

sufficient funds to compensate. A focus on some level of financial compensation may appear to imply that money can make up for what the victim has suffered. This is not the intention. However, it would be ironic if the fact that no amount of money can compensate a victim for what she has suffered was used as a way to prevent women getting any compensation at all.

60 See Bertha Wilson, 'Will Women Judges Really Make a Difference?', *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*, no. 28 (1990) 507 in which Madame Justice Bertha Wilson of the Canadian Supreme Court considers the benefits and the limitations of greater female judicial representation.

WERRC

WOMEN'S EDUCATION, RESEARCH AND RESOURCE CENTRE
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE DUBLIN

WOMEN'S STUDIES at WERRC

Courses, Seminars, Public Lectures, Workshops, 'Lesbian Lives'
Conference (Feb/March), Annual Conference (May)

* PhD and M Litt (Supervised Research Degrees)

* MA and Postgraduate Diploma in Women's Studies
(full-time one-year and part-time two year taught programme)

* BA (Modular) Degree (Levels 2 and 3) (part-time evening degree)

* Certificate in Women's Studies (pre-access/access) (part-time evening (Belfield)
and day (Balbriggan and Longford) non-graduate qualification.

Further details from Ailbhe Smyth, WERRC, Arts Building, UCD, Dublin 4. Tel 353-(0)1-706 8571, Fax 353-(0)1-1195, email werrc@ollamh.ucd.ie.

The Women's Movement in Ireland, 1970-1995

A Social Movements Analysis

Linda Connolly

Introduction

Commentators and scholars alike have described the 1980s and 1990s as a 'post-feminist' era of political apathy. Former feminists have been accused of trading their political ideals for career mobility. Younger women are seen to single-mindedly pursue career goals while viewing feminism as an anachronism.¹ While acknowledging a certain validity in such viewpoints, by and large they fail to recognize the continuity and vibrancy of the Irish women's movement since at least the 1850s. Although Irish feminism has changed form since the resurgence of the contemporary women's movement in 1970, neither the movement nor the injustices that produced it have vanished. Little attention has been paid to conceptualizing the women's movement in periods of decline and transformations. There are thus substantial inaccuracies surrounding our understanding of the contemporary women's movement in Ireland.

I attempt to conceptualize the different stages of the movement's transformation by drawing on certain aspects of the resource mobilization framework of social movements theory as a heuristic device in the analysis.²

The primary research methodology underpinning this analysis is a series of intensive interviews conducted from a feminist epistemological stance.³ Interview data is complemented by the analysis of primary and

Utilizing the above definition of a social movement as a frame of reference implies that the question of understanding the conceptual nature of the women's movement as a social movement must focus on the loosely structured way in which the movement is organized. The women's movement is frequently conceptualized in terms of ideological schisms. However, in this article I contend that the women's movement is better approached as a 'maze' – in terms of ideologies, organizations, and participants – which is in a constant state of organic evolution and is capable of transforming itself over time and place.

Traditional 'breakdown theories' hold that social movements emerge as responses to specific grievances in society. Structural strain leads to a disruptive psychological state such as alienation, cognitive dissonance or relative deprivation.¹³ When this psychological disturbance reaches the aggregate threshold required to produce a social movement, the causal sequence is completed. Social movements are a collective response to a society in disarray. Movement organizations do not play a prominent role – too much organization, especially formal organization, is considered a symptom of institutionalization. This approach implies that the resurgence of the women's movement is predominantly explained by Irish women's particular grievances. However, the grievances which formed the initial demands of the women's movement – including contraception, equality in the law and employment, social welfare rights, property rights – were, in fact, more pronounced in Irish society before 1970, and were not the key precipitating factor.

Resource mobilization theory emerged during the 1970s partly in response to this classical approach to collective behaviour.¹⁴ Resource mobilization theorists argue that social movements emerge not so much because grievances increase, but because there is an increase in resources and opportunities available to an aggrieved population. Organization (especially indigenous organization) is a key resource.¹⁵ Movement organizations facilitate goal achievement and ensure movement survival, and accumulate and allocate resources. Grievances are viewed as ubiquitous in society and do not really tell us very much about the reasons why a social movement mobilizes. The resource mobilization approach has been most fruitful in analysing mobilization processes and in emphasizing the role of existing organizations and networks as catalysts for social movement formation. Existing organizations and networks not only increase the chance that persons will be confronted with a mobilization attempt but also make bloc recruitment possible. Pinard showed that an increase in relative deprivation only leads to more protest if a collectivity has a certain degree of organization.¹⁶ Resource mobilization concepts are drawn upon heuristically here to conceptualize the case of the Irish women's movement.

Abeyance 1922–1969

The new women's movement that arose in the late 1960s and early 1970s in most Western countries was not the first feminist movement in history. The term 'second-wave feminism' has been attached to the new movement to indicate that we are witnessing the second peak of a movement that has existed for more than 100 years, ever since the second half of the nineteenth century.¹⁷

It is evident that the women's movement has been persistently active as a social movement since at least the mid-1800s in Ireland. First-wave activism (1850–1921) has been documented substantially by prominent historians and is characterized by an era of social purity, emancipation and suffrage.¹⁸ The essential point is that a theoretically accurate socio-logical account of the women's movement is one which *links* activity over this period as opposed to dealing exclusively with peak periods of activism in isolation. Such links are unequivocally presented here.

Upon closer examination of empirical data, it is clear that the roots of resurgence in the contemporary movement lie primarily in the previous waves of activism. Conceptualizing those social movement dynamics in periods of decline is thus a necessary prerequisite to accounting for the reasons for resurgence in the current peak phase, 1970–1995. This line of continuity was clearly reflected by my interviewees. Some of those interviewees who are activists in this current wave of the movement were in fact also active in the abeyance phase (1922–1969) and a number of interviewees represented those SMOs that were pivotal in the middle years (in particular, the Irish Housewives' Association; Association of Business and Professional Women; trade unionists; and the National Association of Widows). While there is no doubt that external structural supports that emerged in the 1970s served to push the movement to centre-stage, those supports were merely resonating the concerns which had animated a committed cadre of feminists during the abeyance period. Between 1922 and 1969 political and social factors in Irish society were not propitious to feminist activism. Hence, the crucial importance of those intra-movement networks which operated in a hostile environment to feminism and 'kept alive', albeit on a small scale, the cause of women's rights. This point is demonstrated through an examination of the dynamics specifically within the IHA (Irish Housewives' Association), as an abeyance organization. All previous accounts of the women's movement have not dealt with this crucial aspect of the movement conceptually, overemphasizing the importance of external factors, and the activities of other social movements (such as the Civil Rights and anti-Vietnam movements) of the 1960s, to current mobilization.¹⁹

It is documented how women were heavily involved in social movements throughout the nineteenth century, particularly in secret agrarian societies and in the nationalist movement. A number of social movements

secondary sources encompassing the social history of the women's movement and the changing position of women in Irish society since the late 1960s.⁴ This in some way delineates the progression of the women's movement since 1970 and provides a general sociological overview. It also redresses to some extent the deficit of incorporating the women's movement into prominent sociological accounts of Irish society.⁵

This article identifies four analytical stages in the evolution of the contemporary Irish women's movement:

1. Abeyance 1922–1969;
2. Advancement 1970–1979;
3. Reappraisal 1980–1988;
4. New Directions 1989–1995.⁶

As a prerequisite, however, it is necessary to state that there are four premises to be taken into consideration when embarking upon an analysis of the contemporary women's movement in Ireland:

1. There is no comprehensive body of *qualitative* data, from a feminist epistemological stance, encompassing the evolution of the contemporary women's movement in Ireland⁷ – women telling their *own* story;
2. There is no *integrated social history* of the contemporary women's movement, despite the fact that archives are in existence. There is only sporadic evidence and thematic publications examining specific aspects of this social history.⁸ While acknowledging the huge importance of this work, a general social history could do much to incorporate women's history into mainstream education and would provide a 'springboard' for further in-depth research and theoretical assessment of the various aspects of the contemporary movement;
3. Analysis of the women's movement, or indeed the position of women in Irish society in general, has not been incorporated into recent major socio-historical works on contemporary Irish society. This *exclusion* is inherent in the main body of Irish academic literature.⁹ Furthermore the continuity of the women's movement has not been acknowledged. The contemporary women's movement has been inaccurately portrayed as some form of 'immaculate conception' with no previous historical legacy;
4. The centrality of the women's movement to the rapid pace of *social change* in Ireland has not been adequately demonstrated by mainstream sociology. Arguably, one of the most significant components of social change in Ireland since the late 1960s stems from the persistent challenge to the *status quo* by the women's movement. Sociologists have tended to rely on the modernization framework to account for the nature of social change in Ireland.¹⁰ In particular, the field of social movements itself as a tool of analysis has not been developed by Irish sociologists.

This article attempts to go some of the way towards redressing these imbalances and to introduce an analytical debate surrounding the evolution of the women's movement. It takes into account the vast amount of work that has already been done by Irish feminists, but also points to the areas of deficit in feminist research. The article is thus exploratory and the task is ambitious. However, it is anticipated that it will contribute towards opening a debate surrounding the social analysis of a much discussed but little *analysed* social movement.

A Working Definition of the Women's Movement

The question of definition raises the notion of the specificity of the Irish experience – what are the nuances particular to the women's movement in Ireland, which is *organically* part of the global women's movement? The definition of the women's movement, for the purposes of this analysis, is as a social movement in the broadest, inclusive sense:

A social movement is a conscious, collective activity to promote social change, representing a protest against the established power structure and against the dominant norms and values. The commitment and active participation of its members or activists constitute the main resource of any social movement.¹¹

It refers generically to all those groups/individuals committed in some way towards changing and improving the lives of women, either politically, personally, socially or culturally. The question of definition is related to the boundaries, that are formed by social movement organizations (SMOs), which are in a constant state of evolution. Drude Dahlerup suggests:

The distinction between 'social movement' and 'social movement organisation' (Zald, 1979) is appropriate. A social movement is more than its organisations or centres. In fact, it often has several centres. And the movement is more than its organisations: it represents endeavours to reach beyond its own boundaries.¹²

The frontiers ultimately contract as a movement advances or declines and different sectors consolidate. Dahlerup reiterates the core assumption of the resource mobilization perspective, that particular cycles of advance and decline of SMOs are ultimately related to the resources and opportunities available to a social movement at any given time.

By their very nature social movements are difficult to conceptualize and define. Social movements are not static. Their key characteristic is that they initially form external to routine political activities and represent a protest against established norms and values. Because it does not initially have institutional power, a social movement often uses non-conventional methods of protest. It is in this context that the contemporary women's movement re-emerged in Irish society in the early 1970s.

intertwined during 1916 and the War of Independence – cultural, labour, nationalist, emancipatory – with feminists involved in various organizations.²⁰ Women were radical and socially active agents in all of the movements of the time, but of course in a subordinate political role.²¹ However, the first wave of the women's movement as a social movement in its own right was comprised of organizations such as Inghinidhe na hÉireann (Daughters of Ireland), Cumann na mBan (the Women's Association), the Irish Women Workers' Union and the Irishwomen's Franchise League.²²

The Cumann na nGaedhail government, the first government of the Irish Free State, introduced legislation which restricted the rights of women on a number of levels – women's access to employment and equal treatment, contraception, bar from jury service, illegitimacy and divorce. The opportunities for women in Irish political life, previously available to them in the nationalist movement, were closed off.²³ A small number of women remained active in the labour movement (the Irish Women's Workers Union (IWWU) was founded in 1911 and reorganized by Louie Bennett in 1916) and the Irish Women's Citizens Association (formed in 1923 to carry on the work of the Irish Women's Suffrage and local Government Association). The ICA (founded as Irishwomen United in 1910) remained active during the period. However, in general, the cultural context of the time mitigated against women's involvement in public life:

... those politically active women of the early twentieth century came out of a pre-existing tradition of women's involvement in nationalist struggle, that this offered them scope for a wider range of activities in public life than that experienced by their sisters in imperialist countries, and that all this was then closed off to them by the newly formed patriarchal state, modelled essentially on its colonial predecessor.²⁴

Few first-wave feminists became active in party politics and many travelled abroad in this period. Life-long, committed feminists, such as Louie Bennett, adopted 'abeyance' strategies after 1922. This political and social mood culminated in the 1937 Constitution, which defined women's fundamental role as relegated to the domestic sphere.²⁵ Margaret MacCurtain aptly describes the cultural context evident by the 1940s, in the wake of the enshrinement of this particularly narrow aspiration of women's role:

The Irish Free State had by then become a state where gendered political forces had limited women's access to political and economic power. It was a critical time for the citizens of the Irish Free State. Removed from the theatre of the European war by its constitutional stand on neutrality, the state paid the price in scarcity of money, food and fuel. There was stark poverty in many households and the spectre of tuberculosis struck with deadly effect at families. Children suffered woeful malnutrition with little hope of medical alleviation.²⁶

It was in response to this climate that the IHA (Irish Housewives' Association) mobilized in 1942. O'Dowd reiterates that there is considerable agreement among modern historians and feminists that women's roles in politics and public life diminished in the aftermath of partition.²⁷ However, here I demonstrate how the political work that traditional women's groups *did* carry out (including the ICA and IHA) in the middle years, 1922–1969, was a necessary precondition for the resurgence of the women's movement in 1970. It is evident that apart from structural influences which precipitated mobilization in 1970 itself, intra-movement processes between 1922 and 1969 were creating the necessary networks and repertoire of strategies which were pivotal to later resurgence and advancement. This is especially true in the case of the *ad hoc* initiative which proved to be the impetus on equality in 1968. The *ad hoc* committee on women's rights was dominated by a group comprised of members of long-standing women's organizations, professional and business women. The orthodox assertion is that concern for the lack of equality within the structures of society by middle and upper-class, professional and business women, and their marginalization within professional life, made up the participants of the *ad hoc* committee on women's rights in 1968 and the subsequent liberal/women's rights branch of the movement.²⁸ Such organizations are frequently characterized as moderate, reformist and/or conservative. However, here I suggest a more accurate interpretation. It was those organizations, which existed for a long period *before* 1970 in an environment hostile to feminism, which were crucial in maintaining a core cadre of feminists. The label 'conservative' is falsely dismissive, as the IHA was extremely radical in the context of Irish society from the 1940s to the 1960s and was pivotal in establishing the First Commission on the Status of Women, and later the Council for the Status of Women.

One of the main criticisms of social movements theory in its original formulation is its 'immaculate conception' view of those social movements which emerged during the 1960s.²⁹ However, recent empirical work suggests that the break between the movements of the 1960s and those of the earlier part of the century is not as sharp as previously thought. The work of Verta Taylor has been particularly useful in this area. She suggests that 'What scholars have taken for "births" were in fact breakthroughs or turning points in movement mobilisation.'³⁰ Taylor uses the NWP (National Women's Party) case in the US to highlight the processes by which social movements maintain continuity between different cycles of peak activity.³¹ She applies the factors associated with adaptation of Mizruchi's abeyance process to the case.³² Abeyance is essentially a holding pattern of a group which continues to mount some type of challenge even in a non-receptive environment. Factors that contribute to abeyance are both external and internal to the movement. Externally, a discrepancy between a surplus of activists, and a lack of status opportunities to integrate them into the mainstream,

creates conditions for abeyance. Internally, structures arise that permit organizations to absorb and hold a committed cadre of activists. These abeyance structures, in turn, promote movement continuity and, crucially, are employed in later rounds of mass mobilization. In congruence with the resource mobilization perspective, political opportunities and an indigenous organizational base are viewed as major factors in the rise and decline of social movements.³³

The original aim of the IHA was: 'To unite housewives, so that they may realise, and gain recognition for, their right to play an active part in all spheres of planning for the Community.'³⁴ It is evident that the role of the IHA as a link between the first and second waves of feminist activism in Ireland has been crucial. Hilda Tweedy, founder member and author of the organization's social history, and a small circle of like-minded women formed an organization in 1941 with a view to drawing up a petition in response to their outrage at the level of food shortages and family poverty during the 'Emergency'. Subsequently dubbed the 'housewives' petition' they demanded fair prices for producer and consumer and equitable distribution of food and goods. They sent a copy of the petition to each member of the Dáil before Budget Day and government rationing and the book of coupons were subsequently introduced:

At first it was more consumer oriented, but very soon we discovered we needed women in where the decisions were made, so that gave us some more 'feminist push'.³⁵

There were few groups still in existence since the great wave of the women's movement in the early part of the century, at this time:

A group called the Irish Women's Citizens were originally a suffrage group looking for votes for women – when they got the vote in 1922, they tried to show women how to use the vote. We got established in the forties when they were a dwindling group.³⁶

There were, however, direct links and continuity forged between the IHA and the suffrage movement. In 1949 the IHA merged with the Irish Women's Citizen Association, linking with the older Suffrage Society of 1874 which in 1915 became the Suffrage and Local Government Association. The implications of this link were far reaching:

Then the Women's Citizens asked if they may be incorporated in 1947 and they brought a new dimension with them because they were affiliated to the International Alliance of Women. We took over their affiliation and their group who were all well known – people like Rose Jacob, Louie Bennett, Susan Manning, Rosalie Mills, Ella Mills and Lucy Kingston. All these people joined and they were of course much more feminist than we would have been at this time.³⁷

The IHA absorbed a network of long-time, highly committed feminists. Crucially, it also forged links with the global women's movement, through membership of the IAW (International Alliance of Women).³⁸ Between 1946 and 1986 Hilda Tweedy, along with other members, represented the IHA (and indeed the generic Irish women's movement) at the International Alliance of Women. She became an important and active member of the executive (the IAW congress was held in Dublin in the early 1960s).

The central point here is that this organization, operating during a period of abeyance, forged a direct international link and continuity between the first-wave suffrage movement which peaked in the early 1900s, and retreated after 1922, and the contemporary women's movement which mobilized globally in the late 1960s.

The networks the IHA developed with other SMOs within the women's movement widened the scope of the organization beyond that of the concerns of the housewife – including the Irish Women Workers' Union through Louie Bennet (as a result women gained recognition from the Trade Union Congress) and affiliation to the Joint Committee of Women's Societies and Social Workers, formed in 1931 to campaign on issues dealing with social policy and legislation. The ICA (Irish Countrywomen's Association) was also a very important SMO in this period:

At the time the IHA was founded there was no other organisation dealing with consumerism and the status of women in the way we did. The Irish Countrywomen's Association, with whom we have always had close and friendly relations, came nearest.³⁹

The movement at this time had similar characteristics to the early suffrage movement. Its membership, though not the focus of its political actions, remained predominantly middle class and many of the women were Protestant:

One of our troubles had always been we weren't attracting the working class – although we did go out to the housing districts and hold meetings and so on. But we didn't seem to catch them and we got the reputation of being a middle-class group. That arose from the original snowball effect because you went home and asked your friends and it was more or less the same group being repeated over and over again.⁴⁰

The method of recruitment of members which highlights the organic nature of the women's movement was part of a repertoire of strategies which were employed in later rounds of mobilization.⁴¹ The decline in membership and size of the women's movement resulted in the component SMOs adapting to the inhospitable political and social environment:

We were never a large organization. At our biggest I don't know if we ever reached the 1,500, probably 1,000 odd. But, we had something to contend with . . . if you were one step ahead with public thinking at the time you

were a communist. And we got branded on occasions just by making a suggestion and often lost a branch overnight.⁴²

Strategies and tactics were adapted accordingly to ensure movement survival:

Conscious of the dual role of women in the mid-century they presented to the public the solid frontage of the Irish housewife; strategically they instructed their members on how to negotiate the complex maze of the Irish party machinery.⁴³

The political opportunity structure changed in the late 1960s. The policies of the Lemass government were geared towards modernization, industrialization and were influenced by the diffusion of international ideas.⁴⁴ The IHA was crucial in all events in the run-up to 1970, which marks the contemporary upsurge of the women's movement. The only Irish women's organization affiliated to the IAW, the IHA delegates at the 1967 IAW congress (held in London that year), were told that the UN Commission on the Status of Women had issued a directive to women's international non-governmental organizations to ask their affiliates to examine the status of women in their respective countries and encourage their governments to set up a National Commission on the Status of Women. Networking with other SMOs culminated in 1968 and precipitated mobilization in a fashion unprecedented since the first wave of feminist activism. The Association of Business and Professional Women had received the same directive at its international congress that same year. As a result, the two organizations decided to work together towards the goal of setting up a national commission on the status of women in Ireland. In 1968 a meeting with a view to setting up an *ad hoc* committee on women's rights was organized with members from the IHA, Association of Business and Professional Women, Altrusa Club, ICA, Irish Nursing Organisation (INO), Dublin University Women Graduates Association, The National Association of Widows, The Soroptimists' Clubs of Ireland, Women's International Zionist Organisation, Irish Council of Women, Association of Women Citizens and the Association of Secondary Teachers of Ireland (ASTI). Following intense lobbying and extensive research by this group, the First Commission on the Status of Women was established by the Taoiseach in 1970. The initiative on women's rights taken by these SMOs was facilitated by other resources. The political opportunity structure was more propitious to its aims, as a consequence of several factors including the international impetus engendered by the UN and the EC, and the media's increasing receptivity to women's rights. The 1970s were an optimistic period of rapid industrialization and modernization in Irish society, and the external opportunities available to women had been heightened by the advent of free education in the 1960s.⁴⁵ A rational, organized, active, strategic women's movement was pivotal in bringing about change.

The above illustrates in a practical way the importance of pre-existing links and organizational ties among individuals for the rise of collective action. The feminist network of the women's movement in the 1940s–1960s affected the resurgent movement in a number of ways. Firstly, it was the direct catalyst for the setting-up of the First Commission on the Status of Women and later the Council for the Status of Women which embodied the epitome of liberal feminism in the Irish women's movement. The National Women's Council (as it is now called) continues to be a pivotal mass-based, umbrella SMO. Secondly, many of the participants in the women's movement in the 1940s–1960s continued to be active in the resurgent contemporary movement – particularly in the CSW (Council for the Status of Women) and its offshoots. This highly committed core of activists, though small in numbers, took a crucial initial step in the resource mobilization process in 1968 and provided resources and a repertoire of strategies for consolidating a resurgent mass-based movement during the 1970s.

Advancement 1970–1979

Having explained why the women's movement reappeared, this section analyses the rapid advancement and resulting proliferation of the movement between 1970 and 1979. The challenge here is to move towards conceptualizing the diversity which is at the core of the resurgent women's movement.

The traditional movement sector changed direction in the context of the changing political opportunity structure and movement upsurge in 1970. New SMOs were formed which were offshoots from, or became identified with, this sector – including organizations like Cherish and the Women's Political Association. However, there was a parallel establishment of new SMOs with the expressed (more radical) goal of women's liberation. These organizations resembled those in the small-group sector of the American Women's Movement – small, loosely organized, participatory, radical feminist, autonomous and consciousness-raising groups.⁴⁶ The major forerunner of this style of activism in Ireland was the IWLM (Irish Women's Liberation Movement).

The contemporary women's movement is frequently categorized in terms of ideological orientation. However, these labels do not directly apply in view of the broad definition of a social movement adopted above. It is a feature of the women's movement that activists often interact with different movement organizations simultaneously or at different stages and different intra-movement alliances occur, in the form of coalitions, for instance. The challenge here is to make sense of those strands that intertwine at different stages of the movement's development and the related outcome *for the women's movement as a whole*. The women's movement did not diffuse from the original SMOs in a linear,

segregated ideological pattern. In essence, there was considerable overlap between SMOs' strategies and themes, and the movement's development was organic with several offshoots from the original core SMOs. It is suggested that this fluidity in fact contributed to the high level of mobilization in the 1970s and is at the core of the way in which the movement is organized.

According to Barbara Ryan, previous analyses of the women's movement implies that:⁴⁷

1. Most work on the organizing stage has centred on labelling the constituent groups rather than understanding their relation to each other and the overall formation of the movement. The two movement sectors have often been presented as polarized or even opposed to each other. For example, NOW (the largest feminist SMO in the US) has been singled out falsely as a reform organization with limited goals;⁴⁸
2. The literature tends to connect the 'formation' of the contemporary women's movement to the 1960s social movements, such as the Civil Rights and New Left.⁴⁹ This ignores the roots of women's discontent which led to the movement's resurgence and fails to recognize the conceptual importance of the groundwork done by abeyance organizations;
3. Efforts to promote change in the political legal arena have frequently been ignored or disregarded as conservative forms of activism.

Ryan alludes to the limitations of previous analyses of the women's movement suggesting that 'this new literature provides us with a view of a transformed women's movement; however, for the most part, it fails to tell us how this change came about'.⁵⁰ Ryan suggests that dividing the movement into reform and radical categories is inaccurate since 'all of the emerging feminist groups were radical departures from the prevailing view of women'.⁵¹ Freeman suggests the differences between the two branches to be, primarily, structural and stylistic, and, secondarily, strategic and methodological. Rather, she labels the two branches the 'younger' and 'older' branches – one came into being a year before the other and each initially organized within different age-groups.⁵² Her attempt to neutralize the reform/radical dichotomy fails, however, because radicalism is associated with youth and conservatism with age.⁵³ Ryan hypothesizes the more neutral categories of mass movement and small group sectors. I attempt to overcome these problems in my analysis by taking a grounded theory approach to the interview data.⁵⁴ This allows me to trace the themes, tensions and interconnections in the women's movement which largely emerge from the interview data itself. I utilize the resource mobilization approach heuristically, rather than imposing a pre-ordained model or theory.⁵⁵

The earliest core SMOs included the IWLM and the *ad hoc* committee on women's rights.⁵⁶ It is clear that initially the IWLM and *ad hoc* committee had no direct structural links:

Until comparatively recently I believed that the . . . 24 members of that group . . . were the women's movement of Ireland. Well no they weren't – because recently I was asked to research the forthcoming edition of the Field Day anthology which writes Irish women into history. I discovered that three years before we came on the scene a group of Irish women had got together to pressure the Fianna Fáil government into a First Commission on the Status of Women . . .⁵⁷

The IWLM was more influenced by the international diffusion of the ideas of radical feminism. Events in the radical sector of the American women's movement were pivotal:

*I was a founder member . . . none of us knew what we were at! It was a time when we were taking a lot of our political ideas from America – the Vietnam war was at its height and the Civil Rights movement. I was a member of the anti-Vietnam and anti-apartheid movement. So when the women's liberation movement was started in America it just seemed like an extension of other things we had been at – housing action, all that sort of thing was going on at the time. . . . I don't think we would have ever started it if we hadn't seen it happening in America . . . Our initial ideas came from the States and then we had to look at the Irish situation.*⁵⁸

Tensions between the two original parallel movement sectors in 1970 were manifest. Groups, such as the ICA, were viewed as 'conservative' by the younger, radical members of the IWLM:

*The women's liberation movement didn't come out of anything that had gone before . . . there was nobody old enough to be involved in anything that had gone before and I suppose we wouldn't have been too pleased to be bracketed with the ICA at the time. We mightn't have minded being bracketed with the suffragettes . . .*⁵⁹

The primary difference between the two derived from preferred strategy – persistently lobby the state for moderate, gradual legislative change on the one hand, and engaging in controversial, direct action tactics (pickets, protests, expressive action) on the other. However, even though these methods were more concentrated in each sector, each drew on the same repertoire of tactics (and symbols, ideologies, and resources) in a strategic fashion when the need arose. For example, the fight for change through the courts was utilized both by mainstream and autonomous feminists,⁶⁰ as were petitioning, mass meetings and demonstrations.

There was a distinct difference in the social background of the members of particular SMOs in the early stages. The social composition of the

IWLM was dominated by three distinct groups of women – political women (mainly left-wing and Republican activists), women in the media and professional/university educated women. The media was the primary resource of the IWLM. The relationship between the print media and the women's movement is described by one interviewee as 'almost collusion . . . all we had to do was pick up the phone and we got publicity'.⁶¹ The initial IWLM group which met in 1970 was subsequently joined by other women strategically positioned with in the media.⁶² Catherine Rose states:

The real revolutionaries in this decade and those who sparked the initial enthusiasm for an end to discrimination against women are journalists; . . . who whether reporting on or editorially commissioning work for the women's pages of the national newspapers consistently focused on the injustices and discrimination suffered by women in Irish society. Since the late 1960s they have done their utmost to waken the consciousness of Irish women to the necessity for upgrading the status of women . . .⁶³

In terms of precipitating factors, the following sequence of movement events was crucial. In 1970, the IWLM's manifesto *Chains or Change* was published. On 6 March 1971 the group was invited to appear on the *Late Late Show*, which turned out to be a rather chaotic event. The whole show was devoted to the subject of women's liberation. It was agreed that the IWLM would organize the programme and choose speakers. The event was staged with a view to delivering women's liberation to Irish women: 'In a way the show had forced us to become a mass movement, and we would be ruthless in addressing ourselves to the women of Ireland . . .'⁶⁴

Mary Robinson agreed to appear on the panel to point out the legal inequities in Irish law, despite the fact she was not a member of the group. Mary Cullen, a historian at Maynooth College, made the case for working mothers. Lelia Doolan, one of Ireland's few television producers, spoke on education and social conditioning, with particular reference to the effects of the media. Máirín Johnson talked about discrimination in the workplace. And Nell McCafferty made the case for deserted wives, single mothers and widows. The rest of the IWLM group were 'armed with facts in the audience'.⁶⁵

Following this, the first hint of proliferation emerged. Intra-group tensions *within* the IWLM were partly based on tactics due to the fact that some of the women were more strategic and political – and also some of the women who joined were more attracted to the feminism of equal rights, rather than socialist or radical feminism:

Some of us weren't happy with the Late Late – we thought it was too soon. I suppose looking back on it wasn't as disastrous as we thought it might be. We just thought we were going public far too soon, we were not 100 per cent certain of what we were doing and where we were going. We started off as one group of about twenty women and for ages we were just one group, anybody who wanted to come came to Mrs Gaj's attic room. And then we

broke up into branches and we were all sent out to all the new branches to get them to accept the six-point plan. That was quite difficult . . . for example the notion of one family/one house. I remember having a very difficult time in Donnybrook trying to get this through because they weren't into the social aspect of it, they didn't want to get into left-wing politics. They just wanted contraceptives and equal rights. But we got it through in the end – I don't think there was any branch that did not accept the six-point programme.⁶⁶

Whereas equal rights feminists who preferred political lobbying and more modest tactics were alienated from what were extremely radical tactics in the context of Irish society, the women of the left tended to be involved in other political movements and knew how to organize. They recognized the long-term political consequences of these strategies:

I was more politicized . . . some of those other women were not. A tension was there as a result. Mostly we won out – we didn't discuss abortion at all because we reckoned the time wasn't right.⁶⁷

The 'undignified' nature of the contraceptive train led more conservative women to call for the IWLM to moderate its tone:

The scheme backfired and an ideal opportunity to demonstrate the idiocy of the contraceptive laws was lost. The gleeful women blew up the condoms like balloons and customs officers found it embarrassing to be confronted by women demanding to be arrested. The incident made press headlines the next day and greatly alarmed both the moderate elements within the movement and the ordinary women outside it. The outing was condemned from the pulpit by a priest who said it was 'unworthy and undignified'.⁶⁸

Tarrow elaborates upon the concept of 'movement events' and protest formations (demonstrations, strikes, marches, boycotts, occupations and obstruction).⁶⁹ Social movements make more extensive use of such tactic than conventional organizations and political parties. The general public as well as political decision-makers often get their main impression of social movements through media events. After the Mansion House public meeting, the impending fragmentation of the IWLM became more pronounced because of internal divisions, including preferred tactics, disagreement over feminist ideology, diverging views on the Northern Question and resentment of a 'hierarchy of personalities' by the new influx of members after the Mansion House meeting. Its members diffused into different SMOs who worked on initiatives congruent with their selective and ideological incentives.

The notion of the 'free rider' conceptualized by resource mobilization theorists suggests that women can benefit from the movement's success without participating, but will participate when rewarded by selective incentives.⁷⁰ Incentives vary from personal ambition, prestige, respect, friendship, leadership opportunities and so on. Participation in the

women's movement during the 1970s brought diverse selective incentives – companionship of like-minded women; the enjoyment of demonstrating; planning; campaigning; the challenge of legal cases or dealing with the media; or the basic relief of 'getting out of the house'. It gave women an arena to use their skills denied to them in the public sphere – political organizing, leadership, research, providing social services.

However, Gamson states that a movement's incentive structure is more complicated.⁷¹ Gamson suggests that the 'satisfaction of working for a just cause' is conceptually distinct from selective incentives. Carden⁷² later adopted this notion and coins this class of incentives 'ideological' which are supplementary to selective incentives.⁷³

Ideological differences occur both over strategies and goals. Members of the women's movement have disagreed over the distribution of resources to implement these. I demonstrate here how internal conflict results in factionalism and fragmentation. During the 1970s members realised that it was not possible to pursue *all* of the relevant issues under one organization. When conflict arose it was very often solved by proliferation – by one faction founding a new SMO in which it was possible to co-operate in areas where their ideologies overlapped.⁷⁴ The central point here is that the movement's proliferation resulted in part from its members' consensus that organizational diversity could be a practical means to achieve feminist objectives at the same time as coping with participants' diverse interpretations of a general ideology.⁷⁵ This also applied to non-ideological interests or selective incentives. Women particularly anxious to exercise certain skills, for example, may focus on a single-issue SMO. Political women, business women and lesbians formed their own SMOs. Carden's basic premise is that an individual will be most satisfied in an organization which offers a number of highly valued selective incentives combined with personally-rewarding ideological incentives.⁷⁶ Some women became alienated from the IWLM because it offered them neither ideological nor selective incentives. Ideologically they objected to the radicalism or republicanism of some of these women and focused their action on SMOs which complemented their interest in more practical tasks and reformist, moderate methods. When an organization fails to offer ideological and selective incentives, members create new groups of their own.⁷⁷ According to Carden, by creating small, differentiated groups they can avoid the internal disputes that threaten the personal support that is integral to feminist organizations facing a hostile society. In addition, such women are ideologically committed to bringing about change through long-term activism spurred on by the slow pace of change. Because members have made this sort of life-long, emotional commitment to the cause and the movement is a central part of their lives, their SMO must cater for this.

IWU (Irish Women United) which emerged later in 1975 was more politicized than the IWLM. It encompassed a diverse group of left-wing philosophies, including the Movement for a Socialist Republic,

the Communist Party of Ireland, the Socialist Workers Movement, the Irish Republican Socialist Party and the International Lesbian Caucus.⁷⁸ The prevailing ideological schisms within IWU were based on republicanism, socialism, lesbian separatism and radical feminism:

I think the Irish feminist movement was affected as well as by what was happening in the North. . . . There were huge arguments within, not so much the Irish Women's Liberation Movement which was just a kind of an incredible flourishing of great anger but also great enjoyment. . . . The more political IWU which came afterwards, it was within this that there were colossal arguments about the North. I mean, every single Sunday we would have an argument about the North. But funny enough we managed to stay together despite the huge differences because there were huge blocs within IWU . . . a lesbian bloc which felt that anything that wasn't directed to sexuality was creating diversion. Then you had ones that thought that the North was very much part of our conflict . . . having ties with Republican women and the Armagh strikers was very much part of that. Then you had another section of women who felt that 'yes' they wanted to be involved politically with the other socialist movements around – in the trade unions, very specifically in education – and they felt that they didn't want anything to do with women in the North. . . . They saw the history of women in the South as having been damaged by Republicanism. So these arguments would be had and then you had a fourth group who was in with everybody but just wanted to get on with the actual practicalities of what needed to be done.⁷⁹

It was in IWU that the lesbian feminist debate began in Ireland. In both the US and Britain, prior to the 1960s, feminism was not the major reference point for lesbians, and those who were organized at all were part of the gay rights movement.⁸⁰ Lesbians in the US and Britain were confronted with the question of aligning with gay men or women's liberationists. In the beginning, there was silence within the women's movement in Ireland. A number of influential works were published in the early 1970s in the US which suggested that if gender-appropriate behaviour is a social construction then perhaps lesbians were not 'psychologically flawed'.⁸¹ The international dissemination of these ideas and links with the International Lesbian Caucus were key resources for the involvement of Irish lesbians in the women's movement. Because of the rigid social attitudes to sexuality in Irish society,⁸² lesbian activity in this period of advancement was concentrated almost exclusively within the movement and remained so until recently.

IWU used a similar repertoire of tactics as the IWLM. However, this group as a whole was more politicized. IWU's strategy was a mixture of participatory democracy, direct action, consciousness-raising and political campaigns. Between 1975 and 1977 it was hectic. IWU held its first conference in Liberty Hall on 8 June 1975. The principles of internal democracy and a communal approach to the administrative work of the group was explicitly adopted. *Banshee*, the group's magazine, had a rotating editorial committee. Its advertisement stated:

Irishwomen United works on the basis of general meetings (discussions and action planning), joint actions (e.g. pickets, public meetings, workshops; at present on women in trade unions, contraception, social welfare and political theory) and consciousness raising groups.⁸³

The CAP (Contraceptive Action Programme) was initiated by members of IWU in 1979 and became a focal mobilizing issue. Members of this same group of women were involved with the setting-up of the group that preceded the pro-choice SMO, Open Door Counselling, in 1980. IWU took on these issues in a far more organized and political fashion than IWLM. This reiterates the particular nature of the continuity process of the women's movement and the importance of pre-existing networks for mobilization.

However, there was a large capacity for tension in IWU and the rows were acrimonious. Internal divisions and personal exhaustion became divisory. Members of IWU recall the rows and the anger between the radicals, the socialists, the lesbians and the Republicans. For some women this was oppressive:

It is probably too soon – it will probably be another twenty/thirty years – before someone can really look back and say why it was that so many feminist organisations ended up in the most dreadful rows . . . in IWU the rows would be most unbelievable. It was pretty awful in the end, people were literally at each other's throats. It's not really what feminism is about. . . For me working for a feminist organization was not the best thing I could do. I don't think I would be unique in that experience.⁸⁴

By 1977 the group had fragmented:

In some ways I would definitely say it's a pity it broke up – if a core group of radical women had stayed together and that you had these other things as offshoots because . . . they were the social work areas, facilities, services. . . There was, for instance, only about seventy who turned up to various meetings and got involved in several areas. It was really a matter of people just not having energies . . . eventually after three or five years – I mean we would be picketing 'every single night' or whatever, and putting Banshee together. So that would have been the reason. . . .⁸⁵

From the start, conflict was inherent in IWU based on the diversity of ideologies and the conflict between those who promoted what was termed the revolutionary struggle instead of the radical feminism which many believed was the original purpose of the organization.⁸⁶ For example, the minutes recorded that at one point members had to state their political affiliations before speaking. Although there were advantages from the diversity – the political knowledge, skills and confidence that many members gained – many activists turned from it to pursue more practical or specialized objectives. IWU was the last radical feminist group to attempt a national profile. It diffused into a number of SMOs, which were

to mobilize during the 1980s around lesbian organizing, the reproductive rights campaign (culminating in the anti-amendment group in the abortion referendum in 1983), and the provision of services for women. The radicalism of these women was to have an important influence on the movement as a whole during the 1980s.

One of the most prolific radical SMOs to offshoot from IWU was the Rape Crisis Centre:

About six of us were founder members of the Rape Crisis Centre and all of us except maybe one were in IWU.⁸⁷

The experience of the women's movement in other countries was pivotal to the establishment of the organization. In contrast to the gradual reformist nature of many of the self-help groups set up during the mid-1970s, the Rape Crisis Centre was political in focus and emphasized 'the personal as political':

When some of us started to set up the Rape Crisis Centre we realized that it was going to take a lot of commitment and we realized that we had to spend not just a lot of time but do a lot of research. We had to make contacts with the various groups in England, and we made quite a lot of contact with a Dutch group as well . . . what had happened was that Noreen Winchester was an Armagh prisoner at the time and she had been continuously raped by her father and she had been at home minding the children . . . because the mother had died. . . . She murdered the father one night. . . . A Dutch group were very involved with getting her released and in fact she was released. So the first political action of the Rape Crisis Centre was to be involved with was with them.⁸⁸

Rape became a central radical mobilizing issue for the women's movement from 1977 onwards, but transformed as awareness grew:

We were kind of conscious of how society was going to react to the whole Rape Crisis Centre but we really didn't realize just how deeply ingrained the notion of the rape joke, for instance, was in our culture. That whole area in itself became very radical. As it went on you couldn't work any more than three or four years as a rape counsellor – you just couldn't. It's quite a depressing scenario. We ended up just being totally involved in that area. People who came in after us in the Rape Crisis Centre tended to be less radical. First of all they didn't have the radical tradition, they hadn't been there in IWU, they hadn't had all the arguments. It is an awful pity because in some way a lot of that has been lost. But what I would hope will happen now is that people . . . will look at this area alone because IWU was very different than the IWLM.⁸⁹

In general, there was a tremendous growth in the number of voluntary agencies for women in this period – including the Well Woman Centre, Women's Aid, AIM, Adapt, Rape Crisis Centre and Cherish – many of which were set up by women who were members of the Council for the Status of Women, the IWLM and IWU.

Although autonomous, specifically radical, feminist organizations were short lived during the 1970s, the ideology of radical feminism had a tremendous impact on awakening the consciousness of Irish women.⁹⁰ It is evident that radical feminists (a substantial number of whom were part of this interview sample) went on to participate in newly formed SMOs and within the mainstream during the 1980s. The interweaving and fusion of both styles of activism – mainstream and autonomous – which advanced the movement as a whole during the 1970s laid the foundations for mainstreaming. However, the death of radicalism was far from imminent:

If anything in the mid-1970s we suffered from a lack of understanding about how to mainstream feminism and a lack of political expertise. I think you have to mainstream because you have to get into the institutions of power and you have to change and turn them around. . . . I also want fundamental change so you need both. . . . I see those who joined the established political parties as pure reformists. I think the radicals were in IWU and then were diffused into different things – initiatives like Rape Crisis Centre, Women's Aid, pregnancy counselling centre which achieved its greatest prominence when it was run by Ruth Riddick. It was established two years before that by a collective of women, I was involved in that. And we really sought to push the boat out. We had won the argument about legalization of contraception in '79, albeit in a very distorted way and we felt now is the time to push the boat out. The right wing copped on very quickly because they came back with their strategy of a constitutional amendment. We were trying to move strategically and they responded strategically. The women were there – they were diffused into different initiatives.⁹¹

Re-appraisal 1980–1988

After a period of intense, radical, activity on several fronts, some sectors of the women's movement went into temporary retreat during the 1980s, which led to intra-movement re-appraisal. This contributed to the general mainstreaming of the movement.

The lack of ongoing research and analysis contributes to the prevailing conceptions of the women's movement – which fail to acknowledge the evolution, transformation and consolidation of the contemporary women's movement.⁹² This is reflected in the fact that the women's movement is still discussed in terms of the original branches of the early 1970s, ignoring the subsequent changing structures and proliferation of feminist ideologies (which extended beyond liberal, radical and socialist feminism). As Ryan states: 'There is little recognition of a growing feminist consciousness or of movement transformation when writers concentrate on where women came from rather than where they are aiming to go'.⁹³

The early 1980s saw a rapid decrease in the number of SMOs being formed and the characteristic direct action of the women's movement. The economic climate of deepening recession, endemic unemployment

and emigration,⁹⁴ which resulted in a lack of resources and sweeping government cutbacks, was a tangible constraint for many feminist SMOs (particularly service organizations such as the Well Woman Centres, Women's Aid and the Rape Crisis Centre which are vastly under-resourced). The changed economic and political climate set the context for other movement set-backs during the 1980s. The anti-abortion movement escalated and hardened its tactics globally in the early 1980s. In the US, anti-abortion activists bombed abortion clinics, picketed clinics, and publicly dissuaded women from having abortions.⁹⁵

The transformation of the women's movement in the 1980s is based largely on three dynamics:

1. The constraints on the radicalism of the women's movement which became manifest in the 1983 abortion referendum;
2. The emergence of a counter-right movement;
3. The effects of increased mainstreaming, professionalization and institutionalization of movement sectors.

Prior to 1981, when the abortion question gathered momentum, there had never been a public, comprehensive debate on abortion in the political arena in Ireland.⁹⁶ Irish women have gone to the UK for abortions throughout this century. Today, it is estimated that approximately 5,000 women travel each year to England for abortions.⁹⁷ Of all the social morality questions to emerge in the past two decades, abortion is perhaps the most divisive issue both with the women's movement (contrary to the consensual image of feminism on the question of abortion portrayed in the media) and in Irish society in general. Few women's organizations actually confronted it as a feminist issue, apart from the Women's Right to Choose group. The unwillingness to tackle this issue in the other SMOs was reflected in the defeat of 1983.

In late 1979, a small group of Irish feminists proclaimed themselves the 'Women's Right to Choose Group'.⁹⁸ The principal aims of the group were the decriminalization of abortion and the establishment of a feminist pregnancy counselling service for women in crisis.⁹⁹ The establishment of a counselling service was achieved with the opening of the Irish Pregnancy Counselling Centre in June 1980. In March 1981 a public meeting was held at Liberty Hall by the group. This provided the first evidence of organized opposition and hostility. There were counter pickets to the meeting and the audience was antagonistic to the pro-choice platform. Ruth Riddick spontaneously addressed the meeting from the back of the hall as an ordinary member of the public

A woman, who admitted to having an abortion, spoke out strongly in favour of a woman's right to control her own body last night. Ruth Riddick said that the men of this country are not enlightened enough, or chose not to be, when it comes to the question of taking positive

steps to avoid pregnancy. They have a right to choose whether they will take responsibility for their actions or not. So why should the basic right of control of one's body be denied to women, she asked.¹⁰⁰

Ruth Riddick quickly became a key figure in the pro-choice movement.¹⁰¹ She is an example of a second-generation feminist of the contemporary women's movement, the first generation provided the impetus in 1979 which was carried through the early 1980s by a new influx of such women:

Through this involvement I have come to realise just how significant the question of fertility control is to women's everyday lives and also to see the political importance of offering woman-to-woman help, a 'self-help' process which the women's movement had developed in the 1970s in such groups and campaigns as the establishment of birth control services, the rape crisis centres and the refuges for women survivors of domestic violence. While this has been a richly rewarding experience personally, the years since 1981 have been particularly difficult for reproductive rights in Ireland. . . .¹⁰²

The counter-right forced the issue of abortion into the legal/constitutional arena, in their attempt to block the women's movement from providing its services, by actively seeking a constitutional referendum. It was suggested by one member of the Right to Choose group that prior to this the counter-right was:

*. . . under the surface, it wasn't identified as an organized political force, you couldn't engage with it . . . its public consolidation has been a very positive thing, it's identifiable now and people can make choices and decisions and have discussions. We can engage with them, confront them, expose them.*¹⁰³

Subsequent conservative groups focused on divorce, homosexuality and sex education, and other areas of social reform. Abortion was very emotive and divisive both within the women's movement itself and in Irish society:

The Anti-amendment campaign represented a new era characterised by outright confrontation, formal co-ordination between groups and individuals and a focus on abortion, an issue on which the reproductive rights movement had less power and much disunity. As a result, the success of the PLACs campaign saw the demoralisation and partial defeat of a movement that had achieved so much in the previous decade.¹⁰⁴

Abortion as a radical feminist issue was important because it directly concerned a woman's *autonomous* right to control her own fertility.¹⁰⁵ The strategic response by radical feminists after 1983 contrasted directly with the autonomous, direct-action tactics of radical SMOs of the 1970s. These women had to re-appraise their position

and become legally astute because the 'battle' was almost completely fought in the courts and resources had to be found to do this.

In June 1985 SPUC (Society for the Protection of Unborn Children, the leading anti-abortion organization in Ireland) issued civil proceedings against the Irish Pregnancy Counselling Service and subsequently Open Door Counselling and the Dublin Well Woman Centre. They argued that the provision of non-directive counselling was counter to the constitutional guarantee afforded to the unborn in Article 40.3.3 of the Constitution. On 19 December 1986 the president of the High Court declared:

The right to life of the foetus, the unborn, is afforded statutory protection from the date of its conception. . . . The qualified right to privacy, the rights of association and freedom of expression and the right to disseminate information cannot be invoked to interfere with such a fundamental right.¹⁰⁶

It was no longer possible to offer a service in counselling premises and as a temporary measure, the Open Line telephone helpline (Ruth Riddick's home number) was established in January 1987 to provide information and counselling. Open Door Counselling subsequently appealed to the Supreme Court, with judgment delivered in February 1988. The existing criminal law was extended to add a further abortion offence – that of prohibiting professional service providers from giving practical information to women seeking legal abortion outside the jurisdiction.¹⁰⁷

These cases (between 1985 and 1988) were extremely demoralizing for the core cadre of radical activists within the women's movement. However, following this order, Open Door Counselling appealed to the European Court of Human Rights, of which Ireland is a signatory of its convention. On 29 October 1992, it found that the order issued by the Irish courts was in breach of the convention's information rights clause, Article 10.¹⁰⁸

This judgment was the result of 'eight years of legal wrangling and five years' curtailment of much needed services for women'.¹⁰⁹ Following another constitutional referendum on 25 November 1992, the electorate voted for the freedom to obtain information and the right to travel. Open Door Counselling subsequently initiated proceedings to have the restraining order of the Supreme Court lifted in order to restore services.

It is apparent that the short-term legal-constitutional set-backs of the 1980s were in fact reversed quickly in 1992 following a ruling of the European Court of Human Rights and a change of public attitude in relation to the activities of the pro-choice SMO occurred (including electoral support for abortion information and right to travel referenda in 1992, following the constitutional dilemma posed by the X case). In congruence with this, according to Useem and Zald the movement-counter-movement relation highlights that:

... it would be possible for movements to be quite successful in winning specific battles or policies, yet to lose in the long run. Conversely, many of the short-run battles may be lost, but in the long run the grounds of decision-making are radically changed.¹¹⁰

Other constraints on radicalism included the personal exhaustion of radical activists since the 1970s and the demoralization following the defeat of the referendum in 1983, in particular, and the 'no' vote on divorce in 1986:

I believe that the defeat in '83 and in '86 did much to demoralize the next generation – the radical women. I mean, I came in 70/75. The next decade of younger women suffered a severe blow to their morale politically. . . . There was an acceleration of emigration in the early 1980s and I think the radical feminist movement actually suffered because of that.¹¹¹

What is crucial about the development of a counter-movement (which first consolidated publicly in the guise of the pro-life campaign in Ireland) is that it forces an interaction with the social movement – there is a cascade of change as movement and counter-movement learn from each other, develop new tactics and meet with success or failure.¹¹² Thus, whereas equal rights feminists encouraged mainstream participation and alliances with the state since the 1970s, the emergence of a counter-right forced radical feminists to engage increasingly in the mainstream, particularly through the courts.

The abortion question coincided with the change of direction in the women's movement as a whole in the 1980s, which included the increased participation of women in politics, many of whom campaigned for legal changes on a range of issues of concern to women.¹¹³ The impetus of individual women through the courts (for example, Eileen Flynn took a case to the High Court in 1985 against her sacking from her teaching job after becoming pregnant outside marriage) and a number of highly publicized tragedies (the death of Anne Lovett; Joanna Hayes and the Kerry Babies Case) fomented a more sympathetic climate for the women's movement and its aims. Furthermore, during this period the CSW persisted, mainstreamed and consolidated its position as the chief interest group representing women.

However, in general, movement activists describe the 1980s as a period of 'demoralization'. Whereas certain abeyance processes are identifiable in this stage, it is by no means on the same scale as between 1922 and '69. Firstly, the consolidation of radical feminism ensured a widespread, diffuse, silent women's movement that was absent in the post-independence period – which could be tapped into in times of need. Secondly, the politics and ideology of radical feminism influenced the movement as a whole and became more mainstreamed in response to the constraints it met. In particular, the original more moderate SMOs took on the mobilizing issues and strategies of radical feminism during the

1980s (sexual violence, for example). Feminists concentrated their social movement commitments within the institutions of the state.¹¹⁴ Thirdly, while it is true to say that the overall level of advancement of the movement was severely constrained in comparison with the 1970s, the movement was still growing (albeit on a smaller scale) and new SMOs were being formed in new movement sectors by the end of the 1980s.

These observations on the Irish women's movement have parallels in the analysis of women's movements by other resource mobilization theorists. For example, Ferree and Hess found diverse feminist groups in the 1980s interacting in a complementary rather than a competitive fashion.¹¹⁵ Chafetz and Dworkin suggest that convergence between the two original divisions coined in the early 1970s took place much earlier than the literature on the women's movement acknowledges.¹¹⁶ The central point here is that, since 1970, the two coalescing styles of activism – equal rights and radicalism – have been characterized by ideological, tactical, and organizational diversity *with common themes, concepts and goals*.¹¹⁷ It is this cohesive element that ensured the continuance of a collective, vibrant women's movement into the 1980s and 1990s.

The intense mainstreaming of the movement as a whole which culminated in the 1980s – both in terms of its strategic responses and direct participation within the state's institutions – signalled progression for the movement as a whole. How the movement became more generically radicalized as a social movement by the mid-1980s implies that the methods and tactics of radical feminism became more diffuse and less concentrated in one movement sector, as was the case with the 1970s. As a result, autonomous radical feminism also became more dilute. Ideologies are present in every social movement by definition. However, one of the principal transformations within the women's movement in the 1980s was that the use of ideology as a resource for maintaining group identity and cohesion declined. This is partly as a result of the retreat of autonomous, radical feminist groups which were so characteristic of the women's movement during the 1970s.

A concrete sign of the widespread diffusion of feminist values by the late 1980s is reflected in the fact that selective incentives motivated individual women who were not members of the core SMOs. These concentrated their social movement commitments in individual areas – in the establishment of Women's Studies departments in Irish universities and in the publication of Irish feminist texts, in the formation of community groups, and in individual careers.

New Directions

Following the demoralization of the early 1980s, by the end of the 1980s a general revival of the movement had taken place. A number of

movement successes were important symbolically, including the election of Mary Robinson as president of Ireland in 1990, the European Court's ruling in favour of Open Door Counselling in 1992, the election of twenty women to the Dáil in 1992, and the report of the Second Commission on the Status of Women in 1993. The alliance strategy present between the CSW (National Women's Council) and the State persists and has resulted in its further institutionalisation:

There is no automatic right of consultation or obligation on any Government Department to adopt the recommendations of women's organisations. However, the Council for the Status of Women, which is an umbrella body for all women's organisations, does hold discussions with Ministers and Government Departments. The Council is a permanent body.¹¹⁸

There are, however, three significant new directions evident since the late 1980s, only now becoming manifest:

1. The 'mushrooming' of community based women's groups;
2. The consolidation of Women's Studies in Irish universities and;
3. The tremendous growth in Women's publishing.

The observations here are speculative. Women's publishing has evolved side by side with the growth of Women's Studies as a discipline in Ireland.¹¹⁹ Women's Studies programmes primarily operate within the university structure and are for the most part under-resourced and voluntarily maintained. Sasha Roseneil makes some interesting observations.¹²⁰ Many feminist academics move continuously between and across the boundaries of their own discipline and Women's Studies. They teach mainstream courses which are compulsory elements of undergraduate and postgraduate disciplines and also teach relatively autonomous courses both as options within their disciplines and within Women's Studies programmes. Roseneil contends that the integration/separation tension results partly from the location of feminism at the margin as a critique of mainstream academe and the fact that few lectureships are located entirely within Women's Studies. The challenge facing the autonomous enterprise of Women's Studies currently in the US is what Marilyn Frye terms 'curriculum integration' – the integration of work by women and people from minority groups into the standard college curriculum.¹²¹ This, she argues, results in tokenism and a process of colonization. While many feminist academics choose the dual role as Women's Studies continues to expand in Ireland, the tension between integration into the mainstream and autonomy is tangible. This presents a strategic challenge from within the women's movement – to endeavour to enhance the position of Irish Women's Studies autonomously or to continue to develop feminist research and theory simultaneously for a mainstream disciplinary audience and for a feminist audience, drawing on theoretical tools from both and seeking to contribute to both areas.¹²²

In practice, however, a wide variety of themes and experiences underpin the remit of Women's Studies, which is not exclusively confined to academe. Women's Studies is undertaken in a variety of contexts (particularly in adult education courses and community groups). Through its methods, which are based on the principles of consciousness-raising, it validates the diversity and eclecticism of women's *experiences*. Women's Studies is thus empowering, as well as posing a challenge to the academy. In addition, one of the major successes of the development of Women's Studies and women's publishing has been the vast array of literature and research, providing *evidence* of the manifestations of patriarchy in an Irish context.¹²³

The rapid growth of locally based women's groups is a most exciting development. New forms of structure and organization are emerging in the 1990s. These groups tend to be non-hierarchical, autonomous participatory and empowering. They are mainly based in working-class urban areas and their impact tends to be localized. However, there are also some groups recently formed in rural, peripheral areas. In terms of structure and methods of organization, such organizations resemble the small-group, consciousness-raising, radical women's sector which emerged in the 1970s.¹²⁴ Crucially, the emergence of this new sector is dominated by *working-class women*. Working-class women have been active in various SMOs since the 1970s, but not in such numbers.

There are two central analytical questions. Firstly, the organic link of these groups with the generic women's movement needs to be explored and established. The women's movement and the community sector have much to gain from their association with each other. Some women's groups are autonomous; some are highly interconnected and networked with the generic community groups movement; and others are interconnected to the state through its various funding programmes (including the NOW programme, the PESP Partnerships and Department of Social Welfare schemes). Secondly, the question of whether such groups are tackling structures is important. Locally based women's groups have for the most part focused on personal development and the high level of energy evident in these groups has not translated into bringing about structural change. Cris Mulvey's evaluation of the 'Allen Lane Foundation Programme' cited that only 13 per cent of the projects set out explicitly to develop women's analysis of their situations, to empower them to identify their root causes and to act collectively to bring about long-term structural change.¹²⁵

The emergence of this sector raises an important challenge to the manifestation of class in the internal practice of the women's movement. Mary Daly (who has written extensively on women and poverty) suggests that certain groups of women were by-passed by this current cycle of the women's movement:

Collectively, women have had significant achievements over the last twenty years. . . . The extent to which the lives of women on low incomes have significantly improved is far from certain, however. Class and gender forces ensure that general freedoms for women only very slowly affect life in poor communities.¹²⁶

The women's movement globally was precipitated by white, middle-class, college educated women. Social movements in general are precipitated by the bourgeois, college educated in society. However, the fact is that in the Irish case many activists were interested in the question of class (for example, activists in IWU). Many of the successes of the women's movement to date have benefited women of all classes. However, essentially the *distinct experience* of working-class women has not been *central* to the movement's agenda. The current upsurge in working-class women's groups is attempting to redress this:

I wasn't around 25 years ago . . . my contribution began in 1980 . . . I believe that 'feminism is alive and well and in constant danger' but actually thriving in working-class areas in Dublin. . . . It is a different kind of feminism, it is literally bread and butter issues, it is literally life and death issues that we are now facing on a daily basis.¹²⁷

It is not adequate to speak of the current developments in working-class communities without basing one's findings on the lived experiences of the women themselves. This is a frequent fault of academic discourse and research. There are women within this branch of the movement who are beginning to articulate the working-class perspective – in particular, Cathleen O'Neill and Kathleen Maher – and it is important to encourage the development of a body of critique literature (similar to that which emerged in the context of the black women's movement in Britain and the US). As already stated, however, the assertions here are largely speculative and the broader implications of the continuing 'mushrooming' of working-class women's groups are embryonic. The central point is that these autonomous developments pose an immense challenge from within the contemporary women's movement – which is now in the twenty-fifth year of this particular cycle of movement upsurge. The broader implications of the current mobilization of working-class women will become clearer by the late 1990s.

The 1990s thus marks the emergence of new SMOs and new challenges within the structures of the women's movement. It is an era in which feminism is less visible, however, but it is more pervasive and is still growing.

Conclusion

It is the case empirically that the women's movement in Ireland has existed as a social movement on a continuous basis since at least the

1850s. It is imperative that Irish academic work acknowledges the fact that women's collective activity has experienced periods of advance and decline, but has never in fact disappeared at any stage. In fact, during periods of low levels of activity the women's movement developed new structural forms in order to survive an increasingly non-receptive environment to its demands. Following a period of high energy and consolidation in the 1970s, and demoralization in the 1980s, the 1990s is a period of new developments, particularly in working-class communities. The movement continues to transform in an organic fashion.

Since 1970 two coalescing styles of activism – equal rights and radicalism – have been characterized by ideological, tactical, and organizational diversity with *common themes, concepts and goals*. Rosalind Delmar is correct in asserting that it now makes more sense to speak of a *plurality of feminisms* than of one. Many feminist texts are written as if there were 'true' and authentic feminism, unified and consistent over time and place.¹²⁸ The pivotal assertion in this article is that in practice the women movement is consistently redefining itself from within and there is no overwhelming reason to assume a universal, underlying feminist unity.

It is this diversity which is at the *core* and is the very essence of the evolving women's movement in Ireland.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks to Dr Mary Corcoran for her suggestions.

Notes

- 1 Verta Taylor and Nancy Whittier, 'The New Feminist Movement', in Laurel Richardson & Verta Taylor (eds.), *Feminist Frontiers III: Rethinking Sex, Gender and Society* (MacGraw Hill, US, 1992), pp. 533–48.
- 2 For a broad treatise of the resource mobilization perspective see: Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy, 'Resource Mobilization and Social Movement: A Partial Theory' (*American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 82: no. 6, 1977), pp. 1212–22; Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy (eds.), *Social Movements: An Organisational Society* (Transaction Books, New Brunswick, NJ, 1987); Stanford M. Lyman (ed.), *Social Movements: Critiques, Concepts, Case-Studies* (Macmillan, London, 1995).
- 3 Arriving at this point of theorizing has been partly achieved by the methodology employed for my Ph.D. research – over intensive interview with activists from a wide spectrum of movement organizations. My respondents and data are generally Dublin based, however, it is necessary to note that there are very active feminist organizations operating outside of Dublin (for example, the Cork Women's Collective).
- 4 Including: June Levine, *Sisters: The Personal Story of an Irish Feminist* (Ward River Press, Dublin, 1982); Ailbhe Smyth, 'The Women's Movement in the Republic of Ireland 1970–1990'; in Ailbhe Smyth, (ed.), *Irish Women's Studies Reader* (Attic Press, Dublin, 1993); Jenny Beale, *Women Ireland: Voices of Change* (Gill and Macmillan, Dublin, 1986).

- 5 Recent major works such as, J.J. Lee, *Ireland 1912–1985* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989), a much praised socio-historical account of Irish society, has no comprehensive reference to the women's movement, or indeed, women's contribution to the public sphere in general. This amplifies the need for intricate research and, the need to consolidate the archives of the contemporary women's movement.
- 6 The year 1970 marks the beginning of the contemporary women's movement in the Republic of Ireland, which is examined exclusively in this article (the year the First Commission on the Status of Women was appointed by the government and the IWLM 'Irishwomen's Liberation Movement' was formed). A social movements analysis of the women's movement in Northern Ireland, which followed its own distinct course, has not been undertaken to date (for a general treatise, see Eileen Evason, *Against the Grain: The Contemporary Women's Movement in Northern Ireland* (Attic Press, Dublin, 1991).
- 7 The methodology which I employed was influenced by the work of feminist sociologists such as: Anne Oakley, 'Interviewing Women: a contradiction in terms', in Helen Roberts (ed.), *Doing Feminist Research* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1981); Liz Stanley and Sue Wise, *Breaking Out Again: Feminist Epistemology and Standpoint* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1993). For a comprehensive review of work by Irish feminist sociologists in this field, see Ronit Lentini, 'Feminist Methodologies', *Irish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 3, March, 1994 and Evelyn Mahon's (*Irish Journal of Sociology*, April, 1995) reply which provides an excellent review of feminist qualitative methods, which are primarily reflexive and informal.
- 8 Hilda Tweedy, *A Link in the Chain: The Story of the Irish Housewives' Association 1942–1992*, (Attic Press, Dublin, 1992), Carol Coulter, *The Hidden Tradition: Feminism, Women and Nationalism* (Cork University Press, Cork, 1993).
- 9 J.J. Lee, op. cit., 1989; Kieran A. Kennedy (ed.), *Ireland in Transition* (Mercier, Thomas Davis Lecture Series, Dublin, 1986).
- 10 Richard Breen et al., *Understanding Contemporary Ireland* (Gill and Macmillan, Dublin, 1990).
- 11 Drude Dahlerup (ed.), *The New Women's Movement: Feminism and Political Power in Europe and the US* (Sage, London, 1986), p. 2.
- 12 Ibid., p. 218.
- 13 Turner and Killian, *Collective Behaviour* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs NJ, 1957); Neil Smelser, *Theory of Collective Behaviour* (Free Press, New York, 1962).
- 14 Zald and McCarthy, op. cit.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 Maurice Pinard, *The Rise of a Third Party: A Study in Crisis Politics* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1971).
- 17 Dahlerup, op. cit., p. 2.
- 18 See: Rosemary Cullen-Owens, *Smashing Times: A History of the Irish Women's Suffrage Movement 1889–1922* (Attic Press, Dublin, 1984); Margaret Ward, *Unmanageable Revolutionaries: Women and Irish Nationalism* (Pluto, London, 1983); Cliona Murphy, *The Women's Suffrage Movement and Irish Society in the Early Twentieth Century* (Harvester, London, 1989); Mary Cullen, 'How radical was Irish feminism between 1860 and 1920?', in P.J. Corish (ed.), *Radicals, Rebels and Establishment* (Appletree Press, Belfast, 1985).
- 19 Margaret Andersen, *Thinking About Women: Sociologist and Feminist Perspectives on Sex and Gender* (Macmillan, New York, Third Edition 1993), pp. 282–85; Olive Banks, *Faces of Feminism* (Marlin Robertson, Oxford, 1981).
- 20 Coulter, op. cit., p. 20.
- 21 Ibid., p. 20.
- 22 For a more detailed discussion of the women's movement in this period, see: Margaret Ward, 'Conflicting Interests: The British and Irish Suffrage Movements', in Ailbhe Smyth et al., 'The Irish Issue: the British Question', *Feminist Review*, no. 50, summer, 1995), pp. 127–4; Sarah Benton, 'The Militarization of Politics in Ireland 1913–23', in Ailbhe Smyth et al., *ibid.*, pp. 143–72.
- 23 Coulter, op. cit., p. 27.
- 24 Ibid., p. 3.
- 25 'In particular the State recognises that by her life within the home, woman gives to the State a support without which the common good cannot be achieved'. (1937 Constitution of Ireland, Article 41.2.1) 'The state shall, therefore, endeavour to ensure that mothers shall not be obliged by economic necessity to engage in labour to the neglect of their duties in the home.' (Article 41.2.2).
- 26 Tweedy, op. cit., p. 7.
- 27 Liam O'Dowd, 'Church, State and Women: The Aftermath of Partition', in Chris Curtain et al., *Gender in Irish Society* (University College, Galway, 1987), p. 3.
- 28 Margaret Andersen, op. cit., pp. 282–83.
- 29 Turner and Killian, *Collective Behaviour*, op. cit.
- 29 Verta Taylor, 'Social Movement Continuity: The Women's Movement in Abeyance', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 54, 1989, p. 761.
- 31 Ibid., p. 772.
- 32 Ibid., p. 761.
- 33 Ibid., p. 761.
- 34 Tweedy, op. cit.
- 35 Interview (A): Founder member of the IHA and the Council for the Status of Women.
- 36 Interview (A).
- 37 Interview (A).
- 38 The IAW was formed in 1902 when American feminists including Elizabeth Stanton, Carrie Chapman Catt and Susan B. Anthony organized an international suffrage conference which was attended by delegates from ten countries.
- 39 Tweedy, op. cit., p. 112.
- 40 Interview (A).
- 41 Charles Tilly, 'Repertoires of Contention in America and Britain', in Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy (eds.), *The Dynamics of Social Movements, Resource Mobilization, Social Control and Tactics* (Cambridge, MA, Winthrop, 1979), pp. 126–55.
- 42 Interview (A).
- 43 Tweedy, op. cit. p. 8.

- 44 See J.J. Lee, op. cit., Breen et al., op. cit.
- 45 Breen et al., op. cit.
- 46 Barbara Ryan, *Feminism and the Women's Movement: Dynamics of Change in Social Movement Ideology and Activism* (Routledge, New York, London, 1992).
- 47 Ibid., p. 53–64.
- 48 Leah Fritz, *Dreamers and Dealers: An Intimate Appraisal of the Women's Movement* (Beacon Press, Boston MA, 1979).
- 49 Andersen, op. cit., pp. 282–85.
- 50 Ryan, op. cit., p. 67.
- 51 Ibid., p. 41.
- 52 Jo Freeman, *The Politics of Women's Liberation: A Case Study of an Emerging Social Movement and its Relation to the Policy Process* (Longman, New York, 1975).
- 53 Ryan, op. cit., p. 41.
- 54 B.G. Glaser and A. Strauss, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory* (Aldine, Chicago, 1967).
- 55 All interviewee quotes are in italics. To provide anonymity, I list a sample of some of the groups the interviewees are/were members of and differentiate those interviewees quoted from the sample by an initial. For the purposes of this article, I tend to quote at length those key interviewees who are long-time, core committed activists and have participated in a number of SMOs and campaigns since the 1970s.
- 56 For a summary of the early demands see 'Chains or Change', the first manifesto of the IWLM. June Levine's *Sisters* also provides a comprehensive personalized account of the activities of the IWLM in the early 1970s.
- 57 June Levine, (member of IWLM, journalist, author), speaking at the '25th Anniversary of the IWLM', WERRC Conference, UCD, May 1995.
- 58 Interview (B): Founder IWLM, socialist.
- 59 Interview (B).
- 60 For example, in 1974 Máirín de Burca and Mary Andersen (both journalists, members of IWLM and active in left-wing politics) took a case to the Supreme Court, claiming the 1927 Juries Act (which banned women from sitting on juries) unconstitutional. In contrast, the National Association of Widows were represented on the *ad hoc* committee and the first Council for the Status of Women. However, widows were in fact important activists in the women's movement in the guise of the National Association of Widows, founded in 1967 by calling a public meeting. Their direction-action tactics including a march to Liberty Hall in 1972 followed by a mass meeting as well as yearly budget submissions and extensive political lobbying.
- 61 Interview (C): former director of the Well Woman Centre, Woman's Right to Choose.
- 62 Nuala Fennell (freelance journalist and subsequent minister of state for Women's Affairs), Mary McCutchan (women's editor of the *Irish Independent*), June Levine (freelance journalist and writer), Janet Martin (journalist, *Irish Independent*), Mary Anderson (journalist, *Irish Independent*), Bernadette Quinn (journalist) and Nell McCafferty (journalist *The Irish Times*).
- 63 Catherine Rose, *The Female Experience: The Story of the Woman Movement in Ireland* (Arlen Press, Galway, 1974), p. 78.
- 64 Levine, op. cit., p. 160.
- 65 Ibid., p. 161.
- 66 Interview (B).
- 67 Interview (B).
- 68 Nuala Fennell, *Irishwomen Into Focus: The Road to Equal Opportunity: A Narrative History* (Office of the Minister of State for Women's Affairs, 1987), p. 10.
- 69 Dahlerup, op. cit., p. 218.
- 70 Anthony Oberschall, *Social Conflict and Social Movements* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1973).
- 71 William A. Gamson, *The Strategy of Social Protest* (The Dorsey Press, Homewood, IL, 1975), pp. 66–71.
- 72 Maren Lockwood Carden, 'The Proliferation of a Social Movement: Ideology and Individual Incentives in the Contemporary Feminist Movement', in Kriesberg (ed.), *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change Vol. 1*, (JAI Press, 1978), pp. 179–96.
- 73 Carden, 1978, p. 184, suggests that women participate in the women's movement because they are committed to the new feminist ideology – they find it personally rewarding and try to resolve the frustrations and conflicts inherent in the traditional female role. Intellectually and emotionally they become convinced that the traditional role of women is wrong and the role should be expanded, and situate this experience in a general ideological framework.
- 74 Ibid., p. 187.
- 75 Ibid.
- 76 Ibid.
- 77 Oberschall, op. cit.
- 78 Fennell, op. cit., p. 11.
- 79 Interview (D): IWU, founder Rape Crisis Centre.
- 80 Vicki Randall and Joni Lovenduski, *Contemporary Feminist Politics: Women and Power in Britain* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1993).
- 81 Ryan, op. cit., p. 49.
- 82 Homosexuality was not decriminalized in Irish law until 1993.
- 83 Fennell, op. cit., p. 12.
- 84 Interview (E): IWU, Rape Crisis Centre, Woman's Right to Choose.
- 85 Interview (D).
- 86 Fennell, op. cit., p. 12.
- 87 Interview (D).
- 88 Interview (D).
- 89 Interview (D).
- 90 Rose, op. cit.
- 91 Interview (F): Member of IWU, CAP, Women's Right to Choose, Republican feminist.
- 92 Andersen, op. cit.; Banks, op. cit.; Fritz, op. cit.
- 93 Barbara Ryan, op. cit., p. 66.
- 94 See Kennedy et al., 1986.
- 95 Ryan, op. cit., pp. 144–52.
- 96 Pauline Conroy Jackson, 'Women's movement and abortion: the criminalization of Irish women', in Drude Dahlerun, *The New Women's Movement: Feminism and Political Power in Europe and the US* (Sage,

- London, 1986), p. 52; 'Outside the Jurisdiction: Irish Women Seeking Abortion', in Curtain et al., *Gender in Irish Society*, (Galway University Press 1987), pp. 203–23.
- 97 Source: Women's Information Network (WIN).
- 98 Partial reform regarding access to contraception was not introduced until 1979 under the Health (Family Planning) Act. Article 10 of this Act stated that:
Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorising
(a) the procuring of abortion;
(b) the doing of any other thing; the doing of which is prohibited by Sections 58 or 59 of the Offence Against the Person Act 1861; or
(c) the sale, importation into the State, manufacture, advertising or display of abortifacients.
Source: Ruth Riddick, 'Abortion and the Law in the Republic of Ireland: An Overview 1861–1993' (An address to the New England School of Law, Boston, Massachusetts, 1993).
- 99 Riddick, op. cit.
- 100 *The Evening Herald*, Wednesday 11 March, 1981.
- 101 Ruth Riddick went on to become administrator of the First Irish Pregnancy Counselling Centre, later became director of Open Door Counselling and recently education officer with the Irish Family Planning Association (the national affiliate of the International Planned Parenthood Federation).
- 102 Riddick, op. cit.
- 103 Interview (F).
- 104 Ursula Barry, 'Movement, Change and Reaction: The struggle over reproductive rights in Ireland', in Ailbhe Smyth (ed.), *The Abortion Papers Ireland* (Attic Press, Dublin, 1992), p. 115.
- 105 It is perhaps similar to suffrage as a unitary mobilizing issue for the women's movement, because it focuses on women's autonomy as independent subjects.
- 106 High Court Record, No. 1985/5652P in Riddick, 1983.
- 107 The Court doth declare that the activities of the Defendants, their servants or agents in assisting women within the jurisdiction to travel abroad to obtain abortions by referral to a clinic; by the making of their travel arrangements, or by informing them of the identify of and location of and method of communication with a specified clinic or clinics are unlawful, having regard to the provisions of Article 40.3.3 of the Constitution.
And it is ordered that the Defendants and each of them and each of their servants or agents be perpetually restrained from assisting pregnant women within the jurisdiction to travel abroad to obtain abortions by referral to a clinic, by the making for them of travel arrangements, or by informing them of the identity and location of and the method of communication with a specified clinic or clinics or otherwise. (Supreme Court Record No. 185/77) in Riddick, 1983.
- 108 'Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and without frontiers.'
- 109 Riddick, op. cit.
- 110 Bert Useem and Mayer N. Zald, 'Movement and Countermovement Interaction: Mobilization, Tactics, and State Involvement', in Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy, *Social Movements in an Organisational Society* (Transaction Books, New Brunswick, NJ, 1987), pp. 2477–72.
- 111 Interview (F).
- 112 Useem and Zald, op. cit., p. 269.
- 113 In the November 1982 election fourteen women were elected to the Dáil, including Monica Barnes (Fine Gael), Gemma Hussey (Fine Gael), Nuala Fennell (Fine Gael) who were involved in various SMOs (including IWLM, AIM, Women's Aid and the Women's Political Association).
- 114 For example, Nuala Fennell became the first minister of state at the Department of Women's Affairs established at the Department of the Taoiseach in 1982 and Gemma Hussey was appointed minister for education.
- 115 Myra Marx Ferree and Beth B. Hess, *Controversy and Coalition: the New Feminist Movement* (Twayne Publishers, Boston, MA, 1985).
- 116 Janet Saltzman Chafetz and Anthony Dworkin, *Female Revolt: Women's Movements in World and Historical Perspective* (Rowman and Allanheld, Totowa, 1986).
- 117 Ryan, op. cit.
- 118 The Stationary Office, Report of the Second Commission on the Status of Women (Government Publications Office, Dublin, 1993), p. 389.
- 119 Attic Press is an important feminist publisher and has published crucial texts by Irish women. The life history of Attic is indicative of the legacy of women's organizing. It grew out of the Women's Community Press which was implemented by Irish Feminist Information (the Women in Community Publishing training course for unemployed women was funded by an ANCO scheme – the Industrial Training Authority – and European Social Funding in 1984), which included a previous member of the IWLM, and subsequently expanded into a professional organization.
- 120 Sasha Roseneil, 'The coming of age of feminist sociology', *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 46, no. 2, June 1995, pp. 191–205.
- 121 *Ibid.*, p. 194.
- 122 *Ibid.*, p. 195.
- 123 See: Anne Byrne et al., 'Inventing and Teaching Women's Studies: Considering Feminist Pedagogy', this issue of the *Irish Journal of Feminist Studies*.
- 124 Tom Collins, *Power, Participation and Exclusion* (CMRS, Dublin, 1992).
- 125 Cris Mulvey, *Changing the View; Summary of the Evaluation Report on the Allen Lane Foundation's Programme for Women's Groups in Ireland 1989–1991* (Dublin, 1992), pp. 4–5.
- 126 Mary Daly, *Women and Poverty* (Attic Press, Dublin, 1989), p. 100.
- 127 Cathleen O'Neill, founder of KLEAR, address to WERRC Conference, UCD, May 1995.
- 128 Rosalind Delmar, 'What is Feminism?', in Juliet Mitchell and Anne Oakley (eds.), *What is Feminism?* (Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 1986), pp. 8–22.