Borstal in Clonmel: The Institution and its Inmates, 1906-1914[1]

Conor Reidy

How hard is my fortune
And vain my repining
The strong rope of fate
For this young neck is twining
My strength is departed
My cheek sunk and sallow
While I languish in chains
In the gaol of Cluain Meala[2]

Introduction

For the greater part of the nineteenth century, the judicial system in Ireland and England struggled with the problem of how to treat juvenile offenders. The imprisonment of children in the same environment as adult convicts had long been deemed morally and practically undesirable. The introduction of the reformatory school system to Ireland in 1858 and industrial schools a decade later, alleviated but did not solve the problem. By 1880 there were still over one thousand children incarcerated in Irish convict prisons; approximately one hundred and fifty were under twelve years old.[3] The introduction of the borstal system to Ireland in 1906 heralded a new era as penal policymakers recognised the need for a tailor-made system specifically designed to treat juvenile male offenders. Notwithstanding a renewed focus of attention during the second half of the nineteenth century, there has been limited historical research on the problem of juvenile crime in Ireland. In those studies that do examine the problem, there is often little or no reference to Clonmel borstal institution, despite it being the first and for fifty years, the only such establishment in what is now the Republic of Ireland.[4] This paper will examine the early years of the borstal institution at Clonmel and assess the key role played by the local community in the lives of the inmates, both during and after their incarceration.

Background to the Introduction of the Borstal System to Ireland

At the turn of the twentieth century, Ireland was at a turning point. The process of modernisation was often painful. The population decline of the late nineteenth century had been reduced. It was a period of great change too in education with a steady increase in the numbers attending school. Yet, agriculture remained the dominant occupation at the beginning of the twentieth century. The declining population brought about a move away from human labour towards a reliance on horsepower. Machinery was more widely used and

creameries and co-operatives replaced traditional production methods.[5] Indeed, Ireland's economic focus generally shifted away from those traditional methods of production and embraced a more commercially driven approach. This resulted in an improvement in living standards but it did leave the Irish economy in a weak position in the face of changes in the wider global market, where Ireland was not a significant player.[6] A large number of males were occupied as labourers in the late nineteenth century and many of those were engaged in farm work, but wages for these positions remained substantially lower than in England or Scotland.[7] Poverty remained a serious obstruction to societal development in early twentieth century Ireland. A long-standing consequence of social deprivation was the persistence of juvenile crime in the face of repeated attempts to take control the problem.

One of the most serious problems faced by the penal authorities in England and Ireland was the question of how to punish young offenders. The introduction of reformatories in 1858 represented a significant state intervention in the juvenile penal system. The reformatory was the place of detention for children between the ages of twelve and sixteen years who had been convicted of an offence. The system was undoubtedly a worthy alternative to prison, a place where the inmates could receive education and training in a way that had not previously been possible within the penal system. By 1911 there were five reformatories in Ireland with a total population of 668 inmates.[8]

A substantial portion of Irish children remained outside this new juvenile penal system however and by 1868 another type of institution was conceived. The Industrial School was a place not merely of punishment, but also of protection. Children under the age of fourteen years who were not criminals but were part of a criminal underworld could be detained. Such individuals were seen as being at risk, as were orphans, beggars and homeless children. Industrial schools provided an outlet for the philanthropic activities of the Catholic Church and serviced a very definite need in society. The 1911 census recorded sixty-six industrial schools in Ireland with a population of 8,709 inmates.[9] To further consolidate these changes, the Children Act of 1908 brought a formal end to the imprisonment of persons under the age of fourteen years. This legislation was aimed at the judiciary who had been widely criticised by philanthropic groups among others, for the practice of repeatedly sending children to adult prisons for short periods.[10]

The Borstal Idea: Theory to Reality

By the end of the nineteenth century, penal policy makers had came to recognise the incontrovertible reality that a fresh approach was needed to the now immovable problem of juvenile crime. A new system for treating juvenile males was first considered by the (British) Inter-Departmental Committee on prison administration in 1895. Its three principal findings were stark and reinforced the argument for change. Firstly, in the preceding year, 16,000 custodial sentences had been handed down to those under twenty-one years of age. Secondly, following such a sentence, a typical male had deteriorated in 'character and disposition'. Finally and significantly, the committee found that felonious tendencies emerged between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one years.[11] These facts would become central to the process that shaped a new form of institution that had its roots in an earlier penal innovation.

In 1854 a new Irish Convict Prisons board was set up with Sir Walter Crofton as its chairman. Under Crofton, the board developed a method of imprisonment known as the progressive stage system. A typical sentence combined four stages: solitary confinement, hard

labour, training and release on licence.[12] It was the intermediate or third stage that gained the most attention and was the inspiration for the Elmira Reformatory in New York State in 1876. This institution offered a new kind of prison regime to individuals between the ages of sixteen and thirty years. It was the prelude to a new phase of innovation in the treatment of the juvenile offender as it sought to individualise each boy and subject him to a programme of reform that was not possible in other institutions.

In 1897, the English Prison Commissioner, Sir Evelyn Ruggles-Brise, toured the Elmira Reformatory. He was seeking confirmation on certain aspects of that system in order to advance plans to create a new type of institution in England. The committee had recommended the foundation of such an institution and this was implemented in 1900 when eight young men were moved to a prison at Bedford and isolated from the adult prisoners.[13] A year later, just outside a village in Kent, a portion of the local convict prison was exclusively dedicated to the accommodation of males aged sixteen to twenty-one years old. The name of that village was Borstal and so began a new force in juvenile penal treatment that would survive and dominate that field for the greater part of the twentieth century.

Unlike any previous initiative, the borstal would focus to a large extent, on the problems and needs of the offender. Only those who had developed criminal tendencies or had kept company 'with persons of bad character' would be admitted to a borstal.[14] Prison and judicial authorities carefully examined each individual in order to determine an appropriate programme of rehabilitation and correction 'calculated to turn him into a useful member of society.'[15] The objective therefore was to take a young corrupt offender out of society and reverse his apparent downward spiral into a life of crime. Such was the success in England of this radical new treatment for young offenders, it was decided to extend the system to Ireland.

The Introduction of the Borstal System to Ireland

This country's borstal experiment began without any fanfare in the 'number two' prison at the County Gaol in Clonmel, in south Tipperary, in May 1906. The building had previously functioned as a female prison.[16] Between May 1906 and March 1907, eighteen boys were transferred to Clonmel from adult prisons in all parts of Ireland, including major urban centres such as Dublin and Belfast.[17] Prior to the arrival of the first inmates, a schoolroom, a recreation room and a carpenter's shop were provided, as well as accommodation for fifty-four boys.[18] In keeping with the philosophy of the founders of the system, juveniles and adults were held in complete separation.

Prior to the arrival of the borstal in Clonmel, the town was home to an array of different penal institutions that facilitated a number of categories of offenders. In the early nineteenth century there was a house of correction, a sheriff's gaol, a marshalsea for debtors, a house of industry (or workhouse) and a county gaol.[19] The original County Gaol was built in the late seventeenth century. In his book, *The History of Clonmel*, William P. Burke quotes one Sir Richard Cox who declared that the building was 'the strongest prison in Ireland at the time'. Due in no small part to poor management, the prison subsequently encountered a number of problems including overcrowding, disease and repeated successful attempts at escape.[20] The building encompassed forty-two large single cells, 198 smaller cells, twelve solitary cells, thirteen day rooms, sixteen work rooms and twenty-four yards. It was capable of housing around 340 prisoners at one time.[21] An 1828 report from the Inspectors-General

of Prisons in Ireland criticised the inadequacy of the County Gaol and so by 1830, a process of change was instigated which led to the reconstruction of the complex by 1835. This change, coupled with the introduction of the district asylum in 1834, saw the elimination of certain categories including criminals and lunatics from the gaol, leaving mostly the poor, infirm and orphans.[22] In 1906, a portion of the County Gaol was selected as the site of Ireland's first borstal institution. By August 1910, in a move indicative of an early success of the experiment in Ireland, all of the adult prisoners were transferred to other places of detention and Clonmel County Gaol in its entirety, was legally renamed as a borstal institution.[23]

The rededication of the County Gaol as an exclusively dedicated borstal institution in August 1910 marked a new dawn in Irish penal history. Young men from troubled backgrounds, who had fallen into lawless ways, were taken to a place that was designed to change their lives.[24] The highest proportion of inmates by far came from the major urbanised areas of Dublin and Belfast. Between August 1910 and December 1914 there were 235 inmates committed to Clonmel borstal. The counties with the highest representation tended to be those that also contained large urban centres. This five-year period saw sixty-nine juvenile male adults with Dublin as their last recorded residence enter the borstal.[25] This was by far the highest number of inmates from a single county. Antrim contributed the second highest number with fifty-nine committals. The Census of 1911 reports a population of three hundred and ninety thousand in Dublin and four hundred and eighty thousand in Belfast.[26] It is clear, therefore, that the borstal register reflected the national population and from this, a number of conclusions may be drawn.

Not surprisingly, inmates were more likely to emerge from cities because there were increased opportunities available there for the type of criminal acts in which they were predominantly engaged. While juvenile crime was not an exclusively urban phenomenon, these figures do give weight to the argument that discharged borstal inmates, particularly those from city areas, should be encouraged not to return to the original breeding ground of their criminal habits. The Borstal Association particularly advocated the country life for those under their care, claiming that proper agricultural training would transform a 'city cornerboy' into a decent farm labourer.[27]

Evidence indicates a dramatic decrease between the number of inmates from Antrim and Cork, the third largest county represented in the borstal. Eleven inmates from Cork entered during these years. It is curious to note that Cork city had a population of just seventy-six thousand in 1911 and was the third largest urban centre in Ireland, a fact that is replicated in the borstal population.[28] Louth and Tipperary each had ten young men incarcerated in Clonmel. Londonderry and Down followed with seven and six inmates respectively. Counties of the west and midlands were among those contributing the lowest numbers of inmates. Galway, Mayo, Sligo, Monaghan, Longford, Roscommon and Queen's County were among those contributing just one inmate between 1910 and 1914.[29] Twelve borstal inmates had their last address registered as 'no fixed' abode. A final category includes inmates from a variety of backgrounds including an industrial school, a reformatory and the military. There were just four inmates in this category.[30]

Larceny was by far the most common reason for borstal detention, with 171 convictions in Clonmel borstal. The number convicted was almost three times greater than the second most common offence. Forty-four of the inmates at Clonmel received convictions for breaking and entering. This was followed by the similar crime of housebreaking for which

twenty-four boys were incarcerated.[31] A likely distinction between both of these crimes is that those convicted of breaking and entering probably violated premises of a commercial rather than domestic nature. Fourteen inmates committed the crime of receiving. Offences of a sexual nature were perpetrated by eight of the boys. This is not a high figure but is considerably greater than a more mainstream offence such as burglary for example. In many ways the greatest misfortune of most of these inmates was to have been born into the wrong background.

Writing in 1911, the Attorney-General, Lord Justice Cherry commended the borstal institution for its success in educating the inmates. He claimed that most of the boys were committed with extremely poor literacy levels but many left with at least the ability to write a letter.[32] Many, according to Cherry, showed a distinct improvement in their literacy skills as they left. There was an efficient schoolmaster who taught boys up to the third standard of the National Board of Education.[33] In 1913, the Borstal Association reported that large, well-ventilated new schoolrooms had been added to the Clonmel complex.[34] If they were deemed suitable the boys could avail of training in a range of areas including carpentry, gardening, tailoring and shoemaking. There was also a library where inmates could enjoy books on history and travel, among others. The chaplain or visiting justices selected this material.[35] A 1911 memorandum from the General Prisons Board to the governor directs that special grade boys should be provided with copies of *Illustrated London News, Chambers Journal* and *Strand Magazine*.[36]

Daily Regime

The daily regime in the institution was designed to bring order and discipline into the lives of its previously obstreperous young subjects.[37] The inmates of Clonmel borstal had an early start to their day, rising at 6.30.am. Breakfast was served at 7.50.am and the various work or educational activities took place from 9.30.am to 12.20.pm. Inmates returned to their work from 2.pm to 4.30.pm. Boys in the ordinary grade were locked in for the night at 6.30.pm. Those in the special grade enjoyed an hour of recreation at that time and were locked in at 7.30.pm.[38] The daily routine was almost identical for all the boys but the evening brought some relief for those in special grade as they were granted an hour-long recreation period.[39] There was some variation to this routine at weekends but even this did not reduce the grim reality of the borstal day. Though the routine was often severe and always repetitive, it did contain most of the essential elements of the new penal reformatory that was envisaged by Ruggles-Brise and the Inter-Departmental Committee on Prisons over a decade earlier.

Aspects of borstal life often involved physical exertion and it was important that inmates were provided with the essential dietary requirements in order to meet these needs. Breakfast consisted of one and a half pints of stirabout and one pint of new milk. Stirabout contained a mixture of oatmeal and Indian meal. The dinner menu varied slightly each day though it always included four ounces of beef. This was accompanied on Wednesdays, Sundays and Thursdays for example, by sixteen ounces of potatoes. Bread and soup were also a regular feature of this meal. Supper was served daily at 4.30.pm and entailed ten ounces of bread and one pint of cocoa. Boys in the special grade experienced certain privileges on Sundays and Thursdays when they were allowed two ounces of golden syrup or jam with their supper. All the inmates received a half pint of milk with biscuit at lockup time.[40]

Despite the bleak surroundings and strict nature of their incarceration, the boys of Clonmel borstal did have the opportunity to experience some limited forms of recreational activity. As Osborough points out, such pursuits were not always possible, due to limited space.[41] Outdoor games and sports did not exist due to a lack of space. In fact the only potential scope for such activity came in the form of a small plot of ground about the size of a contemporary residential lawn. Its suitability as an exercise or games area was limited due to it being covered in dust during the summer and mud in winter.[42]

The development of indoor pursuits progressed over time at Clonmel borstal and provided the inmates with welcome relief from the banality of their daily routine.[43] The fourth annual report of the main aftercare body, the Borstal Association of Ireland, outlined a number of events that had been organised for inmates during the previous year. Mr Randáll K. Moore, a visiting justice, gave a lecture on 'his travels in far-off lands,' while his wife accompanied him with songs and music on a piano.[44] A visiting justice of Belfast prison, Mr W. H. McLaughlin, gave the inmates an oral and visual presentation on his visit to South Africa. Lectures were also given by Mr F.E. Hackett of the Royal College of Science on 'Electricity,' Professor Carpenter of the Zoological Gardens on 'Animal Life' and Dr P.J. McGinnis on 'Anatomy.'[45] Despite being enriched in these different ways, the problem remained that the boys were not getting adequate exposure to the one area that would most benefit them on leaving the institution, appropriate training.

The members of the Borstal Association of Ireland took up the issue of relevant practical training in their *Third Annual Report*, published in 1913. While there were a large number of enquiries from potential employers of discharged inmates, the lack of agricultural training was a constant impediment to future employment. The association argued that the type of training received at Clonmel, such as carpentry or tailoring, would be of minimal use to the boys once they had left the institution. The report was unrelenting in its criticism of what the board believed had become a major shortfall in the system at Clonmel. It highlighted a communication to the Chief Secretary of Ireland advocating the purchase of a 160-statute acre farm that had recently come on the market in the Clonmel area. The association went on to spell out the benefits of such training. Such activity, claimed the report, would be particularly advantageous for inmates from large urban centres. Proper training in farm work would lead them into well-paid employment and provide an incentive not to return to the negative influences of their previous lives in the city. These concerns not only serve to highlight the pro-active role of the Association but draw attention to the fact that even by 1914, the institution at Clonmel remained under-resourced and physically lacking in suitability for its purpose. It was often only through the work of the Borstal Association that the institution managed to thrive in the manner that it did.

The Borstal Association in Ireland

The first borstal association originated as the London Prison Visitors' Association, founded by Ruggles-Brise in 1901. Initially, the new body was primarily concerned with the adult convict prisons at Pentonville, Wandsworth and Wormwood Scrubs. However it was 'also charged with giving special attention' to the juvenile male adults at England's two experimental penal reformatories at Bedford and later, Borstal. This organisation evolved over the coming years and in 1904 its name was changed to The Borstal Association.[46] Initially, the association was merely a philanthropic body with no power to impose

conditions or restrictions on its subjects. It did receive official sanction with the passing of the Prevention of Crime Act in 1908, allowing for a more authoritative role. By the time the borstal system arrived in Ireland in 1906, the principles that would govern a similar aftercare body for this country had already been firmly established.

The Borstal Association of Ireland began life as the Clonmel Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society at a meeting in the town on 18 May 1906. The first chairman was the noted barrister and historian Richard Bagwell, DL, with Lord Donoughmore elected vice-chairman. Other founders included local magistrates, merchants, clergy and professionals.[47] Bagwell indicated a sense of guilt about the absence of such an organisation in the town already.[48] The establishment of the borstal institution presented both an opportunity and a challenge to the newly created Discharged Prisoner's Aid Society. The opportunity was open to create an organisation through which these noteworthy individuals could channel their philanthropic energies. The challenge lay in the fact that the borstal was new to Ireland and the society, like the General Prisons Board, would need to embrace an idea that had never been tried before. At political level, the General Prisons Board created that rules of this new system that was implemented at 'ground level' by the staff of the existing County Gaol at Clonmel. The new aftercare body emerged not from any existing structure but from the belief by a number of influential local philanthropists that an opportune moment had arrived for the creation of such an organisation.

The Prevention of Crime Act 1908 gave legislative standing to aftercare bodies such as the Borstal Association, thus paving the way for financial support from the Treasury.[49] However, for its day-to-day operations, it was dependant on the charity of ordinary individuals.[50] The annual reports of the Borstal Association name the various contributors and give an account of their donation. The problem faced by the association in Clonmel was the fact of its dependence on local financial support at a time when it served a national purpose. Boys from many parts of the country populated the borstal yet their aftercare was almost exclusively facilitated by the philanthropic endeavours of the community in the Clonmel area.[51] Members of the association repeatedly expressed their discontent with this situation and indeed it became a somewhat controversial issue. The Clonmel based newspaper, The Nationalist took up the case on numerous occasions criticising the local authorities and philanthropic groups, particularly of Dublin and Belfast for their indifference towards the work of the Association. Indeed an editorial in *The Irish Times* in July 1910 highlighted the work of the association and pointed out that 'those who really desire to help the poor when they most need it could not do better than support the work of the association.'[52] It was a clear endorsement for an organisation, which, as Osborough implies, battled to stay in existence in the early years.[53] The Second Annual Report of the renamed Borstal Association of Ireland gives some insight into the importance of receiving charitable contributions. An increase in donations during the year 1911-12 allowed the association to provide a wider degree of support to discharged inmates. For example, a £50 donation from Pembroke Irish Charities Fund or £10 from Lord Iveagh, allowed for the purchase of better clothing and footwear for the boys as they went into employment.[54]

It is not possible to establish with certainty, the extent to which the BAI influenced the day-to-day work of the institution at Clonmel. While the annual reports illustrate an acute awareness of the borstal and its operation, it seems there was limited 'hands-on' activity by the association members on a daily basis. There was at least one documented occasion when

a small gesture by the committee directly impinged on the lives of the inmates. During the winter of 1913-14, the association provided a gramophone 'which helped to relieve the tedium of confinement in the long winter evenings.'[55] Committee members visited the borstal on an ongoing basis to familiarise themselves with inmates being prepared for discharge on licence. Generally though, the association was more concerned with influencing borstal policy. Its reports contain critiques on a number of issues including sentencing policy, training of inmates and family life. It is likely that because of its unique position as an independent body with a strong connection to the borstal inmates, the association felt qualified to speak on such matters. In this respect it acted almost as an advisory body, both to the government and the judiciary.

The discharge of inmates was a joint undertaking between the Institution Board and the Borstal Association. During the first week of every month, the Board met to compile a list of those inmates 'who are expected to be fit for release on licence during the next month but two.'[56] For example, the board would meet in February to select inmates for discharge in May. The first two pages of a form, numbered 740, were filled in at the institution for each inmate and forwarded to the association. On receiving these forms, the association then began a process of visiting the homes and family members of inmates, as well as their previous employers. Towards the end of the first month the officers of the institution recorded their opinions on form 740 and returned it to the association. On the second Tuesday of the second month, members of the Borstal Association visited the inmate. On the third Tuesday of the following month, the association presented its report to the Visiting Committee of the General Prisons Board who examined 'the inmate as to his adherence to the arrangements proposed...' The Visiting Committee in turn, passed on its recommendations to the Prison Commissioners for a final decision.[57] If the boy was recommended for release on licence, he was discharged to the care of the Borstal Association.

While an accurate statistical survey of discharged inmates is not possible, an examination of the annual reports of the BAI does provide some account of the success rate or otherwise, of the system. The association's assessment appears to be largely based on information received from employers. For the year ending May 1912, forty-six out of fifty-four boys discharged were deemed to be 'doing well'.[58] A year later it was reported that seventy-seven boys had been released on licence and favourable reports had been received from sixty of their employers.[59] In its Fourth Annual Report, published in July 1914, the association gave an overall assessment of the progress of former borstal inmates released since the passing of the Prevention of Crime Act (1908). During that time, 387 boys were held at Clonmel borstal. Of that number, 229 were subsequently handed over to the care of the association, which located employment for the 'vast majority'. The report claimed that seventy-three per cent were known to be 'doing well', most working with farmers as untrained labourers.[60] Part of the problem of information gathering was that beyond the period of a boy's licence, the association had no legal grounds on which to investigate his circumstances. In most cases, this depended on the goodwill of an employer to furnish such information. Several examples of such successes were outlined in the reports.

In May 1912 the Borstal Association reported that many boys released as far back as five years previously, continued to make positive progress. In fact, twelve were already married. One former inmate who had been convicted of a 'serious offence and leading a bad life was now 'sober and well-conducted,' earning twenty-four shillings per week.' Another boy,

convicted of assault, had now obtained a position far from home and was earning twenty-two shillings per week 'for years past'. A third example told of a boy who had been taught shoemaking in the borstal and went on to work with a relative in the same trade. He was now 'in charge of a branch house' and sent a Christmas card to the borstal thanking the governor and officers for the way he was treated.[61] Several further examples were given in the report for the year 1913-14.

The association did not completely ignore the fact that the system inevitably produced a certain number of failures each year. In its 1912-13 report, it surveyed the progress of discharged inmates over the previous three years. Out of 154 boys, seven could not be traced but had not been reported for breaking the law. Twenty-two boys had either been sent to prison or returned to borstal while thirty were deemed unsatisfactory. Finally, twenty-two discharged inmates from this period were deemed 'absolute failures'.[62] Nothing is known of these individuals, making it impossible to ascertain why they did not respond favourably to borstal treatment.

Conclusion

Despite its obvious shortcomings, research to date shows that Clonmel borstal institution was indeed a success during its formative years. Success was measured by the ability of the institution to effectively face the challenge of reforming the young offenders before they matured into the next generation of hardened criminals. The evidence shows that the joint efforts of the institutions' staff and the officers of the Borstal Association of Ireland ensured that an overwhelming percentage of former inmates went on to become upright citizens leading honest and productive lives. This was, in a sense, a unique legacy bestowed upon the Irish penal system by the people of Clonmel. While Clonmel borstal was indeed a state-run institution serving a national purpose, there was little or no interest shown by individuals or groups outside of County Tipperary, in the extraordinary efforts of a small but energetic group of philanthropists, bent on reshaping the lives of those the rest of society seemed to ignore.

References

[1]This paper is part of a doctoral study conducted in the Department of History at the University of Limerick.
[2]Inscription at the site of the original main gate of Clonmel Gaol.
[3]S. J. Connolly, *The Oxford Companion to Irish History* (Oxford, 1998), p. 477.
[4]In *Borstal In Ireland: Custodial provision for the young adult offender 1906-1974*, Nial Osborough examined certain aspects of the institution at Clonmel and his work acts as a valuable secondary source for this study.
[5]S.J.Connolly, *The Oxford Companion to Irish History* (Oxford,1998), p. 9.
[6]Sean Duffy, *Atlas of Irish History* (Dublin, 2000), p. 104.
[7]Mary E. Daly, *Social and Economic History of Ireland Since 1800* (Dublin, 1981), p. 104.
[8]*Census of Ireland*, 1911.
[9]Joseph Robins, *The Lost Children: a Study of Charity Children in Ireland, 1700-1900* (Dublin, 1980), p. 302.
[10]Osborough, *Borstal In Ireland*, p. 3.
[11]R. R. Cherry, 'Juvenile Crime and its Prevention' in *Journal of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland*, 12 (1907-1912), p. 439.
[12]Connolly, *The Oxford Companion to Irish History* (Oxford, 1998), p. 463.
[13]Osborough, *Borstal In Ireland*, pp. 3-4.
[14]Cherry, 'Juvenile Crime and its Prevention', p. 440.
[15]Cherry, 'Juvenile Crime and its Prevention', p. 439.
[16]*The Nationalist*, 11 April 1906.
[17]Osborough, *Borstal in Ireland*, p. 7.

[18]Osborough, *Borstal in Ireland*, p. 10.
[19]Donal A. Murphy, *The Two Tipperarys* (Nenagh, 1994), p. 137.
[20]William P. Burke, *The History of Clonmel* (Waterford, 1983), p. 171.
[21]www.clonmel.ie/display.
[22]Murphy, *The Two Tipperarys*, p.137.
[23]Osborough, *Borstal in Ireland*, p. 11.
[24]Information on inmates was recorded in the Prison Register. Between 1906 and 1910, the names and profiles of borstal inmates were not recorded separately from the adult prisoners on the register, making them difficult to identify with certainty. It is not until the register reaches August 1910, when adult prisoners were removed from Clonmel prison, that a clear and accurate analysis of borstal inmates can take place.
[25]National Archives of Ireland, (hereafter NAI), Prison register, Clonmel prison and borstal institution 1903-1928 (1/7/14).
[26]*Census of Ireland*, 1911.
[27]NAI, Clonmel Borstal Memoranda, 1908-30, The Borstal Association of Ireland, (hereafter BAI) third annual report, 1912-1913.
[28]*Census of Ireland*, 1911.
[29]NAI, Prison register, Clonmel prison and borstal institution 1903-1928 (1/7/14).
[30]NAI, Prison register, Clonmel prison and borstal institution 1903-1928 (1/7/14).
[31]NAI, Prison register, Clonmel prison and borstal institution 1903-1928 (1/7/14).
[32]R.R.Cherry, 'Juvenile Crime and its Prevention' p. 444.
[33]*Ibid.*
[34]NAI, Clonmel Borstal Memoranda, 1908-30, *The Borstal Association of Ireland,Third Annual Report, 1912-1913.*
[35]R.R.Cherry, 'Juvenile Crime and its Prevention', p. 444.
[36]NAI, Clonmel Borstal Memoranda, 1908-30, *Supply of Periodicals.*
[36]Within the institution, inmates were divided into three categories or grades, Penal, Ordinary and Special. New inmates entered at ordinary grade and moved up or down according to their conduct. The penal grade was harsh, intended to be punitive towards disruptive inmates. Boys of exceptionally good behaviour and diligence found themselves in the more tolerable conditions of the special grade.
[38]Osborough, *Borstal in Ireland*, p. 64.
[39]Osborough, *Borstal in Ireland*, p. 64.
[40]NAI, Clonmel Borstal Memoranda, 1908-30, *Dietary for Male Inmates of Borstal Institutions*, 1913.
[41]Osborough, *Borstal in Ireland*, pp. 16.
[42]Edward Fahy, 'The boy criminal' in *The Bell*, 1:3 (1940), p. 47
[43]Osborough, *Borstal in Ireland*, p. 15.
[44]NAI, Clonmel Borstal Memoranda, 1908-30, *The Borstal Association of Ireland, fourth annual report, 1913-1914.*
[45]NAI, Clonmel Borstal Memoranda, 1908-30, *The Borstal Association of Ireland, fourth annual report, 1913-1914.*
[46]Roger Hood, *Borstal Reassessed* (London, 1965), p. 162-3.
[47]Osborough, *Borstal in Ireland*, p. 19-20.
[48]*Clonmel Nationalist*, 19 May, 1906.
[49]Cherry, 'Juvenile Crime and its Prevention', p. 446.
[50]Osborough, *Borstal in Ireland*, pp. 21.
[51]Cherry, 'Juvenile Crime and its Prevention', p. 446.
[52]Irish Times, 29 July, 1910.
[53]Osborough, Borstal in Ireland, p. 21.
[54]NAI, Clonmel Borstal Memoranda, 1908-32, BAI, second annual report, 1911-1912.
[55]NAI, Clonmel Borstal Memoranda, 1908-32, BAI, fourth annual report, 1913-1914.
[56]NAI, Clonmel Borstal Memoranda, 1908-32, Memorandum from Borstal Association, London, to Governor at Clonmel Borstal Institution: Method used at Borstal, January 1910.
[57]NAI, Clonmel Borstal Memoranda, 1908-32,Memorandum from Borstal Association, London, to Governor at Clonmel Borstal Institution: Method used at Borstal, January 1910.
[58]NAI, Clonmel Borstal Memoranda, 1908-32, BAI, second annual report, 1911-1912.
[59]NAI, Clonmel Borstal Memoranda, 1908-32, BAI, third annual report, 1912-1913.
[60]NAI, Clonmel Borstal Memoranda, 1908-32, BAI, fourth annual report, 1913-1914.
[61]NAI, Clonmel Borstal Memoranda, 1908-32, BAI, second annual report, 1911-1912.
[62]NAI, Clonmel Borstal Memoranda, 1908-32, BAI, third annual report, 1912-1913.