

organization and control of this all-important national work, by a committee composed of Dr. Bezly Thorne, Sir John Furley, one Hospital Matron, and one Army Medical Officer, is nothing less than a public scandal. It is this most incapable little clique which must be held responsible in conjunction with the Director-General of the Army Medical Department for failing to organize an Army Nursing Service Reserve worthy of the name, to meet the needs of our brave soldiers, who have died in hundreds from disease, and many of whose lives might have been saved if they had been given the skilled and devoted attendance which many of the best trained nurses of the Empire were longing to bestow upon them.

That Dr. Bezly Thorne, who has never been attached to a Nurse Training School in his life, who knows absolutely nothing of Army Medical work, and whose narrow intolerance of expert nursing opinion is a bye-word in nursing circles, should have been permitted to exclude the trained Matrons who, with Surgeon-General Evatt, brought forward the urgent necessity for the organization of an Army Nursing Reserve, before the Royal British Nurses' Association, in 1895, is, to our mind, one of the most impudent bits of jobbery we are likely to experience, even in this age of shams. That Dr. Thorne's committee has failed ignominiously to do its work; that, as a result, the Army Nursing Department has been condemned and held up to ridicule in every quarter of the globe, and that hundreds of valuable lives have been sacrificed, is beyond all question or reparation; that the Army Medical Department has been smirched in the process, is little more than might have been expected.

At last the women who have for years worked earnestly on this question of how best to care for "Tommie" in his hour of need, have been permitted to place an outline of their scheme before the Secretary of State for War. The brains which evolved that scheme have plenty more good suggestions in reserve. It is to be hoped that the Government will avail itself of the women's suggestions for perfecting this women's work.

The Hon. Sydney Holland informs the Matrons' Council that, in attacking that body in the *Times*, he did not enter into the subject matter of the deputation. He says he "agrees with all they urged, and that he is working hard in the same direction." Now this is more like the Mr. Holland we know, the untiring worker for the East End poor. We will refrain, therefore, from pointing out to Lord Raglan that Mr. Holland is not "representative" of nursing opinion.

"Ideas Outvalue Size."

Miss Lavinia L. Dock, the Hon. Secretary of the International Council of Nurses, has something to say in her admirable paper on "Nursing Organization in Germany and England," which is peculiarly apt at the present moment, and we recommend all those opposed to the co-operation of nurses to procure and study it.

"The dissensions of the English nursing world have reached us in America, but not many of us have paid sufficient attention to understand them. However, to say simply, 'Oh, the English nurses are not united, they are perpetually quarrelling and are all divided up into factions,' is not to get any useful light on the subject. It is better to inquire why they are divided. It is not really necessary to try to unravel all the side questions, minor issues, and sub-divisions, for they are largely matters of different taste or personality and are in their nature transitory. But it is important for us, if there is a big question anywhere, a real principle, to get at it; for it must concern us as well.

"Blocking things out, then, somewhat freely, it may be said that there are two parties in English nursing politics—those who share the views and aims of the Matrons' Council (whether they belong to it or not), and those who do not; or, to describe them in another way, there are those who uphold the principles and purposes of the National Pension Fund (whether they belong to it or not), and those who do not. Or, to describe things yet more clearly, the line of cleavage is between those who believe in the independence and self-government of the graduate nurse and those who do not. For the whole main issue in England seems to be on this question: 'What shall be the future of the graduate nurse?' When the American nurses went to the Congress in June (1899) to take part in the nursing section, various excellent and lovely people were heard to say: 'Ah, you are running after the wrong people. The nursing section is in the hands of a faction. The Matrons' Council is not representative.' Of course this sounds impressive; yet that word 'representative' is a little bit vague. I want to ask: representative of what—of conservatism? I am not sure that the Matrons' Council cares so much to be representative as to be progressive. I know that it does care to be progressive."

"The trouble with this argument is that so few of the world's advances have been initiated by the 'right people.' It has always been the 'wrong people' who have begun movements toward emancipation. The curious thing is that when they have accomplished their purpose and have turned their backs in death they are seen to be reformers. It always seemed to me it would be so much more sensible and satisfactory, and would also speak better for our penetration, if we could recognise the reformers before they were dead; and the thought does occur to me sometimes, when I hear the criticisms made upon this person and that person for what they are doing. 'Why, that sounds remarkably like what was said of So & So and So & So' (thinking back over the list). 'Perhaps now here is a reformer.'"

"Ultimately we will decide for ourselves who the

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)