

domination of the man over the woman. The British Nurses' Association was founded by women for women, and succeeded so long as they were permitted to work conscientiously for one another. Any dissension which may have arisen in their ranks has been sown of malice, and the economical beggary of our sex makes the timorous an easy prey to self-interest.

An interview with Mr. Fardon is also reported, the key-note of whose unsuitability for authority over women is conveyed in a covert sneer. Having acquiesced in depriving the *ex officio* matrons of their seats on the Council, and having by his insulting attitude to any matron who dares to oppose his views, alienated the sympathy of the self-respecting independent members, Mr. Fardon proceeds to bewail the fact that these ladies have refused to turn the other cheek to be similarly smitten. He is asked about the preponderance of the nurses under his control at the Middlesex Hospital who are placed on the General Council. Of course he denies the soft impeachment. To Mr. Fardon, *twenty-seven* votes under his own control seem all too small a number. No doubt under the new Bye-laws he would arrange things much more safely. His statement that he was obliged to nominate his own subordinates, owing to the indifference of the other hospitals, is not a fact, because although the matrons who resent his conduct wisely decline to subject their nurses to his dictation, a substitute was proposed in the place of each of the Middlesex nurses added to the Council this year, and was voted against by Mr. Fardon and his supporters.

When asked "But why are hospitals so indifferent?" this medical Bayard makes answer, "Because, I am sorry to say, a number of matrons are not in sympathy with the Association. Some of the matrons of the larger hospitals were originally connected with the Association (they founded it before Mr. Fardon was informed of the fact), but when they found they could not have their own way (their way being the demand that the provisions of the Charter and Bye-laws should be upheld, that they should be permitted to express an opinion without being ruled out of order, publicly insulted, and *privately intimidated*, to say nothing of being deprived of their *ex officio* seats on the Governing Body) they left us and did not encourage their nurses to join. This no doubt is very unfortunate, but it is only a case of history repeating itself. It often happens that enthusiastic spirits form an association, and then after a time fall away from it because they cannot bend the new body to their own will; but the Association goes on all the same. (Does it? How about

the rapid decrease in membership. Mr. Fardon did not inform the interviewer that hundreds of so-called members have ceased to pay their subscriptions.) Once formed, there are always troubles in the early years in the matter of method and administration (this is not a fact; perfect harmony existed in the conduct of business of the Association 'in the early years' when the nurses managed their own affairs), but in time it gets well rooted (by this we imagine Mr. Fardon means that all persons of independent views get 'rooted out'), and the goodness of its work begins to stamp out everything else (for instance, the very principles upon which the Association was founded); as, for instance, when Mr. Fardon, Hon. Secretary, voted at the British Medical Association Conference, in 1896, for the following resolution:—

'THAT A LEGAL SYSTEM OF REGISTRATION OF NURSES IS INEXPEDIENT IN PRINCIPLE, INJURIOUS TO THE BEST INTERESTS OF NURSES, AND OF DOUBTFUL PUBLIC BENEFIT.'

Mr. Fardon continues: "All Associations with which I have been connected, particularly where women are members, have gone through this phase" (We are not at all surprised to hear that friction and trouble are rife in the Associations of which Mr. Fardon has been a member, although it would be interesting to be told with which women's societies Mr. Fardon was associated, and under what circumstances he left them), "and I have every confidence that before long the Nurses' Association will settle down to its legitimate work."

No doubt it will "settle down" if Mr. Fardon's new Bye-laws ever come into force—"settle down" like other scuttled ships; but before then it would have ceased to be the Royal British Nurses' Association. It would doubtless have assumed the name by which it is already widely known, "The Royal Association of Middlesex Marionettes."

Speaking editorially, *London* says:

"We devote some attention this week to the work and ways of the Royal British Nurses' Association. There is something radically wrong about the present condition of the Association. As it stands, it is not a credit to the medical profession; it is not representative of the nurses, and is not looking properly after their interests. It is honeycombed with petty jealousies, and is paralysed by the spirit of faction.

Such an organisation cannot exercise a wholesome influence. It is pitiful to see medical men of high standing in their profession descending

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)