

**Notes from the States.**

THE reports submitted to the Adjutant-General of the United States Army show that between May 1, 1898, and February 18 this year the following deaths occurred among the American troops in Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines: killed in action, 329; died of wounds, 125; died of disease, 5,277. The deaths from disease include those in the U.S. as well.

\* \* \*

FROM these statistics it will be realised how patriotic and opportune is the action of American women in promoting a Bill to provide for the employment of graduate women nurses in military hospitals in the American Army, and it is with some astonishment and keen regret that we learn that the promoters of the Bill are being strenuously opposed by the Red Cross Society of the United States.

\* \* \*

AN eminent trained nurse in the States, who is warmly interested in organizing a permanent Nursing Service for the United States Army, writes: "Whether we shall succeed or not in passing our Bill is another question, as we have been unexpectedly opposed by the Red Cross Society. I cannot understand why people are so anxious to manage nurses' affairs instead of giving us a chance to manage for ourselves. We had no intention of interfering with the philanthropic work of the Red Cross, and I am of opinion that they should not have interfered in our provisions when we only desired to do our own work in the most efficient manner."

\* \* \*

By the same post we received a letter from a Swedish lady, who has for some years taken the deepest interest in the Nursing Question in which the following significant sentence occurs: "Nurses in Sweden are, as yet, too much absorbed in their special and individual duties to organize, and events in England have shown me that the organization and control of a profession ought to be entirely in their own hands. We hope to arrive at something like that in the future, and we are deeply interested in your work for the State Legislation of the profession."

\* \* \*

THE truth is, that nursing is still surrounded by fictitious glamour, and is an endless field for the exploitation of the wily professional philanthropist. In short, it appeals to the emotions of the public, and the patronage of nurses has been the means, at least in this country, of many a step up the social ladder. For the trained nurse the result is, of course, disastrous, and she becomes the chattel of philanthropic fads, and for the sake of a little cheap notoriety is held up in forma pauperis as an object of charity.

NEARLY every Society to which the trained nurse belongs is under the patronage of some unprofessional titled person, or meddling busy body, who presides at their meetings, manages, or mismanages their affairs, and discourages the spirit of self-respect and independence, by which alone the nursing profession can be made worthy of public confidence and respect. This is the lesson we nurses have got to learn, that if we are ever to obtain self-government on a sound professional and business basis, we must repudiate patronage and manipulation by unprofessional persons, and refuse to be made the means of the social aggrandisement of ignorant and self-assertive nonentities. Self-government, self-respect, must be our watch words.

\* \* \*

THIS admirable spirit animates the American nurse, as it is the essence of the nation's being, as the following letter on the burning question of professional superintendence will prove: "May I, a trained nurse and speaking for trained nurses, be permitted to say a few words concerning the report made by General Sternberg on the subject of women nurses for the army. He holds that there is no reason why the superintendent of women nurses should be herself a woman graduated from a general hospital training school. The training received by nurses in the large training schools, apart from the technical knowledge of nursing which it gives, is invaluable for what it teaches concerning the organization of hospital nursing, and the controlling and directing of women to do that particular work and also in the practical application of that teaching. No doubt, to have in addition to this, 'the more liberal education possessed by a graduate in medicine' is an advantage, but we consider that the previous training of a nurse is indispensable. If not, will you tell me why throughout the length and breadth of the country all our hospitals, having training schools attached, require first and foremost that the superintendent of nurses shall be herself a nurse, and without that qualification it is useless for any one to apply for such a position? No one but a soldier would be appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Army. Why then should we be compelled to have as our commander-in-chief any one but a trained nurse? With reference to the salaries I would say that when graduate nurses of schools of good standing can and do command from \$25 a week up, the Surgeon-General of the Army, if he expects to have the same grade of nurses in his corps, must expect to give corresponding salaries, especially as the life would be a much harder one and the nurses exposed to great risks from change of climate and epidemics. As far as there is any comparison between the work done by trained

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)