

Wheeler, P. F. and Salt, F. W. (2006), Disabled activism, a historically problematic relationship with charity. Paper delivered at the Disability Studies Association Conference, Lancaster University, 18-20 September 2006.

Disabled activism, a historically problematic relationship with charity.

Dr. P.F. Wheeler.
University of Warwick,
Warwick business school.
Coventry CV 4 7AL.
Email: pfwheeler@btinternet.com

F. W. Salt.
Manchester Metropolitan University,
Department of history and Economic History,
Oxford Road,
Manchester.
Email: fw.salt@zen.co.uk

Abstract.

The activism displayed by the members of UPIAS some 30 years ago had as one of its central targets the relationship between disabled people and traditional charities. For the members of UPIAS the battle ground over which their fight for emancipation was to be undertaken could be regarded as who controlled the social and economic destiny of the members., the principally non disabled charity workers or the disabled residents of their home. In many respects this represents a simplistic relationship between disabled people and charity, the individual is either for or against it. This polar oppositional positioning has caused much debate and controversy in the disability movement. For example, in recent years the Greater Manchester Coalition of Disabled People (GMCDP) has held an internal debate over whether to apply for charitable status. On the one hand, one powerful argument held that accepting charitable status would be a surrender to reactionary forces of oppression, a reinforcement of historical negative representations of disabled people; whereas on the other, pragmatists rallied claiming accepting charitable status had financial and tax benefits, which could more easily allow the organisation to continue and perhaps illustrate how a charity guided by the principals of the social model of disability could provide an emancipatory model. Intern this model could provide a template in which disabled people and disability politics could hold a central and powerful position. However, this problematic relationship between disabled people and charity is not new. In 1918 after many years of often hostile debate, a senior member of

the National League of the Blind (NLB), the first trade union of disabled people, forcibly argued that members of the league should hold positions on the boards of charities running workshops for their members. In essence this stance argued that governance of charities concerned with disabled people should be in the control of disabled people, a cause which some 60 years later may have had resonance with UPIAS members. However, the NLB also held contradictory views over its own charitable status. In 1922 two members of the union were prosecuted in London for begging from the public for funds to support the union's fight for economic emancipation and social justice for blind workers. The NLB refused to register as a charity and hence under the war charities act was not permitted to publicly ask for donations in its support. Again this resembles the dilemma faced by GMCDP; the organisation required all the financial assistance it could find to continue its emancipatory struggle, although the most financially expedient i.e. applying for charitable status was politically and philosophically extremely unpalatable. This paper recovers the histories of the struggles both politically and ideologically undertaken by the NLB and considers how their battles and resolutions compare to present day issues and whether these can be informed from an empirical analysis of the past.

Introduction.

There exists for many in the disability movement a belief that the only significant struggle for emancipation for disabled people began in the 1960's followed by the formation of 'The Union of Physically Impaired Against Segregation' (UPIAS) in 1975 (Finkelstein 2002). Other authors acknowledge the existence of previous social movements of disabled people (Barnes, 1991; Campbell and Oliver 1996), although detailed analysis of their struggles and ideological beliefs are in the main unrecorded. The shortage of historical accounts of disability based on actual experiential knowledge from outside institutional settings has been called into question by Elizabeth Bredburg (1999), who has challenged writers of disability history to move away from Meta narratives and concentrate more on the experience of disability from empirical evidence. By adopting a similar methodology, and recovering histories from disabled activists, Wheeler and Danieli (2006) illustrate for example how from the beginning of the 20th century the difference between disability as a socially created phenomena and impairment as an individual medical condition was clearly understood and used as an argument to effect social and political change in the life experiences of disabled people. This paper develops these arguments and draws on documentary data published by the National League of the Blind (NLB) to uncover how this first wave disability movement approached their social positioning in relation to traditional charity.

We have chosen the relationship between disabled people and charity as the prime focus of this paper because it can be argued, at the heart of the formation of UPIAS was a discontent at the subordinate status experienced by the disabled residents of a 'Cheshire home' provided by charity and dominated by a medical

consideration over the causes of disability. In many respects, this opposition to the dominant social status quo reflects the same arguments made by the NLB. The NLB was formed in London in 1893 with the assistance of London dockworkers (Rose 1970). It became a national organisation in 1899 (NLB 1899) AFFILIATED TO THE TUC in 1902 and later the Labour Party in 1909. The NLB played a pivotal role in organizing and mobilizing disabled people to inform the drafting of the 1920 blind persons act. The act called for a national system of sheltered workshops in which visually impaired workers could gain economic emancipation and independent living from what was considered an oppressive relationship with traditional charities. At this time charity operated workshops were dominant in providing opportunities for visually impaired people to gain paid work.

In this paper we will consider the ideology which helped create the NLB as a successful union representing disabled people. Additionally, an analysis of some of the major issues which ultimately caused the union to split will be considered. One significant benefit of recovering histories of actual political agitation by disabled activists is that by taking such a long view we can determine the outcomes of specific incidents, which can provide a historical framework to inform present day disability debates. For example, the recent discussions held by the Greater Manchester coalition of disabled people (GMCDP) over whether or not to register the organisation as a charity (GMCDP 2003). In the following pages we shall illustrate how this issue has historical resonance within disability politics and it is possible to recover such histories to inform present day practices.

Genesis of the National League of the Blind (NLB).

1893 was the year in which a meeting of visually impaired men from Manchester and London agreed to form an association to collectively fight for economic emancipation *away from traditional charities* (Purse, 1919; rose, 1970). *The majority were employed in charity workshops and their* First step was to outline a manifesto entitled “An Appeal to and for the Blind”. The document was an eloquent polemic which claimed traditional charitable institutions for the blind were overwhelmingly inefficient and corrupt, and ineffective in providing long term employment stating “the blind are drafted from these very Institutions and Workshops, into the street gutters and workhouses.” (Purse, 1898b: 8) and existed primarily to exploit the labor of blind workers. For these disabled radicals, the solution to their oppression at the hands of charities was to secure state financing for all workshops and adequate state support for those blind people who were not capable of work. (*ibid*).

It is not difficult to appreciate the parallels between these activists and the members of UPIAS who some 70 years later adopted a similar strategy to challenge their oppressive relationship with charity and wrote the document ‘The

fundamental principals of disability' in the early 1970's (UPIAS 1975). Both documents reflected the demands of the activists and adopted similar language in calling for emancipation, economic independence, and an end to their oppressive relationship with charities.

1894 saw the emergence of an unregistered organisation called the 'National League of the Blind of Great Britain and Ireland'. The group was established to promote the demands, outlined later in the manifesto above, and in 1897 they elected one of its founder members Ben Purse to become the first full time secretary (Purse, 1916a: 8). Purse was an extremely influential figure in the early years of the union formation and through his stewardship a National Conference was convened in 1897 (Purse, 1919). Following this dawn of collective activism the loose association sought and achieved registration under the Trades Unions Acts with the objective of organising the blind population throughout Great Britain and Ireland. The organized blind community was to be politicized to add weight to the union's demands for the State to take responsibility for the employment at adequate wages of all sightless persons already trained in workshop production methods and to provide a centralized training scheme for new entrants to the workshop sector. Additionally, for those who could not be trained, adequate pensions were demanded away from poor law provision (NLB, 1899).

Perhaps unsurprisingly, Largely due to frequent outspoken criticisms published in the Leagues official journal 'The Blind Advocate' founded in 1898, and because of many acts of resistance adopted by the militant activists the NLB faced hostility from many existing institutions for the blind which had the unintended consequence of causing victimization of members working in existing charity workshops (*Banham, 1901: 1-2*). The antagonism towards charities also caused the NLB to be excluded from most national conferences discussing the welfare of the blind which often affected government policy. So the NLB had a clear choice, it could remain a hostile critic with activists attempting to change the status quo from outside the dominant circles of power, or it could take a more conciliatory line attempting to alter opinions and hence policies from within existing power structures.

A critical period for the NLB occurred circa 1910 when the league principally through the influence of Purse modified its approach to their relationship with charities to a point at which cooperation became possible. This pragmatic change saw the influence of the NLB increase in political circles and gain support from some influential individuals who aided a wider recognition of the organisation as a legitimate lobbying group attempting to influence policy, achieve social change and ultimately emancipate blind people from their oppressive relationship with charity (NLB, 1914; Purse, 1919). So, there appears several similarities between the NLB and UPIAS as both attempted to emancipate disabled people initially driven by activists within their respective movements. While the ideology and theoretical stance of UPIAS has been well

documented (Barnes 1991; Campbell and Oliver 1996), detailed analysis of the politics of the NLB has until recently (see: Wheeler and Danieli 2006) been largely absent from writings on disability histories. Hence in this paper we shall give a more detailed account of the ideology and philosophies which steered the NLB to enable some critical comparisons to be drawn with present day disability politics. The two issues most relevant to this paper are, how did the NLB define disability, and which understandings did they have towards the concept of charity?

Definitions of disability.

The NLB considered a clear difference existed between impairment and disability. Impairment was the medical condition which in their case was the malfunction or loss of sight. The union actively sought medical intervention to prevent sight loss in infants (Purse, 1898: 1; The new beacon 1950: 88), in addition to calling for increased health and safety procedures in industry to reduce sight loss through industrial accidents particularly in the chemical and mining industries (Blind Advocate, 1899). However, with regard to disability, they argued the concept was a structural construct which disadvantaged impaired people (Slater 1899: 67-68). Again in an argument which may have had resonance with UPIAS members, one principal target for the NLB was the social roles constructed for blind people mainly through the attitudes of non-impaired workers in charitable institutions (Purse 1918: 2). Hence there is a logically consistent thread which links the understandings of disability as a combination of structural and attitudinal barriers which disabled impaired people and the staff and charitable institutions which produce the barriers as being the principal factor in the creation of disability. So for the NLB to attack charities was to take the fight for emancipation directly to the barriers which caused oppression. However, the term charity is an extremely nebulous concept and once more the NLB defined which aspects of charity were in their opinion the cause of oppression.

The NLB and its relationship with charity.

An 'undelivered address' published in 1911 aimed towards the boards of governors of workshop charities goes some way in helping define the NLB's relationship with charity. The union was not completely against charity and refers to a preindustrial time in ancient Greece when charitable giving was an honorable affair where artistic representations depict charity as caring women nursing the sick and uplifting the fallen (Blind Advocate, 1911: 3-5). This idealized philanthropy is contrasted with workshop charities whose management boards and governors are defined as: "*unscrupulous sweaters, pious hypocrites, political humbugs, and shady characters of all colours and descriptions, whose sole aim in life is to get on*" (ibid). The address is supportive of charity in the widest sense of philanthropic giving being a means of assisting others in times of need, but as illustrated is highly critical of the preponderance of 'middle class' managers and governors who they regarded as creating the disabling barriers, and, reactionary

in terms of accepting change especially when NLB claims were for equal representation and even control of charity management boards. One of the issues which caused greatest union indignation was the salaries paid to non-impaired charity workers while NLB members were fighting for a living wage, mostly on piece rates (Purse, 1911: 8-9).

The NLB were adept at bringing to public attention, often using provocative language, the injustices endemic to the charity business. In 1921 an open letter addressed to 'fellow citizens' titled 'a clergyman's heartless treatment of blind workers' (Perry 1921), crystallizes the union's relationship to charity. While applauding the philanthropic nature of the general public, it attacks the religious leaders of one particular charity, the London association for the blind. The letter accuses the charity of "*embezzlement of funds and callous inhumanity*" towards blind workers who were all poorly paid and often dismissed and left to beg on the streets while the clerics and other paid officials of the institution were paid 'exorbitant' salaries (ibid). One strategy of the NLB was to examine the balance sheets of charities and publicly voice the often large gap between charity income and the amount actually received by blind workers (Purse 1915: 8-9). Hence it is suggested that 'the "*feudal lords*" of charities receive salaries ranging between £400 and £1200 per annum, while workers receive a few shillings per week (Lawley 1920: 4-5). Adopting a more targeted approach brought to public attention the difference between amounts raised through high profile public appeals and the corresponding sums which eventually filtered down to the visually impaired community. In 1921 the National institute for the blind (now the Royal national institute of the blind), held a fund raising event which grossed £87,000. Administration costs and salaries for officials came to £64,000 leaving £23,000 to be used for assisting blind people, the recipients the philanthropic donors had assumed their contributions would be transferred to (Davies and Perry 1923). It becomes clear that the criticism of the NLB was not aimed at philanthropic donation, but rather the managerial processes and people who acted between donors and recipients i.e. "*middle class do-gooders*" extracting large salaries and promoting their own self interest (Lawley 1920; Perry 1921). Perhaps it was this antagonism towards charity which ensured in the early period of existence that the union did not register itself as a charity. However, the issue of whether or not to register as a charity had significant implications for the union and caused internal splits and divisions.

The NLB, trade union or charity?

The NLB operated on two levels, as a trade union it fought for workers rights and improved pay and conditions for members as an affiliated member of the TUC. To fund their activities each member paid subscriptions to the organisation (Drayton 1923: 4-5). Additionally it operated as a quasi

charity giving payments to blind members of the community who were not members of the union (ibid). As subscriptions alone could not provide sufficient income, the union subsidised funds through arranging street collections. In financial terms, the union raised more funds from street collections than it did from member's subscriptions (Drayton 1923: 4). However, the NLB regarded itself primarily as a trade union and not a charity and consequently had not registered as a charity as it was required to do under the 1920 Blind person's act and 1916 war charities act.

For different reasons, both acts permitted the collection of money from the general public only by charities that were registered with the charity commissioners. This restriction was designed to prevent unscrupulous people from making collections ostensibly on behalf of a worthy cause and then keeping any money collected themselves. As the NLB had not registered as a charity for political reasons, it now found itself acting in breach of both pieces of legislation when members continued to make street collections to raise funds. In 1922 two members of the union were arrested and convicted of Illegal Street collecting (NLB, 1922) a conviction that was upheld in the court of appeal in December 1922 (Clydesdale 1923b: 6; Blind Advocate, 1923a: 4-5). This conviction raised some serious issues for the NLB as it was now operating illegally and the question was posed as to whether or not it should swallow the bitter pill and register as a charity. The fact that the organisation raised more funds through street collections than it did from membership subscriptions made the issue of registration one of survival.

As with many issues affecting the disability community today, in 1923 the question of whether or not the NLB should register as a charity was forcibly expressed through the pages of the organisation's own journal, the blind advocate. The seriousness of the question is reflected in the title of one leading article at that time, 'The Preservation of the League' (Clydesdale, 1923a: 3-6). In response to this article one proposal was that the league should become a self sustaining society funded by an increased rate of member subscription (Popple 1923: 3). This suggestion was quickly rebuffed in a later edition which reminded readers that a vote of members had already agreed not to adopt charitable status and not to increase subscriptions (Drayton 1923). ADDITIONALLY Clydesdale, A FREQUENT CONTRIBUTOR, suggested a self financing Society could require a substantial increase in individual subscriptions, and furthermore raised the issue of democratic accountability in the wider blind population. He suggested it was an 'arrogant' claim for the minority who worked in institutions and were members of the NLB to speak on behalf of the vast majority of blind people who lived outside the reach of institutions and were

not members of the NLB. For Clydesdale, the only reasonable solution was for the NLB to retrench in to its original position of demanding state control of all workshops with adequate pensions for those who did not or could not work (Clydesdale 1923c: 2).

A third equally persuasive position was proposed by Drayton who took a considered position over the legal status of the organisation as it stood (Drayton 1923). He suggested trying to continue as before and knowingly operate outside the law was folly, and as the organisation had effectively operated as a charity in the past, charitable registration should take place with the organisation adopting the judge's recommendation of being both a trade union and registered charity (Drayton 1923:4-6). Although Drayton's position could be regarded as reactionary, it could equally be seen as pragmatic and perceptive.

The NLB did not register as a charity. However, this position did have consequences which affected the union's ability to advocate on behalf of both its members and the wider visually impaired community. In February 1923 a delegation from the TUC together with senior NLB officials met the secretary of state for health to complain that the NLB had been refused a place on the central committee on the welfare of the blind (Blind Advocate 1923b: 5-7). The committee was convened to inform government policy and so was an influential means for the NLB to advocate and inform policy. When asked why the NLB would not be allowed representation, the minister referred to the recent court case which had determined the NLB was acting illegally by acting as, but not registering as a charity. From the perspective of government, it could not be seen to advocate illegality by an organisation and hence participation as a member of the committee was not permitted (Blind Advocate 1923b:6). Hence the decision not to register as a charity effectively excluded the organisation from influencing policy and potentially improving living conditions for stakeholders. Similar to present day debates within the disability movement, the way in which registration developed in to a polar opposite choice brought internal conflict, bitter personal attacks and claims of officials 'selling out' in pursuit of personal gain.

For example, Popple accused Clydesdale of trying to 'stampede' members of the union in to accepting registration without due regard to other options more in line with trade union principals (Popple 1923). In reply, Clydesdale argues that Popple and a fellow critic Harris are confused in their attacks as they apparently draw their conclusions from propositions Clydesdale had proposed as alternatives

(Clydesdale 1923c: 2). Perhaps the sternest critique was made by Harris who accuses NLB officials of being:

“leading lights, seeking a public career in national and local politics, we feel that it is only fair to say that more permanent and valuable results might be obtained from such services honestly rendered than from the ambitions of certain other leading members, which has so far resulted in the obtaining of favoured treatment within institutions and societies”.

(Harris cited in Clydesdale 1923c: 2).

Clydesdale replied by suggesting the attack was unworthy of a response (ibid), although another article in the same issue carried on his argument (Clydesdale, 1923d: 6). Never the less, these sentiments appear time and again in the disability movement, when individuals attempt to influence change from within structures of power it seems attack from fellow activists is almost inevitable. Another example of internal battles occurred prior to the debate on charity registration. From 1914 Ben Purse had been a member of the interdepartmental committee (Hayse Fisher, 1917) whose report influenced the drafting of the 1920 blind persons act. Again from the columns of the blind advocate, Purse’s place on the committee was vilified with him being accused of staying ‘mute’ on the subject of when the committees report was to be published and being “*a former comrade influenced through personal gain and was now on the side of the opponents*” (Halkyard 1916: 12). Unsurprisingly Purse responded in kind accusing Halkyard of being ‘mischievous and wholly inaccurate’, and in no position to cast himself as an ‘oracle of the Gods’, intent on developing reputation for himself by attacking others in the union (Purse 1916b: 8-9). Such vitriolic attacks rarely reach compromise or consensus, it seems more likely that they draw to an unresolved conclusion when one or both battle weary sides decide they no longer have either the will or energy to continue.

Much soul searching within the NLB branches and at executive committee level occurred over the contradictions within the union over whether or not it should register as a charity. The problems appeared intractable, the courts had ruled the organisation could be registered as both a trade union and a charity (Blind Advocate 1923a), although many officials (Clydesdale 1923a; Gearson 1923) and rank and file members (Drayton 1923), found the proposition objectionable.

Gearson laid down the ideological problem registration posed by saying, registration meant they would be accepting the most appropriate method of emancipating blind people was the system they had been fighting against for

over 20 years. In effect the union would have to admit they had been going round in circles (Grearson 1923:4).

Grearson skillfully pointed out the inherent contradictions and splits the issue of registration had brought. The NLB required more funding than membership fees raised, a shortfall members had declined to meet through increased subscriptions. Yet they had also voted against pursuing the alternative fund raising option i.e. from charitable collections. Despite this seemingly official and democratic stance, he suggested if branch members are spoken to individually many will openly accept the union is actually a charity as well (ibid). This brings in to the debate the issue of the difference between formal and informal policy.

Formally the NLB opposed charity and would not register as one, informally members accepted much of the work and money raised to enable organisational survival was from charitable sources. The final appeal Grearson made was for the NLB to accept that different voices appeared within the union with different understandings and hence different points of view. He pleads for tolerance and an end to 'prejudice' which he fears will cause uncertainty ultimately threatening organisational survival. Attempting to heal internal divisions he demands there is no branch which can 'wag its finger at any other' because all are collectively responsible for allowing the union too end up in its present unsatisfactory position (Grearson 1923: 4). He ends with the following appeal for unity:

"Let us then with a clear knowledge of the real issue, with clean hands, stout hearts, and unshaken confidence in one another, because the dividing issues have been left behind, make the necessary changes in our rules to meet the new circumstance, tighten up our organisation, and move steadily forward to that success which we hope for, and which we deserve" (Grearson 1923: 4).

Whilst the future of the current disability movement is unclear, it is possible to determine what effects such internal warfare had on the NLB. Put simply the union split in to two with Ben Purse forming a break away union the national union of professional and industrial blind(see Wheeler and Danieli 2006).

Summary and conclusions.

The similarities between the first wave disability movement the NLB and the present movement are many. For example, as the NLB was formed from disabled activists, so was UPIAS. As the NLB regarded charity as a principal cause of oppression, so did UPIAS. As the NLB defined a distinction between impairment and disability, so did UPIAS. As the NLB defined social barriers as the cause of disability, so did UPIAS. As the NLB fought for emancipation and independent living, so did UPIAS. As the NLB fought for political change to end oppression, so did UPIAS. Clearly, many comparisons can be drawn between the two organisations although the experiential knowledge gained from this first

wave disability movement has not been drawn upon to inform either current policy or disability politics (Wheeler and Danieli 2006). The aim of this paper is to draw comparisons between the two organisations over one common theme i.e. the relationship between disabled people's movements and charity to reveal the similarities and perhaps inform current debates from recovered histories.

The principal issue which both helped form the NLB and paradoxically caused the greatest internal strife was the union's relationship with charity. In its formative years the oppressive relationship many individual members had with traditional charities made the call for united action to end the oppression easily recognizable and simple to understand. This allowed the union to gain widespread support based on the ideological belief that charity was the cause of oppression therefore an end to charity workshops and their replacement by state control would ultimately emancipate disabled workshop employees. However, as this simple consistent message made the journey from ideology to everyday action, contradictions and inconsistencies made the concept problematic in application.

The NLB were not set against all charitable actions. They appreciated the generosity of spirit that was often found in philanthropic giving and to some extent were philanthropists themselves giving donations to visually impaired members of the community who were not in the organisation. The method they chose to raise funds to fulfill these charitable acts were the same as many other traditional charities at that time, by asking the general public to subscribe through street collections. One means of analysing the inherent contradictions in NLB ideology is to consider the difference between formal and informal practice. Formally the organisation had used the concept of an anti charity stance as a rallying call around which the union could unite to affect political and social change. Informally the union and many of its members acknowledged the organisation had significant charitable interests (Drayton 1923; Grearson 1923). However, turning the informal practice in to formal policy by officially registering as a charity became a Rubicon the organisation found impossible to cross. Before the union split, there were several bitter and caustic exchanges as opinions became divided in to polar opposites over whether or not to register as a charity and change the charitable system from within (Grearson 1923; Pople 1923; Purse 1923). Perhaps the most damaging criticisms were those which accused elites in the union of 'selling out' to powerful interests in the charity sector to enhance their own careers (Halkyard 1916). Despite warnings from senior NLB figures that the bitterness generated was damaging and should stop (Grearson 1923), the in-fighting continued behind entrenched battle lines until the factions went on separate paths.

The question of registration for charitable status was an issue which recently raised similar ideological and practical tensions within GMCDP. From a practical standpoint charitable status can make economic sense allowing fund raising from more varied sources and tax concessions which can ease the financial plight of

the organisation and potentially assist organisational survival. However, like their counterparts in the NLB some 80 years earlier some activists found the proposal unpalatable and proponents were accused of 'selling out' for the purposes of personal self interest. Again senior members of the disability community appealed for an end to hostilities and an acceptance that others in the disability community can have legitimate views but do not necessarily have to agree with those who hold different understandings of the issues (Oliver 2003).

From recovered histories of disabled activism it is possible to discern that many issues and challenges facing today's disability movement have been confronted in the past and from this distance we can observe the arguments, issues, and outcomes which can provide warnings over any particular course of action. The politicising of large numbers of disabled people can be seen from the early 20th century and many lessons can be learned regarding successes and failures of their political struggle. We would argue, rather than using generalised accounts of disabling practices, a more productive course of recovering disabled histories is to reveal the battles and struggles organised activists have undertaken and consider the results they achieved.

REFERENCES.

Blind Advocate. (1899) Miss Liona Wilson on Blindness. The Blind Advocate Vol II No 13 p1 September 1899.

Blind Advocate. (1911), Direct Representation of the Blind: An Undelivered Address. The Blind Advocate Vol X No 141 pp 3-5 December 1911.

Blind Advocate. (1923a) The League and the Law: High Court Judgment. The Blind Advocate VOL. XX, No. 274. pp 4-5 FEBRUARY 1923.

Blind Advocate. (1923b) Deputation from the League to the Minister of Health. The Blind Advocate Vol XX No 277 pp5-7 April 1923.

Banham, W. . (1901), A BLIND WORKMAN VICTIMISED BY HENSHAW'S CHARITY Manchester! Blind Advocate Vol I, No 12 p1, February 1901.

Barnes, C. (1991), Disabled People in Britain and Discrimination. London. Hurst & Co.

Bredberg, E. 1999. "Writing Disability History: Problems, Perspectives, and Sources." *Disability & Society* 14:189-201.

Campbell, J., Oliver, M. (1996) 'Disability Politics' Understanding our past, changing our future. London, New York. Routledge.

Clydesdale, J. A. (1923a) Preservation of the League. The Blind Advocate Vol XX No 274 pp 3-6 March 1923.

Clydesdale, J. A. (1923b) Unregistered. The Blind Advocate. Vol. XX. No 275 p 6. March 1923.

Clydesdale, J. A. (1923c) Letter from J. A. Clydesdale on Registration. The Blind Advocate. Vol XX. No 278 p2 June 1923.

CLYDESDALE, J. A. (1923d) Trade Union Principles and Method. The Blind Advocate Vol XX. No 278 p6. June 1923.

Davies, j. Perry, J. (c1923) The Fraud, Futility and Hypocrisy of Charity for the Blind: An exposure and appeal by the London District Council of the National League of the Blind of Great Britain and Ireland. Open Letter to Dear Citizens signed Mr J Davies, Chairman and Mr J PERRY Secretary London District Council. National League of the Blind Archive Reference Modern Records Center Warwick University.

Drayton, J. (1923) Registration. The Blind Advocate Vol XX No 277 pp 4-5 May 1923.

Finklestein. (2002), The Social Model of Disability Repossessed. The Greater Manchester coalition of Disabled People Magazine. FEBRUARY 2002.

Halkyard, W. (1916) State Aid After the War. The Blind Advocate Vol XIII No 198 p12 September 1916.

Grearson, J. (1923) Preservation of the League. The Blind Advocate. Vol. XX. No 275 p 4. March 1923.

Hayes Fisher, W (1917), Report of the Departmental Committee on the Welfare of the Blind. London. HMSO.

Lawley, D. B. (1920) The Iron Heel; Some Observations: The Upper and Nether Millstones. The Blind Advocate. VOL XVII NO 238 pp 4-5 JANUARY 1920.

NLB, (1899), Rule Book of The National League of the Blind of Great Britain and Ireland, 12th June 1898. NLB Archive Working Class Movement Library. Salford. NLB.

NLB. (1914) Fourteenth Annual Report year ending December 1914. Annual report of the National League of the BLIND 1914. **Box 1** National League of the Blind Archive Ref: **MSS 349/4 Modern Records Centre Warwick University.**

NLB. (1922) Verbatim Report of the Proceedings at the Tower Bridge Police Court, London. In the case of Messrs. Barber and Dale, prosecuted by the Commissioner of Police for raising funds on behalf of the principles and objects of the National League of the Blind. 10TH August 1922. The TUC Library. The Metropolitan University, London.

Oliver, M. (2003) Selling Out, Should We Care? Coalition, The Magazine of the Greater Manchester Coalition of Disabled People. November 2003. Manchester. GMCDP.

Perry, J. (c1921) A Clergyman's Heartless Treatment of Blind Workers. Open Letter to Fellow Citizens. J Perry, Secretary of the London District Council of the National League of the Blind. TUC Archive Reference MSS 292/91/24 Modern Records Centre Warwick University.

Popple, Mr. (1923) Unregistered? The Blind Advocate. Vol XX. No 277 p3. May 1923

Purse, B. (1898) The Blind of Greater Britain. The Blind Advocate Vol I No 1 pp 1-2, September 1898.

Purse, B. (1901) Henshaw's Blind Asylum: Resignation of the Master. The Blind Advocate Vol III. No 20 p3 October 1901.

Purse, B. (1911) Cheap Labour at Institutions for the Blind. The Blind Advocate Vol X, No 140 pp 8-9 November 1911

Purse, B. (1915) An Undelivered Letter to the Manager of the Tottenham Court Road Workshop for the Blind London. The Blind Advocate Vol

Purse, B. (1916a) Précis of Evidence to the Departmental Committee on the Blind. The Blind Advocate VOL XIII. No. 194 pp 8-12. May 1916.

Purse, B. (1916b) State Aid After the War. The Blind Advocate Vol XIII No 199 pp 8-9 October 1916.

Purse, B. (1918) In Mood Reflective, *The Blind Advocate*, Vol xv, No 217, 2-3
April 1918.

Purse, B. (1919) A Few Interesting Facts. Pamphlet national League of the Blind Archive Ref MSS 292/91/124. Modern Records Centre Warwick University.

Rose, J. (1970), *Changing Focus: The Development of Blind Welfare in Britain*. The Royal Institute for the BLIND, London, Hutchinson.

Slater, J (1899) What do we Mean by State Aid for the blind? *The Blind Advocate* Vol I No 7 pp 67-68 April 1899.

The New Beacon. (1950) Obituary of Mr Ben Purse. *The New Beacon* 15 April 1950 Vol XXXIV No. 400, pp 87-88. London. The Royal National Institute for the Blind

UPIAS. (1975) *Fundamental Principles of Disability*. Union of Physically Impaired Against Segregation.
[Www.leeds.ac.uk/disability-studies/archiveuk/](http://www.leeds.ac.uk/disability-studies/archiveuk/)

Wheeler, P., and Danieli, A. (2006), Old wine in new glasses, employment policies towards disabled people. *'Disability and Society'*, Volume 21, Number 5 (August 2006)