

of course, quite incidentally, "commemorating the founding of *The Throne* :—

1. We will give to *you* the necessary authority to obtain original (first) subscribers to *The Throne* at three guineas per annum.

2. The privilege of co-operation with the Proprietors of *The Throne* to form an Endowment Fund for the following Institutions :—

(a) Royal British Nurses' Association.

(b) Queen Alexandra's Imperial Military and Royal Naval Nursing Services.

(c) The Alexandra Nurses.

(d) Royal National Pension Fund for Nurses.

(e) Any Hospital that you may desire to nominate, such Endowment Fund being created by the gift to you of One Guinea for every Subscriber you obtain for the Endowment Fund Department.

3. The further privilege will be given to you on obtaining five Subscriptions, of a vote of five guineas to any of the above Institutions."

It is further stated that "as *The Throne* can only be purchased by Subscription at four guineas annually, the liberality of *The Throne* Proprietors in proposing this Scheme to you is at once apparent." And, finally, that the "Fund is capable of reaching the magnificent total of £25,000 per annum"; while even 5,000 guineas will be "satisfactory"—we presume to the liberal *Throne* Proprietors.

In simple English, these gentlemen desire nurses to advertise and work to obtain subscribers for their new Journal, on condition that for every annual subscriber they obtain one guinea shall be placed to an "Endowment Fund" in "the names of trustees," the interest of that sum being presumably paid to one of the above-named institutions. Putting aside the many obvious questions which such a scheme suggests, we must at once warn the nursing profession to have nothing whatever to do with this matter. It stands self-condemned, for it is impossible to believe that the Proprietors have received any authority to issue this circular, from the bodies whom they propose to "endow." The Royal British Nurses' Association has long since sunk to the level of a public charity; but it is quite certain that great departments of the War Office, and the Admiralty, as their Nursing Services are, would not accept a penny of "Endowment" from a private business company and we draw their attention to this impertinent suggestion. In short, if the whole scheme is not another illustration of the unblushing efforts constantly being made to exploit the nursing

profession, it evinces a colossal ignorance of the institutions which it is suggested may receive a possible income of "£25,000 per annum" from our forthcoming contemporary; that is to say, from an invested capital of £750,000 (less income tax); which would mean that nurses had obtained 750,000 subscribers for the paper and over two millions of money in hard cash!! Wonderful nurses!

At the Queen Square Club last week, a member, Miss Genn, started and endeavoured to maintain the proposition: "That Mrs. Gamp is preferable to the Trained Nurse." As well might some one try to prove that a Zulu medicine man is preferable to Lord Lister as a surgeon. The modern nurse, Miss Genn contended, is hardened, unsympathetic, cocksure, and her only aim is to marry a medical student or a desirable patient.

This criticism, and we may add, calumny, has aroused a lively discussion in the daily press, in the course of which many foolish and some wise things have been said. Miss Constance Smedley, of the Lyceum Club, goes to the root of the matter when she writes in the *Tribune* :—

"It is easy to understand the resentment which sometimes comes with the introduction of a nurse into a private family. She comes from a well trained army, a soldier used to regulations and routine: disease is the foe, and scientifically, methodically, and impersonally she enters on the conflict. But in the average household disease is a mere accident, whose prevention or cure does not enter into the scheme of existence. Sanitation is a lip-word, meals a convenience; health is taken for granted, and nothing is thought about it. But health is a nurse's incessant occupation, she has ever before her the terrible suffering engendered by its neglect, and the precautions which she knows through long experience to be essential seem to the careless and ignorant mere 'fads,' inconvenient, absurd, and even presumptuous.

"It is the usual tale of the jealousy of the incompetent towards capability. The fact of a woman having devoted years to scientific study of what should be the household laws of health seems to the amateur nurse a species of impertinence. The average non-working woman, the average housewife, the average mother of a family positively resents thoroughness in any woman, and more especially if that thoroughness be applied to any branch of knowledge or work which is popularly known as 'womanly.'

"But though the family may criticise and grumble, oh, the relief of the patient when the well-trained nurse appears! The moral confidence she brings to the sufferer, cried over by relations, overwhelmed by their sympathetic agony! The patient does not resent the nurse's cheering impersonality. The patient does not rebel against the quiet but inflexible routine. Be it man or woman, the sufferer rests in

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)