History Case Study:
The Impact of the EEC on Fisheries
Developing your students’ ability to think critically in history by exploring the issues of causation

Autumn 2016

Efforts have been made to trace and acknowledge copyright holders. In cases where a copyright has been inadvertently overlooked, the copyright holders are requested to contact info@pdst.ie

Note: Every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the historical data contained herein. Any inadvertent errors are regretted.
# CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study: <em>The impact of the EEC on fisheries</em></th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing your students’ ability to think critically by exploring issues of causation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The enquiry-focused approach</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking your work on the case study to the National Literacy Strategy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking your work on the case study to the National Numeracy Strategy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A contextual overview of the case study</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary of important terms: develop your historical literacy skills</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographical notes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline of important developments</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The First Programme for Economic Expansion:</em> a possible line of enquiry</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the proposed hook to introduce the case study</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enquiry, Stage 1: What was the state of Irish fisheries as Ireland joined the EEC?</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enquiry, Stage 2: What arrangements were put in place for Irish fisheries under the terms of accession to the EEC?</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enquiry, Stage 3:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) What challenges did Irish fishermen face following entry to the EEC?</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) How did politicians and their officials attempt to resolve these challenges?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enquiry, Stage 4: What were the implications for Irish fisheries of the 1983 common fisheries policy?</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enquiry, Stage 5: Drawing conclusions – the impact of the EEC on Irish fisheries</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A critical skills exercise</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography and useful websites</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your conclusions on the enquiry</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Developing your students’ ability to think critically in identifying the significance of an historical episode: The impact of the EEC on fisheries

In exploring the case study, The impact of the EEC on fisheries, students are looking at important issues of cause and effect e.g. what significant developments took place in Irish fisheries in the 1970s? What role did EEC membership play in these developments? In exploring issues of causation with students, we have a great opportunity to develop their ability to think critically, which is one of the stated objectives of the syllabus, and an increasingly cherished aim of senior cycle education.

At previous history in-service sessions, it has been argued that some of the best ways in which students’ critical thinking can be generated include:

- the use of the enquiry-focused approach
- the use of ‘critical skills’ exercises that involve group discussion and judgement-forming

Both approaches are drawn on in the following exploration of the case study.

The enquiry-focused approach

The enquiry-focused approach involves organising a set of lessons around an enquiry question on which the teaching and learning activities are focused. It aims to give a clear focus to a series of lessons, to clarify for all concerned what the learning purposes are and to ensure that the sequence of lessons is leading to improved understanding on the part of the students.

In her book, The Twentieth Century World (The Historical Association, 1997), Christine Counsell outlines the rationale behind the approach. The following is an edited extract:

Choosing a sequence of interesting historical enquiries gives a clear focus to any scheme of work. This approach has a number of advantages:

(i) It prevents a superficial run through the content and leads pupils into deeper levels of historical understanding.
(ii) It allows students to engage in real historical debate. Historians usually begin with a question.
(iii) It motivates students by giving a clear focus to their work. Identifying key questions is a powerful way of ‘sharing clarity with learners’. Teachers are thus reinforcing that the whole point of a sequence of lessons or activities is to build towards some attempt at answering the question. Some teachers who use this approach will refer to such a question in every single lesson. Pupils are constantly reminded of what they are trying to do and why.
(iv) Key questions can shape and limit an otherwise sprawling content.
(v) It encourages pupils to produce more substantial and significant outcomes at the end of a section of work. (pp.30-31)
Linking your work on the case study to the National Literacy Strategy

The following quote comes from *Literacy and Numeracy for Learning and Life: The National Strategy to Improve Literacy and Numeracy among Children and Young People* (Department of Education and Skills, 2011, p.8)

Traditionally we have thought about literacy as the skills of reading and writing, but today our understanding of literacy encompasses much more than that. Literacy includes the capacity to read, understand and critically appreciate various forms of communication including spoken language, printed text, broadcast media, and digital media. Throughout this document, when we refer to "literacy" we mean this broader understanding of the skill, including speaking and listening, as well as communication using not only traditional writing and print but also digital media.

The student activities set down in this resource are designed to improve students’ “capacity to read, understand and critically appreciate various forms of communication including spoken language, printed text, broadcast media, and digital media.”

As the literacy strategy makes clear, a key element in developing literacy is promoting students’ listening, talking, reading and writing skills, as well as their ability to critically assess visual images and other broadcast material. Some of the ways in which material from this booklet can be used to achieve these objectives are as follows:

- The video clip can be used to encourage students to watch and listen carefully, and the issues it raises can form the basis of critical reflection drawing on the other two introductory documents, the interview extract and the map.

- The questions/points for discussion that follow the sources are intended to form the basis for purposeful discussion among students and educative interaction between teacher and students. As well as promoting literacy, the teaching and learning conversation which this type of interaction underlies is a key component of all strategies for promoting assessment for learning in the classroom.

- The enquiry approach exemplified in this resource is designed to keep the learning outcomes constantly in the forefront of students’ minds. This is important in all strategies to improve literacy and is a key component of strategies for assessment for learning.

- The critical skills exercise is a type of card sorting exercise which helps to develop students listening and oral skills, as well as the ability to think critically.

- The importance of consolidating learning through carefully-designed written tasks is fundamental to student learning. The enquiry approach exemplified here concludes with an activity for students: ‘Your conclusions on the enquiry”. Also, some of the ‘Questions and points for discussion’ set down for each stage of the enquiry can be used as the basis for written tasks as deemed appropriate by the teacher.
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Linking your work on the case study to the National Numeracy Strategy

The following quote comes from Literacy and Numeracy for Learning and Life: The National Strategy to Improve Literacy and Numeracy among Children and Young People (Department of Education and Skills, 2011, p.8)

Numeracy is not limited to the ability to use numbers, to add, subtract, multiply and divide. Numeracy encompasses the ability to use mathematical understanding and skills to solve problems and meet the demands of day-to-day living in complex social settings. To have this ability, a young person needs to be able to think and communicate quantitatively, to make sense of data, to have a spatial awareness, to understand patterns and sequences, and to recognise situations where mathematical reasoning can be applied to solve problems.

Some of the resources provided and the activities set down in this booklet may be used to enable young people “to think and communicate quantitatively, to make sense of data, to have a spatial awareness, to understand patterns and sequences, and to recognise situations where mathematical reasoning can be applied to solve problems.”

For example:

- Questions relating to numbers of fishing boats and size of fish catches can help students “to think and communicate quantitatively”.

- Questions on the statistics relating to agreements such as the 1976 ‘Hague Resolution’ and the 1983 Common Fisheries Policy can help students “to make sense of data”.

- Questions on the geographic location of places mentioned in various sources (e.g. Secondary Sources 1, 2 and 3) can help students “to have a spatial awareness” in respect of the matters under discussion and to develop that awareness in tandem with other subject areas such as Geography.

- Questions on changing patterns of fishing activity, and how these patterns are affected by policy decisions, can help students “to understand patterns and sequences”.

- Questions on data such as those in Secondary Source 5 can help students “to recognise situations where mathematical reasoning can be applied to solve problems” e.g. the problem of understanding what ‘development’ means in the context of the Irish fishing industry and, here specifically, the nature of the development of the Irish fishing industry that was to take place following the adoption of the ‘Hague Resolution’ in 1976.
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Impact of the EEC on fisheries: a contextual overview of the case study

Despite extensive fish stocks in the waters around its costs, the Irish fishing industry was underdeveloped when Ireland became a member of the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1973. It had the smallest fleet in the EEC and under 2% of the total catch in the year it joined (Barrington, Cooney: 1984). In 1952, Bord Iascaigh Mhara (BIM) had been founded under the Sea Fisheries Act, to promote the development of fishing at sea, but the economic climate was not conducive and development was slow: at the beginning of the 1960s there were fewer than 800 full-time fishermen in the west of Ireland (Ferriter, 2004).

As economic conditions improved, the decade before entry to the EEC saw growth in the fishing industry. The number of fishermen grew by about 50%, the landings tripled, the fleet grew and investment in fish processing increased. (Barrington, Cooney, 1984). The growing importance of the fishing industry was brought home to the Irish public in 1971 when the biennial World Fisheries Exhibition was held in Ireland for the first time. (de Courcy Ireland, 1981).

As accession to the EEC loomed, however, there was increasing concern about the likely impact of membership on the industry. During the 1971 exhibition, fishermen from Ireland, England, Wales and the Isle of Man met to coordinate opposition to the fishery policy of the EEC, a subject that was arousing controversy. The problem was a clause in the Treaty of Rome that permitted fishing craft from EEC member states to fish up to each other’s coasts. The fear was that this could lead to large numbers of German, Dutch and French vessels flocking into our coastal waters. In the negotiations that led to accession, a compromise was reached. A twelve-mile limit was to apply on the north and west coasts from Lough Foyle to Cork for all species of fish and on the east coast from Carlingford Lough to Carnsore Point for shellfish.

Other challenges soon arose. In October 1975, Iceland declared a 200-mile protected zone around its coast. During 1976 it became clear that the United States, the Soviet Union, Canada and Norway would follow this example. Thus in November 1976 the member states of the Community agreed to extend to 200 miles their fisheries zones in the North Sea and the North Atlantic from January 1977. Increasing restrictions on access to international waters caused the EEC to focus attention on the growing problem of diminishing fish stocks in EEC waters due to overfishing. Negotiations on quotas and TACs (total allowable catches) continued for many years until a Common Fisheries Policy was eventually agreed in 1983.

Meanwhile, despite unsuccessful demands from the Irish and British governments for a 50-mile protected zone, some concessions to assist Irish sea fisheries were secured. In The Hague, in October 1976, Minister for Foreign Affairs Garret FitzGerald won recognition of the Irish fishing industry’s right to expand by doubling the catch between 1977 and 1979. To achieve this, the fleet would be increased by some 300 vessels. Processing and other shore-based services would be expanded. In January 1978, Brian Lenihan dropped demands for a 50-mile limit and accepted that Ireland's interests could best be served by a series of interim plans until such time as a common fisheries policy was adopted. Between 1977 and 1982, Ireland secured about IRE15 million in grants for the fishing industry and IRE30 million for surveillance on sea and in the air.

All the while the Killybegs Fishermen’s Association and, subsequently, the Irish Fishermen’s Organisation, under the leadership of Joey Murrin, kept up a vociferous campaign to pressurise the government to get the best deal for fishermen — and for the country. Murrin remained an outspoken critic of EEC fisheries policy for many years. However, once a Common Fisheries Policy was agreed in 1983, a degree of calm descended on a situation which had seen tempers fray and conflicting interests collide for more than a decade.
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### Glossary of important terms: develop your historical literacy skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bord Iascaigh Mhara (BIM)</td>
<td>Established under the Sea Fisheries Act, 1952. It is the state agency charged with the responsibility of developing the Irish sea fisheries industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Fisheries Policy</td>
<td>When the European Economic Community (EEC) was set up under the Treaty of Rome, 1957, there was agreement that a common fisheries policy should be developed. However, at the time, the EEC did not have jurisdiction over the seas now described as ‘Community waters’; until 1978, the North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission was the regulatory body for fisheries. Therefore, the EEC’s fisheries policy developed in a piecemeal fashion throughout the 1970s. The first complete set of legislation establishing a common policy on fisheries was finally adopted in January 1983. Council regulation 170/83 had the basic purpose of “establishing a Community system for the conservation and management of fishery resources”. The policy has been reviewed and updated on a number of occasions, the most recent being 2014. For information on how Ireland’s fisheries were affected by the policy adopted in 1983, see pages 31 to 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish producer organisations</td>
<td>These are groups of fishermen who join together to carry out certain functions under the EEC Common Fisheries Policy. These include intervention (i.e. withdrawal of fish from the market when the price falls below a certain level); this is a means whereby the income of fishermen is protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History Case Study: The Impact of the EEC on Fisheries</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first producer organisation was the Irish Fish Producers’ Organisation founded in 1975. In June 1979 the Minister for Fisheries and Forestry, Paddy Power, approved the recognition of the Killybegs Fishermen’s Organisation as an additional producer organisation under EEC regulations. (In 1995 another producer organisation was set up: the South and West Fish Producers’ Organisation, based in Castletownbere, Co. Cork.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Hague Declaration, 1976</strong></td>
<td>Also known as ‘The Hague Resolution’. This recognised Ireland’s right to expand its fishing industry, specifically by doubling the catch between 1977 and 1979. See the following sources: Source 9; Secondary Sources 5 and 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Inshore fishing** | This term is used to describe fishing carried out by boats that are less than 12 metres in length, and that fish mostly within 6 nautical miles of the coast. Such boats make up over 80% of the national fleet. 
http://www.inshore-ireland.com/News/Fisheries/

Note: 6 nautical miles is just under 7 statute miles and just over 11 kilometres.

See also 
http://oceanservice.noaa.gov/facts/nauticalmile_knot.html |
<p>| <strong>Irish Fishermen’s Organisation</strong> | The Irish Fishermen’s Organisation (IFO) was set up in 1971-72 by Frank Doyle and others as concern grew amongst fishermen about the likely impact on their livelihoods of EEC membership. Under the leadership of Joey Murrin from 1974 to 1979 it attracted much publicity as it sought to pressurise government ministers and officials into achieving the best possible terms for Irish fishermen. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Killybegs Fishermen’s Organisation (KFO)</strong></th>
<th>While the earlier Killybegs Fishermen’s Association represented the views of local fishermen and was most active at times of perceived crisis, the Killybegs Fishermen’s Organisation was set up by Joey Murrin and others in 1979 as a fish producer organisation under EEC rules to service the needs of local fishermen. [See ‘Fish producer organisations’.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quotas</strong></td>
<td>Quotas are the amounts of different types of fish that fishermen are allowed to catch under the Common Fisheries Policy of the European Union. [See also ‘Total Allowable Catches (TACs)’ and ‘Common Fisheries Policy’.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total allowable catches (TACs)</strong></td>
<td>To prevent overfishing the Council of Ministers puts a limit each year on the amount of particular types of fish that may be caught. These are described as ‘Total allowable catches’ or ‘TACs’. The TACs are then divided up between the member states in the form of quotas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treaty of Rome</strong></td>
<td>This is the treaty that established the EEC. It was signed in March 1957 by six countries: Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany). As other countries applied to become members, they were required to sign the treaty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Biographical notes

Garret FitzGerald (1926-2011)


Born in Dublin, he was the son of Desmond Fitzgerald, Minister for External Affairs in the Executive Council of the Irish Free State, 1922-1927, and Minister for Defence, 1927-1932. He made a name as an economist and lectured in UCD from 1959 to 1973.

As Minister for Foreign Affairs, 1973-1977, he took part in negotiations leading to the Sunningdale Agreement of 1973 by which a short-lived power-sharing executive was established in Northern Ireland. He took an active role in Ireland’s first presidency of the EEC, January-June 1975. His role in negotiations on EEC fisheries policy was also significant. At The Hague, in October 1976, he secured concessions which facilitated a sharp increase in the national fish catch and this was welcomed by the Irish Fishermen’s Organisation at the time.

In 1977, FitzGerald replaced Liam Cosgrave as leader of Fine Gael. After the 1981 election, he became Taoiseach in a coalition government and, in September, announced a ‘constitutional crusade’. His meeting with Margaret Thatcher, British Prime Minister, and

https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Garret_FitzGerald_Lisbon_2009_crop.jpg
Dr. Garret FitzGerald in 2009
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Jim Prior, Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, on 6th November resulted in the establishment of the Anglo-Irish Intergovernmental Council on 26th January 1982. A week later, the government fell when it lost a vote on the budget and the campaign that followed included the first televised debate between Fitzgerald and his Fianna Fáil rival, Charles Haughey. The Fianna Fáil minority government that followed was short-lived, losing a Fine Gael motion of no confidence on 4th November, 1982. Following the second general election of that year, 24th November, Fitzgerald became Taoiseach for a second time in a coalition government with the Labour Party.

In 1983, a campaign to include a constitutional ban on abortion led to the government agreeing to wording suggested by Fianna Fáil, and the referendum was carried by a two-to-one majority in September. At the suggestion of John Hume, Fitzgerald established the New Ireland Forum in May 1983 to see if a consensus could be reached on how to achieve lasting peace and stability on the island of Ireland. The forum’s report of May 1984 identified three possible options: a unitary all-Ireland state, a federal arrangement, and joint authority of the British and Irish governments in the governance of Northern Ireland. While all three options were dismissed as unacceptable by Margaret Thatcher, the British Prime Minister, the report served as a basis for discussions that led to the Anglo-Irish Agreement (‘Hillsborough Agreement’) of November 1985.

Following defeat in the election of February 1987, Fitzgerald resigned on 11th March and was replaced as party leader by Alan Dukes. His autobiography All in a Life was published in 1991.

Patrick Hillery (1923-2008)


As Minister for External Affairs, Hillery played a key role in the negotiations leading to Ireland’s membership of the European Economic Community (EEC), including the negotiations on fisheries policy.

Brian Lenihan (1930-1995)
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As the Minister with responsibility for fisheries between 1977 and 1979, Lenihan played an important role in the difficult and drawn-out EEC negotiations on a common fisheries policy. His agreement to the abandonment of Ireland’s claim to an exclusive, wide coastal band for native fishermen, in exchange for favourable fish quotas and a substantial subsidy for the Irish fishery protection fleet, was controversial.

Joey Murrin (born 1937)

Worked as a fisherman on boats out of Killybegs from 1954 until 1976. Secretary of the Killybegs Fishermen’s Association for ten years until 1973. Elected chairman of the Irish Fishermen’s Organisation (IFO) in 1974, becoming a prominent spokesman for fishermen’s interests and a key player in negotiations with government and EEC officials. In 1979, relinquished chairmanship of IFO when Killybegs Fishermen’s Organisation (KFO) was set up as a fish producer organisation under EEC rules. (See glossary.) Was chief executive officer (CEO) of KFO until 2000. Was a director of Bord Iascaigh Mhara (BIM) from 1979 to 1982 and, again, from 1987 to 2000, serving as its chairperson from 1984 until 1987. Has also served on the boards of the Marine Institute and the National Salmon Commission and was a ministerial nominee to the Working Group on Safety, Training & Employment in the Irish Fishing Industry in 2013.

Joey Murrin’s rise to national prominence began as a spokesman for fishermen who were concerned about the implications for Ireland’s sea fisheries of the negotiations for EEC membership. As chairman of the Irish Fishermen’s Organisation from 1974 to 1979 he gained a strong public profile as a promoter of fishermen’s interests, negotiating on their behalf with government and EEC officials. As chief executive officer of the Killybegs Fishermen’s Organisation he played a significant role in the development of services for fishermen in Killybegs and the north-west. When he was presented with the ‘Donegal Person of the Year’ award in March 2000, representatives of the fishing industry from various parts of Ireland came to join in the celebrations.
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**Impact of the EEC on fisheries: timeline**

1952  
An Bord Iascaigh Mhara established under the Sea Fisheries Act.

1964  
London Convention (international agreement): coastal states were given exclusive fishing rights up to 12 nautical miles from their coasts, except for historical rights limited to particular species and areas.

1970  
EEC (original six members) agreed the fundamental principles of a common fisheries policy, including principle of equal access to a common resource.

1971  
World Fisheries Exhibition held in Ireland for first time.
Meeting of fishermen to coordinate opposition to EEC fisheries policy as talks on accession loomed.

1972  
Under Treaty of Accession to EEC, Ireland granted 10-year derogation from equal access, with 6-mile exclusive zone and fishing in outer 6 to 12-mile zone limited to countries with traditional fishing rights.

1973  
Ireland became member of EEC.

1974  
Joey Murrin elected chairman of the Irish Fishermen’s Organisation.

1975 July  
Irish Fish Producers’ Organisation founded to manage ‘intervention’ arrangements.

October  
Iceland declared a 200-mile exclusive zone around its coast.

1976 October  
EEC declared a new 200-mile exclusive zone in its territorial waters of the North Sea and North Atlantic – effective from January 1977.
Fishing lobbies in UK and Ireland demanded 50-mile exclusive one around coast for own fishermen.

At Council of Ministers’ meeting in the Hague, Dr. Garrett FitzGerald, Minister for Foreign Affairs, won recognition of Ireland’s right to expand its fishing industry and to double the catch between 1977 and 1979.

1977 May  
European Commission drew up proposals to run EEC fisheries policy on a system of fishing plans.

1978 December  
Minister for Fisheries and Forestry, Brian Lenihan, dropped demand for 50-mile limit, accepting proposal for fishing plans.

1979 June  
Killybegs Fishermen’s Organisation led by Joey Murrin recognised as an additional producer organisation.

1983 January  
Comprehensive EEC Common Fisheries Policy agreed.
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*The impact of the EEC on fisheries: a possible line of enquiry*

If students are to understand the issues and events of the case study, they will need to examine the state of Ireland’s sea fishing industry at the time of accession to the EEC, the concerns expressed by fishermen prior to and following accession, and the political negotiations and compromises of the 1970s and early 1980s on sea fisheries’ issues (leading to the agreement on the Common Fisheries Policy in 1983). They will also need to explore the complex interplay between official policy, the concerns and practices of local fishermen and the political negotiations that tried to resolve the conflicting positions of member countries. An enquiry question such as the following may be helpful in building up student understanding incrementally and providing a solid framework for student learning:

**What impact did EEC membership have on Irish fisheries?**

To tackle this question, we need to look at the state of Irish fisheries on joining the EEC, the challenging issues that arose for Irish fishermen, the negotiations that attempted to resolve these challenges, and the compromises enshrined in the 1983 Common Fisheries Policy. Tackling the enquiry in the following stages may be found helpful:

**Stage 1**: What was the state of Irish fisheries as Ireland joined the EEC?

**Stage 2**: What arrangements were put in place for Irish fisheries under the terms of accession to the EEC?

**Stage 3**: What challenges did Irish fishermen face following entry to the EEC and how did politicians attempt to resolve these challenges?

**Stage 4**: What were the implications for Irish sea fisheries of the 1983 Common Fisheries Policy?

**Stage 5**: Drawing conclusions – the impact of EEC membership on Irish fisheries

What are the potential benefits of using these questions to focus on the subject matter of the case study?

In the pages that follow, for the first four stages of the enquiry a list of ‘factors identified in commentaries’ is followed by a selection of linked primary source extracts and some secondary source extracts. For the fourth stage, the concept of ‘historical significance’ is explored in the context of the case study, with accompanying source extracts.

While most sources have undergone some degree of editing, teachers may decide to engage in further editing of some documents to facilitate use with their own classes.

A possible ‘hook’ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xyzfX24Dho
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Using the proposed hook to introduce the case study

The purpose in showing this film clip would be to introduce students to some of the issues that arise in a historical context in the case study and that are still current today e.g. the 1983 Common Fisheries Policy; overfishing and the resulting decline in fish stocks; the use, or failure to use scientific advice; the needs of fisheries-dependent communities.

Some of the issues above arose in the course of an interview conducted by Gerry Moore with Joey Murrin, the best-known fishermen’s spokesman during the period of the case study. The following are some edited extracts from that interview.

Joey Murrin:

There’s better scientific advice now than there was maybe 25 to 30 years ago, but are we still adhering to it? Are we using that scientific advice to our best advantage?

Quotas mean nothing, unless the fish are in the water ... and people said, ‘oh, we should have more quotas.’ You can have all the quotas you want, but if the fish is not there to catch, it’s not worth a damn to you, simple as that.

In an interview with Gerry Moore, July 2016. © Gerry Moore

It may also be helpful to explore with students the geographical space in which the action of the case study occurs i.e. western Europe and the sea areas that adjoin it, where European fisheries are active. Of particular importance in the case of Irish fishermen is the Celtic Sea. (See map below.)

https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/3/39/Location_map_Rockall.jpg/510px-Location_map_Rockall.jpg

For a detailed map of the fishery areas adjoining Western Europe, see http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/publications/cfp_factsheets/fishing_areas_en.pdf
Enquiry, Stage 1

What was the state of Irish fisheries as Ireland joined the EEC?

Among the factors identified in commentaries are:

- Despite improvements in the decade before joining the EEC, the Irish fishing industry remained underdeveloped.
- Because of the relatively small size of the overall fishing fleet in Ireland, trawlers from other European countries – including France and the Netherlands – fished productively in Irish waters.
- Most Irish fishing was inshore i.e. close to the shore, leaving the waters further out a ‘happy hunting ground’ for foreign trawlers.
- Fish stocks in some fishing areas – such as the Celtic Sea south of Ireland – were declining due to overfishing.

Relevant sources

Source 1

The following is an edited extract from an Irish Times “Yesterday in the Dáil” report, 17th February, 1972:

Mr. T. O’Connor (F.F.) said that although some progress had been made on fish exports it was only a puny effort considering that boats could leave the Irish harbours for most of the year while ports in Western Europe were frozen over in winter.

The fishing industry could be enlarged if there was proper thinking and direction.

We need not have to worry about foreign trawlers coming into our waters if we had sufficient fishing boats ourselves. He hoped that the Government would devise a scheme by which we could see a target of £50 million for exports by 1982.

The Irish Times, 17th February, 1972

Questions and points for discussion

1. What was Mr. T. O’Connor’s view of the state of Irish fishing industry in February 1972?
2. What problem faced by fishermen in other Western European countries does Mr. O’Connor mention?
3. What does Mr. O’Connor think needs to be done to improve the Irish fishing industry?
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Secondary Source 1

Among the problems looming in 1973 was a growing awareness that herring stocks were sharply diminishing in the Celtic Sea south of Ireland, almost but not quite certainly from over-fishing, particularly by Dutch and French vessels. We were still catching only some 11 per cent of all fish caught in the waters round Ireland and, with the herring moving into the category of luxury fish, the need became apparent for a return to serious fishing of the neglected mackerel, and also for serious consideration of the possibilities of exploiting hitherto unconsidered fish species.


Questions and points to consider

1. What specific problem facing Irish fishermen in 1973 does the writer highlight?
2. Who does the writer think was partly to blame for this problem?
3. What solution became apparent to fishermen, according to the writer?

Source 2

The following is an edited extract from an *Irish Times* "Yesterday in the Dáil" report, 17th February, 1972.

The Parliamentary Secretary, Mr. Fahey, said that the 5% deposit needed to acquire a trawler grant from the Board was a better term than that offered to fishermen anywhere else in the world.

Work had commenced on the erection of a training school in Greencastle, Co. Donegal. It would be completed in the present financial year.

Mr. Fahey said that 68 new and second-hand boats had been added to the fishing fleet this year. The value of our seafish and shellfish catches had increased by nearly £1m. between 1969 and 1970, to about £4m.

The total value of catches had increased by 25% in 1969 and by 31% in 1970.

*The Irish Times*, 17th February, 1972 © The Irish Times

Questions and points for discussion

1. What government position was held by Mr. Fahey? (The nearest equivalent in today's terms would be a 'junior minister' or 'Minister of State'.)
2. According to Mr. Fahey, what was "a better term than that offered to fishermen anywhere else in the world?"
3. What was due to be completed "in the current financial year"?
4. What other examples did Mr. Fahey give of ways in which the fishing industry was improving?

Archive material supplied courtesy of The Irish Times at www.irishtimes.com.
With under 2% of the total EEC catch in 1973 and the smallest fleet, Ireland’s fishing industry was underdeveloped. This was the case despite growth in the decade before joining the EEC when the number of fishermen rose by about 50%, the landings tripled, the fleet grew and investment in fish processing increased. In 1965 the fleet consisted of 1,812 vessels of which thirty-six were over sixty feet; by 1974 it had grown to 2,420 of which 153 were over sixty feet. Fishing was mainly inshore. Killybegs, the largest port, is in Donegal, one of the poorest areas of the Community.


**Questions and points for discussion**

1. In what ways was Ireland’s fishing industry underdeveloped in 1973, according to the writers?
2. In what ways did the fishing industry develop in the decade before EEC entry, according to the writers?
3. What do the writers mean when they say that fishing “was mainly inshore”?  
4. Why is Killybegs significant in the story of the impact of EEC membership on Irish fisheries?

[Image of Killybegs Harbour with fishing boats]  
Trawler ‘Sheanne’ in Killybegs Harbour, 2007
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Enquiry, Stage 2: What arrangements were put in place for Irish fisheries under the terms of accession to the EEC?

Among the factors identified in commentaries are:

- The six original EEC members had recently agreed the principle of equal access to each other's fish stocks for all member states. Irish fishermen were greatly concerned about this and, in the negotiations, a compromise was agreed giving Ireland a ten-year exemption from the equal access rule.
- Before the ten years exemption ended, the European Commission would review the needs of coastal communities and the state of fish stocks.
- EEC funding was to be made available to improve the development of fisheries in Ireland.

Source 3

Patrick Hillery, then Minister for Foreign Affairs, discusses the negotiations on Ireland’s accession to the EEC

Ireland’s fishermen were to a large extent dependent on our exclusive fishing limits. Our valuable inshore shell-fisheries could be damaged, as could our salmon stocks, by opening up the waters to other countries. At the same time, Ireland had no deep-sea fishing fleet that could benefit from access to the waters of the other member states.

After prolonged and difficult negotiation, we agreed that the coastal member states of the enlarged Community be authorised to restrict fishing within a six-mile limit from their base-line, and that for Ireland this be extended to twelve miles on the north and west coasts from Lough Foyle to Cork for all species of fish and on the east coast from Carlingford Lough to Carnsore Point for fisheries of crustaceans and molluscs (shellfish). The Council of Ministers (fisheries) of the enlarged Community would decide on the arrangements for fisheries after 1982, when ten years were up. This was the absolute maximum that could be achieved if Ireland were to progress towards membership of the EEC.


Questions and points for discussion

1. According to Dr. Hillery, why would opening up the waters to other countries (in line with the principle of 'equal access') be damaging to Ireland?
2. How does Dr. Hillery describe the negotiations on fisheries?
3. What specific arrangements were agreed for Ireland to control fishing in the waters around its coast?
4. By what date were new arrangements to be put in place for fisheries – and how were these to be determined?
5. Based on the last sentence above, how important do you think it was for Dr. Hillery that Ireland would become a member of the EEC?
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Secondary Source 3

While the trade prospects for Irish fisheries in an enlarged Community were attractive the equal access principle became a point of contention. There was particular anger in the applicant countries that the big trawlers of the Six, which had overfished their own waters, would be able ‘to fish up to the beaches’. A compromise was reached during accession negotiations, however, giving Ireland and Britain a ten-year exemption from the free access rule. Only countries which had traditionally fished in the six-mile zone around the coastline, were to be allowed to continue fishing there. The six-mile limit was extended to twelve miles from Lough Foyle to Cork Harbour on the west coast, and from Carlingford Lough to Camsore Point on the east for shellfish. Britain obtained a twelve-mile limit off the coastal waters of County Down. Before the end of the ten-year period the Commission was to review ‘the economic and social development of the coastal areas of the member states and the state of stocks’ and the Council was to agree new arrangements.

p. 100


Questions and points for discussion

1. Explain what the writers mean when they say that “the trade prospects for Irish fisheries in an enlarged Community were attractive”.
2. What explanation do the writers give as to why the equal access principle became a matter of contention in the course of the negotiations for membership?
3. What details of the agreed compromise add to the information given in Source 3 above?
4. What was to happen by 1983?

Source 4

The following is an extract from an Irish Times report on the government White Paper on EEC entry:

In equipping itself to take full advantage of the market opportunities in the enlarged community, the Irish fishing industry will be assisted through participating in the development and improvement aspects of the common fisheries policy. Community funds will be available to aid such projects as the improvement of fishing fleets, the modernisation of storage and processing facilities and fisheries research. Financial aid towards the coast of forming and running producer groups will also be available.

The Irish Times, 15th January, 1972

Questions and points for discussion

1. According to the White Paper, in what process would the Irish fishing industry now participate?
2. For what purposes beneficial to fisheries would EEC funding now be available?
3. See if you can find out what ‘producer groups’ are in the context of EEC fisheries policy.

Archive material supplied courtesy of The Irish Times at www.irishtimes.com.
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Enquiry, Stage 3

(a) What challenges did Irish fishermen face following entry to the EEC and (b) how did politicians attempt to resolve these challenges?

Among the factors identified in commentaries are:

(a)  
- Declining fish stocks due to overfishing led to demands in Ireland and Britain for a 50-mile exclusive zone around our coasts and for increased funding for the Irish fishing industry.
- The decision by Norway and Iceland in 1976 to declare a 200-mile exclusion zone around their coasts led to discussions on a 200-mile exclusion zone in EEC waters. However, the likelihood that fellow EEC countries would now seek to increase their fishing activities in British and Irish waters led to increasing pressure from Irish fishermen for an exclusive 50-mile zone around Irish coasts.
- Other EEC countries wanted continued access to Irish fishing waters.

(b)  
- Irish politicians argued for a 50-mile exclusive zone and used it as a bargaining tool to gain concessions from their fellow EEC members.
- The Hague Resolution of November 1976 promised funding to assist the development of the Irish fishing industry.
- In 1977 a separate Department of Fisheries was established.


Group of Irish fishermen wearing flotation devices in 2009
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Source 5
The following is an extract from an Irish Times editorial on declining stocks of herring: Herring stocks in the waters around Ireland are declining seriously. Already it is evident that the fairly restrictive quotas of catches in the last two seasons were too high. The quota for 1976-77 must be further cut, in November, below 16,800 tonnes, of which Ireland was to have got 10,000 tonnes. It would be easy to blame this doleful plight on foreign fishing fleets that operate off our coasts, and too frequently within our territorial limits, but our own trawler fleet surely must take some of the blame.

Twenty years ago trawlers flocked to Dunmore East in the herring season. No-one stopped to think then that future fortune could be jeopardised by catching up too many potential spawners. In nature the truth seldom shows itself in blindfold flashes. It is a slow, inexorable progress bidding men to appreciate that if the breeding stock is lowered to danger-point, there can be no recovery. The message today is being spelt out clearly in the Celtic Sea and elsewhere.
The Irish Times, 14th September, 1976 © The Irish Times

Questions and points for discussion
1. Who was to blame for the decline in herring stocks, according to this Irish Times editorial?
2. In the second paragraph, what does the writer mean by “catching up too many potential spawners”?
3. According to the writer, what truth have fishermen slowly come to realise?
4. Off which coast of Ireland is the Celtic Sea to be found?

Secondary Source 4
At the same time [1976] the Commission became alarmed at the scientific evidence showing that a large number of fish stocks in the Community’s 200-mile zone had become critical. Overfishing in the previous twenty years had endangered many species including herring. Losses of fishing rights in the extended territorial waters of non-EEC states was also a blow to the Community, 30% of whose total catch (about 1.4 million tonnes) was in third-country waters. Because the bulk of the enlarged Community waters in the North Sea and the Atlantic were under Irish and British jurisdiction, the governments in Dublin and London began to demand fifty-mile exclusive zones to satisfy the vocal fish lobbies, but the Commission insisted that such demands were unrealistic. pp.101-102

Questions and points for discussion
1. Over what problem did the European Commission become ‘alarmed’ in 1976?
2. What practice caused this problem to arise?
3. See if you can find out what caused “Losses of fishing rights in the extended territorial waters of non-EEC states”.
4. Why did the British and Irish governments begin to demand a fifty-mile exclusive zone for their fishermen in 1976? What is the connection between this and the loss of fishing rights mentioned in question 3?

Archive material supplied courtesy of The Irish Times at www.irishtimes.com.
History Case Study: The Impact of the EEC on Fisheries

Source 6

The following is an edited extract from the autobiography of Dr. Garrett FitzGerald, who was Minister for Foreign Affairs in the Fine Gael-Labour Party coalition government, 1973-1977.

The third matter that came up in the General Council involving a significant Irish interest during my term as Foreign Minister was the revision in 1976 of the Common Fisheries Policy.

The Community now faced the need to negotiate with Iceland and Norway, which were moving to create a 200-mile zone off their coasts, within which other countries would not be permitted to fish without agreement. In response to this an E[uropean] C[ommunity] 200-mile zone was being considered. This would give Ireland protection against non-EC trawlers but not against boats of its Community partners. What would help would be a 50-mile national zone within this 200-mile Community zone, restricted to smaller vessels.


Questions and points for discussion

1. What government position was held by Dr. FitzGerald in 1976?
2. What development involving two countries outside of the EEC made it necessary for the EEC to review its fisheries policy in 1976?
3. What response to this development was the EEC considering at the meeting to which Dr. Fitzgerald refers?
4. How would the response referred to in Question 3 benefit Irish fishermen?
5. In order for Ireland to have protection “against boats of its Community partners”, what further development would help, according to Dr. FitzGerald?
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Source 7

The following is a edited extract from an Irish Times report:

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. John Kelly, replying to Mr. Denis Gallagher (FF, Mayo West) said that the EEC was now reviewing the common fisheries policy, and the Government was seeking a substantial exclusive band reserved for Irish boats within the 200-mile zone, and, in addition, a preferential exclusive band in the remainder of the zone. He did not regard the exclusive band of 12 miles which the Commission had proposed as sufficient from Ireland’s point of view.

Replying to a supplementary question by Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Kelly said the Government accepted that the demand by the Irish Fishermen’s Organisation for a 50-mile limit was a responsible one, and the Government would make the strongest case for the maximum exclusive limit. He added that our case was being made at the most difficult time, because other nations were at present being put back from their traditional fishing areas.

The Irish Times, 26th February, 1976

Questions and points for discussion
1. What government position was held by Mr. John Kelly? (The nearest equivalent in today’s terms would be a ‘junior minister’ or ‘Minister of State’.)
2. What was the government seeking for Irish fishing boats in the review of the common fisheries policy, according to Mr. Kelly?
3. (a) What had the Commission proposed for Irish fishing boats? 
   (b) What was Mr. Kelly’s attitude towards this Commission proposal?
4. (a) What demand was being made by the Irish Fishermen’s Organisation (IFO) at the time? 
   (b) What was the government’s attitude to the IFO demand, according to Mr. Kelly?
5. Reading the last sentence of the extract carefully, do you think Mr. Kelly expected that the Irish government’s case would be supported by other EEC countries? Explain your answer.
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Source 8
The following is an edited extract from the autobiography of Dr. Garrett FitzGerald, who was Minister for Foreign Affairs in the Fine Gael-Labour Party coalition government, 1973-1977.

After some months of fruitless discussion in the General Council the issue came before the European Council in Brussels in July 1976. Jim Callaghan launched the debate. Liam Cosgrave followed. Ireland would be making a major contribution to the area of exclusive fishing rights accruing to the Community as a result of the creation of 200-mile zones: 23 per cent of the total Community zone would consist of Irish waters. Despite the underdevelopment of Ireland’s fishing industry there was only one other member-state in which this sector provided a larger share of GNP and employment. It was a vital national interest for Ireland to preserve and protect the fish stocks off its coast from destruction by fleets of large vessels. This was the basis for Ireland’s decision to seek a 50-mile coastal band under its own control within what would be a Community 200-mile zone. His government was prepared to discuss with other Community governments arrangements to enable fishermen on traditional-type vessels to fish in the outer part of the proposed Irish-controlled band.

Questions and points for discussion
1. At the meeting of the European Council (the Council of Ministers) in July 1976, what arguments did an Taoiseach Liam Cosgrave put forward in support of his contention that, “It was a vital national interest for Ireland to preserve and protect the fish stocks off its coast from destruction by fleets of large vessels”? 
2. What did the Irish government seek to achieve in these negotiations so that fish stocks could be protected?
3. Was the Irish government prepared to compromise on its demands? Justify your answer.

Secondary Source 5
In The Hague, in October 1976, Minister for Foreign Affairs Garret Fitzgerald won a recognition of the Irish fishing industry’s right to expand, specifically by doubling the catch between 1977 and 1979. Dr. FitzGerald announced that the government’s development plan aimed to double landings of sea fish by 1979, bringing the total to 150,000 tonnes. To achieve this the fleet would be increased by some 300 vessels. Processing and other shore-based services would be expanded and the number employed by the industry was forecast to rise by 2,500 from the 1976 figure of 9,300 to 11,800. It was the government’s objective to raise the numbers to 18,000 in the near future. p.101 Ruth Barrington and John Cooney, Inside the EEC: an Irish Guide. The O’Brien Press (Dublin 1984.)

Questions and points for discussion
1. In what European country is The Hague located?
2. What government position was held by Garrett FitzGerald in October 1976?
3. What ‘recognition’ did Dr. FitzGerald win at the meeting in The Hague?
4. What specific details of the government’s development plan for fisheries are given in relation to (a) the size of the fishing fleet? (b) shore-based services? (c) employment?
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Source 9: Dr. Garrett FitzGerald (edited)
The crucial meeting of the Council was fixed for Saturday 30 October in the Hague. Earlier in that week I got a call from Finn Gundelach, the Commissioner responsible for fishery policy. Could he see me on Wednesday? I agreed. When we met he proposed that on top of the general provision for northern Britain, Ireland and Greenland (known as the ‘Hague Preferences’) there would be a special regime for Ireland. The Common Fisheries Policy would be applied so as ‘to secure the continued the and progressive development of the Irish fishing industry on the basis of the Irish Government’s programme for the development of coastal fisheries’.  

The Commission’s proposals were eventually adopted. The Irish Fishermen’s Organisation paid a welcome tribute to my efforts, remarking that I had had to overcome immense obstacles to achieve this result. Today the Irish fish catch is at three times its 1975 level and the Naval Service boasts a purpose-built fishery protection vessel paid for as to 75 per cent from the Community budget, in recognition of our responsibility for protecting a large area of the Community’s waters.  


Questions and points for discussion
1. Whom did Dr. FitzGerald meet on the Wednesday before the important Council of Ministers meeting of Saturday, 30th October, in The Hague?
2. What proposals were put to Dr. FitzGerald at the meeting?
3. When the proposals were adopted at the Council meeting, what was the response of the Irish Fishermen’s Organisation according to Dr. FitzGerald?
4. Writing in 1991, what improvements in the fishing industry does Dr. FitzGerald mention at the end of the extract?

Secondary Source 6
Ireland, which was represented on the Council of Foreign Ministers by Dr. Garret FitzGerald, was to the forefront in insisting that the Community, before addressing external issues such as the extension of fishing limits, would have to provide assurances that the terms of any internal policy would facilitate the expansion of the relatively underdeveloped Irish fishing industry. Ireland’s efforts eventually paid dividends. In the Hague Resolution of November 1976 Annex VII, the Council declared its intention in a new common fisheries policy, to secure the continued, and progressive development of the Irish fishing industry on the basis of the Irish government’s fisheries development programme. In practice, this would mean that future quota allocations by the Community would facilitate a doubling of the 1975 Irish catch of 75,000 tonnes by 1979.


Questions and points for discussion
1. In 1976, who was Ireland’s representative on the Council of Foreign Ministers?
2. What point did Ireland’s representative insist on at the Council meeting?
3. What commitment did the Council give to Ireland in the Hague Resolution of 1976, Annex VII?
4. In practice, what would the Community be doing to help Ireland develop its fishing industry?
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Source 10: Garrett FitzGerald

The fish saga did not end in 1976; the battle over access to fishing around our coasts had still to be fought. Under the decisions taken at the Hague we retained the right, in the absence of agreement on Community conservation action, to initiate national conservation measures of a non-discriminatory kind. In February 1977 we made orders banning fishing near our shores by large and powerful vessels, in the interest of conservation. The Commission objected to this action as discriminatory, on the grounds that we had hardly any boats in this category.

Several months later our unilateral ‘conservation’ measures were suspended by the European Court pending the later hearing of the full case; this, however, was prejudiced by Fianna Fáil, which described our measures as ‘blatantly discriminatory’. With the essential elements of our national interest protected by the special arrangements that I had negotiated at the Hague for an expansion of our catches, I was happy to leave the rest of the problem to my successors – although I did not agree with the way they subsequently handled it.


Questions and points for discussion

1. Discuss what Dr. FitzGerald means when he says, “the battle over access to fishing around our coasts had still to be fought”.
2. In the context of sea fisheries, what does Dr. FitzGerald mean by “conservation measures”?
3. In February 1977, the Irish government made orders banning fishing near our shores by large and powerful vessels. Why do you think the European Commission described these orders as “discriminatory”?
4. What reasons does Dr. FitzGerald give for the government having to back down on its proposed conservation measures?
5. What were the special conservation measures that Dr. FitzGerald had negotiated at The Hague?
6. What evidence is there in this source of Dr. FitzGerald’s attitude towards the actions of the subsequent Fianna Fáil government? (Dr. FitzGerald was a Fine Gael member.)

New Department of Fisheries to be headed by Donegan

Headline in *The Irish Times*, 5th February 1977 (See Source 11.)

Archive material supplied courtesy of The Irish Times at www.irishtimes.com.
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Source 11

Under the heading, “New Department of Fisheries to be headed by Donegan”, The Irish Times, on Saturday, 5th February 1977, reported on the formation of a new government department. The following is an edited extract:

A separate Department of Fisheries is being established with Mr. Paddy Donegan as Minister.

Explaining the significance of the changes last night, a Government spokesman said: “The establishment of a Department of Fisheries was decided on because the Government feels that at this crucial stage in the development of the fishing industry it should become the major responsibility of a member of the Government. The appointment of a Minister for Fisheries indicates the importance the Government attached to the development to its maximum potential of one of our greatest natural resources.”

The Irish Times, 5th February, 1977 © The Irish Times

Questions and points for discussion

1. To what new Government position was Mr. Paddy Donegan appointed in February 1977?
2. Explain the reasons given by the Government spokesman for setting up the new Department.

Secondary Source 7

To soften the territorial demands of the Irish and British governments, the Commission drew up proposals in May 1977 to run the policy on a system of fishing plans. This did not satisfy British Fisheries Minister John Silkin who demanded a twelve-mile exclusive zone and a ‘dominant preference’ in the twelve to fifty-mile stretch. Mr. Silkin refused to attend an informal meeting of the fisheries ministers in West Berlin at the end of January 1978 at which Fianna Fáil’s Brian Lenihan officially dropped Ireland’s fifty-mile claim. Mr. Lenihan said he was satisfied that ‘substantial advantage’ would be secured through a scheme for fishing plans operating on an interim basis and designed to offer special preference for Irish fishermen up to 200 miles from the coast.

Despite progress in Berlin, negotiations on an overall common policy were not completed until early 1983. p.101


Questions and points for discussion

1. Why did the Commission draw up proposals for fishery plans in May 1977?
2. What was the reaction of the British fisheries minister, John Silkin, to these proposals?
3. What was the response to these proposals of the Irish Minister for Fisheries, Brian Lenihan, at the meeting in West Berlin in January 1978?
4. When was agreement on a new Common Fisheries Policy eventually reached?

Archive material supplied courtesy of The Irish Times at www.irishtimes.com.
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Source 12

Mr. Liam Kavanagh (Labour spokesman on Foreign Affairs) wanted to know if Mr. Lenihan had abandoned the 50-mile exclusive limit which he had supported before the election and also in the European Parliament.

Mr. Lenihan said that we would get the same advantage out of fishery plans which incorporated a reserved zone for Irish fishermen. Along with interested parties in the industry, and in consultation with the Commission and other member states, we could devise a plan that would give us the same advantages.

_The Irish Times_, Monday, 3rd February, 1978 © The Irish Times

Questions and points for discussion
1. Looking back at Secondary Source 8, why do you think Mr. Kavanagh asked the Dáil question referred to above?
2. Explain Mr. Lenihan’s response to Mr. Kavanagh’s question?

Source 13

The Irish Fishermen’s Organisation leader, Mr. Joey Murrin, will be staying on to push the organisation’s claim for a 50-mile exclusive limit despite his personal opposition to the plan. Mr. Murrin, who three weeks ago compared Mr. Lenihan, Minister for Fisheries, to a businessman who had signed a deal he hadn’t seen, subsequently gave in to intense pressure from both the Minister and EEC Commissioner, Mr. Gundelach, and called on the IFO to accept the controversial quota plans. Last Saturday, at a stormy five-hour meeting of the IFO executive, his advice was put to the test and defeated by ten votes to three. However, the executive says he was asked and agreed to continue on as chairman “working rigidly for a 50-mile limit”.

With Mr. Murrin staying on once more to spear head the 50-mile campaign the situation is more or less back at square one. And, yesterday, the Minister warned again that Irish fishermen would be “ill advised” not to cooperate with his plans. In an interview on RTE’s lunchtime news programme, he said he would advise the IFO “very strongly” that they would harm only themselves if they continued to press for a 50-mile limit.

_The Irish Times_, 7th March, 1978 © The Irish Times

Questions and points for discussion
1. What reason does the writer give for Joey Murrin changing his position on the issue of a 50-mile exclusive limit?
2. Suggest reasons why the IFO [Irish Fishermen’s Organisation] meeting of March 1978 described above was “stormy”.
3. What does the writer mean when he says, “the situation is more or less back at square one”?
4. What was the Minister’s response to the IFO decision to continue to demand a 50-mile zone? (The minister in question was Brian Lenihan, Minister for Fisheries.)

Archive material supplied courtesy of The Irish Times at www.irishtimes.com.
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Source 14

The European Commission has drawn up a list of proposed catch quotas for Irish fishermen which the Government has cautiously welcomed as being in line with the EEC’s pledge to promote the expansion of the industry.

However, the Commission has decided that the ban on herring fishing in the Celtic Sea should continue, so that stocks can be replenished.

The Irish Times, 16th July, 1980 © The Irish Times

Questions and points for discussion
1. Explain what is meant by “catch quotas for Irish fishermen”.
2. Explain the government’s response to the proposed quotas.
3. Why had the Commission decided to continue the ban on herring fishing in the Celtic Sea?

‘Recap’ Quiz

• Who was Minister for Foreign Affairs when Ireland signed the Treaty of Accession to the EEC in 1972?

• Who was Minister for Foreign Affairs in 1976 when the ‘Hague Resolutions’ recognised the right of the Irish fishing industry to expand with EEC assistance?

• Who was the first man appointed Minister for Fisheries when a new department dedicated to fisheries was set up in 1977?

• Who was Minister for Fisheries when the demand for a 50-mile exclusive limit was dropped in 1978?

• Who was the leader of the Irish Fishermen’s Organisation from 1974 until 1979?

• Who was the EEC Commissioner responsible for fisheries policy in 1976 when the “Hague Resolutions” were passed, and in 1978 when the Irish demand for a 50-mile exclusive limit was dropped?

Archive material supplied courtesy of The Irish Times at www.irishtimes.com.
Enquiry, Stage 4: What were the implications for Irish fisheries of the 1983 Common Fisheries Policy?

Among the factors identified in commentaries are:

- Government ministers and officials on the one hand, and fishermen on the other, disagreed about the benefits to Ireland under the new policy.
- Ireland was to have an exclusive six-mile zone, with twelve-mile exclusive sections around the coasts of Donegal and Kerry.
- Existing fishing rights held by Irish fishermen in parts of the Irish Sea and elsewhere were to be protected.
- Ireland was allocated approximately 4.3% of the total Community catch.

Source 15

The following is an edited extract from an *Irish Times* report posted from Brussels and published under the headline, “EEC agrees on common fish policy”:

The ten EEC states yesterday finally agreed a Common Fisheries Policy after seven years of negotiations, but only after the Minister for Fisheries, Mr. O’Toole, had held up the Council of Ministers meeting here for two hours seeking clarification about mackerel stocks off Co. Donegal.

Under the Common Fisheries Policy Ireland has been given 4.6 per cent of the total Community catch. The Minister for Fisheries, Mr. O’Toole, said that the agreement meant that Irish fishermen had "exclusive rights to 80 per cent of the total availability of fish in Irish waters (the 12-mile limit)."

Such figures were dismissed as misleading by Mr. Frank Doyle, general secretary of the Irish Fishermen’s Organisation. Mr. Doyle was dissatisfied with the scope in the agreement for expansion of the industry.

Conservation measures and limitations on fish searches due to fuel costs, as well as low market prices, have the industry in a mood of depression, out of keeping with the celebrations among the government delegations about the agreement.

*The Irish Times*, 26th January, 1983 © The Irish Times

Questions and points for discussion

1. On what date in 1983 was the Common Fisheries Policy finally agreed?
2. According to this report, for how many years had the negotiation been on-going?
3. What caused a delay in the final two hours of negotiations, according to the report?
4. What did the Minister for Fisheries see as positive for Irish fishermen in the new agreement?
5. What was the response to the agreement of Mr. Frank Doyle, general secretary of the Irish Fishermen’s Organisation (IFO)?
6. What reasons does this report give for the “mood of depression” among Irish fishermen at the time?

Archive material supplied courtesy of *The Irish Times* at www.irishtimes.com.
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Source 16
The following is an edited extract from an Irish Times report posted from Brussels and published under the headline, “EEC agrees on common fish policy”:

Under the agreement Irish fishermen will have complete exclusivity within a six-mile limit all around the coast with 12-mile exclusive sections off Co. Donegal and Co. Kerry.

Irish vessels will still maintain their existing rights to fish in the British 6-12 mile limit in “the most productive parts of the Irish Sea” according to the Department of Fisheries, as well as off the west coast of Scotland, around the Isle of Man, and around Northern Ireland.

The agreement was attacked last night in a statement by Mr. Joey Murrin, chief executive of the Killybegs Fishermen’s Organisation and a director of the Irish Fishermen’s Organisation.

“While Ireland holds 25 per cent of the fishing waters within the EEC, it still has the smallest percentage of the EEC catch. As a result of the agreement, the countries with the larger fishing industries will continue to develop while Ireland and its fishermen must continue to struggle,” he said.

The Irish Times, 26th January, 1983

© The Irish Times

Questions and points for discussion
1. Under the agreement, what areas around Ireland were to form an exclusion zone for Irish fishermen?
2. In what specific sea areas were Irish fishermen to retain existing rights?
3. What positions were held by Joey Murrin in January 1983?
4. On what basis did Joey Murrin criticise the new Common Fisheries Policy?

Secondary Source 8 (edited)
Although Britain and France reached agreement on the question of access by early 1982, adoption of a comprehensive fish policy was held up by the Danes until January 1983. Under the new policy Ireland was allocated 4.3% of species subject to quota restrictions in all EEC waters. This amounted to 149,485 tonnes, of which 41,485t were white fish, 80,000t mackerel and 28,000t herring. When herring stocks recover, Ireland’s quota will rise to 60,000t or 15% of that stock total. Most Community fish are in the North Sea and other areas where Irish fishermen have not fished. Thus the 4.3% figure is not so small as it looks.


Question/point for discussion
1. What country had delayed the adoption of the Common Fisheries Policy, according to the authors?
2. What comment do the writers make on the 4.3% of species allocated to Ireland? Explain this comment.
3. Why was the allocation for herring smaller than that for the other species mentioned?

Archive material supplied courtesy of The Irish Times at www.irishtimes.com
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Note:

Regarding the apparent discrepancy between the 4.3% figure mentioned above (in Secondary Source 8) and the 4.6% figure mentioned in Source 15, the following explanation may be helpful.

| There was no official publication showing what percentage of the total fish available went to member states. This was because such crude analyses give a misleadingly simple impression of how the various quotas are allocated. Quotas are shared out on a zonal basis as well as by species and member state. | p.243
---|---|

Secondary Source 9 (edited)

Although the Irish had not been able to impose the wide national fishing limit they originally demanded, they had obtained preferential regional status and a very substantial increase in their share of the Community’s available fish resources.  

p.247


Question/point for discussion

1. What was the width of “the wide national fishing limit” that Irish fishermen and the Irish government originally demanded?
2. In what areas of the sea had Ireland received “preferred regional status”? (See Source 16 if you are not sure about this.)
3. The writer says that Ireland obtained “a very substantial increase in their share of the Community’s available fish resources”. What was that share according to Source 15?
4. What were the different responses of the Minister for Fisheries and Joey Murrin to Ireland’s share of the catch? (You will need to check Sources 15 and 16 for this.)
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Enquiry, Stage 5: Drawing conclusions – the impact of EEC membership on Irish fisheries

The subject of the Common Fisheries Policy of the EEC (now, the EU) is a matter of ongoing concern and debate. It received a good deal of attention in discussions on ‘Brexit’ in the UK during 2016. In the ten years following EEC membership, there was much criticism of EEC policy on fisheries as it related to Ireland. There were also significant advances in the development of the Irish sea fishing industry, in particular those that followed on from the adoption of the Hague Resolution of 1976.

Along with the sources already studied, the sources that follow should help students to reach conclusions about the impact of EEC membership on Irish fisheries. Whatever conclusions students arrive at, they should ensure that any statements they make are supported by some of the sources studied.

Source 17: an ‘insider’ view

The following is an edited extract from an interview with Joey Murrin, published in The Irish Times, 30th April, 1985.

“From a fishing point of view entering the EEC was an absolute disaster.”

“Take mackerel. If a man comes in here looking to buy a boat to catch mackerel he won’t get it. The EEC won’t let us help him because we’re fulfilling our quotas already. Effectively the lid is on us.”

Murrin believes that if the Irish industry had begun to build itself up 20 years ago, as did the British and Dutch industries, it could have negotiated quotas several times higher than the present ones. He accepts that fishermen are as much to blame as anyone else. “We do lack solidarity and in difficult situations we tend to go for each other’s throats.”

The Irish Times, 30th April, 1985 © The Irish Times

Questions and points for discussion
1. Two years after the adoption of the revised Common Fisheries Policy in 1983, what was Joey Murrin’s verdict on the impact of the EEC on Irish fisheries?
2. What example does Joey Murrin give to back up his argument?
3. What underlying flaw in the Irish fishing industry does Joey Murrin identify? You will need to explain your answer.
4. On what basis does Joey Murrin accept that, “fishermen are as much to blame as anyone else?”

Archive material supplied courtesy of The Irish Times at www.irishtimes.com.
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Source 18: an ‘outsider’ view

The following is edited an excerpt from an article entitled “The plough and the shores”, published in the British economics journal, The Economist, 9th April, 1977.

In 1963 fishing contributed only £1m to GNP. Now its contribution is estimated to exceed £32m. At the same time the value of fish landings has risen from £1.4m to £10.5m, the number employed in the business has increased by 25% and investment in the fishing fleet has reached almost £22m, with a further £5.5m invested in shore-based industry. Today fishing provides employment directly and indirectly for almost 9,000 people and, within the context of the EEC, the value of Irish landings accounts for a larger share of the country’s gross domestic product than in any other state except Denmark.


Questions and points for discussion

1. According to the writer, in what ways had the Irish fishing industry become more important economically in the period 1963 to 1977?
2. Within the context of the EEC, what point does the writer make about the value of fish landed in Ireland?

Secondary Source 10

The following is an edited excerpt from a report prepared by Killian Kehoe, an expert in European law, for The Institute of International and European Affairs in 2009. Here, the writer reflects on the Common Fisheries Policy as it developed between 1976 and 1983 and why the policy was less than ideal for Ireland. The full report may be downloaded at http://www.iiea.com/publications/fishing-for-a-future-the-reform-of-the-common-fisheries-policy

A Community methodology [was] devised for allocating shares of Total Allowable Catches (TACs) to Member States for each fishing area and species. The allocation key was based on three main criteria:

1. Traditional fishing activity (i.e. average catches over the period 1973-1978).
2. The preferences for regions dependent on fishing (i.e. giving effect to the Hague Resolution and a doubling of the 1975 Irish catch).
3. Compensation to certain Member States for lost fishing opportunities in third country waters (this benefited mainly the UK and Germany).

Despite Ireland’s laudable negotiating achievement at The Hague, any allocation key that was largely reliant on recent historic performance was bound to eventually militate against a country with such a low base in the first place. The allocation key agreed in January 1983 has remained the cornerstone of the CFP for over a quarter of a century.
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Questions and points for discussion

1. The writer explains how the TACs (Total Allowable Catches) were worked out (what he refers to as “the allocation key”). Which one of the three criteria was of benefit to Ireland? Explain why.

2. Which one of the three criteria was potentially damaging for Ireland? Explain why.

3. Which one of the three criteria, therefore, was of no real relevance to Ireland? Explain why.

4. The writer says, “The allocation key agreed in January 1983 has remained the cornerstone of the CFP for over a quarter of a century.” Discuss whether you think he considers this a good thing or a bad thing. If you need to consult the report to answer this, the report is currently available at http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/docs/iiea_en.pdf.
A critical skills exercise

Documents-based study

Development of critical skills

Documents-based question

The Leaving Certificate History syllabus states that the documents-based study is “the primary means of developing [students’] skills in working with evidence”. (p.5)
The syllabus also states that, in the examination, the documents-based question “will test candidates’ ability to interrogate, correlate and evaluate a particular body of evidence”. (p.15)

Rationale for card sorts

In a card sort, cards with text (single words, phrases, sentences) are grouped or ranked according to particular criteria. Card sorts are good in helping students to make connections and form judgements. By having the text on cards, students can move them around, group them and, when necessary, change their minds. This approach promotes discussion and collaborative learning.

The intention of the critical skills exercise on the pages that follow is to illustrate in a practical and active manner the type of critical skills that the documents-based study is designed to develop. Essentially, the purpose of the exercise is to encourage students to THINK by discussing snippets of evidence and making judgements on their import by deciding whether they support or oppose the given proposition. The PLAY element is important and the exercise should be an engaging one for students. The intention is not to come up with answers that are either ‘right’ or ‘wrong’: much of the value of the exercise is in the process itself. That said, it should be possible to reach consensus in most cases and to clarify misunderstandings – where these arise – in the process.

In literacy development, such approaches can play a pivotal role as students engage together in purposeful reading and discussion of text and are active participants in the learning process.

What is involved in the critical skills exercise

Each group of 4-5 students is given an A4 sheet with the proposition at the top of the page and two columns headed: Agrees and Disagrees. Each group is also given an envelope containing 8 short documentary extracts – each on its own small strip of paper or cardboard – and the task is to discuss with each other the appropriate column in which to place each extract. When each group has reached its conclusions, the outcome of the exercise is discussed in a whole group setting.
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**Proposition:** EEC policies had a negative effect on Irish fisheries.

Place each of the secondary source extracts in the appropriate column, depending on whether you think it agrees or disagrees with the above proposition. If the group cannot agree on whether a particular extract agrees or disagrees with the proposition, place it along the dividing line in the middle and wait to hear what other groups have to say about the extract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agrees</th>
<th>Disagrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Source A</strong></th>
<th><strong>Source E</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We’re caged up. The Common Fisheries Policy has done that to us. It has placed a lid on the Irish fishing industry that never will be lifted.</td>
<td>The 1980 ESRI Fishery Report said that many areas within Donegal, Mayo, Galway, Kerry, and West Cork are now thriving areas due almost entirely to income from fishing. Without such incomes they would be deprived, under-populated areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Source B</strong></th>
<th><strong>Source F</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The fishing industry, according to Mr. Brendan O’Kelly, chairman and chief executive of Bord Iascaigh Mhara, is heading into a decade of change. In Ireland, unlike the rest of the industry in Europe where boats are for sale and contraction is the order of the day, fishing is to expand.</td>
<td>The Hague Declaration has largely proved a happy boon for Irish fishermen, with the notable exception of herring catches because of restrictions designed to save the badly depleted stocks of that species.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Source C</strong></th>
<th><strong>Source G</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Minister for Fisheries and Forestry, Mr. O’Toole, has announced £326,259 worth of EEC grants for fishery projects. Five of the projects relate to the construction of new fishing vessels and the remaining six to modernisation of fishing vessels.</td>
<td>Ireland’s position as a clear net beneficiary of EEC policies differentiated it from the UK and made the establishment of a united front on the fishing access issue difficult.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Source D</strong></th>
<th><strong>Source H</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On 1 January 1977, Ireland’s exclusive fishery limits, together with those of the other EEC maritime states, were extended to 200 miles. This had the effect of preventing the eastern European states from fishing for mackerel and horse mackerel in fishing grounds off the Irish coasts.</td>
<td>Charles Haughey posed an interesting question in the Dáil in 1978: ‘Why should Irish fisheries, this one natural resource that our underdeveloped economy has at its disposal to develop, be thrown into a community pool for the benefit of all the member states of the community when German steel, British oil, Dutch gas – none of these are thrown into a community pool?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Your conclusions on the enquiry

Our enquiry has looked at the state of Irish fisheries as Ireland joined the EEC, the arrangements put in place under the terms of accession, the challenges faced by fisheries within the EEC and how politicians responded to these, and the implications for Ireland of the 1983 Common Fisheries Policy.

Based on the evidence you have encountered in the course of the enquiry, identify:

(a) The most important point about the state of Irish fisheries as Ireland joined the EEC
(b) Two important arrangements put in place for Irish fisheries under the terms of accession
(c) Two challenges facing Irish fisheries following entry to the EEC and how politicians responded to these
(d) Two significant implications for Irish fisheries of the 1983 Common Fisheries Policy

Make your case in a written report, devoting one paragraph to each of the points identified. In a concluding paragraph, give your judgement – based on the evidence you have studied – in relation to the question: What was the impact of EEC membership on Irish fisheries?

OR.

Now that we have looked at a wide range of evidence on the impact of the EEC on fisheries

- What do you think is the most important point about the state of Irish fisheries as Ireland joined the EEC?
- What do you think are the TWO most important arrangements put in place for Irish fisheries as Ireland joined the EEC?
- What do you think are the TWO most important actions taken by politicians to deal with the challenges facing fisheries following entry to the EEC?
- What do you think is the most important point about the arrangements put in place for Irish fisheries under the 1983 Common Fisheries Policy?

Back up each point you give with evidence from the sources that we have studied.