for the lives of its citizens. The framework then addressed how schemes and programmes put forward with the ‘Best Intentions’ may turn out, as Foucault suggested, to be oppressive.

The ‘Best Intentions’, typically constructed under the guise of progress, are often deemed inevitable. Gentrification, as a ‘Best Intention’ promises, in the long term, to act as a social leveller (Martin, 2014) that will create communities with sustainable flows of people, capital, and security in the forms of public health and safety. A closer look at street traders under narratives of modernity deepens the understanding of the threats created by the governance strategies of a state working to ‘Thrive’ according to the prerogatives of the business community.

Moving between the experiences of women street traders in a newly independent Ireland in 1926, and those in ‘emerging economies’ in the opening decades of the twenty-first century, reveals that the shared goals of ‘progress’ through ‘prosperity’—signified by wide streets, tidy retail districts, and privileging private interests in public spaces—is prioritised while women street traders are further marginalised and even demonised. At the level of the urban street, and the lives of the urban poor, this translates into legislation that is described as ‘intending’ to regulate women street

---

87 This quotation is taken from an interview with Gregory in the documentary *Alive Alive O: A Requiem for Dublin* available at [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7zm5SuWfOgU](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7zm5SuWfOgU).
traders through licensing to create a fair trading environment, protect the public from unfair and unhealthy trading practices, and make streets and footpaths safe. However, in practice, seemingly innocuous legislation eliminates a means of subsistence earning and affordable food and clothing for a city’s poorest citizens.

In this chapter I explore how the banner of ‘progress’, permits the flow of modernity and neoliberal-style economic efficiency across the social landscape. I examine the experience of women street traders in poor countries in Africa, Latin American, and Asia to determine what insights may be gleaned into the experiences of the Shawlies.

7.2 The ‘Push-Cart Evil’—New York City’s Progressive Threat to Street Traders
New York city’s history with its street traders provides a crucial understanding of the intersection of modernity and street trading. While what follows is not grounded in the contemporary, nor is particular to women, what happened in New York city across the opening decades of the twentieth century is relevant to the study at hand for several reasons. The era when a concerted and overt crack down happened in New York corresponds with the events detailed in this study. Furthermore, the crack down in New York happened under a civic administration characterised as Progressive—the same ethos the DCA and the PCA promoted, and a civic model adopted under the The Cork City Management Act, 1929. Finally, New York was the metropolitan centre of capitalism for much of the twentieth century, and stands as a capitalist development model for cities looking to position themselves in a similar vein.

Historically, Stansall (1986, p. 13) reveals, street trade was the work of women who numbered prominently among the “very poor” in eighteenth and nineteenth century New York City. Those who turned to trade to earn a meagre living were typically African-American women, and those who were old or frail and unable to handle the physical demands of domestic service. Street trade was also a form of seasonal employment for women, as some took in laundry in the winter (p. 17). A finding of Stansall’s (1986) that continues to resonate for poor women in cities is the impact of movements of impoverished people into major urban centres in search of work. This phenomenon increases the consumer demands of a growing urban poor consumer base, and more of the poor will turn to trade when work is not found (Stansall, 1986).
numbers of women street traders in New York increased after 1800 during times of economic uncertainty (Stansall, 1986).

The studies of Bluestone (1997) and Taylor et al (2000) on street traders in New York do not differentiate street traders by gender, but both identify the street-based marketplace as classed: the marketplace of the marginalised poor, working-classes, and immigrants to work and shop. After the closure of the historic, open street markets later in the twentieth century, some remained open and resilient in the neighbourhoods that were defined along ethnic lines, and as working-class (Bluestone, 1997). Many of the open street markets had started out of resistance by traders: when the sale of food on the street was first regulated loosely in New York in the late seventeenth century, vendors refused to move and took up semi-permanent sites next to each other and established large street markets (Taylor et al, 2000).

Bluestone (1997) reports that New York’s street traders lobbied to create sanctioned open markets when regulations governing the street displaced traders. In 1912, an association of petty traders lobbied the municipal government to “assign specified street and open-air markets with fixed stands on rental”, to both formalise these marketplaces and secure their livings (Bluestone, 1997, p. 297). Most of the challenges they faced were a result of the gentrification of the retail landscape, along with a general gentrification of retail trade itself. According to Stansell (1986, p. 4), across the nineteenth century, merchant capitalism “shaped the geography of New York”. During that era department stores, specialty shops, and shopping arcades had come to cater to middle-class and upper-class consumers, making ‘inside’ the place where one did one’s shopping (Bluestone, 1997; Taylor et al, 2000).

According to Bluestone (1997, p. 289), the move inside “protected well-to-do shoppers from the general nastiness” of the urban street. In contrast to the street market, arcades were designed to be “alluring and sumptuous buildings with orderly and controlled interiors” (Bluestone, 1997, p. 289). Bluestone (1997, p. 289) alleges that this design and construction created an image of retail shopping as “a cultivated pursuit”. As a result, those who could afford to buy goods, including food, ‘inside’, did. Shopping had moved from the public marketplace, and into private specialty shops and grocery stores.
The street as a market location in New York was left to the poor as both consumers and traders (Bluestone, 1997). Despite a growing marketplace in an expanding city, the earnings of the typical street trader remained meagre (Stansell, 1986; Bluestone, 1997). Furthermore, despite their prominence and visibility, those who sold on the street were depicted as “individuals” (Bluestone 1997), and as wanderers (Stansell, 1986; Bluestone, 1997) by those with social, economic, and political power.

According to Bluestone (1997, p. 287) the moderate voices calling for the regulation of street trading, and the more extreme voices who sought to wipe it out entirely, came from “civic, political, and business interests” as well as crusaders for “a beautiful, clean, and efficient city”. These calls marked the Progressive Era in the history of the United States: rationalisation efforts in the late 1920s were aimed at modernisation, and the creation of efficient cities and civic administrations. Bluestone (1997, p. 287) posits that these efforts prompted calls for the elimination of street markets based on a “narrow view of the street as a traffic artery” (p. 287), as opposed to a location for social and economic activity. This emphasis on roads and the car in New York, and the designation of the street as a traffic artery, is evident in Berman’s (1988) description of the destruction of the historic, open Bathgate Avenue market in his neighbourhood in the Bronx. Still vibrant in the 1950s, it was destroyed when Robert Moses created the Cross-Bronx Freeway to facilitate the movement of goods and people (Berman, 1988).

The open markets, labelled by public officials as ‘the push-cart evil’, contradicted the vision of what New York’s business and civic leaders envisioned for the city (Bluestone, 1997). The vision they articulated captured what Bluestone (1997, p. 293) encapsulates as “the essence of urban modernity”: new commercial spaces, office towers, and “transportation systems planned for the free circulation of traffic and commodities”. Bluestone (1997, p. 293) insists this vision had the added goal of conforming working-class trade and consumerism to “middle-class norms”. Accordingly, Bluestone (1997) alleges, when opposition to the commercial use of street space was voiced, it obscured the economic goal for those same streets.

---

88 Robert Moses is the embodiment of the modern developer conceptualised by Berman (1988). He and the role of the ‘developer’ and the marginalisation of those characterised as ‘counter-modern’ or ‘anti-modern’ by figures such as Moses was discussed in Chapter 1.
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The assurance of unobstructed streets reserved for transit, allows for the free-flow of people and commodities. Using public funds for the construction of roads, then, allowed the car to transform the street into what Berman (1988, p. 299) refers to as a “uniquely privatised form of public space”. Furthermore, eliminating congestion on streets and footpaths generates, according to Bluestone (1997, p. 294), “higher densities and land values”—serving, ultimately, the goals of large real estate and mercantile interests. Particularly instructive is Bluestone’s (1997) observation that, with time, this narrative shifted the focus from concern with obstruction, to the competition street traders presented to merchants, and then to the problem of ‘appearances’ (Bluestone, 1997). Street markets and street traders were then accused of stigmatising neighbourhoods, thereby forging a link between their presence, and the perceived threat of reduced property values (Bluestone 1997; Taylor et al 2000) or what Bluestone (1997, p. 298) terms neighbourhood ‘de-generation’.

The presence of pushcarts continued on the city’s streets while New York prepared to host the World’s Fair in 1939. This vista did not conform to the official “image of a clean, dignified, modern, commercial metropolis” (Bluestone,1997, pp. 306-307), nor did they conform to the official vision of ‘modern’ New York as a capital of commerce (Berman, 1988; Bluestone, 1997) the Fair’s planners hoped to portray. Furthermore, Bluestone (1997) alleges, a ban was favoured by civic officials in New York of the 1930s not simply because of the World’s Fair. Across the 1930s, New York was in the grip of economic decline during the world-wide depression; visible pushcart traders in large numbers became what Bluestone (1997, p. 293) believes officials saw as an “uncomfortable reminder of the instability and failure of national economic life”. Pushcarts and street traders did not create the appearance of ‘Thrive’ and ‘Prosper’.

That said, Robert Moses, the Fair’s organiser, had billed it as ‘Building the World of Tomorrow’ (Berman, 1988). As the date of the World’s Fair moved closer, the Mayor of New York, Fiorello LaGuardia, moved to abolish all street trading, whether traders had licenses, or were trading without licences (Taylor et al, 2000), in an effort to showcase New York as the city of the future that Moses had promised (Bluestone, 1997). Political opposition to a policy that would see their elimination was overcome by the insistence
of LaGuardia’s administration that purpose-built, enclosed markets would replace the informal open street markets (Bluestone, 1997).

Despite their unpopularity at both the official level and among powerful business interests, the pushcarts in open-air markets had continued support. Charities and philanthropic workers put their support behind them to “supply the poor with cheaper and better quality food” (Bluestone, 1997, p. 305). Fruit and vegetable growers also lobbied on their behalf (Bluestone, 1997, p. 306). Their popularity among consumers was evidenced by the estimates by some produce distributors that between “25 and 40 percent of fresh fruit and produce in New York was sold from pushcarts” in this era (Bluestone, 1997, p. 306). These figures indicate that street traders had a significant market share, in part, because they had consumers who could not or would not pay shop prices.

In 1934, 60 open street markets were operating, and 7000 pushcart ‘itinerant’ licenses were held; by 1939, only 17 markets were operating, and 1000 licences were held (Bluestone, 1997, p. 307). The purpose-built markets promised and later constructed by the city only housed a fraction of those displaced from the street markets that were shut down (Bluestone, 1997, p. 308). In response to complaints that there was not enough space for these small traders, Mayor LaGuardia “insisted that they should move into stores located on private property” (Bluestone, 1997, p. 308) reinforcing, further, the notion of the gentrification of retail commerce.

Despite what was proposed as the regulation of street trading, the ‘Best Intentions’ of the administration were geared to eliminate rather than regulate street trading in New York. In a report compiled in 1936, LaGuardia’s Commissioner of Public Markets wrote that he sought to convert the “pushcart pedlar to a small merchant with self-respect and banking relations” (Bluestone, 1997, p. 287). This conceptualisation of valid and valued trade is not unlike the conflation of ‘ratepayer’ with ‘citizen’. The pushcart, he continued, had “outlived its usefulness in this day of modern, quick, sanitary distribution of food” (Bluestone, 1997, p. 287). In his exhibit at the World’s Fair in 1939, the Commissioner of Public Markets included a section in his exhibit entitled “The Life and Death of the PushCart” (Bluestone, 1997, p. 307).
The case of New York and its street traders is instructive to this study for several reasons. Stansall’s (1986) findings that urban street trade was largely the domain of poor women, including those too frail or old to handle the physical demands of domestic service, resonate for the Shawlies. So, too, does her observation that the numbers of women traders increased during times of economic uncertainty. It was established in Chapter 2 that the Irish economy had, historically, failed to provide employment opportunities for women into the twentieth century (Rhodes, 1992; Luddy, 1995a; Curtin, 2001; Clear, 2007). Furthermore, Irish women relied on the domestic service sector to provide employment (Luddy, 1995b; Clear, 2007). As discussed in Chapter 4, in the early years of Irish independence, the unemployment rate for those employed in domestic service was 17% (Lee, 1989, p. 126). These factors, considered in concert, may explain why street trade in Cork was markedly gendered, and why many of the Shawlies were trading into old age. If they could no longer handle domestic service, or could not enter domestic service because of frailty or lack of opportunities, then the Shawlies may have had no alternative but to turn to street trading in order to survive.

Other findings that resonate for the Shawlies stem from the observations of the push to reconfigure both New York’s centre as a modern commercial hub, and then the push there to reconfigure what constituted ‘valid’ trade. Bluestone (1997) and Taylor et al (2000) observed that shopping moved indoors, with shops catering to middle- and upper-class consumers. This gentrification activity in the city was prompted by merchant capital, and started in the nineteenth century (Stansall, 1986). In Cork, the creation of St. Patrick’s Street with its upscale luxury and specialty shops, and later the upscale English Market, prompted narratives of those locations as orderly and modern into the twentieth century (O’Callaghan, 2010; Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil, 2011). The creation of the covered English Market in the new city centre was a move ‘inside’ to buy food for the middle-class population, and meant they did not have to venture into the open market of the medieval centre. The Corporation created covered markets in that working-class neighbourhood, however these proved unsustainable under what was, apparently, neglect by successive administrations to employ creative fiscal solutions. As in New York, Cork’s streets became the market location for poor women traders and consumers.
Similarly, Bluestone (1997) found that as retail was, increasingly, moving inside, it remained outside in many of New York’s neighbourhoods that were defined along class lines. This may explain why the Coal Quay continued well after the implementation of the Act, and why the aftermath of its implementation in Cork appears to have been more muted than in Dublin. Monahan’s ‘adoption’ of the Act meant the Shawlies were contained in a neighbourhood that had been classed since the creation of the new city centre. Furthermore, they were well out of sight on the upscale St. Patrick’s Street, and well out of view of the city’s power brokers at City Hall. In contrast to Cork, a review of the streets where trading was prohibited in Dublin by Justice Minister Kevin O’Higgins, indicates that the Free State government did not want women trading in numbers in the new state’s capital city, on view to national and local officials, the nation’s commercial interests, and upscale retail. This may also explain why trading was allowed to continue in Moore Street, where is was contained in the city’s north inner city.

The rational approach to creating a modern city, with an emphasis on clean, efficient, and organised (Bluestone, 1997), where pedestrian and vehicular traffic flows are unimpeded (Berman, 1988; Bluestone, 1997), were certainly priorities in Cork, and contributed to the move to regulate street trading. An emphasis on efficiency and modernisation was found in the planning documents of 1926 and 1941. Furthermore, in both Dublin and Cork, the progressive movements wanted clean efficient cities and, in the process, street trading was labelled a threat to health, cleanliness, and the efficient movement of people and goods on thoroughfares in the public narrative constructed from newspaper account, the debates, and the concerns expressed by Monahan. The emphasis on ‘the car’ and unimpeded vehicular and foot traffic was made very clear in Cork by Monahan, the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd., and Gardaí. The car was privileged in the *Town Planning Report* of 1941, witnessed by the large allocation of space in the city centre for car parks, and the widening of streets.

Finally, Bluestone (1997) found that the visibility of poor traders was considered problematic by a civic administration anxious to convey the impression of a vibrant and successful city. The question remains of how much appearances played a role in the Free State government’s implementation of *The Street Trading Act, 1926*. Was the
presence of poor women selling on the street’s of the new nation’s capital a visual representation of the new state’s failure to protect its citizens and eliminate poverty? Certainly the role of appearances, and the connection to stigma, became clear in the observations made in both Irish cities. In Cork, the Musgrave’s solicitor, William Mockler, and the CPTA said publicly that women selling on the streets were not good for business.

7.3 Street Trading Under Neoliberalism: The Shawlies and Their Sisters in Mozambique and Bolivia

Across historical eras, street trading in Cork was typically the work of women. This has been, and remains, the case in poor countries. Street trading is a means of independent earning, particularly when the macroeconomy cannot produce employment, or there are gendered social limits on women gaining employment. The reasons street trading becomes viable are obvious: it requires little economic capital for start up or overhead, and it requires little human capital in terms of education. These factors were clearly relevant for the Shawlies. But what of the role neoliberal economic and social constructions that problematise street trading? How can contemporary applications of neoliberalism in poor, debtor countries help us to understand the practices that led to the demise of the Shawlies, and contextualise the Shawlies experience of gendered poverty? I address these questions by drawing on two current studies.

Companion’s (2010) study of women street traders in Maputo, Mozambique is valuable for a number of reasons. First, Mozambique at the time of her study had, like Ireland, just come out of a civil war that resulted in a large displacement of people. Second, the country has a weak economy and is located next to South Africa, a country with a strong economy; likewise, Ireland is located next to Great Britain, and was trying to deal with economic woes while establishing its post-independence economy. A marked economic downturn was also part of the post-War era in Ireland, and resulted in higher unemployment (Lee, 1989). Finally, Mozambique was also subject to neoliberal policies implemented following assistance by international financial institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.
A study in two Bolivian cities by Agadjanian (2002) directly addresses the question of the economic and social vulnerability of women street traders under political reforms and economic reforms articulated by neoliberal policies, and the factors that complicate their ability to organise collective action against efforts to regulate their trading. Bolivia came under structural adjustment policies dictated by the International Monetary Fund in 1985 to deal with chronic poverty and state debt. According to Agadjanian (2002), macroeconomic stability may have been achieved, however the reforms compromised the livelihood options and strategies for poor Bolivians due to increased unemployment and lower wages in both the public and private sectors, as well as fiscal austerity by the government (Agadjanian, 2002). These factors, namely the uncertainty of political and economic restructuring, the resulting unemployment, reduced income strategies, and government austerity to deal with state debt have some resonance for the Shawlies.

Ireland had just gained its independence, and both the economy and the political landscape were being reformulated. As described in Chapter 4, the country was struggling economically under the expense of rebuilding after the damages of the Anglo-Irish War and then the Civil War, further compounded by rising unemployment and an economic downturn (Lee, 1989). The period was also one of great uncertainty politically, as demonstrated in the dissolution of existing local authorities, but also in terms of the pro- and anti-Treaty divide. As explored in Chapter 4, the new era was marked by an impulse towards a neoliberal ‘bottom-line’ style of public expenditure, one that sought ‘efficiency’ in the operations of the local authorities, and an approach to public expenditure that put the poor at a particular disadvantage.

The qualitative data in both studies provides possible explanations as to why street trading was exclusively the domain of women in Cork through 1928, and some insight into why poor women continued to choose this livelihood option. Certainly the low costs of starting up, and minimal educational requirements to enter street trading (Agadjanian, 2002; Companion, 2010) align with what was learned about the economic circumstances and the literacy information contained in the census data on the Shawlies. More critically, however, Companion (2010) found that low social capital is required to enter street trading: business contacts, or a network that could help to gain access to funds through private or bank loans, were resources that none of the women in her
studies had access to. Many of the Shawlies were in the same circumstances as the women in Companion’s (2010) study: these were women in a classed and gendered society who, for the most part, lived in desperate conditions and did not own property. Thus, the combination of low social capital and low economic capital were factors that would have narrowed the options the Shawlies had to earn, and were likely to have pushed them towards street trading.

Several of Companion’s (2010) findings point toward additional social and economic factors existing in Irish society that made street trading so critical for poor women. For example, many of the Shawlies located in the censuses were the head of the household or lived in a household that were female-led households. In a classed and gendered society, this would account for an even lower social capital. The information gathered by Companion (2010) indicates that access to street trading is even greater for women who are the head of household, or live in female-led households. Companion (2010, p. 166) also found that female-led households are particularly “vulnerable to economic shocks” which may prompt their entry into trade because they have an immediate need for cash, and they remain in street trading through successive economic shocks.

Agadjanian (2002) found a connection between women street traders and domestic service work, and found that many traders started their working lives in domestic service but turned to trading as they aged or when they married. Companion’s (2010) study also found this link, but revealed that in an economy where a significant number of women are employed as domestics, competition for positions becomes fierce, and the chances of women finding work in that sector is thereby reduced. Furthermore, a traditional area where poor women in rural settings have been able to create employment for themselves is the agricultural sector (Companion, 2010). Unfortunately, a depleted rural economy in Mozambique has meant that women have migrated to cities in search of work; with no agricultural work in an urban setting, competition in the domestic service sector, and a lack of work in the larger economy forced more women into street trading (Companion, 2010).
These were, as noted by Luddy (1995b), two of three key sectors where women were clustered. While it is difficult to make a direct link to the Irish economy of the 1920s, it is known that similar conditions prevailed in domestic service and agriculture (Lee, 1989). Certainly, with increased unemployment among men in a newly independent Ireland (Lee, 1989), competition for work would have been even stiffer and may indicate why so many women were trading on the streets of Cork. The need for immediate cash that Companion (2010) noted in a female-led household would have been very real for the Shawlies who were widowed, without a spouse in the home, or those whose spouses had tenuous earnings as labourers. Cork was the location of a British military barracks, and there were two wars during the period in question, 1901 to 1928—the second Boer War in South Africa, and the Great War—which would have caused men to leave home. There is also the very strong possibility that men left home as migrants in search of work, considering the economic conditions in Ireland, particularly following independence.

Employability options of women street traders were also examined in Agadjanian’s study (2002) of women street traders in two Bolivian cities, however he did find that while the range of education levels left these women economically marginalised, there was some diversity of socio-economic backgrounds within the study’s cohort. This appears to provide a point of convergence with the data revealed through the census data. A diverse range of socioeconomic backgrounds and literacy levels within the 1901 and 1911 clothes traders appear to align with this finding. Within Agadjanian’s (2002) sample, 20% of the women had attained basic literacy skills. Among the clothes traders in 1901, nearly 54.35% had basic literacy skills, and in 1911 nearly 69.7% had basic literacy skills. The onion sellers are closer to the Bolivian average: approximately 30.4% had basic literacy skills.

As for family status, Agadjanian’s (2002) study produced some information about why women who are married engage in street trading to bolster the family economy. He learned that married women are forced into street trading when economic instability, such as that prompted by neoliberal restructuring, reduces the ability of men to earn (Agadjanian, 2002). The causes he cites are increased privatisation (i.e., jobs in government are eliminated), and de-industrialisation creates migrations of people in
search of work because traditional forms of employment are eliminated (Agadjanian, 2002). However, Agadjanian (2002) learned that even when women take up street trading, single or married, they remain economically vulnerable and marginalised because their earnings are meagre.

This may shed some light on the economic vulnerability of poor and working-class families in Cork, and explain why street trading in Cork was not simply the domain of single or widowed women, or women who were married but without a spouse in the home, but also married women living with a spouse who was also working. Certainly, economic indicators in the 1920s point to the reduced earning potential of men in the working-class. According to Lee (1989), men in the newly independent Ireland encountered similar problems finding work, and many lost work in the local authorities in areas such as road work (Powell, 1992). Furthermore, according to Powell (1992), government employment schemes during this period paid very low. These conditions indicate that the threat posed by the implementation of *The Street Trading Act, 1926*, was very real.

The social marginalisation and ongoing economic marginalisation of women street traders raises the question of why organising a collective response to attacks such as those by TD Bryan Cooper was difficult to mount. As demonstrated across Chapters 4 and 5, instances where the Shawlies spoke on their own behalf are difficult to locate. There were only a few instances noted in Dublin and in Cork where someone—either solicitors, magistrates, elected officials—spoke out and highlighted their struggles after regulation. Furthermore, in all instances, these representations were rarely sustained, and the lack of consistent newspaper coverage is indicative of how little their voice mattered to the press.

That said, the Shawlies appear to have had some organisation working in their interests at street level: they worked together in their dealings with customers as recorded in the *Irish Times* article in 1985, offering some support for each other in the day-to-day operations of the market. And, as noted in Chapter 2, Beecher (2007, p. 107) witnessed a “loyalty of the stall holders to each other against outside interests”. However, the lack of a concerted, collective voice is offered by the findings of traders in Bolivia.
Agadjanian (2002) found that the shared background of stall traders that included economic vulnerability along with the daily grind of their trade prompted a sense of solidarity, however, both also put limits on that solidarity. These were the vulnerabilities the Shawlies shared with Bolivia’s street traders. Thus, it is likely that both led to Cork’s street traders looking out for each other in the short term, but wanting to protect their individual incomes in the long term. It is likely, too, that limited social capital, access to the public forum, and lack of education may have further hampered their collective efforts beyond the daily grind.

Within this vulnerability, Companion (2010) reports that there are classes within the traders that also compromise a sense of solidarity. She found that a woman has a higher social status if she trades from a stand or a permanent type of structure, and that such status is reduced with increased mobility (Companion, 2010). Among the itinerant traders in Bolivia, Agadjanian (2002) found that the majority were not career vendors, and entered street trading because of poverty or a sudden change in economic circumstances which further reduced their status among their stall-holding peers. This appears to have been the case in Cork based on the information provided to the Irish Times reporter in 1985. One established trader was very clear about how she felt about traders who had come from outside Cork to trade in the Coal Quay. It was also clear throughout that having traded in that location across generations gave them some stability or seniority.

The data collected from the censuses may point to a similar differentiation or ‘class’ distinction among the clothes dealers of both 1901 and 1911, that came with residency and marital status. Certainly, as a cohort, they appeared to be more stable than the onion sellers in terms of the distribution across ages, literacy levels, family status and, in some cases, housing. In the complaints made to the Corporation prior to 1922, there were also instances of complaints about women trading clothes on the North Main Street made by clothes traders in the Bazaar market, an indication that those traders may have had more of a sense of entitlement and legitimacy than their counterparts on the street.
Companion’s (2010) findings provide some insight into how critical keeping a stall in a fixed location—and having space allocated for fixed trading locations—would have been for the women street traders in Cork in 1928. In addition to having the status that comes with a stall, the more established a vendor becomes, the greater the chances that she has “developed some social capital” which would protect her from the “minor gossip” other vendors may use against her (Companion, 2010, p. 173). In addition to this protection, Companion (2010) discovered that with time and some permanence in a location, a woman trader is more likely to establish a strong and loyal customer base and develop a business acumen.

The studies conducted by Companion (2010) and Agadjanian (2002) provide darker insights into why collective efforts are difficult to initiate among women street traders in a society where they lack social capital. Companion (2010) found that under increased competition, they may turn to using gossip about alleged forays into prostitution and sexual activity with clients to hurt another trader’s business. As noted above, itinerant traders were particularly vulnerable to gossip (Companion, 2010). Agadjanian (2002) found street trading in Bolivia is viewed as the domain of women in the lower classes, and this minimises their social status and their economic role in society. Furthermore, the “dominant gender and class stereotypes” make them easy targets because of the association between women “selling in the streets” and prostitution (Agadjanian, 2002, p. 270). However, Companion (2010) found that older women traders were freed from the social stigma of innuendo.

These social factors have some resonance for the Shawlies. Curtin (2001) and Luddy (2007) identified the proximity between prostitution and street trading for poor Irish women seeking subsistence earnings. The increased competition in Cork following the implementation of the Act may have made collective action difficult as such a large number of women were then given fewer locations from which to trade. An increased vulnerability would also have come from Monahan’s decision to limit the number of licences. The potential for traders gossiping or making allegations of deviant activity to hamper a woman’s chances of getting a licence was heightened when the power was given to the Garda Chief Superintendent to be the sole authority deciding who received licences without a woman’s option to appeal. The very real potential for the use of
extortion by Gardaí was created when they were granted the power to decide who was granted a certificate, or who kept her certificate once she was actively trading.

The ability to organise in Bolivia was further undermined, according to Agadjanian (2002), by the emphasis within neoliberalism on self-reliance, and the deepening of individualisation within the dominant class ideology. A parallel for the Shawlies existed in the preexisting social circumstances that dictated how class worked in Cork for women. According to Cronin (2010, p. 108), occupation was a powerful class signifier and could “imply social inferiority” because “some kinds of work” conferred “higher status than others”. Both elected officials such as TD Bryan Cooper, and the press, used terms to describe women street traders that implied social inferiority and, under such an assault, it is likely that street trading was a means of earning that carried a lower status. This leaning toward individualisation, and the ability to work one’s way to social mobility, was demonstrated in the the neoliberal workings of the Free State government under Cosgrave, and in the constructions of the poor by government ministers described in Chapter 4.

Finally, the study by Agadjanian (2002) may explain why the Shawlies were allowed to continue to trade into the 1930s with what appears to be minimal interference by the Corporation. Agadjanian (2002) notes that efforts to regulate street trade were muted under economic downturn because the authorities in Bolivia were willing to overlook its growth as a way of coping with rising unemployment. A similar attitude may have been at work in Cork. The Lord Mayor, Sean French, tried to avoid an outright ban and, before the Corporation was dissolved, sought to find places for the women off the street so that they could continue trading. Monahan was content originally to simply ‘adopt’ the Act with a view to moving the women off North Main Street, Castle Street, and South Main Street, and allowed them to continue trading on the west side of Corn Market Street, the adjoining streets, and the Quay walls. While this may not have been an effort in the main to cope with their poverty, women who were identified as poor were able to continue to try and support themselves. However, the prohibition meant they were off the doorsteps of larger business interests, and they were out of sight except in their working-class neighbourhood.
7.4 Gentrification and Street Trading: The Shawlies and Their Sisters in the Philippines and Vietnam

The following studies from two Asian Tiger economies provide insight into how the hyper-regulation of street trading under gentrification efforts compromises the livelihoods of women like the Shawlies. On the cusp of the twenty-first century, the countries featured, Vietnam and the Philippines, were undergoing macroeconomic modernisation and their cities were being gentrified. These activities were geared to re-articulating their economies as ‘developed’ for the rest of the world, and present their cities as clean, modern, and organised. These two studies highlight how the intersections of gender, modernity, gentrification, and class in Asia affect women street traders.

In the lives of economically marginalised Vietnamese women, petty trade and the sale of street food is steeped in their history, just as it was in that of economically marginalised women in Cork. According to Fahey (1998, p. 224) from the late 1970s onwards, following the end of Vietnam’s civil war, approximately 90% of the meat and vegetables in the country were produced and sold by women. Despite their illegality, many observers believe that pressure from women—notably petty traders—provided the tipping point in the capitalist transformation of Vietnam’s economy, an indication of the unofficial extent to which women street traders had control over the economy (Fahey, 1998). Despite this, their voices have been muted in the debate over regulation of street trade (Fahey, 1998; Lincoln, 2008).

Under communism, the legality of street trading was ambiguous (Fahey, 1998; Lincoln, 2008), much as it was in Cork and Dublin under the laws governing pedlars and hawkers prior to Ireland’s independence. In Vietnam, party officials turned a blind eye to women traders they knew were the heads of households (Fahey, 1998). This raises the question if the amount of dawdling on the issue in Cork between 1928 and 1938 occurred because, in a small city, poor women with dependents were earning independent of state support. This coalesces with the same question raised in the previous section, where the ‘blind eye’ was turned in Bolivia because petty trade was an immediate solution to unemployment. As noted in Chapter 5, Monahan was recorded in the Council minutes in 1939 as saying that if the Cork Corporation was not prepared to
implement *The Street Trading Act, 1926* then they should just continue to ‘wink’ to street trading altogether.

Not unlike Dublin and, perhaps to a lesser degree Cork, the sanctions against women street traders in Vietnam were, at one time, moral. Lincoln (2008, p. 264) sites instances in a novel about the communist era, entitled *Paradise of the Blind*, where communist party officials would refer to a character, a street trader and the protagonist’s mother, as a “parasite”. As was noted in Chapter 4, a direct reference to parasites was made by TD Cooper when he compared street traders to fleas. Furthermore, he made a reference to street traders actively leeching off the state when he remarked that they were more troubled by being chased between the pillar and the post office, the post office being the location where fines would be paid. Similarly, concerns that carried parasitic overtones were voiced by multiple observers: those who insisted that street traders pay a licensing fee to carry on their trade publicly, that they were ‘robbing’ profits from ‘bricks and mortar’ traders, and that they littered at the expense of the Cork Corporation.

In Vietnam, however, despite operating in a ‘grey area’ legally, and being labelled parasites by local officials, women street traders were still willing to take risks to earn a living. Fahey (1998, p. 224) interviewed a business woman in Hanoi who recalled that, as a young girl, she sold pieces of cooked pork on the street, slipping them behind her back when officials were nearby. This is reminiscent of the depictions in Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil (2011), detailed in Chapter 2, of the girls who persisted in selling onions in the English Market despite action by market security, and the prosecutions that followed. More overtly, women continued dealing used clothing from bundles in the street in the North Main Street despite complaints from merchants, which suggests that the need to earn outweighed the risk of persecution and prosecution.

In the 1980s Vietnam reformed its economy from a controlled, communist economy to a partially capitalist economy, allowing for international trade and a free domestic market. According to Fahey (1998, p. 223) this ‘renovation’ in the macroeconomy, as it is
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89 Colloquially, the saying is “chased from pillar to post”, referring to someone who is frequently moving from one place to another.
known locally, prompted multiform changes that made women, particularly poor women, economically vulnerable on a number of counts. A marked increase in unemployment among women was also noted, which led to increases in the number of women who turned to petty trading in urban centres (p. 223). In urban Vietnam, a growth in consumerism and an emphasis on property ownership then lessened the emphasis on cooperative or communal life and state ownership, both of which increased the cost of living and reduced the sense of social responsibility among citizens (Fahey 1998, p. 223)

There are points of convergence noted between the conditions in Vietnam, and those under which the Shawlies were trading in Cork against the backdrop of the larger attack on the poor by the Cosgrave government that was detailed in Chapter 4. A marked increase in unemployment among Irish women was noted, and was not a concern to the government of the day (Lee, 1989; Jones, 1988), making access to trade particularly critical for poor women. The role of the narratives and practices under austerity that emanated from the leaders in the Free State government (Lee, 1989; Powell, 1992), constructions of the poor as deviant and complicit in their poverty, and the blame that was assigned to the poor for their lot in life by the Cosgrave government (Lee, 1989; Powell, 1992; Considine and Dukelow, 2009) may have generated a reduced sense of social responsibility towards the women who numbered among the urban poor in Cork.

In Vietnam’s capital city, Hanoi, these economic shifts coincided with a civic campaign in the decades that followed to “rationalize urban space” (Lincoln 2008, p. 261). In July 2008, while setting out to “beautify the city”, the Mayor of Hanoi also set out to ban street trading after characterising it as a marker of “underdevelopment” (qtd. Lincoln 2008, p. 263). The Mayor’s sentiments echoed the feelings of Hanoi’s growing middle-classes who, according to Lincoln (2008), viewed street trading as pre-modern, and an undisciplined form of urban commercial activity that put on view the country’s uneven development. Leshkowich (2005) discovered that as capitalism was embraced, street trade in Ho Chi Minh City came to be thought of as an undesirable relic of the past (cited Milgram 2011, p. 265). The local authority’s efforts in Ho Chi Minh City to eliminate street trade was symbolic of clearing away the past to make way for their vision of the future (Leshkowich 2005, cited Milgram, 2011, p. 265).
These sentiments that label street trading an anachronism in a modern capital echo those voiced in the *Irish Times* about conditions in Dublin, and may provide an indication of the degree to which modernity and the desire for gentrification prompted the creation of *The Street Trading Act, 1926* in the capital of the new state. In Cork the Shawlies were accused by solicitor William Mockler of being an impediment to the ‘legitimate’ and larger business vision of the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd. To Commissioner Monahan, they were a hazard on streets that needed to accommodate vehicular traffic. Certainly they and their trading places did not figure in the vision of the future articulated in the town planning documents of 1926 and 1941.

Not unlike the implementation of the Act in Dublin and in Cork, the direct ban on street trading implemented in Hanoi prohibited trading on commercial streets and any street bordering tourist districts (Lincoln, 2008). This initiative was pitched as being part of a comprehensive effort to create a sanitary urban space, address food hygiene concerns, and reduce traffic congestion (Lincoln, 2008). In the public narrative, the local authority directly scapegoated traders for health concerns during an outbreak of cholera, despite the fact that it was alleged by observers that the absence of a water treatment facility and Hanoi’s antiquated sewer system were more likely to have caused the outbreak (Lincoln 2008).

According to Lincoln (2008) such a ban had both material and symbolic consequences for a sector characterised by a “feminized vendor workforce” (p. 262). Street vending among Vietnamese women is prolific both in terms of the number who trade, and the fact that they trade on the streets from early in the morning to midnight (p. 261), not unlike the Shawlies. The earnings of women street traders in Vietnam significantly help poor and rural families to “assemble a living wage” (p. 262), not unlike their sisters in Mozambique and the the onion sellers and clothes dealers in Cork who were trading as part of a larger family economy.

In Vietnam women trading on the streets has tremendous symbolic value that has helped to protect their presences on the streets, because they are considered by foreign tourists to be synonymous with nostalgic views of ‘traditional’ Hanoi (Lincoln 2008). Furthermore, locals and tourists consider Vietnamese street food to be “uniquely
delectable”, so much so that travel writers “fetishize” it as delicious and exotic, calling it “authentic” in comparison to the fast food offered by corporate-owned outlets (Lincoln, 2008, p. 264). Women street traders wear conical hats that had also become symbolic on Vietnam’s urban streetscape and are sought out by tourists for photographs, a phenomenon that helped to limit the earlier ban by the government (Lincoln, 2008). The symbolic value of street vending in Vietnam is particularly insightful in shedding light on the constructions of street trading in Cork at the close of the twentieth century described in the previous chapter, and in the more recent memorialisation of the Shawlies under regeneration.

Baguio, the capital of the northern Philippines, has an economy centred primarily on education and tourism: it is home to several universities, and domestic tourists travel there in the summer as it has a cooler climate than Manila. Baguio is also a major commercial and administrative hub. Street trade and street markets in Baguio are female gendered (Milgram, 2011), as were street traders and the street markets in Cork in the period of this study. Following the economic downturn in the Asian economies of 1997, Baguio saw a marked increase in street trading; the government focused on macroeconomic policies to cure unemployment, but the economy failed to provide work on the scale needed, and street trading became essential for the poor (Milgram 2011).

The global downturn after 2008 pushed the urban poor throughout the Philippines further into the economic margins (Milgram 2011), much as the Free State experienced unemployment following the post-Great War economic downturn, and the fiscal limits put on the state by the cost of repairs to the infrastructure following the Anglo-Irish War and the Irish Civil War. As was noted in Chapter 4, older poor women were at a further disadvantage when the Old Age Pension was cut. The ongoing growth of street trade in Baguio that followed the 2008 economic downturn led to specific concerns by the local authority over congestion and disorder in the commercial centre (Milgram 2011). These were two key complaints cited in Cork by the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd., and Commissioner Phillip Monahan in the 1920s.
In Baguio several events or conditions served as what Foucault would term ‘contingencies’ in the greater rationalisation of urban space, particularly in the control of street traders, in the city (Milgram 2011). Changes in the local authority meant that traders were vulnerable to changes in the attitudes of elected officials to their economic activities; however, no matter who was in power, street vendors were excluded from the planning process (Milgram 2011). Furthermore, the local authority consistently responded to pressure from large-scale retailers to have traders banned, as well as to complaints from wealthy urban residents (Milgram 2011).

Three key points of convergence emerge from Milgram’s (2011) study that help to explain the vulnerability of the Shawlies under regulation. First, it is evident from the data in Chapter 5 that the individual attitudes of elected members of the local authority differed with respect to the presence of the street traders prior to independence. The dissolution of the local authority and the appointment of Monahan meant that this inconsistency reduced their agency when regulations were introduced. Secondly, like the Baugio traders, no matter who was in power, the Shawlies were excluded from the planning process as demonstrated by their absence, and that of their neighbourhood, from the planning documents reviewed in Chapter 5. Likewise, at the time when the regulations were ‘adopted’ by Monahan, their protests had little impact. Finally, it is obvious that pressure from retailers and businesses in the neighbourhood—namely the CTPA, and the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd.—influenced the Corporation prior to and following dissolution. In both Dublin and Cork, the emphasis was on what was ‘fair’ to ratepayers as opposed to citizens.

Milgram (2011, p. 262) confirms that national discourses of modernity deny poor women access to work that is classed as “alternative” or informal. She alleges these narratives prompted regulations that were geared to modernising cities in the Philippines (Milgram, 2011). In Baguio the city expressed its vision of ‘progressive’ or appropriate development, which included an understanding of the appropriate uses of public space including streets and footpaths that allow for the free movement of pedestrians and traffic particularly on major commercial arteries (Milgram, 2011).

5. Foucault’s historical contingencies, essential to understanding the premise of this study, are detailed in Chapters 1 and 3.
Milgram (2011) also asserts that the combination of urban growth in the region and the embrace of neoliberal economic policies has heightened the contestation of the use of public space.

In Cork, the use of public space was quietly contested under the sporadic complaints from merchants at the start of the century. This was heightened as independence approached through the calls for a ban on trading by the CTPA and the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd. This contestation certainly favoured larger business interests, and privileged mainstream retail on any scale as ‘legitimate’, thereby classing the Shawlies trading as ‘alternative’. These narratives may not have emanated from the state initially, but they were adopted by the state and re-articulated as policy when they were enshrined in the Act. Furthermore, the privileging of the use of streets for transportation, the primacy of the car in the allocation of parking in the planning process, and the emphasis on clean and ‘efficient’ streets echoes the modern vision at work in the Philippines as it sought to present itself on the world’s stage as having an efficient and modern economy.

In the capital of the Philippines, Manila, efforts to control street traders by the local authority included destroying goods, exorbitant fines, and the use of surveillance cameras to identify itinerant traders (Milgram, 2011). In Baguio the rationalisation of street trading through regulation included specifying times and locations where the activity was legal at locations that were, exclusively, located outside the central business district (Milgram, 2011). Trading was strictly prohibited on the main shopping street in the city centre, and in and around the central green space (Milgram, 2011). The vendors themselves were also required to wear an identification badge that specified the types of goods sold, as well as personal information (Milgram, 2011).

The connections between hyper-regulation in the Philippines and The Street Trading Act, 1926 are clear. The seizure of goods by Gardaí along with the fines set at the level they were, clearly acted as a control mechanism over poor and marginalised women. Furthermore, the hyper-rationalisation of times and locations increased the chance that women were offending, particularly in a larger centre such as Dublin. The strict assignment of street trading outside the central business districts of both Cork and
Dublin made it clear that street trading was not considered legitimate or attractive, nor was the need these women had to work and earn considered a priority over the needs of business. While surveillance cameras were not available, increased surveillance by Gardaí was sanctioned by the Act; furthermore, the need to carry their certificates—much like the badge worn by traders in Baguio—added a surveillance element considering the original certificate issued by the Minister for Justice, Kevin O’Higgins, included a physical description of the street trader.

Milgram (2011) found that the clamp down in Manilla tended to encompass all vendors, including those who had previously secured rights on the street (Milgram, 2011), just as the Cork and Dublin Corporations overlooked previously held rights when the Act was implemented. In Baguio, selected vendors were to be relocated to the city’s public market which was to be renovated (Milgram, 2011). However, this did not happen due to disputes the local authority had with the developer; vendors who were to be relocated continued to sell on the street despite regulation and prosecution (Milgram, 2011).

These observations, according to Milgram (2011), provide an indication that the protection of street vendors livelihoods were not effectively addressed by the local government, and that the planning and regeneration of the urban core, along with the creation of a market district, was not an informed process. This was clearly the case in Cork when St. Peter’s Market was leased to successive private interests, displacing many traders onto the street, and displacing those selling used clothing in the Bazaar Market when room was made for some of the stalls from St. Peter’s. These events are a clear indication that the disregard the Corporation had for the Shawlies mirrors the lack of concern Milgram (2011) identified by the local authority in Baguio.

7.5 Conclusions

The triangulation of the data between this study of the Shawlies, with those of New York and the contemporary studies in Africa, Latin America, and Asia, contributes to an understanding of the struggles the Shawlies had with power—social, political, and economic—that prevailed in Ireland at the founding of the state. This is part of a continuum that Foucault (1980a, p. 83) termed a “historical knowledge of struggles” that helps to inform the present. Thus, a deeper understanding of how The Street
Trading Act, 1926 compromised the ability of poor women to earn by street trading in Cork can inform the struggles of women trading on the streets of poor countries positioning themselves as emerging markets. Likewise, the research available on their lives tells us, via a historical continuum, why the Shawlies traded on Cork’s streets, and how strategies of governance delimit various powers so that regulatory actions geared to ban street trade are prompted.
This photograph, called “The Onion Seller”, was taken in 2012 by Andrew Price. She is a contemporary onion seller in Thailand.

The sharing license is available at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/2.0/. Under the licensing agreement I am obliged to report any modifications made. This photograph is in colour, and I have reprinted it as a black and white photograph.
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When the state failed in its mission to banish communities out of the city centre, they then moved against some of their most traditional ways to make a living. And the most traditional way has been street trading.
—TD Tony Gregory, 1991

TD Gregory’s words in 1991 provide a prophetic lens through which to reflect upon the events in Cork of nearly seventy years earlier—the multiform struggles the Shawlies endured over time with contemporaneous power. At this juncture, I return to the research questions that guided me on the journey I took with the Shawlies. What role did The Street Trading Act, 1926 have in the disappearance of the Shawlies from Cork’s street-based markets? Can the workings of The Street Trading Act, 1926 be conceptualised in social terms?

What follows is an elaboration of the methodological, theoretical, and substantive findings that emerged as I reflected on my research. This conclusion then moves to ‘next steps’—the gaps that were identified, the impetus for future research, and the implications for social policy development.

Methodological Discoveries

As noted in the Introduction, a core premise of this study is that the implementation of the Act by the new Irish state was eased because street trading by the Shawlies was constructed as a legitimate threat to the livelihoods of ‘bricks-and-mortar’ traders. Although street traders were identified as poor women trying to make an honest living, and they did have some supporters, regulation and erasure of their livelihoods was justified and expedited by the Irish Free State, Phillip Monahan, and the Cork Corporation. This was eased by minimal interference in the process, the result of a convergence of existing social and political conditions: men in power easily justified and expedited this erasure because poor, propertyless women dominated street trade.

At the start of this project I was concerned that this would be difficult to establish: what public official would make that public? However, by drawing on Kendall and

Wickham’s (1999) provision that discourses and smaller statements are ongoing and merge, and must then be considered as a whole rather than as isolated instances, my search grew for discourses beyond those in the legislation and the debates in the Oireachtas. Drawing on isolated statements made in Ireland from seemingly disparate locations—business voices and political voices granted ‘space’ in public debates, the media, and correspondence—revealed how all worked as part of a Foucauldian (1980a) ‘unified discourse’. These were used against women street traders in Dublin and in Cork, and allowed them to be coerced or shoved further into the margins.

In particular, I learned that it was possible to do so simply through discourses. Kendall and Wickham (1999) stipulate that Foucault had several goals when he analysed smaller statements to deconstruct how they are used by power to subjugate. As noted in Chapter 3, three of these goals were critical to this study’s use of statements and unified discourses. The first meant shifting attention onto the procedures used by power rather than tackling the feasibility of the messages (Kendall and Wickham, 1999). To do so meant I had to ‘tune out’ an inner debate that focused on justifiable public concerns about a ‘fair’ market, and public health concerns implicit in food handling and litter that are common knowledge. This allowed my attention to shift to what Kendall and Wickham (1999) describe as Foucault’s goal of analysing the positions established between the subjects and the statements to reveal how discourses produce subject positions.

By sidelining the issue of feasibility, I then focused on the swirl of statements surrounding those that had, at first glance, appeared justifiable. There it emerged that women street traders were, in the public debate, spoken about and, via the legislation, spoken to. I was then able to see how the degrading utterances about them from TD Bryan Cooper revealed subject positions: not only had the statements been made, but they were never addressed in the midst of the larger narrative of justification made by Minister O’Higgins. The coexistence of these statements in the Oireachtas both confirmed and deepened the subject positions in Irish society of the Shawlies and their sisters in Dublin.
The early statements in the Oireachtas led me to the *Irish Times*. Elected officials insisted that the situation in Dublin was such that regulation was needed: street trading had increased markedly and this was, allegedly, creating competition for ‘bricks-and-mortar’ traders. I was then able to establish their gendered and classed subject positions: it was common knowledge, even among the less sympathetic correspondents, that street traders were typically poor women who lived precarious lives. Through the deviant constructions of street traders that existed in the press, I discovered that statements made there deepened their subject positions: it was implied that they were threats to public health and public security. This then sparked the call to reduce contagion via containment.

This response echoed that identified by Luddy (1997; 2007) as Ireland’s solution for a proliferation of prostitutes on its streets. Prostitution was problematic when it was visible (Luddy, 1997; 2007). Likewise, the Shawlies were problematic when visible on the Grand Parade, St. Patrick’s Street, and around their English Market, all locations in an upscale city centre and away from their neighbourhood. The problem of visibility for their sisters in Dublin, at least after 1922, was that they could be seen in the centre of the new state’s capital. The first regulations sought to clear them off the streets that housed Dublin’s upscale retail establishments, government buildings, and the business and financial core. The response by political powers—at the beckoning of socio-economic powers—was *The Street Trading Act, 1926*, and the unified discourse that underpinned regulations that were ‘Best Intentions’ to build a ‘Thriving’ and ‘Prosperous’ state.

The documentation available in Cork allowed me to fully understand how regulation was used as a strategy of governance that subjugates. I also learned how statements that produced or reproduced subject positions at the national level could stimulate a unified discourse locally. In Cork, the booming voices of those holding socio-economic power—amalgamated business interests, the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd.—kept their procedure simple: tell the elected representatives of the Cork Corporation what to do. When that did not produce immediate results, street trading was further problematised. In 1924 it was used as evidence by both the CTPA and the Free State government—via the
Inspector’s report into the workings of the Cork Corporation—as yet another reason why the local authority was ineffective and had to be dissolved.

The procedures used by Phillip Monahan further revealed the subject positions of the Shawlies via statements prompted by contemporaneous socio-economic power. As revealed in Chapter 5, he did not use due process to implement the Act in Cork. Instead he said it had been ‘adopted’, and used the threat of prosecution to coerce the Shawlies from streets where business interests had previously asked to have them cleared away. Their classed and gendered positions were very apparent in what marked a clear extension of the historic classed and gendered positions identified in Chapter 2. Women in Cork had dominated street trade in the Coal Quay, thereby occupying marginalised trading positions in a marginalised neighbourhood. Having identified that position, I wanted to establish the context for why, having ‘contained’ the Shawlies, power needed to regulate them out of existence. The planning documents and newspaper accounts allowed me to identify that the Coal Quay neighbourhood was designated, through the ‘science’ of town planning, for firm-based business and commerce, building on the same goal articulated a decade earlier by the firm Musgrave Brothers, Ltd.

From the material available to piece together the plight of the Shawlies in Cork, I was able to identify ‘surfaces of emergence’ (Foucault cited Kendall and Wickham, 1999) that existed both locally and nationally. Foucault’s use of smaller statements, according to Kendall and Wickham (1999, p. 27), allowed him to identify ‘surfaces of emergence’ or “places within which objects are designated and acted upon”. The places within which the Shawlies were designated objects and were acted upon were not strictly geographic, nor were they simply ‘places’: some were locations for discourse such as the media.

The Shawlies were designated ‘objects’ to be removed from the streets, however the significant ‘places’ within which they were objectified included public policy and legislation. These ‘places’ are embodied in The Street Trading Act, 1926. There the objectification of the Shawlies was, I learned, even more acute: by their identification solely as ‘street traders’ they became objects who traded outside the norm of ‘bricks and mortar’, and were now to be regulated, observed, and even prosecuted. This
identification allowed political leaders in the newly independent Ireland, including Phillip Monahan and those elected after 1929 to the Cork City Council, to ignore the desperation of the women who counted among the urban poor in Ireland, and to shift the public eye away from this same reality.

Through the construction of the ‘street trader’ in public policy, those who governed did not have to address gendered poverty through the development of social policy. Constructing the narratives of the Shawlies in Chapter 6, and compiling demographics based on censuses and the 1928 registry, I discovered the degree to which their basic survival and, oftentimes, that of their families, depended upon access to a public market place. I discovered that for a significant number of women, trading was a means of earning across their lifetimes. I also discovered that trading on Cork’s streets was an occupation young women ‘took up’ at the age when they would ordinarily enter the workplace.

However, as established across Chapter 2, opportunities to earn in the larger economy were limited for Irish women. These identifications meant I had resurrected their ‘local knowledge’ (Foucault, 1980a), that which was ignored by those who held power. Foucault (1980a) stipulates that ‘local knowledges’ are opposed harshly by all that surrounds them. The Shawlies and their sisters in Dublin were opposed by the middle and upper classes, those pushing for a firm-based economy, and those who identified the suburbs as the place to house the poor. They were also opposed by the men elected to office in the new Irish state who wanted to shape the Irish state and its society as one that was ‘Thriving’ and ‘Prosperous’, while actively excluding poor women from a share in whatever wealth was in the offing.

Finally, I discovered the value of considering historical contingencies, a series of which deepened the marginalisation of the Shawlies. If the Cork Corporation had not been dissolved and Phillip Monahan appointed Commissioner, would The Street Trading Act, 1926, have arrived in Cork? It is likely that it would considering the needs of vested interests such as Musgraves, and the Cork Town Planning Association. However, based on this genealogy, it is difficult to conceive that, without a “a collection of contingencies” (Hunt and Wickham 1998, p. 119) it would have progressed as it did.
The direct help of Phillip Monahan as Commissioner, and later City Manager, was critical, but so too was the indirect help of the vision provided by the Cork Town Planning Association. At the end of the day, the direct and indirect assistance of both would not have been possible without the vision and voice of the CPA working in concert with the government of the Free State.

According to Giroux (2006), history must be read to reclaim power and identity, particularly where both have been shaped by social categories including gender and race. The value of these methods on the whole, then, is that they made it possible to emancipate the knowledge the Shawlies had of their world that has not been part of the larger, recorded history, or of the official, public record. Establishing what could be known of who they were, and then setting this knowledge in the larger context of the voices of power found in recorded history and the public record, furnished what Foucault (1980a) calls a ‘history of the present’. The ‘present’ elucidated is that of the Coal Quay where the only visible Shawlie is the statue of Mary-Anne, and that of Moore Street, where women street traders remained under siege until recent decades when they were identified as a ‘tourist friendly’. The present elucidated is also that of poor women street trader in poor countries, now subjugated by strategies of governance with city centres that are now positioned, economically, as neoliberal hubs, and visibly as global financial centres.

Theoretical Discoveries

Among the significant findings of this study is the role of and workings of ‘contemporaneous power’ (Foucault, 1980a) to articulate and shape, with ease, both the newly independent state and Irish society according to its vision. The nature of this power as contemporaneous was clear when the narratives of political figures in the debates in the Oireachtas, and the public and private words of Phillip Monahan, merged with those of the business community located in the Irish Times, and the missives of William Mockler acting on behalf of both the CTPA and the Musgrave Brothers, Ltd. Here I discovered the indirect role of the CPA and the Cork Town Planning Association in the demise of the Shawlies and the Coal Quay. The former made this possible through its vision of Cork’s governance structure based on a business model. The latter made this possible through its vision of Cork as a ‘modern’ city. Both were successful.
in sustaining their already privileged narratives in the articulation and shaping of Cork economically, politically, and socially early in an independent Ireland.

In Chapter 1 I set out the conceptual framework to use as a scaffold from the existing knowledge to the data, and onward to this chapter. Early in the journey I had questioned why this fledgling state had identified a pressing need to regulate street trading within three years of the cease fire in the Irish Civil War. It occurred to me then that it was likely that the government was acting quickly to appease its supporters so that the state would at least appear to ‘Thrive’, and ensure that it was thriving by at least appearing to ‘Prosper’. As noted in Chapter 1, I considered that numbers of poor women on the streets trying to make an honest living did not leave the impression of prosperity. However, the state would need to appear to be acting for the general good, and with ‘Best Intentions’, in order to appear credible in the eyes of its citizens. Having explored the concepts of Foucault and his commentators, I identified what I believed was at work: the government of William Cosgrave wanted and needed to ‘Thrive’ to cement its hold on power and, as established in Chapter 4, they had a desperate need for the Irish economy to prosper.

Using the work of Lee (1989), Powell (1992), and Considine and Dukelow (2009), I was able to demonstrate that while a redistribution of wealth was needed to support the significant population of Ireland’s poor, the government consistently told them to wait, or to stop expecting ‘handouts’. I discovered that the government’s priorities included early neoliberal provisions that benefitted the upper and middle-classes, and prioritised the macroeconomy. By identifying the state’s desire to ‘Thrive’, and to at least appear to ‘Prosper’ by embracing these priorities, I discovered how it was that the government was quick to respond to the complaints of merchants and the DCA. Street trading was then problematised because the solution was simple for the government: they could solve the problem of poor women trading on the street’s of the capital quickly and with limited opposition.

This work has demonstrated that the key modern and neoliberal governance structures conceptualised by Foucault (1988a; 2010) underpinned the actions of the Irish Free State government when it acted at the behest of private business interests. From
‘polizei’, a vision of active and productive humans under the pastoral care of the state, rules and practices are implemented to realise this vision (Foucault, 1988a). In short, *The Street Trading Act, 1926* became law. This programme, however, did more than simply provide pastoral care: I discovered that it re-articulated ‘productive’ not according to the survival needs or priorities of individuals, but according to the survival needs and priorities of power.

A new state is always established on the foundation of an old society, one with established priorities, customs, and traditions that are historical. The government of the new Irish state, in passing *The Street Trading Act, 1926*, was willing to forge a comprehensive shift from *The Pedlars Act 1871*. This revealed a government willing to create a means of penalising a significant population of poor women who had a historic right to trade in public spaces, while it enshrined the rights of ‘bricks-and-mortar’ traders, and the priorities of a firm-based economy in that same legislation. This is evident whenever the voices of business interests in Dublin and in Cork were permitted to equate ‘productive’ with ‘ratepayer’, and ‘productive’ with those who carry on business constructed as ‘ordinary’ or, in the words of William Mockler, “legitimate”. Furthermore, they were permitted to equate ‘ratepayer’ with ‘citizen’.

So, too, did elected officials and public officials, including the Civic Commissioners in Dublin and in Cork, when they actively excluded street traders from shaping the legislation and regulations made under it. Foucault (1988a; 2010d) offers that the ‘reason of the state’ is the action of a government to set out what it must do according to how the state is envisioned. It employs rational knowledge (Foucault, 1988a, p. 148) to prioritise its “felicity”. I discovered that the ‘reason of the state’ was the ‘felicity’ of vested business interests in Dublin and in Cork which, in turn, became the ‘felicity’ of elected officials and administrators. The rational knowledge used emanated from the ‘unified discourse’ (Foucault, 1980a) that constructed street trading as a threat to public health and safety, a threat to the ‘rights’ of ratepayers, to the profits of ‘bricks-and-mortar’ traders, and a potential site of criminal deviance.

Drawing on the legislation, the debates, Phillip Monahan’s correspondence, and newspaper accounts in both the *Irish Times* and the *Cork Examiner* together, and
expanding this contextualisation to include the planning documents developed in Cork, I was able to identify how the ‘policy of society’ (Foucault, 2010b) had been a strategy of governance in Cork. This was also evidence of an early neoliberal impetus both locally and nationally. According to Foucault (2010b, p. 147), this goal of neoliberal governments allows the state to interfere in society to create an ‘enterprise society’ where individuals are defined by “enterprise and production”. Ironically, the Shawlies were enterprising in the strictest, entrepreneurial sense of the word, and producers in that they supported themselves and provided affordable commodities and services to poor consumers.

However, as Foucault (2010b) posits, the ‘enterprise society’ is created through the government’s interference to articulate the market. What the Irish government and the local authorities that embraced the Act articulated was a marketplace where the price mechanism was moved out of public spaces, and into properties leased or owned by ‘bricks-and-mortar’ traders. The footpath became a space where consumers moved from shop to shop, and the street was reserved for vehicles to move goods and people to these shops.

*The Street Trading Act, 1926,* then, did not simply regulate street traders: it served as the ‘rule of law’ (Foucault, 2010c) whereby the state applied the law institutionally to the economy in an expression of sovereignty. This was what Foucault (2010c, p. 169) conceptualises as an “administrative measure” distinguished by “principle, effects, and validity”. The ‘validity’ was clear in the rational knowledge used. The ‘principle’ was, clearly, the need to ‘Thrive’ and cement the state’s power base, while appearing, at least, to ‘Prosper’ economically. The ‘effects’ were simple: clear the Shawlies out of spaces of privilege and contain them in their neighbourhood. These ‘effects’ make clear how the state’s ‘Best Intentions’ in designing and implementing the Act equate to Foucault’s (1988c) assertion that oppression frequently results from programmes governments create for the general good.

It was learned that in Dublin the oppression was swift. This is marked by the prevalence of minor criminal charges that generated coverage in the *Irish Times,* and the outcry by the women themselves and the few supporters they had among the men who
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were elected to office. In Cork, however, major demonstrations and large numbers of prosecutions did not result from the ‘adoption’ of the Act in 1929; considering Gardai asked in 1938 that the Act be brought to Cork, it is obvious that there were no prosecutions. Oppression, however, is still evident: slow and insidious, it worked more like a continuum of oppression in the historic privileging of ‘bricks-and-mortar’ traders in the privileged core of St. Patrick’s Street, and in Phillip Monahan’s ability to ‘adopt’ the Act. The existing knowledge about Cork, explored in Chapter 2, revealed that the historical underpinnings of the subject positions of the Shawlies were delineated in the eighteenth century: that same privileged retail core was the ‘felicity’ of the Cork Corporation when it was built with public funds.

A ‘policy of society’ (Foucault, 2010b) in Cork was in evidence early in the twentieth century. The ‘bottom-line’ was the Corporation’s motivation in leasing market space to private interests, thereby displacing stall traders in the publicly-owned markets on North Main Street prior to Irish independence. However, after Irish independence, with the exception of Councillor Gamble who represented the area, elected officials and business interests ignored the needs of the established street traders and the displaced. It was established in the existing knowledge that the English Market had, across its history, earned more than St. Peter’s and the Bazaar markets combined (Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil 2011). However, I did not locate a public statement in the records of the TMC to suggest that the profits of the English Market be used to offset the losses at the other markets so that they could remain open and allow the less affluent traders to continue. Furthermore, suggestions by Lord Mayor French that alternative space be found for street traders were allowed to drop after Monahan became Commissioner. Clearly the Shawlies, whether street or stall traders, were not the ‘felicity’ of the Corporation.

The ‘policy of society’ (Foucault, 2010b) is vivid in the role of amalgamated business interests in articulating how local authorities would operate in independent Ireland, and in shaping urban public space in Cork. I discovered in the recruitment materials of the CPA that, from the group’s inception, their goal was to see that the interests of a firm-based economy were cemented by ensuring that men who supported the goals of industry were elected to Dáil Éireann. Furthermore, this organisation authored the legislation that recreated local authorities across Ireland. This organisation also shared
key members such as John J. Horgan with the Cork Town Planning Association. That organisation’s goals were for a city centre devoted to business and commerce, an objective later embodied in the first official Town Plan in 1941. Here is where the neoliberal nature of Cork as a ‘modern’ city is evident. The vision of an efficient, clean, orderly, and purposeful, prosperous city centre (Berman, 1986; Zukin, 1991; Bluestone, 1997) merges with a ‘policy of society’ that privileges enterprise geared to production (Foucault, 2010b).

By identifying this connection, I then identified how the neoliberal vision of society in a modern ‘policy of society’ is revealed at the intersection of gender and class. Skeggs (2005; 2013) asserts that the rhetoric surrounding respectability—in hygiene, appearances, work habits, and even care for children—has shaped Western society’s constructions of working-class women. The importance and the role of this phenomenon in Cork is detailed in Cronin’s (2010) study of the city in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries where, she asserts, working-class women experienced definite limits on social mobility. By keeping herself, her children, and her home tidy, and if she behaved publicly in ways considered ‘respectable’ for a woman, avoiding what Cronin (2010) terms ‘roughness’ she could, however, maintain a reputation of respectability equating to some social capital. In both Dublin and Cork, women street traders were blamed for litter, dirt on the streets, and illness stemming from poor food handling practices. They were also blamed for draining public resources for the ‘clean up’. According to Cronin (2010, p. 122) “dirt wiped out all respectability”, cleanliness being part of a “middle-class value system” (p. 122).

As economic ‘outsiders’ the Shawlies and their sisters in Dublin also posed threats to the business operations and profits. Ultimately, then, they were working and living outside the ‘dream’ of ‘police’ (Foucault, 2010) that positioned the new Irish state as a ‘Thriving State’ and a ‘Prosperous State’. In Cork class was also founded, ambiguously, on one’s occupation (Cronin 2010). Therefore being a street trader, particularly after the implementation of the Act, created a lower class within the working-class. This provides another explanation for the privileging of ‘bricks-and-mortar’ traders. The construction of the street and stall trader as economic actors in legislation, debates, and narratives ‘individualised’ these women in the same way neoliberalism individualises
citizens, making each responsible for his/her welfare, with their productions measured by the contribution to the welfare of the society.

According to Pasquino (1991), the French state began identifying a population as a collection of individuals from the eighteenth century onward, a strategy contemporaneous with the growing prosperity of that state. French society had, however, been one where “there had once been only groups” (Pasquino, 1991, p.114). Based on the findings of this study, I must add that the same holds true of a state creating an appearance of prosperity. The new Irish state could have addressed the issue of gendered, urban poverty that had, in all likelihood, increased out of the fighting endured in founding the state, and by the ‘cost-saving’ measures of the new government. However, they did not seek change that was socially progressive and addressed the needs of a population. Instead, The Street Trading Act, 1926, transformed them into individuals who were economic actors to be regulated, and initiated a form of neoliberal gentrification to change the use and appearance of public streets according to the vision of larger economic actors.

While they were not constructed as anachronisms, modernity as a process that orders and regulates activity along middle-class lines had implications for the Shawlies, just as it continues to have implications for women in debtor or poor nations. Retail became formally legitimate when it was inside, and the city centre was reserved for designated commercial activities, education, and entertainment. In Chapter 1 it was demonstrated how gentrification is a process that flows from modernity (Berman, 1988; Zukin, 1991; Bluestone, 1997), and works handily with neoliberal imperatives (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Prince, 2014). This change is typically positioned as politically neutral, and yet it is socially exclusive (Martin, 2014).

The transformation of gentrification into ‘gender-fication’ in Ireland was the result of strategies of governance that sought to gentrify a gendered profession located in a gendered space. But then, as Flanagan (2009) observes, town planning in early-twentieth century Ireland, was a patriarchal process that designated city centres as sites of commerce, thereby excluding women who were not dominant economic actors, and those who were largely absent from the mainstream workforce. Likewise, women street
traders have, universally, been excluded from what Milgram (2011, p. 263) describes as a “city’s vision of progress and development”.

The data in the previous chapter revealed that regulatory practices aimed at street traders have been used to gentrify cities as governments promise prosperity through economic modernisation, tourism, and the re-configuration of city centres as business centres. Women dominated street trading in New York, the Philippines, and Vietnam and were, in the process, labelled individuals, itinerants, and informal workers entering the market (Stansell, 1987; Milgram, 2011; Fahey, 1998; Lincoln, 2008). Anachronistic or anomalies at best, interlopers or criminals at worst, attempts were made to regulate them. Much like the Shawlies, they were not believed to be politically credible, whether speaking collectively or individually. I discovered, too, that the labels constructed by politicians and business leaders (Lincoln, 2009; Milgram, 2010) are currently used to appropriate the street and the surrounding public space for the business community and upper and middle-class residents, are analogous to those used much earlier in Dublin and Cork.

Substantive Discoveries

Many of the substantive discoveries made in this study are detailed in the previous two sections. What follows is a further reflection on them, and a reconsideration of the contributions made to the existing knowledge detailed in Chapter 2. As noted earlier, by examining the context in which the Act was designed and implemented, I was able to identify the power of a unified, classed, and patriarchal discourse at work in the slow erasure of the Shawlies. Through that identification I discovered several phenomena in Irish political history that had facilitated this erasure, phenomena that were part of larger political processes and events that are, on the surface, very far removed from the Coal Quay.

The first is that *The Street Trading Act, 1926* was part of a larger attack on the poor. Returning again to my early questions, I was initially baffled as to why the Act was on the agenda of the first government of the Irish Free State considering the turmoil that followed its foundation. However, through reviewing existing knowledge about the foundation of the state and key political players, this discovery was made. The
Democratic Programme adopted by the first Dáil in 1919 had stipulated that every citizen had the right “to an adequate share of the produce of the nation’s labour” (qtd. Powell 1992, p. 158). However, as noted in Chapter 4, this programme was rejected by the Cosgrove government, and was written off by Kevin O’Higgins as being communistic in nature. This rejection became one in practice when the Shawlies were formally excluded from their share in the nation’s labour.

The Democratic Programme had designated the Irish state as one committed to “abolishing the present odious, degrading and foreign poor law system”, while safeguarding the “health of the people” (qtd. Powell 1992, p. 158). However, a new poor law system in which the poor continued to be constructed as deserving and undeserving was established (Powell, 1992; Considine and Dukelow, 2009). The Shawlies would have easily been classified as able-bodied considering they managed the daily physical demands of street trading. Therefore they would have easily been classified as ‘undeserving’ if they had sought state aid. The reality was that these women had, for centuries, created their own ‘relief’ system by exercising their public market right to trade on the streets. What has been learned, though, is that at the foundation of the Irish Free State the men in power who, according to Powell (1992, p. 165), had “little time for social reform”, knew the Shawlies were impoverished, but ignored the need to create spaces for them to legally earn a subsistence living by trading.

The Act, then, was implemented against a backdrop of a made-in-Ireland poor law system that stigmatised (Considine and Dukelow, 2009), and by a government that remained suspicious “of welfare and its effect on character” (Considine and Dukelow, 2009, p. 25). In practice, a contextualised Street Trading Act, 1926 demonstrates how these particular provisos from the Democratic Programme were, in the words of Powell (1992, p. 160), “stillborn in a revolution that was never socialist”. The question of social welfare raises the issues of the rights and entitlements of citizens. Not only were the poor left out of notions of citizenship by groups such as the DCA and the CPA, so too were women. The names of these two organisations appear ironic in light of what they worked to achieve: in practice both conflated ‘citizenship’ and ‘progressive’ with the stakeholders and the needs of a male-controlled, firm-based economy.
CONCLUSIONS

The details of how women were excluded from the political agenda of the Irish Free State government of William Cosgrave were explored in Chapter 4 (Jones, 1988; Powell, 1992; Considine and Dukelow, 2009). That women were pushed further into the private sphere has also been observed (Luddy, 2007; Considine and Dukelow, 2009). Yet it remains difficult to identify this definitively as a reason why the Free State government removed the Shawlies from the streets. They were pushed out of sight, confined to streets outside of the privileged main business, commercial, and retail districts. The intention to push women street traders into the private sphere is more easily identified when the data collected on town planning in Cork, and the work of the Dublin Citizens’ Association are viewed through the lens provided by Flanagan (2009).

She demonstrates that in Dublin in the opening decades of the twentieth century, the patriarchal ‘science’ of town planning designed city centres for firm-based economies and ‘work’, and the suburbs for homes and ‘family’. Such an intention would have served to facilitate ignoring and further stigmatising the work of the Shawlies. Through this discovery I was able to reconcile the workings of The Street Trading Act, 1926 as a function of town planning in Ireland, as working in the service of the larger patriarchal processes that further relegated Irish women to the private sphere. Of particular significance in understanding what constituted a citizen with agency in the new Irish state was the emphasis on the rights of ‘ratepayers’ by men in power over that of citizens. The Cork Town Planning Association characterised itself as being comprised of Cork’s ‘principal citizens’. The Shawlies were propertyless and they were not ratepayers, nor was their work considered enterprising or productive in an economy where firms dominated.

Thus, the data collected on the Shawlies and compiled in narratives to emancipate their stories has contributed to the existing body of knowledge on women and poverty in Ireland, as well as that of women and class. The emancipation of knowledge of how class and gender worked in Cork to marginalise assists in further conceptualising class in Ireland according to what Lane (2010, p. 2) calls “genderic” terms. This also emphasises what Lane (2010) insists is the value of Lerner’s (1997) insistence that class describes “multilayered locations, relations, and experiences” based on identities including gender. The multilayered locations, relations, and experiences where this
divided was palpable in Cork and Dublin included policy, debate, and life visible on the streets.

And yet, as was learned in the review of the existing knowledge, the Shawlies are among the women who have “previously received little or no attention from Irish historians” (Luddy and Murphy, 1992, p. 1). It is clear from the data explored that the moral complications and notions of respectability that Skeggs (2013; 2005) and others (Nicholas, 2009; Cronin, 2010; Lane, 2010; Parkins, 2010) have identified as connected to class, created new complications for the Shawlies. The occupation of street trader was re-articulated via the unified discourse that problematised the presence of poor women trading on the streets, and they were then viewed in juxtaposition to socially acceptable forms of work and enterprise. A reconstruction of the *The Street Trading Act, 1926* in social terms has revealed that the Shawlies were not what Luddy and Murphy (1992, p. 2) refer to as the minority: Irish women who “did have a history” and have been written into history. Instead the Shawlies and their sisters in Dublin were among the women Luddy and Murphy (1992) identify as adapting to and exploiting the situations in which they happened to live.

Through this direct action they were still, despite their ‘minority’ status, what Luddy and Murphy (1992, p. 1) call “active agents in the historical process”. This was the case through both their presence and action in the public sphere geared to survival, and the resulting need by power to take steps to control them. The historical processes where they were ‘active’ and yet silenced include major events at the foundation of the Irish state that, on the surface, bear no relevance. O’Callaghan (2000) notes that the opening years of independence created complications for party politics at all levels because of divisions between Republican and pro-Treaty paradigms. I discovered that, in the midst of this divide, the social and economic ‘complications’ embodied in the notions of class and gender that existed in Cork in the 1920s were deepened for the Shawlies when local governments were dissolved and then re-articulated in the service of amalgamated business interests.

Garvin (2001 p. 33) observes that both Republican and pro-Treaty sides regarded local government as “expensive and anti-national”, and contrary to the needs of the Irish
people. The pro-Treaty government of William Cosgrave sought first to tackle the problem through the *Local Government (Temporary Provisions) Act, 1923*, allowing for the dissolution of any local authority considered “negligent, insubordinate or corrupt” (O'Callaghan 2000, p. 58). The short-term solution was the dissolution of local authorities and the appointment of Civic Commissioners. The final solution was the *Cork City Management Act, 1929*. The first solution created a situation whereby Commissioners appointed by the Cosgrave government implemented *The Street Trading Act, 1926* without a thorough democratic consideration of the legislation and its implications because dialogue with the traders was excluded. The Commissioners in both Dublin and Cork were appointed in order to restore order and confidence in local authorities where corruption or neglect were alleged. Yet, while appointed—not elected—the Commissioners reconstructed the use of public space to privilege private interests and, like the government that appointed them, they ignored the immediate survival needs of impoverished women.

Through the lens provided by *The Street Trading Act, 1926*, the privileging by the Cosgrave government of the middle-classes and big business observed by Meehan (2010), one that Ó Gráda (1994) identifies as favouring the urban middle-classes, materialises and is now drawn clearly into focus. This I identified when I learned of the lobbying by the DCA to have street trading banned. This same group lobbied for the inquiry that would then dissolve the Dublin Corporation. The Commissioners then appointed had, of their own volition, extended exponentially the number of streets beyond the small number first identified by Justice Minister Kevin O’Higgins. This move was, in practice, tantamount to a ban. Ironically, Cosgrave’s government was willing to interfere in local affairs in Dublin by dissolving the Corporation, but would not interfere with the appointed Civic Commissioners when bias in their implementation of the Act was alleged by TD Nagle and TD Byrne.

As detailed in Chapter 5, the connection in Cork between the work of the appointed Commissioner and amalgamated business interests was even more acute. Correspondence in 1929 originating with Monahan, the Secretary to the Minister of Justice, and the Secretary to the Minister of Local Government and Public Health confirmed this connection. At the foundation of the new state these key ministers knew
that the Act had not been given due process in Cork in 1929, and had been used to clear the Shawlies off key streets. Yet they did nothing to correct the situation.

In 1939, as city manager, Monahan’s hold on this power continued when he asked that the City Solicitor draft the regulations but leave the selection of prohibited streets to him. That same year, correspondence revealed that Monahan had worked at the behest of the Cork Master Bakers’ Association, and even provided them with an advance copy of the new regulations made for Cork under the Act. These identifications allowed for the discovery, again through the lens of *The Street Trading Act, 1926*, of a new understanding of the intersection of class and gender in Cork detailed by Cronin (2010), and how that intersection was deepened through the seemingly innocuous regulation of street trading. The men in power were clearly not limited to those who held office or were appointed to the role of Commissioner. At the foundation of the state, the Shawlies had no agency in articulating their futures in Cork with regard to the Act.

The shaping of public life and the city’s future were articulated by the CPA, and men such as John J. Horgan. The material on the CPA examined demonstrated a clear alignment of Cork’s business community in support of the contentious Free State government when they openly supported Cosgrave and his party to safeguard a business and industry agenda in the new state. The CPA, clearly, had the ear of the Cosgrave government: that organisation decided what would replace the British-designed local authorities in Cork and throughout Ireland, when they designed the legislation to re-articulate local government in Cork. Furthermore, at their behest, they shaped Cork’s public life late into the twentieth century through the appointment of Phillip Monahan to the role of City Manager for life.

Detailing the flurry of complaints against street traders within the context of the calls for reform of local government so soon after Irish independence has revealed that there was a successful ‘power grab’ by groups such as the DCA, the CPA, and the CTPA to control both public space and the public agenda. The first government of the Irish Free State allowed them to make this grab for power as the new state attempted to strengthen and ‘Thrive’ and ‘Prosper’ in its infancy. Crippling fiscal and social crises following the Anglo-Irish War and the Irish Civil War, were both poised to push more women in
Ireland’s cities deeper into poverty. There was also an impetus to embrace the ‘science’ of town planning to shape major urban centres by economic lines as economically strong countries including America, Canada, and Great Britain were doing. Each of these factors represents a significant convergence of ‘historical contingencies’ in Dublin and Cork. Potentially, the need for more poor women to trade on Ireland’s streets was fuelled by the fiscal crisis and the displacements of war. However, contemporaneous social, political, and economic powers were aligned and positioned to eliminate street trading, and did so through an embrace of the vision of modern town planning alongside unified discourses against the anachronistic, unhygienic, and deviant street trader.

Gentrification is, according to Prince (2014), neoliberal in its essentialism: it is reflected in the local larger political and economic processes signified by investment business interests make in neglected neighbourhoods under the banner of rehabilitation. The history of those neighbourhoods and the lives lived there are lost to the privileged interests, Prince (2014) asserts. That process began on the Coal Quay with the embrace of business interests, starting with the expropriation of St. Peter’s to be leased to private, large-scale production, and later with the move of the Musgrave Brother’s, Ltd. onto Corn Market Street. I discovered that at each moment ‘rehabilitation’ meant displacing the Shawlies. Following Prince’s (2014) paradigm, neoliberal gentrification through investment by business interests served as a rehabilitation strategy for a neighbourhood and markets that were loosing money. Clearly, this early neoliberal impetus meant the history of the Coal Quay and the lives lived there are now preserved in photographs and statues.

By connecting these events with those later in the twentieth century in Cork, I discovered that the events of the 1920s and the 1930s marked the start of what may have been a long continuum in Ireland. The early neoliberal essentialism that allowed for early regeneration was later noticeable in the Coal Quay through what Berman (1988) would conceptualise as modernity’s move to gentrify the neighbourhood along bourgeois notions of propriety, efficiency, and organisation. On the ground in Cork, local historian Beecher (2007, p. 107) conceptualised the gentrification of Cork’s Coal Quay in the 1980s as “so called progress” and “the dreadful rush to uniformity and ‘respectability’”. It is important to note at this juncture that what would later be called
‘street trading’ as Cork entered the early twenty-first century building boom has little in common, I have learned, with the trading of the Shawlies. Both may be conducted in the open and on the footpath, typically by small-scale traders, but there the commonalities end.

After an examination of the lives of the Shawlies, the lives of contemporary women street traders in poor nations, and the unified discourses used against both, I was able to identify the distinction. Not only did *The Street Trading Act, 1926* gentrify and gender-fy streets and neighbourhoods in Dublin and in Cork, but the unified discourses concerning orderly streets, cleanliness, and the appearances of respectable and ‘legitimate’ trading classed and gentrified the practice of street trading itself. What is now sanctioned in Ireland as ‘street trading’ is a gentrified form of its ancestor, one that follows the patriarchal notion of the modern (Nicholas, 2009; Parkins, 2010). Rather than embodying what the modernists identify in its predecessor as wilfulness, filth, and lawlessness (Bluestone, 1997; Cross, 2000), gentrified, modern ‘street trading’ is orderly, hygienic, and yields to the authority.

‘Next Steps’—Addressing the ‘Gaps’

Across this journey with the Shawlies, many avenues for new research became apparent as new questions about them, their sisters in Dublin, and the Coal Quay itself became evident in the ‘gaps’. The same, of course, was true as I began reading about contemporary women traders and the impact of gentrification in both poor and wealthy nations. These proposed studies are clustered into three streams. The first is a deeper understanding of Irish social history via market places. The second, follows contemporary women street traders to understand the impact of globalisation, gentrification, and other challenges confronting the urban poor. The third addresses the policy implications raised by the regulation of a historic means of subsistence earning for the urban poor.

This discussion of ‘next steps’ begins closest to home—the Coal Quay. The thorough history of the English Market compiled by Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil (2011) stands as a model for the history that remains to be written about St. Peter’s Market and the Bazaar. St. Peter’s and the Bazaar were part of an effort in the mid-nineteenth century
by the Corporation to bring affordable food and clothing to the poor of the ‘other’
neighbourhood. Subsequent administrations neglected this neighbourhood and these
markets that were dedicated at their opening to Cork’s urban poor. A study of the
Corporation’s governance of these two markets would further the understanding of the
workings of class and, potentially, gender in Cork through the lens of the administration
of the public markets. Focusing this study on who held stalls in these two markets
would shed some light on whether the rent-paying stall holders in this classed space
were, largely, women.

An additional study that furthers the understanding of how gender and class have
worked in the administration of Cork and its markets is also evident. The workings of
the English Market in the last half of the twentieth century, merits a study that focuses
on the intersections of class, gender, and modernity identified in this project. According
to Ó Drisceoil and Ó Drisceoil (2011), as Ireland and Cork experienced economic
downturns post-independence, the English Market experienced a marked decline from
its palatial beginnings, and was targeted for regeneration in the 1980s. When I first
ventured into the English Market to make observations, I was struck by the number of
women stall holders, many of whom had inherited stalls from women who had moved
into the Market during the lean years. A study of the ‘gender-scape’ of the English
Market through its lean years may shed light on whether it become a space for women
because of that decline.

Along the course of this study, I heard many anecdotal stories of mothers and
grandmothers who operated petty shops and small businesses such as dress making and
hair styling from their homes in Corporation housing. Was this how the Shawlies who
were rehoused in the suburbs supported themselves after leaving the Coal Quay? I
believe these stories would extend not only this study, but would contribute to the
volume of work that exists on women and work in Ireland, and the histories of working-
class women. I hope to document these accounts, and to determine what, if any, official
response followed. Was trading by women sanctioned but only when they traded from
the ‘private’ sphere?
CONCLUSIONS

Moving offshore, an ongoing review of women street traders in debtor nations during the current financial downturn, particularly as countries scramble in response to shifts in the ‘commanding heights’ of the world economy, is needed. I believe such a study is not just needed of the poor countries in Asia, Africa, or Latin America: the ‘downsizing’ of so many women into petty trading in what are now the debtor nations of the European Union, namely Portugal, Spain, and Italy, as well as nations on the eastern periphery such as Croatia merit attention.

Studies are needed that inform the existing body of work on the needs of the urban poor as both consumers and traders, particularly as cities, globally, continue to expand. This study has confirmed in that the Shawlies were not only supporting themselves, they worked in a marketplace needed by their neighbours because they provided what TD Thomas Johnson and TD Sir Craig each referred to in Dáil Éireann as an alternative to shops for those who could not afford shop prices. The findings of this study demonstrate the care needed when articulating regulations that shape urban space because there is a ‘trickle-down’ effect on the poor. A study of the formation and workings of the urban ‘micro-micro-micro economy’ in major cities would serve as a tool for politicians, advocates, and activists in the design and implementation of programmes to alleviate the effects of poverty.

In retrospect, this project has set me on research paths I could not have anticipated by highlighting, via the lives of the Shawlies, the micro-micro-micro economies formed by the world’s urban poor. But then again, as my attention turned in 2011 to Cork’s Shawlies, on the world’s stage Mohamed Bouazizi, a Tunisian street trader, set fire to himself to protest growing poverty due to high food prices and payoffs to corrupt officials, and initiated the Arab Spring. I arrived in the Middle East to teach in August 2012, and this dissertation was written in places where I have watched ‘modernity’ unfold, and the gentrification of aged, urban settings into global financial centres. Against the backdrop of gleaming bank towers and luxury condominiums, those that appear to indicate ‘Thriving’ and ‘Prosperous’ nations, the micro-micro-micro economy continues to work. Here, unlike in Europe or North America, it does so in the open, largely unfettered. This includes the work of the ‘zabbaleen’ or garbage pickers, men
who push baby buggies around Manama, capital of the Kingdom of Bahrain, all day and night. They sift through refuse for recyclable goods that can be sold to eke out a living.

A comprehensive work on Foucault and policy does not exist, but what was learned about Foucauldian governance and policy development in this study demonstrates that one is possible. Hunt and Wickham (1994: vii-viii) offer that the ‘law’ was not a key area of focus for Foucault, and yet they demonstrate that his body of work is pertinent “for contemporary legal studies” as he had “a great deal to say about law and even more that has legal relevance”. The same may be said of policy: a discrete theory of public or social policy is absent in Foucault’s work, yet Foucault wrote a great deal that informs a theory of policy as a course of action by a governing body to shape life in the public and private spheres. According to Powell (1992, p. ix), Foucault addresses “the power relations upon which the formulation of social policy devolves”. This observation is particularly important considering Foucault's examinations of the role of power in governing away from core sites of power via disciplines such as policies and regulations formulated or adopted by the state. Within the ‘rule of law’ these may, indirectly, shape or articulate social policies or the vision a government has for society and individuals.

Policy Implications:
The role of private interests in shaping public policy was, of course, allowed to happen at the foundation of the Irish state through the actions—or inactions—of both the Irish Free State government and the local authority in Cork. Across the twentieth century the role ‘the market’ and private interests came to have in public policy is explored by Stone (2002) in a way that extends Foucault’s explication of power relations into the arena of legislation and public policy. Stone (2011, p.18) defines public policy as “communities trying to achieve something as communities” despite conflicts that arise over goals and membership. Thus, policies that are truly developed in the polis using a public model evolve through collective will and effort because they come to define economic and social rights in addition to political rights (Stone 2011, p. 20).

Here is where the policy implications from this study are evident: the abuse of power and the privileging of power in the design and implementation of The Street Trading
Act, 1926, illuminate a deepened democratic deficit created by the regulation of street trading that obscured the implications for poor women. The policy-practice divide at work in legislation delivered with ‘Best Intentions’ such as The Street Trading Act, 1926, and the subsequent acceptance of ‘winners’ in the workings of the state, is locatable in the notion of Foucauldian disciplines that did, as noted in Chapter 1, take on the goals of bourgeoise society (Smart 2002). According to Foucault (1980b, p. 131) each society has a “regime of truth” and “a ‘general politics’ of truth”. Within this paradigm, what is accepted as truth is privileged knowledge that is used in the interests of power, discourses which the society comes to accept and employ as true (Foucault 1980b). This premise underscored the policy model governing street trade that was followed in 1926 by the government of the Irish Free State and onwards.

This model was one that Stone (2011) characterised in the late twentieth century as the market model of policy making, one “dominated by economics and its model of society as a market” (Stone 2011, p. xi). Stone (2011) insists that it is not limited to a ‘market-based’ exchange of goods, services and currencies; there are extensions into people’s lives via political and public events including “the behavior of legislators” and “political leadership” (p. 10). The alternative is the polis model of policy making, one that defines public policy as “communities trying to achieve something as communities” despite conflicts that arise over goals and membership (Stone 2011, p. 18). Thus, policies that are truly developed in the polis using a public model evolve through collective will and effort because they come to define economic and social rights in addition to political rights (Stone 2011).

What would have been a pro-polis policy for women street traders in Cork? Addressing what should have been done nearly a century after the event is not my goal here, nor will I examine the current state of the Coal Quay because the two situations are not compatible. However, the lessons to be learned from the design and implementation of The Street Trading Act, 1926 must inform the best practices in policy design and implementation when seeking to regulate the micro-micro-micro economies of the urban poor, or when designating the uses of public space in urban settings. The core lesson that emerges from the data is that the state addressed a problem articulated by business interests as a ‘truth’, while the real issue was that systemic poverty—
poverty that was gendered and urban—was ignored. Furthermore, the voices of those who stood to be negatively affected by the policy were excluded from the process.

What has been termed as an ‘intersectional approach’ to policy development—one that recognises that inequities are nuanced through the intersection of a variety of inequities—is an overarching concept of ‘Best Intentions’ that are genuine. According to the Ontario Human Rights Commission (2001, p. 2), a contextualised approach is necessary to effectively deal with discrimination because it focuses on “society’s response to the individual” rather than the characteristics of the individual that may stem from “historical disadvantage”. In developing policy, then, an intersectional approach will address “multiple identities” that come from experiencing more than one form of discrimination (Ontario Human Rights Commission 2001, p. 28). Likewise, according to Mathur (2014, p. 23), if policies and laws are to succeed in improving the lives of the masses, they must be developed from an “understanding derived from close interaction with the very people they target”.

In recent decades advocacy for inclusive regulatory responses to street traders has shifted the focus to the poverty of traders, and the further disadvantage encountered by poor women who are street traders. This has involved unpacking the stereotypes that continue to oppress street traders—those which dominated the debate in Ireland in the 1920s—to articulate the realities of who they are, what they do, and why their needs and voices must be included in policy design and implementation. The first step proposed by their advocates is to change the perception, or what Foucault (1980a) terms the ‘truth’, of who street traders are and why they do what they do (Dimas, 2008; “Editorial: A Law for Street Vendors,” 2014; Mathur, 2014).

In short, recognition is needed that when the formal economy does not provide work for them, they create their own employment, and they provide affordable goods to consumers across income levels (Dimas, 2008; “Editorial: A Law for Street Vendors” 2014; Mathur, 2014). However the reality is that their contributions to the economy are not recognised, the displacement of the poor and increases in poor urban populations under globalisation are not prioritised, and public spaces are not managed in ways that give them access to that public space to trade (Dimas 2008; “Editorial: A Law for Street
Vendors,” 2014; Mathur, 2014). Among the historical challenges to the meagre earnings of street traders that are created by regulations and their enforcement has been the cost of bureaucracy (Dimas, 2008), a downloading of the cost of administration that was identified in The Street Trading Act, 1926.

In Indonesia, Dimas (2008) observes that macroeconomic ‘trickle-down’ has not worked to improve the lives of the country’s poor, and so the street markets and the informal sector as a whole have continued to grow. In 2008 a comprehensive policy for street traders in Indonesia did not exist. However, he discovered three municipalities where the situation was managed in a way that was agreeable to established vendors and the local authority (Dimas, 2008). This was achieved by finding ‘common ground’, where the local authority provided the vendors with a suitable venue that yielded earnings, along with standardised pitches and storage areas. In return the vendors ‘self-policed’ by removing litter, complying with rules, and they keep unlicensed vendors out of the designated trading area. However, their positions were still tenuous: according to Dimas (2008), the presence of new vendors created the overcrowding that force evictions by the government without working to find an alternative.

In early 2014, a law was passed in India to protect its estimated ten million street vendors—The Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending Act. An Editorial in Economic & Political Weekly on 8 March 2014 offers that there is an ongoing expropriation of public space “by the urban rich” that is “ignored” by civic administrators and the media that, in turn, leads to the harassment and marginalisation of street traders (p. 8). According to Mathur (2014, p. 22), this new legislation in India is a “policy response to unemployment”, and progressive in its recognition that more inclusive regulatory practices can protect livelihoods. One key feature is the creation of regulatory committees where nearly half of the representatives are vendors, elected from within their ranks, with preference given to women and others among the disadvantaged (Mathur, 2014). However, failure is projected if local implementation meets with established local practices and prejudices that are thought of as unshakeable (Mathur, 2014).
According to the Self Employed Women’s Association, a trade union based in India, 94% of Indian women in that country’s labour force are in the unorganised sector (www.sewa.org). The organisation’s founder, Renana Jhabvala, has produced a commentary entitled The Role of Street Vendors in the Growing Urban Economies. This paper details how a classed and gendered economy operates within this sector, but that there are advantages to allowing women street traders access to public space. Jhabvala proposes that policies be developed to both preserve present livelihoods, and ensure that new women be permitted to enter street trading because their work contributes to economic growth and provides employment.

Closing Thoughts
Also critical to the preservation of street trading is the notion of community. Jhabvala sites historic markets as emblematic of local culture as expressed in the local uses of public space for people to meet, in contrast to what she terms the Western tendency towards “privacy and individualism” (p. 9). She also highlights what she terms “the principal of natural markets” (p. 9) which, in this study, stands in juxtaposition to the view expressed in Cork: A Civic Survey of the “natural tendencies of development” (p. 16), discussed in Chapter 5. Unlike the Cork Town Planning Association, Jhabvala observes that “Every city has its own locational arrangements”: consumers prefer to buy according to arrangements such as those in Mumbai, where the large commuter population prefers to buy food from vendors along major urban travel routes (p. 9).

In keeping with a local cultural perspective, and the principal of ‘natural markets’, Jhabvala characterises the street trader as symbolic of the society in which she operates: “The street vendor…is a metaphor for the interactions in the urban areas…the link between rich and poor, between formal and informal, between public and private, between trade and production” (p. 10). To this characterisation I would add that the woman street trader, embodied by the Shawlie in Cork, makes visible the inequities in power relations that exist in the ‘in-between’ spaces she continues to occupy at each of those locations.

It was noted in Chapter 6 that, in 1997, a European Union representative in charge of markets warned of the decline of the street market in Ireland. A representative of the
Cork Corporation noted in an interview published in the same article in the *Irish Times*, that the Coal Quay had been rehabilitated using Corporation and EU funds. It was declared a vibrant market once again. He added that he doubted if Corn Market Street would become a seven day market as it had in the past but, as a Friday and Saturday open market, it would be a “valuable asset” to the city. According to the European Union’s Urban Pilot Projects, only 2,500 people, on average, had been frequenting the market prior to regeneration, and this number had increased to approximately 12,000 afterwards (www.ec.europa.eu).

Eight years later, however, in May 2005, the Cork City Council adopted the *Cornmarket Street Area Action Plan* that set “out an ambitious vision” for the transformation of the Coal Quay into “a thriving urban quarter”, one that would be “attractive for business”, and attractive to potential residents, and visitors (www.corkcity.ie). The report identified the market in Corn Market Street as an active market since the late 18th century. However, the Cork City Council now called for a “Street Market Strategy” to address the decline that followed the resurgence of “activity”, described above, in the late 1990s. That resurgence had clearly died: of the 371 market pitches available on Corn Market Street, only 140 were in use at the time of the report in 2004. According to the *Action Plan*, an EU report blamed the decline of the street market on the movement of residents and businesses from Cork’s city centre to the suburbs.

This movement of people and lives was, of course, promoted by town planning reports and, ultimately, the Cork Corporation, from the 1920s onward. These same processes had, contemporaneously, led to the call for a ban on street trading. Ironically—and sentimentally—the introduction of the *Action Plan* is accompanied by a photograph of a crowded Corn Market Street from a postcard taken in 1910, fourteen years before the call to have street trading banned in Cork. The contemporary movement to revitalise Corn Market Street to its former ‘glory’ aligns with the trend elsewhere in wealthy nations in the Anglo-American world to, nostalgically, resurrect open markets (Bluestone, 1997; Cross, 2000). In recent decades they are said to have been gentrified or ‘yuppified’ (Cross, 2000).
However, the likelihood that poor, itinerant women traders would be welcomed in these new spaces in Cork is, clearly, questionable in light of what has been learned in this study. My findings, then, call into the question the nostalgia that is now heaped on the body of the Shawlie. As noted in the Introduction, this nostalgia is particularly ironic and problematic on Corn Market Street where *The Onion Seller*—dedicated as a monument to the Shawlies at the official reopening of the Coal Quay in June 2012—stands opposite what is now known as the Musgrave Buildings. In the wake of the most recent regeneration scheme, what is now the Coal Quay Market hosted its first Summer Family Festival in 2012. According to an article in the *Cork Independent* on 8 August 2013, the second annual festival on Corn Market Street would include a Cork Shawlies Parade.

A video of the 2012 festival is available on YouTube[^92]. It captures vignettes from the day including a wall of photographs of the Shawlies who were street traders, memorialising who they were and what they sold. I am reminded of photographs of similar but larger memorial walls designating disaster areas where there has been a significant loss of life, such as the World Trade Centre in New York, or Phuket, Thailand, following the 2004 tsunami. However, this nostalgia in the official rush to memorialise and sentimentalise the Shawlies has taken on a near ‘Disney-fication’ of women like Bridget Coleman and those whose voices were emancipated in some small part in Chapter 6. The video on YouTube carries shots of a party stand photography cut out of a faceless Shawlie where visitors pop their faces in to have a souvenir photograph taken of themselves as a ‘Shawlie’.

[^92]: Available to view at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I9mNiGkFDgY](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I9mNiGkFDgY)
CONCLUSIONS

TOP: The sign for the recent regeneration scheme on Corn Market Street.
CENTRE: Detail from the sign showing the architect’s vision of the new ‘Coal Quay’.
BOTTOM: Permanent stalls opposite the refurbished Musgrave Buildings. (Source: Susan Marie Martin) Date of all: August 2013.
Appendix 1—Swift’s Poems

APPLES
COME buy my fine wares,
Plums, apples and pears.
A hundred a penny,
In conscience too many:
Come, will you have any?
My children are seven,
I wish them in Heaven;
My husband ’s a sot,
With his pipe and his pot,
Not a farthen will gain them,
And I must maintain them.

ONIONS
Come, follow me by the smell,
Here are delicate onions to sell;
I promise to use you well.
They make the blood warmer,
You’ll feed like a farmer;
For this is every cook’s opinion,
No savoury dish without an onion;
But, lest your kissing should be spoiled,
Your onions must be thoroughly boiled:
Or else you may spare
Your mistress a share,
The secret will never be known:
She cannot discover
The breath of her lover,
But think it as sweet as her own.

HERRINGS
Be not sparing,
Leave off swearing.
Buy my herring
Fresh from Malahide,
Better never was tried.
Come, eat them with pure fresh butter and mustard,
Their bellies are soft, and as white as a custard.
Come, sixpence a dozen, to get me some bread,
Or, like my own herrings, I soon shall be dead.
Oysters
Charming oysters I cry:
My masters, come buy,
So plump and so fresh,
So sweet is their flesh,
No Colchester oyster
Is sweeter and moister:
Your stomach they settle,
And rouse up your mettle:
They'll make you a dad
Of a lass or a lad;
And madam your wife
They'll please to the life;
Be she barren, be she old,
Be she ****, or be she scold,
Eat my oysters, and lie near her,
She'll be fruitful, never fear her.

Asparagus
Ripe 'sparagrass
Fit for lad or lass,
To make their water pass:
O, 'tis pretty picking
With a tender chicken!

Oranges
Come buy my fine oranges, sauce for your veal,
And charming, when squeezed in a pot of brown ale;
Well roasted, with sugar and wine in a cup,
They'll make a sweet bishop when gentlefolks sup.
APPENDIX 2—Streets in DEDs

Cork No. 2:
Academy Street, Bowling Green Street, Brown Street, Careys Lane, Coal Quay, Corn Market Street, Corporation Buildings, Curtis Lane, Dalton’s Row, Drawbridge Street, Emmet Place, Emmet Place Western Side, Faulkners Lane, Fitzgeraldds Alley, French Church Street, Half Moon Street, Harpers Lane, Hughes Lane, Lavitts Quay, Little Market Street, Paul Street, Paul’s Street, Perry Street, Sheehan’s Alley, St. Patrick’s Street, St. Peter and Paul’s Place, William Street.

Cork No. 7:
Adelaide Street, Batchelors Quay, Broad Lane, Coleman’s Lane, Crofts Alley, Driscolls Alley, Grattan Street, Kyrls Quay, Kyrls Street, Liberty Street North, Little Cross Street, Penrose Square, Philips Lane, Piccadilly Lane, Riordans Court, St. Francis Lane, St. Francis Place, St. Peter’s Avenue.

Cork No. 7 Urban:
Castle Street, Cockpit Lane, Corn Market Street, Cotterns Row, Kyle Street, North Main Street, Portneys Lane.

Cork No. 7 Urban (part of):
Anne Street, Ballard’s Lane, Broad Street, Coach Street, Connell’s Court, Courthouse Street, Cross Street, Devonshire Lane, Devonshire Street, Donoughmore Place, Dyke Parade, Francis Street, Galways Alley, Great Georges Street, Great Georges Street West, Grenville Place, Hanover Street, Henry Street, James Street, Lancaster Quay, Liberty Street, Little Anne Street, Little Hanover Street, Lynche’s Lane, Lynches’ Street, Mardyke Place, Mardyke Street, Mardyke including Terraces, Millerd Street, Moore Street, Moore Street Place, Peters Street, Prospect Row, Prospect Row (West Side), Queen’s Place, Sheares Street, Sheares Street (North Side), South Main Street, Thomas Street, Walshes’ Square, Wandesford Street, Western Road including Terraces, Wood Street (East Side), Woods Alley, Woods Street West Side.
Appendix 3—Cork Corporation Organisational Charts

Organisational Chart - Cork Corporation Pre-1929

COMMITTEES OF COUNCIL (PUBLIC SERVICES)
• 20 including Tolls and Markets, Hackney Carriages, Law and Finance

ELECTED MEMBERS OF COUNCIL
• Lord Mayor (elected by council; 1-year term)
• 14 Aldermen (6-year term)
• 42 Councillors (3-year term)

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF
• City Engineer
• Town Clerk
• City Solicitor
• Secretary
• Treasurer

Organisational Chart - Cork Corporation Post-1929

ELECTED COUNCIL
• 21 Councillors (rotating 3-year terms)
• Lord Mayor (elected by council; 1-year term)

Powers: rates, bylaws, sale of city property, appoint representatives to other public bodies.

MANAGER
• Power over all areas not in the remit of council including control over all officials and preparing the annual budget
• Acts on signed orders from council.

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF
• City Engineer
• Town Clerk
• City Solicitor
• Secretary
• Treasurer
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