

character and intellect to "superiors" (repression and tyranny).

Thus we can explain the attitude of the clergyman (and this, too, in the "Land of the Dollar") who, when engaging a district nurse (a woman of true piety, but poor, with an aged mother to support) asked her "whether she was working for money, or working for the Lord."

And, in the case of the woman, so real did the distinction seem, that the humorousness of the fact that he himself was in receipt of an unusually large salary never occurred to her. So we explain the anxious dread which combats every fresh effort of women to emerge from the conditions of intellectual and economic nothingness in which the power of the middle ages successfully pinned them.

Can we not shake off the influence of these belated ideas as the young leaf sheds its old sheath?

What a strange aversion there seems to the words "technical training."

What is, actually, technical training? It is the training of hand and brain in harmonious duet; when the hand does, with delicate accuracy and dexterity, what the brain directs; when the brain understands why the hand must perform its skilful motion, and for what purpose.

"Technical" or "manual" training is unanimously proclaimed to-day by the most enlightened teachers as of supreme value precisely in the formation of character; of character, of qualities of mind, of truth, reliability, definiteness, and uprightness.

The hand reacts upon the brain and stimulates it. The training of the hand to honesty and accuracy develops steadiness and reliability in the brain, and hand work, intelligently and scientifically taught, is urged as a correction and avoidance of many modern defects of character arising from luxury, idleness, indefinite purpose, aimless and useless occupations.

Of all pernicious ideas, this one that some subtle antagonism exists between "character" and "technical" training—that some subtle affiliation exists between goodness and stupidity, is the most pernicious.

If this were true, art, horticulture, and a myriad other occupations open to women must be sin, and a medical woman must be of all monstrosities the most dreadful. Let us never fear that "character" will be lost to nurses through emphasis on their technical training, provided that mothers, Matrons, and medical men will remember that loving-kindness, tenderness, sympathy, and consideration for others are also attributes of the brain (and not, as was formerly supposed, of the heart or intestines) and dependent on the harmonious development of that noblest organism.

Then, why the dread of the word "profession"? Is it not a noble word, and does it exclude the word "calling"? Can we possibly say seriously that nursing can never be a profession because it is a calling? Does not the "call"—the "inner

voice"—in other words, the "vocation," take people into the occupations and professions which offer them congenial opportunities? The "profession" is the external, systematised, recognised organisation form. The "vocation" is the inclination, the desire, of the person. Law is a profession. Have not many lawyers a true vocation for law? Medicine! Can we say that no medical men have a vocation for their work—that there are none for whom it is a calling? But if the reverse statement holds, this must also hold.

Have teachers no vocation for their work? They belong to a profession, and, by the way, they have State Registration in most civilised countries.

There may be a striking parallel discovered between the teacher and the nurse. The teacher, like the nurse, does not belong to an absolutely independent profession (who does, may we ask? Is there any such thing as an independent profession?) She works under orders of the school authorities as the nurse under the medical authorities. She does not teach just what she pleases, but what is prescribed. She ought to have, and she usually does have, just the characteristics required for a good nurse—namely, patience, firmness, sweetness, uprightness, self-giving. Yet, it has never been suggested that State supervision and examination have had a deteriorating effect on the character of teachers.

It is argued that State Registration for Nurses (in other words the systematising and upbuilding of the chaotic foundations of nursing education) will drive away from nursing those women who have the true vocation. If this be true, then the reverse must also be true, and where no State control exists and disorder reigns there must we find only women who have the true vocation working as nurses. Is this actually the case? Let the public reply.

There is another point to remember about this word "profession." Professions are developed. They do not drop down ready-made from the sky like snow-flakes. There will be professions in existence fifty years from now which are undreamed of or in embryo to-day, and nursing will be one of them. The work of organised charity is fast becoming a profession; the sanitarian will in time belong to a profession. Every mode of activity resting on exact knowledge, and which is progressive and not stationary may become, and is becoming, a profession.

Medicine was not always a profession. In ancient Rome it was practised by slaves, and not so long ago the surgeon sat in the kitchen. Would he have been nobler had he remained there, and will not the salvation of our kitchens come through raising them to professional dignity?

We are told that the nurse is an instrument only in the doctor's hands. Very well. Instruments to-day are so improved that the first instruments would not recognise them.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)