

**Photocopies of letters to Sir James Clark from Florence Nightingale  
concerning Army Medical School**

**Publication/Creation**

1858-1864

**Persistent URL**

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/ehx8qpqt>

**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](mailto:library@wellcomecollection.org)  
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

4.  
I have to read the  
Report & Appendices  
of the Kelly Committee  
I think I never read  
such a mass of  
contradictions - of  
assertions which  
showed <sup>such</sup> an utter  
absence of the ~~most~~  
knowledge of the most  
ordinary sanitary  
principles - & what  
is worse, <sup>and</sup> a want of  
ordinary honesty.  
Simons gave a  
statement of Martin's

3.4/1  
30 Old Burlington St.  
London W.  
Oct 5/58

My dear Sir Simon Clark  
You will receive by  
this post (or next) a  
copy of my "Pecis" for  
yourself - It is of course  
Confidential, as I have  
no right to give away  
any copies. It has  
been presented to the  
War Office. The copy  
for the Queen is being  
bound, & I shall then  
send it to you, & ask



5<sup>th</sup> Oct. 1858.

You be so kind as  
to present it.

I should have liked  
to have sent a copy  
(similarly) through you  
to the Duchess of Kent  
& to the Prince Royal.  
if you approved.

I do not know whether  
it would be proper  
to send one to Prince  
Conant - Perhaps you  
will tell me.

I have written to  
Mr. Herbert about

S. 4/1

Newton's paper, which  
you will have seen,  
read at the British  
Ass. at Leeds. I hope  
he will write an  
Answer in the name  
of the R. Sanitary  
Commission - in which  
case it will be sent  
round to you for your  
approval.

I read the article  
you allude to in the  
Examiner - And also  
I had the misfortune

8.

5 Oct. 1858

Mr. Westergaard  
in reply—

S. 4/1

5.

5 Oct 1858

p. 2.

(which he had asked  
for & which I  
myself saw) — and  
omitted the more  
important & only  
condemnatory part.

The Committee gave  
a passage of St. Paul's  
which they treated  
in exactly the same  
dishonest fashion —

My own opinion  
about Ketter is  
exactly the same  
as what I fancied  
you expressed to me

6.

5 Oct. 1858

when we were both  
on the spot together  
last year - & which  
Dr. Frazer has expressed  
in the passage  
suppressed by the  
Committee - viz. that  
it is unfit for most  
of the cases which  
will be sent there,  
e.g. the Indian ones.  
And certainly, had  
I written ~~an~~ article  
upon ~~the~~ the Examination, I  
should not have

7.

S. 4/1

written in any  
such measured terms.

With my best love  
to Lady Clark & all  
Yours, believe me  
Dear Sir James  
ever sincerely yours  
oblyd

Wrightington



4.  
The Medical School  
stands thus. Prof. Peck  
is quite in its favor.  
Lord Hardinge thinking  
we had asked too  
much from the Treasury  
at once wanted to  
put it off till the  
General Hospital at  
Aldershot was opened.  
Mr. Herbert convinced  
him that it was on  
the contrary better to  
strike when the iron  
was hot. Sir C. Morgan

S. 4/2  
30 Old Burlington St.  
29/11/38 V

My dear Sir James Clark  
I entirely sympathize  
with Dr. Nathan's  
disappointment &  
impatience - Because  
I have been in a  
state of disappoint-  
ment & impatience  
myself for upwards  
of two years - And  
the only things we  
have really done

you are the Warrent  
& the Barrack  
improvements.

But I do not  
entertain the least  
doubt of the School  
being carried. [And  
by nature & experience  
a languid mind  
having been denied  
me, it is not from  
languidness that I  
think so.]

Dr. Aitken is wrong

in attributing the  
blame of delay to  
Mr. Herbert, who  
has been perpetually  
to & from London  
about our War Dep.  
matters. But Dr.  
Aitken does not  
know as I do the  
rate at which these  
things travel - So  
is three weeks' pace  
from the War Office  
to the Horse Guards.  
literally, not metaphorically.



7. Old Document L<sup>5</sup>  
 (a) Sectional Paper Sir James Clark 1st  
 ° October & November /58  
 General Peel at W.O.  
 Army Medical School -  
 Popley & Chatham upon to date }  
 establishments }  
 7th's Part - Regulations &  
 Statistical Schemes -  
 L. Aitken

5.

29 Nov. 1858

p. 2.

being quite in its favor.

I saw Mr. Herbert's  
 letter & sent Peel  
 last week, hoping him  
 to begin it directly  
at Chatham, & send  
 it in to the Treasury  
 at once, & offering  
 his own, yours, Dr.  
 Sutherland's & Mr.  
 Alexander's services

6.

29 Nov. 1858

S. 4/2

but will be back  
on Saturday -

That we shall  
have an immediate  
answer I don't  
expect -

Our Regulations  
& Statistical Scheme  
have been sent in  
since July & are  
not out yet -

to organize at once.  
Mr. Herbert left for last  
night - yours  
J. Highley

2.

I know what was  
Lutherland's opinion  
(when he was  
consulted on a  
prior occasion, when  
you were not in  
town.) It gives  
the substance of  
the papers.

1. "As regards the  
"Dublin Apothecaries'  
"Company & their  
"disputed licence:  
"it would ill become

3.

'Sunday 1859)

"any government  
"Department to  
"give them a locus  
"standi, with regard  
"to their licence,  
"which they have  
"not at present.  
"The decision  
"of the Medical  
"Council, a body  
"appointed by  
"Act of Parliament  
"to guard the public  
"interests, is  
"opposed the licence



"and, until that  
"opinion is reversed  
"the Army Medical  
"Department

"should not accept  
"it as a qualification.

2. "As regards  
"the joint qualification  
"of the Royal College  
"of Physicians &  
"Surgeons of London  
"the opinion given  
"is as follows:—

"House Regulations  
"No III, for admitting

11  
(No 2)  
1850  
Sunder  
May to December 1850  
(Army Medical School) V

My dear Sir James Clark  
Mr. Herbert has  
just sent me  
these papers, with  
a request that I  
would submit them  
to you; & obtain for  
him your verdict  
upon them.

As they are so  
voluminous, it may  
save you trouble

8.

"and any departures  
"from it should be  
"sanctioned by  
"the Sec<sup>y</sup> of State."

Dear Sir James Clark,  
if it would save  
you trouble I give  
a verbal opinion  
instead of a written  
one. Sutherland  
will be here at  
3 o'clock, & I  
would either send  
him to you, or ask  
you to come here.  
Believe me, Sir,  
Yours sincerely,  
J. H. Sturges

5.

'Sunday 1853'

P. 2.

"Candidates (Army  
"Medical School)  
"We, knowingly  
"exact two  
"Examinations by  
"two separate bodies,  
"one Medical, one  
"Surgical. We  
"prescribe certain  
"Colleges as the  
"examining bodies,  
"or some other  
"corporate body  
"legally entitled  
"to grant a  
"diploma in



7.

Lures, on a  
 'license to  
 practice it.

"Now, unless it can be  
 "shown that the joint  
 "board of the Edinburgh  
 "colleges is such a  
 "Corporate body, which  
 "it is not, we cannot  
 "take their license,  
 "either in Surgery  
 "or Medicine. At  
 "present there are  
 "plenty of men  
 "presenting themselves  
 "with degrees &

6.

'Sunday 1859'

"diplomas, and it  
 "would be an injury  
 "to them to accept  
 "a less qualification.

"This is the  
 "law of the case. But  
 "if a preasure came,  
 "we should be  
 "obliged to take  
 "these 'joint board'  
 "men, or even  
 "Dublin Apothecaries'  
 "men. At present  
 "however the law  
 "ought to be obeyed.

S. 4/4

West Hill Lodge  
Highgate Road  
N

May 17/59

My dear Sir James Clark  
Mrs. Luthersland  
sent me your note  
to Dr. Luthersland -  
As he will not be  
back <sup>from Scotland</sup> till the 26<sup>th</sup>,  
would you wait till  
then, or would you  
not rather write  
to Mr. Herbert, at  
Willow? He was ~~too~~

2.

17 May 1859.

here yesterday. But  
he will not be in  
town again till  
Parl<sup>t</sup> meets.

As to Gen<sup>l</sup> Peil,  
his strength has been,  
as far as we have  
been concerned, in  
doing nothing. Like  
many other people,  
his only action is  
to tell you how much  
he would like to  
do something.

3.

S. 4/4

If you can suggest  
anything immediate  
to be done about the  
Army Med<sup>l</sup> School,  
I would ask you to  
write letters to Mr.  
Herbert or to me.

I shall be in  
town again about the  
6<sup>th</sup>.

Love yours very gratefully  
F. Nightingale



been agreed to by  
our Army & G. I.

The "Organization"  
stands as it did  
with the addition  
of the word Indian  
in the first Section.

The "Rules for  
Examination" are the  
same.

Thank you for your  
kind inquiry about  
me. I should be better  
for leaving off Dr.  
Williams' medicine if it  
were not for the very damp  
Autumn. I have done all you told me

3.4/5  
Rampstead NW

Oct 18/59 ✓

Mr. H. H. H. H.

100a Parkes Longmore Litheren

? Monmouth (4th)

My dear Sir James

I understand that  
you wrote some time  
ago to Dr. Litherland  
to know what was  
going on. You could  
not have written to  
a work person. I  
have answered your  
letter, as you see,  
at last.

Yours ever gratefully  
J. H. H. H.

2.

18 Oct. 1889

By way of reply, I  
enclose you a copy  
of the last printed  
document connected  
with the Med. Sch.

Sir C. Wood has  
at last replied  
officially, accepting  
for the Indian Med.  
Service in full.

Mr. Herbert is to  
see Parker, Douglass,  
Aitken this week.

Can you tell when  
Morehead will be

3.

at home, or if arrived,  
What is his address?

Is there a Head  
of the Indian Medical  
Dep. in England - &  
if so who is he?

Who was the man  
to whom you applied  
for information  
about Morehead -  
and what is he  
at the India Ho.?

The "Qualifications  
& Examination" in the  
enclosed Proof have

3.4/5



S. 4/6

4. Dec<sup>r</sup> 1859 <sup>four.</sup>  
upon the Professor  
for a syllabus of  
lectures, which would  
be equivalent to their  
appointment -

As all this was  
told me confidentially,  
let it be between  
ourselves - But I see  
no objection to your  
telling Dr. Aitken  
that, from what you  
hear from me, you  
consider his appoint-  
ment as certain to  
take place at the  
same time as the  
three others - <sup>Yours ever truly</sup>  
<sub>Wm. L. G. Clark</sub>

Private

Hampstead NW  
Dec 19/59

My dear Sir James Clark  
I gave Dr. Lutherland  
a message for you this  
morning which I find  
he has not delivered.  
I saw Mr. Herbert  
yesterday - and spoke  
about the Pathological  
chain & about Dr.  
Aitken having returned.  
He said at once

19 Dec. 1859

that he had better see Mr. Aitken but could not immediately as he was to leave town today.

I assure you, (and you know how anxious I have been,) that I consider Dr. Aitken's <sup>now</sup> appointment as just as safe as any of the others -

The hitch does not lie where you think - as far as the Gazetteing goes.

The Duke of Cambridge has urged the non-gazetting till the Meeting of Parliament because (you would never guess) of the determined opposition of the Army Medical Department to the appointment of Dr. Moorhead!!

Mr. Herbert also added that he meant almost immediately to call

4.  
been impossible -  
His loss undoes a  
great part of the  
work I have done -  
I wish I had not  
tried to see it.

I was very much  
pleased with what  
you said of my little  
Nursing book. I have  
looked for your new  
book which I see  
advertised, but have  
not been able to get  
it yet -

S. 4/7  
Feb 20/60  
Respectfully  
Sympathetic

My dear Sir James

Mr. Herbert promised  
yesterday to forget the  
four Professors immediately,  
which I hope means  
this Tuesday or Friday.  
And as he took away  
their addresses with him,  
I hope he will not forget.

He also promised  
to remember his own  
with & say to Dr. Parker



20 Feb. 1860

that Dr. Sutherland  
would help him in  
the first Course of  
Sanitary Lectures.

He wishes the  
Professors to prepare  
immediately their  
Synopsis of Lectures  
or Prospectus, as he  
calls it.

Poor Alexander's  
loss is an irreparable  
one to us - But I  
think the interregnum

S. 4/7

a favourable time for  
launching the school.  
And I find the Army  
Medical Council is  
bidding for popularity  
(with us civilians) by  
encouraging the school.  
I have asked Mr.  
Herbert to delay the  
appointment of a  
new Director - <sup>the School</sup> - until  
it is established.  
But I find a man  
as useful & as a  
poor Alexander has

8. <sup>to</sup> Sir James Clark 13<sup>th</sup>  
(23) Jan. to Aug 1860 (Mr. Horsford)  
2- War office  
Dr Aisken appointed  
Army Medical School

5. 20 Feb. 1860 ? p. 2.

3 4/7  
first course" of  
lectures must  
be "tentative". I  
do not think  
one lecture on  
Statistics will  
do the needful,  
which is to  
enable the men  
to understand  
& use the forms.  
You will, in  
course of time,  
probably wish  
also



6.

20 Feb. 1860

7.

S. 4/7

I introduce the  
statistical elements  
the farther

I wonder whether  
Mrs. Parker would  
do me the honor  
to accept a  
copy of the 2<sup>d</sup> Edit.  
of my little book  
on "Marketing".

Th.

4. proposed. He then  
said he should  
appoint Dr. Parker  
for 10 & Dr. Aitken  
for 5 years. Dr.  
Lutherland said that  
whatever was done  
for Dr. Parker should  
be done for Dr. Aitken  
too - And Mr. Herbert  
assented to this.

The two Churches  
should unquestionably  
have stipulated for  
Life Appointments.

30 Old Kilmington St.  
London W ✓  
March 17/60

My dear Sir James Clark  
I have just had your  
letter & consulted Dr.  
Lutherland upon its  
subject, who had the  
last conversation about  
it with Mr. Herbert  
here -

He says that he  
could not give his  
opinion to Mr. Herbert  
upon this kind of matter

without being asked.  
He did not know till  
last Sunday that the  
appointments had not  
been arranged for life.

[Surely Dr. Parker &  
Aitken ought to have  
stipulated for this  
themselves when they  
accepted]

I remember your  
mentioning the subject  
to Dr. Lutheland with  
reference to retirement

17 Mar. 1860

S. 4/8

some time ago. And he  
says that he then  
said it was a matter  
for the men themselves  
to negotiate with Mr.  
Herbert. I know his  
memory is defective.

Last Sunday Mr.  
Herbert told Dr.  
Lutheland here (so  
the latter tells me)  
that he had wished  
to appoint for 5 years;  
that objections had  
been raised & 10 years



And I have always  
said so to Mr. Herbert.  
[Dr. Lutherdale I know  
thinks so too.] The  
men are tried men.  
The Minister has not  
to learn whether they  
will answer or not.

We think your  
plan of a retirement  
excellent, as an  
alternative - in case,  
I mean, Mr. Herbert's  
object is to prepare  
for Army teachers in

S. 4/8

6.

those chairs, before  
the present Professor  
would die or retire  
in the course of nature.

Longmore could be  
replaced, if he retired  
in 5 years.

Moorhead does  
not wish to retain  
it more than 5 years,  
I understand.

Of these two it is  
not the question.

7.

17 Mar. 1860

But for the two  
Civilians, unquestionably  
they should have life  
appointments -  
on retirements on  
half pay after 10  
years - or on full pay  
after 20 years -

I shall see Mr.  
Herbert tomorrow &  
will speak to him  
about it & learn  
more

Yours sincerely  
F. Nightingale



D

1.

✓

S. 4/9

April 1 1860

My dear Sir James Clark  
You will be glad  
to hear, (if you have  
not yet heard,) that  
the Senate of the  
Army Medical School  
was constituted a  
Senate yesterday by  
Mr. Herbert at the  
San Office - & that  
"it" is now a School.  
I consider this



1 Apr. 1860

S. 4/9

an important step,  
as placing the Army  
Med<sup>l</sup> Sch. under  
the immediate  
dependence of the  
Sec<sup>y</sup> of State for War.

Very yours sincerely  
& gratefully  
J. Wright

April 1/60

S. 4/10

4. some additions as  
well. And had it  
been out sooner, I  
should have sent it  
(through you to the  
Green - instead of  
what I did send.

I never thanked  
you properly for your  
Edition of Combe,  
which I liked  
exceedingly, & for  
your mention of my  
little book in it.  
Ever yours sincerely & gratefully  
Horace Nightingale

1. 30 Old Paulingston St  
July 13/60 ✓

My dear Sir James Clark  
I should be very  
glad, if you could find  
time just to cast  
your eye over the  
enclosed (three) letters  
of Dr. Arthur, & to  
return them to me,  
with any suggestions.  
I have no doubt,  
however, that you  
have also received



2.

13 July 1860

3.

his complaints.  
Which are well-  
founded indeed.

I do not know  
whether you ever  
go out to breakfast.  
But, if you could  
fix a day, to come  
here at  $\frac{1}{4}$  before  
10, I would get  
Mr. Whitfield, of  
St. Thomas, &  
some, who is very

anxious to be  
introduced to you -  
I Mr. Luthersland,  
& talk over various  
matters with you,  
& some of these  
foreign delegates -  
But then it must be this  
or next week.

Will you allow  
me to lend you a  
copy of the (better  
type) Edition of ~~the~~  
little "Notes on  
Pruning"? So has



S. 4/11

4.

(1) There is no doubt  
but that the  
Pathological Professor  
must have assistance.  
The demand ought  
to come formally  
through the Senate.  
Now there is a Senate.  
But, if the case  
is urgent, and the  
delay dangerous,  
I would ask Mr  
Herbert, if you  
liked it, to authorize  
the immediate  
employment of

30 Old Burlington St.  
July 16/60 ✓

"Notes on anatomy"  
my little book to be presented  
to P. R.

My dear Sir James Clark  
Sir, do you think  
you would be so good  
as to breakfast here  
at 10 before 9, (nine)  
& morrow (Tuesday)  
Mr. Whitfield comes  
in hope of being  
introduced to you.  
And I fixed this  
early hour, on account

2.

of the business of the  
"Sections", as you said.  
I hope it will not  
be too early for you

2. I should be  
proud indeed if  
you would present  
my little book  
to our beloved  
Princess, England's  
eldest daughter.  
[I enclose a copy]  
Good angels speed  
her.

3.

16 July 1860

S. 4/11

I enclose another  
copy, in case it  
would be proper to  
present it to the  
Queen - as having  
a little more  
matter in a  
better type. But  
do not trouble  
yourself to answer  
this. ~~As~~ I don't  
know the proprieties.

3. I entirely concur  
with all you say  
about the School.

16 July 1960

Mr. Tison for 2  
Months at £3.30 a  
week, till the  
formal application  
can be sent in,  
(which we know  
the War Office will  
take a great deal  
more than two  
months even to  
read)

(2) I think there is  
no doubt but that  
the school will be  
removed, as soon  
as there is a



7.

General Hospital in  
a suitable locality,  
probably Aldershot.  
In the mean time,  
we can get Dr.  
Ritche one of  
the highest of the  
Casemates, properly  
shelved, for that  
part of the Museum  
not in immediate  
requisition, and  
next year we  
can get him  
an iron building,  
as used at Kensington

6.

16 July 1860

I should be sorry  
to do more than this,  
as it would negative  
the plea for removal.

Ever yours gratefully  
& affectionately  
Florence Nightingale

S. 4/12

30 Old Burlington St  
July 17/60 ✓

My dear Sir James Clark  
M. Guetelet is  
coming to-morrow to  
breakfast (Wednesday)  
at 10 before 9.  
And as I am very  
anxious to do him  
honor, would you  
be so very good as  
to come yourself?  
I have spoken

17 July 1860

& Mr. Herbert  
 today about both  
 things viz. Aitken's  
 assistant &  
 Maclean's salary.

Would you be so  
 good as to read  
 Aitken's letter  
 (received today)  
 & return it to me?

Very yours sincerely  
 F. Nightingale

John, the D. Q.,  
 is coming also to  
 breakfast tomorrow.  
 And I always  
 think it worth while  
 to keep him straight.



S. 4/13

230 Old Burlington St.  
July 18/60 ✓

My dear Sir James Clark  
Would you be so  
good as to take the  
enclosed down to  
Dr. Arthur Morrison  
if you go; and to  
read this statement,  
altho' I dare say  
he has already  
consulted you upon  
it - ~~also~~  
I hope that you

will be so good as  
to let us know  
the result of your  
visit, as you  
proposed?

Perhaps it will  
be better not to  
let the D. C. (or  
any one) know  
that this statement  
has been seen by  
us. It might

18 July 1860

excite jealousy. If  
you would therefore  
put it into Dr.  
Aitken's hands,  
who will know  
that it is, without  
others knowing it,  
tell him  
what you would  
advise -

Ever yours sincerely  
& gratefully  
Wightwale

S. 4/14

4.  
Matters of importance  
(though they really  
have been gone  
over scores of times)  
that I cannot reply  
without having seen  
Mr. Herbert.

Yours ever sincerely  
Faithfully  
Florence Nightingale

1.  
30 Old Burlington St.  
July 20/60

My dear Sir James Clark  
I entirely agree  
with you as to the  
necessity for obtaining  
a complete School  
& Hospital as soon  
as possible.

The present arrangement  
was, as you know, to be  
only temporary. The  
sooner it is done away



20 July 1860

with, but better.

Your letter appears, however, to contemplate only a similarly temporary arrangement at Aldershot, as you propose to build a Hospital for some 500 or 600 sick, & the School in connection with it.

This I desoutly

hope will be accomplished.

But your proposal (~~for the present~~) is really between a temporary School at Chatham, which already exists, & a temporary School at Aldershot, which would have to be provided.

There are so many points in your letter, involving

had agitated for a  
permanent establish.  
ment at first,  
we should have  
had no school  
at all.

If all of you had  
inspected Aldershot  
at the time you  
inspected Chatham  
for this purpose,  
you would have  
chosen Chatham,  
in preference, for

S. 4/15  
230 Old Kensington St  
July 24/60

My dear Sir James Clerk  
I had an opportunity  
on Sunday of mentioning  
to Mr Herbert the  
proposal you mentioned  
to me for removing  
the Army Med. School  
~~at once~~ from Chatham  
to Aldershot. And  
he at once stated  
that he could not

2.

entertain such a proposal. After ample consideration, Chatham had been fixed upon as the site of a temporary school. He did not feel disposed to take a favourable view of any proposition to undo what had been done partly by himself. He

3.

24 July 1860

considered the school as fixed at Chatham for the present.

I do not think it would be politic (indeed I think it would seriously damage the prospect of future removal) to agitate farther in the matter, until it is done permanently.

Again, if we



6.

(which I will send  
you) rather altering  
his line of requisition.

Mr. Herbert  
will also authorize  
the shelving of the  
Cases for the  
Museum.

As other wants  
show themselves  
(which they will  
before I do) we  
must try to get  
them supplied

24 July 1860

7. And we must  
never cease to look  
<sup>agitate</sup> forward to a more  
permanent Establish-  
ment (with Hospital)  
as soon as possible.

The grant for  
Dorchester is only  
about £11,000.

This would do  
little for us at  
Aldershot.

When the new  
Hospital is decided

upon at the Camp.  
The School buildings  
can easily be  
attached to it.

Yours ever sincerely  
& gratefully  
Florence Nightingale

24 July 1860

a School, on  
account of its  
greater temporary  
advantages.

Mr. Herbert  
will sanction the  
employment of  
Dr. Aitken's assistant  
for two months  
pending a Requisition  
from the Senate.

But meanwhile  
I have a letter  
from Dr. Aitken;

4.  
record of the harm  
disease has done.

Yours sincerely  
& gratefully  
F. Nightingale

5. 4/16  
July 25/60

My dear Sir James Clark  
I should like very  
much to see you, as  
you kindly propose.  
Should 12 o'clock  
tomorrow (Thursday)  
suit you? I only  
mention this hour  
because Dr. Sutherland  
will be here. And  
you would kill  
two birds at one stone.



But almost any  
other house would  
suit me as well.

I enclose Mr.  
Ritken's letter.

Pathologists are  
apt to get into  
the way of considering  
the main end of  
such a school to  
be that of making  
good pathological

preparations. But,  
if the Chatham  
School produces  
many good pathological  
preparations, you  
must report it ~~there~~  
to the Statistical  
Congress as bad.  
Pathology is doubtless  
essential. But  
the aim of our  
Army School is  
the prevention of  
disease, not the

S. 4/17

My dear Mr. James Clark  
Mr. Herbert has, as  
yet, had no official  
answer from Dr.  
Mackay, which  
makes it difficult  
to know exactly  
what to do.

Dr. Morehead has  
evidently written to  
~~say~~ him that the  
salary would be

S. 4/17

3.

£700, made up  
to £1000 from  
some other source.

We considered  
that the £1000  
would be nearly  
made up by the  
£700 & the £250  
pension from the  
India House.

Could you ask  
Mr. Morehead  
from what source

2.

He stated that the  
extra £300 would  
be made up?

Inclosed is the  
letter you sent me.

Yours ever sincerely  
F. Nightingale

July 25/60



4. face becoming a  
very rare work)  
she might look at  
that, because it has  
pictures. And she  
certainly will not  
look at the Report.  
I have some copies  
of my paper  
separately, like the  
one I gave you -  
Might I bind  
the 8<sup>vo</sup> for the Queen.  
If so, I can lend  
you a bound copy  
almost immediately.  
And one of your  
copies will do for.

S. 4/18

A. 1. Cleveland Row SW  
July 29/63

My dear Sir James Clerk  
Gent & Mas,  
according to your desire  
(at least I understood  
it to) one two-folio  
copy of our Report  
for the King of the  
Belgians, two 8<sup>vo</sup>  
copies for yourself  
& the Queen.  
I also enclose  
a letter for the Queen  
which please send  
on turn as you like.

S. 4/18

2.

29 July 1863

Mind, I am not responsible for the 8<sup>th</sup> copy, which I never give, unless I am asked for it. There has been a perfect outcry (& as I think, a legitimate one) that the two-folio book is not to be sold, not to be had, not to be published, not to be presented to Parly, & that the 8<sup>vo</sup> make references passim & a work

3.

which is not to be had. Officers of all men those one most wants to interest - will not look at the 8<sup>vo</sup> copy, & say the folio is keeping something back. And officials say, we don't want opinions (in the Report) we want the facts (in the Blue Book).  
Might I not at least send the General my own paper, (which you have; & which is only printed in the two-folio book,

29 July 1863

\* 5-

P. Louis of Kefae p. 2.

You mentioned that  
he might like me.

Perhaps I ought  
to send the 2 folios  
for the King of the  
Belgians. If so,  
please tell me.

We are getting on  
very well in having  
our home (working)  
Commission appointed.  
Sir C. Wood is much  
more amenable.

But I am greatly  
disappointed that  
not one single Review  
Article has seized



6.

29 July 1863

the main point, viz.  
reform your Station  
first - it is not  
your climate - it  
is not even mainly  
your site - it is  
your living like  
beasts, No civilized  
man, without water  
supply, without  
drainage &c, kept  
by climate & by  
site, which kills  
you -

Now write to me  
Anything you hear  
about the D.P.'s  
difficulty as to

x 7.

Agelae & Longmore  
becoming devious  
of their rank, Qua  
P. M. O.

Ever yours gratefully  
F. Nightingale

S. 4/19

4. have done it quite well.

3. I should have liked very much to have seen you for a few minutes, as you were so kind as to propose, at Cleveland Row.

4. If you like to keep my copy of the two folios, instead of sending it to the King of the Belgians, & all means do so. But I write to you, as I do to all my friends of influence:— apply to the media

1. ~~Original of~~ perfectly faithful copy  
Dampsted NW

Aug 3/63

My dear Sir James Clark  
I sent, as by your kind permission, a copy of my paper, for the Queen, under cover to you.

2. About the Army Med. & Dep. & the want of candidates, I have long thought it a most serious matter. And I have told Lord de Grey so. And that the original

2.

1

Varrant must be restored in all its integrity - on the Med. Dept. will be lost. And he always agrees. But when it comes to the point, I see, tho' he does not say so, that he cannot carry it with the Horse Guards. He is too weak. We restore such things as forage, servants, pay &c. to them. But their "gentleman" privacies,

3.

3 Aug. 1863

which we cannot but smile at but which nevertheless are so important, he is not strong enough to remedy (against the H. G.) Nevertheless it must be done. And a great body of evidence to bring before him, as you propose, is the surest way to enable him to face it on the Command in Chief. It is a great pity. Sidney Herbert Child



3.4/19

8.  
Army nearly perished  
in the Crimea, not  
from wounds, but  
from want of supplies,  
want of sanitary  
measures. Therefore  
peace, not supplies,  
not sanitary measures,  
should have been  
the remedy.

And he tempts us  
with unfairness for  
including the war  
years in the average.

Please insist upon  
having a two folio  
Blue Book for yourself.  
The S.O. have positively  
refused to have them sold

15. 3 Aug. 1863 P.2.  
Office & War Office,  
rather the India Office  
& give you a copy.  
Let them see that  
people wish to see.  
Choose to see the  
two folios - that  
they must not dislike  
it as they wish.  
They are impugning  
our statistics, calling  
them exaggerated  
when they are in fact  
understated. The  
Death rate is under-  
stated, because it

3.4/19

6.

does not take into account the men mowed down from the Army for disease - <sup>not</sup> including those who die on the passage home. And then they dare to state & to write to Lord Stanley that we have exaggerated. And they dare to try & make our evidence. Now this Sidney Herbert never would have done. It is astonishing

7.

3 Aug 1863

how easily Sir C. Wood is satisfied of the truth of that which is thought desirable to appear. It is astonishing how loose his ideas & reasonings are. Col. Baker is the prompter. His argument is, the death rates in the war years are the highest (not from wounds) therefore peace & not sanitary measures is the remedy. As well might he say, the

4  
doctors & Native  
Regiment doctors,  
having no discipline  
with Queen's officers  
who require the  
strictest discipline.  
It is fortunate for  
the British Army  
that Lord de Grey  
refused the amalgamation  
proposal. You are  
aware that all  
officers for India  
must hold Commissions  
in the Queen's service,  
before they are allowed  
to undertake  
3. Will you ask Mr.

S. 4/20  
Hampstead NW.  
Aug 21/63

My dear Sir James Clark  
1. Mr. Paget has  
written me a capital  
letter, as one of the  
Examiners, with  
permission to show  
it to Lord de Grey -  
on the subject of  
the paucity of candidates.  
When you have  
produced your case,  
I shall add to this.  
And I hope we  
shall win.



2.

21 Aug. 1863. A

I do not apprehend any injury to the Queen's Service from the separation of the services in India. The pay & allowances of Queen's Officers ought to be sufficient to provide a supply, if no other countervailing reason exists. But, as there must be some inducement held out to officers volunteering for life-long service in

3.

India, the only way to do this is by somewhat better pay, allowances & retirement. This is what the India Government proposes. But, after all, they can only take a certain number of men. And the others would continue in the Queen's Service. An amalgamated service would never have done. It would have destroyed the efficiency of the Royal Service in toto by mixing up Civil

S. 4/21

1. . . . . Hampstead NW  
Sept 26/63

My dear Sir James Clark  
Enclose Mr. Page's  
letter. You will see  
that it is not exactly  
"examinatory" but  
as advocating, from  
his own knowledge of  
both Civil & Military  
professions, the necessity  
of ~~not~~ entertaining  
the claims of the  
A.M.D. I have the  
original Warrant re-  
sectored.

May let us see the  
Draft of your appeal

2.

26 Sept. 1868

after we have time  
to co-operate with  
you.

I meant to send  
Mr. Peet's letter, which  
he wrote at my  
request, & Lord de  
Grey, at the same  
time with other papers  
& with your remonstrance  
— in order not to  
weaken the blow but  
to give it all at once.

It is essentially  
necessary that  
something be done.

3.

You will see that  
Mr. Peet argues the  
question of supply &  
shows that the Govt.  
has very formidable  
opponents in the field,  
ready to snare up  
every competent man  
who opposes the College.

You must dwell  
strongly on this point,  
& show that additional  
pay will not meet  
the case. What is  
wanted is Military  
status & gentlemanly  
treatment.

Ever yours sincerely  
F. H. Hastings



S. 4/22

4. then they will prep  
for this Commission.  
If I were to aid  
in any such undertaking  
it would be with  
my eyes open to the  
certainty of its failure,  
and of its crippling  
all attempts to remove  
the present cause of  
discontent.

Yours sincerely  
& gratefully  
Florence Nightingale

1. Hampstead NW.  
Oct 7/63

My dear Sir James Clark  
I have been too  
unwell to answer  
your letter of Oct 4  
before today; and  
even now I am  
hardly able to write.  
But I think the  
matter is of such  
extreme importance  
that I would do all  
I can to prevent any  
false step from being

2.

7 Oct. 1863

taken -

In their anxiety to remedy the present state of things, the Army Medical Professors seem to have forgotten that the whole subject (for which they propose to appoint a Commission) was carefully enquired into and decided by a far better Commission than they are even likely to get. Notwithstanding there is not a single

3.

thing I enquire into. All that is wanted is that the result of the former enquiry shall be carried into effect.

If the Professors can help this result by sending information it will be useful. But, if they want to postpone indefinitely all useful action & to embarrass the Department hopelessly with the Government,

S. 4/23

4. I could tell you how,  
as far as he has  
done anything, he  
has stood in the  
way of every thing.  
more India Commission.

Again, who is to  
write the Report?  
Genl. Dyer can't write.  
Lord L. won't.

In every single  
instance it has been  
dithered and I  
who have written  
the Report.

Yes, Certainly, Sir.

Confidential

7 Oakhill Park,  
Hampstead NW  
Oct 7/63

My dear Mr. James Clark  
I write you my  
candid opinion about  
the Commission proposed  
for the 'Mud Officers'  
prievarances.

I would gladly also  
give you some private  
reasons against the  
men chosen altogether.  
Conclusive to my mind.

Catch Lord. Stanley  
licking the tip of one  
of his



2.

purpos to help out of  
the mire any body!

If we could have  
put Hamlet's photo  
into the chair of the  
India Commission, he  
would have served  
us better! And Lord  
S has done nothing  
for us - times neither then  
nor since!

Consider where he  
drove anything on  
our side it would  
rather 'let them  
spin it. He is so  
disliked!

But the first Royal

3.

7 Oct. 1863

Agitation Commission,  
sacked as it was by  
the whole country,  
would have served  
us nothing, had not  
didney Herbert  
undertaken & drawn  
up the warrant  
himself.

He was a great man  
going out of his way  
to help a great many  
little men.

If they expect any  
thing of the kind of  
Lord S. they are  
wofully mistaken.

2.  
Dr. Lutherland & come  
& tell you his opinion.

Believe me  
ever yours  
J.W.

7 Oakhill Park

5.  
Confidential  
7 Oct. 1863 p.2.  
Quin is by far the  
first man in the  
Dept. He is a second  
Dr. Alexander; & will be  
the next D.F.  
But, do you think  
Govt. will have him  
home for this, when  
the very reason why  
they would not have  
him home for a far  
more important office  
is that he cannot  
be spared from his  
present place? I  
think they would be  
great fools, if they

6.

did.

I am quite sure  
that a <sup>very</sup> <sup>factious</sup> <sup>division</sup> <sup>from</sup>  
the Army Medical  
profession - strengthened,  
if you will, by us -  
would influence the  
War Office - that a  
Commission would  
indefinitely alienate  
them.

Believe me, the  
A. M. D. knows what  
what it is about,  
if it thinks that  
the Commission, headed

7 Oct 1863

by Sidney Herbert, which  
had the elements of  
success, could be  
reproduced (without  
him & without <sup>any</sup> of the  
elements of success -)  
to do the same thing.

If you would like  
I drive down here  
on Friday & have  
lunch about two.  
I would gladly talk  
the matter over -  
I could tell many  
things I cannot  
write. I would have



Warrant

They want to get off  
with <sup>minutely</sup> placing the  
doctors on the staff.

Sidney Herbert & the  
first R. Commission  
would have thought  
any man mad for  
proposing such a  
thing.

And as I have  
played my last card,  
I now think the  
only thing to be done  
is to reverse & give  
proposal of another  
R. Commission. But  
whom I have upon it?

S. 4/24

Longmore

115, Park Street, W.

April 15/64

My dear Sir James Clark

We were asked to  
write the Treasury  
letter. But it was too  
late, when written.

Instead of that, Capt.  
Jatton saw Mr.

Asbathnot, and the  
only proposal which  
seems likely to meet  
with Treasury approval  
is to say that Dr.  
Longmore's extra  
duties tender is

S. 4/24

2.

necessary that he should  
reside at the Hospital  
- but as there is no  
house as yet, they will  
allow lodging money  
- & give him rank  
of Inspector Genl.,  
without other emolument  
than the £700 + lodging  
allowance, till a house  
is built.

I am asked whether  
he will take that.

I have no means  
of knowing, except by  
asking you -

3.

4 Apr. 1864

[I do not think Lord  
De Grey is in earnest.  
But that is not my  
business.]

Had we had Sidney  
Herbert & Mervyn,  
we should have got  
this directly.

The Army Med. Dep.  
is going to rack & ruin  
as fast as it can.

Lord De Grey says  
he will see you "about  
the question" again  
soon. But this appears  
rather to refer to:]

2. a much more serious  
matter:—



S. 4/24

51  
Private

4 Apr. 1864

p. 2.

S. 4/24

115. Park Street. W.

And I trust you  
know that I know  
and you might ask me  
we must think  
more about it.

Yours most faithfully  
Florence Nightingale



4. essentially require him  
to have the standing  
of a gentleman with  
his Command Officers  
— we are doing things,  
such as dismissing  
him at parade,  
depriving him of  
presidency at Board  
&c. — which in Military  
life, & a degree we  
have no idea of in  
Civil life, deprive him  
of the weight of a  
gentleman among  
gentlemen.

Lutherland has made  
me propose <sup>your</sup> the second  
R. Commission to D. G. F. &  
Capt. Patton. But about

S. 4/25

I expect they will answer this.  
I am yours faithfully, Wright

115, Park Street, W.

April 6/64

My dear Mr. James Clark  
I have done my best  
to make Mr. Lutherland  
go to you from Saturday  
till Monday. Mr.  
Fleeton on Monday is  
not till one: and he  
could quite well do it.  
I wished it particularly  
for my own sake. For  
I think the Medical  
Board affairs so  
degenerate, that, unless

6 Apr. 1864

You strike me some  
course, I don't know  
what to do.

But Dr.utherland  
always makes any  
excuse & go nowhere.  
And he generally, more  
unfairly, makes me  
the excuse.

I have written to  
the W. O. & say that  
I really could not  
indulge in any more by  
asking him whether  
he would take the  
rank, without its

advantages - & that  
they must go for the  
original proposal.

I have also written  
threatening letters both  
to Lord de Grey & to  
Capt. Pitt-Rivers about the  
Warrant - & after  
pointing out that  
both retraction of  
Warrant & increase of  
pay are now necessary,  
I have shown how,  
when we are exacting  
duties from the Medical  
Officers, such as Sanitary  
Recommendations & other  
Command Officer, which

4.  
 business must come  
 before very thing else  
 for the W.O. seem  
 now willing to listen  
 to some kind of  
 terms. They are frightened.  
 They sent me your  
 letter. It was very  
 good, very firm.  
 Don't be conciliatory -  
 ever your most truly  
 F. Nightingale

7.  
*Private*  
 115 Park Street, W.  
 April 7/64  
 My dear Mr. Lamer Clark  
 The W.O. seem to have  
 taken fright - & I think  
 it will be less disagreeable  
 to have an appeal to meeting  
 from you, Dr. Luther and  
 Parker, than from a  
 R. Commission.  
 They have written to  
 me, asking me to  
 "communicate" with  
 you "about the  
 proposed meeting."  
 I don't exactly know



2.

7 Apr 1864

What is "communicate"  
 If you can make  
 this house a place  
 of meeting for discussion  
 with Dr. Parker &  
 Luthersland, previous  
 to your adjourning  
 in a tour to attack  
 Ad de frey, I need  
 not say that there  
 will be room & food  
 for you any day, any  
 hour that you will.  
 Name -

If on the other hand,

3.

it will be more  
 convenient to you to  
 see them at home, Dr.  
 Luthersland will  
 manage to go down  
 to you after Monday.  
 We are as full of <sup>business</sup>  
 business next week  
 as we can well manage  
 sending out things to  
 Mr John Lawrence  
 who is mad with our  
 delay. And therefore  
 I had far better  
<sup>not have left town again, and</sup>  
 have gone to you on  
 Sunday. But he won't.  
 And this is the

3-4/27

4. did many things  
without his knowledge.  
I have repeatedly  
challenged this W.O.  
& shown me S. Barker's  
signature & the  
charges in the warrant  
attributed to him  
— showing them that  
he himself knew  
but of one — also  
showing that even  
if his signature  
were to be seen to  
more, it was surprised  
from him — & he  
himself did not  
know of it.

Private

115, Park Street, W.

April 8/64

My dear Mr. James Clark  
In reply to your question:  
1. I do not think fibron  
will be of any use  
now. Because, (altho'  
he entirely concurs,  
as he must,) you  
never can depend  
upon what he will  
say — upon whether  
he will stand by you.  
But, should it  
come, e.g. to a Committee

2.

consisting of yourself  
being asked to draw  
up the precise  
meaning of Clause  
14 &c, then Gibson  
must be on it -  
His responsibility  
being mixed in yours  
he will be valuable  
to you.

2. Capt. Patton does  
not say - (or at least  
if he does he has  
no right to say) that  
Sidney Herbert gave  
up the right to peroxide

3. 4/27

3.

at the instigation of 8 Apr. 1864  
What Capt. Patton  
does say is that Sidney  
Herbert "consented  
to the modification  
of the warrant".  
This is true. The  
other is not true.  
I know exactly  
what Sidney Herbert  
did, or believed  
himself to have done.  
But he had nothing  
to do with the "peroxide"  
question. During the  
last months of his  
life, Sir S. Sturges  
(a much more Hawes)



S. 4/27

5.

9 Apr. 1864

P. 2.

115, Park Street, W.

The W. B. has never  
answered my  
challenge - And  
altho' it is (unfortun-  
ately) true that  
S. Pierpont did  
"consent" to one change,  
all the rest is  
untrue - And as  
for the "Confidential  
Circulars," he knew  
nothing of them.

Ever yrs most truly  
J. H. H. H.

4. <sup>time</sup> attestation  
of eight pages, with  
the mission I make  
and use of it - they  
pleased, with my  
signature, as to  
concurrent position  
~~and purpose intentions.~~  
But I positively  
refused to write to  
Mr. Gladstone, who  
certainly ought not  
to grant me what  
the head of my  
Department - the Gov.  
for him, does not urge.  
And I told Capt.  
Fulton very plainly  
that ~~there~~ <sup>what</sup> was in  
contradiction of

S. 4/28

115, Park Street, W.

April 9/64

My dear Sir James Clark  
I shall certainly be  
only fit for a Domestic  
Asylum, if I stay in the  
W.O.

I have received the  
enclosed from Capt.  
Fulton, which I told  
him I should forward  
on to you, in order to  
make sure of no  
mistake being made  
by ~~anyone~~ <sup>anyone</sup> as to the  
"proposals" made to  
him. Please return

9 Apr. 1864

2.

is of me.

At the same time,  
I showed Capt. Patton  
that the "arrangements"  
couple we seek to  
"alter" were not "made  
by Lord Herbert" <sup>that</sup>  
<sup>we were expressing our own intention; that it was not</sup>

on "personal" but on  
public "grounds" that  
we sought to raise  
Donipson's "salary."

That Donipson does  
not "perform as  
better the same duties  
as at Chatham" -

3.

that, if the representation  
made of the Senate  
were the same as what  
patton here makes of me,  
the "Senate" might  
"very naturally object"  
to granting what was  
not urged -

That Donipson might  
very well answer that  
if he were Inspector  
Genl. he would have  
the lodging money as  
a right (as part of his  
emoluments, that is)  
& a chance of becoming  
D.P. besides.

At the same time,  
I wrote for the length





4.  
[It is inability to  
receive you then.]  
I don't think he,  
Dr. Sutherland, will  
go to you, unless it  
is quite inconvenient  
for you & Dr. Parker  
to come here before  
going to Ad de free,  
on whatever day  
that is ultimately  
fixed.

The fact is, what is  
wanted is to put a  
muzzle on the Duke  
of Cambridge, & to tell

115, Park Street, W.

S. 4/29  
April 11/64  
11 A.M.

My dear Lin. James Clark  
I have consulted with  
Dr. Sutherland. And he  
thinks that it is more  
important for you,  
Dr. Parker & himself  
to consult together, &  
then for you three to  
advise immediately  
to attack Ad de free,  
(or for you to go by  
yourself, as you may

2.

think fit, with a  
Minute drawn up  
by you three.)

He thinks this of  
more importance  
than the pain of a  
week would be in  
time.

He says that Dr.  
Parker knows so  
much more than  
any one else of the  
feeling of the men.

He therefore proposes  
that you three should  
meet here on Saturday <sup>week</sup> 23<sup>rd</sup>.

S. 4/29

3.

11 Apr. 1864

or meet here on this day  
fortnight (25<sup>th</sup>) ~~of Dr.~~  
~~Parker proposes~~ <sup>if on</sup>  
~~any Saturday~~ <sup>next</sup> week (25<sup>th</sup>)

if that is proposed.  
— & that, on the same  
day, after <sup>meeting</sup> ~~meeting~~, you  
should all go & look  
de prey, on you alone  
go.

He is aware & not  
doing the whole  
thing at once —

[I tell him this <sup>perhaps</sup> ~~perhaps~~  
fall thro' from Lord de



S. 4/29

4.

11 Apr. 1864

p. 2.

him that he must  
not alter a Royal  
Warrant.

And de Grey is  
the head of the Army,  
& could quite well  
say this, if he pleased,  
to the D. of Cambridge.  
And he must be made  
to say it.

They, our enemies,  
put forwards Lord  
Herbert's name very  
cruelly. The truth is,  
that it was not he  
at all

S. 4/29

5.

but the D. of Somerset,  
who kept the alteration  
in the Warrant. The  
D. of Somerset came  
to D. Herbert, &  
gained his consent  
to an alteration  
as regards the Navy.  
The D. of Cambridge  
took advantage, &  
did the same thing  
as regards the Army.

There will never  
be any confidence  
again, unless I do

6.

11 Apr. 1864

My letter to the Command.  
in Chief, "you shall  
not do this."

Yours most truly  
W. P. M. T. P.

Please tell Mr. Clark  
that I have got  
all the papers,  
including the Head  
of the Bill, proposed  
Amendments &c,  
from Mr. Clarence  
Wright, on the subject  
on which I wrote  
to Mr. Clark. P. M.

4. better they would be  
"grateful"; if they did  
accept.

I wish I had left  
the W. O. myself.  
You may think I am  
not wise in being so  
angry. But I assure  
you, when I write  
civilly, I have a civil  
letter. And nothing is  
done. When I write  
passionately, I have a  
rude letter. And  
something is done -  
(not even then always  
but only then.)

Ever yours truly,  
F. Nightingale

S. 4/30

116, Park Street, W.

April 13/64

My dear Sir James Clark  
I gave Capt. Fulton  
the information that,  
with the "proper  
generosity," (I said,)  
Longmore would  
accept his proposal  
- upon the condition  
that he was to have  
"at some future time"  
"the other advantages"  
of the Inspector's rank.  
I said, among many



2.

13 Apr. 1864

other disagreeable things,  
that I would never  
be any pledge pass  
tho' me again, without  
letting ground of seeing  
it fulfilled.

I send you Capt.  
Fulton's answer. I  
have told him that  
I am sending it to you.

I have replied to  
it, saying

(1) 1. that Longmore's  
position (& Maclean's,  
only that Maclean  
has resigned his claim)

is quite different from  
the two Civilian's - &  
will not lead to any  
claim of theirs.

(2) 2. that I can give  
no opinion about the  
Schminership, having  
no knowledge as to  
Longmore's acceptableness  
or not (by Civil School)

(3) 3. that the way they  
the W.O. "protect"  
themselves is by  
letting Longmore go to  
the wall, & accepting  
his priority - which,  
by the way, I told  
them, in my former

4. I received a letter from  
 Lord de J. written by  
 Capt. Brown asking me  
 to give rates of increase  
 of pay desirable. I  
 replied that nothing  
 of the kind could be  
 done till Lord de J.  
 had settled which  
 of the recommendations  
 in your paper was  
 to be carried out.  
 Whereupon it appeared  
 that the only result  
 which had followed  
 the delivery of your  
 recommendations to  
 the V.O., was that the  
 V.O. had "mislaid" them

Private  
 copy for Mr.  
 Clark

115, Park Street, W.

June 5/61

My dear Sir James Clark  
 Late last night I  
 received the enclosed.  
 [Which it could have  
 been earlier as you  
 & Mr. Clark were  
 in town - And I could  
 have told you what  
 I now must write.]

My answer to the  
 enclosed was: that it  
 is no use Lord de J.  
 shifting the responsibility

2:

of advising the D. of  
Cambridge on to Dr.  
Watson's or Mr. Page's  
or any one else's shoulder.  
Ad de prez knows himself  
quite enough to tell  
the D. of C. what to do.  
If he won't, nobody  
else can.

And I strongly  
depreciated this cowardly  
act of letting any one  
rather than the  
responsible Mr. Pinister  
be responsible for the  
Army <sup>being well doctored</sup> & the  
Army & the fare, & for

3.  
the Commander in Chief  
knowing the truth.

5 June 1864  
Neither Dr. Watson nor  
Mr. Page nor any <sup>one</sup> of them  
knows as much as I do.  
Ad prez knows himself.  
But I said do not  
take my advice. I will  
write & ask Mr. Pinister  
what he thinks.

I think Ad de prez  
utterly hopeless. And I  
am anxious to tell you  
why.

About 3 weeks after  
you had given my young  
paper dated May 2,  
<sup>the paper by yourself, Mr. Parker &</sup>  
Sutherland



2. humiliate another <sup>clap</sup>  
improved the deserving  
clap any more than  
the deserv'd clap.]

But the fact is, D. de  
Frez is utterly hopeless.  
He is Master of the  
Army & of the D. of  
Cambridge. But he  
would shrink every act  
of such responsibility.

I hear that he is going  
to you for Assoc. If you  
could pers. him more  
than you have yet done,  
that is the only chance.

17th Street N.Y.

Mr. Clark, I have no  
doubt,

5.

25 June 1864

3.4/31

And they could not be  
found.

That did, not do much  
signify. For I had a  
rough copy here: &  
immediately replaced  
them.

Whereupon D. de Frez  
said: "I give me a rate  
of increase of pay <sup>such</sup> as  
if I did not mean  
to adopt any of the  
recommendations but  
increase of pay,  
I might adopt."

It was then A. Lathrop  
wrote to you upon my  
showing him the said  
letter.

6.

a also to Dr. Parker.

Upon your reply being received, I sent in a second letter, giving rates of increase of pay, & then saying that it was utterly impossible to fix the values of  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$  in the following equations

for treating  
the Med. Office } £2  
with Continuity }

for putting  
Cancer's } per diem  
payment } £5.0  
into thorough } G. L.  
repair }

7.

5 June 1864

I have since had reason to feel sure that what I do for means I do is to do nothing.

What he says is: that "the D. of Cambridge" represents the feelings "of a large section of" "Military men about" "doctors" that that "section will be made" "hostile to the doctors," "if the present" "arrangements are" "disturbed."

[I never heard that to allow me class to tyrannize over L.



S. 4/31

9.

5 June 1866

S. 4/31

think me querulous  
about the W. O. I can  
only assure him that  
some matter like the  
one just related, is  
of daily occurrence.

I have constantly to  
replace lost papers -  
to bear the brunt of  
these correspondences,  
knowing that, all the  
trouble taken, nothing  
will be done.

Dear yours most truly

J. Nightingale

If you like to consult Dr.  
Parker upon the subject.



5 June 1864

S. 4/31

S. 4/31

10.

of Capt. Patton's letter  
enclosed, pray do.  
But bear in mind  
that it is only a put.  
off of Lord de Grey's.  
Capt. P. himself says:-  
"Ad de P. knows the  
whole case, & can act,  
if he chooses."

F.W.

4. & Lord de Frey is, it  
seems to me, to nail  
him to this. And  
I have no objection  
if you choose to  
communicate it to  
A. Dorymore. <sup>at the School</sup>  
Must not lose him.  
But I need not say  
I will do my best  
to keep the W.D. to  
this pledge. But I am  
weary of seeing them  
break their pledges.  
And I have told them  
that no pledge shall  
ever be conveyed through  
me more.  
Yours truly  
F. Highgate

115, Park Street, W.

S. 4/32  
June 7/64

My dear Sir James Clark  
Nothing is so desperate  
as to put reasons (for  
a course) before a man  
who puts three reasons  
before himself much  
better than you can  
yourself.

15 months ago, just  
before Sir P. Lewis' death  
Lord de Frey put before  
himself (in my presence)  
the reasons for continuing  
Dorymore at the School



2.

& therefore for promoting him - & for fixing Miss the Sanitary place under the D.C. (then proposed for Dorymber) in order that Miss might be the future D.C. - he put these reasons much more strongly than I could myself. And, more than this, after Sir J. Keble's death, he made these a reason why he should be his successor.

S. 4/32

3.

7 June 1864

\* You only hope is with people whom you have & convinced. But what is your hope when people are convinced already? In this case you have not even to take the horse & the water. He has taken himself there already. But you can't make him drink.

I have communicated with the W.D. since I had your letter. And I enclose an extract from their answer - What you have & say



8. these words: "This is  
the life I should like  
to have lived: this is  
the death I should  
like to die." In less  
than 7 weeks he had  
his wish.

How incalculable is  
the mischief, more  
apparent every day,  
of the loss of those  
two men, more  
regretted every day  
by those who know  
anything of the  
incalculable mischief.

116, Park Street, W.

June 7/64

5. 3 7 June 1864  
I send you this, as  
I have received it.  
I need not say that  
I do not agree with  
it. I think anyone  
very hardly used.  
And I have drawn  
up his case not less  
than 12 or 15 times  
in the last 15 months  
for the W.O. at their  
own desire. [I have  
even said that his  
was the "proper  
piece of magnanimity  
I knew."  
I foresee all sorts

6. of difficulties. E.g. there is always to be one Dep. Sec. in the three branches of the D.P.'s office. Now already Ralfour has put in his claim (a more rightful one) to be the next D.P. When Logan returns. He uses the self. same argument that Longmore does - (a more legitimate one) viz. that it is too hard, because he

7. <sup>7 June 1864</sup> is the only man to fill the Statistical branch, therefore he should be promoted by it. He is also a married man, with a child (or children) & having relinquished a better pecuniary post (at one remove) for this.

It is 3 years & day since Sidney Herbert sent me the news of Cavendish's death, by telegram, with

4. And Johnson has done his  
 utmost to do away with  
 Exam<sup>n</sup> & go back  
 to nomination.

I am so pressed now  
 only with Indian work,  
 but with <sup>our</sup> undertaking  
 the raising of Liverpool  
 Workhouse Infirmary,  
 that I can hardly write.

Ever yours sincerely

X. Nightingale

I send you by Book Post a copy  
 of the "Suggestions", waited for  
 & asked for so long by Mr. John  
 Lawrence. Please tell Mr. Clark  
 that I sent a copy to Mr. H. J.  
 Ellis, of Madras, direct, according

Park Hill, Hampstead  
 N.W.

Aug 13/64

My dear Mr James Clark  
 Dr.utherland showed  
 me your letter - & as  
 usual left it for me  
 to answer.

I enclose you all  
 the direct communication  
 I have had with the  
 Professors about joint studies,  
 (which was before I left  
 London.)

Please return it to  
 me.

I have already



2.

13 Aug. 1864.

Communicated with  
the W.D. about it.  
Confidentially.

Fisk was born to  
be our ruin. He is the  
sworn tool of the Civil.  
The Horse Guards are  
the real Army Doctors  
Managers.

And Lord de Grey  
has not the ordinary  
courage or capacity to  
revert the D. of Lambeth,  
altho' he is distinctly  
by position Master of

3.

the Commander in Chief.

Three years lately  
Herbert has been dead.  
And these three years  
have been nothing but  
a slow undermining  
of all he has done.

I am intriguing now  
to get Smith back, as  
Fisk's successor.

Sir C. Wood is, if  
possible, worse than  
D. de Grey.

I have done my best  
in the present emergency  
about Indian Med. Officers

but I personally was well-  
aware of the value Miss V.  
attached to her friendship  
with him & his sympathy with  
her in their common work.  
Please convey to Lady Longmore  
my respectful compliments &  
assure me to be your truly  
Alfred Bonham Carter

1767-92/1911  
J. H. B. C.  
J. H. B. C.  
J. H. B. C.

TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS  
"CARBASUS, LONDON"  
TELEPHONE 2809 MAYFAIR.

S. 4/34a  
4<sup>th</sup> May 1911  
5, HYDE PARK SQUARE,  
W.

To Miss E. C. Lawrence

Dear Madam,

I am obliged to you  
for your kind reply to  
my letter about the pub-  
lication of Miss Nightingale's  
letters in the Nursing Times,  
in which you accede to my  
request that you will not  
publish any more of her  
letters, & I can hardly ac-  
quit the publishers & Editor  
of that paper of ignorance  
of the rights of property  
which the possessors of  
autograph letters of deceased

writers & the representatives  
of the Writers of the letters  
respectively, have in such  
letters, I shall be very  
much obliged to Lady  
Longmore if she will be so  
good, as to lend me all the  
letters she has from Miss  
Nightingale to the late  
Surgeon General Sir Thomas  
Longmore, including the  
autograph letters mentioned  
in the Nursing Times.

I should also be glad to  
see those mentioned in your  
letter addressed to the late  
Sir James Clark. I will

undertake that they shall all  
be returned to Lady Longmore  
and if I should wish to in-  
clude copies or extracts of  
any of such letters in a  
Memoir of Miss Nightingale,  
I should be glad to have her  
permission to do so.

I regret to trouble you with  
this letter, while suffering  
from illness, & beg that you  
will merely acknowledge the  
receipt of it by Deputy or  
by Post-Card.

The arrangement of letters received  
by Miss Nightingale is still far from  
completion & it is through them that  
we become acquainted with the  
names of possessors of her  
own letters. We have Sir Thomas  
Longmore's name among them



Transcripts of SH

COPY

13 *to Sir James Clark*

30, Old Burlington Street,

London W.

Oct 5 / 58

My dear Sir James Clark

You will receive by this post (or next) a copy of my "Precis" for yourself. It is of course "Confidential" as I have no right to give away any copies. It has been presented to the War Office. The copy for the Queen is being bound and I shall then send it to you and ask you to be so kind as to present it.

I should have liked to have sent a copy (similarly) through you to the Duchess of Kent and to the Princess Royal if you approved -

I do not know whether it would be proper to send one to Prince Consort - Perhaps you will tell me.

I have written to Mr. Herbert about Neisow's papers, which you will have seen read at the British Ass. at Leeds. I hope he will write an answer in the name of the R. Sanitary Commission - in which case it will be sent round to you for your approval -

I read the Article you allude to in the Examiners - And also I had the misfortune to have to read the Report and Appendices of the Netley Committee. I think I never read such a mass of contradictions - of assertions which showed such an utter absence of knowledge of the most ordinary sanitary principles - and what is worse, such a want of ordinary honesty.

Simon gave a statement of Martin's (which he had asked for and which I myself saw) - and omitted the most important and only condemnatory part.

The Committee gave a passage of Dr. Grausville's which they treated in exactly the same dishonest fashion.

My own opinion about Netley is exactly the same as what I fancied you expressed to me when we were both on the spot together last year - and which Dr. Grausville expresses in the passage suppressed by the Committee - viz. that it is unfit for most of the cases which will be sent there, e.g. the Indian ones and certainly had I written an article upon it, I should not have written it in any such measured terms.

With my best love to Lady Clark and all yours, believe me,  
dear Sir James,

Ever sincerely yours, obliged,

F NIGHTINGALE.

COPY

30, Old Burlington St

29/ 11/ 58

My dear Sir James Clark,

I entirely sympathize with Dr.Aitken's disappointment & impatience - Because I have been in a state of disappointment & impatience myself for upwards of two years - And the only things we have really done yet are the Warrant & the Barrack improvements.

But I do not entertain the least doubt of the School being carried - (and by nature & experience a sanguine mind having been denied me, it is not from sanguine-ness I think so)

Dr.Aitken is wrong in attributing the blame of delay to Mr.Herbert, who has been perpetually to & from London about our War Dep matters - But Dr.Aitken does not know as I do the rate at which these things travel - It is three weeks' post from the War Office to the Horse Guards - literally, not metaphorically.

The Medical School stands thus. Gen: Peel is quite in its favour. Lord Hardinge thinking we had asked too much from the Treasury at once wanted to put it off till the General Hospital at Aldershot was organized. Mr.Herbert convinced him that it was on the contrary better to strike when the iron was hot. Sir C. Trevelyan being quite in its favour.

I saw Mr.Herbert's letter to Gen.Peel last week, urging him to begin it directly at Chatham, to send it in to the Treasury at

(cont. . . .



once, & offering his own, yours, Dr.Sutherland's & Mr.Alexander's  
services. ( lines cut out )  
but will be back on Saturday.

That we shall have an immediate answer I don't expect -  
Our Regulations & Statistical Scheme have been sent in  
since July and are not out yet.

To organize at once, Mr.Herbert left town last night.

Yours &c

F. NIGHTINGALE.

---



Copy . Miss F. Nightingale to Sir James Clark  
My dear Sir James Clark.

May 1859

Mr. Herbert has just sent me these papers, with a request that I would submit them to you & obtain from you verdict upon them - As they are so voluminous, it may save you trouble to know what was Lushington's opinion (when he was consulted on a prior occasion, when you were not in town) - It gives the substance of the papers. "As regards the Dublin Apothecaries Coy. & their disputed Licence, it would ill become any Gov<sup>t</sup> Dept. to give them a Locus Standi, with regard to their Licence which they have not at present.

"The decision of the Medical Council, a body appointed by Act of Parliament to guard the public interests, is against the Licence & until that opinion is reversed the Army Medical Dept. - should not accept it as a qualification.

"2. As regards the joint qualification of the Royal Colleges of Physicians & Surgeons of Edinburgh, the opinion given is as follows:— In our Regulations No. III for admitting Candidates (Army Medical School), we knowingly exacted two examinations by two separate bodies, one medical & one surgical - we subscribe certain Colleges as the examining body, or some other corporate body, legally entitled to grant a diploma in Surgery or a Licence to practice it.

"Now, unless it can be shown that the Joint Board of the Edinburgh Colleges is such a Corporate Body, which it is not



Florence Nightingale to Sir James Clark Continued

- " we cannot take their Licence either in Surgery or Medicine
- " At present there are plenty of men practicing themselves
- " with degrees & diplomas, & it would be an injury to them
- " to accept a less qualification " This is the law of the Case
- But if a pressure came - we should be obliged to take these
- Joint Board men. or even Dublin Apothecaries men.
- " At present however the law ought to be obeyed & any depart-
- ure - from it should be sanctioned by the Sec<sup>y</sup> of State "
- Dear Sir James Clark - if it would save you trouble to give
- a verbal opinion instead of a written one - Sutherland will be
- here at 3 o'c. & I would either send him to you or ask you to
- come here.

Yours sincerely

(Signed) F. Nightingale

May 1859

Copy

West Hill Lodge

Highgate Rise - N.

May 17<sup>th</sup> / 59.

My dear Mr James Clark . .

Mr Lutherdale sent me some note to D<sup>r</sup> Lutherdale  
- as he will not be back from Scotland till the 26<sup>th</sup>  
- Would you wait till then, or would you not rather write  
to Mr Herbert at Wilton. He was here yesterday, but will  
not be in town again until Parliament meets - As to Peel  
his strength has been as far as we have been concerned,  
in doing nothing like many other people, his only action  
is to tell you how much he would like to do something

If you can suggest anything immediate to be done about  
the Army Med<sup>l</sup> School - I would ask you to write either  
to Mr Herbert, or to me - I shall be in town again about  
the 6<sup>th</sup> - Ever yours very gratefully.

Signed - Florence Nightingale

---



Copy

Hamstead N.W.

Oct. 18<sup>th</sup>/59.

My dear Sir James

I understand that you wrote some time ago to Dr. Letherland to know what was going on - You could not have written to a worse person. I have to answer your letter as you see at last

Yours faithfully F. Nightingale

By way of reply I enclose you copy of the last printed document connected with the Med. School. - Sir C. Wood has at last replied officially accepting the Indian Medical Service in full. - Mr. Herbert is to see Parkes, Langmore Aiken this week. - Can you tell when Monhead will be at home, or if arrived what his address is? Is there a head to the Indian Medical Dept in England? & if so who is he? Who was the man to whom you applied for information about Monhead & what is he at the Indian House?

The "Qualifications & Examination" in the enclosed Proof - have been agreed to by the Army D.G. The organization stands as it did with the addition of the word Indian in the 1<sup>st</sup> Section - The Rules for examination are the same - Thank you for your kind enquiry about me. I should be better (for leaving off Dr. Williams' medicine) if it were not for the very damp Autumn - I have done all you told me -



Copy

Wanstead N.W.  
Dec. 19/54.

My dear Sir James Clark.

I gave Dr. Sutherland a message for you this morning which I find he has not delivered - I saw Mr. Herbert yesterday & spoke about the Pathological chair & about Dr. Cuthken having returned. He said at once, that he had better see Dr. Cuthken but could not immediately as he was to leave town today. I assure you (& you know how anxious I have been) that I consider Dr. Cuthken now as just as safe as any of the others - The bitch does not lie where you think, as far as the forgetting goes - The Duke of Cambridge has urged the non forgetting till the meeting of Parliament because (you would never guess) of the determined opposition of the Army Med. Dept. to the appointment of Dr. Moorhead!! - Mr. Herbert also added that he meant almost immediately to call upon the 4 Professors in a syllabus of Lectures - Such would be equiv. to their appointment - As all this was told me confidentially let it be between ourselves. - But I see no objection to your telling Dr. Cuthken, that from what you hear from me, you consider his appointment as certain to take place at the same time as the 3. Others -

Yours truly  
(Signed) Florence Nightingale

COPY

30 Old Burlington St

London W.

Feb 20 / 60

My dear Sir James

Mr. Herbert promised yesterday to gazette the four Professors immediately, which I hope means this Tuesday or Friday. And as he took away their addresses with him, I hope he will not forget.

He also promised to remember his own wish and say to Dr. Parker that Dr. Sutherland would help him in the first Course of Sanitary Lectures.

He wishes the Professors to prepare immediately their synopsis of Lectures or Prospectus, as he calls it.

Poor Alexander's loss is an irreparable one to us - But I think the interregnum a favourable time for launching the school And I find the Army Medical Council is bidding for popularity (with us Civilians) by encouraging the School. I have asked Mr. Herbert to delay the appointment of a new Director - Genl. till it, the School, be established. But to find a man as useful to us as poor Alexander has been is impossible. His loss undoes a great part of the work I have done. I wish I had not lived to see it.

I was very much pleased with what you said of my little Nursing Book. I have looked for your new book which I see advertised, but have not been able to get it yet -



first course of lectures must be "tentative" I do not think one Lecture on Statistics will do the needful, which is to enable the men to understand and use the Forms. You will, in course of time, probably wish also to introduce the Statistical element still farther.

I wonder whether Mrs. Parker would do me the honour to accept a copy of the 2nd Edit. of my little book on "Nursing".

F.W.

COPY

30 Old Burlington St

London W

March 17 / 60

My dear Sir James Clark,

I have just had your letter and consulted Dr.Sutherland upon the subject, who had the last conversation about it with Mr.Herbert here.

He says that he could not give his opinion to Mr.Herbert upon this kind of matter without being asked. He did not know till last Sunday that the appointments had not been arranged for life. (Surely Dr.Parker and Aitken ought to have stipulated for this themselves when they accepted)

I remember your mentioning the subject to Dr.Sutherland with reference to retirements some time ago and he says that he then said it was a matter for the men themselves to negotiate with Mr.Herbert. I know his memory is defective.

Last Sunday Mr.Herbert told Dr.Sutherland here (so the latter tells me) that he had wished to appoint for 5 years; that objections had been raised and 10 years proposed. He then said he should appoint Dr.Parkes for 10, and Dr.Aitken for 5 years. Dr.Sutherland said that whatever was done for Dr.Parkes, should be done for Dr.Aitken too - And Mr.Herbert assented to this.

The two Civilians should unquestionably have stipulated for life appointments. And I have always said so to Mr.Herbert (Dr.Sutherland I know thinks so too) The men are tried men. The Minister has not to learn whether they will answer or not.

We think your plan of a retirement excellent, as an alternative - in case, I mean, Mr.Herbert's object is to prepare for Army teachers in those chairs, before the present Professors would die or retire in the course of nature.

Longmore could be replaced, if he retired in 5 years. Moorhead does not wish to retain it more than 5 years, I understand.

Of these two it is not the question. But for the two

Civilians, unquestionably they should have life appointments.

On retirements on half pay after 10 years - or on full pay after 20 years.

I shall see Mr. Herbert tomorrow and will speak to him about it and learn more.

Ever yours sincerely,

F. NIGHTINGALE.

---



COPY

April 1 1860.

My dear Sir James Clark,

You will be glad to hear (if you have not yet heard,) that the Senate of the Army Medical School was constituted a Senate yesterday by Mrs. Herbert at the War Office - & that "it" is now a School.

I consider this an important step as placing the Army Med. Sch. under the immediate dependence of the Secy. of State for War.

Ever yours sincerely & gratefully,

F. NIGHTINGALE.

April 1/ 60.

---

COPY

30 Old Burlington St

July 13/60

My dear Sir James Clark

I should be very glad, if you could find time just to cast your eye over the enclosed (three) letters of Dr.Aitken, & to return them to me, with any suggestions. I have no doubt however, that you have also received his complaints which are well founded indeed.

I do not know whether you ever go out to breakfast, But if you could fix a day, to come here at  $\frac{1}{4}$  before 10, I would get Mr.Whitfield, of St.Thomas', to come, who is very anxious to be introduced to you - & Dr.Sutherland, to talk over various matters with you, & some of these foreign Delegates. But then it must be this or next week.

Will you allow me to send you a copy of the (better type) Edition of my little "Notes on Nursing"? It has some additions as well and had it been out sooner, I would have sent it (through you) to the Queen, instead of what I did send.

I never thanked you properly for your Edition of Combe which I liked exceedingly, & for your mention of my little book in it.

Ever yours sincerely & gratefully,

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE.

---

COPY

30 Old Burlington St

July 16/ 60

My dear Sir James Clark,

First, do you think you would be so good as to breakfast here at  $\frac{1}{2}$  before 9, (nine, tomorrow (Tuesday)

Mr. Whitfield comes in hopes of being introduced to you. And I fixed this early hour, on account of the business of the "Sections" as you said. I hope it will not be too early for you.

2 . I should be proud indeed if you would present my little book to our beloved Princess, England's eldest daughter. (I enclose a copy) Good Angels speed her!

I enclose another copy, in case it would be proper to present it to the Queen - as having a little more matter in a better type. But do not trouble yourself to answer this. I don't know the proprieties.

3. I entirely concur with all you say about the School

(1) There is no doubt but that the Pathological Professors must have assistance. The demand ought to come formally through the Senate, now there is a Senate, but, if the case is urgent, and delay dangerous, I would ask Mr. Herbert, if you liked it, to authorize the immediate employment of Mr. Terson for 2 months at £3. 3. a week, till the formal application can be sent in, (which we know the War Office will take a great deal more than two months even to read).

(2) I think there is no doubt but that the School will be removed, as soon as there is a General Hospital in a suitable locality, probably Aldershot. In the meantime we can get Dr. Aitken one of the highest of the casemates, properly shelved, for that part of the Museum not in immediate requisition, and next year we can get him an iron building, as used at Kensington.

I should be sorry to do more than this as it would negative the plea for removal.

Ever yours gratefully & affectionately,

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE.

---



COPY

30 Old Burlington St

July 17/ 60

My dear Sir James Clark

M.Quetelet is coming tomorrow to breakfast (Wednesday)  
at  $\frac{1}{4}$  before 9.

And as I am very anxious to do him honor, would you be so  
very good as to come yourself?

I have spoken to Mr.Herbert today about both things, viz.  
Aitken assistant & Maclean's salary.

Would you be so good as to read Aitken's letter,  
(received today) and return it to me?

Ever yours sincerely,

F. NIGHTINGALE.

---

Gibson, the D.G. is coming also to breakfast tomorrow,  
and I always think it worth while to keep him straight.

COPY

30 Old Burlington St

July 18 / 60

My dear Sir James Clark

Would you be so good as to take the enclosed down to  
Dr.Aitken tomorrow, if you go; and to read this, his, Statement,  
altho' I dare say he has already consulted you upon it.

I hope that you will be so good as to let us know the  
results of your visit, as you proposed?

Perhaps it will be better not to let the D.G. (or anyone)  
know that this Statement has been seen by us. It might excite  
jealousy. If you would therefore put it into Dr.Aitken's hands,  
who will know what it is, without others knowing it, and tell  
him what you would advise.

Ever yours sincerely & gratefully,

F. NIGHTINGALE.

---

COPY

30 Old Burlington St

July 20 / 60

My dear Sir James Clark

I entirely agree with you as to the necessity for obtaining a complete school and Hospital as soon as possible.

The present arrangement was, as you know, to be only temporary. The sooner it is done away with, the better.

Your letter appears, however, to contemplate only a similarly temporary arrangement at Aldershot as you propose to build a Hospital for some 500 or 600 sick and the School in connection with it. This I devoutly hope will be accomplished.

But your proposal (for the present) is really between a temporary school at Chatham, which already exists, and a temporary School at Aldershot, which would have to be provided. There are so many points in your letter, involving matters of importance (though they really have been gone over scores of times) that I cannot reply without having seen Mr. Herbert.

Yours ever sincerely & faithfully,

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE.

---



COPY

30 Old Burlington St

July 24 / 60

My dear Sir James Clark

I had an opportunity on Sunday of mentioning to Mr. Herbert the proposal you mentioned to me for removing the Army Med. School from Chatham to Aldershot. He at once stated that he could not entertain such a proposal. After ample consideration, Chatham had been fixed upon as the site of a temporary school. He did not feel disposed to take a favourable view of any proposition to undo what had been done patly by himself. He considered the School as fixed at Chatham for the present.

I do not think it would be politic (indeed I think it would seriously damage the prospect of future removal) to agitate farther in the matter, until it is done permanently.

Again, if we had agitated for a permanent establishment at first we should have had no school at all.

If all of you had inspected Aldershot at the time you inspected Chatham for this purpose, you would have chosen Chatham in preference, for a School, on account of its greater temporary advantages.

Mr. Herbert will sanction the employment of Dr. Aitken's assistant for two months, pending a Requisition from the Senate. But meanwhile I have a letter from Dr. Aitken (which I will send you) rather altering his line of requisition.

Mr. Herbert will also authorize the shelving of the Casemate for the Museum.

As other wants shew themselves (which they will be sure to do) we must try to get them supplied and we must never cease to agitate for a more permanent Establishment (with Hospital) as soon as possible.

The grant for Woolwich is only about £11,000 This would do little for us at Aldershot. When the new Hospital is decided upon at the Camp, the School buildings can easily be attached to it.

Yours ever sincerely & gratefully,

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE.

COPY

July 25/ 60

My dear Sir James Clark

I should like very much to see you as you kindly propose. Would 12 o'clock tomorrow (Thursday) suit you? I only mention this hour because Dr.Sutherland will be here. And you would kill two birds at one stone. But almost any other hour would suit me as well. I enclose Dr.Aitken's letter.

Pathologists are apt to get into the way of considering the main end of such a School to be that of making good Pathological preparations. But, if the Chatham School produces many good Pathological preparations, you must report it to the Statistical Congress as bad. Pathology is doubtless essential, but the aim of our Army School is the prevention of disease, not the record of the harm disease has done.

Ever yours sincerely & grantefully,

F. NIGHTINGALE.

---



COPY

My dear Sir James Clark,

Mr. Herbert has, as yet, had no official answer from Dr. Maclean, which makes it difficult to know exactly what to do.

Dr. Morehead has evidently written to him that the salary would be £700, made up to £1000 from some other source.

We considered that the £1000 would be nearly made up by the £700 and the £250 pension from the India House.

Could you ask Dr. Morehead from what source he stated that the extra £300 would be made up?

Enclosed is the letter you sent me.

Yours ever sincerely,

F. NIGHTINGALE.

July 25/ 60.

---



21 letters to  
TL

COPY

To Prof. Longmore

30, Old Burlington Street,  
W.

June 19 / 61

Dear Sir,

I was exceedingly sorry to find that after you had so kindly offered to open a Subscription List for "Soldiers' Homes (at Chatham) and after Dr. Gibson had consented to be present at the Meeting, a provoking mistake had occurred owing, as Capt P. Jackson himself said, to his "want of experience in conducting the business of a Public Meeting".

(Capt Pilkington Jackson R.A. was the originator of the Soldiers' Homes at Gibraltar)

I informed him of the Contents of your two kind letters -  
And he informed me that by a mistake, with which it is useless to trouble you, a packet of letters had never been sent to

The Director General

R.M. Milnes Esq. M.P.

And other M.P.s who had promised to attend and speak at the Meeting.

It was a great oversight. And, altho' he has apologized, he tells me, to all these gentlemen - yet that does not remove the mischief of the want of their support at the Meeting -

Cont.

-1-

I send you the "Times" advertisement of the same

And I hope that you will still give your assistance to an object which so well deserves it.

The vote for Chatham Institute altho' it has not passed yet the House of Commons, is, I understand, as certain as if it had - And I am told there is no lack of private subscription there - altho', if there were and you would kindly inform me, I believe I could be of some help in that quarter.

But we are very anxious to extend, especially to Aldershot, where the abominations which go on just outside the Lines are such as are rarely seen in civilized life, the benefits of a place where the men can have refreshments, rest and amusement - which now they can only seek at the Canteen or the Public House, when out of Barracks.

*(F.N.'s Signature Cut-out - with end of letter)*

COPY

*To Prof. Longmore*

30, Old Burlington St.

W.

June 20 / 61

My dear Sir

*3 MUIR*

I do not like to refuse Dr. Mure's request, for the sake of his friend and mine, poor Alexander. He will see that I have done Alexander full justice. And when I wrote those Analyses of the Med. Off's Correspondence, curiously enough, I had never seen Alexander.

But I do hope that the publicity will stop at Dr. <sup>*MUIR*</sup>Mure - No good but harm to the cause would accrue from the re-opening those old sores now - And therefore I must beg that Dr. <sup>*MUIR*</sup>Mure does not even mention this "Private" Report farther.

I read with the greatest shame the evidence (at the inquest) given by the Assistant Surgeon in charge of the detachment of Guards, marched from Kingston to Guildford. - After all that has been done for Medical Officers, that there should be one who holds such opinions is a matter of shame. Upon my word had Alexander been alive, I should not have liked to have been that Asst. Surgeon in his hands. He ought to be sent to your School at Chatham. For he has not so much as read the Medical Regulations, which specially bind the Med. Off. to make representations to the C.O. upon the camping, line of march &c., &c., &c., &c.

( *FN: Signature cancelled* )



COPY

*Prof. Longman*

9, Chesterfield St.

London W.

May 5 / 62

My dear Sir,

I only write these few words (in great haste) today - to acknowledge the very kind gift of Dr. Fyffe, which I have paid into the hands of the Hon. Secretary of the "Herbert Memorial".

I send you my copy of the Report of that Meeting. I will try to ascertain whether it is now to be had. I agree with you that a much greater circulation should have been attempted. Do not trouble yourself to return my copy to me necessarily the whole subject is so painful (I mean in his not having met with the recognition he deserved, as you so truly say) that I had almost rather be without the Copy. The War Office does not follow his traditions, which is the only gratitude he would have cared for.

Two parts of your kind letter in both of which I fully concur, caused me great pain. I may perhaps some day have to write to you more fully about them. They were no surprise.

*(Fyffe's signature cut out)*

COPY

*To  
Prof. Longman*

Hampstead N W

Oct 7 / 62

My dear Sir

I am extremely indebted to you for your kindness and consideration for me in sending me Dr. Muir's remark -

Would you be so kind as to write to him and to say that I am excessively grateful to him for having prevented a thing which would have given me so much pain, and been so hurtful in itself, as the publication of that "Private" Report - and would you say that, if he thinks it desirable to put a stop to it more effectually, I should be truly obliged to him to do so, using my authority, and saying that, however useful they may suppose it to be to put in circulation certain passages, it would be a direct breach of faith in them to do so, or in me to allow it.

I cannot tell you how obliged I am to Dr. Muir for his prompt interference.

I have no idea how the Bp of London could have got hold of it, unless Lord Panmure gave it him himself - But I agree with Clarendon who says that, of all classes of men who can read and write, the clergy are they who have least knowledge how practically to work human affairs.

*- ? Alexander & Herbert - ?*

When, about the time of my dear Master's death, the American Govt. wrote to me for all these things, I sent all the War Office Blue Books, printed Reports & Regulations, but directly refused to send them this.

(cont. . . .)

Cont.

-1-

I am very glad to hear a not unfavourable report of  
the poor Americans from Dr. Muir's account.

*(F.N.'s Signature Cur Ant. D. 1897)*



COPY

To Prof. Longman  
PRIVATE.

32, South Street,  
Grosvenor Square,

W.

Nov 8 / 62

My dear Sir,

I should be very sorry that you should think that your kind and wise letter of May (?) last had been neglected.

I have always had it in my head.

I wrote to the W.O. about it. But as you did not wish your name to be mentioned, they required some quote = able Medical Authority who is absorbed with poor Lady Clark's suffering decline - is the only man who could bring Dr. Parkes to consent. And without his consent of course we can do nothing.

Since then, papers have reached me, of which I dare say you have cognizance, by Dr. Parkes' desire, thro' Sir James Clarke. I hope that all these things will be satisfactorily arranged at a Meeting at the W.O. next week.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) F. NIGHTINGALE.

COPY

*To Prof Longmore*

PRIVATE

21 Cleveland Row,  
St. James' S.W.  
Feb 25 / 63

My dear Sir,

I am sorry to say that all complaints about the deficiency of accommodation round and about Netley are well founded.

The Committee now sitting "upon you", has taken this into account, and recommends the W.O., if you choose to take houses in, on in the immediate vicinity of Southampton (where the best houses are to be had) to allow you carriage "accommodation" to take you to and from Netley.

I have submitted the substance of your letter to the W.O.

I think it not unlikely that they will take next year a grant to build you houses for hire - But these houses will not be ready for two      ...      ...      ...      ...

(several lines cut out)

...      ...      ...      ...

private speculation will have built houses enough (and to spare) round Netley. So is said that private speculators, since they have heard that the Invalids are to be sent to Netley, are buying up all the ground - (same lines cut out )

I sent to the W.O. some days ago copies of Tables (of mine) for registering Surgical Operations - unless comes to Dr. Parkes - for you.

(Signature cut-out)

(Sgd.) F.N.



Cleveland Row. S.W.

July 29/63.

My dear Sir James Clark.

I sent today according to your desire (at least I understand it so) one two-folio copy of our Report for the King of the Belgians, two 8vo copies for yourself & the Queen. I also enclose a letter for the Queen which please send on burn as you like. Mind, I am not responsible for the 8vo copy which I never give unless I am asked for it. - There has been a perfect outcry (& as I think a legitimate one), that the 2 folio book is not to be sold, not to be had, not to be published, not to be presented to Parliament & that the 8vo makes references passim to a work which is not to be had. Officers of all men - those one most wants to interest. Will not look at the 8vo copy, & say the Govt is keeping something back. And officials say we don't want opinions (in the report) we want the facts (in the Blue book). Might I not, at least, send the Queen my own paper (which you have & which is only printed in the two-folio book, - fast becoming a very rare work.) She might look at that because it has pictures. And she certainly will not look at the Report. I have some copies of my paper & perhaps, like the one I gave you. Ought I to bind the 8vo for the Queen? If so, I can send you a bound copy almost immediately & one of your copies will do for Prince Louis of Hesse - you mentioned that he might like one. Perhaps I ought to bind the 2 folios for the King of the Belgians - If so please tell me - we are getting on very well in having our home (working) Commission appointed. Sir C. Wood is much more amenable. - But I am greatly disappointed that not one single review article has seized one main point, viz. reform your Stations first - it is not your climate - it is not even mainly your sites - it is your living like beasts, not civilized P.D.



men, without water supply, without drainage etc, heightened by  
climate & by sites, which kills you. - Please write to  
me anything you hear about the D.G.'s difficulty as to  
Macleod & Longmore becoming Seniors of their Rank  
Yours - P.M.O. Ever yours gratefully

F.N.



"Hornstead N.W."

Aug 3<sup>rd</sup>/63.

My dear Sir James Clark. - I sent - as by your kind permission  
a copy of my paper, for the Queen. Under cover to you.  
2. About the Army Med<sup>l</sup> Dept<sup>l</sup> & the want of Candidatis,  
- I have long thought it a most serious matter. And I have  
told Lord de Grey so. And that the original warrant must  
be restored in all its integrity, or the Medical Dept<sup>l</sup> will  
be lost. And he always agrees, But when it comes to the  
point, I see, though he does not say so, that he cannot  
carry it with the Horseguards. He is too weak - he restores  
such things as forage, servants, hay etc to them. But their  
"Gentleman" grievances, which one cannot but smile at, and  
which nevertheless are most important, he is not strong enough  
to remedy (against the H.G.) nevertheless it must be done  
and a great body of evidence to bring before him, as I propose  
is the surest way to enable him to force it on the Commander  
in Chief. It is a great pity, Sidney Herbert could have done  
it quite well.

3. I should have liked very much to have seen you for a few  
moments - as you were so kind as to propose at Cleveland Row.

4. If you like to keep my two copies of the 2 folios, instead of sending  
it to the King of the Belgians by all means do so. - But  
I write to you, as I do to all my friends of influence :- apply  
to the India Office & War Office, both the India Office to give  
you a copy. Let them see that people wish to see - Choose to see  
the 2 folios - that they must not burn it, as they wish.  
They are impugning our statistics, calling them exaggerated  
when they are in fact, understated. - The death rate is  
understated, because it does not take into acc<sup>t</sup> the men

P.T.O.



invalided from the Army. for disease for those who die on  
the passage home. And then they dare to write & state to  
Lord Stanley - that we have exaggerated. And they dare to  
try & burke our evidence - Now this Sidney Herbert never  
could have done - It is astonishing how easily Sir C Wood  
is satisfied of the truth of that which it is thought desirable  
to assert. It is astonishing how loose his ideas &  
reasonings are - Col Baker is the prompter! His argument  
is, the death rate in the war years are the highest (not from  
wounds). Therefore peace & not sanitary measures, is the  
remedy. - As well might he say, the Army nearly perished  
in the Crimea, not from wounds, but from want of supplies &  
want of sanitary measures. - Therefore peace, not supplies  
not sanitary measures should have been the remedy. And  
he taunts us with unfairness for including the war years in the  
averages. - Please insist upon having a copy of the Blue  
Book for yourself. The India Office has positively refused  
to have them sold. - Ever yours gratefully

F. N.



Harestead NW.

Aug. 21<sup>st</sup> / 63.

My dear Sir James Clark.

1. Mr. Paget has written me a Capital letter, as one of the Examiners, with permission to shew it to Lord de Grey on the Subject of the paucity of Candidates - When you have produced your Case, I shall add this & I hope we shall win.
2. I do not apprehend any injury to the Queen's Service - from the Separation of the Services in India. The pay & allowances of Queen's Officers ought to be sufficient to provide a Supply, if no other countervailing reason exists. - But as there must be some inducement held out to Officers volunteering for life long Service in India, the only way to do this is by somewhat better pay allowances & retirement - This is what the India for. proposes - But after all they can only take a certain number of men & the others would continue in the Queen's Service - An amalgamated Service would never have done - It would have destroyed the efficiency of the Royal Service in toto by mixing up Civil doctors & Native Reg. doctors having no discipline with Queen's Officers who require the strictest discipline: It is fortunate for the British Army Lord de Grey refused the Amalgamation proposal. You are aware that all Officers for India must hold Commissions in the Queen's Service, before they are allowed to Volunteer.
3. With much W. - (End seen lost. 8.7.63.)



Hamstead N.W.

Sept 26/63

My dear Sir James Clark. I enclose Mr. Pafet's letter, You will see that it's not exactly "on Examinations" but as advocating from his own knowledge of both Civil & Military professions the necessity of Gov<sup>t</sup> entertaining the claims of the A.M.D. to have the original warrant re-issued. I pray let us see the draft of your appeal & let us have time to cooperate with you - I meant to have sent Mr. Pafet's letter which he wrote at my request, to Lord de Grey, at the same time with other papers & with your remonstrance - in order not to weaken the blow but to give it all the at once -

It is essentially necessary that something be done - You will see that Mr. Pafet argues the question of supply & shows that the Gov<sup>t</sup> has very formidable rivals in the field, ready to snap up every discontented man who passes the colleges. You must dwell strongly on this point & show that additional pay will not meet the case. What is wanted is military status & gentlemanly treatment

Ever &c Sincerely  
F.N.



Hamstead N.W.

Oct. 7<sup>th</sup>/13.

My dear Sir James Clark,

I have been too unwell to answer your letter of Oct. 4<sup>th</sup> before today: and even now I am hardly able to write - But I think the matter is of such extreme importance that I would do all I can to prevent any false step from being taken - In their desire to remedy the present state of things, the Army Medical Professors seem to have forgotten that the whole subject (for which they propose to appoint a Commission) was carefully enquired into & decided by a far better Commission than they are ever likely to get - In short there is not a single thing to enquire into - All that is wanted is that the result of the former enquiry shall be carried into effect. If the Professors can help this result by sending information it will be useful. But if they want to postpone indefinitely all useful action & to embroil the Department hopelessly with the Gov<sup>t</sup> - then they will press for this Commission. If I were to aid in any such undertaking it would be with my eyes open to the certainty of its failure and of its crippling all attempts to remove the present causes of discontent. Ever sincerely & gratefully

F.N.



7. Oakhill Park  
Hampstead N.W.

Oct. 7. / 63

Confidential

My dear Sir James Clark.

I wrote you my candid opinion about the Commission proposed for the Med. Officers grievances. - I would gladly also give you some private reasons against the men chosen altogether conducive to my mind. Catch Lord Stanley catching the lips of one of his fingers to help out of the mire anybody!

If we could have put Bramble's ghost into the chair of the Indian Commission, he would have served us better. And Lord S. has done nothing for us, neither then nor since. Besides if he was to urge anything on our Gov<sup>t</sup>. - it would rather set them against it. He is so disliked! But the 1<sup>st</sup> Royal Sanitary Commission - backed as it was by the whole Country - would have served us nothing, had not Sidney Herbert undertaken & drawn up the warrant himself - He was a great man going out of his way to help many little men. If they expect anything of the kind from Lord S. they are woefully mistaken. I could tell you how, as far as he has done anything he has stood in the way of everything in the India Commission. Again who is to write the Report? Genl. Eyre can't write, Lord S. won't - In every single instance it has been Sutherland and I. who have written the Reports. - Yes, certainly, Dr. Muir is by far the 1<sup>st</sup> man in the Dept. He is a 2<sup>nd</sup> Dr. Alexander & will be the next D.G. - But do you think Gov<sup>t</sup>. will have him home for this, When the very reason why they would not have him home for a far more important office, is that

RJO



he cannot be spared from his present place? I think they  
they would be great fools, if they did. I feel quite sure  
that a protest with facts drawn up by the Army Medical  
profession, strengthened if you will, by us, would influence  
the War Office - that a Commission would indefinitely  
alienate them. Believe me, the Army Med. Dept knows little  
what it is about; if it thinks that the Commission, headed  
by Sidney Herbert, which had the elements of success,  
could be reproduced (without him & without any of the  
elements of success.) to do the same thing. - If you  
would like to drive down here on Friday & have lunch about two

I would gladly talk the matter over. - I could tell many  
things I cannot write - I would have Sutherland to come  
& tell you his opinion. Believe me ever yrs.

F.N.



115. Park St. W

April 4<sup>th</sup> 1864

(215)

Copy 4/15

My dear Sir James Clark.

he were asked to write the Treasury letter. But it was not sent when written - Instead of that Capt. Gallon saw. Mr. Arbuthnot, & the only proposal which seems likely to meet with Treasury approval is to say that Dr. Simpson's extra duties render it necessary that he should reside at the Hospital - but as there is no house as yet, they will allow lodging money & give him rank of Inspector General without other emoluments than the £700 & lodging allowance, till a house is built - I am asked whether he will take that. I have no means of knowing except by asking you. (I don't think Lord de Grey is in earnest. But that is not my business - Had we had Sidney Herbert & Trevelyan we should have got this done.)

The Army Medical Dept. is going to rack & ruin as fast as it can. Lord de Grey says he will see you "about the question" again soon but this appears to refer to - ) & a much more serious matter - Warrant. They want to get off with merely placing the doctors on the Staff - Sidney Herbert & the 1<sup>st</sup> R. Commission would have thought any man mad for proposing such a thing. And as I have played my last card - I now think the only thing to be done is to revert to your proposal of another Royal Commission. But whom to have upon it? Lord Stanley won't serve. That I know (but you might ask him - we must think more about it - ever yours most faithfully  
Florence Nightingale



115 Park S.E.W.

April 6<sup>th</sup>/64

Copied 1844

My dear Sir James Clark. I have done my best to make  
Dr. Sutherland go to London from Saturday till Monday - His meeting  
on Monday is not till one. And he could quite well do it - I wished  
it particularly for my own sake - for I think the Medical Warrant affair  
so desperate, that, unless you strike out some course, I don't know  
what to do. But Dr. Sutherland always makes any excuse to go  
nowhere. And he generally, most unfairly, makes me that excuse  
- I have written to the War Office to say that I really could not  
indult Dr. Longmore by asking him whether he would take the  
rank, without its advantages & that they must join the  
original proposal - I have also written threatening letters  
both to Lord de Grey & to Capt Gallon about the warrant. &  
after pointing out that both restoration of Warrant & increase  
of pay are now necessary, I have shown how, when we  
are exacting duties from the Medical Officer, such as Sanitary  
Recommendations to his Commanding Officer, which especially  
require him to have the standing of a gentleman with his  
Commanding Officers - we are doing things such as dismounting  
him at parade, depriving him of presidency at Boards -  
which in Military life, to a degree we have no idea of in  
Civil life, - depriving him of the weight of a gentleman among  
gentlemen - Sutherland has made me propose your second  
R. Commission to Lord de Grey & Capt Gallon - but I don't expect  
they will answer this - ever Yrs Gratefully

F. V.



● Park St. W

April 7<sup>th</sup> / 64

*copy to Mr. [unclear]*

My dear Sir James Clark. - The War Office seem to have  
taken fright & to think it will be less disagreeable to have  
an assault-meeting from you, Dr. Lushington & Parkes, than  
from a Royal Commission. They have written to me asking me to  
"communicate" with you, "about the proposed meeting". I don't  
exactly know what to "communicate" - If you can make this  
house a place of meeting for discussion with Dr. Parkes & Lushington,  
previously to your adjourning in a trio to attack L<sup>d</sup> de Grey, I need  
not say that there will be room & food for you any day, & any hour,  
that you will name - If on the other hand it will be more  
convenient for you to see them at home, Dr. Lushington will manage to  
go so down to you after Monday. - We are as full of India business  
next week as we well can be. - Sending out things to Sir John Lawrence  
who is mad with our delay, and therefore Dr. S. had far better not  
have left town then, but have gone to you on Sunday. - But  
he won't! & this warrant business must come before  
everything else. For the War Office seem now willing to listen to  
some kind of terms, they are frightened. - They sent me your  
letter - It was a very good & very firm.

Don't be conciliatory -

Ever yours most truly

L. N.



14<sup>th</sup> Park St. W.

April 8<sup>th</sup> / 64.

Apr 11<sup>th</sup>

My dear Sir James Clark.

In reply to your queries:-

1. I do not think Gibson will be of any use now, because (although he entirely concurs, as he must.) You never can depend upon what he will say, upon whether he will stand by you. But should it come e.g. to a Committee consisting of yourselves being asked to draw up the precise meanings of Clause 17 etc., then Gibson must be on it & his responsibility being merged in Yours - he will be valuable to You.

2. Capt Fallon does not say (or at least if he does he has no right to say) that Sidney Herbert "gave up the right to preside at the Mess". What Capt Fallon does say is that Sidney Herbert "Consented to the modification of the Warrant." This is true - I know exactly what Sidney Herbert did by the warrant; or believed himself to have done - But he had nothing to do with the presiding question. During the last months of his life, Sir J. Lubbock (& much more Hawes) did many things without his knowledge - I have repeatedly challenged the War Office to show me S. Herbert's signature to the charges in the warrant attributed to him - Showing them that he himself knew not of one. - Also showing that even if his signature were to be seen to more, it was surprised from him & he himself did not know of it. The War Office has never answered my challenge - And although it is (unfortunately) true that S. Herbert did "consent" to one charge - all the rest is untrue. As to the "Confidential Circulars" he knew nothing of them. Ever & most truly

F. V.



● Park St W.

April 9<sup>th</sup> / 1872.

My dear Sir James Clark. I shall certainly be only  
fit for a Lunatic Asylum, if I stay in the W.C. I have  
received the enclosed from Capt Fallon which I told him I would  
forward to you, in order to make sure of no mistake being  
made by Longmore as to the "proposal really made" to him.  
Please return it to me. At the same time I showed Capt  
Fallon that the "arrangements" we seek to alter were not made  
by Lord Herbert - that we were carrying out Lord Herbert's own intention  
- that it was not on "personal" but on "public" grounds, that we sought  
to raise Longmore's salary, that Longmore does not perform at  
Kelley the same duties as at Chatham. That if the representation  
made to the Treasury were the same as what Fallon here makes  
to me - the "Treasury" might very naturally object to granting  
what was not urged. That Longmore might very well answer  
that if he were Inspector General, he would have the lodging  
money as a right (as part of his emoluments, that is) &  
a chance of becoming D.G. Beodes - At the same time I  
wrote for the tenth time a statement of eight pages, with permission  
to make any use of it they pleased with my signature - as to  
Longmore's position & Lord Herbert's intentions - But I positively  
refused to write to Mr. Gladstone, who certainly ought not to  
grant me, what the head of my Department, the Sec of State  
for War, does not urge. And I told Capt Fallon v. plainly that  
he was in contradiction of himself, when under Sec of the Treasury  
PTO



+ of what L. J. de Grey promised, if he became S. of State  
nearly a year ago. - Everyones most truly

F.N.

PS Of course, if Longmore will accept the proposal  
as now made (but which I perfectly understood  
to be thus before - did not you?) it will save us  
an almost hopeless contest. F.N.



● Park St. W.

April 11<sup>th</sup>/64

My dear Sir James Clark. - I have consulted with Dr. Sutherland and he thinks that it is more important for you, Dr. Parker & himself to consult together & then for you three to adjourn immediately to attack Lord de Frey. (or for you to go by yourself as you may think fit (with a minute drawn up by you three.) He thinks this <sup>is</sup> more importance than the gain of a week would be in time. He says that Dr. Parker knows so much more than anyone else of the feeling of the men. He therefore proposes that you three should meet here on Sat week 23<sup>rd</sup> or meet here on this day fortnight (25<sup>th</sup>) if that is proposed. & that on the same day, after meeting, you should all go to Lord de Frey, or you alone go. He is adverse to not doing the whole thing at once (I tell him this may <sup>perhaps</sup> fall through from L<sup>d</sup> de Frey's inability to receive you then). I don't think Dr. Sutherland will go to you, unless it is quite inconvenient for you & Dr. Parker to come here before going to L<sup>d</sup> de F on whatever day that is ultimately fixed. The fact is what is wanted is someone to put a muzzle on the Duke of Cambridge, & to tell him he must not alter a Royal Warrant. Lord de Frey is the head of the Army. & will quite well say this, if he pleased, to the Duke of Cambridge & he must be made to say it. - They our enemies - put forward Lord Herbert's name very cruelly. The truth is that it was not he at all but the Duke of Somerset who began the alteration in the warrant. The Duke of Somerset came to Lord Herbert & gained his consent to an alteration as regards the navy. The Duke of Cambridge looks



advantage & did the same thing as regards the Army.

There will never be any confidence again, unless Lord Grey tells the Commander in Chief: "You shall not do this"

Ever yours most truly

F.N.

Please tell Mr. Clark that I have all the papers, including the Heads of the Bill, proposed amendments etc from Lord Clarence Paget, on the subject on which I wrote to Mr. Clark.

F.N.



11. Park St. W.

June 5<sup>th</sup> / 64

Private except for Mr. Clark.

My dear Sir James Clark. — Late last night I received the enclosed (I wish it could have been earlier as you & Mr. Clark were in town, and I could have told you what I must now write). My answer to the enclosed was that it was no use Lord de Grey shifting the responsibility of advising the D. of Cambridge on to Dr. Watson's or Mr. Paget's, or any one else's shoulders. Lord de Grey knows himself quite enough to tell the D. of C. what to do. If he won't, no one else can. And I strongly deprecated this coward's act of letting any one rather than the responsible Minister - responsible for the Army, being well doctored, & for the Commander in Chief knowing the truth. Neither Dr. Watson nor Mr. Paget, nor any one of them, knows as much as Lord de Grey knows himself - But I said do not take any advice - I will write & ask Sir James Clark what he thinks. — I think Lord de Grey utterly hopeless & I am anxious to tell you why.

About 3 weeks after you had given me your paper - the paper by yourself. Dr. Parker & Dr. Sutherland dated May 2<sup>d</sup> - I received a letter from Lord de Grey, written by Capt. Fallon - asking me to give rates of increase of pay desirable - I replied that nothing of the kind could be done, until Lord de Grey had settled which of the recommendations in your paper was to be carried out. Whereupon it appeared that the only result which had followed the delivery of your recommendations to the War Office, was, that the War Office had hurled them



+ They could not be found! That did not so much signify  
as I had a rough copy here & immediately replaced them  
Whereupon Lord de Grey said "give me a rate of increase  
of pay such as, if I did not mean to adopt any of the  
recommendations but increase of pay, I might adopt."

It was then Dr Sutherland wrote to Lord, & upon my  
showing him the said letter, as also to Dr Parkes. - Upon their  
replies being received, I sent in a 2<sup>nd</sup> letter giving rates  
of increase of pay. & then saying that it was utterly  
impossible to fix the values of X, Y & Z. in the following  
equation.

For treating the medical  
Officers with Continuity. } £ X.

For putting 'Lucifers'  
harem into thorough  
repair - } per diem  
£. s. d  
Y. Z.

I have since had reason to believe that what Lord de  
Grey means to do, is to do nothing.

What he says is that the Duke of Cambridge represents the  
feeling of a large section of military men about Doctors  
- That that section will be made hostile to the Doctors  
if the present arrangements are disturbed (I never  
heard that to allow one class to tyrannize over &  
& humiliate another class improved the deserving class  
any more than the deserving devoured 3<sup>rd</sup> class.) But the fact is



Jan 5<sup>th</sup>/64 Continued

Lord de Grey. is utterly hopeless. He is Master of the Army & The Duke of Cambridge. But he would shirk every act of such responsibility. - I hear that he is going to Eton for Ascot. - If you can press him more than you have already done that is the only chance. - Mr. Clark & I have no doubt think me querulous about the V.I.O. I can only assure him that some matters, like the one just related is of daily occurrence. I have constantly to replace lost papers, to bear the brunt of these correspondences, knowing that all the trouble taken, nothing will be done.

Yours most truly  
F.N.

If you like to commit Mr. Parker on the subject of Capt Fallon's letters enclosed pray do. - But bear in mind that it is only a put off. of Lord de Grey. Capt f. himself says. "L<sup>d</sup> de G. knows the whole case & can act if he chooses"

F.N.



100. Park St. W.

June 21/14

My dear Sir James Clark. - Nothing is so desperate as to  
put reasons (for a course) before a man. Who puts those reasons  
before ~~himself~~ himself. much better than you can yourself -  
15 months ago, just before Sir Charles Lewis' death. Lord de Grey  
put before himself (in my presence) the reasons for continuing  
Longmore at the School. & therefore for promoting him & for  
giving Muir the Sanitary place under the D.G. (then proposed  
for Longmore.) in orders that Muir might be the future D.G. He  
put these reasons much more strongly than I could myself. &  
more than this after Sir C. Lewis' death he made these a reason  
why he should be his successor. - Your only hope is with people  
whom you have to convince - But what is your hope. These  
people are convinced already? In this case you have not even to  
take the horse to the water. He has taken himself there already. But  
you can't make him drink. I have communicated with the  
W.O. since I had your letter. And I enclose an extract from  
their answer. - What you have to say to Lord de Grey is that  
it seems to me, to nail him to this & I have no objection if you  
choose to communicate it to Dr. Longmore. We must not lose him  
at the School & I need not say I will do my best to keep the  
W.O. to their pledge. But I am weary of seeing them break  
their pledges And I have told them that no pledge shall ever  
be conveyed through me more.

Ever yrs Truly

F.N.

21/6



P.J. I send you this as I have received it - I need hardly say  
that I do not agree with it. I think Longmore very hardly used  
& I have drawn up his case not less than 12 or 15 times  
in the last 15 months for the W.O. at their own desire (I have  
even said that his was the grossest piece of magnanimity  
I knew). I foresee all sorts of difficulties. E.g.  
there is always to be one Inspector General in the 3 branches  
of the D.G.I. office - how already Balfour has put in  
his claim (a most right (but one) to be the next. I.G. when  
Logan retires. He uses the selfsame argument that  
Longmore does (a most legitimate one) viz: - that it is  
too hard, because he is the only man to fill the Statistical  
branch. Therefore he should lose promotion by it - he being  
also a married man with a child (or children) & having  
relinquished a better pecuniary post (at our request)  
for this.

F.N.

It is 3 years today since Sidney Herbert sent me the  
news of Cavonius's death, by telegram with these words, "This  
is the life I should like to have lived, this is the death I  
should like to die". In less than 4 weeks he had his wish.  
- How incalculable is the mischief, more apparent every day  
of the loss of those two men - more regretted every day by  
those who know anything of the incalculable mischief

F.N.

June 7<sup>th</sup> / 64



COPY

*To Prof Longman*  
PRIVATE.

115, Park Street. W.

July 23 /64

My dear Sir,

I am afraid you will be rather surprised at me writing to you on the following subjects. But not so much surprised as I am at being desired to do so.

Lord de Grey is about to request you and Dr. Rutherford to represent the W.O. at the Geneva Conference in August. - & wishes you to have an authorized W.O. account with you as to our provision for sick and wounded in the Brit. Army.

The Conference has, as you know, advocated a voluntary international system of surveying and messing.

( I need hardly say that I think its views most absurd - just such as would originate in a little State like Geneva which never can see war. They tend to remove responsibility from Governments. They are practically impracticable . And voluntary effort is desirable just in so far as it can be incorporated into military system)

Our present system (military) is the result of voluntary additions to the Service made during the Crimean War, but was prepared to obviate the necessity of future voluntary efforts as far as possible.

If the present Regulations are not sufficient to provide

(cont.....

Cont.

-1-

for wounded, they should be made so. But it would be an error to revert to a voluntary system, or to weaken the military character of the present system by introducing voluntary effort, unless such effort were to become military in its organisation.

The W.O. proposes to draw up such a statement of our present arrangements as will satisfy the Geneva folk that every precaution has been taken and can be taken

(several lines cut out of page)

and make it as wrong and as complete as possible - then return it to me. I will send it to the W.O. and they will make an authoritative document out of it.

The matter rather presses, as the Conference meets early in August,

I am, My dear Sir,

*FNs* (Signature cut out)



Park Hill Haverstead N.W. - Aug 13<sup>th</sup>/64.

My dear Sir James Clark.. Dr. Lutherdale shewed  
me your letter & as usual left it for me to answer.

I enclose you all the direct communication I have had  
with the Professors about your subject. (Which was before  
I left London). Please return it to me. I have already  
communicated with the War Office confidentially -

Gibson was born to be our ruin - He is the mere tool  
of the C. in C. The Horseguards are the real Army Doctors  
managers - And Lord de Grey has not the ordinary courage  
or capacity to resist the D. of Cambridge altho' he is  
distinctly by position Master of the Commander in Chief -

Three years Sidney Herbert has been dead & these three years  
have been nothing but a slow undermining of all he has  
done. I am intriguing now to get Muir back, as  
Gibson's successor. - Sir Charles Wood is, if possible  
worse than Lord de Grey. I have done my best in the  
present emergency about Indian Medical Officers, &  
Gibson has done his worst to do away with Exam<sup>n</sup> & get  
back nomination. I am so pressed not only with Indian work,  
but with our undertaking the nursing of Liverpool for workhouse  
infirmary. That I can hardly write - ever Yrs Sincerely F N

I send you by book post a copy of the suggestion waited for & asked  
for by Sir J. Lawrence. - Please tell Mr Clark that I sent a copy to  
Mr H. ? of Madras, direct, accordingly.



COPY

*To Prof. Longman*

Hampstead N W

PRIVATE

Aug 25 / 64

My dear Sir,

I have only just heard of your return.

I have made all possible use, privately, of the information contained in the enclosed papers, which I return according to your desire.

I cannot believe that anything so preposterous and so destructive to the Medical School, will ever be entertained for a moment.

But, as you say, "forewarned is fore-armed" And I hope our present chief is now fore-armed.

At all events, it is a great comfort to me to know what you so kindly tell me, that the Professors of the Army Medical School, in whose hands its destinies really lie, and who have so wisely upheld them, are determined to maintain the intentions of the founder -

P.S. I would not neglect to tell you that your Memo. about the No. training of Orderlies was very valuable - I have always feared it would be so, that the miles of work at Netley would seriously interfere with the proper training. What I have ventured to advise the W.O. is this:-

That, in lieu of having another Commission, it should call upon Netley to furnish its own plan:- That the W.O. should ask the Governor, Col: W., to report to them on the present method of training Orderlies at Netley for Field Service, and, in consultation with the P.M.O., and Professors of the Medical School, to further report on any improvements in the means of training which experience may have suggested.

I hope this is the course the W.O. will adopt and I mention it to you, that you may see your suggestions have not been neglected and that you may put in your valuable advice at the consultation which will doubtless take place at Netley,

(cont....



Cont.

- 1 -

in pursuance of the W.O. letters - when it is sent.

I have no doubt that there must be special  
Instructors, as you suggest.

(*Signature Cut out*) (Sgd) F.N.

COPY

*Prof. Longmore*

PRIVATE

Hampstead N W

Aug 31 / 64

My dear Sir

I have to thank you very much for taking the trouble to send me M. Durant's pamphlet.

The W.O. sent me the MS copy of the printed Articles, (with other papers) furnished by you.

I agree with you that it will be quite harmless for our Govt. to sign the Convention as it now stands.

It amounts to nothing more than a declaration that humanity to the wounded is a good thing.

It is like an Opera chorus. And if the principal European characters sing, - We never will be cruel more.

I am sure, if England likes to sing too, - I never will be cruel more. I see no objection, but it is like vows. People who keep a vow would do the thing without the vow. And if people will not do it without the vow, they will not do it with.

England and France will not be more humane to the enemy's wounded for having signed the Convention. And the Convention will not keep some barbarous nations like Russia from being inhuman.

Besides which, tho' I do not reckon myself an inhuman person, I can conceive circumstances of "force majeure" in war where the more people are killed, the better.

I was asked my opinion by the W.O. when they sent me your MSS, or I should hardly have thought my opinion worth stating.

For the question appears to me really one for Lord Palmerston to settle.

Ever yours sincerely,

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE

---



COPY

34 South Street,  
Park Lane,  
London W.  
May 26 / 65

My dear Sir,

No doubt you have seen the accompanying little book on  
"Help in Accidents", which has been sent to me.

Will you be so good as to tell me what you think of it -  
and whether it would be at all an useful Aide - Memoire in your  
training of Orderlies for Field Service?

I congratulate you on your success in bringing about that  
object, which I really hope is now near its beginning.

Ever yours sincerely,

(Sgd) F. NIGHTINGALE

Please be so kind as return me the little book on  
"First Help in Accidents".

COPY

34 South Street,  
Park Lane,  
London W.

Oct 4 / 65

*To Prof Longmore*

My dear Sir,

I was sorry but not surprised at your note. How sorry  
I need hardly say.

I have taken such steps as I could, and hope to have to  
write to you again about it.

I at least have nothing new to say in repeating to the  
W.O. what I have always said, that you have made a hearty sacrifice  
of yourself and that they were not men, if they accepted of it.

But we have hardly a man now in the Govt.

Yours ever sincerely,

{Sgd.} F.NIGHTINGALE.

---



COPY

*90 Prof Longmore*  
PRIVATE

35 South Street,  
Park Lane,  
London W.

June 18 / 66

My dear Sir,

I have never thanked you for your pamphlet (Lecture)  
But I have directed the attention of the War Office to this  
point - viz. that the Ambulance Corps is not in training.  
We are indeed obliged to you for drawing attention to this.

I have been bragging about your perfect state of  
preparation to the Italian Govt. But I am afraid I have been  
saying what is not the case.

I hope (but I am tired of hoping) that the W.O. will put  
itself into communication with you, in order to see the thing done.  
We know not what a day may bring forth in Europe.

Believe me,

Ever faithfully yours.

(Sgd) FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE.

Prof Longmore Esq.,

---

COPY

PRIVATE.

BURN

35 South Street,

Park Lane,

London W.

Feb. 14 / 67

My dear Sir,

That is a desperate blunder indeed concerning which you have kindly sent me a copy of Dr. Smith's paper. I have written about it, without mentioning my authority on Dr. Smith's case, which, you say, has gone on to the Acting D.G. - (but I have as you know, small faith in anything that can be said or written now) However we shall see what comes of it.

About the other matter:- The Ladies' Committee for the Relief of the Sick and Wounded, - it had entirely slipped my memory. But it does not alter the substance of what I said. For that Committee had no more to do with the International Society (of Geneva) for Wounded - than it had to do with the London-Bridge Railway Terminus - Also it lasted just one fortnight - But, as I have made a blunder in telling you that there had been no Committee upon which I was, I had better tell you how this arose.

When war was first declared last year, I was applied to in private capacity, by Italy, Prussia and Hope Darmstadt, about the organization of Field and other War Hospitals, including Nursing. I was not asked for any other help. But, after Konigpratz, Mme. Schwabe (a German and a frantic Garibaldian and Prussian) the best heart and the worst head I know, was mad to get up a Subscription - I joined her, at her earnest request, in order to prevent mischief - but only on condition that all monies should be devoted to all sides.

The thing was meant to be entirely private, but, as no one of the ladies who gave their names gave the least assistance, and as money did not come in, Advertisements were put in for us, by a gentleman, We were not very successful.

1. English people like to feel enthusiastic pity for Austria - or enthusiastic rapture for Garibaldi. But they don't like merely to do good (out of England).
2. It was late in the year. People were hot and tired and rushing out of town.

Jenny Lind sang for us at a Concert, and got us some hundreds more. As for the Committee, it was mere moonshine. I believe nothing in kind was collected. I know they did not sit once. As to the precise good done, I believe it was more than if there had been a Committee. The money was put into the hands of responsible persons abroad, £50 and £100 at a time, who sent articles in kind in vans to the Hospitals near the

(cont....



Battle-fields. These, in Germany, as you know, held more wounded Austrians than Prussians.

Many of these Hospitals asked for Surgical Instruments - I demurred because if there is anything Governments should provide, it is surgical instruments. But the want seemed real And surgical instrument makers in London actually supplied us with some Instruments for a present and with more at cost price.

This was about the only assistance in kind we received.

So little of a Committee was it that, till Jenny Lind gave the Concert, I think one fourth of the whole sum came out of Mme.Schwabe's and my pockets.

I do not write this to howl at my fellow-creatures, but simply because I made such a blunder as to tell you there was no Committee and therefore I felt bound to tell you the whole story in a bridgement.

Please BURN.

The moral of the tale is the only part worth having:- And this is, that, having seen a good deal of the "depous des cartes" during the late War, I am more than ever convinced that Governments should be made responsible for their own Sick and Wounded - that they should not decline Volunteer private benevolent effort, but that, exactly in the measure that this is incorporated in, not substituted for - Government organizations (for Sick and Wounded) will it be useful. And exactly in the measure that it is not, will it become an evil.

I hope you agree with me.

I am bound to say that I think the Prussian organization wonderfully good.

Ever yours sincerely,

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE.

---

You have enlightened me very much. For I now see that the heaps of papers I have received addressed to me as "Secrtaire de Comite des Dames &c" (from the International Society) referred to this Committee, which is not.

COPY

*E. Prop. Longman*  
PRIVATE

35 South Street,  
Park Lane,  
London W.  
Feb 28 / 67

My dear Sir

I have had so serious a Chest attack that, for 17 nights I could scarcely lie down, And this must be my excuse for not answering sooner your last note.

I have asked about the "rank" of Surgeon Major (also the case about which you wrote to me)

It was done, I understand, by Sir I. Gibson and Sir E. Lugard. I fear all you have said about it is quite true. I have done what I can a second time in representing the matter. But I have not the least hope that anything wise will be done.

About the other thing: the (Geneva) Societe Internationale - unquestionably the best plan with us would be to render our Army Hospital Corps thoroughly efficient on its present basis and strength. No steps should be taken with the public in any country which should lead their War Office to think that its own work (the War Office's) will be done for it by any body else. After the Corps is thoroughly efficient, there would be little difficulty in devising a scheme for increasing it and admitting volunteer assistance. But the very first thing is, as you say, to make the very best of what we have and make it into an efficient nucleus. No amount of adding to inefficiency will make inefficiency into efficiency.

Ever yours sincerely,

(Sgd) FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE.



COPY

BURN <sup>2</sup>

*To Prof. Longman*

35 South Street,

Park Lane,

London W.

March 18 / 67

My dear Sir,

I have done all I can in the Surgeon-Major matter, and, as far as I know, without the slightest success.

I am told that there is "nothing for it but to have a question asked about it in the House of Commons".

I would gladly arrange for this being done, but that I do not expect any good from it. The Secretary of State would certainly answer (what is true) that it was done with the concurrence (if not at the instigation) of the Director Genl: Now too, Sir John Pilkington<sup>2</sup>, who knows nothing about his business, will be too glad to have this answer put.

But I saw no hope, under Genl. Pell, otherwise I could easily have got the question asked.

I think it however right to tell you what has been suggested to me, as you may wish, and easily find some M.P. to put a question in the House.

Ever yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) F. NIGHTINGALE.

---

COPY

35 South Street,

Park Lane,

W.

May 16 / 69

*Prof. Longmore*

My dear Sir

I was extremely obliged to you for your kind note of May 4, written after your return to London from Berlin.

Perhaps I ought to mention here that I did not receive any "telegram" from "the gentlemen attending "the International Conference" which, you say, was "despatched" to me.

I have not as yet seen your Treatise on the transport of sick and wounded issued by the W.O. But I shall read it with great interest when I do see it.

Within the last day or two, I have received the pamphlet of "Results" of the International Conference. I fear that the practical objections which struck us at the beginning will come up whenever this Convention is brought into active operation.

But I will not anticipate evil.

*F.N.S. Signature cut out*



COPY

35 South Street,

Park Lane,

W.

Feb 10 / 70

My dear Sir,

It is long since I have written to recall myself to your recollection.

A little book which M. Michel Levy, of the Val de Grace, has sent me (tho' I have no doubts you know it already) makes me wish to do so:- "Manuel de L'Infirmier de Visites Paris (J.Dumaine) 1866"

This little book contains the instructions for dressings etc. etc. etc. and appears superior to what has been issued before. We have a young lady of our own training now training at the Val de Grace - And she tells me that nothing can exceed the perfection of the training and discipline of Infirmiers under M. Levy. I have heard from other sources, (and I think too from yourself) that, during the last 2 or 3 years, notable progress has been made at the Val de Grace in this respect.

You have done so much for our Orderly Service that I thought I might venture to ask you whether you have M. Levy's last little Manuel in case you might like to order it.

Pray believe me (tho' in haste)

Ever your faithfull servt.

(Sgd) FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE.

Prof. Longmore Esq. &c &c &c.

COPY

Thos. Longmore Esq.,  
&c., &c.

35 South Street,

Park Lane,

W.

March 5 / 70.

My dear Sir,

In answer to your note, I am afraid that I should hardly feel justified in giving my judgment - or indeed have time to go so thoroughly into Dr. Moffitt's M.I. Manual as to justify any judgment of my own.

It would be incurring a responsibility which I feel, overworked as I am, that I am ill able to fulfil to you and him, But, if you and he would wish me to look over a Proof in type, I would gladly do this and make any suggestions which occur to me.

I am sincerely glad to hear that you have recovered from your Eye attack, which I am afraid was rather serious.

Could you kindly send me a copy of the Manual which I believe is given to each Orderly of the Army Hospital Corps? It is not for the purpose of criticism, but rather of help to myself. And if it is to be superseded in any way by Dr. Moffitt's proposed Manual, I will not give it away nor make further use of it, till I receive the improved form.

Pray believe me,

My dear Sir,

Ever your faithful Servt.

(Sgd) FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE.



COPY

35, South Street,

Park Lane,

Thos. Longmore Esq.,  
&c., &c.

W.

PRIVATE:

March 7 / 70

My dear Sir,

It occurred to me, in relation to your last note, and to the changes which are about to take place thro' the formation of the Army Service Corps, to ask you for information on the following points - the more so, as it is, I believe, the discipline of the "Infirmier" Corps at the Val de Grace which is envied by you and by me:-

1. Can there be any real discipline or progress among the Orderlies at Netley unless there is a tolerably stationary well trained Staff of N.C. Officers and men there, thoroughly knowing the Hospital business and able to train others?
2. Even for the raw ones is 3 months' training enough? And is it not almost ill advt, unless there are some Wardmasters and old Orderlies who are scarcely if ever changed?
3. Do not the trained men long to get away even before their training is complete, whether to "writing" posts or to Regimental posts, because owing to the amount of hard cleaning work at Netley which does not really forward their Hospital knowledge, they dislike Netley so much.

(lines cut out)

*(with M.N.'s Signature)*

Do not suppose that, if these evils exist, I do not know that you do not feel them as much as I do, and they may be impossible to alter. But I am sure that you will agree with me that a Training

(cont....)

Cont.

-1-

School, whether for men or women is scarcely more than a farce, unless the head "Infirmier" or Ward Masters, or Head Nurse or "Sister" (who train ) are permanent more or less



Copy

35. South St.

Park Lane. W.I.

My dear Sir,

31. 3. 76

I am concerned beyond measure at what you are so good as to write to me & am at the same time very thankful to you for writing it. - Depend upon me that I will do, & am doing, what I can, but that is, alas! so little now. And I am so over worked - (I will not mention your name). I agree with every word you say. - would this be possible. There will - if the school is continued) be a great influx of ten year men (as you say all candidates by the new arrangements are to enter on the 10 years plan) They will get £250 a year at once if after passing their initial Exam. They are gazetted & sent for 4 months to Netley - might they not pay for their board? (The School itself is a mere trifle in expense to the Country in return for such a good). The Short Service Argument is most extraordinary - that is to say that Short Service = Netley Training. One would think the Argument was just the other way. viz:- That the 4 months training for a man was too little for a man. - Who has to gain his experience & do his work all in ten years. 10 years is scarcely too much to gain experience in to take care of the Army sickners. and to keep Camps, Barracks, daily life, food, Equipment all in health. - is this to be learnt at any Civil Chair? or at any Station Hospital? - Where soon these new comers will have to learn of; but know as little

Copy

31.8.76 Continued

• The Special knowledge. As their pupils?

The "Civil Chains" come to you for information

- & all this to save the keep etc of the short  
service men!! I believe this to be simply an  
under sec<sup>n</sup> of States affair., but this, from the last  
ten years experience, increases, instead of diminishing  
my fears! Thank God, with you that I did  
not come 3 weeks ago - to disturb St. Parkes last hours

Play believe me - ever yours sincerely

<sup>to</sup> Professor Lygon. (Signed) Florence Nightingale

I have written to St. Lutheraud (Mr. Jean Sir  
his name should not tell him.) I wish Sir W. Jenner  
were in England -

Private I believe Mr. Hardy will be communicated  
with today -

31.8.76



35. Park St

Park Lane, W.

3.4.76

My dear Sir,

I assure you that I have never undervalued the Chair of Military Surgery. — nor the precious importance of the services of its present occupant. & if there could be an "Especially" where all is so important Especially of his acting as a consulting Govt. Servant. both with Foreign Countries & in his own — of his keeping us "au courant" of foreign improvements — of his forming a Museum of Military Surgery. &c. &c. — If you had seen the letter which I was invited to write — you would hardly have thought, but that I went even beyond yourself in attaching value to these things: — but not beyond the truth. And, I assure you that no one who knows you — could think that it was out of personal interest — that you would argue this point. I am much in hope that your (the Professor) statement — when it goes in, will be read by the S. of S. himself. — If he can but look into it himself so that the thing shall be put in this way: Refer to the Senate the arrangements necessary for this new Medical Department (10 years men) in its relation to the Medical School. The game is won. You, the Senate — will of course seek a personal interview with the S. of S.

Pray believe me

Yours anxiously but hopefully

(signed) Florence Nightingale

To Professor Longmore



Slightly  
Private Copy -

Professors Longmire

35. South Street

Park Lane W.

April 26<sup>th</sup> 176.

My dear Sir. - I feel as if I ought to thank you  
"an Courant" of affairs - as far as I know them. - as you  
have been so good as to keep me. Your Statement most  
able & perfectly unanswerable. was sent to the War  
Office. - but was not forwarded to Mr. Hardy. He has  
been informed about it however. - will read it. When he  
returns to London (today) & will, I am sure, study it himself  
carefully & without prejudice. (The Copy was forwarded  
to me by Dr. Ackland after reading it. & after reading it  
- with the greatest interest & admiration, forwarded it back  
to Dr. Ackland, that he might have it at hand - for his  
long conversation with Mr. Hardy at Oxford - which went off  
very well -) . . . I have proposed directly to Mr. Hardy.  
& with Dr. Ackland's assent & with his advice, as to who  
besides himself should serve on the Committee. - which  
you suggested. to go to Berlin to enquire into the teaching  
means of the School. & to report to him on best method  
of adapting these to the new conditions of things resulting  
from the new Army Medical Warrant - Of course we  
shall not hear what Mr. Hardy will do about this  
- till he has read himself your Statement. But I am  
sure he is going into the whole matter himself.



Copy

(Who is at Oxford)

Lord Salisbury & Mr. Ward Hunt have also been directly applied to about the School. - I have applied to another proposed member of the proposed Committee & he is willing to serve - I am too old & born to be habitually sanguine but I assure you there seems good reason to hope that the School may be developed, as it deserves - instead of abolished. - I have no time to arrange these notes in a form which you could communicate to your colleagues (it is better that my name should not come up at all as in communication with Mr. Hardy) therefore this is strictly "entre nous"; but should you wish, if I have told you anything they do not know & that you wish them to know - tell it them quite generally & that rests with your kindness - Pray believe me ever yours sincerely

(Signed) F. Nightingale

Could you kindly tell me where is to be bought the Manual of Instructions for N.C. Officers & men of the Army Hosp. Corps - I return Genl. Eyre's

letter with many thanks. - April 27<sup>th</sup>/96

a private intimation from Mr. Hardy himself that, having read the report of the Senate, "The School is Saved" - I presume he takes time to consider about the proposed Committee & the means of adapting to increased numbers

May God speed you all & us too

(original from F.K.,

herewith

(Signed)

F.N.

COPY

10 South Street,  
Park Lane, W.

Professor Longmore:-

May 26 / 83

My dear Sir,

I was extremely obliged to you for your kind note and for so kindly sending me your valuable and interesting pamphlet on the difference between the French and English Hospitals in the Crimea .

I might indeed have made a strong point of that: for I knew the French Inspectors General well: (one indeed called me his 'camarade') and the large contribution which were gladly accepted from our own personal stores in the second winter showed the wants of the unfortunate French sick.

I have not read the passages to which you refer, as contradicting them, I conclude they are in the last published Vol. Tho' the Vol. was kindly sent me, from what I heard all that was therein written about the Nursing part, both in matters and manner, was so sovereignly disagreeable to me that I did not open it. I was indeed grieved to hear of Dr. Aitken's serious illness ( I had not heard it before) I asked yesterday and was distressed that it still continued.

Perhaps you would give him when he is able the kindest of messages from me.

(cont.....)



cont.

-1-

Perhaps you would be so very kind as to let me know how  
he is going on.

Ever yours most faithfully,

(Sgd) FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE.

I am afraid I may hardly hope that you could attend the reading  
of my Indian paper. Yet I beg to enclose a card.

F.N.

COPY

10, South Street,  
Park Lane,  
W.

May 26 / 85

My dear Sir,

Might I venture to ask you what would be the proper method of sending a "Life of Gordon" pamphlet to be distributed, if approved, in your Hospital among the Invalids returned or returning from Egypt whose Commander died to save him.

I had this pamphlet - which is after all the best life of Gordon in a small Compass - reprinted for our troops, and I regret more than I can say that, owing to the dilatoriness of the printers, it is so late. 500 copies are gone to Egypt.

Would you if it is possible be so very kind as to arrange for the distribution of say 100 copies among the men of the London Expeditionary Force in Hospital at Netley, saying, if you please, that they are from me?

And would you if not too much trouble kindly tell me whether I may send them to you or to whom?

I know not to whom else to write at Netley, pray pardon me for troubling you.

Believe me,

Ever your faithful servt.

(Sgd.) FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE.

Professor Longmore.



COPY

P R I V A T E

Whatever to do with the (Geneva) International affair.  
I was told on high Prussian authority that its Object failed  
most signally at the disastrous Sadowa and after it - as  
compared with what was done by the Prussian Govt. and Army  
Surgeons and Staff for the Wounded and Hospitals.

F.N.

B U R N

COPY

ARMY MED. SCHOOL.

History (in Miss Nightingale's handwriting) of the Prof. of Pathology receiving a less salary than the other Professors at the first starting of the School.

The above memo. refers only to this particular paper.

It is necessary to explain how it came to pass that, while 3 Professors of the Army Med. School at Netley had each a salary of £700 a year, the fourth Professor has only £600. It arose as follows:-

At the time the R.Commission on the Sanitary State of the Army proposed an organization for the School, the only teacher attached to the then establishment at Chatham was the Curator of the Museum who gave lessons in Pathology to the young Medical Officers before they were sent to Regiments. The R.Commission recommended that the permanent appointment of 3 professors besides the Curator and the late Lord Herbert, after consultation with various persons, recommended that the salaries should be fixed for each professor at £700 and for the Curator at £600. At this same time a Commission appointed by Lord Panmure for organizing the School considered that it would be advisable to obtain the best teacher of Pathology who could be had and the appointment was offered at their suggestion to Dr.Aitken at the salary recommended by Lord Herbert, which Dr.Aitken accepted. But on proceeding with the arrangement it was very soon found that the teaching of Pathology as Dr.Aitken intended to carry it out (for he was an eminent teacher and a Pathologist at Scutari, before his appointment) was a very different matter from the Curator's lessons. That the Office was really an important Professorship as indeed it has proved itself to be. Besides which, when the Government of the School came to be organized, it was found that, while three titular Professors would have been members of the Senate, the teacher of Pathology would have had no voice in the government of the school or in the arrangement of his own Lectures, for as Curator he would have been simply an Officer to the Senate. In his - Lord Herbert, in his Warrant constituting the School, indented a Professor of Pathology instead of the Curator for the reason mentioned, and as it has happened that Dr.Aitken, a first rate teacher and one of the Professors has £600 a year, for doing a work equivalent to say the least of it, to that of the other Professors, who received each £700 a year

---