

Correspondence between Dr Parkes and Sir James Clark. Subjects include tenure of Parkes Chair of Hygiene (with some letters concerning this from Drs Aitken and Sutherland); Longmore's appointment as P.M.O.; removal of Army Medical School to Netley

Publication/Creation

1862-1866

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/b5vgwejp>

License and attribution

You have permission to make copies of this work under a Creative Commons, Attribution, Non-commercial license.

Non-commercial use includes private study, academic research, teaching, and other activities that are not primarily intended for, or directed towards, commercial advantage or private monetary compensation. See the Legal Code for further information.

Image source should be attributed as specified in the full catalogue record. If no source is given the image should be attributed to Wellcome Collection.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

(2 pp.)

S. 1/1

7
22 B. Brook Street. Grosvenor Square. W.

Oct. 22. 1857

Dear Parker,

Where are you
and what are your
intended movements?

Is Dr. Over still in prospect,
I mean? - and most
important of all how
is your health? Be honest!

When I know your whereabouts
I will write you. The Journal -
the paper (the medical section)
can be called on to

to make out a code of regulations
for the enumeration & admission
of medical officers into the
army, & ^{again} before this
conclusion - I ~~had~~ drew
up a scheme for the creation
of a military med. school. ~~It~~
I am glad he has taken
my paper as the basis of
his scheme i.e.

a Prof. of Hygiene

— Military Medicine

— Military Surgery

Wrote
subject

a course of Pathology
& that body includes
a element of -

will send appointments to
each of these states we
shall have a good practical
school - if we can get
the right men - Next of
army men. Unless tubular
could take it, he must be
an army man, can be can
of the new kind apparatus -
I have put down Aitken in
the corner of my own mind
for the Polkleyth. The
claimed we that send -
Now part of all turn in
your mind whether we can

improve in the formality
of an examining board; the
the mode of examination
or in the requirements of
our candidates. I have
put these questions to
Doyle & asked him to send
them to Bush & Hooker -
^{the Commission}
we, have had a preliminary
meeting & next week we meet
on business - I see that the
interest of the Navy, as regards
the Generals, will rest on
me, & I am anxious to avoid
myself of to force an opponent



p. 2.

S. 1/1

22 Oct. 1857

of improving the status of
 the Army Medical Officers,
 more especially as it must
 be followed by ^{and} medical
 men in civil life.

Let me hear from you
 soon - I am glad to
 find Mr. Foster has
 got his ^{case} fixed.

I hope he is kindly well
 Remember me my kind
 wishes, Gladly look to
 you both

Respectfully yours
 J. Clark

S. 1/2
Findsbury
Rochester
3rd Nov^r 1862.

My dear Sir James.

I am going to ask you, especially in your capacity as Member of the Royal Sanitary Commission, to give us your opinion on what seems a point of great importance to the Army Medical School.

You know that Professors Longmore & Maclean are appointed for 5 years, with power of re-appointment, and that Aitken & myself are appointed for 10 years with power of re-appointment or compensation.

Some time ago it became of extreme importance to Maclean to ascertain if possible whether there is any chance that he will not be re-appointed when his first term of 5 years expires in 1865. or 1866.

I need not enter into particulars, but it is of really vital moment to him, in connection with his own service, that he should know in what position he will be at the end of his time.

It was at length arranged that I should speak to the Director General, & learn his views on the point.

I did so on the 31st of July, and stated to the Director General the unanimous opinion of Dr. Maclean's colleagues that as a teacher he is quite unsurpassed, & that it would be impossible to find a man who combines in so remarkable a way all the knowledge, the experience, & the mental qualities required for a Professor of Military Medicine.

The Director General at once said in the kindest way that he fully appreciated Maclean

and that as it would be extremely unlikely that a better man could be found, he believed there was no doubt about his re-appointment.

This made us quite comfortable, & Maclean commenced making his arrangements in accordance with the Director General's opinion.

But on Thursday last, Oct. 30th the Director General requested to see Maclean, & said that after consideration he could not be bound by his conversation with me, & that if there were 4 or 5 Candidates for the Chair he must use his own discretion; he also intimated that his view now was that the Chairs in our School should be prizes for the Department, & should be vacated every 5 years.

On Maclean's account, (& he is in a most difficult position) and on account of the School, it is extremely desirable to have this matter settled.

I have no hesitation in saying that if the Professors are to be changed every 5 years, the School will fail. Good teachers are not common; when one is found I believe he ought to be kept as long as he is efficient. Make breaks in his appointment, by all means, so that if he falls off he may be shelved without difficulty, but it seems to me quite a mistake to change a teacher who does his work properly. The longer he teaches, the better he teaches.

The Director General thinks he will recite

the Department to work for the vacant chairs. He may thus make a few men work, who might however work as well for chance vacancies, but he is not likely to influence the mass of medical Officers.

To produce a slight & problematical good, he runs the risk of destroying the very purpose of the School which is to teach the Candidates. To teach them well is the first point; everything else is subsidiary. This will not be done by constant changes, when every change gives the chance that the man who succeeds is inferior to the man who went before him, & who has had the inestimable advantage of 5 years practice. I feel this most strongly, but I am sure I need not enlarge upon it. I am certain you will agree with me that in teaching a good man should never be displaced. It is entirely a different question from that of the Staff appointments of the Army.

It seems very important to learn the opinions of those who founded the School, viz. yourself Miss Nightingale, Sir Ranald Martin, & Dr. Sutherland.

I infer from my correspondence with Lord Herbert that his intention in making appointments of 5 years was merely to drop inefficient men if they had chanced to be appointed. Lord Herbert says, in a letter to me:-

"I propose to offer the appointments to our own officers for 5 years, but with a power of re-appointment."
"This enables me, or rather my successor, to make a change in the not impossible event of a first-rate man turning out a second-rate lecturer."

The intention here is manifestly to

to re-appoint ^{an} efficient Professor, to drop an inefficient one.

Mr. Alexander's views appear to have been the same, as he told Mr. Longmore that if at the end of 5 years he (Mr. Longmore) desired to hold the appointment he could do so, provided he answered the expectations held of him.

I presume that the views of the members of the Commission now living are the same.

Would you think over this & give us your advice. Luckily Maclean has not yet taken the decisive step of retiring from his ^{own} service which he was about to do on the strength of my conversation with the Director General - but he is in a most unhappy position, not knowing what to do best for his family & himself.

I can only say that if they lose him it will be impossible to replace him in the school.

Such a policy would be most short sighted. They ought to bind Maclean to the service by the strongest links, & be thankful to keep him.

Believe me

My dear Sir James
Very sincerely always

E. A. Parkes.

3rd Nov^r 1862.
Mr Parker's opinion on
the importance of Mr Maclean's
to Professor Longmore (57
years. A. V.

On the new arrangements and
requirements of Netley
for the A. M. School
on its removal
from Chatham - 7

S. 1/3

Frindsbury
Rochester

24th November 1862

dear Sir James

We are preparing our Report on Netley for the Senate next Thursday, and I suppose that our Minutes will be sent on to the Committee of Organization. I write you however a summary of the Report & notice also some other matters which the Committee may perhaps consider.

1. The arrangements for teaching. There will I think be sufficient. We shall be able to have 35 men in the Laboratory at one time & as many or more in the Microscopical Room. So that ^{70 men in each session or} ~~140~~ ¹⁴⁰ men ^{yearly} can be trained yearly. The Lecture room will hold 120 men - This ~~calculative~~ amount of accommodation will I should think be sufficient - will it not?

2. Lodging of the Candidates. We can make out about 20 rooms & the Engineer thinks nearly 30 will be available. Then there will probably be a few rooms in the Officers quarters. This point however requires a little more

looking into, so that we may precisely define & number all the rooms.

3. Accommodation for the Professors. None appears to have been provided. There seems little chance of finding accommodation. This is really necessary for Longmore & Maclean to be close to their work & it would be a great convenience to Aitken & to me to be so likewise. The case in respect to Longmore & Maclean is this: They are doing double duty.

(1.) They are acting as Dep^y Inspectors in charge of the Surgical & Medical Divisions. In this capacity they are entitled to Field Officers quarters & if they were not Professors such quarters must be found them.

(2.) They are also acting as Professors, and in this capacity it appears that they lose the privileges which their duties as Dep^y Inspectors give them, & are expected to find quarters for themselves.

There is here a great inconsistency. It must not be supposed that their salaries as Professors are so superior to the salaries they would receive if performing merely ^{the} ordinary duties of Dep^y Inspectors, as to render ^{it extravagant to allow} quarters also.

Comparison of Inspector
& Professor's Duties

If Longmore were doing duty at any station in England
as a 2nd Inspector, as at Thorncliffe, or Colchester
would receive daily (if quarters were not
found him) £ 1.. 14.. 9 1/2. As Professor he ~~only~~
receives £ 1.. 16.. 11 daily. So that as he is
performing double duty, all his Professorial
work only adds 2 1/2 daily to his pay.

Moreover if he were sent on foreign service he
would receive in almost all stations more pay
than he gets now, & he has plainly told us
that as he is now married he will probably feel
himself compelled to accept foreign service when
his term of Professorship expires. But the
addition of a good house to his income would
make his Professorship sufficiently valuable to
make him desirous of remaining. The same
argument might be stated for Maclean. The
plain fact is that their pay as Rats is not
so much better than it would be were they
doing half the duty they do now, to make their
Professorship valuable in a pecuniary point of view.
Yet this should be done if possible & the easiest
mode of doing so is by finding them comfortable
quarters, such as would be occupied by civil
professional men of their reputation & standing.

4. Accommodation for the married men of the Army Hospital Corps.

This seems very imperfect or indeed almost wanting at Netley. But there are a good many married men in this Corps & they ought to be well cared for. At their Head quarters they should be made as comfortable as possible, so that they may look forward to home service with pleasure. I may consider it a reward. It seems most important to provide good quarters for the married people. The other points we shall not mention in our Report but which the Committee may perhaps consider are in this.

The Regulations I believe state that each Professor may have an Assistant. Would it not be a good thing to commence soon the system of training Assistants; - say for 3 or 5 years, so that a succession of men may pass through these duties. Future Professors may perhaps be thus trained; at any rate we should get a certain number of men thoroughly trained. We should however, choose our own Assistants, ^{of course from men in the service} & they ought not to be removable until their term ^{was} completed.

I have a few other things to say but I am afraid of frightening you with my long letter so shall conclude with saying that I am as always
Very sincerely yours

E. A. Parkes.

Woolwich or Chatham—
O'Brien also tells me
the history of the
papers, & asks when it
could not be increased
to six months, by making
three papers in two
years! What say you
to that? — ~~The papers~~ have
been two months acting
between them —

I trust you would write
something, when what you
write me before, but was
mixed up with any

Please
to reach this
for me — S. A. P.

Bagshot Park
Surrey.

Meridagein

S. 1/4

2. Nov. 1862

(2 pp.)

My Dear Parker,

I am just
returned from our
meeting — we have sent
a minute to the members
of war recommending the
immediate commencement
of the works at Nelly-
penny, to be read in our
complete report soon, &
we are to meet ~~the~~ ^{the} day
week to do this —

we entered on this subject
of the permanency of the
Professor appointments -

Dr. Gibson made some
objections, as in duty
bound, but we shall
carry it at next meeting
as Sutherland, Martin
strongly are strong & force
a large majority, but I
have had doubt Gibson
will take the same view
in the end - so I think
Dr. ~~W. H. Hays~~ Hays
may be quiet at least

on the subject - we all
agreed to recommend that
Gibson's salary should be
increased, & I understood
Dr. Gibson that the (weekly)
salary was to be increased
by £100 - But this was
just as we were parting
& I may have misunderstood
him - You are to be
asked if you concur
in favor of the
Oxydizing furnace
Hays to the Engineers.
Then it seems must be

2

? Nov, 1862

other matter. Make it
a reply to my ~~questions~~
request that you would
state the reasons for
the permanency of the Propper
ships, & the ways that
must accrue to the
stead for they was
purposers. I have no
doubt in the subject, but
I think who in very own
opinion to state the grounds
clearly - you can do my
wishes, believe me
presence & as you offer
and is permanent

The question does not
affect you - But they
never get - come for
me letters so I must
finish - I do not
want to be the
same as you and I
don't want to be
the same as you
I don't want to be
the same as you
I don't want to be
the same as you
I don't want to be
the same as you

Yours
J. L. L.

Sir J. Clarke
to Dr. Parkes

S. 1/5

Bayham Park

Decr 28 - 1862

My dear Arthur,

You will not be
surprised to hear of
Lady's (Clarke's) death -
She died yesterday after
noon, after seven weeks
very last week - had to
travel with - carried her
off at last. The deed
has been great calamity
to our family - saying that
keep us all like within

My dear Arthur
I have an hour of
writing here -

The relief was a state
of uneasy suffering, her
suffering the illness her
dear has come here
to me especially - our
union was a happy one,
& I shall long for her
loss - I cannot attend
another night before
Tuesday week -

I have been your only
with the Union, - when
we will still

Very truly yours
J. Clarke

Copy

S. 1/6

Friends being.

Rochester.

3 November 1862.

My dear Sir James

I am sorry to add to all your various anxieties just now by asking you to read the enclosed letter to which I have added one which Aitken sent to me. But as you will see when you have read it, it is on a matter on which a decision must be come to.

What we want to do now is to obtain

without reserve, the
opinions of yourself,
~~Mr~~ Nightingale, Dr
Sutherland & Sir Ronald
Martin in writing. It

is necessary for us that this
should be done, whichever
way the opinions go.

We want a definite
Statement on the
part of those who
oparized the school
for our own guidance.

to Mr James Clark.
Letters relative to Maclean - & the appointments
in the school.

D^r E. A.
November 3/62

Also shows the
positions of the
S. A. for Mr
A. M. S.

Legend remarked by Dr
Parker & Brantley in
the falling of marking
frequent changes of
Professors in the
A. M. School

1862

Copy of ^{my} letter to Sir James Clark

Frindsbury S. 1/7
Rochester
1 Nov: 1862

My dear Sir James

I am going to ask you, especially in your capacity as Member of Royal Sanitary Commission, to give us ~~to~~ your opinion on what seems a point of great importance to the Army Medical School.

You know that Professors ~~Soymore~~ and Maclean are appointed for 5 years, with power of reappointment, and that ~~either~~ I myself are appointed for 10 years with power of reappointment or compensation.

Some time ago it became of extreme importance to Maclean to ascertain if possible whether there ~~was~~ ^{is} any chance that he ~~would~~ ^{will} not be reappointed when his ~~first~~ term of 5 years expires in

I need not enter into particulars but ~~the cause~~ ^{it was} of really vital moment to him ^{in connection with his own service} that he should know in what position he ~~would~~ ^{will} be at the end of his term.

It was at length arranged that I should speak to the Director General & learn his views on this point, ^{on the 7th July}

I did so, and stated to the Director General the unanimous opinion of my ~~colleagues~~ ^{colleagues} Dr. Maclean's colleagues that as a teacher he is quite unsurpassed & that it would be impossible to find a man who combines in ^{so} ~~so~~ ^{so} remarkable a way all the ^{qualifications} ~~the~~ ^{knowledge, the experience & the merit of} ~~the~~ ^{required} for a Professor of Military Medicine.

The Director General at once said

in the kindest way that he fully appreciated Maclean & that as it would be extremely unlikely that a better man could be found he believed there was no doubt about his reappointment.

This made us ~~also~~ quite comfortable & Maclean commenced making his arrangements in accordance with the Director General's opinion.

But on Thursday last, Oct 30th, the Director General requested to see Maclean & said that after consideration he could not be bound by his conversation with me & that if there were 4 or 5 candidates for the Chair he must use his own discretion; he also intimated that his view now was ^{that} the chair in our School should be prizes for the Department, & should be vacated every 5 years.

On Maclean's account, (who is in a most difficult position) and on account of the School, it is extremely desirable to have this matter settled.

I have no hesitation in saying that if the Professors are to be changed every 5 years, the School will fail. Good teachers are not common; when one is found, ^{we have} he ought to be kept as long as he is efficient. Make breaks in his appointment, by all means, so that when if he falls off he may be shelved without difficulty.

it seems some quite a mistake to
but ~~never~~ change a ~~man~~ ^{teacher}, who does his work
properly. ~~For~~ The longer he teaches, the better he teaches.

The Director General thinks he will
revise the Department to work for the
vacant chairs. He may thus make a few
men work, who might however work
as well for chance vacancies, but he
is not likely to influence the map of
medical offices.

To produce a slight & problematical
good, he runs the risk of ~~destruction~~
destroying the very purpose of the School
which is to teach the Candidates. To teach
them well is the first point; everything
^{else} is subsidiary. This ~~is best accomplished~~

will not be done by constant changes,
when every change gives the chance that

the man who succeeds is inferior to
the man who went before him, ^{and who has had the most valuable advantage of 5 years practice} I feel
this most strongly but I am sure I
need not enlarge on it; I am ^{certain} you
will agree with me that in teaching,
a good man should never be

displaced. It is entirely a different question
from that of the staff appointments of the Army.

It seems very important to learn
the opinions of those who founded
the school, viz yourself, Miss Nightingale,
Sir Harold Martin ^{and} Sutherland.

Infer from my correspondence
with Lord Herbert that his intention
in making appointments of 5 years was
merely to drop inefficient men if they had
chanced to be ^{in a letter to me} appointed. Lord Herbert says "I propose

(See my note -
I think this par
a paper might
be put more
strongly in
another way.)

Copy of a letter from D^r. Little ^{S. 1/8} to Dr. Parker
Nov. 2nd 1882 -
(The original sent to Sir James Clark)

My dear Parker

I agree with you, and you have written relative to Maclean -

Assuredly it is ^a most unwise & short-sighted policy to change an efficient & an experienced teacher for an untried & an inexperienced one.

Also to make the Professorships of the School prizes for the department is a total misdirection of the aim of the School as an Institution. If the School had been intended to educate or train men to become teachers, then one could understand the Professors holding office (as teacher-probationers) for a limited period such as five years, to be replaced by others who, in their turn might learn to become teachers. But the School was founded for a totally different purpose - namely to train Candidates for the Medical Service by the aid of efficient teachers - not to be a school for the training of teachers -

I am quite sure that no man ever becomes an efficient teacher till after years of experience in the work of teaching and then he has a special aptitude for the work of instruction (as our Colleague most assuredly)

he becomes more & more efficient the longer
he teaches. Therefore I replace a man whose
qualifications have been put to the test
and are known to be of the highest kind
by a man whose qualifications are
untried & unknown, & who must teach
himself to be a teacher, is a policy, which
will completely divert the school from the purpose
for which it was founded - & which if persisted
in will eventually be the destruction of the school.

Prizes for the department, & incentives to
individual exertion amongst the Medical Officers
of the Army ought to be found in the Department
itself. The Professorships of the School are
prizes which belong to the War Office - to the
Secretary of State for War - & if he does not
cherish them & the School in accordance
with the original design for which the School
was founded - the more is the pity.

May yr. exertions be crowned with
Success is the sincere wish
of yr. for service
(signed) N. Aitken -

S. 1/9

Totterhull

near Birmingham

26 Dec. 1862.

My dear Ritken

I enc. the enclosed
this morning & send it
on to you. Would you
show it to Longmore &
Macleod. I think it is
so far satisfactory. I
have written to give
Sir James again my

reason for some of them for
the permanency of
the appointments, but
perhaps you would also
note & deepen the
impression.

As to the 6 months
question I think is
a difficult one. I
am very much
averse to changing

the times of the competitive
examinations. They ought
to be quite regular in
their recurrence.

Besides I really
question whether 6 months
teaching at one time is
not too much for
teachers & taught.

I shall be home on Monday

Very sincerely yours
E. J. Parkes.

S. 1/10

Sagshot Park
Surrey.

January 1 - 1863

My Dear Parker,

The reasons you
give against the appointment
of new Professors my five
years are unanswerable,
I feel what my dear
mass who know say
they about books with
agree with - but refer
to the contents of the course
of me rather it at all,
it will be thought as a

too long - I feel sure
probably to the night
they - have had clear
months for relaxation
of Professor between
the courses -

Maybe it not still be
arranged that the course:
Dates might be extended
so as to suit the school,
even when your opinion
was in operation - you could
be absent for a week
or a week or so without
much loss to pupils -

But I do not see any way
clearly in this arrangement
to leave it your cheer heart,

Very truly yours

John Lubbock

S. 1/11

Sagshot Park
Surrey.

Dec 5 - 1862
Jan. 4 ^(2pp) 3

My Dear Parker,

Yesterday we
conveyed the remains
of my dear wife to
her last earthly resting
place. - I looked forward
to this final separation
with great dread, but
though it was, I felt
less than I have done
on such occasions, for
years - my feelings seem
dead - I cannot quite
explain this - My father
been alive ever since,

When John & I have
been very much in papers
of the - But I meant
not dwell on best
memories, & I find nothing
which was more than
work -

I shall probably
have per your letters,
on the subject of Aspirants;
but I do not wish you
on another subject, that
of the enclosed note per
Hutchinson, which you
will be good enough to
write over. I am not
sure

that you should show it
to your colleagues, as to that
I may at present consider
it best to be shown to
the Professors - I expect
then an opinion for the
report that the Clinical
Professors have no more
extra duty to that of
work, or what it
interferes - You must own
the matter, & be not
to give your private
opinion - It has as
you have been my opinion
that the work is too
hard, & the fix may be

p. 2. 5 Dec. '62, 4 Jan. '63

3.1/11

D.A.

It appears to me that, as we are now fully embarked on the subject of the complete organization of the school, ~~and~~ we should go fully into it, so as to make it as complete and perfect as it admits of. It will be for you to propose to report well on the whole of the proposals, and assist us in carrying them out. You must know better than we what is wanted to make the school work

to the greatest advantage.
If we get the Navy Land-
Oaks, you will have
support on all! I think
particularly John Caddell
on the Senate would
go far to promote
the interests of the naval
corps. I think you may
get many.

Let me have Saturday
make again. But there
is no hurry, I have put
off my next meeting till
Monday the 8th

J. C.

I also enclose Galton's note
to show that we are called on to
consider the matter.

I have been feeling very
low today, but have
forced myself to work.
The weather is delightful -

Jennens takes
I went to Holland &
Walton who signed it,
& now Jennens has it
& can let Father see
him or the other to
negotiate -

Yours faithfully
J. G. Clark

3.1/12

Wagshot Park
Surrey.

1863

Jan 5-62

Dear Parker,

Thanks for
your kind note, which
I received this afternoon.

I have just sent off to
Sutherland the ussons
for the permanent
operation of the
Proprietors, being a break
always at end of
five years - I have
done with more than
copy the ussons, your

lent me -

We shall have to consider
the apt- of applicants -
How far art then & quality
may I think there be
found any in candidates,
How far the other two
professors, to relieve them
of part of their extra-
professional work, would
I presume be apt to pay
or surmount in the staff -
add to this the consider-
ation of larger courses -
for our course of studies.

I quite agree that five
months would be
sufficiently long - How
to arrange the division
of the three papers, in
two years, so as not
to interfere with the
science schools, is
a difficulty - I have
advised, however, to
let the Dean General
to work out the problem,
as he was the person who
proposed the thing! -

Local A M School (Arrangements)

Long letter from Sir Jas Clark, 11th Jan^r 1863

Sir Thomas Langmore C.B.,
Woolstone





3.1/13

January 11th 1863

(2pp)

My Dear Parkes,

The enclosed queries were agreed on at our last meeting, and it was left to Sutherland and myself to draw them up. They have just been sent to me with a request that I would go over them and make such additions as I thought necessary, - that some men have them copied and forward them to you, with a private note when I now write. A. Sutherland has



made the queries so complete that I think it unnecessary to alter or add to them, as the answers will give a complete view of the whole system of teaching. As I have no one to copy the questions here, & am too busy to do so myself, I will ask you to let me have them again, as I wish to have them, & have kept no copy.

The object of the survey is two fold. First - to know exactly what the course of instruction given at the school consists of, & 2^d - to ascertain whether the professors have not too much work, which we believe they have; & to found on this the appointment of assistants. In reply to this last

The occasion will occur for your own
opinions on the appointment &
character of the Apendants, - unless
you find in the current paper some
of the candidates likely to make effe-
cient Apendants the next paper, it
would perhaps be better to appoint
them for one paper or perhaps one
year only; but I think were you,
if they were good men & of fair
promise, it might be well to
keep them for several years. I
refer especially to your & Atkin's
opponents. Perhaps the style of
the Clerical Professors ought to
be men of more standing, as, of the
candidates, are required to continue
their attendance at the school
for two months after the lectures,

They ought to be equal to carry the
Hospital teaching - directly operations on
the dead body &c. - Mr. Dore, Genl
J. D. Turrelland seem very desirous
that the lecture should extend to
six months, but that the labours of
the professors should terminate at
the end of four months; but they
believe that if you had assistants
you would be able to add a few
lectures to your course with great
advantage to the candidates. Whether
this is right you know best. - I
have to day read again your remarks
on the extension of the course and you
warns for thinking that no good would
result from it, & that it would not be
liked by the candidates. Dr. Gibson thinks
they would, as they would have the

S. V/13

p. 2.



11 Jan. 1863

But this is more applicable to the ordinary schools than to yours which is chiefly a practical school, & where the candidates cannot have too much practical acquaintance with the subjects of the course.

I hope and believe that good will come out of the enquiry, and I think it will be even useful to yourselves to enable you to review the whole curriculum & consider whether it may not be improved.

I came here yesterday & mean to remain till Wednesday week the 20th so direct to me accordingly.

Yours faithfully
J. A. Clark



The increase of spray after passing their
first examination, as they would
be considered as doing perpetual duty
during the last two months. The
State admits that leave should be
given to see their friends before their
being expelled to England. - I think
well on this. - Perhaps it might be
suggested that these leave, say for a
fortnight, might come out in the two
additional months. - What you
say about ever teaching I think quite
right, - but it is not so much the
want of better instruction that is given,
as pulling ^{students} them in the right path
so that they can instruct themselves.

Professors, who alone know
about walls can be accom-
plished - certainly nothing
will be gained by giving
the candidates too
much to do.

Very truly yours
S. J. Lusk

S. 1/14

Buffalo, Pa.

Jan 27 - 1863

Dear Parker,

By all means
show my note (if they can
read it) to your colleagues,
go into the matter
with them as it may
be managed unquietly
space at Nittany -

I am quite for as much
clinical work as possible,
without neglecting other
matters; but I cannot
think that the hospital

Should be entirely devoted
to clinical work on Saturdays,
Two hours at the morning
best time here in the
evening might perhaps
suffice for the Hospital?
Might there not be one
hour given to a lecture
one day, & two hours
in laboratory or research
on alternate days, in addition,
to the hospital work?
I suppose you mean to make
out a programme for the
work of the whole week
work as it is carried on

at present, - and another
as it might be carried
out with more space
I call the apartments where
you are I hope to have.

There would then about
might be effected by the
addition of apartments and
sufficient space. But
I fear I am tiring you
and too many things -
However nothing is well
done without much con-
sideration - & I am sorry
must be pulled by the

shows it to be
his course of excellent,
& just what I think
it should be in its relation
to the other courses, - but
I could not know that
all it has explained to
me. - & talk on the
whole subject will be quite
helpful.

I have just written
a note to Mr. Wood,
enclosing your note in
pursuance of Mr. Hewlett's order,
a few words from myself
in the faith of yours -

very truly yours
J. Clark

S. 1/15

Feb. 4 - 1867

My Dear Parker,

I have just
received and read the
outline of the course
to be offered at Millis.
I cannot help thinking
that it will be an
improvement to carry
the course thro' the four
months. I shall forward
it to Satterland by tonight's
post. I wrote a letter to
Dr. Mallen yesterday,
but omitted stupidly to
put it among my others

into the post basket,
but it will go with this.

The object of my letter
was to suggest Clinical
lectures as a supplement
to the bedside teaching -

I am quite sure that
Clinical lectures, given
with judgment are the
most useful of all medical
lectures & form a very useful
addition to the ward work.

Pray talk this matter over
with your colleagues. They
can make these Clinical
lectures fulfil the object
of these General lectures.

in a great degree - I do
not mean such Clinical
lectures as were often given
in London & published in
the form of what the
lecture was confined to
the single case - a good
Clinical lecture not only
deals with the one case
but compares it with others
of the same disease ^{and its treatment} so
as to make the lecture
a most useful one ~~not~~
only on the ^{special} case treated
in but on the disease
generally. - But I fear
we will all consider me
as a bore - your respectful
of Address made of treaty

that you will have to
do is to reply to my
question - whether it is
for the efficiency & success
of the school that the
Professors should be
removed at the end of
five years, or then appoint-
ments made permanent,
in any as they are considered
efficient teachers?

I think it necessary that
we should have the decided
opinion of the Professors,
as Dr. Gibson is strongly of
opinion that that way

(2pp)

3.1/16

Bayshat Park
Feb. 7 - 1863

Dear Parker,

I have received
your letter & reviewed
syllabus - I cannot
refer to your report, as
it is being used by the
Director General &
Marden, but I have no
doubt the error in
estimating the number
of lecture notes at my
book. - There are two

points to which I wish to
call your attention before
we have our interview
with you, for which I
think it would be better
if we knew your opinion,
before our meeting -

The first and most
important is the mode of
appointing the professors.

There are two ways of
settling your opinion on
this question, you may
give it verbally on being
asked the question at
our meeting, - or, what
appears to me the better

plan, to let us have your
opinion, when I presume
will be precisely the same,
in writing, with your signa-
ture attached, as it would
then form a document
to be referred to at any
future time. I understand
for Dr. Morton any myself
are decidedly of opinion
that the appointments should
be permanent, except in
the case of any professor
being found inefficient, - to
meet which there should be
a clause in the appended
way both ways - all

p. 2.

S. 1/16
7 Feb. 1863

'army professor Morel
is superseded at the end
of his five years, and
to consider the present
contingent, when he
says "militarism, war, national
claim & contingency" These
are his words, and very
clear to me, but quite
clear as to his opinion.
Consider this point with
you (alleges that we
have the result of your
deliberation —

The other point when

requires to be settled
soon as what you mention
to be in one of your
notes of the Government of
the Hospital - But it
has for the Governor
ought to interfere with
the duties & responsibility
of the School - Next
your note to the Board
& the Board we must
take up the subject in
the Committee, but we
will be glad to have
your opinions and before
we decide to express our
opinion -

As the matter I think to
meet before long, the
sooner I have your
opinion on these two
points the better -

Yours faithfully,
J. Clark

S. 1/17

41 New Finchley Road
NW

26th Feb. 1863

Dear Mr James

I had summoned
the Committee & provided a
room for tomorrow, but in consequence
of your note I have written to
Wentin & Gibson to ask them
for Monday at 2 P.M. Can
you come to 4 Cleveland Row
any time before. I dare say that
you will find lunch there.

You might mention Dr
Parker point about the Retirement
but I fear nothing would come

of it. The only way to do would
be to hold on the professorship
until a retirement was granted.

The difficulty would not recur
with military officers who would
always have their usual retirement.

It is quite unnecessary to
have the professors up to the
W.O. Every point is now
quite clear. I have had the
last part of the report copied,
and the best way would be for
you to read it at the meeting.

I am yours ever
Richardson

I should be glad to see what you say about this.

Medical candidates for
the army - try to find
some reason for trying
to the conspicuous generosity
of pay which are recom-
mended. I think hardly
is improper when the
value of the school &
of the importance of
helping Lord May & his wife
himself with his position -
I am glad to hear that
you are pleased with your
course - I fear I shall
not have the pleasure of
seeing you again in it
till the December, when
only in July - yours truly
Jal. 1864

S. 1/18

Sagshot Park
Surrey.

June 10. 1864

Dear Sir,

I enclose a letter
& an extract of rather
memorandum respecting
Langmore - The latter
you can show to Cooper,
whether you think it
himself the letter you can
judge - I have had
several conversations
with him & find
he still ventilates in view
of the facts we wished &

and recommended
to be executed - The
President at a conference
& a board of inquiry he
cannot withdraw, with
the Home guards to
amount to 10 people
are they of a civilian,
as they call them, being
put in a position where
he could take command
of a colonial officer.
I think he sees the absurdity
of the objections but these
they are - If anyone
who made an inspection
with all the privilege

It appears he will be retained
for the present -

Lord Dalrymple says (he has
been here for two days)
that you promised him
to send him a statement
of the various appointments
open to medical candi-
dates, which during them
has been the honor. - If you
made such a promise
you had better send
him something - It is evidently
for the Duke of Cambridge
then address, who seems
incredulous of the difficulty
there is to find good

but I understood the
General tenor of the letter
very sincerely yours

Wm Larsson

I quite understand his receipt
of not telling him his views
regarding him - He & you know
how ago there was a talk
about his taking Logan's
place -

3.1/19
Army Medical School
Royal Victoria Hospital
Netley 12th June 1864

My dear Parker

I return the letter, &
thank you for having given me the
opportunity of seeing them. I fully
concur with what Mr. H. says,
- the horse being at the water, you
can't make him drink, & what
avail in making prepare upon him
to do so!

Mr. H. & Mr. J. Clark
have evidently done all they could -
Mr. H. - I see by this letter - much
more than I had supposed, & much
more than I could have expected
him to do

Yours
L. J.

Lord de Grey knows why
Logan's place was not vacant &
why it was not filled up - the
W.O. officials simply know that
Dr Logan has not retired, &
that therefore there is no vacancy,
& no doubt consider my having looked
for promotion as an inexplicable piece
of ignorance. The extract, in
French, implies this.

If Lord de Grey has entered
such a minute on the records of the
War Office as will make it binding
upon those who may hereafter

accept his portfolio that -
because promotion was offered me in
the regular order of things in the
medical department, & that because
this promotion was stopped in order
that I might be retained at
the school, therefore I have a
claim to the step when
a vacancy occurs - that I
am satisfied. And then I think
ought to be done - I do not know
that it has been -

There are one or two
words in Sir James's letter I
have been unable to decipher

expect to undertake the
journey now - also. I
have already put it off
for a week - It is so
hot here that I can
scarcely write, & I must
ask you to make my
apology to Longmore; ~~tell~~
him I feel most through
the injustice done him,
& shall do what little
I can to get him righted,
as Chairman of that
Committee I can speak
with some force & I
shall tell them that they
are ill treating me as

(2pp)

S. 1/20

Sagshot Park
Surrey.

Monday July 24 - 1865

My Dear Parker,

I have received
your & Longmore's letters,
and I subscribe to every
word in them, with one
exception in Longmore's. I
can hardly think that I
expected myself so decidedly
that "he should not be a
loser by the steps which
had been taken in the
matter" by the Committee.
If I did it shows that
I did not know the people

I had to deal with, at
that time I counted much
also on the influence of
M^r Neftingale in the
war office. I cannot
help myself that he
has not much news.
His whole efforts have
of late been directed
to India, than Sir John
Lawrence. - Altho' Longmore
has been decidedly un-
justly treated, and I
cannot believe that if
the Director General had
stated his petition &
his long offered promises

so long ago, that he would not
have obtained his promo-
tion. I cannot do any
thing at present, but I
will keep both yours
and Longmore's letters,
and shall do what I
can on my return from
Scotland to get justice
done to him. - But I
have also lost a little
confidence in the Ministry
at War, however I
shall certainly try him.
I have had an abomi-
nable cold & am only

p.2. 24 July 1865 S.1/20

Sagshot Park
Surrey.

well as necessary affairs
I fear nothing can be done
till the autumn - I
shall be back here by
the first of September,
and shall apprise
you of my return - I
am to be sure not
to have seen you,
but I am glad that
Mr Green went -
Kind regards to Mr
Parks from
yours sincerely
J. Clark

My address in Scotland
will be after this week

Destrie

Jarlund

A.B.

and shall be glad to
hear from you -

a salary to the Government,
I hope I am right. - All
we know this is - It appears
to me that Lord Herbert's
regulation of Keepers to
3 chief medical officers
might be got over by
appointing Longman as
a special appointment,
giving the three to the
Director General^{at present} - Give
me a few hints in
this subject. I cannot
agree with you that
the D.G. has acted fairly
by Longman - "Because
he was once stopped

(244)

S. 1/21

W. G. Lenth
Sagshot Park
Surrey.

Sep. 10 - 1865

My Dear Parks,

After six weeks
wandering in Scotland
and the north of
England, John & I return
on Friday - He I think
decidedly better, and
I also think that he
has derived benefit
from music, which he

certainties to take in
tongrain doses, were
neglected. On our return
from Scotland we
stayed a few days with
Lord Dalrymple. Fortunately
I took my own gun
rules with me, & took
an opportunity of
visiting Lord Dalrymple to
show them. He told
me that he had been
greatly annoyed on
hearing accidentally
of Dr. Jamieson being

sent to Melby, in Dr. Jamieson,
going away, & spoke to the
Duke on the subject. His
attention was called to
an article in Army regulations,
which gives the Director
General the power of
appointing the medical
^{officers of the hospitals}
~~doctors~~ - He was
obliged to admit that
it was so. I pointed
out to him the advantage
that it would be to
have Surgeons made
Principal Medical Officers,
that it would rather be

This is a sad record written by Webster's
young students - members

see him of getting him
to do something of the kind
to satisfy his own
of course I mention all
the things & his own, but
to no one else, & I mean
to speak to no one but
myself. I felt a little
reluctant in such matters
further in his own house,
but when I see him in his
office I shall have less deli-
cacy - meantime I should
like to know what differ-
ence in pay which his own has
as result of that of P.M.C.
I don't only admit that I
had a right to his own
interest as result of his own
and that his promotion
for his own sake.

p.2 10 Sept. 1865 S. 1/21

in promoting him he
cannot stop again!! -
that appears to me no reason -
because he was stopped
then promote him for
a particular purpose of
his own, is that any
reason why he should
not promote him for
another and better ^{reason} object?
It is quite clear to me
that if the D.G. had reason
wondered his own. That
he could have been
promoted the very

reason that his promise
was stopped against
his own wish & to his
ingenuity, shall have been
was a good reason for
his reluctance, ^{since} ~~then~~
Lord Delguy seems to
me very well disposed
to do you, & if it rests
with him I have no doubt
he would promote him.
The difficulty is with the
Secretary, as Lord Herbert,
and ^{respecting} ~~the~~ ~~affairs~~

^{Whether}
but ~~we~~ we can show that
the little additional paper is very
new would - I hope on
the subject of selling foreign
money at rest by some
authentic memorandum
seeing his prostration had
delguy did not see exactly
how he could do that,
& I did not push the
matter, but he told
me, at the same time,
that if Dr Armstrong had
left a written memoran-
dum that Sir John was
to be promoted in four
years, he would have
acted on it - I have no
fears when I read

P. 2. 4 Nov. 1865

S. 1/22a

note perhaps you might
write me, retaining the D as
note to them long more
after you have heard
from me again - I cannot
help thinking that from the
D's remarks on the 'matters
concerning order of business
~~from~~ a good good per
fectly applicable -

I would take it to be
certainly when the paper
time came -

Let me have your current
order paper to come to
rest for one month now

- Yours truly
J. J.

O. J.

If you think it better
to show Mr. D. G. note
to ~~Mr. D. G.~~ ^{alone}, do so at
once. I cannot help
thinking that he will
look upon it as encouraging
I do.

in me to make the application
you desire.

I entertain a very great
regard for Longmore, and
am sorry it is not in my
power to be useful to
him

de.
(Signed) J. M. Gibson -

Enclosed w. Cr. of 4 Nov. 1865 S. 1/226

Copy

6. Whitehall Yard London
Nov. 1. 1865.

My dear Sir James Clark -

You will be quite correct
in stating to Dr. Parker that I
consider the duties of Principal
Medical Officer of Netley Hospital
incompatible with those of the
Professor of Surgery in the
Medical School, even with
any assistance that could be
given -

Mr. Longmore being supernumerary
to the Administrative Officers
required & allowed for the

General Service of the Army,
and his appointment of
Professor of Surgery to the
School being permanent,
he, of course, could not be
promoted to be one of the
Inspectors for General
Service.

Should the Secretary of
State, at any future time,
consider that his services
as Professor of Surgery

merit promotion to Inspector
General, it would necessarily
be special, and supernumerary
to the fixed establishment.

The duties of the Professor
of Surgery certainly are
more onerous than those
of his colleague, but from
the circumstances of
the appointment of the Professor,
I am sure you will, on consideration,
feel that it would be improper

General made two propositions.

1. To give Longmore the pay of Inspector without the rank - But I presume now he would be willing to give both if ^{Longmore is} made supernumerary,

2. To allow ^{Longmore} ~~him~~ to retire, taking his pension and ~~not~~ retaining his Inspectorship.
~~He would be allowed to retire~~
-

Should I have told him of these two propositions.

I do hope at least his promotion (as supernumerary Inspector) will be granted.

Believe me
My dear Sir James,
Always your sincere
R. A. Parkes.

Returned from
Sir James
Nov 19 - 1865
He altered
sent back some
Ally.

Sydney Cottage S. 1/23
Bitterne
Southampton
5 Nov. 1865

My dear Sir James

It seems to me dear, from the Director-General's letter, that if Lord de Grey were pleased to promote Longmore to a supernumerary Inspectorship, he / the D. G. / would offer no opposition. In fact it would be no injury to any one, as promotion ^{in the service} would go on just the same, while Longmore would be benefitted, as then his time would be running on for the Inspector-General's pension.

for his widow in case of his death. So that all difficulty but that of the Treasury seems at an end.

Let us see what increased expense would be incurred if Longpre were made Superintending (not Local) Inspector General.

At present.

	per annum
Salary as Professor =	700
Allowance	100
Total	<u>£ 800</u>

After promotion

Pay of Inspector General	} 730
25 years service =	
£ 2 per diem =	150
Allowance	<u>880</u>

The additional expense would be only £80 per annum ^{which} ~~would~~ is really nothing if it makes Longpre contented & keeps him at the school; to say nothing of the fact that he was really promised promotion by Alexander, and was actually named for promotion by Sir James Gibson.

+ + + + +

Of course there is not the saving there would be if he were made P.M.O. as well as Professor but that is now out of the question.

I understood you to say that the Director

But I presume now he wd. be
willing to give both if he is made
Superannuated

2. To allow him to retire, taking
his pension & retaining his
Professorship. &

I have told him of these
two propositions.

I do hope at last his
promotion (as Superannuated
Inspector) will be granted.

H. C. P.

(Copy) Sydney Cottage
5 Nov. 1855.
3.1/24

My dear Sir James.

It seems to me clear,
from the Director General's letter, that
if Lord de Grey were pleased to
promote Longmore to a Superannuated
Inspectorship, he (the D. G.) would
offer no opposition. In fact it
wd. be no injury to any one,
as promotion wd. go on just the
same, while Longmore wd. be
benefitted, as then his time wd. be
running on for the Inspector
General's pension for his widow
in case of his death. So that

all difficulties, but that of the Treasury seems at an end.

Let us see what increased expense would be incurred if Longmore were made ^{Superintending} (not local) Inspector general.

<u>At present</u>	
Salary as Professor	per ann: 700
Allowance	100
	<u>Total. 800</u>

<u>After promotion.</u>	
Pay of Inspector genl. under 25 years service	730
£2 per diem allowance	150
	<u>880</u>

The additional expense would be only £80 per annum D. J. is really nothing if it makes Longmore contented & keeps him at the school - & says nothing of the fact that he was really promised promotion by Alexander, & was actually named for promotion by Sir J. Gibson.

Of course there is not the saving there would be if he were made P. M. B. as well as Professor but that is now out of the question.

I understood you to say that the D. J. made two propositions.

1. To give Longmore the pay of Inspector without the rank,

S. 1/25

Sagshot Park
Surrey.

Nov. 7 - 1865

My dear Parker,

I view Mr. D's
note in the same light
as you do, & I am prepared
to lay it before Lord
de Grey with your last
note, omits or rejects
I can be in favour of no
superannuation provision.

Mr. D. did say that no
might be allowed a re-
lating his business, but
from your saying no,

When we met at the Academy,
that you felt our progress
would not be in that
proportion, I did not
think it worth while
to put it among the
proposals of Cabren, but
if Congress should enter-
tain a notice of it,
I would still call the
D's attention to it.

I think there is no fear
of hard dealing, as the
war office will they
severally hold together,
but I think in such cases
should not be very, ~~long~~
that the D's be too much

to my proposals, I meant to
have some details to the
war office in hand of
Lindbergh - let me
hear what you think,

Yours truly
J. A. Clark

John returned from
holland yesterday & I
think improved in health.

Yours truly
Ed. Clarke

S. 1/26

Bagshot Park
Surrey.

Nov: 10 - 1865

My Dear Parkes,

As matters stand
with regard to the new
Government, I think it of
great importance that
Longmore's matter should
be settled soon, as I
am not quite satisfied
that Lord Alfred will
remain in the new office.

There seems an opinion
that he is not up to fight
Mr. Duke of Cambridge,

I wish therefore to be
fully prepared to attack
him on the earliest
opportunity, perhaps to
write him at once. My
reason for telling you
this is to ask you to
write me with a note
as I could show or
induce to send de Gue.

Your note that I never
conclude is very nearly
what I wish of it

+ + + + +

after that I should like
you to express the great
importance to the school
of retaining Longmore -
and perhaps you may
add that his duties
are very heavy that he
is not only Professor
of Surgery but (say that
he does in addition)

I wish to show the importance
of Longmore to the school
as a reason for retaining
him then &c. you
know what I mean

good was hiser, but
that he is not a match
for the Bumpston Duke,
as it was scarcely to be
expected that to young
a man would exceed
he. It was for this reason
that the Duke the Army
pends, pushed the appearance
ment of Dr. Gray. Had he
to Wood or the Duke of Somerset
not been appeared the
matter would have been
different. I wish you could
have come down for a day -

Yours faithfully,
J. Clark

S. 1/27
Dagshot Park
Surrey.

Sunday Nov 12 - 65
(2pp)

My Dear Parkes,

Our thoughts
often run in the same
direction, & they certainly
do so on the present
occasion. On Friday
night I wrote you a long
one & it would have been
gone to Sunday perhaps
perhaps, had your
note not been at the same
time not reached me

Yesterday morning.

What I want is such
a note from you as I
may enclose to New
& Lord Selkirk, & that,
if he thinks fit, may
show to the Chancellor
of the Exchequer together
with a note which I
shall write pointing out
the ruin of many men
in the nation by the heavy
taxes; that is, a note for

gladstone's conscience in
increasing taxmen's pay.

But I think after the
article in the Times, &
a still more rational one
in the Spectator of yesterday,
it would not be dilatory
to push the matter at
this moment, though I will
hold myself in readiness
to do so when I or you
think the time has arrived.
The impudence is very great
that Lord Selkirk is a good
man of business & a

M

p. 2. 12 Nov. 1865

S. 1/27

I do not know if
Mr D. G. is aware that
Alexander had promised
Seymour promotion,
but Lord Selkirk is &
he said to me if Alexan-
der had left a memo-
randum to that effect,
he would have passed
Seymour. It is certain
that Alexander left no
such memorandum? -

The additional expense would be £50
per annum - surely this is an
insignificant sum when it is
to keep the highest English Authority
on Military Surgery, at the ^{only} great
English Military Medical School.

Should upon it in fact as very poor
pay for good service done for
5 years. I ought to have said
before that - besides all his
Professional duties, ^{Longmore} has done those
of dep. Inspector, so that in fact
he has for 5 years done double work.

I feel so strongly the great importance
of Longmore's remaining at the school,
and the great value of the work he
has already done, that I feel no
hesitation in begging you to put
his case ^{again} before Lord de
Grey. I believe he will do what the
Genl. believe me my dear Sir James
yours always
E. H. Park Esq.

Send back
18-19 the
envelope -
sent back -
on the 19th Nov.

Royal Victoria Hospital
Netley
23 November 1865.

My dear Sir James

It seems to me quite clear ^{from his letter} that
the Director General has no objections
to Longmore's being promoted to the
rank of Inspector General, if Lord
de Grey were pleased to ^{propose or}
such an ^{arrangement} ^{recommended}, provided he
(Longmore) is made Supernumerary
to the present establishment. It is quite
true Sir James Gibson uses the words
"if at some future time, Lord de
Grey" &c, but it is quite certain
I should think that he has no
doubt Longmore has already
earned his promotion.

You know so well how Longmire
 has worked in the starting
 & carrying on of our new school for
 the last 5 years, that I need not
 explain ~~how~~ not only how thoroughly
 he has won his step, but what a
 serious indeed ^{irreparable} ~~irreparable~~
 loss his leaving the school would
 be. I have already so fully
 explained his position to you; his
 loss by promotion ^{three} two years ago
 by being kept at the school; the
 want of any record by Alexander
 that he should be promoted in
 5 years, and all the other
 circumstances that I should
 occupy unnecessary space by going
 over it again.

Longmire's promotion as
 Supernumerary (not local) Inspector
 would do no injury to any one. He
 would be benefitted, as his time for
 Inspector's pension for his
 widow in case of death, would
 be ^{the} ~~the~~ running on, but no one would
 be in the least damaged.

The only difficulty would be
 that of the Treasury - let us see
 what would that ~~would~~ ^{would} be come to

Present Arrangement		
Longmire's Salary at Inspector	—	700
Allowance	—	100
	Total	£ 800
Proposed Arrangement		
Longmire pay as Inspector	—	730
General	—	150
Allowance	—	—
	Total	£ 880

S. 1/29

Sagshot Park
Surrey.

Nov: 18 - 1865 -

My Dear Parker,

I have been
puzzled per reply's
to your last note by
my cousin Whindson
when I saw write -

I have gone over your
note carefully & have
marked two or three
parts where signs are
left out - I find people
describe long notes, & in

fact don't read them.

I mean people in London
London - make you
make some fully with
the school with very
two weeks will be

It is true it is
order that I may be
ready - I do hope
we may succeed -

The Duke of Cambridge
was here & I might
have spoken then

but I thought it of no
use - but they can
do tonight & so the thing
of the day over with
except -

Yours truly
J. Clark

In Belgium viz the
Rev, also has been very
ill again - I go to ~~London~~
to meet him on his
return, when I do not
however expect to be
addressed as taking
it at Ardennes -

Always truly yours
J. A. Clark

Sagshot Park
Surrey.

S. 1/30

Nov. 20 - 1865

My Dear Parker,

Your note is
excellent, clearly written
and to the point. ~~It is~~
I will put it over that
of the Director General,
who I think has com-
mended himself to
superior promotion,
It is a noble true say-
ing per D. Hooker truly
that he must resign

his examinership -
Thank well, ^{who} you can
call as his successor.
Do not let them omit
to appoint a successor!
You want all your
examiners - I forget
who is to be your
surgeon examiner if
declines to go on.

I had a note from
Stokes this morning asking
me to speak in his
favor for Grey in favour
of DeGowan, who is

a candidate for the
Chair of Materia Medica
in the University of
Glasgow. I think he
had given up the
profession as he had got
a fortune left him.
What do you think of
Lwan for the appoint-
ment. Has he not
a professorship of
Medical Jurisprudence
is ours in the Anderson
Medical Institution -
Jenner is at present

S. 1/31
Humble 27/11/65

My dear Parker

I return the enclosed
correspondence. It makes me
feel surprize that Mr J.
Clark should have taken so
much pains, and regret
that both he & you should
have had so much trouble,
on my account.

I enclose for your
perusal a letter I have
received from Mrs. W.

in reply to me of mine
telling him of my intended
resignation of the P. ship.
I said it chiefly because
he happens to mention
Dr Alexander having
told him, in nearly the
same terms, what I
have before stated P.A.
told me, that he (D.A.)

should look upon 5 years
service in the school
as claim for promotion.
But I do not think
it likely D.A. left
my record on the
matter - after all,
D.A. could not have
tried to get me my
promotion, my truly yours
E. Langmore

Nyblongali? ~~on the subject~~
I have written & suggested
to him the provisionally a letter
more on the subject, but
are the parents of the school
who claim to take an
interest in it - But then
I expect he will not do,
as I think it probable that
He & Miss N. are the chief
people who have become
cool - Let me hear soon
on the subject, but for
the present I think you
had better consider the
business your own only.

S. 1/32
Sagshot Park
Surrey.

Decr: 25 - 1865

My Dear Parker,

I have been
annoyed by the endless
note, which I received from
Mr Sutherland two days ago,
was a Report ^{marked confidential} of the health
fever which occurred at
Aldershot; what appears
to me to have been unduly
over given course that does
he mean? In what way
have your opinions been
ever published? Does he
mean by publishing to write, or
what else? I have been

looking into whether he
would have been the
truest the cause of peace.
The address ~~stated~~ to
Budd's views, & I think
does not lack support
within our deputation
members' intelligences,
on this subject. I read
Budd's paper some time
ago & Markham's Critique
on them, & the copy left
in my hand is that Markham
is right, that the felicitous
poems are spoken of

in twenty folk & under such
circumstances. I cannot see the
weight of Watson & the
other authorities in comparison
of Budd's view on this point.
However this may be, I think
the subject is just now has
called & demands particular
consideration in all medical
schools. It is very desirable
that Markham view that
to correct that Budd's, -
for a correction of the
facts. - Will you have
been any discussion
on this subject between
you & Markham or not?

S. 1/32

In the Journal of this week
you will find an excellent
paper by Mureburn, of the
Penderford. It has been
me all the information I
sought from you, so I attribute
you entirely from the hands
of any my questions -
I had no idea that it
seems always to be covered
with paper -

They must have felt
my storm at Nelly -

Very truly yours

W. Clark

Tupperland's note is a reply
to one from me after, here

le come deux her pas a
par deux. Il seem the
French army in Algeria
is now so healthy that
it is thought advisable
to theme new way as
married.

Let me have further
note again.

S. 1/33

Copy of a letter from Dr. Sutherland to Sir James
Clark. 26th December 1865.

Dear Sir James Clark

Thank you for your kind invitation
to Buzshot which I should have gladly accepted
only that I am just about to start for Algeria
on a Commission of Enquiry of which Dr. Ellis
is a member -

I send you a Confidential copy of our report
on Scarlet fever at Aldershot Dr. as you will
see throws much light on the disease. I hope
it will dissipate not a little of the ignorant
professional prejudice on the Subject.

I have heard nothing lately about Dr. Longmore's
promotion. The fact is that the School has almost
ceased to excite interest in its best friends. I am
afraid indeed that in future it will have to fight
its own way financially almost without aid.

This I am sorry to say has arisen from undue
prominence having been given publicly to the
old Contagion hypothesis by more than one of
its members -

For many years the advocates for Sanitary
improvement have been hoping that by patient
examination of facts they would ~~eventually~~
^{eventually} ~~eventually~~

ascertain the real value of Contagion as
an efficient cause of disease, and it is really
too bad that our own professors sho^d prejudice
the question by quoting or supporting the
merest opinions of other men without bringing
any scientific contribution to the subject.

The matter is one of immense practical
importance, the only thing is that men
do not always see the results logically
of their own reasonings - There are
however many strong minds ^{not} in the
profession who have judged our school
by its books in this matter, & found
it wanting in grasp of mind.

This is true to be sure, & if you hear of
opposition to it do not be surprised
for I have already heard strong views
expressed on the subject. With good wishes &c &c
(signed) J. Sutherland

City Sydney

3.1/34

30 Dec.

My dear Sir James

I return Dr. Sutherland's letter
It has indeed surprised me &
that - he should have written
forward long answers to my
Memoria which he had a share
in writing, because some of
my colleagues do not appear
to have any command in
writing & I believe
but to your questions

There has been no communication between
Mr. Sutherland & I on the subject of contagion, and the views
I teach and the preventive measures founded
upon them are given in my Manual.
With regard to my opinions on typhoid fever
you will find them given at page 54, page
96, and page 437.

It then does not teach anything
connected with the propagation and origin
of the specific diseases, and if any exception
is taken down teaching it must refer to
Maulean & to me. Our opinions are
identical and we have always taught
the same ^{opinions} since the school opened.

No can we teach differently, for we
must teach what we believe. In our
belief we ~~can~~ can give sufficient reasons,
which is ^{suspect} more than Sutherland can do
for his opinions about Contagion which
are far behind the time.

Although Sutherland refers
to our teaching, I suspect it is not
really that of which he is thinking.
He has been exceedingly indignant with

the Commission's Report on the Cattle Plague.
with an ^{& incomprehensible} ignorance, although he has
read nothing on the subject, and has not seen a
case, he has not only openly pronounced ~~the~~ ^{the}
propagation ^{of the Cattle Plague} by Contagion to be an utter
absurdity worthy only of the dark ages, but he
has written this dead flourish. He has thus
done his utmost ^{without really knowing anything about it,} to open the weight of our
Recommendations, & has been the means
in some measure of the fatal apathy of
the public, and of the loss the country has suffered.

With regard to me I am told he has
~~abused~~ abused me in unmeasured terms
for my participation in the Report, and
this I can very well believe for, (Captain
Galtou with whom I had a long discussion
on the subject, and who holds like Sutherland
himself, the vaguest & crudest notions
about the disease, thinks our Report the
veriest piece of absurdity ever published.

The fact is Sutherland belongs to
a party who ^{think} believe they are standing in
the vanguard of progress by rejecting in toto

doctrine of
the transmission of ^{any} disease from one body
to another by means of putrescent
portions of the sick body. The modern
doctrine of Contagion, based as it is,
on facts of which Sutherland takes no
account, if indeed he ever attempts
to ~~master~~ ^{confute} them, is in the eyes of
this party, a relic of barbarism.
~~Although~~ ^{have} they go all lengths in their
opposition to it, ~~even to the extent~~
~~of falsifying evidence.~~

In sanitary matters Sutherland
has been most useful, but he seems
unable to see that a man may be
an active Sanitarian yet hold
old views about Contagion. He
never will see it, and in my opinion
he never will ~~rightly~~ honestly set
himself down to learn what ^{now} is meant
by Contagion.

I do not think it would do any
good to begin a controversy or
discussion on this point. ~~It has been~~
~~to~~ Sutherland
must go his way & we must go
ours. I only hope we shall be a

little more tolerant than he is

likely to be to us.

I quite agree with you it is a well used
to show Sutherland letter. ^{long} ~~How~~ ~~ever~~ ~~there~~ ~~however~~
made a copy of it & I should like your

permission to show it to my colleagues at some
future time, if it can become necessary for
them to know Sutherland's feelings towards us.

Please give me this permission

Dec: 1865

Johns Jan

Sir J. C.

Dr Sutherland

Robt

S. V. 35

Sagshot Park
Surrey.

Jan 5 - 1866

My dear Parker,

Contrary to my
expectations Sutherland
replied fully to my
note virtually his complaints
are the med. officers of
Nelly - He bids me not
raise his letter to me,
but I had done so before
his response came - But
we can talk over the
matter when you has
me your present dent

December 1865

Dr Sutherland to Sir J. Clark
in Parker to do

The R. M. School Thetford.
on account of the teaching of
some of its supporters regarding
contagious & m. School

I think you are quite
right regarding Galtom.
I have no doubt he
is one of the changed
kind, with the settled
views. He refers me
to your book & differs
in various points.
but such a man may
be too clever to be
willing to show that
he is a really officer &c.

Very truly yours

J. Clark

S. 1/36

Hamble, 16th/2/66

My dear Parker

Many thanks for letting me
see the account. I was in
town and saw the D.G. on
Wednesday. He told me that
some further move in my affairs
was being made but that he
had better not speak of it to me,
as it might end in nothing.
I said nothing on the subject,
but he presently asked me point-

Thank whether I had heard
of his proposal regarding me -
I could only reply that I had
heard something about it through
you, & he then entered fully
into the question of its
advantages & disadvantages.

It seems not unlikely the enclosed
was written after our interview.

The carrying the proposal
out seems to depend wholly

upon Lord de Grey, acting
in the matter before he
leaves the W.O. - he
had not then left the W.O.
& it was not known exactly
in what day he would be
sworn in to his new
Office.

My sincerely yours
E. Langman

The D. G. said he had taken
the opinion of the majority in
the unfortunate case of Pardon

It appears to me that the
most natural way of enabling
me to inform Lord & Grey
of what has taken place
between Mr D.G. & Longmore,
would be for L. to write
me with a note as I
could enclose to Lord & Grey.
It need not be long & a
few sentences would, I think,
do as to show I had
taken an interest in his
proceedings that applied
to Lord & Grey in his favour,
he felt right to inform
me of the substance of his late
interview with Mr D.G. on the subject.

3.1/37

Sagshot Park
Surrey.

Feb. 4 - 1866

(2 pp.)

My dear Garter,

I cannot find
any note among my papers
on the subject of the
Director's promise to Mr
Longmore that if Lord
& Grey would propose
his promise as L.G. &c.,
Mr D.G., would not apply
it. At this moment I
cannot recollect how
this information was

conveyed to me. It was
either by a note from
Longmore himself, or from
you conveying the information
when you had received
from Longmore; and on
thinking over the matter,
I finding no such note
among my papers, I have a
strong impression that I
sent the note in question
with me, either to Lord Grey,
or I gave it to him
when I saw him on the
subject, & now when I
think over the matter I
recalled his asking for it,
when I was here at the War Office.

Now the information when
you gave me the Monday
of Longmore's resignation
was the J. General's advice
that he would give
up all thought of his
promotion till his term
came, & under it almost
meaning that I should
make some countermeas-
ures to Lord Grey.
Does it not appear
to you that I owe this
to Lord Grey for his conduct
in looking to my advancement
in favor of Longmore?

p. 2. 4 Feb. 1866

S. 1/37

Bagshot Park
Surrey.

such a note in short as
I might send, in whole or
an extract, as appeared
to me best. It must be
by writing, as I shall receive
no chance of any lodgings
for a long time, except by
chance. Will you kindly
thank a longman or you
may send him my note
if you please.

Very truly yours

J. Clark

S. 1/38

Saturday Feb. 24 - 1866

My Dear Parker,

I received the
enclosed note this
morning, & have replied
that I would fix
a time to wait on
Lord Hartington after
his return from France.
I enclose it to you in

consequence of one ex-
pression in it - "The subject
of the Army Medical
School & its location at
Nilling". What does
that mean? Has there
been any question of
a change of location of
the school! & if so
to where? - All means
they you know or
have heard and your

opinion, in order that
I may be prepared -
Can there be a notion
of sending the school
to Woolwich &
the Herbert Hospital?
Write me to Baginbun
in the beginning of next
week -

Yours truly
J. Clark

I have long since matter
is finally settled.

The rule which decided
us then was, ^{to go} where we could
~~best~~ ^{get} the best specimens of
tropical disease, wounds,
& accidents of war to show the
men. I fancy the Herbert
Hospital would give us
nothing like the kind of
cases we get at Netley.
We thought not in 1863,
and I do not suppose
things are altered now.

Remember we do not
propose to teach ^{the men} the
common diseases seen

(2 pp)

Sidney Cottage,
Bittern,
Southampton.

S. 1/39

25 February 1866

My dear Sir James

I heard some time ago
that the Director General had
proposed to transfer the
Army Med^l School from Netley
to the Herbert Hospital at
Woolwich, but as I was
asked to say nothing about
it, I could not speak to
you on the subject when I
was at Bagehot.

The reason why we
came to Netley is very simple.

It was thought essential that the School should be where the great map of ^{Tropical} Invalids come to. If you remember the Proposals were asked to meet the Committee of which you were Chairman, at the War Office, and the whole matter was there discussed.

We had before us the number of patients we could calculate upon at Woolwich if we went there, and at Netley, and we found that both as to

character of disease, Netley offered us far more opportunities of teaching Army medicine & surgery than Woolwich could do.

That was the ground on which we elected to go so far from London.

The same reason I presume holds good now; at least I have never heard either Maclean or Longmore express a doubt of the wisdom of the course adopted and recommended by your Committee.

Carried out. But I cannot
imagine what ground he
can have unless he has
found out that the Herbert
Hospital will give us
more of the cases we want
for clinical teaching than
Netley.

P. 2. 25 Feb. 1866

S. V. 39

Sydney Cottage,
Billorne,
Southampton.

in the civil hospitals, but
the special diseases & injuries
seen in Army life & for that
we require the hospital also
invalids, and the men sent
home after wounds. Of this
last class we have had many
from New Zealand lately
which we should not have
had at Woolwich.

If the question is to
be again reopened we
ought to be told again
how many patients & when

Kind of diseases, we can
get at Woolwich, so as
to compare with Netley.

Of course I am judging
the question entirely from
the teaching point of view,
but this is I presume the
proper way.

There are some other matters
however of some weight.

What an expense it
would be to transport back
to Woolwich all our
Museums, Libraries &c;

to provide accommodation,
for the young men; mess
rooms &c! Then our lecture
room, deadhouse, laboratory &c
Even to compensate
for this expenditure, would
require that Woolwich should
give us some decided &
great advantages over Netley.

I do not of course
know the grounds on which
the Director General is moving
but I presume he must
have some new & strong
reasons for disturbing an
arrangement so lately

was out of the question,
as their time was so
much taken up, that, even
if it were desirable, they
could not go to London
helpfully for operations -
that they were nearly exhausted,
or perhaps before they
became candidates, & in the
course of their education
had made themselves
acquainted with all the
ordinary details of
the service in the civil
hospital, and that

5 pp.

S. 1/40

Saturday evening

My Dear Parker,

My interview
with Lord Dartington went
off very pleasantly. He had
our report on the table
and a memorandum
of the views of the D.G.,
and some others he laid
(but did not name them)
why Woolwich would
be a better site for the
Army Medical School.

State Medical - There would
be a better class of patients
for teaching in the hospitals
at Woolwich, & the military
invalids would be
ample for teaching the
diseases of foreign climates,
while the candidates would
have the advantage of
going to the London Hospitals
to see operations &c. There
were all the advantages
he mentioned, but one dis-
advantage of Nelly's - that

it was away from the
country (I think that was
the word) of the Public.
He remarked that they
surprised himself, as
he thought the title of
Nelly was an ^{in that respect} advantage.
In this of course I quite
agreed - I then pointed
out to him that Woolwich
would be rather injurious
to the candidates by leading
them to London to the neglect
of their studies & not to go
to the Hospitals - that the latter

I suggested that the Committee
might new consist of the
former members, but the
addition of the Senate of
the medical school. He
then read out some of the
Report of the Committee and
a memo drawn up with
great care, & he seems to
doubt whether it was worth
while to report to the Committee.

I then suggested whether it would
not be simpler for the matter to
send the mem^o of reasons for
the change to Kelly & Woodland
directly to the Professors & to
ask them to report on it.

2 'Sat. eve' S. 1/40

The great object of
the treaty at Petting was
to make the candidates
acquainted with the details
of foreign climates, which
could only be taught
where the tropicals grew
the climates arrived.

I forgot two objections
raised to Kelly - one was
then by the General
desires see them² &
most important part

of the army medical
man's knowledge. -
In view of this I
stated that a railroad
was in progress ^{from} ~~from~~
New York, where, if it
was considered desirable,
could be of great benefit to
other patients to ~~be~~
with advantage to the
patients & Government hospitals,
then patients were
wanted at Albany -

Lord Halifax expressed himself
as by no means desirous of
the change, ^{and} at any rate nothing
would be done in it without
maturing consideration - He
stated to him the great
expense that would attend
the change from Albany to
Woolwich - He suggested the
calling together the former
Committee which had
decided on this, after mature
consideration & consultation
on the proposed.

3
'Sat. eve'

S. 1/40

He said he thought it over,
& I left him with the
impression that he would
do so - If he does that
you have only to draw
up such a report as will
set the matter at rest -
Let it therefore be a careful
straightforward reply to this
very proposal - Mr D.G.
is not a weak man, &
just has time at an
end, as he seems to have
a really dear & so comely.
Mr Gutter has absent
in the country over a week

working I could not see
him, but shall write
him - ~~But~~, ^{in person} I thought it
well to mention the subject
to Lord Tharbyton - I explain
the purpose of the affair to him
He said he had never heard
of the thing but would enquire
about it - I told him that
Lord Douglas kept all the
medical matters in his
own hands -

Yours truly
J. Clark

Ms.

4

Sunday,

'Sat. eve'

S. 1/40

Since the previous
post was written I have
received your note - I
am glad to find that
you estimate favorably -
Take care of your eye &
use it gently - allow us
the eye to recover & rest
for some time, & disease is
easily excited in it -

I get ^{well} over my eyes
visit to London, but not
without some hints that
I must go there as seldom
as possible. I have
to attend in many of
them when the time of

your kind heart, & if
the weather is favorable
I shall endeavor to attend
in order to see you. The
part of your note alarms
me, you ask if I heard
any thing of Longman's pro-
mises? I thought it better,

In one of your notes you
said Longman's affair is
settled at least. I think
then see your words -

I will not further attempt
the the
Longman's promises -
Always your truly
J. G. Lull

'Sat. eve'

S. 1/40

I am greatly grieved to
hear from James who
was here to day that
Paul is laid up with
another attack of Pneumonia.

I have written Gulliver &
Mr D. G. about the
India Grant by Mrs
do not recd much
but to send Gray on
the subject - I never heard
of such an absurdity.

What a walled letter
I am sending you -

S. 1/41

Bagshot Park
Surrey.

Saturday 26th
(May 1866)

My dear Parker,

As I mentioned
in my last note that
I would write Galton
so as to force an
answer. It came this
morning, & I enclose
it, for altho' it is
marked 'Private', I
cannot think that he
would object to you &

Longman rising etc. I
fear we will get nothing
more out of them, & if
he is correct in stating
that Longman has nearly
two a year it cannot
be said that he is
badly paid, considering
the pay of the other
professors. I will not
be very long I hope before
his promotion comes
in the regular order.
But let me hear what

3.1/41

p. 2. 26 May 1866

you and he think, &
whether you think that
I can do any thing
more in the matter.

I hope this will find
you after finishing your
Council work, and
that Mrs Parker is
better. We have at
last got a shower
for the present the
bad wind has ceased,
I have kept the house
since last Sunday, but

hope to get out tomorrow.

It is a pleasure to see
the rain falling - By the
look of the clouds you
had it before us - It
only began a quarter
of an hour ago here -
that is, at 4 o'clock.

but kind regards to
Mr Park

Yours sincerely
J. Clark

James I am glad Wray has had
great success on a grand field of land
Dorset. It will be a feather in his cap.

that the Treasury would
also entertain strong
objections to the proposal
if it were submitted
to them.

We consider that
in increasing Professor
Langman's emoluments
by £150 a year his
only real grievance
was removed - His
total

(2pp.)



3. 1/42


Private

25th May 1886.

Dear Sir James Clark,

I have delayed replying
to your notes regarding
Professor Langman, as
the matter is one which
has required much
consideration.

I must first
Sir J. Clark Bart: observe


observe (with reference
to suspensions in your
notes which appear to
show that you considered
that the question of
Professor Longman's position
was finally settled)
that my note of
the 9th of February merely
asked

asked your opinion on
Sir James Gibber's suggestion
to promote Professor Longman,
I then place him on
half-pay.

I stated in my
note that I saw
objections to that
course, and on further
consideration we think
that there is no doubt
that

P. 2. 25 May 1866

3.1/42



Total Enrolments now
amount to nearly £1000
a year, & we do
not think that he
has any grievance in
respect of promotion, so
long as no one junior
to him is promoted.

Yours very truly
Arthur Colclough

had merely got the general
impression from Sutherland
that it was better not.

He said at least he thought
there had been some talk about
limiting the Professorships &
5 years to get over the difficulty
but stood him that was an
old affair which was
definitively settled 3 years
ago. I felt at the end of
the conversation we were
just where we were. I
hope you will see Eyre when
you next go to town & hear

(2 pp.)

3.1/43

Sydney Cottage,
Bitterne,
Southampton.

10 June 1866

My dear Longmore

~~I will write to Stridings
& I will also speak to him
about his absence. I will
say that I do so in the
name of all of us.~~

~~I saw the D.G. yesterday
and talked to him about the
providing. Can we meet
tomorrow at 12.30, and I
will tell you what he said?~~

~~I have written to the other, to
fix that time~~

Saloo saw General Eyre but found he had really nothing to say but what we knew before.

He met Sutherland in a room in the W. O. where there was a clerk whom S. was anxious should not hear what he said. Consequently he whispered to Eyre who lost much of the conversation, but he seems to have gathered this much.

That Sutherland speaks of your services in the warmest terms but considers that there is a great determination on the part of (Specimens) that

Lord Barkington & Galton wish to carry out the plan proposed of promotion to S. J. & placing you on half pay. Sutherland did not give any reasons except those assigned in Galton's letter the purport of which he gave to Eyre, as I understood. Sutherland simply advised that we were should be said, but I could not make out from Eyre what his exact motive was.

I told Eyre we were anxious to know precisely why the matter should not be pushed, but Eyre could not tell me; he

meeting when Aiken is
gone to ~~the~~ lecture we
shall have some little time.
Very sincerely yours
E. Parkes.

10.2. 10 June 1866

Honey Cottage,
Bittern,
Southampton.

S.1/43

The particulars of
from him precisely his intention,
but I do not think you will
be sure than the above.
He really did not seem to
know more & was I
really think chiefly influenced
by Sutherland's advice, without
knowing the precise grounds
of the advice.

I presume we may
conclude that Sutherland
considers the application

would really be helpful.

I was very much disappointed to get no further. Eyre said he knew ~~nothing~~ Sutherland a humbug but that as far as he could judge Sutherland seemed quite honest - born in his expressions of friendship to you and of advice to do no more in the matter.

You will I fear be disappointed. I cannot myself at all understand the thing nor conceive on what ground falton is acting. ~~It is~~ ~~do~~ ~~I~~ ~~know~~ ~~what~~ we ought to do next. I never like giving up ^{trying to} ~~doing~~ a thing which it is right & just to do; but we are so in the dark we does not know what we are doing. I shall hear what you say tomorrow - ~~after~~