

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE PROFESSION OF MASSAGE.

We have been asked by Mrs. K. Marriott Fox to publish the correspondence which has taken place between herself and the Incorporated Society of Trained Masseuses, and as it touches upon several very important professional points of special interest to trained masseuses, we have pleasure in complying with her request.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MRS. K. MARRIOTT FOX AND THE INCORPORATED SOCIETY OF TRAINED MASSEUSES.

Training School of Massage,
1, Thorncliffe Grove,
Oxford Road, Manchester,
December 9th, 1914.

To the Chairman of the Incorporated Society of Trained Masseuses.

MADAM,—I beg to tender my resignation as a Member and Certificate holder of the I.S.T.M., and herewith return the certificate under registered cover.

I take this step after much thoughtful consideration, as a protest against the arbitrary methods adopted by the Society towards its certificate holders and towards teachers of massage.

When candidates sit for your examination, they are required to sign a paper to the effect that they undertake to keep the rules of the Society, and the penalty for not doing so is a forfeiture of the certificate. At the foot of the Declaration are these three rules:—

- 1.—“Not to undertake any cases of massage except under the direction of a registered medical practitioner, and in regard to massage for men to act in accordance with the bye-laws of the Society.”
- 2.—“Not to advertise in any way whatever, except in recognised medical papers.”
- 3.—“Not to sell goods to patients in a professional capacity.”

Within the last year the Society has brought out numerous new rules and regulations.

One of the latest new rules is *Compulsory Inspection* of all schools and hospitals sending up candidates for the examinations.

Now, when the idea of inspection was first started, we were given to understand that the inspection would *not* be compulsory, and also that its object was to get the massage schools exempt from inspection by the County Councils. There was no question of inspection on hygienic or sanitary conditions, nor on the qualifications of the teaching staff. I was present in London at both the meetings held to discuss this matter; and there certainly was no mention made of the Society's intention to refuse the candidates from a school that did not agree to come under inspection.

Now you send me a notice of Compulsory inspection on—

- (a) “Hygienic conditions of the school,”
- (b) “Qualifications of the teachers,”
- (c) “Curriculum of training and time-table,”

and also inform me that unless I comply with this and other new rules, my candidates will not be accepted for examinations.

The Inspector to be appointed is not to be a trained masseuse, and you state in one letter that she is to be “other than a teacher of massage.” You assure me also that she is not to be a sanitary inspector. Under these circumstances, I fail to see what qualifications entitle her to inspect my school and teaching staff on either (a), (b) or (c).

Further, the Society has not even one member of the medical profession upon its Council, and until a few months ago the only list of “Recommended Teachers” published by the Society was one containing some 8 or 9 names, and out of these some six of them were members of the Council, so that the Council were recommending themselves!

Can the Society in the face of this be an “Independent Examining Board”?

The members of the Council, as you know, are proposed by the Council, and not by the ordinary members.

At the last election the Council declared three vacancies for representatives of London schools, and the Council proposed three members for those vacancies; so that the voting was a mere farce. A, B and C were bound to get in, even if they had not a single vote!

In your New Regulations re “training of Nurses in Massage,” you state: “In the case of Hospitals training their own Nurses in Massage some reduction in the weekly time-table of instruction may be allowed in consideration of the study already given to physiology, anatomy, and the care of patients.” Yet, you will not allow any reduction in a case where a private teacher is preparing hospital nurses. It seems too absurd to be true; but possibly you are making exceptions for London teachers and London nurses. Provincial candidates and provincial teachers have for long enough realised how little the Society take them into consideration.

I intend to publish this letter and also any reply received from the Society, which please observe.

I remain,

Yours truly,

(Signed) KATHLEEN MARRIOTT FOX.

NOTE.—Between the receipt of the above letter and the next, a notice was received that one of the Society's inspectors would call at Mrs. Marriott Fox's with reference to the question of inspection.

December 15th, 1914.

DEAR MISS ROBINSON,—. . . I am under no misapprehension whatever, and I have no doubt that you will notice the points I cite in my letter to the Society are correct. . . . I must decline absolutely to be visited by any inspector sent by the Society.

Believe me,

Yours truly,

(Signed) KATHLEEN MARRIOTT FOX.

NOTE.—The Inspector called on December 16th.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)