



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: O'Neachtain, Eoghan (2013). Responding to institutional child abuse in Ireland: a Foucauldian analysis. (Unpublished Doctoral thesis, City University London)

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/2461/>

Link to published version:

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Responding to Institutional Child Abuse in Ireland.

A Foucauldian Analysis

Volume Two

Eoghan O' Neachtain

Portfolio submitted in fulfilment of DPsych Counselling Psychology,

Department of Psychology, City University, London.

January 2013.

Table of Contents:

Appendices to B: Responding to Institutional Child Abuse in Ireland.

A Foucauldian Analysis.

Appendix B1: Deconstructing the Author Function	4
Preliminary thoughts	4
What kind of subject am I?	7
What kind of object am I?.....	8
What are the modes of circulation of text.....	10
Analysis of author function.....	11
Appendix B2: Preliminary Guide to Thinking about Foucauldian Analysis.....	14
Appendix B3 Language, Space and Time	26
Appendix B4: Analytic Tool Box	27
Appendix B5: Example of Worked Analysis from Interview	28
Appendix B6: Discursive Constructions.....	100
Appendix B7: List of Distilled Discourses	135
Appendix B8: List of Positioning and Subjectivity	153
Appendix B9: Discursive Function and Effects	172
Appendix B10: Individual Analytic Summary	180
Appendix B11: Collective Analytic Summary	196
Appendix B12: Excerpt from the Cussen Report (1936).....	237
Appendix B13: Excerpt from the Kennedy Report (1970).....	254
Appendix B14: Excerpt from the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse.....	269

Appendix B1 : **Deconstructing the Author Function**

Preliminary Thoughts:

1. What calls me to the research?
2. Summary of discourses which construct the prelim research.
3. What kind of subject am I?
4. What kind of object am I?
5. What are the modes of existence, distribution and circulation of the text?
 - What calls me? Cognitive, affective and philosophical reasons. Academic but personal as well.
 - During the recruitment phases my discourse on local radio during their community discussion slot was deconstructed by a listener who made the following observations, communicated in person to me. He said I used religious imagery and words such as “I wanted to shine a light on dark places”. He even suggested a well-known monastery at where I could say if I mentioned his name. Despite being an atheist, I am informed by religious discourse and would have held in mind St John’s injunction, “Work while ye have the light”, which was a favourite quotation of my favourite author, Marcel Proust.

In fact, my discourse is also Enlightenment discourse. It was Kant who coined the phrase “ausgang” as a means of denoting an exit out of darkness, ignorance and servility.

Foucault was critical of the Enlightenment as a normalizing force which doubles back on itself and imprisons human subjectivity within the categories of new knowledge which it establishes. However, there is no getting away from the irony that FDA is a child of the

Enlightenment project, so we can say that Enlightenment provides the tools for the scrutiny of its own project, and perhaps its own undoing.

To summarise my way of communicating in order to recruit is already catalysed by at least five obvious discourses:

1. Literary discourse,
2. Religious discourse.
3. Enlightenment discourse
4. Academic discourse (introducing who I am and what I am doing and the wish to distance myself from journalistic discourse).
5. Discourse of the Radio (the pressure to be interesting and economical, the desire for one's voice to be heard, the unseen listeners), the discourse of the outsider (identifiable by accent).

Summary of discourses which construct pre-research stage

Summary of what I can identify as the discourses which inform my thinking apriori before beginning analysis of textual material. All of these discourses could become reifying impediments to analysis if not interrogated thoroughly:

- Discourse of Autobiography (unified subject – this who I am etc.)
- Discourse of University
- Discourse of Psychology
- Discourse of Psychoanalysis
- Discourse of Philosophy (Platonic, v Aristotelian- Idealism v Materialism.)
- Discourse of New Paradigm Qualitative Research

- Discourse of Enlightenment (positivist knowledge)
- Discourse of Literature
- Discourse of Religion
- Discourse of Child Abuse Literature
- Discourse of Institutional Abuse Literature
- Discourse of FDA
- Discourse of Trauma Literature (stages of)
- Discourse of Humanism?
- Discourse of Nationalism
- Discourse of Religion.
- Discourse of Aesthetics
- Discourse of Art
- Discourse of Journalism
- Discourse of Education
- Discourse of Economics
- Discourse of Childhood
- Family Discourse
- Discourse of Friendship (Aristotle's starting point for the polis)
- Discourse of the Student
- Discourse of the Researcher
- Discourse of Politics
- Discourse of War
- Discourse of Freedom/Independence
- Discourse of History etc.

What kind of subject am I?

- Embarrassed because I realise that within my postmodernist persona there lurks a positivist modernist who want to add to the stock of knowledge in the world in a “respectable” manner. I found beginning the work challenging for many obvious reasons such as time poverty, the disabling effect of the unknown (can I do this?) which can cause a regression into a sort of learned helplessness, insecurity, lack of authority (who am I to ask), fear etc.. I knew that what I wanted to find out was not possible through positivist methods. I was clear about that because one of my obsessive hinges was: “Why did people not talk about institutional child abuse in the past? Was it identifiable as a topic? What made it possible for people to ignore suffering? Was it even possible to be able to construct the other as victim? What was going on that made it possible not to question? Initially I felt a great deal of unmetabolised anger at those who had authority. As I write I can feel it well up again and this is important because I realise that this will get in the way of the cool analysis of the text because I am clearly angry about something, but I know that the source of my anger may be displaced from one object of concern onto another. We see this in extremist positions where ignorance, education can often lead to a displacement of anger onto an external object independent of the real source of anger. So, how can I begin to analyse when I am blinded by an unresolved anger? I think this question could be put to the side because the objective is to analyse discourse and not

interiority of affect. However, this seems to me to be unsatisfactory the line between the discursive and the non-discursive, between words and feelings cannot be arbitrarily drawn. For instance, is it possible that there is such a thing as a discursive formation of anger as recognizable as medical discourse or psychological discourse etc? Therefore, the unspoken discursive formation of anger may guide the analysis in a manner which privileges an emotional, as opposed to an analytic attitude. I cannot answer this question at the moment.

What kind of object am I?

One fashioned by the discourse of anger, literature, religion, university, psychology, etc? Bearing in mind the obvious discourses which position me, how can I stop becoming a principle of unity? By concentrating on the surface of the text and to query those identified discourses which seem to conform to my own preferred discourses. For example, is it possible to see that an apparent literary discourse may be another type of discourse?

- What kind of subjected subject am I?
- If I am subjected, does this mean I am subjugated? Under the yoke (French for yoke is joug, the joug in subjugated) of university discourse. However, being subjected is not the same as being subjugated and yet can we be ever sure whether our subjection is not in fact a subjugation? Arguably, my respondents did not present themselves during the interview as subjugated citizens but they may have presented themselves as retrospectively subjugated.
- What political interest is there in me pursuing this research question at the moment? There are emotional motives, practical motives (gaining a thesis)- political motives? Yes, in the sense that I am very interested in the capacity of the individual to act within the

social body and I am interested in the effects of the social body on the individual. I believe that my research questions stems from a very sceptical vision of :

1. Ethical positions of institutions
2. Capacity for ethics to be translated into action
3. Humanist psychology. (Previous research was on comparing Zola's *La Bête Humaine* to the screen version by Jean Renoir. My conclusion was that Renoir's reading of the *la Bete Humaine* in the 1930s was a Humanist account typical of the 1930s soft French culture which emphasised collective unity and harmony, and was blind to the germinating evil within French and German culture, which culminating in genocide. Renoir's reading of Zola is a humanist reading but Zola's original analysis of evil is a realist viewpoint. This was my first research insight into how discourses such as can mask the violence and cruelty operative in society, which in the case of 1930s France was the an ugly anti-Semitism, which had become explicit in the Dreyfus affair.

I wonder whether the current contemporary discourse on positive psychology is a repeat of the facile optimism of the 1930s, a prelude to the unleashing of unspeakable horror.

What are the modes of existence, distribution and circulation of the text?

- 1 Research interview
- 2 Part of Research Portfolio.
- 3 Part of Research Portfolio that may be published.
- 4 Part of an academic book.
- 5 Part of a non-academic book
- 6 Part of a journal article

- 7 Part of a newspaper, radio, TV piece.
- 8 Part of a web publication.
- 9 Informs the formal sharing with academics (oral presentations).
- 10 Informs the informal sharing with academics (conversations).
- 11 Informs the informal sharing with non-academics (shared opinions, knowledge about psycho-social events, and ways of thinking about things).
- 12 Audio Recorder
- 13 USB key (password protected)
- 14 Desktop (password protected)
- 15 Email
- 16 Viva.
- 17 Web. Ethos
- 18 Print. (Academic publishers)
- 19 Video-conferencing?
- 20 Radio
- 21 Television

Analysis of Author Function in First Interview (Line by Line)

- 1. Reassurance. Courtesy- thanks
- 2. Outlines objective-topic – interview- naming the institution
- 3. Asks for thoughts, feelings and response- frames it in psychological way- constructing the subject according to a psychological model (psychodynamic or CBT).
- 4. Use of word “interview”
- 5. Building sequentiality.
- 6. Clarify subjects.

7. Chronology
8. Locating chronology. Verb (mentioned) .
9. Chronology
10. Clarifying educational institution. Use of past perfect indicating something comes after
11. Questioning not hearing (Past perfect)
12. Questioning not hearing
13. Wondering (romantic language) intr. To feel or be affected with wonder; to be struck with surprise or astonishment, to marvel. Also occas. to express wonder in speech
OED
14. Phatic
15. Making distinctions between schools. Use of word “significant”- (meaning making)
16. Unfinished question
17. Phatic
18. Phatic
19. Clarification : “new management” Use of “you felt”-
20. Clarification of authority function...using word “described”
21. Same- “you referring”
22. Phatic
23. Clarify definition of institution . Confining and binding discourse- closing it down?
24. Phatic
25. Phatic
26. Clarify reference to “Rising”
27. Sequencing over time
28. Phatic

29. Reference to psychology- use of romantic language, cliché “you paint a picture”.
Corrects discourse- to “give a very vivid account” – use of “deep” language-
profoundly
30. Questioning of change in response. Introduction of the word public response-
constructing that there is such a thing.
31. Clarify – change in public reaction
32. Phatic
33. Pause...use of “too long” . Why not long?
34. Chronology: home place- young man
35. Phatic
36. Phatic
37. Clarifying subject. Use of words such as “awareness”, “community”
38. Communal response
39. Clarification
40. Chronology
41. Subject orientation... “the people”
42. Phatic
43. Draw attention to non-verbal sign- “formal empty gesture”
44. Make my desire explicit: community response?- use of terms such as “community”;
“response”. Different subject positions- chronology
45. Clarification- affirmation of interest
46. Questioning of motivation. Use of word “sudden”. Assumption it was sudden
47. Phatic
48. Extend and draw out more.
49. Clarification of reference to Church hierarchy

50. Clarification of archbishop. Use of title- “My best friend” knows him
51. Reference to feelings-
52. Questioning about belonging to institution. Use of word “inside” , as if there were an inside and outside of institution – positivist categories.
53. Phatic
54. Again –question about belonging to Catholic Church. Notion of human agency driving the question.
55. Phatic
56. Situating in time question.
57. Phatic
58. Personal jargon- one more , one last thing (helped me identify my own personal discursive style). Shift from use of “we have explored” to “you’ve talked about”
59. Use of metaphor- “percolate” and latinate “permeate” – rhetorical pleasure.
60. Use of “one “ – “In one sense”
61. Use of “surviving” descriptor-.
62. Use of hesitancy-
63. Use of summary – 7 objects confusing-unformulated – the “brave “ journalist-
64. Repeats the adverb “very” before helpful.

Appendix B2: Preliminary Guide to Thinking about Foucauldian Analysis

- 1 Look for contingencies instead of causes. Suspend all second order judgements.
- 2 General history eschews the “totalising theme, concentrating on describing differences. How do you choose the two objects in which difference can be seen for there are multiple levels of difference within the apparent unity of a text? Then the added complication of difference between interviewer and interviewee ? Where do transformations, contingencies, mutations and so forth lie and how are they to be identified within the analysis? Visker (1996) draws attention to concepts such as transformation, restructuring, modification, simplification, displacement, and recurrence and non- contemporaneity. Is there an overlap here with Freudian terminology? Again and again commentators seem to be unable to describe the evolution of discourse without adverting to the unconscious. Is Foucault’s love of surface dynamics adequate without reference to an explanatory model for the mutations, slips, contingencies of the thinking subject? However, for Foucault there is no thinking subject, no Cartesian cogito. Wherein resides subjectivity and how can you account for resistance if there is no cogito? Or is resistance simply born out of a competing discourse? Tunisia 2010? There you had a small frustrated stall-holder and his act of self-immolation, but it was the discursive activity around the act which led to regime change. Not just discourse.
- 3 Genealogy is the same as archaeology except there is a greater emphasis on power.
- 4 Archaeology according to Kendall and Wickham (1999) is analysis of local discursivities and genealogy is the analysis of tactics , whereby on the basis of the descriptions of these local discursivities , the subjected knowledges which were thus

released would be brought into play. So, genealogy is simply an elaboration of archaeology.

- 5 Two functions : criticism of human sciences and investigating the topic under question. In my case, the methodology will be analysing the object: response to institutional abuse and the object which examines the object: FDA
- 6 Disagree with Foucault's rejection of the repressive hypothesis of sexuality because of the proliferation of discourses around that topic. This was certainly not the case in Ireland...and internationally, research in CSA seems to point to hiddenness and obscurity as genuine features in the aetiology of sexual abuse. In other words, there is a problem contra Foucault to do with the repression of sexuality. On the other hand, the increasing commercial sexualisation of contemporary culture including its children does seem to point to an important insight that F provided: that increase in discourse does not lead to more enlightenment but rather the embedding of power relations (sexist, patriarchal, dominant) at local levels.
- 7 Although, Foucault's critique does seem to have explanatory power for the exponential rise in discourse on sex in contemporary capitalist society as means of control, profit making, subjugation of women, sexualisation.. etc. Perhaps, Foucault's model cannot be applied willy-nilly without regard to the discourses particular to that particular society.
- 8 Mechanisms of subjectivization procedures which enable something to recognise itself as a subject .
- 9 Non-vertical power mirrors the structures of the Church where the Bishop are independent monarchs...no direct chain of command.
- 10 Inquiry found that the Bishops saw the sexual abuse of children as a moral failure: the psychiatric and criminal aspects were not identified.

- 11 Before 1933 only manager allowed to punish and thereafter privilege extended to deputy and alter defacto authorisation of punishment...not rules were problem but the absence of rules
- 12 Visker criticises Foucault that if bodies were so amenable to power nobody would resist. McNay (1994) follows same line.
- 13 Visker : Subjectivity is constituted by a process of subjectivisation which may have connections with power but is essentially distinct from them.... Subjectivation can lead to subjection- “asujetissement”
- 14 Rigid discourse theory where discourse constitutes the human subject versus more flexible theory. Discourse theory doesn't explain why the homogenising effects aren't actually more pronounced. Why is there any resistance at all? It must mean that the phenomenologists and Sartreans claims for individual manoeuvre must have some validity. However, perhaps it is a matter of emphasis and not substance.
- 15 The difference between early and late Foucault- between neo-structuralist and post-structuralist.
- 16 “The turning of real lives into writing is no longer a procedure of heroization ; it functions as a procedure of objectification” However, what is the alternative? Not to change real lives into writing? It seems that Foucault falls into agreement with the scientific psychologists he criticises elsewhere, that we should not attempt to formally verbalise and graphically express the messiness of real life because this takes from the quintessence of it. Again, Foucault seems to have more in common with Catholic thinking I grew up with which had a deep distrust of the written word and a reverence for mythos, for symbol, for ceremony, the processes of heroization which F applauds.
- 17 “What people accept as justification is shown in how they think and live ”
(Waddenels, as cited in Visker, 1996)

- 18 (1) Specify a series of relations between institutions;
- 19 (2) socio-economic processes, behavioural patterns, systems of norms and
classifications. Discourse is a host of such relations which makes it possible to say
something new.
- 20 The ambitious scientific claims for validity and reliability deterred several generations
of social scientists in Ireland away from, arguably, the most important question within
social science: How do we live with each other? How do we bring up our young with
that question in mind?
- 21 Image of the body ...body and the social body ...power to punish more deeply into
the social body.
- 22 I conceive of the risks of reification are offset by the expansion of thought and
awareness thus sensitising researcher to more possibilities in the analysis, as long as
the caveats to poor DA are borne in mind: under-analysis through summary, under-
analysis through taking sides, under analysis through over quotation or through
isolated quotation, the circular identification of discourses, false survey, analysis that
consists in simply spotting features. (Antaki et al, 2003)
- 23 No longer the body which is punished but the mind.
- 24 The art of distribution: enclosure, partitioning...aim was to interrupt others, discipline
organises and analytic space...creates complex spaces that are at once architectural,
functional and hierarchical
- 25 Our society is not one of spectacle but one of surveillance. Work of Guy de Bord and
the situationists developing Foucault's concept of surveillance as spectacle.
- 26 Where can discipline be conceptualised in relation to discourse? It is a type of
discursive practice.

- 27 “Discipline characterises, classifies, specialises. They distribute along a scale , around a norm, hierarchizing individuals in relation to one another.
- 28 Foucault says “ The system of penitentiary Panopticon was also a system of individualising and permanent documentation “. We have to be careful because again this cannot be said of the Irish context.
- 29 The disciplinary technique upon the body had a double effect: a soul to be known and a subjection to be maintained.
- 30 In this sense , the genealogical shift from torturing the body to training it is hardly the eradication of the punitive gesture; rather it works to extend and refine the efficiency of that gesture by taking the dramas of punitive power and resistance out of the relatively scarce and costly criminal realms and into new situations and “markets”- to everyday life in the factory, the home , the school, the army , the hospital (Foucault, 1977)
- 31 Foucauldian power is not hoarded or held by a few institutions, groups or individual people... power regulates relations, not objects, precisely because if power regulates the relations , it gets the objects for free- there are no natural or essential objects that exist before power relations.
- 32 Foucault: Imperatives of Non Sovereign Power Modality: obtain exercise of power economically: politically by its discretion, its low exteriorisation, its relative instability, the little resistance it arouses.
- 33 We’re moving to control societies that no longer operate (primarily) by confining people but through continuous control and instant communication.
- 34 Useful distinction-discipline as a form of power commits you to do research on institutions- site specific and highly mediated form of training.

- 35 Late Foucault's claim that ethics concerns one's relation to the self, while politics is the realm of the other: the self and the other are both inexorably exterior sets of relations...ethics the forces that come to bear on self and politics the forces that comes to bear on the other.
- 36 Nealon's useful notion of "intensification" - a matter of attempting to extend, broaden, or saturate certain effects within a given field, while trying to constrict, limit, or downplay other effects.
- 37 In late 1970s he moved from a preoccupation with technologies of domination to a new interest in what he termed technologies of the self. This is the question I am asking. How is the technology of self deployed with regard to the knowledge of Institutional Abuse in Ireland.
- 38 Resistance is not a rare attribute of certain heroic subjects, but an essential fact of everyone's everyday struggles with power. So, perhaps later Foucault has turned away from a mythologisation of the past (pre-Enlightenment) and admiration for the heroic to a real concern for everyone's struggles with power, as in Joyce's reversal of the Hero paradigm in Ulysses to concentrate on the quotidian and the ordinary.
- 39 Discourses are "practise which form the objects of which they speak" Limits of the sayable.
- 40 What is being constructed? I am particularly interested how subjectivity is constructed through language and bearing in mind Foucault's distinction between ethics and politics where the former is denotes a concern with oneself and the latter a concern with others. This brings to mind an ethics of self with which the late Foucault was preoccupied.
- 41 Subjectivity not as a product of power but as a result of techniques of subjectivisation.

- 42 Subjectivity is always split, anarchic...perhaps analysis requires the use of psychoanalytic ideas.
- 43 Identity. Foucault favours dissolution of identity. I think that Foucault is both right and wrong. Identity allows someone to be named out as suitable for incarceration. But when this process is underway the reverse process of loss of identity takes place. Or perhaps what Foucault is saying is that a grimmer identity takes places of non-identity which becomes rigid in itself.
- .

Recognition of Discourse as:

- 1 Series of statements
- 2 Identification of rules for production of statements
- 3 Identification of rules that delimit the sayable
- 4 Identification of rules that create spaces in which new statements are made.
- 5 Identification of rules that a practise is material and discursive at the same time.

Foucault's Four Rules of Discourse

- 1 Immanence
- 2 Continuing variation
- 3 Double conditioning: the local tactics and relationships must fit in with overarching strategies and conversely the overall arching strategies can only be specified in local relationships
- 4 Polyvalence of discourse (ambiguous, complex, contradictory and unstable)

Six Stages in Willig

- 1 Way in which discourse objects are constructed.
- 2 Analysis of difference between constructs identified in previous stage
- 3 Close analysis of discourse context within which discourse is deployed
- 4 Subject positions constructed within interview.
- 5 Relationship between discourse and practise: pivots: discourse constructs and subjectivity.
- 6 Relationship between discourse and subjectivity.

From Morgan (2010)

- Analysis is a philosophy, a way of being.
- F (relativist epistemology): Group of statements, objects and events that represent knowledge about or construct a particular topic. The way a topic has been constructed within a society.
- Bakhtinian distinction between language as centripetal (authoritative, fixed, inflexible discourse) and centrifugal (genres, professions, historical specificity, cohorts) forces.
- The concept of discursive formation assumes that any discursive event, action or text that refers to the same phenomenon, shares the same style and supports the same strategy.
Episteme is a higher level , more dominant discourse characteristic of the state of knowledge at the time (religion, science)
- Criticises Willig and K and W and says that these guides are concerned with the direct analysis of a piece of text and ignore fundamental precepts of Foucauldian method, such as power, knowledge, and historicity and governmentally, ignoring the broader tissues of meaning that make up a particular discourse. Yes, but how do you analyse these broader tissues of meaning?

Graham (2005)

- Orientation...discursive practise embodied in techniques and effect shot through with the positivity of knowledge
- Mapping systems of knowledge. Discursive/technological grid- Scheurich (1997) “grid of social regularities”: epistemological and ontological: Who the problem group is and how the group is seen or known as a problem
- Identification of statements which have constitutive effects
- Statement as a function (discursive junction box in which words and things intersect and become invested with particular relations of power, resulting in an interpellative event (Althusser, 1971; Butler, 1990) in which one can “recognise and isolate an act of formulation”
- Recognising particular objects of discourse. Butler (1997) . One exists not only by virtue of being recognised , but, in a prior sense , by being recognisable” (Berkelyian) .
Statement as an articulation that functions with constitutive effects.
- Tracing the positivity of knowledge/power which becomes the mantra of self-regulation marking the psychological project to construct the self-governing individual.
- The case is no longer a monument for future memory but a document for future use.
(Foucault, 1977)
- Regularity of statements, both in general form and dispersion, come to represent a discursive field; “a family of statements”.

(Talja, 2000)

- As Frohmann (1994) emphasizes , Foucault-influenced discourse analysis does not study the rules and conventions of mundane talk; rather , it examines “serious speech acts”, institutionalized talk or practices”
- Meaning may depend on the local and broader discursive system in which utterance is embedded.
- Variability...each actor has many different voices
- The discourses existing in a particular field can be discerned on the basis of the interpretative acts , or points of incompatibility, present in the texts under study (Foucault, 1972; Parker, 1992). Search for pattern of repertoires:
 - 1 Analysis of inconsistencies and internal contradictions in the answers of participant.
 - 2 Identification of regular patterns in the variability of accounts: repeatedly occurring descriptions, explanations, and arguments, in different participants’ talk (Potter and Wetherell, 1987)
 - 3 Identifying the basic assumptions and starting points (statements) which underlie a particular way of talking about a phenomenon.
- According to Foucault (1972) the internal coherence of a discourse is not based on 1: the object of the talk; 2 the style or manner of speech, 3 a coherent and logical system of terms, or 4 established themes. When it is possible to discern a limited viewpoint on the basis of which the objects, style and themes of talk are selected and common concepts are defined, one can speak of a discourse (Foucault, 1972).
- According to Foucault each discourse is based on a few background assumptions , or statements , as he calls them.
- Volsinov: a (1986) A word can get cemented as one-accented

- Volsinov emphasises that it is always a particular viewpoint, or horizon of evaluation , that brings “the facts” into speakers’ sight.
- As discourse provide the language for talking about a topic, for presenting knowledge and views, in a profound sense , they construct the lived reality (Hall, 1992).
- It means exploring the particular connotations, allusions and implications which particular discursive forms evoke
- Discourses are not individual creations: they have taken their shape with the passage of time, they reflect the whole history of the societal form, and they have effects, which no one has consciously meant.
- Historically- formed discourses are repositories of starting points, definitions and themes that position the speakers as they give meanings to phenomena (Hall, 1982; Parker, 1992)
- Discourse produce the objects of which they speak and the speaking subjects- Wittgenstein’s well-known critique of private languages.
- The kind of navigation between different subject positions, or temporary identities and categories of person, strongly clashes with the traditional view that qualitative research should aim at capturing the speakers’ authentic intentions, experiences, meanings and behaviour
- Bakhtin (1981) Words of language are always half someone else’s. When subjects use words they formulate themselves and their thoughts from the point of view of others, from the point of view of their “community”.
- Individuals are not able to modify the resources of interpretation freely, since they are limited by the episteme of a specific cultural and historical phase.
- Validity and Reliability of DA: Research data do not describe reality, they are specimens of interpretative practise. In the specimen perceptive, the question of generalizability is

approached from a different direction: a key concept is possibility (Perakyla, 1007).

Social practise that are possible, that is the possibilities of language use are the central objects of analysis

- DA makes visible on-going conversations, important debates and interpretative conflicts exiting in society, and the genuine ambivalence of many social questions and issues.

Show problems and possibilities

Appendix B.3: Language, Space and Time.

(i) Language, Space and Time.

First off it seems to me that these interviews are constructed out of a recognisably anthropocentric discourse of Renaissance humanism where the human being is constructed out of several basic presuppositions: as possessing free will, as evolving towards perfectibility, as living in a human-centred world. For example, I, as a researcher, am fashioned by the very discourse which I proclaim to critique using FDA. This is shown, for example, in my invitation to the respondent to locate meaning in the individual “feelings, thoughts and perceptions” (2,7). I deploy the very discourses which construct a subjectivity characterised by coherence and a free-willed individuality presumed to be the architect of its surrounding environment. The respondents’ discourse is also overwhelmingly structured by anthropocentric, humanist discourse, especially in its avowal of individual agency. This is of course unavoidable in one sense because of the structure of language where the conventions of the pronominal forms are often automatically identified with corresponding objects in reality. Rimbaud’s formulation of the problem of the linguistic expression of subjectivity, “je est un autre” is a concise critique of the very assumptions undergirding the possibilities of thought (Rimbaud, 2000).

Thus grammar and discourse position the interviewer and interviewee in a number of finite and limited positions from which reality can be apprehended. The next major discursive formation constitutive of the subject within this interview is the discourse of science. The discourse of science deployed within the following interviews is a mechanistic Newtonian scientific discourse (pre-twentieth century) which constructs the world in a predictable manner according to the rules of causality, unity of time and space. This discourse allows for the integrity of the human subject to be maintained in line with the Humanist construction of

man as a free agent. The subject is normalised with the temporal/spatial grid of essentialist Western Philosophy in contradistinction to other possible discourses of time and space such as Aboriginal Space time or contemporary string theory. Philosophy and science has its derivative discourses such as the Enlightenment discourse which is a further elaboration of the construction of man as a teleological adventure in rationality, expressed throughout the interview in such statements as, “If I could do anything to enlighten” (1, 15), “You see, you have the idea that the perpetrators...were people of sharpened enlightened...moral perceptions” (1, 375).

Appendix B4: Analytic Tool Box

Version 8

KEY QUESTIONS	CORRESPONDING ANALYTIC STAGE
<p>How is “institutional abuse constructed”?</p> <p>What type of object does the discourse construct in terms of institution, industrial school child and the wider society?</p> <p>What’s not constructed?</p>	<p>DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS</p> <p>(NEGATIVE SIGN OF DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION)</p>
<p>What discourses are drawn upon in the conversation?</p> <p>Locate within wider social discourse</p> <p>What are the relationships between these discourses?</p>	<p>DISCOURSES</p> <p>APPARATUS- NETWORK THAT BINDS VARIOUS DISCOURSE TOGETHER. MASTER DISCOURSE</p>
<p>What subject position is made available by that construction? Who is speaking on behalf of whom?</p>	<p>POSITIONINGS</p> <p>and</p> <p>SUBJECTIVITY</p>

<p>What can be felt, thought experienced from various subjects?</p> <p>Subjectivisation V Subjugation</p>	
<p>What are the functions of these discourses?</p> <p>What are the effects of these constructions?</p> <p>What is gained from constructing an event/person in this way? What is the speaker doing?</p>	<p>DISCURSIVE FUNCTION AND EFFECT</p> <p>(ACTION ORIENTATION)</p>

Apparatus is the network that binds discourse together (psychiatry, judicial system, epidemiology)

.

Appendix B8: Sample of worked analysis from an interview

Section 1

Q Emm..thw...Ok R. Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed.

Emm..thw...Hesitation. Confusion.

“Ok R.” What is Ok? The situation, the person? Who , what or who or what is being addressed by this word. OK was originally used as an electioneering slogan (OED). Is this one of the recessive properties of this word? What do I want the respondent to vote for? Use of informal personal address , use of first name.

“**Thank you for agreeing** ”: Convention of courtesy. Elision of subject through apheresis. Use of gerund to indicate the unfolding nature of the agreement which can be revoked or continued at any time. (Process, not state or event)

“to be interviewed”: Passive construction. Something does to the subject. What other positions are elided by the refusal of alternatives other than “interviewed” such as conversation, take part, to respond? Connotations of interview: application for job, journalistic exchange. Earlier meanings included a meeting of two people or sharing of minds, mutuality (OED) but more recent meanings are much more formal and less about a meeting between two people than a formal state of knowledge inquiry and formal conferencing: media, academia, commerce. In other words, over time discourses have altered the signifying properties of the word. The urgent needs of the institutional practise have grabbed the word and reshaped according to the imperative of the apparatus/dispositive.

Discursive Constructions

1. Courtesy.
2. Response constructed as volitional

3. Response constructed as elicited from passive party
4. Response constructed within more recent discursive formation: academic, economic, journalistic in contrast with other former discourses (courtly poetry for example)

Discourses

1. Diplomacy? Courtesy.
2. Judaeo-Christian philosophy- Humanist philosophy: Cartesian Subject.
Phenomenological Subject. (Free will, individual agency).
3. Academia.
4. Economics (Language of recruitment)
5. Journalism.

Negative Sign of Discourses

1. Absence of courtesy markers.
2. Foucauldian Discourse
3. Plain speech
4. Vernacular
5. Gift Exchange (Hyde, 1983)
6. Privacy- Non-Distribution- (Not Academia)

Discursive Function:

(1) Conciliatory. To reduce conflict.

(2) To open up communication between different states (states of being?)

Positionings:

The respondent is constructed in the passive tense.

Practise

The number of possibilities for action are quite wide but there have been markers laid down, locating the interview in the context of academic inquiry with all the implications of that discourse already structuring the opening of our exchange. Naturally, this is a follow on from the signing of the ethics release form and the reading of participant information, thereby codifying the interview within the discourse of academia.

Subjectivity.

At this stage it is not clear what can be thought, felt from the various subject positions.

Preliminary observations are that the subject positions are at once informal and formal. The discursive construction is academic but the positions mapped out within the discursive construction are apparently informal (use of address of first name). Is there a concealed manipulation going on with this alloy of formal and informal discourse? To put it another way, would it not have been possible for the discourse to have been kept more formal? It seems to me that that what can be felt or thought is in part constituted out of discourses of courtesy (formality) and informality (use of personal address). In line with the above notes on the function of these discourses it may be stated that the function of courtesy is manifold but includes (a) conciliation and thereby may foreclose conflict and (b) generative- in that it generates trust or warmth, thereby constructing subjects that are positioned in closeness to

each other. On the other hand, the academic discourse constructs subjects that are distanced from each other, that the respondent is positioned passively by use of a formal discursive marker (interview). Subjectivity vacillates between these two poles.

Section 2

A **Uh hm**

Uh hm: Acquiescent? Affirmative? Non-Committal? Committal?

Q **For this topic which , for the purposes of this interview today will be your response to emmm the instiution that is St Josephs in Salthill.**

Section 3

“For this topic which,”: Use of selection and classifying tool. Etymology linked to “place, commonplace and local” (OED)

“for the purposes of this interview today”,: Aim , object of inquiry- plural form.

What are the purposes of this interview? Have they been spelled out? Grammatical contradiction between the plural subject clause and its singular complement: the next clause:

“will be your response to emm” : the expectation of the grammatical heralding sign of “your purposes” deferred by the singular “your response”. Perhaps “your response” functions as a false singular, an umbrella singular , concealing multiple responses.

Note the future tense, as if the interview has been deferred but it has started. Use of tense, of deferred action, anticipation, fear of the present.

Discursive constructions

1. Response constructed as purposive
2. Response constructed as contradictory: both plural and singular.
3. Response constructed as temporally locatable.
4. Response constructed as temporally contradictory.
5. Response constructed as deferred.

Discourses: (In parentheses are the negative sign of discourse, **NSD**)

1. Rhetoric. Language of debates: “topic”. (NSD: plain speech)
2. Discourse of Newtonian physics. (NSD Post Newtonian physics- string theory, relativity)
3. Academia (NSD: Quotidian)

Discursive Function:

1. To present a context of referentiality. To move from idealism to materiality within language. To enable communication.
2. Speaker is constructing a version of how reality can be constructed.

Positionings:

1. Passivity-subject subjected to academic discourse.

Practise:

1. No possibility for present action as the response is constructed as having been deferred. Limited degrees of freedom.
2. Academia- means that the possibilities for action/reaction are limited.
3. Rhetoric. What does it mean to refer to a topic for an interview as opposed to for another function, for example self -revelation? It keeps the available positions for action located in the *topos* of the interview.

Subjectivity

Response as originally possessed by the participant but then he is dispossessed of responsiveness as his response is deferred by the grammatical construction. So he is given the capacity to respond and to not respond at the same time. Also the response is constructed as possessed by respondent (your response) rather than constructed by interview. In other words the response is constructed as an essential category within the subject, rather than as co-constructed process.

Section 4

A **Uhh hmm**

Q Emm. First of all I'd like to ask you what were your thoughts or feelings or responses to me asking you to take place, to, to take part in this interview?

Discursive Constructions:

1. Construction of response as deferred (I'd like to)
2. Construction of response as historical
3. Construction of response in cognitive and affective modes.
4. Construction of discourse of participation.

Discourses

1. Discourse of idealism (wish fulfillment/deferred reality)
2. Discourse of cognitive, behavioural therapy. (thoughts, feelings)
3. Discourse of democracy (shared values)

NSD

1. Discourse of materialism or engagement
2. Discourse of affect/irrationality/surrealism/ non- conditioned responses.
3. Discourse of theocracy, autocracy, anarchy etc.

Positionings:

Interviewer speaking on behalf of academic institution. Respondent positioned as a thinker, feeler but not as actor. Interviewer positioned as agentic character and respondent as passive character.

Practise:

The possibilities for practise are restricted to the academic domaine because of the constructions of self and object: passivity, deferred action, idealism and democratic discourse (not rupturing or revolutionary discourse)

Subjectivity:

The above segment facilitates the construction of a subject within temporal/spatial and logical grid (first of all...to take place, to take part). Subject is normalised within this grid of essentialist Western philosophy (time and space) in contradistinction to say other discourses of time and space such as Aboriginal dream time or the mathematical perception of time and space. In other words language insists on a certain way of viewing the world.

Section 5

Emm. Well, I felt, I ,well I thought was that if my memories of, of that institution and of others. My mother was raised in one in _. And you know if I could do anything to enlighten people as to the general feeling or response to the revelations, the public revelations.

Shift from affective to cognitive, from singular to plural. Possessive and personal to the named locale. Shift to address to cognitive aspect in interviewer. Use of enlightenment .

DC

1. Thought and feeling constructed
2. Memory constructed
3. Mother/child rearing constructed.
4. Construction of deductive method of science proposes from general to particular.
Or is it the inductive method? Perhaps not clear in this material.
5. Distinction between public and private constructed.
6. Idea of enlightenment constructed

Discourses

1. Deductive reasoning (NSD: inductive method)
2. Historical past constructed. (NSD: the contemporary past)
3. Public and private discourse. (NSD- combined public/private discourse)
4. Scientific Discourse-Induction/Deduction- (NSD: Arational – for example pre-socratic discourse/magical thinking)
5. Enlightenment discourse. NSD (Pre-enlightenment discourse- magic/prescience/poetry/asynchronicity)
6. Buddhist discourse. (NSD: Western hegemonic Christianity (duality))

Discursive Function

1. Function of these discourses is to construct an intelligent and intelligible subject.

2. The discourse constructs a world outside the interview.
3. The speaker is constructing personality (my mother) and impersonality (the people, the general feeling)
4. Discourse creates an audience. Moves interview beyond the dyadic.

Positionings

1. Speaker is positioned in time- speaking on behalf of mother and on behalf of people. However, the speaker is not speaking on his own behalf or rather the discourse in which he is located seems to position him as peripheral to the mother and the people.

Practice

1. There is a certain foreclosure of practise implied in this discourse because the subject is dead (mother) and the recipients of discourse are absent. Therefore who is the respondent talking to and why? Moreover if the speaker is directing his discourse to an unnamed, perhaps fantasy audience who or what is doing the talking and to whose desire is the speaker responding? None other, perhaps than the imagined audience constructed by the academic discourse. Also, the reference to the specific institution is followed by unnamed institutions. Perhaps a reference to the institutional discourse in which we are both operating. (academic)

Subjectivity

1. Personal past and impersonal context. How can the subject be recognised when there are so many other actors in this field mother, the people and abstract thoughts such as the Enlightenment? Does the pressure of the need to account for himself cause the

subject in this instance to become absent? Perhaps , too much can be felt at the personal pole and too little can be felt at the impersonal pole and the subject wavers like a compass between the two.

Section 6.

We all knew privately it was going on anyway, you know when we were young we all knew there were sinister things going on at St Josephs and we used to see these boys, you know labouring in the fields, in the depths of winter and they ...it was in situated in a , in a

DC

1. Knowledge constructed as private, belonging to the mass and to the young. (NDC: public, individual and adult- does this mean that knowledge is not possessed by adults or does it mean that knowledge is individual and public or all these categories not mutually exclusive? Is there knowledge being constructed in binary modes here : private versus public, individual versus all, old versus the young. However, is it not possible that some of these categories create confusion as knowledge can be both public/communal and individual, private and public. In other words, the words construct a version of reality contingent on a binary opposition which may not exist outside this discursive field. To summarise: Discourse constructed out of binary categorisation.
2. Discourse construction of the sinister object. From the Latin meaning left. Does this belong to a wider discourse on left-handedness as deviance and which was corrected within institutions until the late 20th century. Various discourses of left-

handedness constructed lefthanders as weak, diabolic and homosexual from the Classical Era to more recent times.

3. Discourse – grammar constructs objects (boys) in the past and in the present and constructs as visible.
4. Boys constructed as “labouring in the fields” (contrast this to much later in interview when boys aren’t seen by him when he works there as painter).
Constructs a rural tableau like a scene from Millais or an American movie of chain gang prisoners
5. Memory constructed in time- “in the depths of winter”. Use of rhetoric.

Discourses

1. Analytic Knowledge (categorisation..you could say this of the whole text? Yes, but there is a degree of intensity in certain aspects where the power of analytic thought seems to shape the thing viewed or said. Not all discursive talk has this feature. For example, Dr Johnson was noted for his extraordinary eloquence and his ability to talk in prose. His subjectivity was constituted by the discourse of prose.
2. Discourse of the sinister. (Left-handedness, the devil, homosexuality, horror movies etc.)
3. Discourse of the visible- “esse est percipi”. To be is to be perceived (Berkeley).

Discursive function:

1. To construct childhood and adulthood.

2. To construct a scene to appeal to compassion

Positionings

- 1 Speaker is speaking on behalf of an undefined “we”. We can see the seen (the boys) but not the seers. Technique of the camera, the impartial regard. Speaker is speaking on behalf of at least four subjects: community, the young, the boys (the objects whom he describes) and his family which is the discourse directly following on from this. So, there are a wide number of subject positions made available in this discursive section, thereby complicating how we can understand what is being communicated.

Practise

1. Knowledge is possible, private, individual and communal.
2. Perception is possible-
3. Speech or action do not seem possible

Subjectivity

1. Cellular/Larval subjectivity- “we all knew”. How can massed knowledge be operationalized as individual knowledge? Is this type of knowledge a version of Bollas’ unthought known or Bion’s undigested knowledge, knowledge that has not been reflected upon (beta knowledge)? Or indeed, does this refer to Klein’s notion of the internal object that is concrete, lodged within the individual, on the borders of the psyche and soma, which eludes reflection because it is felt as an elemental part of the individual, a constituent of the psyche, beyond awareness thus incapable of being integrated into experience and thus subjectivity remains at a larval stage.

Section 7.

..my uncle was raised there actually, now that I think about it , my uncle Tom, my brother's, my mother's brother. He was raised there and my mother was raised in Taylor's Hill in St Anne's, another orphan's institution where she went in there when she was 4 and came out when she was 17. Neither of them ever mentioned this in their lives. We found out when we were advanced in adulthood.

Construction of upbringing (raised). The word "raised "is a word that can be used to classify the upbringing of human and animal. Also , there are myriad meanings latent in the word , such as its constructivist possibilities such as "raising the dead, raising a question, a subject etc."

Discursive constructions

1. Construction of extended family.
2. Construction of constructivist perspective .
3. Construction of family as possessed "My"
4. Construction of Platonic idealism (now that I think of it).
5. Construction of cognitive primacy.
6. Construction of "orphan institution" – contradicted by the facts- the mother was not an orphan.
7. Construction of them and us . (Neither of them...we found out)

8. Construction of timelines (4, 17, advanced adulthood)
9. Construction of mute actors.

Discourses

1. Biography: Dickensian biography (orphan literature)

DF: To use the resources of biography to furnish autobiography? To introduced more subject positions. To construct the family within a larger tradition of 19 and 20th century biographical norms. (Dickens, Zola, Balzac, movies and musicals such as David Copperfield, Annie, Oliver Twist. Heathcliff in Wuthering Heights- the unspoken point of origin . Personal memory of being greatly affected by Oliver Twist . Powerful discourse of orphanology which is a sub discourse of biography.

2. Orphanology.

DF

1. To create empathy/sympathy in line with the df of the genre of orphanology.
2. Appeals to a wide audience because of the strong penetration of discourse in music, film, art etc.

Positionings:

The respondent is positioning himself in contradistinction to orphans, even though the subjects referred to are not orphans, they become orphans by virtue of their belong to an “orphan institution.” I wonder about the discourse of orphans as directed to consumers who are not orphans. What is the reason for the success of this discourse? Relief at one’s parented ontology? Or the gain in exploring the subjectivity of orphanhood by using the discourse. A sort of solution to an oedipal drama where one is the child of one’s parents but avoids intercourse or murder by not being the child of one’s parents, by becoming orphaned.

Practise:

Memorialist constructions. Limited possibilities for practise because actors are dead and events constructed in the past. Orientation towards the past.

Subjectivity

The various subjects are constructed as silent, uncommunicative. They are constructed as having being “raised” , perhaps raised from the dead. The respondent constructing subjectivities in order to elaborate on his own subjectivity which was existentially absent, (before birth), then ontologically absent (as a child, the experience is unspoken). (See , *The Dark Room*, Dillon, 2007 in which he mentions Nabokov analysis of photograph of a time before he was a born (*Speak Memory*) and he refers to himself as a chronophobe. Hatred of time that does not belong to us.

Subjectivity is temporally organised and according to the modality of 19th century discourse: orphans (them) versus the family (us). Complex combinatory subjectivity: respondent + mother + uncle+brother+ mother’s brother. The

slippage in text indicates the fluidity of subjectivity as it flows from respondent to uncle to brother's absence, to mother's brother. Of course, St Anne was mother of Mary and grandmother of Jesus Christ who was not an orphan but was half an orphan in that he was born of Mary but not of Joseph. (Jewish matrilineal genealogy). The importance of genealogy as a discourse in Ireland.

Subject is normalised according to two poles: orphaned or parented. This takes place with a larger Christian tradition of debate over parentage and lineage.

Modern version : DNA discourse.

Section 8

We six children of my mother's emmm..that she had indeed been, been raised in this institution and we knew, of course, the reputation of these places but knowledge in those days was discouraged to say the least of it and emm, you know punitive measures would be taken if you suggested that, that anything was other than the authorities would like you to believe it was.

Discursive Constructions

1. Family /children constructed in matrilineal fashion
2. Upbringing constructed
3. Knowledge constructed
4. Punishment constructed (Lateral effects)
5. Resistance/Authority constructed

Discourses

1. Autobiography
2. Knowledge/Ignorance
3. Authority
4. Resistance (1960's talk)

Discursive Function

1. To construct private and public contexts.
2. To construct a historical scene.

Positionings:

Speaker positioned as part of group (family of 6) as located in an unspecified time “those days”. Speaker speaks from group process. Positioned against identified authorities who punish the pursuit of knowledge.

Practise

Practise needs to be considered as something other than its common sense meaning. It needs to be considered that speech too can be a practise. Furthermore, speech is constructed as not possible then but possible now. Is there an implication that the present encourages knowledge more? Perhaps possibilities for practise greater if referenced in the present. Ambivalence in the discourse of whether practise is possible according to two axis: temporal (in the past /present) and modality (thought, speech and action)

Subjectivity

We- children of a family speaking en masse. Subjectivity flows from 1st person plural to second person address to impersonal desubjectivised hand of authority: “punitive measures would be taken if you suggested” Construction of subjectivity through knowledge. Two types of subjectivities: knowledge that is silent /passive or that is active/expressible/expressed.

Power

1. Family/Institution/ Authorities.
2. Panopticon power machine (the all seeing discourager of knowledge)
3. Forbidding objects “unnamed- the authorities.
4. Constituting objects (the family, permitting speech, acting as a dynamo to combat the lack of sufficient dynamism in individual representation). Watch out for when the constituting object becomes a forbidding object.

Section 9:

So, in a sense the public revelations and the various investigatory boards and all that came as no surprise to those of us (I am 75 now so I would have memories going back, certainly 65 years, clear memories and emm what, what was shocking was the extent of it. We didn't quite realise that it was endemic, that it was almost a working part of the culture if I could put it that way without being facetious.

Discursive Constructions

1. Knowledge as revelation (religious) and constructed as public versus private.
2. Investigation and the administrative apparatus constructed as expected
3. Reality constructed through memory (“clear memories”)
4. Construction of the abuse as shocking and extensive, (endemic) shocking because extensive. Is abuse which is isolated constructible as less shocking or more shocking? Contradicts Gill’s work on abuse where large scale abuse seems to have less impact than individualised narratives.
5. Construction of abuse as cultural.
6. Construction of opinion about abuse as permissible or subject to evaluation/laughter?
7. Construction of culture as plastic and protean. (working culture)

Discourses

1. Religious discourse (revelations)
2. Legal discourse (investigatory bodies)
3. Private and Public Discourse
4. Rhetorical discourse (not surprising, shocking)
5. Autobiographical discourse (memories)
6. Discourse of culture (of live culture)

Discursive Function

To use religious discourse and autobiographical discourse to construct private knowledge as equal to public knowledge. In other words, the respondent constructs the public revelations as not surprising. But then he constructs the revelations as shocking, thereby putting two constructions of the same object in contrast with each other which has a jarring effect. The construction of knowledge as not surprising may have the function of preserving a sense of potency or omnipotence, a childlike, private, magical knowledge (picked up in the word “revelations”- the discourse of epiphany. Then the discourse rubs up against the world of symbolic meaning (public discourse)

Positionings

1. Us. The speaker positioned as member of group-
2. Positioned historically in time (75 years old)
3. We positioned outside of culture- “abuse” constructed as working part of culture but “we didn’t realise it was endemic”

Practise

There seems to be a contrast between knowledge and realisation and that these are two very different constructs, both which allow awareness but the latter constructs seems to allow for greater possibilities of action. Practise seems to be linked to processes of realisation . People seem to be able to know but this does not

conduce to speech or action but if people realise they are more in a position to say and to act.

Subjectivity

1. Massed. Combinatory. Multivoiced. The “I” cannot see? “Je est un autre”
2. Subjectivity organic in the sense that knowledge of abuse does not disturb organic homeostasis. (Abuse constructed as not surprising)
3. Subjectivity alters with time- shift from knowledge to realisation –
4. Subjectivity normalised by “working culture”
5. Subjectivity contrast with plastic culture and constructed as more stable (previous excerpt 8 : we knew of course; this excerpt, no surprise)

Resistance

Made possible by this shift from inert knowledge to active realisation which can be operationalized within “working culture”. Also subjectivity made less stable, and less monolithic by this shift in discourse from conceptual idealism to materialist realism.

Section 10

So we used to see these boys, now I was in the army with some of these boys, that the tendency was for these boys was to leave these institutions to come into the army, from one institution into another. And quite a number of them came into the army and there were, I was going to say, graduates of these places, (mild laughter) but they had been in these places, but the remarkable thing about them

was their silence. Now the army is pretty raucous place as you can imagine and you know you live in a dormitory with men coming from all sorts of psychological directions but they were renowned for their passivity and consequently were bullied in , as , the., they pretty much continued being abused in another institution called , “The Army”. And it is, it is as though they- I don’t want to be speculative, philosophical or psychological about this but it did seem that if they had settled on that as a method of life that for, for, for food and shelter came with it sort of abuse. Ehh , (sigh) So, I have forgotten what the question was actually

DC

1. Residents of schools constructed as “boys”, as visible (recurring DC) and again later as “renowned” (very visible)
2. Biography of residents constructed as “institutional”
3. Residents constructed “graduates” (University discourse)
4. Residents constructed as “silent”
5. Residents constructed as passive and bullied and abused.
6. Residents constructed as boys but people in the army are constructed as men.
7. Army men constructed as “coming from all sorts of psychological directions” set up as contrast to unidirectional, unpsychological, passive, abused, demasculinised ex residents
8. Residents constructed as having free will (it did seem that they had settled on that as a method of life”

Discourses.

1. Discourse of perception/vision. DF is to equate perception with awareness, what is perceived is made to exist,
2. Discourse of institutions (the army, the university) DF is to locate the discursive object (those who were in institutions) in the wider carceral net.
3. Discourse of masculinity (boys and men). DF is to take away the potency of those who were in the institutions, de sex them. Perhaps this discourse alludes to unsaid homosexual practises.
4. Discourse constructed as speculative, philosophical and psychological.
5. Discourse of civilisation (psychological men versus the animal boys (settling for food and shelter). DF: To construct the locale of abuse as one restricted to basic animal needs. To construct institutional abuse as occurring in non-discursive domains: the boys are silent, animal in contrast to the speaker's psychological, speculative and philosophical discourse.

Positionings

1. Shift from "We" to "I"
2. Speaks on behalf of those who were in institutions.
3. Speaker positioned as individual (I) psychological, philosophical and speculative whereas residents are positioned as deindividualised, demasculinized, and naturalized (as animal). Positioning of nature versus culture through the act of discourse.

Practise

1. The ex-residents of the school cannot speak or act as they or constructed as silent, passive, and consequently opaque.
2. The others are presented as active, masculine and vocal (raucous)
3. The university (and by association the interviewer) is positioned in the same domaine as the abused (graduates) who are passive, institutionalised and silent. (this crops up again) and therefore the possibilities for practise in university are nullified.

Subjectivity

1. Culture promotes the recognition of the subject (I don't want to be speculative, philosophical or psychological)
2. Nature nullifies the subject's recognition of self- they are seen but they do not seem to see
3. Certain subjects drawn to institutions. The speaker does not say why he or non-residents of schools were in the Army. This remains unsaid, but yet he speaks for the "dumb" subjects, the residents of the industrial schools.

Power

1. Institutional power of the army: Individuality constructed by discipline according to cellular ("dormitory"); organic (food/shelter), genetic (accumulation of time-from industrial school to Army); combinatory (masculinity, institutions, sexuality, education, psychology)

Section 11

E Emm, So, you, you're saying that they, they found one institution after

P Yes

E after another

DC

Reconstructing respondent's construction of passive into active- they found.

Discourses

Mirroring (Rogerian?)

DF: To clarify or perhaps to adjust?

Positioning- I am positioning the respondent more firmly as origin of discourse. He positioned himself in 10 as we and I.

Subjectivity: My intervention leads to a cementing of subjective positions.

Section 12.

P Yes they did and equally secretive institution. Ahh, in a sense you see, I have friends who were in St Joseph's- to get straight to the point- and many many years ago they had, I don't know if I'm supposed to name the clerics or not name them. But

for the sake of whatever discretion , we shan't name them, suffice to say that one of these clerics ended up as the Bishop of Galway. And my friends, well one friend in particular and then others that I know of, but my intimate friend, my good friend Denis had actually complained to this man about the abuse of a child who was bugged on his Holy Communion day. Shocking, horrendous stuff. Now this man later became the secretary of another bishop and then he became a bishop .

DC

1. Institutions as secretive
2. Abuse constructed as an identifiable topic (a point)
3. Residents constructed as friends
4. Discourse constructed as open to censorship (I don't know if I am supposed to name)
5. Abuser constructed as complainant.
6. Abuse constructed as buggery and defilement.
7. Constructed as shocking/horrendous.
8. Constructed as defilement (buggery on Holy Communion Day)
9. Hierarchy constructed (boy, man, secretary, bishop)
10. Revelation constructed as heard

Discourses

1. Friendship. **DF**: to contrast with discourse of signor and vassal (complainant to priest, priest to secretary, secretary to bishop)
2. Discourse of the confessional (secrecy) – complainant as confessor. **DF**- to thwart the circulation of speech outside the confessional box. Confessional discourse as constraint.
3. Hierarchy. **DF** To show how knowledge had a bottom up approach but there was no horizontal spilling over-in contrast to media discourse , where knowledge flows along horizontal planes.
4. Clerical/Catholic discourse (Sanctity (St Joseph's, Holy Communion Day, Bishop) . **DF**: To locate the institution within the name of the saint, within history , within the name of the impotent father of Jesus (Joseph), within the 200 year old history of Christianity. To give temporal and historical depth to the context of the abuse.

Positionings and Subjectivity

1. Respondent speaking on behalf of friend who speaks on behalf of abused boy to priest who may speak or may not on behalf of boy or complainant to another (bishop). Positions of secrecy taken and this is replicated within the discourse of the respondent who does not name the priest and I as respondent to respondent to not ask, so therefore the circle of secrecy is maintained and closed and we are all positioned within it. I, my respondent, the friend (the complainant, the abused boy (now a man if alive), the secretary, the bishop) Is there such a thing as a disciplining secrecy, a non-discursive element that enjoins us not to go beyond and to break the secret.

2. Subjectivity .

Here subjectivity is constituted by a marker designating a category Saint, boy, friend, cleric, man secretary, bishop. All of these positions like pieces on a chessboard allow certain limited positions of manoeuvre. Notice the absence of any feminine designation of subjectivity in terms of the network of relations established.

Practice

Like in statistics where there is such a thing as limited degrees of freedom, this seems to be the case as constituted by this discourse.

Power

Complainant tells cleric who becomes secretary who speak/does not speak to Bishop (we do not know) – complainant tells my respondent who tells me- but the important thing to bear in mind is that knowledge \neq power. Important distinction between *connaissance* and *savoir*. Maybe this maps onto the distinction noted earlier on between knowing and realizing.

Note the resistance to the silence. Resistance and compliance. Discourse of linking the profane with the sacred is a form of resistance as an engagement with taboo, and an attack on culture.

Section 13

And we were all of us convinced that this was track covering, cover our tracks thing.
And we still- when I say we , I mean the people of Bohermore, the ordinary people
who have the background knowledge to this sinister darkness, not to mention the

Magdalen Laundry. And Emm, we always sort of expected somebody to subpoena the records of the Galway diocese, which they obviously haven't.

DC

1. Abuse constructed as covered up, “track covering”
2. Community members constructed as ordinary
3. Knowledge constructed as background
4. Abuse constructed as sinister darkness.
5. Abuse constructed as not just isolated to institution in question
6. Construction of the geographical limits –diocese; different to secular geographical constructions (town, county, province versus parish, diocese, arch diocese, Rome)

Discourses

1. Discourse of the down to earth- the ordinary . **DF:** For the discourse to be validated as common sensical and thus impervious to interpretation. The common folk, the vernacular, the tell it how it us –powerful discursive operation which upholds and propagates limited and limiting constructions of reality, but leaves the subject with the illusion of being content with having chosen from the limited repertoire available to it.
2. Discourse of the sinister (see earlier reference) **DF:** To locate “abuse” within the categories of Christian superstition (the sinistral); referred to in above.

3. Discourse of Christianity (Magdalan Laundry) **DF** : To repeat the discursive insistence of the “fallen woman”, the implicit Madonna and Whore discourse.
4. Legal Discourse . **DF**: To combat one powerful resistance with another. (We were convinced-the verbal form of conviction)

Positionings. Subjectivity and Practise

1. Massed subjectivity-“we, the people”
2. The people positioned as having the background knowledge. Who has foreground knowledge? What is the function of “background knowledge”, but to remain in the background, occulted from vision.
3. The people positioned as ordinary-powerful discourse that normalizes a whole community through process of desubjectivisation.
4. Impotent subjectivity- “we always sort of expected somebody to subpoena the records”. Somebody does not belong to the mass.
5. Practise – deferred- “we always expected somebody” . The subject position inhabited by “we” is not an agentive body. The agentive body is the “somebody” is the expected figure.

Power

1. Again knowledge \neq power. Convictions/background knowledge belonging to the people but expectation of “sujet suppose savoir” to be called up by legal discourse.

2. Networks of relations – the successful disciplining of bodies ensuring that activities are natural for them : this is one of the organic characteristics of discipline which constructs individuality- which constructs the ordinary folk who are not alienated are uncanny but are possessing of background knowledge, but the discourse does not seem to allow for the sense of how emasculated the knowledge is. Instead the discourse of common sense ensures the integrity of the subject, the lack of disruption of the concept of the subject, and therefore the continuing homogenization of the social space.

Section 14

Q When you say we, who are you referring to?

I Well the neighborhood. Well I mean some Galway boys were in , were in, in St Josephs. And ahh, we all knew their families . They were mostly there because their mother died. In St Wi..blrrr..emm. Ah, As opposed to Letterfrack which was seen as a , as a really punishment place, a, a gulag, incidentally we didn't have that word but you know the Irish gulag was these awful places. But people went there because they were unruly and they wouldn't go to school and stuff like that but in St Joseph's they were orphans for the most part , they weren't there to be punished so to speak. And the interesting thing is when you mentioned to me about this project I had a very vivid memory of- I need to give you a little bit of background on this.

DC

1. Construction of residents in industrial school as part of the community
2. Construction of residents as orphans through death of mother- perhaps a cross layering of autobiographical discourse and discourse of “institutional abuse”.
3. Institution constructed as gulag/not gulag
4. Residents constructed as unruly and truants.
5. Constructed as not punished.
6. Discourse constructed as having background and foreground.

Discourses

1. Discourse of ein volk, the people. DF: To foreclose critique or scrutiny because of the self-evident common sense language of the people. To disguise individual difference and heterogeneity.
2. Discourse of incarceration –“the gulag” of punishment. DF: To install fear, to situate “institutional abuse” within an historical context , which appears to be a tendentious comparison? (Soviet gulag versus Irish industrial schools). Respondent refers to the absence of this discursive term, “We didn’t have the word for that”

3. Discourse of punishment. DF: Incarceration \neq Punishment (not necessarily) Two very different discourses
4. Discourse of memory : DF: To authenticate the construction. “I have a very vivid memory”
5. Discourse of visual painting –giving background. (repeated motif of two planes: background and unmentioned foreground. Is the foreground deferred, does it exist? Is there just background?

Positioning, Subjectivity and Practise

1. Residents positioned within the local community.
2. Speaker position adjacent to residents of school as within the community.
3. Speakers positioned as “not having the word” as outside discourse
4. Residents of industrial school positioned in relation to another industrial school and thus positioned as the inverse of unruly and truant, as docile and compliant?
5. The neighbourhood, the industrial school, the mothers

Power and Resistance

1. Networks of relations: Galway/Not Galway boys. The importance of geography. Boys known through their families.
2. Relations between institutions : St Josephs and Letterfrack. Letterfrack was also St Josephs but rarely referred to as thus; referred by its topographical marker. Letterfrack was an isolated and rural institution and the other institution named is located within a city.

3. Relationship between social and economic hubs and the institutions. Importance of distance from communication arteries. Letterfrack constructed as the “gulag” , related to the relations of topography. The speaker constructs the rural institution as more “punishing” than the urban institution.
4. Biopower: Normalising structuring of individual through family, through geography.
5. Disciplining- use of punishment and its transversal effects: the effects felt far from their originating locus. Rule of sufficient idealist : in other words, the symbolic efficacy of the punishment , the idea of punishment as a disciplining force within Irish society.
6. RESISTANCE: Little resistance as the discourse takes from the social cohesive structures (the neighbourhood) and repeats the historical constructions without critique (that Letterfrack was used to punish) . There is little detachment because the speaker is embedded within the community and the social discourse from which he speaks.

Section 15

I was raised by my grandparents in New Road until I was 8. I didn't know my mother actually until I was around 7 I think and I used to refer to her as “that woman” when she used to come and visit me but this household in New Road was very Victorian and very, ehh religious and emm. My grandfather had three daughters who were nuns , and all that kind of thing. It was a very sort of muted unlovely environment really and I went to the Bishop's school. Now the Bishop's school at that time, the

Bishops' school was opened in order, in order to give boys of a certain background, you had to pay half a crown every year, I later found out, I didn't know that, to go there and I went there and the interesting thing was while I was there I never once heard the word "Letterfrack", never once heard that word but when I was transferred to St Brendan's School, a national school in 1946, I would say, yes, 1946 of similar, (inaudible) I heard that word every day and it was used as a threat every single day.

Discursive Constructions.

1. Construction of personal biography as religious, motherless and Victorian.
2. Construction of unhomeliness/motherlessness.
3. Construction of upbringing as silent and unlovely (muted)
4. Construction of educational hierarchy (Bishop school/state school) and economics ("half a crown")
5. Different discourses in different schools.
6. Discourse of punishment and discipline (it was used as a threat every single day)
7. The industrial school as negative place is here constructed as not secret, in contrast to muteness of home- the threat is discursively operationalized but is the effect of the threat muted?

Discourses

1. Religion . DF: To illustrate a scene associated with rites and rituals, monotony.

2. Victorianism: DF: Associated phenomena: repressed sexuality, children to be seen and not heard.
3. Discourse of economics (fee of “half of crown” for Bishop’s school). DF: To reveal the workings of social division.
4. Discourse of punishment and discipline. DF: To show how the industrial school such as Letterfrack was used as a disciplining tool.
5. Discourse of Education. DF: To show how the industrial school was used as a disciplining function in one type of school
6. Discourse of background appears again (boys of a certain background). DF: To show the ongoing stratification of Irish society at all levels within the home (that woman, my grandparents, three daughters who were nuns) and within extrafamilial environment (the state school, the Bishop’s school and the industrial school).

NSD: Homeliness, Spontaneity, sexuality, economic freedom, “the hedgeschool (erstwhile illegal schools under British occupation).

Positionings, Subjectivity, Practise

1. House located in New Road but contrasted with old ways (Victorianism).
2. Speakers positioned as boy between two schools (Bishop’s and National) and between two generations (his mother’s and his grandparents’. The subject position of past self allows the e, speaker to telescope time, to construct the past from vantage point of the young boy but he later positions himself as finding it out knowledge later (you had to pay a crown a year, I later found out). Positioning between silence and noise, between naivety and knowledge, between being

outcast and en famille, between being fee paying and free, between Victorian era and the Modern (the Free State, born 1921). The language foists these positions on the subject.

3. In terms of subjectivity one can the anxieties that may have been felt by the speaker as his life wavered between radically different discourses. Or , more accurately, it could be argued that this is an ongoing discursive flux that may give rise to ongoing anxiety that at any one time that a certain discourse may confer on a subject unthinkable anxiety which shifts into another discourse which masks the previous discourse, but the effects of which , it must be assumed are no less significant than the replacing discourse. For example, in more recent times you have the shift from the Discourse of Dispossessed Irish to Celtic Tiger Irish (Business success) to the PIGS (the return of the an older discourse (The Irish with a pig under his arm) but now reconfigured in a multinational economic “shame” shared by Portugal, Greece and Spain.

Power

1. Networks of relations between patriarchy : the grandfather and the feminine with revelation of potential misogyny (“that woman”) .
2. Relations between religion and moral codes (Victorian) and the attendant suppression of voice (muted environment). Suppression of “vice” through voice through the social vicegrip.
3. Relationship between economics, social position and Catholic power.
4. The operation of disciplining discourse in the state but not in the Bishop’s school. Threat of abuse as a radiating influence. Note Foucault’s idea of 5 characteristics of

discipline: minimum quantity (that word (Letterfrack); sufficient ideality (symbolic-
 the threat not the reality, the idea of the thing, not the thing) ; rule of perfect certainty
 (that this place existed for undisciplined children; rule of common truth evidence
 (every day the word was used, becomes part of the truth; rule of optimal specification
 (all offences classified: that the boys were there not because of charity but because
 they had committed an offence of disobedience.

5. Shift between biopower and institutional power: the educational system, the Church
 and the repetition of discourses around the industrial school as a place of punishment
 for unruliness

Section 16

**You'd almost . You'd either hear of a boy who was sent to Letterfrack or a
 boy who had escaped from Letterfrack and there was , ..It was, it was It
 was extremely dramatic for me because I had never ...Letterfrack. What
 is this? Now. I found myself in Bohermore, in the first Government-
 sponsored ghetto, so to speak, except that it wasn't a ghetto in the modern
 sense of the world but it was a ghetto in the sense that it was a deprived
 area that the Government had built these houses and felt they had done
 enough for the people and the price you paid for being in those houses
 was absolute conformity and you didn't, you know, raise your head
 above the parapet, blah blah blah. So, I had been in what you might call a
 genteel, repressed , I suppose, environment and was then catapulted into
 an environment where , you know, everything was on the table, in a sense
 you know**

Discursive constructions

1. Construction of story through second hand accounts.
2. Construction of carceral discourse (escaped
3. Construction of social housing as ghettos and conformity inducing.
4. Construction of social housing as ungentle

Discourses:

1. Gossip. (You'd hear of a boy escaped)
2. Incarceration
3. Theatrical (It was extremely dramatic for me)
4. Governmentality
5. Repression/Gentility
6. Non-Repression/Ghettoisation

DF:

The function of these discourses is to introduce the notion of conformity and perhaps is a commentary on the previous section in which the speaker positions himself from within the discourse. The effects of these discourses are to construct a causal explanation for the non-resistance of people. Government support = conformity .

Positionings, Subjectivity and Practise

Not clear who speakers are speaking on behalf of? The local community, the working class or the boys who were living within the institution

Speaker is positioned within and without the ghetto. The people located in two different classes are rigidly constructed within the discourse of gentility or ghettoization which removed a lot of room for exploring heterogeneity or diversity within these two different domains. Limited positions for subjectivity. The subject constructed as subjugated.

Power

1. Relation between boy going to or escaping from institution and the speaker who constructs himself as a listener in response to an unidentified speaker. (You'd hear of a ...). Relation between speaker and community, between community and institution, between community and government, between government and institution. The move from one community to another constructed as violent (catapulted from genteel to ghetto).
2. Individuals and communities subjugated through Government discourse: biopower-housing as form of control-Discourse of epidemiology.
3. Governmentality indicating resistance as well; for example the reference to hearing about resistance (you'd either hear of a boy who had escaped-subjectivising element .

Resistance

Temporal shift in the discourse from past (modal auxiliary verb would to indicate habitual activity (you would hear) to simple past (definitive construction) to a present focus (what is this?) in reference to the past indicates an unstable positioning of the speaker in multiple

places and times , thus undermining the stable, structural self , indicating possibilities of resistance to sclerotic subjective positions.

Section 17

People tried to repress all the rumours about the paedophiles etc that were abroad. I, I, I doubt that very few children from Bohermore, the poor neighbourhoods escaped being prop, propositioned by some, included myself, paedophiles and indeed slightly assaulted by them too. The point is that we saw that St Joseph's as being a sort of benign place , where people were cared for, even though we knew, even though we had information out of it, that there were terrible punishments going on there. Now the word sex was never mentioned. I don't believe anybody I knew and certainly I didn't know what the word buggery meant. Or , We didn't have, we didn't have the emm, the language to express, you know what might have been going on there . We knew that people were beaten because we heard them sort of cry out from time to time when you were passing there.

DC

1. Construction of response as determined (people tried to repress)
2. Construction of paedophilia as prevalent in impoverished areas.
3. Construction of institution as retrospectively benign and caring.

4. Construction of a knowing community (“we knew”)
5. Construction of the institution as a punitive place (no contradiction between this and it as benign and caring; therefore punishment = caring/benign according to the construction of meaning.
6. Construction of sex as unmentionable
7. Construction of the unknown signifier (“buggery”)
8. Construction of silence as linked to lack in language (construction of discourse impoverishment)
9. Construction of knowledge of punishment, not based on witnessing but on hearing. Repeated again: the discourse of the “heard”, the transmission of information through auditory and not through visual or written modalities. Something is heard but the speaker is not seen or identified.

NSD:

1. Sexual abuse constructed as not contingent on social class. Construction of punishment as malignant, construction of community as ignorant; construction of sex as expressible; construction of being deaf to discourse.

Discourses

1. Paedophilia
2. Repression
3. Discourse of Medicine and Disease (“benign”)

4. Discourse of sex as outside language
5. Discourse of punishment (beaten, cry out)

DF

Function to locate the origin of abuse in social and economic contexts and to position the subjects as in a pre-enlightened place of naivety and to construct the phenomenon of abuse as extramural, as taking place within the community as well as within the institution.

Positionings, subjectivity and practise.

1. Respondent is speaking on behalf of the community (“including myself”)
2. Positions himself as naïve and others as naïve- preverbal era. Construction of the community as a preverbal stage where they “didn’t have the language to express”.
3. Subjectivisation allows respondent to construct himself as having experienced sexual intrusiveness.
4. Subjection by a linguistic procedure: silence. The foreclosure of the subject and potential resistance.

Power

1. Subjection to preverbal which halts resistance in the past but restores resistance in the present by virtue of the interview.

Section 18

And I worked in there actually. I had forgotten this . I, I was an apprentice to an interior decorator. And he go this job to essentially paint the inside of this place. St Joseph's and the first thing that struck me was, that that in the few weeks I was there, from 8 o clock in the morning to 6 in the evening, I never met another child. And I was in these long corridors which were incredibly quiet (intoning) and you, you felt an atmosphere, kind of terrible repression, you know when you hear people talk about vibes they do exist man. When you're in an environment that is evil you feel it and when you are in an environment that is joyous you feel that as well. But what struck me, not at the time it didn't strike me, because I just, just you know, doing this job , sandpapering wa.. doors and stuff. Looking back on it now, I never met another child while I was there.

Section 19

DC

1. Self construction as apprentice painter and as child ("I never met another child" (Uttered twice in
2. Construction of institution as place of absence (children invisible)
3. Construction of place as silent and repressive.
4. Construction of place as evil

5. Use of 1960s Hippy /"New Age" discourse : "vibes" from vibrations.
6. Construction of narrative as realisation (it struck me, what struck me...")
7. Construction of work as decorator- sandpapering

NSD: Self construction as adult, as site as open and full of volume. Construction of measured thought as opposed to epiphanic speech.

Discourses

1. Discourse of work- the daily routine, the tasks delineated

DF and effects:

2. Discourse of memory-contemporary versus historical realisation

DF and effects:

To a sense of historical depth- to absolve the younger self of "consciousness", To exonerate the younger self, the historical era for not knowing.

3. Discourse of horror (long corridors (The Shining), the theatrical language (which were incredibly quiet):

DF and effects:

To use effects of horror genre to "paint a scene" . The internal construct becomes an organising principle, the thing described (painting the walls) become replicated in his discourse of painting the scene (the long corridors, the theatrical language.

4. Discourse of the child (Victoriana: children should be seen and not heard.

DF and effects:

To create a sense of absence. To use the construction of a child in order to sharpen the portraiture, much in the same way that Huckleberry Finn, David Copperfield use first person child narration.

Positioning, subjectivity and practise.

1. Speakers speaking on behalf the “dispossessed”, the silent children, of which he was included as an external figure. Positions himself as naïve. Subjectivisation made possible through the use of picaresque discourse, use of visual background and foregrounding in order to set a scene.-
2. Positioned as a child and a worker.
3. The institutionalised children positioned as elsewhere
4. Subjectivity – speaker comes to know his position as a silent , unreflective worker-child but in later life he is able to reflect (“not at the time didn’t strike me”)
5. Possibilities for action limited- absence, subjection to disciplinary procedures: work and timetabling and child subjectivity with its inherent lack of rights.

Power and resistance

1. Biopower: Timetable, work, child inscribed into the unquestioning and unquestioned silence. Objectified subjectivity.
2. Later speaker realises something else about the scene through a process of distanciation- becoming an adult, distanced from the scene, desubjecification of child

worker. The original subjectivization was a process of subjection. The use of governmentality : the application of notions of governance and it with the accompanying resistance opens up new possibilities for the speaker, thereby inscribing new investments of power at new relational points : adult respondent +adult interviewer (co-respondent) adult respondent with historical construction. He deconstructs himself here, offering a way of recasting what was once felt, thought and said into something new.

Section 19

E What age were you at that time?

P I was 14. Maybe a little bit older, 15. I was that.

E You said that you were brought up in New Road

P Yeah

Q until you were about the age of 8.

P Yes

Q And then you mentioned that you had started in the Bishop's school

P In the Bishop's school that's right

Q and you had never heard

P With the Galway elite kind of thing

E That was my

P sort of (cross talk)

E I was wondering

P Greengrocer's sons, the quasi elite you know

E Umm

P with a few token pitiful cases like myself thrown in there. Well my grandfather was a civil servant and so was my father so they had pull as it was called but for all that they weren't well off because my gr..grandfather and my father drank incredibly and died of it ultimately

actually, both at the age of 66. So we were I suppose what you would call the genteel poor or something like that. I suppose.

DC

1. Construction of biography and timelines
2. Construction of hierarchy and class in education
3. Construction of self as pitiful case
4. Construction of education based on nepotism (“they had pull”)
5. Construction of class ; “genteel poor”
6. Alcoholism constructed as incredible.

Discourses and effects, positionings, subjectivity and practise:

Autobiographical Discourse.

Positioned in relation to social class- thus allowing the privilege of speaking on behalf of the “marginalised”?

Practise: Justification for paralysis, a field of non-activity due to poverty and alcoholism. (my father and grandfather drank incredibly: alcoholism and the link with the state jobs of father and grandfather. State jobs normalising and disciplining.

Power: Alcoholism as mechanism to work on the familial or social body, turning subjectivity into subjugation? The link between

Resistance: Contrast between the respondent position now and the position of subjects described, the distance allows reflection and thus resistance to unspoken, automatic playing out of subject positions . However, the speaker assumes the discourse of the time “pitiful cases” and occupies the same position as was laid out by the historical discourse which constructed him as a “pitiful case”. It is not clear whether this is said in irony but the ambivalence means that the discourse has non-ironic properties and is thus efficacious in maintaining the constructive continuity between the historical scene described and the contemporary constructions deployed.

Section 20

E **And , eh, eh , eh It seems that it was significant the way you said it that the, that it was not mentioned in the Bishop’s school but when you went to the, the, the St Brendan’s was it?**

P **Yeah**

E **It was**

P **Yeah. St Brendan’s it was like the sword of Damocles in St Brendans**

E **Right**

P **O yes. Absolutely. Now I saw a lot of cruelty in the Bishop's school too.**

P **Emm**

Q **A lot of violent cruelty . I mean children were being knocked out by a full fisted punch from Patrician brothers, especially by a man called Brother Kieran, who seemed to take delight in terrifying children. Now, whether or not, I don't know , this is just speculating about, I mean he seemed to enjoy it as much as other people would enjoy sex or are supposed to enjoy sex, you know what I mean. You know we were all terrified by him. But I didn't realise that I had a kind of protection. I was never struck while I was there and I was never struck while I was in St Brendan's either because my father's; my father and my grandfather were civil servants and you didn't beat the children of civil servants because they'd probably complain or something. Somebody would be down to you, (intoned) you know, that's the term they used. Now violence was not confined to institutions , I hasten to say that , it was general. Violence was general, cruelty to animals was general, cruelty to children was general , beating women was general.**

Discursive Constructions

1. Construction of fear of being put into institution . (“sword of Damocles”)
2. Construction of violence as general and cross classes. (“Violence was general”)
3. Construction of violence as systemic (cruelty to animals, women and children) Are men, constructed as
4. Construction of violence against children as pleasurable- sadism
5. Construction of civil and non-civil servants, the latter victims of violence.

Discourses

1. Violence and sex- use of word “struck” the same word used earlier to indicate realisation. The same signifier has two different signified- violence or epiphany.

NDS: Equality, peace.

DF and Effects (Action Orientation): To construct institution as violent and to construct the schools as violent.

Positionings, Subjectivity and Practise

1. Speaker positioned as non-victim, as protected as son of civil servant. Speaking on behalf of the other children. Speaker not recognised as victim of violence but his discourse is contradicted by the use of self referring term in 19 (pitiful case).

Biopower and Discipline

Violence as disciplining mechanism. Those who are connected with state seem to be subjugated according to the respondent's construction of children of civil servants as not being victim to violence.

1. Subjectivising force of two different categories : state workers and offspring and non –state worker. This is according to the respondents constructions.
2. Resistance. Little resistance as the speaker's subjectivity is constructed as exceptional, as not having experienced violence, though earlier he refers to himself as “pitiful case” and victim of poverty and paternal alcoholisms. His discourse as having preserved his sovereign subjectivity blinds him the way his discourse positions him as outside culture, in a transcendent position. The apparatus of violence becomes monolithic and eliminates the strands of acts which may be violent but are not subsumed under the apparatus of violence, thereby constructing a version of reality that serves particular aims.

Section 21

So, it's not as though we were this nice, you know conformist Christian Catholic slash Catholic community . We were as, well I don't include myself in it actually but- there was a savage environment in the, in the early 40s and in the 50s too. And you know when I see these Corpus Christi parades, you know with all these little girls dressed as virgins and all these little boys dressed as miniature sort of gentlemen preparing for the priesthood. We were all supposed to look like that . What a horror.

What a, what a What a façade. What a, You know Bishop Brown as bishop of this diocese for thirty years and he never visited Bohermore, never once. And ah, ag I mean the the the the the the ..In the sense , the society as it was , informed, as it was, first of all by a siege mentality.

DC

1. Community constructed as not nice , conformist Chrisitan/Catholic community
2. Self constructed as exceptional
3. Environment constructed as savage in the 1940s and 1950s. Does this construct the earlier or later times as not savage?
4. Children constructed as little gentlemen (recurring term “gentle) and virgin girls preparing for priesthood.
5. Construction of façade versus depth.
6. Construction of the community (Bohermore) as not visible to the Bishop.
7. Construction of the then society as one of siege mentality. Is the speaker making a distinction between historical facts and constructing a present transcendental position.

NSD: Unconformist, inclusiveness, civility, children constructed as not objects.

Discourses

1. Spectacle: Parade-Corpus Christi- Façade
2. Military Discourse- siege mentality of the society- defensive

DF:

To show how the spectacle and the wider social practise affects individuals. Effects are to maybe convince of progress, from a society of savagery in the 40s and 50s to one of implied more civility in the present. The speaker is constructing a “horror ..a façade” of the historical decades to show how all were “supposed to look like that”. The effects of the construction is to serve an anti-clerical establishment view.

Positionings, subjectivity and practise

1. The respondent is speaking on behalf of community (“we”) but then he excludes himself from the plural pronoun. (I don’t include myself). Positioning of a transcendent role.
2. Positions himself as witnessing the Corpus Christi parades now.
3. Repositions himself as belonging to the community (we were all supposed to look like that)
4. Positions himself as within and without the community, the siege mentality.
5. Action possibilities are limited because the subject is constructed without the social scene in a transcendental scene.

Power

1. Use of parades to normalise the populace, objectivising individuals.
2. Power cut off from the poorer areas. Traditional model of sovereign power constructed by the speaker.

Resistance

1. Little resistance as the power within the discourse is located within the vertical structures of society (the Bishop) and not within the body of the community. This negative model of power stymies the sense of agency in the social body. So, even though the speaker constructs the objectifying force of the disciplining parades and had a critical distance from it, the discourse collapses back into the constructing the subject as passive and helpless within power grids of vertical dominance.

Section 22

Secondly, the new management decided that their method of management would be total. You know you weren't being administered by some central imperialist power that was kind of you know hand controlling you. This was direct hands on. In school the local guard came about once a month and threatened everybody and the local priest came every week and threatened everybody and assaulted people, twisted their ears and pulled their hair until they screamed out. That never happened me. So

this made me a sort of , in a sense almost a guilty bystander. I used to think why is this happening to these children and not to me. Now, I didn't think it that articulately. But I remember standing with my brother John, the Lord of Mercy on him; he was I think three years younger than me so he, when we started there I would have been 9 and he would have been 6 and I remember finding some part of the playground, finding a corner that I could get him into and protect because I knew violence was afoot here both inside the school and outside it . It was you know Monkey see Monkey do, you know. So then, out of this pool of savagery, of general savagery, you have these men and women prepared for the religious life, under the cosh if you want to put it that way. I never met one of them who actually volunteered for it. And they were 14 or 15 years of age, taken out of a savage environment where they were beaten as a way of life .

DC

1. The new management constructed as totalising contrasted with light hand of central imperial power.
2. Power constructed as violent within and without the school.
3. Self constructed as guilty bystander-again excluded from social body.
4. Self constructed as protector of other (brother)
5. Childhood discourse as constructed inarticulate (again repeated theme)
6. Construction of 3 monkeys- not seeing, not hearing, not listening.

7. Construction of religious training choice as involuntary. (Economic pressures)
8. Construction of object of children trained into religious life. Construction of abused becomes abuser object.

Summary : Object constructed is one of a totalising vertical power structure.

NDS : Power as positive, as non-violent. Self constructed as participant, childhood as talkative, observant and attentive.

Discourses:

1. Government
2. Violence
3. Discourse of silence
4. Discourse of punishment (under the cosh)

DC . Function and Effects.

1. To increase passivity of the community members by emphasising the totalising effect of management structures. The aim is to target the sympathy of the listener to high level of threat and violence in the society.

Positionings. Subjectivity and Practise

1. Speaker speaking on behalf of children who abuse and are abused physically. Speaker positioned as observer, as “guilty bystander”, as compliant with the abusers because

of non-verbalisation of what was witnessed. His subjectivity is discursively deployed according to collaborationist type discourse (guilty bystander).

2. Practise or action limited because the violence is operating along two axes: vertical from the new management and horizontally with children attacking children in school. Apparent little room for manoeuvre. The speaker finds “ a corner in the playground “ to protect him and his brother, maybe mirroring the discursive operation where he tries to find a corner in between hegemonic discourses.

Section 23

Fathers felt obliged to beat you. My father wouldn't beat us, but my mother would. You know (laughing) my father was too genteel. It was beneath him to beat a child. But my mother would but not, not savagely you know I mean. She'd beat them but she never beat me. That's another thing and emm in a sense she had turned me into her little companion more than her child but that's another story. Now I didn't realise , that none of us knew that she had been orphaned,– well, she wasn't been orphaned , and her father disappeared. And my grandmother. her mother came from Corrandulla, a country woman, a beautiful woman had 4 children with this man, a man called Flaherty; they married. He was from Middle Street. Then he disappeared. The idea is that he went to the British Navy and was killed in the first world ward but nobody is quite sure about that. My grandmother was renowned in the town as being known as highly respectable and highly dependable and she went and you know did people's laundry and scrubbed the steps in front of their houses and all that and one day while she was away the authorities

came and got the four children, because she considered to be a widow, widowed and then she got a job in the institution where her children were but she was not allowed to speak to them, and they weren't allowed to speak to her. (tapping table angrily).

DC

1. Fathers constructed as violent but speaker excludes himself . Again men constructed as violent, although the personal experience of the speaker contradicts this construction. Interesting phenomenological construction around this depiction “fathers felt obliged to beat you”
2. Personal story constructed as exception. “My father was genteel”.
3. Discourse of Courtly behaviour. Again this construct of gentility, belonging to an old discourse such as in Chaucer’s “parfit gentil knight”.
4. Child-beating constructed as an activity denoting inferiority. (“It was beneath him to beat a child”)
5. Two categories of beating constructed: savage and not savage
6. Speaker constructed as escaping punishment.
7. Mother constructed as orphan and reconstructed as losing father.
8. Grandmother constructed as beautiful, respectable, dependable and vulnerable as widow.
9. Institution constructed as barrier between mother and children- as silent, a place of non-verbalisation.

Discourses

1. Masculinity as violent/inferior or superior/genteel/snobbish or as abandoning
2. Femininity as respectable, dependable, renowned.
3. Fairytale (horror) Use of the trope: “One day the authorities came...”
4. Savagery and civilisation.
5. Discourse of orphanhood
6. Discourse of silence.

NDS: Masculinity as violent/superior or as inferior/genteel. Discourse of middle ground between civilisation and savagery. Discourse seems to either shunt from one pole to the other.

Apparatus : Discourse of the Primitive and the Civilised . (Is this the older discourse of Imperial Britain and its “shadow”, the savage Irish?)

DF and Effects (Action Orientation)

1. The function of this discourse may not be to address phenomenon in hand but to refer to a private scene where fathers are presented as weak or absent and women presented as solid, “highly respectable and dependable” and sexual/oedipal, “I was her little companion more than her child”.

2. The discourse also insists on the pre-verbal or non verbal environment where nothing is said , where people act without explanation, where a husband, father, grandfather disappears into the Imperial background of war but nothing is said, where authorities come without warning, without explanation. All of this activity must be underpinned by some social agency – a discourse that is not named but which engenders activity on the social plane, such as the talking of the children away from the mother.

Function of this discourse is to horrify, The effect is one of communicating a sense of arbitrary acts of cruelty which defy understanding. In a sense the discourse forecloses possibilities of action because it replicates the same sense of uncanniness and helplessness that the unnamed discourses installed in subjects referred to within this passage. The male is captured by some discourse of impotence (too genteel) and emasculation (alcoholic) or by powerful international discourses leading to the barbarism of the great war. One can speculate that there are a plurality of discursive possibilities disguised by speakers discourse. It is a fact that Lord Kitchener's iconic posters were prevalent in Ireland at the time and many men from Connaught fought in the WW1. We can see these effects of these hidden discourses on the edges of the discourse of the speaker. This military discourse is referred to more explicitly in the next section.

Positionings, Subjectivity and Practise

Speaker is positioning himself in the male camp perhaps as one who may find that it is beneath him to be beaten. If this is how he positions himself in a contradictory masculinity, where fathers beat children but not his father as he was genteel, it seems from the speaker that he too positions himself in the non-violent masculine role, a

masculinity denuded of savagery. He is speaking on behalf of himself, and his ancestors. He positions himself as a little companion , a premature man, not a child. Perhaps, when he is talking about the four children in his mother's family who are taken away, he is talking about his mother taking away his own sense of childishness, that the group discourse is masking an individual discourse. In other words, he is able to occupy wider ranges of subjective feeling by talking through the institutionalised mother. This raises a question about what is happening when people are using discourse of institutional abuse, such as , “who are they talking about when they talk about institutional abuse”?

Contradiction as the field of subjectivity may be enlarged by accessing the wider systemic discourse; however this discursive manoeuvre also conceals that individual's subjective feeling as now they have become discursively located in the past or in the dead, thereby constituting a dead end in terms of action.

Power

1. Institutional power of state: the authorities.
2. Familial power- “she turned me into her little companion”. Matriarchal power.
3. Patriarchal power. “The authorities came and took”. Powerless position of widows.
4. Biopower- The power circulating within and among people. “My grandmother was renowned in the town as being highly respectable...”

Resistance

Little resistance because the subjugation of subjectivity to wider dominant discourses such as empire, patriarchy and morality. It seems as if the speaker's constructions allow for little subjective room.

Section 24

Now , emm, I I used to get very very angry about this. But I found that my anger either would have to be expressed, in upfront violence , you know get at it, join the IRA or whatever and or- you know- have it in a sense repressed or suppressed perhaps is the word. No it was suppressed, in my case because I was fully aware I was violent and was angry about these things . I often accuse myself of not having had the courage to follow that anger, you know to shoot some priest or something like that . I mean even to this day I think you should have done something. I'll give you an instance of what I mean, I was very young, I can't have been about 10 maybe 11. My father was drinking very much and we were starving ; I was in hospital from from malnutrition when I was about 8, dying of malnutrition, and my mother decided to go and complain to the parish

priest. And at that time the parish house as it was called was where the parking lot is now in market street, the other parking lot.

Discursive Constructions:

1. Anger has two channels of expression: violence or suppression
2. Self-accusation for not expressing anger- second person plural used (“you should have done something”)
3. Childhood reconstructed- alcoholism, starvation
4. Construction of monolithic power centre: the Parish House.
5. Construction of complaint procedure about father to the “father” (priest)

Discourses:

1. Violence
2. Self-accusation
3. Confessional
4. Patriarchy

NDS:

Pacifism, self-esteem, feminism, child-centeredness.

Apparatus:

Violence-network that binds all these things together: the anger that needs to be suppressed for fear of violence.

DF and Effects (Action Orientation):

1. The function of these discourses is to convey the anger in response to injustice and the forces suppressing the anger: The clerical hierarchy.
2. Effects of discourse is to create a sense of claustrophobia. The speaker gains the sympathy of the listener in constructing a monolithic , identifiable target of criticism (the priest in the house)
3. Speaker is constructing a scene of monolithic power and dispossessed woman and child.

Positionings, Subjectivity and Practise:

1. Speaker is speaking on behalf of mother, against the two fathers (the biological and the symbolic)
2. Self positioned as angry and violent
3. Self positioned as only having two available positions brave/violent or cowardly/pacifist.
4. Self positioned in narrative in two places at the same time: hospital and the priest's house.
5. Self positioned as starving . Priest positioned as being nourished.
6. Practise limited by the fear of violence. Pacifist practise limited by the desire for violence.

Biopower and Discipline:

1. Starvation-acting on the body , malnutrition , alcoholism,
2. Disciplining of bodies through violence

Governmentality:

1. The resistance of mother to the internal patriarchal structure but the resistance is barred at a deeper patriarchal level, when she goes to the priest.

Resistance:

1. Raised through the idea of violence but deferred because of the threat of violence.

Discursive Constructions:

1. Abuse constructed as polymorphous
2. Abuse hierarchy constructed from sexual to physical/emotional in terms of effects. (Psychological discourse)
3. Psychological health constructed as lack of anger and resentment.
4. Sexual abuse constructed as confined to small minority.
5. Absolutist discourse (we lived in terror day and night)
6. Biblical discourse (flesh is corrupt)

7. Genealogy constructed (bastards) connected to economics and inheritance.
(very important historically in post famine Ireland where small tenures could not support large families)
8. General abuse constructed – tyranny as general
9. Sexuality constructed as “filthy”
10. Humans constructed as right or wrong (the moral constructions of earlier on)
and as evil

Discourses:

1. Discourse of “abuse” – physical, emotional, sexual- Psychological discourse
2. Religious discourse (genuflect, hell, evil)
3. Political discourse (“tyranny”)
4. Biological discourse (“oxygen”)
5. Sexuality.
6. Consumerism

NDS:

1. Secular discourse

Apparatus:

1. Religious discourse of purity/impurity. How the spoken word become unspoken after a certain time . (John 1:1 In the beginning there was the word and the Word was with God and

the Word was God. The discursive becomes non-discursive, invisible but materially secreted through the bodies of people.

Biopower AND Discipline:

1. Language of biopower and epidemiology (“the population of children”).
2. Body as machine subject to tyranny.

Positionings and Subjectivity :

1. Speaker’s knowledge is “passionate”
2. Objects positioned in passive position (“buggered”)
3. Speaker constructed as omniscient (“it never got to him psychologically”). The evident becomes the true which repeats the dynamic of the society which is condemned as a masquerade. Is this the same construction – “the surface = the reality”.
4. Bastards positioned in the second person: (“you bastards”)
5. Speaker positioned as constructor: (“I was reading last night”)
6. Speaker uses absolutist markers with no modifying or qualifying descriptors : “so total, so all pervasive”.
7. Political positioned within the personal and vice versa in the sense that the father does not embrace the mother , nor does the culture embrace the people.

8. Subjectivity subjugated on multiple levels- the flesh is subjugated to corruption and decay, the body is subjected to rape, the voice is subjugated to a tribunal (he's told his story to the authorities).
9. Body subject to effects of distancing/alienation (we can't shop ourselves out of it)

Governmentality, Resistance and Practise:

1. Absence of governmentality
2. Effects of violence and the lack of resisting possibilities because of the absolutist framing of the discourse.
3. Resistance constructed around the possibilities offered by economic collapse.
Capitalism constructed as a “distraction”. However, Ireland was a near command economy for much of the duration of the twentieth century.

DF and Effects (Action Orientation):

1. The discourses deployed create minimum possibilities because they convey the image of a fated world trapped in aspic by the discursive/non –discursive matrix where nobody has agency.

Appendix B6 : Discursive Construction

1. Courtesy. (Courtesy) “Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed” (Line 1)
2. Response constructed as volitional (Free Will- Meta) (Construction of Interview) “for agreeing to be interviewed”
3. Response constructed as elicited from passive party in the respondent (Construction of Interview) (Passive/Active) “to be interviewed” (Line 1)

4. Response construction shifting to different discursive formations: academic, economic, journalistic in contrast other former discourses (the precipitates of courtly poetry for example) (Construction of Interview)
5. Response constructed as purposive. (Construction of Interview). “For the purpose of this “ (Line 5)
6. Response constructed as contradictory: both plural and singular. “purposes of this interview...your response” (Line 5)
7. Response constructed as temporally locatable. “to take place..to take part” (Line 11)
8. Response constructed as temporally contradictory. “what were your thoughts” (Line 10)
9. Response constructed as deferred. “I’d like to” (Line 10)
10. Construction of response as historical as opposed to contemporary. (Line 10)
11. Construction of response in cognitive and affective modes. “your thoughts or feelings or responses” (Line 10)
12. Construction of discourse of participation. “to take part” (Line 10)
13. Thought and feeling constructed (Line 10)
14. Memory constructed. “my memories of, of that institution ” (Line 14)
15. Mother/child rearing constructed. “My mother was raised in one” (PEDAGOGY)
16. Construction of deductive method of science proposed from general to particular. Or is it the inductive method? (SCIENCE)

17. Distinction between public and private constructed. “the public revelations, we all knew privately it was going on anyway” (Line 18)
18. Idea of enlightenment constructed. “If I could do anything to enlighten” (Line 16)
(RATIONALITY)
19. Knowledge constructed as private, belonging to the mass and to the young. “you know when we were young we all knew there were sinister things” (Line 19)
(PRIVATE-PUBLIC)
20. Knowledge being constructed in binary modes here : private versus public, individual versus all, old versus the young. However, is it not possible that some of these categories create confusion, as knowledge can be public/communal and individual, private and public? In other words, the words construct a version of reality contingent on a binary opposition which may not exist outside this discursive field. To summarise: Discourse constructed out of binary categorisation. (BINARY CATEGORISATION-DUALISM)
21. Discourse construction of the sinister object. From the Latin meaning left. Does this belong to a wider discourse on left-handedness as deviance and which was corrected within institutions until the late 20th century. Various discourses of left-handedness constructed lefthanders as weak, diabolic and homosexual from the Classical Era to more recent times. (SINISTER)
22. Discourse – grammar constructs objects (boys) in the past and in the present and constructs as visible. “we used to see these boys, you know labouring in the fields” (Line 21) VISUAL Boys constructed as “labouring in the fields” (contrast this to much later in interview when boys aren’t seen by him when he works there as painter).

Constructs a rural tableau like a scene from Millais or an American movie of chain gang prisoners. (TABLEAUX-SCENES-VISUALITY)

23. Memory constructed in time- “in the depths of winter”. Use of rhetoric
24. Construction of upbringing (raised). The word “raised ”is a word that can be used to classify the upbringing of human and animal. Also , there are myriad meanings latent in the word , such as its constructivist possibilities such as “raising the dead, raising a question, a subject etc.” (PEDAGOGY)
25. Construction of extended family.
26. Construction of constructivist perspective .
27. Construction of family as possessed “My”
28. Construction of Platonic idealism/ Construction of cognitive primacy. “now that I think of it” (Line
29. Construction of “orphan institution” – contradicted by the facts- the mother was not an orphan. (DISCOURSE? OF ORPHANS Examples from classic literature include [Charlotte Brontë](#), [Charles Dickens](#), [Mark Twain's Tom Sawyer](#), [L. M. Montgomery's Anne of Green Gables](#) books, Thomas Hardy's [Jude the Obscure](#), and [J. R. R. Tolkien](#). Among more recent authors, [A. J. Cronin](#), [Lemony Snicket](#), [Roald Dahl](#), [J. K. Rowling's Harry Potter](#) series, as well as some less well-known authors of famous orphans like [Little Orphan Annie](#) have used orphans as major characters.
30. Construction of timelines . “ We found out when we were in advances adulthood” (4, 17, advanced adulthood)

31. Construction of mute actors. “neither of them ever mentioned this in their lives” (Line 27) (NARRATIVE/THEATRICAL CONSTRUCTION)
32. Family /children constructed in matrilineal fashion. “ We six children of my mother’s” (DISCOURSE OF MOTHER)
33. Upbringing constructed “she had been raised in this institution (Line 29). (PEDAGOGY)
34. Knowledge constructed as discouraged. (Line 31) (EPISTEMOLOGY)
35. Punishment constructed (Lateral effects) “punitive measures would be taken if you suggested” (Line 32) (PUNITION)
36. Resistance/Authority constructed.
37. Knowledge as revelation (religious) and constructed as public versus private. “the public revelations and the various investigatory boards and all that came as no surprise”. (Line 35). EPISTEMOLOGY
38. Investigatory and the administrative apparatus constructed as expected. GOVERNMENTALITY “KNOWN”- RIGID
39. Reality constructed through memory, “I have memories going back 65 years, clear memories”, (Line 37). NARRATIVE
40. Construction of the abuse as shocking and extensive, (endemic) shocking because extensive. Is abuse which is isolated constructible as less shocking or more shocking? Contradicts Gill’s work on abuse where large scale abuse seems to have less impact than individualised narratives. “what was shocking was the extent of it, we didn’t quite realise that it was endemic” ABUSE

41. Construction of abuse as cultural. “working part of the culture” (Line 39). ABUSE
42. Construction of opinion about abuse as permissible or subject to evaluation/laughter?
“if I could it that way without being facetious” ABUSE
43. Construction of culture as plastic and protean. (working culture). CULTURE
44. Residents of schools constructed as “boys”, as visible (recurring DC) and again later
as “renowned” (very visible) (Line 41). RESIDENTS
45. Biography of residents constructed as “institutional”. “the tendency was for these
boys to leave these institutions to come into the army” (Line 43) RESIDENTS
46. Residents constructed as “graduates” (Line 45) (University discourse)
.EDUCATION- PEDAGOGY?
47. Residents constructed as “silent”. (Line 47) RESIDENTS
48. Residents constructed as passive and bullied and abused. (Line 50) “you live in a
dormitory with men coming from all sorts of psychological directions...but they were
renowned for their passivity and consequently were bullied, they pretty much
continued being abused in another institution “ (Line 50). RESIDENTS
49. Residents constructed as boys but people in the army are constructed as men.
RESIDENTS
50. Army men constructed as “coming from all sorts of psychological directions” set up
as contrast to unidirectional, unpsychological, passive, abused, demasculinised ex
residents RESIDENTS

51. Residents constructed as having free will (it did seem that they had settled on that as a method of life” (Line 54) RESIDENTS
52. Reconstructing respondents’ from passive into active- “they found” (line 58 – my intervention)
53. Institutions as secretive INSTITUTIONS (Line 65)
54. Abuse constructed as an identifiable topic (a point) ABUSE
55. Residents constructed as friends. “I have friends who were in St Josephs”. (Line 66)
RESIDENTS
56. Discourse constructed as open to censorship “I don’t know if I am supposed to name” (Line 68) CENSORSHIP
57. Abused constructed as complainant. ABUSED
58. Abuse constructed as buggery and defilement. “the abuse of a child who was buggered on his Holy Communion day”. ABUSE
59. Constructed as “shocking, horrendous.” (Line 75) ABUSE
60. Hierarchy constructed (boy, man, secretary, bishop) MASCULINITY/HIERARCHY (Lines 74-77)
61. Revelation constructed as heard . ORAL TRADITION -
62. Abuse constructed as covered up, “track covering” (Line 78) ABUSE
63. Community members constructed as ordinary. (line 80) “COMMUNITY”
64. Knowledge constructed as background. (Line 80) EPISTEMOLOGY

65. Abuse constructed as “sinister darkness”. (Line 81). ABUSE- SINISTER
66. Abuse constructed as not just isolated to institution in question. ABUSE
67. Construction of the geographical limits –diocese; different to secular geographical constructions (town, county, province versus parish, diocese, arch diocese, Rome)
SPATIAL –STRUCTURE-HORIZONTAL HIERARCHY.
68. Construction of residents in industrial school as part of the community. RESIDENTS
/ COMMUNITY “we all knew their families” (Line 90)
69. Construction of residents as orphans through death of mother- perhaps a cross
layering of autobiographical discourse and discourse of “institutional abuse”. “They
were mostly there because their mothers died”. (Line 90) ORPHANS-PEDAGOGY
70. Institution constructed as gulag/not gulag. INSTITUTION
71. Residents constructed as unruly and truants. (Line 92) RESIDENTS
72. Discourse constructed as having background and foreground. VISUAL FIELD. “I
need to give you a little bit of background on this (line 100)
73. Construction of personal biography as religious, motherless and Victorian. (Lines
101-106)NARRATIVE/LITERARY TROPES
74. Construction of unhomeliness/motherlessness.
75. Construction of upbringing as “silent and unlovely” (Line 107) (muted) SILENCE-
BLANK-ABSENCE
76. Construction of educational hierarchy (Bishop school/state school) and economics:
“half a crown” (Line 110). EDUCATION

77. Different discourses in different schools. (Bishop's school and St Brendan's National School) (Lines 113-117) EDUCATION
78. Discourse of punishment and discipline (it was used as a threat every single day) "I heard that every single day" (Line 117) PUNITION -THREAT
79. The industrial school as negative place is here constructed as not secret, in contrast to muteness of home- the threat is discursively operationalized but is the effect of the threat muted? INSTITUTION
80. Construction of story through second hand accounts. NARRATIVE
81. Construction of carceral discourse (escaped)- PUNITION INCARCERATION-
82. Construction of social housing as ghettos and conformity inducing. SPACE-HOUSING
83. Construction of social housing as ungentle- "I had been in what you might call a genteel, repressed...and was then catapulted into an environment where" (Line 132) HOUSING-SPACE
84. Construction of response as determined (Line 133) (people tried to repress). WILL
85. Construction of paedophilia as prevalent in impoverished areas. (Line 135) CLASS-POVERTY-SEX
86. Construction of institution as retrospectively benign and caring. "The point is that we saw St Joseph's as being a sort of benign place" (Line 138) INSTIUTION
87. Construction of a knowing community : "we knew" (Line 139) COMMUNITY-EPISTEMOLOGY

88. Construction of the institution as a punitive place (no contradiction between this and it as benign and caring; therefore punishment = caring/benign according to the meaning constructed.: “there were terrible punishments going on there” (Line 142)
89. Construction of sex as unmentionable. Sex: “Now the word sex was never mentioned “ (Line 142)
90. Construction of the unknown signifier (“buggery”)? “ “I didn’t know what the word buggery meant” (Line 143)
91. Construction of silence as linked to lack in language (construction of discourse impoverishment). “ We didn’t have the language to express, you know what might have been going on there”. (Line 145)
92. Construction of knowledge of punishment , not based on witnessing but on hearing. Repeated again: the discourse of the “heard”, the transmission of information through auditory and not through visual or written modalities. Something is heard but the speaker is not seen or identified. ORAL- AUDITORY- INVISIBLE TRACE- SET AGAINST THE WRITTEN CULTURE
93. Self-construction as apprentice painter and as child (“I never met another child” (Line 162) (ABSENCE- CONTRADICTION- HE SAW AND DIDN’T SEE)
94. Construction of institution as place of absence (children invisible).
95. Construction of place as silent and repressive. INSTITUTION
96. Construction of place as evil . EVIL SINISTER
97. Use of 1960s Hippy /”New Age” discourse : “vibes” from vibrations. NON-VERBAL-NON VISUAL FIELD- NON-VERBAL

98. Construction of narrative as realisation (it struck me, what struck me...”)
NARRATIVE
99. Construction of work as decorator- sandpapering. WORK
100. Construction of biography and timelines. NARRATIVE-BIOGRAPHY
101. Construction of hierarchy and class in education. EDUCATION-HIERARCHY-
STRATIFICATION
102. Construction of self as pitiful case. NARRATIVE-
103. Construction of education based on nepotism (“they had pull”) NEPOTISM
104. Construction of class ; “genteel poor” CLASS
105. Alcoholism constructed as incredible.
106. Construction of fear of being put into institution : “it was like the sword of Damocles
in St Brendan’s” (Line 210) PUNITION THREAT FEAR
107. Construction of violence as general and cross classes. (“Violence was general”)
VIOLENCE THREAT- PUNITION – NON GOVERNMENTALITY
108. Construction of violence as systemic (cruelty to animals, women and children)
CLASSIFICATION OF ONE CATEGORY VICTIM -
109. Construction of violence against children as pleasurable- sadism. SADISM-
VIOLENCE-SEX-CHILD
110. Construction of civil and non-civil servants, the latter victims of violence. CIVILITY-
GOVERNMENTALITY-

111. Community constructed as not nice , conformist Christian/Catholic community.
COMMUNITY –CONFORMISM = COLLUSION
112. Self-constructed as exceptional- NOT BELONGING TO COMMUNITY
113. Environment constructed as savage in the 1940s and 1950s. Does this construct the earlier or later times as not savage? HISTORICAL-RETROSPECTIVE.
114. Children constructed as little gentlemen (recurring term “gentle) and virgin girls preparing for priesthood. COURTESY-GENTILITY-CIVILITY-APPARATUS?
115. Construction of façade versus depth. DEPTH V SURFACE
116. Construction of the community (Bohermore) as not visible to the Bishop.
INVISIBLE /INVISIBLE-
117. Construction of the society as one of siege mentality. Is the speaker making a distinction between historical facts and constructing a present transcendental position.
SIEGE- TRANSCENDENT
118. The “new management “ (Line 251) constructed as totalising contrasted with light hand of central imperial power. STATE-
119. Power constructed as violent within and without the school. VIOLENCE-- POWER
120. Self-constructed as guilty bystander-again excluded from social body. GUILT-
EXCEPTIONALITY- THE NON-PARTICIPANT
121. Self-constructed as protector of other (brother) NOT VICTIM
122. Childhood discourse as constructed inarticulate (again repeated theme) SILENCE-
(WOMEN, CHILDREN, ANIMALS? – DUMB NATURE?) ANIMALITY?

123. Construction of 3 monkeys- not seeing, not hearing, not listening. SILENCE
124. Construction of religious training choice as involuntary. (Economic pressures) .
RELIGION
125. Construction of object of children trained into religious life.
126. Construction of abused becomes abuser object. “Out of this pool of savagery , of general savagery, you have these men and women prepared for the religious life “
(Line 271) SINS OF FATHER – BIBLICAL INHERITANCE- ORIGINAL SIN
127. Summary : Object constructed is one of a totalising vertical power structure. NDS :
Power as positive, as non-violent. Self constructed as participant, childhood as talkative, observant and attentive.
128. Fathers constructed as violent but speaker excludes himself . “Fathers felt obliged to beat you” (Line 275). Again men constructed as violent, although the personal experience of the speaker contradicts this construction. Interesting phenomenological construction around this depiction “fathers felt obliged to beat you” EXCLUSION -
MASCULINITY
129. Personal story constructed as exception. “My father was too genteel”. (Line 277)
COURTESY-GENTILITY .Discourse of Courtly behaviour. Again this construct of gentility, belonging to an old discourse such as in Chaucer’s “parfit gentil knight”.
130. Child-beating constructed as an activity denoting inferiority. (“It was beneath him to beat a child”).
131. Two categories of beating constructed: savage and not savage. COURTESY -
GENTILITY

132. Speaker constructed as escaping punishment. EXCEPTIONAL-DOES THE NARRATIVE CONSTRUCTION DEMAND THE AUTHOR TO BE EXCEPTIONAL
133. Mother constructed as orphan and reconstructed as losing father.
134. Grandmother constructed as beautiful, respectable, dependable and vulnerable as widow. FEMINITY/MASCULINITY
135. Institution constructed as barrier between mother and children- as silent, a place of non-verbalisation. SILENCE- PASSIVE –ACTIVE- WOMEN. “then she got a job in the institution where the children were but she was not allowed to speak to the, and they weren’t allowed to speak to her” (Line 298)
136. Anger constructed as having two channels of expression: violence or suppression. “But I found that my anger either would have to be expressed , in upfront violence, you know, get at it , join the IRA or whatever and or- you know- have it in a sense repressed or suppressed ...” (Line 302) ANGER
137. Self-accusation for not expressing anger- second person plural used (“you should have done something”). (Line 308) GUILT
138. Childhood reconstructed- alcoholism, starvation. MEMOIR/BIOGRAPHY
139. Construction of monolithic power centre: the Parish House. “there was a huge house there, a pseudo-Georgian house as I recall and I went my mother into this- there was marble-covered hall...” (Line 317) (SPACE – POWER-GEOGRAPHY
140. Construction of complaint procedure about father to the “father” (priest) MASCULINITY

141. Memory constructed around architectural features (pseudo-Georgian, marble hall).
SPACE-
142. Construction of the atmosphere as “silent”. (“silent vibe”)
143. Priest constructed as not disturbed but interrupted.
144. Scene constructed at noon. (High Noon- conflict). NARRATIVE
145. Mother constructed as emotionally eruptive and intimidated.
146. Self constructed as standing up for mother. “Not even her own child was allowed to stand up for her” (Line 331) HERO
147. Institutional abuse constructed as a “whole business”. (Line 334)
ADMINISTRATON-BUSINESS
148. Institution constructed as having to include home. SYSTEMIC- HOME AS
INSTITUTION
149. Society constructed as violent, originating in intrigue and on-going. “ this was a punitive society; it was a society born in blood, in intrigue and treachery” (Line 339)
VIOLENCE
150. Family repeats the violence form without.
151. Construction of phenomenological standpoint (you felt)
152. Free State Government constructed as New Management. BUSINESS
153. History of country constructed as romanticised. COURTESY-FICTION-
NARRATIVES

154. History constructed as savage and cancerous and hateful. VIOLENCE-SAVAGE
155. Knowledge of residents constructed as intimate. EPISTEMOLOGY-
CONTRADICTIONS – SEEN V NOT SEEN
156. Knowledge of residents’ stories constructed as abusive and fictional, as concrete when orally delivered. Does this imply that writing leaves more to the imagination because the book referred to is a “fictional idea”? “I know Mannix Flynn who wrote a book about Letterfrack, “Enough Said” or something..I don’t know what it’s called, a sort of fictional idea” (Line 370)
157. Construction of residents as observers, as witnesses.(and who witnessed a murder)
OBSERVER- PASSIVE
158. “Abusers” constructed as perpetrators. (Criminal Discourse)
159. Abuse constructed as “crime” and as savagery (two opposing discourses)
160. “Abusers” constructed as enlightened and moral and reconstructed as “country bastards”. “You see you have this idea that the perpetrators of these crimes, this savagery were people of sharpened enlightened model, mor, moral perceptions. They weren’t , they were what we called country bastards” (Lines 374-376)
161. Urbanites constructed as not recruits in religious brothers. COUNTRY VERSUS CITY
162. Country people as strange, as “creatures” (Discourse of civilisation again versus savagery).
163. Construction of country people as fearful of TB-reconstructed as bring TB with cows into the city.

164. City constructed as dirty and full of malnutrition.
165. Society constructed as murderous and treacherous.
166. Irish religious constitution , unique-
167. .Authorities constructed as abandoning- term referred to earlier on.
168. Institutions constructed as educational establishments (second time) “Steve McQueen was a graduate” (Line 398) Is this a sly critique of the university discourse of which I am a representative.
169. Ireland constructed as a bloody place.
170. External critic.
171. Guilt as a communal construct
172. Object of co-conspirators- (Military discourse –collaborationist discourse)
173. Pronominal confusion as subjectivity glides between “we, the authorities, we..they, they” (Line 403)
174. Discourse of shared guilt but not shared violence. “Not we, but the authorities, they were cruel, they beat people”
175. Construction of savagery as natural. “Savagery was the nature of the beast” (Line 405)
176. Construction of the famine period and independent observers’ constructions of Ireland as a savage place. SAVAGERY

177. People constructed as aboriginal. SAVAGERY. INHERITED CONSTRUCTIONS OF IRISH?
178. . Clans break down during the encounter with imperialism. CIVIL WAR
179. “Institutional Abuse” constructed as polymorphous. “So, abuse in institutions takes many forms (Line 420)
180. Psychological terror/repression as non-locatable, non-expressible as communicated through osmosis. “you came by this terror in the same manner as you came by breathing the air “ (Line 423) “Nobody told you that your body was dirty ad bad and you didn’t want to touch your private parts (Line 423) KINESTHETIC-Proprioceptive KNOWLEDGE
181. Bodily shame communicated through non-directive means. NON VERBAL
182. Children as operating independent of society. EXCEPTIONAL CHILD
183. Fear of external shadows (the priest, the guard, the “poverty guy”). (Line 432)
THREAT
184. Charity constructed as humiliating agency.
185. Violence and insensitivity endemic.
186. Lexicon used for violence: “violence, terror, repression, cruelty.”
187. Shadows located in external and not in internal processes. (“the guards, the priest etc.) and not in the people. Power located always in the authorities.
188. Retrospective relativism rejected (that it was the “mind-set of the time”). (Line 441)

189. Military construction (“defence”).
190. People constructed as hypocrites (hearing Sermon on the Mount but carrying on with brutality). COMMUNITY? NOT CLEAR WHO IS- COMMUNITY IS BOTH ORDINARY DECENT FOLK AND HYPOCRITS- OSCILLATION
191. Genitalia constructed as “private parts”. PRIVATE-PUBLIC
192. Irish people constructed as Lawrence’s construction of Arabs because mind could hold 2 contradictory ideas in their heads. (Line 448) CONSTRUCTION CONTRADICTION- A AND NOT A CAN BE One and the same- PRIMARY PROCESS THINKING- RULES OF LOGIC DEFERRED.
193. Constitution constructed as “stinking” and to be burned. (Line 458) WRITING.
194. Deconstructs the Constitution construction of children as not people. “All the children of the country be cherished equally” (Line 460)
195. Construction of universality- “I don’t know anybody from Bohermore who wasn’t battered or other place either.” (Line 464) (Omniscient) EPISTEMOLOGY- NARRATIVE- OMNISCIENT
196. Omniscient author “Mother never recovered” AUTHOR FUNCTION
197. Construction of speech as contributing to research . RHETORIC-
198. Outrage as turned inwards. ANGER
199. Homelessness and lostness as a result of unexpressed rage. INTERROGATE CONSTRUCTION OF HOME- SO OBVIOUS BUT WHAT IS IT-
200. Violence

201. Anger reconstructed as outwards- “not available to children”.
202. Outrage as turned inwards.
203. Homelessness and lostness as a result of unexpressed rage
204. Anger reconstructed as outwards- “not available to children”.
205. Cynicism about family affection.
206. Institutions (legal and governmental) constructed as defensive.
207. Psychologists, solicitors as “barrier”. (Line 483) AGENTS OF
GOVERNMENTALITY AS BARRIER
208. Deconstruction of the Industrial School Report construction of mother as “cheerful”
and then “sullen”.
209. Non-conformism constructed as vulnerability to physical attack. CONFORMISM
CONSTRUCTED AS COLLUSION
210. Damage constructed as psychological. AFTERWARDNESS?
211. Damage constructed as “fallout” affecting society at large. Discourse of
contamination. CONTAMINATION- NON-VERBAL EFFECTS (Line 494)
212. Damage constructed as virulent (repeat of medical discourse-disease).Community
constructed as fearful of being confined in institution. CONTAMINATION (Line
496)
213. Life in institution constructed as known- “if you go in there , you know what’s going
to happen you” (Line 500) EPISTEMOLOGY

214. Construction of school as “industrial school” in polite society. COURTESY-CIVILITY (Line 500)
215. Construction of society as “polite”. (Line CIVILITY/COURTESY
216. School constructed as “trade school”.
217. Residents constructed as “fit for capitalist consumption” (Darwinian discourse, Marxist discourse). RESIDENTS CONSTRUCTED AS PRODUCTS
218. Institution constructed as self-sufficient. ECONOMICS
219. Institution constructed as granted on per capita basis. ECONOMICS
220. Institution constructed negatively because it was independent of Governance.
221. Merchants in the town constructed as profiteering. ECONOMICS
222. Institutions constructed as contaminating. (“fall out immensely damaging)
223. “Damage” as heritable through mother, through culture . ORIGINAL SIN
224. Silence constructed as generative of self-blame, and guilt by “osmosis”. NON-VERBAL
225. Silence constructed as stricture :STRICTURE (Line 519)
226. Victims constructed as not believing. (Contrast with respondent’s comment later: “I passionately believe...”)
227. Responsible “complicit” in their fate- “most vitally (Lien 526)
228. Self-blame constructed as a vital property-Paradoxical-maybe self renewing- feeding on its own despair

229. Fate constructed as “faith”
230. Numeration as rhetorical device deployed (USE OF NUMBERS-LOGICAL PROCESSES)
231. Explanatory object constructed .
232. Abuse as terror.
233. Terror constructed as deserved and as perverse power. ABUSE
234. Extreme case constructed, “there is more psychological damage in this country”
(Line 533) PSYCHOLOGICAL
235. Abuse constructed as senseless. EPSTEMOLOGY- IRRATIONALITY
236. Abuse constructed as inexcusable. CONTRADICTS PREVIOUS
237. Construction of generational consciousness, “the generation now trying to make sense of the previous generation” CONSTRUCTION OF LINKS
238. Community constructed as “they” as knowing the religious codes. SPEAKER
CONSTRUCTED AS EXCEPTIONAL
239. Knowledge of abuse compared to knowledge of genocide of Jews.
240. Hyperbolic discourse – discourse of possible isolated murders in institutions become generalised to equivalence with Nazi program. (Line 522) EXTREME
FORMULATION

241. Mein Kampf and the Bible constructed as texts with directive messages but contradiction as one text is constructed as potent and the latter as impotent to effect and affect behaviour. (Line 543) WRITING/TEXTS NARRATIVE
242. Hatred constructed as rationale for massacre. HATRED
243. Institutions constructed as “society writ large” (line 547) WRITING-THE BOOK OF LIFE
244. Abuser constructed as “country gawks” and as abused.
245. Seminarians constructed as abusive environments
246. Discourse of conspiracy and thriller, “there was a lot of stuff going down”
247. Original sin. (Prime mover of discourse). “Tainted stuff” (Line 553)
248. Theory of slippery slope ethics- emotional, physical, sexual, and homicidal attacks.
249. Response to abuse constructed as “blame”.
250. Blame being “on the hook”
251. Country constructed as terrible in the past . DISTANCIATION , “this was a terrible country” (Line 570)
252. Reconstructed as “more terrible” through reflection. “When I was a child this was a terrible country and it is more terrible in reflection “ (Line 571) Powerlessness to change it? DOES SOMETHING BECOME ACTIVATED EMOTIONALLY THROUGH DISCURSIVE MEDIATION. NARRATIVE
253. Memory as means of vivifying historical terror. NARRATIVE

254. Independence deconstructed as non-revolutionary.
255. History constructed as “power broking” and killing of idealists/poets.
256. Educational system constructed as the “Murder Machine” doing the damage in Ireland.
257. Military discourse
258. History constructed as power struggle.
259. Independence constructed as greed for power.
260. New Ireland constructed nepotist , clannish, dynastic. HISTORY
261. Ireland constructed as feudal and medieval. HISTORY
262. Looking for “excuse” constructed as “crime”. “Now there’s no excuse, and it’s looking for the excuse, that’s where the crime, that’s where the the real crime is in trying to explain it. There is no excuse. (Line 606)
263. Existential discourse (“the human condition”) (Line 604)
264. Judicial discourse – entire people constructed as “guilty”.
265. Terror constructed as disclosed. (something that can be opened or closed) “you were saying emm that things are coming back to you and terror is beginning to disclose itself again” (My intervention- Line 611)
266. Progressive versus statist conceptions constructed. (Opening or closing)
267. Construction of thinking as “evolving”. (movement)

268. Construction of society as oppressive, dark and spectral (repetition of “shadows” from earlier on) “but that spectre of that oppressive dark society followed me all my life.
(Line 620) SINISTER-
269. Evolution –“came to the point”
270. Peace with oneself and with society as separate constructions.
271. Own discourse deconstructed as “moral grandstanding”. POSTMODERN
REFLEXIVITY
272. Moral grandstanding = non-duplicity.
273. Interview constructed as an “exercise”- Educational/sports discourse. ACADEMIC-
NON-ACADEMIC
274. “it followed me all my life” What? The spectre? The spectral discourse??? WHAT
DISCOURSE
275. Irish society constructed as drunken, destructive. COMMUNITY
276. Continent constructed as sober (Belgium)
277. Foundations of society constructed as “rivers of filth” as “poisoned fumes” (line 637)
(repeat of earlier discourse of contamination and viral infection) . ORIGINAL SIN
278. Society constructed on the basis of “original sin”, as inherited corruption.
279. Construction of “corruption” (A word with political and biblical resonances –
corruption of the flesh and the political body-

280. Society constructed around disgrace=the medical, clerical and policing professions.
“They all belonged to this horror”. (Line 641)
281. Construction of “disgrace”- the theme of grace/disgrace- Earlier, the speaker says ,
“By the grace of God” (Line 621) - Trace this “word “throughout”. Is disgrace the
flipside of a buried discourse of what is “grace”.
282. Abuse constructed as “horror”. (Line 641)
283. People (undifferentiated) constructed as knowing what happened, as not innocent/not
ignorant. Very inflexible. EPISTEMOLOGY- COMMUNITY
284. Plea (Legal discourse) constructed as legitimate-
285. People constructed as knowing it was about power (the old sovereign model of power,
top heavy and dichotomous (rich versus poor, power brokers versus poets, country
versus city, Bishop and palace versus ghetto, Bishop’s school versus state school).
EDUCATION
286. Behaviour of professions constructed as collusive. “Except they did know what they
were doing, they knew it was about power” (Line 645) GOVERNMENTALITY
287. Power constructed as a possession. “if I don’t get the power”. STATIST
DISCOURSE OF POWER- POWER NOT AS BETWEEN PEOPLE BUT AS
LOCATED IN ORGANISATIONS.
288. Powerless constructed as the dead, “coming out in coffins”
289. Image – personal memory? Coffin coming out of the top window. (Line 648)

290. Powerless something to be got rid of-shameful if not in coffins. can't be brought out the open door.
291. constructed as polymorphous. "So abuse takes many forms" (Line 649)
292. Abuse hierarchy constructed from sexual to physical/emotional in terms of effects. (Psychological discourse). "physical , I feel, can be recovered from infinitely more readily than psychological and emotional abuse" (Line 650) ABUSE
293. Psychological health constructed as lack of anger and resentment.
294. Sexual abuse constructed as confined to small minority.
295. Absolutist discourse : "we lived in terror day and night" (Line 662)
296. Biblical discourse : " flesh is corrupt". (Line 662)
297. Genealogy constructed (bastards) connected to economics and inheritance. (very important historically in post famine Ireland where small tenures could not support large families) .
298. General abuse constructed – tyranny as general.
299. Sexuality constructed as "filthy".
300. . Humans constructed as right or wrong (the moral constructions of earlier on) and as evil .
301. Academic
302. Abuse constructed as a "concept"

303. Abuse constructed as “narrow” “I think that if in your research and ultimately by your thesis you manage to, to broaden the concept of abuse and the damage away from , this is to do with the buggery and incest thing, very narrow, very narrow” (Line 694)
304. Abuse constructed as separate to damage- not clear whether it is inclusive of or separate from
305. Discourse of Morality (right and wrong-) Dichotomous thinking.
306. Guilty (Discourse of Law/Crime). Abusers constructed as out group and then deconstructed as in-group.
307. Abuse constructed as an “it”- impersonal as a moving target like an arrow: “it missed me”.
308. Abuse constructed as character defamation, “to expand abuse to every time I blacken another person’s character” (Line 699)
309. Abuse constructed from visual “you paint a picture, not paint a picture but give a very vivid account” (Line 702- My intervention) Aesthetic discourse
310. Discourse of enumeration. “This country needs 10’000 psychotherapists tomorrow” (Line 706)
311. Discourse of entrapment, capture (hunting or fishing)
312. Military discourse
313. Discourse of civilisation versus savagery
314. Discourse of expiation

315. Discourse of Christianity (prayer)
316. Discourse of the inner and outer experiences (outrageous picking up the rabid tones in “tooth and nail”) (line 721)
317. Local settlement constructed as “community”.
318. Enumeration (hundreds of thousands)
319. Abuse constructed as a spiritual problem
320. Response to abuse constructed by speaker as a “Mammonite” solution. (Line 732)
321. Speakers constructs ideal response as “community refuge” (line 727)
322. Response constructed as “double-think” and “hypocrisy” and as vomit. “a refuge from this horrible, horrible double-think hypocrisy thing where children and youngsters, people can spill their guts and say whatever they want” (Line 737)
323. Ideal response constructed as moral edification. People constructed as illiterate and debased.
324. Construction of corporate literacy (Reader Limited) as solution.
325. Talking of deprivation constructed as “bullshit “ and “bollocks”. (Line 744)
326. Action constructed as ideal solution- Talking versus Action. Writing versus Speaking (classics versus Discharge).
327. Elevation/Lowering (Note theme of dragging versus elevation). Gravity and Celestial light. Raising. VERTICAL /HORIZONTAL
328. Disease. (“stuck in their scabs”). (Line 749)

329. Construct the academic object: “your thesis” (line 750)
330. Discourse of flight-technology of elevation
331. People constructed as “human beings”- Note that this is the first time the term is used. Does this discourse create the object “human beings in this instance”. The discourse of Platonic celestialty?
332. Discourse of ethnic cleansing, the holocaust, refusal of refugees, anti-Semitism.
333. Discourse of darkness/light/Legion of Mary – HIDDEN AND VISIBLE “Now the auld Legion of Mary thing right, better it is to strike a light than to curse the darkness, that’s their thing right”. (Line 774)
334. Discourse of segregation (economic, ethnic, gender, generational (children versus adults)- See Smirgel’s paper (Universal Law and Perversion)
335. Deprivation constructed as educational lack.
336. Intelligence constructed as a “knife” as a medical lance or a guillotine. “intelligence is like a very sharp knife, you can use it to lance a boil or to decapitate yourself“ (Line 791) DISEASE
337. Abused constructed as headless
338. Society constructed as conformist.
339. Discourse of materiality/celestialty – (For example , “under..the the surface of this country ...savagery) “You know there’s not very much under ...the...the...the surface of this country far from savagery” (Line 804)
340. Religious discourse (thank God, thank God,)

341. Capitalism constructed as beast, again the animal , the savage. “most of these educations are placed in the service of the capitalist beast where all they want is a career” (Line 807)
342. University constructed as unenlightened (discourse of darkness and lightness. “A university is like a qualifying place so that you can work in the bank or the post office , that kind of shit , it’s not a place of enlightenment” (Line 809)
343. Communitarism constructed , “ “community awareness” (Line 811)
344. Originary thinking: the construction of the autochthonism-(honest folk) “the auld stock, the honest people” (Line 814)
345. Construction of society as non-institutional as if institutions are only indicated by buildings.
346. “People” constructed as community
347. Community constructed as responsive
348. Response constructed as contemporary, not historical
349. Response constructed as following on reports “when the reports, when the various reports came out. You began to see, to begin with there was if you like paedophilia” (Line 831)
350. Construction of two categories of abuse (sexual and other). “And the number of people who were abused in other ways is a very small thing” (Line 836)
351. Construction of response as shame due to inaction. “now they feel ashamed because they didn’t do something about it” (Line 837)

352. Response generalised from a small group of individuals. “We knew what was going on...my mother knew what was going on; my uncle had come out of that place, my auntie Bridget had come out of that lace and my auntie Katie had come out of that place but the terror is so pervasive” (Line 842-844)
353. Abuse reconstructed (threat of hell) as worse than murder. Abuse constructed as psychological terror. Calls into question previous construction of 2 categories of abuse. (sexual versus general) and the implicit scale of severity. “ At least the Soviets didn’t threaten people with hell, you got a bullet in the back of the head, that’s a very- you know- momentary thing” (Line 849)
354. Construction of notions of truth and truth-telling. “But to be threatened with hell for all eternity for questioning people or telling the truth; I told my mother the truth about the priest” (Line 850)
355. Construction of individual experience as microcosm for larger experiences. Language of Science.
356. Construction of the journalistic idea of the exposé. “ I suppose too that there is a fear of exposing the rottenness in case we’re all engulfed in it” (Line 858)
357. Construction of truth as overwhelming, “engulfing”
358. Construction of public confessionality . See earlier in interview where speaker criticises public confessional for victims but seems to support for perpetrators. “so we’re having these religious orders confessing and renewal weekends; we’ll have these renewal weekends” (Line 865)

359. Construction of causality between reports and response. “I’d like to know when you said the community response from your neighbourhood became more vocal after the reports” (Line 872)
360. Journalism constructed as expository. “Because some brave person said, “I’m going to expose these bastards” (Line 890)
361. Response constructed by me as understanding, belief or perception. (Blunderbuss constructions that obscure the real meaning of what one is saying). “What is your understanding or why did you believe it suddenly happened at that time” (Line 887)
362. Perpetrators constructed as “bastards”
363. Whistle-blower constructed as individual and brave.
364. Media response constructed mangling (destructive /cleansing). “this overweight lady makes this documentary which mangles the whole goddamn lot of them” (Line 893)
365. Perpetrators constructed as god –damned
366. Construction of equivalence between responding to holocaust and to institutional abuse
367. Construction of the obliterated individual (Atomisation/vaporisation). “Now unfortunately these individuals are often obliterated before the effects of their standing up is, are felt , you know” (Line 901)
368. Violent response- “Well I mean , for me to have done what I ought to have done to that priest , which was to kick him in the balls” (Line 906)

369. Construction of the perspectival difference between child and adult- priest and child: “Jesus M you were ten years of age . You’re looking at the fucking pope” (Line 910)
370. Moral knowledge constructed as “deep and persecuting” (Line 912) and cross all the ages.
371. Construction of everyone as complicit, as child as complicit. “the horror of it is that everybody is complicit” (Line 920)
372. Construction of absence of complicity as “full disclosure”. (Is full disclosure possible?)
373. Church leader constructed as “pseudo Vatican” and hitman. (Vatican as mafia organisation) (Line 925)
374. Construction of sovereignty of Church (Bishop’s Palace). “I know where they (records) are , they’re in a reinforced building up in the Bishop’s Palace” (Line 922)
375. Construction of conflict between conciliation and change
376. Construction of Catholic Church as institution and as rotten. “he belongs to an institution that is rotten from the top to the bottom, “Line 927)
377. Church Hierarchy – Bishop/Arch bishop
378. Reformation
379. Church Practise (Mass)
380. Participation constructed as contributing to institution

381. Constructed self as outside Church. “I’m not participating within the institution. I’m going to mass” (Line 954) “That’s not the institution. That’s the only place I can get mass”
382. Going to Mass constructed as separate from child abuse
383. Church constructed as a physical hyphen of continuity between adult and child experiences. “like Martin Luther said, there are certain practises, Catholic practise so deeply ingrained in me that it would be a waste of time trying to find something else (Line 962) It’s about you going to say your prayers in a place that you like to say your prayers where you said them as a child” (Line 973-974)
384. Relationship to society constructed as not at peace.
385. Irish history deconstructed as sentimental and bullshit and falsified. “ “I don’t buy its bullshit history, the Minstrel Boy to the war is gone and Mother McCree, up you go” (Line 979)
386. Deconstruction of mythologies. “an oppressed people will tend to create myths to sustain themselves but once the sustaining is over you should drop it” (Line 994)
387. Civil War
388. Teleological constructions (“one last thing, the end”). (LINE 1001)
389. Therapeutic constructions (“we’ve explored”) (Line 1002)
390. Abuse constructed as “percolating” through families. (Line 1006)

391. Response to “abuse” constructed as journalistic, statutory, familial, personal. “not just my family...and the idea of surviving these experiences seems to be of we can’t be just limited to buildings and confined institutions.. (My intervention (Line 1016)

Responses deconstructed as “dick shit” because “you’ve been caught”. Who’s been caught?
Not clear (Line 1027) Apology versus meaningless Apologia

392. Self-construction as honest – the interview constructed as completely honest
(Absolutist construction) “ I was more driven by the need to be completely honest”
(Line 1033)

Appendix B7 : List of Distilled Discourses

Apparatus: (Network that binds discourses together- I am using the term developed by Giorgio Agamben, as a concept denoting anything that has the capacity to capture, orientate, determine, intercept, model, control or secure the gestures, opinions, behaviours or discourses

of living beings. The concept is important because power is located, for Foucault, within the matrix of relationships and not within a stable site, such as in the sovereign King or President etc. So, identification of the apparatuses allows for the clearer understanding of the channel of distribution of power within the context of this interview. Of course, it must be acknowledged that we come up against an intractable philosophical problem which has its roots in the unresolved debate between materialism and idealism. What external validity to me has for identifying these apparatuses? Upon what criterion are they based? Let me start from first principles: I recorded an interview between the respondent and I which was based on some broad lines of inquiry in relation to institutional abuse in Ireland. Firstly, this exchange was an oral co-construction, something born out of the moment, out of the context with innumerable and unknowable determinants (personal, social history, history of mutual homeplace, friendship, differences, weather, accidents of mood, happenstance etc.; in other words a combination of the aleatory and the planned) . This meeting and this oral event is structured or circumscribed by the audio recording, which in this instance becomes the canvas that frames the encounter. Now, the material reality of our conversation is captured by the apparatus , the audio recording. I am reminded of Marx's phrase, "all that is solid melts into air"- Where do the unrecorded, private conversations go when they are not recorded? Do they penetrate into the public consciousness.? What is different about this one? Anyway, the materiality of our conversation is fixed, as a photograph in its solution. And my analysis takes a methodology (FDA) which I interpret and then apply. So , in a sense my reading of our conversation is read through my reading of Foucault. How can I say with any confidence that what I establish within the text of the interview has any relationship to the external world? In other words, if I am talking about apparatuses identified within the text, can I say that these apparatuses exist in the world outside our interview? No , I cannot make such a direct equivalence. However, I can say that the apparatuses identified have a coherent

relationship to the world outside the interview because these apparatuses are identified within the discourse, which is a social and historical structure of material consciousness. So, I am siding with a theory of knowledge which favours the coherence theory of truth (truth of a statement is determined by its relation to other statements rather than the world) over the correspondence theory of truth. (truth of statement is determined by its relationship to the world and whether it accurately describes it) It is another debate to say whether these discourses or apparatuses determine reality or are effects of reality. The objective of my writing is not to debate this, but to identify these discourses, to flag them up as significant and hitherto ignored features of the topic under question: institutional abuse in Ireland.

In this interview the following apparatuses have been identified throughout. The apparatus is a heuristic device which could be also called a master discourse and there is no reason why discourses identified below can function as apparatuses for in reality, as every discourse functions a kind of apparatus. The difference is that an apparatus can also be something other than a discourse (as in architecture or money) and that is why I use it here. However, it may be argued that I cannot describe these elements as non-discursive as that moves me out of my site of research (the material discourse elaborated within the interview) into referencing the world outside. In other words, I am confusing the description with the thing described, a procedural and categorical error, mistaking the symbolic structure of discourse for the material reality it constructs. My response is that there is another way of looking at it. If there is a distinction between apparatuses and discourses identified within the discourse of the respondent, then this difference should be schematised but it must be acknowledged that this is a constructed difference. The question is whether these constructions exist in other

respondents' accounts which would be an interesting question and shed light on whether there is likelihood for the existence of these structures in the consciousness of people.

Institutions constructed as secretive, silent, "benign" (Line 138) defensive, "barrier" (Line 483)

Abuse constructed as not surprising, as categorisable (physical and sexual), as shocking, horrendous, censored, "track-covering" (echoes palimpsest metaphor later), as threat, as disciplining, as terror (Line 525) polymorphous "So abuse takes many forms" (Line 649). "Physical, I feel, can be recovered from infinitely more readily than psychological and emotional abuse" (Line 650). Constructed as "too narrow to be confined to sexuality. "to expand abuse to every time I blacken another person's name" (Line 699) Collapse back into moral categorisation of acts. "The number of people who were abused in other ways is a very small thing" (Line 836)

Experience is constructed as identical to its description, as if having experienced an event permits its description. Illusory correspondence between what has happened and what can be described:

"We knew what was going on...my mother knew what was going on, my uncle had come out of that place, my auntie Bridget had come out of that place and my auntie Katie had come out of that place but the terror is so pervasive" (Line 842-844)

Abused coming out of coffins.

Construction of community as knowing “we knew” (Line 139) as savage , as horrible , as invisible (Bishop never visited) . “Out of this pool of general savagery , you have these men and women prepared for the religious life” (Line 271) Aboriginals, Arabs, shadows located in the external world “ the priest, the guard, the “poverty guy” .cast shadows . drunken, violent, destructive. “The auld stock , the honest people” (Line 814)

Abusers constructed as the Government, the “ new management” (Line 251) “country bastards” “creatures” “gawks” . “I’m going to expose these bastards” (Line 890) Legitimacy

Speaker constructed in various positions see positioning

List of identified set-ups

1. **Epistemological Discourse/Philosophical discourse Platonism/ Idealism/** where literally the idea is suspended in the ether. Platonic Christianity: Existentialist discourse (man’s search for meaning). Discourse of idealism (wish fulfilment/deferred reality). Discourse of the visible- “esse est percipi”. To be is to be perceived . Judaeo-Christian philosophy- Humanist philosophy: Cartesian Subject. Phenomenological Subject. (Free will, individual agency).
Free will- “it did seem that they had settled on that as method of life”

(Berkeleyian idealism). Discourse of perception/vision. Throughout the interview

2. **Discourse of Science. Newtonian physics.** (NSD Post Newtonian physics- string theory, relativity) Deductive reasoning (NSD: inductive method). Scientific Discourse- Induction/Deduction- (NSD: Arational – for example pre-socratic discourse/magical thinking). Epistemes. Top down discourse. Darwinian discourse seen in use of language “it evolved “
3. **Enlightenment discourse. NSD** (Pre-enlightenment discourse- magic/ prescience/poetry/asynchronicity) Science/not science-Buddhism/French enlightenment. “If I could do anything to enlighten” (Line 16) . “You see, you have this idea that the perpetrators of these crimes, this savagery were people of sharpened enlightened mod..mor...moral perceptions. They weren’t , they were what we called country bastards”
4. **Architecture**: Parish house, hospital and the home. Discourse of town planning/architectural. Ghetto – social housing – “I had been in what you might call a genteel, repressed...and was then catapulted into an environment where”

“there was huge house there, a pseudo-Georgian house as I recall and I went with my mother into this- there was marble-covered hall”

The Body: Ancient Epidemiology discourse (“body was dirty”) related to religious discourse and its injunction against defiling the body. Religious discourse of purity/impurity. How the spoken word become unspoken after a certain time . (John 1:1) In the beginning there was the word and the Word was with God and the Word was God. The discursive becomes non-discursive, invisible but materially secreted through the bodies of people.

5. Discourse of medicine Disease/medicine contagion- “the fallout” ; “mother passed it on to us”. Discourse of Medicine and Disease (“benign”). Discourse of medicine and disease. (Epidemiology-probably one of the oldest discourses.) Damage of abuse constructed as “fall out” (Line 494) Discourse of contamination (original sin) (Picks up the theme of contamination from TB) . Damage constructed as virulent (Line 496) “Tainted stuff” (Line 553) . “rivers of filth” ...poisoned fumes” (line 637) . “flesh is corrupt “ (Line 662) “stuck in their scabs” (Line 750) . Intelligence constructed as a medical instrument “ Intelligence is like a very sharp knife, you can use to lance a boil or decapitate yourself” . “I suppose too that there was fear of exposing the rottenness in case we’re all engulfed by it” (Line 858) Not to myself- Reith lecture by John Searles- or Ramachandra- How did people distinguish themselves from each other- If one has a disease, the other will have it , if there is no distinction- maps onto the idea of the psychic skin covering a community- lack of individuation . Varying processes of individuation – Bishop’s poem about visiting the dentist. “Now unfortunately these individuals are often obliterated before the effects of their standing up is, are felt, you now” (Line 901) . Medical discourse (repeated) (“the cancer is confined”). Discourse of disease /medicine corruption- contamination (“the whole thing breaks down again”). Discourse of contagion- “ghettos”.

6. Sexual Discourse. “Now the word sex was never mentioned” (Line 142) “I didn’t know what the word buggery meant” (Line 143). Genitalia constructed as private parts (Line 445) . “filthy” (Line 680?) (“he’s only a fucker”) Discourse of sex, constructed as outside language. (wasn’t talked about- osmosis)

7. **Patriarchal Discourse** – boy, man , priest, secretary (priest) , bishop. “Fathers felt obliged to beat you” (Line 275)
8. **Feminine discourse** (Then she got a job in an institution where the children were but she was not allowed to speak to the children and they were not allowed to speak to her” (Line 298) . Damage heritable through the mother? Original sin?
9. **Nature?** natural law, harmony, communality-no hierarchy, oral culture, folk wisdom, biohealth?
10. **Economics / Money**. (mercantile exchange units). Civilisation needs money, industrial schools train their residents to earn money and to have the potential to earn money in the future. Discourse of capitalism : “the merchants” Marxist discourse. Economics (Language of recruitment) - Discourse of economics (fee of “half of crown” for Bishop’s school). DF: To reveal the workings of social division. Institutional abuse constructed as “a whole business” (Line 334) . residents “fit for capitalist consumption” (Line 505?) . Merchants constructed as profiteering in the town . Compensation a “mammonite solution” (Line 732). “Most of these educations are placed in the service of the capitalist beast where all they want is a career.” (Line 807). Business Discourse . (“part of the deal”)
11. **Genealogy**. Linking systems- whether through bloodlines (dynasties) or timelines (medieval), terror of remembering. Inheritance. Or is the apparatus murder? (rising, the educational system, power struggles.) Discourse of Legitimacy – orphans- “St Anne’s , another orphan institution” (Line 25)
12. Written Word. **The Text** (Bible, The Classics, literacy, conceptualisation, enumeration- these are the strategies of discourse which constitute the scaffolding of the constructs

deployed. Reports (Inquiries, records on former resident, the academic text (thesis), journalistic texts, documentaries (reportage). Writing is the codifying scheme which screens and constitutes these discourses. Text/ Writing (palimpsest, the constitution, the Sermon on the Mount) dawn of history and discourse Written word apparatus: Bible, Constitution, reports, Mein Kampf...institutions were : Subcategories of Writing: Archival, Scriptural, Letters, Records, Legal, Parliamentary, constitution, memoirs, school reports (his mother's) . Rarefied discourse of writing (classic) . Originalism (Biblical, Constitutional, Legal, Social discourses, Scalia- discourses constructing meanings from constructed origins.) Powerful discourse along the lines of , “in the beginning was the Word”. Maybe link this to the “Written Word”. Think of all the modern movements which proceed from a reversion back to older documents: virtually all new religions of the past 400 years based on a return to “Ur texts” (the Bible).

NARRATIVE discourse- is this subsumed under **WRITING** . Constitution constructed as “stinking” (Line 458) (should be burned...this is the discourse of Nazism which is criticised later) .

Reader limited- daughter elevation talking versus action

Inextricably linked with writing and the construction of a narrative is the OMNISCIENT construction of reality- the eagle-eye view . “I don't know anybody from X who wasn't battered “ (Line 464) “Mother never recovered” (Line ?)

(a)Biography:

(b) Memoir “ I know Mannix Flynn who wrote a book about Letterfrack , “ enough said “ or something like that ..I don't know what it's called, a sort of fictional idea” (Line 373)

(c) Orphan literature. “It was extremely dramatic for me”- theatrics. Narrative framing

(chronology) shapes material which in reality does not adhere to clear chronologies (for example the 3 Act Play of Hollywood scripting)

(d) Rhetorical discourse (not surprising, shocking) . “They all belonged to this horror” (Line 641) “We lived in terror day and night “ (Line 662)

(e) Fairy-tale (horror) Use of the trope: “One day the authorities came...” NARRATIVE

(f) Thriller conspiracy “There was a lot of stuff going down” (Line 550)

(g) Discourse Travel Writing of the critic (the observer, Fr O Brien and the 19th century travellers) adopted by respondent. Discourse of savagery and tribal violence.

(h) Discourse itself constructed as speculative, philosophical and psychological- privileging of action or silence over writing. These competing constructions of the oral and the written, the verbal and the textual reappear again and again.

(i) **Literary discourse** (what is fiction or not- a very topical discourse) controversial over falsified memoirs (alloys of fact and fiction) in US at present.

13. **Religion** Discourse of hell (see previous section on discourse of celestiaity /materiality). Eternal versus Temporary. Not just Christian discourse. Subsume under Religious Discourse. Rite (expressed in song or religious practise) Does this precede religion. I am thinking of the birth of tragedy, when the pastoral tradition of chasing the goat away from eating the crops, becomes transfigured into scapegoating in which a goat is killed, and the this becomes locus for the choir, and the birth of tragedy. Rite, a fundamental structuring principle that holds things together until they emerge and become known. Buddhist discourse. (NSD: Western hegemonic Christianity (duality))

Biblical discourse ? Discourse of the sinister. (Left-handedness, the devil, homosexuality, horror movies etc.) . Discourse of Christianity? Biblical, religious, Christian and Catholic . How name the discourse? Religious discourse ? Umbrella phrase. Vernacular. 12. “Buggery”, anal intercourse but also abominable heresy (obs OED.

Discourse of **Christianity** (Magdalan Laundry) DF : To repeat the discursive insistence of the “fallen woman”, the implicit Madonna and Whore discourse. Does this discourse precede Christianity.?

Religion . DF: To illustrate a scene associated with rites and rituals, monotony.

Discourse of **Catholicism** :

the confessional (secrecy) – complainant as confessor. DF- to thwart the circulation of speech outside the confessional box. Confessional discourse as constraint.

So we’re having these religious order confessing and renewal weekend “ (Lien 865)

BAPTISM- Liquid apparatus: the alcohol, the river- Original sin (to be washed away?)

The hidden discourse of “baptism”, the apparatus par excellence of the Christian era to signify initiation.

“like Martin Luther said, there are certain practice, Catholic practise so deeply ingrained in me that it would be a waste of time trying to find something else” (Line 962) “It’s about you going to say your prayers in a place that you like to say your prayers where you said them as a child”

14. **Oral Discourse** versus written discourse. Primitive discourse of orality (tooth and nail). "Neither of them ever mentioned this in their lives" (Line 27) Something is heard but the speaker is not identified – no trace set against the written culture. "stricture of silence" (Line 519)

15. **Visual Discourse**- Discourse of visual painting –giving background. (repeated motif of two planes: background and unmentioned foreground. Is the foreground deferred, does it exist? Is there just background?

"I need to give you a little bit of background on this " (Line 100)

"We used to see these boys, you know labouring in the fields" (Line 21)

"I never met another child" (Line 162) contradicts the tableau of having seen "the boys labouring in the depths of winter"- (Hilary Clinton's famous comment about arriving in Sarajevo under sniper fire.

"you paint a picture, not paint a picture but give a very vivid account" (Line 702)

Auditory Discourse: HEARING -ORAL-AUDITORY-Vernacular - Gossip. (You'd hear of a boy escaped)

Discourse of horror – belong to TV or VISUAL or NARRATIVE (long corridors (The Shining), the theatrical language (which were incredibly quiet):

Filmic (High Noon)- (hero son). Hollywood- Steven McQueen... Slang (Movie Talk) : "the clean-up guy"

Discourse of the VISUAL PLANE horizontal and the vertical: (spectre above, the river below, the coffins coming out top windows, buried below).

List of General Discourses

1. Courtly Discourse :Diplomacy? Courtesy. “Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed” (Line 3) Civilisation – “polite society” from Discourse of civilisation? (psychological men versus the animal boys (settling for food and shelter). Savagery and civilisation: Discourse of the Primitive and the Civilised . (Is this the older discourse of Imperial Britain and its “shadow”, the savage Irish?) Romanticism- (nature versus nurture, civilisation versus savagery). ROMANTICISM Sublime versus the material.
2. Discourse of genealogy (country bastards) Discourse of hunter/gatherer –phylogenetic discourse . Construction of society as “polite” (Line 500) . Civil discourse (governmentality).
3. Discourse of Time- Linguistic Discourse- “what were your thoughts” (Line 10). Discourse of Teleology (“I see the end that it is coming to”) Construction of response as historical as opposed to contemporary. “We found out when we were in advanced adulthood” (Lines 4 and 17) . “In the depths of winter”. “We found out when we were in the advanced adulthood” (Line 4 and 17)
12. Academia. Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed” (Line 3). “A university is like a qualifying place so that you can work in the bank of post office, that kind of shit, it’s not a place of enlightenment” (Line 809)
13. Discourse of the Mother (Matrilineal discourse) : “We six children of my mother’s ”
14. Journalism. “for agreeing to be interviewed” (Line 2)

15. Psychological Discourse. “your thoughts or feelings or responses” (Line 10) Discourse of Psychology?) cognitive, behavioural tropes. (thoughts, feelings). Psychology discourse. Army recruits constructed as “coming from all sorts of psychological directions” (contrast to unidirectional, apsychological (“decapitated”) passive, silent, demasculinised (“boys”) residents. “There is more psychological damage in this country “ (Line 533)
16. Pedagogy. “My mother was raised in one” (Line 15) “She had been raised in this institution” (Line 29) The word “raised” is a word that be used to classify the upbringing of human and animal and has myriad associative possibilities such as raising the dead, raising a subject etc.
17. Education: Residents constructed as “graduates” (Line 45) “Steve McQueen was a graduate” (of Boystown) (Line 398) Murder machine (line 580?) . Interview constructed as an “exercise”.
18. Discourse of Magic : The sinister- “sinister darkness “ (Line 81). “that spectre of that oppressive dark society followed me all my life” (Line 620)
19. Rhetoric. (subsume style) Language of debates: “topic”. (NSD: plain
20. Discourse of democracy (shared values)
21. Public and private discourse. (Rules which govern public/private discourse.) “the public revelations, we all knew privately it was going on anyway” (Line 18). “You know when we were young we all knew there were sinister things” (Line 19) . “the public revelations and the various investigatory boards and that came as no surprise” (Line 35)

22. Legal discourse (investigatory bodies) . Legal (“bona fide”) underpinned by Biblical discourse (“good faith”). Entire people constructed as “guilty, your honour” Line 600?) .
Use of the word “plea” (line 645?)
23. Gender Discourse : Masculinity/Feminity- Gender?.Discourse of masculinity (boys and men). DF is to take away the potency of those who were in the institutions, de sex them. Perhaps this discourse alludes to unsaid homosexual practises. Masculinity as violent/inferior or superior/genteel/snobbish or as abandoning. Masculinity as violent/inferior or superior/genteel/snobbish or as abandoning. Femininity as respectable, dependable, renowned. Patriarchy
24. Friendship. DF: to contrast with discourse of seignor and vassal complainant to priest, priest to secretary, secretary to bishop.
25. Discourse of Punishment : “punitive measures would be taken if you suggested “
(Line 32) Lateral effects of punishment incarceration –“the gulag” of punishment. DF: To install fear, to situate “institutional abuse” within an historical context , which appears to be a tendentious comparison? (Soviet gulag versus Irish industrial schools). Respondent refers to the absence of this discursive term, “We didn’t have the word for that.”. In other words a word which wasn’t known at the time (gulag) is now used to describe a historical reality. Discourse of punishment. DF: Incarceration ≠ Punishment (not necessarily) Two very different discourses. Discourse of punishment and discipline. DF: To show how the industrial school such as Letterfrack was used as a disciplining tool. “punitive measures would be taken if you suggested”
(Line 32)

26. Discourse of the CHILD- Victorianism: DF: Associated phenomena: repressed sexuality, children to be seen and not heard. CHILD Discourse Magical thinking (in relation to the child's constructed omnipotence). "Society works one way, children make their own arrangements" The quotidian, the vernacular, the "natural". Discourse of Child Abuse. (older terminology , "children were battered and beaten") Discourse of the 1960s-1980s.
27. Discourse of work- the daily routine, the tasks delineated
28. Violence - use of word "struck" the same word used earlier to indicate realisation. The same signifier has two different signifieds- violence and epiphany. "this was a punitive society ; it was a society born in blood, in intrigue and treachery" (Line 339)
29. Military Discourse- siege mentality of the society- defensive. War. Discourse of warfare (murderous and treacherous). Military discourse (repeated- defensive – earlier "siege mentality"). (you can either be volunteered or you can be drafted) Spectacle: Parade- Corpus Christi- Façade- Archaic discourses. Overlapping military and patriotic discourses. Patriotism (fly the flag) Discourse of Songs (Patriotic Discourses). Discourse of the Holocaust Discourse of War reconciliation. Conciliation , peace-making (see later the construction of the IRA)
30. Criminal discourse. Surveillance/crime.
31. Imperialism discourse (half crown, under the British)
32. Discourse of biology ("breathing in the air")-
33. Professionalism/ Guilds - Discourse of the professionals as barriers (psychologists, solicitors)

34. Cuisine “dishing out what they had been given”
35. Revolutionary discourse. (Picking up terror in other places).
36. Demotic discourse Use of deliberate ungrammatical discourse –“them people”:.Discourse of style (“if this isn’t too awkward a comparison”) . Discourse of ein volk, the people.
DF: To foreclose critique or scrutiny because of the self-evident common sense language of the people. To disguise individual difference and heterogeneity.
37. Discourse of professionalism/ amateurism (paedophila constructed as occupation; Soviets constructed as amateurs).
38. Discourse of Mythology (see Barthes’ 7 categories of myth). “an oppressed people will tend to create myths to sustain themselves but once the sustaining is over you should drop it” (Line 994) . “I don’t buy its bullshit history, the Minstrel Boy to the war is gone, and Mother Macree” (Line 979)

Absent Discourses at certain junctures in the text.

- 7 Foucauldian Discourse
- 8 Plain speech
- 9 Vernacular
- 10 Gift Exchange (Hyde, 1983)
- 11 Privacy- Non-Distribution- (Not Academia)

- 12 Free thinking. Free individual adults (as opposed to the children)
- 13 Secular, natural law, harmony, communality-no hierarchy, oral culture, folk wisdom, biohealth?
- 14 Nature, “hedge school (19th century unofficial schools en plein air)
- 15 Discourse of gift economy, feudalism, bartering etc. Discourse of benignity and facilitative environments? Speech/Verbalisation
- 16 Natural law discourse, anarchic discourse.
- 17 Less deterministic discourse. Nonsense talk. Discourses of dishonesty, trickery, invention (possible sites of resistance to being captured) Individualism, the postmodern stance on not fetishizing the past, the discourse of the oral tradition, secularism, relativism, Unclassifiable, the spontaneous, the amoral, the homely, the productive economy, Secular discourse Materialistic discourse, Achronological discourse (quantum physics or Presocratic philosophy). Very old and very recent discourses....Alogical experience of time,

Appendix B7: Positioning and Subjectivity

1. The respondent is constructed in the passive tense. At this stage it is not clear what can be thought, felt from the various subject positions. Preliminary observations are that the subject positions are at once informal and formal. The discursive construction is academic but the positions mapped out within the discursive construction are apparently informal (use of address of first name). Is there a concealed manipulation going on with this alloy of formal and informal discourse? To put it another way, would it not have been possible for the discourse to have been kept more formal? It seems to me that that what can be felt or thought is in part constituted out of discourses of courtesy (formality) and informality (use of personal address). In line with the above notes on the function of these discourses it may be stated that the function of courtesy is manifold but includes (a) conciliation and thereby may foreclose conflict and (b) generative- in that it generates trust or warmth, thereby constructing subjects that are positioned in closeness to each other. On the other hand, the academic discourse constructs subjects that are distanced from each other, that the respondent is positioned passively by use of a formal discursive marker (interview). Subjectivity vacillates between these two poles.

2. Passivity-subject subjected to academic discourse. Response as originally possessed by the participant but then he is dispossessed of responsiveness as his response is deferred by the grammatical construction. So he is given the capacity to respond and to not respond at the same time. Also the response is constructed as possessed by respondent (your response) rather than constructed by interview. In other words the response is constructed as an essential category within the subject, rather than as co-constructed process.
3. Interviewer speaking on behalf of academic institution. Respondent positioned as a thinker, feeler but not as actor. Interviewer positioned as agentive character and respondent as passive character. The above segment facilitates the construction of a subject within temporal/spatial and logical grid (first of all...to take place, to take part). Subject is normalised within this grid of essentialist Western philosophy (time and space) in contradistinction to say other discourses of time and space such as Aboriginal dream time or the mathematical perception of time and space. In other words language insists on a certain way of viewing the world.
4. Speaker is positioned in time- speaking on behalf of mother and on behalf of people. However, the speaker is not speaking on his own behalf or rather the discourse in which he is located seems to position him as peripheral to the mother and the people.
5. Personal past and impersonal context. How can the subject be recognised when there are so many other actors in this field mother, the people and abstract thoughts such as the Enlightenment? Does the pressure of the need to account for himself cause the subject in

this instance to become absent? Perhaps, too much can be felt at the personal pole and too little can be felt at the impersonal pole and the subject wavers like a compass between the two.

6. Speaker is speaking on behalf of an undefined “we”. We can see the seen (the boys) but not the seers. Technique of the camera, the impartial regard. Speaker is speaking on behalf of at least four subjects: community, the young, the boys (the objects whom he describes) and his family which is the discourse directly following on from this. So, there are a wide number of subject positions made available in this discursive section, thereby complicating how we can understand what is being communicated.

7. Cellular/Larval subjectivity- “we all knew”. How can massed knowledge be operationalized as individual knowledge? Is this type of knowledge a version of Bollas’ unthought known or Bion’s undigested knowledge, knowledge that has not been reflected upon (beta knowledge)? Or indeed, does this refer to Klein’s notion of the internal object that is concrete, lodged within the individual, on the borders of the psyche and soma, which eludes reflection because it is felt as an elemental part of the individual, a constituent of the psyche, beyond awareness thus incapable of being integrated into experience and thus subjectivity remains at a larval stage.

8. The respondent is positioning himself in contradistinction to orphans, even though the subjects referred to are not orphans, they become orphans by virtue of their belong to an “orphan institution.” I wonder about the discourse of orphans as directed to consumers who are not orphans. What is the reason for the success of this discourse? Relief at one’s parented ontology? Or the gain in exploring the subjectivity of orphanhood by using the

discourse. A sort of solution to an oedipal drama where one is the child of one's parents but avoids intercourse or murder by not being the child of one's parents, by becoming orphaned.

9. The various subjects are constructed as silent, uncommunicative. They are constructed as having being "raised" , perhaps raised from the dead. The respondent is constructing subjectivities in order to elaborate on his own subjectivity which was existentially absent, (the time before his birth), then discursively absent (as a child, the experience is unspoken). (See ,The Dark Room, Dillon, 2007 in which he mentions Nabokov analysis of photograph of a time before he was a born (Speak Memory) and he refers to himself as a chronophobe, revealing a hatred of time that does not belong to us.

10. Subjectivity is temporally organised and according to the modality of 19th century discourse: orphans (them) versus the family (us). Complex combinatory subjectivity: respondent + mother + uncle+brother+ mother's brother. The slippage in text indicates the fluidity of subjectivity as it flows from respondent to uncle to brother's absence, to mother's brother. Of course , St Anne was mother of Mary and grandmother of Jesus Christ who was not an orphan but was half an orphan in that he was born of Mary but not of Joseph. (Jewish matrilineal genealogy). The importance of genealogy as a discourse in Ireland.

11. Subject is normalised according to two poles: orphaned or parented. This takes place with a larger Christian tradition of debate over parentage and lineage. Modern version : DNA discourse?

- 12.** Speaker positioned as part of group (family of 6) as located in an unspecified time “those days”. Speaker speaks from group process. Positioned against identified authorities who punish the pursuit of knowledge.
- 13.** We- children of a family speaking en masse. Subjectivity flows from 1st person plural to second person address to impersonal desubjectivised hand of authority: “punitive measures would be taken if you suggested” Construction of subjectivity through knowledge. Two types of subjectivities: knowledge that is silent /passive or that is active/expressible/expressed.
- 14.** Us. The speaker positioned as member of group-
4. Positioned historically in time (75 years old)
 5. We positioned outside of culture- “abuse” constructed as working part of culture but “we didn’t realise it was endemic” .
- 15.** Massed. Combinatory. Multivoiced. The “I” cannot see? “Je est un autre”.
- 16.** Subjectivity organic in the sense that knowledge of abuse does not disturb organic homeostasis. (Abuse constructed as not surprising)
- 17.** Subjectivity alters with time- shift from knowledge to realisation –Subjectivity normalised by “working culture”
- 18.** Subjectivity contrast with plastic culture and constructed as more stable (previous excerpt 8 : we knew of course; this excerpt, no surprise)
- 19.** Shift from “We” to “I”
- 20.** Speaks on behalf of those who were in institutions.

21. Speaker positioned as individual (I) don't wish to be psychological, philosophical and speculative whereas residents are positioned as deindividualised, demasculinized, and naturalized (as animal). Positioning of nature versus culture through the act of discourse.
22. Culture promotes the recognition of the subject (I don't want to be speculative, philosophical or psychological)
23. Nature nullifies the subject's recognition of self- they are seen but they do not seem to see
24. Certain subjects drawn to institutions. The speaker does not say why he or non-residents of schools were in the Army. This remains unsaid, but yet he speaks for the "dumb" subjects, the residents of the industrial schools.
25. I am positioning the respondent more firmly as origin of discourse. He positioned himself in 10 as we and I. My intervention leads to a cementing of subjective positions.
26. Respondent speaking on behalf of friend who speaks on behalf of abused boy to priest who may speak or may not on behalf of boy or complainant to another (bishop). Positions of secrecy taken and this is replicated within the discourse of the respondent who does not name the priest and therefore the circle of secrecy is maintained and closed and we are all positioned within it. I, my respondent, the friend (the complainant, the abused boy (now a man if alive), the secretary, the bishop) Is there such a thing as a disciplining secrecy, a non-discursive element that enjoins us not to go beyond and to break the secret.
27. Here subjectivity is constituted by a marker designating a category Saint, boy, friend, cleric, man secretary, bishop. All of these positions like pieces on a chessboard allow certain limited positions of manoeuvre. Notice the absence of any feminine designation of subjectivity in terms of the network of relations established.
28. Massed subjectivity-"we, the people".
29. Impotent subjectivity- "we always sort of expected somebody to subpoena the records".
Somebody does not belong to the mass.

- 30.** Practise – deferred- “we always expected somebody” . The subject position inhabited by “we” is not an agentive body. The agentive body is the “somebody” is the expected figure.
- 31.** Residents positioned within the local community.
- 32.** Speaker position adjacent to residents of school as within the community.
- 33.** Speakers positioned as “not having the word” as outside discourse
- 34.** Residents of industrial school positioned in relation to another industrial school and thus positioned as the inverse of unruly and truant, as docile and compliant?
- 35.** The neighbourhood, the industrial school, the mothers
- 36.** . House located in New Road but contrasted with old ways (Victorianism). Speakers positioned as boy between two schools (Bishop’s and National) and between two generations (his mother’s and his grandparents’. The subject position of past self allows the e, speaker to telescope time, to construct the past from vantage point of the young boy but he later positions himself as finding it out knowledge later (you had to pay a crown a year, I later found out). Positioning between silence and noise, between naivety and knowledge, between being outcast and en famille, between being fee paying and free, between Victorian era and the Modern (the Free State, born 1921). The language foists these positions on the subject. In terms of subjectivity one can the anxieties that may have been felt by the speaker as his life wavered between radically different discourses. Or , more accurately, it could be argued that this is an ongoing discursive flux that may give rise to ongoing anxiety that at any one time that a certain discourse may confer on a subject unthinkable anxiety which shifts into another discourse which masks the previous discourse, but the effects of which , it must be assumed are no less significant than the

replacing discourse. For example, in more recent times you have the shift from the Discourse of Dispossessed Irish to Celtic Tiger Irish (Business success) to the PIGS (the return of the an older discourse (The Irish with a pig under his arm) but now reconfigured in a multinational economic “shame” shared by Portugal, Greece and Spain.

37. Not clear who speakers are speaking on behalf of? The local community, the working class or the boys who were living within the institution. Speaker is positioned within and without the ghetto. The people located in two different classes are rigidly constructed within the discourse of gentility or ghettoization which removed a lot of room for exploring heterogeneity or diversity within these two different domains. Limited positions for subjectivity. The subject constructed as subjugated.

38. Respondent is speaking on behalf of the community (“including myself”) Positions himself as naïve and others as naïve- preverbal era. Construction of the community as a preverbal stage where they “didn’t have the language to express”.

- Subjectivisation allows respondent to construct himself as having experienced sexual intrusiveness.
- Subjection by a linguistic procedure: silence. The foreclosure of the subject and potential resistance.

39. Speakers speaking on behalf the “dispossessed”, the silent children, of which he was included as an external figure. Positions himself as naïve. Subjectivisation made possible through the use of picaresque discourse, use of visual background and foregrounding in order to set a scene.-

40. Positioned as a child and a worker.

The institutionalised children positioned as elsewhere

Subjectivity – speaker comes to know his position as a silent , unreflective worker-child but in later life he is able to reflect (“not at the time didn’t strike me”)

- Possibilities for action limited- absence, subjection to disciplinary procedures: work and timetabling and child subjectivity with its inherent lack of rights.
- Positioned in relation to social class- thus allowing the privilege of speaking on behalf of the “marginalised”?
- Practise: Justification for paralysis, a field of non-activity due to poverty and alcoholism. (my father and grandfather drank incredibly: alcoholism and the link with the state jobs of father and grandfather. State jobs normalising and disciplining.

41. Speaker positioned as non-victim, as protected as son of civil servant. Speaking on behalf of the other children. Speaker not recognised as victim of violence but his discourse is contradicted by the use of self referring term in 19 (pitiful case).

- The respondent is speaking on behalf of community (“we”) but then he excludes himself from the plural pronoun. (I don’t include myself).
Positioning of a transcendent role.
- Positions himself as witnessing the Corpus Christi parades now.
- Repositions himself as belonging to the community (we were all supposed to look like that)
- Positions himself as within and without the community, the siege mentality.

- Action possibilities are limited because the subject is constructed without the social scene in a transcendental scene.
42. Speaker speaking on behalf of children who abuse and are abused physically. Speaker positioned as observer, as “guilty bystander”, as compliant with the abusers because of non-verbalisation of what was witnessed. His subjectivity is discursively deployed according to collaborationist type discourse (guilty bystander).
43. Practise or action limited because the violence is operating along two axes: vertical from the new management and horizontally with children attacking children in school. Apparent little room for manoeuvre. The speaker finds “ a corner in the playground “ to protect him and his brother, maybe mirroring the discursive operation where he tries to find a corner in between hegemonic discourses.
44. Speaker is positioning himself in the male camp perhaps as one who may find that it is beneath him to be beaten. If this is how he positions himself in a contradictory masculinity, where fathers beat children but not his father as he was genteel, it seems from the speaker that he too positions himself in the non-violent masculine role, a masculinity denuded of savagery. He is speaking on behalf of himself, and his ancestors. He positions himself as a little companion , a premature man, not a child. Perhaps, when he is talking about the four children in his mother’s family who are taken away, he is talking about his mother taking away his own sense of childishness, that the group discourse is masking an individual discourse. In other words, he is able to occupy wider ranges of

subjective feeling by talking through the institutionalised mother. This raises a question about what is happening when people are using discourse of institutional abuse, such as , “who are they talking about when they talk about institutional abuse”?

Contradiction as the field of subjectivity may be enlarged by accessing the wider systemic discourse; however this discursive manoeuvre also conceals that individual’s subjective feeling as now they have become discursively located in the past or in the dead, thereby constituting a dead end in terms of action.

45. Speaker is speaking on behalf of mother, against the two fathers (the biological and the symbolic)

- Self positioned as angry and violent
- Self positioned as only having two available positions brave/violent or cowardly/pacifist.
- Self positioned in narrative in two places at the same time: hospital and the priest’s house.
- Self positioned as starving . Priest positioned as being nourished.
- Practise limited by the fear of violence. Pacifist practise limited by the desire for violence.

46. The self is positioned as dying from malnutrition and the fighting back as rebel.

Again the self is positioned outside of the general culture, as an interpreter of events. Speaker is speaking on behalf of his child self. In the constructions of the various characters the priest is deployed as hungry, annoyed and unfeeling.

47. Mother positioned as complaining deferential towards man but angry towards boy.

- Son constructed as proud but subject to maternal violence.
- Possibilities for action are very limited as the potential for action is sourced within the child but this response is foreclosed because of the child's immaturity.

48. Positions self as omniscient t overviewer and historian. Positions himself in this position just before he speaks of abuse of people he knew. The omniscient positioning allows the subject to inhabit the subject position of the angry God of the Old Testament who speaks on behalf of the defiled children. (But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea. Matthew 18:6)

Practise is limited because of the discourse of the omniscient narrator who absents himself from history, so he is therefore ahistorical. The author referred to also is omniscient and uses fiction.

49. The speaker positions himself in the field of rationality, enlightenment and positions the perpetrators in a polar position of the pastoral, the uneducated, violent (stone-throwing). The "perpetrators" are constructed as "Country Gawks", which means Country Simpletons but the "gawk" also contains the meaning of the word "gawk" which is to look.

50. Confusing because the speaker is speaking from various pronominal vantage points, positioning himself as guilty, identifying himself with the abusers.

51. However, the “authorities “ are positioned clearly as other as not caring less. So there is a shift from a radical desubjectification to the classical polarity of bad authority and suffering people.
52. The critical agency and ethical distance is given to independent observers who are outside the system. The effects of these constructions are to show a block the possibility of action from within the community as discourse makes it pessimistically savage and unreflective.
53. Self positioned as child living under terror.
54. Self positioned as independent from society. (repeat of the omniscient construct)
55. Helpers positioned in non-helping positions. SPCC constructed as cruel to adults.
56. Speaker speaking as child for adults?
57. Possibilities for action are limited by the construction of a child as at once impervious to the pressures of society. However, the same dynamic leaves a pocket for resistance because the child isn't constructed as under a totalising dominance. However, does this resistance reside in the a place that isn't discursively elaborated.(vanished into the ether)
58. Speaker positioned as child and mother and speaks on behalf of those passive , in his view, within the social matrix.
59. Speaker positions himself as Lawrence of Arabia and the people as the “Arabs”.
60. Children have no voice or presence because they are categorised as exceptional in the Constitution and therefore are subject to a subjugating objectification.
61. The speaker constructs himself as research contributor-within academic field.
62. Positioned as victim-passively
63. Postioned as potential explosion

64. Positioned as father and as son- produces discourse on being “aloof and cynical”
65. Subjectivisation takes place at three levels: academic, filial and paternal. Then outside society as potential terror
66. Speaker positioned as outside the institution trying to get in
67. Researcher (me) positioned as both psychologist and not psychologist. (“save in your presence”). In other words psychologists are constructed as part of the problem.
68. Positioned without but yet within the zone of damage. (“nuclear fallout”)
69. Son, the complainant, the researcher. Occupies three poles of subjectivity and the discourse which constitutes each of these subjectivities is respectively; familiar discourse : “what’s this about my mother and use of familiar language “I got it out of them” ; “And they have a big sort of” ; all I got out of them “; legal discourse “present your bonafides ” and academic discourse (use of complex analogy and high register language (“nuclear fall out” and “that would befall.
70. Polite society has no identified subjects.
71. The naming of the school is passively and impassively described (It was called the industrial school..no room for difference)
72. Uncle positioned as shoemaker.
73. The industrial school positioned as “they”. Not clear whether it refers to the school or the residents who leave the school. Does discourse position the authorities . managers of the school in the same group as the residents, all subsumed under “they”.
74. Self positioned again outside of society- “the merchants” enrich themselves. Merchants all positioned under the sign of profiteering , thereby homogenizing a heterogeneous category.

75. Self position in the abstract: “a human being”, then repositioned in third person plural , “they “
76. The residents become objectivised subjects , tradespeople who will become pawns in capitalist society. Deprives them of any agency beyond that of passive compliance. Construction of conformism alluded to earlier on.
77. Government is subjectivised as a source of attentiveness because it is constructed that that the intuitions could ask the Government for what they need if they had a need.
78. Merchants objectified as a homogenous pool-disappearance of subjectivity. Or an appearance of a subjectivity which elides all dissension and difference, becoming caricatural .
79. Speaker positioned in opposition to survivors
80. Subjectivity of the Jews colonised by certainty indicated by logical deployment of “explanations”, 1,2,3. There is no hesitation of equivocation, as the speaker has placed himself in the omniscient role: “they didn’t think; they wanted to put it all behind the; they felt complicit in their own fate...” Note the marker eschewing any ambiguity “they wanted to put it all behind them”. We can see how the discourse wants the speaker to not hedge bets , to include the totality of the terrible experience in order for this to have maximum effect, for is there is a remainder which they don’t want to put behind them, will this act as rhetorical brake and diluter of the terror which the speaker wants to construct. What is lost by way of semantics is gained by way of rhetoric.
81. Abused positioned in passive formation where they become locked into a self-perpetuating discourse of abused become abusers.
82. Self positioned as omniscient, “there is more psychological damage...”

83. Self positioned as JC? As judge, as prophet, “They knew, there’s no excuse”.
84. Self positioned as child
85. Self positioned as critic/observer (“in my opinion”)
86. Dichotomous positioning of first leaders as poets/idealists or powerbrokers.
87. Homogenising discourse “the British had a thing called , “The Murder Machine”.
88. Positions himself as unthinking- passively, haunted by “spectre”, pursued.
89. Positions himself within the Catholic tradition – “by the grace of God”- ; the importance of the intermediary.
90. Positions himself as outside society (recurrent theme)
91. He constructs himself as a “moral grandstander” which he equates with non-duplicity.
92. The object “it” is not fully explained- (“it followed me all my life”)
93. Constructs himself in the Tolstoyevian mode (a 19th century posture, made possible by rise of popular press and the advent of the novel, along with Fabianism-GB Shaw and later Orwell examples of a tradition of moral speech. Charles Lamb). This is a discourse associated with Victorianism which has come to be repeated throughout this interview (Victorian household, the genteel atmosphere, the Victorian travel writers).
94. Subjectivity of people subjugated to “drunkenness, passive corrupted subjects poisoned from below (poisoned river) and from above (spectre). We have a sealed atmosphere – a fishbowl .
95. Society constructed as dark and oppressive-this construction evolves into later construction of smashed lamp posts through violence of nihilistic wreckage.
96. Speaker’s knowledge is “passionate
97. Objects positioned in passive position (“buggered”)

98. Speaker constructed as omniscient (“it never got to him psychologically”) . The evident becomes the true which repeats the dynamic of the society which is condemned as a masquerade. Is this the same construction – “the surface = the reality”.
99. Bastards positioned in the second person: (“you bastards”)
100. Speaker positioned as constructor: (“I was reading last night”)
101. Speaker uses absolutist markers with no modifying or qualifying descriptors : “so total, so all pervasive”.
102. Political positioned within the personal and vice versa in the sense that the father does not embrace the mother , nor does the culture embrace the people.
103. Subjectivity subjugated on multiple levels- the flesh is subjugated to corruption and decay, the body is subjected to rape, the voice is subjugated to a tribunal (he’s told his story to the authorities).
104. Body subject to effects of distancing/alienation (we can’t shop ourselves out of it)
105. Speaker constructs interviewee as academic
106. Speaker tries to position the research direction
107. Speaker and interviewee position themselves in alignment within psychological discourse (this country was and is psychologically damaged)
108. Abusers constructed as religious and positioned as outsiders (they)
109. State constructed as alien other, “they”
110. Speaker positions himself in a “moral ” vantage point of omniscience describing his objects as illiterate, uncultured and untutored financially .
111. Positions himself and his family on the side of the educators- perhaps picking up in the Victorian references earlier on , which was an era which heralded the

first large-scale social interventions such as attempts to improve the “plight” of child labourers or improving the “plight” of prostitutes in London

112. “Abused “ are described within narrow confines and are constructed as passive objects. So too are the community onlookers .
113. Constructs the people as low needing to be raised. Look to earlier part of interview when he refers to himself as having been “raised”. Elevation constructed as education and enlightenment (Frankl, Eastern teacher, secondary school etc.) But not university which is constructed as anti –enlightenment and collusive with capitalist hegemony. Positions himself as pedagogue “you must read...”
114. Constructs the children he knew as headless, as having been “decapitated”
115. Constructs the founding fathers as incestuously violent and savage and anti-Semitic. Positions himself within the tradition of civilisation, light (better to strike a light) and perhaps in the gender specific role category of womanhood (Legion of Mary).
116. Constructs the “people” as having the possibility of education.
117. In summary, he positions himself on a higher plane and the others are positioned as children , illiterate or passively in service of the capitalist economy.
118. Subjugating subjectivisation.:
119. _Speaker positioned as part of the community (of both victims and non-victims...not clear whether this includes the perpetrators)
120. Positioned himself as truth teller and as microcosm – he gets hit for speaking the “truth”. Incongruent discourse as if he were the macrocosm everyone would have spoken up and gotten hit, but very few did. Unless the effects of being hit are the microcosm of the macrocosm : silence.

121. Victims constructed as “knowing”.
122. Community constructed as “rotten”
123. Violence as a factor in subjugating subjectivity
124. Journalist documentary –maker constructed as overweight lady –
125. “Abused” constructed as “victims”, as concealed, as hidden.
126. Positions the “brave person” “over there”- Off limits , off stage?
127. Resistance located in one person.
128. Speakers positions himself in childhood as 10 year old and as “brave” because he stands up. Does he position himself as obliterated before his resistance can be felt, in line with previous lines?
129. Positions everybody as complicit until full disclosure
130. Authority positioned as extremely violent – “Vatican hitman.
131. Irish history anthropomorphised as an Irish “terrorist”.
132. Positions the authority figure as a Mafia hitman.
133. Positions the authority figure as indecent for being in institution.
134. Positions himself as being outside institution but attends the physical site of the institution for mass.
135. Identified with Martin Luther King and uses the discourse of the Reformation to both defend and to accuse the institution of the Church.
136. Positions the place that is corrupt (Church) as the site of his attendance, but disconnects this from child abuse. By his own discourse he is positioning himself on a personal continuum between childhood and adulthood. (Perhaps the Church is where he is at peace) But in the larger society he cannot be “at peace”. Paradoxically, he constructs the Church as outside the society.

137. He constructs his own subjectivity through the discourse of being honest.

(Correspondence theory of truth, how I say it is how it is) This is very much an Enlightenment approach and he positions himself within this tradition.

Appendix B9: Discursive Function and Effects

- (1) Conciliatory. To reduce conflict.
- (2) To open up communication between different states. (states of being?)
- (3) To present a context of referentiality. To move from idealism to materiality within language. To enable communication.
- (4) Speaker is constructing a version of how reality can be constructed.

- (5) Function of these discourses is to construct an intelligent and intelligible subject. The discourse constructs a world outside the interview.
- (6) The speaker is constructing personality (my mother) and impersonality (the people, the general feeling)
- (7) Discourse creates an audience. Moves interview beyond the dyadic.
- (8) To construct childhood and adulthood.
- (9) To construct a scene to appeal to compassion. To create empathy/sympathy in line with the df of the genre of orphanology.
- (10) Appeals to a wide audience because of the strong penetration of discourse in music, film, art etc.
- (11) To construct private and public contexts. To construct an historical scene.
- (12) To use religious discourse and autobiographical discourse to construct private knowledge as equal to public knowledge. In other words, the respondent constructs the public revelations as not surprising. But then he constructs the revelations as shocking, thereby putting two constructions of the same object in contrast with each other which has a jarring effect. The construction of knowledge as not surprising may have the function of preserving a sense of potency or omnipotence, a childlike, private, magical knowledge (picked up in the word "revelations"- the discourse of epiphany. Then the discourse rubs up against the world of symbolic meaning (public discourse)
- (13) The function of this discourse may not be to address phenomenon in hand but to refer to a private scene where fathers are presented as weak or absent and women presented as

solid, “highly respectable and dependable” and sexual/oedipal, “I was her little companion more than her child”.

(14)The discourse also insists on the pre-verbal or nonverbal environment where nothing is said , where people act without explanation, where a husband, father, grandfather disappears into the Imperial background of war but nothing is said, where authorities come without warning, without explanation. All of this activity must be underpinned by some social agency – a discourse that is not named but which engenders activity on the social plane, such as the talking of the children away from the mother. Function of this discourse is to horrify, The effect is one of communicating a sense of arbitrary acts of cruelty which defy understanding. In a sense the discourse forecloses possibilities of action because it replicates the same sense of uncanniness and helplessness that the unnamed discourses installed in subjects referred to within this passage. The male is captured by some discourse of impotence (too genteel) and emasculation (alcoholic) or by powerful international discourses leading to the barbarism of the great war. One can speculate that there are a plurality of discursive possibilities disguised by speakers discourse. It is a fact that Lord Kitchener’s iconic posters were prevalent in Ireland at the time and many men from Connaught fought in the WW1. We can see these effects of these hidden discourses on the edges of the discourse of the speaker. This military discourse is referred to more explicitly in the next section.

(15)The function of these discourses is to convey the anger in response to injustice and the forces suppressing the anger: The clerical hierarchy.

(16)Effects of discourse is to create a sense of claustrophobia. The speaker gains the sympathy of the listener in constructing a monolithic , identifiable target of criticism (the priest in the house)

- (17) Speaker is constructing a scene of monolithic power and dispossessed woman and child.
- (18) Function of the discourse is to appeal to the audience to sympathise with the hero child, the rebel child and the downtrodden mother.
- (19) Effect of the discourse is to show the implacable power of the two fathers: the priest and the biological father and the impotence of the child and mother. It also serves to underline how the violence of rejection circulates from without to within, from the priest to mother, to child.
- (20) The function of the discourse is to construct a scene of savagery and hatred in the general society and to link this with the savagery within institutions, culminating in the observation of murder.
- (21) Function of personal knowledge of residents leads to an authentication of material. Ambivalence because material also constructed as “fictional”.
- (22) He constructs the residents as unspeaking observers (witness a murder) but he too is unspeaking about this.
- (23) Decriminalised discourse, romantic pre Enlightenment discourse, discourse of magic or superstition, discourse of universality, discourse of the denationalised state.
- (24) The function of these discourses is to set an uncultivated scene which constitutes the scene for violence. The discourse appeals to the rational listener as it emphasises the written codes such as the constitution. The speaker is constructing a rationale for how abuse has its source in conditions of ignorance, disease and poverty.
- (25) Child freedom? Unheroic reality, Gentility/peace. Spontaneous memory, (non-lapidary memory) self-reflection, discourses of ambivalence and non polarity.

- (26) Film (movie) binds these discourses together in that outside discourses are put into circulation : “Boy’s Town” The judicial and political apparatus are at the source of Irish industrial schools as the system was inherited from the British juvenile detention system.
- (27) To deploy an image of Ireland as a savage, tribal, bloody , beastly place and to blame outside forces for the breakdown in order, at the same time praising outside forces for being able to observe Ireland. Contradictory : the savagery originates with the encounter with the Empire but can be saved by the encounter with the Empire (the 19th century travellers or Hollywood)
- (28) To show that outside voices are able to see (“independent observers”), that the indigenous are blind to their own activity.
- (29) To convey how pervasive certain discourses were (bodily shame, fear etc) but more importantly how these discourses were concealed and were not discursively manifest (in writing and in words) Concealed discourse.
- (30) Effect of discourse is to describe a scene of pervasive terror within and without institution.
- (31) Effects of these constructions is to convey an image of the Irish mind as contradictory.
- (32) The constructions show how there is gap between the discursive procedures and the actions of those who were subject to these discourses. It is not clear how discourse operates. The speaker’s metaphor is apt of a palimpsest disguising former meanings.
- (33) Speaker is borrowing preaching discourse to deliver a sermon from the pulpit.
- (34) To cover generational vantage points over 75 year period

- (35) To convince the audience of the violence of feeling and the potential for overflowing into action.
- (36) The effect of the discourse is to convey a scene of social intercourse where “you have to penetrate a barrier”. The use of all the discourses above show the complex system of articulations needed for the subject to move into a zone of activity as opposed to remaining in passivity. All of the discourses combine in the apparatus of writing to facilitate a shift from passivity to activity, from violence to communication.
- (37) To convey the nefariousness of excessive autonomy
- (38) To show how society and the industrial schools were in a symbiotic relationship. Earlier the construction was that they were in symbiosis in terms of their function as a disciplining tool in society.
- (39) To convince the reader of the “social hook” . But there is no understanding of the individual desire to get off the hook.
- (40) To convey the terror of memory.
- (41) Desired outcome: to establish the corruption of the state and the guilt of the individual
- (42) To moralise, educate, condemn, edify.
- (43) The effects of these constructions lie in their rhetorical persuasiveness (“think about it” – note the speaker's self construction as unthinking ; he has now foisted the same construction onto me)
- (44) Appeals to left –wing audience, those who believe in certain moral virtues (maybe religious or people of philosophical persuasion).

- (45) The speaker is orientating himself in the role of pastor or preacher.
- (46) The discourses deployed create minimum possibilities because they convey the image of a fated world trapped like aspic in honey by the discursive/non –discursive matrix where nobody has agency.
- (47) The deployment of the discourses have the objective of positioning the interviewer in a certain orientation, towards broadening the category of abuse . The use of child abuse discourse dovetails with psychological discourse with the function of elaborating a need for psychotherapy. Later Discourses of Morality and Aesthetics (classics) are used to overturn the psychological discourses.
- (48) Pedagogical. To instruct and to position the interviewer and the objects constructed into passive places. To create world consonant with Christian Platonic traditions.
- (49) To show how fear (psychological and physical) silences resistance.
- (50) The speaker is elaborating a theory of truth as volitional and public- reconstruction of the idea of the confessional.
- (51) On the one had to deploy the message of individual resistance.
- (52) On the other hand to convey the monolithos of the institutions (the reinforced walls, the Bishop's Palace etc.)
- (53) To communicate how persecutory is “moral knowledge”.
- (54) Is the speaker speaking on behalf of his doubly humiliated 10 year old self, whose being was later full of seething anger.
- (55) To liken the Church to the mafia.

(56) To convey a notion of practise as deeply ingrained and therefore a waste of time to overturn. To deconstruct versions of Irish history based on sentimentality and falsehood

(57) To convince the listener that the discourse is honest and therefore truer than a dishonest discourse which opens up an interesting question of whether honesty is coeval with truth or whether they are properties independent of one another.

(58) To attack the discourse of governmentality (commission , apology) etc. but what are the alternative possibilities.

Appendix B10: Individual Analytic Summary

Discourses

This analytic summary is structured in two parts: the first part looks at the constructions deployed in the interview in reference to institutional “abuse”, the “abused”, the “abusers” and the “bystanders”. So the first part looks at the discursive constructions deployed in the interview.

The second part focuses on how ways of responding to the topic in question are constructed and I will be looking at the discourses which construct that response. The first part will shine a light on what are the discursive constructions deployed in the construction of the object in question (abuse, abuser, abused, bystanders) whereas the second part takes a wider-angled-lensed focus on use of discourse, by examining the prime discourses deployed in the construction of the constructions, paying particular attention to how subjectivity is constituted in this account.

I have identified 392 discursive constructions, 50 discourses. 50 items on positionings and subjectivity, 40 items on power and 40 items on biopower, governmentality and resistance. Before I outline the two parts of my analysis I would like to introduce the context of the interview and place its setting within a discursive context.

Introduction to the setting of the interview

I would like to introduce the setting of the interview and describe how the contextual elements of the interview scene can play a constructive element.

Academic Discourse

The beginning of the interview shows how the discourse of journalism and academia position both interviewer and respondent in pre-determined roles. The academic discourse positions the respondent in a passive role. “Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed” (Line 10). Later in the interview the academic text is constructed as belonging to the academic, “your thesis” (Line 750). Later, in the interview the university is constructed as “a qualifying place so that you can work in the bank or post office, that kind of shit, it’s not a place of enlightenment” (Line 809). So, academia is constructed as pacifying, utilitarian and unenlightening. Elsewhere the residents of the institutions are constructed using the descriptive markers of academia, as “graduates” (Line 45); “Steven McQueen was a graduate of that place (Boystown institution).(Line 398). The educational system is constructed using a phrase borrowed from the Irish nationalist Padraig Pearse, used to describe the British educational system in Ireland: the “murder machine” (Line 580). Elsewhere the residents of the industrial school are constructed as passive and silent and the question needs to be asked whether the respondent is also constructing the academic interviewer as passive and silent. In other words, can the equation be reversed? If the residents are constructed using the language of academia, can the academic be constructed using the discourse of abuse? These constructions seem to me to point to an important aspect of this topic which is that it is never entirely clear who is talking on behalf of who when we talk of institutional abuse and this is because the concept of the institution is smeared across different entities in the discussion: the industrial school, the family, the Church, the business community, the media and of course academia. Of course, the role of academia in the questioning of institutional abuse has been at best ineffectual and at worst, enabling and complicit in its neglect in questioning the role of the industrial schools in Irish society in the twentieth century. . Therefore, this interview is

haunted by the impotence of academia, and its historical silence on the matter and the respondent's discourse reconstructs this absence and impotence. Another aspect of the setting of this interview is the use of courtly discourse, the discourse of diplomacy and good manners which has multiple functions. "Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed"

This discourse is reprised throughout by the constructions of society as "polite" (Line 500) and conversely as savage. The function of this discourse may be conciliatory, an effort to neuter protest and smooth over difference, but it may also be generative, and in that it forecloses conflict which may arrest the interview which always has the potential to spill over into violence. In summary, I would argue that it may be a misnomer to speak of a constructed interview in this context. Rather, in line with FDA, it seems to me that this interview is poly-constructed, and that talk from the respondent is constituted out of those polymorphous constructions. The use of psychological discourse also bolsters the view of man as a transcendental subject. Thoughts, feelings and response are located within the individual phenomenology of the subject, "your thoughts, feeling or responses" (Line 10). Moreover, the use of the audio recorder in the form of a Dictaphone machine should not be underestimated in terms of its function as a form of technology (particular to journalism and academic) in which the gestalt of conversation is converted into the linguistic text by the interviewer. The audio recorder may function, in this instance, as a version of Foucault's panopticon, the all-seeing surveilling eye of disciplinary activity, originally conceived as a watchtower, but reconfigured in Foucault's account as the omnipresence of surveillance, as in CCTV.

Institutional Abuse

I would like to begin by analysing the various ways in which the institution has been constructed; however this is not as straightforward as it seems because while the concept of

the institution is readily apprehensible , in reality the way “institution” is constructed means that it is not readily identifiable with a geographical site, a collection of people, a historical or contemporary entity etc. It is not always clear from this interview whether the institution referred to is a specific institution (St Josephs in Galway) or whether it refers to the a more abstract term (institution denoting any of the industrial schools in Ireland). When we move from the particular to the universal there is a potential that the field of description is indeed much larger, and that the discourse of international institutions may actually be the signified properties in the discussion, and not an actual institution in Ireland. Therefore, caution needs to be exercised in order that we do not confuse these constructions with corresponding entities in the objective world.

The institutional abuse is constructed as sinister (Line 19), as a “working part of the culture” (Line 39), as shocking and endemic (Line 38), as a threat “It was used as threat every single day” (Line 117) ; it was like the Sword of Damocles in St Brendan” (Line 210). The industrial school is constructed as secretive “ silent and benign” (Line 138) as defensive, “barrier” (Line 483), as a place of incarceration, a “gulag” (Line 91) as presence of absence , “I never met another child” (Line 162) ; as uncanny, “sinister eerie dark.” It is constructed as a microcosm of Irish society, as “society writ large” (Line 547). “Abuse” is constructed as cruelty to women , children and adults , Violence was general, cruelty to animals was general, cruelty to children was general , and beating women was general. (Line 235-237) as “a pool of general savagery” (line 271) , as a crime (the perpetrators of these crimes (Line 373) , “crime, that’s where the real crime is in trying to explain it. There is no excuse . Guilty your honour is all any of us can say.” (Line 606-608) and as savagery (Line 361, 374, 406, 412). Abuse is constructed as mediated through non –discursive channels, “ you came by this terror in the same manner as you came by breathing the air (Line 423) . “Nobody told you

that your body was dirty and bad and you didn't want to touch your private parts" (Line 423). Abuse is constructed through omniscient discourse, "I don't know anybody from X who wasn't battered either" (Line 464). Abuse is constructed as an active agent "but that spectre of that oppressive dark society followed me all my life" (Line 620), as "poisoned fumes, as rivers of filth" (Line 637) , as categorisable (physical and sexual), "Physical , I feel, can be recovered from infinitely more readily than psychological and emotional abuse" (Line 650) . "Abuse" is constructed as "too narrow to be confined to sexuality, "to expand abuse to every time I blacken another person's name" (Line 699). "And the number of people who were bugged, I imagine, in, in, in comparison to the people who were abused in other ways is a very small thing." (Lines 834-836). Abuse is constructed as worse than a Soviet gulag because of the psychology of eternal damnation. " At least the Soviets didn't threaten people with hell, you got a bullet in the back of the head, that's a very-you know-momentary thing" (Line 849) . "I suppose too that there is a fear of exposing the rottenness in case we're all engulfed in it" (Line 858) "Abuse" is constructed as shocking , horrendous, censored, "track –covering" (echoes palimpsest metaphor later) , as threat, as disciplining, as terror (Line 525), as polymorphous "So abuse takes many forms" (Line 649) . "

Industrial School Residents are constructed as visible, invisible, as graduates of institution, as silent, as passive (Line 47). The residents are constructed as boys in comparison to the non-industrial school boys in the army who are referred to as men. "They were renowned for their passivity and consequently were bullied" (Line 50) The other men in the army are constructed coming from "all sorts of psychological directions" but the ex-residents of industrial schools are constructed as passive, abused, demasculinised and psychologically

uniform, “ it did seem that they had settled on that as a method of life” (Line 54). They are constructed as “friends” and as part of the community, “we all knew their families” and they are constructed as orphans, “they were mostly there because their mothers had died”. (Line 90) The residents are constructed in contradiction with the autobiographical constructions of the respondent whose own mother was institutionalised, not because of the death of her mother but because she was a widow. From the literature we have available , the vast bulk of institutionalised children were not orphaned but came from impoverished holdings. It was widely viewed by the resident boys of institutions as a lesser stigma to be perceived as there for petty crime rather than having been placed there due to parental poverty. The discourse of orphans permeates this interview and I believe is linked to allied discourses of legitimacy, genealogy and disease. “They trained my uncle to be a shoemaker and you know, send them out in the world and fit for capitalist consumption” (Line 516). Again the industrial school boy is constructed as a passive object of capitalist consumption.

Analysis of the discourses used to construct the residents and the perpetrators of abuse reveal striking congruence of discursive operations. Both putative abuser and abuse are positioned with the same subject positions by the deployment of discourses of legitimacy/genealogy. The abusers are constructed as passive, ignorant “country gawks”, as “strange creatures”, as “country bastards”, as bastards (890), as beasts “Savagery was the nature of the beast”.(Line 406) “Except they did know what they were doing, they knew it was about power” (Line 645) “I’m going to expose these bastards” (Line 890)

The abused are constructed as silent, as passive and as bastards, there because of their mothers’ deaths. And the bystanders are also constructed as “bastards” , We were terrified; we lived in terror day and night because of that Augustinian belief, flesh is corrupt, you

bastards are in bad shape, no matter what you do you're going to die and procreation is" (Line 661-664) . In other words, abused, abusers and bystanders are all positioned as having no claims for legitimacy which might go some way in explaining why the possibilities for action were so limited, if we are to believe that legitimacy confers activity on a subject, that legitimacy subjectivised subjectivity.

"Community"

The bystanders are constructed as having known about the abuse . "You know when we were young we all knew there were sinister things". (Line 19-20). The construction of self vacillates between personal and impersonal poles of subjectivity. (We can see the seers but not the seen. How can massed knowledge be operationalized as individual knowledge? How can thought begin to grow?) . The adoption of the plural forms , "we" and "they" seems to indicate a lack of agency. Perhaps, in times of intense social stress, as in a Tsunami or famine, the individual is faced with an undeniable impotence, and by necessity the collective body must act and therefore trauma locates the agentive force in the plural forms. However, when there is social stasis and a need for individual resistance there is a paralysis from an over investment in the collective forms denoted by "we" and "they", which has led to a sclerosis of capacity for individual thought and action; in other words discourse leads to sclerosis. "Emm, we always sort of expected somebody to subpoena the records of the Galway diocese, which they obviously haven't." (Lines 82-84)

Bystanders in the community are constructed as hypocrites . "And you know there's a defence offered, well you know it was the mind-set at the times blah blah blah. But my answer to that is that they all knew, by heart, the Sermon at the Mount and the Ten

Commandments. They all knew that.” (Line 440 to 444)”. Experience is constructed as identical to its description, as if having experienced an event permits its description. Illusory correspondence between what has happened and what can be described: Realisation and awareness. Construction of community as knowing “we knew” (Line 139). “We knew what was going on...my mother knew what was going on, my uncle had come out of that place, my auntie Bridget had come out of that place and my auntie Katie had come out of that place but the terror is so pervasive” (Line 842-844)

Self constructed as being outside and being within the community. Self constructed as “moral grand-standing” (Line 624) as being in and outside the Church simultaneously. “I’m not participating within the institution . I’m going to mass” (Line 954) “That’s not the institution, that’s the only place I can get mass” (Line 954). The discourse of the authorial eye predominates in this interview and the bird’s eye view of the narrator comes into play at key areas of the interview. This is the lofty locus of the transcendental human view which is an elaborate construction in itself, which gives the illusion of having a greater purchase of perceptive power than all the other positions described. This is the eye of the omniscient third person author of 19th century literature or the sweeping crane shot of a three act Hollywood movie. This authorial construction also leads to a calcification of positions in that the objects of discourse become reified through the authorial construction, and thus are subjugated within that discourses. The author function takes on an increasingly didactic role as the speaker positions himself as judge, as prophet as biblical discourse begins to channel the communications (with references to the Mount on the Sermon and through the use of criminal discourse (guilty your honour). Rhetoric constructs the terror of abuse but also seems to be a way of diluting it, of warding it off, “they didn’t think, they wanted it all behind them, they

felt complicit in their own fate” (Line 527). The speaker is positioning himself in the Tolstevan mode or the Shavian mode of moral public speechifying and attempts to reposition himself by deconstructing his own “moral grandstanding” (Line 624). This moral discourse picks up on the speaker’s earlier constructions of his own background as Victorian and genteel. This discourse seems to be pitched in an antagonism against discourses of violence and savagery which are numerous throughout the interview. Again there seems to be no possibility for occupying medial positions along a dimension between violence and genteel morality, as expressed in psychotherapy with reference to Viktor Frankl or in references to Legion of Mary or to the role of liturgy in daily life (his prayers). The moral viewpoint is constructed as belonging to outside the community (perhaps a vestige of post-colonialism) and this is seen in the description of English travel writers in Ireland who described the country as “savage”. “ and I find independent observers, travellers writing in Ireland and the consistent word is savagery amongst all of them” (411-412).

It is interesting to see how the function of the authorial discourse is to foist positions on the subject, positions in which subjectivity can become constituted and therefore known. For example we can see how the speaker positions himself within binary categories, as either victim or hero, as rebel or conformist, as naïve or knowledgeable, as pacifist or warrior, as brave or cowardly, as private or public, as child or adult, as male or female, as protector or protected and so on. Close analysis shows how subjectivity is constructed at either end of the pole and not on a dimensional scale. In other words the discourse constructs antinomies of nature, and reifies essential subject positions, and thereby a material reality is constructed out of a conceptual category. This constructivist process has intriguing parallels with object relational psychoanalytic thinking, the psychological drive to keep good and bad object separate. (Klein, Smirgel) The effect of this discursive process in this interview is that

idiosyncrasies and inconsistencies are levelled out because there is little heterogeneity of experience and diversity at either end of the pole. Is it possible that this binary splitting into contrary parts may lead a hardening of this feature, which has an exponential effect, thus barring the possibilities of discourse which are more constitutive of more complex, subjective positioning. In other words the discursive operations within this interview can conduce to a limited vision of subjectivity, where the subject is subjugated into either/or categories. For example, when respondent constructs the new first generation of national leaders as poets and idealists. “You know all the idealists were killed in the Rising (said sarcastically) and all the powerbrokers survived, in my opinion. All the poets and all them were all shot.” (Line 576-577). This discourse of binary opposites cancels out the possibility that a poet may also be a powerbroker, as in the case of Mao Tse Tung or Radovan Karadzic. We can also see how the microdiscursive procedures of totalising categories is achieved through absolutist discourse, all the idealists were killed, all the powerbrokers survived, all the poets...were all shot”. This reinforces discourse of binary categorisation. Another feature of binary categorisation is that is often associated with style and rhetoric where the effects of constructing a scene rely more on the value of using contrast for scene construction rather than for analytic thought. This is why rhetoric and indeed the arts came in for acerbic criticism by Plato and Socrates because they say how aesthetics could be confused with ethics.

Honest community is constructed out of some older genealogical stock, “the auld stock, the honest people”. (Line 814) which points to an obsession rooted in the language with genealogy. This viewed in relation to the discourse around legitimacy calls into question whether there was an anxiety being expressed through or constituted by discourse over legitimacy, over familial bonds, over sovereign legitimacy (in the sense the maternal language having been usurped by the colonial tongue). This is another facet of the discursive

elaboration around contagion, that there is something that is discursively contagious and must be kept at bay by silence, (mother, uncle, aunt never mentioned it) or by seclusion (keeping the contagion within safe bounds, quarantined within the institutions).

As Irish history – sentimental and bullshit and falsified: “ I don’t buy its bullshit history, the Minstrel Boy to the war is gone and Mother Macree, up you go” (Line 979). Journalism constructed as expository, “Because some brave person said, I’m going to expose these bastards. “ (Line 890)Media response constructed as “mangling the whole goddamn lot of them” (Line 893. Moral knowledge constructed as “deep and persecutory” (line 912)

The following discussion is about discourses of a different order, which are related to sense-experience, and ways of knowing about the world as they relate to the topic in question. I have classified these discourses into the following categories: oral discourse, visual discourse, written discourse. I would like to show how these discourses construct the topic under discussion. Following discussion of these discourses I would like to widen the focus to a discussion of the discourses of knowledge systems such as architecture, philosophy, science etc. In line with FDA both of these planes of discourses are coeval with each other, and neither transcends the other in order of structuring importance. I hope this becomes clear as the analysis unfolds. For example, the discourse of traditional sense perception might be employed by a scientist who is a poet and so his description of the setting sun is not vetoed by the discourse of science in which this description is non-sensical

Epistemological constructions of response:

I have identified 13 major discourses which have been deployed throughout this interview and I would like to describe these discourses as nodal points which are connected to other discourses. These fundamental discourses which act as distribution points on a network of meaning were described by Foucault as “dispositifs”, which are routinely translated as “apparatuses”. This is a somewhat awkward and opaque translation and perhaps the term “set-up” used by Janet Lyold gives a more accurate sense of its meaning. (Veyne, 2010). In other words, the set-up is a structuring or constituting discourse of significant value. The conceptualisation of discourse can be envisaged from either two directions : bottom up or top down. One can begin to enumerate the discourses which appear to be related to fundamental sense-experience or one can proceed by enumerating the discourses from top down processes, from epistemes (welthanchchanungs) to philosophical/scientific discourses. However, in a sense to prioritise either approach would be epistemologically dubious because it is not clear which order precedes the other, or how bottom up and top down discourses interact. In a sense this opens up philosophical questions beyond the remit of this research, questions related to idealist and materialist conceptions of the world.

Philosophical Discourse (Religion, Philosophy, Science)

First off it seems to me that this interview is constructed out of a Platonic/Christian discourse which overlaps with ancillary discourses of humanist philosophy where the human being is constructed out of several basic presuppositions: will, as evolving towards perfectibility, as living in a God-centred world. These discourses position the interviewer and interviewee in a number of finite and limited positions from which we can apprehend reality. The next major

set –up is the discourse of science which constitutes the subject within this interview. I would argue that the discourse of science deployed is a mechanistic Newtonian scientific discourse (pre twentieth century) which constructs the world in predicable manner according to the rules of unity of time and space. This discourse allows for the integrity of the human subject to be maintained in line with the Platonic/Christian concept of man as a free agent. The next major set up is the use of Enlightenment discourse which is a further elaboration of the construction of man as a teleological adventure in rationality. “If I could do anything to enlighten” (Line 15), “You see, you have the idea that the perpetrators...were people of sharpened enlightened...moral perceptions” (Line ?)

The discourses of sense-experience, namely oral, visual and textual culture. These break down into discourse of speech, the written word (the thesis, the Bible, novels, reports , constitution etc. and the various genres linked to its productions (biography, memoir, fairy-tale, thriller, travel writing etc.); visual discourse (theatre, architecture, film, painting)

Written Word

Firstly, I would like to give an account of the importance of the written word as a discourse. The primacy of the written word is seen through ancient constructions such as the well-known Biblical formulation , “In the beginning was the Word...the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us ” (John, 1,1; 1,14). In this interview the textual discourses deployed are numerous and range from academic (“your thesis”), journalism, the Constitution, “stinking Constitution which should be burned” (Line 458) the Episcopal tradition, (palimpsest) poetry, the civil archive (reports), historical writing, genre (biography, memoir, novel) . In turn each of these forms and genres are smeared with multiple discourses : patriarchal, religious ,educational, pedagogical, patriotic, political. And this interview is constructed out of these multiple textual motivations.

Oral Discourse

Set against the written discourse is the oral discourse, of what is heard and what is not. “ I never once heard the word Letterfrack...”(Line 113); “when I was transferred to St Brendan’s I heard that word every day” (Line 116). “You’d hear of a boy who was sent to Letterfrack of a boy who had escaped” (Line 117); “we knew that people were being beaten because we heard them sort of cry out from time to time” (Line 145-146) In a sense the oral discourse constructs a more primitive world than the written discourse, “the people who fought tooth and nail to get the government to compensate the people who had been abused” (Line 721) The negative space of oral culture is constructed throughout, “Neither of them ever mentioned this in their lives” (Line 27. Silence is constructed using a vivid word indicating difficulties of breathing, the “strictures of silence”. So in a sense oral culture can be seen as a foil to these strictures of silence. The speaker is not identified ; something is heard but the speaker is not identified.

Visual Discourse

Thirdly, visual discourse constructs the material, with reference to foreground and background, so the scenes are constructed using the perspectival discourses of Renaissance art in which perspective is used to construct a homocentric vision of reality.

“I need to give you a little bit of background on this” (Line 100)

“We used to see these boys labouring in the fields (Line 21) . This is a mirror image of a construction deployed later in the text : “And I worked in there actually. I had forgotten this . I, I was an apprentice to an interior decorator. And he’d go this job to essentially paint the inside of this place. St Joseph’s and the first thing that struck me was, that that in the few

weeks I was there, from 8 o' clock in the morning to 6 in the evening, I never met another child.” (Line 147-153). This construction deployed through the use of a visual scene contradicts the previous image in which the residents are constructed as seen. Both constructions are deployed through techniques borrowed from the discourse of painting. In the first image the boys are constructed in the foreground as in a Millais painting or in a tracking shot of a chain gang in Hollywood movies. In the second construction the boys are constructed beyond the vanishing point of the pictorial perspective. The use of visual discourse is so effective that I unwittingly comment on this (and try to deconstruct mid-sentence) at a late stage in the interview, “You paint a picture, not paint a picture but give a very vivid account”. (Line 702).

The use of visual discourse is not just restricted to painting but the discourse of film is also deployed. The scene of the respondent painting in the industrial school is reminiscent of the constructions found in the genre of horror, such as Kubrick's “The Shining”. “ I was in these long corridors which were incredibly quiet, and you felt an atmosphere (Line 153-154) . Here the construction is deployed through the visual modality is layered with the acoustic track , thereby calling to mind the use of talking pictures. Elsewhere in the text, there are references to filmic codes, the meeting of the mother, son and priest in a stand-off at noon (High Noon), the reference to Steven McQueen as “graduate” of the industrial schools, the use of US movie slang, “the clean-up guy” , the “fucking pseudo-Vatican hitman” (Line 925). Then there is the use of architecture/geometry which is a key feature of this interview. Firstly, it is striking how the scenes in this interview are constructed along two visual planes: the vertical and horizontal. The society is constructed as poisoned from the emanations and fumes below (the horizontal plane. In a sense , if this isn't too awkward a comparison , poisoned rivers blow fumes and people don't actually know that the fumes are coming from that goddamn river.

This society, due to its previous corruption, has put out fumes and people are poisoned by these fumes.(Line 635- 639) The society is constructed as having been poisoned from the river of corruption which flows underneath but the society is constructed as the river. This discourse is contrasted with vertical discourse in which man's elevation (in line with Humanist thought) is foregrounded in the discourse , "You elevate people by giving them elevated things" (Line 748).

"They knew that if I don't get the power I'm going to wind up like them, over there, them people coming out in coffins through the windows because the stairs were too narrow, so you had to get them out the top window." Here again we see the construction of liberty as elevation , that even in death , escape is constructed as happening on the vertical axis, presumably to get as far away as possible from the ground (linked to death and dying, lack of oxygen, putrefaction). Lastly , in addition to the use of geometric discourse we have its natural extension in the use of architectural discourse. We see how key architectural features become structuring principle of discourse : Parish house, town planning, social housing, the school , the hospital. We can see how these objects can act as framing devices or portals through which the discourse is constructed, as in the section on "coming out in coffins through the windows." (line 647)

Abuse constructed as not surprising, as categorisable (physical and sexual) , as shocking , horrendous, censored, "track –covering" (echoes palimpsest metaphor later) , as threat, as disciplining, as terror (Line 525) polymorphous "So abuse takes many forms" (Line 649) . "Physical , I feel, can be recovered from infinitely more readily than psychological and emotional abuse" (Line 650) . Constructed as "too narrow to be confined to sexuality. "to expand abuse to every time I blacken another person's name" (Line 699) Collapse back into moral categorisation of acts. "The number of people who were abused in other ways is a very

small thing” (Line 836). Experience is constructed as identical to its description, as if having experienced an event permits its description. Illusory correspondence between what has happened and what can be described: “We knew what was going on... my mother knew what was going on, my uncle had come out of that place, my auntie Bridget had come out of that place and my auntie Katie had come out of that place but the terror is so pervasive” (Line 842-844)

Construction of **community** as knowing “we knew” (Line 139) as savage , as horrible , as invisible (Bishop never visited) . “Out of this pool of general savagery , you have these men and women prepared for the religious life” (Line 271) Aboriginals, Arabs, shadows located in the external world “ the priest, the guard, the “poverty guy” .cast shadows . drunken, violent, destructive. “The auld stock , the honest people” (Line 814)

Abusers constructed as the Government, the “ new management” (Line 251) “country bastards” “creatures” “gawks” . “I’m going to expose these bastards” (Line 890) Legitimacy

Appendix 10: Collective Analytic Summary

Colour Codes:

Black: Respondent 1

Blue: Respondent 2

Green: Respondent 3

Red: Respondent 4

Brown: Respondent 5

Purple: Respondent 6

COLLECTIVE DISCOURSES

List of identified apparatuses

1. **Epistemological Discourse/Philosophical discourse Platonism/ Idealism/** where literally the idea is suspended in the ether. Platonic Christianity: Existentialist discourse (man's search for meaning). Discourse of idealism (wish fulfilment/deferred reality). Discourse of the visible- "esse est percipi". To be is to be perceived . Judaeo-Christian philosophy- Humanist philosophy: Cartesian Subject. Phenomenological Subject. (Free will, individual agency).**Free will-** "it did seem that they had settled on that as method of life" .**Epistemological discourse** 14-- Line 12: " I suppose we just knew they were from the industrial school". Line " we kind of felt"7...Line 20: "But we were always aware...but it was a very secretive place and we didn't really know what was going on " Awareness ≠Knowledge, a distinct construct. Line 46 : "Knowledge constructed as awareness"; Line 202: "thought us unknown to ourselves to not be judgmental. (Judgment versus Critical thinking?)
Epistemological Discourse. "I knew then that there was something strange about them" (Line 31). "And we knew that they were being beaten" (Line 329-321).. "well-known fact" .Abuse constructed as well-known but not verbalised. "not mentioned in polite circles" (Line 316). "Everyone knew about it but it's just now that it's being spoken about" (Line 388-389). "The poem I mentioned to you before the recorder was switched on" (Line 299). "Maybe the more enlightened of my generation saw through it" (Line

457-458). Church constructed as “knowing best” Bishop “overseeing all of this” (VERTICAL POWER). Verbal discourse constructed as “frightening the horses” (Line 316) Transparency constructed as knowledge. “even as a teenager I saw through that institution. “ FUNCTION- self –serving or self-justifying function in that KNOWLEDGE confers authority on the speaker. The speaker is deploying the discourse in order to create anchor points in the text that of solid epistemology such as “well-known fact” which function almost like stanchions in the sea. Epistemological. The construction of difference between AWARENESS and KNOWLEDGE has been seen in previous interview (1,2). “We wouldn’t have the phrase or we wouldn’t have the knowledge. We wouldn’t be able to verbalise that” (Line 71-72). Yet later he constructs himself as possessing knowledge. So there is an uncompromising contradiction in constructions here, that is smoothed over by the fact that the constructions appear in separate sections and the contradiction only comes to by breaking up the surface of the text through the process of deconstruction. “I knew then that there was something strange about them” (Line 31). “And we knew that they were being beaten” (Line 329-321)..”well-known fact” .

Abuse constructed as well-known but not verbalised. “not mentioned in polite circles” (Line 316). “Everyone knew about it but it’s just now that it’s being spoken about” (Line 388-389). “The poem I mentioned to you before the recorder was switched on” (Line 299). “Maybe the more enlightened of my generation saw through it” (Line 457-458). Church constructed as “knowing best” Bishop “overseeing all of this” (VERTICAL POWER)

Verbal discourse constructed as “frightening the horses” (Line 316)

Transparency constructed as knowledge. “even as a teenager I saw through that institution. “ FUNCTION- self –serving or self-justifying function in that

KNOWLEDGE confers authority on the speaker. The speaker is deploying the discourse in order to create anchor points in the text that of solid epistemology such as “well-known fact” which function almost like stanchions in the sea.

Inheritance. The behaviour of the response of the parents is constructed as inherited from parents. It seems as if this related to the notion of communication that happens by non-verbal means which is a recurrent theme in these interviews, a kind of osmotic communication. Hence the need to keep things separate; there is a sense of toxicity constructed. The moral discourse constructs the response of knowledge within the frame of morality. “They failed from my conscience” (Interesting , the etymological connections between the root of the verb conscience which means “knowledge” , as in scientific knowledge and not moral knowledge.

Epistemological Discourse – “I didn’t know much about the industrial school system” (Line 5) **Epistemology**- knowledge as direct or indirect, marginal or central. (Line 6, Line 44). Function of discourse is to authorise speech or not- Knowledge confers power to speak. Knowledge that impinges and knowledge that doesn’t – An element of rationality is indicated as present by one type and absent by the other.

2. . **Architecture**: Parish house, hospital and the home. Discourse of town planning/architectural. Ghetto – social housing – “I had been in what you might call a genteel, repressed...and was then catapulted into an environment where”.

“there was huge house there, a pseudo-Georgian house as I recall and I went with my mother into this- there was marble-covered hall”

The Body: Ancient Epidemiology discourse (“body was dirty”) related to religious discourse and its injunction against defiling the body. Religious discourse of

purity/impurity. How the spoken word become unspoken after a certain time . (John 1:1)
 In the beginning there was the word and the Word was with God and the Word was God.
 The discursive becomes non-discursive, invisible but materially secreted through the
 bodies of people

Architectural Discourse- “the industrial school and the whole world of it”. Discourse of
 Architecture/Public Space- Line 38 – the cinema. Line 103: “dormitory, you don’t have
 your own personal space”. Line 128 “he didn’t know what was going on behind closed
 doors”.

Line 196: “that goes all out the window when you’re on the hurling pitch” . Discourse of
 Inner/Outer- Somatic- Architectural? – Line 103- “you don’t have your own personal
 space”. Line 160: “you know he’s a really good outgoing guy” – Line 168: “it’s been
 through him that the only **insight** I really have to the industrial school” Line 198: “the
 Jesuits gave us a really good outlook on life”. Line 204: “gone out the window” Line 225:
 “I can actually remember seeing them climbing out the windows” (Architecture as an
 apparatus- a set up). Line 290 “he was good and open”. Contradiction between private
 and public space because if they have no personal belongings , then they are open. Line
 377: Boys constructed as “sheltered”. Institution constructed as “hostile environment”
 Contradiction. **Action Orientation:** The discourse is embedded within language and acts
 as a framing device in metaphoric use. Speaker is building up structures of reality through
 the use of architecture and this discourse also allows for ideas to be expressed about
 inside/outside/ massive versus flimsy structures (stability versus fragility) and therefore it
 carries a lot of complex emotional cargo.

Discourse of Architecture. “knowing the existence of the building and what the palace
 looked like” (Line 467). “They weren’t at all the sort of priests to be put sitting in the

parlour” (Line 644) The meeting of Architectural/moral discourse. (the idea of the good room). Contrast with the discourse of nature. (Priest out the back digging ditches) . Not in the parlour. The importance of this word “back” . In the discourse the scene is set in the back road leading to the house and later the priests are constructed as normal human beings “who stood with their back to the fire eating their porridge and drinking out of a mug”. (Line 657). “I mean they had this huge understanding not just of their own little perch, pump, patch but they read the papers, they knew world stuff” . The clerical students have got to be in separate quarters, and separate entrance, hoardings going up” (Line 920) This maps onto the construction of private and public space in the section on the priest P not being in the parlour. “That’s a very small window in a very large.

Architectural Discourse- Institution was a “closed shop” (Line 487). “You see what goes on inside closed doors is a very different thing from what’s shown on the outside” (Line 494) .

18. 3. **Theatrical Discourse-** I think this is a subtle discourse present within the actual frame of the interview which reprises the unity of time and space. This reminds me of classical notions of theatre, expressed by Racine in the 17th century where the unity of time, space, and action were fundamental requirements of the drama. Visually if I detach myself from the interviewing process I can see two individuals whose physical setting over a kitchen table calls to mind a theatrical scene in its essential rigidity. There is no interruption , no physical breaks, no shifting of positions. This discourse is to be contrasted with filmic discourse whose language allows for time and space to be cut up. **Theatrical discourse** – used to constructed both abuser and abused. “A character who was odd of interesting” (Line 18) . “People came in eventually to teach them a little stagecraft or elocution or music or that kind of thing..it would have been

fairly harmless” (Line 41-42). “Abusers” constructed as “unfortunate characters” (Line 122). Reference to An Ghiall ... Function to create a distance , as screen between the description and the thing described; a character somehow is not a real person. Or contrariwise, a character can paradoxically be more real than a non-impersonated individual. In this case, I think the function of the discourse is to located the individual described on a more “dignified” plane, where she is not reduced or levelled to “victim” status. (The transmutative power of theatre and art) . **Discourse of theatre : “the star performer”** (Line 949). **“I have known enough of the good guys”** (Line 961). **Courtly Discourse** :Diplomacy? Courtesy. “Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed” (Line 3) Civilisation – “polite society” from Discourse of civilisation? (psychological men versus the animal boys (settling for food and shelter). Savagery and civilisation: Discourse of the Primitive and the Civilised . (Is this the older discourse of Imperial Britain and its “shadow”, the savage Irish?) Romanticism- (nature versus nurture, civilisation versus savagery). ROMANTICISM Sublime versus the material. Discourse of genealogy (country **bastards**) Discourse of hunter/gatherer –phylogenetic discourse . Construction of society as “polite” (Line 500) . Civil discourse (governmentality). **Courtesy** – “Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed” (Line 3) “leniency devolved to people who thought they were entitled to respect” (Line 115). Vigilance constructed as ordinary and not heroic virtue. (Line 242) . “They gave respect to these people and didn’t question them” (Line 266-267). Function of discourse: To stymie questioning and interrogation, to placate- Interesting overlap with the psychodynamic approach. **Courtesy Discourse** – Line 520: “ I think it’s a very noble thing to be able to apologise for wrongdoing”

4. Filmic Discourse: I have been surprised by importance of filmic discourse in the interviews conducted and it is clear to me that this is a fundamental discursive operation in terms of the structuring of the response to the research topic. This is evident on two levels, at the level of content where the respondent refers to seeing the industrial school boys in the cinema, (Line 38) or recalls his work on film and wonders about a story making a good film. (Line But this discourse leavens the material at the formal linguistic level. For example, I as interviewer construct knowledge as perception in the beginning of the interview: “What is your perception of it” (Line 58). The connection of perception (anschauung) to world view (weltanschauung) is etymologically connected and it seems to me that the discourse around looking/seeing is key in this material. The respondent goes on to describe how there was a “blind eye thrown” (Line 454/461) by members of the community to “institutional abuse” and this evocative image expressed in the passive tense recalls a theatrical discourse (Oedipus, tragedy) etc but is also an image of the camera, which is a blind eye, recording impassively without comment as the images are captured through the lens and are photochemically stored on the negative. Of course , the use of the term blind eye captures the dynamics of photography or film much better than human perception, and we know from recent research in visual perception that our vision is constructed through the visual cortex, that vision is constructed actively, that we see more accurately with our brains than with our retina. However, the ancient visual discourse of theatre and the more modern visual discourse of film continue to construct a vision of human activity as more passive than it appears to be, thereby consolidating a naïve realism, where the objects which are in reality constructed as inferred as revealed. What are the implications of this in terms of our construction of subjectivities? It is likely that these discursive operations insist on subjugating

subjectivity, moulding people into passive receptacles of experience. This ensures the frustration of resistance and the upholding of hegemonic structures.

5. **Discourse of Science** Newtonian physics. (NSD Post Newtonian physics- string theory, relativity) Deductive reasoning (NSD: inductive method). Scientific Discourse- Induction/Deduction- (NSD: Arational – for example pre-socratic discourse/magical thinking). Epistemes. Top down discourse. Darwinian discourse seen in use of language “it evolved “
6. **Enlightenment discourse.** NSD (Pre-enlightenment discourse- magic/ prescience/poetry/asynchronicity) Science/not science-Buddhism/French enlightenment. “If I could do anything to enlighten” (Line 16) . “You see, you have this idea that the perpetrators of these crimes, this savagery were people of sharpened enlightened mod..mor...moral perceptions. They weren’t , they were what we called country bastards”
7. Discourse of **medicine/ disease/ contagion-** “the fallout” ; “mother passed it on to us”. Discourse of Medicine and Disease (“benign”). Discourse of medicine and disease. (Epidemiology-probably one of the oldest discourses.) Damage of abuse constructed as “fall out” (Line 494) Discourse of contamination (original sin) (Picks up the theme of contamination from TB) . Damage constructed as virulent (Line 496) “Tainted stuff” (Line 553) . “rivers of filth” ...poisoned fumes” (line 637) . “flesh is corrupt “ (Line 662) “stuck in their scabs” (Line 750) . Intelligence constructed as a medical instrument “ Intelligence is like a very sharp knife, you can use to lance a boil or decapitate yourself” . “I suppose too that there was fear of exposing the rottenness in case we’re all engulfed

by it” (Line 858) Not to myself- Reith lecture by John Searles- or Ramachandra- How did people distinguish themselves from each other- If one has a disease, the other will have it , if there is no distinction- maps onto the idea of the psychic skin covering a community- lack of individuation . Varying processes of individuation – Bishop’s poem about visiting the dentist. “Now unfortunately these individuals are often obliterated before the effects of their standing up is, are felt, you now” (Line 901) . Medical discourse (repeated) (“the cancer is confined”). Discourse of disease /medicine corruption- contamination (“the whole thing breaks down again”). Discourse of contagion- “ghettos”.

8. **Discourse of Disease-** Putrefaction “it would open the proverbial can of worm”- literally the disease of the verb: OED: a complex and largely unexamined problem or state of affairs the investigation of which is likely to cause much trouble or scandal. **Medical Discourse-** “Terrible treatment of pupils” (Line 18) . “Most of them would have left with terrible scars in their lives” (Line 24-26). **Medical/Psychological Discourse-** abusers “deeply wounded and damaged” (Line 106)- To use the discourse of trauma (the wound).
9. **Sexuality.** “Now the word sex was never mentioned” (Line 142) “I didn’t know what the word buggery meant” (Line 143). Genitalia constructed as private parts (Line 445) . “filthy” (Line 680?) (“he’s only a fucker”) Discourse of sex, constructed as outside language. (wasn’t talked about- osmosis). (B) **Discourse of Sexuality** (largely absent, although argument about its terms of reference) . Abuse constructed according to two categories: sexual and physical cruelty. “spared the rod”- (the ambiguous nature of discourse overlapping physical and sexual discourses- sexual disciplining?). **Sexual discourse-** “pulling up her skirt and beating her” **Sexual Discourse-** Abuse of boys constructed as sexual but not of girls. “Sure 90% of the boys who went to the industrial schools were sexually abused nearly” (Line 389). Cause of sex abuse by males constructed as born out of frustration. “You see men were so frustrated” (Line 375)

Sexual Discourse- Confronting “Abuse” constructed as a sexual challenge. Function : to – not sure- absence of sexual discourse-. What is a sexual challenge? Perhaps the function here is to interrogate rather than to resolve.

10. **Patriarchal Discourse** – boy, man , priest, secretary (priest) , bishop. “Fathers felt obliged to beat you” (Line 275)
11. **Feminine discourse** (Then she got a job in an institution where the children were but she was not allowed to speak to the children and they were not allowed to speak to her” (Line 298) . Damage heritable through the mother? Original sin?
12. **Nature?** natural law, harmony, communality-no hierarchy, oral culture, folk wisdom, biohealth?
13. **Economics / Money.** (mercantile exchange units). Civilisation needs money, industrial schools train their residents to earn money and to have the potential to earn money in the future. Discourse of capitalism : “the merchants” Marxist discourse. Economics (Language of recruitment) - Discourse of economics (fee of “half of crown” for Bishop’s school). DF: To reveal the workings of social division. Institutional abuse constructed as “a whole business” (Line 334) . residents “fit for capitalist consumption” (Line 505?) . Merchants constructed as profiteering in the town . Compensation a “mammonite solution” (Line 732). “Most of these educations are placed in the service of the capitalist beast where all they want is a career.” (Line 807). Business Discourse . (“part of the deal”).
14. **Discourse of Economics:** per capita payments: “were paid by state by inmate they had”. Line 523: compensation as corruption, as blood money. **Economic discourse (Imperial)** “whereas now you would want the crown jewel if you really wanted a nursing home in

your old age” (Line 130-132) . “That business with his father” (Line 552) . “The whole business of Ferns” (Line 598). **Economic Discourse** . “The business community made money out of the Magdalene and they knew what was going on there” (Line 394). “people were making money out of these places” (Line 467). Compensation constructed as a “cheap way out” (Line 494) . FUNCTION of this discourse is to simplify the reasons for the institutions , that their function was primarily as economic units which may be true but this detracts from analysing other discursive operations constituting speech on institutional abuse in Ireland. **Discourse of Economics-** “Some of them (abusers) came from very poor houses...thought it was a safe option, they thought no chance of a job, no education. Either that or take the boat to England the fear of going off on their own to England” (Line 369-371). “And a poor person like you or me, if we avoided taxes we’d have penalties”. (Line 408). Economic/Planning corruption constructed as “fierce abuse”**Economic Discourse-** “They were probably entitled to some small pension at that stage” (Line 57). “She escaped because she was middle class” (To England- but later committed suicide- hot to construct escape?) “Community” constructed as dichotomous (rich and poor) Contradictory- constructed as pulling together. Function of discourse is to allude to economics as salvation but this is contradicted by the sad revelation that the friend did not escape but in fact committed suicide.

15. **Genealogy**. Linking systems- whether through bloodlines (dynasties) or timelines (medieval), terror of remembering. **Inheritance**. Or is the apparatus murder? (rising, the educational system, power struggles.) Discourse of Legitimacy – orphans- “St Anne’s , another orphan institution” (Line 25) **Educational Discourse**. “there was a baby school, a primary and a secondary school”. “They wouldn’t , any of them have gone past the seventh class” (Line 341) **Genealogical Discourse**. “I suppose that came from my

parents” (Line 34). “It was these sorts of communion suits handed down. “ (Line 148)
 “they would have awkward shoes or awkward boots” (Line 149) . “There was some kind
 of naivety in the generation that preceded my generation” (Line 455-456). FUNCTION of
 this discourse is to posit a causality between events in the past and in the present and in a
 way create an object of blame. (The sins of the father will be visited on the sons) .

Educational Discourse. “It should have stopped in the sixties because we were pretty
 educated in the sixties” (Line 592-593) . **Educational Discourse-** “You know I am head
 of Form Four; I am in charge of dormitory 3” (Line 116). Abuse a “kind of education ,
 deranged nevertheless” Function: to show how imbricated it is within societal normative
 constructs- **Discourse of Fertility-** “it’s a person who believes that wielding a certain
 amount of what I would describe as defensive, protective, self-protective barrenness”.
 “It’s a barren way of living. ” (Line 237). Function : to link lack of fertility with isolation,
 protectiveness, defensiveness. **Orphan Discourse /Legitimacy/Genealogy-** “ and they
 were orphans we were told” (Line 36) . Parents constructed as “moderators” (Line 329).
Discourse of the ORPHAN- “Some of our friends of fostered a young German boy and
 they had no children themselves so they fostered him... We all felt that here were children
 who were endangered and whose families had an opportunity to send them away for the
 course of the conflict” (In contrast to the disguised conflict in Ireland with regard to
 children who had no one to care for them).

16. **Written Word.** The Text (Bible, The Classics, literacy, conceptualisation, enumeration-
 these are the strategies of discourse which constitute the scaffolding of the constructs
 deployed. Reports (Inquiries, records on former resident, the academic text (thesis),
 journalistic texts, documentaries (reportage). Writing is the codifying scheme which
 screens and constitutes these discourses. **Text/ Writing** (palimpsest, the constitution, the

Sermon on the Mount) dawn of history and discourse Written word apparatus: Bible, Constitution, reports, Mein Kampf...institutions were : Subcategories of Writing: Archival, Scriptural, Letters, Records, Legal, Parliamentary, constitution, memoirs, school reports (his mother's) . Rarefied discourse of writing (classic) . Originalism (Biblical, Constitutional, Legal, Social discourses, Scalia- discourses constructing meanings from constructed origins.) Powerful discourse along the lines of , “in the beginning was the Word”. Maybe link this to the “Written Word”. Think of all the modern movements which proceed from a reversion back to older documents: virtually all new religions of the past 400 years based on a return to “Ur texts” (the Bible). NARRATIVE discourse- is this subsumed under WRITING . Constitution constructed as “stinking” (Line 458) (should be burned...this is the discourse of Nazism which is criticised later) .

Reader limited- daughter elevation talking versus action

Inextricably linked with writing and the construction of a narrative is the

OMNISCIENT construction of reality- the eagle-eye view . “I don't know anybody from X who wasn't battered “ (Line 464) “Mother never recovered” (Line ?)

(a)Biography:

(b) Memoir “ **I know Mannix Flynn who wrote a book about Letterfrack , “ enough said “ or something like that ..I don't know what it's called, a sort of fictional idea” (Line 373) NB.**

(c) Orphan literature. “It was extremely dramatic for me”- theatrics. Narrative framing (chronology) shapes material which in reality does not adhere to clear chronologies (for example the 3 Act Play of Hollywood scripting) **Orphanhood.** “Industrial schools also

had orphans who were there because they didn't have parents" (Line 32-33) "If a mother died fathers couldn't look after children" (Line 73-74). Function of this discourse is to allow for the expression of complex themes of belonging, legitimacy, child care, infanticide, etc. The position of ORPHAN seems to be a passive site where the possibilities of action and change are nil. The ORPHAN is nameless and is a way constructed in this account as deprived of colour, humour and expression in contrast to the other positions within the account (Mother, Wife, Husband, Son, Daughter, Bishop, Missionary, Student etc.) Is this a case of a subjugated subjectivity; this is a discourse which allows an entity to be recognised and simultaneously legitimises the piteous nature of the ontological category created. (Orphan)

(d) Rhetorical discourse (not surprising, shocking) . "They all belonged to this horror" (Line 641) "We lived in terror day and night" (Line 662) **Rhetorical Discourse**— use of the modal style to indicate valence in thought and feeling, ambivalence, prevarication etc. Use of the diminutive form. Hiberno-English Discourse- "bold" Line 236 "a couple of brothers". (Counter to systematic theory of abuse) . Again minimisation techniques : Line 290: "One of two guys" **Rhetoric**- I 'm wondering how the discourse of style seems to set things up... You have two aunts living in Dublin, both married to brothers; one is rich ; one is poor. You have the description of a two tone background- the urban and the rural. You have the wise old poor bachelor who is erudite and the Bishop with the fancy car. You have the back and the front of the house. You have the good guys and the bad guys. I am wondering whether the possibilities of talk are analogous to those buttons on used to find on TV sets; one for volume and one for control with a limited number of setting. I wonder whether contrast and binary modes of categorisation are an aspect of a discourse of style . In other words the talk of meaningful but is meaning is circumscribed, or

conditioned by one among many discursive settings- one of tone and volume and contrast.
Rhetoric.

Mein Kampf

- (e) Fairy-tale (horror) Use of the trope: “One day the authorities came...” NARRATIVE
- (f) Thriller conspiracy “There was a lot of stuff going down” (Line 550)
- (g) Discourse Travel Writing of the critic (the observer, Fr O'Brien and the 19th century travellers) adopted by respondent. Discourse of savagery and tribal violence.
- (h) Discourse itself constructed as speculative, philosophical and psychological- privileging of action or silence over writing. These competing constructions of the oral and the written, the verbal and the textual reappear again and again.
- (i) Literary discourse (what is fiction or not- a very topical discourse) controversial over falsified memoirs (alloys of fact and fiction) in US at present. **Literary Discourse.**
“They were all published in a book which she published at the time, “But where will I go”? (Line 38). Function to refer to different registers in Irish society- The stagecraft taught to the Magdalenas as “harmless” (Impotent art) High and Low art- to use literary discourse is to show that there are different registers, different books of life in operation in Irish society.
- (j) **Narrative discourses-** (biography, timelines, professional, social worlds).
Construction of story on Sunday afternoons. Memory constructed as “vague” (Line 42) “On sunny Sundays” “I hope I’m not casting back my own adult mind” (Line 70)
The idea of forming, shaping, constructing reality. “and even up to 14, 15, 16 which brings me to 1970, 68, 69, 70, 71” “Or else I am just reflecting my own thoughts on

the place” (Line 283). “I probably thought that they weren’t real or that they were something out of a story book” (Line 364-365). Personal and impersonal constructions of point of view- “ I personally wasn’t at all surprised” (Line 383-384). “Isn’t that amazing that I wrote the poem and I can’t remember it” (Line 415). “The other night there was a clip..from that song “Raggy Boy” from a book”. FUNCTION of this discourse is to bind material in an apprehensible form – it’s effect is to create a sense of continuity where there may be none, and to produce an effect of seamlessness and epistemological integrity. However, we can see how contradictions are multiple and confusions abound in the interstices of discursive formation.

- (k) **Circular constructions** (think of spirals) – “I live today within a mile from where I was born” (Line 9). “I think they would reconnect and come back in some kind of circuitous route back to base” (Line 48-49). FUNCTION of this discourse is to structure an account as having a formal property, the circle being one of the oldest, perhaps from heliocentric cultures, the spirals and circular patterns of Palaeolithic art. The gain in deploying these discourses is a sense of patterning, shaping and moulding of an account which has two functions\; aesthetic and epistemological- Perhaps epistemological because aesthetic. Style as the expression of personality.

(l) **THEATRICAL / Sporting Discourse.** “ We would huddle in our own huddle..and when the game was over they would be ushered off and we would be ushered into our own tog out” (Line 239) Repeated “usher” from early on in interview (parents ushering the children in when the industrial school boys were passing). USHER- OED. “An official or servant who has charge of the door and admits people to a hall or chamber” FUNCTION – to depict conflict and to demonstrate how action fills a circumscribed space (ushering) .

(m) Temporal constructions – see discursive constructions. Temporal constructions interesting- “I’ve done lots of things over the years” (Line 10); “In the later years before it was closed” (Line 15) “When we hear what went on in the early years” (Line 17) “It was terrible bad treatment of pupils in the early years” (Line 18-19). “Not in recent years” (Line 39). “Afterwards we heard that one of the brothers who was walking them to school had been abusing them” (Line 43). “Then it was years later when we heard about it” (Line 83-84). “My own brother is a doctor in X now . You can imagine his predecessors would have had contact with these children” (Lien 97-98). “Do you remember, you don’t remember, you’re probably too young” (Line 101-102). “I think a lot more could have been done earlier on” (Line 158) . “No- they were the older girls” (Line 309) **Cowed down- trans. ‘To depress with fear’ (Johnson); to dispirit, overawe, intimidate. OED**

17 Spatial Discourse- Clergy constructed as “up there” (Line 205) “up on his high q horse” (Line 211) Hierarchy constructed in terms of elevation and depression.

19. **Religion** Discourse of hell (see previous section on discourse of celectiality /materiality).

Eternal versus Temporary. Not just Christian discourse. Subsume under Religious Discourse. Rite (expressed in song or religious practise) Does this precede religion. I am thinking of the birth of tragedy, when the pastoral tradition of chasing the goat away from eating the crops, becomes transfigured into scapegoating in which a goat is killed, and the this becomes locus for the choir, and the birth of tragedy. Rite, a fundamental structuring principle that holds things together until they emerge and become known. Buddhist discourse. (NSD: Western hegemonic Christianity (duality)

Biblical discourse ? Discourse of the sinister. (Left-handedness, the devil, homosexuality, horror movies etc.) . Discourse of Christianity? Biblical, religious,

Christian and Catholic . How name the discourse? Religious discourse ? Umbrella phrase.

Vernacular. 12. “Buggery”, anal intercourse but also abominable heresy (obs OED.

Discourse of Christianity (Magdalan Laundry) DF : To repeat the discursive insistence of the “fallen woman”, the implicit Madonna and Whore discourse. Does this discourse precede Christianity.?

Religion . DF: To illustrate a scene associated with rites and rituals, monotony.

Discourse of Catholicism :

the confessional (secrecy) – complainant as confessor. DF- to thwart the circulation of speech outside the confessional box. Confessional discourse as constraint.

So we’re having these religious order confessing and renewal weekend “ (Lien 865)

BAPTISM- Liquid apparatus: the alcohol, the river- Original sin (to be washed away?)

The hidden **discourse of “baptism”**, the apparatus par excellence of the Christian era to signify initiation.

“like Martin Luther said, there are certain practice, Catholic practise so deeply ingrained in me that it would be a waste of time trying to find something else” (Line 962) “It’s about you going to say your prayers in a place that you like to say your prayers where you said them as a child” **Religious Discourse** Line 270: “holiness of women”- Line 273:

“The whole country was under the spell of the Church” Contrasting discourse of femininity to masculinity because the masculine discourse is associated with threat and castration where the feminine discourse is associated with the arts (seamstresses and religion) . Line 427 “ We had to go and it was a Catholic country” (reference to mass).

Line 141: “we did not eat meat on Friday” (Dietary Discourse) **Discourse of the**

Confessional - Apologia- Line 288 “If I brought up something I’d feel like apologising. Line 473: “I find myself apologising for bringing it up” (NOTE active versus passive forms of bringing up throughout material) . Line 517 : “Apology came but it didn’t really change anything”

Religious Discourse- “I remember the nun getting the postulant...” “but the biggest threat from women like that was that they would send the kids to the Model school” (Line 229-230). Other people’s experience was of the big stick and the belted crozier” (Line 652). “French Huguenots who came to Ireland to escape persecution” (Line 683-684). “Marriage was sacrosanct” (Line 837) . “Where was the Holy Spirit in all of this, he was on his holiday” (Line 900). Europe as Christian civilisation.

Biblical Discourse- “The whole of society is being brought to account”

Religious Discourse. “I think man would go wild with no religion” (Line 465) **Religious Discourse** . “They had never been let out until Pope John the 23rd came to be” (Line 32-33) . “A notion of righteousness that seemed to emanate from a notion of Catholicism that is really dead thank God” (Line 92-93). Function of religious discourse is to demonstrate how powerful it was- the toxic element perhaps alluded to in the verb “emanate “ – religious discourse as all pervasive from which something emanates.

Theological Discourse- “Evil is something one hesitates- it’s a word you’d hesitate to use” Not just the act but the conceptualisation of the act. “It is not truthful in that there is no juxtaposition of good with evil” (Line 220) . “Abuse” constructed as ghastly, evil and frightful. “It wasn’t so much of a question of their having fallen foul of some institution, they fell foul of some fellow who seduced them, or they were themselves part of that exchange” (Line 164-165). Function: Again to demarcate and to remove the abuser from the camp of general humanity. To marginalise as other.

20. **Visual Discourse-** Discourse of visual painting –giving background. (repeated motif of two planes: background and unmentioned foreground. Is the foreground deferred, does it exist? Is there just background?)

“I need to give you a little bit of background on this “ (Line 100)

“We used to see these boys, you know labouring in the fields” (Line 21)

“I never met another child” (Line 162) contradicts the tableau of having seen “the boys labouring in the depths of winter”- (“you paint a picture, not paint a picture but give a very vivid account” (Line 702)

Auditory Discourse: HEARING -ORAL-AUDITORY-Vernacular - Gossip. (You’d hear of a boy escaped)

Discourse of horror – belong to TV or VISUAL or NARRATIVE (long corridors (The Shining), the theatrical language (which were incredibly quiet):

Filmic (High Noon)- (hero son). Hollywood- Steven McQueen... Slang (Movie Talk) : “the clean-up guy”

Discourse of the VISUAL PLANE horizontal and the vertical: (spectre above, the river below, the coffins coming out top windows, buried below).

Visual Discourse: Line 58: Knowledge constructed as perception. “What is your perception of it”? Line 88: response constructed as judgment. Line 116 Line 134: “we were having a look around..one of the saddest sights”- Image as product of knowledge. Line 130: “ I worked on a film” Line 137: “the images came to me”. Line 139: “it stood very vivid in my mind”. “Spielbergian Discourse” - Construction of a story – a three act Hollywood structure to abuse- this is what Godard objected to in Spielberg’s “Schindler’s List”. Same principles going on here: the boy as a “rogue”. The stories which insist on the

leavening aspect of humour , of a positive end. Origins in theatre in the round. The goatsong. Line 454: “blind eye was thrown to it” Line 461: “There was a blind eye thrown to it” **Visual /Verbal discourse.** “When doc martins became fashionable they would spell orphanage kids” . “He couldn’t see himself doing anything about a man of the church” (Line 622-623). “Different blobs come out of different...” (Line 575). “You see it’s different people’s perceptions. And mostly I depends on where you are coming from” (Line 758-759) Architectural discourse? Perspective **Visual Discourse/Architecture- Visual construction of boundaries** (gates, walls, windows, buildings) “the Western boundary of the city” (Line 7). “the garden wall between us was not a boundary bot to be crossed” (Line 69-70) Brings up the CROSS of later section- “There was..there still is a very high stone wall about ten feet high” (Line 163). Construction of windows on institution as “barred” . “ There was something about the wall” The cinema as social space. (The gods, the balcony, the bad seats). “Your neck would be straining up to see...they were the worst seats in the house” (Line 118). “Just before the film would start these doors would open” (Line 127). “They certainly entered your consciousness in some frame” (Photography). “You couldn’t see in there but at least it had windows all along” (Line 220). “So we would tog out in this room and they would tog out somewhere else” (Line 233). “There was always a feeling of relief getting out of the gate, out of that place” (Line 241). FUNCTION- To structure the space- Universal appeal in these discourse as they connect to the preverbal/magical audience. **Visual Discourse-** “You probably heard of Cathy Come Home and those kinds of the dramas. There was one called , “ A Day in the Life of Martin Cluxton”. “You know that film , the Magdalens by Peter what’s his name-it’s a very monochrome piece” (Line 196). “I’m struggling like nothing on earth to build a cinema here and ouch ouch but you work through them. It opens your eyes to

what is really going on” (Line 329-330). Function: To construct a different type of epistemology, a different way of knowing- to keep one’s eyes open. (Blind Oedipus)

21. **Discourse of Humour.** “They all had a certain resilience, a sense of humour” (Line 39).
Function is to rescue the character from being over reified by construction of victimhood.
“as sense of humour; they needed it to survive- you know they talked about the elements that were not too terrible”. (Line 39-40) Find a way to make a joke about things”
Function: To make laugh/defensive/to create a polychrome effect in contrast to the monochrome effect
22. **Discourse of Time-** Linguistic Discourse- “what were your thoughts” (Line 10).
Discourse of Teleology (“I see the end that it is coming to”) Construction of response as historical as opposed to contemporary. “We found out when we were in advanced adulthood” (Lines 4 and 17) . “In the depths of winter”. “We found out when we were in the advanced adulthood” (Line 4 and 17)
23. **Academia.** Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed” (Line 3). “A university is like a qualifying place so that you can work in the bank of post office, that kind of shit, it’s not a place of enlightenment” (Line 809)
24. **Journalism.** “for agreeing to be interviewed” (Line 2) **Discourse of Journalism-** “the play wright started talking on the radio “ (Line 46) . “more and more the morning radio ...he really opened up a lot of stuff” (Line 509) . “clergy –bashing “ (Line 902).
“Discourse of **Journalism.** “Again, I’d take note of their presence...” (Line 130). “Their presence was, were noted” (Line 141). “ I remember taking note of their clothes” (Line 142) . “You noticed them” (Line 156). “when the stories began to come out in the late eighties...” (Line 322). “I never pass the place without taking note of it”. (Line 296).
FUNCTION of this discourse could be to formalise the chaos of perceptions- to

retrospectively show that that the observing subject was not passive but was active, noting and observing. However, this discourse of journalism does not seem to be able to bridge over into activity, into practise, into action . **Discourse of Journalism**. “Just from what I read and a few maybe television programs where I saw people being interviewed” (Line 30).

25. **Psychological Discourse**. “your thoughts or feelings or responses” (Line 10) Discourse of Psychology?) cognitive, behavioural tropes. (thoughts, feelings). Psychology discourse. Army recruits constructed as “coming from all sorts of psychological directions” (contrast to unidirectional, apsychological (“decapitated”) passive, silent, demasculinised (“boys”) residents. “There is more psychological damage in this country “ (Line 533) **Pedagogy**. “My mother was raised in one” (Line 15) “She had been raised in this institution” (Line 29) The word “raised” is a word that be used to classify the upbringing of human and animal and has myriad associative possibilities such as raising the dead, raising a subject etc. **Psychological/Humanist Discourse-** Line 7 “your feelings, thoughts and perceptions”. Function to locate meaning in the individual, to propagate transcendental humanist vision of reality. Action Orientation: Appeals to common sense notion of the individual as possessing free will. The speaker is courting this appeal. **Discourse of Humanism** : Line 315: “I mean you’d want to be inhuman not to be shocked” Line 527: “Everyone is an individual and everyone has their own spirit and their own soul and character”- Contradicts his earlier insistent reference to the boys as having **no personal** belongings. **Discourse of Humanism**. “The poor nun that was being human and getting nowhere” (Line 800) **Psychological Discourse**. “This squad of counsellors comes in and you wonder sometimes how people learn to cope” (Line 851-853) . **Psychological Discourse** “It may be tied in with a psychological quasi –religious idea, that they were born somehow in sin” (Line 473). “It must be in my psyche for some

reason” (Line 520). **FUNCTION:** the location of meaning in individual representation in accordance with the humanist tradition. **Psychological discourse.** “your thoughts and feelings” (Line 4). “To put this children in those places without proper supervision” (21-22) **Discourse of Sin/Psychology?** “ We should be ashamed of our lives- that’s how I feel about it” (Line 320-321) **Contradiction** – Nuns constructed as kind and vicious- “Abusers” constructed as ashamed and bystanders constructed as shameless- “We should be ashamed of our lives” **Humanist Discourse-** “Who was the final person that said enough, no more” (Line 549). **Discourse of Humanism.** “I’m sure there were places which were relatively human in which children could thrive to some extent” (Line 229-230). Abuse constructed as a “derangement of psyche and the human spirit” (Line 258) .
Function : to sustain a Platonic /Christian weltanschauung.

26. **Education:** Residents constructed as “graduates” (Line 45) “Steve McQueen was a graduate” (of Boystown) (Line 398) Murder machine (line 580?) . Interview constructed as an “exercise”.

27. **Discourse of Magic** : The sinister- “sinister darkness “ (Line 81). “that spectre of that oppressive dark society followed me all my life” (Line 620) **Magical Discourse/Superstition:** talking about institutional “abuse” Line 3: as “a bit of a taboo”. Line 16: “eerie”. Line 142: “it was giving him the heebie jeebies” Line 142: “Thank God we’ve moved on from that...” Line 272: “The whole country was under the spell of the Church at the time”. This discourse function as a means of appealing to the non-rational , the mystical, and the suprasensible. Also attends to proprioceptive qualities of experiencing. The effect the discourse.

28. Discourse of **democracy** (shared values) .

29. Public and private discourse. (Rules which govern public/private discourse.) “the public revelations, we all knew privately it was going on anyway” (Line 18). “You know when we were young we all knew there were sinister things” (Line 19) . “the public revelations and the various investigatory boards and that came as no surprise” (Line 35)
30. **Legal discourse** (investigatory bodies) . Legal (“bona fide”) underpinned by Biblical discourse (“good faith”). Entire people constructed as “guilty, your honour” Line 600?) . Use of the word “plea” (line 645?) . **Legal discourse – Line 235:** “ We knew from the news and the courts” **Legal discourse.** “in reality it wasn’t an industrial school in terms of the name and the procedures” (Line 67) “the injustice of that sort of thing” (Line 225). “There were no precedents” (Line 611). “The details of the attorney general...your man was Opus Dei and he could not see himself doing anything about a man of the Church” (Line 622-623). “As far as I was concerned that was it, you signed up for granted...” (Line 849). “There were guidelines, there was precedent, there was everything” (Line 886) . “It was great when you were told exactly what you should do and that was the law and God’s will and that was easy” (Lien 927-928) . **Legal Discourse-** “up in court” (Line 43-44). Justice constructed as either based on religion or natural (Line 46). “I think there were a few court cases we heard about” (Line 541). “There was such a sense of injustice and nobody cared” (Line 590)**Legal Discourse:** “Well I suppose I was always interested in issues of justice and I suppose in that context it would have become of interest to me” (Line 155-156). To show that the topic of institutional abuse is not restricted to psychology or sociology but to one of rights and justice.

31. **Gender Discourse** : Masculinity/Feminity- Gender?.Discourse of masculinity (boys and men). DF is to take away the potency of those who were in the institutions, de sex them. Perhaps this discourse alludes to unsaid homosexual practises. Masculinity as violent/inferior or superior/genteel/snobbish or as abandoning. Masculinity as violent/inferior or superior/genteel/snobbish or as abandoning. Femininity as respectable, dependable, renowned. Patriarchy. *Another distinct discursive formation within this interview relates to gender roles, femininity and masculinity as discourses. In particular the patriarchy as discourse is linked with the threat of being sent to industrial school. In all accounts I have analysed each respondent has spoken about the common and pervasive threat of being sent to the industrial school if the child was “bold”. In effect this was a disciplining mechanism. What is obvious from this material is how closely aligned this threat is with the patriarchal discourse as represented by the father.*
32. **Patriarchal** discourse- Line 10, parents constructed as “father”; Line 44 cared for by brothers and priests”. Line 115: “the generation of my father” . **Patriarchy (negative)** - If a mother died fathers couldn’t look after children” (Line 73-74). The Louis’ could “cock a snoot at him, they didn’t have to toe the line or to be told what to do” (Line 314). “this family were being seriously abused in every direction by their father” (Line 613). (Positive) “I had three priests who were uncles. “ (Line 638). The talk is generated in two equally distinct directions: patriarchy and matriarchy (later in relation to education of women, women as conduits of knowledge). The” prince of the Church” (Line 296). “He could cope with those kind of horrific stories” (Line 547) (In contrast with M Murphy, another broadcaster. So patriarchy is presented in a

contradictory manner here , as both able and helpless. “Abuse “ arguable constructed in a patriarchal mode, “that business with his father”. (Line 552) . “They were a family being seriously abused in every direction by their father” (Line 613) The function of this discourse is to underscore the seriousness of patriarchal abuse within the society and this is perhaps the core message of the discourses deployed in this interview, that abuse within institutions must be connected back to a patriarchal discourse of sexuality, dominance, economics etc and that perhaps the issue of institutional abuse as independent of gender is being challenged here repeatedly.

“Your man was an Opus Dei and he could not see himself doing anything about a man of the church” (Line 622-623) Interesting “your man” is a translation of the Gaelic “mo dhuine” which is gender neutral, “dhuine” referring to person. In other words, at some point a discursive address, apostrophe? changed from neutral to male. I had three priest who were uncles” (Line 633). “I mean those nuns fought an uphill battle against the White Fathers” (Line 767-769). “Where did married women go when they were beaten up themselves” (Line 826-827). “If you married you made your bed and laid on it” (Line 848). “You could fight as much as you liked, there was no out” (Line 854). “I have known enough of the good guys” (Line 961). **Discourse of Matriarchy . Woman/Mother.** I refer to the women who protested and this reconstructed as “mothers” in riposte to my word. “the mothers like” (Line 330) . Two different discourses are cleaving the speech. One, the discourse of women and the other the discourse of mothers. “It was only in Victorian times of unmarried mothers that you had women left to fend for themselves” (Line 696) . I mean women’s lib was lived and practised because I can still remember being told in school...if you teach a woman you teach a whole family; if you teach a man you only teach a man” (Line 730). I mean the nuns’ fought and uphill battle ...against the White Fathers (in Australia). (Line 767-769). “Where did married women go

when they were beaten up themselves” (Line 826-827) **Construction of a community without refuge- communal space as a prison- a jail, and the only relief from being in jail is to find another jail- two negatives making a positive. Kafka’s “A bird flew in search of a cage”** . “Ok, women’s refuges only came into existence ..in what, the late 80s”. The discourse of matriarchy seems to be contradictory in that the central role of the mother is underscored by the position of mother as “bargers” as coming down to the school protest. In fact , I was wondering about this phrasing, “coming down” , the use of discourse to signal a shift from a place of altitude to a place of disempowerment. And this is in fact repeated in the discourse as the female respondent describes going down to her daughter’s school to defend her daughter against a false accusation. Is the function of this matriarchal discourse to communicate the possibility of moving from position of power (on high) and to use that power to help the powerless (daughters). When I refer to these women as “women” the respondent says almost reprovngly “the mothers, like” as if my intervention had to be reconstructed, not just in feminine terms but in matriarchal terms. Interestingly , for a Catholic there is no reference to the cult of the Virgin Mary; the Marian cult not entering into the explicit religious reference. However, maybe the discourse of the suffering woman is present in the section where women are constructed not as the powerbrokers but as the abused who have to ask to be put in jail in order to be protected from male violence. In other words, they asked to be put into the position of the criminal ,a more preferable position than the position of subjugated wife. Look how close subjugate if to conjugal and to the form of discourse itself, “conjugate”. Here we can see how the etymological yoke denoted by “joug” is present in subjugate, conjugal and conjugate as if the discourse of agricultural bondage has permeated the relations between people, between man and wife and not just the relations , but has also permeated the representation of those relations, as if the use of the syntactical unit of action, the verb is to

apply the yoke to the object of representation. **Discourse of Patriarchy**- “Again serving the men” (Line 380). “Single mothers were beginning to be accepted” (Line 559) . “If you go through any organisation you’ll find that power is the killer” (Line 585)

Discourse of patriarchy/femininity- “the Irish institutionalised mother and baby system” “You see more prevalent at the time were the problems of young women who found themselves pregnant and it wasn’t so much a question of their having fallen foul of some institution “ (Line 162-163). “You just had two choices: you went to England and had the baby . Or home in some place that you might or might not get out of” (Line 190-191)

Function: To highlight and focus a viewpoint on matters relating to feminine experience- to show how one topic cannot be viewed. **Discourse of the Mother (Matrilineal discourse)** : “We six children of my mother’s (Line ?)

33. Discourse of Power. “It is a degree simply of the same kind of abuse of power by power groupings who employ functionaries to carry out their policies” (Line 224-225)
Function :to located power in central government as opposed to Foucauldian notions but then the speaker constructed power within the community as being disabled by charity and a refusal to ask questions. Links up with courtesy- what stops the asking of questions.

34. Friendship. DF: to contrast with discourse of seignor and vassal complainant to priest, priest to secretary, secretary to bishop. (B) **Discourse of Friendship**- repeated throughout- Line 29 “I have a couple of friends...” Line 499: “it’s because my friendship is so strong with my friend that I keep referring to that I have no problem”. (contrasting with Aristotelian notion of friendship as a virtuous circle, radiating out between friendship dyads to the communal ethical polis) .

35. Discourse of Prison/Punishment/Carceral : “punitive measures would be taken if you suggested “ (Line 32) Lateral effects of punishment incarceration –“the gulag” of

punishment. DF: To install fear, to situate “institutional abuse” within an historical context , which appears to be a tendentious comparison? (Soviet gulag versus Irish industrial schools). Respondent refers to the absence of this discursive term, “We didn’t have the word for that.”. In other words a word which wasn’t known at the time (gulag) is now used to describe a historical reality. Discourse of punishment. DF: Incarceration ≠ Punishment (not necessarily) Two very different discourses. Discourse of punishment and discipline. DF: To show how the industrial school such as Letterfrack was used as a disciplining tool. “Punitive measures would be taken if you suggested” (Line 32) (B) **Discourse of Prison:** Discourse of Escape (Psychological Discourse): Sport as escape, Line 99: “maybe it was a bit if an escape for them” Boy as pupil or inmate (Line 90). **Discourse of Discipline.** Line 126: “I don’t know how many times I heard that as a child” (threat of being sent to industrial school”. **Carceral Discourse-** “juvenile detention centres” (Line 92). “There were nights when the guards would put women in their own cells for their own protection” (Line 841-842). “If you married you made your bed and laid in it” (Overlap of sexual, carceral, matrimonial and architectural discourses). “There was nowhere to go” (Line 842). “There was no out” (Line 849) “Because you had no other option” (Line 853). “You could fight as much as you liked but you had no out”. (Line 854). It’s interesting to see how the carceral discourse overlaps with the discourse of matriarchy and patriarchy. **Interesting the . Discourse of Punishment.** “You would be hit with a stick was instilled in us as a children” (Line 112). “You’d be afraid to mitch school or for a serious crime as in stealing sweets from Woolworths” (Line 341-342). Punishment constructed as normal, “hum-drum punishment life” (Line 352) FUNCTION to show how fear operate and how obedience was obtained. **Discourse of Punishment/Discipline/Prison.** “ If you don’t behave yourself you’ll be sent to Letterfrack” (Line 57-58). “If they escaped they were followed around town” (Line 329). “I think we kind of thought it was a mini jail for

children”. (Line 477) **Carceral Discourse**. “Whatever happened within the walls of the institution, plenty happened to them outside”. Function : To describe the institution as a place of incarceration, of bondage.

36. Discourse of the **CHILD**- Victorianism: DF: Associated phenomena: repressed sexuality, children to be seen and not heard. CHILD Discourse Magical thinking (in relation to the child’s constructed omnipotence). “Society works one way, children make their own arrangements” The quotidian, the vernacular, the “natural”. Discourse of Child Abuse. (older terminology , “children were battered and beaten”) Discourse of the 1960s-1980s.

37. **Military Discourse**- siege mentality of the society- defensive. War. Discourse of warfare (murderous and treacherous). Military discourse (repeated- defensive – earlier “siege mentality”). (you can either be volunteered or you can be drafted) Spectacle: Parade-Corpus Christi- Façade- Archaic discourses. Overlapping military and patriotic discourses. Patriotism (fly the flag) Discourse of Songs (Patriotic Discourses). Discourse of the Holocaust Discourse of War reconciliation. Conciliation, peace-making (see later the construction of the IRA). (B) **Discourse of Patriotism** – as escape, Line 106: “They’d be the first guys with their hands up” **Military Discourse**. “It was a leg in every camp” (Line 494)

- **Military Discourse**: “Residents constructed as an army “a big platoon. Marching...in a much regimented way” (Line 25-26). “I found out later that there were brought out for strict marches” (Line 46). “These boys would troop in “ (Line 112). FUNCTION is to show how the subjectivity of the boys is constituted as subject and subjugated to the mass. (mob) . **Military Discourse**- “Those who are obedient are being obedient are being obedient to superiors to a rule , to some sort of regulation, to some tenets which is at the

heart so it is rather like an army” (Line 96-97). Function-to highlight conflict and to show how group think operates.

38. **Moral Discourse**- Line 17 : “good guys”. Line 116: “this is where bad people go”
 Line 172: “good ordinary guys, friends, colleagues” Line 190: “I’m not sure we thought that these guys had done something bad, I’m not sure” Line 193: “If you’re bad you’re going to go there”. Line 206: “I’m presuming I thought that anyone was there had done something bad”. Spartan codes (Line 415 : If you were caught not going to mass that was a bad thing”). **Moral discourse**. “I remember one girl coming into the sixth class and I’d say she had come from a good family and was well-educated and everything” (Line 215-216). “Would have been brought up to be good wives and mothers” (Line 283-294) **Moral Discourse**. Construction of bad behaviour as relative to age. “”whatever bold was in those days” (Line 194) “bold” as a sixties word. “They failed from my conscience” (Line 281) How close constructions of consciousness and conscience are (NB). “That they were born somehow in original sin” (Line 473) “Whole puritanistic religious mind-set that existed in Ireland” (Line 468). FUNCTION is to link this with all the other discourses and to show how moral discourse has such an effect on subjectivity and the manner in which it is constituted in systems in Ireland. **Moral Discourse**. “I think if you haven’t a conscience , you’re a very dangerous human being” (Line 467). Human beings constructed as being on a very wide dimension of good and evil. **Discourse of Morality**- “a notion of

righteousness” that seemed to emanate from a notion of Catholicism that is really dead thank God, if not dying” (Line 91-92). “It was a societal attitude to transgression...I suppose people in the laundries were transgressors” (Line 176). Not just the act but the conceptualisation of the act. “It is not truthful in that there is no juxtaposition of good with evil” (Line 220) . Vigilance constructed as virtue- constructed as heroic and ordinary. Function : to demonstrate how morality conduces to punishment, how inextricably linked it is to discipline and punishment . Moral discourse is a striking feature of each interview and it is striking how insistent a discourse this is within this interview. The respondent repeatedly refers to the industrial school boys in moral terms: “good guys (line 17); this is where the bad people go (Line 116), good ordinary guys (Line 172); I’m not sure we thought these guys had done something bad, I’m not sure” (Line 190); if you’re bad you’re going to go there (Line 193); I’m presuming I thought that anyone was there had done something bad” (Line 206); If you were caught not going to mass that was a bad thing (Line 415). In addition to this the discourse around illegitimacy seen in other interviews is present in this interview: “his only crime was that his mother got pregnant with him out of wedlock” (Line 120). What is clear from this material is that the moral discourse constructs the industrial school boy as good or bad. In other words, at different points in the interview an essentialist moral discourse holds sway where the subjectivity of the industrial school children is constituted as either bad or good but not both simultaneously. Moral discourse which could be called an apparatus acts as the locus for other discourses to come together, for example religion, education, journalism etc.). Religious discourse is an instance of moral discourse, as Greek tragedy may be an instance of moral discourse. From my analysis of the material in these interviews I have come to see how the discourse of disease might be the discourse which gives rise to moral

discourse. In this interview, the respondent refers to opening up the “proverbial can of worms” (Line?) and I think moral discourse and the discourse of disease are closely linked. In other words, the use of terms of “good” and “bad” originally referred to putrefaction or health and then became grafted onto psychological discourse. See interview 1 for clear examples of this. This might also explain the older Religious rites of Judaism to keep certain foodstuff separate to control toxicity, the discourse of food evolving into a moral discourse of keeping psychological “toxins” separate from “nutrients”. (See Smirgel, 1981 paper on Biblical discourse, on Judaic rites for keeping things apart)

The moral discourse overlaps with the confessional discourse. “If I brought something I’d feel like apologising (Line 288) ; I find myself apologising for bringing it up” (Line 473) ; “Apology came but it didn’t really change anything”; “so that has to be a form of guilt, subconscious guilt”, It’s a very noble thing to be able to apologise for wrongdoing (Line 520). What is striking is how invested the act of speech is with moral codes. In other words, the moral discourse is not just restricted to actions or behaviour, it is also embedded in the act of language, of speech. Representation or symbolic activity is structured by morality and therefore the reality that is constructed, must in turn be structured by moral discourse. Viewed within this light it can be seen how difficult “institutional abuse “ can be spoken about because there is an elemental confusion between events and words, whereby the representation of the event somehow becomes another immoral event. Perhaps this is one of the many reasons why being a victim of abuse is so difficult to talk about. And, perhaps too this explains why the bystander will often have recourse to asking why the victim did not speak. It seems to me that perhaps the questioner propagates a common sense but erroneous notion that there is a direct correspondence between words and experience,

that people can wilfully describe the awful things that happen to them. The propagation of this discourse leads to a crazy construction of events where the abused is implicitly criticised for not having talked about what could not be talked about. At some level all parties, the bystander, the abuser and the victim perhaps and know that it could not be talked about but an illusion is foisted upon the victim that it could be talked about. This leads me onto a discussion of how seems to me that the signifier is often disabled in this material, that a word will not have signifying properties as in, “He didn’t mean it” (Line 127). I wonder whether language becomes redundant or ineffectual (maybe a corrupted discourse) at this point and whether image thinking becomes more prevalent, more insistent, calling into play more infantile modes of preverbal thinking. (See visual discourse.)

39. Criminal discourse. Surveillance/crime. **Discourse of Crime**. Illegitimacy – Line 118:

“His only crime was that his mother got pregnant”. Line 145: “they’d no crime” (use of possessive case- not usual formulation of activity, doing or committing a crime).

Line 145: “ I don’t even think their parents had a crime” (ORIGINAL SIN) Line 147: “up in court to be made a ward of state”

40. Imperialism discourse (half crown, under the British)

41. Discourse of biology (“breathing in the air”)-

42. Professionalism/ Guilds - Discourse of the professionals as barriers (psychologists, solicitors)

43. Cuisine “dishing out what they had been given”

44. Revolutionary discourse. (Picking up terror in other places).

45. Demotic discourse Use of deliberate ungrammatical discourse –“them people”:.Discourse of style (“if this isn’t too awkward a comparison”) . Discourse of ein volk, the people. DF: To foreclose critique or scrutiny because of the self-evident common sense language of the people. To disguise individual difference and heterogeneity. **Demotic/Democratic Discourse?** Line 17: “they were ordinary, ordinary good guys”
46. Discourse of professionalism/ amateurism (paedophila constructed as occupation; Soviets constructed as amateurs).
47. Discourse of Mythology (see Barthes’ 7 categories of myth). “an oppressed people will tend to create myths to sustain themselves but once the sustaining is over you should drop it” (Line 994) . “I don’t buy its bullshit history, the Minstrel Boy to the war is gone, and Mother Macree” (1, 979)
48. **Discourse of Sport:** Line 76, Line 86 **Discourse of Sport.** “They played football with the other children in the yard” (Line 50)
49. **Discourse of Dress-** Line 126: “ He got this pair of 1940s show band horrible boots”
Line 124: “they never had a choice in whatever clothes they wore”. **Discourse of dress. Boots, the uniform. Visual/Discourse of Dress.** “If you see photographs of the era in the sixties you’d see young people, young fellows in communion suits. “ (Line 144). Artane boys’ band, “ dressed in their funny em marching boys uniform, blue for the Artane boys band and almost like sailors; strange suit up” (Line 349-350); “something that even had a little bit of glamour” (Line 351). Clothing marked off in a much more accentuated way classes and your position in society and em if you were expected to dress in a way that represented your social status. Em, obviously whoever

designed these wanted to mark off the, the, the band as special “ (Line 372-375)

FUNCTION could be a supplement to the discourse of JOURNALISM, to supplement the visual, architectural space. This visual discourse acts as a gathering together of previous discourses (military, visual, economic, carceral, fictional (story book).

Discourse of Dress. “Wherever they went they wore a uniform...the fact of their being in a uniform was clearly a way of marking them off from other people as special” (Line 34) Canterbury Tales. “There is change in status or a change in dress very often and a uniformity to mark off that particular stage”. (Line 73). “This is the way people divest themselves of personal freedom, and to divest themselves of personal responsibility and manage therefore to allow despicable and unspeakable things ...” (Line 107). “People have divested themselves of so much of their responsibilities and have handed them over to other people that they’re finding it difficult to get back” (Line 265) . Function : To allow different positions in society to be observed, noted – for demarcations to be observed in terms of external change. It allows for observations and registering of social change.

50. **Political Discourse:** Confusion between 2 types of conservatism. Line 411: “There’s still conservatism abundant in this country” . Citizenship: Line 460. **Political Discourse.** “I know what the regime was like and blind obedience was one of the sort of things...” (Line 803-804) “that was the regime and you towed the line, you know (Line 813-815). “The whole new regime there is for the benefit of the guys coming from Rome to investigate” (Line 917-918). Political/Religious discourse combine in the concept of **guilt (apparatus?)** “so that has to be a form of guilt, subconscious guilt”. **Political discourse.** “I lived in Belfast and the kind of abuse that was going on there had very little to do with child abuse” (Line 26) . “It’s not exactly industrial

schools who are putting out their power play on you; it's not exactly industrial schools who are putting out their play on you-it's minor civil servants, major civil servants" (Line 237-238). "Notions of hierarchy and centralism are somehow endemic in the Irish psyche and I don't know whether that comes from a long colonisation with Britain" (Line 269-270). "All that palaver about a constitution for children" (Line 250). Function of this discourse is to broaden scope of conversation, to alert and to point to events on a larger stage, to move the debate to a macrocultural level, to begin to make connections between different phenomenon with interlinking causes and effects. (Political discourse constructs and ecosystem of thought).

51. **Mental Illness-** "Sister Hilda ended up in a mental hospital" "Now the nun was crazy" (Line 196. **Discourse of Madness-** Institutions as "crazy" (Line 60). "If you thought too much about it you could probably go crazy" (Line 301-302). "You would think that adult nuns would think this is crazy" (Line 318). "She' start running around the class hitting whoever she saw or whatever legs were on view under the desk with a cane. She was a nutter and that was fifty years ago" (Line 366) **Discourse of Madness.** "No sane ordinary loving human being would think it possible to do that type of thing" (Line 107) - abuse a kind of "education, a derangement nevertheless...a kind of derangement" (Line 257). Function: to make some kind of equivalence between.
52. **Regal/Imperial/Monarchial** Discourse "he was Prince of the Church".
53. **Culinary Discourse** . "We were all disgusted" (Line 18) . Link with toxic foodstuff-contagion
54. **Geographical Discourse** (Town Planning) – rural/urban divide. "coming out from Dublin, . inner city Dublin to the absolute wilds" (Line 48-479)

- 55. Discourse of the Child.** “Even as a child , I was a person who had as much right to an opinion as anybody else” (Line 696-697).
- 56. Colonial Discourse.** The missions in Africa. “Why can’t we just leave them alone..” (Line 782)
- 57. Linear/Developmental/Age Discourse.** Important “When we would be 7, 8 or 9” (Line 103. “when we got 11,12, or 13...5, 6,7,8 or 9 (Line 172). “They seemed to be a bit older as well” (Line 172) “a general threat by adults” (Line 186). “It retained for me anyway and a lot of Y fellows my age...an atmosphere of some unpleasantness” (Line 294). “Speaking personally as a child and young adolescent, pre-adolescent, as an adolescent into young adulthood” . “That these victims who would be my age or older..some younger” (Line 498) “People of your generation and younger just can’t understand that the idea of the Bastille being stormed” (Line 525-526). “Even as a teenager I saw through that institution “ (Line 533). FUNCTION of this discourse could be to create ontological characters with various potentialities and roles and responsibilities(child, adolescent, adult, old , young)
- 58. Discourse of Discourse-** residents “left to their own devices” (Archaic form of discourse, “devis”)
- 59. Discourse of Nature-** Institution constructed as “natural” “I just felt it was such an unnatural system that children should not be at home with their parents, too young” (Line 295). “We’re so egotistical ; we can’t get outside of that” (Line 530)
- 60. Discourse of Empiricism.** “I don’t know what the fact is...Maybe it’s not a known fact” (Line 391)
- 61. Discourse of Human Rights.** “You know we all have our rights and no one has a right to interfere with anybody in that way” (Line 298-399)

62. **Discourse of Power-** “Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely” (Line 405). Sovereign model of power constructed- Mugabe, Hitler, Idi Amin (reappearance of the outlandish- the alien other)
63. **Discourse of Modifiers-** (Magnification and Minimisation) – “ the big killer, the big developers, the little woman with little hands”
64. **Mechanical Discourse-** “ People are funny little machines” (Line 496)
65. **Discourse of the Uncanny-** “Life is so fascinating and weird that we have to face into talking about something like this that should have never existed” (Line 502 to 503).
66. **Discourse of Revolution/Violence.** “ I mean eventually when it gets to when people can take no more , they just took him out and shot him” (Line 527)
67. **Discourse of Disability.** Community constructed as disabled. (Line 267). Function:
To use a physical metaphor to describe a psychical state of affairs.
- 68.

Appendix B12: Excerpt from Cussen Report

CUSSENS REPORT 1936

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO THE REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL
SCHOOL SYSTEM

III NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

The early association in the public mind of Industrial Schools with the Prison system was undoubtedly responsible for a misconception that persists even to the present day regarding these institutions and the children trained in them. The grounds, if any ever existed, for such a misconception have long since disappeared and we draw attention to this aspect of the matter, not only because the misconception is now altogether unjustifiable, but also because it affects adversely Institutions which have been remarkably successful in carrying out their self-imposed task, and, moreover, prejudices very seriously the prospects of the children in after – life.

25. That in the main the problem is one not of criminal tendencies, but of poverty , will be apparent from the appended figures, showing the percentages of children committed to Industrial Schools during each of the last five years for different causes:-

Year	Serious Offences	Failure to attend School	Poverty and Neglect	Other Causes
1930	3.8	7.0	89.1	0.1
1931	5.2	5.1	89.4	0.3
1932	3.4	6.2	90.3	0.1
1933	4.5	5.0	89.9	0.6
1934	6.2	6.1	87.7	-

26. These observations apply also in large measure to Reformatories. Although the young persons committed to the Reformatories have been found guilty of offences it is the case that the percentage of them who subsequently make a further appearance in the Courts is negligible. It follows, we suggest, that such young persons cannot in any sense fairly be looked upon as criminals.

27. The Reformatory and Industrial Schools are voluntary institutions, established , built, staffed and equipped by the various managements, who carry out their work in an unobtrusive manner, undertaking responsibilities that were placed by legislation primarily on the Local Authorities . We think it may be stated that the Local Authorities as a whole would appear not to have sufficiently appreciated their responsibility under law in regard either to

the schools or the children, and the evidence which we have adduced indicates that they still display little interest in the work of the schools beyond the payment of a weekly capitation grant for children committed from their respective districts. The rate of grant actually paid by the Local Authorities, having regard to their obligations and having regard in particular to the considerations indicated in the preceding paragraph, i.e., that the problem is mainly a poverty problem, does not in our view represent adequate recognition of the work which is being achieved by these institutions. Since the certification of the first school in 1859, upwards of 80'000 children have passed through them; of these over 70'000 have been trained in the Industrial Schools and about 10'000 in Reformatories.

28. As a result of our investigation we are satisfied that, subject to the introduction of various changes which we have indicated in the course of this Report as desirable, the present system of Reformatory and Industrial Schools affords the most suitable method of dealing with children suffering from the disabilities to which we have referred, and we recommend its continuance.

Grounds of Committal

40 Reformatory Schools- A youthful offender who is 12 years and under 16 years of age, and who is convicted, whether on indictment or by a District Court, of an offence punishable in the case of an adult with penal servitude or imprisonment, may be sent to a Reformatory School.

41. Industrial Schools- Any child apparently under the age of 14 years if brought before a Justice on any of the grounds set out hereunder may be sent to an Industrial School.

- (a) if found begging or receiving alms; or frequenting any street, premises, etc., for such a purpose;
- (b) if found wandering and not having any home or settled place or abode, or visible means of subsistence, or if found wandering and having no parent or guardian, or a parent or guardian who does not exercise proper guardianship;
- (c) if found destitute, not being an orphan and having both his parents or his surviving parent, or in the case of an illegitimate child, his mother, undergoing penal servitude or imprisonment;
- (d) if under the care of a parent or guardian, who, by reason of criminal or drunken habits, is unfit to have the care of the child;
- (e) of the daughter, whether legitimate, of a father who has been convicted of an offence under the Criminal Law Amendment Acts, 1885 to 1935, in respect of any of his daughters, whether legitimate or illegitimate;
- (f) if frequenting the company of any reputed thief, or of any common or reputed prostitute;
- (g) if lodging or residing in a house of the part of a house used by any prostitute for the purposes of prostitution, or if otherwise living in circumstances calculated to cause, encourage, or favour the seduction or prostitution of the child;
- (h) if found destitute and if not an orphan, and his parents are or (sic) his surviving parent, or in the case of an illegitimate child, his mother, is unable to support him; provided the parent or parents' consent to committal;
- (i) if under the age of twelve years and charged with an offence punishable in the case of an adult by penal servitude or a less punishment, or a child of twelve or thirteen years who has

not been previously convicted and similarly charged, may on certain conditions be sent to an Industrial School instead of a Reformatory;

(j) if it be shown to the satisfaction of the Court that the parent or guardian is unable to control the child;

(k) if the Guardians of a County Home satisfy the Court that a child is refractory or is the child of parents either of whom is convicted of an offence is punishable with penal servitude or imprisonment and that it is desirable that the child be sent to an Industrial School;

(l) if found destitute, being an orphan;

(m) if found guilty of a contravention (second or subsequent offence) of the provisions of any bye-law as to street trading made under the Employment of Children Act, 1903;

(n) failure to comply with the provisions of the School Attendance Act, 1926.

42. Committal to Reformatory Schools- We are of the opinion that too rigid limitations as to the age of committal and the period of detention tend to defeat in certain cases the object for which Reformatories have been established. It is important to remember that at a given age there may be a very great difference in mental development as between individual children. A young person nearing 17 years may be mentally backward as compared with one of 15 years. For this reason alone there appears to be a strong case for according the Justices a greater degree of elasticity in the matter of committals than obtains under the law as it stands. Also it often happens that a young person suitable for Reformatory training maybe a few months over the present maximum age for committal when the case is being disposed of , although he was under the age of limit when the offence was committed. We consider, therefore , that in the interests of the young person the law should be amended so as to give

Justices the power, where they are satisfied that the circumstances warrant such a course, to commit young persons to Reformatory Schools up but not beyond the age of 17 years.

43. Justices are frequently reluctant to commit for three years (the present statutory minimum period of detention) a young person, the gravity of whose offence scarcely might be contributing to the family income. To overcome this difficulty we consider that power to commit for a shorter term is desirable, and we accordingly recommend that the minimum period of detention should be 2 years instead of 3 years, but not to extend in any case beyond the age of 19 years.

44. Committal to Industrial Schools- Under the existing procedure children may be committed to Industrial Schools up to the age of 14 years. Where the young persons over the age of 14 years are found guilty of an offence which, in the opinion of the Justice, does not merit committal to a Reformatory, he has no option under the present law but to discharge them even though restraint for a period might be advisable. To meet such contingencies we recommend that the maximum age for committal be raised to 15 years.

45. In some schools we have found that a number of children are retained beyond the age of 16 years- the present age for discharge- so as to enable them to derive benefit from a special course of training. At present such training has to be undertaken at the sole expense of the school, and we recommend that the Minister be given power, where he is satisfied the circumstances so warrant, to authorise the retention of such children up to the age of 17 years, subject to payment of an appropriate grant.

46. As regards cases under the School Attendance Act, we find that the committal of young children for a short period to an Industrial School has often a salutary effect, and we recommend that detention should be for six months or until the 30th. June next following

committal (the end of the normal school year) , whichever is the longer period , unless the child has attained the age of 13 years , in which case the Justice, having regard to the circumstances, and if he thinks it necessary , should have power to send the child to a school for a longer period.

47. Children Act, 1929- The Act of 1929 provided a very necessary addition to the grounds of committal as set forth in the Act of 1908. Under the later Act a child, found destitute, not an orphan, and whose parents are, or whose surviving parent is, or in the case of an illegitimate child, his mother, is unable to support him may be sent to an Industrial School, subject to the condition that the parents, etc. consent to the committal. The Act further provides that if an application is made to the Minister for Education by the parents etc. for the child's discharge from the school, the Minister shall, if satisfied that the persons making such application are able to support the child, order the discharge of the child.

48. The purpose of the Act was apparently to deal with cases of actual destitution , and in effect to eliminate the technical charge of "found wandering" prescribed in the Act of 1908. In actual practise, however, the Act of 1908 does not in our opinion go far enough , in as much as a destitute child abandoned by one or both parents who may be living , or at least whose death cannot be presumed, cannot in the absence of "consent" be committed. It is also in our view a weakness that the only consideration to which the Minister is required to have regard in connection with the question of discharge in such cases is the ability of the parents or parent to support the child. The Act does not provide for any safeguard in the matter of the fitness of the parents or parent on moral or other grounds to resume control of the child. To cover such cases we suggest the following amendments of the Act:-

Sec.1 (Sub-section 1). Add at end of sub-section: "or has failed to support him"

(Sub-section 2) line 5, commencing “Provided also “ to end of sub-section. Delete and substitute the following words:-

“Provided also that the Court shall not make an order that a
“child be sent to a certified industrial school on the grounds stated
“in paragraph (h) unless the child’s parents consent or his surviving
“parent or in the case of an illegitimate child his mother consents
“to such order being made or unless after proof of service of notice
“of the application of the parents, surviving parent or in the case of
“an illegitimate child on the mother, the person or persons so served
“do not appear and object , or unless none of such persons can be found
“Provided also that is an application by any of such persons for
“the discharge of such child committed by a certified industrial
“school on the grounds stated in paragraph (h) is made to the
“Minister for Education, he shall, if satisfied that the persons or
“person making the application are or is able to support such child
“and are fit persons or is a fit person” in the opinion of the Minister
“to have the custody and control of such child, order the discharge
“of such child”

49. Method of Sending to Industrial Schools.-The evidence submitted to us indicates that there is a strong consensus of opinion that the practice of hearing children's cases within the precincts of the ordinary courts is objectionable , in that its effect on the public mind is to suggest that the children concerned have been offenders against the law . There is solid ground for this opinion , and we fear that the practise referred to has been in no small measure responsible for the common misconceptions regarding the type of children sent to the Industrial Schools.

50. We are aware that for a number of years past here has been in Dublin a Children's Court , housed separately from the District Courts, where children's cases are disposed of. This arrangement is in our view admirable, and we strongly recommend that corresponding arrangements should be adopted wherever possible throughout the country as a whole.

51. We are of opinion that the system which a child is sent on an order of the Justice should be continued but the term "Committal Order" should be abolished; we suggest the words "Admission Order" instead.

52. We recommend also that the Justice when hearing children's cases should not wear his robes of Office, and that Gardaí , whether acting as escorts or driver, should not wear uniform when bringing children to the schools. If the parents wish to take the child to the school themselves, the justice , if he thinks it desirable, should allow them to do so. Whenever practicable, and at the discretion of the Justice, children should be sent to Industrial Schools as near as possible to their homes. The Birth certificate of the child, or Baptismal Certificate, if available, together with a memorandum of such circumstances as the Justice may think desirable, and of the child's history , should be sent to the Manager who should regard this document as confidential. It will be obvious that the information contained in a memorandum

of this kind would be of great value to the persons to whose care the training of the child for a relatively long period is to be entrusted

V THE CARE, EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSONS IN REFORMATORIES AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS, AND THEIR AFTER-CARE AND SUPERVISION WHEN DISCHARGED FROM THESE INSTITUTIONS.

65. Inspection of Schools- Under Section 46 of the Children Act. 1908, every certified school must be inspected at least once a year. This duty is carried by two Inspectors (a man and a woman) appointed by the Department. They inquire into the working of the system generally . The woman Inspector also inspects the Domestic Training of the Girls' Schools. Inspectors of the Primary Branch of the Department inspect from time to time the elementary education given in the Institutions , and the schools where Drawing and Manual Instruction are taught are also visited by the Inspectors of the Technical Instruction Branch.

66. Care. Subject to the views expressed later in our Report, particularly in regard to the medical attention, the care of the children in the Industrial Schools and Reformatories has been generally good.

67. The children are on the whole suitably housed, fed and clothed and their treatment is in general kindly and humane.

68. We consider, however, that there are a number of directions in which improvements should be effected. We have dealt with these matters in detail throughout the Report.

69. The success attained by these schools depends in large measure on the personality and fitness for office of the Managers-their capacity in directing their staffs, their power to make every pupil feel that the Manager is the guardian and his friend, while maintaining an even vigilant and unobtrusive discipline. It must be borne in mind that the children committed to these schools have been deprived of parental control, where such control existed, and that in many cases they are children requiring special study and care. It is therefore, obvious that the persons in whose charge they have been placed should be carefully selected for the work which, because of its difficult and peculiar nature, demands qualification and gifts that might not be considered indispensable in ordinary schools. We think it desirable to direct attention to this connection to the views expressed in the Report on Occupational Training in the schools in Appendix H, page 79.

70. We regard this aspect of the problem as of great importance. We recommend (a) that the appointment of the Manager should be subject to the approval of the Minister of Education, and (b) that it should be within the competence of the Minister to report to his or her Superior, with a view to replacement, a Manager who is found unsatisfactory. It is necessary also to emphasise the undesirability of too frequent changes of Manager in a school. One case

has been brought to our notice in which three changes of Manager were made in an Industrial School within a period of less than 18 months. It is obvious that changes of this kind must react adversely on administration . We recognise, of course, that in certain cases the rules of an Order conducting a school may provide for the retention of the office of Manager by a particular member of the Order only for a prescribed period, but subject to this limitation, and to unforeseen circumstances which may render a change unavoidable, we think that where a Manager is satisfactory he or she should be retained in control of a school for as long a period as possible.

71. It should be a normal duty of the Inspectors of Reformatory and Industrial Schools to deal particularly with this aspect of administration in their reports.

72. In our opinion the best results can be obtained only where the number under any one Manager does not exceed 200 pupils. We think that in no case should the number exceed 250. It is necessary in this connection to refer specifically to the case of Artane Industrial School, which is certified for 800 boys and where there are on an average about 700 boys. It is in our view impossible for the Manager in an Institution of this size to bring to bear that personal touch essential to give each child the impression that he is an individual in whose troubles, ambitions and welfare a lively interest is being taken . We strongly recommend , therefore , that Artane should be divided into separate schools, the pupils being segregated according to age and attainments . Each school should contain no more than 250 pupils under the control of a sub-manger, whose appointment and removal should be subject to the approval of the Minister in the same manner as we have recommended should apply to the appointment and removal of all school Managers, and who would be jointly responsible with the Manager to the Minister for the boys under his care. We contemplate that the general administration of the Institution and the co-ordination of its activities should continue to be vested in the

Manager. We feel that re-organisation on these lines would be of particular value both as regards the care and after-care of the pupils.

73 We have had submitted to us the diet scales obtaining in all the schools. On the whole the diet is adequate, but we consider that in many instance more variety in the meals is desirable. We recommend that diet scales, which should in particular provide for an adequate supply of milk and butter to each pupil, be circulated by the Department to the Managers of the schools. As matters stand, milk is not supplied in the majority of schools to the extent which is necessary for growing children, and butter is seldom provided.

74. We have found that in a number of the schools silence at meals, and in some cases also in the workrooms, is prescribed. This is, in our opinion, a harsh and unnecessary disciplinary measure which should be abolished forthwith. We have taken occasion , where on inspection we have found the arrangement in operation, to suggest its discontinuance to the Managers concerned.

75. We suggest also that the schoolrooms, dormitories, and halls might in many cases, without undue expense, be made brighter by the general use of charts, photographs and pictures of interest to the children.

76. Contact within reasonable limits with the outside world, by means of games or otherwise, is desirable and should be permitted to a greater extent than at present exists. We feel indeed that this is indispensable to the training of boys and girls who, on leaving these Institutions, will ultimately be thrown to a greater extent on their own resources for their livelihood than children educated in the ordinary schools. Arrangements should be made to attain this end, especially in schools managed by Nuns.

77. Under existing arrangements, Home Leave, with full payment of the appropriate grant to the schools, is limited to 14 days in any one year, and may be allowed at the Manager's discretions to children in Industrial Schools who have been at least three months under detention. We have noted with satisfaction that a large number of children avail of this privilege, but parents and guardians should in our opinion, be informed by the school authorities of its existence so that the greatest possible number of children may enjoy it. In cases where a child has no suitable home or relatives, facilities should be provided for a holiday in camp or in another Institution conducted by the same Order. An arrangement of this sort would not, we think, bear unduly on the financial resources of the school. The period of Home Leave should be increased to three weeks at least, and the Minister might consider an increase in the capitation grant for each child sent to a camp for a period spent there. We have learned with pleasure that the Conductors of one Industrial School, Drogheda Junior Boys, in charge of the French Sisters of Charity, have provided a camp of wooden huts at Termonfeckin, to which they have taken all their charges for a month's holiday at the seaside during the past two years. The Sisters expressed the opinion that the resulting benefit in the health and spirits of the children and the widening of their experiences, more than repaid the trouble and expense entailed. We were also pleased to learn that the boys of St. Kevin's Reformatory, Glenree, were brought for a seaside holiday of two weeks during August, 1935, to a camp at Gormanstown. The Superior was granted the use of the huts and equipment. The Superior was granted the use of the huts and equipment there, and he reports very favourably on the beneficial effect of the holiday on the pupils.

78. Recreation . – In many schools (particularly girls' schools) at the time of our visit playing fields were not provided. In one school for girls near the City of Dublin we found that although there was several acres of grazing land (the property of the School Authorities)

surrounding the school, the girls were not allowed to play in the fields save on Church holidays, and had to take all their recreation in a flagged or concrete yard; and although the school was convenient to the sea, the children were never brought to play on the strand.

79. In some time-tables we found that a number of short periods were given to recreation, but that there was not a play period of reasonable length. We consider that there should be, apart from the short periods, at least one period daily of recreation of not less than one hour.

80. In some schools monotonous marching round a school yard took the place of free play at the time for recreation. Such drill-like exercise, especially if prolonged, becomes a dreary routine deleterious to mind and body, and it should be replaced by free play and organised games that will develop in the child alertness of movement and individual confidence, and thus help to compensate in some measure for the lack of initiative and individuality that are characteristic of children reared in institutions. We favour regular short periods of drill, especially when given by a trained instructor according to an approved system such as Sokol, but such instruction should not be given at the time of recreation and should not be considered a substitute for free play and organised games.

81. Medical inspection during period of residence- We are not satisfied with the existing system, of medical attendance and inspection. As already pointed out no examination is carried out prior to the order for detention. We have no evidence that any system of isolation is adopted before the child is examined by the School Medical Attendant or allowed to mix with the general body of the pupils. The quarterly reports sent by the Medical Officer to the Department certifying each child as being in good health are, we fear, too often mere formalities. Only, in a few instances can we find that the children are individually inspected as is done, for example in National Schools by the Medical Officer of Health. We understand that the prevailing custom in some of the schools is to parade the children for quarterly

medical inspection as for a drill inspection. Tests for susceptibility to such a disease as diphtheria and immunisation against it, which is now more or less general throughout the National Schools, have not been carried out in the majority of the certified schools.

82. In some of the schools children with trachoma (a contagious disease of the eyes), ringworm (a contagious disease of the skin and hair) and other contagious diseases with , in addition , children suffering from defects of sight and hearing are found mixing with the other children. This primitive and dangerous condition of affairs we attribute to several causes, chief amongst which we might mention (i) the absence of medical examination prior to detention ; (ii) an obvious lack of appreciation of the necessity for thorough medical inspection at the time of admission and of periodical inspections during the period of residence; (iii)the inadequate salaries paid in most cases to doctors for their professional services in case of illness, and for other duties they are expected to discharge; (iv) the lack of provision for the transfer of serious cases to a centre where special opinion and treatment would be available.

83. As a result a casual system of medical care has apparently grown up. The doctor, in the majority of cases , sees at his next school visit only the children recently admitted and , when called on those who are ill. In fairness to him we consider he could not be expected to provide adequate medical attention at the rates of remuneration at present obtaining in the majority of schools. We indicate hereunder the very low payments made in certain schools:-

		Number of Children	Amount paid in year 1935 to School Medical Attendant £ s d.

School A	89	4	10
				0	
School B	62	6	10
				0	
School C	90	7	10
				0	
School D	139	11	0
				0	

CHAPTER 4

RESIDENTIAL CARE

4.1 In listing the limitations of the present child care system insofar as it concerns the Reformatory and Industrial Schools, it may seem that we are criticising those responsible for running the schools. This is not the intention of this Committee. Indeed, we are very much aware that if it were not for the dedicated work of many of our religious bodies the position would be a great deal worse than it is now. The fact remains, however, that the present system is far from satisfactory and before we can make recommendations for its improvement we must indicate clearly what we feel requires to be improved.

It is also clear that the rules and regulations for the certification of Industrial Schools do not conform with modern thinking in the field of child care and require amendments.

The Child Care system has evolved in a haphazard and amateurish way and has not altered radically down the years. It may have been admirable at one time but it is now no longer suited to the requirements of our modern and more scientific age and our greater realisation of our duty to the less fortunate members of society. .

4.2 Our visits, discussions and surveys have given us concrete and valuable information. One point which emerged clearly from these studies is that there is, in general, a lack of awareness of the needs of the child in care. By this we do not mean physical needs which are, in the main, adequately if unimaginatively catered for. We are referring to the need for love

and security. All children experience these needs from their earliest days; the child who has suffered deprivation has an even greater need for them if he is to overcome the handicap which almost inevitably results from deprivation and becomes a fully developed and well-adjusted individual.

This lack of awareness is, we think, due to lack of professional training in Child Care. Most of those working in Industrial schools and Reformatories have no proper qualifications for their work. Their only previous experience may have been in teaching, nursing or mission work and to expect them to put into practise the principles of Child care without adequate training is expecting the impossible. "It is a fallacy to think that any motherly woman with common sense can successfully undertake such work. This is an unrealistic and misleading over-simplification, which ignore the understanding and the skills required to care for other people's emotionally unsettled if not disturbed and unhappy children. Neither affection nor common sense are sufficient by themselves.

*Residential Child Care- Facts and Fallacies. Dinnage and Kellmer Pring (Longmans).

4.3 Not only are the majority of those engaged in Residential Child Care untrained but there are no active adequate courses in the country to give professional training in this sensitive field. There is a diploma course in Child Care in the UCD calendar for those who hold a degree or Diploma but some for some years now not enough applications have been received to enable the course to be held. The minority in residential Child Care, who have been trained, have been trained abroad, generally in Britain, where the Home Office runs long and short term courses.

Even where a member of the Residential Staff of an Industrial School or Reformatory may be trained, a further difficulty may arise where he or she is subordinate to somebody who is

untrained. We have come across one case at least where the Manager of a school took no active part in the running of the school except to veto the proposals made by the trained member of staff. This was probably due to a lack of appreciation of the reasoning behind the proposals. The frustrations which such a situation could cause to staff may be imagined but the damage which it could do to the children in care is incalculable.

4.4. It is of prime importance that all those engaged in Child Care must be fully aware that the child's needs come first and that they must be equally aware what the child's needs are. For this purpose, they must be trained in their work and the provision of trained should take precedence over any other recommendations. This is not to say that other recommendations should not be carried out while staff are being trained but that arrangements to train staff should be made without delay.

4.5 We recommend that an independent advisory body with Statutory powers should be set up at the earliest possible opportunity. The fundamental purpose of this body would be to ensure that the highest standard of child care should be attained and constantly maintained

(a) We feel that the function of the body should be to act as a Watch Dog Committee: and to concern itself with any other areas of weakness which may appear during the development of services and to make recommendations for the eradication of those weaknesses.

(b) To encourage the initiation of training courses both general and in-service and to advise on the requirements for different posts in the field of child care.

(c) To arrange that facilities should be available to suitable persons for research work in child care thus ensuring that thinking on all aspects of this important work should remain fluid and progressive.

(d) To make the public aware of and interested in the development in the child care field.

(e) To foster and encourage co-operation and co-ordination between the various bodies and persons, both voluntary and official, engaged in the different areas of child care work.

The members of the Board should be drawn from appropriate disciplines, professions and vocations so that the thinking which would be channelled into the child care field would come from varied areas of thought and experience.

As an interim measure it should be possible to arrange that members of different Orders and Local Authority personnel engaged in the work of child care should attend the British Home Office courses. These courses have been attended by Religious Orders in Britain engaged in similar work and have proved very successful.

4.6 From our investigations, we are aware that most of these schools are very inadequately staffed. In almost every case the same staff members are required to perform the duties of teaching, supervision and residential care which means that they are on duty, to all intents and purposes, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. This is highly undesirable and can only be to the detriment of both staff and children.

Some of the Orders in charge of Industrial Schools and Reformatories are engaged in other work which is of more direct concern to them and which come more into the public eye. There appears to be a tendency to staff the schools, in part at least, with those who are no longer required in other work rather than with those specially chosen for Child Care work. All staff involved in child care must be carefully selected and carefully trained for the particular aspect of the work in which they are involved. There should not be the slightest implication that those involved in this most difficult task are in some ways inferior to those in similar professions and careers.

4.7 All of the Industrial Schools and Reformatories in the State are housed in old buildings, some of which were built for purposes other than that for which they are now being used. In fact, none of the present buildings were built specifically for use as child care institutions although in some cases certain adaptation have been made. The present buildings are basically unsuitable for use as Residential Homes for children in care, being too much institutional in character.

Apart from the institutional nature of the buildings we found an institutional approach to the care of the children in many of the schools we visited. This is harmful to the development of the children in care. For instance, children of passive or introvert nature can merge into the institutional background to such a degree that their emotional and mental problems may go unnoticed and untended until they are forced to face an outside world which requires an initiative and adaptability they do not possess. In fact, the institutional life will probably have aggravated the problems they had before admission to the institution and created new ones for them.

One of the dangers of large institutions is that they tend to become depersonalized. This applies to schools dealing with normal homes with fundamentally sound backgrounds. It applies even more so to children who come from unstable backgrounds or those who have been deprived of the love and care of parents. In many cases these children have received emotional scars of a deep and abiding nature. They tend to merge into their background, to attract as little attention as possible, to eschew any form of individuality because, hitherto, the exercise of individuality may have led them into trouble. If the needs of the deprived child are to be adequately catered for and if he is to receive the love and care which are necessary for his development, then every effort must be made to eliminate the institutional aspects of all schools of Residential Homes. This applies to the psychological as well as to the physical

aspects of institutionalism. 4.8 We are aware that the Residential Care for deprived children is, at best, a substitute car and should not be resorted to if there is a satisfactory alternative. There is, however, no reasons why Residential Care should be an inferior form of care. The aim should be to find out what are the most beneficial aspects of group life and to see that they are incorporated into any system evolved here.

Once we have recognised the fact that, while Residential Care is not the most desirable form of upbringing for a child, it can still be extremely beneficial to those who are denied any other form of upbringing, we can then proceed to the considerations of what is the best form of residential care for such children. Modern thinking on this matter, and we are in agreement with this thinking, is that any form of residential care should approximate as closely as possible to the normal family unit. Consequently, when children have to be placed in such care, those from one family should, where at all possible, be kept together. The effect on a child of being parted from one or both parents can be terrifying in its results. If in addition he is deprived of the companionship of his brothers and sisters –possibly the only familiar figures left to him in the world-the sense of loss must be aggravated and the ill-effects consequently greater. We feel, therefore, that only the gravest reasons should justify the separation of a family.

4.9. In order to create a normal family atmosphere Residential Homes should be broken up into self-contained units with groups of 7-9 children in each unit. The term Industrial School, which has acquired unfortunate connotations over the years, should be dropped and replaced by the term Residential Home.

These Residential Homes should be administered by trained staff capable of understanding the children's needs, emotional as well as physical, and of catering for them adequately.

The units should be run by houseparents or, where this is not feasible, by a housemother.

They should not be run on the same lines as a normal home. The ideal situation would be that the housemother should look after the running of the unit and the housefather should go out to work in the usual way. The children should be brought into the everyday activities of the unit in the same way as they would if they were in a good family environment. Every effort should be made to ensure continuity of staffing in these Homes.

4.10 We have had experience of meeting children who had so little contact with the outside world that they were unaware that food had to be paid for or that letters had to be stamped. They were not permitted to undertake any of the day-today- tasks performed by normal children who help to make them realise how some of the normal activities of society are carried out. Such children must suffer severe handicap when faced with the problem of life outside the institution. We wish to emphasise that every unit in a residential centre should be independent of other units in the centre. There should be no such thing as a communal dormitory or refectory. Children should sleep in bedrooms in their own unit with not more than three and in more cases only one in a bedroom. Meals could and should be selected and prepared by the housemother in charge of the unit and should be eaten in the unit.

4.11 At present most of the schools cater for girls only and for boys only or, in certain cases, for girls and young boys. This means that many of the children spend their formative years without any social experience of members of the opposite sex. When they enter society at large they are at a grave disadvantage. They have no standards of behaviour to judge by, they cannot mix easily with members of the opposite sex, and are as a result, retarded in their general development.

This is obviously highly undesirable and the solution is that the children of both sexes should be reared, not only in the same centres but in the same units. Furthermore the children

in a particular should come from different age groups. In this way the resemblance to the pattern of the normal family group is strengthened and children could be afforded an opportunity of learning the value of co-operation, interdependence and love. This system would avoid the position whereby a boy aged 7 or 10 is removed from familiar surroundings and persons and transferred to a strange new home in an all-male atmosphere. .

4.12 The Committee is aware that many practical difficulties exist so far as the placement of young babies is concerned. The fact remains, however, that the earlier an infant is placed into a secure and happy relationship with which he can readily identify himself the better are his chances of developing fully. So we feel that an infant should be adopted, boarded out or admitted to a Residential Home at the earliest possible opportunity. Many experts in the field of infant and child care are of the opinion that if an infant has not been placed in secure stable surroundings before he is one year old he may suffer from a sense of deprivation which may be very difficult to overcome. There is the added difficulty that some homes looking after young babies and, indeed, children of all age-groups up to 18 years of age or so, are neither approved by the Department of Health, nor certified by the Department of Education. They may be quite admirable in their way but, under present legislation, are not subject to inspection. This is very undesirable. We are not suggesting that many of these Homes are not well run but the fact remains that without inspection and up-to-date advice such a Home could stagnate. We feel strongly, therefore, that all Homes caring for children, irrespective of the status they enjoy, should not only be subject to inspection but should be inspected regularly.

4.13 Children in care, especially those in long –term residential substitute care, are disadvantaged compared with children who are reared in normal homes and certainly when compared with those reared in homes that have stable family relationships and reasonable

incomes . The main disadvantages they are likely to suffer are a lack of experience of deep attachment to parent figures who provide security and with whom they can identify, a lack of stimulation and companionship provided by brothers and sisters, lack of freedom to mix with children from other homes at play and at school, together with a lack of many of the amenities and privileges available to children in normal homes. In general, they do not appear to have the same opportunities as other children or to be able to avail of whatever opportunities there are to the same extent.

The aim of residential substitute care should be to overcome the disadvantages as far as possible. This means in fact that children in residential care must be overcompensated if they are to overcome their initial deprivation and be provided with equality of opportunity. Overcompensation means a planned enrichment of the environment. It should be viewed as a preventive measure in early childhood and as an alleviation measure later on. The enrichment programme should not only be concerned with providing physical and material facilities – buildings, home furnishings, graded play equipment , holidays, outings –but should be concerned especially with the quality of the personal relations. Therefore, both the attitudes and professional competence of those responsible for children in care are important and we stress again the importance of careful selection and training. It must be borne in mind that these homes are not boarding schools as we know them but are substitutes for natural homes. The children in care are completely dependent on the residential home staff for all the love understanding security and religious formation they need as well as for support in making their way in life, unlike children in boarding schools who have, normally, a background of family life. However, a planned programmed of overcompensation will require close co-operation between those concerned with providing residential care and those concerned with providing education . As well as trained child care staff this type of programme will require

the continuous involvement of skilled professional personnel such as doctors, psychologists, social workers, counsellors, remedial and social teachers who will work as a team.

4.14 We feel that children in care should enjoy the right to personal property and be encouraged to have it. Only in this way can a respect for property and a realisation of its purposes develop in children. If one has never owned personal possessions of any kind, no matter how small or insignificant, it is impossible to understand why another's personal possession should be respected. Again, the children should be given pocket money and within the usual restrictions of an ordinary home, should be allowed to spend it as and how they please.

4.15 There has been a tendency, now mercifully disappearing towards an institutional style of clothes for children in industrial schools or reformatories. This tendency is to be deprecated as it serves only to give a child the impression that he is something apart from and inferior to others in ordinary homes. Dress should not, therefore, be institutional in appearance and uniforms should not be worn except in cases where the children attend an outside school which prescribes a particular uniform.

In this matter teenagers in particular should be encouraged to exercise their individuality in the choice of their clothing. All too soon they will be thrown on their own resources in such matters and in matters of even greater importance, and it is essential that they should have gained some experience and judgement in affairs so close to their everyday lives.

Children should also be encouraged to look upon the clothes given to them as their personal property and to look after them accordingly. In order to do this we feel that all children, but in particular older children, should have private clothes lockers and lockers for other personal effects.

4.16 It should be part of the function of a housemother to encourage and, in conjunction with the school, to offer to the children conditions which promote their normal day-day development and train them in skills, manners and responsibilities appropriate to their stage of development. In this way they will be more capable of coping with intricacies of an ordinary social existence in an outside world. With this purpose in mind houseparents should encourage children to join in as many outside activities as possible. In this way they will meet others from different environments but often with similar problems and will come to realise that many of those problems are part of the normal process of maturing and are not just problems occurring to them because of their own particular situation .

4.17 In the chapter on education we advocate that where at all possible children in care should attend schools outside the Home. We also feel that they should be encouraged to avail themselves of all the local vocational, educational, and recreational facilities in the area in which they live. This means using the local public libraries, music classes, art schools, swimming pools, tennis courts and playing fields.

4.18 This process of integration should go even further. They should be encouraged to make friends outside the Residential Home, to bring them to their home or unit as well as to accept invitations from their friends to visit their homes. In this way they can learn gradually, and without conscious effort, the art of integrating into society. This is very important as many of these children have never known what a normal home or society is like.

4.19 Where new buildings for Residential Homes are being planned the units should be built separately from one another thus giving those living in them a better opportunity of achieving their own individuality

Where old buildings have to be adapted care should be taken to ensure that the adaptation does not take the form of make-shift partitions but should result in modern self-contained units with their own bedrooms, bathrooms, lavatories, kitchens, living rooms and entrances.

4.20 In some instances in areas abroad which we have visited we have found that those engaged in Child Care work have purchased homes in ordinary housing schemes and have transferred a number of children to those houses in the care of houseparents. We also understand that at least one Industrial School here is at present engaged in initiating a similar scheme.

4.21 Whether children in residential care are centred in Residential Homes or in private houses run by trained staff in an ordinary housing estate the aim is the same- to approximate as closely as possible to a normal family atmosphere, while realising, of course that no form of care can ever equal the advantages of a real home. The smaller the residential care units are the better the chance of approximating to the usual family group. There should not be more 7-9 children in every unit. Where practicable, and certainly in any new developments, these units should not be grouped together thus forming a new institution. In well-populated areas the units could be purchased or rented houses in ordinary housing areas. Administration should not prove difficult in such circumstances but there might be some administrative difficulties in rural areas. Where it is essential to adapt an existing building there should not be more than 3-4 units in any one building. We visualise that with the decreasing numbers admitted to residential care due to increased adoption, boarding-out and social welfare facilities, the numbers in each Home should decrease but we realise that there will always be a number of children who must be cared for in Residential Homes.

4.22 In their visits abroad the Committee members have visited Residential Homes operating on the family unit basis. In some cases they were new buildings, in other cases they were old buildings which had been adapted. In all cases they were impressed with the success of this system. The children seemed happier than those living in “institutional “surroundings. Their behaviour was, for the most part, the behaviour one would expect from children reared in an ordinary family. Whatever operational difficulties the system might create the effect on the children appeared to be very beneficial. Again, we must emphasise that this was not due merely to the physical difference between these centres and the old style Institution but also to the trained and enlightened attitude of those in charge of the homes.

4.23 At present most of the schools are institutional but in a small number laudable efforts are being made to break the residential portion of the schools into units. We feel that these efforts must be intensified and must spread to all Industrial Schools.

We are aware that in some cases the nature of the buildings might make it difficult if not impossible to adapt the present schools to the unit system –in other cases it might prove unnecessarily expensive to do so. The question then arises whether it might not be better to close those particular schools and open new Homes conforming with the foregoing recommendations. Every case will have to be considered on its merits and the future of each school decided accordingly. It is obvious; however, that no matter what decisions are taken a deal of capital expenditure will be involved.

4.24. It is recommended, therefore, that where considered desirable, grants should be given to them for building purposes as in the case of schools and hospitals. These grants will, inevitably, in the earlier stages of the scheme, have to be generous as many of the buildings involved would require fairly drastic alterations to bring them into line with modern thinking in this field.

Reception into Residential Care

4.25 As the system operates at present a child is often admitted or committed to the care of a school manager who knows little if anything about the child's background. This can lead to great difficulties particularly in the case of delinquent children or those with delinquent or anti-social tendencies. The child may be retarded, suicidal, homicidal, or homosexual but the School Authorities have no way of knowing this and by the time they learn it much damage may have been done.

4.26 We feel, therefore, that before a child is admitted to Residential Care he should have the benefit of medical, psychiatric and psychological assessment to ascertain where he can be suitably placed with most advantage to himself. For this purpose every Health Authority should have one centre designated as a Reception and Assessment which may also be a Residential Home. In referring to Health authorities we are acting upon the assumption that Health Authorities will, as recommended in the Health Bill (1969), be based upon regional rather than Local Authority areas.

This Reception and Assessment Centre would receive all new cases and be responsible for collecting the background information required for the assessment of the child and his subsequent placement.

4.27 The experience of those in charge of Industrial Schools and Reformatories has shown that the absence of personal records containing even minimal information in respect of the children has led to many difficulties for the school and for the children themselves. On occasions it cannot even be ascertained where or when a child was born whether he was baptised, or who his parents were. It is imperative, therefore, that the records in respect of each child in a School or Centre should be as complete as possible. For this reason we

recommend that before a child is placed from the Reception and Assessment centre the following records should be obtained where available (a) Birth, Baptismal and Confirmation Certificates (b) a report of the child's social background (c) a school report and (d) any personal records. These records should accompany the child when he is placed in a suitable home.

4.28 During the period in care a comprehensive records should be kept of each child including his medical history, school progress and results of psychological tests and any other reports relevant to the child. At first glance this might seem like a recommendation to proliferate form –filling but we have seen from our studies how important such documentation is in the work of rehabilitating children in care. These reports should be made available to visiting doctors and specialists and where a child is transferred from one Home to another, copies of his personal records and a full summary of his case history should go with him. We need hardly add that all such records should be treated as confidential and made available only to the authorised persons.

4.29 The implementation of the foregoing recommendations on residential care and particular those relating to the breaking up of schools into small groups will require a much greater staff than at present employed in running institutional style schools. This staff will also require specialised training. However, we must face the fact that unless the approach to the problem of child care is professional and whole-hearted, a grave injustice will be done.

These are children who are totally dependent on the community and we feel that, once the public is aware of their needs, it will be prepared to meet these to the full.

Appendix 14: Excerpt from Cica

COMMISSION TO INQUIRE INTO CHILD ABUSE 2009

Conclusions

1. Physical and emotional abuse and neglect were features of the institutions. Sexual abuse occurred in many of them, particularly boys' institutions. Schools were run in a severe, regimented manner that imposed unreasonable and oppressive discipline on children and even on staff.
2. The system of large-scale institutionalisation was a response to a nineteenth century social problem, which was outdated and incapable of meeting the needs of individual children. The defects of the system were exacerbated by the way it was operated by the Congregations that owned and managed the schools. This failure led to the institutional abuse of children where their developmental, emotional and educational needs were not met.
3. The deferential and submissive attitude of the Department of Education towards the Congregations compromised its ability to carry out its statutory duty of inspection and monitoring of the schools. The Reformatory and Industrial Schools Section of the Department was accorded a low status within the Department and generally saw itself as facilitating the Congregations and the Resident Managers.
4. The capital and financial commitment made by the religious Congregations was a major factor in prolonging the system of institutional care of children in the State. From the mid-1920s in England, smaller more family-like settings were established and they were seen as providing a better standard of care for children in need. In Ireland, however, the Industrial School system thrived.

5. The system of funding through capitation grants led to demands by Managers for children to be committed to Industrial Schools for reasons of economic viability of the institutions.

6. The system of inspection by the Department of Education was fundamentally flawed and incapable of being effective.

The Inspector was not supported by a regulatory authority with the power to insist on changes being made.

There were no uniform, objective standards of care applicable to all institutions on which the inspections could be based.

The Inspector's position was compromised by lack of independence from the Department.

Inspections were limited to the standard of physical care of the children and did not extend to their emotional needs. The type of inspection carried out made it difficult to ascertain the emotional state of the children.

The statutory obligation to inspect more than 50 residential schools was too much for one person.

Inspections were not random or unannounced: School Managers were alerted in advance that an inspection was due. As a result, the Inspector did not get an accurate picture of conditions in the schools.

The Inspector did not ensure that punishment books were kept and made available for inspection even though they were required by the regulations.

The Inspector rarely spoke to the children in the institutions.

7. Many witnesses who complained of abuse nevertheless expressed some positive memories: small gestures of kindness were vividly recalled. A word of consideration or encouragement, or an act of sympathy or understanding had a profound effect. Adults in their sixties and seventies recalled seemingly insignificant events that had remained with them all their lives. Often the act of kindness recalled in such a positive light arose from the simple fact that the staff member had not given a beating when one was expected.

8. More kindness and humanity would have gone far to make up for poor standards of care.

Physical abuse

9. The Rules and Regulations governing the use of corporal punishment were disregarded with the knowledge of the Department of Education.

The legislation and the Department of Education guidelines were unambiguous in the restrictions placed on corporal punishment. These limits however, were not observed in any of the schools investigated. Complaints of physical abuse were frequent enough for the Department of Education to be aware that they referred to more than acts of sporadic violence by some individuals. The Department knew that violence and beatings were endemic within the system itself.

10. The Reformatory and Industrial Schools depended on rigid control by means of severe corporal punishment and the fear of such punishment.

The harshness of the regime was inculcated into the culture of the schools by successive generations of Brothers, priests and nuns. It was systemic and not the result of individual breaches by persons who operated outside lawful and acceptable boundaries. Excesses of punishment generated the fear that the school authorities believed to be essential for the

maintenance of order. In many schools, staff considered themselves to be custodians rather than carers.

11. A climate of fear, created by pervasive, excessive and arbitrary punishment, permeated most of the institutions and all those run for boys. Children lived with the daily terror of not knowing where the next beating was coming from.

Seeing or hearing other children being beaten was a frightening experience that stayed with many complainants all their lives.

12. Children who ran away were subjected to extremely severe punishment.

Absconders were severely beaten, at times publicly. Some had their heads shaved and were humiliated. Details were not reported to the Department, which did not insist on receiving information about the causes of absconding. Neither the Department nor the school management investigated the reasons why children absconded even when schools had a particularly high rate of absconding. Cases of absconding associated with chronic sexual or physical abuse therefore remained undiscovered. In some instances all the children in a school were punished because a child ran away which meant that the child was then a target for mistreatment by other children as well as the staff.

13. Complaints by parents and others made to the Department were not properly investigated.

Punishments outside the permitted guidelines were ignored and even condoned by the Department of Education. The Department did not apply the standards in the rules and their own guidelines when investigating complaints but sought to protect and defend the religious Congregations and the schools.

14. The boys' schools investigated revealed a pervasive use of severe corporal punishment.

Corporal punishment was the option of first resort for breaches of discipline. Extreme punishment was a feature of the boys' schools. Prolonged, excessive beatings with implements intended to cause maximum pain occurred with the knowledge of staff management.

15. There was little variation in the use of physical beating from region to region, from decade to decade, or from Congregation to Congregation.

This would indicate a cultural understanding within the system that beating boys was acceptable and appropriate. Individual Brothers, priests or lay staff who were extreme in their punishments were tolerated by management and their behaviour was rarely challenged.

16. Corporal punishment in girls' schools was pervasive, severe, arbitrary and unpredictable and this led to a climate of fear amongst the children.

The regulations imposed greater restrictions on the use of corporal punishment for girls. Schools varied as to the level of corporal punishment that was tolerated on a day-to-day basis. In some schools a high level of ritualised beating was routine whilst in other schools lower levels of corporal punishment were used. The degree of reliance on corporal punishment depended on the Resident Manager, who could be a force for good or ill, but almost all institutions employed fear of punishment as a means of discipline. Some Managers administered excessive punishment themselves or permitted excesses by religious and lay staff. Girls were struck with implements designed to maximise pain and were struck on all parts of the body. The prohibition on corporal punishment for girls over 15 years was generally not observed.

17. Corporal punishment was often administered in a way calculated to increase anguish and humiliation for girls.

One way of doing this was for children to be left waiting for long periods to be beaten. Another was when it was accompanied by denigrating or humiliating language. Some beatings were more distressing when administered in front of other children and staff.

Sexual abuse

18. Sexual abuse was endemic in boys' institutions. The situation in girls' institutions was different. Although girls were subjected to predatory sexual abuse by male employees or visitors or in outside placements, sexual abuse was not systemic in girls' schools.

19. It is impossible to determine the full extent of sexual abuse committed in boys' schools. The schools investigated revealed a substantial level of sexual abuse of boys in care that extended over a range from improper touching and fondling to rape with violence. Perpetrators of abuse were able to operate undetected for long periods at the core of institutions.

20. Cases of sexual abuse were managed with a view to minimising the risk of public disclosure and consequent damage to the institution and the Congregation. This policy resulted in the protection of the perpetrator. When lay people were discovered to have sexually abused, they were generally reported to the Gardai. When a member of a Congregation was found to be abusing, it was dealt with internally and was not reported to the Gardaí.

The damage to the children affected and the danger to others were disregarded. The difference in treatment of lay and religious abusers points to an awareness on the part of

Congregational authorities of the seriousness of the offence, yet there was a reluctance to confront religious who offended in this way. The desire to protect the reputation of the Congregation and institution was paramount. Congregations asserted that knowledge of sexual abuse was not available in society at the time and that it was seen as a moral failing on the part of the Brother or priest. This assertion, however, ignores the fact that sexual abuse of children was a criminal offence.

21. The recidivist nature of sexual abuse was known to religious authorities.

The documents revealed that sexual abusers were often long-term offenders who repeatedly abused children wherever they were working. Contrary to the Congregations' claims that the recidivist nature of sexual offending was not understood, it is clear from the documented cases that they were aware of the propensity for abusers to re-abuse. The risk, however, was seen by the Congregations in terms of the potential for scandal and bad publicity should the abuse be disclosed. The danger to children was not taken into account.

22. When confronted with evidence of sexual abuse, the response of the religious authorities was to transfer the offender to another location where, in many instances, he was free to abuse again. Permitting an offender to obtain dispensation from vows often enabled him to continue working as a lay teacher.

Men who were discovered to be sexual abusers were allowed to take dispensation rather than incur the opprobrium of dismissal from the Order. There was evidence that such men took up teaching positions sometimes within days of receiving dispensations because of serious allegations or admissions of sexual abuse. The safety of children in general was not a consideration.

23. Sexual abuse was known to religious authorities to be a persistent problem in male religious organisations throughout the relevant period.

Nevertheless, each instance of sexual abuse was treated in isolation and in secrecy by the authorities and there was no attempt to address the underlying systemic nature of the problem. There were no protocols or guidelines put in place that would have protected children from predatory behaviour. The management did not listen to or believe children when they complained of the activities of some of the men who had responsibility for their care. At best, the abusers were moved, but nothing was done about the harm done to the child. At worst, the child was blamed and seen as corrupted by the sexual activity, and was punished severely.

24. In the exceptional circumstances where opportunities for disclosing abuse arose, the number of sexual abusers identified increased significantly.

For a brief period in the 1940s, boys felt able to speak about sexual abuse in confidence at a sodality that met in one school. Brothers were identified by the boys as sexual abusers and were removed as a result. The sodality was discontinued. In another school, one Brother embarked on a campaign to uncover sexual activity in the school and identified a number of religious who were sexual abusers. This indicated that the level of sexual abuse in boys' institutions was much higher than was revealed by the records or could be discovered by this investigation. Authoritarian management systems prevented disclosures by staff and served to perpetuate abuse.

25. The Congregational authorities did not listen to or believe people who complained of sexual abuse that occurred in the past, notwithstanding the extensive evidence that emerged from Garda investigations, criminal convictions and witness accounts.

Some Congregations remained defensive and disbelieving of much of the evidence heard by the Investigation Committee in respect of sexual abuse in institutions, even in cases where men had been convicted in court and admitted to such behaviour at the hearings.

26. In general, male religious Congregations were not prepared to accept their responsibility for the sexual abuse that their members perpetrated.

Congregational loyalty enjoyed priority over other considerations including safety and protection of children.

27. Older boys sexually abused younger boys and the system did not offer protection from bullying of this kind.

There was evidence that boys who were victims of sexual abuse were physically punished as severely as the perpetrator when the abuse was reported or discovered. Inevitably, boys learned to suffer in silence rather than report the abuse and face punishment.

28. Sexual abuse of girls was generally taken seriously by the Sisters in charge and lay staff were dismissed when their activities were discovered. However, nuns' attitudes and mores made it difficult for them to deal with such cases candidly and openly and victims of sexual assault felt shame and fear of reporting sexual abuse.

Girls who were abused reported that it happened most often when they were sent to host families for weekend, work or holiday placements. They did not feel able to report abusive behaviour to the Sisters in charge of the schools for fear of disbelief and punishment if they did.

29. Sexual abuse by members of religious Orders was seldom brought to the attention of the Department of Education by religious authorities because of a culture of silence about the issue.

When religious staff abused, the matter tended to be dealt with using internal disciplinary procedures and Canon Law. The Gardaí were not informed. On the rare occasions when the Department was informed, it colluded in the silence. There was a lack of transparency in how the matter of sexual abuse was dealt with between the Congregations, dioceses and the Department. Men with histories of sexual abuse when they were members of religious Orders continued their teaching careers as lay teachers in State schools.

30. The Department of Education dealt inadequately with complaints about sexual abuse. These complaints were generally dismissed or ignored. A full investigation of the extent of the abuse should have been carried out in all cases.

All such complaints should have been directed to the Gardaí for investigation.

The Department, however, gave the impression that it had a function in relation to investigating allegations of abuse but actually failed to do so and delayed the involvement of the proper authority. The Department neglected to advise parents and complainants appropriately of the limitations of their role in respect of these complaints.

Neglect

31. Poor standards of physical care were reported by most male and female complainants.

Schools varied as to the standard of physical care provided to the children and while there was evidence from many complainants that conditions improved in the late 1960s, in general no school provided an adequate standard of care across all the categories.

32. Children were frequently hungry and food was inadequate, inedible and badly prepared in many schools.

Witnesses spoke of scavenging for food from waste bins and animal feed.

In boys' schools there was so little supervision at meal times that bullying was widespread and smaller, weaker boys were often deprived of food.

The Inspector found that malnourishment was a serious problem in schools run by nuns in the 1940s and, although improvements were made, the food provided in many of these schools continued to be meagre and basic.

33. Witnesses recalled being cold because of inadequate clothing, particularly when engaged in outdoor activities.

Clothing was a particular problem in boys' schools where children often worked for long hours outdoors on farms. In addition, boys were often left in their soiled and wet work clothes throughout the day and wore them for long periods.

Clothing was better in girls' schools and some individual Resident Managers made particular efforts in this regard but in general girls were obliged to wear inadequate ill-fitting clothes that were often threadbare and worn.

In all schools up until the 1960s clothes stigmatised the children as Industrial School residents.

34. Accommodation was cold, spartan and bleak. Sanitary provision was primitive in most boys' schools and general hygiene facilities were poor.

Children slept in large unheated dormitories with inadequate bedding, which was a particular problem for children with enuresis.

Sanitary protection for menstruation was generally inadequate for girls.

35. The Cussen Report recommended in 1936 that Industrial School children should be integrated into the community and be educated in outside national schools. Until the late 1960s, this was not done in any of the boys' schools investigated and in only in a small number of girls' schools.

36. Where Industrial School children were educated in internal national schools, the standard was consistently poorer than that in outside schools.

National school education was available to all children in the State and those in Industrial Schools were entitled to at least the same standard as that available in the country generally. Internal national schools were funded by a national school grant and teachers were paid in the same way as in ordinary national schools. The evidence was however that the standard of education in these schools was poor.

There was evidence particularly in girls' schools that children were removed from their classes in order to perform domestic chores or work in the institution during the school day. In general, Industrial School children did not receive the same standard of national school education as would have been available to them in the local community. This lack of educational opportunity condemned many of them to a life of low-paying jobs and was a commonly expressed loss among witnesses.

37. Academic education was not seen as a priority for industrial school children.

When discharged, boys were generally placed in manual or unskilled jobs and girls in positions as domestic servants. There were exceptions, and particularly in girls' schools in the later years, some girls received the opportunity of a secretarial or nursing qualification. Education usually ceased in 6th class, after which children were involved in industrial trades, farming and domestic work with very limited education thereafter. Even where religious Congregations operated secondary schools beside industrial schools, children from the Industrial Schools were very rarely given the opportunity of pursuing secondary school education.

38. Industrial Schools were intended to provide basic industrial training to young people to enable them to take up positions of employment as young adults. In reality, the industrial training afforded by all schools was of a nature that served the needs of the institution rather than the needs of the child.

This was a problem that had been pointed out by the Cussen Commission in 1936 and continued to be a feature of industrial training in these schools throughout the relevant period. Child labour on farms and in workshops was used to reduce the costs of running the Industrial Schools and in many cases to produce a profit. Clothing and footwear were often made on the premises and bakeries and laundries provided facilities to the school and in some cases to the general public. The cleaning and upkeep of girls' Industrial Schools was largely done by the girls themselves. Some of these chores were heavy and arduous and exacting standards were imposed that were difficult for young children to meet. In girls' schools also, older residents were expected to care for young children and babies on a 24-hour basis. Large

nurseries were supervised and staffed by older residents with only minimal supervision by adults.

Emotional abuse

39. A disturbing element of the evidence before the Commission was the level of emotional abuse that disadvantaged, neglected and abandoned children were subjected to generally by religious and lay staff in institutions.

Witnesses spoke of being belittled and ridiculed on a daily basis. Humiliating practices such as underwear inspections and displaying soiled or wet sheets were conducted throughout the Industrial School system. Private matters such as bodily functions and personal hygiene were used as opportunities for degradation and humiliation. Personal and family denigration was widespread, particularly in girls' schools. There was constant criticism and verbal abuse and children were told they were worthless. The pervasiveness of emotional abuse of children in care throughout the relevant period points to damaging cultural attitudes of many who taught in and operated these schools.

40. The system as managed by the Congregations made it difficult for individual religious who tried to respond to the emotional needs of the children in their care.

Witnesses from the religious Congregations described the conflict they experienced in fulfilling their religious vows, whilst at the same time providing care and affection to children. Authoritarian management in all schools meant that staff members were afraid to question the practices of managers and disciplinarians.

41. Witnessing abuse of co-residents, including seeing other children being beaten or hearing their cries, witnessing the humiliation of siblings and others and being forced to participate in beatings, had a powerful and distressing impact.

Many witnesses spoke of being constantly fearful or terrified, which impeded their emotional development and impacted on every aspect of their life in the institution. The psychological damage caused by these experiences continued into adulthood for many witnesses.

42. Separating siblings and restrictions on family contact were profoundly damaging for family relationships. Some children lost their sense of identity and kinship, which was never recovered.

Sending children to isolated locations increased the sense of loss and made it almost impossible for family contact to be maintained. Management did not recognise the rights of children to have contact with family members and failed to acknowledge the value of family relationships.

43. The Confidential Committee heard evidence in relation to 161 settings other than Industrial and Reformatory Schools, including primary and second-level schools, Children's Homes, foster care, hospitals and services for children with special needs, hostels, and other residential settings. The majority of witnesses reported abuse and neglect, in some instances up to the year 2000. Many common features emerged about failures of care and protection of children in all of these institutions and services.

Witnesses reported severe physical abuse in primary schools, foster care, Children's Homes and other residential settings where those responsible neglected their duty of care to children.

The predatory nature of sexual abuse including the selection and grooming of socially disadvantaged and vulnerable children was a feature of the witness reports in relation to special needs services, Children's homes, hospitals and primary and second-level schools. Children with impairments of sight, hearing and learning were particularly vulnerable to sexual abuse.

Witnesses reported neglect of their education, health and aftercare in all residential settings and foster care. No priority was given to the special care needs of children who were placed away from their families.

Children in isolated foster care placements were abused in the absence of supervision by external authorities. They were placed with foster parents who had no training, support or supervision. The suitability of those selected as foster parents was repeatedly questioned by witnesses who were physically and sexually abused.

Many witnesses described losing their sense of family and identity when placed in out-of-home care, they reported that separation from siblings and deprivation of family contact was abusive and contributed to difficulties reintegrating with their family of origin when they left care. Witnesses reported emotional abuse in institutions, foster care and schools when they were deprived of affection, secure relationships and were exposed to personal denigration, fear and threats of harm.

When witnesses left care the failure to provide them with personal and family records contributed to disadvantage in later life. Many witnesses spent years searching for information to establish their identity.

The failure of authorities to inspect and supervise the care provided to children in hospitals and special needs services was noted as contributing to abuse which occurred in those facilities. The absence of structures for making complaints or investigating abuse allowed abuse to continue.

When opportunities were provided for children to disclose abuse they did so.

Witnesses reported that the power of the abuser, the culture of secrecy, isolation and the fear of physical punishment inhibited them in disclosing abuse.

Recommendations

1. Arising from the findings of its investigations and the conclusions that were reached, the Commission was required to make recommendations under two headings:

- (i) To alleviate or otherwise address the effects of the abuse on those who suffered
- (ii) To prevent where possible and reduce the incidence of abuse of children in institutions and to protect children from such abuse

(i) To alleviate or otherwise address the effects of the abuse on those who suffered

2. A memorial should be erected.

The following words of the special statement made by the Taoiseach in May 1999 should be inscribed on a memorial to victims of abuse in institutions as a permanent public acknowledgement of their experiences. It is important for the alleviation of the effects of childhood abuse that the State's formal recognition of the abuse that occurred and the suffering of the victims should be preserved in a permanent place:

On behalf of the State and of all citizens of the State, the Government wishes to make a sincere and long overdue apology to the victims of childhood abuse for our collective failure to intervene, to detect their pain, to come to their rescue.

3. The lessons of the past should be learned.

For the State, it is important to admit that abuse of children occurred because of failures of systems and policy, of management and administration, as well as of senior personnel who were concerned with Industrial and Reformatory Schools. This admission is, however, the beginning of a process. Further steps require internal departmental analysis and understanding of how these failures came about so that steps can be taken to reduce the risk of repeating them.

The Congregations need to examine how their ideals became debased by systemic abuse. They must ask themselves how they came to tolerate breaches of their own rules and, when sexual and physical abuse was discovered, how they responded to it, and to those who perpetrated it. They must examine their attitude to neglect and emotional abuse and, more generally, how the interests of the institutions and the Congregations came to be placed ahead those of the children who were in their care.

An important aspect of this process of exploration, acceptance and understanding by the State and the Congregations is the acknowledgement of the fact that the system failed the children, not just that children were abused because occasional individual lapses occurred.

4. Counselling and educational services should be available.

Counselling and mental health services have a significant role in alleviating the effects of childhood abuse and its legacy on following generations. These services should continue to

be provided to ex-residents and their families. Educational services to help alleviate the disadvantages experienced by children in care are also essential.

5. Family tracing services should be continued.

Family tracing services to assist individuals who were deprived of their family identities in the process of being placed in care should be continued. The right of access to personal documents and information must be recognised and afforded to ex-residents of institutions.

(ii) To prevent where possible and reduce the incidence of abuse of children in institutions and to protect children from such abuse

6. Childcare policy should be child-centred. The needs of the child should be paramount.

The overall policy of childcare should respect the rights and dignity of the child and have as its primary focus their safe care and welfare. Services should be tailored to the developmental, educational and health needs of the particular child. Adults entrusted with the care of children must prioritise the well-being and protection of those children above personal, professional or institutional loyalty.

7. National childcare policy should be clearly articulated and reviewed on a regular basis.

It is essential that the aims and objectives of national childcare policy and planning should be stated as clearly and simply as possible. The State and Congregations lost sight of the purpose for which the institutions were established, which was to provide children with a safe and secure environment and an opportunity of acquiring education and training. In the absence of an articulated, coherent policy, organisational interests became prioritised over those of the children in care. In order to prevent this happening again childcare services must have

focused objectives that are centred on the needs of the child rather than the systems or organisations providing those services.

8. A method of evaluating the extent to which services meet the aims and objectives of the national childcare policy should be devised.

Evaluating the success or failure of childcare services in the context of a clearly articulated national childcare policy will ensure that the evolving needs of children will remain the focus of service providers.

9. The provision of childcare services should be reviewed on a regular basis.

Out-of-home care services should be reviewed on a regular basis with reference to best international practice and evidence-based research. This review should be the responsibility of the Department of Health and Children and should be coordinated to ensure that consistent standards are maintained nationally. The Department should also maintain a central database containing information relevant to childcare in the State while protecting anonymity.

Included in such a database should be the social and demographic profile of children in care, their health and educational needs, the range of preventative services available and interventions used. In addition, there should be a record of what happens to children when they leave care in order to inform future policy and planning of services. A review of legislation, policies and programmes relating to children in care should be carried out at regular intervals.

10. It is important that rules and regulations be enforced, breaches be reported and sanctions applied.

The failures that occurred in all the schools cannot be explained by the absence of rules or any difficulty in interpreting what they meant. The problem lay in the implementation of the regulatory framework. The rules were ignored and treated as though they set some aspirational and unachievable standard that had no application to the particular circumstances of running the institution. Not only did the individual carers disregard the rules and precepts about punishment, but their superiors did not enforce the rules or impose any disciplinary measures for breaches. Neither did the Department of Education

11. A culture of respecting and implementing rules and regulations and of observing codes of conduct should be developed.

Managers and those supervising and inspecting the services must ensure regularly that standards are observed.

12. Independent inspections are essential.

All services for children should be subject to regular inspections in respect of all aspects of their care. The requirements of a system of inspection include the following:

- There is a sufficient number of inspectors.
- The inspectors must be independent.
- The inspectors should talk with and listen to the children.
- There should be objective national standards for inspection of all settings where children are placed.
- Unannounced inspection should take place.
- Complaints to an inspector should be recorded and followed up.

- Inspectors should have power to ensure that inadequate standards are addressed without delay.

13. Management at all levels should be accountable for the quality of services and care.

Performance should be assessed by the quality of care delivered. The manager of an institution should be responsible for:

- Making the best use of the available resources
- Vetting of staff and volunteers
- Ensuring that staff are well trained, matched to the nature of the work to be undertaken and progressively trained so as to be kept up to date
- Ensuring on-going supervision, support and advice for all staff
- Regularly reviewing the system to identify problem areas for both staff and children
- Ensuring rules and regulations are adhered to
- Establishing whether system failures caused or contributed to instances of abuse
- Putting procedures in place to enable staff and others to make complaints and raise matters of concern without fear of adverse consequences.

14. Children in care should be able to communicate concerns without fear.

Children in care are often isolated with their concerns, without an adult to whom they can talk. Children communicate best when they feel they have a protective figure in whom they can confide.

The Department of Health and Children must examine international best practice to establish the most appropriate method of giving effect to this recommendation.

15. Childcare services depend on good communication.

Every childcare facility depends for its efficient functioning on good communication between all the departments and agencies responsible. It requires more than meetings and case conferences. It should involve professionals and others communicating concerns and suspicions so that they can act in the best interests of the child. Overall responsibility for this process should rest with a designated official.

16. Children in care need a consistent care figure.

Continuity of care should be an objective wherever possible. Children in care should have a consistent professional figure with overall responsibility.

The supervising social worker should have a detailed care plan the implementation of which should be regularly reviewed, and there should be the power to direct that changes be made to ensure standards are met. The child, and where possible the family, should be involved in developing and reviewing the care plan.

17. Children who have been in State care should have access to support services.

Aftercare services should be provided to give young adults a support structure they can rely on. In a similar way to families, childcare services should continue contact with young people after they have left care as minors.

18. Children who have been in childcare facilities are in a good position to identify failings and deficiencies in the system, and should be consulted.

Continued contact makes it possible to evaluate whether the needs of children are being met and to identify positive and negative aspects of experience of care.

19. Children in care should not, save in exceptional circumstances, be cut off from their families.

Priority should be given to supporting ongoing contact with family members for the benefit of the child.

20. The full personal records of children in care must be maintained.

Reports, files and records essential to validate the child's identity and their social, family and educational history must be retained. These records need to be kept secure and up to date.

Details should be kept of all children who go missing from care. The privacy of such records must be respected.

21. 'Children First: The National Guidelines for the Protection and Welfare of Children' should be uniformly and consistently implemented throughout the State in dealing with allegations of abuse.