

then it is a cruel and inexcusable thing to trade on the gratitude felt by sick and wounded men for those who nursed them, by pretending that they are in such dire straits as to appeal for, and accept with thankfulness, the shillings which these men can ill afford.

Sir Archibald Williamson made no statement as to the identity of "Nurse Juliet," but endeavoured to repudiate responsibility for her alleged destitution by stating that "the War Office is not responsible for nurses employed by the British Red Cross Society, or other organisations." We believe that on the outbreak of war the Voluntary Aid Detachments of the British Red Cross Society came under the authority of the War Office as an integral part of its organisation, and, in any case, the War Office, which is responsible for the efficient care of the sick and wounded, cannot justly repudiate responsibility for those who have been broken in its service. But, even so, if, as the *Daily Telegraph* alleges, "Nurse Juliet" "is typical of many thousands of cases, and that very large numbers of women who unhesitatingly gave their all when war broke out are now in actual want and in real distress of mind," what is the British Red Cross Society doing that it permits this want and distress, while it scatters largesse around, and, for example, presents one V.A.D. with £900 in order to obtain a medical education?

But who is "Nurse Juliet"? We have publicly challenged Lord Burnham and the editor of the *Daily Telegraph* to give a straight reply to our straight questions:—

1. Is "Nurse Juliet" a real or fictitious personality?

2. Has the money subscribed to the Shilling Fund for Nurses as the direct result of the harrowing appeal in "Nurse Juliet's" name been extracted from the public by a mythical story—or has it not?

3. Has the *Daily Telegraph* descended to fiction because its appeal cannot be justified by fact?

No answer has been forthcoming to these questions publicly asked in our issue of February 21st. We now suggest that they are unanswered because they are unanswerable, except with the reply that there is no such person as "Nurse Juliet," and that the public have been duped to give their money because of the supposed want and distress of a fake.

But other enquiries have been made as to the identity of "Nurse Juliet" by the Hon. Secretary of the Society for the State Registration of Trained Nurses, as related below:—

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

431, Oxford Street, London, W. 1.

March 15th, 1920.

To the Right Hon. Winston S. Churchill, M.P.,  
Secretary of State for War and Air.

SIR,—I am directed by the Executive Committee of the Society for the State Registration of Trained Nurses to draw your attention to the case

of "Nurse Juliet" as detailed in the *Daily Telegraph* of February 6th, and to ask you whether the War Office will investigate the case, and if the facts, as alleged, are verified it will take steps to relieve the necessities of this woman, which, as related, appear so distressing as to attract hundreds of shillings to the *Daily Telegraph* Shilling Fund for Nurses?

Moreover, that paper asserts that "Nurse Juliet" "is typical of many thousands of cases." It appears to my Committee incredible that thousands of women who in the time of their country's need have "spent youth and health and the joy of life in ministering to its stricken sons" should be reduced to the pitiable condition of ill-health and penury in which "Nurse Juliet" is portrayed, but, if so, they venture to hope that provision may be made by the State for the relief of their necessities.

(Signed) MARGARET BREAY,  
Hon. Secretary.

[The cutting from the *Daily Telegraph* containing the case of Nurse Juliet was enclosed with the above letter. A copy of the letter and cutting were also sent to Sir Reginald H. Brade, G.C.B., Secretary of the War Office.]

REPLY.

War Office, S.W. 1.

March 20th, 1920.

MADAM,—I am commanded by the Army Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th inst., which is receiving attention.

(Signed) H. J. CREEDY.

431, Oxford Street, W.

March 16th, 1920.

To the Chairman of the Nursing Board, Queen Alexandra's Imperial Military Nursing Service.

SIR,—I am instructed by the Executive Committee of the Society for the State Registration of Trained Nurses to direct the attention of the Nursing Board of Queen Alexandra's Imperial Military Nursing Service to the Appeal appearing daily in the *Daily Telegraph*, with the object of raising a "Shilling Fund" "for our nurses," the indigent War Nurse being put prominently forward as the *raison d'être* of an appeal directed to "every soldier, every sailor, everyone who served his country in an auxiliary force, as in the women's uniformed services," and to enter a serious protest against the depreciation of the professional and economic status of nurses by an appeal to the rank and file of the Army to relieve the necessities of members of the nursing services, and of other nurses who are in necessitous circumstances owing to the services they have rendered to the sick and wounded.

I enclose a cutting relating to "Nurse Juliet" who is described as a "Nursing Sister." My committee is of opinion that if the facts are as alleged, the State, not the rank and file of the Army, should be responsible for relieving the

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)