

PRIVILEGES *v.* RIGHTS.

To the Editor of "The Nursing Record."

DEAR MADAM,—I am interested to note that events justify me in my belief that my last quotation from Mr. Crawford's latest was of a nature to arrest attention.

I hope your correspondent, "Rights *v.* Privileges," will not be deeply offended if I remind her that a thought sometimes fails to strike us, merely because we do not understand it. Had she gone to the length of consulting a dictionary, she could hardly have continued to suppose that a privilege is "a thing to which one is not entitled, but receives as a favour." The four authorities which I have at hand—Johnson, Chambers, Nuttall, and Skeat—are all quite unanimous in defining a privilege as a right, though a right of a special kind: and Johnson adds, "privilege, verb active, *to invest with rights.*"

The point is, that a privilege is a right not given to all: and a right given, not because one is strong enough to take and keep it by force, but conceded, on certain specific grounds.

I would like to ask your indignant correspondent to read your suggestive paragraph in this week's issue—"The note of the Jubilee Procession was the predominance of armed force as the factor of power!" Humiliating, but true! Force is still the world's ultimate resort, and, speaking generally, the only thing which makes law and government possible. It will scarcely be claimed, I suppose, that if "Women were to arise and demand their rights," there could be any doubt whatever of the issue, were "Man the Tyrant" in arms to prevent their obtaining them. So long, then, as we hold our rights because Man thinks we ought to hold them, and not because he is not strong enough to take them from us if he wished, there is at least an element of truth in applying to them the term of "privileges."

Such is the position which woman, considered as apart, or distinct from man, undoubtedly occupies. The mistake seems to lie in the curious assumption that the interests of men and women are diverse, or opposed. I believe in the "solidarity of race," and strenuously hold, with Tennyson, that

"The woman's cause is man's; they rise or sink  
Together, dwarfed or godlike, bond or free."

The army of brute force is made up, not of antagonists, but of our husbands, sons, and brothers. What they are, we have made them. "The future of humanity depends upon us from generation to generation"; and, if we have made them what they should be, there can be no question of opposing camps; it is only a moving on together, year by year, from strength to strength.

The force of Mr. Crawford's thought I take to be this. Rights are only what we must perforce allow; privileges are what we are able to confer, in recognition of service done to the State. Therefore shall woman, on whom depends so much, have, not merely what a man might demand, but what a general consensus of opinion shall declare to be undoubtedly her due.

This is, of course, an opinion which nobody is obliged to share; but I own I fail to see the "unfairness" of it.

I am, Madam,  
Yours faithfully,  
G. M. R.

## A CENTRAL HOSPITAL FUND.

To the Editor of "The Nursing Record."

DEAR MADAM,—When first the Prince of Wales Hospital Fund was started, with the most kindly and generous motives upon the part of the Prince, your thoughtful articles on the results of a centralised Hospital Fund were read with interest by many hospital workers. How true were your anticipations but a few weeks have proved. There is no doubt now that the public do not intend to give the sum necessary for the annual support of the Metropolitan Hospitals to a central fund, and continue their private subscriptions at the same time, and I believe that many hospital secretaries will agree with me that this year of Jubilee has been a very disastrous one for many hospitals. Never in my ten years' experience have so few subscriptions been sent to this institution, and even if we get a grant from the Prince's Fund I cannot hope that it will meet our needs by many thousands. Again, I would ask what incentive have hospital secretaries to work to obtain funds when they are told even by old subscribers that "I have given to the Prince's Fund, and cannot give twice." Before the Central Fund becomes an annual arrangement hospital managers and secretaries should be invited to confer with the Committee of the Prince's Fund, and there give their opinions formed after many years' work and experience.

I am, Madam, yours truly,  
A HOSPITAL SECRETARY.

## GRATUITOUS ADVERTISEMENT.

To the Editor of "The Nursing Record."

DEAR MADAM,—Will you kindly allow me to draw attention in the NURSING RECORD to the fact that in the last issue of the *Nurses' Journal* nearly half a column of space was devoted to the doings of the Chartered Nurses' Society. What possible reason there can be for puffing this Society in our official organ, at the expense of the members of the Royal British Nurses' Association, I am unable to understand. If the Society of Chartered Nurses needs advertisement, let it pay for it in the ordinary way. In no way is it connected with the Association, and the methods whereby it was formed were so widely questioned, that many members of the Royal British Nurses' Association who are acquainted with these proceedings must object, as strongly as I do, to the article in question appearing in our journal.

I am, dear Madam,  
Yours faithfully,  
A MEMBER.

## PROFESSIONAL INTIMIDATION.

DEAR MADAM,—I was very glad to see your Annotation last week upon "Professional Intimidation." I, for one, was bitterly indignant when I read in the *Nurses' Journal* Dr. Outtersen Wood's attack upon Miss Waddington. I wonder how long the members of the Royal British Nurses' Association will submit to such extraordinary insults in the journal paid for by their own money. Can it be possible that nurses really *like* to be treated as door-mats?

Yours faithfully,  
ONE WHO OBJECTS.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)