

we decided not to publish these either. And to place our motives beyond suspicion, we actually put aside our own unimpeachable arguments, and only used those contained in a pamphlet, issued by the Fund itself. From these latter we showed, that it was quite impossible for the scheme to be successful.

Once more no attempt was made—as, indeed, none was possible—to confute our conclusions. But then the statement was publicly made that the Fund was “assured of success,” because, forsooth, one hundred and twenty policies had been issued; and several facts were given, whose most misleading character we proved. Among others, it was actually stated that the Fund would commence with a Bonus Income of close upon £1,000 a year. We dissected the announcement, and showed conclusively, not only that the Fund could not have an income, at the best, of more than £800, but also that the whole of this, and probably much more, would be swallowed up in the essential expenses of working the business. In short, then, we proved that the scheme could not succeed, and that the hopes that were held out to Nurses of a probable “bonus” were utterly delusive. When we had done this much, we felt we had discharged our duty, to our readers in particular, and to Nurses in general. As we have said before, we could have shown greater proofs for our conviction, but we imagined we had proved enough.

That we were fully justified in our remarks, is evidenced by the mere fact that, although the Fund was only floated four months ago, it has been almost entirely remodelled since. As to this, we shall shortly have something more to say. At present, we desire merely to call to our readers' remembrance our action in this matter. For this is the head and front of our offence to our contemporary: because we have dared, in the face of its ungrammatical growling, to do our duty to the great profession, to whose interests we have devoted ourselves. In our fifth number, we went out of our way to reason quietly and calmly on this matter with our contemporary. We called attention to its onslaughts upon us; reminded it how unusual, in English journalism, this rude and riotous conduct is, and offered to it the olive branch frankly, proceeding to say: “But we earnestly hope for better things. We look forward to our contemporary and this journal—each with ever-widening circles for whom we respectively cater—working and writing on our separate lines, and doing honestly and thoroughly all that in our power lays, to instruct, interest, and amuse our readers, and to forward the objects and advance the wishes of our respective *clientele*.”

But our contemporary, apparently, was unable to understand our magnanimity, or, more

probably, construed our preference for peaceful progress as indicative of a timorous disposition. At any rate, since then it has rarely passed a week without some gibe at this journal, or at the great body of Nurses who are united together in the British Nurses' Association. We have had to write severely about the conduct of our contemporary in this and other particulars. No one regrets more than ourselves the necessity which has been forced upon us so to do. But that we are not alone in the ill-treatment we have received we are well aware. Other journals have been, in self-defence, obliged to speak far more strongly about our contemporary's course of action, and views of truthfulness and honour, than we have permitted ourselves to do. We reprint, for example, in another column, an extract on this subject from the leading Charitable Journal, whose language is, as a rule, as benevolent as its views. But, as our readers will perceive, it has been stung into using the strongest terms of disapprobation of our contemporary's behaviour to it. Were we, in the smallest degree, maliciously inclined, we could publish, indeed, some facts which we have now before us, which would, once and for all, convince our readers that we have erred on the side of gentleness in our comments upon our contemporary. But, once more, we refrain from showing the smallest animus or bad feeling.

We desire, however, to make our position quite clear for the future. We shall take no notice of our contemporary, in any manner or shape, unless it is ill-advised enough to attack either ourselves or the British Nurses' Association. In either of those events, we shall not be found unable to reply effectually.

If we are asked why we intend, in future, to defend the British Nurses' Association from any open or veiled onslaughts from this quarter, we answer, frankly, and without the slightest reserve—We are not connected in any way with that Association. We sincerely wish we were, because then we should be even more successful than we have already been. But it is, to our judgment, as clear as daylight, that this Association, which has already so rapidly and so marvellously succeeded, is the great and coming power in the Nursing world. If it continues as it has begun, every Nurse, of any standing or education, will be a Member in a very few years, perhaps even months. It is, therefore, imperative upon us, we conceive, to stand well with that Association. At present we can assist it; in the future it will certainly be able to assist us. There, in what has been termed “words of brutal frankness,” is the very plain and straightforward reason for the course of action we have laid down for ourselves to follow and abide by.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)